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Soliloquy and linguistic politeness

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter 1, we considered Vygotsky’s (1934/1986) theory of language acquisition. It contends that children first learn language as a means of communication. Although a young child’s private speech may sound like autistic soliloquy because it is frequently incomprehensible to a listener (as Piaget (1923/2002) had claimed), this failure to communicate is attributed to the child’s inability to consider other people’s perspectives, rather than because such speech is intended for one’s own self. Therefore, when the child is surrounded by a group of deaf and mute children or children who do not speak his/her native language, the amount of the child’s private speech will diminish drastically. Eventually, as the child grows, s/he starts to distinguish speech for oneself (i.e. for thinking) from speech for others, normally during the early school years.

Once the child has acquired genuine soliloquy for thinking, it is plausible that s/he will ultimately discover its special uses in communication with other people. That is, the child learns to manifest his/her thought without telling the interlocutor, because this mode of communication is often adequate to accomplish one’s communicative goals. And soon the child learns that under certain circumstances this way of communicating is even more efficient than addressing one’s intentions forthrightly, because cooperative interlocutors would likely infer what the child wants to accomplish. This chapter investigates one such special use of soliloquy, viz. as it pertains to the phenomenon of politeness in Japanese.¹

The organization of this chapter is as follows: Sections 5.2 outlines the Japanese honorific system, which targets two different entities, referents and addressees. Section 5.3 provides a brief discussion and clarification of some pertinent concepts of linguistic politeness in Japanese. Section 5.4 summarizes several major works on the so-called 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

¹. The use of soliloquy in conversation has been studied by Washi (1997) and Noda (2006), as introduced in Chapter 1, Section 1.3.
tone of deference. Section 5.5 explores the morphosyntactic characteristics of soliloquy. Section 5.6 delves into the use of soliloquy in dialogic discourse and examines how it simultaneously indexes intimacy and deference. Section 5.7 concludes the chapter.

5.2 The Japanese honorific system

The Japanese honorific system consists of two orthogonal dimensions: *addressee honorifics* regard the addressee in the speech situation, and *referent honorifics* regard the referent of linguistic expressions. When addressee honorifics are employed, the resultant speech is commonly recognized as being in the polite style/form (or desu-masu style); otherwise, it is considered to be in the plain style/form. Referent honorifics are further divided into *exalting expressions* (used for other persons), e.g. *irassharu* ‘go’, and *humbling expressions* (used for oneself), e.g. *mairu* ‘go’. In this study, humbling expressions are not considered.

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

(1) a. [+AH; +RH] (polite style)
   Tanaka-san ga irasshaimashita.
   ‘Ms. Tanaka has arrived.’

b. [+AH; –RH] (polite style)
   Tanaka-san ga ki-mashita.
   come-PAST (AH)

b. [–AH; +RH] (plain style)
   Tanaka-san ga irashita.
   come (RH)-PAST

d. [–AH; –RH] (plain style)
   Tanaka-san ga ki-ta.
   come-PAST

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. 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. (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, which will be discussed shortly.) For (i), the use of the polite style is the norm; for (ii), the use of the plain style is. In the (B) situation in Table 1, where the speaker considers the addressee psychologically distant but exaltation superfluous, the plain style is normally used, and the speech may sound vulgar or too informal, e.g. (2).

Table 1. Categorization of addressees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>Distant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exalted</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(i) Polite Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exalted</td>
<td>(ii) Plain Style</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. It is not the case that the polite style consists merely of an addition of an addressee honorific to the plain style, as the examples in (1) might suggest. These two styles are governed by different discourse 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 agen nasu*, is customarily unacceptable because *ageru* is closer to the meaning of ‘to donate, to bestow, to make a present of’ than ‘to give’ in English, i.e. someone who is well off gives something to an unfortunate one. Therefore its use is inappropriate in polite utterances.

3. 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.
5.3 Some remarks on honorifics

5.3.1 Honorifics as an indication of refinement

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 18th and 19th century Western society, however, linguistic politeness was not correlated with a consideration for or deference toward other individuals (Watts 1992). “Politeness” meant “prudence,” inextricably linked to social class and sociopolitical 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 (3), 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, with no addressee honorifics.

