Embedded Soliloquy and Affective Stances in Japanese
Yoko Hasegawa

University of California, Berkeley

Abstract
This article discusses strategies to express intimacy with and exaltation of the addressee —
affective stances morphologically incompatible in the Japanese honorific system, wherein
addressees are marked as either psychologically distant and exalted, honored, shown respect *or*
intimate and not exalted. To resolve this dilemma, speakers commonly embed soliloquy in
dialogic discourse, a strategy distinct from normal speech style shifts. To account for this,
recognition of the distinction between public expression (presupposing an addressee and
fulfilling the communicative function of language) and private expression (not presupposing an
addressee and satisfying the thought-expressing function) is essential. By employing soliloquy to
reveal one's private thoughts, the speaker can index psychological closeness to the addressee
without switching to the canonical plain speech style.

1.   Introduction

In recent years an increasing number of studies on pragmatics in general and linguistic politeness
in particular have been conducted based on the idea of *indexicality*, the relationship between a
linguistic expression and its context.[1] The term *indexicality* is defined as: a sign A indexes
information C when the occurrence of A can imply the presence or existence of C (Lyons 1977:
106). If a meaning is indexical, it changes as the speech situation changes. In this view, language
practice involves indexing a multiplicity of socio-cultural significances (i.e. meanings), including
spatiotemporal locus of the communicative situation (deixis), social identity, social acts (speech
acts), social activities (sequences of social acts, e.g. disputing, storytelling), and affective and
epistemic stances (Ochs 1996: 410). To investigate such meanings, "it is important to distinguish
the range of situational dimensions that a form (set of forms) *potentially* indexes from the range
of situational dimensions that a form (set of forms) *actually* indexes in a particular instance of
use." The indexical potential "derives from a history of usage and cultural expectations
surrounding that form," whereas actual indexing is uniquely configured by the participants in the
communicative setting using the situational information that the form provides (ibid.: 418).
Considering its potential indexing functions, the present study investigates the use of *soliloquy*
(uttering one's thoughts without addressing anyone) as it pertains to the politeness phenomenon
of Japanese.

The Japanese honorific system consists of two orthogonal dimensions: one which regards
the addressee in the speech situation, labeled *addressee honorifics*, and another, which regards
the referent of linguistic expressions, labeled *referent honorifics*. When addressee honorifics are
employed, the speech is commonly recognized as being in the *polite style* (or *desu-masu style*);
otherwise, it is considered to be in the *plain style*.

Referent honorifics can be used independently of addressee honorifics, i.e. independently of speech style. For example, (1a) is in the polite style with referent honorifics (+AH, +RH); (1b) is also in the polite style but without referent honorifics (+AH, –RH); (1c) is in the plain style with referent honorifics (–AH, +RH); (1d) is in the plain style without referent honorifics (–AH, –RH).[2]

(1) a. *Tanaka-san ga irasshai-mashita.*[3] +AH; +RH (polite style)
         Tanaka   NOM come(RH)-PST(AH)
         'Ms. Tanaka arrived.'
     b. *Tanaka-san ga ki-mashita.*   +AH; –RH (polite style)
                          come-PST(AH)
     c. *Tanaka-san ga irasshat-ta.*   –AH; +RH (plain style)
                          come(RH)-PST
     d. *Tanaka-san ga ki-ta.*   –AH; –RH (plain style)
                          come-PST

Normally, the polite style is employed when the speaker considers the addressee psychologically distant, and/or the speaker wishes to exalt (i.e. honor, show respect to) the addressee.[4] Here again, two orthogonal dimensions are observed: psychological distance and exaltation. Linguistically, addressees are dichotomized into (i) distant and exalted, and (ii) intimate and not exalted.[5] With the former, the use of the polite style is the norm; with the latter, the use of the plain style is. In the (B) situation below, where the speaker considers the addressee psychologically distant but exaltation superfluous, the plain style is normally used, and the speech may sound vulgar or impolite, e.g. *Dare da* 'Who are you?'

Addressee	Intimate	Distant
Exalted	(A)	(i) Polite Style
Not Exalted	(ii) Plain Style	(B)

A serious problem occurs in the (A) situation when the speaker wishes to convey intimacy and exaltation simultaneously, because in the Japanese honorific system, these two affective stances are morphologically incompatible. In fact, this is quite possibly a universal problem, as seen in Brown and Levinson's (1978/1987) analysis of addressing terms. They consider non-intimate expressions as polite; that is, politeness is defined as an opposite notion of intimacy.

---

[2] It is not the case that the polite style consists merely of an addition of addressee honorifics to the plain style, as the examples in (1) might suggest. These two styles are governed by different principles, and what can be acceptably articulated varies depending on the style (Suzuki 1997). For example, one can say *Kore ageru* 'I'll give this to you' in the plain style, but expressing the same idea in the polite style, *Kore agemasu*, is customarily unacceptable.

[3] Abbreviations: AH (addressee honorific), EI (exclamatory interjection), EP (exclamatory particle), NOM (nominative), PST (past tense), RH (referent honorific), QUOT (quotative), TOP (topic marker).

[4] Usami (1995: 31) reports that in her conversation data of nine Japanese speakers unfamiliar with each other, 93.9% of the utterances are in the polite style.

[5] Other factors are also involved in the selection of the speech style, e.g. the mode of communication and the formality of the speech situation.

Nevertheless, intimacy and exaltation are *not inherently incompatible*, and at times, we will certainly wish to articulate both stances toward the addressee. This paper argues that the most prominent strategy to express intimate exaltation in Japanese is the use of *embedded soliloquy*.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 provides a brief discussion and clarification of some pertinent notions of linguistic politeness and honorifics. Section 3 summarizes several recent works on the speech-style shift phenomenon in Japanese. It is demonstrated that insertion of soliloquy into a dialogical discourse can index intimacy while at the same time maintaining the overall tone of deference.

