

Soliloquy in Japanese and English

## *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series (P&BNS)*

*Pragmatics & Beyond New Series* is a continuation of *Pragmatics & Beyond* and its Companion Series. The New Series offers a selection of high quality work covering the full richness of Pragmatics as an interdisciplinary field, within language sciences.

### **Editor**

Anita Fetzer  
University of Würzburg

### **Associate Editor**

Andreas H. Jucker  
University of Zurich

### **Founding Editors**

Jacob L. Mey  
University of Southern  
Denmark

Herman Parret  
Belgian National Science  
Foundation, Universities of  
Louvain and Antwerp

Jef Verschueren  
Belgian National Science  
Foundation,  
University of Antwerp

### **Editorial Board**

Robyn Carston  
University College London

Sachiko Ide  
Japan Women's University

Deborah Schiffrin  
Georgetown University

Thorstein Fretheim  
University of Trondheim

Kuniyoshi Kataoka  
Aichi University

Paul Osamu Takahara  
Kobe City University of  
Foreign Studies

John C. Heritage  
University of California at Los  
Angeles

Miriam A. Locher  
Universität Basel

Sandra A. Thompson  
University of California at  
Santa Barbara

Susan C. Herring  
Indiana University

Srikant Sarangi  
Cardiff University

Teun A. van Dijk  
Universitat Pompeu Fabra,  
Barcelona

Masako K. Hiraga  
St. Paul's (Rikkyo) University

Marina Sbisà  
University of Trieste

Yunxia Zhu  
The University of Queensland

### **Volume 202**

*Soliloquy in Japanese and English*  
by Yoko Hasegawa

## **Soliloquy in Japanese and English**

Yoko Hasegawa

University of California, Berkeley

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hasegawa, Yoko.

Soliloquy in Japanese and English / Yoko Hasegawa.

p. cm. (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, ISSN 0922-842X ; v. 202)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Discourse analysis. 2. Corpora (Linguistics) 3. Japanese language--Discourse analysis.

4. English language--Discourse analysis. I. Title.

P302.H38 2010

495.6'0141--dc22

2010034265

ISBN 978 90 272 5606 5 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 8753 3 (Eb)

© 2010 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands

John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

## Table of contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>IX</b>
CHAPTER 1	
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Soliloquy for linguistic investigation	1
1.2 Private speech	4
1.2.1 Egocentric speech	5
1.2.2 Categories of private speech	9
1.2.3 Crib speech	10
1.2.4 Self-talk	11
1.3 Utility of soliloquy in linguistics research	13
1.3.1 Kuroda (1979/1992)	13
1.3.2 Moriyama (1989)	13
1.3.3 Nitta (1991)	15
1.3.4 Hirose (1995), Hasegawa and Hirose (2005)	17
1.3.5 Tokui (1995)	20
1.3.6 Washi (1997)	23
1.3.7 Moriyama (1997)	24
1.3.8 Shinzato (2004)	25
1.3.9 Noda (2006)	27
1.4 The experiment	29
1.4.1 The data	29
1.4.2 Soliloquy types	34
1.5 Summary	38
CHAPTER 2	
<b>Sentence-final particles</b>	<b>41</b>
2.1 Introduction	41
2.2 Previous studies on <i>ne</i> and <i>yo</i>	42
2.3 The data	46
2.3.1 Utterances without a sentence-final particle	47
2.3.2 Frequencies and examples of sentence-final particles	49

