Involvement and attitudes in spoken discourse: So-called sentence-final particles in Japanese

Naomi Ogi

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of The Australian National University

March 2011
Declaration

Unless otherwise acknowledged in the text, this thesis is my own original work.

Naomi Ogi
Acknowledgements

I am indebted to the many people who have given me invaluable assistance throughout the years. This thesis could not have been completed without the help, support and encouragement of many of my teachers and my friends, as well as my family.

First, I would like to express my gratitude to my principal supervisor, Dr. Duck-Young Lee for his invaluable intellectual criticism and discussions. Without his enormous support, including reading diligently through my drafts and providing me with insightful comments, this thesis would not have been as complete as it is. I sincerely appreciate him for his guidance and constant support. I would also like to thank my second supervisor, Dr. Timothy Hassall for his careful reading and constructive suggestions on my drafts. My sincere thanks also to my advisor, Mr. Shunichi Ikeda for sharing his expertise in the Japanese language and providing me with helpful suggestions. I owe particular thanks to Ms. Aya Horne and Mr. Christopher Hennessy for patiently reading through and editing my drafts. Without their attention to detail, I would not have been able to compile this thesis.

I wish to thank staff members at the Japan Centre, Mr. Shunichi Ikeda, Dr. Duck-Young Lee, Dr. Shunichi Ishihara and Dr. Carol Hayes for giving me the opportunity to teach. I also wish to thank Mr. Masahiro Toma, Ms. Yoko Yonezawa, Ms. Akane Narushima, Ms. Emi Yoshida, Ms. Shiori Watanabe, Dr. Tami Sato, Dr. Mami Iwashita and Ms. Hyunsu Kim, who allowed me to have the delightful experience of team teaching. I have been very fortunate to work with various people at the Japan Centre. The teaching has always been a source of energy for me. My gratitude also goes to other staff at the Japan Centre, Professor Li Narangoa, Dr. Peter Hendriks and Dr. Mark Gibeau, who have provided me with a warm and supportive environment. I would also like to express my gratitude to the Australian National University for a PhD scholarship and various grants for interstate and international conferences that I have received. These conferences have given me wonderful opportunities to update my knowledge of linguistics and language teaching, and widen my professional network of scholars and educators.
I would also like to heartily thank my caring, understanding, and supportive friends in Australia and Japan: Yoshimi Ookubo, Chizuru Kobayashi, Ikuyo Kawanishi, Mika Toda, Ayano Yasui, Kumiko Yamaguchi, Mitsuru Kudo, Naoko Inoue, Kaori Saito, Andrew Cock, Emi Kawaguchi, Takeshi Osada, Risa Osada, Masataka Nakagawa, Janelle Mahoney, Adam, Croft, Lee Jnani and Indi Utami. They have always made time for me and encouraged me in many ways.

My special thanks go to my parents Kazuo and Junko, and my sister Yoshimi for providing me with a nice home to come back to. I am very fortunate to have them as my family. Without their understanding, support, patience and love, getting here would not have been possible.

Canberra, Australia
February 2011
Naomi Ogi
Abstract

This thesis investigates Japanese interactive markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo,* and *ze,* with particular reference to their functions in spoken discourse. In the literature of Japanese linguistics (e.g. Saji, 1957; Uyeno, 1971; Cheng, 1987), these seven markers are widely acknowledged as *shuu-joshi* ‘sentence-final particles’ due to the fact that they generally appear in sentence-final positions. These markers are also well known as having conspicuous features in the following three respects. First, they are frequently used in spoken language, whereas they are rarely found in written language (e.g. Uyeno, 1971; Maynard, 1989; Katagiri, 2007). Second, the use of these markers does not affect the truth-condition of the propositional information of an utterance, and yet it plays an important role for the hearer’s interpretation of the utterance (e.g. Uyeno, 1971; Kose, 1997). Third, the use of these markers has certain effects on formality and gender. For example, they are more frequently used in casual conversation than in formal conversation (e.g. Uyeno, 1971; Maynard, 1989), and some of the markers, i.e. *na, wa,* *zo* and *ze,* are gender-specific and exclusively used by either men or women (e.g. Uyeno, 1971; Tanaka, 1977; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987).

As pointed out in many studies, the use of these markers is almost mandatory in Japanese conversation (McGloin, 1990; Ide and Sakurai, 1997; Hayashi, 2000; Katagiri, 2007), and thus numerous studies have been devoted to the issues related to the use of these markers for decades. Nonetheless, the majority of these studies have tended to focus only on partial aspects of these markers, and consequently the interactive nature of these markers has not fully been explored in an integrated manner. In light of the above-noted general features of the seven interactive markers, the current study assumes that the functions of these markers are closely related to the interactional aspect of language rather than the informational aspect of language, and takes an interactional approach to these markers, in conjunction with the notion of involvement (cf. Chafe, 1982, 1985; Gumperz, 1982; Tannen, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1989; Arndt & Janney, 1987; Lee, 2007; among others). By doing so, this study attempts to provide a synthetic analysis of the seven interactive markers in terms of the speaker’s attitude, formality and gender, and shed light on some aspects of the nature of spoken discourse in general, as well as of conversation patterns of the Japanese language in particular.
Throughout this study, it will be shown that while the general function of the seven interactive markers is to signal the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement, these markers can be divided into two groups according to the different ways of inviting the hearer’s involvement: (i) Incorporative: *ne, na* and (ii) Monopolistic: *yo, sa, wa, zo, ze*. Further, it will also be shown that these markers deliver different attitudes of the speaker within a respective manner, i.e. incorporative or monopolistic, and invoke their own unique effects which influence certain aspects of formality and gender.

By highlighting the general function of the seven interactive markers as a device for expressing the speaker’s attitude towards the hearer, the current study attempts to make a contribution to our understanding of how the speaker’s particular attitude can be manifested by a particular linguistic sign, and how that in turn affects some aspects of formality and gender. The findings of this study are also expected to contribute to Japanese language education with regard to the practical use of the seven interactive markers, as well as to second or foreign language education by suggesting the importance of enhancing socio-cultural understanding.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1. Aims and background

The aim of this study is to discuss Japanese interactive markers ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo and ze, with special reference to their functions in spoken discourse. In the literature of Japanese linguistics (e.g. Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Saji, 1957; Watanabe, 1968; Uyeno, 1971; Teramura, 1982; Cheng, 1987; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; McGloin, 1990; Miyazaki et al., 2002), these seven markers are widely known as shuu-joshi ‘sentence-final particles’ due to the fact that they generally appear in sentence-final positions\(^1\). By clarifying their functions in spoken discourse, the current study attempts to shed light on some aspects of the mechanism of our verbal exchange in general, and of conversation patterns of the Japanese language in particular.

The seven interactive markers are special in the following three respects. First, they are frequently used in spoken language (typically face-to-face conversation), whereas they are rarely found in written language (typically expository prose), as also pointed out in a number of studies (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Sakuma, 1983; Oishi, 1985; Maynard, 1989; McGloin, 1990; Hasunuma, 1998; Hayashi, 2000; Yonezawa, 2005; Katagiri, 2007; Izuhara, 2008). Let us look at (1) and (2) below. (1) is a conversational segment extracted from a face-to-face conversation between two female friends, while (2) is a paragraph of a written descriptive text from an article in the newspaper Yomiuri Shinbun.

\(^1\) Ne, na, yo and sa may also appear in non-sentence-final positions. See Section 1.2 for details.
A: Nantoka shitā atoni, koo kekkonsuru aite ga ireba
somewhat did after like this get married partner SUB there is CD
2 ii n da kedo ne.
good NOM BE but NE
‘It would be nice to have someone to marry after I get myself set up.’
3 B: Hontoo.
ture
‘I agree.’
4 A: Kekkoo juuyoo janai.
fairly important BE-NEG
‘It’s pretty important, isn’t it?’
5 B: Sore wa iru yo.
that TOP need YO
‘(You) need that (person).’
6 A: Zuutto hitorimi, dokushin tte iu no mo ne, kanashii to forever single spinsterhood QT say NOM also NE sad QT
7 omou yo, josei no baai wa.
think YO woman LK case TOP
‘I think it’s sad for women to be alone forever, too.’
8 B: Un, soo da ne.
yes so BE NE
‘Yes, I think so.’
9 A: Un, yappari ne, un. Watashi no tomodachi kekkoo,
yes as expected NE yes LK friend fairly
10 kekkonshinai tte hito ooi yo.
get married-NEG QT people many YO
‘Yeah, I thought so. I have quite a few friends who say they won’t get married.’
11 B: So.
su
‘Really?’
12 A: Ano, minna koo, eriito no michi o iku yoono, ko well everyone like this elite LK path OBJ go a sort of child
13 bakkari da Kara sa.
only BE because SA
‘Well, everyone is taking this sort of elite path, so.’ (CFF4)
(2) Tandem jitensha to yobareru futari nori no jitensha de
Tandem bicycle QT call-PASS 2-seater LK bicycle by
'Sekai-isshuu-ryokoo' ni, Minato ku Mita no shisutemuenjinia no
a.trip.around.the.world toward Minato.Ward Mita LK system.engineer APP
Aoki Fumiya san to Naomi san fusai ga choosenshiteiru.
Mr.Fumiya.Aoki and Mrs.Naomi wife.and.husband SUB challenge-PROG
Sudeni nisen yo nen shichi gatsu kara hantoshi kakete Hokubei,
already 2004 July from half.a.year take North.America
Tahichi, Oosutoraria nado Taiheiyoo shuhen no kuniguni o megutteori,
Tahiti Australia etc. Pacific vicinity LK countries OBJ have.toured
rainen shi gatsu kara, nokori no Nanbei, Ooshuu, Ajia, Afroika
next.year April from rest APP South.America Europe Asia Africa
no yaku yonjukkakoku o mawatte, mokuhyoo o tasseishitai
APP about 40.countries OBJ tour goal OBJ want.to.attain
kangae da.
thought BE

'Mr. Fumiya Aoki who is a system engineer at Mita in Minato Ward and his wife
Naomi are attempting 'a trip around the world' on a 2-seater bicycle called Tandem.
They have already been to areas surrounding the Pacific such as North America,
Tahiti and Australia, taking half a year from July 2004, and from April next year
they are thinking of reaching their goal by touring around another 40 or so countries
in South America, Europe, Asia and Africa.' (Yomiuri Newspaper, 2006)

What is clearly observed in the comparison of (1) and (2) is that in the conversation (1)
the markers ne, yo and sa appear four times, three times and once, respectively, whereas
in the article (2) they do not appear at all. Of course, this data is limited, but they are
well-considered representative examples of the typical use of the seven interactive
markers in spoken language, and non-use in written language. As pointed out in many
studies, it is indeed difficult and unnatural to have a conversation without using these
interactive markers in Japanese (McGloin, 1990; Ide and Sakurai, 1997; Hayashi, 2000; Katagiri, 2007). Conversely, if they were used in a written article, as illustrated below, sentences would begin to indicate the speaker’s attitude of drawing the other person’s attention, such as ‘Listen. I want to tell you something’ or ‘Don’t you think?’ (See also (3) below). With such attitudes of the speaker, the sentences are seen to be delivered to the particular hearer and can no longer be regarded as a written article.

(2)’ (Redisplay of (2) with the interactive markers used in an appropriate manner)

Tandemu jitensha to yobareru futari nori no jitensha de sa ‘Sekai-isshuu-ryokoo’ ni ne, Minato ku Mita no ne shisutemu enjinia no Aoki Fumiya san to Naomi san fusai ga ne choosenshiteiru yo...

The frequent use of the seven interactive markers in spoken language and their non-use in written language suggest the possibility that these markers have certain functions peculiar to spoken discourse.

The second point is that the use of the seven interactive markers does not affect the truth-condition of the propositional information of an utterance, and yet it plays an important role for the hearer’s interpretation of the utterance (Uyeno, 1971; Sakuma, 1983; Chino, 1991; Kose, 1996, 1997; Hasunuma, 1998). This point is exemplified in (3) below, which is extracted from Kose (1997) (The English translation of each utterance is also given by the author).

---

2 In fact, in the conversation (1), without ne in line 8 and yo in line 10, the utterances would sound odd.

3 Kose (1997) does not provide examples for our targeted markers na and ze. However, these markers also share the property discussed here with the other five markers given in (3).
(3) a. Taroo wa uta ga umai yo.
   Taro TOP song SUB is.good.at YO
   ‘Taro sings well, (I tell you).’

b. Taroo wa uta ga umai zo.
   Taro TOP song SUB is.good.at ZO
   ‘Taro sings well, (damn it!).’

c. Taroo wa uta ga umai wa.
   Taro TOP song SUB is.good.at WA
   ‘(Oh), Taro sings well…’

d. Taroo wa uta ga umai sa.
   Taro TOP song SUB is.good.at SA
   ‘Taro signs well, (naturally).’

e. Taroo wa uta ga umai ne.
   Taro TOP song SUB is.good.at NE
   ‘Taro sings well, (doesn’t he?)’
   (Kose, 1997: 119)

As shown in the English translations, all the sentences have the same truth-conditional value with respect to the propositional information; that is, the speaker’s positive judgement about Taro’s ability of singing, i.e. ‘Taro sings well’. Further, as specifically indicated in the brackets, each marker conveys a different nuance such as ‘I tell you’ with yo, ‘damn it’ with zo, ‘Oh’ with wa, ‘naturally’ with sa or ‘doesn’t he?’ with ne⁴, and these different nuances associated with the different markers delineate the hearer’s different interpretations of the given utterance. From this, what we can see is that these

---

⁴ Note that these interpretations of the given markers are not comprehensive ones, and a detailed discussion of the nuance delivered by the use of each marker will be given in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. I present them here for the purpose of demonstrating the point discussed.
markers function beyond the mere conveyance of information and may be closely related to the non-referential meaning of language.

The third point is that the use of the seven interactive markers has certain effects in terms of the socio-cultural perspective. For example, a number of studies point out the general effect of these markers on the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer (Tokieda, 1951; Uyeno, 1971; Suzuki, 1976; Tanaka, 1989; McGloin, 1990; Masuoka, 1991; Shirakawa, 1992; Hayashi, 2000). Some point out more specifically an influence of these markers in connection with the tone of an utterance, e.g. ‘softening’ or ‘strengthening’, to which they are attached (e.g. Uyeno, 1971; Suzuki, 1976; Masuoka, 1991; Izuhara, 1996; Lee, 2007), or in connection with their more frequent use in casual settings than in formal situations (e.g. Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Oishi, 1985; Maynard, 1989; Oota, 1992). With respect to the socio-cultural perspective, another informative fact is that the use of some markers, i.e. na, wa, zo and ze, is sensitive to the gender of the speaker. To be brief, wa is mainly used by female speakers, whereas na, zo and ze by male speakers (e.g. Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Tanaka, 1977; Ide, 1982, 1990; Reynolds, 1985; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; McGloin, 1990, 1997; Miyazaki et al., 2002). This implies that the socio-cultural connection should be included in a full analysis of the functions of these markers.

Thus far, I have summarised some conspicuous features of our seven targeted interactive markers and have shown that they play a significant role in Japanese spoken discourse. The issues related to the use of these markers are not new. In fact, from an

---

5 The term ‘non-referential’ is used in the current study in a way that is close to the term used to refer to one of the two types of information which language generally conveys such as ‘emotive’ (Jakobson, 1960), ‘interpersonal’ (Halliday, 1970), ‘social-expressive’ (Lyons, 1977), ‘transactional’ (Brown and Yule, 1983) and ‘non-referential’ (Maynard, 1993), as opposed to ‘referential’ (Jakobson, 1960), ‘ideational’ (Halliday, 1970), ‘descriptive’ (Lyons, 1977), ‘transactional’ (Brown and Yule, 1983) and ‘referential’ (Maynard, 1993).
early stage in the study of modern Japanese a number of studies have acknowledged the importance of these markers in conversation, and have taken various approaches in an effort to analyse their functions (A review of these studies will be given in Chapter 2). Further, some of these studies have correctly pointed out that the use of these markers do not affect the propositional content of an utterance and that their functions are closely related to the interactional aspect of utterances; that is, the expression of the speaker’s concern towards the hearer (e.g. Tokieda, 1951; Saji, 1957; Watanabe, 1968; Suzuki, 1976; Teramura, 1982; Sakuma, 1983; Lee, 2007). Nevertheless, the majority of previous studies to date have tended to account for the use of these markers from the perspective of the state of information that each conversational participant possesses (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Moriyama, 1989; Kamio, 1990, 1994; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Squires, 1994; Han and Kaya, 1996; Ohama, 1996; Nishikawa, 2007). As will be shown in Chapter 2, this ‘information-state-based’ account largely relies on the informational aspect of utterances alone, and thus faces difficulties in providing a systematic and sufficient account for the interactive nature of these markers.

There are also studies which have tried to explicate the interactional and/or social aspects of the seven interactive markers. For example, some studies have examined these markers as interactional resources by which the speaker manages turns (Tanaka, 2000) or negotiates an interactional space (or conversational move) of on-going interaction (Morita, 2005). Some others have analysed these markers from the viewpoint of formality and/or politeness (e.g. Fujiwara, 1991; Cook, 1992; Sasaki, 1992; Izuhara, 1994; Kusumoto, 1994; Usami, 1997; Hayashi, 2000; Onodera, 2004; Fukushima et al., 2007, 2008). These studies have offered insightful analyses in their
own right. Yet, they have also tended to focus only on partial aspects of the markers, and as a result have failed to provide an integrated analysis of the markers (cf. Chapter 2).

Given the above-noted three general features of the seven interactive markers, the current study intends to take an interactional approach\(^6\) to the use of these markers, in conjunction with ‘involvement’, which is a key notion of spoken discourse, and to provide a synthetic analysis of these markers in incorporating other key notions such as formality and gender, which are particularly influential on the use of these markers. With this intention, the study assumes that the ‘involvement-based’ approach proposed by Lee (2007) is effective for the current analysis and adopts its initial spirit as a theoretical basis for the study\(^7\). As will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4, the ‘involvement-based’ approach adopts the notion of involvement in close connection with a role of the speaker’s attitude in spoken discourse, and sets up ‘involvement’ and ‘the speaker’s attitude’ as core components of the analysis of the markers *ne* and *yo*. To be more precise, within this approach the general function of these two markers is seen as signalling the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement, and yet they differ in the way that they indicate different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer’s involvement. In short, in light of the importance of the interactional functions of the seven interactive markers in spoken discourse, the current study views them as a

\(^6\) What I mean by ‘interactional approach’ is not situated in sequentially based approaches such as turn-taking systems. Rather, it focuses on the effect of the speaker’s use of the markers on the hearer, and how the markers operate within social contexts.

\(^7\) As a detailed discussion will be presented in Chapter 4, Lee (2007) takes this approach in order to account for the interactive nature of *ne* and *yo*. This approach will be expanded in the current study to analyse our other five targeted markers *na, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*. 
type of 'Discourse Markers'\textsuperscript{8}, which express different attitudes of the speaker towards the hearer through involvement, and consequently derives certain expressive effects which influence the speaker’s use of these markers within social contexts particularly in terms of formality and gender.

To summarise, the current study ultimately aims at clarifying the functions of the seven interactive markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*, by addressing the following research questions:

(i) Why are these markers mainly used in spoken language, whereas rarely used in written language?

(ii) What is the common property shared by these markers?

(iii) What is the unique function of each marker?

(iv) What effects does the use of each marker have, and how do these effects influence the speaker’s use of the marker within social contexts?

As frequently reported in the literature, it is often very difficult for learners of Japanese to comprehend what is expressed by different interactive markers and also difficult to use the right marker in a given situation (e.g. Mizutani, 1984; Ohso, 1986; Hayashi, 2000; Morita, 2005; Yonezawa, 2005; Ko, 2008). As noted earlier, since our seven targeted interactive markers play an important role in Japanese conversation, it is necessary for us to clarify their functions including their similarities and differences, and to explain to the learners the possible social consequences associated with the use of these markers. In this respect, I hope that the current study will be able to make a

\textsuperscript{8} In 1.2, I provide an overview of the literature on Discourse Markers and explain why I treat our targeted markers as a type of Discourse Markers and also why I call them ‘interactive markers’ in this thesis.
contribution not only to the area of linguistics, but also to the area of Japanese language education.

1.2. Discourse Markers and the term ‘interactive markers’

In Japanese, the word class of *joshi* ‘particles’ is basically divided into *kaku-joshi* ‘case particles’, *fuku-joshi* ‘adverbial particles’, *kakari-joshi* ‘sentence-inner associative particles’, *setsuzoku-joshi* ‘connective particles’, *shuu-joshi* ‘sentence-final particles’ and *kantoo-joshi* ‘sentence-medial particles’ (cf. Yamada, 1936; Hashimoto, 1948; Matsumura, 1969, 1971; Kokugo Gakkai, 1980; Kuwayama, 1981; Morita, 1981; Iori et al., 2000)\(^9\). As stated earlier, our targeted markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* are widely treated as *shuu-joshi* ‘sentence-final particles’. Further, of these markers, *ne, na, yo* and *sa* are viewed as *kantoo-joshi* ‘sentence-medial particles’ as well, since they may also occur in sentence-initial or sentence-medial positions (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Watanabe, 1968; Uyeno, 1971; Tanaka, 1977; Haga, 1978; Kuwayama, 1981; Teramura, 1982; Konoshima, 1983; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Hatsukano, 1994; Izuhara, 2008)\(^10\). Brief examples of these two types of particles, i.e. sentence-final particles and sentence-medial particles, have been given earlier in (1) and (3). While these two types of particles are termed as such on the basis of the locations in which they may appear in a sentence, it is an interesting issue whether or not they are also different from each other in terms of their functions. I will discuss this issue in

---

\(^9\) The classification of *joshi* ‘particles’ is slightly different among the studies. The characteristics of *joshi* ‘particles’ are well summarised in Matsumura (1971), Kokugo Gakkai (1980), Kuwayama (1981), and Iori et al. (2000).

\(^10\) Some studies (Konoshima, 1983; Izuhara, 1994a, 2001) further divide the particles which occur in non-sentence-final positions into two, i.e. *kandooshi* ‘interjections’ for those used alone or in sentence-initial positions, and *kantoo-joshi* ‘sentence-medial particles’ for those used in sentence-medial positions. As will be stated later in this section, I also include an analysis of the non-sentence-final use of our four targeted markers *ne, na, yo* and *sa* in the current study.
Chapter 4 (Also see Chapters 5 and 6 for the non-sentence-final use of each marker in detail).

As briefly mentioned in the prior section, one of the characteristics peculiar to our targeted markers is that they do not add any semantic component to the propositional content of an utterance, yet their role is closely related to the hearer’s interpretation of the utterance. This implies that the use of these markers is linked to the ‘non-referential’ meaning of language rather than to the ‘referential’ one, and in this connection I find that the study of Discourse Markers (e.g. Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1990, 1996, 1999; Redeker, 1990; Erman, 2001) is relevant to the current analysis. In this section, I will present an overview of the literature on Discourse Markers and show the close resemblance between Discourse Markers and our targeted markers in terms of their interactional functions in spoken discourse. I will also note why I adopt the term ‘interactive markers’ instead of ‘sentence-final particles’/‘sentence-medial particles’ or ‘Discourse Markers’ to refer to our targeted markers throughout this study.

The study of Discourse Markers has long gained considerable attention in the area of linguistics. However, as pointed out in a number of studies (e.g. Jucker, 1993; Jucker and Ziv, 1998; Fraser, 1999; Louwere and Mitchell, 2003; Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen, 2004; Taboada, 2006), what is often referred to by the term ‘Discourse Markers’ has been, in fact, studied under a variety of labels such as discourse marker (e.g. Schiffrin, 1987; Redeker, 1990, 1991; Fraser, 1990, 1996; 1999; Schwenter, 1996; Jucker and Ziv, 1998; Archakis, 2001; Erman, 2001; Fuller, 2003; Taboada, 2006), pragmatic marker (e.g. Redeker, 1990; Fraser, 1990, 1996; Brinton, 1996; Anderson and Fretheim, 2000; Erman, 2001; Chen and He, 2001), discourse connective (Blakemore, 1987, 1992), discourse operator (Redeker, 1991), discourse particle (James, 1983;
Schorup, 1985), pragmatic expression (Erman, 1987), cue word (Horne et al., 2001), pragmatic particle (Östman, 1981; Fried and Östman, 2005), and so forth. Jucker and Ziv (1998) note that such terminological diversity reflects a variety of approaches taken by each study and the difficulty in defining the function and scope of Discourse Markers.

Nevertheless, according to Jucker and Ziv (1998), some of these different terms are used in a relatively restricted manner. For example, the term ‘discourse connective’ tends to refer to elements such as so and therefore, and the term ‘discourse particle’ tends to be used for particular elements in German, Dutch, and Norwegian, which seem to function differently from those elements in English that are generally referred to as Discourse Markers. Furthermore, Jucker and Ziv (1998) note that the term ‘pragmatic expression’ tends to be used particularly for markers that consist of more than one word such as you know, you see or I mean. Compared to such terms used in a limited range, the terms ‘discourse marker’ and ‘pragmatic marker’ have been adopted in a wider range of ways in different language contexts: for example, Tchizmarova (2005) for Bulgarian; Chen and He (2001) for Chinese; Jucker (1983), Blakemore (1987), Schiffrin (1987), Fraser (1990, 1996, 1999), Redeker (1990, 1991), Brinton (1996), Jucker and Ziv (1998), Lenk (1998), Montes (1999), Anderson and Fretheim (2000), Erman (2001), Schourup (2001), Fuller (2003) for English; Vlemings (2003), Dorgeloh (2004) for French; Archakis (2001) for Greek; Wouk (2001) for Indonesian; Matsui (2002), Onodera (2004), Kim (2005) for Japanese; Soares da Silva (2006) for Portuguese; Schwenter (1996), Montes (1999) for Spanish; and Furman and Özyürek (2007) for Turkish. Below, I provide an overview of previous studies which have discussed the
function of Discourse Markers under the terms ‘discourse marker’ and ‘pragmatic marker’.

Fraser (1990, 1996, 1999) uses both terms ‘discourse marker’ and ‘pragmatic marker’ in examining English markers, in which discourse markers are a subset of pragmatic markers. According to Fraser (1996), sentence meaning contains two types of information: content, i.e. propositional, and pragmatic, i.e. non-propositional. The former “represents a state of the world which the speaker wishes to bring to the addressee’s attention” (Fraser, 1996: 167), whereas the latter “signals the speaker’s potential communicative intentions” (Fraser, 1990: 386; 1996: 168) and can be marked by pragmatic markers. Pragmatic markers are further categorised into four subtypes: basic markers, commentary markers, parallel markers and discourse markers. Fraser (1996) identifies discourse markers as expressions such as now, well, so, however and then, which signal a ‘sequential relationship between the current message and the prior discourse’, and distinguishes them from the other pragmatic markers such as (i) basic markers, e.g. I promise and please, which signal more or less specifically the illocutionary force of the sentence proposition, (ii) commentary pragmatic markers, e.g. certainly, frankly and amazingly, which signal messages that comment on the content meaning of the sentence, and (iii) parallel markers, e.g. John, waiter, and y’know, which signal messages in addition to the primary message conveyed by the sentence. Within Fraser’s (1996) framework, interjections, e.g. oh and yeah, and expressions including y’know and I mean, are excluded from the members of discourse markers because, for instance, y’know signals the speaker’s attitude of solidarity, not a sequential discourse relationship, although they are often seen as ‘discourse markers’ in other studies: for example, Schiffrin (1987), Redeker (1990), Jucker and Smith (1998), Montes (1999),

Similarly, Erman (2001) regards discourse markers as a subset of pragmatic markers. Erman (2001) identifies three functional domains such as textual, social and metalinguistic domains, and notes that pragmatic markers are used as monitors in communication across these domains. Erman (2001) gives the following examples of the pragmatic marker *you know* and shows how the marker functions in each domain.

(4) a. Textual monitor

```
<1> That woman, you know, that advert, the thingy [she does]
<2> [Right] the woman out of the advert, right. (Erman, 2001: 1343)
```

b. Social monitor

```
<1> *Er you know* I told you that thingy?
<2> What?
<1> (continues) (Erman, 2001: 1346)
```

c. Metalinguistic monitor

```
<1> I didn't realize what I was doing. Idunno.
<2> You're so stupid! *You know.*
<1> Yeah, yeah erm.

Melanie was talk ... I was talking to Melanie about <unclear> and Melanie goes to me <unclear> if you go out with him, and you realize that I'm mad, and you pull your eyes out of your head!
<2> (laugh) (Erman, 2001: 1347)
```
According to Erman (2001), the function of pragmatic markers as textual monitors, as in (4a), is to structure and edit the discourse in order to create coherence of the text. Erman (2001) uses the term ‘discourse markers’ to indicate the pragmatic markers which specifically function in this domain. Further, Erman (2001) notes that, as social monitors in (4b), the pragmatic marker negotiates signals such as ‘Can I butt into the conversation here?’, ‘You can go on speaking and I’m still listening’, ‘Can I get some response, please?’ and ‘Could you listen to me, please?’ in order to ascertain or elicit audience involvement. Finally, Erman (2001) states that in the metalinguistic domain in (4c) the pragmatic marker functions to show the speaker’s attitude towards the propositional content, e.g. the illocutionary force.

In contrast to the above two studies in which the term ‘discourse marker’ is used in a limited scope, some studies adopt the term in a relatively broad manner. For instance, Schiffrin (1987: 31) defines discourse markers in general as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk”. Schiffrin (1987) further notes that they operate in one or more distinct planes of discourse (See (5) below) and provide contextual coordinates for an utterance, thereby contributing to the integration of discourse, that is, to discourse coherence. The five planes of discourse proposed by Schiffrin (1987) are well summarised by Fraser (1999) as follows:

(5) Schiffrin’s (1987) five planes of discourse (imported from Fraser, 1999: 934)

**Exchange Structure**, which reflects the mechanics of the conversational interchange (ethnomethodology) and shows the result of the participant turn-taking and how these alternations are related to each other
**Action Structure**, which reflects the sequence of speech acts which occur within the discourse

**Ideational Structure**, which reflects certain relationships between the ideas (propositions) found within the discourse, including cohesive relations, topic relations, and functional relations

**Participation Framework**, which reflects the ways in which the speakers and hearers can relate to one another as well as orientation toward utterances

**Information State**, which reflects the ongoing organisation and management of knowledge and metaknowledge as it evolves over the course of the discourse

Taking Schiffrin (1987) a step further, Redeker (1990: 372) defines a discourse marker as “a linguistic expression that is used to signal the relation of an utterance to the immediate context”, and provides two types of discourse markers, i.e. ideational markers and pragmatic markers, based on the notion that “content structure and pragmatic structure are two complementary aspects of one paradigm of discourse coherence” (Redeker, 1990: 369). Redeker (1990) revises the five planes of discourse proposed by Schiffrin (1987), and suggests that these markers contribute to Redeker's (1990) model of discourse coherence which consists of ideational structure, rhetorical structure and sequential structure. The revision is made on the basis of Redeker's (1990) view that the information structure and participation framework previously suggested by Schiffrin (1987) are not independent of the other three, and thus should be incorporated into them.

Taking the coherence link specified in the model into account, Redeker (1990) identifies discourse markers as the markers of ideational structure and of pragmatic structure. The former includes (i) simple connectives, e.g. *that, who, which*, (ii)
semantically rich connectives, e.g. *how*, *why*, *meanwhile*, *then*, *because*, *so* and (iii) other temporal adverbials, e.g. *now, after that, all this time*. The latter (Redeker calls this group of markers ‘pragmatic markers’) includes (i) pragmatic uses of conjunctions, e.g. *(and)* *so, because, but*, (ii) interjections, e.g. utterance-initial uses of *oh, all right, okay, anyway and well,* and utterance-final tags such as *okay? and right?,* and (iii) comment clauses, e.g. *you know, I mean, mind you, but anyways*. In Redeker (1991), it is suggested that the term ‘discourse marker’ needs to be changed to ‘discourse operator’ since the term ‘discourse marker’ is more pragmatically biased. Redeker (1991:1168) defines the discourse operator as “a word or phrase — for instance, a conjunction, adverbial, comment clause, interjection — that is uttered with the primary function of bringing to the listener’s attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context”.

It is clear from the discussion provided so far that the function and scope as well as the definition of Discourse Markers vary from study to study\textsuperscript{11}. As pointed out by Archakis (2001), these differences reflect alternative conceptions of the overall organisation of discourse, e.g. textual, attitudinal, cognitive and interactional parameters, and there are various points to which one may specifically object. Nonetheless, a group of markers under the term ‘Discourse Markers’ are seen as having some common features. From the syntactical and semantic point of view, Archakis (2001) and Fuller (2003) note:

(i) Discourse markers are syntactically separated from the rest of the sentence, and thus they can be omitted without syntactic changes.

\textsuperscript{11}In addition to the studies introduced in this section, there are a number of well-known studies on the issue of Discourse Markers: for example, Blakemore (1987, 1992) and Brinton (1996).
(ii) Discourse markers do not add anything to the propositional content of an utterance nor do they affect its truth conditions, and thus omitting them has no effect on the truth-conditional meaning of the utterance.

(iii) Discourse markers are used to signal relationships between discourse units in order to create discourse coherence.

Further, focusing on the aspect of social interaction, Travis (2005: 48) summarises three common features of Discourse Markers as follows:

Discourse markers
(i) indicate how an upcoming or prior utterance is to be understood in the context of the surrounding discourse;

(ii) in so doing, can indicate the speaker's attitude to the message content as well as addressee; and

(iii) thereby can also be used by the speaker to appeal to the addressee to play the participatory role the speaker desires.

As previously noted, our targeted markers do not add any semantic component to the propositional content of an utterance, and this is a feature that is shared with Discourse Markers, as seen above. More importantly, Discourse Markers and our targeted markers are also similar at the functional level. That is to say, both are closely related to each other in terms of their interactional functions in spoken discourse. Note that although Discourse Markers are seen to be multi-functional, their interactional functions are widely acknowledged in many studies including Schiffrin (1987) and Travis (2005) shown above. Further, Giles et al. (1979) and James (1983) more precisely claim that Discourse Markers make a large contribution to the interaction in
the sense that the markers "permit interlocutors indirectly to communicate important attitudes, beliefs, values and intentions about their own social states as well as processing the emotional significance of the social states of others" (Giles et al., 1979: 344), and they are "vehicles for the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relations between interlocutors" (James, 1983: 193).

Such interactional functions of Discourse Markers are observed in our targeted markers as well. Indeed, some studies have shed light on the functions of our targeted markers in close connection with certain aspects of interaction (Tanaka, 2000; Morita, 2005; Lee, 2007)\(^{12}\). Furthermore, it is well known that the use of our targeted markers has certain effects on the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants (Tokieda, 1951; Uyeno, 1971; Suzuki, 1976; Tanaka, 1989; McGloin, 1990; Masuoka, 1991; Shirakawa, 1992; Hayashi, 2000). As noted in 1.1, the current study also assumes that our targeted markers are closely related to the interactional aspect of utterances in the way that they express the speaker's attitude towards the hearer through involvement, hence their interactional role is particularly significant for the maintenance of the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

In giving a particular focus on a close resemblance of the interactional functions of our targeted markers to those of Discourse Markers, I identify the former as a type of the latter, yet would like to refer to the former as 'interactive markers'. By doing so, I attempt to draw special attention to the functional importance of our targeted markers at an interactional level rather than at a discourse organisational level\(^{13}\). Moreover, the term is also intended to reflect the view of the current study about the fact that our

---

\(^{12}\) I will review the first two studies in Chapter 2 and the last in Chapter 4.

\(^{13}\) There are some other terms which are used to refer to so-called 'sentence-final particles': for example, 'interactional particle' (Maynard, 1997 for ne, na, yo, sa and no; Janes, 2000 for ne and yo; Morita, 2005 for ne and sa) and 'interactive particle' (Lee, 2007 for ne and yo). These terms also seem to reflect the interactional aspect of the given particles.
targeted markers have traditionally been treated as two types of particles, i.e. *shuu-joshi* ‘sentence-final particles’ (*ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo, ze*) and *kantoo-joshi* ‘sentence-medial particles’ (*ne, na, yo, sa*). Although this sub-group division is based on the positions in which they may appear in a sentence, these two are in fact the same in terms of their interactional functions, and can be unified as one\(^{14}\), which I shall refer to as ‘interactive markers’.

In sum, I regard our targeted markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* as a type of Discourse Markers, and in light of the importance of their non-referential functions, in particular their interactional functions in spoken discourse, I would like to refer to them as ‘interactive markers’ throughout this thesis.

1.3. Scope

In this section, I make some comments on the scope of the current study. As I have already mentioned several times, the current study examines the seven Japanese interactive markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*, which are generally used in sentence-final positions, as also indicated by their traditional name *shuu-joshi* ‘sentence-final particles’. What is meant by their use in such sentence-final positions is that they ‘mark’ the particular independent propositional information of a sentence. For instance, in (6) below *ne* appears in the sentence-final position and indicates the speaker’s intention of seeking the hearer’s alignment with respect to the propositional information, *Tookyoo wa atsui* ‘Tokyo is hot’.

\(^{14}\) As noted earlier, a detailed discussion of this issue will be presented in Chapter 4.
(6) Yappari, Tookyo wa atsui desu ne.
as.expected Tokyo TOP hot BE NE
‘Just as expected, Tokyo is hot, isn’t it.’ (FMM3)

Note that the seven markers analysed in the current study are not the only ones which have been categorised as sentence-final particles by Japanese linguists. For example, in Suzuki (1976), zo, ze, sa, na, ka, yo, ya, i, ne, no, kashira and mono are identified as sentence-final particles, and Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo (1951) also examines a number of particles including kedo, teba, tomo, te, ni, ke and koto, under the term of sentence-final particles. Although these particles also deserve further investigation, due to the limited timeframe given for this study, its scope is limited to the seven ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo and ze, which are frequently observed in daily conversation and have often been collectively targeted in previous analyses (e.g. Saji, 1957; Uyeno, 1971; Cheng, 1987; McGloin, 1990; Miyazaki et al., 2002).

As stated earlier, the four targeted markers ne, na, yo and sa may also appear in non-sentence-final positions. Taking ne as an example, (7) below illustrates the cases of its non-sentence-final use.

(7) a. Nee, nanka niowanai?
NE something smell-NEG
‘NE, don’t you smell something?’ (HD10)

b. Demo ne, ore ne, saisho ne, daigaku haitta toki ne...
but NE I NE beginning NE university entered time NE
‘But, I, at the beginning, when I entered the university...’ (CMF3)

---

15 These particles also share a common property that involves the interaction between the conversational participants.
In (7a) *Nee* (*ne*’s variant) appears in the sentence-initial position, and in (7b) *ne* is used four times in the sentence-medial position. Roughly speaking, their use is to draw the hearer’s attention, and, again, none of the *ne* are associated with any particular part of the propositional information. The current study will also include such non-sentence-final use of the four markers, and attempt to provide a unified account for their interactional functions regardless of their positions in a sentence.

It should also be noted here that the three targeted markers *na*, *wa* and *zo* are reported to be used in monologues as well (Uyeno, 1971, Washi, 1997, Miyazaki et al., 2002 for *na*, *wa*, and *zo*; Cheng, 1987, McGloin, 1990 for *na* and *zo*; Hattori, 1992, Tokui, 1995, Nakazaki, 2004a, 2004b for *wa* and *zo*; Washi, 1995, Izuhara, 1996, Imao, 2000, Miyazaki, 2002, Shinoda, 2006 for *na*; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951 for *zo*). While further careful investigation is needed to clarify the issues related to their use in monologues, I exclude such usage of these markers from the scope of this study since the purpose of this study is to reveal the mechanism of how the speaker and the hearer facilitate and maintain interaction through their deployment of the seven interactive markers and to identify the interactional functions of these markers.

Finally, *wa* is sometimes seen as being used by men as well as women (cf. Studies listed in this paragraph). These two usages of *wa* are distinguishable in terms of intonation. *Wa* by female speakers in principle carries a rising intonation, while *wa* by male speakers carries a falling intonation (Tanaka, 1977; Ide, 1982; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; McGloin, 1990; Hattori, 1992; Oota, 1992; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Aizawa, 2003). However, what makes the relevant issue more complicated is the fact that *wa* with a falling intonation is reported to be used by female speakers as well (Hattori, 1992; Oota, 1992; Aizawa, 2003). Furthermore, this *wa* with a falling
intonation is sometimes treated as a dialect in particular regions such as Kansai and Hokkaido (Hattori, 1992; Washi, 1997; Aizawa, 2003). In Japanese there are indeed a number of dialectical variations concerning interactive markers (Maeda, 1961; Izuhara, 1996; Washi, 1997). For example, according to Maeda (1961), ze and sa in the Tokyo-standard variety is replaced by de and te in Osaka, respectively. The current study, however, focuses on the Tokyo-standard variety, and throughout this thesis the term ‘Japanese’ indicates the Tokyo-standard variety of modern Japanese, unless otherwise specified. Therefore, I deal with wa used by female speakers only in order to avoid an unnecessary dispute with respect to the issue of dialects.

As in the case of wa above, intonation often plays an important role in spoken discourse, and indeed it may influence the interpretations of particular interactive markers, especially ne. It is, however, not my intention to explore this area in the current study. Rather, the study investigates the core functions of the seven interactive markers apart from the meanings of their intonational patterns. The current study will, thus, not in principle consider the intonational patterns of the seven markers systematically.

1.4. Methodology

The theoretical significance of the current study lies in an exploration of the nature of spoken discourse (or the mechanism of conversational exchange) which has been

---

16 According to Koyama (2004), standard varieties, such as the Modern Tokyo-Standard Japanese, are consciously articulated, ideologically prescribed normative standards to which are in principle accessible to anyone (‘public’ in a strong sense) and speakers’ behavioural and ideological (dis)loyalty to which indexes their group identities and power-statuses. See Koyama (2004) for more details.

17 For analyses between the functions of interactive markers and the intonational patterns, see, for example, Hashimoto (1992), Izuhara (1994a), Inoue (1997) and Eda (2001).
developed in terms of the notion of ‘involvement’, and of a role of linguistic signs that the speaker uses for the purpose of expressing his/her attitude towards the hearer. In the present study, I examine the seven interactive markers on the basis of discourse analysis, and attempt to show that these markers are an instance of linguistic signs which express the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer into conversation, hence leading to an increase of the dynamics of interaction.

Simpson (1998: 236) states that “the term ‘discourse analysis’ is both ambiguous and controversial”. In fact, depending on the focus of the analysis, the term is used to refer to a wide range of activities even within sub-disciplines of linguistics such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, speech act theory, conversation analysis, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics (Brown and Yule, 1983; Stubb, 1983; van Dijk, 1985; Schiffrin, 1987; Simpson, 1998; Cameron, 2001; Schiffrin et al., 2001). Nevertheless, Simpson (1998: 237) claims that:

“these approaches are united insofar as they share a common interest in analysing naturally occurring connected language. Furthermore, unlike other branches of linguistic inquiry, discourse analysis examines the organisation of language ‘above’ the level of the sentence, and in doing so explores the ways in which spoken and written texts are developed”.

Schiffrin (1994: 406-407) also notes that although there are a number of different approaches to discourse analysis, all the approaches can be used to address general problems such as “how one utterance contributes to the communicative content of another, how utterances are related to one another”, and further remarks that the view of ‘language as social interaction’ best unites these different approaches to the analysis of discourse. Schiffrin (1994: 419) argues that:
“it is difficult to separate language from the rest of the world. It is this ultimate inability to separate language from how it is used in the world in which we live that provides the most basic reason for the interdisciplinary basis of discourse analysis. To understand the language of discourse, then, we need to understand the world in which it resides…”

What is relevant to the current analysis of the seven interactive markers in connection with Schiffrin’s (1994) remarks given above is that the use of these markers is highly dependent on the contextual information made available in Japanese socio-cultural discourse, e.g. situational formality, the conversational participants’ age and social status and the speaker’s gender, so that it is fundamental for us to look at the use of these markers within a particular socio-cultural discourse. Furthermore, where these markers are syntactically and stylistically interchangeable, the different effects that such an interchange may bring to interaction — how each marker functions differently, thereby bringing complementary effects to interaction — must be explained, for which it is necessary to examine these markers on the level of conversational exchange and from the perspective of discourse organisation of which they play a part and of which they assist in the creation of dynamic discourse.

To sum up, the current study investigates the interactional functions of the seven interactive markers within the parameters of discourse analysis. In doing so, I adopt the related key notions of involvement, formality and gender, and offer a synthetic approach to the functions of these markers in spoken discourse. I will discuss the key notions in detail in Chapter 3.
1.5. Data and presentation

The data for this study consists of two types of sources (The full reference for the data is given in ‘Data sources’ under ‘Bibliography’). One is the conversational corpora of Japanese spoken language (Usami, 2007a, 2007b) and the other is Japanese comics. The former is further composed of two sub-data sets:

(i) ‘The Corpus of Japanese Spoken Language by ‘Basic Transcription System of Japanese — Japanese Conversation 1’ (ninety-nine conversations in total; approximately twenty-seven hours) (Usami, 2007a)

(ii) ‘The Corpus of Spoken Language in Multi Languages by ‘Basic Transcription System — Japanese Conversation 1’ (one-hundred-sixteen conversations in total; approximately twenty-four hours) (Usami, 2007b)

In both data sets, each conversation is carried out by a different pair of native speakers of Japanese. These data sets include conversations between two males, two females or a male and a female, in a wide variety of settings such as telephone, debate, first meeting, and chat between friends. In considering various factors for the use of the seven interactive markers, I have chosen thirty-two conversations, approximately five-hundred-fifty-five-minutes long in total. Within those thirty-two conversations, half are carried out by a different pair of friends (casual conversation), while the other half is by a different pair who met for the first time (formal conversation). Of the former, five are

---

18 I thank Professor Mayumi Usami for allowing me to use the corpora. Note that all data in the corpora are transcripts in Japanese only, and when I present data as examples I will supply the gloss and English translations to the original ones.

19 Only a few participants speak dialects that are different from that spoken in Tokyo. I will not adopt their utterances as examples in the current study in order to be consistent with the issue of dialects (The current study deals with the Tokyo-standard variety of modern Japanese only, as noted in 1.3).
produced by two males, five are by two females and six are by a male and a female. Of the latter, half are produced by two males and the rest is by two females.

The other source of the data for this study is two series (thirty-one books in total) of Japanese comics:


(ii) *Hana yori Dango* (Kamio, 1993), Vol. 1 - Vol. 20

These comics have widely been read by Japanese people, and are deemed to be an ideal data source for the current analysis apart from that of spontaneous conversation with respect to the following two points. First, as Kabashima (1990) reports, language used in comics overlaps with that used in spontaneous conversation to a large extent, and thus in terms of language use, comics are also seen to be valid conversational data. Second, as Maynard (2000: 1212) notes, “comics provide abundant examples of conversational interaction along with graphic and visual cues useful for interpreting emotives”. Since the current study views that the use of the seven interactive markers is the expression of the speaker’s attitude towards the hearer, comics are expected to provide varied examples which show this important aspect of these markers with a variety of visualised contexts: for example, the conversational participants’ age and social status and the speaker’s gender as well as the level of formality of a situation.

When examples are presented, their sources are given at the end of the examples. For instance, a casual conversation between a male and a female adopted from the conversational corpora (Usami, 2007a, 2007b) is indicated as CMF (C stands for casual, M for male and F for female), whereas a formal conversation between two males as FMM (F stands for formal and M for male). They are, then, followed by the number of
conversation²⁰, e.g. FMM12. For comics, *Tatchi* (Adachi, 1992) is abbreviated to T and *Hana yori Dango* (Kamio, 1993) to HD, and they are followed by the number of volume, e.g. T5 or HD8. When examples are extracted from other sources rather than the given two types, it is also indicated as so at the end of the examples. Examples which do not have any indication of resources are constructed by my own.

Each example consists of Japanese in Romanisation, English gloss and English translation. Note that for the purpose of consistency, the transcription conventions including the abbreviations for gloss and Romanisation for Japanese in the original data (if they have already been supplied in the data) may be modified to those of the current study. Also, when the original data does not have the gloss and/or English translation, they will be supplied by my own.

In English translations, words or phrases in a single bracket, i.e. (* ), indicate that they do not appear in Japanese utterances, but are provided to assist the comprehension of the meanings or intentions of the utterances. All the names of the participants in examples used for this thesis have been replaced with pseudonyms, using letters such as ‘A’ or ‘B’, unless they are specified. Instead of using continuous numbers for the examples throughout the thesis, the examples have been numbered for each chapter. Some of the examples are presented more than once, for discussions of different points through the thesis, and are indicated as so.

Finally, Romanisation has been used to represent Japanese scripts in this study. The study adopts the Hepburn system for the Romanisation of Japanese with one modification, i.e. Long vowels are expressed by a succession of two short vowels such

²⁰ For convenience, I arbitrary numbered each conversation from 1 to 32.
as aa, ii, uu, ei (ei is used for a long vowel of e) and oo, following the convention in the
literature, instead of short vowels with superscript diacritics such as ā, ī, ū, ē and ő.

1.6. Organisation of the study

This study consists of eight chapters and is organised in the following manner. Following the introduction in the current chapter, Chapter 2 reviews previous studies on our seven targeted interactive markers. This chapter will point out some of their shortcomings and also some issues that will be taken into account by the current study. Chapter 3 provides the definitions and explications of the key notions of involvement, formality and gender, which are particularly important for the analysis of the current study.

Chapter 4 elaborates on the relationship between the seven interactive markers and the notion of involvement, and discusses the general function of these markers. My focus in this chapter is twofold. First, I will show that the general function of the seven interactive markers is to signal the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement. Second, by adopting the notions of ‘incorporative’ and ‘monopolistic’ proposed by Lee (2007), I will suggest a model for the classification of the seven interactive markers. I will claim that within this model, ne and na share the function of signalling the speaker’s incorporative attitude; that is, the speaker invites the hearer’s involvement, through which he/she aligns with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. Further, yo, sa, wa, zo and ze share the function of signalling the speaker’s monopolistic attitude; that is, the speaker invites the hearer’s involvement, through which he/she enhances his/her position as a deliverer of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.
On the basis of the classification provided in Chapter 4, i.e. incorporative \{ne, na\} and monopolistic \{yo, sa, wa, zo, ze\}, the remainder of the study will then be devoted to discussions that examine the distinct function of each marker. Chapter 5 presents the analysis of the incorporative markers ne and na. I will demonstrate that although these two markers share the same function of inviting the hearer’s involvement in an incorporative manner, they indicate different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer’s involvement within an incorporative manner, thereby evoking the different expressive effects which influence the speaker’s use of the markers within social contexts in terms of formality and gender.

Chapters 6 and 7 examine a group of monopolistic markers: yo and sa in Chapter 6 and wa, zo and ze in Chapter 7. In a similar fashion to Chapter 5, I will show that although these five monopolistic markers share the same function of inviting the hearer’s involvement in a monopolistic manner, they are characteristically different from each other in the sense that they indicate different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer’s involvement within a monopolistic manner. In particular, the distinct function of each monopolistic marker will be discussed through its distributional restrictions in co-occurrence with modal expressions and commands/requests/proposals, as well as its unique usage within social contexts with respect to formality and gender.

Finally, Chapter 8 provides a summary of the findings of the study, implications, and concluding remarks.
CHAPTER 2

Literature review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews previous studies on the seven interactive markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*, which are thought to be particularly noteworthy for our understanding of how these markers have previously been considered. As briefly mentioned in Chapter 1, the functions (or usages) of these markers have been one of the most interesting issues in the literature of Japanese linguistics for decades, and thus there are numerous studies on the use of an individual marker or a group of markers, and a variety of approaches have been put forward.

Previous studies can roughly be divided into the following five groups according to their approaches to the use of these seven markers:

(i) Syntactical approach

(ii) Cognitive approach

(iii) Illocutionary force
(iv) Interactional approach

(v) Social approach

In what follows, I will discuss each approach in detail in the following sections, respectively: (i) 2.2, (ii) 2.3, (iii) 2.4, (iv) 2.5 and (v) 2.6, and then summarise the chapter in Section 2.7.

Readers should note that, as stated in Chapter 1, the seven interactive markers are traditionally categorised into two sub-groups by reference to their positions in a sentence, i.e. ‘sentence-final particles’ and ‘sentence-medial particles’. Some studies we will observe in this chapter have paid little attention to ‘sentence-medial particles’ and have exclusively focused on ‘sentence-final particles’. While the purpose of this chapter is to review these previous studies, in this chapter, and in this chapter only, I will not use the term ‘interactive markers’ in order to avoid confusion. Instead, I will use either the term ‘sentence-final particles’ or ‘sentence-medial particles’ depending on the scope of each study.