It is remarkable that all fluent speakers of Japanese have a categorical awareness of soliloquy. Hearing such conversations as those cited in this article, they can invariably identify certain sentences or sentence fragments as soliloquy. English speakers, by contrast, do not always have the same clear distinction. For example, when asked whether such an expression as 'I see' is addressed to the hearer or rather the speaker talking to him-/herself, their answers differ considerably. This difference is likely due to the fact that the soliloquy mode of discourse has been grammaticized in Japanese, but not in English. Consequently, soliloquy plays a more significant role in Japanese, although it arguably has pragmatic significance in both languages.[6] Sections 4 and 5 discuss this issue by introducing Hirose's (1995) theory of public and private expressions and consider the mechanism of soliloquy as an index of intimate exaltation. Conclusions follow in section 6.

2.   Some remarks on honorifics

In modern times, linguistic politeness is considered a political behavior — a means to avoid conflict, tone down potential aggression, and ensure smooth interaction (Lakoff 1975, Leech 1983, Brown and Levinson 1978/1987). In the 18th and 19th centuries, however, linguistic politeness was not correlated with a consideration for or deference toward other individuals in Western society (Watts 1992). 'Politeness' meant 'prudence', inextricably linked to social class and socio-political power. Politeness was considered a manifestation of a high degree of mental cultivation, elegant refinement, polished manners, and good taste; it was used to enhance one's own social standing and signal membership in a particular social class (Sell 1992).

This older sense of politeness must be acknowledged when investigating honorifics in contemporary Japanese. For example, in (2), the addressee and the person referred to by the covert subject of the verb *irassharu* 'come' are identical, and yet the speaker uses only the referent honorific, without any addressee honorifics.

---

[6] Wesley Leonard (p.c.) provides the following episode to illustrate how soliloquy is used in English: A customer is in a check-out line late in the evening and a clerk is ringing up the purchases. The clerk declares the total amount, and the customer notices that the clerk has forgotten to scan one item. The customer points this out, and the clerk, who is just finishing a 12-hour shift, shakes his head slightly and without making eye contact with the customer says *I need to go home*. Immediately afterward, the clerk looks back at the customer, apologizes for the mistake, rings up the item, and declares the amended total cost. In this case almost everybody would recognize the *I need to go home* as soliloquy, and its significance here is to get the customer to recognize the speaker's hard work while not directly complaining, which would be inappropriate professionally.

(2) *Ashita   irassharu?*   (plain style)
    tomorrow   come(RH)
    'Will you come tomorrow?'

This seemingly inconsistent [−AH, +RH] combination regarding the same individual is commonly associated with the female speech style. It indexes the affective stance of the speaker communicating that she considers the addressee psychologically close (−AH), but that she nevertheless prefers to apply a referent honorific to show her linguistic refinement.

Another matter requiring our awareness is that the use of honorifics is not automatically coterminous with polite behavior. That is, there is no direct indexicality between honorifics and polite intentions. Honorifics can be used in an impolite way, e.g. to convey unfriendliness, contempt, etc. (Such an effect is referred to as *ingin-burei* 'being polite on the surface but actually contemptuous'.) On the other hand, the plain speech style can be used to convey what Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) term *positive politeness*, i.e. friendliness, camaraderie, intimacy, etc. Nevertheless, it is important to note that in Japanese, *deference cannot be expressed without employing the polite style*. For example, *Dare da* 'Who are you?' cannot convey the speaker's intention of deference in any circumstance. This fact would support Ide's (1991: 64) contention that "[f]or the Japanese people, linguistic politeness is mainly a matter of conforming to social conventions for a choice of linguistic forms."

Honorifics can also be used for purposes other than politeness, for example, to indicate *kejime* 'distinctions between appropriateness and inappropriateness, good and bad, public and private, etc.'[7] In many interpersonal relationships, as people become familiar with each other, they gradually shift their speech style from polite to plain. However, in certain types of relationships, to become intimate is discouraged. This is based on the belief that intimacy might weaken one's ability to judge appropriately, making people insensitive to abuses of power, etc. (This idea is expressed as *Naa naa ni naru no wa yokunai* 'it's not good to become so familiar with a person that one starts using a plain style with frequent accompaniment of the particle *naa*, which marks intimacy'.) Therefore, many people maintain a polite speech style with long-time acquaintances even when there is no difference in rank, especially in occupational relationships.

While it is difficult to imagine that some societies value impoliteness, it is easily imaginable that some prefer friendliness to deference, while others prefer deference to friendliness. Some segments of American society exemplify the former, and, in general, Japanese society the latter. But friendliness and politeness are not mutually exclusive. Some anecdotal examples can illustrate the failure of comfortable communication caused by different and variant expectations regarding linguistic politeness. Because of many Japanese tourists, shops in San Francisco often employ Japanese women who have lived in the United States for lengthy periods of time. These women tend to use positive politeness strategies more frequently than most Japanese living in Japan, e.g. (3) (both in the plain style).[8]

---

[7] The concept of *kejime* overlaps but is not identical with the concept of *wakimae* 'discretion' used by Hill et al. (1986) and Ide (1991) (they translate this term as 'discernment'; 'discretion' has been suggested by R. Lakoff). They consider *wakimae* to be one of two major components of politeness. *Kejime*, on the other hand, has nothing to do with politeness per se because it does not presuppose an addressee or a particular referent.

[8] According to Suckle (1994: 123), in Japan the polite style is employed in 77.3% of transactions at a railroad station, 51.9% at a post office, and 36.2% at a vegetable market. He also reports that

(3) a. *Kore, ima seeru nano yo.*
   'This is on sale now.'
   b. *Aru ka mo shirenai kara, mite kite ageru.*
   'There may be more in stock, so I'll go check for you.'

While the speakers of (3) might think that friendliness should be more valued than deference, many visitors from Japan consider their speech style not to meet the politeness level expected from salespersons. Expectations regarding linguistic politeness vary within a single society as well; some speakers feel more comfortable with the polite style, whereas others prefer the plain style (cf. S. Okamoto 1997, 1999).

