

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav asijských studií

Jazyky zemí Asie a Afriky

Disertační práce

**Verbal resources for affective stance display
in Japanese conversational interactions**

**Verbální prostředky vyjadřování afektivního postoje
v japonských konverzačních interakcích**

Mgr. Halina Zawiszová

Školitelka: doc. Mgr. Ivona Barešová, Ph.D.

2021

Prohlašuji, že jsem disertační práci napsala samostatně s využitím pouze uvedených a řádně citovaných pramenů a literatury a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 30. 6. 2021

Mgr. Halina Zawiszová v. r.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to wholeheartedly thank my family and my partner for their constant support throughout the writing process. To my supervisor, doc. Mgr. Ivona Barešová, Ph.D., I would like to express my sincere gratitude for her kindness, patience, encouragement, and her critical comments and suggestions. I am immensely grateful to all my Japanese friends and informants who have helped me with the data collection process and especially to those who have provided me with recordings of their personal conversations and snapshots of their communication on social media over the years. I also wish to express my deep appreciation to my friend Mikey and to my Mum who helped me with the proofreading. Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues from the Department of Asian Studies at Palacký University Olomouc for their support.

Contents

CHAPTER 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Affective stance display and social interaction	1
1.2 Objectives.....	4
1.3 Organization	6
CHAPTER 2 An overview of prior scholarship	7
2.1 Linguistic subjectivity and modality	9
2.2 Expressiveness of language.....	12
2.3 Involvement.....	17
2.4 Contextualization cues	20
2.5 Emotion lexicon	21
2.6 Affect.....	23
2.7 Emotive communication	26
2.8 Discourse modality.....	28
2.9 Linguistic emotivity	30
2.10 Evaluation.....	32
2.11 Stance	35
2.12 Affect(ive stance) display.....	39
CHAPTER 3 Preliminaries	43
3.1 Theoretical and methodological framing	43
3.2 Basic terminology	46
3.3 Data and procedure.....	50
3.4 Transcription conventions	53
3.5 Some remarks on (conversational) Japanese.....	56
CHAPTER 4 Major verbal resources for affective stance display	60
4.1 Lexical categories.....	60

4.1.1 Adjectives.....	62
4.1.2 Adverbs	77
4.1.3 Mimetics.....	85
4.1.4 Verbs	91
4.1.4.1 Affective-stance-expressive uses of verbs	92
4.1.4.2 Plain and polite forms	97
4.1.4.3 Passive form	103
4.1.4.4 Verb-verb complexes	106
4.1.5 Nouns	113
4.2 Demonstratives.....	119
4.3 Particles	129
4.3.1 Zero-marking.....	131
4.3.2 Topic-marking.....	136
4.4 Person reference	143
4.4.1 Choice of reference terms	144
4.4.2 Overt expression of first- and second-person subjects.....	150
4.5 Interjections.....	161
4.6 Connective expressions	178
4.7 Linguistic-interactional practices related to syntactic form.....	189
4.7.1 Non-predicate-final constituent order	190
4.7.1.1 Non-predicate-final utterance constructions	190
4.7.1.2 Post-possible completion of turns	200
4.7.2 Direct speech constructions.....	207
4.7.3 Question forms	221
4.7.4 Syntactically incomplete utterance formats	235
4.8 Utterance-final elements	242
CHAPTER 5 Discussion and conclusion	267

5.1 Illustration of the interplay of verbal resources	267
5.2 Diversity of resources for affective stance display	276
5.3 Contributions of this thesis and future research perspectives	281
Appendix A Transcription Conventions	284
Appendix B Abbreviations used in the interlinear glosses	286
Bibliography	287

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This thesis was instigated by my deep fascination with the question of how people use language in their everyday conversational interactions in order to express and make interpretable various emotions, feelings, moods, and attitudes, or – to put it differently – how people use language to construct affective stance displays. As part of my endeavour to contribute to the growing body of research that tries to answer this question, I devoted this thesis to the exploration of verbal resources for affective stance display which are routinely deployed by Japanese speakers in their informal conversational interactions.

1.1 Affective stance display and social interaction

When we interact, we engage in various types of affective-stance-expressive, affectively charged, or affectively coloured actions and activities and necessarily position ourselves with respect to different kinds of entities, including ourselves, our co-participants, the content of our as well as our co-participants' turns, but also the ongoing interaction and our surroundings. Displays of affective stance in interaction may be regarded as primary actions themselves, as is the case when one uses an interjection to convey their surprise, for example. More commonly, however, they form a constitutive part of other actions, such as complaining, blaming, or assessing, or represent what Levinson (2013) would call 'secondary actions', that is, actions that we wish our co-participants to recognize alongside 'primary actions' that a given turn accomplishes, such as questioning, greeting, or inviting. In addition, affective stance displays constitute indispensable and often defining components of numerous conversational activities, such as storytelling, joking, or arguing.

In fact, many have pointed out the ubiquitous nature of affective stance displays in social interaction. Jakobson (1960:354), for example, argues that the speaker's expression of their attitude towards what they are speaking about "flavors to some extent all [...] utterances". Goffman (1981:120) asserts that "it is impossible to utter a sentence without coloring the utterance with some kind of perceivable affect, even (in special cases) if only with the emotionally distinctive aura of affectlessness". Ochs (1986:256) likewise maintains that "[i]n most arenas of daily communication, speakers convey not only information concerning some

state or event but their feelings about some state or event as well, and languages will have varying structures for encoding this level of information”. Similarly, Tannen (1985:131) contends that “one cannot speak without showing one’s attitude toward the message and the speech activity”, while Jaffe (2009b:3) states that “speech cannot be affectively neutral; we can indeed convey a stance of affective neutrality, but it will of necessity be read in relation to other possible emotional orientations we could have displayed” and, as such, potentially oriented to by the co-participants as interactionally relevant. In brief, as Du Bois and Kärkkäinen (2012:434) point out, “emotion is in principle present in interaction, at least as a potentiality via its projectable consequences on many levels”.

In our everyday social encounters, we normally produce and interpret complex displays of a great variety of affective stances quite effortlessly and without giving these tasks much thought. This is so because “people growing up in a culture learn techniques not only for expressing logical relations between concepts in speech, but also for expressing feelings and attitudes toward things, events, concepts, partners, etc.” (Arndt and Janney 1991:522). Accordingly, the so-called competent adult speakers of a given language are all assumed to be endowed with a certain level of what could be referred to as ‘emotive capacity’, that is, “basic, conventional, learned, affective-relational communicative skills that help [us] interact smoothly, negotiate potential interpersonal conflicts, and reach different ends in speech” (Caffi and Janney 1994:327). Our conduct as participants in social interaction is always of “real consequence to the social relationship currently being exercised” (Enfield 2006:412). Affective stance displays in social interaction thus need to be viewed as publicly available and hence, potentially interpretable but also accountable social actions that have social-relational consequences. Part of our emotive capacity is, therefore, not only knowledge of means for affective stance display, but also knowledge of sociocultural norms and rules regarding their expression and affiliation management, that is, cooperation on the affective level of social interaction (Stivers 2008; Stivers, Mondada, and Steensig 2011).

We are able to express how we feel, label and topicalize our affective stances, as well as interpret and respond to affective stance displays produced by others. We are also able to perform affective stance displays to attain certain strategic goals. For example, we can express emotions that we do not experience at all or modify and modulate the expression of what we actually feel when we believe that such a display is desirable, appropriate, or otherwise advantageous for us in the given situation. In other words, we can convey what we feel with greater or lesser intensity than what we are actually experiencing, we can qualify what we feel by displaying what we feel as blended with something else, we can mask what we feel by

showing something other than what we are experiencing, or we can choose to neutralize the expression of what we feel by showing nothing (Matsumoto et al. 2005). Furthermore, we can construct and recognize mock affective stance displays, that is, affective stance displays that are produced with the intention to come across and be interpreted as fake and non-serious (e.g., Sandlund 2004; Haakana 2012). On the other hand, we may also inadvertently reveal how we feel in a situation when we would have preferred to or even have consciously tried to conceal it.

In different languages and cultures, the use of particular resources and bundles of resources for constructing affective stance displays is arguably routinized and conventionalized to various degrees. Were there no recurrent correlations between certain culturally shared ideas of affective stances and the means deployed to build their displays in the course of specific actions and activities in social interaction, how would we be able to interpret the affective stance displays produced by others or how would we know how to believably fake specific affective stances while actually feeling something different? Language supplies us with a great array of resources that may be mobilized and utilized for affective stance display. According to Ochs and Schieffelin (1989:22), for example, “[a]ffect permeates the entire linguistic system” and “[a]lmost any aspect of the linguistic system that is variable is a candidate for expressing affect”. In conversational interactions, however, affective stance displays are not realized and made interpretable by means of isolated linguistic resources, but by, as Sorjonen and Peräkylä (2012:9) emphasize, “the cooccurrence of resources from different modalities and levels of modality” that “are interpreted and oriented to by the recipients of the displays at specifiable places in interaction”. In the context of conversational interactions, vocal and visual resources may be used in particular sequential positions to convey particular affective stances, such as surprise or contempt, by themselves. They are, however, more commonly employed together with verbal resources which they typically complement, specify, and modulate, but may also override and contradict, as is the case with ironic remarks, for example.

For a long time, there was a marked tendency for studies of affective-stance-display-related phenomena in language and discourse to either discuss a broad range of linguistic (and occasionally also certain other semiotic) forms from a largely theoretical perspective or to concentrate on a rather limited number of linguistic forms mainly using made-up example sentences and non-spontaneous written language data from sources such as novels or newspaper articles. By contrast, especially over the past two decades or so, we have witnessed a great surge in scholarly interest in the topic and its exploration from an interactional perspective. These studies yield invaluable insights into the workings of specific linguistic forms and formats and

the ways in which particular actions and activities are accomplished. However, they are (quite understandably) generally very narrowly focused on the context of specific actions, activities, and sequential positions and so their findings about individual resources are frequently not generalizable and are scattered across a number of publications. In this thesis, I aspired to both show the impressive plurality of verbal resources that Japanese language speakers commonly deploy for affective stance display purposes in their everyday informal conversational interactions and demonstrate how they may be used to construct affective stance displays in co-occurrence with other resources in specific interactional contexts by using close analyses of excerpts from naturally occurring conversational interactions.

1.2 Objectives

I have been studying various aspects of conversational interactions of Japanese young adult speakers for more than a decade (e.g., Barešová and Zawiszová 2012; Zawiszová 2016; Zawiszová 2018; Zawiszová 2021). In the process of exploring both naturally occurring face-to-face conversational interactions and technically mediated conversational interactions on social media, I grew more and more intrigued by the ways in which the participants in these interactions construct and make interpretable affective stance displays. I started noticing recurrent deployment of an astounding number of particular types of linguistic forms and formats as resources for accomplishing particular types of affective-stance-display-related actions in specifiable interactional contexts. The more individual cases of affective-stance-expressive, affectively charged, or affectively coloured actions and activities I considered, the clearer it became that while affective stance displays in social interaction are multimodal and contextually situated and in one way or another can be viewed as collaboratively built by the participants in interaction, their construction routinely involves specific types of linguistic forms and formats, which play a crucial role in the process. This thesis presents the key findings from my investigation.

The main objective that I pursued in this thesis was to determine the types of linguistic forms and formats which are systematically and methodically employed by contemporary Japanese speakers (and specifically young adults) for the purpose of constructing affective stance displays in their everyday informal conversational interactions and demonstrate some of the ways in which they may be used together with other resources to accomplish particular affective stance displays in the context of specific actions and activities. In formulating the goals of my study, I was particularly influenced by existing research in interactional linguistics

and conversation analysis, but also by the line of thought advanced in linguistic anthropological research on affect represented, for example, by Irvine (1982), who examined ‘modes of affective expression’ in Wolof and argues that “it is useful to inventory the communicative devices that involve affective display, so that one can compare them with each other and so that one can get a sense of the range of devices available in a particular linguistic and cultural system” (Irvine 1982:37).

As a result, this thesis provides a survey of major types of verbal resources for affective stance display that are available to Japanese speakers in their conversational interactions, but also illustrates how they are used in co-occurrence with other resources for the purpose of specific affective stance displays by means of close analyses of excerpts from actual conversational interactions. Because of the astonishing wealth and diversity of verbal resources that I identified, I limited the scope of the present study to lexico-semantic and grammatical resources. Whereas some of the verbal resources that are commonly used for constructing affective stance displays – such as evaluative adjectives or degree adverbs that are used as intensifiers – are quite transparent, there are also many resources – such as demonstratives or question forms – whose main function is not normally thought to be that of means for affective stance display. The Japanese language has repeatedly been described as a language that is particularly rich in surface-segmentable lexico-grammatical resources for expressing pragmatic meanings, including indexing of affective and epistemic stances, personal identities, and social relations (e.g., Maynard 1993:4; Dunn 1999:109; Suzuki 2006b:1, 5–6). Maynard (1993:15) further observes that while “some languages are more deeply imbued with subjectivity than others”, “Japanese may be a primary candidate for a language that has many linguistic devices and strategies primarily committed to the expression of personal voice”.¹

Some of the lexical and grammatical means that the Japanese language makes available for affective stance display purposes have been studied quite extensively. However, these studies have often been based on the authors’ introspection, made-up example sentences, and non-spontaneous written language data rather than close analyses of their occurrences in spontaneous discourse. The actual use of the individual linguistic forms and formats as context-dependent and context-co-constitutive resources that are deployed in specific interactional environments in order to accomplish particular tasks in conjunction with other semiotic resources has seldom been explored. Consequently, little is known about the ways in which

¹ In her earlier publication, Maynard (1989:219) actually goes as far as to suggest that “[t]he Japanese people are more preoccupied with using words in ways that contribute to empathy building in conversation than they are with what propositional meaning the words themselves provide”.

they function in the course of ordinary conversational interactions and there are numerous competing and even contradictory accounts of what it is that they do. The secondary aim of this thesis is, therefore, to connect the findings from the specifically (but not exclusively) interactionally oriented research regarding the individual linguistic forms and formats that this thesis discusses by approaching them from the perspective of affective stance display.

1.3 Organization

This thesis is organized into five chapters, including the present one. The chapter that follows this introduction provides an overview of some of the most representative and influential approaches to affective-stance-display-related issues in language and discourse that have been proposed so far. It outlines different conceptualizations of the research problem and situates the present study in the mix. Chapter 3 introduces the theoretical and methodological frameworks that have most strongly influenced my understanding of and approach to the topic at hand. It also explains the data that this thesis is based on, some rudimentary characteristics of the Japanese (conversational) grammar that will be of relevance in the ensuing chapter, the basic terminology that is applied when discussing the excerpts, and the transcription conventions that are employed. Chapter 4 constitutes the central part of this thesis and, as such, surveys a variety of verbal resources that are available to Japanese language speakers for the purpose of constructing affective stance displays in their conversational interactions. Chapter 5 offers an illustration of the interplay of a variety of verbal resources that are examined in the preceding chapter, summarizes the key findings regarding the use of resources for affective stance display in Japanese conversational interactions, points out the contributions this thesis makes and, finally, closes by providing several suggestions for possible avenues for further research that seem worth pursuing.

CHAPTER 2

An overview of prior scholarship

For a long time, (Western) mainstream linguistics was “dominated by the intellectualist prejudice that language is, essentially, if not solely, an instrument for the expression of propositional thought” (Lyons 1982:103) and the theories and methods that it devised were heavily influenced by the written language bias (Linell 2005). Consequently, affective-stance-display-related issues have been commonly viewed as “too slippery an area of language for ‘scientific’ investigation” and “consistently set aside as an essentially unexplorable aspect of linguistic behaviour” (Besnier 1990:420). In contrast to the Saussurean and Chomskyan linguistic tradition, in which ‘*langue*’ has been prioritized over ‘*parole*’ and ‘competence’ over ‘performance’, in *kokugogaku*, that is, traditional Japanese language studies, the consideration of the ‘human factor’ has never been quite absent. As Maynard (1993:5) explains, studies in this scholarly tradition are typically based on the idea that “in language lies the essential function of ‘expressiveness’ which is the power of the speaking subject”.

Admittedly, emotions, feelings, moods, and attitudes, all represent complex notions that are difficult to define accurately. It is, therefore, not surprising that the affective-stance-display-related issues have not occupied the centre-stage of mainstream linguistic inquiry. On the other hand, it would be a mistake to think that they have been completely ignored. In fact (and perhaps necessarily so, considering the object of inquiry), a number of competing terms and definitions, theoretical perspectives, and methodological approaches have been proposed to deal with various affective-stance-display-related phenomena, reflecting different disciplinary and personal assumptions, interests, and preferences. A conspicuous lack of consensus on terminology in this body of research is particularly vexing. The definitions of different terms tend to overlap substantially and often make use of terms that other scholars view as referring to distinct concepts. A single term is often defined in a number of ways and applied to refer to disparate phenomena. Likewise, comparable phenomena are frequently explored under a range of labels. Individual scholars commonly operationalize the terms they use within their publications and some use more than one term to refer to their object of interest even within individual works. In addition, there are also significant differences across the languages in which research on the topic is published, as not all languages differentiate between the same terms as is done in English, the medium in which much of the discussion takes place. This all

results in much terminological heterogeneity and, at times, terminological chaos, which makes it difficult to follow the development in this currently boisterous field, meaningfully compare individual arguments and findings, and efficiently build on the existing research and contribute to the field without coining new terms or appropriating the definitions of existing ones. Indeed, as Du Bois and Kärkkäinen (2012:433) aptly note, “[e]motion, or at least the potential for emotion, is everywhere in social life; it is just hard to talk about it”.

The lack of conceptual and theoretical clarity makes providing even the most simplistic overview of the existing contributions to this area of research an uneasy task. Among the most often-cited older sources of important insight and inspiration for research on affective-stance-display-related phenomena are: Aristotle’s distinction between *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*; Marty’s (1908) differentiation between ‘emotional (cathartic, spontaneous) expressions’ and ‘emotive (strategic, appellative) expressions’;² Bally’s (1913) linguistic stylistics and his idea that messages can be oriented either towards ‘intellectual (analytic) mode’ (*mode pur*) or towards ‘affective (performative) mode’ (*mode vécu*) that form two poles of a continuum; Sapir’s (1927) study of speech as a personality trait; the understanding of “language as something living” (Mathesius 1983[1929]:30) embraced by the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle; Bühler’s (1934) ‘Organon model’ of language, which differentiates between referential (*Darstellung*), expressive (*Ausdruck*), and conative (*Appell*) functions; Jakobson’s (1960) model of six language functions; Stankiewicz’s (1964) study of emotive features in language; pragmatically oriented studies on speech acts (e.g., Austin 1962; Searle 1969) and politeness (e.g., Lakoff 1973; Leech 1983; Brown and Levinson 1987); Lyons’s (1977) linguistic semantics; Halliday’s (1975) investigation of intonation and grammar; and Bolinger’s views on intonation as “indispensable to grammar”, but primarily serving as a symptom of emotion (Bolinger 1986:27). Overall, it seems fair to say that the more linguists took interest in and explored ordinary situated talk, the clearer it became for them that the affective-relational aspects pertaining to language use cannot be overlooked.

It is impossible for this chapter to do justice to the full range of perspectives and approaches that have been taken thus far. Rather, in what follows, I offer a selective excursion into some of the ways in which the topic has been addressed, focusing on the contributions that may be regarded as representative of different strands of research that are particularly important

² As Caffi and Janney (1994:328) summarize, Marty (1908) proposes to reserve the term ‘emotional expressions’ to refer to “spontaneous cathartic outbursts of emotion” and proposes the use of the term ‘emotive expressions’ to refer to “the intentional, strategic signalling of affective information in speech and writing (e.g., evaluative dispositions, evidential commitments, volitional stances, relational orientations, degrees of emphasis, etc.) in order to influence partners’ interpretations and reach different goals”.

and influential for the general development of this area of investigation, or otherwise noteworthy.³ The contributions that are introduced here are grounded in diverse frameworks. Therefore, it is not just their approaches to affective-stance-display-related phenomena but also their general conceptualizations of language that are not necessarily shared. Nevertheless, there appears to be general agreement on two points: the enormous significance of affective-stance-display-related functions of language and the ubiquity of affective-stance-displays in all language use.

2.1 Linguistic subjectivity and modality

The idea that language conveys not only ‘objective facts’, but also certain aspects of the speaking/writing self can be discerned across a range of linguistic theories and paradigms, including, for example, the Saussurean distinction between *langue* and *parole*, the Chomskyan competence/performance dichotomy, the often advocated bipartition of a sentence into proposition and modality, and the commonly made differentiation between referential (descriptive, propositional) and non-referential (non-descriptive, non-propositional) meanings or functions of language. In Japanese linguistic tradition, we can trace an orientation to this contrast in the notions of *jojutsu* and *chinjutsu*, as variously conceptualized, for example, by Yamada Yoshio, Watanabe Minoru, and Haga Yasushi, or in the distinction between *shi* (objective, referential expressions, concepts) and *ji* (subjective, functional expressions, speaker’s perspectives) made by Tokieda Motoki and other *kokugogaku* scholars (for overview see, e.g., Maynard 1993, 2002). In Tokieda’s understanding, for example, the subjective expression (*ji*) envelops the objective expression (*shi*) and the two are viewed as forming a unified whole (see, e.g., Naito 2006).⁴

The ways in which we linguistically express ourselves as cognizant, feeling, speaking/writing subjects, and thereby influence the formal structure of discourse, have often been dealt with under the heading of ‘subjectivity’. In his influential discussion regarding subjectivity in language, Benveniste (1971:225) states that “[l]anguage is marked so deeply by the expression of subjectivity that one might ask if it could still function and be called language

³ See the edited volume by Pritzker, Fenigsen, and Wilce (2020) to find out about different avenues of research on language and emotion.

⁴ See Maynard (1993, 2002) to learn about some of the ideas held by Japanese *kokugogaku* scholars concerning subjectivity in language, Narrog (2009:21–32) for a concise historical overview of the development of the Japanese concepts related to modality, and Shinzato’s (2014) survey study on subjectivity and intersubjectivity in which the author argues for the incorporation of the two notions into our constructions of grammar, and Japanese grammar in particular.

if it were constructed otherwise”. Lyons (1982:102) uses the term to refer to “the way in which natural languages, in their structure and their normal manner of operation, provide for the locutionary agent’s expression of himself and of his attitudes and beliefs”. He argues that “in the structure and use of language”, it is necessary to distinguish between ‘an objective component’, which comprises a set of propositions, and ‘a subjective component’, comprising the locutionary agents’ expression of themselves (Lyons 1982:105). Later works dealing with the topic offer similar definitions. Finegan (1995:1), for example, maintains that ‘subjectivity’ may be understood as concerning “expression of self and the representation of a speaker’s (or, more generally, a locutionary agent’s) perspective or point of view in discourse – what has been called a speaker’s imprint”.

Japanese scholars have paid considerable attention to the role that subjectivity plays in the Japanese language (see, e.g., Kuroda 1973; Kuno 1987), which has commonly been attributed to the fact that Japanese, as was already mentioned earlier, makes available a wide range of overt lexical and grammatical resources that may be viewed as indices of subjectivity. Ikegami (2005) contends that Japanese is a subjectivity-prominent and ego-oriented language, while Maynard (1993:4) claims that “a personal voice echoes so prominently in Japanese communication that often [...] rather than information-sharing, it is subtextual emotion-sharing that forms the heart of communication”. Finally, Iwasaki (1993) uses Japanese to produce the first book-length study dedicated specifically to subjectivity. He argues that “subjectivity is one of the most important properties of language” (Iwasaki 1993:xii) which finds its outlets throughout linguistic structure (Iwasaki 1993:7). Approaching subjectivity from a pragmatic point of view, the author distinguishes three types of subjectivity phenomena based on the role of the speaker as the centre of (1) deictic elements, (2) evaluation and attitude, and (3) epistemological perspective, which forms the dominant focus of the book. The subjectivity phenomena that fall into the second category can be viewed as most closely related to the topic of affective stance display, but the author gives them very limited attention. He mentions only evaluative words, social titles, and adverbs as examples of ‘lexical outlets of subjectivity’. As examples of ‘morphosyntactic outlets of subjectivity’, he lists the use of the case particles *no* and *ga* in Old/Middle Japanese, constructions with negative polarity, passives, honorifics, the expression of regret consisting of the *-te* form of a verb (also known as the gerundive) and the auxiliary verb *shimau*, and the expression of gratitude consisting of the *-te* form of a verb and the auxiliary verb of giving or receiving (Iwasaki 1993:7–12).

Interestingly, the three types of subjectivity phenomena that Iwasaki (1993) distinguishes have formed three major foci of subjectivity research in general. Finegan (1995:4),

for example, discusses studies that deal with topics related to subjectivity and subjectification from a linguistic perspective and suggests that it is possible to discern three main areas of research that the studies have concentrated on, namely, the locutionary agent's: (1) perspective as shaping linguistic expression, (2) expression of proposition-oriented affect, and (3) expression of epistemic modality. Despite considerable diversity among the individual studies, they have predominantly concentrated on individual grammatical forms and lexical items, semantic change, and the process of grammaticalization (see, e.g., Stein and Wright 1995; Athanasiadou, Canakis, and Cornillie 2006).

Probably the most commonly studied aspect of subjectivity is 'modality'. For Lyons (1977:452), for example, modality concerns the expression of "the speaker's opinion or attitude towards the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describes". Palmer (1986:16) suggests that it is possible to describe modality as "grammaticalization of speakers' (subjective) attitudes and opinions", while Nitta (1989:34), one of the most influential among the Japanese scholars focusing on modality, understands it as "the linguistic expression of the speaker's psychological attitude towards the verbalized state of affairs or towards the utterance and the communication itself at the time of speech" (quoted in Narrog 2009:12).⁵ As the above-mentioned examples illustrate, the scope of the definitions of modality proposed by the authors who view the category in terms of subjectivity is extremely wide. Regardless, as Narrog (e.g., 2005:169–170), who argues for the adoption of a definition of modality in terms of factuality, points out, their studies tend to concern the traditional modal forms, such as modal verbs, suffixes, and other formal expressions, rather than more complex outlets of subjectivity.⁶

One example of a somewhat different approach to modality is represented by Stubbs's (1986) study. Working towards a description of 'a modal grammar of English', Stubbs (1986:1) argues:

whenever speakers (or writers) say anything, they encode their point of view towards it: whether they think it is a reasonable thing to say, or might be found to be obvious, questionable, tentative, provisional, controversial, contradictory, irrelevant, impolite, or whatever.

⁵ Another scholar whose views on modality have proven highly influential in Japan is Masuoka Takashi. Masuoka (1991:6, 47–59) explicitly bases his definition of modality on the idea of a bi-partition of a sentence and claims that whereas 'proposition' refers to the expression of objective facts, 'modality' to the expression of subjective attitudes, feelings, emotions, volition, impressions, opinions, etc. and comprises of such diverse elements as markers of politeness, sentential mood, tense, or polarity.