2.4 Data analysis	55		
2.4.1 <i>Ne</i>	55		
2.4.2 <i>Yo</i>	61		
2.5 Acquisition of <i>ne</i>	65		
2.6 The discrepancy in frequency between <i>ne</i> and <i>yo</i>	68		
2.7 Summary	70		
CHAPTER 3			
<b>Deixis and anaphora</b>		73	
3.1 <i>Ko-so-a</i> : The Japanese demonstratives	73		
3.1.1 Deixis, anaphora, and demonstratives	73		
3.1.2 Deictic use of demonstratives	74		
3.1.3 Anaphoric use of demonstratives	76		
3.2 <i>Ko-so-a</i> in the soliloquy data	80		
3.2.1 Non-deictic, non-anaphoric uses of <i>ko-so-a</i>	80		
3.2.2 <i>Ko</i> -series	81		
3.2.3 <i>So</i> -series	83		
3.2.4 <i>A</i> -series	87		
3.3 The notions of deixis and anaphora reconsidered	93		
3.4 Third person pronouns	97		
3.5 Summary	102		
CHAPTER 4			
<b>Gendered speech in soliloquy</b>		105	
4.1 Introduction	105		
4.2 Morphosyntax of Japanese gendered language	110		
4.3 Origins and development of gendered language in Japanese	112		
4.4 The data	115		
4.4.1 Female soliloquies	115		
4.4.2 Male soliloquies	122		
4.5 Indexicality and linguistic ideology	125		
4.6 Discussion	128		
4.6.1 First person pronouns	129		
4.6.2 Asymmetry in gendered language	132		
4.7 Summary	137		
CHAPTER 5			
<b>Soliloquy and linguistic politeness</b>		139	
5.1 Introduction	139		
5.2 The Japanese honorific system	140		
5.3 Some remarks on honorifics	142		
5.3.1 Honorifics as an indication of refinement	142		
5.3.2 Honorifics as an indication of distance	142		
5.3.3 Honorifics as an indication of a social role	143		
5.3.4 Strategies for intimate exaltation	145		
5.4 Speech style shift	148		
5.5 Morphosyntactic characteristics of soliloquy	159		
5.6 Soliloquy as an index of intimate exaltation	161		
5.7 Summary	162		
CHAPTER 6			
<b>The indefinite <i>you</i> in English soliloquy</b>		165	
6.1 Introduction	165		
6.2 Major characteristics of indefinite <i>you</i>	166		
6.2.1 Whitley (1978)	166		
6.2.2 Bolinger (1979)	168		
6.2.3 Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990)	171		
6.2.4 Wales (1996)	174		
6.2.5 Hyman (2004)	175		
6.3 The data	176		
6.4 The analysis of English soliloquy	178		
6.4.1 Deictic <i>you</i>	178		
6.4.2 Indefinite <i>you</i>	180		
6.5 Soliloquy and inner speech	182		
6.5.1 Inner speech vs. mentalese	182		
6.5.2 The dialogic nature of inner speech	185		
6.5.3 Publicness in soliloquy	188		
6.6 Summary	192		
CHAPTER 7			
<b>Considerations and conclusions</b>		195	
<b>References</b>		213	
<b>Appendix: Abbreviations</b>		223	
<b>Index</b>		225	

## CHAPTER 5

# 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 peoples' 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.<sup>1</sup>

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].<sup>2</sup>

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

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 agemasu*, 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.

- 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

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

- (2) a. *Dare da.*  
 who COP  
 'Who are you?'
- b. *Tabenai?*  
 Eat-not  
 'Do you want some?'

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

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)  
 tomorrow come (RH)  
 ‘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 indexicality between honorifics and polite intentions (for a discussion of indexicality, see Chapter 4, Section 4.5). Honorifics can be used in a discourteous 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.’<sup>4</sup> 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.’

4. 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.

C: ((Brings her left hand toward M))

M: ((Pretends to take a bite of the noodle))

C: ((Quickly puts the noodle in M's mouth, then takes it out and holds it out to F again.))

→ F: *Naaaa. Ippen kuchi ni ireta mono irimasen.*  
 once mouth in put-in thing need-not (AH)  
 'I don't want things that have already been in someone else's mouth.'

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.<sup>5</sup> Cook's analysis can account for most occurrences of *desu/masu*, e.g.:

(5) *5-gatsu 24-ka gogo 2-ji deesu to.*  
 May 24th P.M. 2-o'clock COP (AH) QUOT  
*Hitorigoto-tte iwaretemo naa. Fudan hitorigoto*  
 soliloquy-QUOT be-said-to SFP usually soliloquy

5. I have difficulty in analyzing *deshoo*, an auxiliary expressing the modality of conjecture. It occurred 13 times in the data, e.g. *Uchi de tsukau ni wa chotto takasugiru deshoo nee* '[talking about a chair pictured in a catalog] It's a little too high for in-house use'. It is traditionally considered as the polite form of *daroo* in morphological terms. However, unlike *desu/masu*, it does not seem to imply the existence of an addressee. I therefore did not include *deshoo* when counting addressee honorifics in this study. Even if these are added, the use of addressee honorifics will still rarely occur: 36 instances, or 1.2% of 3,042 utterances.