Generally, honorifics index a sense of deference, but they can also be interpreted as unfriendly, standoffish, or rejecting. The plain style could be interpreted as conveying one's trust, intimacy, etc., but it might also be interpreted as too familiar and disrespectful. Therefore, the expression of both respect and intimacy simultaneously requires highly elaborate linguistic skills. This goal is most frequently achieved by the use of both polite and plain styles, and the mixture of the two is commonly referred to as *speech style shift*.[9]

3. Speech style shift

Researchers have recognized that selection of speech style not only *reflects* the social relationships between interlocutors, it also *constructs* such relationships. Thus, the style in linguistic interaction is dynamic, with shifting and evolving relationships. For example, it is commonly observed that unfamiliar interlocutors start their conversation with the polite style, and, as they become familiar, switch to the plain style. Or fairly familiar interlocutors habitually use the plain style, but when the conversation topic becomes grave (e.g. a death, disputes), they may switch to the polite style. Although speech styles can shift back and forth during even a single span of discourse, such shifts are by no means arbitrarily made; different strategies are required when a superior interlocutor initiates a polite-to-plain shift as opposed to when the inferior does so (Neustupný 1982). This section summarizes several recent works on this topic.

In her pioneering work, Ikuta (1983) points out that the previously proposed analyses, which claim the polite style to be an indication of politeness or formalness, are inadequate because they cannot account for speech style shifts in a conversation in which the social and situational conditions remain constant. Instead, she characterizes the basic function of the polite style metaphorically to be *distancing*: the speech styles are used to express whether the speaker considers the addressee 'close' or 'distant'.[10] She contends that the dominant speech style is determined by the interlocutors' social relationship at the start of their conversation. As the conversation unfolds, style shifts will take place, reflecting the speaker's empathy with the

---

a vegetable vendor with his neighborhood customers restricts his speech to the plain style to approximately 50% of the time, while his customers employ the plain style with him more frequently.
[9] *Speech style shift* is also referred to as *speech level shift*, which reflects the traditional conception of the polite (higher) and plain (lower) hierarchy, which is not always applicable. This article, therefore, prefers the term *speech style shift* to avoid such a hierarchical metaphor.
[10] Ikuta also argues that speech style shift is used to indicate coherence and the hierarchical positioning of utterances in discourse. Although insightful, this part of her analysis is not directly relevant to the topic of the present paper and therefore will not be discussed further.

addressee at a particular moment in a conversation. She generalizes that empathy is expected when the speaker shows strong agreement, positively evaluating a preceding statement, or admiring the addressee. For example, in the following conversation between two female speakers, the polite style is utilized in (4a-b), but (4c) is in the plain style (the translation is Ikuta's).

(4) a. K: *Sono oheya wa koshitsu ni natte irun desu ka?*
'Is your apartment designed for a single person?'
b. J: *Ee, rokujoo to yojoohan to sanruumu ga taihen hiroin desu no.*
'Yes, there is a six-mat (tatami) room, a four-and-one-half mat room, and a sunroom, which is really large.'
→ c. K: *Maa, **zuibun ii no ne**.* (plain style)
'Oh, that's very nice.'

On the other hand, Ikuta contends, empathy is avoided (i.e. distancing is expected) when the topic is a very private or sensitive matter. The utterances preceding (5) were in the plain style, for the interlocutors had become relaxed and frank. Then, K switched back to the polite style in *Shitsuree desu kedo* 'Excuse me, but'.

(5) → K: ***Shitsuree desu kedo***, *Joo-san wa zutto dokushin de irassharu no?*[11]
'Excuse me, but have you always been single?'
J: *Iie, ano ne, nido oyome ni itta no.*
'No, you know, I married twice.'
K: *Ara, soo nan desu ka.*
'Oh, is that so.'

Ikuta explains that asking a person for her marital history is highly personal, so K employs the polite style as the ritual required before embarking on the question. The rest of the utterance by K is in the plain style, which could have also been in the polite style, *Joo-san wa zutto dokushin de irassharun desu ka* 'have you always been single?'. Ikuta considers that keeping the polite style (i.e. distancing) throughout this utterance would have made J more reluctant to speak without reserve.

While Ikuta's work with naturalistic data is a significant contribution to our understanding of the speech style shift, some inaccuracies are readily observable. For example, contrary to Ikuta's claim, positive remarks in the plain style are not necessarily appropriate when the speaker wants to show deference toward the address. *Waa, tottemo niau yo* 'That suits you well (with the addressee-oriented particle *yo*)' is unacceptable, whereas *Waa, tottemo niau* (which can be interpreted as soliloquy) is. Ikuta's analysis is unable to account for this difference.

Maynard (1991: 577-78) observes that in casual conversation, the plain style marks the speaker's *low awareness of the addressee* as a separate and potentially opposing entity. She contends that the plain style is likely to be employed when the speaker (i) exclaims or suddenly recalls something, (ii) vividly expresses events scene-internally as if the speaker were right there, (iii) expresses internal thought self-reflexively, including monologues, (iv) jointly creates utterances with the addressee, (v) presents backgrounded information, or (vi) is in an intimate

---

[11] *Irassharu no?* in (5) exhibits the [–AH, +RH] strategy for the same individual discussed in section 2.

relationship with the addressee, expressing social familiarity and closeness. By contrast, Maynard argues, the polite style is likely to be employed when the speaker (a) expresses a thought which directly addresses the partner with expressions appropriate in terms of sociolinguistic variables and (b) communicates essential information directly addressed to the listener.

N. Okamoto (1997), analyzing elementary-school third-grade classroom conversations, reports that the polite style indexes *social identity*, representing statements based on one's role as a teacher or as a student (i.e. public statements). The plain style, on the other hand, conveys that the statement is made as a private person, not based on one's official role (i.e. private statements). In (6) and (7), the students were instructed to underline in their textbooks both the passages that explain why the girl from Tokyo and her classmates in a rural school started fighting as well as those that explain the girl's feelings at that time. The following represents the teacher's utterances. (Unless otherwise stated, the glosses and translations of (6) and the subsequent examples cited in this section are all mine.)