⁶ To find out more about contemporary approaches to modality in Japanese, see, for example, Narrog (2009, 2012) and the papers in the volume edited by Pizziconi and Kizu (2009).

He maintains that “all utterances express not only content, but also the speaker’s attitude towards that content” (Stubbs 1986:15) and that the markers of the speaker’s point of view should, therefore, be of central interest for linguistics.⁷ In his paper, he specifically focuses on the ways in which English speakers express their ‘commitment’ or ‘detachment’ with regards a statement and proposes that “the expression of commitment and detachment, or of modality in all its senses, can be seen as a central organizing principle in language” (Stubbs 1986:4).

2.2 Expressiveness of language

‘Expressiveness’ or ‘expressivity’ of language has mostly been viewed as a component of linguistic meaning or one of the functions of language. According to Maynard (2002:3), for example, expressivity of language refers to

a dimension pervasive in human communication, [which] includes all aspects of self-expression, whether they are dispositions, general moods and feelings, aroused emotive responses, evaluative attitudes, sense-based judgments, or cultural sentiments, as long as they are linguistically expressed.

Sapir (1921:40) asserts that “ideation reigns supreme in language, that volition and emotion come in as distinctly secondary factors”, even though they “are, strictly speaking, never absent from normal speech”. Later, he notices that in actual ordinary speech, “the denotive function of speech is always compounded with certain expressive factors which we are in the habit of leaving out of account in our formal designations of linguistic processes” (Sapir 2008[1927]:208). Accordingly, in his understanding, speech consists of “two rather distinct things, though these are never to be completely sundered except by a process of abstraction”, namely, of making references and of conveying our states of mind, our attitudes towards the referents, our interlocutors, etc. (Sapir 2008:208–209). He argues against the idea of the referential and the expressive functions of language being viewed as strictly separate, asserting that “[t]he two aspects of speech, expressive and referential, are rarely seen in their purity. In the workaday world they are constantly intertwining their functions in countless compromises” (Sapir 2008:215).⁸ In his well-known paper on “Speech as a Personality Trait” (1927), the

⁷ Compare this view to that advanced in pragmatically oriented studies on ‘propositional attitude’ (e.g., Andersen and Fretheim 2000a), which are based on the idea that “in interactive discourse we not only express propositions, we also express different attitudes to them. That is, we communicate how our mind entertains those propositions that we express” and manifest attitudes such as “belief, desire, hope, doubt, fear, regret, or pretense that a given proposition P represents a true state of affairs” (Andersen and Fretheim 2000b:3).

⁸ Around the same time, Hjelmslev (1928:240, quoted in Stankiewicz 1964:241) also warns against making a strict distinction between ‘intellectual’ and ‘affective’ language, arguing, “Il est, selon nous, dangereux d’établir

author approaches language as a form of personal expression and discusses how factors such as voice, intonation, rhythm, speed, continuity of speech, pronunciation, vocabulary, and style lead us to make personality judgements. He emphasizes that the speech of an individual must always be analysed in light of the social norms fostered in that person's speech community, because we make judgements regarding other people's personalities based on the degrees and kinds of variation from 'the nuclear patterns of behaviour'.

Members of the Prague Linguistic Circle and other scholars associated with it were among those who assigned linguistic expressiveness prominence, as they brought the speaker/writer and the receiver/reader to the fore and advanced linguistic analysis that proceeds from function (understood as the speaker's or writer's communicative needs) to form. Mathesius (1983[1929]:122–123), the founder of the Prague Linguistic Circle, describes the Prague school functionalism as an approach that "conceives language as something living, underneath the words it sees the speaker or the writer from whose communicative intention they have resulted. It realizes that in a large majority of cases the words are aimed at a hearer or reader". In their 1929 manifesto, members of the Prague Linguistic Circle advocate the position that both the referential and the expressive aspects of language must form a part of a linguistic analysis and description. They state that "[t]he examination of language requires painstaking attention to the variety of linguistic functions and to the ways in which they are realized", while "[f]eatures important for the characterization of language are the *intellectuality* and the *emotionality* of language manifestations. Both these features either interpenetrate each other or one of them prevails over the other" (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983[1929]:88).⁹

Jakobson (1960) was among those who developed this line of thought into a model of language functions. He distinguishes six "factors inalienably involved in verbal communication", namely, addresser, addressee, message, context, contact, and code, and argues that "[e]ach of these six factors determines a different function of language", which he labels 'emotive', 'conative', 'poetic', 'referential', 'phatic', and 'metalinguistic', respectively (Jakobson 1960:353). In line with the above-mentioned manifesto, Jakobson (1960:353) notices that "we could [...] hardly find verbal messages that would fulfil only one function. The

d'avance une distinction entre des éléments grammaticaux d'un côté et certains autres qu'on appelle extragrammaticaux, de l'autre, entre un langage intellectuel et un langage affectif. Les éléments dits extragrammaticaux ou affectifs peuvent en effet obéir aux règles grammaticales, en partie peut-être à des règles grammaticales qu'on n'a pas encore réussi à dégager".

⁹ We can see similar position being later advanced, for example, by Labov (1984:43), who insists that to describe a grammar of a language entails paying attention to the social and expressive aspects of the language and stresses that "[i]f grammatical descriptions don't take social and emotional expression into account, and their effect on the underlying system, they will be incomplete and even misleading for language learners".

diversity lies not in a monopoly of some one of these several functions but in a different hierarchical order of functions. The verbal structure of a message depends primarily on the predominant function". He admits that the referential (denotative, cognitive) function often seems to prevail, but notes that an observant linguist should not overlook the other functions that supplement it. While 'affective stance display' might be viewed as spanning several of the functions, it is the 'emotive (expressive) function' that seems to be of greatest relevance to our discussion. Jakobson (1960:354) defines it as a function that "aims a direct expression of the speaker's attitude toward what he is speaking about. It tends to produce an impression of a certain emotion whether true or feigned". He considers it pervasive and points out that it "flavors to some extent all our utterances, on their phonic, grammatical, and lexical level", while forms that carry emotive information are conventionalized in a similar way as forms carrying other types of information in language (Jakobson 1960:354).

Influenced by the Prague linguistic functionalism, Stankiewicz (1964:239) maintains that "[c]urrents of emotion surround verbal discourse and penetrate all kinds of human and animal activity". Following Marty (1908), he emphasizes the need to differentiate between 'emotional' and 'emotive' planes and himself focuses on what he refers to as 'emotive language'.¹⁰ Drawing on examples from different languages, Stankiewicz (1964) emphasizes the systematic character of expressive devices in language and demonstrates that they can be found across all levels of linguistic structure. He contends that while there are some devices that have exclusively emotive functions in a given language, other forms acquire their emotive functions in context, adding that in appropriate context, practically any word can gain emotive connotations, any use of a grammatical form that deviates from its normal cognitive use may bear emotive colouring, and any sound may be endowed with emotive value. Moreover, with time and repeated use in specific contexts, the author continues, those forms may also become viewed as inherently expressive (Stankiewicz 1964:243).

Akin to Stankiewicz (1964), Volek (1987:25) insists that "[l]anguage as an instrument of human communication makes possible the communication of human feelings" and "has developed a special code" to fulfil this task. Approaching the issue from the point of view of semantics, the author distinguishes between 'notional' and 'emotive' meaning, claiming that "the meaning of linguistic signs is constituted either by notions or by 'direct' emotional

¹⁰ 'Emotive plane', Stankiewicz (1964:240) explains, "is rendered through situationally independent, arbitrary symbols", whereas 'emotional plane' "reveals itself in a variety of articulated or non-articulated 'forms' of a symptomatic nature, that is, through signals which are inextricably bound to the situation which evokes them and which they evoke".

experiences not transformed into notions” (ibid.). Accordingly, ‘emotivity in language’ is viewed by the author as constituting “a system in its own right” (Volek 1987:3) and referring to “certain psycho-physical experiences or attitudes of the speaker (not necessarily evaluative attitudes) which he experiences during the speech and which he expresses in it without transforming them into notional signs” (Volek 1987:12; original emphasis omitted). The author differentiates between six types of linguistic signs based on the components of their meaning and makes ‘emotive signs’ in language the focus of her concern, defining them as “those linguistic devices that serve for the direct expression of the actual emotive attitude of the speaker (and not for the expression of ‘ideas of emotions’), devices that are at the same time established as special signs expressing emotions in a given language” (ibid.; original emphasis omitted). She states that such devices can be found at all levels of linguistic description and supports her claim by offering examples of ‘emotive signs’ from several languages, especially Russian (Volek 1987:15–25). She further notes that expressing emotion in language is a largely ‘textual matter’, as even the lexical and morphological devices whose emotivity is coded acquire their specific emotive meanings from their context of use (Volek 1987:24). In the research she presents in the book, the author specifically concentrates on Russian diminutives as an emotive type of word formation and a typical means used for expressing emotivity in Russian.

In his introduction to linguistic semantics, Lyons (1995:44) suggests that it is possible to broadly differentiate between ‘descriptive (propositional) meaning’ and ‘non-descriptive (non-propositional) meaning’. The latter is viewed as quite heterogeneous, including, among others, ‘expressive (affective, attitudinal, emotive) component’, which Lyons (ibid.) views as “the kind of meaning by virtue of which speakers express, rather than describe, their beliefs, attitudes and feelings”. He emphasizes that

expressive meaning necessarily merges with what many authors have referred to as interpersonal, instrumental, social or conative, meaning. In other words, as far as the structure and function of natural languages are concerned, the expressive is necessarily socio-expressive and the personal is necessarily interpersonal. (Lyons 1995:45)

In a similar fashion to the authors whose works were introduced above, he further notes that expressive meaning can be conveyed through forms at all levels of the linguistic system (Lyons 1995:276) and maintains that while languages grammaticalize expressive meaning to different degrees (Lyons 1995:44–45), the meaning of lexemes in everyday use typically consist of both

a descriptive and a socio-expressive component that all competent speakers of a given language should be aware of (Lyons 1995:64–65).¹¹

In his book on the ‘expressivity of grammar’, Hübler (1998:1) posits:

Expressivity is one of the dimensions defining human communication. It has its basis in the personal setting of every communicative event in that it originates in a person (sender, addresser) and is directed at some other person (receiver, addressee).

In his view, expressivity relates to the expression of the speaker’s emotions and “presupposes that there are means available through which such emotions can be expressed” (ibid.). Taking a diachronic approach, Hübler (1998) specifically focuses on the expressivity implicit in six grammatical devices taken from different periods in the development of the English language, namely, the so-called possessive dative, ethic dative, expanded form, present perfect, periphrastic *do*, and *get*-passive. Inspired by Bally’s theory, the author characterises them as *mode vécu* devices of expressivity that in certain contexts acquire the function of indexical signs which point toward an emotive meaning and express the speaker’s emotional attitudes toward (involvement in or attachment to) propositional states of affairs. He explains that the ability of the devices to function as such indices stems from the fact that they have alternatives that the speakers could choose instead without affecting the propositional content and that the devices the speakers choose are ‘costlier’ (that is, made up of more linguistic material) than their alternatives, which implies a ‘meaning surplus’ and makes them appear ‘marked’ (Hübler 1998:15).

Maynard (2005b) explores what she refers to as ‘expressive Japanese’. More specifically, she lists emotion words falling into different grammatical categories as well as certain expressive strategies that are frequently used in contemporary Japanese to express emotions, feelings, attitudes, and what the author refers to as empathy in a range of situations. The book is designed as a guide for Japanese language learners and is based on the idea that

¹¹ Emotive or expressive meanings or functions of linguistic structures are often mentioned in publications dedicated to the description of a specific language. In *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, for example, Quirk et al. (1985) repeatedly refer to the ‘emotive sense’ of certain linguistic forms and, as part of a discussion on theme, focus, and information processing, consider the means that English provides for “giving a unit purely emotive emphasis” (Quirk et al. 1985:1414–1416). They first review the means that are mentioned elsewhere in the book, including exclamations, the persuasive *do* used in exclamations, expletives, intensifiers, and clause emphasizers, and subsequently focus on noncorrelative *so* and *such* and emphatic stress that is used to convey the speaker’s emotions, such as enthusiasm, concern, sympathy, or petulance. In addition, they also comment on the topic of ‘reinforcement’, focusing on repetition and amplificatory tags (Quirk et al. 1985:1416–1419). Another line of research that often refers to expressive meaning of words is the variegated body of studies on ‘connotation’ (see, e.g., Osgood, May, and Miron 1975).

[u]ltimately, true communication requires speakers to be able to share not only information but also feelings. [...] Interpreting how others feel while at the same time expressing one's own feelings in Japanese requires the knowledge of how Japanese is and is not used for expressive purposes. (Maynard 2005b:5)

Maynard (ibid.) admits that expressing emotion involves mixing resources from different modalities, including facial expressions, gestures, tone of voice, laughter, crying, style, choice of topic, discourse structure, etc. However, she maintains, “language plays a key role in identifying, experiencing, and sharing feelings with others” (Maynard 2005b:11).

2.3 Involvement

The devices and strategies that allow us to create and signal our emotional investment or interest in the ongoing act of communication, our co-participants, and that which we are talking or writing about have been studied under various labels. Notably, especially in (interactional) sociolinguistic and discourse analytic studies, we may commonly encounter the term ‘involvement’.¹² Even though the term has enjoyed considerable popularity, it has often been called highly problematic and seriously lacking in “explanatory power” (Besnier 1994:297). It has been criticised as “a pre-theoretical, intuitive, rather vague, unfocused notion [...] whose present use, even within individual frameworks, is inconsistent” (Caffi and Janney 1994:345). Admittedly, the term has seldom been applied as a strictly technical term and its uses are (probably inevitably) circular – we regard participants as involved or as showing involvement when they make use of certain devices or strategies that we believe are used to signal the participants’ involvement. Nonetheless, owing to its intuitively understandable, albeit vague meaning, it has frequently been employed in explanations of certain affective-stance-display-related processes as well as effects in discourse.¹³

Chafe (1982) uses the term in his discussion concerning written and spoken discourse, claiming that written discourse is characterized by integration and detachment from the audience, whereas the typical features of spoken discourse are fragmentation and involvement with the audience. Detachment, according to Chafe (1982:45), “is manifested in devices which

¹² However, see also Labov’s (1984:43–44) notion of ‘intensity’, which he views as a gradient linguistic feature that depends on other linguistic structures and defines it as “the emotional expression of social orientation toward the linguistic proposition: the commitment of the self to the proposition”. Specifically, he concerns himself mainly with the signalling of intensity accomplished by adverbs, aspectual categories, and quantifiers. Interestingly, Arndt and Janney (1987), who approach ‘involvement’ as one of three emotive dimensions of speech, explicitly explain it by referring to the notion of ‘intensity’ (see Section 2.7).

¹³ In addition, some authors further view involvement as the fundamental precondition for a successful interaction (e.g., Gumperz 1982; Ogi 2017).

serve to distance the language from specific concrete states and events”. On the other hand, the speakers’ involvement, the author suggests, can be manifested in their more frequent use of self-reference, reference to their mental processes, monitoring of the communication channel, use of emphatic particles (such as *just* and *really* in English), fuzziness, and direct quotes (Chafe 1982:46–49). The author elaborates on these ideas in his later paper and, among other things, proposes a classification of involvement into three (potentially intertwined) categories: the speaker’s ego involvement, involvement with the hearer, and involvement with the subject matter (Chafe 1985:116–117). Dealing with similar issues, Tannen (1985) disagrees with the idea that the features that Chafe (1982) lists are features of spoken discourse as opposed to written discourse and proposes to instead view them as features reflecting ‘relative focus on interpersonal involvement’ as opposed to those reflecting ‘relative focus on the information conveyed’, respectively.

Tannen herself conceptualizes ‘involvement’ variously. In her seminal book focused on ‘conversational style’, Tannen (2005[1984]) contrasts ‘involvement’ with ‘considerateness’ and characterizes features of what she refers to as ‘high-involvement style’ as opposed to the features of ‘high-considerateness style’. Even though the author stresses that “[i]t is impossible to posit a one-to-one relationship between linguistic form and meaning (or, put another way, between language form and function)” (Tannen 2005:12), she enumerates features of high-involvement style, including, for example: preference for personal topics, abrupt topic shifts, frequent storytelling, telling stories in rounds, dramatization of the point of a story, fast rate of speech and turn-taking, cooperative overlap, avoidance of pauses, participatory listenership, and expressive paralinguistics (Tannen 2005:40–41). In addition, she hypothesizes that non-verbal features, such as broad facial expressions and gestures, can be expected to be correlated with the features listed above (Tannen 2005:183).¹⁴

In her most detailed examination of ‘involvement strategies’, Tannen (2007[1989]:12) explains that she understands the notion of ‘involvement’ as “an internal, even emotional connection individuals feel, which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories, and words”. Involvement is regarded as an achievement, while involvement strategies are believed to manifest and at the same time construct interpersonal involvement, bringing about a sense of vividness, rapport, sharedness, etc. (Tannen 2007:1). The involving effect of strategies that work primarily on sound (such as rhythm and repetition or variation of different linguistic units), the author argues, stems from what Scollon (1982)

¹⁴ See also Clancy (2016:35) who attempts to supplement Tannen’s (2005) findings with ‘high-involvement strategies’ that he discerned in his corpus-informed study on interactions of families, couples, and friends.

refers to as ‘rhythmic ensemble’, while the involving effect of those strategies that work primarily on sense (such as indirectness, ellipsis, or narrative) is created by engaging the audience in sensemaking (Tannen 2007:31), for, “the more work readers or hearers do to supply meaning, the deeper their understanding and the greater their sense of involvement with both text and author” (Tannen 2007:37). In her book, Tannen (2007) specifically focuses on the use of repetition, constructed dialogue (more commonly known as direct or reported speech), and the use of details and imagery.

Inspired by the Prague School’s idea of ‘experiencing language’, Daneš (1994) reflects on what he refers to as the ‘involvement with and in language’, which he sees as one of the ways in which ‘experiencing language’ might be viewed. In his understanding, ‘involvement’ is “an absolutely fundamental aspect of our linguistic awareness and conduct” (Daneš 1994:253), while emotion forms “the most typical, natural, and important manifestation of the speaker’s involvement” (Daneš 1994:256). He insists that we should abandon the idea of ‘emotional neutrality’ and the tendency to treat emotionally coloured items as ‘marked’, for “*any* utterance or higher discourse unit has an *emotional value* in its communicative situation, both on the producer’s and the receiver’s side” (Daneš 1994:258). He further holds that ‘involvement’ must be approached as a degree-concept rather than in a sense of a presence/absence dichotomy (Daneš 1994:257), arguing that

[e]motion [...] does not constitute a level or layer [...], but an aspect – and a substantial and omnipresent one – of the message conveyed by an utterance. It is a specific aspect of the overall linguistic behavior of speech participants, that permeates the whole discourse, which is thus ‘imbued’ with it. And it belongs to the specificity of emotion that it is experiential and ‘interactional’, rather than ‘communicative’. (Daneš 1994:262)

Means for expressing emotion, in Daneš’s (1994:260) view, can be ‘conceptually descriptive’ or ‘signal-like’, both verbal (in a broad sense of the term) and non-verbal, spanning across linguistic, paralinguistic, and extralinguistic domains. Echoing Stankiewicz (1964), for example, the author maintains that “*any* language form can be endowed with emotive connotations in an appropriate verbal context and/or situation” and emphasizes that in the course of actual speech events, means for expressing emotion that fall into different categories tend to be combined (Daneš 1994:260).

The term has also been used in more interactionally oriented studies. For example, in Selting’s (1994:375) understanding, “‘involvement’ is less closely linked to the notion of inner emotional states than to the notion of outward emotive performances”, that is, “displayed emotionality”. Drawing on conversation analysis, Selting (1994) explores what she refers to as

prosodic signalling of heightened ‘emotive involvement’ in actual conversational interactions, approaching it as an ‘emphatic speech style’. The author demonstrates and argues that “impressions of heightened emotive involvement are [...] sequentially constituted and organized in everyday speech” (Selting 1994:403). To contextualize their turn-constructive units or sequences of units as displaying ‘more-than-normal involvement’, the author explains, speakers make use of a particularly marked prosody (in comparison to the surrounding units) in co-occurrence with marked syntactic and lexico-semantic units in particular sequential environments. Specifically, Selting (1994) concentrates on the climaxes in storytelling events and observes that the signalling of a speaker’s heightened ‘emotive involvement’ is deployed as a technique for making certain types of response, and notably the construction of affiliation, on the part of the story recipients ‘locally relevant’.¹⁵

2.4 Contextualization cues

Speakers’ affective stance displays have also been approached as means that provide context for the interpretation of ‘messages’ conveyed. This line of thought can perhaps best be exemplified by Gumperz’s (e.g., 1982, 1992a, 1992b) notion of ‘contextualization cues’.¹⁶ According to Gumperz (1982:131), contextualization cues are “constellations of surface features of message form” by means of which “speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and *how* each sentence relates to what precedes or follows”. They represent socio-culturally specific indexical signs whose “signalling value depends on the participants’ tacit awareness of their meaningfulness” (Gumperz 1982:131–132). In his more recent publication, Gumperz (2015:315) defines the term as referring to “any verbal sign which, when processed in co-occurrence with symbolic grammatical and lexical signs, serves to construct the contextual ground for situated interpretation and thereby affects how constituent messages are understood”. The phenomena

¹⁵ For more examples of studies that employ the term, see, for example, Dunn (1999) who studies two speeches given in Japanese during the same event and shows how one of the speakers builds rapport with her audience by shifting into an ‘emotionally engaged (or involved) style’ of speech, while the other remains emotionally restrained and impersonal. The author examines how various linguistic forms and rhetorical strategies in combination with the content of the speeches create rhetorical effects of the speaker’s emotional involvement in their talk and index their affective stance of intimacy or distance towards their audience. Kataoka (2008) considers what he refers to as ‘involved speech style’ in reference to Japanese deictics in monologic narratives. Günthner (2011) offers a study on syntactically ‘dense constructions’ signalling ‘emotional involvement’ in German conversational narratives, while Ogi (2017) explores the expressive effects of selected Japanese interactional particles in terms of ‘involvement’ (understood by the author as the core property of the particles) and ‘the speaker’s attitude’.

¹⁶ But see also such notions as ‘metacommunication’ (Bateson 1972), ‘keying’ (Hymes 1972; Goffman 1974), and ‘framing’ (Goffman 1974; Tannen 1993).

that have most commonly been studied in this line of research are quite diverse, including lexical and syntactic choice, code-switching, style-shifting, intonation, stress, pitch, tempo, pausing, as well as non-verbal phenomena, such as gestures, gaze, and body posture (see, e.g., Auer and Di Luzio 1992). While many, such as Auer (1992:35), point out that “the concept is not entirely unproblematic and has fuzzy theoretical contours”, the body of research on contextualization is significant for the development of research on the resources for affective stance display in that it advances the understanding of context as reflexive and flexible and of language as both situated in context and simultaneously co-constructing it.

2.5 Emotion lexicon

Much linguistically oriented research has focused on emotion words and metaphors, often using a cross-linguistic and a cross-cultural perspective. Wierzbicka represents one of the key figures in this line of research. In her book on *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures* (1999), Wierzbicka argues that human emotions vary cross-linguistically and cross-culturally, but also show many similarities. As an analytical tool to approach this diversity and universality in human emotions, the author suggests using ‘Natural Semantic Metalanguage’ (NSM), which is a set of semantic primitives and rules for their combination that she and her colleagues have developed over the years. The NSM is also used by most of the contributors to the volume entitled *Emotions in Crosslinguistic Perspective*, edited by Harkins and Wierzbicka (2001), as they examine and describe the culturally-situated meanings of lexical units related to emotions in different languages, showing language specific elements of their meanings as well as elements that are shared across languages. Using the methods they do, the editors argue, the studies included in the volume “offer glimpses into other people’s emotional lives – without imposing on those lives a perspective derived from the vocabulary and other resources of our own native language” (Wierzbicka and Harkins 2001:25).¹⁷

Another key scholar in this field of study is Kövecses, who investigates cognitive models that structure ‘emotion talk’. Some of the models are culture-specific, some apply cross-linguistically, and some, the author claims, apply universally. His “major goal is to provide a new synthesis in the study of emotion, that is, to bring together language, culture, and body in such a way that we get a relatively complete and integrated account of emotional phenomena in human beings” (Kövecses 2000:xii). Kövecses (2000) divides ‘emotion words’ into

¹⁷ The volume includes a chapter that focuses on Japanese, namely, a paper by Hasada Rie which deals with the topic of the Japanese psychomimetic words.

‘expressive’ and ‘descriptive’, which he further subdivides into ‘literal’ and ‘figurative’. In his book, he focuses on the descriptive terms, and more specifically, on the figurative expressions which “denote various *aspects* of emotion concepts, such as intensity, cause, control, and so forth” (Kövecses 2000:4). Such expressions are shown to have a metaphorical and metonymic character and are viewed by the author as “both motivated by the human body and produced by a particular social and cultural environment” (Kövecses 2000:14).

The contributions presented at the 21st LAUD Symposium on *The Language of Emotions*, which was held in Duisburg, Germany in 1995, form the core of two publications. The volume edited by Niemeier and Dirven (1997), entitled *The Language of Emotions: Conceptualization, Expression, and Theoretical Foundation*, includes papers that approach the topic from a variety of perspectives and concentrate on issues such as theoretical and methodological concerns related to the study of emotion from a linguistic perspective, the conceptualization of emotions and emotional expressivity in specific languages and cultures, the acquisition of the language of emotions, and emotional expressions in discourse. The other volume, *Speaking of Emotions: Conceptualisation and Expression*, was edited by Athanasiadou and Tabakowska (1998) and consists of papers that represent different approaches to the topic at hand within the cognitive-linguistic paradigm. The papers consider a range of issues related to the conceptualisation of emotion terms and certain grammatical and pragmatic aspects of emotion expression in different languages and cultures.¹⁸

The foci of another edited volume that concerns emotion lexicon are ‘languages of sentiment’ (Palmer and Occhi 1999a). ‘Sentiments’ are understood here as “emotions that are culturally defined and organized; sentiments are socially constructed emotions” (Palmer and Occhi 1999b:2). The volume includes papers that represent two general orientations in the linguistically oriented study of sentiments: the cognitive approach and the pragmatic/social-constructionist approach. Collectively, the editors remark, the papers contribute to our understanding of “the problem of what emotion-language reveals about emotional thought and the problem of how emotional language serves social and interpersonal goals” (ibid.).¹⁹

¹⁸ The volume includes two papers that specifically concern the Japanese language: a paper by Catherine Travis which uses the NSM to deal with the concept of *omoiyari* (viewed as an ‘intuitive’ understanding of what the others feel, think, and desire) and a paper by Hasada Rie on sound symbolic words that are used by the Japanese people to express emotions.