(3)  *Ashita irassharu?* (plain style)

‘Will you come tomorrow?’

This seemingly inconsistent [–AH, +RH] combination regarding the same individual is commonly associated with so-called women’s language (cf. Chapter 4). It indexes the affective stance of the speaker: she considers the addressee psychologically close [–AH], but nevertheless prefers to apply a referent honorific to show her linguistic refinement. (The opposite combination, *Ashita kimasu?* [+AH, –RH] does not have the same effect; for many, it merely sounds less polite than (3), and it can be used by male speakers as well.)

5.3.2 Honorifics as an indication of distance

Another matter requiring our awareness is that the use of honorifics is not automatically coterminous with polite behavior. That is, there is no direct indexability between honorifics and polite intentions (for a discussion of indexicality, see Chapter 4, Section 4.5). Honorifics can be used in a courteous way 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. genuine friendliness, camaraderie, intimacy, etc.

Nevertheless, it is crucial to note that, in Japanese, *deference cannot be expressed without employing the polite style*. For example, *Dare da ‘Who are you?* (plain style)” in (2a) cannot convey the speaker’s intention of deference in any circumstance. This fact would indirectly 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,” although the reality is far more complex than that might seem.

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.’ In many interpersonal relationships, people gradually shift their speech style from polite to plain as they become familiar with each other. However, in certain types of relationships, becoming intimate is inappropriate and discouraged, based on the belief that intimacy might weaken one’s ability to judge rightfully, make 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 and close acquaintances when there is no difference in rank, or even when the speaker is of higher rank than the addressee, especially in occupational relationships.

5.3.3 Honorifics as an indication of a social role

To associate *desu/masu* with politeness and/or formality exclusively appears an oversimplification because the style’s full range of utility cannot be accounted for, e.g. its use by parent to child (Cook 2008). Consider the interaction in (4) among a father (F), a mother (M), and a two-year-old girl (C), in this slightly modified description taken from Cook (2008: 54).

(4)  C:  ((Picks up a noodle from her bowl with her left hand and holds it up toward F))

F:  *Toosan iranai.*  ((Turns away his hand))

father need-not

‘I don’t want it.’

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, pc). 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.
Adapting Elinor Ochs’ (1993, 1996) work (cf. Chapter 4, Section 4.5), Cook employs as the underpinning of her analysis a two-step model of indexical relationships. In it, linguistic expressions directly index particular acts (goal-oriented behavior) as well as affective and epistemic stances, while indirectly indexing activities (sequences of acts) and social identity. Cook argues that the desu-masu form directly indexes a self-presentational stance, defined as an affective stance of displaying one’s positive social role to other individuals (the attitude described as shisei o tadasu ‘to hold oneself up’ or kichin to suru ‘to do something neatly’) when one is literally or figuratively ‘on stage’ (p. 46). (This idea is similar, if not identical, to the use for kejime, as discussed above.) It then indirectly indexes politeness, which is highlighted when used in out-group contexts, where polite behavior is expected. By contrast, in the in-group context (e.g. within the family), a display of the self-presentational stance foregrounds the speaker’s social identities related to responsibilities in the group (pp. 47–48). Therefore, parents tend to switch from the plain to the desu-masu form when teaching children, doing household chores, and cooking and serving food. The parental practice, through the use of the desu-masu form, of showing how and when to present one’s various social identities is part of socializing children (p. 62).

In the soliloquy experiment, the subjects were explicitly instructed not to speak to an imaginary addressee, resulting in addressee honorifics being rarely utilized: only 23 instances in a corpus of 3,042 utterances. Cook’s analysis can account for most occurrences of desu/masu, e.g.:

(5) 5-gatsu 24-ka gogo 2-ji desu to.
May 24th P.M. 2-o’clock cop (AH) quot
Hitorigoto-te iwaretemo naa. Fudan hitorigoto
soliloquy-quot be-said-to sfp usually soliloquy

Maynard (1996:208–209) contends:

“Speakers assume different character roles as they interact according to a context which the speakers themselves help create. When assuming the voice of a character, the speakers are capable of echoing multiple voices manipulated through … quotation strategies. … what motivates the speaker to self-quote is a desire to manipulate a broader range of expressiveness in interaction. More concretely, self-quotations facilitate discourse functions such as dramatization and distancing. Self-quotations also serve to qualify speech acts as it mitigates, parodies, and/or emphasizes the act of saying itself.”