(6)   *Hai, dewa, empitsu oite kudasaai.*
      'Well, then, put down your pencils.'
      Sorede, mada kakete nakutemo, tochuude ki ga tsuitara ne, happyoo sureba iin desu kara ne. Ii desu ka.
      'And if you haven't finished underlining, that's okay; if you notice something, you can say it at that point. Okay?'
      Hai, jaa, mazu ne, sen o hippatta tokoro kara happyoo shite moraimaasu.
      'Well, first, please recite from the places you underlined.'
      Hai, jaa, sen hippatta hito, te o agete kudasaai.
      'Those of you who have underlined something, raise your hands.'
      [After wiping her perspiration]
→   *Atsusa ni makezu ni **gambaroo ne.***
      'Let's not let the heat get (the better of) us!'
      Hai, jaa, Miya Yutaka-san, onegai shimaasu.
      'All right, Yutaka Miya-san, please tell us your results.'

In (6), the teacher's utterances are all in the polite style, except *Atsusa ni makezu ni gambaroo ne* 'Let's not let the heat get (the better of) us!', which should be taken as her personal friendly encouragement, rather than a routine classroom direction.

In (7) below, Yoshie Ikuma (Y), a female student, misreads the word *tori-musubu* 'to act as a go-between' as *musubu* 'to tie'. This error was corrected by a male classmate, Kazuhiro (K). The marked line in the teacher's utterance (T) employs a plain style to convey that the utterance is addressed only to Kazuhiro, not to the entire class.

(7) Y: *Hai, watashi wa "musunde kureta no desu" to iu tokoro ni sen o hikimashita.*
      'Okay, I underlined "they tied it."'
   T: *"Musunde kureta" no to-, tokoro desu ka?*
      'You underlined "they tied it"?'
   Y: *Hai.*
      'Yes.'

K: [In background] *Tori-musubu, tori-musubu.*
'To act as a go-between, go-between.'

→ T: *N, chotto, n. Kazuhiro-kun,* **moo ichido itte agete,** *ima itta tokoro.*
'Um, well, Kazuhiro-kun, tell Ikuma-san again what you just said.'

K: *Ikuma-san ga itta koto wa, tabun "tori-musubu" no koto de wa arimasen ka?*
'Didn't you mean "to act as a go-between," Ikuma-san?'

Y: *Hai, soo deesu.*
'Yes, that's right.'

This speech style shift along the official-personal (or public to private) dimension of interaction is clearly related to the use of honorifics to index *kejime* as discussed in section 2.

Usami (1995) proposes five conditions under which polite-to-plain style shifts may occur: (i) reduction of psychological distance, (ii) matching the other's speech style, (iii) soliloquy, (iv) confirmation, (v) incomplete sentences. Examples in (8-12) are taken from Usami's data which record conversations of nine native Japanese speakers residing in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The subjects were all unfamiliar with each other and were asked to talk about their student lives in the United States. The bold-italic parts in (8-12) are intended to illustrate her analysis. (*F* stands for 'female', *M* for 'male', *H* for 'higher status', *L* for 'lower status'.)

(8) Reduction of psychological distance (Two Fs with equal status)
  F1: *Ringuistikku desu ka? Gosemmon wa.*
    'Is your specialization linguistics?'
  F2: *Ejukeeshon desu ne, koko wa.*
    'It's education here.'
→   **Jibun ga koko ni iru no ga wakaranai.** <laugh>
    'I don't understand why I'm here.'

(9) Matching the other's speech style (Two Fs with equal status)
  F1: *Sochira wa nagain desu ka?*
    'Have you been there a long time?'
  F2: *U. Mass Boston de MA o totte, de, kyonen kara koko.*
    'I got an MA from U. Mass Boston, and I've been here since last year.'
→ F1: **Aa soo.**
    'Oh, really?'

(10) Soliloquy (FL to FH)
  FL: *Watashi mo gakubu wa eebee, eegogaku, eebee, n?*
    'I'm also majoring in English-American Literature, English Linguistics, English-American, umm …'
→   **Eegogaku, eebeeka tte iun datta ka na.**
    'Department of English Linguistics, no, it's called English-American Literature?'
→   **Nanka wakannai, namae …**
    'I don't know how to say it in Japanese …'

(11) Confirmation
      FH: *Peepaa kaku to, 30-peeji deshita-kke?*
          'If we are writing a paper … was it 30 pages?'
→ FL: ***15 kara 30.***
          '15 to 30.'

(12) Incomplete sentences (Two Fs with equal status)
      F1: *Izure wa nihon ni okaerininaru koto mo arun desu ka?*
          'Eventually will you go back to Japan?'
→ F2: *Soo desu ne. Soreni, yappari,* **shigoto no koto o kangaeru to, sore ga ichiban …**
          'That's right. And after all, if I think about the job market, it'd be the best …'
→ F1: ***Kotchi de amerikajin ni eego o oshieru wake ni mo ikanai shi …***
          'And it's not like we can teach English to Americans here …'

While Usami's work contains useful data, her analysis awaits public scrutiny. Her classification criteria are of different kinds and therefore not mutually exclusive. Most importantly, all examples that Usami provides for the category shown in (8), reduction of psychological distance, are essentially the same as those in (10), what she categorizes as soliloquy specifically. The present paper argues that it is the soliloquy style that a speaker can uniquely employ as a strategy to express intimacy while maintaining deference.

Regarding the category in (9), Usami's claim that style shift can be motivated by matching the other's speech style is inadequate because an interlocutor is not always encouraged to use a plain style even when the other has made a shift. Next, whether confirmation, as in (11), and incomplete sentences, as in (12), form distinct categories is questionable because all of her confirmation examples are also incomplete sentences. Furthermore, because incomplete sentences can be completed in either the polite or the plain style, it is unclear whether they should uniformly be categorized as being in the plain style. For example, the demonstration in (11) could be completed with an addressee honorific, as *15 kara 30 peezi desu* 'It's 15 to 30 pages'.