¹⁹ The volume contains three papers that deal with the Japanese language. The paper by Cynthia Dickel Dunn was already introduced in Section 2.3. Janet Shibamoto Smith explores the contemporary cultural model of the Japanese emotion *ai* ‘love’ based on an analysis of Japanese romance novels and concludes that unlike the American models, for example, Japanese true love must be contained within an appropriate social vehicle. The last one of the three papers that address the Japanese language was penned by Debra J. Occhi and investigates the topic of Japanese mimetic expressions of emotional states.

To add one more example, the volume edited by Baider and Cislaru (2014), *Linguistic Approaches to Emotions in Context*, includes papers that approach emotions using a variety of linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic theories and methods, including the NSM and other forms of semantic analysis of emotion lexicon, but also corpus linguistics and discourse analysis. Some of the papers explore specific emotion words and constructions, but they mostly go beyond the study of emotion-descriptive terms and consider the topics such as prosody and emotions, the nature of emotions as such, various properties of emotions, as well as the functions that emotions serve in different contexts.

2.6 Affect

The means used for the communication of affective stances and the affective framing of propositional content in different languages and cultures have also been explored from a linguistic anthropological perspective. The scholars who subscribe to this line of inquiry generally stress that “[a]n approach to language as an object divorceable from its context is ill-equipped for an investigation of affective dimensions of language” (Besnier 1990:429). They also explicitly disassociate their object of interest from psychologically oriented research on emotion and argue against the dichotomizing view of cognition and affect (or referential and non-referential meanings and functions in language), illustrating the wealth of forms and formats that different languages and cultures make available for conveying affect.

In her oft-quoted paper, Irvine (1982) considers general issues, such as the definition of the domain of affect and affective expression, the evidence that people use to attribute affective states to others, the problem of sincerity of affective expression (or reliability of our judgements regarding other people’s affective states), and the role of situational context in communicating affect. She further provides an overview of the ‘modes (channels and devices) of affective expression’ that are available to the Wolof speakers of Senegal, warning the reader that a complete inventory “would be coterminous with the total set of utterances in Wolof” (Irvine 1982:37). Significantly, Irvine (ibid.) maintains that “[t]he communication of affect is not done only by a finite set of linguistic elements present or absent in a particular utterance, but, instead, represents a function or dimension of any utterance, even the most bland (for blandness [...] may say something about affect)”.

Instead of drawing a two-way distinction between expressive and cognitive dimensions of language, Irvine (1982:41) distinguishes between the ‘referential’, ‘affective’, and ‘social’ functional dimensions of language that may variously intersect. While the ‘affective dimension

of communication’, according to Irvine (1982:32), involves “all levels of linguistic organization as well as nonverbal phenomena and the organization of discourse and interaction”, the individual devices must always be considered “in relation to each other, but also against a backdrop of social contexts, social identities, and culturally constituted expectations”. When devices from different channels of affective communication co-occur, Irvine (1982:39–40) continues, they can either be ‘disjunctive’, that is, signalling different types of affect, or ‘cumulative’, signalling the same types of affect.

Ochs (1986:256) holds that owing to the fact that in ordinary interpersonal communication, people normally do not just relay information regarding entities, states, and events, but also convey their feelings about them, languages will necessarily provide their users with means for encoding affect-related information. In her 1986 paper, the author considers conventional linguistic encoding of affect in Samoan and the ways in which children in a Western Samoan village acquire these conventional expressions of affect over developmental time. Akin to Irvine (1982), Ochs (1986:256) takes the position that “all sentences expressed in context will have an affective component”. She provides an illustrative list of specific affect encoding devices that Samoan makes available and divides them into two nonexclusive functional categories based on their semantic roles, namely: ‘affect specifiers’, which indicate the nature of affect that is being conveyed, and ‘affect intensifiers’, which indicate the intensity of the conveyed affect. With regard to the developmental patterns associated with the acquisition of the expressions of affect in Samoan, the author found that there is a strong tendency for affectively marked forms to be acquired before the corresponding neutral forms (Ochs 1986:267) and that children acquire the majority of grammatical forms for expressing positive and negative affect before they turn four (Ochs 1986:264).

In their paper included in a special issue of *Text*, which dealt with the “potential of language to express different emotions and degrees of emotional intensity” (Ochs 1989:1), Ochs and Schieffelin (1989:9) argue that the need to “convey and assess feelings, moods, dispositions and attitudes” is “as critical and as human as that of describing events”, because of the fact that “the affective orientation provides critical cues to the interlocutor as to how that interlocutor should interpret and respond to the predication communicated”. Their influential article, provocatively entitled “Language has a heart”, represents the authors’ attempt to build “a general framework for understanding affect in language” (Ochs and Schieffelin 1989:7). In the framework, ‘affect’ is understood “to be a broader term than emotion, to include feelings, moods, dispositions, and attitudes associated with persons and/or situations” (ibid.). It can be conveyed both verbally and nonverbally, but the article concentrates on the linguistic means for

the expression of affect. Drawing on their own research in Western Samoa and Papua New Guinea, but also on data borrowed from other researchers working with different languages, the authors demonstrate a range of lexical, grammatical, and prosodic resources as well as some discourse structures that may be used to express affect in different languages, emphasizing that as long as an aspect of the linguistic system is variable, it may serve as a resource for communicating affect (Ochs and Schieffelin 1989:22). They refer to the linguistic resources they found as ‘affect keys’. Following Ochs (1986), they divide them into ‘affect specifiers’ and ‘affect intensifiers’ and, subsequently, attempt to describe the possible differences in their scope of influence and position with respect to the unit they operate on. The authors contend that affect intensifiers are more numerous than affect specifiers and suggest that “affect tends to be specified syntagmatically through co-occurring or emergent features in talk, gesture, facial expression and other semiotic systems” (Ochs and Schieffelin 1989:15).

Besnier (1990) reviews the (linguistic) anthropological research on language and affect, focusing on issues such as the loci of affect in language, the semiotic status of affective meaning, and the relationship between language, affect, culture, and social structure. Same as the authors of the papers introduced above, he regards affect as a multichannel phenomenon, which “permeates all levels of linguistic and communicative structures, all utterances, and all communicative contexts” in more or less overt ways (Besnier 1990:437). In order to demonstrate the diversity and range of linguistic and other communicative devices that may convey affective meaning, the author offers a survey of such devices in different languages, including, for example, certain components of lexicon and word-formation processes, sound symbolism, hedging, discourse markers, comparative constructions, evidentiality, mood, modality, case marking, certain syntactic features, acoustic phenomena, discourse strategies, such as quoting and code switching, poetic devices like parallelisms, and communicative activities, such as laughing, weeping, silence, and disfluency. According to Besnier (1990:428), affect is mostly communicated covertly, but it is “never absent from an interactional context, even though certain situations may be described as if it were” (Besnier 1990:431). He views ‘affective signs’ as cross-culturally variable multifunctional devices that may index different affects in different situations or several different affects at the same time. They may not only work together with other signs but also be in syntagmatic or paradigmatic conflict with them (Besnier 1990:429–430).²⁰

²⁰ See also the book-length study by Wilce (2009) who takes a historical and global approach in order to discuss various aspects of affect, language, and culture from an anthropological perspective. Akin to many of the contributions that have already been or will be introduced in this chapter, he posits that “[a]ll speaking and writing

2.7 Emotive communication

Affective dimensions of discourse have also been approached as ‘emotive communication’ (cf., Marty 1908; Stankiewicz 1964). Arndt and Janney’s (1987, 1991) studies represent some of the more elaborate examples. Arndt and Janney (1987) describe speech as contextually situated, multimodal, goal-directed human activity and – drawing heavily on the work of (social) psychologists – devise an interpretive framework for understanding how participants in face-to-face interaction communicate. They call their model the ‘InterGrammar’ and consider ‘emotive communication’, that is, “communication of transitory attitudes, feelings, and other affective states” that entails verbal, prosodic, and kinesic choices and their interpretations, its domain of relevance (Arndt and Janney 1987:329). The authors assume that “[e]very instance of referential communication in speech is embedded in a nonreferential emotive context” (Arndt and Janney 1987:5) and that “[i]nformation about a speaker’s ideas, intentions, and feelings is all present at any moment of speech” (Arndt and Janney 1987:326). More specifically, they identify three interrelated emotive dimensions of speech: ‘confidence’ (that is, assertiveness or control expressed mainly by means of variation in verbal directness and pitch contour), ‘positive-negative affect’ (or evaluation), and ‘involvement’ (or intensity, which embodies different levels of ‘emotional involvement’ and ‘interpersonal involvement’). ‘Emotional involvement’ is created and made manifest by “more or less spontaneous expressions of momentary personal affective states” (Arndt and Janney 1987:351), whereas ‘interpersonal involvement’ is realized via “approach-avoidance signals produced directly for the benefit of the partner” (Arndt and Janney 1987:352).²¹

In their later paper, Arndt and Janney (1991) heuristically distinguish ‘emotive communication’ from ‘emotional communication’ and ‘cognitive communication’. They regard

is inherently emotional to a greater or lesser extent; objective, distant coolness is an emotional stance. Emotion is not confined to the outskirts of linguistic civilization but pervades its core” (Wilce 2009:3).

²¹ The authors list several verbal, prosodic, and kinesic resources that they believe function as primary or secondary cues associated with the three dimensions in English face-to-face communication. Primary cues represent interpretations of choices made “in the absence of further modifying or modulating emotive cues. Secondary interpretations are alternatives for cases where cross-modal cues impel the interpreter to revise or further elaborate primary interpretations” (Arndt and Janney 1987:10). For example, the authors state that cues associated with the positive-negative dimension in speech are practically infinite. However, value-laden language and facial expressions represent the primary cues. Secondary positive-negative cues then include tone of voice, explicitness or inexplicitness of references, body posture, etc. Primary emotional involvement cues, according to the authors, involve verbal intensity (i.e., the degree of assertiveness or value-ladenness of lexical choices that the speaker makes), pitch prominence, and body posture. Secondary emotional involvement cues include sudden increases in informality or directness, falling or rising pitch in types of utterances that normally require the opposite pitch contour, gaze and gaze aversion. Primary interpersonal involvement cues include the degrees of verbal formality and gaze, whereas secondary interpersonal involvement cues are exemplified by the presence or absence of references to the co-participant and smiling.

the three types of communication as behaviourally closely interrelated and forming a continuum with the 'emotive communication' situated in the middle and featuring a kind of mixture of characteristics of the other two constructs which are thought of as forming the two extremes. 'Emotional communication' is understood as "basically a spontaneous, unplanned, instinctive externalization of internal affect that is not under conscious control and is not necessarily intended to communicate anything concretely to anyone", whereas 'cognitive communication' refers to the volitional and non-instinctive "signaling of referential or ideational information" (Arndt and Janney 1991:527). 'Emotive communication' is then defined as a feature of speech that involves "culturally learned, cognitively mediated use of nonpropositional verbal, prosodic, and kinesic signals to express feelings, manage impressions, and reach goals in speech" (Arndt and Janney 1991:521). Consequently, studying emotive communication entails focusing on the ways in which speakers intentionally use different nonpropositional resources to modify and modulate propositions (Arndt and Janney 1991:533). More specifically, to make the notion of 'emotive communication' useful for interactional pragmatics, the authors suggest making 'emotive contrasts' in speech behaviour the foci of analysis. Emotive contrasts are explained as nondiscrete, gradient, and variable and are said to include phenomena such as verbal formality, value-ladenness, modality, mood, explicitness, vocal emphasis, facial expressions, and gaze, which can further be interpreted along the three dimensions of emotive communication that were introduced above as signals of (un)assertiveness, positive/negative affect or (non)affiliation, and (un)involvement. The authors point out that the distinctions between ranges of alternative impressions vary from culture to culture and themselves discuss some of the general principles of emotive communication and conventional emotive strategies that are used by the speakers of American English.

Caffi and Janney (1994) further advance the idea that pragmatics should concern itself with what they view as inherently strategic and interpersonal 'emotive communication', rather than 'emotional communication', and attempt to prepare the foundation for a unified framework for 'a pragmatics of emotive communication'. In addition to providing a critical overview of selected past studies on language and affect and a survey of 'emotive categories' applied in linguistics, the authors discuss issues such as possible perspectives, units, and loci of analysis, types of emotive devices, emotive contrasts, and objects and objectives of emotive choices. Based on findings from previous research, they distinguish six types of emotive 'framing devices' (indices or markers), namely devices of: evaluation, proximity, specificity, evidentiality, volitionality, and quantity (Caffi and Janney 1994:354–358). Subsequently, when addressing the question of 'markedness', the authors propose three kinds of anticipatory

schemata that are involved in marking and interpreting ‘emotive contrasts’, namely: ‘linguistic anticipatory schemata’ that include assumptions about language and its use, both global and situational ‘contextual anticipatory schemata’, which consist of assumptions about communicative behaviour of different categories of people in different kinds of situations, and ‘cotextual anticipatory schemata’, which primarily involve assumptions about succession of actions and activities.

In her introduction to the edited volume entitled *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, Suzuki (2006b:2) proposes the following understanding of ‘emotive communication’:

What emotive communication refers to is broader than expressions of what is commonly thought of as emotions such as anger and joy. It represents what is considered to reflect subjective perspectives and includes expressions of evaluative stances, moods, attitudes, degrees of emphasis, and viewpoints.

It is not solely “a personal psychological phenomenon”, but also “an interpersonal social act” and, as such, Suzuki (ibid.) asserts, it corresponds to Lyons’s (1977) understanding of ‘expressive meaning’ and belongs to “the heart of language use”. Suzuki (2006b:1) points out that the Japanese language abounds in grammaticalized forms for expressing affective information and therefore serves as an excellent example of a language that allows us to appreciate the importance of emotive communication. The volume includes five papers that consider linguistic forms that have been grammaticalized in Japanese to express affective information and four papers that are concerned with various cognitive and pragmatic dimensions of emotive expressions in Japanese (Suzuki 2006a).

2.8 Discourse modality

One notable exception to the approaches that define modality in terms of subjectivity but do not consider anything other than ‘traditional’ modal categories is Maynard’s (1993) book on what she refers to as ‘Discourse Modality’ (DM). Maynard (1993:38–39) expands the concept of sentential modality to the level of discourse and defines DM as referring to information which “does not or only minimally conveys objective propositional message content”, “conveys the speaker’s subjective emotional, mental or psychological attitude toward the message content, the speech act itself or toward his or her interlocutor in discourse”, “operates to define and to foreground certain ways of interpreting the propositional content in discourse”, and “directly expresses the speaking self’s personal voice on the basis of which the utterance is intended to be meaningfully interpreted”. To metaphorically describe DM, Maynard (1993:40)

uses the notion of a ‘scene’, which she characterizes as “an emotional and conceptual space established and activated by participants of communicative interaction within which states and events are identified, interpreted and described”. It is a space where the subjectivity of the speaker or the writer and the intersubjectivity of speaker-listener or writer-reader meet (Maynard 1993:40–41).

The construction of a modal ‘scene’ is partly accomplished via ‘modal contextualization effects’ that are achieved in the process of ‘modal contextualization’ which involves the so-called ‘DM indicators’ activating one or more aspects of DM (Maynard 1993:58). DM indicators are defined as “non-referential linguistic signs whose primary functions are to directly express emotion and personal voice” (Maynard 1993:6). Maynard (1993:47), however, further specifies that some DM indicators have referential meanings, but it is their non-referential functions that are primary, and that “in some cases one must examine the context of a linguistic sign in order to identify a DM indicator as such”, for “some referential devices may operate non-referentially as DM indicators” (Maynard 1993:48). In other words, it appears that the author suggests that while some linguistic signs intrinsically function as DM indicators, other signs may acquire this function in context. Elsewhere, however, she also claims that “[t]he meaning of DM indicator is understood only in reference to its actual text and context” (Maynard 1993:274). DM indicators are further divided into several categories: paralinguistic (including sound-related phenomena as well as non-verbal signs), syntactic, independent (including interjections, interactional particles, modal adverbs, and discourse connectives), complex (including auxiliary verbs and adjectives), and multi-phrase phenomena (such as stylistic alternation).

Maintaining that “the modal characteristics of language are primary and are more critical than propositional information to interpreting the message” (Maynard 1993:21), the author explains that she proposes the framework of DM to approach the expressiveness of language in discourse and interaction and to enable an analysis of language as “modality-centred”, that is, “interaction-based, subjectivity-conscious and textuality-bound” (Maynard 1993:6). In the process, she also introduces the reader to the traditional Japanese scholarship dealing with the related issues, which is an important contribution of her work. In the study, Maynard (1993) specifically discusses several selected Japanese DM indicators, namely: connectives *dakara* and *datte*, adverbs *yahari/yappari* and *dōse*, stylistic shift between speech styles, interactional particles *yo* and *ne*, and the clause-noun constructions with *to yū*. Even though she concentrates on individual DM indicators, Maynard (1993:40) explicitly recognizes

that DM is often accomplished via the complex patterning of devices and strategies at different levels of organization.

2.9 Linguistic emotivity

Unsatisfied with the manner in which linguistics continues to treat the expressiveness of language, Maynard (2002:xii) calls for “a paradigmatic shift from the linguistics of *logos* to the linguistics of *pathos*”, that is, a linguistics that considers expressivity its primary focus of concern. The author explains that she views language and emotion as inseparable and that “[i]ndeed, no expression in language is totally void of emotive meaning” (Maynard 2002:25), for even those linguistic signs and strategies that may appear to carry referential meanings alone “always express, in varying degrees, emotive meanings as well” (Maynard 2002:4). Accordingly, the author proposes to understand language “as an experience of *pathos*, as sources of human emotion, and as a way of realizing our emotional *feeling* selves” (ibid.) and introduces the concept of ‘linguistic emotivity’ in order to refer to “a specific case of expressivity” (Maynard 2002:3). Linguistic emotivity, according to the author, includes “the speaker’s attitude toward the speech act, toward the content of what is conveyed, feelings toward partners, emotions associated with interaction, as well as the general mood, feelings, and sentiment the speaker and the partner experience and share in communication” (Maynard 2002:xi).

Linguistic emotivity is viewed as expressed by ‘emotives’, which include lexical items that denote emotions (in a broad sense of the term), linguistic strategies that index emotional attitudes, grammatical devices and rhetorical strategies that bring the emotive meaning to the fore, as well as “any linguistic sign when its emotive meaning is foregrounded” (Maynard 2002:3). In practice, Maynard (2002) focuses on several linguistic structures, which she claims have not been traditionally regarded as bearing emotive meanings or functions in Japanese. Using examples from comics, novels, television dramas, other people’s research, and sentences created by herself, the author concentrates on ‘emotive topics’ (namely, vocatives and some topic-marking expressions, emotive nominals, quotative topics, and emotive *nan(i)* ‘what’) and ‘emotive comments’ (including the copula *da* and its negative form *ja nai*, some emotive interrogatives, and stylistic shift).

In order to allow for a linguistic analysis that would reflect her view of language, Maynard (2002) devised a comprehensive theoretical construct, the ‘Place of Negotiation theory’, which represents an interesting fusion of Japanese and Western linguistic influences.

The key premise of the framework is the assumption that meanings are “indexically linked to the place of communication” (Maynard 2002: xii) and determined in the process of negotiation performed by the participants in interaction. Specifically, Maynard (2002:53–72) distinguishes six linguistic functions (namely, ‘recognition of objects’, ‘construction of proposition’, ‘expression of emotional attitude’, ‘communication of attitudes toward others’, ‘management of participatory action’, and ‘coordination of joint utterances’), which are associated with three dimensions of place: ‘cognitive’, ‘emotive’, and ‘interactional’. Projections onto these places are seen as connected to five kinds of meanings: ‘potential (or dictionary) meaning’, ‘informational (or propositional) meaning’, ‘emotive meaning’ (consisting of “the speaker’s emotional attitudes, aroused emotional responses, and the broad range of general feelings associated with the linguistic expression”), ‘interactional meaning’ (which refers to “the socially motivated feelings and attitudes primarily associated with how speaker, partner, and other participants [if any] express, understand, and manage interpersonal relations among themselves”), and finally, ‘negotiative meaning’, which refers to the result of the negotiation (combination, competition, and integration) of the other four meanings in ‘topica’, the place of negotiation, within which, speaker, object, and partner interact (Maynard 2002:54–55).

According to Maynard (2002), various features of language and discourse form either a part of the ‘Rhetoric of Pathos’ or the ‘Rhetoric of Logos’. In contrast to the Rhetoric of Logos, the Rhetoric of Pathos is characterized by features such as the relative unimportance of and little trust being placed in language, the relatively fluid perspectives, and the relative importance of topic-comment structure, modality effects, the context of place, etc. (Maynard 2002:112). In addition, Maynard (2002:395) distinguishes three dimensions of self that correspond to the three above-mentioned dimensions of place – namely, ‘thinking self’, ‘feeling self’, and ‘interactional self’, respectively – and contends that it is the feeling self that is realized through emotivity and the Rhetoric of Pathos. The author argues that Japanese is a prime example of a language that shows clear preference for the Rhetoric of Pathos (Maynard 2002:111–114). Therefore, she insists, ignoring the feeling self, which “looms high in ordinary discourse”, “results in a distorted picture of Japanese language and culture” (Maynard 2002:395).

Maynard (2002:45) acknowledges that ‘linguistic emotivity’ is in basic agreement with the notion of ‘affect’ as conceptualized by Ochs and Schieffelin (1989). However, she maintains that the two approaches differ in that her “work goes beyond those features of language customarily considered affective”. The author also attempts to explicate the difference between ‘linguistic emotivity’ and ‘Discourse Modality’, which was introduced in the preceding subchapter, stating that “[l]inguistic emotivity concentrates on the emotional aspect of language

more closely than the concept of Discourse Modality. It also focuses more intensely on the negotiative process of meaning under the Place of Negotiation theory” and studies “seemingly emotionless signs and strategies in broader discourse genres” (Maynard 2002:58). In practice, the two concepts are not easily distinguishable and, if not for the theoretical frameworks that Maynard develops, her studies could be neatly grouped together with studies exploring the linguistic means for expressing affect in different languages.

Maynard deals with the topic of the expressiveness of Japanese in her other publications as well. For example, a collection of emotion words and expressive strategies in Japanese, entitled *Expressive Japanese: A Reference Guide to Sharing Emotion and Empathy* (2005b), was already mentioned in Subchapter 2.2. Her later book, entitled *Linguistic Creativity in Japanese Discourse: Exploring the multiplicity of self, perspective and voice* (2007), then focuses on ‘linguistic creativity’, which, according to Maynard (2007:4), “refers to the use of language and discourse in specific ways to foreground personalized expressive meanings beyond the literal proposition-based information”, including “psychological, emotive, interpersonal, and rhetorical aspects of communication”, which form a part of Discourse Modality. Nonetheless, the author explains, compared to Discourse Modality, “linguistic creativity encompasses broader meanings and effects realized in discourse, such as feelings of intimacy or distance, emotion, empathy, humor, playfulness, persona, sense of self, identity, rhetorical effects, and so on” (ibid.). Specifically, Maynard (2002) considers topics such as: style mixing, borrowing, and manipulation, the use of rhetorical sentences, quotations, and negatives for non-negative effects, puns, metaphors, the use of demonstratives, and first person referencing.

2.10 Evaluation

A range of terms have been proposed and used to approach language expressing the speaker’s or writer’s attitudinal positions, judgements, and opinions. ‘Evaluation’ constitutes one such term, which has, moreover, also been commonly employed as a “broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about” (Thompson and Hunston 2000:5). Some scholars regard ‘evaluation’ as essentially comprising two broad components that can be subsumed under general headings, such as ‘modal evaluation’ and ‘affective (or attitudinal) evaluation’; others consider ‘modality’ and ‘evaluation’ conceptually separate.

In their introduction to the volume entitled *Evaluation in Text* (2000), which is a collection of papers that deal with various aspects of evaluation, using different terms and different linguistic approaches, Thompson and Hunston (2000) argue that evaluation is of great importance to the description of language and text, as it fulfils three vital functions: it expresses the speaker's or writer's opinion which is seen as important in and of itself but also reflects their personal as well as communal value systems, which, in turn, form a component of an ideology that lies behind the text and simultaneously co-creates it; it builds particular kinds of writer-reader and speaker-hearer relations; and it organizes the discourse. They point out that "evaluation tends to be found throughout a text rather than being confined to one particular part of it" (Thompson and Hunston 2000:19) and notice that it can be expressed via lexical, grammatical, and textual features, which can be conceptually grouped into three categories, namely, those that mark: the comparison of the object of evaluation against some kind of a comparator, the speaker's or writer's subjectivity, and social value. In addition, they also list four 'parameters of evaluation' that have regularly been made use of in previous research: good-bad, certainty, importance, and expectedness. The good-bad parameter, however, appears to form "the most basic parameter, the one to which the others can be seen to relate" (Thompson and Hunston 2000:25).

Thompson and Alba-Juez's (2014) *Evaluation in Context* is designed as a sequel to Hunston and Thompson's (2000) publication. It includes papers that deal with a number of theoretical and practical issues related to the study of evaluation, approaching the topic from a variety of perspectives and exploring it at different levels of linguistic description, in diverse text types and discursive contexts. The editors remark that "the expression of values is an all-pervading feature of language. Finding a text or even a sentence without any trace of evaluation is a very challenging, if not impossible, task" (Alba-Juez and Thompson 2014:5). They view evaluation as a dynamic, context-dependent, multi-faceted phenomenon that has many phases and permeates all levels of language structure. Consequently, they revise the definition of evaluation provided in the earlier volume and propose that it constitutes

a dynamic subsystem of language, permeating all linguistic levels and involving the expression of the speaker's or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that s/he is talking about, which entails relational work including the (possible and prototypically expected and subsequent) response of the hearer or (potential) audience. This relational work is generally related to the speaker's and/or the hearer's personal, group, or cultural set of values. (Alba-Juez and Thompson 2014:13)

They further differentiate between evaluation and another term that often appears in research in this area of investigation, ‘stance’. Specifically, they suggest that stance is “a more abstract concept”, while evaluation refers to “the actual verbal realization or manifestation of the stance” (Alba-Juez and Thompson 2014:10).

The ‘appraisal’ theory was developed by Martin and White and their colleagues as a framework for analysing ‘language of evaluation’, that is, the linguistic resources that signal the speaker’s or writer’s “evaluative involvement in the text as they adopt stances either toward phenomena [...] or toward metaphenomena” (White 2015:55). The framework emerged out of the systemic functional linguistic paradigm as an elaboration of Halliday’s ‘interpersonal metafunction’, which concerns the enactment and negotiation of personal and social relations and positions.²² The framework presents “speakers/writers as revealing their feelings, tastes, and opinions with greater or lesser degrees of intensity and directness, as construing propositions as more or as less contentious or warrantable, and as thereby aligning or disaligning with value positions in play in the current communicative context” (ibid.). It offers an elaborate categorisation of evaluative resources that languages make available and a methodology that allows a systematic analysis of attitudinal meanings in texts as they are activated and negotiated. In effect, as White (2011:34) summarizes, the framework provides “an account in which the lexico-grammatical, semantic and the social and contextual are integrated, and by which, therefore, it becomes possible to provide linguistically based explanations of such social effects as attitudinal positioning, the construction of authorial personae and negotiations of solidarity”.