2.2. Syntactical approach

The focus of the linguistic debate in the area of Kokugogaku ‘Traditional Japanese language studies’ has been on the shi-ji or jojutsu-chinjutsu dichotomy, with early studies of sentence-final particles discussing the particles in relation to this dichotomy. For example, Tokieda (1950) claims that a Japanese sentence comprises of shi and ji. Tokieda (1950: 66) characterises shi as hyoogen sareru jibutsu, kotogara no
kyakutaiteki gainenteki hyoogen ‘an expression representing an objective and conceptualised notion of referents’, while ji as hyoogen sareru kotogara ni taisuru hanashite no tachiba no hyoogen ‘an expression representing the speaker’s perspective toward the referent’. Tokieda (1951) includes various types of particles and auxiliary verbs in ji as the expression of the speaker’s subjective attitude, and concludes that sentence-final particles (in Tokieda’s term, kandojo-shi ‘emotive particles’) belong to ji and directly express the speaker’s concern towards the hearer (taijin kankei o kooseisuru ‘forming an interpersonal relationship (with the hearer)’). Watanabe (1968) claims that a Japanese sentence is composed of jojutsu, which expresses the speaker’s attitude of drawing the content of a proposition, and chinjutsu, which expresses the speaker’s subjectivity such as his/her judgement about the propositional information and his/her appeal to the hearer, concluding that sentence-final particles as well as sentence-medial particles belong to the latter.

The early studies of sentence-final particles and/or sentence-medial particles have primarily been concerned with the shi-ji (objective vs. subjective) or jojutsu-chinjutsu dichotomy, and have discussed the role of these particles as ji or chinjutsu in relation to shi or jojutsu, or other linguistic components identified as ji or chinjutsu within a sentence. These studies have categorised the particles based on their syntactical relationship to a sentence or to the other sentence-final particles (Saji, 1957; Watanabe, 1968; Suzuki, 1976), in particular on the co-occurrence restrictions of the particles with certain predicates or with the other sentence-final particles, and/or on the order in which the particles may appear, e.g. yo is followed by ne, but not vice versa. These studies have made an invaluable contribution to the area of Japanese linguistics. In particular,

---

1 The English translation is Maynard’s (1989: 30).
the recognition of the impact of sentence-final particles and sentence-medial particles on the interpersonal relationship (Tokieda, 1951) and the notification of their important role of expressing the speaker's concern towards the hearer (Tokieda, 1951; Saji, 1957; Watanabe, 1968; Suzuki, 1976) are a very important step towards our understanding of their interactive nature. Also, the investigation into the co-occurrence restrictions of the particles with various types of predicates deserves special attention as such co-occurrence restrictions provide an important clue for clarifying what kind of the speaker's attitude is indicated by each particle (I will also investigate co-occurrence restrictions of our seven targeted particles with various sentence types in my analysis in Chapters 5, 6 and 7). Yet, due to their prominent focus on the syntactical aspect of the particles, these studies lack an empirical study of the actual use of the particles in interaction, and fail to provide an integrated and systematic account for the interactive nature of the particles. Further, the detailed function of each particle is not sufficiently described.

For example, Saji (1957) claims that both sentence-final particles and sentence-medial particles express certain attitudes of the speaker. Saji (1957) examines twelve particles and classifies them into two groups based on whether or not they can appear in non-sentence-final positions: those which can appear are categorised as Group 1 \{ne, na, yo, ya, e, i, sa\} and those which cannot are categorised as Group 2 \{wa, tomo, zo, ze, ka\}. According to Saji (1957), Group 1 particles directly convey the speaker's attitude towards the hearer, while Group 2 particles deliver the speaker's attitude towards his/her judgement about the propositional information. Saji (1957) further classifies Group 1 particles into three sub-groups according to their occurrence order and their co-occurrence restrictions with copula da. For example, yo, ya, e, i and sa can precede ne
and na, but not vice versa, and among these particles, yo, ya, e and i may co-occur with copula da, but sa may not. Saji (1957) also divides Group 2 particles into four sub-groups on the basis of their co-occurrence restrictions with certain predicates, e.g. copula da and auxiliary verbs such as daroo (and deshoo which is more formal than daroo) ‘suppose’, soo(da) ‘(hearsay)’ and yoo(da) ‘apparently’. Saji (1957) suggests that the difference among Group 2 particles is the degree of strength of the speaker’s assertion associated with his/her judgement about the propositional information. For example, wa is the strongest, and zo and ze are the weakest since wa has the least co-occurrence possibility with daroo (deshoo) ‘suppose’, while zo and ze may co-occur with it.

Focusing on our seven targeted particles, the first problem with Saji’s (1957) account is that, although it correctly points out that wa, zo, and ze as well as ne, na, yo and sa are used only in spoken language, its classification of these particles stipulates that the former group \{wa, zo, ze\} indicates the speaker’s attitude towards his/her judgement about the propositional information, and the latter \{ne, na, yo, sa\} indicates the speaker’s attitude towards the hearer. As a result, it fails to capture their interactive nature in an integrated manner. As will be shown in Chapter 4, the primary function of all the seven targeted particles is to express the speaker’s interactional attitude towards the hearer, and this is the main reason for the fact that they are commonly used in spoken language only.

The second problem is that Saji’s (1957) account largely relies on the syntactical aspect of the particles, hence it is limited in providing a detailed analysis of the function of each particle. For instance, under Saji’s (1957) classification of the particles, ne and na are seen to share the same syntactical regulation and are identified as the same. This
is also the same for the case of zo and ze\(^2\). As will be demonstrated in the current study, however, if we closely look at the use of ne and na as well as of zo and ze in actual interaction, the two particles in each pair behave very differently with each other. For example, observe (1) below in which a teacher warns his students that they cannot take advantage of being first year students forever. (1a) is drawn from the actual data, and (1b) is a duplication of (1a), but with zo being replaced with ze.

(1) a. *Itsumademo ichi nensei, ichi nensei to amaeteite wa* forever first.grade first.grade QT take.advantage.of-PROG TOP *ikenai zo.* wrong ZO ‘It’s wrong to think that you can take advantage of being first year students forever.’

b. *? Itsumademo ichi nensei, ichi nensei to amaeteite wa* forever first.grade first.grade QT take.advantage.of-PROG TOP *ikenai ze.* wrong ZE ‘It’s wrong to think that you can take advantage of being first year students forever.’

Native speakers of Japanese intuitively feel that the utterance with ze in (1b) sounds odd compared to that with zo in (1a). In fact, as will be discussed in Chapter 7, ze cannot in principle be used when the speaker is socially superior to the hearer, i.e. The speaker is

\(^2\) Watanabe (1968) also investigates nine particles and classifies them into three groups based on their hierarchical order as to which particles can precede which. In Watanabe’s (1968) classification, Group 1 particles such as ka, sa, wa, zo and ze can precede Group 2 particles yo and i and Group 3 particles ne and na, whereas Group 2 particles can precede Group 3 particles but not Group 1 particles, and Group 3 particles cannot precede any other particles. The noteworthy fact is that Watanabe (1968) has reached a similar conclusion to that of Saji (1957) in the sense that Group 1 particles zo and ze, and Group 3 particles ne and na are identified as the same, respectively.
typically socially higher and/or older than the hearer, whereas zo can. As suggested by this example, zo and ze indeed have the different functions, thereby invoking the different effects on the interpersonal relationship. Such differences cannot sufficiently be captured by simply looking at the syntactical aspect of these particles.

As such, the studies of the functions of sentence-final particles and/or sentence-medial particles from the syntactical perspective alone tend to lack empirical investigation of the actual use of these particles in interaction, and consequently cannot provide a satisfactory account for their interactional functions (in particular, their social and interpersonal aspects). This in turn suggests that the use of these particles needs to be studied at an interactional level which goes beyond a syntactical level of a sentence, as also pointed out in some studies (e.g. Maynard, 1993; Morita, 2005).

2.3. Cognitive approach

There are a number of studies which have focused on the cognitive dimension of the use of sentence-final particles (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Kamio, 1990, 1994; Maynard, 1993; Takubo and Kinsui, 1996, 1997; Katagiri, 2007; Nishikawa, 2007; and many others). Among these studies, the major trend has been to account for the use of these particles from the perspective of the state of information that each participant possesses (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Moriyama, 1989; Kamio, 1990, 1994; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Squires, 1994; Han and Kaya, 1996; Ohama, 1996; Nishikawa, 2007). As will be shown shortly, however, there are also some studies (Takubo, 1992; Kinsui, 1993; Takubo and Kinsui, 1996, 1997; Katagiri, 2007) which have taken a cognitive approach, and have attempted to overcome the problems which the ‘information-state-based’ account encounters. Below, I further
divide the cognitive approach into three sub-groups, namely the ‘information-state-based’ account, the ‘discourse-management-based’ account, and the ‘dialogue-coordination-based’ account, and discuss each in a sub-section.

2.3.1. Information-state-based account

In previous studies the use of sentence-final particles has often been discussed in relation to ‘the state of information’ which each conversational participant possesses (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Moriyama, 1989; Kamio, 1990, 1994; McGloin, 1990; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Squires, 1994; Han and Kaya, 1996; Ohama, 1996; Nishikawa, 2007). This account is based on the notion that the speaker’s choice of these particles is determined by his/her perspective towards the state of information, as to whether it is shared by both participants or possessed by either participant. For example, with respect to the use of ne and yo, Ohso (1986: 93) notes as follows:

‘Ne’ ga gensoku to shite hanashite to kikite no joohoo, handan no icchi o zentei to surumara, ‘yo’ wa gyakuni hanashite to kikite no joohoo, handan no kuichigai o zentei to shiteiru yooda.

“It is most likely that the use of ‘ne’ in principle presupposes the coincidence of information/judgement between the speaker and the hearer, whereas ‘yo’ presupposes a difference of information/judgement between the participants.”


The following examples (2) and (3) illustrate such use of ne and of yo, respectively.
(2) Kyoo wa ii tenki desu ne.
today TOP good weather BE NE
'It's a fine day today, isn't it.' (Ohso, 1986: 91)

(3) A: Amerika jin wa amari hatarakimasen ne.
American.people TOP not.much work-NEG NE
'American people don't work very hard, do they.'
B: Iya, yoku hatarakimasu yo.
no well work YO
'No, they work hard.' (Ohso, 1986: 93)

The use of ne in (2) displays the case where ne is appended to information shared by the speaker and the hearer. In the given situation the speaker and the hearer are experiencing the same weather, thus the speaker assumes that the given information, Kyoo wa ii tenki desu 'It's a fine day today', is shared with the hearer and uses ne, but not yo. In contrast, (3) is the case where yo is appended to information which the speaker assumes that the hearer does not share. In (3), B knows that his/her opinion about how hard American people work, i.e. yoku hatarakimasu 'American people work hard', differs from A's given in the previous utterance, Amerika jin wa amari hatarakimasen 'American people don't work very hard', and employs yo, but not ne. Although the 'information-state-based' account is able to explain the most typical use of ne and of yo as in (2) and (3)3, it is limited in its range and there are many cases which it cannot sufficiently explain.

First, as often pointed out in the literature (Cook, 1992; Kinsui, 1993; Hasunuma, 1998; Cho, 2000; Izuhara, 2001; Kato, 2001; Katagiri, 2007; Lee, 2007), it is impossible

3 I will explain the reason why these cases may be the typical use of ne and of yo in Chapter 5 for ne and Chapter 6 for yo.
for this account to describe cases where *ne* is appended to information exclusively held by the speaker (which means that the information is not shared by the hearer), which are contrary to the case of (2) above, and cases where *yo* is appended to information shared by both participants, which are also contrary to the case of (3). Observe the following examples.

(4) A: *Ima nanji desu ka.*
   now what.time BE QUE
   ‘What time is it now?’
   B: *Etto, shichi ji desu ne.*
   well 7.o’clock BE NE
   ‘Well, it’s 7 o’clock.’

   (Kinsui, 1993: 119)

(5) [A and B talk about a boss who drives his juniors very hard.]
   A: *Ano hito wa hidoi hito ne.*
   that person TOP terrible person NE
   ‘The person (That boss) is a terrible person, isn’t he/she.’
   B: *Hontooni hidoi hito desu yo.*
   really terrible person BE YO
   ‘He/She really is a terrible person.’

   (Cho, 2000: 3)

In this short conversational extract in (4), A asks B the time and B answers it. With B’s utterance which provides the information about the time, he/she uses *ne*. Since asking the time indicates that A does not know the time, in terms of the state of information, the information about the time, *shichi ji desu* ‘It’s 7 o’clock’, provided by B, is not shared with A. Nonetheless, *ne* is used here. (5) exemplifies the case of *yo*. In (5) A and B are talking about their boss who drives his/her juniors very hard. By using *ne*, A seeks B’s alignment with regard to her opinion that the boss is a terrible person. B responds to
this by using *yo*, and shows his/her concurrence with A’s opinion. As clearly shown in B’s utterance, *Hontooni hidoi hito desu* ‘He/She really is a terrible person’, the given information in his/her utterance is the same as what A has provided in her previous utterance, and yet *yo* is used here. As illustrated in (4) and (5), there are cases which the information-state-based account cannot manage.

Secondly, the information-state-based account largely relies on the informational aspect of utterances, and thus it is unable to systematically describe the difference between an utterance with a certain particle and that without the same particle (Matsui, 2000; Lee, 2007). Consider the following examples:

(6) A: *Karaoke choo sukina no ne, boku mo.*
    karaoke super like SFP NE I also
    ‘I also like karaoke very much.’
B: *A, A mo?*
    oh A also
    ‘Oh, do you like karaoke as well?’

    (CMF5)

(7) A: *Shingapooru mo kekkoo chika soo da kedo, dono kurai kakarimasu?*
    Singapore also quite close seem BE but how long about take
    ‘It seems that Singapore is also close (from Japan), but how long does it take?’
B: *Shichi jikan kurai desu yo, hikooki de.*
    7.hours about BE YO airplane by
    ‘It takes about 7 hours by airplane.’

    (FFF4)

In (6) two friends, A and B, are talking about C who likes karaoke. A expresses that he also likes karaoke very much and attaches *ne* to the statement. The important fact is that A’s use of *ne* is optional, and thus it may be dropped without affecting the state of information, i.e. *Karaoke choo suki na no, boku mo* ‘I also like karaoke very much’. In
(7) A and B are talking about the countries where B has travelled before. A shows her interest in Singapore to which B has travelled before and asks B how long it takes from Japan to Singapore. B answers A with よ。Here again, よ may also be dropped without affecting the state of information, i.e. 七時間くらいです ‘It takes about 7 hours’.

As demonstrated in these examples, the information-state-based account cannot systematically deal with cases where the use of ne and よ is optional, as the utterance with よ and that without the particle are the same in terms of the state of information⁴.

In short, the fundamental problem with the information-state-based account lies in its prominent focus on the informational aspect of utterances. As shown above, there are various cases that it is not able to consistently and systematically explain. Moreover, the account fails to address the well-recognised issue related to the use of sentence-final particles; that is, these particles are mainly used in face-to-face conversation, while rarely in written texts (cf. 1.1) where the writer can also equally assess ‘sharedness’ or ‘non-sharedness’ of information between him/her and the reader.

2.3.2. Discourse-management-based account

Takubo (1992), Kinsui (1993) and Takubo and Kinsui (1996, 1997) hypothesise that utterances in a dialogue are instructions for various operations on the memory base such as registering, searching and marking inferences, and claim that the sentence-final particles ne and よ express such particular mental states of the speaker, thereby contributing to discourse management. More precisely, for instance, Takubo and Kinsui

⁴ These two types of utterances, one with a particle and the other without, are of course different from each other from the interactive point of view. This will be made clear in our later discussions.
(1996: 72) note that *ne* indicates that *toogai no meidai no datoosei o keisanchuu de aru* ‘the speaker is in the process of verifying the propositional information’, while *yo* indicates *toogai no meidai o kanyotekina chishiki jootai ni kuwaeta ato, tekitoona suiron o okonae to iu shiji* ‘the speaker’s instruction that the hearer links the proposition to his/her relevant knowledge and infers adequately’ (Also see Takubo (1992) and Kinsui (1993) for a similar claim). The function of *ne* identified as such is, for example, justified by describing the difference between (8) and (9) below.

(8) A: *Anata no onamae wa?*

    you     LK name   TOP
    ‘What is your name?’

    B: *? Nakamura Taroo desu ne.*

    Taro.Nakamura     BE   NE
    ‘(My name) is Taro Nakamura.’ (Kinsui, 1993: 119)

(9) A: *Okosan no nenrei wa?*

    child     LK age    TOP
    ‘How old is your child?’

    B: *Moosugu juuni desu ne.*

    soon     12        BE   NE
    ‘He/She will be 12-year-old soon.’ (Kinsui, 1993: 119)

First of all, Kinsui (1993) points out that *ne* can be used even with information which is not shared with the hearer as in (9), which counters the function of *ne* proposed within the information-state-based account (cf. 2.3.1). Furthermore, Kinsui (1993) argues that although the information provided in B’s utterances of (8) and (9) commonly convey B’s personal information (hence they are not shared with A), the use of *ne* in (8) is

---

5 The English translation is my own.
unacceptable, whereas that in (9) is acceptable. In assuming that *ne* indicates that the speaker is in the process of verifying the propositional information, Kinsui (1993) explains that B’s own name in (8) does not require speaker B to perform such a process, thus the use of *ne* sounds odd, whereas B’s child’s age in (9) may require speaker B to perform the process, thus its use is natural.

However, as also pointed out by Shinoda (2006), there are some cases in which *ne* can be used with information which does not require the speaker to verify. Look at the following example.

(10) A: *Yamada Shinichi sama, ichi gatsu too ka juusun ji*  *Takamatsu hatsu*
    Mr.Shinich.Yamada January 10th 13.o’clock depart.from.Takamatsu
    Haneda yuki, *de yoroshikatta deshoo ka.*
    bound.for.Haneda BE was.good suppose QUE
    ‘Mr. Shinichi Yamada, your flight is from Takamatsu for Haneda at 13:00 on
    10\textsuperscript{th} of January. Is that right?’
    
    B: *Iya Shinichi janakute, Shinji desu ne.*
    no Shinichi BE-NEG Shinji BE NE
    ‘No, (my name) is not Shinichi, but Shinji.’ (Shinoda, 2006: 2)

This is a conversation between a travel agent, A, and a customer, B. A confirms with B whether the information provided on the air ticket including B’s name is correct. B corrects the information by stating his correct name, Shinji. Here, *ne* is appended to B’s own name, but acceptable, contrary to the case of (8). This raises a question as to why B’s use of *ne* in (8) is not permissible but that in (10) is, although the information given by B in both examples are the same, i.e. B’s own name, which does not require speaker
B to verify within the ‘discourse-management-based’ account\(^6\). I assume that, similar to the information-state-based account (cf. 2.3.1), the problem with this discourse-management-based account lies in its particular focus on the type of information as to whether or not the information requires the speaker’s verification, and consequently the function of *ne* proposed within this account cannot systematically describe the difference between (8) and (10).

The claim about the use of *yo* also has some shortcomings. As noted earlier, the discourse-management-based account views *yo* as the particle which indicates the speaker’s instruction that the hearer links the proposition to his/her relevant knowledge and infers adequately. This means that *yo* is used to trigger inferences rather than to inform the propositional content of an utterance. Takubo and Kinsui (1996) provide the following set of examples in order to demonstrate the claim.

\[(11)\]  
\[
a. \hspace{10pt} \textit{Ame ga futteru.} \]
\[
\hspace{10pt} \text{rain SUB fall-PROG} \]
\[
\hspace{10pt} \text{‘It’s raining.’} \\
\]
\[
b. \hspace{10pt} \textit{Ame ga futteru yo.} \]
\[
\hspace{10pt} \text{rain SUB fall-PROG YO} \]
\[
\hspace{10pt} \text{‘It’s raining.’} \hspace{60pt} \text{(Takubo and Kinsui, 1996: 72)}
\]

(11a) without *yo* is a simple report of the fact that it is raining, while (11b) with *yo* gives the hearer directions for further actions such as ‘Take an umbrella with you’, ‘Take the laundry inside’ or ‘You don’t need to turn on TV because the baseball game will be cancelled’. This is indeed true, and as will be discussed in Chapter 6, *yo* may be used to

\(^6\)I will deal with this case in Chapter 5 in close connection with the relationship between the speaker’s ‘incorporative’ attitude signalled by *ne* and the situational context.
denote an implied message as in (11b). Nonetheless, the problem with the proposed 
function of *yo* is that it is also applicable to other particles such as *zo* and *ze* 
7. Compare the following examples. In (12a) *yo* is used, while *zo* and *ze* are replaced with *yo* in 
(12b) and (12c), respectively.

(12) [To a person who is about to go out without an umbrella]

a. *Soto ame futteru yo.*
outside rain fall-PROG YO
‘It’s raining outside. (Take an umbrella).’

b. *Soto ame futteru zo.*
outside rain fall-PROG ZO
‘It’s raining outside. (Take an umbrella).’

c. *Soto ame futteru ze.*
outside rain fall-PROG ZE
‘It’s raining outside. (Take an umbrella).’

(12) is the situation where the speaker has just come back from outside where it is 
raining and talks to the hearer who is about to go out without an umbrella. Given the 
situation, the purpose of the utterance in (12) is to convince the hearer to take an 
umbrella. The important point is that in this situation all of the three utterances, (12a), 
(12b) and (12c), convey an implied message, ‘Take an umbrella’. If *zo* in (12b) and *ze* 
in (12c) as well as *yo* in (12a) were dropped from the utterances, i.e. *Soto ame futteru,* 
the utterances would be interpreted as simply expressing the fact that it is raining 
outside, and the implied message would not properly be delivered. This shows that in a 
particular context where the main concern of an utterance is to deliver the speaker’s

7 I will provide a detailed discussion on the relation between implication and the functions of *zo* 
and *ze* in Chapter 7.
implied message, the use of yo, zo or ze is equally crucial, and the function of yo proposed within the discourse-management-based account is not clearly differentiated from the functions of zo and ze.

2.3.3. Dialogue-coordination-based account

Katagiri (2007) analyses the functions of the sentence-final particles yo and ne in terms of dialogue coordination. Katagiri (2007) particularly focuses on the issue of why these particles are used only in spoken dialogues, but not in written texts or monologues, and adopts the conception of dialogues as joint activities (or dialogue coordination) into the analysis. According to Katagiri (2007), dialogue coordination is to assist and assure the establishment of mutual beliefs about the status of information (information sharing process) between the conversational participants in order to guarantee that the dialogue proceeds successfully. Given that conception, Katagiri (2007: 1317) claims that yo and ne “contribute to dialogue coordination by indicating to the hearer the speaker’s state of acceptance about information expressed with clauses to which the particles are attached”, and proposes the function of each particle as follows:

(13) The functions of yo and ne (Katagiri, 2007:1317)

(i) Yo presents the propositional content of an utterance preceding it as something the speaker has accepted.

(ii) Ne presents the propositional content as something the speaker has not yet wholeheartedly accepted.

This ‘dialogue-coordination-based’ account tries to capture the use of the particles as something that is interactionally motivated. By doing so, it also attempts to tackle
some of the cases which the information-state-based account cannot systematically explain (cf. 2.3.1). For example, with respect to the use of *ne* in (14) below, Katagiri (2007) notes that although the information provided in B’s utterance, ‘The meeting will be held in room 6’, is not previously shared with A, speaker B uses *ne* to indicate that he/she does not know the answer by himself/herself and is referring to the information from other information resources such as notes, documents or computers. That is to say, *ne* indicates that B has not fully accepted the information yet.

(14) A: *Tsugi no kaigi wa doko desu ka?*
   next LK meeting TOP where BE QUE
   ‘Where will the next meeting be held?’

   B: *Kaigi wa roku goo shitsu desu ne.*
   meeting TOP room.6 BE NE
   ‘The meeting will be held in room 6.’
   (Katagiri, 2007:1315)

However, as shown in the following example, there are cases in which the use of *ne* cannot be interpreted in such a way. In (15) below, A asks B if he (B) can speak any foreign languages other than Japanese, and B provides his answer with *ne*.

(15) A: *Eito, Nihongo againi gaikokugo wa?*
   well Japanese other than foreign language TOP
   ‘Well, (can’t you speak) any foreign languages other than Japanese?’

   B: *Ee, (gaikokugo) wa dekinai desu ne.*
   yes (foreign language) TOP can-NEG BE NE
   ‘No, I cannot speak (any foreign languages).’
   (FMM8)

---

8 When a yes-no question is in the negative style, the way to give an answer is different in English and Japanese. In English, ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in principle indicates whether it is true (yes) or not (no) (regardless whether or not the question is an affirmative or negative), while in Japanese, *hai* ‘yes’ or *iie* ‘no’ indicates what is said/assumed in the question is correct (*hai*) or incorrect (*iie*). Thus, to answer a negative question, *Kyoo, koohii nomimasendeshita ka* ‘Didn’t you drink coffee today?’, *Hai* (what you said is correct), *nomimasendeshita* (I did not) or *iie* (what you
As indicated by *Ee* ‘No’, B first acknowledges that he cannot speak any foreign languages other than Japanese, and further confirms it by saying, *dekinai desu* ‘I cannot’, with *ne*. This means that the information to which *ne* is appended has already been accepted by speaker B by initially providing *Ee* ‘No’. Moreover, the given information is about speaker B’s ability, and thus it is hard to imagine that there are any resources other than B himself to access to the information unless there are other participants who know that B cannot speak any foreign languages other than Japanese (In the situation of (15), there are no other participants besides A and B. Further, it is obvious from A’s question that A does not know whether or not B has an ability to speak foreign languages other than Japanese). From this observation, it is difficult to say that B’s use of *ne* here shows that he has not fully accepted the given information yet.

Furthermore, the claim that *yo* indicates the speaker’s acceptance of information is also problematic, as with this claim it is difficult to distinguish between an utterance with *yo* and that without *yo*. Compare (16a) with (16b) below. (16a) is drawn from the actual data, and (16b) is a duplication of (16a), but with *yo* omitted.


  still 9:30  BE  YO

  ‘It’s still 9:30.’

                     (T1)

  b. *Mada kuji han da.*

  still 9:30  BE

  ‘It’s still 9:30.’

said is incorrect), *nomimashita* (I did), is normally used. In (15) A’s utterance is interpreted as a negative question, thus B’s answer *Ee* ‘Yes’ is translated to ‘No’ in English.
Since the use of *yo* does not affect the truth-condition of the propositional information, (16a) and (16b) deliver the same propositional content, ‘It’s still 9:30’. Note that a bare expression like (16b) indicates that the propositional information is true for the speaker, and that the given information has already been accepted by the speaker at the time he/she mentions it. If we followed the function of *yo* proposed within the dialogue-coordination-based account, there would be no difference between (16a) with *yo* and (16b) without *yo* because both utterances are the same in terms of the speaker’s acceptance of the information.

Approaching the functions of sentence-final particles as an indication of the speaker’s information acceptance/non-acceptance further contains conceptual difficulties in differentiating one particle from another. For instance, the proposed function of *yo* is also shared with that of *sa*. Observe the use of *sa* in (17) below as an example of this.

\[(17) \text{ A: } A, \text{ are nakanakana mono da na.} \]
\[\text{ oh that quite thing BE NA} \]
\[\text{ ‘Oh, (the binoculars) are quite good.’} \]
\[\text{ B: Sorya soo sa.} \]
\[\text{ it-TOP so SA} \]
\[\text{ ‘That’s right.’} \quad (T1) \]

Prior to this conversational exchange, A has borrowed B’s binoculars. In (17) A compliments B on his (B’s) binoculars. In responding to A, B comments that they are in fact very good, and attaches *sa* to the comment. Note that *sa* is reported to indicate that what is conveyed in the utterance is natural and a matter of course for the speaker (e.g. Uyeno, 1971; Alfonso, 1974; Cheng, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Also see Chapter 6
for details). Thus, B’s utterance with *sa* can roughly be interpreted as ‘It’s of course good’. Such an attitude delivered by B through the use of *sa* presupposes that he has already accepted the given information. In this regard, the utterance with *yo* and that with *sa* are the same in terms of the speaker’s information acceptance. This means that the account based on the speaker’s information acceptability cannot provide a theoretical means to analyse the difference between *yo* and *sa* (and possibly other particles).

To summarise 2.3, in this section I have discussed the three accounts which take a cognitive approach to the use of sentence-final particles, and have pointed out some of the associated shortcomings. What underlies the problems with these accounts is, first of all, their limited scope. For instance, the information-state-based account and the dialogue-coordination-based account do not consider the characteristic of a bare expression, and consequently fail to differentiate an utterance with a certain particle from that without the same particle. These accounts also have conceptual difficulties in providing a systematic account for the difference of a wider range of particles such as *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*, because the core property of the particles is analysed on the basis of the binary properties such as ‘shared/non-shared’ information or ‘accepted/non-accepted’ information, respectively.

The second problem commonly observed in the given three accounts is that their primary focus is on the informational aspect of utterances, and thus they cannot provide a unified account for the use of the particles in different positions of a sentence. Recall that within the information-state-based account, the particles are characterised as indicating the speaker’s perspective towards the state of propositional information. Similarly, within the discourse-management-based account they are identified as
expressing the speaker’s mental state towards the propositional information, and within
the dialogue-coordination-based account they are seen as presenting the speaker’s state
of acceptance/non-acceptance of the propositional information. The scope of these
accounts is naturally limited to sentence-final particles which are appended to particular
independent propositional information, and as a result they fail to deal with non-
sentence-final particles (sentence-medial particles) which are not associated with any
particular independent propositional information.

Given that the cognitive approach tends to take a limited view from the
informational perspective, and has difficulties in providing a sufficient account for the
functions of the particles, what is suggested here is that in order to adequately capture
their functions we need to take the nature of spoken discourse into account; that is,
spoken language is not merely an exchange of one’s information but also an exchange
of one’s attitude and feelings/emotions (Maynard, 2001; Lee and Yoshida, 2002; Lee,
2007; Izuhara, 2008), which the current study shall discuss in terms of ‘involvement’.
This is especially so when we consider the facts that the use of our targeted particles is
peculiar to spoken language and also makes an impact on the interpersonal relationship
between the conversational participants (cf. 1.1).

2.4. Illocutionary force

There are some studies that have adopted a different framework, but have drawn similar
conclusions that the use of sentence-final particles contributes to the illocutionary force

2.4.1. **Insistence-compliance-based account**

Uyeno (1971) examines the sentence-final particles *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* within the framework of performative analysis. Uyeno (1971) proposes that these particles are derived from presupposed performative verbs including STATE, ASK, ORDER and SUGGEST, and divides them into the following two groups:

(i) those which express the speaker's insistence on forcing the given information on the hearer; and

(ii) those which express a request for compliance with the given information leaving the option of confirmation to the hearer. (Uyeno, 1971:140)

In this model, *yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* belong to the former, whereas *ne* and *na* to the latter. Uyeno (1971) also remarks that social variables are closely related to the speaker's appropriate choice of these particles, and incorporates those such as the relative social status of the conversational participants and the gender of the speaker into the analysis.

---

9 Morita (2002) analyses the turn-final use of *ne* and *yo* which includes the sentence-final and non-sentence-final use of these particles defined in the current study (cf. 1.3).

10 McGloin (1990) classifies eight sentence-final particles *ne, na, no, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* into three groups: (i) particles of insistence (*yo, sa, zo, ze*), (ii) particles of confirmation (*ne, na*), and (iii) particles of rapport (*ne, na, wa, no*). Although McGloin's (1990) classification of these particles is slightly different from Uyeno's (1971), the argument of these two studies with respect to the functions of the particles are similar.
While Uyeno (1971) attempts to provide a unified account for the interpersonal nature of the particles, this ‘insistence-compliance-based’ account shows difficulty with providing a consistent account for the functions of the particles, as also pointed out in some studies (e.g. Matsui, 2000; Asano, 2003). Let us first look at yo as an example. Uyeno (1971) claims that yo evokes different effects depending on the sentence type to which it is attached. Uyeno (1971) notes that when yo is used with declarative sentences, it forces the information on the addressee, whereas with commands and requests, it has an effect of softening the force of the commands and requests. In relation to Uyeno’s (1971) claim, it is worth mentioning that Masuoka (1991) also states that yo strengthens the tone of requests and invitations, while it softens the tone of commands and prohibitions. Although Uyeno’s (1971) claim and that of Masuoka (1991) are slightly different from each other, it is agreed that yo softens the tone of commands, and what is notable here is that the effect of yo which softens the tone of commands is not consistent with yo characterised as an insistence particle within the insistence-compliance-based account. Compare the abrupt command with yo in (18a) to that without yo in (18b) below. (18a) is drawn from Masuoka (1991) and (18b) is a duplication of (18a), but with yo omitted.

(18) a. Sugu ike  yo.
   soon go    YO
   ‘Go now.’               (Masuoka, 1991: 93)

   b. Sugu ike.
   soon go
   ‘Go now.’
If *yo* expressed the speaker’s insistence on forcing the given information on the hearer as Uyeno (1971) claims, we would naturally expect that the tone of the command in (18a) with *yo* is stronger than that in (18b) without *yo*. However, (18a) sounds softer than (18b), as also noted by Uyeno (1971) as well as Masuoka (1991)\(^{11}\).

The inconsistency of the insistence-compliance-based account can also be observed in the characterisations of *ne* and *na*. In providing the functions of these particles as shown above, Uyeno (1971: 133) suggests that “with a declarative sentence they modify the basic nature of the declarative sentence in such a way that the addressee will have the choice of judgement about the information. In other words, the use of these particles softens the declarative nature of the sentence”. However, consider the use of *ne* in (19) below. In this conversational exchange, A asks B to go somewhere together, and B replies and provides his refusal of going with *ne*.

(19) A: *Doo, isshoni ikanai?*  
how together go-NEG  
‘How about going together?’  
B: *Iya, ore wa ikanai ne.*  
no I TOP go-NEG NE  
‘No, I’m not going.’ (Kamio, 1990: 76)

If Uyeno’s (1971) account were true, we would predict that B’s use of *ne* here softens the declarative tone of the statement. However, as pointed out by Kamio (1990), it is considered as strengthening the tone of B’s refusal (Also see Hasunuma (1998) for a similar claim), and cannot be seen as softening the tone of the statement\(^{12}\).

\(^{11}\) The effects of *yo* on the tone of an utterance will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

\(^{12}\) The effects of *ne* on the tone of an utterance will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
2.4.2. Authority-based account

Morita (2002) analyses *ne, yo* and *yone* and proposes that they indicate the speaker’s stance of ‘authority’ in relation to the hearer in order to facilitate the collaborative completion of utterances. Morita (2002: 223) states that "‘authority’ is the relationship between the speakers regarding the relative degree of autonomy (or dependency) with which one advances a given utterance”, and claims that *ne* advances the speaker’s stance of a weak or incomplete authority to require participatory uptake of the hearer, whereas *yo* advances the speaker’s stance of a strong authority for not opening negotiation to the hearer.

While this ‘authority-based’ account offers an insightful analysis by attempting to explain the functions of the particles as interactive resources for constructing ongoing interaction (which I will discuss in terms of ‘involvement’ in the current study), the problem with the account is that it characterises the particles as those which indicate two opposite authorities (weak or strong) of the speaker. As pointed out in 2.4.1 in relation to the insistence-compliance-based account, such a weak (soft)-strong dimension of the particles is not able to provide a consistent account for the functions of the particles. Indeed, the authority-based account is unable to deal with the cases of (18) and (19) discussed earlier on the same grounds as the insistence-compliance-based account. (18) and (19) are re-presented below.

(18)' a. *Sugu ike yo.*
   soon go YO
   ‘Go now.’
b. *Sugu ike.*
   soon go
   ‘Go now.’

(19)’ A: *Doo, isshoni ikanai?*
   how together go-NEG
   ‘How about going together?’
B: *Iya, ore wa ikanai ne.*
   no I TOP go-NEG NE
   ‘No, I’m not going.’

In terms of (18)’, as pointed out by Uyeno (1971) and Masuoka (1991), the tone of the bare expression in (18b)’ sounds stronger than (18a)’ with *yo*, and in fact (18b)’ delivers the command in an ‘official’ tone, and provides the stronger, more non-negotiable stance of the speaker than (18a)’ (cf. Chapter 6). Therefore, identifying *yo* as the signal of the speaker’s strong authority within the authority-based account is not accurate. Likewise, in the case of (19)’, B’s refusal with *ne* conveys his stronger refusal compared to that without *ne* (cf. Kamio, 1990; Hasunuma, 1998; cf. Chapter 5), and thus *ne* as the signal of the speaker’s weak stance as proposed in the authority-based account is, again, inadequate.

Another problem with the authority-based account is that it cannot make a clear distinction between an utterance with *yo* and that without *yo*, as also pointed out by Lee (2007). Look at the following example (20). In (20) A did not attend a meeting and asks B whether Taro came to the meeting. B may answer the question with or without *yo*.

(20) A: *Taroo kita?*
   Taro came
   ‘Did Taro come (to the meeting)’?
B: A, kita. / A, kita yo.
oh came oh came YO
‘Yeah, he did.’ ‘Yeah, he did.’ (Lee, 2007: 372)

Morita (2002: 227) claims that “yo marks an epistemic stance of authority on the part of the speaker that is not open to negotiation on the part of the hearer. Yo does not require any approval or confirmation from the hearer, and hence marks a stance of ‘strong’ authority on the part of the speaker”. However, as Lee (2007) correctly points out, in the given situation of (20), speaker B is in a position of having full autonomy/independence towards hearer A by virtue of the fact that only he/she (B) can truly validate his/her own claim of Taro’s attendance at the meeting. B’s answer without yo, thus, also indicates his/her non-negotiable attitude that does not require any approval or confirmation of hearer A. This means that, in terms of ‘strong’ authority, the utterance without yo cannot be distinguished from that with yo.

As shown through 2.4, the major problem with the approach to the functions of sentence-final particles and/or sentence-medial particles from the perspective of illocutionary force (weaken/soften or strengthen the tone of the utterance) is that it links the core property of the particles and illocutionary force in a direct manner. This leads to its inconsistency with the fact that a particular particle can be interpreted as strengthening the tone of the utterance in some cases, and as having the opposite effect of softening the tone in some other cases. The current study will discuss such an illocutionary force as the expressive effects of each particle in terms of ‘involvement’ and ‘the speaker’s attitude’, and systematically explain the reason why a particular particle is seen as having the two opposite effects.
2.5. Interactional approach

Tanaka (2000) and Morita (2005) are representative works that approach the functions of sentence-final particles and sentence-medial particles based on the interaction between the conversational participants. Tanaka (2000) employs key concepts of conversation analysis and examines *ne*. Tanaka (2000) especially focuses on the occurrence of *ne* in four different positions within a turn: turn-initial, turn-internal, turn-final as well as occupying an entire turn, and proposes that *ne* functions as a turn-management device. I agree with Tanaka (2000) that the use of *ne* (and all of our targeted particles) is closely related to the turn-management in conversation, as far as I assume that it expresses the speaker’s invitation of the hearer into conversation, thus accordingly invites speaker-change to some extent. However, as also noted by Morita (2005), Tanaka’s (2000) account has difficulties in explaining the relationship between the turn-management and various pragmatic effects involved in the deployment of *ne*, for example, formality/informality.

Morita (2005) examines *ne* and *sa* by adopting the framework of interactional linguistics and of conversation analysis, and claims that these particles (in Morita’s term, ‘interactional particles’ which occur in various positions of an utterance) are a device used to highlight the speaker’s immediate interactional concern upon advancing a particular move in relation to the ongoing conversational activity and its internal sequential environment. To put it differently, Morita (2005: 213) states that these particles “explicitly highlight interactionally relevant units within a stretch of talk in order to deal with sequential implicativeness as an object of interaction”. Morita (2005)
characterises *ne* as the ‘alignment marker’\(^{13}\) which explicitly displays the speaker’s interactional concern at that moment in terms of establishing or maintaining alignment to the ongoing activity, and *sa* as the marker with which the speaker closes down the negotiation space by marking the conversational move as a prospective non-negotiable to the hearer.

Morita (2005) analyses the use of the particles from the interactional perspective and attempts to provide a unified account for their interactional functions regardless of their positions in a sentence. Nonetheless, because the scope of the analysis is limited to *ne* and *sa*, Morita (2005) fails to convincingly differentiate one particle form another when the scope is extended to other particles, for example, *yo*.

Recall that in Morita (2002; cf. 2.4.2) *yo* is characterised as the marker which indicates a strong epistemic authority on the part of the speaker that is not open to negotiation on the part of the hearer. This function of *yo* is very similar to the function of *sa* proposed by Morita (2005) (which is currently discussed here) as both particles are seen to indicate ‘non-negotiability’. With respect to this point, Morita (2005: 209) notes that “By limiting the scope of the particle *yo* in epistemic stance marking, we can distinguish between *sa* and *yo*. While *yo* seems to be specifically dealing with epistemic stance marking, *sa* seems to have a larger scope. Rather, *sa*’s prospective non-negotiability can range from the particular ‘meaning’ of referent…to the action as a whole…” This statement suggests that *yo* is limited to be attached to particular

\(^{13}\) Readers may notice that the term ‘alignment’ is also used in the current study to describe the characteristics of *ne* and *na* (cf. Chapter 5). However, note that as also pointed out by Morita (2005), the term ‘alignment’ is often used differently in studies of interaction-and-grammar, and in fact there are studies including Morita (2005) and the current study, which use it in different manners according to the different framework or approach adopted in each study. For example, in Morita (2005) the term indicates the mutual definitive positioning of the participants towards conversational move. Comparatively, in the current study it indicates the speaker’s attitude of establishing a mutual understanding with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.
propositional information, while sa does not have such a restriction, and thus sa seems to have a larger scope compared to yo. However, this is not true, and indeed yo is also used in non-sentence-final positions (thus, it is not associated with any independent propositional information), as mentioned several times already. This means that the function of yo proposed by Morita (2002) and that of sa proposed by Morita (2005) are basically the same, and the interactional approach of Morita (2005) does not provide a convincing explanation for the difference between these two particles.

As stated in Chapter 1, the current study deals with the larger scope of particles, i.e. ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo and ze, and takes a different interactional approach from Morita's (2005), i.e. the 'involvement-based' approach. This approach is expected to explain, for example, why Morita (2002, 2005) has arrived at the conclusion that yo and sa are similar, and also how these two particles are different from each other, in a comprehensive manner (cf. Chapter 6).

2.6. Social approach

As noted in Chapter 1, it has been acknowledged that the use of sentence-final particles influences the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants or some aspects of formality (Tokieda, 1951; Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Suzuki, 1976; Oishi, 1985; Maynard, 1989; Tanaka, 1989; McGlone, 1990; Masuoka, 1991; Cook, 1992; Oota, 1992; Shirakawa, 1992; Hayashi, 2000; Onodera, 2004). Here we focus on two representative studies, Cook (1992) and Onodera (2004), which particularly analyse the particles from such a social perspective.
2.6.1. Indexicality-based account

In line with the notion that language is used not only to express referential meaning but also to express 'social meaning' such as the speaker's attitudinal stance, the social identity of the participants, social relationships among the participants and social acts, Cook (1992) analyses *ne* by adopting the framework of indexicality. According to Cook (1992), language uses are indexes to express various social contexts. Cook (1992) more precisely states that indexes are signs that directly or indirectly indicate contextual information, and that the indirect indexical meaning (specific meaning) is particularised by the combination of the direct indexical meaning (core meaning) and its specific context. From such a perspective of indexicality, Cook (1992) examines how *ne* indexes direct and indirect meanings, and proposes a model, as illustrated below:

---

14 Cook (1992) incorporates the non-sentence-final use of *ne* as well as its sentence-final use into the analysis and attempts to provide a unified account for its function regardless of its positions in a sentence.

15 Cook (1992) provides the Japanese suffix *-masu* as an example to explain this. The Japanese suffix *-masu* directly indexes psychological distance between the conversational participants. This direct indexical meaning evokes the indirect indexical meaning as politeness in some social contexts because distancing implies non-imposition, while it evokes cold affect in intimate social contexts because distancing implies evaporation of intimacy.
In this model, *ne* directly indexes affective common ground between the speaker and the hearer, and indirectly indexes various social acts that require the hearer’s cooperation. Cook (1992) further argues that *ne* as the particle of affective common ground can also account for various social issues relevant to the use of *ne*: for example, the motivation of the frequent use of *ne* in face-to-face conversation, and the relationship between *ne* and formality.

While this ‘indexicality-based’ account offers an intensive and insightful analysis of *ne*, in attempting to capture its core function and its context sensitiveness, it adopts the notion of involvement in a restricted manner, in relation to the particular indirect indexes of the particle such as getting attention and keeping the floor. As pointed out by Lee (2007), this account is limited to the use of *ne* and incorporates the notion of involvement at its subset-level only. As a result, it has structural difficulties in providing an integrated analysis when the scope of the analysis is extended to other particles such
as *na, yo, sa, wa, zo*, and *ze*. Note that the current study sets up ‘involvement’ as the shared property of our seven targeted particles. By doing so, it attempts to account for their interactive nature including their social and interpersonal aspects in an integrated manner. That is to say, not only *ne* but also the other targeted particles *na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* are in principle more frequently used in informal face-to-face conversation due to the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement commonly indicated by these particles.

### 2.6.2. Politeness-based account

Onodera (2004) examines the functions of *ne* and *na* which occur in sentence-initial positions. Onodera (2004) classifies their functions into primary and secondary functions. The primary functions are further divided into (i) agreement, (ii) back channel, (iii) call attention before new information, (iv) reinforcement, (v) summons, and (vi) linking prior and upcoming information. The secondary functions are divided into (i) fillers and (ii) atmosphere sustainer. Onodera (2004) concludes that all of these functions fulfil positive politeness, and that they are markers of involvement\(^\text{16}\).

Although Onodera (2004) adopts the notion of involvement as the core function of *ne* and *na*, the scope of the analysis is limited to their sentence-initial use only. Moreover, Onodera (2004) adopts the notion of involvement restricted to positive politeness, and as a result encounters difficulties in dealing with some cases like the following example (22) (Also see example (19)) and fails to provide an accurate

---

\(^\text{16}\) By adopting the notion of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) positive politeness, Onodera (2004) uses the term ‘involvement’ in the sense that it is positive politeness which is a communicative strategy to ‘approach others’, in contrast to negative politeness which is a strategy to ‘keep distance from others’. As will be shown in Chapter 3, the notion of involvement in Onodera’s (2004) study is different from the one in the current study.
account for the functions of *ne* and *na*. In (22) below, *ne* is used in the sentence-final position, and may impart an impolite nuance.

(22) A: *Konna koto mo wakaranai no?*
   this thing even know-NEG SFP
   ‘You don’t even know about this?’

   B: *Wakaranai ne.*
   know-NEG NE
   ‘I don’t know it.’

   (Hasunuma, 1998:95)

In this conversational exchange, A asks B if he/she (B) does not know the thing, implying his/her (A’s) expectation that B should know such a thing. B responds to A that he/she does not know it, which contradicts A’s expectation, and importantly *ne* is used here. As noted by Hasunuma (1998), B’s use of *ne* in this case is considered as expressing his/her strong negation of A’s claim, compared to the utterance without *ne*, i.e. *Wakaranai*. A noteworthy point is that in the given context B’s negation, *Wakaranai*, is clearly unwanted by A (because A expects that B knows the thing), and the use of *ne* with the negation adds B’s attitude of seeking A’s alignment with such an undesirable response for A. This turns out to exert pressure on A and to make B’s negation sound stronger. Consequently, the use of *ne* here may be interpreted as B’s imposition on A and possibly heard as impolite. In short, the expression of politeness is not a genuine property of *ne* (and *na*), as also pointed out in some studies (Masuoka, 1991; Asano, 2003 for *ne*), and their use may sound impolite depending on information to which they are attached as well as the situational contexts (cf. Chapter 5). In this regard, Onodera’s (2004) account does not adequately capture the functions of *ne* and *na*.

---

17 Imposition violates the hearer’s negative face, hence may be interpreted as impolite (Brown and Levinson, 1987).
As will be discussed through Chapters 5, 6, and 7, the indication of politeness/impoliteness is not a genuine property of our seven targeted particles. For example, as briefly shown above, the single particle *ne* is perceived as polite in some cases, but not in other cases. In the current analysis, I define ‘involvement’ in terms of the expression of the speaker’s interactional attitude towards the hearer, and characterise it as the core property of our targeted particles. Furthermore, I clarify that these particles behave differently in the way that they deliver different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer’s involvement. By doing so, I will systematically explain not only the common effects of these particles, but also the unique effects of each particle on formality and politeness.

### 2.7. Summary

Throughout this chapter, I have provided an overview of how our seven targeted interactive markers have previously been analysed (I will provide details of previous studies on each marker in later discussions). I have shown that the interactive nature of the seven markers has not systematically and sufficiently been described in the previous studies due to their focus only on partial aspects of these markers (*ne* and *yo*, in particular) and/or on the syntactical, informational, or social aspect of these markers.

As has been noted several times, throughout this study, I will adopt the notion of involvement in close connection with the speaker’s attitude and offer an integrated analysis of the functions of the seven interactive markers, which comprehensively accounts for the issues related to the use of these markers such as their frequent use in spoken language, and their effects on the tone of the utterance, formality and the speaker’s gender.
CHAPTER 3

The key notions:
Involvement, formality and gender

3.1. Introduction

As shown in Chapter 2, while the previous studies have offered insights in their own right, they have tended to focus only on partial aspects of the seven interactive markers ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo and ze, and as a result their interactive nature has not sufficiently been described. The current study, thus, attempts to undertake a synthetic analysis of these markers in conjunction with the notion of involvement and social variables, i.e. formality and gender, which are closely related to the use of these markers, and to provide a systematic and comprehensive account for their interactional functions in spoken discourse.

However, before starting a detailed analysis, this chapter outlines the key notions of involvement, formality and gender that will relate to the analysis given in the subsequent chapters. Section 3.2 discusses the notion of involvement and provides the definition that is adopted in the current study. Sections 3.3 and 3.4 present some issues concerning the notions of formality and gender. As pointed out in many studies (e.g. Fischer, 1958 cited from Pride, 1975; Danziger, 1975; Mizutani, 1983 for formality; Falconer, 1984; Ide and MacGloin, 1990 for gender), the way in which formality and gender are exercised often differs between cultures. In Sections 3.3 and 3.4, I will show how Japanese culture reflects formality and gender in its language in comparison to Western culture. This will provide a basis for our analysis of how the functions of the
seven interactive markers are connected to the expressions of these social variables. Section 3.5 is a summary of the chapter.

3.2. Involvement

According to Besnier (1994), involvement as a systematic analytic category was predominantly invoked in two research areas: interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982) and discourse analysis (Chafe, 1982, 1985; Tannen, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1989). Besnier (1994: 279) notes that in the former area, involvement is regarded as "a prerequisite to the success of any conversational encounter, and is rendered possible by the presence of a shared body of linguistic and socio-cultural knowledge among conversationalists". Similarly, Gumperz (1982) claims that conversational involvement conveyed by the contextualization cues, e.g. prosodic signals, lexical choices and discourse devices, is fundamental for all linguistic understanding in this body. Gumperz (1982) states that in order to maintain conversational involvement interactants need to send and interpret 'contextualization cues' which carry implicit information such as what the activity is, how the semantic content of each sentence is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows.

In the latter research area, the notion of involvement is prominently discussed on the basis of the difference in speaking and writing processes (Chafe, 1982, 1985), or the distinction between oral and literate behaviours (Tannen, 1982, 1985). For example, Chafe (1982) notes that 'fragmentation' and 'involvement' are characterised as peculiar to spoken discourse, while 'integration' and 'detachment' as peculiar to written discourse. Chafe (1982) remarks that spoken discourse shows a variety of manifestations of involvement, which includes: the use of first-person references, the
overt use of speaker’s mental processes, the performances of monitoring the information flow, the use of emphatic particles, the use of vagueness and hedges, and the frequent choice of direct quotations. In contrast, written discourse fosters detachment in the frequent use of passives and nominalisations.

Tannen (1982, 1985) claims that the relative focus on involvement is the key dimension to distinguish between oral and literate behaviours. In Tannen (1982, 1985), oral and literate discourses are differentiated by the relative focus on interpersonal involvement and content (or information), respectively. Further, Tannen (1989) explicitly discusses the relationship between involvement and linguistic form in a conversational discourse. Tannen (1989) notes that involvement is created and maintained when speakers consistently employ a variety of linguistic strategies, and identifies (i) the repetition of phonemes, words and phrases, (ii) constructed dialogue and (iii) detail and imaginary, as particularly powerful markers of involvement. According to Tannen (1989), these strategies bring rhetorical effects or senses of vividness, and carry metamessages of rapport and shared feelings which determine the feature of involvement. More specifically, Tannen (1989: 12) states that “involvement is an internal, even emotional connection individuals feel which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories, and words”.

In close connection with the ‘shared feelings’ and ‘emotional connection’ which Tannen (1989) sees as the feature of involvement, it is informative to note that the expressions of feelings/emotions are often treated as a specific dimension of the

---

1 The interpersonal involvement and content (or information) are not viewed as mutually exclusive but rather as different points of focus on a continuum (Tannen, 1982, 1985).

2 Tannen (1985) notes that in face-to-face conversation, communicating what Bateson [1972] calls ‘metamessages of rapport’, e.g. statements about the relationship between the interactants, is often more important than the information or message conveyed in the utterance, and it is the necessary basis for any interaction.
conversational participants’ involvement (Daneš, 1994; Selting, 1994; Fried and Östman, 2005). For instance, Daneš (1994) discusses a general relationship between emotion/attitude and involvement with language and in language. Daneš (1994) points out that emotion is the most typical, natural and important manifestation of people’s involvement in language and different attitudes of language users towards language, and thus involvement can be seen as ‘more-than-normal’ signalling cues of participants’ emotion and attitude. Fried and Östman (2005: 1760) define involvement as a parameter which constrains the way of expressing the speaker’s feelings, opinions, affect and attitude. Furthermore, focusing on an emphatic speech style in conjunction with the notion of involvement, Selting (1994) identifies prosodic marking as an emphatic speech style which is used to heighten the speaker’s emotive involvement.