Matsumura and Chinami (1998) also consider that incomplete sentences are to be categorized as being in the plain style. They assert that motivations for a polite-to-plain style shift are the interlocutor's wish to carry on a conversation cooperatively and to become psychologically closer. The conversation in (13), taken from Matsumura and Chinami (ibid.), is between a well-known female TV interviewer (the same person as K in Ikuta's data) and her guest, who is explaining how her father reacted when she was born. Matsumura and Chinami consider the interviewer socially superior (FH) than the guest (FL). Most of the incomplete utterances in their data sound to me to be in the plain style. It appears that some incomplete sentences are naturally interpreted as plain, while others are interpreted as polite. Further investigation in this area is needed. The bold-italic parts in (13) exemplify incomplete sentences:

(13) FL: *De, umaretara, … onna datta wake desu yo.*
         'And when the baby was born, … it was another girl.'
         Soshitara, sono chichi ga byooin ni kuru maeni, kinjo no hito ni
→   *"Mata onna dattan desutte"* **tte kiite shimatte.**
         'Then, my father heard from a neighbor "It's another girl" before he came to the hospital.'

FH: *Ara, iya da. Dooshite kinjo no hito ga saki ni shittetan deshoo ne.*
'Oh, no! How did the neighbor know first?'
[snip]
FL: *Sorede, ikkai mo byooin ni mimai ni mo konakattan desu.*
'So he didn't visit us at all in the hospital.'
→ *Chichi ga shokku de, sorede, moo gohan mo tabezu ni **heya toka tojikomotchatte.***
'My father was so shocked that he shut himself up in his room without eating.'
→ *Nanka, hontoo ni onna no ko datta no ga **shokku data mitai de.***
'Indeed, he appeared to be shocked that the baby was a girl.'
→ *Sorede, okaasan mo sore o kiite, zutto atashi o yoko ni oita mama, byooin de zuutto **poro-poro-poro-poro naitetan desu-tte.***
'So, my mom heard about it in the hospital and cried and kept me near her.'
FH: *Heee, hisan deshita ne. Kawaisoo ne. Anata no sekinin ja nai noni ne.*
'Hmm, that's terrible. What a pity! And it's not (even) your responsibility.'

They observe that style shifts are normally initiated by the superior interlocutor; the inferior detects such a desire and tries to lesson her/his formality. In (13), the superior, FH, initiates a plain style overtly (rather than employing an incomplete sentence) by uttering such a highly colloquial expression as *ara iya da* 'Oh, no!'. FL infers FH's intention and responds to it by using such informal expressions as *okaasan* 'Mom' and the onomatopoeic *poro-poro-poro-poro*.

Researchers have recognized that different strategies are required when a superior initiates a polite-to-plain shift as opposed to when the inferior does so. Furthermore, Suzuki (1997) contends that the boundary between the speaker's and the addressee's territories is clearly drawn in a polite style, and the speaker normally avoids invading the addressee's territory. In the plain style, by contrast, there is no clear boundary; the interlocutors value camaraderie more than deference. In (14), where FL expresses appreciation to FH for the present FH gave FL, Suzuki analyzes *Are, sugoku kiree* 'They were very pretty' and *Motto ippai hoshii naa* 'I want more of them' to exhibit a shift from the polite to the plain speech style.

(14) FL: *Kono aida wa doomo arigatoo gozaimashita.*
'Thank you very much for the other day.'
→ ***Are sugoku kiree.***
'They were very pretty.'
FH: *Soo deshoo?*
'Weren't they?'
[snip]
→ FL: ***Motto ippai hoshii naa.***
'I want more of them.'
FH: *Sora yokatta.*
'That's good.'
FL: *Jibun de kaitain desu kedo, futsuu ni uttemasu ka?*
'I want to buy some more myself. Are they always sold?'
FH: *Shoozan ni aru kedo.*
'Shozan sells them.'
FL: *Shoozan? Oosaka desu ka?*
'Shozan? In Osaka?'

FH: *Kyooto.*
　　 'In Kyoto.'
FL: *Ja, kondo oshiete itadakemasu ka?*
　　 'Would you give me the directions next time?'

Suzuki recognizes that when a plain style is used by FL, the statement is about something in FL's or in a neutral territory. When a statement is made regarding FH's territory (i.e. expressing gratitude, question, request), only the polite style is employed. Significantly, the shifted utterances in Suzuki's data are all in soliloquy.

　　 S. Okamoto (1999) also points out such a use of soliloquy. In her conversation data between a 38-year old male professor and a 23-year old female graduate student, the latter occasionally employs the plain style. Okamoto (ibid.: 62) asserts that "she [the graduate student] used plain forms mostly for exclamatory remarks (e.g. *Aa sugoi* [Oh, wow!] … *A, honto da* [Oh, that's true] …) or for soliloquy-like remarks (e.g. *Ue no hito nan ja nai ka naa* [I wonder if (I guess) he is the highest] …). That is, for certain types of speech acts, eliminating formality is considered appropriate" (ibid.: 62; the translations here are Okamoto's). The professor also mixes the plain and polite styles, but, Okamoto remarks, his uses of the plain style are not restricted to soliloquy.

　　 An insertion of soliloquy into a conversation can reconcile psychological distancing that necessarily accompanies the polite style. The following are typical examples from my data:

(15) FH: *Honto ni eego de wa kuroo shimasu.*
　　　　 'English is sure a pain in the neck!'
　　 FL: *Eee, honto desu kaa?*
　　　　 'Eh, really?'
　　 FH: *Honto, honto.*
　　　　 'That's true.'
→　 FL: ***Hee, sensee demo soo nan daa.***
　　　　 'Hmm, even teachers have trouble with it.'