Martin and White (2005:34–35) explain that, in their understanding, “appraisal is one of three major discourse semantic resources construing interpersonal meaning (alongside involvement and negotiation)” and itself consists of three interrelated domains: ‘attitude’, ‘engagement’, and ‘graduation’. Attitude relates to the expression of feelings and is further subcategorized into three regions based on what those feelings are grounded in, namely: ‘affect’, ‘judgement’, and ‘appreciation’. Affect concerns construing emotional responses; judgement concerns assessing human behaviour or character with reference to social norms and expectations; while appreciation is concerned with assessing products of human endeavour, natural phenomena, and states of affairs with reference to social value. Influenced by

²² Halliday (e.g., 2014) distinguishes three metafunctions of language: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Ideational resources construe the worlds of experience, interpersonal resources enact personal and social relationships, and textual resources relate to the construction of texts that make sense in their context.

dialogism,²³ engagement deals with the ways in which the speakers or writers position themselves with respect to the actual or potential value positions and engage with other voices in the text. Graduation attends to the modulation of meaning by degree, including the expression of intensity of feelings (referred to as ‘force’) and sharpness of boundaries between semantic categories in case of non-gradable resources (referred to as ‘focus’). Attitude is regarded as “in some sense focal”, whereas engagement and graduation are viewed as specific resources “for adopting a position with respect to propositions and for scaling intensity or degree of investment respectively” (Martin and White 2005:39). Attitudinal meanings can be activated in text either directly or indirectly, that is, they do not have to be overtly verbalized but could be only implied. Moreover, individual linguistic items, as White (2015:57) sums up, “typically do not have fixed attitudinal meanings that are stable across all textual settings. Rather, attitudinal meanings are activated by combinations of words in particular cotextual settings”.²⁴

2.11 Stance

Evaluating and positioning, which form a central part of the appraisal framework introduced above, have also been dealt with under the heading of ‘stance’ (see, e.g., Englebretson 2007a; Jaffe 2009a). Over the past two decades or so, this notion has enjoyed a remarkable upsurge of scholarly interest. While the proliferation of studies on stance may be viewed as indicative of a noticeable change that has been taking place in linguistics towards the exploration of the expressive and social-relational functions of language, there seems to be “no consensus [...] on how stance can be defined, what it may encompass, on what levels of language and discourse it operates and how it should consequently be studied” (Keisanen and Kärkkäinen 2014:295). As such, stance remains a term “with unclear and overlapping reference” (Coupland and Coupland 2004, quoted in Georgakopoulou 2007:393), which, as Irvine (2009:53) remarks, “is perhaps better thought of as a family of concepts, because it finds genealogies in several academic traditions”. On the one hand, it is sometimes employed to refer to what others would prefer to study under such labels as subjectivity, modality, evaluation, attitude, or affect. On the other hand, there are also interactionally oriented studies that adopt theoretical and

²³ See Linell (2009) for an overview of a dialogistic perspective.

²⁴ See Bednarek (2008) for a study that uses the appraisal theory and develops its insights into ‘emotion talk’ (or the ‘language of evaluation’) in different types of texts, including casual conversation, using systemic functional linguistics and corpus linguistics.

methodological positions comparable to the body of research that advocates the use of the term stance to refer to its research interest, but utilize one of the more ‘traditional’ terms.

In their overview of the development of research on stance, Keisanen and Kärkkäinen (2014) note that the term has been used mainly to refer to (1) the expression of the speaker’s or writer’s subjectivity in language locatable in concrete grammatical and lexical forms, (2) a dialogic phenomenon that involves both a subjective and an intersubjective dimension, motivates our actions, and is consequential for the construction of larger social constructs, such as our identities, (3) a collaborative, sequentially organized interactional activity that is embedded in the ongoing social interaction, and (4) a multimodal collaborative sequentially organized activity that involves the whole semiotic environment of social interaction. Overall, we can thus observe “a shift over recent decades from studying a single speaker’s stance in individual utterances, towards viewing stance as a dialogic, intersubjective and interactionally organized construct emergent and negotiated over longer conversational sequences” (Keisanen and Kärkkäinen 2014:314). We can further notice that irrespective of the ways in which individual contributions to this field of study define stance as their object of interest, they generally represent “an orientation toward conceiving of language in terms of the functions for which it is used, based on the contexts within which it occurs” (Englebretson 2007b:1).

Biber et al. (1999) represent one of the earlier endeavours to address stance, even though their approach is closely comparable to some of the studies on subjectivity or modality. In their *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, they include a chapter that focuses on ‘the grammatical marking of stance’ (Biber et al. 1999:965–986). In their introductory remarks to the chapter, the authors note that “[i]n addition to communicating propositional content, speakers and writers commonly express personal feelings, attitudes, value judgments, or assessments; that is, they express a ‘stance’” (Biber et al. 1999:966). They suggest that stance can be conveyed via linguistic, paralinguistic, as well as non-linguistic resources, but “both speakers and writers commonly express stance meanings overtly, using either grammatical or lexical means” (Biber et al. 1999:966). By contrast, they also admit that speakers may “express a kind of linguistically covert stance with every utterance”, which makes inferences from cues such as intonation or facial expressions necessary (Biber et al. 1999:967). In particular, the authors concern themselves with ‘grammatical stance devices’, such as adverbials, complement clauses, modals, and semi-modals, using corpus linguistics. They divide ‘stance markers’ into three major semantic categories based on the subjective meaning that they express. ‘Epistemic stance markers’ comment on the status of information that is conveyed in a proposition. ‘Attitudinal stance markers’ are used to express the speaker’s or writer’s personal attitudes,

evaluations, feelings, and emotions. Finally, the ‘style of speaking stance markers’ include means that present the speaker’s or writer’s comments on the act of communication itself.

Presently, stance-taking is commonly considered an activity that is central to any act of communication. Jaffe (2009b:3), for example, asserts that while “some forms of speech and writing are more stance-saturated than others, there is no such thing as a completely neutral position vis-à-vis one’s linguistic productions, because neutrality is itself a stance”, which is necessarily interpreted against all possible alternative affective orientations that could have been manifested in the given context. Likewise, Du Bois and Kärkkäinen (2012:438) assume that “[s]tance is always present when we speak; there is never a moment in conversation when it is not relevant to know where we stand with respect to the other”, and Englebretson (2007c:70) insists that “every utterance enacts a stance, and awareness of this should inform the linguist’s work at all levels”. Stance-taking in social interaction is “a public action that is shaped by the talk and stances of other participants in sequentially unfolding turns-at-talk” (Kärkkäinen 2006:701). It is shaped by the context in which it is embedded but, at the same time, it is also consequential for the further development of the ongoing interaction and the construction of the attendant social relations and identities.

Across different fields of study, stance (in a similar manner to evaluation) has commonly been approached as comprising an attitudinal component and an epistemic component. Consequently, many have employed the term to refer to the superordinate concept that subsumes different and variously interwoven types of stances, mostly drawing a distinction between epistemic (or epistemological) stance and affective (or attitudinal) stance, but also between more specific categories, such as epistemic, evidential, evaluative, and affective stances. For example, Biber and Finegan (1989:92), who approach the topic of stance using corpus linguistics, define stance as “the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message”; in other words, “the lexical and grammatical encoding of both evidentiality and affect” (Biber and Finegan 1989:94). Ochs (1996:410), a linguistic anthropologist, differentiates between ‘affective stance’, which “refers to a mood, attitude, feeling, and disposition, as well as degrees of emotional intensity vis-à-vis some focus of concern”, and ‘epistemic stance’, which “refers to knowledge or belief vis-à-vis some focus of concern, including degrees of certainty of knowledge, degrees of commitment to truth of propositions, and sources of knowledge, among other epistemic qualities”. Likewise, Wu (2004:3), who subscribes to the framework of conversation analysis,

defines stance as “a speaker’s indication of how he or she knows about, is commenting on, or is taking an affective or other position toward the person or matter being addressed”.²⁵

An attempt to provide an alternative to defining stance in a disjunctive manner (as encompassing different types of phenomena) is represented by Du Bois’s (2007) holistic model of stance as a linguistically realized social action referred to as the ‘stance triangle’. According to Du Bois (2007:163):

Stance is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field.

While this conceptualization of stance has gained substantial popularity and has been used by a number of researchers, many prefer to view stance not only as something that needs to be marked explicitly, but also as something that might only be evoked or implied. Another attempt at a more overarching characterization of stance is offered by Jaffe (2009b:4) who, having surveyed the sociolinguistic research on ‘stance’, concludes that it has been

concerned with *positionality*: how speakers and writers are necessarily engaged in positioning themselves vis-à-vis their words and texts [...], their interlocutors and audiences [...], and with respect to a context that they simultaneously respond to and construct linguistically.

Looking at stance from another perspective, she further adds that, “[a]t a very basic level, stance can be seen as a form of *contextualization*, because stancetaking indicates how the speaker’s position with respect to a particular utterance or bit of text is to be interpreted” (Jaffe 2009b:10). From this vantage point, stance-taking is regarded as achieved via stance markers or contextualization cues (introduced in Subchapter 2.4) at specifiable moments in discourse.

Considering different definitions and conceptualizations of stance, it appears safe to say that affect (i.e., emotions, feelings, moods, attitudes, dispositions, sentiments, etc.) has generally been viewed as highly pervasive in the domain of stance and that public display of affect can be approached as an act of stance-taking or a situated performance of affective stance accomplished through a combination of resources. Du Bois and Kärkkäinen (2012:446) apply Du Bois’s above-mentioned model of stance as a triplex act to the study of affect and explain that, when approached from this standpoint, affect display constitutes a particular kind of

²⁵ Many different stance categories have been proposed and investigated. Goodwin (2007), for example, differentiates between five categories of stance: ‘instrumental’, ‘cooperative’, ‘epistemic’, ‘moral’, and ‘affective’. Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen (2015) discuss ‘epistemic’, ‘affiliative’, ‘affective’, ‘agentive’, and ‘deontic’ stances. Other concepts include such categories as: ‘authorial stance’ (Hunston and Thompson 2000), ‘listener stance’ (Gardner 2001), ‘interpersonal stance’ (Kiesling 2009), and ‘discourse stance’ (Berman et al. 2002; Dunn 2010).

affective evaluation of a stance object, during which “participants position themselves as the kind of person who would make that kind of evaluation”, and thereby line up their stances with those of other people and voices, taking stock of the ‘stance differential’ between them. Representing a conversation analytic approach to affect, Couper-Kuhlen (2012b:453) posits that affect involves visible and/or hearable public displays of something that is interpretable as an affective stance in specifiable sequential locations. As a consequence, affect displays need to be viewed as “*situated*, localizable with reference to ongoing activities and specific to particular actions being accomplished at particular moments in time” (Couper-Kuhlen 2012b:454).

2.12 Affect(ive stance) display

Researchers who draw on frameworks such as conversation analysis or interactional linguistics often call their object of study ‘affect display’, ‘affective stance display’, or ‘affectivity’, rather than ‘affect’ or ‘emotion’, but this is not a set rule. Many have applied different terms or, as seen in the title of the collection of studies that take an interactional perspective and utilize naturally occurring interactions as their data, *Emotions in Interaction* (Peräkylä and Sorjonen 2012), some do not avoid the terms ‘affect’ or ‘emotion’ either. Regardless of the label, however, the studies in these fields of research always consider the outward interactional manifestation of affect(ive stance) and disregard questions concerning the genuineness of the displays unless specifically oriented to by the participants in interaction themselves.²⁶ The current position is such that affect(ive stance) is to be treated as a social display that is observable (and therefore analysable) in specifiable sequential environments and as an integral part of actions and activities that are being accomplished. Affectivity is viewed as continuously variable property of talk-in-interaction that is collaboratively constructed and managed by the co-participants in interaction by means of various situated combinations of resources from different channels or modalities. Affect(ive stance) displays are further considered contingent on their context of occurrence and, at the same time, consequential for the unfolding interaction.

²⁶ However, as Voutilainen et al. (2014), for example, demonstrate, studying affect(ive stance) displays and physiological (or other) processes is not impossible. The authors connect the study of affective stance displays and affiliation with investigation into the participants’ physiological responses by measuring the participants’ heart rate, electrodermal activity, and facial muscle activity in the course of happy, sad, and ambivalent conversational stories. They report that the affective stances that are displayed by the storyteller (especially in case of the affectively ambivalent stories) can be linked with an increase of activity in the story recipient’s autonomic nervous system.

The foci of research undertaken by those who subscribe to the position described above have been diverse and numerous, including the exploration of: individual resources, such as response tokens, specific prosodic features, or visual resources; the interplay of resources in the organisation of specific affect(ive stance) displays; the co-construction of particular types of affective actions and activities; the interactional management of affectivity and affiliation; the role of affect(ive stance) displays in action formation or in specific sequential contexts, etc.²⁷ For example, Selting (1996) investigates other-initiation of self-repair with higher global pitch and increased loudness as ‘astonished questions’. Günthner (1997) considers verbal and prosodic means used for display of affect in reported dialogues. Maynard (2003) and Maynard and Freese (2012) explore the delivery of good and bad news and suggest that there are systematic differences in the prosodic realization of good and bad news and responses to the news. Wilkinson and Kitzinger (2006) focus on displays of surprise and demonstrate how they are interactionally accomplished. Local and Walker (2008) study the interplay of sequential organization and lexical and phonetic resources, concluding that “there is no straightforward mapping between the design of talk (either in terms of voice quality, turn design, or sequential organization) and the ascription of affect” (Local and Walker 2008:733), nor “between *valence* and phonetic design” (Local and Walker 2008:735). Therefore, they argue, it is crucial to take into account the entire design of talk when making judgements relating to affect. Couper-Kuhlen (2009) examines vocal delivery of a particular expression (English ‘*oh*’) in a particular sequential position (after a rejection of a request or a proposal) and shows that specific delivery in that particular sequential position makes it hearable as a display of disappointment. However, she adds, there are no specific prosodic features that would encode specific affects. Rather, when interpreting affect displays, we always take into consideration context and a set of affective responses that are potentially relevant in a given sequential position. Kangasharju (2009) studies displays of emotional stance in the course of three disputes in three different settings. Selting (2010) considers displays of anger and indignation in complaint stories; Couper-Kuhlen (2012a) is concerned with the lexico-syntactic and prosodic-phonetic resources that are used by the recipients of conversational complaint stories to show affiliation; while Selting (2012) explores complaint stories and the subsequent complaint stories with affect displays. Heritage (2011b) focuses on ‘emphatic moments in interaction’ by looking at the formats that participants use to respond to the emerging moments for emphatic engagement. Reber (2012) studies ‘affect-laden sound objects’ (e.g., ‘*oh*’, ‘*ah*’, ‘*ooh*’) in English; Hakulinen

²⁷ See Ruusuvuori (2013) for a brief introduction into the development of research on affect within the framework of conversation analysis.

and Sorjonen (2012) concentrate on the use of a single phrasal response form (*'voi että'*) in Finnish and describe it as an equivocal affective response; while Golato (2012), for example, studies German *'oh'* (as opposed to *'ach'*) and reports that it is used to mark an emotional change of state.

A growing number of researchers examine affect(ive stance) displays as multimodal processes that involve not only verbal and vocal resources but also other modalities. For example, Charles and Marjorie H. Goodwin explore emotion as an embodied performance that entails systematic coordination of phonetic-prosodic features, grammatical choices, body postures, gestures, and timing (see, e.g., Goodwin 2000; Goodwin and Goodwin 2001; Goodwin 2007; Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012). Haddington (2006) considers assessments and three different gaze patterns as resources for stance-taking in everyday conversational interactions. Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin (2012) study emotion as “organized within the flow of ongoing interaction as a contextualized, multiparty, multimodal process” (Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012:18) and point out that “emotion and stance are not simply add-ons to an isolated individual action, but constitute an inherent feature of temporally unfolding sequences of social interaction” (Goodwin, Cekaite, and Goodwin 2012:39). Stivers (2008) draws our attention to the key importance of a sequential position for affective stance display, as she demonstrates that head nods are used to show affiliation during a storytelling event but can also convey a lack of affiliation upon the story completion. Ruusuvuori and Peräkylä (2009) investigate the interplay of facial expressions and verbal resources in the context of assessments in storytelling and announcement sequences and observe that facial expressions are organized in congruence with verbal expressions, but their relation to the organization of turn-taking is not the same as that of verbal expressions. Specifically, they suggest that “the face seems to be able to stretch the temporal boundaries of an action” (Ruusuvuori and Peräkylä 2009:393). In their later paper, Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori (2012) focus on the role of facial expressions in relation to verbal expressions in the interactional regulation of emotion at the closure of telling sequences and demonstrate that there are “intimate linkages between facial expression and the actions [...] carried out through spoken utterances” (Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori 2012:88). Sugita (2012) studies verbal, vocal, and visual resources used in the pre-climax position of conversational *'scary'* stories by both the tellers and the recipients, focusing on the minimal affect uptake done nonverbally by the recipients. Kaukomaa, Peräkylä, and Ruusuvuori (2013) examine turn-opening smiles as resources for shifting emotional stances in everyday conversation, while their more recent paper (Kaukomaa,

Peräkylä, and Ruusuvuori 2015) investigates the ways in which listeners make use of facial expressions to convey affective stances and to shift the affective stances of their co-participants.

As the following chapter makes clear, in addition to the countless important insights gained through the study of all the approaches to affective-stance-display-related phenomena outlined in this chapter, it is the conversation analytic and interactional linguistic research tradition, briefly introduced in the present subchapter, that has had the most profound impact on my understanding of the issues related to affective stance display, language, and social interaction.

CHAPTER 3

Preliminaries

This chapter first briefly introduces two frameworks that have most strongly influenced the approach I take to affective stance display, language, and social interaction. Next, it explains the basic terminology that will be applied when commenting on the resources and analysing the examples in the following chapter. Subsequently, it describes the data that I have worked with and outlines the transcription conventions that were adopted. Finally, the chapter finishes off by presenting – in a highly cursory fashion – some basic characteristics of (conversational) Japanese, focusing on those features that will be of relevance throughout the ensuing chapter.

3.1 Theoretical and methodological framing

The present thesis aims to underscore the importance and merits of the interactional approach to the study of linguistic resources deployed for affective stance display purposes. While it does not fully fit into any single field and makes use of research conducted in a range of disciplines, it is guided primarily by the theoretical and methodological principles of conversation analysis and interactional linguistics. These have impacted my theoretical framing of the issues at hand, choice of data, methods applied when looking for the forms and formats to include in this thesis as well as my analyses of the excerpts that are included in the following chapter. In what follows, the two frameworks are thus briefly introduced.

Conversation analysis (CA) is an empirical, inductive, and (for the most part) qualitative approach to social interaction that boasts its own theoretical assumptions, methodological tools, and proof procedures, which made it into arguably the most popular framework for the systematic analysis of social interaction among scholars working in a variety of fields. It has its roots in sociology and the work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson, whose seminal paper on turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974) connected the concerns of CA with those of linguistics. The fundamental assumption that CA makes is that in social interaction there is order (possible) at all points (e.g., Sacks 1984:22; Schegloff 2004:17–18). It is “conceived of as the product of shared methods of reasoning and action to which all competent social interactants attend” (Stivers and Sidnell 2013:2) and which the analysts try to uncover, describe, and explicate, while being guided by the principle that “no order of detail in

interaction can be dismissed *a priori* as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant” (Heritage 1984b:241). Participants in interaction “are seen as mutually orienting to and collaborating in order to achieve orderly and meaningful communication” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008:1), which, in turn, means that the analysts need to pay close attention to sequentiality. Another key assumption that CA makes is that “the significance of any speaker’s communicative action is doubly contextual in being both context-shaped and context-renewing” (Heritage 1984b:242). Accordingly, CA argues that contributions to a talk exchange cannot be adequately understood without referring to their context of occurrence.

CA is interested in the ‘organization of social life’ and ordinary social actions and activities, as they are temporally and sequentially arranged and collaboratively accomplished by the co-participants in a locally situated way by means of a great variety of publicly mobilized verbal, vocal, and visual resources.²⁸ To this end, analysts use audio and, more and more frequently, also video recordings of naturalistic (unscripted, non-elicited, spontaneous) talk-in-interaction or talk-and-other-conduct-in-interaction as their data and employ detailed transcriptions of the recorded materials (see Jefferson 2004).²⁹ The basic analytic procedure involves observation of a selected phenomenon in close single case analyses as well as analyses of collections of similar instances and the so-called ‘deviant cases’, that is, examples that do not seem to exhibit the normative orientations that were observed in other examples (e.g., Clayman and Maynard 1995). Analysts strive to approach the studied interactions from the emic perspective, warranting their interpretations by referring to the participants’ observable orientations and using the so-called ‘next turn proof procedure’ (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974; Heritage 1984b). This procedure is based on the idea that “in subsequent turns-at-talk participants display an understanding of a prior turn” (Sidnell 2013:79) and so it involves studying subsequent turns with a view to grounding the analysis of what the preceding turn is doing in the co-participant’s understanding of it as displayed in their turn, affording thereby the analyst a proof criterion.³⁰ The co-participant’s understanding of a turn may be consistent with

²⁸ Its key foci include turn-taking, turn design, action formation and ascription, the organization of actions into sequences, preference organization, practices of repair, and recipient design. To learn more about the research interests and methods of CA, see, for example, Heritage (1984b), Sacks (1995), Schegloff (2007), ten Have (2007), Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008), Sidnell (2010), Sidnell and Stivers (2013), or Clift (2016).

²⁹ The term ‘talk-in-interaction’ is used as an umbrella term to cover all forms of naturally occurring talk exchanges. ‘Talk-and-other-conduct-in-interaction’ is a term that is sometimes used in studies that pay attention to the multimodality of social interaction.

³⁰ Despite the explicit efforts of conversation analysts to assume the perspective of the participants themselves and avoid forcing the analysts’ categories onto the analysis, critics point out that the notion of participant orientation might be too restrictive and that even in case of the next turn proof procedure, it is still the analyst who interprets the data and while doing so draws on other sources of knowledge, just as participants themselves (see, e.g., Weber 2003).

what the participant who produced the turn intended, or not; “whichever is the case, that itself is something which gets displayed in the next turn in the sequence” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008:13).³¹

Over the years, it has transpired that “linguistic structures are of paramount importance for the conduct of interaction” (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018:7–8) and that “some of the most fundamental features of natural language are shaped in accordance with their home environment in co-present interaction, as adaptations to it, or as part of its very warp and weft” (Schegloff 1996b:54). This led to the realization that language(s) should be studied in the context of social interaction and resulted in the development of what is now known as interactional linguistics (IL). IL thus originally emerged as a CA-informed approach to the study of language(s) and, even though it has since broadened its scope and methods, the two frameworks continue to be closely interrelated, so much so that the contemporary studies that subscribe to them, as Ford (2010:213) notices, “cannot be neatly separated”. The most easily perceptible difference between the two is ostensibly their main focus: CA is primarily interested in the structure and organization of social interaction, whereas IL makes the linguistic (and other semiotic) resources that are systematically and methodically mobilized and made use of by the participants in interaction in order to accomplish sequentially situated actions and activities and make them interpretable in their specifiable contexts of occurrence its object of study.

IL may be characterized as “a descriptive, functional, linguistically informed approach to language and language use” (Barth-Weingarten 2008:80), which is heavily informed not only by CA but also functional linguistics, anthropological linguistics, and contextualization theory. The fundamental premise that it holds is that “linguistic categories and structures are designed for service in the organization of social interaction and must be described and explained accordingly” (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018:14–15). IL approaches language as “a form of social behaviour”, “an inherently interactional activity observable in social encounters between human beings”, and “one means of communication”, which provides its speakers with a set of resources that can be deployed together with other semiotic resources for the purpose of accomplishing particular tasks in social interaction (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018:541). Accordingly, it views different organizations of language and interaction as co-influential and explores how language shapes interaction and how language itself is shaped by interaction (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2001:3). In their studies, IL practitioners combine sequential

³¹ There are, of course, other types of evidence that analysts can work with. See, for example, Wootton (1989) for a description of five types of evidence as to what a turn is doing.

analysis with linguistic analysis and, when relevant, multimodal analysis. They either look at the ways in which certain types of actions and activities are constructed and made interpretable by means of linguistic and other semiotic resources, or they make particular linguistic (or other semiotic) resources their point of departure and try to find out about their situated workings, that is, what actions and activities they are routinely deployed to implement and in what type of sequential environments.³²

3.2 Basic terminology

Throughout the thesis, and especially in the following chapter wherein I discuss the selected resources and analyse the excerpts that are provided to illustrate their use, I employ a number of terms that are specific to CA and IL studies. Therefore, a brief introduction into the basic terminology is in order. When we interact, we take ‘turns’ to talk and design each turn so as to ‘do’ something (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974). Each turn-at-talk is contingent on its prior turn and itself creates contingencies for the turn that follows (e.g., Drew 2013). A turn consists of one or more coherent and self-contained ‘turn-constructional units’, which are dynamic, interactionally relevant entities that emerge in real-time in response to local contingencies, are recognizable by reference to grammar, prosody, and action, and upon possible completion may entail a ‘transition relevance place’, that is, a place where a change of speakership is a salient possibility (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974; Ford and Thompson 1996; Fox 1999; Tanaka 1999; Ford 2004; Goodwin 2010, 2013; Szczepek Reed 2010; Schegloff 2011; among many).

The “‘main job’ that the turn is performing” and “what the response must deal with in order to count as an adequate next turn” is called ‘action’ (Levinson 2013:107; original emphasis omitted). In consequence, Hayashi (2005:47), for example, defines turns as “multimodal packages for the production of action (and collaborative action) that make use of a range of different modalities, e.g., grammatical structure, sequential organization, organization of gaze and gesture, spatial-orientational framework, etc., in conjunction with each other”. Actions are commonly labelled using everyday language, such as ‘offering’ or ‘requesting’, but certain actions that are recognized by CA, such as ‘pre-closings’ or ‘pre-

³² See the extensive publication by Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018) or the short overviews by Barth-Weingarten (2008), Lindström (2009), or Kern and Selting (2013) to find out more about the framework. To learn more about the IL research, see, for example, the edited volumes by Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (1996), Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (1996), Selting and Couper-Kuhlen (2001), Ford, Fox and Thompson (2002), Hakulinen and Selting (2005), or Barth-Weingarten, Reber, and Selting (2010).

announcements’, lack vernacular labels. A ‘sequence’ of actions consists minimally of an ‘initiating action’ and a ‘responding action’, which is specifically fitted so as to form a response to the initiating action on a number of levels (see, e.g., Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen 2015). Consequently, the most basic organization of turns produced by different speakers that form a sequence is called an ‘adjacency pair’ and consists of a ‘first pair part’ that makes a ‘second pair part’ ‘conditionally relevant’ (e.g., Schegloff 1968; Schegloff and Sacks 1973). Not all sequence organizations are, however, based on the format of adjacency pairs. For example, the organization of conversational storytelling may involve quite different patterns. Sequence organization is connected to ‘turn design’ which “embodies both an action selection and a selection of how the action is to be realized in words” (Drew and Heritage 1992:36). ‘Activities’ then involve more than one sequence of actions that get their coherence from overall structural organization (e.g., Robinson 2013).