Arndt and Janney (1987) also view that ‘emotional involvement’ plays an important role in our conversation and identify ‘emotional involvement cues’ as more or less spontaneous expressions of momentary personal affective states. Yet, what is more important to note here is that there is the other dimension of involvement which Arndt and Janney (1987) call ‘interpersonal involvement’. According to Arndt and Janney (1987), ‘interpersonal involvement cues’ are approach-avoidance signals produced directly for the benefit of the hearer, and can further be divided into two: primary cues, e.g. verbal formality and gaze, and secondary cues, e.g. the presence or absence of references to the hearer in an utterance and smiling. Arndt and Janney (1987) discuss three cases for one of the secondary cues, i.e. the presence or absence of references to the hearer in an utterance, as illustrated below. (1) is the case where neither

---

3 Arndt and Janney (1987) also divide emotional involvement cues into primary and secondary cues. The primary cues include verbal intensity, pitch prominence and body posture, while the secondary cues include sudden increase in informality, sudden increase in directness, falling pitch in utterances normally requiring a rise, rising pitch in utterances normally requiring a fall, and gaze or gaze aversion.
conversational participant is referred to in utterances, whereas (2) is the case where the other participant is included and (3) is the cases where both participants are included.

(1) a. These things have to be put over there.  
b. It’s time to leave.  
   (Arndt and Janney, 1987: 359)

(2) a. John, put these things over there.  
b. Would you like to leave?  
   (Arndt and Janney, 1987: 360)

(3) a. Let’s put these things over there.  
b. Should we leave?  
   (Arndt and Janney, 1987: 360)

Arndt and Janney (1987) claim that the utterances in (1) tend to be interpreted as signs of interpersonal uninvolve, especially if they are not accompanied by other signs of interpersonal involvement, while those in (2) suggest a somewhat higher level of interpersonal involvement and those in (3) tend to be interpreted as signs of greater interpersonal involvement.

The notion of involvement, as we have seen, is interpreted in different ways among different researches due to their variance of research interests, different conceptual frameworks and assumptions. However, building upon these previous studies, involvement can be seen as a fundamental element in the initiation and maintenance of interaction, which is created and maintained by the consistent use of a variety of linguistic strategies including verbal and non-verbal means. Note that, as pointed out in Chapter 1, our seven targeted interactive markers frequently occur in face-to-face conversation and their use is almost mandatory for the success of conversation in Japanese (McGloin, 1990; Ide and Sakurai, 1997; Hayashi, 2000;
Katagiri, 2007). Furthermore, they are closely related to the non-referential (or interactional) meaning of language rather than referential (or propositional) meaning in the sense that they do not affect the truth-condition of the propositional information of an utterance, but influence the hearer’s interpretation of the utterance. Taking these features of the seven interactive markers into account, the current study assumes that these markers are linguistic signs that are directly related to the notion of involvement.

It is worth noting that, given the two dimensions of involvement, namely, emotional and interpersonal involvement, the use of the seven interactive markers neither explicitly expresses the speaker’s emotion nor is directly relevant to the presence of reference to the hearer. Nevertheless, in terms of the level of involvement, these markers have a similar effect as the cases of (2) and (3) above where interpersonal involvement is explicitly indicated, which can roughly be denoted as ‘I want you to understand’, ‘Don’t you think?’, ‘Listen to me’, ‘I have something to tell you’, and so forth. As implied by these paraphrases (These will be clarified through our analysis in later chapters), the impact of these markers is strong enough to draw the hearer’s special attention to the speaker’s utterance. It is true that when the speaker delivers information it is difficult to regard his/her utterance as only conveying what is actually said. Rather, as Tannen (1985: 131) points out, “one cannot speak without showing one’s attitude toward the message and the speech activity”. What should be emphasised here is that the seven interactive markers express the speaker’s ‘more-than-normal’ or ‘marked’ interactional attitude towards the hearer as exemplified in the above paraphrases, and
accordingly they can be seen as a manifestation of the speaker’s attitude\(^4\) of inviting the hearer’s involvement.

In sum, the relationship between involvement and the seven interactive markers lies in the speaker’s interactional attitude towards the hearer. In Chapter 4, I will highlight that the general function of these seven markers is to signal the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement.

### 3.3. Formality

Different linguistic variations are often discussed in connection with the bipolar dimension of formal vs. informal (Joos, 1967; Quirk et al. 1978; Trudgill, 1983; Arndt and Janney, 1987; Backhouse, 1993; Maynard, 1997; Iwasaki, 2002). For example, Joos (1967) proposes five distinct styles (in Joos’s term, ‘Five Clocks’): (i) frozen style, (ii) formal style, (iii) consultative style, (iv) casual style and (v) intimate style, associated with five degrees of formality in English.

According to Joos (1967), the frozen style is a style for print and declamation. It displays higher contextual independence than any other styles, seeking to channel as much information as possible into words. It discourages feedback or cross-questioning (the hearer’s participation) when it is used in face-to-face conversation. This style is for people who are to remain social strangers. The formal style is identified as having features such as informativeness, detachment and cohesiveness. It is less autonomous

\(^4\) The term ‘attitude’ I use throughout the current study is adopted from Kim (2005). Kim (2005) elaborates the term ‘attitude’ based on the definitions of ‘attitude’ provided in the New Shorter Oxford Dictionary [1993: 144] and the third edition of the Macquarie Dictionary [1997: 127]. The former defines attitude as “implying some action or mental state”, whereas the latter defines it as “position, disposition, or manner with regard to a person or thing”. By bringing the two definitions together, Kim (2005: 37) defines attitude as “a disposition/manner that implies the speaker’s mental state”. 
than the frozen style, but still discourages the hearer’s participation as well as protects the speaker himself/herself from involvement. This style is also used between strangers, but particularly in situations where the speaker is uncertain about the hearer’s reaction. The consultative style is characterised as a more or less normative communicative style. In contrast to the frozen and formal styles, it invites the hearer’s feedback and participation. It supplies contextual or background information, but is minimally based on the speaker’s assumption that the hearer shares socio-cultural and situational norms. This style is, thus, used when the speaker thinks that the hearer speaks his/her language but the hearer’s personal stock of information may be different from his/hers (cf. Joos, 1967: 23). Compared with the consultative style which supplies a type of public information (socio-cultural and situational norms) as fast as it is needed, the casual style tends to take this information for granted or merely alludes to it indirectly. By doing so, it pays the compliment of implying that the hearer understands without having to be given more information, and attempts to integrate the hearer into the speaker’s momentary inner-circle. This style is for friends, acquaintances or others whom the speaker wishes to define as insiders. The intimate style is used when the speaker assumes that the hearer knows what is being talked about and he/she (the hearer) hardly needs words. Therefore, it excludes public information, while such information is crucial for the consultative style.

It is widely acknowledged that the speaker’s choice of such verbal formality (or informality) is important for the success of social interaction. However, it is difficult to determine what exactly influences our choices of the level of formality in a particular conversation. This is because these choices involve a very complicated process which requires us to consider various aspects such as conversational settings, e.g. a job
interview vs. a casual lunch, social roles, e.g. strangers vs. friends, social status or power, e.g. section chief vs. subordinate, genres, e.g. written vs. spoken, gender, age, and so forth. It is also pointed out that the ‘formality complex’ may be universal to some extent, but particular components of the formality complex may vary from one culture to another (Fischer, 1958 cited from Pride, 1975).

Nonetheless, what is noteworthy from Joos’s (1967) study in relation to the current study is that there seems to be a correlation between the speaker’s projection of affective and behavioural interdependence with the hearer and the speech style, i.e. more formal or informal, he/she chooses, as also noted by Arndt and Janney (1987). More precisely, the less the speaker’s interdependence with the hearer is, the more he/she uses formal speech, whereas the greater the speaker’s interdependence with the hearer is, the more he/she chooses informal speech. This correlation is further connected to the point that within spoken language the variations in ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ speech styles can be understood as signals of interpersonal distance (Rands and Levinger, 1979; Ide, 1982; Arndt and Janney, 1987; Cook, 1990; Backhouse, 1993; Kikuchi, 1994). Therefore, accordingly they are accompanied by different degrees of involvement, as pointed out by Arndt and Janney (1987). Consider (4) below.

(4) a. Hello, Mrs. Johnson

   vs.

b. Hi, Marie  
   (Arndt and Janney, 1987: 358)

(4) shows the contrast of formal vs. informal forms. When the speaker finds or attempts to increase the interpersonal space between himself/herself and the hearer, he/she adopts a more formal style such as ‘Hello’ and title plus last name, Mrs. Johnson, as in (4a). In
contrast, when the speaker defines or desires to establish his/her relationship with the hearer as one closer, he/she adopts a more informal style such as ‘Hi’ and first name, Marie, as in (4b). Arndt and Janney (1987) argue that the higher formality expressed in (4a) is associated with a lower level of interpersonal involvement, and the low formality expressed in (4b) is associated with a higher level of interpersonal involvement. Recall that involvement is often manifested through the expressions of the conversational participants’ feelings/emotions and attitude, thereby involving them in the deployment of interaction (cf. 3.2). This suggests that the formality which is associated with the different degrees of involvement is ensured not only by the formality of verbal forms, e.g. “Hello, Mrs. Johnson” or “Hi, Marie”, but also by the different ways the speaker expresses his/her feelings/emotions and attitude towards the hearer, e.g. indirect or direct manner. As will be discussed throughout Chapters 5, 6 and 7, this feature of formality is closely related to the way in which our seven targeted interactive markers contribute to formality through signalling the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement.

Another important aspect of formality relevant to the current study is that, as mentioned earlier, the particular components of ‘formality complex’ differ from one culture to another (Fischer, 1958 cited from Pride, 1975; Danziger, 1975; Mizutani, 1983). As pointed out in the literature (e.g. Lyons, 1977; Brown and Fraser, 1979; Irvine, 1979), there is a scale of formality in all languages. The Japanese language is not an exception to this and it also shows distinct speech levels along with a formal-informal dimension⁵ (Martin, 1964; Mizutani, 1983; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987;

---

⁵ Polite forms, i.e. ‘desu’ and ‘masu’, are a typical verbal device used to express formality, while plain forms, i.e. ‘da’ and ‘ru’, are considered to be informal speech markers (Martin, 1964; Ide, 1982; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Niyekawa, 1991).
Niyejawa, 1991; Backhouse, 1993; Maynard, 1997; Iwasaki, 2002; Sturtzsreetharan, 2006). However, there are some factors that play a crucial part in the choice of formal (or informal) style in Japanese culture. According to Mizutani (1983), in Japanese culture the choice of formal (or informal) style tends to be largely conditioned by the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants rather than the conversational setting. This can be understood by comparing an example of social interaction in a Japanese cultural context with that in an American cultural context. Danziger (1976: 44) notes that in an American context “it is possible that the same persons will address each other differently in a formal committee meeting and at a cocktail party”\(^6\). This means that in an American context, for example, a boss normally refers to his/her subordinate as Mr./Ms. Brown at a formal committee meeting, while he/she may refer to the subordinate by the first name, e.g. Tom or Kate, at an informal cocktail party. Similarly, the subordinate refers to his/her boss as Mr./Ms. Smith at a formal committee meeting, but may refer to the boss as John or Mary at a cocktail party.

Now let us consider the speech style in the same conversational setting of a Japanese context. A boss normally refers to his/her subordinate as Mr./Ms. at a formal committee meeting, e.g. Kimura-kun or Kimura-san, while he/she may refer to the subordinate by the family name without the address term -san\(^7\), e.g. Kimura, at an informal cocktail party. This is the same case as the American context mentioned above. However, when the subordinate calls his/her boss in a Japanese context, unlike in an

\(^6\) Although the focus of the current study is not on the use of address terms, it has widely been accepted that address terms are linguistic means to demonstrate the complex social relationship between people in a particular community (Trudgill, 1983) or reflect the relationship between language and society (Shih, 1986; Keshavarz, 2001). Thus, the discussion on the use of address terms is relevant to the current discussion in order to illustrate how the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants is related to the language formality/informality in different cultural contexts.

\(^7\) -san is used after a name as a generic title in Japanese and equivalent to English Mr., Ms., Mrs. or Miss.
American context, it is unacceptable for him/her to call the boss by the family name without the name of the position, e.g. Yamada⁸, or the first name, e.g. Takashi or Hiroko, regardless of the conversational setting. That is to say, in an American context calling one’s boss by the first name ‘John/Mary’ in an informal occasion is conceivable⁹, whereas in a Japanese context calling one’s boss by the first name ‘Takashi/Hiroko’ instead of ‘Yamada kachoo’ (lit. Section Chief, Yamada) is not acceptable no matter whether the conversational setting is formal or informal (Mizutani, 1983; Sugito, 1983; Ide, 1989; Maynard, 1997). The reason for this unacceptability of calling one’s boss by the first name is because someone socially lower is supposed to speak in a formal way to someone socially higher not only in formal settings, but also in informal settings in a Japanese context. As such, although the formality of the linguistic expressions used may vary in specific cases, as far as the speech style of someone socially lower to someone socially higher is concerned, the formal or informal stylistic choice in a Japanese context is not essentially a product of the particular conversational setting. Rather, it is pre-determined by the interpersonal relationship, and thus can be regarded as exhibiting a relatively permanent characteristic¹⁰ as far as address terms are concerned (Also see Kim (2005) for a similar claim).

Thus far, I have discussed some issues on formality that are assumed to be closely related to the use of our seven targeted interactive markers. I have pointed out that formality which signals the interpersonal distance between the speaker and the hearer is

---

⁸ It is normal to address someone of a higher social status by the name of that position such as Kachoo ‘Section Chief’ and Sensei ‘Teacher’ in Japanese (Suzuki, 1978).
⁹ According to Maynard (1997), American people feel more comfortable minimising the difference even though there is a difference in social hierarchy between the conversational participants. Thus, they often use the strategy in calling each other by first names, which conveys a message that they are (or want to be) friends.
¹⁰ In Japanese culture someone socially lower, younger, and/or junior is generally required to speak in a formal way to someone socially higher, older and/or senior (Sugito, 1983).
often associated with different degrees of involvement, hence it is thought to be ensured not only by the formality of verbal forms, but also by the different ways the speaker expresses his/her feelings/emotions and attitude towards the hearer, e.g. indirect or direct manner. As will be shown in later chapters, this feature of formality is particularly important for the analysis of the expressive effects of the seven interactive markers.

As noted in Chapter 1, the use of the seven interactive markers is closely related to some aspects of formality (e.g. Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Oishi, 1985; Maynard, 1989; Oota, 1992). The current study assumes that this is because the use of these markers is a direct presentation of the speaker's attitude towards the hearer through expressing his/her invitation of the hearer's involvement (cf. 3.2). The use of these markers is thus restricted by the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer such as the relative social hierarchy and/or age which play a significant role for Japanese speaker's choice of speech styles, i.e. more formal or informal. Further discussions about the relationship between the use of the seven interactive markers and formality will be given through the detailed analysis of these markers in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

3.4. Gender

So far I have discussed the two key notions, involvement and formality, relevant to the use of the seven interactive markers. Lastly, I will outline some major issues concerning the relationship between gender and language in this section.

It has often been claimed that in many societies men and women use language differently (cf. Coates, 1993; McCormick, 1998). Among numerous studies on the different use of language between men and women, I have found that three approaches
developed in Western societies\textsuperscript{11} are particularly noteworthy, and they reveal some underlying issues on the relationship between gender and language. They are the ‘dominance’ approach (e.g. Trudgill, 1972; Lakoff, 1975; Zimmerman and West, 1975), the ‘difference’ approach (e.g. Maitz and Borker, 1982; Tannen, 1990, 1993, 1996), and the ‘social construction’ approach\textsuperscript{12} (e.g. McElhinny, 1995; Eckert, 2003; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2003; McConnell-Ginet, 2003; Holmes and Stubbe, 2003).

The ‘dominance’ approach (e.g. Trudgill, 1972; Lakoff, 1975; Zimmerman and West, 1975) empirically investigates differences between male and female speeches and identifies the role of language as creating and maintaining social inequality between men and women. For instance, Zimmerman and West (1975: 125) report that men interrupt women more often in conversations and conclude that “just as male dominance is exhibited through male control of macro-institutions in society, it is also exhibited through control of at least a part of one micro-institution”. Lakoff (1975: 54) also links women’s use of hedges with unassertiveness and argues that this is because women “are socialised to believe that asserting themselves strongly isn’t nice or ladylike, or even feminine”. Within this approach the difference in using language between men and women reflects the unequal gender relations (or power relations) in society in a way that men dominate women.

The ‘difference’ approach (e.g. Maitz and Borker, 1982; Tannen, 1990, 1993, 1996) argues that sex-separate socialisation is the source of different language use between men and women. Tannen (1990), for example, claims that while all speakers

\textsuperscript{11} McCormick (1998) notes that most research on gender and language has been conducted in Western industrialised societies and has provided a wealth of materials with regard to the relationship between gender and language. In particular, the three below are widely acknowledged as major approaches by many scholars (See, for example, Kendall and Tannen (2001), McIlvenny (2002), Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003), and Yukawa and Saito (2004)).

\textsuperscript{12} This approach is closely related to the ‘doing gender’ approach (West and Zimmerman, 1987) and the ‘performative’ approach (Bulter, 1990).
must find a balance between seeking connection and negotiating relative status, conversational rituals learned by boys and maintained by men tend to focus on the status dimension, and those learned by girls and maintained by women do more on the connection dimension. This approach does not deny either the existence of dominance relations in general or the dominance of women by men in particular. Rather, it questions the notion that the source of the different use of language between men and women is simply located in male domination over women. Crawford (1995) notes that within the difference approach male and female talk are equally limiting for their users in cross-sex interaction, and thus the speech style attributed to men is no longer powerful, but merely one way of negotiating the social landscape.

The ‘social construction’ approach (e.g. McElhinny, 1995; Eckert, 2003; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2003; McConnell-Ginet, 2003; Holmes and Stubbe, 2003) considers diverse language forms and gender meaning mediated by cultural ideologies\(^\text{13}\), and attempts to overcome the essentialism\(^\text{14}\) of the earlier studies. Within this approach, gender is not seen as an identity someone just ‘has’ or ‘is’, but rather as a product of people’s social interaction. More specifically, this approach assumes that gender does not just exist, but is continually produced, reproduced, and changed through people’s performance in social interaction, recognising that such performances are related to both conventional gendered identities and identities that in one way or another challenge such conventional gendered norms.

\(^{13}\) The term ‘ideology’ refers to “the system of beliefs by which people explain, account for, and justify their behaviour, and interpret and assess that of others” (Eckert and McConnell, 2003: 35).

\(^{14}\) According to McIlvenny (2002: 2), the perspective of essentialism is that “gender has tended to be seen as a variable attribute or essence of a speaker that is expressed in, or causes, certain linguistic behaviours, practices and/or actions in particular social contexts. Talk is simply a vehicle for the display of what essentially independent, internal properties: one talks the way one does because one is a man or a woman, and talk is reflective of that essential difference”.
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For example, Holmes and Stubbe (2003) provide a summary of the most widely cited features of ‘feminine’ and ‘masculine’ interactional styles and examine data produced by two female managers from New Zealand at different business meetings. Holmes and Stubbe (2003) find that both managers skilfully mixed a variety of features typically associated with the feminine and masculine speech styles (cf. Footnote 15) in a way that is appropriate to the norms of their workgroup, and to the specific situation at the given time. Holmes and Stubbe (2003: 595) conclude that “individual women and men construct their gender identities and balance these with their professional roles within the parameters established as acceptable by the group with which they work”.

Up to now I have summarised the three major approaches to the issues involved in gender and language in Western societies. They show that gendered socio-cultural constraints influence different language use by men and women to some extent, while individuals accommodate, resist or contest such gendered socio-cultural norms and strategically choose appropriate linguistic behaviours to suit a given situation. Bearing this in mind, let us now turn to review studies on the relationship between gender and language in a Japanese context.

The Japanese language has also been characterised as having distinct male and female speeches and expressions, and many studies have pointed out a number of linguistic features differently used by men and women, which include personal pronouns, sentence-final particles, honorifics, pitch heights and intonation (e.g. Oda, 1964; Jugaku, 1979; Ide, 1982; 1990; Reynolds, 1985; Shibamoto Smith, 1985, 2004; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Ide and McGloin, 1990; Oohara, 1992; Oota, 1992; 15 Feminine interactional styles are characterised as indirect, conciliatory, facilitative, collaborative, giving minor contribution (in public), supportive feedback, person/process-oriented and affectively oriented. Masculine styles are characterised as direct, confrontational, competitive, autonomous, dominating (public) talking time, aggressive interruptions, task/outcome-oriented and referentially oriented (Holmes and Stubbe, 2003: 574).
Fukushima, 1993; Suzuki, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Maynard, 1997; Iwasaki, 2002; Aizawa, 2003; Kawasaki and Mcdougall, 2003; Inoue, 2004; Okamoto and Shibamoto Smith, 2004; Kashiwagi, 2006). Nonetheless, a particularly noteworthy fact is that in a Japanese context, considerable attention has been paid to the female speech called ‘Japanese women’s language’ which is closely connected to the notion of onnarashisa ‘womanliness’ (Jugaku, 1979; Ide, 1982, 1990; Reynolds, 1985, 1990; Shibamoto Smith, 1985; Suzuki, 1993; Endo, 1997; Inoue, 2004; Okamoto, 2004; Yukawa and Saito, 2004). As noted by Ide and McGloin (1990) below, this indicates that gender exercised in the Japanese language cannot be reduced to questions of power and status alone, as has been one of the central issues in Western societies, as noted earlier:

“...among highly developed industrial countries Japan is unique in that feminism has not revolutionised people’s ways of thinking and living. Though it has had a certain influence, most people stick to old ways. The reasons might lie in assumptions about what it is to be a man or a woman in Japanese society. In Western societies interaction is carried out on the basis of individualism and egalitarianism. Instead of claiming the same status and role as men, Japanese women prefer a complementary vision of status and role differences, giving them equal dignity, despite differences in form”.

(Ide and McGloin, 1990: i-ii)

Falconer (1984) also remarks that the difference between Japanese male and female speeches is induced by much greater significance of -rashii ‘-like’ such as otokorashii ‘man-like’ and onna-rashii ‘woman-like’ in Japanese society, carrying much stronger connotations of expectations and conforming to rules, than in the West.

---

16 Falconer (1984) uses the term ‘-rashii’ as attributes, activities and behaviours which one is expected to have in Japanese society.
Such ‘Japanese women’s language’ has been discussed in terms of female-specific values, attributes and social roles registered in speech forms and in the management of conversation (cf. Inoue, 2004). For instance, polite speech is interpreted as an index of femininity because the essence of ‘women’s language’ is their concern with politeness (Suzuki, 1993)\textsuperscript{17}. Nakamura (1995) notes that the maintenance of a concept such as ‘women’s language’ leads to the belief that there are characteristic features common to all Japanese women’s language use, and in this way the concept helps to keep women in submissive silence or seduces them into using the stereotypical feminine speech style, which most likely protects them from criticism\textsuperscript{18}.

However, as pointed out by Jugaku (1979), although Japanese women’s use of language seems to be considerably constrained by the concept of ‘women’s language’ or the notion of onna-rashisa ‘womanliness’, the arbitrary and intentional nature of ‘Japanese women’s language’ can hardly be denied\textsuperscript{19}. For example, Okamoto (1995) analyses young female speech styles and finds that the styles are actually chosen strategically, according to multiple social factors such as gender, age, marital and occupational status, the degree of intimacy and the level of formality of the situation, in order to communicate a desired pragmatic meaning and construct their identities and relationships\textsuperscript{20}. Okamoto (1995) highlights the variability of the actual language

\textsuperscript{17} ‘Japanese women’s language’ is also characterised as soft, indirect, emphatic, non-assertive, and so forth. For more details, see Suzuki (1976), Falconer (1984), Raynolds (1990), Masuoka and Takubo (1994), Shibamoto Smith (2001) and Inoue (2004).

\textsuperscript{18} Okamoto (1997) notes that female speech styles that do not conform to ‘women’s language’ may be criticised as unfeminine, unattractive, ignorant and symptomatic of improper upbringing.

\textsuperscript{19} Jugaku (1979) notes that onna-rashisa ‘womanliness’ in female speech is the result of very carefully manipulating various features of the Japanese language to create the appearance of ‘natural’ femininity.

\textsuperscript{20} Maynard (1997) also points out that the speaker’s gender is not the only determinant for choosing male and female speeches, but that it interacts with other variables such as (i) psychological factors, e.g. social identification, (ii) social and ideological factors, e.g. power
behaviour of Japanese women and reveals that ‘Japanese women’s language’ is not reality but ideology.

Takasaki (1993) makes a similar point to Okamoto (1995). Takasaki (1993) asks female informants if they sometimes control their speech while thinking that since they are women, they should speak onna-rashiku ‘as expected of women’. The majority answer that they try to speak onna-rashiku ‘as expected of women’ depending on the situation. This answer, in turn, indicates that they do not try to speak onna-rashiku ‘as expected of women’ all the time, but rather deliberately and arbitrarily adopt ‘Japanese women’s language’ based on what they think is most appropriate for the given situation (Also see Matsumoto (2007) and Suzuki (2007) for a similar claim). In sum, Okamoto (1995) and Takasaki (1993) imply that Japanese women strategically choose to speak in a certain way under the influence of a gender ideology that determines how women should speak. This means that although the ‘dominant’ linguistic ideology influences Japanese women’s strategies of language use, it is not always exercised by everyone in exactly the same way at all times.

Having said that, what is important to keep in mind for our analysis of the seven interactive markers is the fact that some of these markers have been seen as playing an important role in marking the difference between male and female speeches in the Japanese language (Oda, 1964; Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Kitagawa, 1977; Tanaka, 1977; Jugaku, 1979; Ide, 1982, 1990; Reynolds, 1985; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; McGloin, 1990, 1997; Oota, 1992; Uchida, 1993; Maynard, 1997; Olivares, 1998; Iwasaki, 2002; 21

associated with male speech, (iii) situational factors, e.g. framing of the situation, and (iv) discourse factors, e.g. topic.

A similar point is made by Nakamura (2005) and Inoue (2006). For instance, Inoue (2006: 13) notes that “‘women’s language’ is a set of linguistic beliefs about forms and functions of language used by and associated with Japanese women...it is a culturally salient category and knowledge about ‘how women speak’, how they ‘usually speak’ or ‘should speak’.”
Aizawa, 2003; Kawasaki and McDougall, 2003; Shibamoto Smith, 2004; Yonezawa, 2005; Inoue, 2006). More specifically, although men do not always use *na, zo* and *ze* and women do not always use *wa*, the use of *na, zo* and *ze* has still been considered as a specific feature of male speech, whereas *wa* as a feature of female speech (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Tanaka, 1977; Ide, 1982, 1990; Reynolds, 1985; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; McGloin, 1990, 1997). It is sometimes pointed out that the difference between male and female speeches in the Japanese language has been diminished due to various social changes (Oota, 1992; Kobayashi, 1993; Okamoto, 1995; Ozaki, 1997; Lee, 2003; Ogawa, 2006). For example, Okamoto (1995) reports that young women now use the masculine expressions as well. Yet, what needs to be stressed here is the fact that *na, zo* and *ze* are characterised as male speech, and *wa* as female speech, and the focus of the current study will be on the grounds for these characteristics in close connection with the distinct function of each marker, rather than for how women and men have recently been using these markers. The relationship between the use of the seven interactive markers and gender will be explored throughout Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

3.5. Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the three key notions of involvement, formality and gender, which are particularly influential on the speaker’s use of our seven targeted interactive markers. Focusing on the notion of involvement, I have overviewed previous studies on involvement and defined it as a fundamental element for the initiation and maintenance of interaction, which can in particular be created by the expressions of the conversational participants’ feelings/emotions and attitude through various linguistic strategies.
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With respect to formality, I have noted that it can be ensured not only by the formality of verbal forms, but also by the different ways the speaker expresses his/her feelings/emotions and attitude towards the hearer. By comparing the interaction in a Japanese context with that of an American context, I have also shown that especially in the former, the speaker’s choice of formal (or informal) speech style tends to be conditioned by the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer rather than by the particular conversational setting.

I have also outlined the major issues in the relationship between gender and language in a Japanese context as well as in a Western context. I have highlighted that in a Japanese context the notions of otoko-rashisa ‘manliness’ and onna-rashisa ‘womanliness’, rather than the power relationship between men and women, influence one’s language choice, in particular for the case of women.

Grounded on these key notions presented in this chapter, in the following chapters, 5 through 7, I will provide a detailed analysis of the functions of the seven interactive markers. Before that, however, in Chapter 4, I will elaborate on the relationship between these markers and the notion of involvement, and establish a framework for the analysis.
CHAPTER 4

Involvement and the speaker's attitude: Incorporative vs. monopolistic

4.1. Introduction

Following on from Section 3.2, this chapter elucidates the relationship between the seven interactive markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* and the notion of involvement, and provides a framework for the analysis presented in the following chapters. As noted in Section 3.2, the current study views these markers as closely related to the notion of involvement in the sense that they are a linguistic device of signalling the speaker's attitude of inviting the hearer's involvement. Further, the study assumes that these markers are characteristically different from each other in the way that they deliver different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer's involvement. This chapter attempts to provide a theoretical basis for these views of this study, and to further show that the seven interactive markers can be divided into two subsets according to attitudes of the speaker in inviting the hearer's involvement signalled by the different markers. These are:

(i) Incorporative: *ne, na*

(ii) Monopolistic: *yo, sa, wa, zo, ze*

The chapter is organised in the following manner. I will first demonstrate in Section 4.2 that signalling the speaker's attitude of inviting the hearer's involvement is
the general function shared by the seven interactive markers. Then, in Section 4.3, I will summarise the notions of ‘incorporative’ and ‘monopolistic’ which have been proposed by Lee (2007) with respect to the interactive nature of ne and yo within the ‘involvement-based’ approach. In Section 4.4, I will adopt the initial spirit of Lee’s (2007) account, and suggest that the incorporative-monopolistic distinction is extendedly applicable to the other five targeted markers na, sa, wa, zo and ze as well. In Section 4.5, I will present a summary of this chapter.

4.2. Involvement and the speaker’s attitude

As noted in the previous chapters, one of the distinct features of the seven interactive markers is that they are primarily used in spoken language, and hardly found in written language (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Sakuma, 1983; Oishi, 1985; Maynard, 1989; McGloin, 1990; Hasunuma, 1998; Hayashi, 2000; Yonezawa, 2005; Katagiri, 2007; Izuhara, 2008). This simple and well-known fact is directly connected to the different characteristics between spoken and written language. Let us compare the following examples (1) and (2) below ((1) and (2) below were given as (1) and (2) in Chapter 1 and are re-presented here in order to provide a further discussion on the given issue). (1) is a typical conversational segment extracted from a face-to-face conversation between two female friends, whereas (2) is a paragraph of a typical written descriptive text from an article in the newspaper Yomiuri Shinbun.

(1) 1 A: Nantoka shita atoni, koo kekkonsuru aite ga ireba somehow did after like.this get.married partner SUB there.is-CD
2  ii  n  da  kedo  ne.
good  NOM  BE  but  NE
‘It would be nice to have someone to marry after I get myself set up.’

3  B:  Hontoo.
true
‘I agree.’

4  A:  Kekekoo  juuyoo  janai.
fairly  important  BE-NEG
‘It’s pretty important, isn’t it?’

5  B:  Sore  wa  iru  yo.
that  TOP  need  YO
‘(You) need that (person).’

6  A:  Zutto  hitorimi,  dokushin  tte  iu  no  mo  ne,  kanashii  to
forever  single  spinsterhood  QT  say  NOM  also  NE  sad  QT

7  omou  yo,  josei  no  baai  wa.
think  YO  woman  LK  case  TOP
‘I think it’s sad for women to be alone forever, too.’

8  B:  Un,  soo  da  ne.
yes  so  BE  NE
‘Yes, I think so.’

9  A:  Un,  yappari  ne,  un.  Watashi  no  tomodachi  kekkoo,
yes,  as.expected  NE  yes  LK  friend  fairly

10 kekkonshinai  tte  hito  ooi  yo.
get.married-NEG  QT  people  many  YO
‘Yeah, I thought so. I have quite a few friends who say they won’t get
married.’

11  B:  So.
so
‘Really?’

12  A:  Ano,  minna  koo,  eritoo  no  michi  o  iku  yoona,  ko
well  everyone  like.this  elite  LK  path  OBJ  go  a.sort.of  child

13 bakkari  da  kara  sa.
only  BE  because  SA
‘Well, everyone is taking this sort of elite path, so.’  (CFF4)
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(2) Tandem jitensha to yobareru futari nori no jitensha de
Tandem bicycle QT call-PASS 2-seater LK bicycle by
‘Sekai-isshu-ryokoo’ ni, Minato ku Mita no shisutemuenjinia no
a.trip.around.the.world toward Minato.Ward Mita LK system.engineer APP
Aoki Fumiya san to Naomi san fusai ga choosenshiteiru.
Mr.Fumiya.Aoki and Mrs.Naomi wife.and.husband SUB challenge-PROG
Suden ni nisen yo nen shichi gatsu kara hantoshi kakete Hokubei,
already 2004 July from half.a.year take North.America
Tahichi, Oosutoraria nado Taiheiyou shuuhen no kuniguni o megutteori,
Tahiti Australia etc. Pacific vicinity LK countries OBJ have.toured
rainen shi gatsu kara, nokori no Nanbei, Ooshuu, Aija, Afurika
next.year April from rest APP South.America Europe Asia Africa
no yaku yonjukkakoku o mawatte, mokuhyoo o tasseishitai
APP about 40.countries OBJ tour goal OBJ want.to.reach
kangae da.
thought BE

‘Mr. Fumiya Aoki who is a system engineer at Mita in Minato Ward and his wife
Naomi are attempting ‘a trip around the world’ on a 2-seater bicycle called Tandem.
They have already been to areas surrounding the Pacific such as North America,
Tahiti and Australia, taking half a year from July 2004, and from April next year
they are thinking of reaching their goal by touring around another 40 or so countries
in South America, Europe, Asia and Africa.’ (Yomiuri Newspaper, 2006)

In relation to our current discussion, what should be focused on in the comparison of the
above two examples is that in the conversation (1) the interactive markers ne, yo and sa
are used, while in the written descriptive text (2) no interactive markers are used.

The different characteristics of spoken and written language have been discussed
in a number of studies (e.g. Chafe, 1982, 1985; Tannen, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1989;
difference between face-to-face conversation and expository prose and states that face-
to-face conversation “seeks primarily to move an audience by means of involvement”,
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as opposed to expository prose which "seeks to convince an audience while maintaining
distance between speaker/writer and audience". Similarly, Chafe (1985: 105) notes that
writing involves the isolation of the writer, which "causes written language to have a
detached quality that contrasts with the involvement of spoken language". As implied in
these studies, face-to-face conversation involves the dynamics of interaction with the
hearer, for which the speaker's expression of his/her interactional attitude towards the
hearer through involvement plays a significant role. In contrast, in written descriptive
texts the writer is required to describe events or situations in an expository manner and
he/she is generally restricted from engaging in direct interaction with the reader, hence
no direct involvement with the reader is expressed. The different characteristics between
spoken and written language that are based on the level of involvement, are the primary
reason for the fact that the seven interactive markers are found basically only in spoken
language — Their general function is to signal the speaker's attitude of inviting the
hearer’s involvement.

Let us consider the following example, which is a rewritten version of the
descriptive text in (2) above, with some interactive markers added, in order to observe
their effect.

(2)’ (Redisplay of (2) with the interactive markers used in an appropriate manner)

_Tandemu jitensha to yobareru futari nori no jitensha de sa 'Sekai-isshuu-ryokoo'
i ne, Minato ku Mita no ne shisutemenjinia no Aoki Fumiya san to Naomi san
fusai ga ne choosenshiteiru yo..._

In this example, the interactive markers _sa, ne and yo_ are inserted in the sentence-medial
position as well as in the sentence-final position. Native speakers of Japanese will
immediately feel that the text has lost its expository nature, and sounds unnatural as a
descriptive text, while it instead has the interactive mood, i.e. speaking towards
someone. As noted above, since the direct involvement of the writer with the reader is
restricted in written texts, it is obvious that the unnaturalness of the above text is
induced by the conflict of the nature of the text with the high level of involvement
signalled by the use of the given interactive markers.

(3) below is an extract from Maynard (1991), which further illustrates that the
general function of the seven interactive markers is to signal the speaker’s attitude of
inviting the hearer’s involvement. (3) is a single speech made by a man who is the
secretary of a prosecutor’s office. He reports to his boss how Harue, who is a neighbour
of a crime suspect, commented about the suspect. His speech focuses on explaining why
Harue maintains an unfriendly attitude towards the suspect.

(3) Kore to itte genin ni naru yoona dekigotoga atta wake QT say cause RES become something like incident SUB there was reason
de wanai to omoimasu ne. Moshi omotedatta kenka demo BE-TOP-NEG QT think NE if apparent fight or something
shiteireba, kitto Harue no kuchi kara kinjo ni hiromatteiru do-PROG-CD certainly Harue LK mouth from neighbour RES spread-PROG
hazu desu kara. Tabun, Harue ni shitemireba, jibun to doonenpai no should BE since perhaps Harue for self as same age LK
onna ga hitori de shareta uchi ni sunde, akanuketa minari de woman SUB by alone stylish house in live fashionable clothes with
tsuukinshiteiru. Tokitama gaisha de okurarete kaette kuru. Sooyuu commute PROG sometimes foreign car by drive PASS return as such
hadena kurashi ga netamashikatta to yuu koto janai n deshoo showy life style OBJ was jealous QT say fact BE-NEG NOM suppose
ka.
QUE
‘I don’t think there was a specific incident that caused the incident. If they actually had a fight, that is sure to be known by the neighbours since Harue is certain to have spread that. Perhaps for Harue, (it was upsetting to see that) a woman about the same age as herself lives in a stylish house and goes to work, wearing fashionable clothes. And sometimes the woman is driven back home by a foreign car. Isn’t it that (Harue) was jealous of such a showy life style?’

(Maynard, 1991: 562-563)

What is particularly important to our present discussion is the mixed use of the da/ru and desu/masu forms in this speech. In (3) the da/ru form is used in the third (tsuukinshiteiru) and fourth (kaette kuru) sentences, while the desu/masu form is used in the first (omoi masu), second (hazu desu) and fifth (koto janai n deshoo ka). In Japanese, the da/ru and desu/masu forms of verb morphology have been traditionally characterised as representing different speech styles, the ‘informal’ and ‘formal’, respectively (Martin, 1964; Ide, 1982; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Niye kawa, 1991). Thus, it is usually the case that either one of the two forms is consistently used in a single speech. However, as shown in (3), there are some cases where both da/ru and desu/masu forms are used in a single speaking turn. Another important point is that the use of the seven interactive markers with the da/ru form in the third and fourth sentences is impossible.

According to Maynard (1991: 580), “in predominantly desu/masu discourse, the da ending often marks background information subordinate to the overall structure of discourse” and in that case the speaker’s awareness of ‘thou’ (the speaker’s sensitivity towards the other) is tentatively low. Indeed, in (3) the main concern of the statements in the third and fourth sentences which employ the da/ru form, i.e. tsuukinshiteiru in the third and kaette kuru in the fourth, is to develop the content of the conversation by
simply adding the background information to the speaker’s point in the fifth sentence,
Soo yuu haden a kurashi ga netamashikatta to yuu koto janai n deshoo ka ‘Isn’t it that
(Harue) was jealous of such a showy life style?’. While delivering the third and fourth
sentences, the speaker tentatively disregards his interactional attitude of directly
conveying the information to the hearer (his boss) (although these sentences are still
informative for the hearer by virtue of the interactive nature of the conversational
setting). More importantly, the seven interactive markers cannot be used with the third
and fourth sentences. What is shown by this impossible use of the seven markers with
the given sentences is that the use of these markers is not allowed when the main
concern of the statement is not to interact with the hearer, and this, in turn, again
indicates that the speaker’s interactional attitude, i.e. the speaker’s invitation of the
hearer’s involvement, is the core property of these markers. This point that the core
property commonly shared by the seven interactive markers is the speaker’s invitation
of the hearer’s involvement, will further be justified through later discussions of this
thesis.

4.3. Incorporative vs. monopolistic

Given that the general function of the seven interactive markers is to signal the
speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement, in this section I discuss two
types of such attitudes of the speaker, ‘incorporative’ and ‘monopolistic’, which have
been proposed by Lee (2007) with respect to the interactive nature of ne and yo. The
notions of ‘incorporative’ and ‘monopolistic’ have been developed within the
interactional approach (or more specifically, the involvement-based approach), which
sets up ‘involvement’ and ‘the speaker’s attitude’ as core components of the analysis of
the two markers. In what follows, I first provide an overview of the notions of incorporative and monopolistic since they will be a basis for my classification of the seven interactive markers presented in the next section.

Lee (2007) adopts the notion of involvement in close connection with a role of the speaker’s attitude in conversation, and characterises *ne* and *yo* as the incorporative and monopolistic marker, respectively. In order to understand the incorporative attitude signalled by *ne* and the monopolistic attitude by *yo*, let us first observe (4) below.

(4) a. *Eiga, omoshirokatta.*  
movie was.interesting  
‘The movie was interesting.’

b. *Eiga, omoshirokatta ne.*  
movie was.interesting NE  
‘The movie was interesting.’

c. *Eiga, omoshirokatta yo.*  
movie was.interesting YO  
‘The movie was interesting.’

(Lee, 2007: 367)

As noted in the previous chapters, the seven interactive markers including *ne* and *yo* do not affect the truth-condition of the propositional information of an utterance. Therefore, the three utterances above hold the same truth-conditional value with respect to the content of the utterance; that is, the speaker’s positive evaluation of the movie he/she watched, i.e. ‘The movie was interesting’.

Lee (2007) claims that these three utterances deliver different attitudes of the speaker in conveying his/her positive evaluation towards the hearer, as follows. (4a) without either *ne* or *yo*, indicates the speaker’s attitude of unilaterally delivering his/her
positive evaluation of the movie, without ‘markedly’ inviting the hearer’s involvement. With such a simple statement, the involvement of the hearer is not particularly expressed, and thus it may be used in monologues or written language. In contrast, (4b), with ne, and (4c), with yo, convey the speaker’s straightforward invitation of the hearer’s involvement in different manners. (4b), with ne, signals the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement in an incorporative manner. With ne, the speaker encourages the hearer to align with his/her positive evaluation of the movie. This can roughly be glossed as ‘I think that the movie was interesting. Don’t you think so?’ (4c), with yo, signals the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement in a monopolistic manner. With yo, the speaker is committed to enhance his/her position as a deliverer of his/her positive evaluation of the movie, through which he/she intends to show that he/she is in a superior position over the hearer with respect to the information about the movie. This can roughly be paraphrased as ‘Listen. I tell you that the movie was interesting’. As also shown in the previous section, with such statements with these interactive markers, the involvement of the hearer is markedly indicated, and thus they can be used in spoken language only. Based on Lee’s (2007) account provided so far, the notions of incorporative and monopolistic can be summarised as follows:

(5) a. Incorporative

The speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement through which he/she is committed to align with the hearer with respect to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance

\footnote{Lee (2007: 379) notes that “In a superior position over the partner’ should be read as implying that the speaker is adopting such an attitude to the partner in delivering the utterance contents, including the speaker’s judgement on the certainty/evidentiality of the propositional content, rather than indicating the higher degree of the speaker’s certainty/evidentiality.”}
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b. Monopolistic

The speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement through which he/she is committed to enhance his/her position as a deliverer in conveying the content and feeling towards the hearer

With this in mind, consider (6) below which further illustrates the difference between the incorporative marker *ne* and the monopolistic marker *yo*.

(6) O: *Masaka konna shinya ni okyakusan ga korareru no kana*  
by.no.means this late.at.night customer SUB come CN I.wonder.if  
to omottara ippai kite itadaite hontoo ureshikatta desu ne.  
QT think-CD lots come really was.glad BE NE  
‘I didn’t think by any means that customers would come (to see my film) at such a late time, but in fact lots of people came and I was really glad.’

K: *Nee.*

NE  
‘NE (I fully understand how you felt).’  

(Lee, 2007: 368)

In this example, O and K are talking about a film in which O featured as a main character. The film was shown very late at night, and because of this O did not expect that many people would come to see it. O expresses his happiness in finding that in fact many people had turned up, and uses *ne*. By adding *ne* here, O seeks K’s alignment with regard to his happiness. When K responds to O’s utterance, she uses *Nee* (the variant of *ne*), and shows her full alignment with O. This is a typical situation in which the speaker’s incorporative attitude is explicitly communicated, and an informative point is that K’s role here is as a receiver of O’s utterance. In this case, the use of the monopolistic marker *yo* is not acceptable, as it indeed signals the speaker’s attitude of
enhancing his/her position as a producer rather than as a receiver of the other participant’s utterance.

Up to now, I have briefly outlined the notions of incorporative and monopolistic, which have been well attested through the case of *ne* and *yo*. As will be shown in the next section, the notions of incorporative and monopolistic are also effective for addressing the functions of the other targeted interactive markers *na, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*. However, before discussing their functions, I would like to summarise some advantageous points of adopting the notions of incorporative and monopolistic, i.e. the involvement-based approach, in particular, compared to the ‘information-state-based’ account\(^2\).

As discussed in 2.3.1, the information-state-based account is based on the notion that the speaker’s choice of the markers depends on his/her perspective towards the state of information. Within this account, for example, it is claimed that *ne* is used when the speaker assumes that his/her information is shared with the hearer, while *yo* is used when the speaker assumes that his/her information differs from the hearer’s (e.g. Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Masuoka, 1991). It has already been pointed out in 2.3.1 that this information-state-based account has some shortcomings due to its prominent focus on the informational aspect of utterances. Below, I will recollect the two cases which the information-state-based account cannot sufficiently deal with, and demonstrate how the notions of incorporative and monopolistic successfully deal with those cases.

\(^2\) I have chosen the ‘information-state-based’ account for our discussion here because it has been the major approach to the functions of the markers to date, as noted in Chapter 1 (Also see 2.3.1).
First, recall the cases where *ne* is used with information exclusively possessed by the speaker and *yo* is used with information shared by both participants. (7) represents the former case and (8) the latter.

(7) KA: *Gaikoku itte mo te de tsukutte, isshokenmei saikushite aru mono overseas even.go hand by make work.hard have.been.made thing tsui katchau n desu ne.*

without.thinking buy NOM BE NE

‘Even when I go overseas, without thinking I buy goods that are handmade by hard-working people.’

K: *Ma, kawaii seikaku na n desu yone.*

well cute personality BE NOM BE SFP

‘Well, you are a kind person.’ (Lee, 2007: 370)

(8) K: *Kore, oishii desu ne.*

this delicious BE NE

‘This is delicious.’

D: *Soo, oishii desu yo.*

so delicious BE YO

‘Yes, it is delicious.’ (Lee, 2007: 370)

In (7) KA and K talk about KA’s shopping habit. In terms of the information state, the habit explained in KA’s utterance belongs exclusively to KA, and *ne* is used here. In (8) K is tasting the food that D has cooked. In terms of the information state, as indicated by *Soo ‘It is’, the information delivered in D’s utterance, *oishii desu ‘It is delicious’, has already been shared with (actually first provided by) K, and *yo* is used here. The use of *ne* in (7) and of *yo* in (8) are clearly counter to the functions of these markers proposed within the information-state-based account.
In contrast, as the notions of incorporative and monopolistic approach these markers from the perspective of interaction rather than the information state, it is able to provide a comprehensive account for the use of *ne* in (7) and of *yo* in (8) in terms of the speaker’s attitude towards the hearer. Focusing on the incorporative marker *ne* in (7) first, it is interpreted as signalling KA’s attitude of inviting K’s involvement through which she seeks K’s alignment with regard to feeling and situation associated with her own habit, i.e. ‘I wish that you too understand my feeling and situation associated with my shopping habit like this’. The monopolistic marker *yo* in (8) is interpreted as indicating D’s attitude of inviting K’s involvement through which he enhances his position as a deliverer of his positive feeling about the food, i.e. ‘Listen. I tell you that the food is delicious’. By doing so, D attempts to deliver the utterance with humour, implying ‘The food is of course delicious because it was cooked by me, a famous chef’.

Next, recall that the information-state-based account has difficulties in providing a unified account for the use of the markers that appear in different positions of a sentence. As mentioned several times already, our four targeted interactive markers *ne, na, yo* and *sa* occur not only in sentence-final positions, but also in non-sentence-final positions. Since the information-state-based account is based on an analysis of propositional information, its scope is naturally limited to these markers in sentence-final positions that are attached to particular independent propositional information, and consequently fails to deal with these markers in non-sentence-final positions that are not associated with any independent propositional information.

Related to the fact that our four targeted interactive markers are used in non-sentence-final positions, one of the significant aspects of the notions of incorporative

---

3 Delivering an implied message is in fact a very important usage of *yo*. I discuss this usage of *yo* in detail in Chapter 6.
and monopolistic is that they consistently account for the functions of *ne* and *yo* regardless of their positions in a sentence. Lee (2007) notes that when *ne* and *yo* are used in non-sentence-final positions, they prominently indicate their interactive role of inviting the hearer's involvement, and are not related to any particular propositional information. More precisely, the use of these markers indicates that through their general function of inviting the hearer's involvement, the speaker wishes to invite the hearer into conversation and continue the conversation together with the hearer. This is particularly so when these markers are not associated with the interpretation of a particular utterance⁴. Therefore, *ne* in the following example is interpreted as indicating the speaker's attitude of delivering her feeling, i.e. her willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer, in an incorporative manner.

(9)  *Ano, aru teidoo, maa jibun no peisu de ne, soreden ne hito ni ne,*

    well certain degree well own LK pace BE NE then NE people to NE
    *anoo nanka iroppoku iru jinsei ni naritai* ....

    well somewhat sexy exist life RES want.to.become

    'Well, (I like to live) at my own pace, and so like to be a person whose life is seen

    as somewhat sexy.'

    (Lee, 2007: 369)

In (9) *ne* appears three times in the sentence-medial position and none of the *ne* are appended to independent propositional information, while their use explicitly indicates that the speaker invites the hearer's involvement and seeks the hearer's alignment with

⁴ It is important to stress here that no matter where these markers appear, the speaker's willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer is pervasively expressed due to the speaker's invitation of the hearer's involvement consistently signalled by the use of these markers. What is suggested by Lee (2007) is that such a feeling of the speaker is prominently expressed when these markers are not attached to any particular independent propositional information, i.e. when they occur in non-sentence-final positions.
respect to her feeling, i.e. ‘I wish that you too understand my willingness to continue the conversation with you’. The next example is the case of *yo*.

(10) Yamaoka Hisano san wa ne hontooni iji ga yo ii n da
Ms.Hisano.Yamaoka TOP NE really temper SUB YO good NOM BE
ka warui n da ka wakaranai.
QUE bad NOM BE QUE know-NEG
‘I really don’t know whether Ms. Hisano Yamaoka is good-tempered or bad-tempered.’

(Lee, 2007: 369)

Here again, in (10) *yo* appears in the sentence-medial position, and similar to the case of *ne* in (9), the use of *yo* also prominently indicates the speaker’s feeling; however, it does so in a different manner from *ne*, i.e. in a monopolistic manner. That is to say, the use of *yo* in (10) shows that the speaker invites the hearer’s involvement and enhances his position as a deliverer of his feeling, i.e. ‘Listen. I tell you that I am willing to continue the conversation with you’. As demonstrated through (9) and (10), the functions of *ne* and *yo* are consistently accountable in terms of the speaker’s incorporative attitude signalled by *ne* and the monopolistic attitude by *yo*, no matter where these markers are located in a sentence.

To summarise, the notions of incorporative and monopolistic in the involvement-based approach consider a wide range of the usages of *ne* and *yo*, and offer a systematic and comprehensive approach to the functions of these markers. As will be shown through a detailed analysis of each marker given in the subsequent chapters, the functions of our seven targeted interactive markers identified within this approach also

---

5 As will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6, in contrast to *ne*, the use of *yo* adds a very strong dominating tone to the utterance due to the speaker’s strong dominance over the hearer in terms of his feeling indicated by the marker.
account for the relevant issues, i.e. formality and gender, in an integrated manner. I will now move on to the next section and propose a classification of the seven markers, by adopting the notions of incorporative and monopolistic.

4.4. Incorporative \( \{ne, na\} \) vs. monopolistic \( \{yo, sa, wa, zo, ze\} \)

In this section, I adopt the notions of incorporative and monopolistic, and further extend them to the analysis of the seven interactive markers. The seven interactive markers are grouped as follows:

(11) (i) Incorporative: \( ne, na \)

(ii) Monopolistic: \( yo, sa, wa, zo, ze \)

In this grouping, \( ne \) and \( na \) are characterised as incorporative markers, whereas \( yo, sa, wa, zo \) and \( ze \) are categorised as a group of monopolistic markers. In what follows, I demonstrate how I comprise this classification.