*shinai kara, nante itte-ii-no-ka wakannai kedo ma,*  
 do-not because what I-should-say know-not but well  
*toriaezu ganbatte mimaasu. Te iu ka, ganbarimasu.*  
 anyway do-best try (AH) QUOT say or do-best (AH)  
 'It's 2 P.M. on May 24th. So, I'm told to talk to myself but ... I usually don't talk to myself, so I don't know what to say. Well, anyway, I'll try to do my best. Or, rather, (I should say) I'll do my best.'

At first glance, these addressee honorifics marked in bold face in (5) appear to be addressed to myself, the experimenter. However, a closer examination reveals that *deesu* and *mimaasu* are in the scope of the quotative particle, and, quite possibly, *ganbarimasu* is as well. That is, these expressions are within self-quotation, in which the quotee and the quoter are physically the same person, but they are not identical in terms of the characters represented in the discourse. Normally, the quoted situation is detached from the speech situation. Or, in Kamada's (1988) account, self-quotation introduces one situation of talk into another situation. 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-quotation facilitates discourse functions such as dramatization and distancing. Self-quotation also serves 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 yonee. 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 sarerun desu yone. Sokode, yuuben 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).<sup>6</sup>

6. 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 a vegetable vendor with his neighborhood customers uses the plain style approximately 50% of the time, while his customers employ the plain style with him more frequently.

- (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 trust, intimacy, etc., but it might also be interpreted negatively as too familiar and disrespectful. Therefore, the expression of both respect and intimacy simultaneously can be accomplished only by deftly applied, highly elaborate linguistic skills. Fluent and eloquent users of the Japanese language make use of subtle, non-conventional cues.

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) QUOT think COND 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."<sup>7</sup> 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 yojoohan 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 NMLZ 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 TOP always single  
*de irassharu no?*<sup>8</sup>  
 COP (RH) SFP  
 'Excuse me, but have you always been single?'  
 J: *Iie, ano ne, nido oyome ni itta no.*  
 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 irassharu 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, totemo 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 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. *Irassharu 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, dewa, enpitsu oite kudasaai.*  
 well then pencil put-down please  
 'Well, then, put down your pencils.'  
*Sorede, mada kakete nakutemo, tochuude*  
 and yet if-not-finished-writing on-the-way  
*ki ga tsuitara ne, happyoo sureba iin desu kara*  
 if-realize INTJ present if-do good COP because  
*ne. Ii 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 hippatta tokoro kara*  
 well then first INTJ line ACC drew place from  
*happyoo shite moraimaasu.*  
 present receive  
 'Well, first, please recite from the places you underlined.'  
*Hai, jaa, sen hippatta hito, te o agete kudasaai.*  
 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 makezu ni ganbaroo 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 shimaasu.*  
 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, 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.

- (12) Y: *Hai, watashi wa "musunde kureta no desu" to iu*  
 yes, I TOP tie gave COP QUOT  
*tokoro ni sen o hikimashita.*  
 place LOC line ACC drew  
 '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.*  
 'Yes.'

 K: ((In background)) *Tori-musubu, tori-musubu.*  
 go-between  
 '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.*  
 now said place  
 'Um, well, Kazuhiro-kun, tell Ikuma-san again what you just said.'

 K: *Ikuma-san ga itta koto wa, tabun*  
 NOM said thing TOP perhaps  
*"tori-musubu" no koto dewa arimasen ka?*  
 go-between GEN thing TOP is-not Q  
 'Didn't you mean "to act as a go-between," Ikuma-san?'

 Y: *Hai, soo deesu.*  
 yes so COP  
 '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* 'distinctions between appropriateness and inappropriateness, good and bad, public and private, etc.' or Cook's (2008) notion of *shisei o tadasu* 'to hold oneself up' as discussed in Section 5.3.

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 (13–17) 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 lives as students in the United States. The bold-italic parts in (13–17) are intended to illustrate her analysis.

- (13) Reduction of psychological distance (Two females with equal status)
- A: *Ringuistikku desu ka? Gosenmon wa.*  
 linguistics COP Q specialization TOP  
 'Is linguistics your specialization?'

 B: *Ejukeshon 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 mo 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, umm ...'