For example, the term ‘tellings’ refers to a generic category of activities that includes such forms as storytelling, gossiping, troubles-tellings, complaint stories, or informings. Different types of tellings can also “be closely linked and may blend virtually imperceptibly into one another” (Schegloff 2007:42). The simplest participation framework involves a single participant in the role of the teller and another participant in the role of the recipient. Such conversational tellings then typically necessitate a temporary suspension of turn-by-turn talk because they tend to be accomplished across multiple turns (or in multi-unit turns). Tellings represent activities that have important informational as well as socio-relational consequences. They can have positive, negative, or mixed affective valence and entail various forms of positioning and evaluation. As such, they form regular loci for affective stance building and negotiation of affiliation. Another category of activities that are of key significance for this thesis are ‘assessments’, which involve participants making variously valenced evaluations of people, things, ideas, events, situations, etc. (e.g., Pomerantz 1984; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987, 1992). A single turn or a turn-constructive unit can implement an assessment action. Sequences of turns that implement assessment-related actions form assessment activities.

‘Resources’, as explained by Couper-Kuhlen and Selting (2018:29), refer to “substance-based linguistic (and other) forms or entities that can be described with respect to their structure and use” and consist of

single forms of different sizes, including *verbal* forms such as phones and other sound objects, morphs, words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and recurrent larger discourse units, and *non-verbal* forms, such as prosodies, gaze, facial/bodily gestures, and bodily position and movement; as well as *combinations* of forms in (construction) formats.

Recurrent deployment of resources in particular types of sequential contexts with a view to accomplishing particular types of actions leads to the establishment of ‘practices’, which can be viewed as “a link between linguistic (and other) resources (forms or formats) on the one hand and actions on the other, in such a way that the action is accomplished and its recognition enabled by the deployment of the practice” (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 2018:28). Alternatively, we can define practice as Heritage (2011a:212) does in his introduction to the CA treatment of interactional practices, which conceives of it as “any feature of the design of a turn in a sequence that (i) has a distinctive character, (ii) has specific locations within a turn or sequence, and (iii) is distinctive in its consequences for the nature or the meaning of the action that the turn implements”.

Participants in interaction are said to follow certain (often implicit) ‘preference’ principles, which are reflected in the ways that they act and react in different situations (e.g., Pomerantz and Heritage 2013). For example, in responding actions, which have formed the most common object of research focusing on preference organization, there typically appears to be preference for agreement, acceptance, confirmation, and other actions that are seen as supportive of the co-participant. This is evident, for example, from the fact that such responses are usually short, direct, and unmitigated, while dispreferred responding actions, such as disagreement, rejection, and disconfirmation in non-conflictual pro-social interaction tend to be delivered more indirectly, in a more complex, roundabout, and lengthy way, accompanied by accounts, apologies, excuses, explanations, and the like (e.g., Pomerantz 1984). The structure of the sequence initiating turn and the type of action or activity that is being conducted make certain preference principles (which may also be in conflict with one another) relevant. Overall, Heritage (1984b:269) claims, “[p]referred format actions are normally affiliative in character while dispreferred format actions are disaffiliative. Similarly, while preferred format actions are generally supportive of social solidarity, dispreferred format actions are destructive of it”. This is not to say that affiliative actions are always designed as preferred actions and the other way around, only that there is a distributional tendency.

The term ‘affiliation’ has not been applied consistently, but it now tends to be discussed in relation to ‘alignment’ from which it is distinguished. Both affiliation and alignment are viewed as forms of cooperation and have mostly been studied in reference to responding actions.³³ Whereas the term ‘alignment’ is used to refer to the cooperation on the structural level

³³ But see research produced by scholars associated with the collaborative European project *Language and Social Action: A Comparative Study of Affiliation and Disaffiliation across National Communities and Institutional Contexts*, as they primarily focus on affiliative and disaffiliative potential of first actions, rather than responsive

of social interaction and an aligning responding action is, therefore, such that provides support to the ongoing activity or sequence in terms of its organization and participation framework, ‘affiliation’ relates to the affective level of social interaction (Stivers 2008; Stivers, Mondada, and Steensig 2011). Affiliative responding actions are, therefore, considered to be such actions that display the participant’s support for or endorsement of the affective stances displayed by the co-participant, show empathy with them, or accord with the preference organization invited by the initiating action (Stivers 2008:35; Stivers, Mondada, and Steensig 2011:20–21).³⁴ Affiliation is a gradient phenomenon that can be achieved with varying degrees of commitment, ranging from unequivocal affiliation to various degrees of affiliation, non-affiliation, various degrees of disaffiliation, and unequivocal disaffiliation. There are no resources that are intrinsically affiliative or disaffiliative; they always derive their valence in their context of occurrence. Affiliative responding actions are not necessarily aligning and disaffiliative responding actions are not necessarily disaligning. Rather, “the design and conduct of responding actions may involve a close interplay (and selection) between the two” (Lee and Tanaka 2016:4), while the participants normally closely monitor, show orientation to, and jointly manage both forms of cooperation.

People are imperfect beings that often experience troubles with speaking, hearing, or understanding. The practices that we as participants in interaction employ to manage such troubles thus form an indispensable part of our everyday talk exchanges. The ‘organization of repair’, as these practices are called, involves an interplay of a variety of verbal and non-verbal means of communication. ‘Repair’ may be self- or other-initiated and may be carried out either by the speaker who produced the trouble-source (or the ‘repairable’) or by another participant (see, e.g., Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks 1977; Hayashi, Raymond, and Sidnell 2013).

In and through their talk, participants in the momentary participation role of the speaker always indicate who they believe their addressee to be, what they think the addressee knows, what they consider their relationship to be (like), and so forth (see, e.g., Day and Wagner 2010). In CA and IL studies, such “multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the co-participants” is referred to as ‘recipient design’ (Sacks, Schegloff, and

actions. They examine such topics as complaints, assessments, requests, offers, and questions. A special issue of *Discourse Studies* (Steensig and Drew 2008), for example, deals with the topic of questioning and affiliation in different settings. The articles included in the issue consider the ways in which questioning in five European languages contributes to the construction of affiliation or disaffiliation between the co-participants.

³⁴ Steensig (2013) regards the term ‘affective level’ of social interaction vague and nonanalytic and voices his reservations about the idea that the cooperation with the preference of the prior action constitutes an issue that concerns the ‘affective level’. Nonetheless, he does not attempt to redefine the concept.

Jefferson 1974:727). Another way in which participants in the momentary participation role of the recipients affect the emergent talk is through their behaviour, which may involve embodied (visual) resources (such as gaze, facial expressions, head nods, and body posture), non-verbal vocal resources (such as laughter and non-linguistic vocalizations), as well as a wide range of verbal resources (such as interjections, repeats, evaluative comments, summarizing formulations, co-construction of the speaker's turns, various forms of questions, etc.). In this sense, listeners are also 'speakers' and speakers need to listen to their responses and monitor their behaviour, so that they can react to it and modify and modulate their talk accordingly.

3.3 Data and procedure

Conforming with the CA and IL requirements, this thesis is based on naturally occurring data and – even though I do make use of ethnographic knowledge that the participants themselves necessarily refer to when interpreting each other's contributions (cf. Deppermann 2013:78) – the analyses are firmly grounded in the evidence found in the studied interactions. I started off by studying numerous recordings of Japanese young people's spontaneous face-to-face conversational interactions and screenshots of their technically mediated conversational interactions on social media that my Japanese informants and I have been collecting since 2012. The interactants are Japanese young adults generally in their twenties up to mid-thirties in different types of relationships. The recordings feature both dyadic and multiparty conversational interactions taking place in a great variety of informal settings – such as cafes, pubs, cafeterias, lower-price range restaurants, university grounds, flats, or guest houses – where participants always gathered for purposes other than the recording and recorded their spontaneous conversational interactions on their own smartphones or digital cameras, or, alternatively, my small digital voice recorder whose impact on the setting is minimal. The technically mediated conversational interactions that were used in the initial phase of this study included screenshots of anonymised public and semi-public interactions on the social networking site Facebook and consisted of status updates and the corresponding comments as well as any subsequent interactions between the participants in the given thread. I further examined naturalistic telephone conversations between Japanese friends and family members of different ages that are included in the Japanese versions of the CallFriend and CallHome

corpora available from the TalkBank database.³⁵ In addition, I also considered the resources used to construct affective stance displays in Japanese blogs, vlogs, and various forms of interaction in television talk shows, films, and dramas.

The goal of the first phase was to gain a better understanding about the ways in which affective stance displays are constructed and the diversity of resources that Japanese people mobilize and make use of for affective stance display purposes. In the process, I was able to observe that people build their affective stance displays in different ways depending on a range of factors, including their age, identity concerns (such as their self-concept, gender, or social roles), the relationship between them and their co-participants, communicative situation, channel of communication, etc. While the types (or categories) of verbal resources that I found seem to form a part of the linguistic repertoire of all competent adult speakers of the Japanese language, the differences across speakers – as individuals, incumbents of different social and cultural groups, and participants in social interactions situated in different contexts – appear to exist mainly in the use and non-use of specific expressions and the frequencies of usage of particular forms and formats. For example, intensifiers represent a type of lexical resource that is commonly deployed in the construction of affective stance displays by all adult speakers of the language, however, the specific expressions that are used as intensifiers vary. Similarly, to offer one more example, certain verbal forms and formats that are commonly used by Japanese young people in their informal face-to-face conversational interactions with a view to accomplishing affective stance displays do not seem to normally occur in their informal posts on social media because of the differences between these channels.

In the second phase, I limited my exploration to informal spoken conversational interactions and proceeded to list and categorize the specific forms and formats that appeared to be systematically and methodically employed as verbal resources for affective stance display in the studied interactions. In this way, I made an extensive survey of various types of linguistic forms and formats, from which I subsequently selected those that are included in the following chapter. The types of resources that I chose to include in this thesis exemplify some of the most commonly used resources for constructing affective stance displays in Japanese conversational interactions. It is not an exhaustive list of verbal resources that the Japanese language makes available, but a survey of major verbal resources that showcases the great variety and diversity of verbal means that are regularly employed by the Japanese speakers for the purpose of

³⁵ The corpora can be accessed from <<https://ca.talkbank.org/access/CallFriend/jpn.html>> (CallFriend – Japanese Corpus) and <<https://ca.talkbank.org/access/CallHome/jpn.html>> (CallHome – Japanese Corpus). For an introduction to the TalkBank Project, see MacWhinney (2007).

affective stance display. Most of the data that I worked with come from informal conversational interactions of Japanese young adults. Therefore, the examples of specific expressions that I provide and discuss as illustrating the individual types of resources either represent expressions that are commonly used by adult Japanese speakers across different age and social groups or expressions that frequently occur specifically in the speech of contemporary Japanese young adult speakers.

I demonstrate the use of individual resources primarily using excerpts from my recordings of informal spoken conversational interactions of Japanese young adult speakers most of whom are in relationships that they describe as friendships (others are couples) and telephone conversations between young adult friends included in the Japanese CallFriend corpus. A prominent source of examples are also my recordings of conversational interactions between two young male close friends (Takuya and Shōta) that I used in my book on ‘doing friendship’ in and through talk (Zawiszová 2018). I use short excerpts from their conversational interactions in order to be able to provide short examples featuring the resources discussed in particular sections, while allowing the reader who would be interested in broader contextualization to refer to the book. The longer excerpts from their conversational interactions that I reproduce here were generally chosen because they allowed me to comment on issues that require deeper knowledge of the participants and their relationship. In addition, I also use transcribed conversational excerpts borrowed from a variety of studies by other authors and some telephone conversations that are included in the Japanese CallHome corpus. The corpus consists of conversations between people who belong to different age groups and generally represent family members or close friends. There is much dialectal variation in Japanese. The specific linguistic forms and formats that are discussed here represent the variety that is regarded as the Tokyo-type dialect or the standard Japanese (*kyōtsūgo*, lit. ‘common language’). The excerpts, however, occasionally contain certain regional features as well.

In order to further supplement the discussion, I also include some examples from my collection of primarily text-based conversational interactions between Japanese young adults on social media (such as Facebook, Twitter, or YouTube). These can be viewed as written in what Satake (1995) refers to as *shin genbun itchitai* ‘new style of unity between speaking and writing’, that is, a style that resembles a transcription of spoken informal speech. Owing to the specific affordances of the channel and the asynchronous character of the studied interactions, these technically mediated written conversational interactions allow us to ascertain the extent of the conventionalization of some of the studied resources and more fully appreciate the performative nature of affective stance displays.

As was repeatedly pointed out in the preceding chapters, affective stance displays constitute multimodal phenomena. Therefore, depending on the communicative channel, in addition to verbal resources, they may also involve vocal and visual resources, such as intonation, pitch, loudness, speech rate, voice quality, laughter, smiling, gaze, facial expressions, head movements, gestures, body posture, emoticons, punctuation, spelling, hashtags, gifs, etc. During the analysis, I paid attention to the totality of resources that were available to me in different types of data and I will comment on certain non-verbal features that are of particular relevance to the constitution of several practices. The objective of this thesis, however, is not to provide comprehensive analyses of the ways in which affective stance displays are organized and accomplished in conversational interactions, but, to reiterate, to find out about and illustrate the wealth and range of verbal resources that the Japanese speakers mobilize and make use of for affective-stance-display-related purposes. While other than verbal resources will thus only be given fairly limited attention, it is important to remember that the verbal resources that are discussed in the following chapter do not work in isolation, but acquire their particular affective-stance-display-related functions in co-occurrence with other resources (including not only other verbal resources but also resources from different modalities) in specifiable sequential positions and as part of particular actions and activities.

3.4 Transcription conventions

Transcribing and translating the data constitute processes that form a part of the analysis. Transcription necessarily involves selection and a certain level of simplification and reduction (see, e.g., Ochs 1979; Selting 2001). For that reason, rather than as an objective and complete representation of talk, transcripts should always be regarded as a work in progress which is influenced by the theoretical framework that the analyst subscribes to and the research questions that are being pursued. The translation of transcripts is debated far less extensively than transcription itself (see, e.g., Belczyk-Kohl 2016). However, especially in the case of languages that are as structurally different as Japanese and English, it represents an endeavour that is also quite challenging. In this thesis, I decided to use a two- to three-line transcription for the excerpts from spoken language data and a three- to four-line transcription for the excerpts from technically mediated written language data.

All data were anonymized, including identifying place references. I use common Japanese given names and family names to refer to the participants and the initial letters of the names I gave them to mark their turns in the transcripts. Sometimes participants in the telephone

conversations included in the TalkBank project refer to their co-participants using their real names. However, unless I make use of a fragment of talk that involves the participants referring to each other using names, I give them random names as well. I also change some real names that I was able to catch in the recording to make it easier to distinguish between participants, for example, when the names of both participants start with the same letter or when participants in different conversations that I quote from repeatedly have the same name. I also give names to the nameless participants in interactions whose transcripts I borrow from other people's research.

The first line of the transcripts of spoken language data includes a representation of Japanese talk, using the modified Hepburn system of romanization.³⁶ Word boundaries are indicated to make the transcripts easily readable and to preserve the identifiability of words as far as possible. However, in fast colloquial speech, the pronunciation of individual words frequently coalesces so word division becomes tricky. For example, the predicate part of *nani o itte iru no darō* 'I wonder what [someone] is saying' may be realized as [it:en daro], in which case it would be transcribed here as *itten daro*. Words in which regular phonological processes (such as the devocalization of high vowels) apply are transcribed using standard orthography, but colloquial pronunciation is marked. Therefore, when, for example, *notte iru kara* 'because [someone] rides' is pronounced as [not:ek:ara], it is transcribed as *nottekkara*. Long vowels which are part of the standard pronunciation of words or result from vowel lengthening that takes place as part of colloquial morpho-phonological processes are transcribed using macrons, as in *kōkō* 'high school' or *ikitakunē*, a colloquial variant of *ikitakunai* 'I don't want to go'. Other types of vowel elongation are marked using a colon, with each symbol corresponding to the approximate length of a mora in the given environment, as in the elongated variant of the interactional particle *ne*, *ne::*. Emphatic gemination (or lengthening) of consonants is marked in the same way as it is done when transcribing geminates in standard pronunciation, that is, by doubling the consonant (e.g., <tt>, <pp>), the first part of the digraph (in case of <ssh> and <tts>) or by adding <t> in front of the digraph (in case of <tch>). When a trill consonant [r] is used instead of the standard tap [ɾ], it is marked in the transcript as <rr>, as in *orre* 'I', otherwise transcribed as *ore*. The expressive word-final glottalization is represented using the IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) symbol for the glottal stop <ʔ>. Proper nouns and the initial words in utterances are not capitalized, while

³⁶ I used the same conventions in my earlier publication. Therefore, the description provided here is close to identical to the one that I offered there (Zawiszová 2018:9).

punctuation and other markings are used to capture temporal and sequential features of speech as well as various aspects of speech delivery, as described in Appendix A.

The second line of the transcripts of spoken language data may contain interlinear glosses. I add glosses only when they seem necessary or particularly useful for the discussion at hand. When employed, I use a combination of word-by-word glosses and grammatical or pragmatic descriptions, the granularity of which I adjust based on the phenomenon that the given excerpt is meant to illustrate. The list of abbreviations that are used in the glosses is provided in Appendix B. Overall, because this thesis is concerned with issues that for the most part do not require methodical morpheme-by-morpheme glossing, I make sure to keep the interlinear glossing as simple and easy to follow as possible.

The last (mostly second but sometimes third) line of the transcripts of spoken language data includes an idiomatic translation of the Japanese data into English. The temporal ordering of elements in Japanese turns-at-talk is quite different from that in English. This means that translating the temporally unfolding talk from Japanese to English is not an easy task. In the translations, I attempt to provide an idiomatically correct rendering of the given stretch of talk, while preserving some of the specifics of conversational Japanese. This approach results in a certain amount of disparity between the glosses and the vernacular translations as well as occasional unnaturalness of the English translations but enables the reader who is not familiar with Japanese to better understand the way in which the Japanese conversational interactions are structured. In Japanese, arguments are frequently left unexpressed. As long as it is not particularly relevant for the discussion at hand, I do not use any special markings to suggest that the English translation includes an argument that the Japanese utterance does not. When in need to mark that the translation includes an element that is not overtly expressed in the source, I use square brackets. To indicate that an utterance ended in a cut-off, I mark it with a hyphen, while I use ellipses to represent fade-outs.

The three- to four-line transcripts of the examples of technically mediated conversational interactions provide the same two or three lines as the transcripts of spoken language data, but additionally include a line that consists of the written text in Japanese, exactly as it appeared in the post, as the first line of the transcript. The second line then supplies the romanization of the text, following the same rules as those regarding the transcription of spoken interactions described above, but using punctuation in the same way as the transcribed text. The third line may offer glosses, while the English translation is included in the final line of the transcripts. The rules for glossing and translation that I followed when transcribing

technically mediated conversational interactions were the same as those applied in case of the transcripts of spoken language data, as presented above.

Individual authors whose publications I worked with use different systems of transcription and romanization, different levels of granularity of their transcripts, different conventions for marking temporal and sequential features and aspects of speech delivery, different glossing rules and abbreviations. Therefore, when borrowing excerpts and examples from other publications, I decided to rewrite them so that they conform with the conventions introduced above as much as possible. In this way, the excerpts and examples are much easier to read, as they all follow one system of romanization and glossing. However, owing to the great differences in the transcription conventions applied in different publications, some of the transcripts of borrowed data are far more detailed than others, especially with regard to information on various temporal and sequential features as well as aspects related to speech delivery. The English translations that the authors provided are often modified as well in order to better fit the style of translations adopted in this thesis.

3.5 Some remarks on (conversational) Japanese

Japanese is traditionally regarded as a predicate-final language with the normative (otherwise also referred to as ‘canonical’ or ‘standard’) constituent order of the SOV type. However, especially in informal conversational Japanese, the order of constituents is fairly flexible. Japanese represents a predominantly agglutinating language with normatively post-positioned case marking particles, subordinate clauses preceding main clauses, and main clauses following their complement clauses. It is often classified as a clause-chaining language (e.g., Iwasaki 1993; Clancy 2020) and as a language with delayed (or late) projectability, which refers to the fact that “turns in Japanese do not necessarily project from their beginnings what their ultimate shape and type will be” (Tanaka 1999:29). For example, auxiliary verbs, interactional particles, epistemic modality markers, and other elements that occur in the post-predicate position abound and can completely change the structure and meaning of an emerging turn. Moreover, different forms of turn-constructive unit continuation beyond the point of possible completion are also common (see, e.g., Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007). In other words, turns in Japanese may be quite flexible and may remain indeterminate to varying degrees throughout the course of their production up to their completion.³⁷

³⁷ Japanese turn structure and the projectability of Japanese turns constitutes the subject of an ongoing debate (see, e.g., Fox, Hayashi, and Jaspersen 1996; Hayashi 1999, 2003, 2004; Hayashi and Mori 1998; Lerner and Takagi

Even though it remains the subject of much debate, Japanese can further be characterized as a language that is both subject-prominent and topic-prominent, as it involves “two equally important distinct sentence constructions, the subject-predicate construction and the topic-comment construction” (Li and Thompson 1976:459). Topics and core arguments can be left unexpressed as long as they are deemed recoverable from the context (in the broadest sense of the word) or irrelevant with respect to the message content and, in fact, unexpressed syntactic constituents (often – and according to some mistakenly – referred to as ‘zero anaphora’ or ‘ellipses’) are prevalent and “massively not treated as ‘absent’ or ‘omitted’” (Hayashi, Mori, and Takagi 2002:96).³⁸ Japanese is further renowned for making use of a wide range of postpositional particles that serve various functions. For example, one of the central features of conversational Japanese is the use of interactional (also commonly called sentence/utterance-final or pragmatic) particles. On the other hand, certain topic-marking and case-marking particles are frequently omitted in conversational Japanese and some researchers now eschew the notion of particle ellipsis (typically explained as a feature of colloquial language) and posit zero-marking as a full-fledged paradigmatic choice (see, e.g., Lee 2002).

In Japanese, the past tense forms and the non-past tense forms of verbs and adjectives can be distinguished. With regards verbs, Jacobsen (2018:332) further notes that in Japanese, “[t]ense and aspect interact very closely, and it is not always apparent where the boundary between them lies, leading some native Japanese grammarians to question whether Japanese even has forms that express tense”. The past tense forms are also used to express the perfective (or completive) aspect, while the non-past tense forms constitute one of the ways in which the imperfective (or incompletive) aspect is expressed. Furthermore, there are cases in which the past tense forms are used to refer to present or future events and even more common cases in which the non-past tense forms are used to represent past events. A representative conversational activity in which the non-past tense forms coexist alongside the past tense forms

1999; Mori 1999; Tanaka 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b; Shi. Iwasaki 2011, 2013; Hayashi, Mori, and Takagi 2002; Nakamura 2018; among many). Nakamura (2018), for example, shows that there is an interrelation between gaze and syntax in projecting the imminent onset of a transition relevance place in Japanese. Shi. Iwasaki (e.g., 2011, 2013) argues that the idea of the delayed projectability of Japanese is misconceived, pointing out that the Japanese speakers create interstitial spaces within their turn-constructural units in which they invite the co-participants to produce reactive components.

³⁸ See Nariyama (2003) for an investigation into the linguistic mechanisms which allow Japanese speakers to identify the unexpressed arguments. She discusses predicate devices, sentence devices, and discourse devices. Ueno and Kehler (2016) consider grammatical and pragmatic factors in the interpretation of the so-called ‘null pronouns’ as well as overt pronouns in Japanese. Maynard (2007:266) argues that the phenomenon “cannot be fully accounted for by purely pragmatics-oriented approaches. In Japanese, the recoverability rests on the hearer, and the speaker seems to feel free to delete (sometimes for aesthetic reasons) by simply hoping that the hearer understands”.

are conversational tellings about past events. This use of the non-past tense forms in Japanese has repeatedly been both compared to and distinguished from the English '(conversational) historical present' and its pragmatic effects have been debated (e.g., Soga 1983; Szatrowski 1987; Iwasaki 1993). Among the most commonly cited effects are dramatization of the tellings, increased vividness and relatability, and the creation of an involving effect.

Other important characteristics of conversational Japanese concern the segmentation of talk and the style of speaker-listener collaboration. Especially in informal conversational interactions, Japanese speakers tend to produce their talk in a highly fragmented manner, or, as Hayashi (2003a:207) describes it, in a "bit-by-bit fashion", which further appears to be intricately coordinated with listeners' behaviour (e.g., Maynard 1989; Clancy et al. 1996; Fox, Hayashi, and Jaspersen 1996; Iwasaki 1997; Tanaka 1999, 2000; Ward and Tsukahara 2000; Hayashi 2003a, 2005; Matsumoto 2003; Morita 2005). Speakers pause and make use of various multimodal resources in order to invite their co-participants to engage and participate in the production of the emergent talk by offering various forms of responses not only upon the completion of a turn-constructive unit, but also in the process of production of a turn-constructive unit, creating thereby what Shi. Iwasaki (e.g., 2011, 2013) refers to as 'interactive turn spaces'. Japanese listeners' responses, traditionally called '*aizuchi*' in Japanese and 'backchannels' in English, involve resources from different modalities and – owing to their high frequency of occurrence and specific positional characteristics – arguably represent "a most famous noticeable interactional characteristic and behavior in the language" (Ono and Suzuki 2018:217).³⁹

In Japanese, there is much sociolinguistic variation. In addition to the so-called standard language and numerous regional and social dialects, a form of stylistic variation that is frequently discussed with reference to Japanese is the so-called gendered speech. It involves certain forms and features that are stereotypically regarded as forming a part of women's language or men's language, even though their actual use is generally not restricted to the speakers of a particular gender. In fact, rather than indexing gender as such, they can be more

³⁹ *Aizuchi* represent one of the most studied areas of Japanese social interaction (see, e.g., Clancy et al. 1996; Iwasaki 1997; Ward and Tsukahara 2000; Kita and Ide 2007; Saft 2007; Fujii 2008; Saigo 2011; Ogi 2017; among many). According to Iwasaki (1997:666), verbal backchannels in Japanese can be formally classified into three basic types: 'non-lexical backchannels', which consist of vocalic sounds with limited or no referential meaning (e.g., *nn*, *n::*, *ee*, *e::*, *haa*, *ho::*, *he::*, *hn::n*), 'phrasal backchannels', which consist of conventionalized expressions with more substantive meaning (e.g., *Honto?* 'Really?', *Maji?* 'Seriously?', *Ussso:!* 'No way! You're kidding me, right?'), and 'substantive backchannels', which involve non-stereotypic expressions with full referential content. In addition, Japanese conversational interactions also feature a specific type of turn-taking pattern called the 'loop sequence', which involves "consecutive backchannel and backchannel expressions, produced by different speakers" (Iwasaki 1997:673; cf. Kogure 2007).

accurately viewed as indexing certain socio-cultural meanings that are stereotypically associated with gender (see, e.g., Ochs 1992; Okamoto and Shibamoto Smith 2004). The term 'style' in Japanese linguistics has primarily been applied with reference to verbal morphology and the distinction between the so-called 'plain' and 'polite' forms. Depending on the context, the use of plain forms may imply friendliness, closeness, and solidarity, as well as contribute to the construction of displays of negative affective stances, such as impatience, dislike, or contempt. Polite forms, on the other hand, may be employed to co-construct affective stances such as respect, humbleness, and consideration, as well as imply a sense of distance or create an effect of mock politeness. In addition, speakers may also use honorific language (or *keigo* in Japanese) and more or less (in)formal registers. Prototypically, honorifics are used to convey the speaker's understanding of their hierarchical position vis-à-vis their co-participants and the referents, while registers relate reflexively to the situational context in which they are used and which they, thereby, co-create. Both honorifics and registers, as well as other forms of stylistic variation, can also be used strategically with a view to achieving various social and interactional goals, including affective stance display.