(16) FL: *Kore, saikin kekkoo hayatterun desu.*
　　　　 'These [a pair of gloves] are kind of popular now-a-days.'
→　 FH: ***Ara, kawaii.*** *Doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.*
　　　　 'Oh, they're cute. Thank you very much.'
　　 FL: *Ookisa, daijobu desu ka?*
　　　　 'Is the size right?'
　　 FH: *Choodo mitai.*
　　　　 'It looks just right.'
→　 FL: ***Aa, yokatta.***
　　　　 'Oh, good.'

　　 As we have seen, most studies of Japanese speech style shift mention that the utterances in the plain style are interpreted as soliloquy. However, no study, to my knowledge, has investigated the relationship between the plain style and soliloquy in speech style shift. The next section discusses the lexico-grammatical characteristics of soliloquy and explores how soliloquy can serve as an indexical cue to express intimate exaltation.

4. Public vs. private expression

As mentioned in section 1, Japanese provides unique markers for soliloquy so that fluent speakers can easily identify certain utterances as such. This fact is not widely known, and native speakers of English, in which soliloquy is not grammaticized, are sometimes bewildered by soliloquy examples because their English translations might not sound like soliloquy. Although a comprehensive description of the linguistic properties of soliloquy is beyond the scope of the present paper, sections 4 and 5 consider some phenomena relevant to the understanding of soliloquy in the Japanese language. (Shinzato (this volume) provides some grammatical characteristics of soliloquy.)

Hirose (1995) contends that the speaker has two different aspects of self ─ *public* and *private* ─ and that English and Japanese languages differ in the way those aspects are encoded in their lexico-grammatical systems. The public self is the speaker as the subject of communication, facing an addressee or having one in mind. The private self is the speaker as the subject of thinking or consciousness, with no addressee in mind. The public self and private self appear in two different kinds of linguistic expression called *public expression* and *private expression*, respectively. Public expression corresponds to the communicative function of language; private expression corresponds to the non-communicative, thought-expressing function of language. For a discussion of similar distinctions, see Shinzato (this volume).

Public expressions frequently, but not always, include interactional devices, or addressee-oriented elements, e.g. (a) certain sentence-final particles (e.g. *yo* 'I tell you', *ne* 'you know'), (b) directives (e.g. commands, requests, questions), (c) vocative expressions (e.g. *oi* 'hey'), (d) responses (e.g. *hai* 'yes', *iie* 'no'), (e) pragmatic adverbials of various sorts (e.g. *sumimasen ga* 'Excuse me, but', *koko dake no hanashi dakedo* 'it's between you and me'), (f) hearsay expressions (e.g. *(da)sooda/(da)tte* 'I hear'), and (g) addressee honorifics (e.g. *desu/masu*). Addressee-oriented words or phrases appear exclusively in public expressions; conversely, sentences containing addressee-oriented items are public expressions. On the other hand, for Hirose, sentences that lack addressee-oriented items can be either public or private. When the speaker intends to communicate with another person, the expression is public; otherwise, it is private.

While public expressions involve communicative intention, private expressions correspond to mental states. In Japanese, mental states are typically described by verbs like *omou* 'think'. *Omou* and other mental-state verbs can take as their complement a reported clause marked by the quotative particle *to*. Descriptions of what one thinks, believes, doubts, or wishes are necessarily private expressions, and mental-state verbs allow only a private expression as their reported-clause complement. In the following examples, taken from Hasegawa and Hirose (2005), angle brackets represent a private expression, and square brackets represent a public expression.

(17) a. *Haruo wa*   <$_{Priv}$ *ame*   *ni chigainai*>   *to*   *omotte-iru.*
          TOP   rain   must   QUOT   is.thinking
          'Haruo thinks it must be raining.'

     b. *Haruo wa*   <$_{Priv}$ *ame*   *daroo*>   *to omotte-iru.*
                             will
          'Haruo thinks it will be raining.'

(18) a.   *#Haruo wa*   [$_{Pub}$ *ame   da   **yo***   ]   *to omotte-iru.*
                              be I.tell.you
         'Haruo thinks "It's raining, I tell you."'   [Intended]
     b.   *#Haruo wa*   [$_{Pub}$ *ame   **desu***]   *to omotte-iru.*
                              is(AH)
         'Haruo thinks politely "It's raining."'   [Intended]

The sentences in (17) contain a private expression as their reported clause, which in turn includes a modal expression representing a mental state of certainty or conjecture. In (18), on the other hand, the items in bold-italic are addressee-oriented expressions, making the whole reported clauses public expressions. Because the public expression cannot be a complement of mental-state verbs, (18a-b) are anomalous.

Unlike mental-state verbs, utterance verbs such as *iu* 'say' allow either a public or private expression as their reported clause. The reported clauses in (19) are public expressions, considered direct discourse.

(19) a.   *Haruo wa Natsuko ni* [$_{Pub}$ *ame   da   yo*   ]   *to*   *itta.*
                                 to   is   I.tell.you   QUOT   said
         'Haruo said to Natsuko, "It's raining, I tell you."'
     b.   *Haruo wa Natsuko ni*   [$_{Pub}$ *ame   desu*]   *to itta.*
                                        is(AH)
         'Haruo politely said to Natsuko, "It's raining."'

Haruo's belief that it is raining in (19) can also be reported as private expression, using indirect discourse, as in (20):

(20) *Haruo wa Natsuko ni* <$_{Priv}$ *ame da*> *to itta.*
     'Haruo told Natsuko that it was raining.'

Japanese has a distinct word for the private self, viz. the reflexive pronoun *jibun* 'self', but it lacks a designated word for the public self (Hirose 1995). The public self is referred to by various words of self-reference, such as *atashi* (female-casual), *boku* (male-casual), *ore* (male-casual/vulgar), *watakushi* (super formal), *watashi* (male-formal or female-formal/informal), or role names, such as *okaasan* 'mother', and *sensee* 'teacher', depending on the communicative situation. By contrast, English has the designated word 'I' for the public self, but it lacks a special word for the private self. The private self in English is referred to by different personal pronouns, depending on gender and person, as shown in (21).