In (5), the framing situation is in the soliloquy mode, but, unlike standard quotations, the quoted situation here does not consist of the subject’s utterance that was addressed to an interlocutor in another speech situation. Rather, it represents the speaker’s internal thought (i.e. determination). Cook’s characterization of desu/masu as an indication of the self-presentational stance of shisei o tadasu ‘to hold oneself up’ straightforwardly explains the motivation for the use of addressee honorifics in this case.

5.3.4 Strategies for intimate exaltation

While it is difficult to acknowledge that some societies and communities value impoliteness, it is easily imaginable that some prefer friendliness to deference – positive politeness to negative politeness, respectively, in Brown and Levinson’s (1978/1987) terms – while others prefer deference to friendliness. American society commonly exemplifies the former, while, in general, Japanese society the latter. But friendliness
and politeness are not mutually exclusive, and skillful language users employ various techniques to mix them. In fact, both negative politeness and positive politeness are frequently expressed simultaneously in conversations (Hasegawa 2008), e.g.:

(6) a. Aki-chan, itsumo itsumo tanonde bakkari de gomen
always request only sorry
ne. Demo kooyuu kototte Aki-chan
sfp but this-kind-of thing-quot
igai, chotto tanomenain da yone. Sorede, ...
other-than a-little cannot-request cop sfp so
'Aki, I'm awfully sorry to ask you to do favors for me all the time, but I don't have anyone else. So …'

b. Kondo no kooshoo wa, nankoo ga this-time GEN negotiation TOP difficulty NOM
yosoku sareruu desu yone. Sokode, yyuben de, can-be-anticipated cop sfp then eloquent
katsu kado ga tatanai kata to naru to, yahari and civil person if as-expected
Yamada-san de wa nai ka to ...
cop TOP not Q quot
'We expect problems with our next negotiation. So, we need someone who is effective but civil. So, as you know, it ought to be Yamada-san …'

In the first sentence in (6a), the use of the plain form as well as the hypocoristic -chan indexes the speaker’s desire to display positive politeness (intimacy). By contrast, its semantic content indexes negative politeness, viz., apologizing for intrusion. In (6b), the use of honorifics and kata ‘person (honorific variation)’ indexes negative politeness (distancing), but the content aims at positive politeness, viz., praising Yamada’s tactfulness. Mixing positive and negative politeness strategies is normal in Japanese.

Some anecdotal examples can illustrate the failure of comfortable communication that can be caused by different and variant expectations regarding linguistic politeness. Due to the large number of Japanese tourists in San Francisco, many business establishments there employ Japanese women who have lived in the United States for some time. These women tend to use positive politeness strategies more frequently than do most Japanese people living in Japan, e.g. (7) (both in the plain style).6

(7) a. Kore, ima seeru nano yo.
this now sale cop sfp
‘This is on sale now.’

b. Aru ka mo shirenai kara, mite kite ageru.
exist might-be because see come give
‘There may be more in stock, so I’ll go check for you.’

The speakers of (7) might assume that, from a salesperson, friendliness should be valued more than deference because customers then can expect genuine trustworthy advice such as they might receive from friends. However, many Japanese tourist-visitors do not consider the speech style of this particular group to meet the politeness level expected from salespersons. Similarly, expectations regarding linguistic politeness also vary within a single society; some speakers feel more comfortable with the polite style, while others prefer the plain style (cf. S. Okamoto 1997, 1999).

In general, honorifics index a sense of deference, but they carry the risk of being interpreted as unfriendly, standoffish, or rejecting. The plain style could be interpreted as conveying one’s trustworthiness such as they might receive from friends. However, many Japanese tourist-visitors do not consider the speech style of this particular group to meet the politeness level expected from salespersons. Similarly, expectations regarding linguistic politeness also vary within a single society; some speakers feel more comfortable with the polite style, while others prefer the plain style (cf. S. Okamoto 1997, 1999).