First, recall example (6) to understand the difference between the incorporative nature of \( ne \) and the monopolistic nature of \( yo \).

(6)' O: Masaka konna shinya ni okyakusan ga korareruno kana by.no.means this late.at.night customer SUB come CN I.wonder.if to omottara ippai kite itadaite hontoo ureshikatta desu ne. QT think-CD lots come really was.glad BE NE ‘I didn’t think by any means that customers would come (to see my film) at such a late time, but in fact lots of people came and I was really glad.’

K: Nee.

NE ‘NE (I fully understand how you felt).’
As noted earlier, in this example K responds to O, using *Nee*, through which she shows her full alignment with O with regard to O’s happiness. While K uses *Nee* and shows her full alignment with O, K’s role is as a receiver of O’s utterance. Thus, the monopolistic marker *yo*, which enhances the speaker’s position as a producer of the utterance rather than as a receiver of the other participant’s utterance, cannot be used.

What is informative to our current discussion is that among the remaining five markers *na, sa, wa, zo and ze*, only *na* (and its variant *naa*) can be used in the same manner as K’s use of *Nee* above, which is illustrated below.

\[(12) \text{O: Masaka konna shinyani okyakusan ga korareruno kana }\]
\[
\text{by.no.means this late.at.night customer SUB come CN I.wonder.if }\]
\[
to omottara ippai kite itadaite hontoo ureshikatta desu ne.\]
\[
\text{QT think-CD lots come really was.glad BE NE }\]
\[
\text{‘I didn’t think by any means that customers would come (to see my film) at such a late time, but in fact lots of people came and I was really glad.’}\]

\[
\text{K: *Naa.* (*yoi/*sai/*warai/*zo/*ze*)}\]
\[
\text{NA YO SA WA ZO ZE}\]
\[
\text{‘NA (I fully understand how you felt).’}\]

Native speakers of Japanese immediately feel that the use of *Naa* above provides the same effect as *Nee* in (6)’ in that K fully aligns with O with regard to what O has said, while the use of the other markers *yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* is impossible.

Observe (13) below in which *Naa* in line 4 shows the speaker’s incorporative attitude, similar to the case of *Nee* in (6)’. In this example, A and B are talking about how to punctually collect money for the band to which they belong. Although there is a treasurer, i.e. Shimi, in the band, A is currently collecting money on behalf of the treasurer, against his (A’s) intention.
In line 1, A says that collecting money is the job of the treasurer. In line 2, B expresses his opinion that the treasurer, Shimi, will complain if A asks Shimi to collect money. In lines 3 and 4, A says that Shimi should not complain about it since accounting is an easy job to do, and further uses Naa to seek B’s alignment with respect to his (A’s) opinion. In line 5, B responds to A by saying Naa to show his full alignment with regard to A’s opinion and feeling about Shimi given in lines 3 and 4. The use of Nee here can also indicate B’s incorporative attitude. What should be emphasised now is that as illustrated in (13), na as well as ne signals the speaker’s incorporative attitude. Furthermore, in line 4, the role of B is to receive A’s utterance, and thus the use of yo, sa, wa, zo or ze instead of Naa (or Nee) is impossible because these markers are, in fact, monopolistic markers which deliver the speaker’s attitude of enhancing his/her position as a speaker rather than as a receiver of the other participant’s utterance.

The following example further illustrates this point.
Chapter 4 Involvement and a speaker’s attitude: Incorporative and monopolistic

(14) a. *Tooshu ni daijin no wa kahanshin, ashikoshi pitcher for important NOM TOP the.lower.half.of.the.body leg.and.hip
da, wakatteru na.
BE know-PROG NA
‘What is important for pitchers is the lower half of the body such as their legs and hips. You know it, right?’

(T7)

b. *Tooshu ni daijin no wa kahanshin, ashikoshi pitcher for important NOM TOP the.lower.half.of.the.body leg.and.hip
da, wakatteru ne.
BE know-PROG NE
‘What is important for pitchers is the lower half of the body such as their legs and hips. You know it, right?’

c. *Tooshu ni daijin no wa kahanshin, ashikoshi pitcher for important NOM TOP the.lower.half.of.the.body leg.and.hip
da, wakatteru *yo/*sa/*wa/*zo/*ze.
BE know-PROG YO SA WA ZO ZE
‘What is important for pitchers is the lower half of the body such as their legs and hips. You know it, right?’

In (14a), a baseball coach confirms with a pitcher whether or not the pitcher knows that the lower half of the body such as legs and hips is important for pitchers. Here *na is used to seek the pitcher’s alignment with the coach’s expectation that the pitcher knows how important the lower half of the body is for pitchers. In this case, *na can be replaced with *ne as in (14b) and successfully delivers the coach’s incorporative attitude, whereas the use of *yo, *sa, *wa, *zo or *ze is impossible as in (14c). If *yo, *sa, *wa, *zo or *ze were used here, e.g. wakatteru *yo, the utterance would simply indicate the speaker’s knowledge, e.g. ‘Listen. I tell you that I know it’, and cannot indicate the coach’s intended attitude of seeking the pitcher’s alignment. In fact, it does not even make sense in this context.
In short, *ne* and *na* share the common property of signalling the speaker’s incorporative attitude. More precisely, both markers indicate that the speaker invites the hearer’s involvement through which he/she aligns with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. With this incorporative attitude, *ne* and *na* may be used when the speaker expects to be a receiver of, and indicates his/her alignment towards, the other participant’s utterance\(^6\). In contrast, the impossible use of *yo*, *sa*, *wa*, *zo* and *ze* in the same manner as *ne* and *na* is attributed to their monopolistic nature; that is, enhancing the speaker’s position as a deliverer of the utterance.

Let us now take a closer look at the monopolistic markers *yo*, *sa*, *wa*, *zo* and *ze*. (15) below shows the use of *yo*.

(15) K:  *A, yapppari Tsukushi chanda. Boku da yo, boku Shoogakkoo no*  
*oh as.expected Tsukushi BE I BE YO I primary.school LK*  
*toki onaji kurasu datta Aoike Kazuya da yo.*  
*time same class BE-past Kazuya.Aoike BE YO*  
‘Oh, It is you, Tsukushi. It’s me, Kazuya Aoike. We were in the same class in primary school.’

T:  *E... E～～～～, Kazuya kun?!*  
*well really Kazuya*  
‘Well...Really?! Kazuya?!’ (HD2)

(15) is a short conversation between K (Kazuya) and T (Tsukushi), who had studied at the same primary school. They have not met since their primary school days, and when they meet accidentally, K tries to make T recognise that he is K. Needless to say, K’s role as a speaker (or a deliverer) of the utterance is identifiable by virtue of the given conversational setting, i.e. K is talking and T is listening. Nonetheless, by employing *yo*  

---

\(^6\)This is not to say that *ne* and *na* are exactly the same in every aspect. I will discuss the difference between these markers in detail in Chapter 5.
K markedly invites T’s involvement and enhances his position as a deliverer of the fact that he is K, which can be denoted as ‘Listen. I have something to tell you. The thing is that I am K’. As a result, K makes sure that T more carefully listens to him and recognises that he is K.

The following examples, (16)-(19), show that the markers *sa*, *wa*, *zo* and *ze* also share this monopolistic nature with *yo*. (16) below illustrates the use of *sa*.

(16) A: *Chuushi ka...*  
cancel QUE
‘(The baseball game) will be cancelled...’
B: *Kono kurai no amenara yaru sa.*  
this about LK rain-CD play SA
‘If it’s only raining a bit like this, they will play (the baseball game).’ (T3)

In this conversational exchange, A and B talk about the baseball game which their friends are supposed to play on that day. It is raining and A guesses that the game will be cancelled. B states his opinion which is opposite to A’s. In providing his opinion, B uses *sa* and invites A’s involvement, while he further enhances his deliverer’s position, through which he makes his feeling connected to the opinion clearer and stronger.

The next example below shows the use of *wa*.

(17) *Akira. Nodo kawaichatta wa, watashi.*  
Akira throat has.become.dry WA I
‘Akira. I’m thirsty.’ (HD6)

In (17), the speaker says to the hearer, Akira, that she is thirsty, and *wa* is used here. Apart from the connotation that the speaker is female, this *wa* also signals A’s invitation
of B’s involvement and her commitment to enhance her position as a deliverer of the
fact that she is thirsty, i.e. ‘Listen. I have something to tell you. The thing is that I am
thirsty’.

Finally, let us observe the use of zo in (18) and of ze in (19) below.

(18) A: Oi, asoko aiteru zo.
   hey over.there become.vacant-PROG ZO
   ‘Hey, (the seats) over there are vacant. (We should go there and get them.)’
B: Hoi, hoi.
   yes yes
   ‘Yes, yes.’
   (T3)

(19) Kooshien ikoo ze.
   Kooshien let’s.go ZE
   ‘Let’s go to Kooshien.’
   (T3)

In (18) A recognises that there are vacant seats and attempts to let B know of it. With zo, A invites B’s involvement and enhances his position as a deliverer of what he has recognised. This can be denoted as ‘Listen. I have something to tell you. The seats over there are vacant. (We should go there and get them.)’ In (19), the speaker proposes to the hearer that they should go to Kooshien (which is the national tournament for high school baseball in Japan) together and attaches ze to the proposal. The use of ze, again, signals the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement, and enhances his position as a proposer. This turns out to convey the speaker’s reinforced wish to go to Kooshien together with the hearer.

As such, what is commonly expressed by the use of yo, sa, wa, zo and ze is the speaker’s monopolistic attitude; that is, his/her attitude of inviting the hearer’s
involvement through which he/she enhances his/her position as a deliverer of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. This monopolistic attitude of the speaker can roughly be paraphrased as ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’. As noted already, such a speaker role, i.e. ‘I am the speaker and you listen to me while I am speaking’, has otherwise already been given to the speaker by the interactive nature of the conversational setting. Yet, what is worth mentioning here is that *yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* notably draw the hearer’s attention to the utterance and make sure that the hearer more carefully listens to the speaker. Since this monopolistic nature is shared by these five markers, there are many cases where they are interchangeable with respect to the speaker’s monopolistic attitude\(^7\). (20) below is an example of such cases.

(20) 1 A: *Sorede, gogatsu no owari kara mata, kyooshuujo kayoi hajimete,* then *May LK end from again driving.school start.going de, maa, hitodanraku tsuite, ima, nanka hatto to, ato* then *well come.to.the.end now like part-time.job and additionally yatto gakkoo no benkyoo no hoo ni, me ga mute kita tte finally school LK study COMP to eyes SUB came.to.turn QT kanji.* feeling

‘Then, from the end of May I again started going driving school, then, well, it came to the end, and now I’m doing some part-time job, and afterwards I finally started to look more towards studying, something like that.’

5 B: *Un.*
yes
‘Right.’

---

\(^7\) This does not mean that the sentences are the same in every aspect when these five markers are interchanged. As will be discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, each marker has its own unique function, and consequently there are cases in which these markers cannot be used interchangeably.
6 A: *Konna insei ite ii n daroo ka.*
   such as this postgraduate student exist good NOM suppose QUE
   ‘I wonder if it’s OK to live sort of postgraduate life.’

7 B: *Iyaa, jujitsushiteru desho?*
   well is.full-PROG suppose
   ‘Well. You’re living a full life, right?’

8 A: *Juujitsushitenai yo.*
   is.full-PROG-NEG YO
   ‘It’s not full.’ (CFF2)

In (20) A and B are talking about A’s life. From line 1 to line 4 A expresses her concern that she has spent most of her time doing many other things rather than study, and in line 6 she also expresses her worries if this is acceptable as she is a postgraduate student who is supposed to study very hard. In line 7, B remarks that A’s life (or what she is doing) is full, as she (B) believes that it is full. In line 8, A denies this by saying, *juujitsushitenai* ‘It’s not full’, and importantly uses *yo* here. A’s purpose of using *yo* is to show her monopolistic attitude and markedly draw B’s attention to her view that is against B’s given in line 7. As a result, her view and feeling of denial are reinforced.

What is important to the present discussion is the fact that, as shown below, this *yo* in A’s utterance is interchangeable with *sa, wa, zo* or *ze*, while A’s monopolistic attitude is sustained.

(21) A: *Juujitsushitenai sa /wa /zo /ze.*
   is.full-PROG-NEG SAWA ZO ZE
   ‘It’s not full.’

Although the sentence with the different marker indicates the different nuance (or more technically, the speaker’s different attitude in inviting the hearer’s involvement within a
monopolistic manner), native speakers of Japanese easily notice that all the markers commonly indicate the speaker's attitude, 'Listen. I have something to tell you'.

4.5. Summary

In this chapter, I have provided a detailed discussion on the relationship between our seven targeted interactive markers and the notion of involvement. I have first shown that the general function shared by these seven markers is to signal the speaker's attitude of inviting the hearer's involvement. Then, in setting up a framework for the current analysis, I have provided an overview of two types of the speaker's attitudes of inviting the hearer's involvement, i.e. incorporative and monopolistic, proposed by Lee (2007). By adopting the notions of incorporative and monopolistic, I have also proposed a model for the classification of the seven interactive markers: (i) Incorporative: ne, na and (ii) Monopolistic: yo, sa, wa, zo, ze. Within this model, ne and na share the function of signalling the speaker's incorporative attitude; that is, the speaker's attitude of inviting the hearer's involvement through which he/she aligns with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. Further, yo, sa, wa, zo and ze share the function of signalling the speaker's monopolistic attitude; that is, the speaker's attitude of inviting the hearer's involvement through which he/she enhances his/her position as a deliverer of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.

However, a question arises as to why the speaker selects a particular marker, but not others in a particular situation. More specifically, for example, in (14) earlier, why does the coach choose the incorporative marker na rather than ne? Likewise, in (20), why does speaker A choose the monopolistic marker yo, but not the others such as sa, wa, zo or ze? There clearly must be some reasons for the speaker selecting one but not
the others. The current study assumes that the incorporative markers *ne* and *na*, in fact, deliver different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer's involvement within an incorporative manner. Similarly, the monopolistic markers *yo*, *sa*, *wa*, *zo* and *ze* also convey different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer's involvement within a monopolistic manner. The speaker's different intentions (purposes) of showing his/her incorporative/monopolistic attitude expressed by the different markers consequently evoke the different interpretations of a particular utterance by the hearer, thereby inducing some cases where the speaker cannot use the same group of markers interchangeably. The difference between the incorporative markers *ne* and *na* will be discussed in Chapter 5, and the differences among the monopolistic markers *yo*, *sa*, *wa*, *zo* and *ze* in Chapters 6 and 7.
CHAPTER 5
Incorporative markers *ne* and *na*

5.1. Introduction

In Section 4.4, I have categorised *ne* and *na* as a group of markers which signal the speaker’s ‘incorporative’ attitude. To be more precise, these markers indicate the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement through which he/she is committed to align with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. In Chapter 5, I detail how the speaker’s incorporative attitude is manifested through the use of *ne* and *na* in conversation.

I will discuss the function of *ne* in Section 5.2 and of *na* in Section 5.3. In these sections, I will further develop the idea that *ne* and *na* deliver the speaker’s incorporative attitude, and point out that the speaker’s expectation or wish that the hearer will understand the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance is an important feature of *ne* and *na*. In order to further highlight this aspect of *ne* and *na*, in Section 5.4, I will also show some cases in which the use of neither *ne* nor *na* is possible. In Section 5.5, I will then explore the common expressive effects of *ne* and *na* and their influence on the speaker’s use of these markers in social contexts. This will be followed by Section 5.6 in which I particularly shed light on the difference between *ne* and *na*. Their difference has often been stated in terms of the gender of the speaker; that is, *ne* can be used by both male and female speakers, while *na* by male speakers only (Uyeno, 1971; Cheng, 1987; McGloin, 1990; Izuhara, 1996; Imao, 2000; Miyazaki, 2002; Asano, 2003). However, the reason for this gender difference has not yet been explained clearly.
I will lastly attempt to account for the male’s exclusive use of *na* in connection with the special effect of the marker. Finally, Section 5.7 will summarise the chapter.

5.2. *Ne*

5.2 discusses the function of *ne*. I first review previous studies on the function of the marker in 5.2.1, and then analyse the function of the marker in 5.2.2.

5.2.1. Previous studies


I have already discussed many of these previous studies and pointed out their shortcomings in Chapter 2. For example, there is the information-state-based account (cf. 2.3.1) which explains that *ne* is used when the speaker assumes that the hearer has the same degree of information as him/her (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Moriyama, 1989; Kamio, 1990, 1994; McGloin, 1990; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994). The major problem with this account is that it fails to describe cases
where *ne* is appended to information exclusively held by the speaker (which means that the information is not shared with the hearer). It is also unable to deal with cases where the use of *ne* is optional; in these cases the utterance with *ne* is the same as that without *ne* in terms of the state of information, making these two types of utterances indistinguishable under this account. We will discuss the given cases in 5.2.2.2.

There is also an approach to the function of *ne* from the perspective of illocutionally force (cf. Insistence-compliance-based account in 2.4.1 and Authority-based account in 2.4.2). Uyeno (1971) notes that *ne* expresses a request for compliance with the given information leaving the option of confirmation to the hearer. Further, Uyeno (1971) suggests that with a declarative sentence the marker modifies the basic nature of the declarative sentence in a way that the hearer will have the choice of judgement about the information and softens the declarative nature of the sentence. Similarly, Morita (2002) characterises *ne* as the marker that advances the speaker’s stance of a weak or incomplete authority to require participatory uptake of the hearer. As I have noted in 2.4, in some cases the use of *ne* is also seen as strengthening the tone of the utterance (cf. Kamio 1990; Hasunuma, 1998), which is an opposite view to those of Uyeno (1971) and Morita (2002). The problem with the accounts of Uyeno (1971) and Morita (2002) is that they directly link the core property of *ne* to its effect (of softening/weakening the tone of the utterance), and thus they lead to inconsistency with the fact that the single marker *ne* can be interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance in some cases, and as strengthening in some other cases (See 5.5.1 for a detailed discussion on the effects of *ne*).

Onodera (2004) notes that the use of *ne* indicates positive politeness (cf. Politeness-based account in 2.6.2). It is true that the use of *ne* is closely related to
formality and politeness (cf. 5.5). However, there are some cases where the use of *ne* would be interpreted as impolite, and the indication of politeness cannot be seen as a fundamental property of the marker, as also pointed out by Masuoka (1991) and Asano (2003)\(^1\).

Apart from the function of *ne* provided in the above-noted studies, *ne* has often been seen to have a usage of `seeking agreement` (Uyeno, 1971; Mizutani, 1984; Ohso, 1986; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Suzuki, 1990; Maynard, 1993; Han and Kaya, 1996; Itani, 1998), `showing agreement` (Saji, 1957; Uyeno, 1971; Suzuki, 1976; Mizutani, 1984; Ohso, 1986; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Kamio, 1990, 1994; Suzuki, 1990; Kinsui, 1993; Maynard, 1993; Izuhara, 1994a, 2008; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Han and Kaya, 1996; Itani, 1998; Cho, 2000; Miyazaki, et al. 2002), or `confirming information` (Uyeno, 1971; Mizutani, 1984; Ohso, 1986; Kamio, 1990, 1994; McGloin, 1990; Maynard, 1993; Izuhara, 1994a, 2008; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Han and Kaya, 1996; Itani, 1998; Cho, 2000; Miyazaki et al. 2002). There are indeed some cases where the use of *ne* can be interpreted as such. It will be shown in 5.2.2.1 that these usages are also accountable in terms of the incorporative function of *ne*.

As noted in Chapter 4, among previous accounts for the function of *ne*, Lee’s (2007) is particularly noteworthy. Lee (2007) has revealed the incorporative nature of the marker in terms of the interactional point of view, and has provided an integrated account for various issues related to the use of the marker. More precisely, the incorporative function of *ne* has the potential to systematically explain a wide range of the usages of *ne*, which have been acknowledged in the other previous studies.

---

\(^1\) There are also many more studies on the function of *ne* discussed in Chapter 2 (e.g. Cook, 1992; Takubo, 1992; Kinsui, 1993; Takubo and Kinsui, 1996; Tanaka, 2000; Morita, 2005; Katagiri, 2007). See Chapter 2 for details.
mentioned above. In what follows, I adopt the basic spirit of the notion of ‘incorporative’, and provide a detailed analysis of the function of *ne*.

Before starting the analysis of *ne*, I would like to note that, as Lee (2007) suggests, there are some conditions for the use of the marker. In other words, there are certain conditions which make the use of *ne* crucial, optional or impossible. As will be demonstrated shortly, these conditions are very important for understanding the behaviour of *ne*, and also for clarifying the mechanism of how the incorporative function of the marker is operated in conversation. Below are the conditions for the use of *ne*.

(1) Conditions for the use of *ne* (Lee, 2007: 373)

(i) The main concern of the speaker is to align himself with the partner in respect to the utterance contents.

(ii) The speaker assumes that the partner will also fully understand the content and feeling of the utterance.

According to Lee (2007), (i) reflects a core property of *ne* as the incorporative marker, i.e. the speaker is committed to align with the hearer. Needless to say, this is essential for the use of *ne*. Further, Lee (2007) notes that by using *ne* the speaker assumes that the hearer will fully understand the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance, as indicated in (ii). This statement is based on the fact that *ne* indicates the speaker’s expectation or desire that the hearer will accept his/her offer to share the content of the utterance (Cheng, 1987; Asano, 2003). This is particularly relevant to the use of *ne* in some cases, as well as for the effect of the marker on the tone of the utterance.
Lee (2007) reveals that if the two conditions (i) and (ii) are fulfilled the use of *ne* is crucial, while if (i) is met, but not (ii), its use is optional. Following Lee’s (2007) account, I divide our discussion on *ne* into two: the analysis of the cases where the use of the marker is crucial (5.2.2.1) and of those where its use is optional (5.2.2.2) (The further cases where the use of *ne* is impossible will be discussed in 5.4 together with *na*). I also deal with the non-sentence-final use of the marker in 5.2.2.3.

### 5.2.2. The function of *ne*: Aligning with the hearer

#### 5.2.2.1. The crucial use of *ne*

We first take a look at (2) below in which the use of *ne* is crucial. Before this conversational exchange, A and B talked about the cities in China where they had visited before. They found that both had previously been to Beijing.

(2) 1 A: *Demo, Pekin wa sugoi desu ne.*
   but Beijing TOP impressive BE NE
   ‘But Beijing is impressive, isn’t it.’
2 B: *Soo desu ne.*
   so BE NE
   ‘Yes, it is.’
3 A: *Nanka itaku tabi ni basho ga kawatte yoku well go every.time places SUB change-PROG well*
4  *wakaranai mitaina kanji de.*
   know-NEG like feeling BE
   ‘Well, every time I visit (there) it’s somehow changed and I feel as if I don’t know (there).’
   (FFF8)

In line 1, *ne* is used, when A seeks B’s alignment with regard to what she thinks about Beijing, i.e. *sugoi* ‘impressive’. In line 2, B responds to A, and also uses *ne* to show her
alignment with A with respect to A’s impression on Beijing given in line 1. Note that the purpose of the conversation (2) is to share their feelings about Beijing, for which aligning with each other is very important. The use of *ne* in A’s and B’s utterances delivers such intentions by indicating the incorporative attitudes of A and B. By using *ne*, A and B invite the other’s involvement and attempt to align with the other in terms of their feelings about Beijing. Furthermore, it is important to note that in aligning with B, A expects that B also thinks the same and will fully understand what she says since B has also been to Beijing before and has seen its impressive development. Similarly, in aligning with A, B also expects that A will fully understand her concurrence with what A has said as A had already expressed the same in her previous utterance.

Given that in (2) A and B attempt to align with each other based on each other’s expectation that the other will also fully understand what is said in the utterance, the two conditions (1(i)) and (1(ii)) above are fully met. Thus, A’s and B’s use of *ne* are crucial. In fact, if *ne* were dropped from A’s statement, i.e. *Demo Pekin wa sugoi desu*, it would simply indicate her impression on Beijing and could not achieve her intended conversational goal, i.e. aligning with B in terms of what A thinks about Beijing. Likewise, if *ne* were not used in B’s utterance, i.e. *Soo desu*, it would sound as if B merely acknowledges that A’s impression on Beijing is correct, and would be unable to achieve her goal of this utterance, i.e. aligning with A in terms of what A has said.

Considering this, it is worth mentioning again that in the literature it has widely been acknowledged that *ne* can be used for ‘seeking agreement’ (Uyeno, 1971; Mizutani, 1984; Ohso, 1986; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Suzuki, 1990; Maynard, 1993; Han and Kaya, 1996; Itani, 1998) or ‘showing agreement’ (Saji, 1957; Uyeno, 1971; Suzuki, 1976; Mizutani, 1984; Ohso, 1986; Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Kamio,
1990, 1994; Suzuki, 1990; Kinsui, 1993; Maynard, 1993; Izuhara, 1994a, 2008; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Han and Kaya, 1996; Itani, 1998; Cho, 2000; Miyazaki, 2002), and the use of *ne* in (2) above may be seen as such that A’s use of *ne* seeks B’s agreement and B’s use of *ne* indicates her agreement with A. Let us observe the extended example (3) below, in which *ne* is used in a similar fashion to that in (2), and is generally considered to seek agreement (A’s utterance) or to show agreement (B’s utterance) (Ohso, 1986).

(3) A: *Kyoo wa ii tenki desu ne.*
   today TOP good weather BE NE
   ‘It’s a fine day today, isn’t it.’
B: *Soo desu ne.*
   so BE NE
   ‘Yes, it is.’ (Ohso, 1986: 91)

In (3) A and B are walking under the blue sky together. A thinks that the weather is nice and wants to share his/her good feeling with B. Here, it is possible to see that A uses *ne* and seeks B’s agreement with A’s feeling, and B also uses *ne* and shows his/her agreement with A’s feeling. While it is true that as in (3) as well as (2) the speaker may use *ne* to seek the hearer’s agreement or show the speaker’s agreement with the hearer, a noteworthy point is that such usage of *ne* represents the case where the use of the marker is crucial, and again, for this, the two conditions for the use of *ne* given in (1) earlier systematically provide the reason why it is so, which has not sufficiently been clarified in previous studies.

Revisit (3) above. It presents the conversational setting where A and B try to align with each other with regard to each other’s feeling about the weather. A’s and B’s use
of *ne* correspond well to this setting by expressing their attempts to align with the other. Moreover, in aligning with B, A expects that B also feels the same about the weather and will fully understand A’s feeling since B also sees the same nice weather. In B’s response, he/she also aligns with A based on his/her expectation that A will fully understand his/her concurrence with what A has said since A had already expressed his/her (A’s) feeling which is the same as his/hers (B’s). As such, the conversational setting of (3) fully meets the conditions (1(i)) and (1(ii)), and similar to the case of (2), the use of *ne* in A’s and B’s utterances is crucial. Without *ne* these utterances would fail to deliver A’s and B’s intentions of markedly involving the other, and sound odd in the given context. For example, A’s utterance without *ne*, i.e. *Kyoo wa ii tenki desu*, would sound as if A reports the weather to B who has not known the weather yet for some reason. Similarly, if *ne* dropped from B’s utterance, i.e. *Soo desu*, the utterance would sound as if B merely acknowledges that A’s judgement about the weather is correct.

(4) below illustrates another case where the use of *ne* is crucial. In (4), a waiter confirms if he has correctly received what his customers have ordered.

(4) *Hanbaagu teishoku futatsu ni guratan hitotsu de gozaimasu ne.*

hamburger.steak.set 2 and gratin 1 BE there.is NE

‘(You ordered) 2 hamburger steak sets and 1 gratin. Is that right?’

(Ohso, 1986: 91)

As pointed out by Ohso (1986), the waiter’s use of *ne* here is to confirm that what he has said is correct. This usage of *ne* has been acknowledged as ‘confirming information’ in many studies (Uyeno, 1971; Mizutani, 1984; Ohso, 1986; Kamio, 1990, 1994; McGloin, 1990; Maynard, 1993; Izuhara, 1994a, 2008; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994;
Han and Kaya, 1996; Itani, 1998; Cho, 2000; Miyazaki, 2002). According to Jung (1992), ‘confirming information’ presupposes that the hearer is better informed than the speaker. Importantly, what makes the waiter’s use of ne here as ‘confirming information’ is the fact that he is committed to align with the customers with regard to the order which has already been provided by the customers. This is also the situation in which the waiter naturally expects that the customers will fully understand what he says since it is the order provided by the customers. Thus, the waiter’s use of ne is crucial, too, as the two conditions (1(i)) and (1(ii)) are fully met, and this again, accounts for the crucial use of ne in the case of ‘confirming information’. If ne were dropped from the utterance, i.e. Hanbaagu teishoku futatsu ni guratan hitotsu de gozaimasu, it would sound as if the waiter delivered two hamburger steak sets and one gratin to the customers’ table and asserted that the foods are such, and would be unable to achieve the intended result of the given conversation, i.e. aligning with the customers in terms of what they have ordered. As demonstrated through (2), (3) and (4), the use of ne is crucial when the two conditions (1(i)) and (1(ii)) are satisfied. That is to say, ne should be used when the speaker is committed to align with the hearer, expecting that the hearer will also fully understand what he/she says.

Having reached this point, it is worth revisiting the information-state-based account (cf. 2.3.1). I have noted in Chapter 2 as well as in 5.2.1 that many previous studies have pointed out that ne is used when the speaker assumes that the hearer has the same degree of information as him/her (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Moriyama, 1989; Kamio, 1990, 1994; McGloin, 1990; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1989). For example, (2) and (3) above, indeed, present the cases in which ne is attached to the information which is assumed to be shared between the speaker and the
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hearer. (4) is the case in which *ne* is used with the information which has been provided by the hearers, and thus the speaker naturally assumes that it is already shared with the hearers. However, marking such an assumption by the speaker, i.e. the hearer already shares the given information with the speaker, is not a genuine property of *ne*. Consider (5) below.

(5) *Kyoo kono yoo ni genki ni natte taiin o shite mairimashita.*

   today as.this well RES become leave.hospital
   ‘I have gotten well and got out of the hospital today as you can see.’

   (Cook, 1992: 517)

(5) is a speech given by Mr. Enoki in the opposition party who was attacked and injured, and had stayed in the hospital. He reports to the ministers that he was discharged from the hospital earlier that day. What is obvious in this case is that, in the given situation, the fact that Mr. Enoki has recovered is observed by all the ministers present. This means that the speaker (Mr. Enoki) assumes that the information given in his speech is shared with everyone present, and yet *ne* is not used here. As noted by Cook (1992), in the context of reporting information as in (5), the main goal of the speaker’s speech is simply to deliver a piece of information to the hearer. More specifically, in the case of (5), the purpose of Mr. Enoki’s statement is not to align with the hearers (the ministers), but to merely report the fact that he got out of the hospital regardless of his assumption that the fact is already shared with the hearers. This example clearly shows that even though the given information is assumed to be shared with the hearer, there are some cases in which the speaker does not employ *ne*. This confirms that a genuine property of *ne* is not to mark the speaker’s assumption that the hearer shares the given information,
but rather to show the speaker’s commitment to align with the hearer in terms of the
given information (This is indicated in (1(i)) as the essential condition for the use of \textit{ne}).
If such a commitment from the speaker is not required, then \textit{ne} is not necessarily used
even when the given information is assumed to be shared with the hearer.

As will be shown in 5.2.2.2, \textit{ne} is, in fact, attached not only to information
assumed to be shared with the hearer, but also to that which cannot be assumed to be
shared with the hearer. Given that \textit{ne} signals the speaker’s attitude of aligning with the
hearer, it is plausible that the function of \textit{ne} has often been seen as marking shared
information because it is relatively easy for the speaker to align with the hearer,
particularly in a situation where information is already shared with the hearer. In this
connection, the speaker’s expectation for the hearer’s full understanding of the content
of the utterance (which is indicated in condition (1(ii))) is seen as interrelated with the
speaker’s assumption that the content of the utterance is shared with the hearer, since
the expectation may be formed typically based on such an assumption by the speaker.
However, again, this is not a genuine property of \textit{ne} (thus, it is not the essential
condition for the use of \textit{ne}), as illustrated in (5) above. In sum, the speaker’s
commitment to align with the hearer is essential for the use of \textit{ne}. Further, as shown in
(2), (3) and (4) above, when the speaker delivers such a commitment with an
expectation that the hearer will also fully understand what is conveyed in the utterance,
the use of \textit{ne} is crucial.

\textbf{5.2.2.2. The optional use of \textit{ne}}

As stated in 5.2.1, the use of \textit{ne} is optional when the speaker is committed to align with
the hearer without his/her assumption that the hearer will also fully understand the
content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. Consider, for example, (6) below which is an extract from a dialogue about how A and B spend their commuting time on a train.

(6) A: *Watashi nanka, anmari, sono densha ni notteru jikan ga*,
I like not.much that train to take-PROG time OBJ
*yuukenai tsukaenai taipu to iu ka, futsuu, fudan wa,*
effectively can.use-NEG type QT say QUE normally daily.life TOP
*benkyoo shitari toka, hon o yondari suru n*
study or.something.like book OBJ read do NOM
*deshoo kedo sono jikan ga takusan aru hito wa. Watashi*
suppose but that time SUB lots have people TOP I
*nanka anmari shuuchuu dekinai to iu ka...*
like not.much concentration can-NEG QT say QUE

‘I’m the type of person who cannot use the commuting time on a train effectively. People in general who have lots of time on the train usually do things like studying or reading, but I cannot concentrate enough to do...’

B: *Boku mo soo desu ne.*
I also so BE NE
‘Me, too.’ (FMM1)

First, A describes himself that unlike the majority of people, he is the type of person who cannot use his commuting time effectively. In responding to A, B uses *ne* and also describes himself as the same type of person as A. What is significant in this case is that, unlike the obligatory case discussed in 5.2.2.1, the statement to which *ne* is attached describes speaker B’s own matter as indicated by *Boku mo ‘I also’,* which was not previously shared with hearer A. It is thus difficult for B to expect that hearer A will fully understand his (B’s) feelings or thoughts involved in his statement. Since condition (1(ii)) is not met, the use of *ne* in B’s utterance is optional. In fact, the marker
may be omitted, i.e. *Boku mo soo desu*, without causing any problem in the given context.

A point that needs to be discussed here is that, as noted by Lee (2007), this is a typical case in which *ne* is used to express the speaker’s commitment to align with the hearer through which he/she wishes the hearer to understand what is said. More specifically, in (6) above, by using *ne*, speaker B attempts to align with hearer A, wishing that A will also understand B’s similar personality type to A’s and his (B’s) sympathy towards A’s type, e.g. ‘I wish that you understand that I am also like you, so I can understand how you feel’. Alternatively, *ne* does not need to be used in this case, if B intends simply to provide his personality type unilaterally towards A, since it is B’s own type and can be delivered in such a manner.

In the literature, the use of *ne* as in (6) has been labelled as *naibu-kakunin-kooi* ‘action of inner-confirmation’ (Hasunuma, 1998) or *jiko-kakunin* ‘self-confirmation’

(2) Takubo, 1992; Takubo and Kinsui, 1996, 1997; Miyazaki, 2000). Hasunuma (1998) provides (7) below and notes that *ne* signals the process in which the speaker is producing the utterance while he/she confirms it to himself/herself in accordance with his/her own knowledge or memory, i.e. *naibu-kakunin-kooi* ‘action of inner-confirmation’. Hasunuma (1998) further points out that *ne* in this case may not necessarily be used towards the hearer.

(7) A: *Daikyoukoo wa okoru no deshoo ka.*  
Great.Depression TOP occur NOM suppose QUE  
‘Do you think it will be the Great Depression?’

---

The English translations for *naibu-kakunin-kooi* and *jiko-kakunin* are my own.
B: Okoru to omoimasu *ne.*

occur QT think NE

'I think it will be.'

(Hasunuma, 1998: 98)

Although this is the case where *ne* is attached to the speaker’s own matter rather than shared matter or the hearer’s matter, *ne* consistently plays a role as an incorporative marker and invites the hearer’s involvement. In (7) A seeks B’s opinion about whether or not it will be the Great Depression. The use of *ne* in B’s response markedly invites hearer A’s involvement and delivers B’s attempt to align with A, through which B’s wish that A will also understand his/her opinion is expressed. Again, as in (6), this *ne* may be omitted, i.e. Okoru to omoimasu, if B is not committed to align with A, since it is his/her opinion and can be delivered in a unilateral manner.

As shown in (6) and (7), when the speaker delivers his/her own matter such as thoughts, feelings, opinion or judgement, he/she cannot expect that the hearer will fully understand what he/she says. However, in this case *ne* may still be used optionally, and if it is used, it indicates the speaker’s commitment to align with the hearer through which he/she wishes that the hearer will also understand the content and feeling associated with the utterance.

5.2.2.3. **The non-sentence-final use of *ne***

Thus far, I have discussed the function of *ne* when the marker is used in sentence-final positions and appended to independent propositional information. However, as noted

---

3 Again, the use of *ne* in this case is against the information-state-based account which views that *ne* indicates the speaker’s assumption that his/her information is shared with the hearer (cf. 2.3.1).

4 This is not to say that the speaker has absolute freedom in using *ne* to convey the speaker’s own matter. This issue will be discussed in detail in 5.4.
several times earlier, *ne* may also occur in sentence-initial or sentence-medial positions, and in this case it does not accompany any particular independent propositional information. In the literature, such non-sentence-final use of *ne* has been treated as *kantoo-joshi* ‘sentence-medial particles’ and differentiated from the sentence-final use of *ne* (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Watanabe, 1968; Tanaka, 1977; Haga, 1978; Kuwayama, 1981; Konoshima, 1983; Hatsukano, 1994; Izuhara, 2008). I suggest that *ne* that are characterised as *kantoo-joshi* ‘sentence-medial particles’ also signal the speaker’s incorporative attitude and can be identified as incorporative markers in an integrated manner.

Observe the following examples in which *ne* is used in the non-sentence-final position: sentence-initial in (8a) and sentence-medial in (8b).

(8) a. **Nee, kyoo disuko ikanai? Suggoi ii toko mitsuketa no.**
   NE today disco go-NEG very good place found SFP
   ‘NE, shall we go to the disco today? I found a very good place.’  (HD1)

   b. **Ore mo ne, zutto ne, kateikyooshi yarinagara**
   I also NE for.a.long.time NE tutor while.doing
   **zutto omotteta no wa ne...**
   for.a.long.time thought-PROG NOM TOP NE
   ‘What I have also thought for a long time, for a long time while being tutor is...’  (CMF3)

Since none of the *ne* in these examples are appended to independent propositional information, they are irrelevant to the interpretation of the overall propositional information. Nevertheless, they play an important interactional role of inviting the

---

5 There are some studies which have attempted to account for the function of *ne* regardless of its positions in a sentence: for example, Cook (1992), Tanaka (2000) and Morita (2005). See 2.5 and 2.6.1 for details.
hearer’s involvement. In (8a), *ne* is deployed before the speaker provides any information, and in this regard, the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement is particularly well presented. Such an attitude of the speaker of inviting the hearer’s involvement is also observed in (8b) in which *ne* is used in the sentence-medial position. Further, in both examples, the speakers are committed to align with the hearers, wishing that the hearers will also understand their feelings associated with their invitation of the hearers’ involvement. This can be interpreted as ‘I want to align with you, wishing that you too understand my willingness to invite you into the given conversation and to continue the conversation together’. This point becomes clearer when compared with the cases in which *yo* or *sa* is used in non-sentence-final positions.

(9) a. *Ore mo yo, zutto yo, kateikyooshi yarinagara*  
I also YO for.a.long.time YO tutor while.doing  
*zutto omotteta no wa yo...*  
for.a.long.time thought-PROG NOM TOP YO  
‘What I have also thought for a long time, for a long time while being a tutor is...’

b. *Ore mo sa, zutto sa, kateikyooshi yarinagara*  
I also SA for.a.long.time SA tutor while.doing  
*zutto omotteta no wa sa...*  
for.a.long.time thought-PROG NOM TOP SA  
‘What I have also thought for a long time, for a long time while being a tutor is...’

(9) is a modified version of (8b) for the purpose of comparison: *ne* is replaced with *yo* in (9a) and with *sa* in (9b). Details apart, in these two examples the use of *yo* or *sa* adds the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement (See Chapter 6 for detailed
discussions of yo and sa). This is the same as the case of ne. However, the speaker’s attitude, ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’, is strongly and directly indicated due to their monopolistic nature. Compared to this, as illustrated in (8), the use of ne shows the speaker’s incorporative attitude, ‘I wish that you too understand my feeling’. In short, the non-sentence-final use of ne as well as the sentence-final use of ne invites the hearer’s involvement in an incorporative manner. Further, in the former, ne does not ‘mark’ any independent propositional information, and in this sense, the speaker’s incorporative feeling associated with his/her invitation of the hearer’s involvement is seen as more prominently expressed.

To summarise 5.2, this section has discussed the function of ne, which signals the speaker’s incorporative attitude. I have demonstrated that the use of ne is crucial when the speaker is committed to align with the hearer, expecting that the hearer will also fully understand what he/she says. Ne may also optionally be used when the speaker delivers his/her own matter including his/her thoughts, feelings, opinion and judgement, and thus cannot expect that the hearer will fully understand it. In the latter case, the use of ne indicates the speaker’s wish that the hearer will also understand what he/she says. I have also dealt with ne which is used in non-sentence-final positions. I have suggested that such use of ne also functions as an incorporative marker. It clearly indicates the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement and delivers the speaker’s attitude of aligning with the hearer with respect to his/her feeling, i.e. his/her willingness to invite the hearer into conversation and continue the conversation together. (10) below is a summary of the function of ne.
(10) The function of \textit{ne}

\textit{Ne} signals the speaker's incorporative attitude of aligning with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.

In the next section, I will discuss the other incorporative marker \textit{na}.

5.3. \textit{Na}

5.3 discusses the function of \textit{na}. In a similar vein to the structure of 5.2, this section begins with a review of previous studies on the function of the marker (5.3.1). Then, it moves on to exploring the function of the marker (5.3.2). 5.3.2 is further divided into three as same as the case of \textit{ne}: the analysis of the cases where the use of the marker is crucial (5.3.2.1), of those where its use is optional (5.3.2.2) and of those where it is used in non-sentence-final positions (5.3.2.3).

5.3.1. Previous studies

Many previous studies (Saji, 1957; Watanabe, 1968; Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Suzuki, 1976; McGloin, 1990; Washi, 1995; Izuhara, 1996; Takubo and Kinsui, 1996; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Asano, 2003) have pointed out that the function of \textit{na} is quite similar to that of \textit{ne}. For example, Cheng (1987) notes that ‘\textit{na} wa kikite no ninshiki ni yotte hanashite ga jibun no ninshiki o tashikana mono ni suru toki ni tsukawareru ‘\textit{na}’ is used when the speaker attempts to confirm his thoughts with the hearer’, and further points out that \textit{na} can be replaced with \textit{ne}, but when \textit{na} is used the hearer should be socially equal to, or lower than, the speaker. Miyazaki et al. (2002) state that \textit{na} is used by male speakers, but has the same function as \textit{ne}. Similarly, Asano (2003) claims that the replacement of \textit{ne} with \textit{na} simply makes the utterance sound masculine, and the difference between \textit{ne}
and *na* is only stylistic. I agree with the view of these previous studies in the sense that the core function of *na* is the same as that of *ne*, although there is a difference between these two in relation to the age and gender of the speaker and formality (The difference between *ne* and *na* will be discussed in 5.6). Below, I will demonstrate that *na* shares the core property with *ne* and signals the speaker’s incorporative attitude.

### 5.3.2. The function of *na*: Aligning with the hearer

#### 5.3.2.1. The crucial use of *na*

We will first look at the cases where *na* is used in the same fashion as *ne* and signals that the speaker is committed to align with the hearer, expecting that the hearer will also fully understand what is conveyed in the utterance. Let us observe (11) below.

(11) A: *Karaoke ittenai na.*
    karaoke go-PROG-NEG NA
    ‘(We) haven’t been to karaoke (for a long time).’

B: *Ittenai ne.*
    go-PROG-NEG NE
    ‘(We) haven’t been (there for a long time).’

(CMM5)

In this conversational segment, A first states that he has not been to karaoke with B for a long time. By adding *na* to his statement, A attempts to align with B with regard to their long absence from karaoke as well as his feelings such as ‘I want to go to karaoke with you someday again’. While he attempts to align with B, A expects that B will also fully understand the given fact and his feelings since B has also shared the experience of long absence from karaoke. Therefore, the use of *na* is crucial here. Without *na*, A’s utterance would become a statement which simply delivers the fact that he has not been
to karaoke for a long time, and no longer indicate A’s intention of aligning with B in terms of what he recalls and the associated feelings. As a response to A, B also states the same and uses *ne* to show his full alignment with A, expecting that A will also fully understand his concurrence with what A has said. B’s use of *ne* here is crucial, too. Without *ne*, B’s utterance otherwise simply conveys B’s recognition that he has not been to karaoke, without clearly indicating his intention of aligning with A.

Recall the crucial use of *ne* discussed in 5.2.2.1. The use of *ne* is crucial when the speaker aligns with the hearer, expecting that the hearer will also fully understand the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. A’s use of *na* in (11) is identical with such use of *ne*. Given that, it is naturally predicted that *na* used by A in (11) can be replaced with *ne*, and *ne* used by B can be replaced with *na*. As illustrated in (12) below, our expectation is indeed borne out by the fact that *na* in A’s utterance is replaced with *ne*, and *ne* in B’s utterance is replaced with *na*, while A’s and B’s incorporative attitudes are sustained.

(12) A: *Karaoke ittenai ne.*
    karaoke go-PROG-NEG NE
    ‘(We) haven’t been to karaoke (for a long time).’

    B: *Ittenai na.*
    go-PROG-NEG NA
    ‘(We) haven’t been (there for a long time).’

The following (13) is another example that shows that *na* has the same incorporative function as *ne* and its use is crucial. In (13), A and B talk about B’s previous dating experience. B said that he did not tell anybody that he had a girl whom he had been dating for a while.
(13) 1 A: *Soo da ne, betsuni nanka 'ore tsukiattan da' mitai*
   so BE NE, especially like I dated NOM BE something.like
2    no    ore wa    iu kedo.
   NOM I TOP say but
   ‘Well, I would say something like “I’m dating someone” but…’
3 B: *Doo iu taimingu de ieba ii ka wakaranakute, mutcha*
   how say timing BE say-CD good QUE know-NEG very
4    hazukashikute sa.
   feel.embarrassed SA
   ‘I didn’t know what timing I should have said it because I was embarrassed.’
5 A: *Aa, shai da na.*
   well shy BE NA
   ‘Well, you’re shy.’
6 B: *Un.*
   yes
   ‘Yes.’ (CMM4)

In lines 1 and 2, A states if he were B he would have said to everybody that he (A) had been dating a girl. In lines 3 and 4, B responds to A that he did not know what timing he should have said it because he was too shy to do so. In line 5, A speaks about B’s known shyness and uses *na*. By using *na*, A seeks B’s alignment with his (A’s) comment on B’s shy character. This is another situation where speaker A can expect hearer B’s full understanding of his (A’s) comment since in B’s utterance of lines 3 and 4 he (B) has already acknowledged his own shyness. Also note that the main concern of A’s utterance is to align with B in terms of A’s comment on B’s shy character. In order to deliver such concern of the utterance, A’s use of *na* is crucial. Without *na*, i.e. *shai da*, the utterance would unilaterally deliver A’s comment towards B, and fail to achieve A’s intended result of this conversation, i.e. aligning with B in terms of his (A’s) comment on B’s shy character.
What is demonstrated through (11), (12) and (13) is that na shares the same property with ne and explicitly communicates the speaker’s incorporative attitude. The use of na as well as of ne is crucial when the speaker is committed to align with the hearer, expecting that the hearer will also fully understand the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. In this regard, na is interchangeable with ne in many cases (but see 5.6 for cases in which na and ne are not interchangeable). In the following subsection, I will deal with the cases in which na may optionally be used.

5.3.2.2. The optional use of na

In 5.2.2.2, it has been shown that ne may optionally be used when the speaker attempts to align with the hearer, while he/she assumes that the hearer may not fully understand what he/she says. Na is also used in such a way as shown in (14) below.

(14) Kesa wa sakini itte warukatta na.
    this.morning TOP ahead go was.sorry NA
    ‘I’m sorry for having gone (to school) ahead of you this morning.’ (HD20)

In (14), the speaker apologises to his girlfriend about him having gone to school ahead of her in the morning. He uses na with his apology here. Since the speaker’s apology is his own feeling about what he has done to his girlfriend, he cannot expect that she will fully understand his feeling. Nonetheless, with na he invites her involvement and encourages her to align with him with respect to his feeling of apology, wishing that she will also understand and accept it. Here, na may be omitted, i.e. Kesa wa sakini itte warukatta. However, the utterance would then lose the speaker’s invitation of the direct involvement of his girlfriend to seek her understanding of his feeling of apology.
Another example which illustrates the optional use of *na* is given below. In (15), *na* in line 4 is attached to the speaker’s (B’s) own feeling about his ex-girlfriend, which is also difficult for speaker B to expect that hearer A will fully understand. Just prior to this conversational exchange, B mentioned that he had bumped into his ex-girlfriend one day.

(15) 1 A: *E, nantomo, nani, koo, moeagaru yoona yatsu,*
well something like what such as this flame up like thing
2 *nakatta? Moo ikkai koo, nanika...*
had-NEG one more time such as this something
‘Well, didn’t you have that chemistry? That sparks one more time?’
3 B: *Iya.*
no
‘No.’
4 A: *Kokoro n naka kara toka...*
heart LK inside from or something like
‘From the inside of your heart like...’
5 B: *Nai na.*
have-NEG NA
‘I don’t have (the feeling).’

In lines 1 and 2, A asks B if B felt that he wanted to go out with his ex-girlfriend one more time when he met her. As shown in line 4 as well as in these lines 1 and 2, A strongly expresses his curiosity whether or not B had a feeling to go out with the girl again. In line 5, B answers A and clearly indicates that it was not the case, by saying, *Nai* ‘I don’t have (the feeling)’, with *na*. B’s answer expresses his strong denial which was not previously shared with A. Therefore, it is not a typical case in which speaker B can expect that hearer A will fully understand what he (B) says. What is delivered by B’s use of *na* here is his attempt to align with A with respect to his strong denial, hoping
that A will also understand it. Given that, again, the use of *na* in this case is optional. However, if *na* were not used here, i.e. *Nai*, the utterance would no longer deliver B’s incorporative attitude and would be interpreted as his unilateral denial.

As shown in (14) and (15), the optional use of *na* is also identical with the optional use of *ne*. *Na* may optionally be used when the speaker is committed to align with the hearer, wishing that the hearer will also understand the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. In this light, *na* used in the given examples above may be replaced with *ne*, i.e. *warukatta ne* for (14) and *Nai ne* for (15), while the incorporative attitude of the speaker in each example is sustained.

### 5.3.2.3. The non-sentence-final use of *na*

As in the case of *ne*, the non-sentence-final use of *na* also shares the same property with the sentence-final use of *na*. (16) below illustrates the cases in which *na* is used in non-sentence-final positions.

(16) a. 1 A: *Naa, Minami.*
NA Minami
‘NA, Minami.’

2 B: *Un?*
what
‘What?’

3 A: *Koko ni Kazuya no shashin haroo.*
here in Kazuya LK picture let’s.display
‘Let’s display Kazuya’s picture here.’ (T4)
b. *Shinda uchi no nyoobo na, are ga ore to shiriaumae*
   died I LK wife NA that SUB I with meet before
   *tsukiatteta otoro ga sooiu taipu de na.*
   dated-PROG guy SUB as.such type BE NA
   ‘The guy my now deceased wife used to date was that sort of guy.’ (T3)

In (16a), A suggests to B (Minami) that they should display a picture of Kazuya who
used to study with them but died in a car accident in their study room. *Naa* in line 1 is
not associated with any independent propositional information, while it clearly indicates
A’s invitation of B’s involvement and his attempt to align with B in terms of his feeling
associated with his invocation, i.e. his willingness to talk to B. A’s utterance, *Minami,*
B’s name, after *Naa* in line 1, also shows A’s willingness to talk to B. Nonetheless, the
use of *Naa* initially draws B’s attention to A’s feeling and importantly it seeks B’s
alignment with it. Likewise, in (16b), *na* appears two times in the given utterance, and
none of the *na* are attached to independent propositional information. In this case as
well, the use of *na* indicates the speaker’s commitment to align with the hearer with
respect to his willingness to continue the conversation together with the hearer.

As such, the function of *na* used in non-sentence-final positions is also identical
with that of *ne* which occurs in the same environment. It invites the hearer’s
involvement in an incorporative manner and delivers the speaker’s attempt to align with
the hearer with respect to his/her willingness to invite the hearer into conversation and
continue the conversation with the hearer. As expected, *na* in (16a) and (16b) can,
therefore, be replaced with *ne,* i.e. *Nee, Minami* for (16a), and *Shinda uchi no nyoobo ne,
are ga ore to shiriau mae tsukiatteta otoro ga sooiu taipu de ne* for (16b), without the
loss of the speakers’ incorporative attitudes.
Throughout 5.3, I have demonstrated that na shares the same incorporative function with ne. The incorporative function of na can be summarised as follows:

(17) The function of na (Tentative)

Na signals the speaker’s incorporative attitude of aligning with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.