(21) a.   *Watashi wa* <$_{Priv}$ ***jibun***   *wa*   *oyogenai* >   *to*   *itta.*
          I   TOP   self   TOP   swim.can't   QUOT   said
          'I said that *I* can't swim.'
     b.   *Kimi wa* <$_{Priv}$ ***jibun*** *wa oyogenai*> *to itta.*
          you
          'You said that *you* can't swim.'

c. *Zyon/Marii wa _{Priv} **jibun** wa oyogenai> to itta.*
   John/Mary
   '{John/Mary}$_i$ said that *{he/she}$_i$* can't swim.'

Metaphorically, the private self represented by *jibun* is the *naked* self, whereas various words of self-reference ― e.g. *boku, watashi, okaasan* 'mother', and *sensee* 'teacher' ― are diverse *clothes* for the private self to wear in public.
   It is worth pointing out that *jibun* can also be used to refer to the public self, as in (22):

(22) **Jibun** wa sono koto   ni tsuite   wa   nanimo   shiri-masen.
     self   TOP that   matter about   TOP anything know.not(AH)
     'I don't know anything about that matter.'

Because the addressee honorific *-masen* is used, (22) must be a public expression, and yet the use of *jibun* is acceptable. This marked use of *jibun* carries an unusual tone: it is as if the speaker is appearing in public without clothes. Thus, just as it is indecorous to appear naked in public, so the use of *jibun* to refer to the public self sounds peculiar. In fact, examples like (22) remind many Japanese of the military where soldiers are talking to their superiors, or of sports clubs where junior (= inferior) male members are talking to their senior (= superior) members. Probably in these situations it is tacitly assumed that one must show one's real self to one's superior or senior, to whom absolute loyalty is expected.

5. Soliloquy in a dialogue

Let us now return to the discussion of soliloquy in the polite style of dialogue. Soliloquy employs only private expressions and normally lacks an overt grammatical subject. If a subject is overtly present, it frequently lacks *wa* (topic marker) or *ga* (nominative marker), e.g. (23).

(23) *ano   hito   daijobu   kana.*
     that   person all.right   EP
     'I wonder if that person is all right.'

It was mentioned earlier that addressee-oriented elements, or interactional devices, can appear only in public expressions, and that if an utterance contains an addressee-oriented item, it is a public expression. However, also mentioned was the fact that the lack of addressee-oriented expressions does not guarantee that the utterance is private, for public expressions need not include interactional items. Are there positive indicators of private expression? The answer is yes. The so-called exclamatory interjections (EI, e.g. *waa, maa, hee, huun*) and exclamatory sentence-final particles (EP, e.g. *naa, kana, ya*) are used exclusively in private expressions. These expressions should be familiar by now because they have appeared repeatedly in the examples in this paper. Additional examples are provided below.

(24) a. *waa   sugoi.*
        EI   great
        'That's great.'

    b.   *honto   kanaa.*
       true   EP
       'It may not be true.'
    c.   *maa ii   ya.*
       EI   okay   EP
       '(reluctantly) This'll do …'

The effect of soliloquy seems analogous to the effect of *jibun* in a public expression conceived by members of certain circles. Soliloquy supposedly expresses one's private thoughts, and revealing one's private thoughts is to be interpreted as a sign of trust, loyalty, or psychological closeness.

It should be noted that not all soliloquy utterances can serve to express intimate exaltation. The addressee's territory of information (Kamio 1994) must strictly be honored. Thus, soliloquy for this purpose is limited to information that falls completely within the speaker's territory and not in the least within the addressee's territory. Typically, the content of soliloquy refers to the speaker's mental state, e.g. (24a). Naturally, an utterance like (24b) that doubts the addressee's previous statement does not serve to this end, nor do sulky remarks, e.g. (24c).

The function of soliloquy as an index of intimate exaltation strongly supports the analysis of indirect mapping between linguistic expressions and social meanings. Ochs (1993) considers that affective stances, social acts, and social activities are direct indices, whereas gender and social relations are indirect. She explains, for example, that such sentence-final particles as *ze* and *wa* in Japanese *directly* index affective stances of coarse versus delicate intensity, which in turn *indirectly* index gender and gender images of masculinity and femininity, respectively (ibid.: 150-151). The grammar of soliloquy is yet to be investigated thoroughly, but it appears that soliloquy has indexing potential slightly different from those applying to dialogues. For example, like *ze*, the final particle *zo* is commonly attributed to male speech in dialogues, but in soliloquy women can use it without exerting masculinity, e.g. *gambaru zo!* 'I'll make it!', *makenai zo!* 'I won't be defeated!' It only indexes coarse intensity, as Ochs contends. (Being interactional, *ze* cannot be used in soliloquy.)

Recognition of a particular indexical meaning need not be based on a single linguistic expression; rather, it is more likely dependent on such an expression in relation to its cotext and context. What is relevant to the strategy at hand is not soliloquy per se, but rather its appearance as speech style shift. Furthermore, a set of linguistic expressions more likely index a multiplicity of socio-cultural dimensions (Ochs 1996). It cannot be presupposed that certain linguistic features *always* index certain socio-cultural meanings. Notice, in this light, that the plain speech style indexes not only the affective dimensions and, in turn, a (positive) polite attitude, but it can also index the soliloquy mode of discourse so long as it does not contain any interactional devices. Therefore, this intimate exaltation strategy is rather a natural consequence of the multiple indexical potential of the plain speech style.