For example, in many graduate schools in the United States, students normally address professors by their first names. In Japan, this practice is unthinkable. Therefore, if a professor is a native speaker of Japanese, students from Japan find themselves in a dilemma. They cannot address me, for example, as Yoko, which would clearly indicate their incompetence as mature speakers of Japanese. But calling me Hasegawa-sensei ‘teacher Hasegawa’, as in Japan, sounds stiff and obedient, and it would be considered rather peculiar behavior in many American academic institutions. Therefore, many of my students address me as Yoko-sensei in an attempt to express both deference and intimacy. The use of the given name followed by sensei is not novel, but in Japan, it is generally restricted to kindergarten teachers or teachers of arts and crafts or music.

Another strategy I have recognized, outside of the graduate school context, is the frequent use of ja nai desu ka ‘isn’t it the case, as you know’:

(8) a. Watashi-tte kooyuu no ni yowai
I-quot this-kind-of thing to weak
ja nai desu ka.
‘I’m obsessed by things like this, as you know.’
b. Yatto kakoo to omou to kanarazu
finally write (com) think always
nanika okoru ja nai desu ka.
something occur

‘When I decide to write, something always happens, as you know.’

The use of ja nai desu ka in the speech of young people has given rise recently to public censure as evidenced in many Internet blogs addressing this phenomenon. Most are negative, criticizing the users of the phrase for imposing one’s opinion on others. (For other uses of janai desu ka, see Ishii 1998). However, this sense of imposition can be understood as an indication of closeness and intimacy. By framing this rather imposing expression with the addressee honorific desu ka, one attempts to convey both intimacy and deference.

There must be other subtle strategies of this kind. Nevertheless, the most versatile device to achieve the goal of conveying deference and intimacy simultaneously is a mixture of polite and plain styles, which is commonly referred to as speech style shift. It is also referred to as speech level shift, reflecting the traditional conception of the polite (higher) and plain (lower) hierarchy, which is not always applicable. This study, therefore, prefers the term speech style shift to avoid the notion of hierarchy.

5.4 Speech style shift

Researchers have recognized that selection of speech style not only reflects the social relationships between interlocutors, but that it also constructs such relationships. Thus, style in linguistic interaction is dynamic, varying with changed and evolved relationships. For example, it is observable that unfamiliar interlocutors start their conversation with the polite style, and, as they become more familiar with each other, switch gradually to the plain style. Or, that fairly familiar interlocutors who habitually use the plain style may switch to the polite style when the conversation topic becomes grave (e.g. a death, divorce, or dispute).

Although speech styles can shift back and forth during even a single span of discourse, such shifts are by no means arbitrarily made. Thus, communication can be disturbed when an unskilled person makes such a shift. In fact, different strategies are required when a superior interlocutor initiates a polite-to-plain shift as opposed to an inferior’s doing so (Neustupný 1982). This section summarizes several works on the topic of speech-style shift.

In her pioneering work, Ikuta (1983) points out that the previously proposed analyses, which claim the polite style is an indicator of politeness or formalness, are inadequate because they cannot account for speech style shifts in a conversation in which social and situational conditions remain constant. Instead, she characterizes the basic function of the polite style as distancing; the speech styles are used to express whether the speaker considers the addressee “close” or “distant.” 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 may take place, reflecting the speaker’s empathy with the addressee at a particular point within the conversation. She claims that in general empathy is expected when the speaker shows strong agreement, positively evaluating a preceding statement, or when the speaker shows admiration. For example, in the following conversation between two female speakers, the polite style is utilized in (9a, b), but (9c) is in the plain style (the translations are Ikuta’s).

(9) a. K: Sono oheya wa koshitsu ni natte irun desu ka?
that room top private-room set-to-be cop q
‘Is your apartment designed for a single person?’

b. J: Ee, rokujoo to yoojoohan to sanruumu ga
yes 6-mats and 4.5-mats and sunroom nom
taihen hiroin desu no.
very large cop sfp
‘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 very good nmiz sfp
‘Oh, that’s very nice.’