While (17) shows that the core function of na is the same as that of ne (cf. (10)), the unique feature of na, which is not shared with ne, will be discussed in 5.6. The refined function of na will be provided after this, in 5.7, in which I will summarise the findings of this chapter. Before discussing the difference between ne and na, in the next section I further highlight the incorporative function of these markers by observing the cases in which the use of these markers is impossible.

5.4. The impossible use of ne and na

As will be shown below, there are some cases in which the use of neither ne nor na is possible, and these cases will further support our analysis of the incorporative function of these markers. First, consider (18) below, which illustrates the cases where the use of ne is unacceptable.

(18) a. A: Osumai wa dochira desu ka.
       living.place TOP where BE QUE
       ‘Where do you live?’

       B: Koobe desu ne.
       Kobe BE NE
       ‘It’s Kobe’

       (Hasunuma, 1998: 94)
b. A: *Onamae wa?*
   name TOP
   ‘What is your name?’
B:  *Tanaka Hanako desu ne.*
   Hanako.Tanaka BE NE
   ‘(My name) is Hanako Tanaka.’

In (18a) A asks B’s living place and B answers it. Here, B’s response cannot be marked by *ne*. Similarly, in (18b) A asks B’s name and B provides her name. In this case as well, B’s response cannot be marked by *ne*. What is noteworthy in relation to this impossible use of *ne* in B’s utterances is the fact that, as pointed out by Lee (2007), speaker B is required simply to provide the information of his/her living place in (18a) or of her name in (18b), and it is the situation where speaker B is not concerned whether or not hearer A aligns with him/her in terms of the given information. In other words, in responding to A speaker B naturally expects that hearer A will simply accept the given information because it is his/her living place or her name, and thus there is no room for B to express his/her commitment to align with A. This fails to meet the essential condition for the use of *ne*, i.e. (1(i)) ‘The main concern of the speaker is to align with the hearer with respect to the content of the utterance’, and consequently the marker is not allowed to be used.

By the same token, the use of *na* in the following examples is also unacceptable.

(19) a. A: *Osumai wa dochira desu ka.*
   living.place TOP where BE QUE
   ‘Where do you live?’

---

6 A similar point is made by Asano (2003). Asano (2003) states that there are cases where the speaker simply needs to answer what he/she knows without consulting the hearer, and in those cases the use of *ne* is impossible.
B: ?Tokyoo desu na.
Tokyo BE NA
‘It’s Tokyo.’

b. A: Onamae wa?
name TOP
‘What is your name?’
Taro.Yamada BE NA
‘(My name) is Taro Yamada.’

Similar to the case in (18a), in (19a) na cannot be attached to the utterance that simply states B’s own living place. Also, in (19b) na cannot be used with B’s own name, which is provided as his simple answer to A’s question. Again, the impossible use of na in these examples is induced by the fact that in the situation of (19), speaker B is expected merely to provide the information, and in delivering the information, he does not have any doubt that hearer A will simply accept the given information. As such, because ne and na are incorporative markers which are used to deliver the speaker’s commitment to align with the hearer, these markers cannot be used in a situation where the main concern of an utterance (the nature of information) does not have room for the speaker to align with the hearer.

To clarify this point further, here is a contrasting example, in which B provides his own name, and yet it is possible for him to use ne or na. The following example was given as (10) in Chapter 2, and in this example speaker B uses ne, but he could also have used na instead.

(20) A: Yamada Shinichi sama, ichi gatsu too ka juusan ji Takamatsu hatsu
Mr.Shinich.Yamada January 10th 13.o’clock depart.from.Takamatsu
Haneda yuki, de yoroshikatta deshoo ka.
bound.for.Haneda BE was.good suppose QUE
‘Mr Shinichi Yamada, your flight is from Takamatsu for Haneda at 13:00 on 10th of January. Is that right?’

B: Iya Shinichi janakute, Shinji desu ne.
no Shinichi BE-NEG Shinji BE NE
‘No, (my name) is not Shinichi, but Shinji.’ (Shinoda, 2006: 2)

In (20), a travel agent, A, confirms with a customer, B, if the information provided on the air ticket is correct. Since B’s name is not Shinichi, but Shinji, B corrects A’s mistake, by saying Iya ‘No’ and providing his correct name, Shinji. In this case the use of ne or na is permissible although the given information is B’s own name. The significant difference of this example (20) from (18b) and (19b) earlier is that in this situation of (20) B is not sure if A will record his name correctly, since A has already made a mistake on his name, and further, whether or not his correct name is written on the air ticket is a serious matter for B. B may therefore want to confirm that A has his name correctly this time, rather than to simply provide his name. Given this situation, B’s use of ne or na is optionally acceptable, and the use of the marker indicates B’s invitation of A’s involvement through which he expects A to confirm by aligning with him in terms of his (B’s) name. Needless to say, B’s response without ne or na would simply provide his name unilaterally.

Let us now move on to another case in which neither ne nor na can be used. As illustrated below, ne and na cannot be used with abrupt commands. (21) below represents this for the case of ne.
(21) a. *Byooin ni ike ne.
    hospital to go NE
    ‘Go to the hospital.’

b. *Henna koto iu na ne.
    strange thing don’t say NE
    ‘Don’t say a strange thing.’

    (Masuoka, 1991: 99)

(21a) is an abrupt affirmative command ike ‘Go’, while (21b) is an abrupt negative command iu na ‘Don’t say’. As shown, ne is not allowed to be attached to both types of abrupt commands, as also pointed out in previous studies (Cheng, 1987; Masuoka, 1991; Takubo, 1992; Miyazaki, 2000, 2002; Lee, 2007). This is because the speaker’s incorporative attitude signalled by the use of ne conflicts with the speaker’s intention of unilaterally delivering the utterance towards the hearer expressed by these abrupt commands. These abrupt commands generally indicate the speaker’s strong intention of forcing the hearer’s action (Masuoka, 1991; Nitta, 1991; Takubo, 1992; Miyazaki, 2002; Lee, 2007). With such commands the speaker straightforwardly delivers what the hearer is required to do, and it does not matter for him/her whether or not the hearer aligns with him/her with respect to what is commanded. This is the reason for the impossible use of ne in this case. As expected, since na shares the same incorporative function with ne, the use of na with abrupt commands, e.g. tabero ‘Eat’ in (22a) and iku na ‘Don’t go’ in (22b) below, is also impossible.\footnote{Ne and na can be attached to expressions including the command -nasai (e.g. ikinasai ‘please go’ (more formal than the abrupt command)) and the requests such as -te (e.g. itte ‘please go’) and -te kudasai (e.g. itte kudasai ‘Please go’ (more formal than -te)) in contrast to the cases of the abrupt commands (e.g. Ike ‘Go’ and Lu na ‘Don’t say’) (Masuoka, 1991; Lee, 2007). This is because unlike the abrupt commands, these expressions convey the speaker’s respect or consideration for the hearer (Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Nitta, 1991; Miyazaki, 2000; Lee, 2007), and thus there is still room for the speaker to align with the hearer.}
(22) a. *Hayaku tabero na.
quickly eat NA
‘Eat quickly.’

b. *Anmari tookuni iku na na.
not.much far don’t.go NA
‘Don’t go too far.’

Following on from the prior sections 5.2 and 5.3, in 5.4 I have further shown the incorporative nature of $ne$ and $na$, by considering the cases in which the use of these markers is impossible. In the next section, I will focus on the common expressive effects of the two markers and their influence on the speaker’s use of these markers in social contexts.

5.5. The common expressive effects of $ne$ and $na$ and their use in social contexts

The effect of $ne$ and $na$ is seen as ‘softening’ the tone of a request in some studies (Uyeno, 1971; Martin, 1975; Han and Kaya, 1996; Usami, 1997; Asano, 2003; Lee, 2007 for $ne$; Izuhara, 1996 for $na$). Interestingly, their effect is seen as ‘strengthening’ the tone of a negation in some others (Kamio, 1990; Hasunuma, 1998 for $ne$). Furthermore, some studies view their effect from a slightly different angle, and note that the use of $ne$ and $na$ makes the utterance sound ‘friendly’ or ‘intimate’ (Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Masuoka, 1991; Cook, 1990; Han and Kaya, 1996; Izuhara, 1996; Asano, 2003 for $ne$; Imao, 2000 for $na$). There are also some studies which point out that these markers are used more frequently in casual conversation than in formal

---

8 As noted in 5.2.1, Uyeno (1971) also points out that the use of $ne$ (and $na$) with a declarative sentence softens the declarative tone.
conversation (Cook, 1992; Maynard, 1993; Izuhara, 2001; Fukushima et al., 2007 for *ne*; Uyeno, 1971 for *na*).

In this section, I attempt to provide a systematic account for the above mentioned effects of *ne* and *na* and some relevant issues in terms of the incorporative function of these markers. I will first focus on their effects of softening the tone of a request and of strengthening the tone of a negation in 5.5.1, and then on their effect of friendliness/intimacy and their more frequent use in casual conversation in 5.5.2.

### 5.5.1. Softening vs. strengthening

As I briefly mentioned above, the effect of *ne* and *na* is viewed as softening the tone of a request, in some studies (Uyeno, 1971; Martin, 1975; Han and Kaya, 1996; Usami, 1997; Asano, 2003; Lee, 2007 for *ne*; Izuhara, 1996 for *na*), while it is viewed as strengthening the tone of a negation, in some others (Kamio, 1990; Hasunuma, 1998 for *ne*). A question arises as to how the single marker, *ne*/*na*, can be interpreted in such completely opposing ways. As will be demonstrated below, such contrasting views can consistently be accounted for from the perspective of involvement and the incorporative nature of *ne* and *na*.

Let us first consider the effect of *ne* and *na* which is seen as softening the tone of a request. Lee (2007) for *ne* and Izuhara (1996) for *na*, claim that these markers have an effect of softening the force of a request and provide the following examples (23) and (24), respectively. Compare (23a) with (23b) for the case of *ne*, and (24a) with (24b) for the case of *na*.
(23) a. *Ashita hayaku kudasai.*
tomorrow early please come
‘Please come (here) early tomorrow.’

b. *Ashita hayaku kite kudasai ne.*
tomorrow early please come NE
‘Please come (here) early tomorrow.’ (Lee, 2007: 383)

(24) a. *Chotto mite kudasai.*
a.little.bit please look
‘Please have a look.’

b. *Chotto mite kudasai na.*
a.little.bit please look NA
‘Please have a look.’ (Izuvara, 1996: 75)

(23a) and (23b) are the same in that they both indicate the speaker’s request to come early tomorrow, except that (23b) accompanies *ne*, while (23a) does not. However, as suggested by Lee (2007), the force conveyed by (23a) without *ne* and (23b) with *ne* may be different. According to Lee (2007), the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement expressed by *ne* implies the speaker’s recognition and acceptance of the hearer as his/her conversation partner as well as his/her willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer. This speaker’s recognition of, and feeling towards, the hearer, results in the effect of softening the force of the request as in (23b). In contrast, (23a) without *ne* does not markedly invite the hearer’s involvement, hence it lacks the expression of the speaker’s concern towards the hearer. The assertiveness of the request tone is thus straightforwardly expressed, and that results in delivering the request in an ‘official’ tone, implying ‘I request you to come here early, and have no more to say’.
This is also applicable to the case of *na* in (24). In (24a) without *na*, the speaker expresses the request (to have a look) unilaterally without markedly indicating his recognition of the hearer as his conversation partner and his willingness to maintain the conversation with the hearer. Thus, the request tends to firmly be delivered in an ‘official’ tone. On the other hand, in (24b) with *na*, the speaker conveys his concern towards the hearer in inviting the hearer’s involvement, and thus the force of the request is moderated. As such, if we focus on the delivery manner of *ne* and *na* with the speaker’s marked invitation of the hearer’s involvement, their effect would be interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance.

Next, let us observe the cases in which the effect of these markers is seen as strengthening the tone of the utterance. As pointed out by Kamio (1990) and Hasunuma (1998), the use of *ne* in (25a) and (25b) below would be considered to strengthen the tone of the negations ((25a) and (25b) were given as (19) and (22) in Chapter 2, respectively. They are re-presented here for the purpose of the current discussion).

(25) a. A: *Doo, isshoni ikanai?*
   how together go-NEG
   ‘How about going together?’

   B: *Iya, ore wa ikanai ne.*
   no I TOP go-NEG NE
   ‘No, I’m not going.’
   (Kamio, 1990: 76)

b. A: *Konna koto mo wakaranai no?*
   this thing even know-NEG SFP
   ‘You don’t even know about this?’

   B: *Wakaranai ne.*
   know-NEG NE
   ‘I don’t know it.’
   (Hasunuma, 1998:95)
In (25a), A asks B to go together, and B refuses A’s invitation. B’s use of *ne* here can be interpreted as his strong refusal of going, because he seeks A’s alignment in terms of his refusal of going which is understandably an unwanted response for A. Since A’s invitation is obviously based on his/her wish that B accompanies him/her, in B’s response B’s attitude of seeking alignment from A, ‘I want to align with you, wishing that you too understand my refusal’, appears as pressure on A. Therefore, the tone of the refusal would sound stronger. Similarly, in (25b), A’s utterance implies his/her expectation that B should know the thing, and B’s response that he/she does not know it contradicts A’s expectation. Here too, B’s use of *ne* denotes a certain aspect of his/her feelings that is related to his/her negative answer, for example, ‘I do not know it. Why am I supposed to know such a thing?’, and further seeks A’s alignment with regard to such feelings. Again, this places pressure on A and would be perceived as B’s strengthened attitude of refusing A’s claim.

The use of *na* in (26) below can also be seen as having the effect of strengthening the tone of the utterance.

(26) **A:** *Ore da yo. Omae ni ago nagurareta... Oboeteru ka?*

*I BE YO by.you jaw hit-PASS remember-PROG QUE*

‘It’s me. You hit me in the jaw. Do you remember (me)?’

**B:** *Shiranee *na.*

*know-NEG NA*

‘I don’t know (you).’

(HD15)

In this example, A asks B if B remembers A, and B answers that he does not know A. In asking B if B remembers A, A clearly expects that B remembers him since B had a fight with him before. B’s negation is, thus, unexpected for A. The use of *na* with B’s
unexpected response to A seeks A’s alignment with it and adds pressure on A to accept it, hence B’s utterance as a whole would be heard as B’s stronger negation, compared to the utterance without _na_, i.e. _Shiranee_. What is shown in (25) and (26) is that when the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance are unexpected or unwanted by the hearer, the use of _ne_ and _na_ adds pressure on the hearer because these markers seek the hearer’s alignment with such unexpected or unwanted information for the hearer, and would be interpreted as strengthening the tone of the utterance.

In sum, with their incorporative function to align with the hearer, the use of _ne_ and _na_ indicates the speaker’s recognition of the hearer as his/her conversation partner and his/her willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer. The speaker’s concern towards the hearer expressed by these markers moderates the tone of a request, and is interpreted as softening the tone of the request. However, the use of _ne_ and _na_ is not always interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance. When what the speaker says is something that is against, or negative to, the hearer, the use of these markers indicates the speaker’s attempt to seek the hearer’s alignment with it, which is hard to accept for the hearer. The use of the markers is, thus, seen as forcing the hearer to understand and accept the undesirable information, and this appears as strengthening the tone of the utterance, or as impolite.

### 5.5.2. More frequent use in casual conversation

As noted at the beginning of this section, in the literature it has been pointed out that _ne_ and _na_ are more frequently used in casual conversation than in formal conversation (Cook, 1992; Maynard, 1993; Izuhara, 2001; Fukushima et al., 2007 for _ne_; Uyeno,
1971 for *na*). This is indeed true, and, again, comprehensively explainable from the perspective of involvement and the incorporative nature of these markers.

As stated in 3.3, formality/informality is generally ensured not only by the formality of verbal forms, but also by the different ways the speaker expresses his/her attitude and feelings/emotions towards the hearer. For instance, Lee (2002) notes that the speaker in principle more directly and strongly expresses his/her attitude and feelings/emotions in a situation where he/she has a close relationship rather than a formal relationship with the hearer. Keeping this in mind, recall (23b), (24b), (25b) and (26).

(23)' b. *Ashita hayaku kite kudasai ne.*  
tomorrow early please.come NE  
‘Please come (here) early tomorrow.’

(24)' b. *Chotto mite kudasai na.*  
a.little.bit please.look NA  
‘Please have a look.’

(25)' b. B: *Wakaranai ne.*  
know-NEG NE  
‘I don’t know it.’

(26)' B: *Shiranee na.*  
know-NEG NA  
‘I don’t know (you).’

In the softening cases of (23b)' and (24b)', it has been shown that the use of *ne* or *na* with the request directly and strongly indicates the speaker’s feeling and willingness to
continue the conversation with the hearer. For the strengthening cases of (25b)' and (26)', too, it has been demonstrated that the use of *ne* or *na* with the negative expression directly and strongly expresses the speaker’s feeling and emotion of refusing towards the hearer. What is clearly observed in these examples is that the use of *ne* or *na*, whether it softens or strengthens the tone of the utterance, directly and strongly expresses the speaker’s attitude and feelings/emotions towards the hearer. Such a direct and strong expression of the speaker’s attitude and feelings/emotions is generally allowed in casual conversation, as noted by Lee (2002). This accounts for the reason why *ne* and *na* are more frequently used in casual conversation than in formal conversation.

This also provides a straightforward explanation for why the use of these markers is often viewed as making the utterance sound ‘friendly’ or ‘intimate’, as pointed out in previous studies (Mizutani and Mizutani, 1987; Masuoka, 1991; Cook, 1992; Han and Kaya, 1996; Izuhara, 1996, Asano, 2003 for *ne*; Imao, 2000 for *na*). Recall that the speaker in principle more directly and strongly expresses his/her attitude and feelings/emotions when the speaker and the hearer have a close relationship. The use of *ne* and *na*, thus, implies that the speaker treats the hearer as a person who is close enough to him so that he/she can express his/her attitude and feelings/emotions in a direct and strong fashion⁹. This is seen as friendly or intimate. Therefore, in a conversational situation that requires a high level of formality, the use of *ne* and *na* is inappropriate. For example, (27) is a conversation between an interviewer, A, and an interviewee, B, at a job interview.

---

⁹ As the other targeted interactive markers *yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze* also signal the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement, all the markers impart a more or less ‘friendly’ or ‘intimate’ nuance on the same grounds for *ne* and *na*, and consequently they are more frequently used in casual conversation than in formal conversation. I will deal with this issue in the relevant chapters.
Chapter 5

Incorporative markers ne and na

(27) A: Hikkishiken wa ikaga deshita ka.
   written test TOP how BE-past QUE
   ‘How was your written test?’

      a.little bit was difficult BE
      ‘It was a little bit difficult.’

   b. ?Chotto muzukashikatta desu ne/na.
      a.little bit was difficult BE NE/NA
      ‘It was a little bit difficult.’

The use of ne or na in interviewee B’s utterance (B’s reply in b) indicates his/her friendly feeling towards interviewer A. Thus, the utterance sounds inappropriate for the official job interview as in (27), which in general requires a high level of formality. Furthermore, with ne or na B’s utterance adds his/her attitude of aligning with A, wishing that A will also understand his/her (B’s) feeling. This would be interpreted as imposing B’s feeling and wish onto interviewer A, and would even be seen as rude.

To summarise, 5.5 has discussed the common expressive effects of ne and na and their influence on the speaker’s use of these markers in social contexts, i.e. softening, strengthening, friendliness/intimacy and the more frequent use in casual conversation. It has been shown that the effects of softening/strengthening the tone of the utterance and of making the utterance sound friendly/intimate are a manifestation of the speaker’s incorporative attitude indicated by the use of ne and na, i.e. the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement and his/her commitment to align with the hearer. In this line of argument, it has also been shown that they are more frequently used in casual
conversation, which naturally contributes to their less frequent use in formal conversation.

Note that Japanese culture is sometimes characterised as a ‘negative-politeness culture’ in which non-imposition is valued as polite (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Onodera, 2004). This is particularly true when someone of a socially lower status speaks to someone of a socially higher status, as also well indicated by Matsumoto’s (1988) strategy of deference; ‘Leave it to someone higher’ is the conventional mode of politeness in Japanese culture. With their incorporative function, *ne* and *na* might give the speaker a risk of violating the hearer’s ‘negative face’, i.e. freedom of action and freedom from imposition (Ide, 1982; Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). That is, the speaker’s attitude of aligning with the hearer indicated by the use of these markers may turn up as pressure on the hearer to understand and accept what he/she says and how he/she feels, and may consequently create an impression that the speaker imposes the given information and his/her feeling on the hearer. This confirms the frequent use of these markers in casual conversation, in which the violation of the hearer’s negative face is often allowed.

5.6. The difference between *ne* and *na*

Thus far, I have discussed the function and the expressive effects, that are shared by *ne* and *na*. In 5.6, I explore the difference between these markers.

5.6.1. Effect of *na*: Camaraderie

In previous studies, the difference between *ne* and *na* has often been stated in terms of the ‘gender’ and/or ‘age’ of the speaker. More specifically, many studies note that the
use of *na* is restricted to male speakers, while *ne* is not as restricted and can be used by both male and female speakers (Uyeno, 1971; Cheng, 1987; McGloin, 1990; Izuhara, 1996; Imao, 2000; Miyazaki, 2002; Asano, 2003). Further, some studies point out that the use of *na* with the *desu/masu* form (the polite form) is limited to speakers who are ‘aged’ males, while there is no such restriction to the use of *ne* (Uyeno, 1972; Izuhara, 1996; Miyazaki, 2002; Miyazaki et al., 2002). However, despite the fact that these special features of *na* have widely been acknowledged by a number of researchers, to the best of my knowledge, no attempt has previously been made to provide a detailed explanation of these features of *na*: for example, on what ground *na* behaves in such ways.

What has been claimed in the above previous studies is indeed true, and in our data too it is found that the use of *na* does have restrictions with regard to the gender and age of the speaker, while the use of *ne* does not. In order to confirm this, let us briefly consider (28) below. In each utterance, the speaker expresses his/her good feeling about the weather, and the use of *ne* or *na* shows that the speaker wants to align with the hearer with regard to his/her feeling, expecting that the hearer will also feel the same.

(28) a. *Iti tenki desu ne.*
   good weather BE NE
   ‘It’s a fine day, isn’t it.’

   b. *Iti tenki desu na.*
   good weather BE NA
   ‘It’s a fine day, isn’t it.’
Apart from such an incorporative attitude of the speaker, more importantly for the current discussion, native speakers of Japanese feel that (28b) with *na* denotes that the speaker is typically an aged male, who has a certain social status. It also indicates that the speaker is socially higher than, or at least equal to, the hearer, and yet tries to be friendly, or to share ‘camaraderie’ with the hearer. (28a) with *ne* does not particularly denote such effects or information.

Note that the concept of ‘camaraderie’ is thought to be the key characteristic of *na*, which differentiates the marker from *ne*. Some previous studies have pointed out that, compared to *ne*, *na* has a nuance that the participants are in a closer relationship (Irmao, 2000) or provides a more informal tone (Uyeno, 1971). I also agree with these views, and would like to propose that *na* indicates a sort of friendship, or more precisely, the speaker’s attempt to share ‘camaraderie’ or ‘*nakama-ishiki*’, using a Japanese term, which denotes ‘a sort of friendship’. The decision to use the term ‘camaraderie’ instead of ‘mateship’ or ‘friendship’ is based on consultations with my colleagues who are Japanese-English bilingual. I asked them if they could find any particular English term which was close to what I meant by ‘*nakama-ishiki*’. They provided some related concepts such as ‘friendship’, ‘intimacy’, ‘fellowship’ and ‘mateship’, yet their common detailed feeling was that ‘camaraderie’ was probably closest to what I meant by the ‘*nakama-ishiki*’.\(^{10}\)

Above, I have proposed that *na* is characterised as indicating the speaker’s attempt to share ‘camaraderie’ with the hearer. In fact, there is another possibility when dealing with the behaviour of *na*. That is to assume that the feature of ‘age’ and ‘male’

\(^{10}\) I would like to thank the people who assisted by answering my questions. In particular, I would like to express my sincere thank to Shun Ikeda, Carol Hayes, Peter Hendriks, Janelle Mahoney for their time and invaluable comments that were very comprehensive beyond my intended questions. However, I am solely responsible for any errors and misinterpretations.
(the speaker being an aged male) is a genuine property of \( na \). If it were the case, it would indeed be much simpler and more straightforward than the 'camaraderie' account. However, first of all, the indication of the speaker's age cannot be a genuine property of \( na \). Look at the following examples that representatively display cases where \( na \) is used with the \( da/ru \) form (the plain form).

(29) A: \textit{Yoo, Uesugi... sugokatta na, kinoo wa.}  
\textit{Hei Uesugi was.wonderful NA yesterday TOP}
\textit{‘Hey, Uesugi... (Your play in the baseball game) yesterday was wonderful.’}

B: \textit{A, ohayoo gozaimasu.}
\textit{oh good.morning}
\textit{‘Oh, good morning.’}  \hspace{1cm} (T2)

(30) A: \textit{Oren chi no toire no ookisa da na.}
\textit{I LK house LK toilet LK size BE NA}
\textit{‘The size of (this room) is the same as that of the toilet in my house.’}

B: \textit{A Anta ittai nani shi ni kita no yo.}
\textit{y you what.on.earth what.to.do came SFP YO}
\textit{‘What on earth, what did you come here to do?’}  \hspace{1cm} (HD2)

In (29) A makes a compliment to B on his winning of the baseball game held the day before. The marker \( na \) is used by A (who is in fact middle-aged). However, unlike the case in which \( na \) is used with the \textit{desu/masu} form, the use of \( na \) with the plain form here, i.e. \textit{sugokatta}, does not provide any clue about the age of speaker A. In (30), A visits B's house and states that the size of the living room in B's house is the same as that of the toilet in his (A's) house. Unlike (29), in this case \( na \) is used by A who is a high school student. As such, \( na \) with the \textit{da/ru} form can be used by either an aged or young speaker, and by just hearing the expression, \textit{da/ru na}, it is impossible to tell the
speaker's age without knowing the context of the given conversation. This suggests that
the use of na does not directly indicate the speaker's age.

The direct indication of the speaker's gender being male cannot be a genuine
property of na, either, since it cannot explain how the use of na indicates that the
speaker is aged (and male) when used with the desu/masu form. There is no direct
logical connection between 'being male' and 'being aged', and it cannot provide a
convincing ground for why indicating the speaker 'being male' is automatically
interpreted as the speaker 'being aged', when used with the desu/masu form (We will
return to this issue later in 5.6.4).

Having reached this point, it is rather natural to assume that na has a certain
property, other than the direct indication of the speaker's age or gender, and this
property is the major cause for the special effects of na. As already noted above, I
assume that na has the characteristic to indicate the speaker's attempt to share
'camaraderie' with the hearer, and this is the property that produces the related effects
of the marker. Below, we consider cases in which na is used with the da/ru form in
5.6.2 and with the desu/masu form in 5.6.3, in connection with the concept of
'camaraderie'.

5.6.2. Da/ru form and na

I have already provided some examples of na with the da/ru form in (29) and (30)
above. When the casual-ending da/ru is used the speaker is presupposed to be in a close
relationship with the hearer, or socially superior to the hearer, and speaking in a tone of
camaraderie is naturally accepted. For example, in (29)' below, A uses na and he is B's
teacher who is superior to B, thus he is naturally allowed to speak in a tone of
camaraderie in using *na*. The use of *na* in this case expresses speaker A’s attempt to share camaraderie with hearer B. This further reinforces the friendly feeling of A towards B.

(29)’ A: *Yoo, Uesugi... sugokatta na, kinoo wa.*
   hey Uesugi was.wonderful NA yesterday TOP
   ‘Hey, Uesugi...(Your play in the baseball game) yesterday was wonderful.’
   B: *A, ohayoo gozaimasu.*
   oh good.morning
   ‘Oh, good morning.’

(30)’ A: *Oren chi no toire no ookisa da na.*
   I LK house LK toilet LK size BE NA
   ‘The size of (this room) is the same as that of the toilet in my house.’
   B: *A Anta ittai nani shi ni kita no yo.*
   y you what.on.earth what.to.do came SFP YO
   ‘What on earth, what did you come here to do?’

Similarly, in (30)’ since A and B are classmates and in a very close relationship, it is so natural that they use the *da/ru* form, and that A uses *na* and indicates his attempt to share camaraderie with B. With *na* A seeks B’s alignment with respect to his comment on the size of the living room in B’s house, exaggeratedly compared to the size of the toilet in his (A’s) house. A’s attitude of seeking B’s alignment in terms of his comment on the size of B’s toilet may be rude to B. However, A’s attitude here implies that A treats B as a close friend who will accept his rudeness, and more importantly, the tone of camaraderie of *na* further reinforces such an attitude of A towards B, e.g. ‘I treat you as my ‘buddy’ whom I can speak in a camaraderie way, and make my utterance sound as if I am just teasing you rather than rude’.
An extended example is given below. This is also a conversation between very close friends. Before this conversational exchange, A made a joke and B got annoyed by his (A’s) joke.

    joke BE YO joke joke OBJ understand-NEG guy BE NA
    ‘It’s a joke, a joke. You don’t get jokes, do you.’

    B: Urusee.
    noisy
    ‘You are annoying.’

In (31) A states that B is a guy who does not understand jokes and attaches na to the statement. The use of na here indicates that A seeks B’s alignment in terms of A’s comment on B’s personality, which may not be desirable for B. Similar to the case in (30), A’s undesirable attitude for B is interpreted as such that A treats B as a close friend who allows him to display such a rude attitude. Here again, the tone of camaraderie of na further reinforces such an attitude of A towards B, and makes his (A’s) utterance sound even more friendly rather than rude and impolite.

In short, when the speaker uses na with the da/ru form, the camaraderie expressed by the marker implies that the speaker treats the hearer as a person who is close to him so that he can share camaraderie with the hearer, which in turn reinforces friendliness which is already conveyed in the utterance.

5.6.3. Desu/masu form and na

Let us now consider cases where na is used with the polite-ending desu/masu. As already mentioned several times earlier, in Japanese society someone younger and/or
socially lower is in general required to speak in a formal and polite way to someone older and/or socially higher. This means that the speaker who is younger and/or socially lower than the hearer is not allowed to express his/her camaraderie to the hearer, since expressing such camaraderie presupposes a close relationship with the hearer, and is not interpreted as either formal or polite. Given that, the use of na presumes that the speaker is in a position where he is allowed to show his attempt to share camaraderie with the hearer, through which he expresses his friendliness or intimacy towards the hearer. This explains the fact that na is only used by the speaker who is equal to, or older and/or socially higher than, the hearer, as also pointed out by Cheng (1987) and Izuhara (1996).

Keeping the above points in mind, let us consider (32) below.

(32) Iyaa, jitsuni migotona hoomuran deshita na.
well truly spectacular home.run BE-past NA
‘Well, it was a really spectacular home run.’ (T1)

(32) is an utterance of a male speaker who drives an expensive car (Jaguar) towards another male speaker who is a high school student. Before making the utterance (32), the speaker saw that the student hit a home run and the ball accidentally hit the side mirror of his (the speaker’s) car. The use of na here delivers the speaker’s attempt to seek the student’s alignment with his statement, ‘It was a really spectacular home run’. More importantly, it adds the speaker’s attempt to share camaraderie with the hearer, through which his friendly feeling is expressed. This friendliness in fact appears to strengthen the speaker’s joking attitude towards the student’s home run which caused the damage of his car.
Another example (33) below confirms that the use of na adds to the speaker’s attempt to share camaraderie with the hearer.

(33) 1 A: Iya, iya, migoto, migoto.
      well well wonderful wonderful
      ‘Well, well. It was wonderful, wonderful.’
  2 B: A, koochoo sensei.
      oh principal
      ‘Oh, principal.’
  3 A: Kore wa natsu ga tanoshimi ni natte kimashita naa,
      this TOP summer OBJ pleasure RES got.to.become NA,
  4 Nishino sensei.
      Nishino teacher
      ‘After seeing this, I’m getting excited about summer, Mr. Nishino.’
  5 B: Maa, kitaishiteite kudasai.
      well please.look.forward.to-PROG
      ‘Well, please look forward to it.’

(33) is a conversation between a male high school principal (speaker A) and a male manager of the high school baseball team, Mr. Nishino (speaker B). After A saw that the pitcher in the baseball team played well in practice, he states that he is getting excited about the big baseball competition held in summer. By using na in his second utterance (line 3), A expects that B will also fully understand his (A’s) excitement for the potential success of the baseball team in the competition, and attempts to seek B’s alignment with regard to his excitement. A’s use of na here, again, adds to his attempt to share camaraderie with B, whereby displaying his somewhat overwhelming friendly attitude to B.

Our next question is then how the use of na indicates that the speaker is aged when used with the desu/masu form, as shown in (32) and (33). In (32) the speaker is an
upper-middle-aged male and in (33) the speaker is a senior male speaker aged around 60 years old. As noted earlier, when native speakers of Japanese hear the expression, *desu/masu na*, they will instinctively feel that the utterance is made by an aged male even without knowing his actual age\textsuperscript{11}. According to Ide (1982: 371), “the occurrence of formality and politeness are partially overlapping as formality is partially expressed by politeness and *vice versa*”. In Japanese, the *desu/masu* form is a typical verbal device to indicate formality as well as politeness. In other words, the use of the *desu/masu* form represents that the conversation involves a certain level of formality and politeness of the conversational participants, while the level may vary depending on many other factors such as the conversation topic, the conversational setting, and the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants. With its ‘camaraderie tone’, the use of *na* with the *desu/masu* form implies that the speaker is someone who is entitled to offer camaraderie, and further to express his friendliness towards the hearer, even in a situation where the participants are supposed to maintain a certain level of formality and politeness. It is thought that such a person is typically one who is relatively aged and already has a certain social status. Put differently, the use of *na* with the *desu/masu* form is a useful strategy for aged male speakers to indicate their confidence and ensure their social status, and yet to express their friendly feeling towards the hearer.

While it is understandable that, as discussed above, aged male speakers with a certain social status are typical users of *na* with the *desu/masu* form, the exact reason why male speakers in their 20s-30s or even 40s rarely use the marker in this way is not clear. That is, it is thought that there might be no problem for them to show their

\textsuperscript{11} Note that, if *na* in (32) or that in (33) is replaced with *ne*, i.e. *migotona hoomuran deshita ne* for (32) and *tanoshimini natte kimashita ne* for (33), the utterance no longer specifies the speaker’s age unless other expressions which indicate the speaker’s age are used in the utterance.
attempts to share camaraderie and friendless with their friends or junior colleagues, just in the same way that aged speakers do. One conceivable reason is that these younger generations in general indicate their close relationship more directly by using the da/ru form. According to Ide (1990), the polite strategy may be used not only for indicating the relationship with the hearer, but also for presenting the speaker himself/herself such as that he/she is well educated, mannered and/or has a certain social status. Ide (1990) refers to the former as ‘deference’ and the latter as ‘demeanour’. The use of na presupposes that the speaker basically has a friendly feeling towards the hearer. In such a situation, the use of the desu/masu form is seen as reflecting the speaker’s polite strategy of ‘demeanour’, whereby he intends to present himself as a person who is educated and/or has a certain social status. Thus, the use of na for the camaraderie tone while using the desu/masu form in fact leads to a quite ‘unique’ situation that requires the speaker to be with a ‘special’ status (the speaker is well educated and/or has a certain social status), as noted above. The fact that desu na and masu na are not normally used by speakers in their 20s-40s, suggests that they are still too young to be qualified for this.

5.6.4. Issue of gender

Thus far, I have shown that the camaraderie tone of na is the major factor which affects the speaker’s age and social status. Finally, I would like to point out that the camaraderie tone of the marker also influences the gender of the speaker. As mentioned earlier, in the literature the gender restriction where ne is used by male and female speakers, and na by male speakers only, is often referred to as the fundamental difference between the two markers (Uyeno, 1971; Cheng, 1987; McGloin, 1990;
Izuhara, 1996; Imao, 2000; Miyazaki, 2002; Asano, 2003). However, such a gender restriction cannot be considered as their fundamental difference. Let us revisit (33) as an example.

(33)’ 1 A: _Iya, iya, migoto, migoto._
   well well wonderful wonderful
   ‘Well, well. It is wonderful, wonderful.’

2 B: A. _koochoo sensei._
   oh principal
   ‘Oh, principal.’

3 A: _Kore wa natsu ga tanoshimi ni natte kimashita naa,_
   this TOP summer OBJ pleasure RES got.to.become NA,

4 _Nishino sensei._
   Nishino teacher
   ‘After seeing this, I’m getting excited about summer, Mr. Nishino.’

5 B: _Maa, kitaishiteite kudasai._
   well please.look.forward.to-PROG
   ‘Well, please look forward to it.’

In this conversational exchange, as noted earlier, _na_ is used by a principal, A, and indicates his excitement to his junior colleague, B. Importantly, _na_ cannot be used by teacher B to principal A although teacher B is male and thus meets the gender criterion, whereas the use of _ne_ does not have such a restriction, and it can be used by teacher B to principal A, and _vice versa_. Similarly, in (29)’ _na_ is used by a teacher, A, to his student, B, who is a baseball player.

(29)’ A: _Yoo, Uesugi... sugokatta na, kinoo wa._
   hey Uesugi was.wonderful NA yesterday TOP
   ‘Hey, Uesugi...(Your play in the baseball game) yesterday was wonderful.’
B:  *A, ohayoo gozaimasu.*

oh  good.morning

‘Oh, good morning.’

Here, student B is not allowed to use *na* to teacher A, despite the fact that he (B) is male, while the use of *ne* is not the case. That is to say, it is true that *na* is used by male speakers only, but the indication of the speaker being male is not a genuine property of the marker.

The male’s exclusive use of *na* can also be attributed to the camaraderie tone associated with the use of the marker. It has already been noted that the concept of ‘camaraderie’ indicates the nuance of mateship or a buddy-feeling. Such a concept of camaraderie does not match with *onna-rashisa* ‘womanliness’ which is expected to be maintained by the use of ‘Japanese women’s language’. As noted in 3.4, ‘Japanese women’s language’ is a set of linguistic beliefs about forma and functions of language used by, and associated with, Japanese women, and it is a culturally salient category and contains knowledge about how women usually speak or should speak (Inoue, 2006). Also, as pointed out by Suzuki (1993), polite speech is interpreted as an index of femininity because the essence of ‘women’s language’ is their concern with politeness. Furthermore, instead of claiming the same status and role as men, Japanese women prefer a complementary version of status and role differences (Ide and McGloin, 1990: i-ii). That is, Japanese women, with *onna-rashisa* ‘womanliness’, are expected, or even prefer, to be seen as polite with a certain social distance, rather than to be ‘equal’ to, or a ‘comrade’ with, the hearer. This is deemed to be the main reason for the fact that women in principle do not use *na*, which would otherwise be interpreted as speaking in a man’s way and claiming to be equal to, or a comrade with, the hearer. They use *ne*
instead, which has the same incorporative function with \textit{na}, but does not have such a
tone of camaraderie.

As discussed throughout this section, the difference of \textit{ne} and \textit{na} is grounded on
the different tone conveyed by these markers, i.e. a camaraderie tone expressed by \textit{na}
but not by \textit{ne}. This enables us to consistently and systematically deal with the relevant
issues, i.e. the use of \textit{na} is more limited with respect to the speaker’s age, social status
and gender, compared to the use of \textit{ne}.

5.7. Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the two incorporative markers \textit{ne} and \textit{na}. I have shown
that the speaker’s incorporative attitude — the speaker invites the hearer’s involvement,
through which he/she is committed to align with the hearer with regard to the content
and feeling conveyed in the utterance — is essential for the use of these markers. I have
also detailed the cases where the use of these markers is crucial, optional and impossible.
Their use is crucial when the speaker is committed to align with the hearer based on
his/her expectation that the hearer will also fully understand what he/she says. Further,
their use is optional when the speaker tries to align with the hearer without his/her
assumption that the hearer will also fully understand what he/she says. In this case, their
use expresses the speaker’s wish that the hearer will also understand what he/she says.
Due to the incorporative function of \textit{ne} and \textit{na}, their use is impossible when the nature
of information or expressions does not have room for the speaker to align with the
hearer.

This chapter has also provided a comprehensive account for the common effects
of these markers (softening, strengthening and friendliness/intimacy) and the more
frequent use of these markers in casual conversation, and confirmed that they are a manifestation of the incorporative function of these markers.

In the final section of this chapter, I have explored the difference between *ne* and *na*, and have shown that the ‘camaraderie tone’ of *na* is the major factor which influences its more limited use in terms of the speaker’s age, social status and gender, compared to the use of *ne*.

To summarise the functions of *ne* and *na*:

(i) *Ne* and *na* signal the speaker’s incorporative attitude of aligning with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.

(ii) *Na* further denotes the speaker’s attempt to share camaraderie with the hearer.
CHAPTER 6
Monopolistic markers *yo* and *sa*

6.1. Introduction

In Section 4.4, I have suggested that the interactive markers *yo*, *sa*, *wa*, *zo* and *ze* signal the speaker's 'monopolistic' attitude. By using these markers, the speaker invites the hearer's involvement, through which he/she is committed to enhance his/her position as a deliverer of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. Further, I have noted that although these five markers share this property in common, they are different from each other in the sense that they indicate different attitudes of the speaker when inviting the hearer's involvement within a monopolistic manner. In the remainder of the thesis, I will discuss the use of these five monopolistic markers and clarify what kind of monopolistic attitude is manifested through the use of each marker (the distinct function of each marker). For convenience, the analysis of these five markers will be presented in two chapters: *yo* and *sa* in Chapter 6, and *wa*, *zo* and *ze* in Chapter 7.

This chapter is organised as follows: Section 6.2 reviews what the speaker's monopolistic attitude is, focusing on *yo* and *sa*. Section 6.3 examines the use of *yo*, including its distinct function and expressive effects, and the speaker's use of the marker in social contexts. Section 6.4 discusses the use of *sa*. Similar to the case of *yo*, its function and expressive effects, and the speaker's use of the marker in social contexts will be explored. Section 6.5 presents a summary of the chapter.
6.2. Monopolistic attitude

Before starting a detailed analysis of the monopolistic markers, in this section I briefly re-summarise the notion of ‘monopolistic’, focusing on yo and sa. As stated in 4.4, the current study assumes that yo and sa as well as wa, zo and ze share the monopolistic nature, in contrast to the incorporative nature shared by ne and na (cf. Chapter 5).

First, let us observe the following example, which was used in Chapter 4 (as (13)) in order to illustrate the difference between the incorporative markers \{ne, na\} and the monopolistic markers \{yo, sa, wa, zo, ze\}.

(1) 1 A: \textit{Sonna koto kaikei ga yaryaa ii n da yo.}  
\text{such thing treasurer SUB do-CD good NOM BE YO}  
\text{‘That’s the sort of thing the treasurer should be doing’}

2 B: \textit{Shimi ka. Shimi, monku ooi kara na, tabun.}  
\text{Shimi QUE Shimi complaints lots because NA probably}  
\text{‘Well, Shimi. Because Shimi probably has lots of complaints…’}

3 A: \textit{Naa n da, kaikei nanka rakuna n da kara}  
\text{what NOM BE accounting,job like easy NOM BE since}  

4 \textit{monku iu na. Naa.}  
\text{complaints don’t say NA}  
\text{‘What? The accounting job is easy, so he shouldn’t complain. NA.’}

5 B: \textit{Naa.}  
\text{NA}  
\text{‘NA (I fully understand what you said and how you feel).’}  
\text{(CMM1)}

In (1), A and B are talking about how to punctually collect money for the band to which they belong. Although there is a treasurer, i.e. Shimi, in the band, A is currently collecting money on behalf of the treasurer, against his (A’s) intention. What needs to be focused on here is B’s utterance, \textit{Naa}, in line 5. In line 5, B receives A’s opinion and feeling about Shimi provided in lines 3 and 4, and indicates his full alignment with A,
by employing the incorporative marker *Naa*. Given that in line 5 B’s role is as a receiver of A’s utterance, the use of *yo* and *sa* instead is impossible here because they are monopolistic markers which deliver the speaker’s attitude of enhancing his/her position as a producer of the utterance rather than as a receiver of the other participant’s utterance. In contrast, the use of *Nee* instead of *Naa* is possible in sustaining B’s incorporative attitude and fulfilling B’s role as a receiver of A’s utterance.

To further understand the monopolistic nature of *yo* and *sa*, we consider some examples below. First, look at the use of *yo* in (2) below.

(2) 1 A: *Naami? Kono kappu. Chanto aratta no?*
   what this cup thoroughly washed SFP
   ‘What happened to this cup? Did you wash it thoroughly?’

2 B: *Nureteru kara aratta n daro.*
get.wet-PROG because washed NOM suppose
   ‘It’s wet, so I think I washed it.’

3 A: *Dame, yarinaoshi.*
hopeless do.again
   ‘It’s not clean. Wash it again.’

4 B: *Sukoshi kurai yogoreteta tte shiniyashinai yo.*
a.little about became.dirty-PROG QT die-TOP-do-NEG YO
   ‘(Someone) isn’t going to die just because it’s a little dirty.’ (T2)

(2) is a conversational exchange between A and B who are working at a café together. A discovers that the cup is wet, although it has not thoroughly been washed. In line 3, thus, A asks B to wash it again. In line 4, B expresses his unhappy feeling, stating that someone is not going to die just because the cup is a little dirty. B uses *yo* here. The intended meaning of B’s statement is still denoted even if the given utterance does not have *yo*, i.e. *Sukoshi kurai yogoreteta tte shiniyashinai* ‘(Someone) isn’t going to die
just because it’s a little dirty’. It is also obvious that even without *yo* B is already taking a role of the message deliverer by virtue of the conversational setting. Nonetheless, B employs *yo* and markedly invites A’s involvement through which he is committed to enhance his position as the speaker. By so doing, he attempts to draw A’s exclusive attention to what he says, and makes sure that A more carefully listens to it, which may reinforce A’s understanding that B is unhappy about A having asked him to wash the cup again and he (B) does not want to follow A’s suggestion.

The next example illustrates the use of *sa*. In (3), A and B talk about their friend, Katchan, who is an ace pitcher in the high school baseball team.

(3) A: *Moshi asu Katchan ga katte Kooshien ni iketara...*
   if tomorrow Katchan SUB win Koshien to-go-CD
   ‘If Katchan wins (the baseball game) tomorrow and is able to go to Koshien…’

B: *Moshi? Zettai iku sa.*
   if definitely go SA
   ‘If? He is definitely going to go (to Koshien).’ (T3)

A says ‘If Katchan wins (the baseball game) tomorrow and is able to go to Koshien, (which is the national tournament for high school baseball in Japan)’. Then, B does not like A’s idea of *Moshi* ‘If’, and states that Katchan is definitely going to go to Koshien, using *sa*. Similar to the case of *yo* shown in (2), the use of *sa* here is redundant in the sense that B’s belief in Katchan winning can also be delivered without *sa*. Nevertheless, by using *sa* B shows his monopolistic attitude, ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’, and attempts to draw A’s reinforced attention to his belief of this outcome.

As shown above, *yo* and *sa* share the common property of signalling the speaker’s monopolistic attitude, and to make an impact on the hearer, which can be denoted as
‘Listen. I have something to tell you’. Our next concern is then how *yo* and *sa* differ from each other. Below I will discuss the unique functions of *yo* and *sa*.

6.3. *Yo*

In 6.3, I focus on *yo*. I first outline previous studies on the function of the marker in 6.3.1. Then, I examine the function of the marker in 6.3.2, and discuss its expressive effects and their influence on the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts in 6.3.3.

6.3.1. Previous studies

In previous studies, it has often been claimed that *yo* has the opposite function of *ne* with regard to the state of information which each conversational participant possesses (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; cf. Information-state-based account in 2.3.1). Roughly speaking, this information-state-based account sees that when *yo* is used the speaker assumes that his/her information is not shared with the hearer, while when *ne* is used the speaker assumes that his/her information is shared with the hearer. However, as I have already discussed with some examples in 2.3 and 4.3, there are cases in which *yo* is appended to information shared by both participants. Let us revisit the following example, which was used as (5) in 2.3.1, to note this point.

(4)  [A and B talk about a boss who drives his juniors very hard.]

A: *Ano hito wa hidoi hito ne.*

that person TOP terrible person NE

‘That person (the boss) is a terrible person, isn’t he/she.’
B: *Hontooni hidoi hito desu yo.*
   really terrible person BE YO
   ‘He/She really is a terrible person.’  

(Cho, 2000: 3)

In (4) A and B are talking about their boss who drives his/her juniors very hard. By using *ne*, A seeks B’s alignment with regard to her opinion that the boss is a terrible person. B responds to this by using *yo*, and shows his/her concurrence with A’s opinion. As clearly shown in B’s utterance, *Hontooni hidoi hito desu* ‘He/She really is a terrible person’, the given information in his/her utterance is the same as what A has provided in her previous utterance, and yet *yo* is used here. As such, there are counter examples to the claim that the marker is used only when the speaker assumes that his/her information is not shared with the hearer.

The information-state-based account is also unable to deal with cases in which *yo* is used in non-sentence-final positions. Remember that within this account the marker is characterised in terms of the speaker’s perspective towards the state of information. The marker which appears in non-sentence-final positions is not associated with any independent propositional information, and thus it is out of the scope of the analysis. This means that, to begin with, we should disregard the possibility that the marker has the same features when used in sentence-final positions and when used in non-sentence-final positions. It will be shown shortly in 6.3.2 that the use of *yo* in both sentence-final positions and non-sentence-final positions can be accounted for in a unified manner from the involvement-based approach of the current study.

There are many previous studies that have accounted for the use of *yo* in terms of the effect of the marker that influences the tone of the utterance. For example, Uyeno (1971, 1972, 1982) and Saji (1991) point out that *yo* imparts a pushy tone or strengthens
the tone in declarative sentences. Interestingly, with commands and requests, the effect of the marker has been accounted for differently among studies. Some studies view that the marker has an effect of ‘strengthening’ the force of a command or request (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Matsumura, 1971; Hayashi, 2000 for commands; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Matsumura, 1971; Masuoka, 1991; Kawanari, 1995 for requests), while some others view that it has an effect of ‘softening’ the force (Uyeno, 1971, 1972, 1982; Masuoka, 1991 for commands; Uyeno, 1971 for requests). The two contradictory views towards the effect of *yo* as strengthening and as softening the tone of commands and requests raise an interesting question as to how the single marker *yo* can be interpreted in such opposing ways. As far as I know, this question has not clearly been explained in previous studies. In 6.3.3, I will account for these contrasting views in close connection with the function of the marker proposed in 6.3.2.

### 6.3.2. The function of *yo*: Ensuring the hearer’s understanding

This sub-section discusses the function of *yo*. First let us observe (5) and (6) below. (5) is a short conversation carried out when A comes to B’s café late in the night. A finds that there are no other customers in the café and says a joke to B that B does not look very busy as usual. B replies that what A says is nonsense and provides the reason why he does not look busy at that time, using *yo*. The use of *yo* here indicates B’s attitude of enhancing his position as a deliverer of the utterance and making sure that A carefully listens to it. Yet, what is more important to note here is that in delivering such a

---

1 I have also discussed some other approaches to the function of *yo* and pointed out their shortcomings in Chapter 2: for example, the discourse-management-based account in 2.3.2 (Takubo, 1992; Kinsui, 1993; Takubo and Kinsui, 1996, 1997), the dialogue-coordination-based account in 2.3.3 (Katagiri, 2007) and the authority-based account in 2.4.2 (Morita, 2002). See Chapter 2 for details.
monopolistic attitude, with yo speaker B is further committed to ‘ensure’ that hearer A understands what he (B) says. B’s utterance without yo, i.e. Moo heiten jikan da kara da, would already be informative enough to deliver the intended meaning of the utterance, ‘(I don’t look very busy) because it’s already closing time’. Nevertheless, B uses yo and shows his monopolistic attitude, which accompanies his commitment to ensure that A understands what he (B) says and recognises its importance. By doing so, B enhances his attempt to correct A’s misunderstanding about his (B’s) idleness.

    as.usual idle look BE NA
   ‘As usual you don’t look very busy.’

    B: Baka ie. Moo heiten jikan da kara da yo.
    nonsense say already closing.time BE because BE YO
   ‘Don’t be silly. (I don’t look busy) because it’s already closing time.’ (T1)

(6) Furo haitta hoo ga ii yo. Kaze hiku kara.
    bath enter-COMP SUB good YO cold catch because
   ‘You better take a bath or else you’ll catch a cold.’ (T2)

(6) is delivered to the speaker’s older brother who just came home sopping wet. Here, the speaker suggests to his brother that he (the brother) should take a bath, and his (the speaker’s) suggestion is stated with yo. Similar to the case of (5), the use of yo signals the speaker’s attitude of enhancing his position as a deliverer of the utterance and of making his brother understand his suggestion and realise its importance so the brother does not catch a cold. Apart from such an attitudinal aspect expressed by yo, here again, the use of yo is optional in the sense that the intended meaning of the utterance, ‘You better take a bath’, can also be delivered without yo, i.e. Furo haitta hoo ga ii.
As demonstrated through (5) and (6) above, the use of *yo* indicates that the speaker enhances his/her position as an information deliverer and attempts to ensure that the hearer understands the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance and recognises their importance. This function of *yo* which signals the speaker’s attitude of ‘ensuring the hearer’s understanding’ is particularly notable when it is used in non-sentence-final positions as shown below. I have already discussed the use of *yo* in these positions in 4.3 when I introduced the notions of monopolistic and incorporative, comparing *yo* with *ne*. Focusing on *yo*, I provide further examples below in order to show the function of the marker.