Pizziconi (2003: 1497) argues that "the constitution of social identities and affective stances can be carried out via a multitude of typically and non-typically 'polite' devices … but also typically 'polite' devices such as honorifics neither uniquely nor directly index politeness." Although it is valid to say that a one-to-one correspondence does not exist between honorifics and politeness, *a unidirectional link does exist*. That is, while the use of addressee honorifics does not necessarily index deference, *deference cannot be expressed without addressee honorifics*. This constraint appears to demand the dialogue-soliloquy bimodal discourse. The

speaker employs the polite style, which conventionally indexes both affective stances of deference and distancing. S/he then wishes to express intimacy by decreasing distance. To this end, s/he cannot switch to the plain style because such a shift necessarily disclaims deference. Faced with this dilemma, the speaker would temporarily quit the on-going dialogic discourse and switch to soliloquy.

Compare such a move with N. Okamoto's elementary-school classroom examples cited as (6) and (7) in section 3. There, we observed a mixture of polite and plain styles, but the mode of discourse is fixed at dialogic, providing an example of a speech style shift *proper*, indexing a change in one's social identity, from a teacher role to a private person. However, the mixture of the polite and plain styles as an index of intimate exaltation is, strictly speaking, not a speech style shift, but a metapragmatic shift between two modes of discourse. As such, this strategy has idiosyncratic peculiarity. Recall Maynard's (1991) characterization of the plain style presented in section 3. She convincingly argues that the plain style marks the speaker's *low awareness of the addressee* as a separate and potentially opposing entity. In the soliloquy strategy, however, the plain style is selected with *high awareness of the addressee*, rejecting Maynard's generalization at the surface level. This fact supports the claim that the soliloquy strategy is operative on a different, metapragmatic ground.

6.   Conclusions

In Japanese, where linguistic politeness has been grammaticized, indexicality between the form and socio-cultural significances in the politeness phenomenon is more tightly fixed than in languages that do not have an honorific system. Deference and distancing are predominantly associated together, which causes a dilemma to its users when they desire to express intimate exaltation. Reviewing recent works in the area of speech style shift in Japanese, the present paper has shown that insertion of soliloquy is commonly used to index these two affective stances simultaneously, and it has discussed the rationale and motivation behind such a strategy. It is significant that Japanese has also grammaticized the soliloquy mode of discourse to a considerable extent, allowing it to contain only private expressions, frequently with exclamatory interjections and/or exclamatory particles. This strategy appears to be evoked by the idea that revealing one's inner thoughts is supposed to be based on trust and psychological closeness, the same reasoning also motivating the use of *jibun* 'self' in public expressions. Because such parenthetical soliloquy is embedded but detached from the dialogic mode of communication, the speaker is able to avoid the risk of changing the speech style from polite to plain, the latter risking being considered disrespectful.

References

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1978/1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hasegawa, Y. 2004. "Speech-style shifts and intimate exaltation in Japanese." *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, University of Chicago, 269-284.

Hasegawa, Y. and Hirose, Y. 2005. "What the Japanese language tells us about the alleged Japanese collectivism." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25: 219-251.

Hill, B. Ide, S. Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A. and Ogino, T. 1986. "Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English." *Journal of Pragmatics* 10: 347-371.

Hirose, Y. 1995. "Direct and indirect speech as quotations of public and private expression." *Lingua* 95: 223-238.

Ide, S. 1991. "How and why do women speak more politely in Japanese?" In *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language*, S. Ide and N. McGloin (eds.), 63-79. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Ikuta, S. 1983. "Speech level shift and conversational strategy in Japanese discourse." *Language Sciences* 5: 37-53.

Kamio, A. 1994. "The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese." *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 67-100.

Lakoff, R. T. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.

Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London/New York: Longman.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics: 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matsumura, Y. and Chinami, K. 1998. "Nihongo danwa ni okeru sutairu kootai no jittai to sono kooka." *Gengokagaku* 33: 109-118.

Maynard, S. 1991. "Pragmatics of discourse modality: A case of *da* and *desu/masu* forms in Japanese." *Journal of Pragmatics* 15: 551-582.

Neustupný, J. V. 1982. *Gaikokujin to no komyunikeeshon*. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Ochs, E. 1993. "Indexing gender." In *Sex and Gender Hierarchies*, B. Miller (ed.), 146-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. 1996. "Linguistic resources for socializing humanity." In *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity,* J. Gumperz and S. Levinson (eds.), 407-437. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Okamoto, N. 1997. "Kyooshitsu-danwa ni okeru buntai-shifuto no shihyooteki kinoo: Teineitai to futsuutai no tsukaiwake." *Nihongogaku* 16: 39-51.

Okamoto, S. 1997. "Social context, linguistic ideology, and indexical expressions in Japanese." *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 795-817.

Okamoto, S. 1999. "Situated politeness: Coordinating honorific and non-honorific expressions in Japanese conversations." *Pragmatics* 9: 51-74.

Pizziconi, B. 2003. "Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1471-1506.

Sell, R. 1992. "Literary texts and diachronic aspects of politeness." In *Politeness in Language: Studies in Its History, Theory, and Practice*, R. Watts, S. Ide and K. Ehlich (eds.), 109-129. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Shinzato, R. this volume. "Subjectivity, intersubjectivity, and grammaticalization."

Suckle, R. 1994. "Uchi/soto: choices in directive speech acts in Japanese." In *Situated Meaning: Inside and Outside in Japanese Self, Society, and Language*, J. Bachnik and C. Quinn (eds.), 114-142. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Suzuki, M. 1997. "Nihongo-kyooiku ni okeru teineitai-sekai to futsuutai-sekai." In *Shiten to Gengo-koodoo*, Y. Takubo (ed.), 45-76. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Usami, M. 1995. "Danwa-reberu kara mita keigo shiyoo: supiichi-reberu-shifuto seiki no jooken to kinoo (Conditions for speech-level shift occurrence in Japanese discourse)." *Gakuen* 662: 27-42. Tokyo: Showa Women's University Kindai Bunka Kenkyujo.

Watts, R. 1992. "Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality." In *Politeness in Language: Studies in Its History, Theory, and Practice*, R. Watts, S. Ide and K. Ehlich (eds.), 43-70. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.