On the other hand, Ikuta contends, empathy is avoided (i.e. distancing is expected) when the topic turns out to be a very private or sensitive matter. For example, the utterances preceding (10) were in the plain style, as the interlocutors had become relaxed and spoke freely. Then, K suddenly switched back to the polite style in Shitsuree desu kedo ‘Excuse me, but.

7. Ikuta (1983) also argues that speech style shift is used to indicate not only social and attitudinal distance but also distance in coherence and the hierarchical positioning of utterances in discourse. For example, she observes that in one conversation, the utterances directly addressing the main topic are in [+distance], whereas those for illustrative instances are in [−distance] (p. 47). Although highly insightful, this part of Ikuta’s analysis is not directly relevant to the topic of the present study and, therefore, will not be discussed further.
(10) → K: Shitsuree desu kedo, Joo-san wa zutto dokushin excuse-me always single
de irasharu no? cop (RH) sfp
‘Excuse me, but have you always been single?’
J: Iie, ano ne, nido oyome ni itta no. well twice married sfp
‘No, you know; I married twice.’
K: Ara, soo nan desu ka. oh so cop q
‘Oh, is that so.’

Ikuta explains that asking the interlocutor for her marital history is highly personal, so K employs the polite style as the ritual required before embarking on such a question. The balance of the utterance by K is in the plain style, which could also have been in the polite style, Joo-san wa zutto dokushin de irasharan desu ka ‘have you always been single?’ Ikuta, however, contends that maintaining the polite style (i.e. distancing) throughout this utterance would have made J more reluctant to speak without reservation. Therefore, K dexterously returns to the plain style in order to make J comfortable.

While Ikuta’s work with her 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 addressee. Waa, tottemo niau yo ‘That suits you very well’ (with the addressee-oriented particle yo) is unacceptable, whereas Waa, tottemo niau (which can be interpreted as soliloquy) is acceptable. Ikuta’s analysis cannot account for this difference.

Maynard (1991:577–578) characterizes speech-style shift from a different perspective. She observes that in a 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 seen internally as though the speaker were present, (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 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

---

8. Irasharu no? in (10) exhibits the [–AH, +RH] strategy for the same individual discussed in Section 5.2.

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 (11) and (12), 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 explicate the girl’s feelings at that time. The following represents the teacher’s utterances.

(11) Hai, dawa, enpitsu oite kudasai. well then pencil put-down please
‘Well, then, put down your pencils.’
Sorede, mada kakete tochuu de and yet if-not-finished-writing on-the-way
ki ga tsuitara ne, happyoo sureba in desu kara if-realize intj present if-do good cop because ne. li desu ka.
sfp good cop q
‘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 hipatta tokoro kata well then first intj line acc drew place from happyoo shite moraimasu. present receive
‘Well, first, please recite from the places you underlined.’
Hai, jaa, sen hippatta hito, te o agete kudasai. yes then line draw person hand acc raise give ‘Those of you who have underlined something, raise your hands.’
((After wiping away her perspiration))
→ Atsusa ni nakezu ni ganbaru ne. heat dat not-lose work-hard sfp
‘Let’s not let the heat get (the better of) us!’
Hai, jaa, Miya Yutaka-san, onegai shimasu. yes then please
‘All right, Yutaka Miya-san, please tell us your results.’
In (11), the teacher’s utterances are all in the polite style, except *Atsusa ni mak-ezu ni gambaroo ne* ‘Let’s not let the heat get (the better of) us!’ which should be taken as her personal and friendly encouragement, rather than a routine classroom direction.

In (12) below, Yosie 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.

(12) Y: *Hai, watashi wa “musunde kureta no desu” to iu place loc gen cop quot top tie gave cop quot nokoro ni sen o hikimashita. ‘Okay, I underlined “they tied it.”’