CHAPTER 4

Major verbal resources for affective stance display

This is the central chapter of this thesis. It presents the results from my investigation with respect to the major types of verbal means that are routinely deployed as resources for the purpose of constructing affective stance displays in Japanese informal conversational interactions. As the literature review undertaken in Chapter 2 reveals, there seems to be a rather broad consensus that, in principle, any linguistic form or format may function as a means for affective stance display in an appropriate context. Consequently, as Wilce (2009:39) puts it, “[t]he loci of emotion in language are as numerous as locusts in a plague”. By considering a range of different types of linguistic forms and formats that I found to be systematically and methodically employed as resources for affective stance display and exemplifying their use in the context of actual conversational interactions, this chapter demonstrates both the astounding variety of conventionalized verbal resources for affective stance display that are available to Japanese language speakers as well as certain possibilities of their situated use. Because individual resources can fulfil different functions depending on their context of occurrence, it is impossible for this thesis to provide a complete description of their workings. Moreover, since affective stance displays are not accomplished through isolated verbal resources but by means of co-occurring resources from different modalities in particular sequential positions and as part of particular actions and activities, the descriptions of individual resources provided in this chapter offer examples (rather than comprehensive accounts) of their common uses which were established based on my exploration of the data as well as based on the findings from other people’s research.

4.1 Lexical categories

According to Shibatani (1990:141), one of the areas in which the Japanese lexicon is particularly well-endowed is that comprising expressions relating to “senses and feelings”.⁴⁰ While this thesis is not interested in affective-stance-descriptive lexicon or emotion words as such, it posits lexical resources as crucial for the construction and interpretation of affective

⁴⁰ See also the vocabulary list on ‘emotions’ included in *A Frequency Dictionary of Japanese* (Tono, Yamazaki, and Maekawa 2013:65–67), which presents the core vocabulary in this semantic field based on the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese and the Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese.

stance displays in everyday conversational interactions. Lexical resources may be used to overtly express affective stances, specify affective stances, modify and modulate affective stance displays, contribute to the affective contextualization of the given unit of talk, and evoke affective-stance-display-related interpretations. The semantics of lexical resources has a substantial impact on the interpretation of the co-occurring resources and the constitution of actions and activities in which they are embedded.

Lexical resources may also function as ‘prospective indexicals’, to use Goodwin’s (1996) term. When serving this function, lexical resources in their context of use indicate the affective stance displays that can be expected to be relevant in the unfolding talk, affecting thereby the co-participant’s interpretation and participation in it and making the co-participant attend closely to the emergent talk with a view to actively uncovering the full significance of the indexicals. In other words, as Goodwin (1996:384–385) explains:

The occurrence of a prospective indexical [...] invokes a distributed, multi-party process. The cognitive operations relevant to the ongoing constitution of the event in process are by no means confined to speaker alone. Hearers must engage in an active, somewhat problematic process of interpretation in order to uncover the specification of the indexical that will enable them to build appropriate subsequent action at a particular place.

In addition, lexical items may also have various expressive and socio-cultural connotations, which can be exploited for affective-stance-display-related purposes. Lexical selection, therefore, constitutes an important means that participants in interaction can employ in the process of affective stance display and interpretation.

In what follows, we will consider some of the ways in which participants in Japanese conversational interactions regularly use adjectives, adverbs, mimetic expressions, verbs, and nouns to construct affective stance displays. Each section provides examples of common lexical items (accompanied by my approximate and non-exhaustive translations into English) that frequently occur in the data that I studied and thus can be viewed as representative examples of the discussed categories that are routinely used by contemporary Japanese young adults in their informal conversational interactions with friends. Each section also includes excerpts from conversational interactions which illustrate the use of selected forms. As central to affective stance displays as they are, lexical resources will, of course, appear throughout the entire Chapter 4.

4.1.1 Adjectives

Japanese has two types of morphologically distinguishable adjectives: inflecting qualitative-verb-like adjectives and non-inflecting nominal adjectives that need to be followed by a copula to fulfil different syntactic functions.⁴¹ Throughout the thesis, I use the term ‘adjectives’ to refer to the category of adjectives in general and to refer to the subcategory of the inflecting adjectives. In case I need to distinguish the subcategory of inflecting adjectives from the general category of adjectives, I use the term ‘inflecting adjectives’. I call the other subcategory ‘nominal adjectives’. Both types are used adnominally and predicatively.

When used predicatively, adjectives do not require overt expression of their arguments as long as these are recoverable from the preceding talk or larger context. This feature of the Japanese grammar is frequently exploited for the purposes of affective stance display and affiliation, as it enables participants in interaction to produce the affectively loaded adjectival predicate in the turn-initial position, that is, as early as possible. In fact, when speakers overtly express arguments of adjectival predicates in turns that are meant to be interpreted as affectively charged, speakers often express them in the post-predicate position rather than in their normative position before the predicate. This results in non-predicate-final constituent order which, as I argue in Section 4.7.1 and as we will be able to observe in a number of extracts throughout this thesis, constitutes one of the most popular and effective resources for making an utterance come across as markedly affectively charged. This is so, because by appealing to the principle of iconicity, speakers are able to imply uncontrollability, spontaneity, immediacy, intensity, urgency, and – by extension – cognitively unmediated character and genuineness of the affective stances that they display. In responding turns, this practice is further routinely employed to accomplish affiliation with co-participants, as it allows speakers to express their support for their co-participants, their agreement, or their matching affective stance displays as early as possible. Another common means for conveying heightened affective stance in utterances that involve an overtly expressed argument is zero-marking, that is, the practice of not marking the constituent with any phonetically realized postpositional particle (see Section 4.3.1).

Adjectives can be employed to convey the speaker’s affective stances both in descriptive and exclamatory utterances. Examples of affective-stance-expressive adjectives that are frequently employed not only in descriptive utterances but also exclamatorily include: *ureshii* >

⁴¹ In informal conversational interactions, the copula of predicatively used nominal adjectives is frequently omitted in case of non-past positive forms.

Ureshii! ‘I’m so happy/glad!’, *hazukashii* > *Hazukashii!* ‘I’m so embarrassed! It’s embarrassing! I’m too embarrassed to do that!’, *tanoshii* > *Tanoshii!* ‘This is so much fun! This is exciting!’, *mendokusai* > *Mendokusai!* ‘What a bother! What a pain in the ass!’, *kuyashii* > *Kuyashii!* ‘I feel so regretful/frustrated/helpless!’, *urayamashii* > *Urayamashii!* ‘I’m so jealous of you!’, *sabishii* > *Sabishii!* ‘I feel so lonely! I miss you!’, *nasakenai* > *Nasakenai!* ‘What a shame/pity!’, *arigatai* > *Arigatai!* ‘I’m so grateful!’, *Suki!* ‘I like it! I love you!’, *rakkī da* > *Rakkī!* ‘How lucky!’, *shiawase da* > *Shiawase!* ‘I’m so happy!’, *zannen da* > *Zannen!* ‘What a shame!’. For example, in (1.1), we can observe Keiko use the adjective *hazukashii* as a sole component of a turn-constructural unit (line 5). She makes use of the expression to convey her embarrassment during a conversation with Etsuko. When they talk about cooking, Keiko discloses that she has never made *ozōni*, a traditional Japanese New Year’s dish.

- (1.1) 1 E: *ozōni wa shio:- shio ga ii wa ne aji wa.*
As for ozōni [= a soup with rice cakes], the salty flavour is the best.
- 2 K: (.) *a sō:,*
Oh, is it so?
- 3 [atashi ozōni nante tsukutta koto nai no yo.=
I’ve actually never prepared ozōni myself.
- 4 E: [un (XXXX)
Mm ()
- 5 K: =*hazukashii.*
is.embarrassing
It’s embarrassing.

(CallFriend JPN6422)

In (1.2), we can observe Hiroki express his happiness and excitement about buying a car by overtly expressing his feelings in line 5.

- (1.2) 1 H: *a ore kuruma katta.*
I’ve bought a car!
- 2 N: HE?
What?!
- 3 H: un.
Mm.
- 4 N: (.) *uso: nani:?*
No way! What is it?
- 5 H: (.) *katta katta ureshii.*
bought bought am.happy
I did. I did. I’m happy.

- 6 (.) yasukute yokatta mitaina.
 I was like, "I'm happy it was for a good price".
- 7 [(XXXX)]
- 8 N: [nani katta no?
 What did you buy?
- 9 H: n?
 Huh?
- 10 supōtsukā mitaina.
 Something like a sports car.

(CallFriend JPN1773)

The exclamatory utterance (*I*)*ya da!*, which consists of an affective-stance-expressive nominal adjective *iya* ‘disagreeable, detestable, unpleasant, reluctant’ and the plain non-past form of the copula *da*, represents an example of a lexical expression that has developed a number of affective-stance-display-related functions. In fact, especially its phonetically reduced form may be viewed as a secondary interjection. It is commonly employed in responding turns, where it can be used to display the participant’s surprise upon hearing something unexpected (e.g., ‘No way!’), their disgust (e.g., ‘Ewww!’), reluctance and unwillingness to do something (e.g., ‘Never!’, ‘No way I’m doing that!’), unhappiness about a situation (e.g., ‘Nooooo!’), dislike for what someone is saying (e.g., ‘Stop it!’), etc. In (1.3), the expression is used by Sakura in response to Mai telling her how cold it is where she lives (line 7). Notice that Sakura employs substantial lengthening of the word-final vowel to convey greater intensity of the emotion that she displays. Notice also that Mai employs the adjective *gerosamui* to describe how cold it is (line 6). The adjective consists of the adjective *samui* ‘cold’ modified by the mimetic expression *gero* ‘vomit, puke’. The word can thus be translated as ‘disgustingly cold’. Sakura’s response in line 7 can thus be viewed as highly affiliative, as she also expresses her disgust.

- (1.3) 1 S: mō sorosoro wa?
 Any time now?
- 2 M: mada futtenai yo.
 It's not snowing yet.
- 3 zenzen zenzen.
 Not at all, not at all.
- 4 S: demo sugo:i samu:i?
 But it's extremely cold?
- 5 M: u:n.
 Mm.

- 6 gerosamui.
 It's disgustingly cold.
- 7 S: yada[::-
 is.detestable
 Ewww.
- 8 M: [ima mō hitā haitteru mon.
 Even the heating is on.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Another category of adjectives that routinely contribute to affective stance displays are adjectives with evaluative meaning. They are employed to construct assessment actions and can again occur both in descriptive and exclamatory utterances. In the data that I studied, I repeatedly encountered adjectival exclamatory expressions, such as *Kawaii!* ‘That’s so cute! That’s adorable!’, *Sugoi!* ‘That’s great/awesome/amazing/impressive/terrible!’, *Yabai!* ‘That’s crazy/cool/insane/awful/extreme!’,⁴² *Umai!* ‘That’s so good! You’re so skilled!’, *Hidoi!* ‘How awful/nasty!’, *Omoshiroi!* ‘That’s funny/interesting!’, *Kimo(chiwaru)i!* ‘That’s disgusting!’, *Mottainai!* ‘What a waste! That’s too good for me!’, *Igai!* ‘That’s so strange/unexpected!’, *Kawaisō!* ‘Poor thing!’. An interesting evaluative nominal adjective that is commonly employed to co-construct affective stance displays is *sasuga* ‘as one would expect, as always’. It can be used, for example, to praise, compliment, and display affective stances such as respect, admiration, or affection for a referent in response to an informing about their success, abilities, actions, etc.⁴³ A rare example of a past tense form of an adjective that is routinely used exclamatorily for affective stance display purposes is *yokatta*, the plain past tense form of the evaluative adjective *ii* ‘good, nice, fine’. The expression can be used in responding turns where it functions in a similar way as interjections. It is employed to convey affective stances such as happiness for oneself or someone else and a feeling of relief (e.g., ‘What a relief! Oh, good! That’s great!’).

In (1.4), we can observe Itsumi use the evaluative adjective *mendokusai* ‘bothersome, tiresome’ in order to co-construct her display of antipathy, aversion, and reluctance with reference to certain tasks connected to flat renting (lines 1–3). Other resources that help her

⁴² The evaluative adjectives *sugoi* and *yabai* were originally associated with negative meanings. Nowadays, however, they are employed to convey both (extremely) positive and (extremely) negative evaluations and the attendant affective stances, but the positive valence seems prevalent. See Sano (2005), for example, for a study on the positive use of *yabai*.

⁴³ This affective-stance-display-related function of this expression stems from the fact that the speaker who uses it in the way described above assesses the contents of the informing as something that is typical of or that can be expected from that referent. When used within a turn-constructive unit that is to be interpreted as an exclamation, the adjective *sasuga* can either form the turn-constructive unit by itself or it can form a part of an exclamatory format *{Sasuga RT!}*, where RT stands for a reference term.

construct this affective stance display include, for example, the nominal adjective *iya da*, which was introduced above, modified by the evaluative adjective *sugoi* employed as an intensifier (see below).

- (1.4) 1 I: mendokusai kara,
is.bothersome because
Because it's bothersome,
- 2 watashi mo mō sono mendokusai no wa,
I also already that bothersome NML TOP
I also started to feel like this bother
- 3 mō sugoi iya da kara sa-
already extreme is.detestable because IP
is something I don't want to deal with anymore.
- 4 S: rūmumeito dake yappari shikkari intabyū shite sa,
In any case, one just needs to properly interview the flatmates.
- 5 I: so:.
Exactly.
- 6 S: u::n.
Hmmm.
- 7 ii ko erabanai to sa:-
If you don't choose the right people, you know.
- 8 I: un.
Mm.

(CallFriend JPN6717)

In (1.5), Mai tells Sakura that she started teaching Japanese. Sakura evaluates it as impressive and conveys her surprise and amazement by means of expressive prosody – such as, producing the pro-form in line 3 with a marked rising and falling pitch contour and whispering the utterance shown in line 5 – as well as lexically, making use of the evaluative adjective *sugoi*, grammatically, by using the interactional particle *jan* (see Subchapter 4.8), and rhetorically, by making use of repetition (line 5).

- (1.5) 1 M: nihongo oshieten n da yo.
I'm teaching Japanese.
- 2 ima seito mo iru shi.
I even have (a) student(s) now.
- 3 S: sō↑o.↓
Oh really?
- 4 M: n:-
Mm.

5 S: <<p> sugoi jan su[goi.]
That's impressive! That's impressive!

6 M: [kyōikujisshūsei.
A trainee teacher.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Especially in conversational interactions of Japanese young people, we can also encounter assessments carried out by means of evaluative adjectives that can be regarded as ‘extreme case formulations’ (Pomerantz 1986), that is, nonliteral, hyperbolic, semantically maximal and universalizing expressions. They may again be used both in descriptive and exclamatory utterances. The most common forms include expressions such as *saiaku* ‘the worst (situation you can think of)’, *saitai* ‘the lowest (kind of behaviour)’, and *saikō* ‘the best (thing ever)’. Excerpt (1.6) represents a fragment from a conversation of Shinkai and Okamoto. They are talking about breakfast. In the segment shown below, we can observe Shinkai use the adjective *saikō* to convey how happy and satisfied the breakfast that he describes would make him feel.

(1.6) 1 S: u:n ato kimuchi toka de ore okkē.
Mmm, then kimchi or something and I'm fine.
2 misoshiru mo areba,
If I could also have miso soup,
3 saikō.
there is nothing better.

(CallFriend JPN6166)

It appears only natural for assessments to involve the use of evaluative adjectives, as they allow participants in interaction to overtly attribute certain qualities to the objects of their assessments (the so-called ‘assessables’). An assessment produced by one participant often makes a response on part of the co-participant conditionally relevant. Responding turns may then implement the speaker’s agreement or disagreement with the prior assessment, using different practices, including proffering of an assessment themselves. Evaluative adjectives then commonly occur both in the sequentially first and second (or subsequent) assessment actions and these are closely linked to affective stance displays as well as affiliation management. Consider excerpt (1.7) which represents an assessment sequence produced by Emi and Akiko during their conversation taking place in a café. The two are drinking tea and evaluating its taste.

- (1.7) 1 E: un tottemo oishii.
 INT very is.delicious
Mm, it's very good.
- 2 A: oishii kore mo.
 is.delicious this too
It's good, mine as well.

(Shinzato 2018:51)

The first assessment is made by Emi and includes the evaluative adjectival predicate *oishii* ‘is tasty, good’ modified by a degree adverb *tottemo* which forms an emphatic colloquial variant of *totemo* ‘very’ and is used here as an intensifier. Akiko constructs her assessment as a repetitional response produced within a format of a non-predicate-final utterance construction (see Section 4.7.1.1). She begins her turn by first producing the same evaluative adjectival predicate as Emi did in her assessment and subsequently appends the referent (serving as a topic) in the post-predicate position. Thereby, she is able to mark her response as affectively charged and express her full agreement with the prior speaker at the earliest point possible, which further makes it sound as strongly affiliative. Both women thus communicate their positive affective stance towards their tea and at the same time build affiliation or a sense of social cohesiveness.

Repeating the first assessment or its core evaluative part, such as the predicatively used evaluative adjective, in the second (or subsequent) assessment which conveys an agreement with the first (or prior) assessment appears to represent a common practice across different languages.⁴⁴ In Japanese, repetitional responses are prevalent and interestingly, unlike in English – where same-degree second assessments seem to be commonly treated as indicating a weak agreement or even an upcoming disagreement, whereas upgraded second assessments are generally produced and interpreted as fully affiliating (Pomerantz 1984) – in Japanese conversational interactions, “same-degree evaluation is commonly found in a second assessment that is treated as a full agreement, and proffering an upgraded evaluation is rather marked” (Hayano 2011:64).⁴⁵ Excerpt (1.8) provides another example of an assessment sequence. The fragment comes from a conversation of a group of three friends, Aya, Hitomi,

⁴⁴ For example, Pomerantz (1984:67) offers examples of agreeing responses to assessments from English that involve repeats of the subject and the verbal predicate, while Hakulinen and Sorjonen (2009) discuss the practice of verb repeat in agreeing responses to assessments in Finnish.

⁴⁵ According to Hayano (2011:62), “same-degree evaluations are about twice as common as those with upgraded evaluations and their recipients do not treat them as insufficient or as prefaces to disagreement”. Rather, they seem to be used to convey independently formed affective stances. Hayano (2011) further explains that upgraded and more specific second assessments tend to be employed to claim epistemic primacy, that is, an incongruence in epistemic stances. Downgraded second assessments are produced to show or to preface disagreement. Finally, weak agreements (which may further serve as prefaces to disagreements) are often accomplished through anaphorical agreements that include an anaphorical expression *sō* ‘that’, as in *Sō da ne* ‘That’s right/true’.

and Miho, who are all in their early twenties. The conversation took place after they had lunch in a university cafeteria. The fragment presented here forms a part of a longer gossip talk focused on their fellow male student, Ryū.

- (1.8) 1 M: kanojo inai no?
He doesn't have a girlfriend?
- 2 H: n:?
Huh?
- 3 M: kanojo inai no?=
He doesn't have a girlfriend?
- 4 =ryū.
Ryū.
- 5 H: ryū ga?
Ryū?
- 6 kanojo inai yo:,
He doesn't have a girlfriend.
- 7 (0.9)
- 8 A: [inasō.]
It doesn't look like he does.
- 9 H: [ina:i.]
He doesn't.
- 10 (.)
- 11 H: demo nanka:,
But, like,
- 12 daigaku o deru mae kanojo ga hoshii tte yutteta n da tte.
I heard that he said that he'd like to get a girlfriend before he graduates.
- 13 A: e:::::-
Mmmmm.
- 14 M: igai.=
That's unexpected.
- 15 A: =igai.
That's unexpected.
- 16 (1.3)

In response to Hitomi's informing shown in line 12, Aya marks it as a piece of news and displays her surprise by using an emphatically elongated interjection *e:::::-* (see Subchapter 4.5) produced in a high flat pitch contour (line 13). Her response is immediately followed by Miho's congruent assessment and affective stance display, accomplished by means of a turn formatted

as an exclamation consisting solely of the predicatively used evaluative adjective *igai* ‘to be unexpected, surprising, strange’ (line 14). Subsequently, Aya proceeds to produce another turn to contribute to this sequence (line 15). She uses the same exclamatory utterance construction and the same adjectival predicate as Miho did in her turn. Moreover, she produces her turn using prosodic features that copy those of Miho’s turn. The only difference is that Aya starts her turn at a higher pitch. In this way, Aya complements her earlier non-lexical vocalization with an overtly evaluative expression to construct her display of surprise. In addition, by using the same expression as Miho and producing her turn with prosodic features matching those of Miho’s turn, Aya achieves affiliation with Miho. It is by means of the responses of both Aya and Miho that the informing is characterized as a surprising piece of news.

Certain adjectives are also routinely employed performatively to accomplish particular affectively charged actions. For example, the adjective *urusai* ‘noisy, annoying’ is commonly used exclamatorily to communicate the speaker’s annoyance or irritation in situation when someone is talking, nagging, saying something repeatedly, etc. and to demand that they stop (in a similar way as the English phrase ‘Shut up!’). The predicatively used nominal adjective *muri* ‘impossible, unreasonable, excessive’ can be employed, for example, to convey the speaker’s negative affective stance towards a request or a suggestion and communicate their categorical refusal, as in *Muri!* ‘No way! Not a chance!’. The nominal adjective *dame* ‘hopeless, useless, no good’ can be employed to convey the speaker’s negative affective stance towards an action or a proposal and communicate the speaker’s request for the person to stop the given action or their refusal of the given proposal. The adjective *warui!* ‘bad’ is conventionally employed to implement an apology, as ‘My bad!’ or ‘I’m sorry’ in English do. We can observe this use of the adjective in excerpt (1.9). When Kyōko jokingly reproaches Mayumi for never being available when she calls, Mayumi first conveys her surprise, using the secondary interjection *usso*: ‘No way!, Seriously?!’, but immediately follows it with a display of remorse, which functions as an apology (line 8).

- (1.9) 1 K: hoka no tomodachi ni kaketa n da kedo:-
I also called another friend, but...
- 2 M: hontō?
Really?
- 3 K: u:n.
Mm.
- 4 de mayumi n tokoro ni kaketa n da kedo,
And I called you, but

- 5 iNA:I deshō itsumo:.
you're NEVER there, are you?
- 6 M: atashi inakatta ka ne:.,
I wasn't here, was I?
- 7 K: itsumo inai no. [hhhhh
You're never there.
- 8 M: [usso: warui ne:-
lie is.bad IP
Really?! I'm sorry.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

To modify and modulate affective stance displays that involve adjectives speakers often use various categories of adverbs (see Section 4.1.2). In addition, I also frequently encountered the evaluative adjective *sugoi*, which was introduced above, employed in an adverbial function, serving as an intensifier (e.g., *sugoi hazukashikute* ‘[I] was so embarrassed’). Another adjective that I repeatedly found to be used in this way is *yabai*, which was also introduced above (e.g., *yabai kawaii* ‘[that’s] freaking cute’). This development – that is, the use of adjectival forms instead of adverbial forms as intensifiers – is not entirely surprising. Intensifiers range among the types of expressions that are quite susceptible to trends, while the non-standard use of grammar constitutes one of the most notable features of language used by teenagers and young adults – that is, the principal language innovators – cross-culturally and cross-linguistically (see, e.g., Stenström, Andersen, Hasund 2002). The following fragment illustrates the use of *sugoi* as an intensifier. The speaker expresses her feelings of irritation and frustration with regards a Spanish class that she attends. She uses emphatic gemination of the word-medial consonant in the word *sugoi* to make the affective stance that she displays come across as even more intense.

- (1.10) 1 N: suggoi mukatsuku no yo:.,
terrible feel.irritated NML IP
That irritates me terribly.

(CallFriend JPN1773)

The gemination of word-medial consonant that we saw in excerpt (1.10) represents one of the common phonological and morphophonological practices that speakers employ to imply greater degree or intensity of affective stances whose display adjectives help construct. The resultant adjectival forms can be shorter or longer than their basic forms, but we can always view them as iconically motivated. The longer forms may create an implication of there being a great amount or degree of the feelings and emotions that are displayed, while the shorter forms may

imply acuteness, unmediated character, and overwhelming nature or strength of the affective stances that are displayed. In addition to the gemination of word-medial consonants (e.g., *yasui* > *Yassui!* ‘It’s sooo cheap!’), we can also commonly encounter vowel elongation (e.g., *umai* > *Uma::i!* ‘It’s sooo good!’), and word-final glottalization (e.g., *dame* > *Dame?!* ‘Don’t!’). Inflecting adjectives are frequently produced as independent stems with their conjugational ending *-i* dropped and often replaced with a glottal stop (e.g., *mazui* > *Mazu!*, *Mazu?!* ‘That’s disgusting!’).⁴⁶ Certain longer adjectives can be shortened and may include word-final glottalization as well (e.g., *hazukashii* > *Hazu?!* ‘That’s so embarrassing!’). The word-final /ai/ and /oi/ of inflecting adjectives, the word-final /ai/ of adjectives and verbs in the plain non-past negative form, and the word-final /ai/ of verbs in the plain non-past desiderative form may be realized as [e:], [e], or [eʔ] (e.g., *yabai* > *Yabē!*, *Yabe!*, *Yabe?!* ‘That’s crazy!’).⁴⁷ Similarly, the adjectives that end in /ui/ can be realized as ending in [i:], [i], or [iʔ] when employed for affective-stance-display-related purposes (e.g., *samui* > *Samī!*, *Sami!*, *Sami?!* ‘It’s freezing!’). To intensify affective stance displays built by means of adjectives, speakers also sometimes use repetition.