- *Eegogaku, eebeeka tte iun datta ka na.*  
English-American-division QUOT said Q SFP  
'Department of English Linguistics, no, it's called English-American Literature?'
- *Nanka wakannai, namae ...*  
somehow understand-not name  
'I don't know how to say it in Japanese ...'
- (16) Confirmation (Two females with differential statuses)  
H: *Peepaa kaku to, 30-peeji deshita-kke?*  
paper write COND 30-pages it-should-be-SFP  
'If we are writing a paper ... was it 30 pages?'
- L: *15 kara 30.*  
from  
'15 to 30.'
- (17) Incomplete sentences (Two females with equal status)  
A: *Izure wa nihon ni okaerininaru koto mo arun desu ka?*  
some-day Japan to return thing also exist COP Q  
'Will you go back to Japan eventually?'
- B: *Soo desu ne. Soreni, yappari, shigoto no koto*  
well and as-expected work GEN matter  
*o kangaeru to, sore ga ichiban ...*  
ACC think COND that NOM best  
'That's right. And after all, if I think about the job market, it'd be the best ...'
- A: *Kotchi de amerikajin ni eego o oshieru*  
here American to English ACC teach  
*wake ni mo ikanai shi ...*  
cannot-do and  
'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 belong to different categories and are, therefore, not mutually exclusive. Most importantly, all of the examples that Usami provides for the category shown in (13), reduction of psychological distance, are essentially the same as those in (15), which she specifically categorizes as soliloquy. I argue that it is the soliloquy style that a speaker can uniquely employ as a strategy to express intimacy while maintaining deference.

Regarding the category demonstrated in (14), 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 (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 addressee honorific, as *15 kara 30 peeji 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, umaretara, ... onna datta wake desu yo.*  
and when-born girl was SFP  
'And when the baby was born, ... it was another girl.'
- Soshitara, 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  
→ *desutte" tte kiite shimatte.*  
I-hear QUOT heard  
'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 SFP  
'Oh, no! How did the neighbor know first?'
- [snip]
- L: *Sorede, 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.'

*desu. Chichi ga shokku de, sorede, moo gohan*  
 COP father NOM shock be because meal  
 → *mo tabezu ni heya toka tojikomotchatte.*  
 even eat-not room shut-onself-up  
 'My father was so shocked that he shut himself up in his room without eating.'

*Nanka, hontooni onna no ko datta no ga*  
 somewhat really girl was NMLZ NOM  
 'Indeed he appeared to be shocked that the baby was a girl.'

→ *shokku data mitai de. Sorede, okaasan mo sore*  
 shocking was seems then mother too it  
*o kiite, zutto atashi o yoko ni oita*  
 ACC hear all-the-time I ACC side kept

→ *mama, byooin de zuutto poro-poro-poro-poro*  
 as hospital at all-the-time  
*naitetan desu-tte.*  
 cried I-hear  
 'So, my mom heard about it in the hospital and cried and kept me near her.'

H: *Heee, hisan deshita ne. Kawaisoo ne. Anata no*  
 miserable was SFP pity SFP you GEN  
*sekinin janai noni ne.*  
 responsibility is-not although SFP  
 'Hmm, that's terrible. What a pity! And it's not even your responsibility.'

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, *ara iya 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-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.

(19) L: *Kono aida wa doomo arigatoo gozaimashita.*  
 the-other-day TOP very thank-you  
 'Thank you very much for the other day.'

→ *Are sugoku kiree.*  
 that very pretty  
 'They were very pretty.'

H: *Soo deshoo?*  
 so isn't-it  
 'Weren't they?'

[snip]

→ L: *Motto ippai hoshii naa.*  
 more want SFP  
 'I want more of them.'

H: *Sora yokatta.*  
 that was-good  
 'That's good.'

L: *Jibun de kaitain desu kedo, futsuuni uttemasu ka?*  
 self by want-to-buy COP but always sold Q  
 'I want to buy some more myself. Are they always on sale?'

H: *Shoozan ni aru kedo.*  
 at exist but  
 'Shoozan sells them.'

L: *Shoozan? Oosaka desu ka?*  
 COP Q  
 'Shoozan? In Osaka?'

H: *Kyotoo.*  
 'In Kyoto.'

L: *Ja, kondo oshiete itadakemasu ka?*  
 then next-time tell give Q  
 'Would you give me the directions next time?'

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 eego 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  
‘Eh, 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 kanaa.*  
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.’
- c. *A, yuushoku da. Suupu, koon suupu mitai.*  
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 kana.*  
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)soodal (da)tte* 'I hear'), and (g) addressee honorifics (e.g. *desu/masu*).

Addressee-oriented elements can appear only in public expressions, so, *ipso facto*, if an utterance contains an addressee-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, hee, huun*) 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.<sup>9</sup> Here are some additional examples:

- (24) a. *Waa sugoi.*  
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 ikemassen 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).<sup>10</sup> 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 *jibun* ‘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.