T: “Musunde kureta” no to, tokoro desu ka? tie gave gen place cop q ‘You underlined “they tied it”? ’

Y: *Hai. ’

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, um a little more once say give ima itta tokoro. ‘Um, well, Kazuhiro-kun, tell Ikuma-san again what you just said.’*

(13) Reduction of psychological distance (Two females with equal status)

A: *Ringuistikku desu ka? Gozenmon wa. linguistics cop q specialization top ‘Is linguistics your specialization?’

B: *Ejukeeshon desu ne, koko wa. education cop sfp here top ‘It’s education here.’*

→ *Jibun ga koko ni iru no ga wakaranai. (laugh)) self nom here loc exist nmlz nom not-understand ‘I don’t understand why I’m here.’*

(14) Matching the other’s speech style (Two females with equal status)

A: *Sochira wa nagain desu ka? there top long cop q ‘Have you been there a long time?’

B: *U. Mass Boston de MA o totte, de, kyonen kara koko. loc acc got and last-year since here ‘I got an MA from U. Mass Boston, and I’ve been here since last year.’*

→ A: *Aa soo. ‘Oh, really?’*

(15) Soliloquy (Lower status female to higher status female)

L: *Watashi no gakubu wa eebee, I also department top English-American eegogaku, eebee, n? English Linguistics English-American umm ‘I’m also majoring in English-American Literature, English Linguistics, English-American ...’*
interlocutor is not always encouraged to use a plain style even when the other has made a shift. Next, whether confirmation, as in (16), and incomplete sentences, as in (17), form distinct categories is questionable because all of her confirmation examples are also incomplete sentences. 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 highlighted turn in (16) could be completed with an addresssee honorific, as 15 kara 30 pejji 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 (i) to carry on a conversation cooperatively and (ii) to become psychologically closer. The conversation in (18), taken from Matsumura and Chinami, is between Tetsuko Kuroyanagi, a well-known female TV interviewer (the same person as K in Ikuta’s data), and her guest. The guest is explaining how her father reacted when she was born. Matsumura and Chinami consider the interviewer socially superior (H) than the guest (L). Most of the incomplete utterances in their data sound as though they are 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 (18) exemplify incomplete sentences:

(18) L: De, unaretara, onna datta wake desu yo. [snip]  Moreover, when-born girl was ‘And when the baby was born, … it was another girl.’

Sesihita, sono chichi ga byooin ni kuru then that father nom hospital to come maeni, kinjo no hito ni “Mata onna dattan before neighbor dat again female was desute” tte kiite shimatte. I-hear quoted ‘Then, my father heard from a neighbor “It’s another girl” before he came to the hospital.’

H: Ara, iya da. Dooshite kinjo no hito ga oh disagreeable cop why neighbor nom saki ni shittetan deshoo ne. before knew ‘Oh, no! How did the neighbor know first?’

[snip]

L: Soredede, ikkai mo byooin ni mimai nimo konakattan then even-once hospital to visit for came-not ‘So he didn’t visit us at all in the hospital.’
Matsumura and Chinami 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 (18), the superior, H, utters a highly colloquial expression, *arai ya da* ‘Oh, no!’, and so initiate a plain style overtly (rather than employing an incomplete sentence). L infers H’s intention and responds to it by using such informal expressions as *okaasan* ‘Mom’ and the mimetic *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 friendship more than deference. In (19), where L expresses appreciation to H for the present H gave L, 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.

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

Okamoto (1999) also demonstrates 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 (p. 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" (p. 62; the translations here are Okamoto’s). The professor also mixes the plain and polite styles, but, as Okamoto notes, his uses of the plain style are not restricted to soliloquy.

An insertion of soliloquy into a conversation can mitigate the psychological distancing that necessarily accompanies the polite style. The following are typical examples from my conversational data (all by female speakers):

(20) H: Honto ni ego de wa kuroo shimasu.
really English loc top am-troubled
'English is sure a pain in the neck!'

L: Eee, honto desu kaa?
true cop q
'Oh, really?'

H: Honto, honto.
true true
'That's true.'

→ L: Hee, sensee demo soo nan daa.
teacher also same cop
'Hmm, even teachers have trouble with it.'