The following examples illustrate how adjectives whose pronunciation is modified in the ways described above can be employed to co-construct affective stance displays. In (1.11), we can observe Emi display how surprised and amazed she is upon seeing the food she ordered, using the independent adjectival stem of the adjective *sugoi* produced with word-final glottalization (line 1). In (1.12), we can see Keiko describe how tiny her room is. To co-construct her negative affective stance towards her room, Keiko makes use of substantial vowel elongation applied to the adjective *semai* ‘small’ (line 2).

- (1.11) 1 E: *sugoʔ-*
 is.impressive
 Wow!
- 2 *tare tsuitoru yo.*
 There’s [soy-based] sauce!

⁴⁶ The exclamatory utterance construction that involves this form of adjectives is referred to as *i-ochi kōbun*, lit. ‘dropping of *-i* construction’, in Japanese. It is described as a construction that has specialized for subjective expression of affective stances (e.g., Sugiura 2006; Togashi 2006; Konno 2012). Togashi (2006) distinguishes three types of independent adjectival stem uses: the adjectival stem followed by the glottal stop, or *sokuongata* (e.g., *takai* ‘expensive’ > *takaʔ*), the adjectival stem with sound lengthening, *chōongata* (e.g., *takai* ‘expensive’ > *taka:*, *takka:*), and the adjectival stem without glottalization and lengthening, *hisokuonhichōongata* (e.g., *takai* ‘expensive’ > *taka*).

⁴⁷ This pronunciation in the contemporary Tokyo-type dialect is stereotypically associated with a certain degree of roughness, crudeness, or even vulgarity and by extension with the so-called masculine style of speech. It appears especially marked in the speech of those speakers who do not apply this morphophonological process systematically.

- 3 T: wafū?
It's Japanese style?
- (1.12) 1 K: heya: aru kedo:,
I do have a room, but
- 2 atashi no heya SEMA::kute:-
I GEN room is.tiny
my room is sooo tiny.
- 3 M: h[n:::-
Hmmm.
- 4 K: [nanka: ano: beddo ga attara mō beddo dake?
Like, eh, there's a bed and that's it?
- 5 M: a sō na n da.
Oh, I see.

(CallFriend JPN6698)

The following examples illustrate that Japanese speakers also regularly mark the abovementioned processes in their informal written communication on social media. For example, the glottal stop that is used at the end of words can be marked with *sokuon*, that is, a small grapheme that in its full size is used to represent /tsu/. Vowel elongation is nowadays often indicated using *chōonpu*, that is, a katakana grapheme that is used in standard writing to indicate long vowel sounds in words written in katakana. (1.13) occurred as a status update on Facebook. It shows how the emphatically shortened evaluative adjective *daisai* ‘tacky, lame’ is used to construct the writer’s display of his dislike for the new iMac. (1.14) occurred as a response to a status update on Facebook. It demonstrates the use of the evaluative adjective *sugoi* ‘great, impressive, amazing’ produced with word-medial vowel elongation in order to co-construct the writer’s display of surprise and amazement.

- (1.13) 新型 iMac、デザインもカラバリもダサっ!
shinkei iMac, dezain mo karabari mo dasa?!
new iMac design too colour.variation too is.lame
Both the design and the colour palette of the new iMac are lame!

- (1.14) へー!! すごーい!! 😲
he:!! sugo:i!!
INT is.impressive
Wow! That's impressive!

(Zawiszová 2016:37)

Example (1.15) reproduces the last part of a longer status update on Facebook in which the writer explains how happy and grateful he feels when he is on stage as a music performer. Notice that in addition to using the marked form *sugē* of the adjective *sugoi* as an intensifier of an affective-stance-expressive adjectival predicate *ureshii* ‘[I feel] happy’, the writer employs a wide range of other resources in order to construct his affective stance display. For example, he uses a non-predicate-final utterance construction, as he places the adverb *honto* ‘really, seriously’, which functions here as an intensifier, in the post-predicate position. Another resource worth noticing here is the benefactive auxiliary verb *kureru* which he employs to convey his feeling of gratitude and indebtedness (see Section 4.1.4.4).

- (1.15) 手上げてくれてるのとか、すげー嬉しいよほんと。
 te agete kureteru no toka, sugē ureshii yo honto.
 hands raise.for.me NML TOP great happy IP really
When people raise their hands up, I feel extremely happy, like seriously.

Iwasaki (1993:7) notices that “Japanese does not have a large variety of epithets and adjectives with figurative meaning in the strict sense” which could be used to construct insults or invectives and mentions only *baka na RT* ‘that fool RT’, where RT stands for a reference term and *baka na* is the adnominal form of the nominal adjective *baka* ‘stupid’, as a “marginal case of epithet”. *Baka na* can also be used exclamatorily, frequently together with the demonstrative *sonna*. It may be employed to convey the speaker’s surprise or frustration upon learning about something that someone did, as in *Sonna baka na!* ‘No way [he/she/they did that]!’. Many adjectives also have strongly negative core semantic meanings which can be exploited in a variety of ways both for serious and non-serious purposes. For example, adjectives, such as *debu* ‘fat’, *busu* ‘ugly’, *jimi* ‘plain’, *uzai* ‘annoying’, *dasai* ‘tacky, lame’, *kimoi* ‘gross’, *kudaranai* ‘stupid, not worth bothering with’, *tsumaranai* ‘dull, boring’, *yokei* ‘stupid, unnecessary, uncalled for’, *wagamama* ‘selfish’, *tekitō* ‘lazy, sloppy’, are commonly employed in turns which implement actions such as insulting, criticising, complaining, teasing, mocking, etc., but the affective stance displays that they help construct are not necessarily negative.

Consider the use of the adjective *kimoi* ‘disgusting’ in line 3 in the following excerpt which comes from a conversation between two close friends, Takuya and Shōta. Takuya recounts about measures that he has recently adopted with a view to cutting down on his food expenses. In the fragment shown below, Takuya tells his friend that he has started keeping a household accounts book (*kakeibo*) and uses various resources, including marked stress (manifested as a change in pitch and relatively greater loudness) on the word *kakeibo*, to convey

his negative affective stance – locally interpretable as disgust – towards the recounted event (lines 1–2).

- (1.16) 1 T: <<:-)> nan- NANka ne:,>
Like, like, you know,
- 2 kaKEIBo tsukehajimeta n da yo.>
I've started keeping a household accounts book!
- 3 S: <<laughing> kimoi omae.> hhh
is.disgusting you
You're gross!
- 4 T: <<:-)> okane tameyō tte.>
I thought I'd save up some money.
- 5 S: hh [<<:-)> maji ka.>]
For real?!
- 6 T: [<<:-)> sugē] be.
That's impressive, right?

(Zawiszová 2018:120)

The affective stance display implied by Takuya in his turn is mirrored in Shōta's response to it, which comprises the evaluative adjective *kimoi* 'disgusting' (line 3). Shōta designs his responding turn as a non-predicate-final utterance construction. He produces the strongly affectively loaded evaluative adjectival predicate *kimoi* 'is disgusting' first and expresses the second-person deictic expression *omae* in the post-predicate position within the same intonation unit as the predicate. By appending the reference term in the post-predicate position, he is able to draw on the affective-stance-display-related effects of non-predicate-final constituent order (see Section 4.7.1) as well as the overt expression of a second-person reference (see Section 4.4.2). By producing the strongly affectively loaded predicate at the earliest point possible, he implies a particularly high intensity of the affective stance that he displays. Despite the strongly pejorative associations that the adjective *kimoi* bears, Shōta's amused laughter throughout the turn signals that his criticism is not intended to be taken seriously. Takuya, in fact, does not overtly orient to Shōta's turn at all but proceeds to provide an explanation for his actions (line 4), to which Shōta responds with laughter and the idiomatic phrase *maji ka* 'Seriously?, For real?' which is used here to convey his incredulity and surprise, mixed with amusement signalled by laughter and smiling (line 5). In overlap with Shōta's exclamation, Takuya proffers an extremely positive assessment of his own actions (line 6). He deploys the evaluative adjectival predicate *sugē* followed by the interactional particle *be* to construct an affective stance of self-satisfaction and pride in his achievements.

In (1.17), we can observe Mai use the adjective *debu* ‘fat, chubby’ to describe a man she likes (line 3). Through laughter and the use of the hedging expression *chotto* ‘a bit’, she mitigates the pejorative connotations of the term. In her next turn, she further explains that she actually might even like it.

- (1.17) 1 S: airishukei tte kakkoi- ii hito wa kakkoyokunai? hhehh
People of Irish origin are good-looking, I mean, those that are, aren't they good looking?
- 2 M: demo ne,
But, you know?
- 3 chotto debu na no <<laughing> ne,>
a.bit is.chubby NML IP
He's a bit chubby.
- 4 he[hhhhh
- 5 S: [a uSSO:<<laughing>::-> hhhh
Oh, no waaaay!
- 6 M: demo ne,
But, you know?
- 7 mā ii ka tte kanji.
I feel like that's ok.
- 8 nanka mūmin mitai. hehhhh
Like, he's like a Moomin.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Several suffixes can derive adjectives with evaluative meaning. For example, the suffix *-yasui* is attached to verbal stems to derive adjectives that convey the meaning of an action being easy to do (e.g., *wakariyasui* ‘easy to understand’), while the suffixes *-nikui*, *-gatai*, or *-dzurai* attach to verbal stems to derive adjectives that convey the meaning of an action being difficult to do (e.g., *wakarินิกui* ‘difficult to understand’). Another example of a suffix that attaches to verbal stems to create adjectives with evaluative meaning is *-gachi*. It is used to convey that someone or something tends to do something or is likely to do something, while the thing that they tend to do is typically thought of as bad and undesirable (e.g., *wasuregachi* ‘forgetful’). The suffix *-sugi* can be attached to adjectival or verbal stems to derive nominal adjectives that convey the speaker’s evaluation of the given quality, state, or action as excessive (e.g., *omoshirosugi* ‘too funny’).⁴⁸ The suffix *-ppoi* may attach to nouns or adjectival stems to derive adjectives that convey evaluative descriptions similar to adjectives derived by *-ish* or *-like* in English (e.g.,

⁴⁸ In addition, adjectival stems can also form compound verbs together with the phrasal verb *-sugiru* ‘to exceed’ (e.g., *omoshiroi* ‘to be funny’ > *omoshirosugiru* ‘to be too funny’).

yasuppoi ‘cheap-looking’, *kodomoppoi* ‘childish’). The final two examples are the suffixes *-kei* and *-teki* ‘something like, of the kind, bearing the characteristics of’ which are used by all adult speakers of Japanese but have further developed new uses in the speech of the younger generations, where we can encounter them attached to final verb forms as well as clauses representing direct speech.⁴⁹

The excerpt provided below represents a fragment from an argument between a husband (Kentarō) and his wife (Maki). It involves a number of verbal resources for affective stance display that will be discussed later on. Here, let us just note the use of the derived adjective *gakippoi* ‘childish’ in line 5. Maki employs the term in order to co-construct her display of contempt towards her husband. The word is derived from the noun *gaki* ‘brat, kid’ which – compared to the semantically neutral *kodomo* ‘child’ – is commonly used to convey a negative affective stance towards the referent. The negative implication of comparing an adult to a child is thus further emphasised by the lexical selection. She also pronounces the word markedly more loudly than the surrounding words, employs substantial elongation, and produces a single laugh token at the onset of the word.

- (1.18) 1 K: DA::kara mō iwanai shi yannai shi,
Alright, so I'm not going to say a word or do a thing anymore,
- 2 jibuntachi de yarya ii ja nai ka yo: ja::.
you guys just do it on your own, OK?
- 3 M: (0.5) nani o yo:?
Do what?
- 4 K: (.) sō: da yo:: sonna erasō[ni yo.]
Right. You talk like you are better than I am.
- 5 M: [A:::] nanka (.) G(h)AKIPPO:::I.
Oh, you're like so childish!

(Takagi 1999:405)

4.1.2 Adverbs

Adverbs can play a range of roles in the construction of affective stance displays. In this section, we will consider only some of the more prominent ones. For example, certain adverbs contribute to the affective stance displays by modulating the degree or intensity of otherwise conveyed affective stances from the position of intensifiers (amplifiers, boosters) or downtoners.

⁴⁹ For example, *iranaikei* ‘of the kind I don’t need’ consists of the plain non-past negative verb form *iranai* ‘[I] don’t need’ and the suffix *-kei*, while *anta ni kankeinē daro teki na* ‘of the kind that has nothing to do with you’ consists of direct speech followed by the suffix *-teki* in its adnominal form.

In my data, I often observed these functions being accomplished by adverbs, such as *sugoku* ‘extremely, very, awfully, terribly’ (as well as its adjectival form *sugoi*, as mentioned in the previous section), *honto/hontō (ni)* ‘really, truly’, *maji (de)* ‘seriously, totally’, *mechakucha/mecha/metcha* ‘extremely, super’, *taihen* ‘very, awfully’, *zutto* ‘far more’, *totemo* ‘very’, *zenzen* ‘absolutely, very’, *nakanaka* ‘considerably, more than expected’, *amari* ‘not very, not much’ (used with verbs and adjectives in the negative form), *chotto* ‘a bit’, *kanari* ‘considerably, quite’, *kekkō* ‘fairly, rather, more than expected’, *warito* ‘relatively’, etc.⁵⁰

The following fragments exemplify this use of adverbs. Excerpt (1.19) comes from a conversation between Yorita and Megumi. They are discussing films and engaging in numerous assessment sequences. In the fragment shown below, we can observe both Megumi and Yorita use the adjective *sugoi* in its adverbial function as an intensifier (lines 3 and 5). Yorita also makes use of the adverb *nakanaka* in line 5. The adverbs do not specify the speakers’ affective stances but help construct affective stance displays in co-occurrence with other resources. Excerpt (1.20) represents a fragment of talk from the beginning of Mari and Fumi’s phone call. Fumi remarks that Mari seems to be speaking slowly and asks whether she does it on purpose because of being recorded. Mari responds that not at all, claiming that she is generally a slow-speaking person and adding a self-deprecatory comment in which she mocks her English. She uses the adverb *sugogu* as an intensifier to co-construct her self-criticism (line 2).

- (1.19) 1 M: are kowakunakatta?
You didn’t find them scary?
- 2 nanka-
Like,
- 3 atashi misery toka mita toki sugoi kowakatta kedo-
 I Misery or.something saw when extreme was.scared but
when I saw “Misery” and the like, I was extremely scared.
- 4 Y: a:.
Hmm.
- 5 are wa nakanaka sugoi yoku dekite ita kedo,
 that TOP considerably extreme well was.done but
That one was quite extremely well done, though.
- 6 eiga de ano: e:to shainingu.
The, the, the film [based on King’s book] “The Shining”.

(CallFriend JPN1841)

⁵⁰ See Sawada (2018) for a book-length investigation into the pragmatic aspects of scalar modifiers in Japanese and Shinzato (2018) for an exploration of the present use and the diachronic development of the adverbs *amari* and *totemo* and their morphophonological variants (i.e., *anmari* and *anma*, and *tottemo*, respectively) as positive polarity items and negative polarity items.

- (1.20) 1 M: jibun de motomoto osoi kara,
I PRT originally slow because
I am slow by nature so,
- 2 yappari eigo ni natte mo sugoku osoi no ne,
sure.enough English PRT become also very slow NML IP
sure enough, when I speak English, I am extremely slow.
- 3 F: hehehehe

(CallFriend JPN1758)

Another category of adverbs that are conventionally used to co-construct various affective stance displays is the category of the so-called attitudinal adverbs (e.g., *masaka* ‘by no means, no way, never, that cannot be, surely’, *yahari/yappari/yappa* ‘as expected, as I thought, at any rate, sure enough, in the end’, *wazawaza* ‘expressly, especially’, *butchake* ‘frankly, to put it bluntly’, *ittai* ‘what/who/why the heck’, *nante* ‘how, what’, *tsui* ‘unintentionally, by mistake’).⁵¹ *Yappari*, for example, is used in quite a few excerpts provided in this thesis, including excerpt (1.20) shown above or excerpt (1.23) which appears below. Below, we can observe Yoshie and Ayaka use the attitudinal adverbs *sekkaku* (line 1) and *wazawaza* (line 4). Both Yoshie and Ayaka now live in the USA. They both visited Japan recently, but did not manage to meet. Yoshie, however, visited Ayaka’s mother. By using the adverb *sekkaku* ‘with considerable trouble/effort, especially, purposely, at great pains’ together with other resources, Yoshie is able to convey that she felt that because of going to the trouble of coming that close to Ayaka’s family house, not visiting her mother would not make any sense (lines 1–3).⁵² By using the adverb *wazawaza* ‘expressly, especially’ together with the benefactive auxiliary construction *-te kureru* (see Section 4.1.4.4), the *n(o) da* construction (see Subchapter 4.8), and the utterance-final quotative marker *tte* (see Section 4.3.2), Akaya is able to construct an affective stance display of gratitude and surprise (line 4).

- (1.21) 1 Y: mō sekkaku: soba made itta noni:,
Since I had already gone to the trouble of coming that close,
- 2 anata no okāsan ni wa awanai no wa mottainai to=
it would be a shame not to go visit your mother
- 3 =omot[te:,
I thought.

⁵¹ Japanese is notably rich in attitudinal adverbs and some of them have repeatedly been described as carrying strongly culturally specific meanings (see, e.g., Maynard 1993, 1997).

⁵² *Sekkaku* is also commonly used, for example, to co-construct affective stance displays of disappointment, disillusionment, regret, sadness, frustration, etc., when communicating that something happened not as expected and wished for.

- 4 A: [wazawaza ai ni itte kureteta n da tte?
You're saying that you expressly went to see her?
- 5 Y: ai ni itta no yo::-
I went to see her.

(CallFriend JPN6805)

The attitudinal adverb *nante* regularly co-constructs exclamatory utterances that involve overtly evaluative or affective-stance-expressive verbs or adjectives. In addition, it also conventionally implies the speaker's surprise. To simplify, it may be viewed as fulfilling a role similar to the pronouns 'how' and 'what' in English exclamative constructions. The following examples illustrate this use of the expression. (1.22) represents a comment that occurred on Twitter in response to a piece of news. Utterance-initial *nante* is employed here together with other resources which are conventionally used to form an exclamatory utterance construction in Japanese (i.e., the *n(o) da* construction and the modal auxiliary *darō*). However, it is the evaluative adjective *hidoi* 'awful, terrible' that specifies the affective stance that is displayed and makes it clear that the comment was produced with the intention to express indignation and criticize the referent. (1.23) represents a fragment of a status update on Facebook. In the post, the writer expresses his affection for people from South America and Mexicans in particular. *Nante* is again employed together with other conventional resources for the construction of exclamatory utterances in Japanese. Notice that the writer makes use of non-predicate-final constituent order to make his utterance come across as even more strongly affectively charged (line 1).

- (1.22) なんてひどい人なんだろう!
 nante hidoi hito na n darō!
 what awful person COP NML MOD
What an awful person!

- (1.23) 1 なんて、人懐っこい人達なんだろう！彼らは！！
 nante, hitonatsukkoī hitotachi na n darō! karera wa!!
 how friendly people COP NML MOD they TOP
How friendly are these people! They are!!
- 2 やっぱり、最高だね！ViVa Mexico!
 yappari, saikō da ne! ViVa Mexico!
They're just the best! Viva Mexico!

In spoken conversational interactions, exclamatory utterance constructions of the type exemplified above are not very common. However, *nante*, as an expression that lends an

utterance an exclamatory quality, is. In (1.24), we can see a fragment from a conversation between Fumi and Mari. Fumi dislikes the Imperial system of measurement that is used in the USA. In the segment shown below, she is telling Mari about an incident that she had the other day, making use of direct speech constructions to enact her speech and perform the affective stances that she took (see Section 4.7.2). In line 6, within a direct speech construction, we can observe her construct an exclamatory utterance starting with *nante*. She also uses *nante* in line 1, where it, however, functions as an expressive topic-marker (see Section 4.3.2).

- (1.24) 1 F: *nanka inchi o tsukau nante* <<f> *kono kuni* DAKE:->
 FIL inch OBJ use TOP this country only
Like, "No other but this country uses inches!"
- 2 M: *un.*
Mm.
- 3 F: *toka tte yutte,*
or something like this I said.
- 4 M: *un un.*
Mm mm.
- 5 F: *saiensu no sekai minna nanka senchimētā na noni,*
"All the while the entire scientific world is using centimetres,
- 6 *nante okureteru* NO: *toka* [tte,
 how lag.behind NML or.something QUOT
how far behind are you, America?!" or something like that
- 7 M: [un
Mm.
- 8 F: *gya:: tto kō ōkii koe de yuttara* [sugoi iwarechatta.
I loudly yelled like this and then was totally reprimanded.
- 9 M: [un.
Mm.

(CallFriend JPN1758)

The attitudinal adverb *dōse* ‘anyway, after all, no matter what’ was studied by Maynard (1993, 1997) as a Discourse Modality indicator (see Subchapter 2.8), which shows the speaker’s feeling of inevitability or unavoidability of an event and “expresses [their] attitude of submitting to this inevitability, often with a feeling of resignation” (Maynard 1997:84), which stems from their belief or speculation “that what is described is certain to have existed, to exist, to have happened, or to happen because that event is part of how the world operates” (Maynard 1997:84–85). The speaker who produces the utterance represented in (1.26) can thus be viewed as using the expression to co-construct their negative affective stance towards the upcoming

party and convey their feeling of resignation with regards to its quality based on their belief that it is predetermined and cannot be changed. In (1.27), we can observe Mai realize that she left her laundry in the dryer. Unfortunately, it is not clear what she says in line 3 because of Sakura's loud overlapping speech. In lines 4 and 6, however, we can observe Mai use *dōse* to construct a stance of resignation and nonchalance.

(1.26) *dōse ashita no pāti wa taikutsu darō.*
 anyway tomorrow GEN party TOP boring will.probably.be
Tomorrow's party will be boring anyway.

(Maynard 1993:140)

(1.27) 1 M: a demo sentakumono kansōki ni haitteru.
Oh, but my laundry is in the dryer.

2 S: [E::?]
Whaaat?

3 M: [(XXX)] natteru.
 ().

4 ii ya dōse. [hhh hh
 is.ok IP anyway
That's fine, anyway.

5 S: [heheh hh

6 M: <<:-)> dōse sageru n da kara.> hhh
I'll hang it anyway so.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Adverbs of manner constitute yet another subcategory of adverbs that frequently contribute to the construction of affective stance displays. For example, many adverbs have intrinsically evaluative or affective-stance-expressive meanings (e.g., *igaito* 'surprisingly, unexpectedly', *iyaiya* 'unwillingly, reluctantly', *katte ni* 'as one pleases', *ukkari* 'carelessly, inadvertently'), which can play a significant role in the specification of the affective stances whose displays they co-construct. When describing Japanese adverbs in his reference grammar, Martin (1975:798), in fact, distinguishes 'affective adverbs' as a category of adverbs that often have "special shapes (many reduplicative)" and refer "to emotional affect". For example, he mentions adverbs of mimetic and onomatopoeic origin that consist of reduplicated dissyllables (e.g., *bikubiku* 'fearfully', *sekaseka* 'restlessly'), adverbs that were formed by reduplicating verb forms (e.g., *tsukudzuku* 'earnestly', *ikiiki* 'vividly'), adverbs that were formed by

reduplicating adjectival bases (e.g., *utouto* ‘drowsily’, *kudokudo* ‘tediously’), etc. (Martin 1975:798–801).

Certain adverbs (e.g., *chotto* ‘a little, a bit’, *toriaezu/toriēzu* ‘for the time being’, *ichiō/ichio* ‘generally, for the time being’) and phrases that fulfil an adverbial function (e.g., *aru imi de* ‘in a sense’) can be used as hedges, which can contribute to the affective stance display, for example, by mitigating the intensity, directness, acuteness, abruptness, seriousness, or definitiveness of the affective stances that are being conveyed and thereby also possibly making the displays (in the eyes of the speakers) more acceptable in the context of the unfolding interaction in light of a variety of interpersonal concerns.⁵³ The use of the degree adverb *chotto* ‘a little, a bit’ is very prevalent. It can, for example, be employed as a hedging expression to mitigate the force of a negative assessment (see, e.g., Matsumoto 2001) and by extension also the intensity, seriousness, or abruptness of a negative affective stance display.

The use of *chotto* is exemplified in (1.28) and (1.29). In (1.28), the adverb can be interpreted not only as a hedging expression but also as a degree adverb that qualifies the evaluative adjectival predicate *okashii desu* ‘is strange’. In any case, however, it contributes to making the assessment and the attendant affective stance display come across as less intensely negative and less definitive. The turn is designed as a non-predicate-final utterance construction, which includes the attitudinal adverb *yahari* ‘as expected, just as one thought, indeed’ and the topic phrase *sore wa* ‘that’ in the post-predicate position. While the non-predicate-final construction creates an implication that the utterance is affectively charged, the use of the adverb *chotto* attenuates the strength of the affective stances that are being displayed. In (1.29), Tomo is telling Makoto that their common friend is soon leaving the USA (where they resided at the time) for Japan. In line 4, we can observe him use the adverb *chotto* – together with the interactional particle *kana:* and the interjection *u::n* – to mitigate the display of the negative affective stance that the prospect of his friend leaving soon evokes in him.

- (1.28) *chotto okashii desu ne: yahari sore wa*
 a.bit is.strange IP indeed that TOP
 It's a bit strange that, I must say.

(Matsumoto 2001:11)

- (1.29) 1 T: *u:n de kugatsu ni joshu ga (.) [nihon ni kaetchau no.*
 Hm, and in September, Josh will go back to Japan.

⁵³ Japanese young people in particular have been repeatedly reported to use a lot of hedges or what has traditionally been called ‘vague expressions’ or *aimai hyōgen* in Japanese (see, e.g., Yonekawa 1996; Lauwereyns 2002; Zawiszová 2012).

- 2 M: [a:::-
Aaah.
- 3 sokka.
I see.
- 4 T: dakara: u::n chotto zannen kana::-
so INT a.bit is.regrettable IP
So, hmm, I feel a bit sad about it, I guess.
- 5 M: sō da ne,
You're right.

(CallFriend JPN4608)

Several adverbs can be routinely encountered being used exclamationarily in responding turns. They can be employed to display a variety of affective stances and some of them may be said to have already developed into expressive interjections (see Subchapter 4.5). They can be used as standalone tokens (e.g., *Honto ni!* 'Really!', *Masaka!* 'You don't say! No way! That can't be!'), but they also commonly co-occur with other resources, such as non-lexical vocalizations (e.g., *He:: maji?!* 'What?! No way!'). For example, the expression *Kawaisō ni!* 'How pitiful! Poor thing!' is conventionally used exclamationarily to express affective stances such as sympathy or compassion, but it may, of course, also be used ironically, for example, to tease or criticise the co-participant. In line 8 in excerpt (1.30), we can observe the speaker produce *Maji de?* 'Seriously?!' as an exclamation or an expressive interjection to convey his surprise in response to an informing that presents the events it relays as unexpected.