(7) a. *Yoo, nani hanashiteta n da?*  
    YO what talked-PROG NOM BE  
    ‘YO, what were you talking about?’  

    b. *Dooiu kankei ka shiranee ga yo, mada kotchi no hanashi ga owattenee n da.*  
    what.kind.of relationship QUE know-NEG but YO yet this.side LK story SUB finish-PROG-NEG NOM BE  
    ‘I don’t know the relationship (between you two), but I haven’t finished my side of the story yet.’  

As briefly mentioned in 4.3, when *yo* is used in non-sentence-final positions as in (7) and is not related to the interpretation of the overall propositional information, the speaker’s willingness to invite the hearer into the given conversation and to continue the conversation with the hearer is prominently expressed. Importantly, given the special characteristic of the marker, that is ‘ensuring the hearer’s understanding’, the speaker’s willingness with the non-sentence-final *yo* is presented in a way that the speaker makes
sure that the hearer understands it, implying ‘Listen. I want to ensure that you understand my feeling’. Such use of the marker delivers the speaker’s strong attitude of dominating the hearer with regard to his/her feeling and makes the utterance sound as if the speaker imposes his/her feeling on the hearer, i.e. ‘You should understand my feeling’. This adds a very strong dominating tone to the utterance\(^2\), and consequently the use of the marker in non-sentence-final positions is strictly limited to particular situations such as gangster talk in TV drama, as also pointed out in some studies (Tanaka, 1977; Maynard, 1993; Lee, 2007)\(^3\).

Thus far, I have demonstrated the function of \(yo\) which can be summarised as follows:

\[(8) \text{ The function of } yo\]

\(Yo\) signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of ensuring that the hearer understands the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.

What should be stressed here is that as shown above, regardless of the positions of \(yo\) in a sentence, it clearly indicates the speaker’s marked invitation of the hearer’s involvement in order to ensure the hearer’s understanding of what is conveyed in the utterance. The function of \(yo\) stated in (8) above provides a unified account for the use of the marker in sentence-final positions and non-sentence-final positions.

---

\(^2\) This characteristic of \(yo\) can be well attested when it is compared with \(ne\). As discussed in 5.2.2.3, the non-sentence-final use of \(ne\) delivers the speaker’s feeling in an incorporative manner, i.e. ‘I wish that you too understand my feeling’. Compared to this, the use of \(yo\) expresses the speaker’s feeling in a way that the speaker ensures the hearer’s understanding of it, i.e. ‘Listen. I want to ensure that you understand my feeling’, hence it naturally makes the tone of the utterance sound stronger.

\(^3\) For example, Maynard (1993) notes that it is used only in the most blunt and casual male conversation between social equals.
The function of yo in (8) also accounts for another interesting usage of the marker. As often reported in the literature, yo is used to denote an implied message (Izuhara, 1994b, 2001, 2003; Hasunuma, 1996; Takubo and Kinsui, 1996, 1997; Matsuoka, 2003; Lee, 2007), and more importantly the use of the marker in such a case is crucial (Lee, 2007). Look at (9) and (10) below.

(9) [To a person who is about to go out lightly dressed]
   a. Soto samui yo.
      outside cold YO
      ‘It’s cold outside. (Put on a coat.)’
   
      (Lee, 2007: 381)

   b. ? Soto samui.
      outside cold
      ‘It’s cold outside.’

(10) [To a person who dropped something]
   a. Nanika ochimashita yo.
      something fell YO
      ‘Something fell. (Pick it up.)’
   
      (Izuhara, 2001: 41)

   b. ? Nanika ochimashita.
      something fell
      ‘Something fell.’

The main concern of (9a) is to convince the hearer to wear more clothing such as a coat, as indicated in the bracket, i.e. ‘Put on a coat’. In this case, if yo were dropped from the statement as in (9b), the statement would be interpreted as simply expressing the

---

4 This is not to say that yo is the only marker that delivers an implied message. As will be discussed in Chapter 7, the monopolistic markers zo and ze also deliver an implied message. The details will be given in 7.4.3 for zo and 7.5.3 for ze.
coldness of outside, and the implied message, ‘You should wear a coat’, would not properly be delivered. Similarly, the main concern of (10a) is to convince the hearer to pick up the dropped item. In this case as well, the utterance without yo as in (10b), merely conveys the fact that something fell, and the implied message, ‘You should pick up the dropped item’, would not sufficiently be indicated.

In relation to this usage of yo, a point that needs to be focused on is that yo signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of ensuring the hearer’s understanding of what is conveyed in the utterance, thereby drawing the hearer’s exclusive attention to the content of the utterance and making the hearer realise its importance in the given context. This realisation by the hearer of the importance of the given information drawn by the use of the marker helps the hearer to figure out the relevance between the given information and an implied message. For instance, in the case of (9a), by employing yo the speaker ensures the hearer’s understanding of the coldness of outside. It makes the hearer realise the importance of the given information, ‘It’s cold outside’, and allows him/her to relate the information to the given context where he/she is about to go out lightly dressed. This results in his/her solid understanding of the speaker’s implied message that he/she should put on a coat. What is suggested here is that when the speaker attempts to deliver an implied message, indicating his/her particular commitment to make the hearer understand the conveyed information is essential. Otherwise, the hearer might not realise the particular importance of the given information, and fail to relate the information to the given context, which ultimately leads him/her (the hearer) to figure out the relevance between the given information and the implied message. In this respect, the compulsory use of yo in the case of delivering an implied message is well understood, since, as we have seen above, the marker
functions to signal the speaker’s commitment to ensure that the hearer understands what he/she says.

This crucial use of yo for delivering the speaker’s implied message is further closely related to the cases where the marker is used with information that is already shared by the speaker and the hearer. As already noted several times earlier, yo is often seen as indicating the speaker’s assumption that his/her information is not shared with the hearer (Ohso, 1986; Cheng, 1987; Masuoka, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; cf. Information-state-based account in 2.3.1). Given the function of the marker, which ensures the hearer’s understanding of the information conveyed in the utterance, it is plausible that the marker may be frequently used when the hearer does not have the information, and thus the speaker easily assumes that it is necessary for him/her to let the hearer know of it. However, this is not always the case, and when the speaker uses yo with shared information the speaker intends to deliver an implied message\(^5\). Reconsider the following example given in 6.3.1.

(4)’ [A and B talk about a boss who drives his juniors very hard.]

A: *Ano hito wa hidoi hito ne.*
that person TOP terrible person NE
‘That person (The boss) is a terrible person, isn’t he/she.’

B: *Hontooni hidoi hito desu yo.*
really terrible person BE YO
‘He/She really is a terrible person.’

In this conversation, A and B are talking about their boss who drives his/her juniors very hard. By using *ne*, A seeks B’s alignment with regard to her opinion that the boss is a terrible person. B responds to this by using *yo*, and shows his/her concurrence with

\(^5\) Izuhara (1994b) also makes a similar claim.
A’s opinion. As pointed out in 6.3.1, the information given in B’s utterance, ‘He/She really is a terrible person’, is the same as what A has provided in her previous utterance, while yo is used here. What is significant in this case is that B’s response here is not meant merely to show his/her agreement with A. The importance of using yo in B’s response is that it indicates the speaker’s stronger critical tone against the boss, and further implies his/her full agreement with A, ‘Yes, I completely agree with you’, with a nuance that his/her criticism is based on something, for example, that he/she received verbal abuse from the boss, or was unfairly forced to work on holiday. Without yo, i.e. Hontooni hidoi hito desu ‘He/She really is a terrible person’, the utterance would not particularly present such a message or nuance.

(11) below is another example ((11) was previously used as (8) in Chapter 4).

(11) K: Kore, oishii desu ne.
    this delicious BE NE
    ‘This is delicious.’
D: Soo, oishii desu yo.
    so delicious BE YO
    ‘Yes, it is delicious.’

(Lee, 2007: 370)

In (11) K pays D a compliment about the food D has cooked. D, who is a famous chef, responds to this by agreeing with what K has said. In terms of the information state, as indicated by Soo ‘Yes’, the information delivered in D’s utterance, ‘It is delicious’, has already been shared with (actually first provided by) K, while yo is used here. Again, similar to (4)’ above, an important point is that D’s response here is not meant merely to show his agreement with K. Rather, the use of yo in D’s response is related to D’s intention to respond to K’s compliment with humour, implying ‘The food is of course
delicious because it was cooked by me, a famous chef'. In order to make K understand this implied message, the use of yo is crucial. Otherwise, D’s response would lose its humorous nuance, and sound odd as a response to K’s compliment.

As such, when the speaker attaches yo to information already shared with the hearer, he/she intends to deliver an implied message, and in that case, again, the use of the marker is crucial. This is a special situation in which the speaker is required to put further effort into making the hearer realise the importance of the content of the utterance in the given situation and figure out the implied message. The monopolistic marker yo, with its unique function of ensuring that the hearer understands the content conveyed in the utterance, has been shown to be a perfect linguistic device for indicating an implied message (We will return to the use of the interactive markers for implication in 6.4.4 when we discuss the use of sa). In the following sub-section, I will investigate the expressive effects of yo.

6.3.3. The expressive effects of yo and its use in social contexts

As noted in 6.3.1, there are many previous studies that have accounted for the use of yo based on a strong-weak dimension of the marker. For example, Uyeno (1971, 1972, 1982) and Saji (1991) point out that yo imparts a pushy tone or strengthens the tone in declarative sentences. Interestingly, with commands and requests, the effect of the marker has been accounted for differently among studies; that is, in some studies it is seen as ‘strengthening’ the force of a command or request (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Matsumura, 1971; Hayashi, 2000 for commands; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Matsumura, 1971; Masuoka, 1991; Kawanari, 1995 for requests), while in some others it is seen as softening the force (Uyeno, 1971, 1972, 1982;
Masuoka, 1991 for commands; Uyeno, 1971 for requests). Considering the claims made in these previous studies, there are two conflicting views towards the use of yo; that is, the ‘strengthening’ view vs. the ‘softening’ view. As Lee (2007) suggests, these two conflicting views for the single marker yo are due to the fact that each account sees only one aspect of the use of yo, and these views are in fact comprehensively explainable from the perspective of involvement and the monopolistic nature of the marker.

First, consider (12) below, in which B’s utterance ends with the declarative sentence, saki no koto wa wakaranai ‘I don’t know about (my) future’, followed by yo.

(12) A: Amari murisuru na. Kooshien wa rainen mo, sono tsugi mo not.much don’t.overwork Kooshien TOP next.year also that next also aru n da kara. there.is NOM BE because ‘Take it easy. There will also be Koshien next year and the year after next, so.’

B: Doo kana? Saki no koto wa wakaranai yo. how I.wonder.if future LK thing TOP know-NEG YO ‘I’m not sure. I don’t know about (my) future.’ (T3)

Prior to this conversational exchange, A saw B practising baseball very hard for Koshien, the national tournament for high school baseball in Japan. In (12), A says to B that B should not overwork because there will also be Koshien next year and the year after next, implying that this is not the last chance for B to participate in Koshien. In responding to A, with yo B states that he does not know about his future, which contradicts A’s view. What underlies the use of yo here is B’s commitment to ensure that A understands his (B’s) uncertainty about his own future, and thus he needs to work hard for the given chance this year.
As noted above, it has been reported that *yo* used with declarative sentences as in (12) imparts a pushy tone (Uyeno, 1971, 1972, 1982; Saji, 1991), and indeed B’s use of *yo* in (12) has a sort of pushiness towards A. This pushy tone can be seen as representing the monopolistic nature of *yo*. The marker accompanies the speaker’s attitude of enhancing his/her superior position over the hearer in delivering information and his/her feeling, i.e. ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’. The marker further delivers the speaker’s attitude of ensuring the hearer’s understanding, i.e. ‘I want to ensure that you understand what I say and how I feel’. The speaker’s attitude and feeling expressed by the marker as such make the utterance sound as if he/she pushes the hearer to listen to him/her and understand what he/she says.

(13) below illustrates that the effect of the pushy tone of *yo* is also applicable to the cases in which the marker is used with polite forms.

(13) A: *E, Perushago mo aru n desu ka, kenkyuuugengo de.*
what Persian also there.is NOM BE QUE research.language in
‘What! Is there also Persian in the research language course?’

B: *Arimasu yo.*
there.is YO
‘There is.’

Prior to this conversational exchange, B said that she had taken the university course called *kenkyuuugengo* ‘research language’ and learnt Persian in the course. A did not know that the course offered Persian and in (13) she confirms whether or not the course still offers Persian. B answers that it offers, and uses *yo*. Unlike (12), (13) involves a certain level of formality, and thus B employs the *masu* form, i.e. *Arimasu*, and attaches *yo* to it. In this case as well, B’s use of *yo* indicates a sort of pushiness towards A, and
again, this is because *yo* signals B’s monopolistic attitude of ensuring A’s understanding of what she says.

We now move on to discussing the cases in which *yo* is used with commands and requests. As mentioned earlier, the effect of *yo* with these types of sentences is seen as ‘strengthening’ the command or request force in some studies (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Matsumura, 1971; Hayashi, 2000 for commands; Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Matsumura, 1971; Masuoka, 1991; Kawanari, 1995 for requests), while it is seen as ‘softening’ the force in some others (Uyeno, 1971, 1972, 1982; Masuoka, 1991 for commands; Uyeno, 1971 for requests). Look at (14) below. In (14a) and (14b) *yo* is attached to an abrupt command *hottoke* ‘Leave alone’ and a less abrupt command *Machinasai* ‘Wait’, respectively, whereas in (14c) and (14d) the marker is used with a casual request *yonde* ‘Please invite’ and a formal request *shite kudasai* ‘Please do’, respectively.

(14) a. *Rui, hottoke yo.*
    Rui leave.alone YO
    ‘Rui, leave (him) alone.’
    (HD1)

    b. *Machinasai yo.*
    wait YO
    ‘Wait.’
    (HD5)

    c. *Kekkonshiki yonde yo.*
    wedding please.invite YO
    ‘Please invite (me) to your wedding.’
    (CMM4)

---

6 This implies that the given conversational context is somewhat semi-formal, in which speaking in such a pushy tone is still allowed. As will be shown shortly, the use of *yo* would be inappropriate if the context involves a high level of formality.
d. Botchan, nantoka shite kudasai yo.
young.master somehow please.do YO
‘Young master, please do something.’ (HD1)

(14a) indicates that the speaker wants the hearer, Rui, to leave their friend alone, and
(14b) indicates that the speaker wants the hearer to wait for her. Further, (14c) shows
that the speaker wants the hearer to invite him to the hearer’s wedding, and (14d) shows
that the speaker wants the hearer, Botchan ‘young master’, to do something. We have
already seen how the monopolistic marker yo adds a pushy tone, or strengthens the tone
of the utterance. In (14a) and (14b), by using yo, the speaker markedly draws the
hearer’s attention, ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’, and further indicates, ‘I want to
ensure that you leave him alone’ and ‘I want to ensure that you wait for me’,
respectively. This reinforced attitude of the speaker appears as the expression of his/her
strong feelings to push the hearer to listen to him/her and do as he/she commands.
Similarly, in (14c) and (14d), with yo the speaker in each example indicates his
monopolistic attitude of ensuring that the hearer does as requested, i.e. ‘Listen. I want to
ensure that you invite me to your wedding’ in (14c) and ‘Listen. I want to ensure that
you do something about it’ in (14d). This speaker’s reinforced attitude, again, appears
as the presentation of his strengthened feelings, and the force of the request is heard
strengthened.

However, what is important to remark on is that this does not necessarily mean
that these sentences with yo carry a higher degree of command/request force. This point
is shown more clearly when the above sentences in (14) are compared to those without
yo in (15) below.
(15) a. *Rui, hottoke.*
   Rui   leave.alone
   ‘Rui, leave (him) alone.’

b. *Machinasai.*
   wait
   ‘Wait.’

c. *Kekkonshiki yonde.*
   wedding   please.invite
   ‘Please invite me to your wedding.’

d. *Botchan, nantoka shite kudasai.*
   young.master   somehow   please.do
   ‘Young master, please do something.’

These sentences unilaterally state the speaker’s command or request, i.e. ‘I command/request you to do as I say, and have no more to say’. With such an ‘official’ tone, the assertiveness of the command/request tone is straightforwardly expressed. Compared to them, the sentences with *yo*, i.e. *hottoke yo, Machinasai yo, yonde yo* and *shite kudasai yo*, markedly indicate the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement, by which they explicitly show the speaker’s recognition of the hearer as his/her conversation partner and his/her willingness to maintain the conversation with the hearer. With the sentences associated with the speaker’s recognition of, and feeling towards, the hearer, the assertiveness of the command/request tone is moderated, and the sentences would sound softer. This is the basis of the view that *yo* softens the tone of the utterance.

In short, the use of *yo* has dual aspects in terms of its expressive effects, i.e. strengthening and softening. Its effect of strengthening the tone of the utterance can be
seen as a realisation of the monopolistic nature of *yo*, which indicates the speaker’s attitude of making sure that the hearer carefully listens to him/her and further ensuring that the hearer understands what he/she says. This reinforced attitude of the speaker appears to express his/her strong feelings to push the hearer to listen to him/her and understand what is said, and is interpreted as strengthening the tone of the utterance. In contrast, the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement indicated by the use of the marker (the speaker’s recognition of the hearer as his/her conversation partner and his/her willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer) is realised as an expression of the speaker’s concern towards the hearer. This appears to moderate the assertiveness of the utterance, and is interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance. Given these dual aspects of *yo*, if we focus on the speaker’s marked invitation of the hearer’s involvement, the marker would be interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance. Yet, if we focus on the monopolistic nature of *yo*, and, for example, with an angry tone of voice, the marker would be perceived as a stronger presentation of the speaker’s attitude and feeling, and interpreted as strengthening the tone of the utterance.

Let us now turn to discuss the use of *yo* in social contexts. It is often reported that the use of the marker indicates ‘intimacy’ (Masuoka, 1991; Oota, 1994; Nishikawa, 2000), or the marker is less frequently used in formal conversation (Oota, 1994; Onuki, 1986; Nishikawa, 2000). Such features of *yo* are closely related to the attitudinal aspect of the marker, similar to the case of *ne* and *na*. In 5.5.2, I have noted that it is often the case that a straightforward presentation of the speaker’s attitude and feelings/emotions towards the hearer is more easily acceptable in a situation where the conversational participants have a close relationship. *Yo* signals the monopolistic attitude of the speaker, through which the speaker’s attitude, ‘Listen. I want to ensure that you understand what
I say and how I feel’, is directly expressed. Furthermore, as shown above, the marker also denotes the speaker’s feeling, ‘I recognise you as my conversation partner and wish to continue the conversation together’. The use of yo, regardless of whether its effect is strengthening or softening the tone of the utterance, directly expresses the speaker’s attitude and feeling towards the hearer. In this connection, the use of the marker is regarded as indicating the speaker’s ‘intimacy’ towards the hearer, since the use of the marker is presumed as such that the speaker treats the hearer as a person who is close enough to directly expose his/her attitude and feeling. This aspect of the marker provides a straightforward account for its less frequent use in formal conversation, as expressing intimacy is less reciprocal in formal conversation where the conversational participants are presumed to have interpersonal distance.

In this line of argument, it is naturally predicted that when yo is used in a situation where intimacy is not reciprocal, its use would be interpreted as impolite, as also pointed out in some studies (Izuwara, 1994b; Oota, 1994; Masuoka, 1991; Hayashi, 2000). For example, consider (16) below.

(16) Teacher: \textit{Moo repooto wa dashimashita ka.}
\hspace{1cm} already report TOP submitted QUE
‘Have you already submitted your report?’

Student1: \textit{Ee. moo dashimashita.}
\hspace{1cm} yes already submitted
‘Yes, I have already submitted it.’

Student2: \textit{?Ee, moo dashimashita yo.}
\hspace{1cm} yes already submitted YO
‘Yes, I have already submitted it.’ \hspace{5cm} (Hayashi, 2000: 39)
This is a short conversation between a teacher and two students. In responding to the teacher’s question as to whether or not the students have already submitted their reports, Student 1 answers that he/she has already submitted it without *yo*, while Student 2 answers the same with *yo*. Hayashi (2000) points out that Student 1 and Student 2 deliver the same propositional information, and yet Student 2’s answer with *yo* sounds impolite compared to Student 1’s without *yo*. The point made by Hayashi (2000) is true, and in fact Student 2’s utterance may imply his/her somewhat unhappy feeling, e.g. ‘I have already submitted it, but you do not believe me’. The direct expression of such feelings of the speaker would be acceptable between close friends. However, in a Japanese context, students are generally expected to speak in a formal and polite way to keep a certain distance between teachers. The use of *yo* by Student 2 above, thus, inappropriately imparts an intimate nuance towards the teacher and would be interpreted as impolite.

Having reached this point, I would like to add some further comments on the more frequent use of the marker in casual conversation (and thus the less frequent use in formal conversation). We have discussed earlier that the use of *yo* indicates the speaker’s attitude, ‘Listen. I want to ensure that you understand what I say and how I feel’, and with this monopolistic attitude it would be interpreted as pushy or strengthening the tone of the utterance. Such an effect of the marker consequently leads to the hearer’s impression that the speaker imposes the given information and feeling on the hearer. As I have mentioned in 5.5, in a Japanese context non-imposition is valued as polite especially when a high level of formality is required. Thus, in formal conversation the pushy tone indicated by the use of *yo* might create a risk where the speaker violates the hearer’s negative face and be interpreted as impolite. This is
another reason for the frequent use of the marker in casual conversation where the violation of the hearer’s negative face is more easily allowed, compared to formal conversation.

To sum up, 6.3 has discussed the use of *yo*. I have characterised *yo* as the marker which signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of ensuring the hearer’s understanding of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. I have also shown that due to the given function of the marker, the marker can deliver the speaker’s implied message, and when the speaker intends to deliver an implied message the use of the marker is crucial. The expressive effects of *yo* such as strengthening, softening and intimacy, and the more frequent use of the marker in casual conversation, have also been accounted for as a manifestation of the speaker’s particular monopolistic attitude indicated by the use of the marker; that is, ‘Listen. I want to ensure that you understand what I say and how I feel’ and ‘I recognise you as my conversation partner and wish to continue the conversation with you’.

### 6.4. *Sa*

6.4 examines *sa*. Interestingly, our targeted monopolistic markers other than *yo* have some co-occurrence restrictions with particular expressions, and these restrictions are thought to reflect the unique characteristic of each marker\(^7\). Thus, in this section, I first show some distributional facts related to the use of *sa* in 6.4.1. Then, I review previous studies on the function of the marker in 6.4.2 and examine the function of the marker in

---

\(^7\) In 6.4.3, I will discuss why *yo* does not have co-occurrence restrictions with particular expressions, compared to *sa*. 
6.4.3. Finally, in 6.4.4 I discuss the expressive effects of the marker and their influence on the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts.

### 6.4.1. Relevant facts

There are some interesting facts found with respect to the use of *sa*. First, as pointed out in many studies, *sa* cannot co-occur with particular types of modal expressions.

(17) a. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru soo sa.*
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come hear SA
‘I hear that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.’

b. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru yoo sa.*
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come apparently SA
‘It looks like Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.’

c. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru rashii sa.*
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come seem SA
‘It seems that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.’

(18) a. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru ni chigainai sa.*
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come must SA
‘Tanaka will surely come to the party tonight, too.’

b. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru daroo sa.*
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come suppose SA
‘I think Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.’

---

8 The term ‘modal expressions’ is used as the speaker’s subject judgement or attitude towards the proposition, as opposed to a propositional content which expresses an objective statement (Johnson, 2003). Hereafter, the term ‘modal expressions’ include *soo(da)* ‘(hearsay)’, *yoo(da)* ‘apparently’, *rashii* ‘it seems’, *(ni)chigainai* ‘must (be)’, *daroo* ‘suppose’ and *kamoshirenai* ‘may (be)’ for the purpose of the discussion.
c. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru kamoshirenai sa.*

Tanaka also tonight LK party to come may SA

‘Tanaka may also come to the party tonight.’

(17a), (17b) and (17c) illustrate that sa is incompatible with soo(da) ‘(hearsay)’ (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987), yoo(da) ‘apparently’ (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987) and rashii ‘it seems’ (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Suzuki, 1976; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002), respectively. Conversely, (18a), (18b) and (18c) show that the marker is compatible with (ni)chigainai ‘must (be)’ (Uyeno, 1972), daroo ‘suppose’ (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Suzuki, 1976; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Kashiwagi, 2006) and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’

9 respectively.

The second fact is that sa cannot co-occur with commands (Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Kashiwagi, 2001; Miyazaki et al., 2002), requests (Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002) and proposals (Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Kashiwagi, 2001; Miyazaki et al., 2002). (19) below illustrates this fact.

(19) a. *Ima ike sa.*

now go SA

‘Go now.’

b. *Ima itte sa.*

now please go SA

‘Please go now.’

9 To the best of my knowledge, there have been no studies which discuss the co-occurrence of sa with kamoshirenai. I also could not find this co-occurrence in my data. I have informally asked 20 native speakers of Japanese whether or not sa is compatible with kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’; for example, *Tanaka mo iku kamoshirenai sa* ‘Tanaka may also go-SA’. They all answered that it was compatible.
c. *\textit{Ima} ikoo \textit{sa}.

now let's go SA

'Let's go now.'

\textit{Ike} in (19a) is a command to go, \textit{itte} in (19b) is a request to go and \textit{ikoo} in (19c) is a proposal to go. As shown, \textit{sa} is incompatible with these types of sentences\textsuperscript{10}.

The final fact is that the use of \textit{sa} is restricted to plain forms (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Alfonso, 1974; Suzuki, 1976; Morita, 1981). Look at the following examples.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Kono eiga wa omoshiroi desu sa}.
\begin{itemize}
\item this movie TOP interesting BE SA
\item 'This movie is interesting.'
\end{itemize}

\item \textit{Kono eiga wa omoshiroi sa}.
\begin{itemize}
\item this movie TOP interesting SA
\item 'This movie is interesting.'
\end{itemize}

\item \textit{Ashita wa haremasu sa}.
\begin{itemize}
\item tomorrow TOP clear.up SA
\item 'It will clear up tomorrow.'
\end{itemize}

\item \textit{Ashita wa hareru sa}.
\begin{itemize}
\item tomorrow TOP clear.up SA
\item 'It will clear up tomorrow.'
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{10} In (19), I did not include the more formal version of the given three sentences such as \textit{ikinasai} 'Go', \textit{itte kudasai} 'Please go' and \textit{ikimashoo} 'Let's go', because as shown in (20a) and (21a), \textit{sa} cannot be used with polite forms.
As in (20a) and (21a) sa cannot be used with the polite forms such as desu in omoshiroi desu and masu in haremasu, respectively, while it can with the plain forms such as omoshiroi and hareru, as in (20b) and (21b), respectively.

As illustrated above, sa has some co-occurrence restrictions with particular types of expressions. These restrictions are deemed to be closely related to the special function of the marker. In 6.4.3 and 6.4.4, I elaborate on these distributional facts in relation to the function as well as the expressive effects of the marker.

6.4.2. Previous studies

With regard to the function of sa, the most prominent claim in the literature is that it indicates that what is conveyed in the utterance is toozen ‘natural’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Uyeno, 1972; Cheng, 1987; Tanaka, 1989; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002) or in Uyeno's (1971) term ‘the obviousness of the matter’. Alfonso (1974) also notes that sa is used to indicate that something is obvious, which is equivalent to ‘naturally’. Observe the following example.

(22) A: Doo naru n (de) suka ne, kono shiai. how become NOM BE QUE NE this game 'How will this game end?'
B: Katsu sa.
win SA
'(We) will win.'

In this conversational exchange, A asks B (who is in the same baseball team) how the ongoing baseball game will end. B states, Katsu '(We) will win', and attaches sa to the
statement. The important fact is that, as pointed out in the literature, the use of \textit{sa} here indeed delivers a nuance that the winning of B’s team is obvious and natural for B.

The previous studies have captured this special characteristic of \textit{sa} well. However, the majority of researchers have largely relied on their intuitive knowledge without much empirical or theoretical discussion. To the best of my knowledge, there have been no studies which provide a comprehensive account for the function of the marker in relation to its distributional facts (cf. 6.4.1). In this regard, the analysis of the function of the marker does not seem to be convincingly complete, and a further systematic analysis is required. In 6.4.3 below, I will develop the initial spirit of the account given in the previous studies and propose the function of \textit{sa} in a more comprehensive manner.

\section*{6.4.3. The function of \textit{sa}: Presenting the utterance as a matter of course for the speaker}

As stated in 6.4.2, I concur with the view of the previous studies that the function of \textit{sa} is closely related to the speaker’s feeling that what is said in the utterance is natural and a matter of course for the speaker. I, thus, develop the basic spirit of the view in these previous studies, and propose the function of \textit{sa} as (23) below. As will be shown shortly, this proposed function of the marker will also systematically deal with various distributional facts illustrated in 6.4.1.

\begin{quote}
(23) The function of \textit{sa}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Sa} signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of presenting the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance as a matter of course for him/her.
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}
The crucial difference between the function of *sa* proposed in (23) and that in the previous studies is that the function in (23) is first of all stated in conjunction with the term ‘monopolistic attitude’, and describes the nature of the marker more effectively. This term systematically differentiates *sa* from the incorporative markers *ne* and *na*, and indicates the shared property with the other monopolistic markers *yo*, *wa*, *zo* and *ze*. Moreover, the function in (23) also specifies the speaker’s particular intention delivered by the use of the marker; that is, presenting the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance ‘as a matter of course’ for the speaker.

Bearing this proposed function in mind, let us consider the use of *sa* in (24) below.

(24) A: *Warui wane, wazawaza. Bokushingubu ga bodiigaadonara*  
sorry SFP go.out.of.one’s.way boxing.club SUB bodyguard-CD  
anshin da.  
security BE
‘Thank you for going to the trouble (of protecting me on my way home). I feel secure as a person (i.e. you) from the boxing club is my bodyguard.’

B: *Abunakunattara nigeru sa.*  
become.dangerous-CD run.away SA
‘I’ll run away if I face a dangerous situation.’  

In (24) A shows her appreciation to B for taking her home in the night. In responding to A, B humorously states that he will run away if he faces a dangerous situation. He employs *sa* here. Similar to the case of *yo*, B’s role as an information deliverer is naturally identifiable by the given conversational setting, and yet B uses *sa* and indicates his monopolistic attitude of enhancing his position as a message deliverer. Further and more importantly, with *sa*, B presents his emphasised feeling that what he says is a matter of course for him, which can roughly be paraphrased as ‘I of course run
away if I face a dangerous situation'. Note that without sa, i.e. Abunakunattara nigeru, B’s statement would simply indicate what he would do. Compared to this, the use of sa adds B’s feeling that this (he will run away) is just natural for him and he will of course do as such. This additional feeling in turn reinforces the humorousness involved in the statement, e.g. ‘I am a very big and strong guy’.

I now move on to exploring the distributional facts of sa in conjunction with the function of the marker proposed in (23) above. The first fact to be considered is the co-occurrence restriction of sa with particular types of modal expressions. As noted in 6.4.1, the marker cannot be used with soo(da) ‘(hearsay)’, yoo(da) ‘apparently’ and rashii ‘it seems’, while it can with (ni)chigainai ‘must (be)’, daroo ‘suppose’ and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’ (Examples of these were given in (17) and (18) earlier). It is widely agreed among Japanese linguists that soo(da), yoo(da) and rashii differ from (ni)chigainai, daroo and kamoshirenai, in terms of the speaker’s attitude towards the truth-value or factual status of the proposition (cf. Miyazaki, 1993; Moriyama et al., 2000; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Johnson, 2003; Narrog, 2009)\(^{11}\). Broadly speaking, the former expressions, i.e. soo(da), yoo(da) and rashii, are seen as specifying the evidence/ground based on which the speaker judges the truth-value of the proposition (‘evidentiality’ in Miyazaki et al.’s (2002) or ‘evidentials’ in Johnson’s (2003) and Narrog’s (2009) term\(^{12}\), and the latter, i.e. (ni)chigainai, daroo and kamoshirenai,

\(^{11}\) There are some studies that do not particularly categorise these modal expressions as such, yet they discuss the characteristics of each modal expression. See Teramura (1984), Moriyama (1989), Masuoka (1991), Nitta (1991), Masuoka and Takubo (1994) and Asano (2003) for details.

\(^{12}\) Narrog (2009) divides evidentials into two: pure evidentials, e.g. soo(da) ‘(hearsay)’ and inferential evidentials, e.g. yoo(da) ‘apparently’ and rashii ‘it seems’. This classification is based on the notion that the former contains no element of inference, while the latter contains such an element. Since this classification of evidentials is not an issue for the discussion of this study, I use the term ‘evidentials’ to collectively indicate all the targeted evidentials, i.e. soo(da)
express the way or degree of the speaker’s conviction in judging the truth-value of the proposition (‘suppositionals’ in Johnson’s (2003) term). To put it differently, when soo(da), yoo(da) and rashii are used, they indicate what evidence the speaker has in judging the truth-value of the proposition — whether he/she has gained the propositional information through visual or other sensory impressions such as hearing or feeling. On the other hand, when (ni)chigainai, daroo and kamoshirenai are used, they do not specify any evidence for the truth-value of the proposition13, but rather indicate in what way or how much the speaker is certain about the proposition being true (Moriyama, 1989; Miyazaki, 1993; Asano, 2003) (We will discuss the difference among the suppositionals in Chapter 7).

(i) Evidentials: soo(da), yoo(da), rashii

(ii) Suppositionals: (ni)chigainai, daroo, kamoshirenai

What is informative to our current discussion is that the difference between these two types of modal expressions, evidentials and suppositionals, induces the compatibility/incompatibility of sa with these modal expressions. Note that the marker signals the speaker’s feeling that what he/she says is just natural and a matter of course for him/her. Focusing on the case of the suppositionals first, the co-occurrence of sa with these expressions seems to be well predicted one. As noted above, the

13 This is not to say that the speaker does not have any grounds for his/her judgement (certainty) when he/she uses (ni)chigainai, daroo or kamoshirenai. For example, Asano (2009a) claims that (ni)chigainai indicates the speaker’s strong certainty which is based on his/her current knowledge or relevant information. What I mean by “they do not specify any evidence” is that the focus of the suppositionals is not on specifically indicating the source of the speaker’s judgement.
suppositionals indicate the way or degree of the speaker being certain about the proposition being true. This relies on the speaker’s belief as such, that is, he/she believes it strongly or less strongly, and the use of *sa* adds the speaker’s feeling that his/her belief and the level of its strength is just natural and a matter of course for him/her. Thus, for example, (18a) given at the beginning of 6.4.1 is interpreted as such that ‘It is just natural and a matter of course for me to strongly believe that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight’.

(18)’ a. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru ni chigainai sa.*

    Tanaka also tonight LK party to come must SA

‘Tanaka will surely come to the party tonight, too.’

In contrast, the impossible use of *sa* with the evidentials is due to the fact that the nature of the evidentials does not match with the speaker’s intention delivered by the use of the marker. Recall that the main concern of the evidentials is to indicate how the speaker has gained the propositional information, for example, *Taroo wa gakusei da sooda* ‘I hear that Taro is a student’. While the main concern of the statement with *soo(da)* ‘(hearsay)’ is to indicate that the speaker has gained the information from other people (what they said), it is not something which the speaker feels to be natural and a matter of course for him/her. In other words, with *soo(da)*, there is no room for the speaker to feel it to be a matter of course, since the speaker is simply meant to specify that the information is based on what other people said. For example, reconsider (17a) in which *sa* is combined with *soo(da)* in force.
Monopolistic markers *yo and *sa

(17) a. *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru soo sa.
        Tanaka also tonight LK party to come hear SA
        ‘I hear that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.’

The interpretation of the sentence, ‘?The fact that the information (that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight) is based on what other people said is just natural and a matter of course for me’, sounds odd, since here the fact that the information is what other people said is something to be merely recognised, and is not something to be felt to be a matter of course. Compared to this, again, the use of *sa with the suppositionals is well justified with the logical connection between ‘I feel it to be a matter of course’ and ‘It is something that I have judged/believed as such’, as shown in its interpretation, ‘The fact that I have judged/believed the information as such, is just natural and a matter of course for me’ (Also see Uyeno (1971, 1972) for a similar claim).

Up to now, I have discussed the compatibility/incompatibility of *sa with modal expressions. Here, it is of interest to note that, *yo, unlike *sa, does not have such a co-occurrence restriction with different types of modal expressions (cf. Uyeno, 1971; Miyazaki et al., 2002), and it is compatible with soo(da), yoo(da) and rashii as well as (ni)chigainai, daroo and kamoshirenai. This is because the speaker’s intention delivered by the use of *yo is to ensure the hearer’s understanding of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance (cf. 6.3.2), and how he/she has gained or judged the proposition is not an issue. Thus, for example, *yo with the suppositional (ni)chigainai in Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru ni chigainai *yo ‘Tanaka will surely come to the party tonight, too-YO’ can be interpreted as the speaker attempting to ensure that the hearer understands that he (the speaker) strongly believes in Tanaka’s participation in the party that night. Similarly, *yo with the evidential soo(da) in Tanaka mo konya no
paatii ni kuru sooda yo ‘I hear that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight-YO’ is interpreted as such that the speaker is committed to ensure the hearer’s understanding that the information, ‘Tanaka will also come to the party tonight’, has been gained from other people (what they said).

The next distributional fact of sa to be discussed is that the marker cannot be used with commands, requests and proposals. Look at (25) below.

    this eat     SA
    ‘Eat this.’

    b. *Kore tabete sa.
    this please.eat SA
    ‘Please eat this.’

c. *Kore tabeyoo sa.
    this let’s.eat SA
    ‘Let’s eat this.’

*Tabero* in (25a) is a command, *tabete* in (25b) is a request and *tabeyoo* in (25c) is a proposal. As illustrated in these examples, *sa* is compatible with none of these sentences.

What commonly underlies these three types of sentences is the speaker’s intention of controlling the hearer’s future action. For example, with *tabero* in (25a), *tabete* in (25b) and *tabeyoo* in (25c), all the sentences convey the speaker’s intention of making the hearer eat. Naturally, these sentences presuppose that the hearer completely understands what he/she is supposed to do, and otherwise he/she would be unable to correctly respond to the speaker’s intention. From the speaker’s point of view, this means that these sentences require the speaker’s strong commitment to make the hearer
understand what to do. In other words, the speaker needs to ‘consider the hearer’s side’ in order to make sure that the hearer does act as he/she (the speaker) commands, requests or proposes. This point of ‘considering the hearer’s side’ in these three sentences can be seen more clearly by comparing them with a simple descriptive statement, for example, *Kore taberu* ‘I will eat this’. The descriptive statement can still inform the content of the statement to the hearer, but, it is only by virtue of the interactive conversational setting, i.e. ‘While I am talking, you are assumed to be listening to me’, and the level of the speaker’s commitment to make the hearer understand the conveyed information is relatively low, especially when it is not accompanied with any involvement cues of the speaker such as great volume of his/her voice or eye gaze. That is to say, the speaker’s ‘consideration of the hearer’s side’ is not particularly expected in this case of descriptive statement, while the earlier three types of sentences involve a high level of the speaker’s ‘consideration of the hearer’s side’, since, as noted above, the success of the speaker’s intended goal with these sentences depends on whether or not the hearer understands and acts as the speaker says.

The speaker’s ‘consideration of the hearer’s side’ is further well observed in the case of *yo* when it is used with commands, requests and proposals. Unlike the case of *sa*, *yo* is compatible with all of these sentences, as illustrated in (26) below. *Yo* is used with a command *wasurero* ‘Forget it’ in (26a), with a request *kikasete* ‘Please let me hear’ in (26b) and with a proposal *asoboo* ‘Let’s play’ in (26c).

(26) a. *Hayaku wasurero yo.*
quickly forget YO
‘Forget it quickly.’

(T2)
Given that *yo* signals the speaker’s attitude of ensuring the hearer’s understanding of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance (cf. 6.3.2), the use of the marker indicates the speaker’s reinforced commitment to make the hearer understand what he/she says. In this regard, *yo* is seen as explicitly indicating the speaker’s ‘consideration of the hearer’s side’. Therefore, its use perfectly matches with the speaker’s intention conveyed by commands, requests and proposals, and adds the speaker’s further effort to ensure that the hearer understands what is commanded, requested and proposed. As such, *yo*, unlike *sa*, can be used with commands, requests and proposals without any problem, with its function to explicitly deliver the speaker’s commitment to make the hearer understand what is conveyed in the utterance.

Returning to our discussion of *sa*, it should now be clear that ‘considering the hearer’s side’ is essential for the success of commands, requests and proposals. Most relevant to the current discussion is the relationship between this nature (‘considering the hearer’s side’) of these sentences, and the speaker’s attitude signalled by the use of *sa*. Recall that *sa* signals the speaker’s attitude of presenting what is stated is a matter of course for him/her, with the focus given onto the speaker’s interests. This speaker’s attitude indicated by the use of the marker does not presuppose the speaker’s particular commitment to make the hearer understand what is stated. This means that the marker
cannot be seen as denoting the speaker’s ‘consideration of the hearer’s side’. In fact, *sa* is reported to be a ‘speaker-centred’ expression. For example, it is reported that *sa* is an expression of *aite o tsukihanasu* ‘lit. abandoning the hearer’ (Saji, 1957), of *kikite no mae ni nooridasu* ‘lit. throwing (the information) to the hearer’ (Uyeno, 1972; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987), or of *kikite no hannoo o yookyuushinai* ‘lit. not ask for the hearer’s reaction’ (Suzuki, 1976)\(^{14}\). Furthermore, it is sometimes characterised as ‘ego-assertive’ (Martin, 1975) or even as ‘scornful’ (Uyeno, 1971). As these interpretations indicate, with *sa* the speaker focuses on his/her own side in providing his/her feeling that what is said is a matter of course for him/her, and does not show special ‘consideration to the hearer’. This aspect of the marker is the reason for its incompatibility with commands, requests and proposals. To be more specific, *sa* cannot be used with these sentences because it is speaker-centred and basically focuses on the speaker's own side, and conflicts with what is required for the success of these sentences, i.e. ‘considering the hearer’s side’.

Based on the function of *sa* discussed in this sub-section, in what follows, I will investigate the expressive effects of the marker and further deal with the relevant issues.

6.4.4. **The expressive effects of *sa* and its use in social contexts**

In 6.4.3, I have claimed that *sa* signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of presenting the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance as a matter of course for him/her. Furthermore, I have shown that with this attitude, the marker does not indicate the speaker's particular consideration of the hearer's side, but rather focuses on the

---

\(^{14}\) The English translations of the given examples here are my own.
speaker’s side. As noted above, because of this property, \textit{sa} is characterised as speaker-centred and ego-assertive/scornful. Reconsider (22) given above.

(22)’ \begin{itemize}
\item A: \textit{Doo naru n (de) suka ne, kono shiai.}
\textit{How become NOM BE QUE NE this game}
\textit{‘How will this game end?’}
\item B: \textit{Katsu sa.}
\textit{win SA}
\textit{‘(We) will win.’}
\end{itemize}

In this conversational exchange, A asks B (who is in the same baseball team) how the ongoing baseball game will end. B states, \textit{Katsu ‘(We) will win’}, and attaches \textit{sa} to the statement. The use of \textit{sa} here indicates B’s attitude of presenting his feeling that their winning is a matter of course for him, which can be denoted as ‘We will of course win’ or ‘I have no doubt that we will win’. This attitude of B expresses the obviousness of his judgement about their winning without considering A’s side with regard to whether or not A might have a different judgement or opinion. This speaker-centred way of presenting the utterance, ‘What is stated is a matter of course for me and I do not care about what you think about it’, invokes an ego-assertive/scornful tone. As will be shown below, this speaker-centredness and ego-assertiveness/scornfulness expressed by the use of \textit{sa} is the basis for the incompatibility of the marker with polite forms as well as the impossible use of the marker for implication.

First, I would like to consider the use of \textit{sa} in connection with implication, and show that the relevant fact is also accounted for in line with the speaker-centred nature of the marker. Look at the following example, which was given as (9a) earlier in this chapter. It is reused here as (27) for the purpose of the current discussion.
(27) [To a person who is about to go out lightly dressed]

Soto samui yo.
outside cold YO
‘It’s cold outside. (Put on a coat.)’

The main concern of (27) is to convince the hearer to wear a coat, by letting the hearer realise that it is cold outside. Provided that the speaker explicitly states only the coldness of outside, the main message of making the hearer wear a coat is only implicitly indicated. The use of yo is crucial here because it is this marker that functions to make the hearer understand this implied message (cf. 6.3.2). Without yo, i.e. Soto samui, the utterance simply states the coldness of outside and the implied message, 'Put on a coat', is not properly delivered. In other words, yo has a function to make the hearer figure out the relevance between the fact that [It is cold outside] and the implied suggestion [You should wear a coat].

According to Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 2001), in the course of producing an ostensive stimulus that attracts the hearer’s attention to an utterance and indicates that the utterance is relevant enough to be worth his/her attention, the speaker’s following two intentions play an important role: (i) ‘the informative intention’ which manifests some set of assumptions to the hearer and (ii) ‘the communicative intention’ which makes it mutually manifest to the hearer and the speaker that the speaker has the informative intention. Sperber and Wilson (2001), in other words, suggest that recognising the speaker’s intentions behind the ostensive stimulus is crucial for the hearer to realise how the information is meant to be relevant to him/her. As discussed in 6.3.2, yo functions to invite the hearer’s involvement and further ensure that the hearer understands the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. In light of
that function of yo, it is suggested that yo is a perfect linguistic device for this communicative intention. It directly draws the hearer’s exclusive attention to the content of the utterance, and delivers the speaker’s commitment to ensure that the hearer understands it. Through this process, the speaker’s informative intention of indicating an implied message is sufficiently manifested to the hearer, hence the hearer is able to figure out the relevance between what the speaker says and the implied message.\textsuperscript{15}

However, sa is in a different situation. First of all, the above-mentioned facts related to the use of the marker suggest that the marker cannot be used to deliver an implied message, as it is a speaker-centred expression and just deploys the speaker’s feeling that what he/she says is a matter of course for him/her. This suggestion is indeed borne out in (28) below.

(28) a. [To a person who is about to go out lightly dressed]

\textit{Soto samui sa.}

outside cold SA

‘(Intended meaning) You should wear a coat as it’s cold outside.’

b. [Taro was holding all the money for expenses of the trip, and did not turn up.]

\textit{Taro, konakatta sa.}

Taro came-NEG SA

‘(Intended meaning) What should we do now as Taro didn’t come?’

The impossibility of sa to deliver the implied message is due to the speaker-centred nature of the marker. Being a speaker-centred expression, the marker lacks the indication of the speaker’s particular commitment to make the hearer understand the content of the utterance, through which the hearer recognises the importance of the

\textsuperscript{15}Matsui (2000) also suggests that yo directs the hearer to pay more attention to the speaker’s informative intention, through which it overtly encodes a guarantee of relevance.
content in the given context and figures out the relevance between the content and the implied message. The utterance (28a), *Soto samui sa* ‘It’s cold outside-SA’, simply indicates that the speaker’s feeling of coldness outside is just a matter of course for him/her\(^{16}\). The utterance (28b), *Taro konakatta sa* ‘Taro didn’t come-SA’, also merely indicates that the incident that Taro did not come is a matter of course for the speaker. Thus, it is virtually impossible for the hearers in (28a) and (28b) to relate the contents of these utterances to the implied messages. That is to say, the utterance with *sa* does not function to indicate the speaker’s communicative intention, and as a result, fails to lead the hearer to figure out the implied message.

Above, we have attributed the impossible use of *sa* for delivering an implied message to the speaker-centred nature of the marker. It has also been noted that because of its speaker-centred nature, *sa* is further characterised as an expression of ‘ego-assertiveness’ (Martin, 1975) or ‘scornfulness’ (Uyeno, 1971). It is also this characteristic that causes the impossible use of *sa* with the polite-ending *desu/masu*. Look at (29) below.

---

\(^{16}\) Although (28a) cannot be used for delivering the implied message, it can be used for different purposes, for example, as shown below.

A: *Sonna kakko shite samukunai no?*  
such fashion do cold-NEG SFP  
‘Aren’t you cold with such clothes on?’

B: *Samui sa.*  
cold SA  
‘I’m cold.’

In this conversational exchange, A thinks that B wears too little and asks B if he does not feel cold with such little clothes on. B states that he feels cold and uses *sa*. B’s purpose of using *sa* here is to indicate his feeling of coldness is a matter of course, which can roughly be glossed as ‘I of course feel cold’.
(29) a. *Hokkaidoo wa samui desu sa.
   Hokkaido TOP cold BE SA
   ‘Hokkaido is cold.’

   b. *Tanaka san wa kanarazu kimasu sa.
      Mr. Tanaka TOP definitely come SA
      ‘Mr. Tanaka will definitely come.’

As illustrated in these examples as well as the earlier examples (20a) and (21a) in 6.4.1, sa cannot be used with the desu/masu form. Note that desu in (29a) and masu in (29b) are a typical verbal device to express formality and/or politeness in the Japanese language, as already noted many times. It is obvious that the ego-assertiveness/scornfulness indicated by the use of sa is far from one’s formal and/or polite attitude expressed by the desu/masu form. Hence, it is thought that the nature of the desu/masu form does not allow the marker to be appended. Needless to say, this equally means that the use of the marker is impossible in formal conversation, as also pointed out in many studies (Uyeno, 1971; Alfonso, 1974; McGloin, 1990; Inoue, 2006). Not to mention the inappropriateness of using the ego-assertive/scornful sa in formal conversation, the speaker is in principle presumed to use the desu/masu form in formal conversation anyway.

6.5. Summary

This chapter has discussed the two monopolistic markers yo and sa. After re-summarising the monopolistic nature of these markers, I have proposed the distinct function of each marker. I have characterised the function of yo as:
Yo signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of ensuring that the hearer understands the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.

In relation to this function of the marker, I have shown that the use of the marker is crucial when the speaker intends to deliver an implied message. The effects of the marker (softening, strengthening and intimacy) and the more frequent use of the marker in casual conversation have also consistently been accounted for from the perspective of involvement and the monopolistic nature of the marker.

I have also proposed the function of sa as:

Sa signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of presenting the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance as a matter of course for him/her.

In close connection with this function of the marker, I have accounted for the incompatibility of the marker with evidentials and commands/requests/proposals, and the impossible use of the marker for delivering an implied message. Furthermore, I have shown that the given function of the marker invokes an ego-assertive or scornful tone, which particularly influences the impossible use of the marker in formal conversation.
CHAPTER 7
Monopolistic markers wa, zo and ze

7.1. Introduction

Following on from the preceding chapter, this chapter investigates the other monopolistic markers wa, zo and ze. These three markers as well as yo and sa discussed in Chapter 6 signal the speaker’s monopolistic attitude through which he/she invites the hearer’s involvement and enhances his/her position as a deliverer of the utterance. The message being communicated is ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’. Further, similar to the case of yo and sa, each marker delivers the monopolistic attitude of the speaker in a unique way. In this chapter, I will discuss the use of the three markers and reveal how each marker behaves differently from the other monopolistic markers.

The chapter is organised in the following manner. Before starting an analysis of the markers, Section 7.2 clarifies the function of the modal expression daroo (deshoo), which is closely related to the use of wa and zo. As will be shown later, the markers wa and zo cannot co-occur with daroo (deshoo), but can with the other modal expressions, rashii ‘it seems’, yoeda ‘apparently’, soo(da) ‘(hearsay)’, (ni)chigainai ‘must (be)’ and kamoshirena ‘may (be)’. These co-occurrence restrictions are important for an analysis of these two markers. Section 7.3 examines the use of wa. The next two sections 7.4 and 7.5 explore the use of zo and of ze, respectively. The last section 7.6 is a summary of the chapter.
7.2. **Daroo (Deshoo)**

In this section, I describe the nature of *daroo* and *deshoo* (the formal version of *daroo*)\(^1\) in comparison to the other modal expressions, *rashii* ‘it seems’, *yoo(da)* ‘apparently’, *soo(da)* ‘(hearsay)’, *(ni)*chigainai ‘must (be)’ and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’. I have already noted in 6.4.3 that the evidentials, *rashii* ‘it seems’, *yoo(da)* ‘apparently’ and *soo(da)* ‘(hearsay)’, are generally differentiated from the suppositionals, *daroo*\(^2\) ‘suppose’, *(ni)*chigainai ‘must (be)’ and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’. The evidentials indicate that the speaker has gained the propositional information through his/her experience of seeing, hearing or feeling, while the suppositionals indicate the way or degree of the speaker’s conviction in judging the truth-value of the proposition. Since the difference of *daroo* and the evidentials is obvious, below I will focus on clarifying the difference of *daroo* from the other suppositionals, *(ni)*chigainai and kamoshirenai.