(21) L: Kore, saikin kekkoo hayatterun desu.
this recently fairly fashionable cop
'These [a pair of gloves] are kind of popular now-a-days.'

→ H: Ara, kawaii. Doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.
oh cute thank-you-very-much
'Oh, they're cute. Thank you very much.'

L: Ookisa, daijobu desu ka?
size all-right cop q
'Is the size right?'

H: Choodo mitai.
just seems
'It looks just right.'

→ L: Aa, yokatta.
oh was-good
'Oh, good.'

We have seen that most studies of Japanese speech style shift include mention that the utterances in the plain style are interpreted as soliloquy. However, the relationship between the plain style and soliloquy in the phenomenon of speech style shift has yet to be investigated. The next section discusses the morphosyntactic characteristics of soliloquy and explores how soliloquy can serve as an indexical cue to express intimate exaltation.

5.5 Morphosyntactic characteristics of soliloquy

Utterances in soliloquy frequently lack an overt grammatical subject, especially when the subject is the speaker, e.g. (22).

(22) a. Kyoo uchi kaettara, nani shiyoo kanai.
today home when-return what do sfp
'What shall (I) do when (I) get home today?'

b. Tegami zenzen kaite nai wa, tegami nanka.
letter at-all write not sfp letter or-alike
'(I) haven't written letters for a long time.'

oh dinner cop soup corn soup look-like
'Oh, (here)'s a dinner. (It) looks like soup, corn soup.'

If a subject is overtly present, it frequently lacks either wa (topic marker) or ga (nominative marker), e.g. (23).

(23) a. Ano hito daijobu kanai.
that person all-right sfp
'I wonder if that person is all right.'

b. A shimekiri itsu da-kke.
oh dead-line when cop-sfp
'Oh, when's the deadline?'

In Chapter 1, Section 1.3.4, Hirose's (1995) and Hasegawa and Hirose's (2005) works were introduced. They divide linguistic expressions into public and private. Public expression corresponds to the communicative function of language, whereas private expression corresponds to the non-communicative, thought-expressing function of language. Public expressions frequently include interactional, addressee-oriented words or phrases, e.g. (a) certain sentence-final particles (e.g. ze 'I tell you'), (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*).

Addresser-oriented elements can appear only in public expressions, so, *ipso facto*, if an utterance contains an addresser-oriented item, it is a public expression. However, the lack of such an expression does not guarantee that the utterance is private, for public expressions need not include interactional items. Are there positive indicators of private expression? Yes, indeed. The so-called exclamatory interjections (EI, e.g. *waa, maa, hoo, huuu*) and exclamatory sentence-final particles (ESFP, e.g. *naa, kana, ya*) are used exclusively in private expressions, which should be familiar by now because they have appeared repeatedly in the examples throughout this book.9 Here are some additional examples:

   *ei* great
   'That's great.'

b. *Honto kanaa.*
   *true* *ESFP*
   'It may not be true.'

c. *Maa ii ya.*
   *ei* okay *ESFP*
   '[Reluctantly] This will do …'

The effect of soliloquy seems analogous to the effect of *jibun* in a public expression conceived by members of certain circles, as discussed in Section 1.3.4. 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. However, it should be noted that not all soliloquial 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).

9. *Ya* can appear in dialogue with a hortative or addressee honorific, e.g. *yameyoo ya* 'let's stop here', *sore wa ikemasen ya* 'you can't do that'. However, such expressions have a distinct flavor. To me, they sound like utterances of elderly male speakers.

### 5.6 Soliloquy as an index of intimate exaltation

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 co-text and context. What is relevant to the strategy at hand is not soliloquy per se, but, instead, its appearance in a dialogue as a speech style shift. Furthermore, a set of linguistic expressions more than likely indexes a multiplicity of sociocultural dimensions (Ochs 1996). Therefore, it cannot be presupposed that certain linguistic features always index certain sociocultural meanings. In light of this, notice that the plain speech style indexes not only the affective dimensions and, in turn, (a) (positive) polite attitude, but that it can also index the soliloquy mode of discourse as long as it does not contain any interactional expressions. This intimate exaltation strategy with soliloquy is rather a natural consequence of the multiple indexical potential of the plain speech style.