*(Ni)*chigainai ‘must (be)’ and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’ both indicate that the speaker is uncertain about the truth-value of the proposition. More specifically, it is well known that *(ni)*chigainai represents the high degree of the speaker’s certainty of the proposition being true (from the perspective of the speaker) or the high degree of likelihood of the proposition being true (from the perspective of the proposition). On the other hand, kamoshirenai expresses the low degree of the speaker’s certainty or of the likelihood of the proposition being true (Teramura, 1984; Masuoka, 1991; Nitta, 1991; Miyazaki, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Moriyama et al., 2000; Narrog, 2009).

---

\(^1\) Here I focus on *daroo* (*deshoo*), which indicates the speaker’s attitude towards the truth-value of the proposition. It is widely acknowledged that there are other usages of *daroo* (*deshoo*), for example, requiring confirmation (e.g. Moriyama, 1989; Miyazaki, 1993). I exclude such usages of *daroo* (*deshoo*) from our discussion since they are not directly related to the analysis of the markers.

\(^2\) For the purpose of presentation, hereafter I omit *deshoo* and use *daroo* representatively.
The difference between these two expressions is well illustrated in the following examples which are extracted from Miyazaki (1993).

(1)   a.  *(Kitto/??Tabun/*Moshikasuruto) kare wa konai ni chigainai.
    surely maybe perhaps he TOP come-NEG must
    ‘{Surely/?? Maybe/* Perhaps} he will surely not come.’

    b.  *(Kitto/??Tabun/Moshikasuruto) kare wa konai kamoshirenai.
    surely maybe perhaps he TOP come-NEG may
    ‘{Surely/?? Maybe/Perhaps} he may not come.’  (Miyazaki, 1993: 41)

(1a) and (1b) show the co-occurrence restrictions of (ni)chigainai and kamoshirenai when paired with adverbs that indicate different degrees of certainty, respectively. In the literature it is noted that the possibility/impossibility of co-occurrence of each modal expression with these adverbs is due to their semantic properties (cf. Masuoka, 1991; Nitta, 1991; Miyazaki, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Miyazaki et al., 2002). Since (ni)chigainai represents a high degree of certainty, (1a) shows that it can be used with kittō ‘surely’ which also indicates a high degree of certainty, while it cannot be used with moshikasuruto ‘perhaps’ which indicates a low degree of certainty. In contrast, kamoshirenai in (1b) represents a low degree of certainty, thus it can be used with moshikasuruto, whereas it cannot be used with kittō. As such, (ni)chigainai and kamoshirenai are the modal expressions that specify a degree of certainty or likelihood, hence they have co-occurrence restrictions with particular adverbs according to the degree of certainty inherent in them.
In relation to the difference between *daroo* and *(ni)chigainai/kamoshirenai*, an interesting fact is that unlike *(ni)chigainai* and *kamoshirenai*, *daroo* does not show a specific degree of certainty or likelihood. Observe the following example.

(2)  \{Kitto/Tabun/Moshikasuruto\) kare wa konai      *daroo*.
      surely maybe perhaps he TOP come-NEG suppose
      ‘Surely/Maybe/Perhaps) I don’t think he will come.’   \(\)Miyazaki, 1993: 41\)

(2) shows that *daroo* is compatible with the adverbs that indicate a wider range for the degree of certainty from high to low, as also pointed out in many studies (Masuoka, 1991; Miyazaki, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Moriyama et al., 2000; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Narrog, 2009). This suggests that *daroo* is different from *(ni)chigainai* and *kamoshirenai* in that a genuine property of *daroo* is not to specifically indicate a high or low degree of certainty/likelihood of the truth-value of the proposition.

Another noteworthy fact with regard to the difference between *daroo* and *(ni)chigainai/kamoshirenai* is that *daroo* can co-occur with the question marker *ka*, while *(ni)chigainai* and *kamoshirenai* cannot (Miyazaki, 1993; Johnson, 2003 for *(ni)chigainai*; Miyazaki, 1993; Asano, 2003 for *kamoshirenai*). Examples in (3) below are drawn from Miyazaki (1993).

(3) a. *Ashita wa hareru daroo ka.*
   tomorrow TOP sunny suppose QUE
   ‘I wonder if it will be sunny tomorrow.’

b. *Ashita wa hareru ni chigainai ka.*
   tomorrow TOP sunny must QUE
   ‘It must be sunny tomorrow.’
c. *Ashita wa hareru kamoshirenai ka.
   tomorrow TOP sunny may QUE
   ‘It may be sunny tomorrow.’ (Miyazaki, 1993: 42)

In close connection with these facts, Asano (2003) points out that the nature of the question marker *ka, which indicates one’s uncertainty, is the reason for its possible/impossible co-occurrence with the given modal expressions. According to Asano (2003), *kamoshirenai involves one’s uncertainty, thus its combination with *ka, another expression of one’s uncertainty, is semantically redundant, and as a result, their co-occurrence is not allowed. Needless to say, this point made by Asano (2003) is also applicable to (ni)chigainai which is the same as *kamoshirenai in the sense that it also involves one’s uncertainty. In contrast, *daroo does not involve one’s uncertainty, hence there is no problem with its co-occurrence with *ka, as illustrated in (3a).

Having reached this point, it is important to further note that while *daroo does not involve the speaker’s uncertainty as suggested above, what distinguishes it from *da, which is a typical assertive expression used to indicate the speaker’s certainty, is the fact that *daroo indicates the speaker’s attitude of refraining from asserting his/her certainty. In the literature of Japanese linguistics, this feature of *daroo is referred to as

3 sonomama danteishinai ‘the speaker does not assert his/her certainty of the proposition being true as it is’ (Moriyama, 1989: 112) or dantei o horyuusuru ‘the speaker refrains from asserting his/her certainty of the proposition being true’ (Morita, 1980, 222; Masuoka, 1991: 112). That is, with *daroo the speaker is certain that the proposition is true, and yet he/she does not assert his/her certainty in a straightforward manner.

---

Teramura (1984) confirms this by stating that *daroo* softens the assertive tone of *da*, and further claims that *da ni yoru kakugenteki dangen o sakeru no wa kanarazushimo kakushin no doai ga hikui kara de wa nai* ‘[By using *daroo*], avoiding the *da*-like way of asserting the speaker’s certainty of the proposition being true is not necessarily because the degree of the speaker’s certainty is low’. Johnson (2003) also makes a similar claim, saying that *daroo* is typically used when the speaker wishes to avoid the tone of directness associated with the use of *da*.

It is now clear that *daroo* does not involve the speaker’s uncertainty, but it rather indicates that the speaker refrains from asserting his/her certainty of the proposition being true. This feature of *daroo* is borne out by the frequent use of *deshoo* in weather forecasts⁴. (4) below is extracted from a TV weather forecast.

(4) *Asu, nichiyooobi no tenki desu. Nairiku wa... hiru mae kara ame tomorrow Sunday LK weather BE inland TOP...noon before from rain deshoo. Engan hokubu wa... hare tokidoki kumori deshoo. Engan nanbu suppose coast north TOP sunny sometimes cloudy suppose coast south wa... kaze ga tsuyoku, hare tokidoki kumori deshoo. Nami no takasa TOP wind SUB strong sunny sometimes cloudy suppose wave LK height wa engan zenpanni san meetoru no vosoo desu. Koosui kakuritsu TOP coast whole 3 metre APP prediction BE precipitation percentage wa izuremo... nijuppaasento desu. TOP all 20.percent BE*

---

⁴ In TV weather forecasts, *deshoo* (the formal version of *daroo*) rather than *daroo* is used to show the weather forecaster’s polite attitude towards viewers.
‘And now the weather report for Sunday. Rain is expected for the inland beginning before noon. The northern coast will be sunny with periods of cloud cover. The southern coast will have strong winds and will be sunny with periods of cloud cover. Waves along the whole coast are expected to reach 3 metres in height. There is a 20 percent chance of rain.’

(Extract from NHK weather forecast broadcasted on 14th of November 2009)

(4) shows that, during this relatively short weather forecast, deshoo is used three times. In providing his/her prediction of the weather, the forecaster is supposedly committed to make viewers trust his/her prediction. The use of the assertive desu (the polite form of da) in nijuppaasento desu ‘There is a 20 percent (chance of rain)’, rather than nijuppaasento ni chigaiarimasen/kamoshiremasen ‘There must/may be a 20 percent (chance of rain)’, reflects this aspect of weather forecasts. However, it is also a prediction of the future weather which might change, and thus the forecaster does not want to assert his/her prediction too strongly, either. The use of yosoo desu ‘It is expected’ in san meetoru no yosoo desu ‘(Waves along the whole coast) are expected to reach 3 metres (in height)’ is a straightforward example of this. Likewise, in providing his/her prediction of the future weather, the forecaster, on the one hand, does not want to give viewers the impression that his/her prediction is merely based on a certain degree of likelihood. On the other hand, he/she is supposed to provide his/her prediction in a definite manner so that viewers can trust it, and yet he/she also wants to avoid doing so since the predicted weather may change. Deshoo is a very suitable expression for the weather forecaster in such a situation, since with the expression he/she can avoid not only specifically indicating how much certain he/she is about the future weather, but

---

5 URL: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rtsR2nh9TzM
also asserting his/her certainty about the future weather while maintaining his/her certainty. This is the main reason for the frequent use of deshoo in weather forecasts in Japan.

In short, while (ni)chigainai and kamoshirenai involve the speaker’s uncertainty of the proposition being true, daroo does not involve such uncertainty. Further, although daroo does not involve the speaker’s uncertainty, it is different from the assertive expression da in that it expresses the speaker’s attitude of refraining from asserting his/her certainty. Keeping this feature of daroo in mind, let us now explore the use of the three monopolistic markers.

7.3. Wa

7.3 focuses on wa. In 7.3.1 I first show some distributional facts related to the use of wa, and then, in 7.3.2 I overview previous studies on the function of the marker. 7.3.3 examines the function of the marker, and finally, 7.3.4 discusses the expressive effects of the marker and their influence on the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts.

7.3.1. Relevant facts

The marker wa has some co-occurrence restrictions with particular expressions. First, as pointed out in some studies, it cannot be used with commands (Cheng, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002), requests (Uyeno, 1971; Miyazaki et al., 2002) and proposals (Miyazaki et al., 2002; Asano, 2003).
(5) a. *Ima ike wa.
    now go WA
    ‘Go now.’

    b. *Ima ikinasai wa.
    now go WA
    ‘Go now.’

(6) a. *Ima itte wa.
    now please go WA
    ‘Please go now.’

    b. *Ima itte kudasai wa.
    now please go WA
    ‘Please go now.’

(7) a. *Ima ikoo wa.
    now let’s go WA
    ‘Let’s go now.’

    b. *Ima ikimashoo wa.
    now let’s go WA
    ‘Let’s go now.’

(5) illustrates that wa is not compatible with a command, *ike⁶ ‘Go (abrupt)’ or ikinasai ‘Go (more formal than ike)’. Similarly, (6) shows that the use of the marker is impossible with a request, itte ‘Please go (casual)’ or itte kudasai ‘Please go (formal)’. Furthermore, (7) shows that the marker cannot be used with a proposal, ikoo ‘Let’s go (casual)’ or ikimashoo ‘Let’s go (formal)’.

---

⁶ Ike ‘Go’ sounds vulgar and is not normally used by female speakers in actual conversation.
Another interesting fact with regard to the use of *wa* is observed in its compatibility/incompatibility with modal expressions. As illustrated in (8) and (9) below, the marker cannot be used with the modal expression *deshoo*⁷ ‘suppose’ (Uyeno, 1971; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Asano, 2003), while it can with the other modal expressions, *rashii* ‘it seems’ (Uyeno, 1971; Miyazaki et al., 2002), *yoo(da)* ‘apparently’ (Uyeno, 1971), *soo(da)* ‘(hearsay)’ (Uyeno, 1971), *(ni)chigainai* ‘must (be)’⁸ and *kamoshirenai* ‘may (be)’ (Kashiwagi, 2006).

(8) *Akiko mo kon ya no paatii ni kuru deshoo wa.*
Akiko also tonight LK party to come suppose WA
‘I think Akiko will also come to the party tonight.’

(9) a. *Akiko mo kon ya no paatii ni kuru rashii wa.*
Akiko also tonight LK party to come seem WA
‘It seems that Akiko will also come to the party tonight.’

b. *Akiko mo kon ya no paatii ni kuru yoo da wa.*
Akiko also tonight LK party to come apparently WA
‘It looks like Akiko will also come to the party tonight.’

c. *Akiko mo kon ya no paatii ni kuru soo da wa.*
Akiko also tonight LK party to come hear WA
‘I hear that Akiko will also come to the party tonight.’

⁷ Note that *wa* as discussed in the current study is exclusively used by female speakers (cf. 1.3). I exclude *daro o* from my argument in relation to this gender feature of *wa*. As pointed out by Asano (2003) and Kashiwagi (2006), *daro o* sounds quite masculine and its use is generally limited to male speakers. Instead of *daro o*, female speakers normally choose to use *deshoo* for the same function even in casual conversation.

⁸ To the best of my knowledge, there have been no studies which point out the compatibility/incompatibility of *wa* with *(ni)chigainai*. I also could not find the co-occurrence of *wa* with *(ni)chigainai* in my data. I have informally asked 20 native speakers of Japanese if this co-occurrence is possible: for example, *Akiko mo iku ni chigainai wa* ‘Akiko will surely go, too-WA’. All of them answered that it was possible.
d. Akiko mo konya no paatii ni kuru ni chigainai wa.
    Akiko also tonight LK party to come must WA
    ‘Akiko will surely come to the party tonight, too.’

e. Akiko mo konya no paatii ni kuru kamoshirenai wa.
    Akiko also tonight LK party to come may WA
    ‘Akiko may also come to the party tonight.’

Similarly to the case of *sa*, the distributional facts of *wa* listed above are assumed to be important for an analysis of the marker. In 7.3.3 and 7.3.4, I will account for these facts based on the function and the expressive effects of the marker.

### 7.3.2. Previous studies

Cheng (1987) compares *wa* with *yo* and notes that *yo* can be used with sentences like commands which attempt to control the hearer’s future action, while *wa* cannot (Examples of these were given in (5), (6) and (7) earlier). According to Cheng (1987), this is because the nature of *yo* is to let the hearer know the speaker’s thoughts or judgement for the hearer’s benefit (*jibun no ninshiki handan shita koto o aite ni shirasete yaru*), while the nature of *wa* is to convince the hearer of the speaker’s thoughts or judgement for the speaker’s benefit (*jibun no ninshiki handan shita koto o aite ni nattokushite morau)*. Cheng (1987) concludes that *wa* is used when a female speaker is committed to convey her thoughts or judgement towards the hearer for the sake of herself. As will be discussed in 7.3.3, Cheng’s (1987) account provides some useful information for an analysis of *wa*; that is, in using the marker the speaker does not indicate her particular consideration of the hearer’s side. Nonetheless, a shortcoming

---

*The English translations are my own.*
of Cheng’s (1987) definition of wa is that it has difficulty in differentiating an utterance with wa from that without wa. Compare (10a) and (10b) below ((10a) is drawn from the actual data and (10b) is its duplication with wa omitted).

(10) a. Katchan ga inakunatte dare yori mo kanashinda no wa
Katchan SUB has.gone more.than.anyone.else was.sad NOM TOP
Tatchan yo. Sore wa machigainai wa.
Tatchan YO that TOP certain WA
‘After Katchan died, the person who was sad more than anyone else was Tatchan. That’s definitely true.’

b. Katchan ga inakunatte dare yori mo kanashinda no wa
Katchan SUB has.gone more.than.anyone.else was.sad NOM TOP
Tatchan yo. Sore wa machigainai.
Tatchan YO that TOP certain
‘After Katchan died, the person who was sad more than anyone else was Tatchan. That’s definitely true.’

In (10a), the speaker says that the person who was saddest the most by Katchan’s death was Tatchan, and further states that what she has just said is definitely true. Wa is used here. Based on Cheng’s (1987) definition of the marker, (10a) with wa can be interpreted as such that the speaker is committed to convey her judgement, Sore wa machigainai ‘That’s definitely true’, towards the hearer for the sake of herself. A noteworthy point is that (10b) without wa is also interpreted in the same manner, since the utterance without the marker unilaterally delivers the information towards the hearer, in which the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s view is relatively low (cf. 6.4.3). In this respect, (10a) with wa and (10b) without wa are indistinguishable within Cheng’s (1987) account.
Further, there are many previous studies that account for the use of *wa* in terms of its illocutionary force. For example, some claim that the marker indicates the speaker’s ‘insistence’ (Uyeno, 1971; Tanaka, 1989), and others claim that the basic function of the marker is to express the speaker’s ‘strong emotional feeling’ (McGloin, 1990). Conversely, some studies see that the marker has an effect of ‘softening’ the tone of the utterance (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Oda, 1964; Suzuki, 1976; Kuwayama, 1981; Ide, 1982; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Chino, 1991; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994). The interpretations of the marker as indicating ‘insistence/strong emotional feeling’ and as ‘softening’ the tone of the utterance are seen to be opposite, and it is interesting to consider how such contrasting views are possible for the single marker *wa*. No previous studies have provided a convincing account for this. As insightful readers would have already realised, similar to the case of *yo*, these contradictory views are due to the dual aspects of the marker, i.e. the monopolistic nature of the marker and the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement indicated by the marker. I will discuss these dual aspects of *wa* in 7.3.4.

7.3.3. The function of *wa*: Delivering the utterance in a firm manner

In 7.3.1, we have seen that *wa* cannot be used with *deshoo*, while it can with the other modal expressions. I assume that this restriction is not random, but linguistically or semantically well motivated. In considering this restriction as well as the other relevant facts to be discussed in the latter of this section, I shall first propose the function of *wa* as follows:
(11) The function of *wa*

*Wa* signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of delivering the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance in a firm manner.

First, this definition of the marker in (11) clearly states that the marker is monopolistic in nature. Thus, the marker shares the general function of enhancing the speaker’s position as a message deliverer, similar to the other monopolistic markers *yo, sa, zo* and *ze*. Next, (11) states that the marker indicates that the way the speaker delivers the utterance to the hearer is firm. What should be noted carefully here is that ‘in a firm manner’ in (11) means that the marker delivers the utterance with the speaker’s confidence in what she says. In other words, by using *wa*, the speaker adds her feeling that she is very firm about what is conveyed in the utterance. With this in mind, observe (12) below.

(12) a. *Hanako wa  gakusei da.*

Hanako TOP student BE
‘Hanako is a student.’

b. *Hanako wa  gakusei da wa.*

Hanako TOP student BE WA
‘Hanako is a student.’

The declarative statement without *wa* in (12a) indicates that the speaker is certain about Hanako being a student. By adding *wa* to this statement as in (12b), the speaker attempts to deliver her certainty (judgement) in a firm manner, implying ‘I am certain about Hanako being a student, and I am firmly stating my certainty to you’. The
speaker’s attitude of firm delivery is associated with her feeling that she has confidence in her judgement that Hanako is a student.

Let us further observe other examples in which wa is attached to modal expressions that also indicate a certain judgement of the speaker. We first consider (13) below in which wa is used with (ni)chigainai ‘must (be)’ and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’.

(13) a. Hanako wa gakusei ni chigainai wa.
    Hanako TOP student must WA
    ‘Hanako must be a student.’

    b. Hanako wa gakusei kamoshirenai wa.
    Hanako TOP student may WA
    ‘Hanako may be a student.’

Recall that in 7.2, (ni)chigainai and kamoshirenai have been characterised as the expressions which specify the degree of the speaker’s certainty of the proposition being true. (Ni)chigainai in (13a) indicates a high degree of the speaker’s certainty, and thus the sentence, Hanako wa gakusei ni chigainai, is interpreted as such that the speaker strongly believes that Hanako is a student. By adding wa to this sentence, the speaker is committed to deliver her strong belief in a firm manner, which can be paraphrased as ‘I strongly believe that Hanako is a student, and I am firmly stating my belief to you’. Likewise, kamoshirenai in (13b) indicates a low degree of the speaker’s certainty. By using wa in (13b), the speaker attempts to deliver her judgement that Hanako may or may not be a student in a firm manner.

Given the possible use of the marker with (ni)chigainai and kamoshirenai, we now discuss the impossible use of the marker with deshoo ‘suppose’ that is another
modal expression which indicates the speaker’s judgement. In 7.2, we have noted that unlike (ni)chigainai and kamoshirenai, deshoo (daroo) does not involve the speaker’s uncertainty of the proposition being true, and it rather indicates the speaker’s attitude of refraining from asserting her certainty. This is briefly shown in (14) below.

(14) Hanako wa gakusei deshoo.

Hanako TOP student suppose
‘I think Hanako is a student.’

In this example, the speaker judges Hanako to be a student, while she uses deshoo and attempts to avoid asserting her certainty of Hanako being a student. This feature of daroo, which indicates the speaker’s attitude of refraining from assertion, is thought to be the major cause for its incompatibility with wa. Consider the following example in which wa is attached to (14) above in force.

(15) *Hanako wa gakusei deshoo wa.

Hanako TOP student suppose WA
‘I think Hanako is a student.’

As noted above, the use of deshoo here indicates that the speaker is committed to refraining from asserting her certainty of Hanako being a student. A noteworthy point is that this speaker’s attitude indicated by the use of deshoo reflects her feeling that she needs (or wants) to speak with deliberation as also pointed out by Morita (1980). In order to confirm this, recall the use of deshoo in weather forecasts discussed in 7.2. The weather forecaster is an expert in predicting the future weather, thus he/she judges the future weather to be as such, for example, Ashita wa hareru ‘It will be sunny tomorrow’.
However, this is also the situation where his/her prediction is not absolute since the future weather may change. I have noted that deshoo is a very suitable expression, e.g. *Ashita wa hareru deshoo* ‘It will probably be (should be) sunny tomorrow’, for this situation. What is our immediate concern is that the use of deshoo implies that the forecaster does not want to assert his/her prediction, *Ashita wa hareru* ‘It will be sunny tomorrow’. Returning to (15), this means that by using deshoo, while the speaker judges Hanako to be a student, she wants to avoid showing her definite attitude.

In contrast, the use of *wa* attempts to add the speaker’s attitude of delivering her judgement conveyed in the utterance in a firm manner. As stated earlier, the speaker’s attitude of firm delivery indicated by the use of the marker accompanies her feeling that she wants to say her judgement in a definite manner with full confidence. The speaker’s attitude and feeling associated with the use of *wa*, thus, directly conflicts with the characteristic of deshoo by which the speaker attempts to avoid showing her definite attitude. This is the reason for the incompatibility of *wa* with deshoo.

Next, we discuss cases in which *wa* is used with the evidentials. As already briefly noted in 7.3.1, *wa* can co-occur with the evidentials which indicate the fact that the speaker has gained the information from a secondary source. (16) below provides extended examples of this, in which *wa* is used with *rashii* ‘it seems’ in (16a), *yoo(da)* ‘apparently’ in (16b) and *soo(da)* ‘(hearsay)’ in (16c).

(16) a. **Hanako wa gakusei rashii wa.**
    Hanako TOP student seem WA
    ‘It seems that Hanako is a student.’
b. Hanako wa gakusei no yooda wa.
Hanako TOP student BE apparently WA
'It looks like Hanako is a student.'

c. Hanako wa gakusei da sooda wa.
Hanako TOP student BE hear WA
'I hear that Hanako is a student.'

*Hanako wa gakusei rashii* in (16a) and *Hanako wa gakusei no yooda* in (16b) indicate the fact that the speaker is not one hundred percent sure what Hanako is, but for instance, she saw the picture of Hanako wearing school uniform and has judged Hanako as being a student\(^{10}\). *Hanako wa gakusei da sooda* in (16c) indicates the fact that the speaker has heard from somebody that Hanako is a student. These facts signified by the given evidentials can be delivered in a firm manner without any problem. With *wa*, these sentences are interpreted as 'I have gained the information that Hanako is a student from what I saw, heard or felt, and I am firmly stating this fact to you'.

Thus far, I have demonstrated how the speaker's attitude of firm delivery is expressed through the use of *wa* in close connection with the compatibility /incompatibility of the marker with modal expressions. Next, I would like to add a further point in terms of this particular attitude indicated by the use of the marker. That is, the speaker's attitude of firm delivery indicated by the use of *wa* does not denote her particular consideration of the hearer's side. Rather, it denotes that the speaker focuses on her side only, as shown in the interpretation of the marker, 'Listen. I am firmly stating this to you'. I have noted in 7.3.2 that this feature of the marker is also acknowledged in Cheng's (1987) statement, *aite ni nattokushite morau* 'convince the

\(^{10}\) For details of the difference between *rashii* 'it seems' and *yooda* 'apparently', see Teramura (1984), Tanomura (1991), Johnson (2003), Asano (2009b) and Narrog (2009).
hearer of it for the speaker’s benefit’. This means that with *wa* the speaker does not show her particular commitment to make the hearer understand what she says. This aspect of *wa* can further be confirmed by the following two facts.

The first fact is that, as shown earlier, *wa* cannot co-occur with commands, requests and proposals. Examples are re-presented below.

(5)’ a. *Ima ike wa.*
   now go WA
   ‘Go now.’

   b. *Ima ikinasai wa.*
   now go WA
   ‘Go now.’

(6)’ a. *Ima itte wa.*
   now please go WA
   ‘Please go now.’

   b. *Ima itte kudasai wa.*
   now please go WA
   ‘Please go now.’

(7)’ a. *Ima ikoo wa.*
   now let’s go WA
   ‘Let’s go now.’

   b. *Ima ikimashoo wa.*
   now let’s go WA
   ‘Let’s go now.’
Recall that these sentences require a high level of the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side because the success of the speaker’s intended goal with these sentences depends on whether or not the hearer understands and acts as he/she commands, requests or proposes (cf. Chapter 6). The incompatibility of wa with these sentences suggests that the nature of the marker lacks the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side.

The second fact which proves the speaker-centred nature of wa is that the marker cannot deliver an implied message. Consider the following example (This example was used several times in Chapter 6 in order to discuss the issues related to implication).

(17) [To a person who is about to go out lightly dressed]
   a. Soto samui yo.
      outside cold YO
      ‘It’s cold outside. (Put on a coat.)’

   b. ?Soto samui wa.
      outside cold WA
      ‘(Intended meaning) You should wear a coat as it’s cold outside.’

By notifying the coldness of outside with yo, the main concern of (17a) is to convince the hearer to wear a coat. As noted in Chapter 6, when the speaker attempts to deliver an implied message, his/her consideration of the hearer’s side is required, through which the hearer realises the importance of the given information in the given context, and figures out the relevance between the information and the implied message. We have seen in 6.3.2 that in such a case, the use of yo is crucial, because it is this marker that indicates the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side by virtue of its function of ensuring that the hearer understands what is conveyed in the utterance. In contrast, as
shown in (17b), it is impossible for wa to imply the message, ‘You should wear a coat’. The impossible use of wa to deliver the implied message is, again, due to its nature which does not indicate the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side. The utterance with wa in (17b) simply indicates the coldness of outside with the speaker’s attitude of firm delivery.

In sum, wa is characterised as the marker which signals that the speaker delivers the utterance in a firm manner without indicating her consideration of the hearer’s side. Below, I will show this function of the marker invokes some unique expressive effects which influence the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts.

7.3.4. The expressive effects of wa and its use in social contexts

As noted in 7.3.2, the effect of wa is often seen as ‘softening’ the tone of the utterance (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Oda, 1964; Suzuki, 1976; Kuwayama, 1981; Ide, 1982; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Chino, 1991; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994). On the other hand, some studies view that the marker indicates the speaker’s ‘insistence’ (Uyeno, 1971; Tanaka, 1989), or ‘strong emotional feeling’ (McGloin, 1990), which is opposite to the effect of softening the tone of the utterance. These two contrasting views for the single marker wa are due to the fact that each account sees only one aspect of the use of the marker, which is similar to the case of yo as discussed in 6.3.2. These two views can comprehensively be explained from the perspective of involvement and the monopolistic nature of wa. Look at (18) and (19) below.

(18) Hora, mada yogoreteru wa.
look still become.dirty-PROG WA
‘Look, (your clothes) are still dirty.’
In (18) the speaker states that the hearer’s clothes are still dirty and employs wa. What underlies the use of wa here is the speaker’s commitment to deliver the given information in a firm manner, which denotes her feeling that she is very firm about the hearer’s clothes still being dirty. (19) is a conversation between A whose father owns the Lionel Group, and B, Mr. Kirishima, who established his company which is under the umbrella of the Lionel Group. At a party of the Lionel Group, A congratulates B on establishing his company and states that she is proud of him. A’s use of wa here also adds a nuance that she is very firm about her feeling of being proud of B.

What we can easily assume from these examples is that wa delivers the speaker’s confidence in what she says and how she feels without indicating her consideration of the hearer’s side. This invokes a ‘self-assured’ tone, which is also interpreted as ‘insistence’ in the literature (Uyeno, 1971; Tanaka, 1989), and would be heard as strengthening the tone of the utterance.

However, this does not necessarily mean that the statement with wa carries a higher degree of the declarative tone compared to a normal declarative statement.
without the marker. For example, compare A’s utterance in (19) with (20) below which is a duplication of A’s utterance in (19), but with wa omitted.

(19)’ Waga Raioneru Guruupu no hokori desu wa.  
my Lionel.Group LK pride BE WA  
‘Our Lionel Group is proud of your achievement.’

(20) Waga Raioneru Guruupu no hokori desu.  
my Lionel.Group LK pride BE  
‘Our Lionel Group is proud of your achievement.’

(20) without wa unilaterally states the speaker’s feeling, ‘Our Lionel Group is proud of your achievement, and have no more to say’, and tends to be seen as connoting an official tone, especially when it is not accompanied by a strong emotional intonation. With such an official tone, the assertiveness of the declarative tone is straightforwardly expressed. Compared to this, (19)’ with wa markedly indicates the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement, by which it explicitly shows the speaker’s recognition of the hearer as her conversation partner and her willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer. When the sentence is associated with the speaker’s recognition of, and feeling towards, the hearer as such, the assertiveness of the declarative tone would be moderated, and the sentence would sound softer. Thus, the marker would be interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance.

In short, wa as well as yo has dual aspects with respect to its expressive effects, i.e. strengthening and softening. If we focus on the monopolistic nature of the marker, i.e. ‘Listen. I am firmly stating this to you’, the marker would be perceived as a stronger presentation of the speaker’s attitude and feeling, and be heard as self-assured or
strengthening the tone of the utterance. If our focus is placed on the speaker’s marked invitation of the hearer’s involvement, the marker would be interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance.

As shown above, wa expresses the speaker’s attitude of firm delivery, ‘Listen. I am firmly stating this to you’, as well as her feeling, ‘I am willing to continue the conversation with you’; that is, the use of the marker necessarily accompanies the direct and strong expression of the speaker’s attitude and feeling towards the hearer. Therefore, the marker is not generally used in a situation where such a direct and strong expression of the speaker’s attitude and feelings/emotions is not allowed. For example, Asano (2003) correctly notes that the use of wa is considered to be inappropriate in a formal situation. Observe (21) below, which is a conversation between a teacher, A, and her student, B.

(21) A: B-san, natsuyasumi wa dokoka ni ikimashita ka.
Miss.B summer.holidays TOP somewhere to went QUE
‘Miss. B, did you go somewhere during your summer holidays?’

   yes Okinawa to went
   ‘Yes, I went to Okinawa.’

b. ?Hai, Okinawa ni ikimashita wa.
   yes Okinawa to went WA
   ‘Yes, I went to Okinawa.’

In (21), teacher A asks student B if she went somewhere during her summer holidays, and B answers that she went to Okinawa. In the given situation, B’s answer with wa in (21b) sounds inappropriate, compared to (21a) without the marker. In this case, B is
required simply to answer A’s question whether or not she went somewhere. Nonetheless, in (21b) by using wa B expresses her confidence in what she says and talks to A in a self-assured tone. This makes the utterance sound as if she is very proud of the fact that she went to Okinawa, and imparts an overbearing nuance. As noted in earlier chapters, such an expression of the speaker’s strong attitude and feelings/emotions would be acceptable between close friends. However, in a Japanese context, students are, in general, presumed to keep a formal relationship with teachers, hence they are not allowed to directly and strongly express their attitudes and feelings/emotions towards teachers. Thus, B’s use of wa in (21b) is interpreted as inappropriate and impolite. This is the reason for the fact that wa is not, in principle, used in a situation where a high level of formality is required.

Having said that, there is a second point that I would like to mention in connection with the less frequent use of wa in formal conversation (and thus the more frequent use in casual conversation). As stated in Chapter 3, it is widely acknowledged that wa is used by female speakers only and makes the utterance sound feminine (Uyeno, 1971; Martin, 1975; Suzuki, 1976; Asano, 2003). This femininity overtly indicated by the use of wa is assumed to be another factor which induces the less frequent use of the marker in formal conversation. According to Inoue (2002) and Nakamura (2005, 2006), historically speaking, wa was officially incorporated into the Japanese national language system as women’s language in order to differentiate Japanese women from Japanese men. More precisely, in the middle of the 20th century the Japanese government officially required that men speak otoko-rashiku ‘man-like’ and women speak onnarashiku ‘woman-like’ so that women were limited to play their role as ryooosai-kenbo ‘a
good wife and wise mother\textsuperscript{11}, and incorporated \textit{wa, wayo, teyo, noyo, koto}, etc. into the national language system as a direct index of women\textsuperscript{12}. What is suggested by this historical background of \textit{wa} is that the marker has become one of the linguistic tools which directly indicates the speaker being female and displays her \textit{onna-rashisa} ‘womanliness’\textsuperscript{13}. Given that, the use of \textit{wa} naturally imparts a feminine tone. As noted by Uyeno (1971), with this feminine tone, the use of the marker gives emphasis to the speaker’s femininity, and often implies an intimate relationship between the speaker and the hearer. This is also seen to be the grounds for the fact that the use of the marker is inappropriate when the speaker and the hearer maintain an official relationship such as business relationships or formal job interviews, as also pointed out by Uyeno (1971) and McGloin (1990).

To sum up, in 7.3 I have provided a detailed discussion on the use of \textit{wa}. I have shown that \textit{wa} signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of delivering the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance in a firm manner. In relation to this function of the marker, I have also provided an account for the distributional facts, including the incompatibility of the marker with \textit{deshoo} ‘suppose’ and commands/requests/proposals, and the impossible use of the marker for delivering an implied message. Further, I have discussed the expressive effects of the marker and their influence on the speaker’s use

\textsuperscript{11} The idea of \textit{ryoosai-kenbo} ‘a good wife and wise mother’ was derived from Confucianism. It required women to take on a critical gendered role in Japanese modern society, which included an emphasis on motherhood, rational and scientific management, and saving (Inoue, 2002).

\textsuperscript{12} The historical process through which Japanese women’s language was constructed is well summarised in Inoue (2002) and Nakamura (2005, 2006).

\textsuperscript{13} As will be detailed shortly in 7.4 and 7.5, \textit{zo} and \textit{ze} are in principle used by male speakers only. However, according to Nakamura (2005), unlike the case of \textit{wa}, \textit{zo} and \textit{ze} had been treated as a part of the ‘standard language’ in the national language system without particular acknowledgement that they were men’s language. This suggests that when the concept of \textit{onna-rashisa} ‘womanliness’ was introduced with \textit{wa, zo} and \textit{ze} were developed to be men’s language in connection with their functions. The current study also adopts this view, and accounts for their exclusive use by male speakers in terms of their functions. See 7.4 and 7.5 for details.
of the marker, i.e. strengthening, softening, a feminine tone and the more frequent use in casual conversation. It has been shown that the effects of the marker and their social consequences are a manifestation of the speaker’s particular monopolistic attitude indicated by the use of *wa*; that is, ‘Listen. I am firmly stating this to you’ and ‘I recognise you as my conversation partner and wish to continue the conversation with you’, as well as the indication of the speaker being female.

7.4. *Zo*

In 7.4, I examine *zo*. 7.4.1 shows some of the facts related to the use of *zo*, and subsequently 7.4.2 reviews previous studies on the function of the marker. Then, 7.4.3 explores the function of the marker, and 7.4.4 provides a discussion on the expressive effects of the marker and their influence on the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts.

7.4.1. Relevant facts

Below I will show three distributional facts related to the use of *zo*. The first fact is that the marker cannot be used with commands, requests and proposals (Uyeno, 1971; Martin, 1975; Nihon Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002).

(22) a. *Ima* _ike* zo.
     now  go   ZO
     ‘Go now.’

     b. *Ima* _itte _ zo.
     now please go ZO
     ‘Please go now.’
c. *Ima ikoo zo.
   now let's go ZO
   ‘Let’s go now.’

ike ‘Go’ in (22a), itte ‘Please go’ in (22b) and ikoo ‘Let’s go’ in (22c) are a command, a request and a proposal to go, respectively. As illustrated in these examples, zo is incompatible with all of these sentences\(^{14}\).

The second fact is that zo cannot co-occur with the modal expression daroo\(^{15}\) ‘suppose’ (Uyeno, 1971; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Kashiwagi, 2006), while it can with the other modal expressions, rashii ‘it seems’ (Uyeno, 1971; Nihon Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Nakazaki, 2004b; Kashiwagi, 2006), yoo(da) ‘apparently’ (Uyeno, 1971; Nakazaki, 2004b; Kashiwagi, 2006), soo(da) ‘(hearsay)’ (Uyeno, 1971; Nakazaki, 2004b; Kashiwagi, 2006), (ni)chigainai ‘must (be)’ (Nakazaki, 2004b) and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’ (Nakazaki, 2004b; Kashiwagi, 2006).

(23) *Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru daroo zo.
   Tanaka also tonight LK party to come suppose ZO
   ‘I think Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.’

(24) a. Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru rashii zo.
   Tanaka also tonight LK party to come seem ZO
   ‘It seems that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.’

---

\(^{14}\) In (22), I did not include the more formal version of the three sentences such as ikinasai ‘Go’, itte kudasai ‘Please go’ and ikimashoo ‘Let’s go’, because as will be shown in (25a) and (26a), in principle, zo is not used with polite forms.

\(^{15}\) Here I exclude deshoo which is the more formal version of daroo because, again, zo is not used with polite forms.
b. *Kono eiga wa omoshiroi desu zo.
   this movie TOP interesting BE ZO
   ‘This movie is interesting.’

b. Kono eiga wa omoshiroi zo.
   this movie TOP interesting ZO
   ‘This movie is interesting.’

16 Some studies point out that zo is sometimes used with polite forms (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Tanaka, 1977; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Nakazaki, 2004b). However, they also note that such use of zo is not common.
(26) a. *Ashita wa haremasu zo.
    tomorrow TOP clear.up ZO
    ‘It will clear up tomorrow.’

    b. Ashita wa hareru zo.
    tomorrow TOP clear.up ZO
    ‘It will clear up tomorrow.’

In the following sub-sections 7.4.3 and 7.4.4 I will discuss the function and expressive effects of zo in connection with these distributional facts.

7.4.2. Previous studies

Previous studies on the function of zo can be categorised into the following three groups:

(i) First group: Zo indicates strong insistence  

(ii) Second group: Zo conveys a tone of warning or threatening  
    Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo (1951), Chino (1991)

(iii) Third group: Zo is used to make the hearer understand the propositional information and;
    - lead the hearer to do a certain action (Cheng, 1987)
    - change the hearer’s mind (Miyazaki et al., 2002)

The findings of these studies have shown some unique characteristics of zo, and yet they have not adequately captured the fundamental function of the marker. For instance, in
terms of ‘insistence’ suggested in the first group, it is impossible to differentiate zo from the other monopolistic markers. Observe the following examples.

(27) A: Kinoo mita eiga doo datta?
    yesterday watched movie how BE-past
    ‘How was the movie you watched yesterday?’

B:  
ad. Omoshirokatta zo.
    was.interesting ZO
    ‘It was interesting.’

b. Omoshirokatta yo.
    was.interesting YO
    ‘It was interesting.’

c. Omoshirokatta sa.
    was.interesting SA
    ‘It was interesting.’

d. Omoshirokatta wa.
    was.interesting WA
    ‘It was interesting.’

In (27), A asks B how the movie B watched yesterday was, and B states that it was interesting. As illustrated above, B may employ a different monopolistic marker zo, yo, sa or wa here. It has been shown in the previous section as well as in Chapter 6 that ‘pushiness’, ‘assertiveness’ and ‘insistence’ are typical terms used for describing the effect of ‘strengthening’ the tone of an utterance and can be seen as a characteristic that resides widely in all the monopolistic markers. This is due the fact that the monopolistic markers in nature indicate the speaker’s attitude of enhancing his/her superior position
over the hearer in delivering the utterance, i.e. ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’. Indeed, all of the markers yo, sa and wa as well as zo used in (27) above can be interpreted as indicating a sort of B’s ‘insistence’ towards A in delivering his/her positive evaluation of the movie, although each marker has its own unique effects. Therefore, it is difficult to adopt ‘insistence’ as a distinct characteristic of zo.

The second group claims that zo often gives an impression to the hearer that the speaker threatens or warns the hearer. Look at (28) below.

(28) Michi arukinagara benkyoo nanka shitetto abunee zo.
    street while.walking study as.such do-PROG-CD dangerous ZO
    ‘It’s dangerous if you study like that while you’re walking on the street.’ (T1)

In (28) the speaker warns his friends who are studying while walking on the street that it is dangerous to do so. Without zo the utterance would be interpreted as a statement which simply tells his friend that studying while walking is dangerous. Therefore, it looks like the warning tone is indeed induced by the use of zo. However, the warning tone itself cannot be seen as a genuine property of the marker. Consider (29) below.

(29) A: Isshoni aratte ageru.
    together wash
    ‘I’ll wash (your clothes) together with mine for you.’

B: Erai, erai. Ii yome san ni nareru zo.
    great great good wife RES can.become ZO
    ‘Great, great. You’ll become a good wife.’ (T1)

In (29) A tells her male friend, B, that she would wash his clothes for him. In responding to A’s offer, B gives a compliment, ‘You’ll become a good wife’, and zo is
used here. It is obvious that this *zo*, unlike *zo* in (28), does not sound like a warning or threat. Rather, it is again used with a compliment that encourages A to keep doing the washing. This observation clearly shows that the claim of the second group is only tentative and cannot deal with a wider range of the usages of the marker.

Compared to the function of the marker proposed in the first and second groups, the account made by the third group seems to be more plausible. What commonly lies in the account of this group is that *zo* is used to make the hearer understand the propositional information and to seek a certain reaction towards it from the hearer. Cheng (1987) claims that when *zo* is used the speaker expects that the hearer will do a certain action through understanding the propositional information. For example, the utterance with *zo* in (30) below conveys not only the fact that the bath was ready, but also the speaker’s expectation for the hearer’s action, that is, ‘to take a bath’, as pointed out by Cheng (1987).

(30) *Sa, furo wait eru zo.*
    SA bath boil-PROG ZO
    ‘SA, the bath is ready. (Take a bath.)’ (Cheng, 1987: 105)

However, Miyazaki et al. (2002) disagree with this Cheng’s (1987) claim, and point out that the use of *zo* does not always require the hearer’s action, and that the marker is used when the speaker attempts to change the hearer’s mind by making the hearer understand the content of the utterance. The following example is cited in Miyazaki et al. (2002).
(31) *Daijoobu ka, Yuki? Massao da zo.*
   ok QUE Yuki pale BE ZO
   ‘Are you ok, Yuki? You look pale. (You should know that.)’

   (Miyazaki et al., 2002: 268)

In (31) the speaker informs Yuki that she looks pale. According to Miyazaki et al.
(2002), the use of *zo* here delivers the speaker’s attempt to change Yuki’s mind. In this
case, it may be true that Yuki has not recognised that she looks pale, and thus the
speaker uses *zo* in order to make her understand that she looks pale and change her
mind about how she feels. In this sense, Miyazaki et al.’s (2002) account sounds
reasonable.

However, there are some cases in which *zo* is also used in a situation where the
speaker does not assume that the hearer has a different understanding from what is said
in the utterance, and thus we cannot say that the marker delivers the speaker’s attempt to
change the hearer’s mind. For example, consider the use of *zo* in (32) below.

(32) 1 A: *Yoshi, shookin o tsukeyoo! Moshi Katchan no tama o*
   good prize.money OBJ let’s.set if Katchan LK ball OBJ
2    *uttara ichi man en.*
   hit-CD  10000.yen
   ‘Good. Let’s set a price. If you hit Katchan’s ball, the prize will be 10000
   yen.’
3 B:  *San man roku sen en.*
   36000.yen
   ‘It should be 36000 yen.’
   what good good good suppose 36000.yen
   ‘What? Ok, ok. I think it’s all right. It will be 36000 yen.’
5 B: *Zettai da zo. Yakusokushita zo.*
definite BE ZO promised ZO

‘It’s definite. You promised.’ (T1)

In this conversational exchange, A and B talk about how much the prize money should be if B hits a ball that Katchan throws. Starting from line 4, A promises B that he will pay 36000 yen as the prize money. Since in line 4 A and B have already promised that the prize money will be 36000 yen, when B makes the utterances in line 5, in which *zo* is used, it is difficult to say that B presupposes A having a different understanding from the contents of the utterances, i.e. *Zettai da. Yakusokushita* ‘It’s definite. You promised’.

Furthermore, if B intended to change A’s mind by using *zo*, the utterance would sound strange because A has already promised that he will pay B 36000 yen and B does not want A to change the promise. This example shows that the main concern of B’s utterances with *zo* is not to change A’s mind, and thus serves as a counter example against the account of Miyazaki et al. (2002).

In 7.4.2, I have considered the accounts of the three groups for the function of *zo* and pointed out their shortcomings. In the next sub-section, I will propose a refined function of *zo*.

**7.4.3. The function of *zo*: Urging the hearer’s understanding of an implied message**

In 7.4.2, I have reviewed the three proposed accounts for the function of *zo*. Of those accounts, although it has some shortcomings as noted above, the direction of the account of the third group is relatively insightful. Unlike the account of the first group, it attempts to analyse the function that differs from those of the other monopolistic
markers, and also unlike the account of the second group it has the potential to deal with a wide range of the usages of the marker. Having said so, I would like to further develop the account of the third group and suggest the function of *zo* as follows:

(33) The function of *zo*

*Zo* signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of urging the hearer to understand an implied message in connection with the given context.

(33) clearly states that *zo* is monopolistic in nature, with a somewhat intrusive attitude of the speaker, as indicated by the term ‘urging’. More importantly, the statement is based on the observation of my data where the use of *zo* always indicates a certain hidden message. First, let us revisit the example (32).

(32) 1 A: *Yoshi, shookin o tsueyoo! Moshi Katchan no tama o* good prize money OBJ let’s set if Katchan LK ball OBJ

2 *uttara ichi man en.*

hit-CD 10000 yen ‘Good. Let’s set a price. If you hit Katchan’s ball, the price will be 10000 yen.’

3 B: *San man roku sen en.*

36000 yen ‘It should be 36000 yen.’


what good good good suppose 36000 yen ‘What? Ok, ok. I suppose it’s all right. It will be 36000 yen.’

5 B: *Zettai da zo. Yakusokushita zo.*

definite BE ZO promised ZO ‘It’s definite. You promised.’
As already noted, the third group’s account, ‘changing the hearer’s mind’, does not sufficiently explain what is involved in the use of the marker in some cases like this, in which zo is still used although the speaker does not presuppose the hearer having a different understanding from what he says (and thus there is nothing to change). For the case in question, the utterance is interpreted as such that B urges A to understand his implied message which is related to what he actually says: for example, ‘Keep your promise’, ‘Don’t break your promise’ or ‘If you break our promise, I will not forgive you’.

The function of zo proposed in the current study reflects the view that zo does not merely seek the hearer’s understanding of the referential meaning of the utterance, but it also requires the hearer to relate what is said in the utterance to its relevant context, and to further figure out what the speaker intends to imply. The term ‘urge’ used in (33) attempts to represent this speaker’s reinforced attitude of establishing the procedure for the hearer’s understanding of an implied message. The statement, ‘lead the hearer to do a certain action’ in Cheng’s (1987) account, or ‘change the hearer’s mind’ in Miyazaki et al.’s (2002) account, can be seen as reflecting the speaker’s commitment to urge the hearer to understand an implied message in relation to the literal information and the given context indicated by the use of the marker. In order to further illustrate this special characteristic of the marker, extended examples are provided below.

(34) *Iku zo, Kootaroo.*
    go ZO Kotaro
    ‘I’ll go, Kotaro.’

(35) *Oh, Minami. Sakki Shimizu san to iu onnanoko kara denwa*
    hey Minami a.little.while.ago Miss.Shimizu QT say girl from telephone
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ga atta zo.

SUB there was ZO

‘Hey, Minami. A little while ago there was a phone call from a girl called Miss Shimizu.’

In (34) the speaker tells his friend, Kotaro, that he (the speaker) will go, and employs zo. Here, the purpose of using zo is not simply to seek Kotaro’s understanding of the referential meaning of the utterance, i.e. The speaker will go. Rather, it requires Kotaro to relate the speaker’s intention to the relevant context, i.e. Kotaro is also supposed to go, and to figure out his (the speaker’s) implied message, that is, his suggestion that the hearer should go, too, i.e. ‘Let’s go’. Note that without zo, i.e. Iku, Kootaroo, the utterance would simply indicate the speaker’s intention of going alone, and the implied message cannot possibly be conveyed. Similarly, the use of zo in (35) does not merely seek the hearer’s (Minami’s) understanding of the fact that there was a phone call from Miss Shimizu. Rather, it urges Minami to understand the speaker’s concern related to the fact conveyed in the utterance, such as ‘Miss Shimizu may have had something important to tell you’, ‘Why don’t you call her back?’, and so forth. Again, without zo, i.e. ...onnanoko kara denwa ga atta, the utterance would be a simple notice of the fact that there was a phone call from a girl, and the implied message cannot be indicated. This confirms that the unique feature of zo is ultimately to indicate a certain implied message and feeling towards the hearer. The speaker’s attitude of urging the hearer’s understanding is to let him/her (the hearer) connect what the speaker says with the given context, and figure out the implied message and feeling.

In what follows, I will show that the function of zo given in (33) above is also capable of dealing with the distributional facts of the marker illustrated in 7.4.1. The
first fact to be accounted for is the incompatibility of the marker with commands, requests and proposals. (36) below as well as (22) given earlier represents this fact (Koi in (36a), kite in (36b) and koyoo in (36c) are a command, a request and a proposal to come, respectively).

(36) a. *Ashita wa hayaku koi zo.
tomorrow TOP early come ZO
‘Come early tomorrow.’

b. *Ashita wa hayaku kite zo.
tomorrow TOP early please.come ZO
‘Please come early tomorrow.’

c. *Ashita wa hayaku koyoo zo.
tomorrow TOP early let’s.come ZO
‘Let’s come early tomorrow.’

As previously discussed, commands, requests and proposals require the speaker’s strong commitment to make the hearer understand what is commanded, requested and proposed, which leads the hearer to take action as required. What should be emphasised here is that these sentences indicate that the speaker tries to make sure that the hearer understands what is literally meant by these sentences (the referential meaning of the sentences) rather than anything else. For example, in the case of (36) above, koi, kite and koyoo require the hearer simply to come (early on the next day), and nothing else. This nature of these sentences does not allow zo to be used in these cases. Recall that the use of the marker is to urge the hearer to pay his/her exclusive attention to the content of the utterance (referential meaning) and figure out the speaker’s implied message by relating the content to the given context. While the goal of commands,
requests and proposals in question is achieved by the hearer doing as commanded, requested and proposed respectively, there is no room for zo to be used with these sentences. The use of the marker would otherwise indicate the speaker’s attempt to add an unnecessary implied message, and would not make sense. For instance, the command, Koi ‘Come’, requires the hearer simply to come, and does not require any further action. Thus, *Koi zo ‘Come-ZO’, would sound odd because, as stated above, zo tries to add a certain implied message while the goal of the command is completely achieved when the hearer simply comes. This point is further made clearer when compared with Kuru zo ‘(Someone) comes-ZO’, which is interpreted as such that the speaker urges the hearer to realise the fact that someone comes and understand an implied message in light of the context, such as ‘Get ready to hit him (who comes)’, ‘Hide yourself’, and so forth.

Next, we consider the incompatibility of zo with daroo ‘suppose’. As shown in (23) and (24), zo cannot co-occur with the modal expression daroo, while it can with the other modal expressions, rashii ‘it seems’, yoo(da) ‘apparently’, soo(da) ‘hearsay’), (ni)chigainai ‘must (be)’ and kamoshirenai ‘may (be)’. Recall that in 7.2 daroo is differentiated from the other modal expressions in that it indicates that the speaker refrains from asserting his certainty of the proposition being true. This means that the expression indicates that the speaker does not want to provide his judgement in a definite manner. This special feature of daroo is deemed to be the main cause for its impossible use with zo. Note that zo signals the speaker’s commitment to deliver his implied message. Such commitment from the speaker expressed by the use of zo does not match with the speaker’s attitude and feeling associated with the use of daroo. For example, suppose that a man is about to give a glass of beer to Taro. Another person
tries to stop the man from doing this because Taro is in fact a high school student. Zo may be used here.