To a significant extent, this situation is analogous to that of the historical present tense, whose function has traditionally been characterized as making a narrative dramatic or vivid. The present tense is considered to make an event seem as if it is taking place at the moment of speaking, rather than at some time in the past, and, by describing past (or imaginary) events in the present tense, the narrator can make the hearer(s) relive such an event. However, in conversational narratives, most important events are presented in the past tense (Wolfson 1979:172).10 This fact contradicts the traditional characterization because, if the main function of the historical present were to make the story vivid or more dramatic, it would be more effective and impactful to mark significant events with it.

Wolfson determines that there is nothing special in the present tense itself, and therefore, consideration of the historical present tense in isolation is meaningless. Rather, the significance of historical present use lies in the switching from past to present tense and vice versa in a narrative. Alternation between past and present tenses is a discourse phenomenon that organizes the narrative by creating a division between two events.

As mentioned in Section 5.5, Japanese provides positive indicators of the soliloquy mode of discourse, viz. exclamatory interjections and exclamatory sentence-final particles. However, the most salient cue for the metapragmatic shift from dialogue to soliloquy is a sudden switch from the polite to the plain speech style, giving rise to an implicature. The anticipated implicature is the speaker's desire to convey intimacy while maintaining the overall tone of deference.

10. Schiffrin (1981:60) reports a contradictory observation. The historical present is used more frequently in the climax of a narrative and in the build-up to the climax than in the clauses either preceding the build-up or following the climax.
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 one-to-one correspondence does not exist between honorifics and polite intention, 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 dialogue-soliloquy bimodal discourse. The speaker employs the polite style, which conventionally indexes affective stances of both deference and distancing, and 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 may 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 (11) and (12) in Section 5.4. We observed there a mixture of polite and plain styles, but the mode of discourse was fixed at dialogic, providing an example of a speech style shift proper, indexing a change in one’s social identity, from 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 rather a metapragmatic shift between two modes of discourse. As such, this strategy is idiosyncratic and peculiar. Recall Maynard’s (1991) characterization of the plain style presented in Section 5.4. 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 strategic use of soliloquy for intimate exaltation, however, the plain style is selected with high awareness of the addressee, which is at odds with Maynard’s generalization at the surface level. This fact supports the claim that the soliloquy strategy is operative on a different, metapragmatic ground.

**5.7 Summary**

Linguistic politeness has become a part of Japanese grammar. In its politeness system, indexicality between form and sociocultural significance is more tightly fixed than in languages that do not have such a system. Deference and distancing are associated together. That is, with the use of the polite style, one can convey deference, but an utterance in that style necessarily implies psychological distance. By contrast, with the use of the plain style, one may successfully convey intimacy but risks sacrificing deference. This incompatibility arises because in Japanese, deference cannot be expressed without addressee honorifics, although the use of addressee honorifics does not guarantee the speaker’s affective stance of deference. This limitation in Japanese causes a dilemma for its users when they desire to express intimate exaltation, a not unusual wish.

Reviewing recent works in the area of speech style shift in Japanese, Chapter 5 has shown that insertion of soliloquy is commonly used to index these two affective stances simultaneously. When the speaker cannot switch from the polite to the plain style because such a shift would undesirably cancel deference, a metapragmatic shift from ongoing dialogic discourse to soliloquy is employed as a sophisticated linguistic strategy.

It is significant that, in addition to the discourse constraint that demands that one not invade the addressee’s territory of information, Japanese has grammaticized the soliloquy mode of discourse to a considerable extent. Soliloquy contains only private expressions, frequently with exclamatory interjections and/or exclamatory particles. The strategy of dialogue-soliloquy bimodal discourse appears to be motivated by the idea that revealing one’s inner thoughts is supposed to be based on trust and psychological closeness, the same reasoning that motivates the use of *jiban* ‘self’ in public expressions (cf. Chapter 1, Section 1.3.4). Because such parenthetical soliloquy is embedded but detached from the dialogic mode of communication, the speaker is able to avoid a change of speech style from polite to plain, the latter risking being considered disrespectful.