(37) Taroo wa kookoosei da zo.  
    Taro TOP high.school.student BE ZO  
    ‘Taro is a high school student. (Why are you giving him beer? Stop it.)’

In this case, the speaker’s implied message, ‘(Taro is only a high school student) Why are you giving him beer? Stop it’, presumes that the hearer first of all recognises the fact that Taro is a high school student. The next step is to relate this fact to the context, and figure out the implied message. What is important to note here is that the information, ‘Taro is a high school student’, needs to be provided in a definite manner, otherwise, the hearer would be unable to perceive it as a clearly recognised fact based on which he/she can understand the implied message. For example, Taroo wa kookoosei daroo in (38) below connotes that, as noted earlier, ‘I refrain from asserting my judgement that Taro is a high school student’. That is to say, the utterance indicates that the speaker does not want to provide his judgement that, Taro is a high school student, in a definite manner.

(38) *Taroo wa kookoosei daroo zo.  
    Taro TOP high.school.student suppose ZO  
    ‘I think Taro is a high school student.’

With such an attitude of the speaker, the information, ‘Taro is a high school student’, would only be vague to the hearer, and the utterance as a whole would be interpreted as ‘?Don’t let him drink beer as I do not want to provide my judgement that Taro is a high school student, in a definite manner’. As indicated by this interpretation of the utterance,
**daroo** cannot provide a concrete basis for the intended implied message. This is the reason why **zo** is never attached to **daroo**.

In contrast, **zo** can be attached to *(ni)chigainai* ‘must (be)’ and *kamoshirenai* ‘may (be)’, since the use of these modal expressions delivers the speaker’s judgement in a definite manner as a high or low degree of likelihood of the proposition being true (See 7.2 for details). For example, in (39) below *(ni)chigainai* and *kamoshirenai* clearly state that there is a possibility that Taro is a high school student. Regardless of whether it is strong or not, this possibility of Taro being a high school student indicated by *(ni)chigainai* or *kamoshirenai* provides the hearer with the solid information that it is possible that Taro is a high school student. Thus, there is no problem for **zo** to combine with these expressions, as the marker successfully indicates the implied message, ‘Don’t let him drink beer’.

(39) a. **Taroo wa kookoosei ni chigainai zo.**

   Taro TOP high.school.student must ZO
   ‘Taro must be a high school student. (Don’t let him drink beer.’)

b. **Taroo wa kookoosei kamoshirenai zo.**

   Taro TOP high.school.student may ZO
   ‘Taro may be a high school student. (Don’t let him drink beer.’)

Furthermore, the use of **zo** with the evidentials, *rashii* ‘it seems’, *yoo(da)* ‘apparently’ and *soo(da)* ‘(hearsay)’, is also possible. For instance, look at (40) below in which **zo** is used with *soo(da).*

---
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(40) Taroo wa kookoosei da sooda zo.

Taro TOP high.school.student BE hear ZO

‘I hear that Taro is a high school student. (Don’t let him drink beer.)’

Recall that the evidentials indicate that the speaker has gained the propositional information through a secondary source. In the case of soo(da) in (40) above, Taroo wa kookoosei da sooda, conveys that the speaker has heard from somebody that Taro is a high school student. By adding zo here, the speaker urges the hearer to relate the fact (that he (the speaker) has gained the information that Taro is a high school student from somebody), to the given context where the hearer is about to let Taro drink beer. This naturally enables the hearer to realise that Taro is a high school student and to figure out the relevance between the fact and the speaker’s implied message, ‘Do not let him drink beer’. Needless to say, the possible use of zo with rashit ‘it seems’ and yoo(da) ‘apparently’ can be explained in the same fashion as the case of soo(da).

In this sub-section, I have clarified the function of zo. In the next sub-section, I will discuss the expressive effects of the marker and their influence on the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts in relation to the function of the marker given above.

7.4.4. The expressive effects of zo and its use in social context

When we observe the use of zo in social contexts, we are able to find two notable facts. One is that zo is mainly used by male speakers (Uyeno, 1971; Suzuki, 1976; Tanaka, 1977; Kuwayama, 1981; Sakuma, 1983; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Tanaka, 1989; Chino, 1991; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Suzuki, 1997; Kashiwagi, 2001; Miyazaki et al., 2002). The other is that it is not generally used with polite forms (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Martin, 1975; Miyazaki et al., 2002; Nakazaki, 2004b). These
features of the marker are accountable in terms of the expressive effects invoked by the function of the marker proposed in 7.4.3.

We first characterise the effects of zo. In 7.4.3, I have noted that zo signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of urging the hearer to understand an implied message in connection with the given context. This speaker’s attitude of urging the hearer to understand his implied message imparts a strong pushy tone, as illustrated in (41) below. In (41) a teacher tells his students that he will start the lesson.

(41) *Ohayoo. Jugyoo o hajimeru zo.*
Good.morning lesson OBJ start ZO
‘Good morning. I’ll start the lesson. (Be seated and open your textbooks.)’

(HD1)

The use of zo in this case delivers the teacher’s attitude of making sure that the students understand the conveyed information, *Jugyoo o hajimeru* ‘I’ll start the lesson’, and that they relate the information to the given situation, ‘the lesson begins’, and further figure out his implied message, ‘Be seated and open your textbooks’. Due to this teacher’s reinforced attitude of ‘urging’ the students to understand his implied message as well as the general monopolistic attitude, ‘Listen. I have something to tell you’, the utterance invokes a strong pushy tone, implying ‘You should listen to me and understand what I intend to imply’. This strong pushy tone of the marker is also viewed as a strong authoritative tone (McGloin, 1990) and as vulgar (Ide, 1990).

With regard to this strong pushy tone of the marker, it is informative to note that yo is also interpreted as indicating a pushy tone. Recall from 6.3.3 that yo conveys a pushy tone due to its nature of ‘ensuring’ the hearer’s understanding of what the speaker
says. That is, in the case of yo the pushy tone is induced by the speaker's attitude of
drawing the hearer's reinforced attention and making sure that he/she (the hearer)
understands the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. It should be noted here
that the pushy tone of zo is much stronger than that of yo, as also pointed out in some
studies (Uyeno, 1971; Cheng, 1987; McGloon, 1990; Miyazaki et al, 2002). For example,
Uyeno (1971) provides (42) below and notes that the replacement of zo in (42a) with yo
in (42b) will result in a softer tone.

(42) a. Kore wa oishii zo.
   this TOP delicious ZO
   ‘This is delicious.’  (Uyeno, 1971: 71)

b. Kore wa oishii yo.
   this TOP delicious YO
   ‘This is delicious.’  (Uyeno, 1971: 75)

Native speakers of Japanese would agree that (42a) with zo indeed sounds stronger than
(42b) with yo. This stronger pushy tone of zo, compared to that of yo, is also well stated
in its function of urging the hearer's understanding of the implied message. That is, the
use of zo is not only to draw the hearer's reinforced attention to make sure that the
hearer understands the content of the utterance, but also to further persuade the hearer to
relate the content to the context, and figure out the implied message. The speaker's
attitude of urging the hearer to figure out an implied message, as such, appears as a very
strong imposition of his will over the hearer.

It is deemed that this much stronger pushy tone of zo over that of yo is the main
cause of its gender restriction, i.e. exclusive use by male speakers only, while there is no
such restriction to the use of yo. That is to say, as also pointed out by Uyeno (1971), the tone associated with the use of the marker does not match with onna-rashisa ‘womanliness’ which is expected to be indicated and maintained by Japanese women’s language. As already mentioned several times, Japanese women are generally expected, or prefer, to be seen as polite in order to maintain their onna-rashisa ‘womanliness’. The strong pushy tone of the marker, again, sounds authoritative and vulgar, and thus it conflicts with the notion of onna-rashisa ‘womanliness’, the main concern of which is politeness. Conversely, as it goes well with the notion of otoko-rashisa ‘manliness’, it is adopted by male speakers in order to show their close relationship with the hearer.

The strong pushy tone of the marker also accounts for the impossible use of zo with the desu/masu form, which is a typical verbal device to express formality and/or politeness. Recall (25a) and (26a) given earlier.

(25)’ a. *Kono eiga wa omoshiroi desu zo.
   this movie TOP interesting BE ZO
   ‘This movie is interesting.’

(26)’ a. *Ashita wa haremasu zo.
   tomorrow TOP clear.up ZO
   ‘It will clear up tomorrow.’

Again, the speaker’s attitude, ‘I urge you to understand what I intend to imply’, signalled by the use of zo, conveys a very strong pushy tone towards the hearer, and would be interpreted as authoritative and vulgar. Obviously, speaking in such a tone does not match with the use of the desu/masu form, which presumes the speaker’s formal and/or polite attitude towards the hearer. This further provides a straightforward
explanation as to the impossible use of the marker in formal conversation, which is also pointed out in many studies (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Uyeno, 1971; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Tanaka, 1989; McGlone, 1990; Miyazaki, et al., 2002).

To summarise, in 7.4 I have discussed the use of zo. I have proposed that zo signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of urging the hearer to understand an implied message in connection with the given context. Based on this proposed function of the marker, I have also provided an account for the incompatibility of the marker with commands/requests/proposals and the modal expression daroo ‘suppose’. Furthermore, I have shown that the function of the marker invokes a strong pushy tone, which would be interpreted as authoritative and vulgar. Such an effect of the marker has been attributed to the male’s exclusive use of the marker as well as the impossible use of the marker with polite forms.

7.5. Ze

7.5 discusses ze which is another marker exclusively used by male speakers (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Suzuki, 1976; Tanaka, 1977; Sakuma, 1983; Cheng, 1987; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Chino, 1991; Masuoka and Takubo, 1994; Kashiwagi, 2001; Miyazaki et al., 2002). I first show some distributional facts related to the use of ze in 7.5.1, and outline previous studies on the function of the marker in 7.5.2. In 7.5.3 I analyse the function of the marker, and in 7.5.4 discuss the expressive effects of the marker and their influence on the unique usages of the marker in social contexts.
7.5.1. Relevant facts

Similar to the other monopolistic markers discussed so far, we can find some interesting facts related to the use of ze. Of these facts, however, the most conspicuous and important one is that, as also noted in some studies, ze can be used with proposals (Uyeno, 1971; Martin, 1975; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002), while it cannot with commands (Martin, 1975; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002) and requests (Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002). This fact is illustrated in the following examples.

(43) *Ima ikoo ze.
     now let’s.go ZE
     ‘Let’s go now.’

(44) a. *Ima ike ze.
     now go ZE
     ‘Go now.’

b. *Ima itte ze.
     now please.go ZE
     ‘Please go now.’

As in (43) ze is compatible with a proposal ikoo ‘Let’s go’, whereas it is incompatible with a command ike ‘Go’ and a request itte ‘please go’, as in (44a) and (44b), respectively.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) In the examples (43) and (44), I did not include the more formal version of the three sentences such as ikimashoo ‘Let’s go’, ikinasai ‘Go’ and itte kudasai ‘Please go’ because as we shall see in (45a) and (46a), in principle, ze cannot be used with polite forms.
Another interesting fact is that, as pointed out by Uyeno (1971) and McGloin (1990), ze is generally used with plain forms and the use of the marker with polite forms is very limited\(^{18}\).

(45) a. \( ?Kono \ eiga \ wa \ omoshiroi \ desu \ ze. \)  
this movie TOP interesting BE ZE  
‘This movie is interesting.’

b. \( Kono \ eiga \ wa \ omoshiroi \ ze. \)  
this movie TOP interesting ZE  
‘This movie is interesting.’

(46) a. \( ?Ashita \ wa \ harematsu \ ze. \)  
tomorrow TOP clear.up ZE  
‘It will clear up tomorrow.’

b. \( Ashita \ wa \ har eru \ ze. \)  
tomorrow TOP clear.up ZE  
‘It will clear up tomorrow.’

(45a) and (46a) show that ze cannot co-occur with the polite forms such as desu in omoshiroi desu and masu in harematsu, respectively, while (45b) and (46b) show that it can with the plain forms such as omoshiroi and har eru, respectively.

I would also like to note that ze does not seem to have particular co-occurrence restrictions with different types of modal expressions. In previous studies it has been reported that the marker can be used with the evidential rashii ‘it seems’ (Miyazaki et

\(^{18}\) Uyeno (1971) and McGloin (1990) point out that ze is used with the desu/masu form in very limited situations. I will discuss this exceptional case in 7.5.4.
al., 2002)\textsuperscript{19}, as well as with the suppositionals, \textit{kamoshirenai} ‘may (be)’ (Kashiwagi, 2006) and \textit{daroo} ‘suppose’ (Uyeno, 1971; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; Miyazaki et al., 2002). I will confirm the compatibility of \textit{ze} with these types of modal expressions in 7.5.3 (Examples will also be given in 7.5.3).

\subsection*{7.5.2. Previous studies}

In terms of the function of \textit{ze}, the most popular claim in the literature is that the marker indicates ‘insistence’ (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, 1951; Uyeno, 1971; Suzuki, 1976; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; McGlone, 1990). However, as I have already mentioned in previous discussions, the term ‘insistence’ has widely and commonly been used to describe the characteristics of the monopolistic markers, and has difficulty in differentiating the function of one marker from that of another. In contrast, the following two studies, Cheng (1987) and Miyazaki et al. (2002), attempt to capture the unique aspects of \textit{ze} in somewhat different fashions.

Cheng (1987) claims that similar to \textit{wa}, \textit{ze} is used when a (male) speaker is committed to convey his thoughts or judgement towards the hearer for the sake of the speaker. Cheng (1987) further points out that \textit{ze} ‘shows off’ (\textit{misebirakasu}) the speaker’s thoughts or judgement, (while \textit{wa} delivers the speaker’s thoughts or judgement in a ‘moderate’ manner (\textit{hikaeme}). Similarly, Miyazaki et al. (2002) note that \textit{ze} is used when the speaker unilaterally delivers the content of the utterance towards the hearer with little intention of changing the hearer’s mind. The following examples are extracted from Miyazaki et al. (2002).

\textsuperscript{19} In my data, it is also found that \textit{ze} is used with the evidential \textit{soo(da)} ‘(hearsay)’.
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(47) **Suware yo, isshoni nomoo ze.**
sit.down YO together let's.drink ZE
‘Sit down. Let’s drink together.’
(Miyazaki et al., 2002: 270)

(48) **Doko ni sunderu n da? Apaato made okutte yaru ze.**
where in live-PROG NOM BE apartment to send ZE
‘Where are you living? I can give you a lift to your apartment.’
(Miyazaki et al., 2002: 270)

Miyazaki et al. (2002) state that in (47) the utterance sounds as if the speaker takes it for
granted that the hearer will accept his invitation and drink with him. Similarly, in (48)
the utterance sounds as if the speaker thinks that the hearer will naturally accept his
offer and get a ride from him to his (the hearer’s) apartment. Miyazaki et al.’s (2002)
observation of *ze* through the examples (47) and (48) can be summarised as such that
the marker unilaterally delivers the content of the utterance towards the hearer with little
intention of changing the hearer’s mind, and makes the utterance sound as if the speaker
thinks that the hearer will naturally accept the content conveyed in the utterance.

What is commonly shown in the accounts of Cheng (1987) and Miyazaki et al.
(2002) is that *ze* does not indicate the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side, i.e.
the speaker’s particular commitment to make the hearer understand the content of the
utterance. However, this is not an exhaustive feature of *ze*. For example, look at (49)
below, in which *ze* is used with a volitional verb *Iku* ‘go’ that literally indicates the
speaker’s intention of going.

(49) **Iku ze, Kootaroo.**
go ZE Kotaro
‘I’ll go, Kotaro. (Let’s go.)’
(T6)
In (49), the speaker who is a pitcher in the baseball team is about to go out to the field, and says, Iku ze, to the catcher, Kotaro, who is also supposed to go out to the field. If we followed the accounts of Cheng (1987) and Miyazaki et al. (2002), (49) would be interpreted as such that the speaker unilaterally states (or shows off) his intention of going without considering the hearer’s side, and also he thinks that the hearer will naturally accept his intention and let him go. However, an interesting fact is that, with ze, this utterance in fact indicates the speaker’s proposal that the hearer should go, too, as shown in the bracket, i.e. ‘Let’s go’. Without ze, i.e. Iku, Kootaroo, the utterance would not be interpreted as such, and it would sound awkward in the given situation where the speaker and the hearer are supposed to go out to the field together. This example clearly shows that ze involves the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side since a proposal presumes the speaker’s particular commitment to make the hearer understand what is proposed in the sentence and act as proposed (cf. 6.4.3). In this regard, we need to add some amendments to the accounts of Cheng (1987) and Miyazaki et al. (2002).

Nevertheless, as will be shown shortly, the point made by Miyazaki et al. (2002)—the utterance with the marker sounds as if the speaker thinks that the hearer will naturally accept the content conveyed in the utterance—is closely related to the function of ze. In what follows, I will investigate the function of ze, in close connection with ‘the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side’ and ‘the speaker’s belief that the hearer will naturally accept the content conveyed in the utterance’.
7.5.3. The function of ze: Enhancing the hearer’s understanding of the speaker’s belief in sharing

As briefly noted above, when ze is used with volitional verbs the marker possibly indicates that the speaker suggests to the hearer that he/she (the hearer) should take the action together with him. This was illustrated in (49) above, and (50) below is an extended example of this.

(50) 1 A: *Omae, ore ga inakunatte doo omotta?*

you I SUB has.gone how thought
‘How did you feel when I was gone?’

2 B: *Doo ite?*

how QT
‘What do you mean by ‘how’?’

3 A: *Seiseishita toka sabishikatta toka yo.*

feel.better or.something.like was.lonely or.something.like YO

4 *Ma ii ya sonna koto doodemo. Neru ze.*

well good SFP such thing whatever sleep ZE
‘Did you feel better? Feel lonely? Something like that? Well, fine. Whatever. I’m going to sleep. (Let’s sleep now.)’

5 B: *Oyasumi.*

Good.night
‘Good night.’

In (50) two friends are in bed and have a chat. Focusing on line 4, A decides here that he is talking about nothing important and says to B that, *Neru* ‘I’m going to sleep’, with *ze*. Given the situation where both A and B are in bed and they are ready to sleep, both are expected to sleep soon. In this situation, similar to the case of (49) earlier, i.e. *Iku ze* ‘Let’s go’, A’s use of *ze* here indicates A’s suggestion that B should also sleep, ‘Let’s sleep now’. Furthermore, as implied by Miyazaki et al. (2002), the utterance sounds as
if A thinks that B will naturally accept his intention of sleeping. From this observation, I assume that ze signals the speaker’s attempt to enhance the hearer’s understanding of the speaker’s belief that what he says should be shared with the hearer. (50) can, thus, be interpreted as ‘I believe that my intention of sleeping now should be shared with you, and want you to understand this belief of mine’.

Recall that Cheng (1987) and Miyazaki et al. (2002) note that ze does not indicate the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side. The interpretation of the marker as such seems to reflect the nuance that the speaker unilaterally states his/her intention. However, as we assume, ze indicates the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side by ‘enhancing the hearer’s understanding’ of the speaker’s belief in sharing. This aspect of ze, i.e. the speaker considers the hearer’s side, can be confirmed by the fact that the marker is able to deliver an implied message. Let us consider the following examples.

(51) A: *Yakyuubu wa doo natta kana?*

baseball.club TOP how became I.wonder.if
‘I wonder how (the game of) the baseball club went.’

B: *Uesugi Kazuya ga nageteru n da ze.*

Uesugi Kazuya SUB pitch-PROG NOM BE ZE
‘Uesugi Kazuya is pitching. (Don’t worry.)’

(52) A: *Saate, sorosoro kaeru ka.*

well soon go.home QUE
‘Well, shall we go home now?’

B: *Oo. Moo ni ji da ze. Yoake da ze.*

yeah already 2.o’clock BE ZE dawn BE ZE
‘Yes. It’s already 2 o’clock. It’s (nearly) dawn. (Hurry up. We should go home now.)’

(HD20)
In (51) A expresses his concern with the baseball game which he and B were not able to
go and watch. In responding to A, B states that Uesugi Kazuya is pitching at the game
and attaches ze to the statement. What is significant in this case is that the use of ze here
delivers B’s implied message that A does not have to worry about the game because
their ace pitcher Uesugi Kazuya is pitching. If ze were dropped from the statement, i.e.
_Uesugi Kazuya ga nageteru n da_, it would be interpreted as simply stating the fact that
Uesugi Kazuya is pitching, and the implied message, ‘Don’t worry (about the game)’,
would not properly be delivered. (52) is the situation where A, B and three other friends
are talking late at night at a coffee shop. In this conversational segment, A suggests that
they should go home, and B agrees with A and states that it is already two o’clock and it
will be dawn soon. Here B uses ze twice in his statements, i.e. _Moo ni ji da ze. Yoake da
ze_, and importantly, both of the ze convey B’s implied message, ‘Hurry up. We should
go home now’.

In Chapter 6 we have intensively discussed that implication requires the
speaker’s particular commitment to make the hearer understand what is said in the
utterance (the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side). Through this the hearer
recognises the importance of the content of the utterance and relates it to the context,
and figures out the relevance between the content and the implied message. As noted
above, ze enhances the hearer’s understanding of the speaker’s belief that what he says
should be shared with the hearer. Needless to say, successful achievement of such
linguistic activity presupposes the hearer’s recognition that the content of the utterance
is believed by the speaker to be shared with him/her (the hearer). This means that the
marker has an effect of drawing the hearer’s special attention to the content of the
utterance and makes the hearer realise the importance of the content to him/her as well
as the speaker in order to share it together. Accordingly, this realisation enables him/her (the hearer) to relate the content of the utterance to the given situation and figure out the relevance between the content and the implied message.

Having reached this point, next I shall focus on the term ‘share’. As shown below, this term ‘share’ reflects the very important characteristic of the marker, and this is well observed in the compatibility/incompatibility of ze with commands, requests and proposals. Consider (53) and (54) below. As illustrated in these examples as well as (43) and (44) earlier, ze is compatible with proposals, but incompatible with commands and requests.

(53) Kyoo wa hayaku kaeroo ze.
    today TOP early let’s.go.home ZE
    ‘Let’s go home early today.’

(54) a. *Kyoo wa hayaku kaere ze.
    today TOP early go.home ZE
    ‘Go home early today.’

b. *Kyoo wa hayaku kaette ze.
    today TOP early please.go.home ZE
    ‘Please go home early today.’

What is important for our current discussion is that proposals, as in (53), indicate the speaker’s wish that the hearer will do a joint activity with him, while commands, as in (54a), and requests as in (54b), indicate the speaker’s wish that the hearer will take the action alone. That is to say, unlike proposals, commands and requests do not require the speaker to take the action, and consequently there is no room for the speaker to believe
that the action should be ‘shared’ with the hearer. Recall that ze indicates the speaker’s belief that what is said in the utterance should be shared with the hearer. This speaker’s belief delivered by the marker conflicts with the nature of commands and requests, in which the speaker does not have room to share what he commands or requests with the hearer. In contrast, proposals explicitly indicate the speaker’s intention of taking the action together with the hearer. Thus, they perfectly match with the speaker’s belief expressed by the use of the marker, and the marker indicates the speaker’s attitude, ‘I believe that my intended action should be shared with you, and want you to understand this belief of mine’.

Another important point that needs to be noted here is that what can be shared is not limited to an action itself. Rather, it depends on the situational context as well as the content of an utterance to which the marker is attached. Compare the following examples, in both of which a volitional verb taberu ‘eat’ is used with ze.

(55) a. [There is a piece of cake on the table.]
   Oi, kore taberu ze.
   hey this eat ZE
   ‘Hey, I’ll eat this.’

b. [Dinner for two people is ready on the table and the speaker is about to take a seat to eat.]
   Oi, taberu ze.
   hey eat ZE
   ‘Hey, I’ll eat. (Let’s eat.)’

In (55a), the speaker sees that there is a piece of cake on the table and tells his friend that he will eat the cake. In this situational context where the hearer is not expected to
eat the cake together, the utterance with \textit{ze} would be interpreted as the speaker's belief that the given information, 'the speaker's intention of eating the cake', other than the action itself should be shared with his friend, implying 'I believe that the information that I will eat this cake should be shared with you'. In contrast, the context of (55b) is that dinner for two people is ready on the table and the speaker is about to take a seat to eat it. In such a context, \textit{taberu} with \textit{ze} is interpreted as the speaker's belief that the action of eating dinner should be shared with the hearer, provided that the speaker and the hearer are supposed to eat dinner together.

The next examples further illustrate that in using \textit{ze} what is believed to be shared with the hearer may vary depending on the content of the utterance.

(56) a. \textit{Kinoo no Sumikoo no shiai mite kita ze.}  
yesterday  LK Sumiko.high.school  LK game went.to.see  ZE  
'I went to see the Sumiko high school (baseball) game yesterday.' (T8)

b. \textit{Hontoni migotona hoomuran datta ze.}  
Really  wonderful home run  BE-past ZE  
'It was a really wonderful home run.' (T5)

What these examples have in common is that the content of the utterance does not convey any speaker's intention of taking action, but it simply delivers the fact or the speaker's evaluative feeling. In (56a), the speaker states that he went to see the Sumiko high school baseball game the day before. It shows that what is believed to be shared by the use of \textit{ze} is the simple information given in the utterance. In (56b), the speaker says to his friend who just hit a home run that it was a wonderful home run. In this case, the
The use of ze indicates the speaker's belief that the speaker's feeling of being impressed by the hearer's home run should be shared with the hearer.

Compared to (56a) and (56b), the utterances without ze, i.e. Kinoo no Sumikoo no shiai mite kita and Hontoo ni migotona hoomuran datta, unilaterally deliver the fact or the speaker's impression, and as a result the hearer would still be able to process the information. However, these sentences do not indicate the speaker's specific attitude of drawing the hearer's attention, and would be unable to make him/her (the hearer) recognise the speaker's belief that the fact or impression should be shared, 'Look, I believe that this fact/my impression should be shared with you'. In short, as representatively illustrated above, by using ze in descriptive statements, what is believed by the speaker to be shared with the hearer is typically the information or feeling rather than the action.

Thus far, I have demonstrated how ze functions in conversation. The following is a summary of the function of the marker.

(57) The function of ze

Ze signals the speaker's monopolistic attitude of enhancing the hearer's understanding of the speaker's belief that the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance should be shared with the hearer.

A final point which I would like to make in relation to the function of ze stated in (57) above is that, as noted in 7.5.1, the marker does not have co-occurrence restrictions with particular types of modal expressions. Look at (58) below.
(58) a. Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru rashii ze.
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come seem ZE
'It seems that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.'

b. Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru sooda ze.
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come hear ZE
'I hear that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.'

c. Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru kamoshirenaiz ze.
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come may ZE
'Tanaka may also come to the party tonight.'

d. Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru daroo ze.
Tanaka also tonight LK party to come suppose ZE
'I think Tanaka will also come to the party tonight.'

In (58a) and (58b) ze is used with the evidentials, rashii ‘it seems’ and soo(da) ‘(hearsay)’, respectively. In (58c) and (58d) the marker is used with the suppositionals, kamoshirenaiz ‘may (be)’ and daroo ‘suppose’, respectively. The use of ze with both, evidentials and suppositionals, without any problem is in fact well predicted. For instance, the sentence (58a), Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru rashii, indicates that the speaker, for example, saw the party list on which Tanaka’s name was written, and has judged that he would also come to the party that night. With ze, the speaker attempts to enhance the hearer’s understanding of his (the speaker’s) belief that the fact, ‘I have some evidence for my judgement that Tanaka will also come to the party’, should be shared with the hearer. Likewise, the sentence (58b), Tanaka mo konya no paatii ni kuru sooda, indicates that the speaker heard from somebody that Tanaka would also come to the party that night. By adding ze, the speaker tries to enhance the hearer’s understanding of the speaker’s belief that the fact should be shared with the hearer,
which can be interpreted as ‘I heard from somebody that Tanaka would also come to the party tonight, and I believe that this fact should be shared with you, and I want you to understand this belief of mine’.

With respect to the use of ze with the suppositionals, \textit{Tanaka mo konya no paatti ni kuru kamoshienai ze} in (58c), indicates the speaker’s commitment to enhance the hearer’s understanding of his belief that his judgement should be shared with the hearer, which can be denoted as ‘I believe that my judgement that Tanaka may or may not come to the party tonight should be shared with you, and want you to understand this belief of mine’. Similarly, the sentence (58d) with \textit{daro no} is interpreted as ‘I want to refrain from asserting my judgement that Tanaka will also come to the party tonight, and I believe that this feeling should be shared with you, and I want you to understand this belief of mine’. As such, with these modal expressions, \textit{ze} simply additionally includes the speaker’s belief that the fact or the judgement conveyed by the modal expressions should be shared with the hearer. Therefore, how the speaker has gained or judged the proposition is not an issue, and as a result, the marker does not have co-occurrence restrictions with particular types of modal expressions.

The next sub-section will explore the expressive effects of \textit{ze} in close connection with the function of the marker discussed above, and will show how these effects influence the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts.

\textbf{7.5.4. The expressive effects of \textit{ze} and its use in social contexts}

In 7.5.3, I have shown that \textit{ze} signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of enhancing the hearer’s understanding of the speaker’s belief that the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance should be shared with the hearer. The effects invoked by this function of
the marker make a great impact on the speaker’s use of the marker in social contexts; that is, the use of the marker is strictly limited to a situation where the conversational participants have a very close relationship or a buddy relationship, as also pointed out in many studies (Uyeno, 1971, 1972; Alfonso, 1974; Tanaka, 1977; Cheng, 1987; Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai, 1987; McGloin, 1990). This means that the use of the marker is impossible not only when the speaker is socially lower and/or younger than the hearer, but even also when the speaker is socially higher and/or older than the hearer. Look at the following examples.

(59) a. [A teacher says to his student]

\[ Chaimu ga \ natta ze. \]

chime SUB rang ZE

‘The bell has rung.’

b. [A school student says to his classmate]

\[ Chaimu ga \ natta ze. \]

chime SUB rang ZE

‘The bell has rung.’

(59a) is an utterance which a teacher intends to tell his student. Native speakers of Japanese may immediately feel that the teacher’s use of \textit{ze} here sounds unnatural. (59b) shows that the same statement as (59a) has no problem when it is uttered by a student to his classmate.

The fact that the use of \textit{ze} is limited to a situation where the participants have a very close relationship can be attributed to the special effect of the marker. Recall that \textit{ze} indicates the speaker’s belief that what he says and how he feels should be shared with the hearer. This belief of the speaker’s implies that the speaker treats the hearer as
a person who naturally accepts and shares what he says and how he feels, and imparts
his strengthened feeling of closeness to the hearer. The effect of the marker that is
associated with such a feeling of closeness, therefore, strictly limits the speaker to be
someone who has a very close relationship or a buddy relationship with the hearer,
thereby being able to express such a feeling of closeness in a straightforward manner.

With this effect of ze, it is also made clear why the marker is not normally used
with polite forms and only used with plain forms (Examples of these were given in (45)
and (46) earlier). Given that polite forms are a typical verbal device to indicate
formality and/or politeness (or social distance between the participants), the use of ze
which particularly connotes the speaker’s buddy-feeling towards the hearer obviously
does not match with these forms.

Having said that, it is worth mentioning that there is an exceptional case in which
ze can be used with polite forms, as also noted by Uyeno (1971) and McGloin (1990).
Observe the following example.

(60) *Oyakata, aitsu moo imasen ze.*
    boss that.person anymore there.is-NEG ZE
    ‘Boss, the person is not here anymore.’
    (McGloin, 1990: 38)

In (60) a henchman and his oyakata ‘boss’ are looking for someone. The henchman
informs his boss that the person is not there anymore and attaches ze to the polite form
imasen ‘(He) is not here’. McGloin (1990) states that ze can be used with polite forms
when henchmen talk to their boss as in (60), however, McGloin (1990) does not provide
any grounds for this. Although such use of the marker is very limited, this phenomenon
further clarifies the effect of the marker. What is special about (60) is that while
henchmen are generally expected to speak to their boss in a formal way by incorporating polite forms into their speech, they are at the same time expected to show their feelings of fellowship (or community spirit) to their boss because of their particular boss-henchmen relationship. The use of ze in this case confirms that the marker plays an important role for expressing the speaker's buddy-feeling towards the hearer, while the use of masu indicates his respectful feeling towards the hearer.

Given that the use of ze imparts the speaker's buddy-feeling towards the hearer, it provides the grounds for the fact that the marker is used by male speakers only. As mentioned several times earlier, Japanese women, with onna-rashisa 'womanliness', are expected, or prefer, to be seen as polite with a certain social distance, rather than to be equal to, or to be a buddy with, the hearer. Thus, the speaker's buddy-feeling towards the hearer particularly emphasised by the use of ze, conceptually does not match with onna-rashisa 'womanliness', which is expected to be maintained largely by the use of Japanese women's language. Rather, with its buddy-feeling, the use of ze is seen as a useful strategy for male speakers to indicate their otoko-rashisa 'manliness' and their very close relationship with the hearer.

7.6. Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the three monopolistic markers wa, zo and ze. The function of wa has been characterised as:

Wa signals the speaker's monopolistic attitude of delivering the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance in a firm matter.
I have shown that the given function of the marker does not allow the marker to be attached to the modal expression *deshoo* ‘suppose’ and commands/requests/proposals as well as to deliver an implied message. I have also demonstrated that the effects of the marker (strengthening, softening and a feminine tone) and the more frequent use of the marker in casual conversation can consistently and systematically be accounted for in terms of the marker’s function stated above.

I have also offered the function of *zo* as follows:

*Zo* signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of urging the hearer to understand an implied message in connection with the given context.

It has been confirmed that due to the given function of the marker, the marker cannot be used with commands/requests/proposals and the modal expression *daroo* ‘suppose’. It has also been shown that the function of the marker invokes a strong pushy tone, which would be interpreted as authoritative and vulgar. This effect of the marker has provided a comprehensive account for the male’s exclusive use of the marker and the impossible use of the marker in formal conversation.

Finally, *ze* has been defined as:

*Ze* signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of enhancing the hearer’s understanding of the speaker’s belief that the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance should be shared with the hearer.

I have shown that with this function, *ze* is incompatible with commands and requests, while it is compatible with proposals. Further, I have noted that due to this function of the marker, it is possible for the marker to be attached to different types of modal expressions, and to deliver an implied message. I have also demonstrated that the given
function of the marker conveys the speaker’s buddy-feeling towards the hearer. This speaker’s buddy-feeling towards the hearer has provided a basis for the limited use of the marker between the conversational participants who have a buddy relationship, the difficult use of the marker in formal conversation and the male’s exclusive use of the marker.
CHAPTER 8

Conclusion

8.1. Introduction

This study has provided a synthetic analysis of the seven Japanese interactive markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*, with special reference to their interactional functions in spoken discourse, and demonstrated that it is possible to account for the interactive nature of these markers in an integrated manner, particularly in terms of the speaker’s attitude, formality and gender. In clarifying a fundamental aspect of the role of these seven interactive markers in Japanese conversation, this study has also shed light on some aspects of the mechanism of conversational exchange in general as well as of conversation patterns of the Japanese language in particular. As stated in Chapter 1, the findings of this study are expected to be beneficial not only to the area of linguistics, but also to the area of Japanese language education.

As the final chapter of this thesis, I shall first summarise the findings in the analysis of the seven interactive markers in Section 8.2, and then provide some implications drawn from the current study in Section 8.3. This will be followed by concluding remarks in Section 8.4.

8.2. Summary of the findings

Chapters 1 and 2 have provided the background to the current study. After outlining the general features of the seven interactive markers *ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo* and *ze*, and looking at some views on Discourse Markers, Chapter 1 has provided the view of the
current study that the seven markers function beyond the mere conveyance of information with their functions closely related to the interactional aspect of language. Chapter 2 has reviewed previous studies on the use of the seven interactive markers and has pointed out that those studies focus only on their partial aspects such as the syntactical, informational or social aspect. I have suggested that we need a synthetic analysis, which allows us to systematically account for a number of issues related to their use including their frequent use in spoken language and their effects on formality and gender. Chapter 3 has outlined the three key notions for the subsequent chapters, i.e. involvement, formality and gender. I have claimed that the seven interactive markers express the speaker’s interactional attitude towards the hearer, which is closely related to the notion of involvement. I have also noted that this speaker’s reinforced attitude towards the hearer indicated by the seven markers particularly influences certain aspects of formality and gender.

Following Chapter 3, Chapter 4 has elucidated the relationship between the seven interactive markers and the notion of involvement. It has been demonstrated that the seven markers are used to express the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement, whereby the hearer pays his/her exclusive attention to the utterance and more actively participates in the conversation. This general function of the seven markers is particularly verified by the fact that they are in principle used only in spoken language, which presumes the hearer’s existence and requires the dynamics of interaction. Provided the general function of the seven markers, it has also been shown that these markers are divided into two groups according to their different ways of inviting the hearer’s involvement: (i) Incorporative: ne, na and (ii) Monopolistic: yo, sa, wa, zo, ze.
**Ne** and **na** invite the hearer's involvement in an incorporative manner, by which the speaker is committed to align with the hearer with respect to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. Further, **yo**, **sa**, **wa**, **zo** and **ze** invite the hearer's involvement in a monopolistic manner, by which the speaker is committed to enhance his/her position as a deliverer of the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance. Given the classification of the seven markers, Chapter 4 has also pointed out that the incorporative markers **ne** and **na** deliver different attitudes of the speaker in inviting the hearer's involvement within an incorporative manner. Likewise, the monopolistic markers **yo**, **sa**, **wa**, **zo** and **ze** deliver different attitudes of the speaker in inviting the hearer's involvement within a monopolistic manner.

Chapters 5 through 7 have been devoted to the analysis of each marker. In Chapter 5, I have discussed the functions of the incorporative markers **ne** and **na** by examining the cases in which the use of these markers is crucial, optional and impossible. Within the chapter, I have also provided a detailed discussion on the difference of these markers. In Chapters 6 and 7, the five monopolistic markers **yo**, **sa**, **wa**, **zo** and **ze** have been explored. The special function and expressive effects of each monopolistic marker have been analysed based on the compatibility/incompatibility of each marker with modal expressions, commands/requests/proposals and polite forms including the issues related to implication.

Below, I summarise the functions and expressive effects of **ne** and **na**, and then provide a summary of the function and expressive effects of each monopolistic marker.

**The functions of ne and na**

(i) **Ne** and **na** signal the speaker's incorporative attitude of aligning with the hearer with regard to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.
(ii) *Na* further denotes the speaker’s attempt to share camaraderie with the hearer.

Through the case-analysis where the use of these markers is crucial, optional and impossible, I have shown that these markers share the core property of signalling the speaker’s incorporative attitude. I have also shown that due to the core function shared by these markers, some expressive effects such as softening/strengthening the tone of the utterance and making the utterance sound friendly/intimate, are also shared by these markers. When our focus is given on the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement (the speaker’s recognition of the hearer as his/her conversation partner and his/her willingness to continue the conversation together) expressed by these markers, their use is interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance. In contrast, when these markers are appended to something that is against, or negative to, the hearer, their use appears as pressure on the hearer and is heard as strengthening the tone of the utterance. The speaker’s attitude and feelings/emotions towards the hearer directly and strongly indicated by these markers also have an effect of making the utterance sound friendly or intimate, and thus they are more frequently used in casual conversation than in formal conversation.

In terms of the difference between *ne* and *na*, I have argued that the direct indication of the speaker’s gender or age is not a genuine property of *na*, and have demonstrated that *na* denotes the speaker’s attempt to share camaraderie with the hearer. With this tone of camaraderie, the use of *na* has more restrictions with respect to the speaker’s age, social status and gender, compared to the use of *ne*. That is to say, *na* is in principle used by male speakers only. Furthermore, it cannot be used by someone socially lower and/or younger to someone socially higher and/or older.
The function of $yo$

$Yo$ signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of ensuring that the hearer understands the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance.

Based on this function of the marker, it has been explained that the marker does not have co-occurrence restrictions with particular types of modal expressions, commands/requests/proposals and polite forms. It has also been shown that with this function of $yo$, the use of the marker is crucial when the speaker attempts to deliver an implied message. As demonstrated in Chapter 6, when the speaker attempts to deliver an implied message, indicating his/her particular commitment to make the hearer understand the content of the utterance (the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side), is crucial. The speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side allows the hearer to realise the importance of the content of the utterance in the given context and figure out the relevance between the content and the implied message. The use of $yo$ is obligatory in the case of delivering an implied message because it is this marker which explicitly indicates the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side by signalling the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of ensuring the hearer’s understanding of the content conveyed in the utterance.

The expressive effects of $yo$ such as softening/strengthening the tone of the utterance and making the utterance sound intimate have also been accounted for on the basis of the given function of the marker. If we focus on the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement expressed by the marker and thus the speaker’s willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer is fully indicated, the use of the marker is interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance. On the other hand, if we focus on the monopolistic nature of $yo$ which delivers the speaker’s reinforced attitude of ensuring
the hearer’s understanding, the use of the marker is interpreted as pushy or strengthening the tone of the utterance. The speaker’s attitude and feelings/emotions directly and strongly expressed by the marker also invokes an intimate nuance, hence the use of the marker is more easily allowed in casual conversation than in formal conversation.

**The function of sa**

*sa* signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of presenting the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance as a matter of course for him/her.

I have shown that since the use of the marker is based on the speaker’s feeling that the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance is a matter of course, the marker is incompatible with evidentials, with which there is no room for the speaker to feel it to be a matter of course for him/her. Furthermore, I have also demonstrated that due to the given function of the marker which does not indicate the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side and merely focuses on the speaker’s side, the marker cannot be used with commands/requests/proposals which require the speaker’s strong commitment to make the hearer understand what to do.

It has further been shown that it is impossible to use *sa* to deliver an implied message due to its speaker-centred nature. The speaker-centred nature of the marker has also been attributed to the effect of the marker which makes the utterance sound ego-assertive or scornful. Speaking in an ego-assertive or scornful tone by the use of the marker does not presume the speaker’s formal and/or polite attitude towards the hearer. This has provided the reason for the impossible use of the marker with polite forms, whereby the use of the marker in formal conversation is strictly restricted.
The function of *wa*

*Wa* signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of delivering the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance in a firm manner.

It has been demonstrated that the speaker’s attitude of firm delivery indicated by the use of the marker is associated with the speaker’s feeling that she wants to say her judgement conveyed in the utterance in a definite manner with full confidence. Thus, the marker cannot be used with the modal expression *deshoo* ‘suppose’ which indicates that the speaker refrains from providing his/her judgement in a definite manner. It has also been shown that the incompatibility of the marker with commands/requests/proposals as well as the impossible use of the marker for delivering an implied message is due to the speaker’s attitude of firm delivery signalled by the use of the marker which lacks the speaker’s consideration of the hearer’s side.

Similar to the case of *yo*, it has also been argued that *wa* has dual aspects in terms of its expressive effects, i.e. softening and strengthening the tone of the utterance. The speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement expressed by the marker, which indicates the speaker’s willingness to continue the conversation with the hearer, is interpreted as softening the tone of the utterance. On the other hand, the monopolistic nature of the marker which signals the speaker’s attitude of firm delivery without considering the hearer’s side is interpreted as self-assured or to be strengthening the tone of the utterance. The female’s exclusive use of *wa* has been discussed in conjunction with the historical background of the marker, through which the marker was incorporated into the national language system as a linguistic sign that directly indicates the speaker being female. This has provided an account for the fact that the marker has an effect which makes the utterance sound feminine or *onna-rashiku* ‘as
expected of woman'. The speaker's femininity as well as her attitude of firm delivery indicated by the use of the marker invokes an intimate nuance, and this effect of the marker has provided a basis for the fact that the marker is more frequently used in casual conversation than in formal conversation.

**The function of zo**

Zo signals the speaker's monopolistic attitude of urging the hearer to understand an implied message in connection with the given context.

The speaker's intention of delivering an implied message indicated by the use of the marker has been considered to conflict with the nature of commands/requests/proposals which simply requires the hearer to understand the referential meanings of these sentences. It has also been discussed that the marker cannot be used with the modal expression *daroo* 'suppose' because the speaker's attitude of refraining from providing his judgement in a definite manner indicated by *daroo* does not allow the hearer to perceive the conveyed information as a clearly recognised fact, which is presumed to be a basis for the hearer's understanding of an implied message.

It has been noted that with the given function of the marker, which is not only to make sure that the hearer understands the content of the utterance, but also to further persuade the hearer to relate the content to the context and figure out an implied message, the use of the marker imparts a strong pushy tone. The strong pushy tone of the marker, which is also interpreted as authoritative and vulgar, has provided an account for the male's exclusive use of the marker as well as the incompatibility of the marker with polite forms. The strong pushy tone of the marker conflicts with the notion of *onna-rashisa* 'womanliness', the main concern of which is politeness, and thus the
marker is not used by women. The tone of the marker also does not match with the use of polite forms, which presumes the speaker’s formal and/or polite attitude towards the hearer, and thus the marker is not allowed to be attached to these forms. This has naturally explained the rare use of the marker in formal conversation.

The function of ze

Ze signals the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of enhancing the hearer’s understanding of the speaker’s belief that the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance should be shared with the hearer.

I have discussed that because the marker indicates the speaker’s belief that what is stated in the utterance should be shared with the hearer, it is incompatible with commands and requests, which simply specify what the hearer should do and have no room for the speaker to share with the hearer. I have also pointed out that with the speaker’s attitude of enhancing the hearer’s understanding of his (the speaker’s) belief in sharing, the marker has an effect of drawing the hearer’s reinforced attention to the importance of the content of the utterance, through which the hearer successfully receives an implied message. Further, I have shown that with this function of the marker, the marker does not have co-occurrence restrictions with particular types of modal expressions.

The speaker’s belief in sharing indicated by the use of the marker has been found as invoking a unique expressive effect. The speaker’s belief in sharing implies that the speaker treats the hearer as a person who naturally accepts and shares what he says and how he feels, and imparts the speaker’s buddy-feeling towards the hearer. This effect of the marker has been seen to be the major cause for the fact that the marker is only used
by the conversational participants who have a buddy relationship. The speaker’s buddy-feeling towards the hearer indicated by the use of the marker has also accounted for the fact that the marker cannot be used with polite forms which presume interpersonal distance between the speaker and the hearer. Moreover, while the use of the marker could be a good strategy to express the speaker’s buddy-feeling towards the hearer, it does not match with onna-rashisa ‘womanliness’, with which is preferential for Japanese women to be seen as polite with a certain social distance. This has provided a straightforward explanation for the reason why the marker is not used by women.

In sum, this study has shown that the seven interactive markers signal the speaker’s attitude of inviting the hearer’s involvement. Due to the speaker’s invitation of the hearer’s involvement commonly signalled by the seven markers, these markers are in principle used only in spoken conversation where the hearer’s existence is presupposed and the dynamics of interaction is particularly presumed. Further, these markers are in general more frequently used in casual conversation than in formal conversation because they are associated with the speaker’s stronger expression of his/her attitude and feelings/emotions towards the hearer, compared to the utterance without these markers. This study has also demonstrated that different attitudes of the speaker delivered by different markers and their consequent effects on formality and gender delineate the hearer’s different interpretations of a particular utterance, hence the speaker chooses a particular marker depending on the given context.
8.3. Implications

This study has first confirmed a fundamental aspect of our verbal exchange, which is stated by Gumperz (1982: 1) as:

"Once involved in a conversation, both speaker and hearer must actively respond to what transpires by signalling involvement, either directly through words or indirectly through gestures or similar nonverbal signals".

Since "conversation is a joint production" (Tannen, 1989: 12), it is not merely a matter of two people alternately taking the role of speaker and hearer. Rather, as noted by Gumperz (1982), it requires the active participation of the speaker and the hearer in conversation, for which signalling involvement is particularly important. Throughout the analysis in the current study, it has been discussed that the seven interactive markers are non-referential linguistic signs that signal the speaker's attitude of inviting the hearer's involvement, hence they are particularly significant for the initiation and maintenance of Japanese conversation. This confirms that in order to collaboratively establish and sustain conversation, expressing the conversational participants' commitment to invite each other's involvement is essential, and for which non-referential linguistic signs play an important role.

This study has also revealed some aspects of conversation patterns of the Japanese language in terms of the expressions of formality and gender. As often noted in this study, the polite form desu/masu, and the plain form da/ru, are a typical device used to indicate the level of formality in the Japanese language. It is mandatory in the language to indicate the level of the speaker's social or interpersonal relationship with the hearer, by choosing either the polite-ending desu/masu or the casual-ending da/ru for each
main predicate of every sentence. It is also well known that the Japanese language has an honorific system. Honorifics are in general divided into two types: referent honorifics and addressee honorifics, both of which are commonly regarded as markers of social distance between the conversational participants (See Ide (1982) and Okamoto (1997) for details of the honorific system of Japanese). Furthermore, the Japanese language has a number of first and second person references which indicate the speaker’s gender as well as the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants (Ide, 1982). For example, the first personal pronoun boku or ore indicates the speaker being male, while atashi indicates the speaker being female. These pronouns also suggest that the speaker is in an informal situation and socially equal to, or higher than, the hearer. As such, the Japanese language has various linguistic devices which directly indicate the situational formality/informality, the interpersonal/social relationship of the speaker with the hearer and the speaker’s gender\(^1\). The current study implies that the seven interactive markers are a unique linguistic device in the language which indirectly characterises the situational formality/informality, the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants and the speaker’s gender by signalling the speaker’s particular attitude towards the hearer.

Another implication drawn from the current study is that the context of interaction where the speaker can display a particular attitude may vary from one socio-cultural linguistic environment to another. Through the analysis of the seven interactive markers, I have shown that each marker delivers the speaker’s attitude in a unique way, thereby

\(^1\) There may also be many non-linguistic devices which indicate the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer such as verbal intensity, pitch prominence, gesture and so forth. For example, in Japanese culture, the non-imposition is in principle valued as polite (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Onodera, 2004), and thus we tend to use a softer tone of voice to superiors, while we often express our feelings and emotions more bluntly and strongly to our inferiors.
indicating a different characteristic of the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants, and of the speaker’s gender. As discussed in Chapter 3, the factors which define the level of formality, e.g. situational formality vs. interpersonal relationship, or the difference between men and women, e.g. power vs. -rashii ‘-like’, often differ from one culture to another. This means that the speaker’s particular attitude associated with certain aspects of formality and gender can be displayed in a certain context of one culture, but not in the same context of another culture. For example, in Japanese culture the speaker’s incorporative attitude with a tone of camaraderie signalled by the use of na cannot be displayed if the speaker is socially lower and/or younger than the hearer even at an informal cocktail party, otherwise the speaker would be seen as impolite. In contrast, such an attitude of the speaker could be acceptable at the same conversational setting in Western culture because in Western culture the level of formality tends to be determined by the conversational setting rather than the interpersonal relationship between the conversational participants.

Given this point, it can further be suggested that enhancing socio-cultural understanding in the second or foreign language educational setting is particularly important for learners. Recalling the example above, if at the cocktail party in Japan a person with a Western cultural background, e.g. a learner of Japanese who came from USA, applies his socio-cultural convention, and in using na expresses his incorporative attitude with a tone of camaraderie to a person who is socially higher and/or older than him, he would be seen as rude and impolite. Maynard (1993: 270) points out that “unlike grammatical mistakes, which can be dismissed simply as lack of knowledge, non-referential signs in general can cause serious communication problems”. This is indeed true, as briefly exemplified above. The inappropriate use of non-referential signs,
such as the interactive markers, may often be due to the lack of socio-cultural knowledge, and may cause communication problems in cross-cultural settings. This suggests that in order to achieve the intended communicative goal without unnecessary misunderstandings, learners of a language are required to not only memorise particular attitudes and their consequent effects expressed through the employment of non-referential signs, but also understand the socio-cultural context where the signs are used.

8.4. Concluding remarks

To conclude, this thesis has demonstrated that the seven interactive markers ne, na, yo, sa, wa, zo and ze signal different attitudes of the speaker in inviting the hearer’s involvement. By using these markers, the speaker attempts to invite the hearer to be more involved in the conversation and maintain the dynamics of interaction. I hope that the findings in this study have shed some light on how the speaker’s particular attitude can be manifested by a particular linguistic sign, and how that in turn affects some aspects of formality and gender in conversation. I also hope that the findings in this study make a contribution to Japanese language education with regard to the practical use of the seven interactive markers, as well as to second or foreign language education by suggesting the importance of enhancing socio-cultural understanding.

For further studies, I would like to suggest the analysis of the many other interactive markers. For this study I have chosen the seven interactive markers which are frequently used in daily conversation. However, as noted in Chapter 1, there are many more markers such as ka, kedo, mono and no which have been labelled as ‘sentence-final particles’ in Japanese. It is also interesting to see what kind of particular attitude can be delivered through each of those markers. I believe that such an extended
analysis of the interactive markers will further deepen our understanding of Japanese conversation, and benefit Japanese language education.
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