- (1.30) 1 S: entorī shiyō to omotteta n da kedo:,
I wanted to register [for a race in Kusatsu], but
- 2 T: un.
Mm.
- 3 S: entorī mō isshūkan de kireta n da yo.
the race was full in a week.
- 4 T: nani?
What?
- 5 S: ōbō shite kara,
From the moment the registration opened,
- 6 T: ippai?
Full?
- 7 S: isshūkan de sō.
Within a week, yeah.
- 8 T: maji de?
Seriously?

- 9 S: mō sugu owatchatta rashikute,
They say it was full in no time.
- 10 entorīsū ga hanpanakute,
The number of people who applied was just crazy.

(Zawiszová 2018:177–178)

To maximize the expressive effect of some of the adverbs and make the affective stances that they co-construct come across as more intense, genuine, serious, etc., speakers may modify their pronunciation. One of the commonly employed processes involves emphatic word-medial gemination or alternatively, nasal epenthesis in case of word-medial nasal consonants (e.g., *sugoku* > *suggoku* ‘terribly, very’, *totemo* > *tottemo* ‘very’, *yahari* > *yappari* ‘as expected, as I thought, indeed’, *amari* > *anmari* ‘not very, very’). In fact, in the data that I studied, the emphatic forms of the most frequently used adverbs, such as those listed above, appear prevalent. In addition, the adverbs *yappari* and *anmari* also have shortened variants, *yappa* and *anma*, respectively. Masuda (2009) studied *yahari* and its emphatic and shortened forms in spoken corpora and found that even though they all express the same lexical meaning, “only the emphatic form and the shortened form occur in the expression when they function pragmatically or subjectively” (Masuda 2009:50–51). Interestingly, the author also observes that the newer forms, *yappari* and *yappa*, are frequently used in the post-predicate position, whereas *yahari* is not.⁵⁴ Other sound-related processes that are routinely applied to certain adverbs for affective-stance-display-related purposes include, for example, vowel lengthening (e.g., *yoku* > *yo:ku* ‘well’) and glottalization (e.g., *zenzen* > *zenʔzen* ‘not at all’).

4.1.3 *Mimetics*

The Japanese language is conspicuously well-endowed with sound symbolic expressions, whose use in everyday conversational interactions contributes to making them come across as more nuanced, vivid, dramatic, involving, and relatable. The ways in which sound symbolic expressions can co-construct affective stance displays are many and relate to their semantics as well as phonological and morpho-syntactic characteristics. The form of sound symbolic expressions itself conventionally contributes to the pragmatic effects they produce. Japanese sound symbolic expressions often feature reduplication, gemination, word-final glottalization, and vowel elongation, which have all been discussed as resources that are used to make a unit

⁵⁴ More specifically, Masuda (2009) reports that the degree of (inter)subjectivity increases in the direction of *yahari* > *yappari* > *yappa*, which corresponds to the diachronic development of the expressions.

of talk come across as bearing certain affective-stance-display-related implications. Baba (2003) studied the correlation between the use of sound symbolic expressions and the ‘emotive level’ of different spoken registers and found that, indeed, the frequency of occurrence of sound symbolic expressions is positively correlated with the level of emotive intensity of discourse. Sound symbolic expressions can broadly be categorized into onomatopoeic expressions and mimetic expressions. While onomatopoeic expressions imitate sounds from the physical world, mimetic expressions do not imitate sounds as such and can be divided into at least two broad categories: *gitaigo* (phenomimes), that is, expressions that are used to represent manners and situations, and *gijōgo* (psychomimes), that is, expressions that convey affective stances.

Psychomimes represent a common and highly effective way of communicating affective stances in Japanese. They are morpho-syntactically quite flexible, but most commonly function as bare nominals that stand on their own, adverbials, compound verbs with the light verb *suru* ‘to do’, or nominal predicates. Summing up previous research on psychomimes, Occhi (1999:152) aptly points out that they “predicate not just emotions, but whole scenarios that evoke particular emotions and feeling states”. Kita (1997:386, quoted in Occhi 1999:156) explains this evocative potential and embodied nature of Japanese mimetics in the following way:

Japanese mimetics have a unique psychological effect. They evoke vivid “images” of an experience, full of affect. This imagery is not only visual but can also be based on other perceptual modalities and physiological states. The meaning is felt, by native speakers, to be direct and real, as if one is at the scene.

In effect, these images that mimetic expressions evoke allow speakers to capture the meaning of the affective stances that they wish to convey in such a way that their co-participants can understand them on an experiential rather than purely cognitive level (cf. Hasada 1998).

To express rather than to describe affective stances, mimetics may occur in a form of bare nominals that are used in a similar way to expressive interjections (e.g., *Dokidoki!* ‘I’m so excited and/or nervous [anticipating something with a pounding heart]!’, *Wakuwaku!* ‘I’m thrilled! I’m excited [in anticipation]!’, *Gakkari!* ‘What a disappointment!’, *Bikkuri!* ‘Oh! No way! [exclaimed in surprise]’). Another form that mimetics often take when serving the affective-stance-expressive function is the form of a compound verb construction with the light verb *suru* ‘to do’ in the past tense form (e.g., *Bikkuri shita!* ‘Oh! You startled me!’, *Hotto shita!* ‘What a relief!’, *Sukkiri shita!* ‘I feel so refreshed! Now, that feels good!’). In line 3 in excerpt (1.31), we can observe Hiroki make use of a direct speech construction to enact his past emotions and let Nao, his co-participant, witness his thoughts. In the construction, he performs

the interjection *o:* and the exclamatorily used mimetic bare nominal form *bikkuri*. Both represent resources that are conventionally employed in situations when the speaker feels surprised, astonished, amazed, etc. Instead of describing how he felt about the news that someone got married, Hiroki performs his past thoughts (see Section 4.7.2).

- (1.31) 1 H: a: mō soshite kekkon shita hito ita.
Oh, and there was a wedding!
- 2 N: he:::-
Mmmmmm.
- 3 H: o: BIKKURI mitaina.
 INT MIM QUOT
I was like, “Oh! What?!”.
- 4 N: a:::: [sugo:i.
Oooooh, wow.
- 5 H: [o:-
Hmm.

(CallFriend JPN1773)

In their everyday conversational interactions, Japanese speakers seem to mostly employ mimetics either in direct speech constructions or in descriptive utterances. For example, in (1.32), the speaker uses the nominal predicate *bikubiku da* ‘to feel nervous, to be worried, to be afraid’ followed by the *n(o) da* utterance construction (see Subchapter 4.8) to explain how he feels. The same mimetic expression is also used in (1.33), where it, however, takes form of a compound verb together with the light verb *suru* ‘to do’. The excerpt comes from a conversation between two female friends. One of them explains why she thinks that her child wants to change schools. She makes a conjecture that there are too many African Americans and so her child might be afraid of them.

- (1.32) 1 A: uso o tsuita no ga bareta node,
Because it was exposed that I lied
- 2 bikubiku na n da.
 MIM COP NML COP
I feel nervous and worried.

(Hasada 2001:244)

- (1.33) 1 Y: sono kota- ano yutta kotachi no kao miru to,
When he sees the face of those kids, the kids I was talking about before,
- 2 nanka bikubiku shichau n ja nai no kana:::-
 FIL end.up.being.afraid NML COP NEG NML IP

maybe he can't help feeling afraid of them.

(CallFriend JPN1367)

The following excerpts illustrate the use of mimetic compound verbs. In (1.34), we can observe Hiroki explain to Nao how recent bad weather is making him feel, using the compound verb *mukamuka suru*, which is conventionally employed to convey that the speaker is feeling angry, vexed, upset, etc. (lines 4–5). Excerpt (1.35) represents a fragment from a conversation between Itsuko and Rumi. In line 8, Rumi uses the mimetic compound verb *hotto suru* in order to describes the feeling that she believes people experience after getting back home. The verb is commonly employed to convey a feeling of relief, relaxation, safety, peace of mind, etc.

- (1.34) 1 N: mō yuki futteru no?
Is it already snowing?
- 2 H: a: futta futta:.
Yeah, it did, it did.
- 3 N: he::[:-
Mmmmmm.
- 4 H: [uwe: TENki warukute imagoro zu:tto ne,
Aaah, the weather has been terrible these days,
- 5 kotchi mo mukamuka shite kuru gurai tenki warukute,
I've even started to feel vexed, that's how bad the weather has been.

(CallFriend JPN1773)

- (1.35) 1 I: demo (.) a: hon yomanakya toka tte sa:,
But, "Oh, I need to read!" or something like that
- 2 atama no naka de wa omotteru no ne,
I am thinking in my head, you know?
- 3 R: u:n.
Mm.
- 4 I: <<laughing> dakedo (.) nanka kō> hon o hirakete yondete mo,
But, somehow, even if I open a book and start reading,
- 5 atama no naka ni haitte konai no yo mō.
I just cannot retain anything.
- 6 tsukaretete-
Because of how tired I am.
- 7 R: u:n wakaruru sono kimochi:-
Hmm, I know that feeling.
- 8 (.) hotto shichau yone:,
MIM end.up IP

You feel like you can put your mind at ease, right?

9 ie ni kaeru to.
Once you get back home.

(CallFriend JPN6666)

Excerpts (1.36) and (1.37) exemplify the affective-stance-display-related uses of mimetic nominal predicates. In (1.36), we can again observe a speaker explain how she felt using a direct speech construction. This time, however, it is not the mimetic expression that is produced as direct speech, but an enactment of the speaker's past thoughts and affective stances formatted as a question form. The mimetic nominal predicate *hiyahiya datta* specifies the affective stances that were enacted through the direct speech. The mimetic expression *hiyahiya* is regularly used to convey affective stances, such as anxiety, nervousness, and worry. In (1.37), we meet again with Nao and Hiroki. Nao discloses to Hiroki that she has a boyfriend, but he wants to keep their relationship a secret. Hiroki assesses the situation that Nao describes very positively and makes use of mimetic expressions *wakuwaku* 'to be thrilled and excited [in anticipation]' and *dokidoki* 'to be excited and/or nervous [anticipating something with a pounding heart]' to communicate what emotions he believes Nao is currently experiencing (lines 3–5).⁵⁵

(1.36) itai n ja nai ka to naishin hiyahiya datta.
hurts NML COP NEG Q QUOT inward MIM was
I was feeling anxious, thinking it might be painful for you.

(Hasada 2001:239)

(1.37) 1 N: tsukiatteru tte.
That we're dating.

2 himitsu na no ne,
He's keeping it a secret.

3 H: a: sugoi jan.
Aah, that's great!

4 N: (.) [un.
Hm.

5 H: [mō wakuwaku dokidoki jan mō [mainichi.
INT MIM MIM IP INT every.day
Excitement and thrill every day then!

6 N: [<<f> chigau yo:::>
Not at all.

7 suggoi tsurai yo::.

⁵⁵ A somewhat longer transcript from this interaction is provided in Subchapter 4.8 as excerpt (8.15).

It's extremely exhausting.

(CallFriend JPN1773)

The following fragment illustrates one more creative use of mimetic expressions employed as resources for affective stance display. In response to Sakura's question about the quality of food in the buffet, Mai replies that it is *geromazu*. The expression consists of the stem of the adjective *mazui* 'disgusting' which is modified by the mimetic expression *gero* 'vomit, puke'. While it is possible to use the expression *geromazui* (i.e., the variant with the adjectival inflectional suffix) as well, nominal adjectival use of the expression (i.e., the use that we can see here) seems to be more common. Mai evidently likes using *gero-* as an expressive prefix. We have already encountered its use in her speech in excerpt (1.3), where she used the word *gerosamui* 'disgustingly cold'.

- (1.38) 1 S: sore de gohan wa? hhhhh
So, how is food?
- 2 M: gohan.
Food.
- 3 mō geromazu da yo-
INT disgusting COP IP
I mean, it tastes like vomit.
- 4 geromazu. hhhhh
It tastes like vomit.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Pinpointing the meaning of mimetics is notoriously difficult, which, in turn, makes it an uneasy task for learners of the language to use them and interpret their use appropriately.⁵⁶ Hasada (2001) suggests that applying the natural semantic metalanguage developed by Anna Wierzbicka and colleagues (see Subchapter 2.5) enables us to overcome the problems of definition. In particular, she makes use of the tool to explicate the meaning of seven psychomimes: *gyo?*, *ha?*, and *doki?*, which represent "momentary mental activities" related to experiencing "surprise", and *harahara*, *hiyahiya*, *bikubiku*, and *odoodo*, which represent "continuous restless emotions" related to "bad feelings about an anticipated bad happening". With regards the expressions related to surprise, for example, the author observes that while neither *ha?* nor *doki?* include a good or bad semantic component, *gyo?* is used to convey the speaker's intense feeling of momentarily being at a loss about a discovery of something

⁵⁶ For more on this topic, see the chapters in Parts II and III in Iwasaki, Sells, and Akita (2017).

unexpected and unbelievable, which they regard as bad. In (1.39), we can see this expression employed as an interjection.

- (1.39) 1 A: he: ano hito sonna toshi na no?
INT that person such age COP Q
Whaat?! He's that old?!
- 2 gyo?
MIM
Wow [that's shocking].

(Hasada 2001:228)

4.1.4 Verbs

Verbs are the major inflectional category in Japanese and boast quite complex morphology. Consequently, in everyday conversational interactions, we can observe both verbal semantics and verbal morphology contribute to the construction of affective stance displays. In Japanese conversational interactions, there are some verbs that are routinely used exclamatorily to express the speaker's affective stances, but most verbs co-construct affective stance displays in more nuanced ways. Japanese verbal morphology is rich in forms that are conventionally used to accomplish actions that intrinsically convey certain affective-stance-related implications. For example, the desiderative form of verbs is used to express the speaker's desires, the hortative (or volitional) form may be used to encourage or discourage actions, the causative form may convey that someone forces someone else to do something, affirmative and negative imperative forms are used to make requests or give commands, while the representative (also known as alternative) auxiliary suffix *-tari* can be employed to co-construct displays of various affective stances, such as puzzlement, annoyance, or criticism. Conditional forms are not only used to communicate a range of affective stances, such as the speaker's wishes, fears, regrets, disillusionment, satisfaction, irritation, annoyance, etc., but also feature in a number of grammatical constructions that are employed to make suggestions, give advice, issue a warning, give permission, and so on.⁵⁷ Japanese further has a number of auxiliary suffixes, modal markers, periphrastic modal constructions, and idiomatic expressions that are also commonly

⁵⁷ In fact, Akatsuka (1991) argues for an affect-based conceptualization of conditionality in Japanese. More specifically, the author examines Japanese modal conditionals as devices that encode the speaker's affect and suggests that "the Japanese language has grammaticized the speaker's attitude *I want it to happen/not to happen* in the form of the conditional structure, 'if p, q', where q is the speaker's subjective, evaluative judgment, *desirable/undesirable*, towards the realization of p" (Akatsuka 1991:1). She supports her position by the data from children's language acquisition that show that the acquisition of conditionals in Japanese takes place very early, which may serve as evidence for the claim that in Japanese conditionality is based on the speaker's subjective evaluation rather than true/false judgements.

employed for affective-stance-display-related purposes. In addition, the Japanese language often provides its speakers with alternatives to choose from when producing different types of actions. Consequently, the speaker's choice of a form itself – in comparison with the alternatives – may create affective-stance-related implications.

In what follows, we will first consider some affective-stance-expressive uses of verbs. Subsequently, we will focus on the use of plain and polite forms of predicates, passives, and selected verb-verb complexes to exemplify some of the commonly encountered affective-stance-display-related uses of verbal morphology other than those mentioned above.

4.1.4.1 *Affective-stance-expressive uses of verbs*

In everyday conversational interactions, we can notice that some verbs are routinely deployed for the purpose of expressing the speaker's affective stances both in descriptive and in exclamatory utterances. For example, the past tense form of the verb *kandō suru* can be used both exclamatorily and as a component of a larger turn-constructive unit to convey that the speaker felt moved, touched, inspired, and overwhelmed by powerful emotions. The idiomatic verb phrase *ki ni naru* in its non-past tense form recurs as an exclamatory utterance in situations when something captures the speaker's interest and attention and they wish to express their engagement and curiosity. The non-past form of the verb *mukatsuku* 'to feel angry/irritated' is commonly used especially by young people both as an exclamation and as part of larger turn-constructive units in situations when the speaker feels fed up with someone or something and wants to express their anger or irritation. The following example illustrates the use of this verb. The speaker expresses her irritation with regard a non-present man in the course of a conversation with her friend. Notice that she formulates her turn as a non-predicate-final utterance construction, which makes the utterance come across as even more strongly affectively charged (see Section 4.7.1.1). She also makes use of expressive interjections (see Subchapter 4.5) and refers to the man as *soitsu*, which is a term of reference that is commonly employed in situations when the speaker wishes to communicate their negative affective stance towards the referent (see Section 4.4.1).

(1.40) Y: hh <<:-)> ya:d- iya mukatsuku no soitsu ga nanka->
 INT INT feel.irritated NML he SBJ FIL
Eew, I mean, I get really irritated by him.

(CallFriend JPN4044)

The colloquial verb *ukeru* ‘to find something funny/humorous’ in its non-past tense form is nowadays used especially by young people both as part of larger turn-constructive units and on its own as an exclamation in situations when they wish to express their amusement. In excerpt (1.41), we can observe the verb being used in a comment to a status update on Facebook. The excerpt reproduces a status update posted by Kenta, a comment that was posted in response to the status update by Kenta’s friend Ryōta, and Kenta’s response to Ryōta’s comment. In his post, Kenta informs everyone that he has finally bought a smartphone (after years of refusing to get one and stubbornly insisting on using his old flip phone) and conveys how satisfied he is with his new device. Ryōta designs his comment as an exclamatory utterance that consists of the verb *ukeru* in its non-past tense form, modified by the colloquial intensifier *maji de* ‘seriously’, and followed by the abbreviation *w*, which stands for *wara(u/i)* ‘to laugh/laughter’. The abbreviation is used in technically mediated communication in a similar manner to the emoticons and emojis representing laughter or the Chinese character 笑 with the same meaning.⁵⁸ In effect, Ryōta communicates his amusement both lexically and non-lexically, by implying the co-occurrence of laughter.

- (1.41) 1 K: ついに!!!
tsui ni!!!
At long last!!!
- 2 スマホ買いました〜笑
sumaho kaimashita 笑
I've bought a smartphone! :D
- 3 いや〜、分かってましたけど使ってみるとめっちゃめっちゃ便利ですね!
iya:, wakattemashita kedo tsukatte miru to mechamecha benri
desu ne!
I mean, I knew it all the way, but it really is soooo convenient, right?!
- 4 らいんとか最高です!!
rain toka saikō desu!!
Things like LINE [= a social network] are just the best!!
- 5 歩きスマホに注意します。
arukisumaho ni chūi shimasu.
I'll be careful when using the phone while walking.
- 6 R: まじでウケる w
maji de ukeru w
seriously find.funny
Absolutely hilarious :D
- 7 K: こら! バカにすんな! 笑
kora! baka ni sun na! 笑

⁵⁸ Notice that Kenta uses the character 笑 in both his posts (lines 2 and 7).

Certain verbs occur in their past tense form when they are employed exclamatorily to express affective stances. The past tense forms of these verbs may be interpreted as referring to events whose implications have just been realized and so the affective-stance-related effects of these realizations on the speaker linger. For example, *Tasukatta!*, an exclamation that involves the past tense form of the verb *tasukaru* 'to be saved, to be helped', is commonly used to express the feeling of relief, happiness, and gratitude. The exclamatorily used past tense form of the verb *shimau* 'to happen to do, to do accidentally', *Shimatta!*, is used as an expressive interjection, similar to 'Oops!', 'Damn it!' or 'Oh no!', when the speaker recognizes that they have made a mistake, did something they did not mean to, etc. Similarly, the exclamatorily used past tense form of the verb *yaru* 'to do', *Yatta!*, functions as an expressive interjection. It commonly occurs in situations when the speaker expresses positive affective stances, such as happiness about their own success or happiness for their co-participant upon hearing about their accomplishment. *Bibitta!*, an exclamation that consists of the past tense form of the colloquial verb *bibiru* 'to be surprised, to get the jitters', is used to express the speaker's affective stance in a situation when one feels surprised, spooked, intimidated, lacking courage, uneasy, etc.⁵⁹

Certain verbs that express affective stances also routinely co-occur with certain interactional particles, such as *na:*, *ne:*, or *yo* (see Subchapter 4.8). For example, the particle *na:* co-constructs the affective stance displays accomplished in this way by indicating that the unit of talk which precedes it conveys the speaker's subjective judgement 'here and now' (Shinoda 2013). Compared to exclamations that consist of bare forms of verbs, the exclamatory utterances that involve the elongated variant of the interactional particle *na* are hearable as less spontaneous and more cognitively processed. For example, *Maitta na:!*, an exclamatory utterance consisting of the past tense form of the verb *mairu* 'to be nonplussed, to be at a loss' and the elongated interactional particle *na*, can be encountered in situations when the speaker wishes to express negative affective stances, such as the feeling of being nonplussed, being at a loss, being embarrassed, etc. Similarly, the exclamatory utterance *Komatta na:!*, which

⁵⁹ Teramura (1971, quoted in Soga 1983:39) notes that the past tense form of verbs in Japanese is interconnected with mood and one of its uses is to communicate "the speaker's present feelings or emotion concerning some past event". Commenting on the use of the past tense forms of verbs in exclamatory utterances similar to those presented above, Soga (1983:59) suggests that the past tense morpheme "*-ta* in those sentences indicates the 'realized' aspect", while Iwasaki (1993:32) explains a similar example by referring to the speaker's perspective, or more specifically, by pointing out that the speaker is not making an objective statement, but rather a subjective statement that conveys their involvement.

consists of the past tense form of the verb *komaru* ‘to be in trouble’ followed by *na:*, can be encountered in situations when the speaker wishes to express negative affective stances, such as their feeling of hopelessness, distress, or embarrassment.

The following examples illustrate the use of the expression *komatta na:*. Both (1.42) and (1.43) come from a conversation of Yorita and Megumi. The two are talking about Yorita’s way of interacting with other people. Megumi asserts that his way of speaking comes across as quite confrontational. His response is shown in (1.42). In (1.43), we can observe Yorita produce the expression *komatta na:* in a direct speech construction to perform rather than to describe how he felt at the time that he is referring to (see Section 4.7.2). In particular, the situation that he is talking about involved him talking to a woman and not really letting her speak.

- (1.42) 1 Y: *komatta na:-*
I'm really at a loss as to what to do about this.
- 2 *jinkaku no kado ga torenai na:-*
My personality doesn't seem to be getting mellow with age...

(CallFriend JPN1841)

- (1.43) 1 Y: *chotto kō: sugoku komatta na: to omotteta kedo ne zutto.*
A bit like this, I was pretty much all the time thinking, "I'm so very screwed!"
- 2 M: *u:n.*
Mmm.
- 3 Y: *motto kō: hanashi shitekurereba ii noni tteyūka.*
I mean, I should have let her speak more.

(CallFriend JPN1841)

The interactional particle *yo* commonly co-occurs, for example, with the verb *tereru* ‘to feel embarrassed/abashed’ in its non-past tense form referring to the future. The exclamatory utterance *Tereru yo!* can be encountered in situations when the speaker is being praised or admired to convey their humble attitude of not deserving such praise or admiration and to offset their shyness or the feeling of embarrassment (Maynard 2005b:241). The exclamation *Wakatteru yo!*, which consists of the resultative aspectual form of the verb *wakaru* ‘to understand’ and the interactional particle *yo*, can be encountered in situations when the speaker wishes to display that they are growing impatient, irritated, and annoyed because of, for example, being repeatedly told something that they already know. The following fragment illustrates this use. It comes from a conversation between Haruna and Takehito, who are siblings. Haruna is older. Takehito tells Haruna that he has a stomach-ache and that he has taken Seirohan

which is a pharmaceutical drug that is widely used in Japan as a treatment for diarrhoea. It seems that Haruna understood that he has diarrhoea and that they can move on with their conversation but then she again asks him about it, as shown in line 1. Takehito produces the utterance *wakatteru yo* in line 12 to convey his growing annoyance and impatience.

- (1.44) 1 H: *geri ni natteru?*
Do you have diarrhoea?
- 2 T: *hhh <<laughing> mattaku.> hh*
Oh god!
- 3 H: *a?*
What?
- 4 T: *u:n.*
Yeah.
- 5 H: *natteru no?*
Do you have it?
- 6 T: *hhh <<laughing> sonna- sonna koto iwanaide yo.>*
Don't say such things!
- 7 H: *a?*
What?
- 8 T: *hh u:n.*
Yeah.
- 9 H: *n: na- na- nattara (ta-) nomu no yo.*
If you have diarrhoea, you should take the medicine.
- 10 T: *u:n.*
Mm.
- 11 H: *naranaï to nonja dame na no yo.*
If you don't have diarrhoea, don't take it.
- 12 T: *u:n wakatteru yo,*
INT know IP
Mm, I know.

(CallFriend JPN1612)

In (1.45), we can observe an affectively laden pseudo-threat made by Mamoru in response to his male friend's repeated blatant refusal to respond to his reiterated question and instead stubbornly talking about something else (arguably for the purpose of eliciting humour by annoying his friend). The speaker designs his turn as comprising a non-predicate-final utterance construction, whereby he creates an implication of the given unit of talk as highly affectively charged and the affective stance that it displays as intense. He first produces the affective-stance-descriptive predicate *okoru* 'to get mad, to get angry' in its non-past tense form, which

lends it the interpretation of ‘I’ll get mad’. He follows the predicate with the interactional particle *yo*, which can be interpreted here as adding to a sense of assertiveness and insistence that the turn (in this context and produced with the phonetic-prosodic features that it is) carries. By using the particle in his turn, Mamoru communicates that he wishes to have that “particular stretch of talk [...] properly ‘registered’” (Morita 2012b:1721) and understood with respect to “the content and feeling conveyed in [it]” (Ogi 2017:129). Finally, in the post-predicate position he produces two more linguistic items that help him co-construct his affective stance display. The interjection *mō* is used in contexts such as this to help convey the speaker’s frustration and suggest that their patience has run out. The adverb *honto ni* ‘really, seriously’ communicates here that the speaker means what he says seriously, which effectively adds to the intensity of the affective stance that he displays. By means of this turn, the speaker does not express his anger, as the semantics of the verb would suggest, but his frustration and annoyance.

- (1.45) M: okoru yo mō honto ni.
 will.get.mad IP INT really
 I’ll get mad, I’m telling you, like seriously.

4.1.4.2 Plain and polite forms

It has been repeatedly pointed out that no form of a predicate in Japanese can be regarded as completely neutral and so any utterance that contains a predicate necessarily evokes certain socio-cultural, interpersonal, and affective-stance-related associations (see, e.g., Matsumoto 1988:414–419; Suzuki 2006b:6). Broadly speaking, the Japanese honorific system (*keigo*) consists of three components: addressee honorifics, referent honorifics, and the so-called beautification words. According to the general language ideology, the use of addressee honorifics indicates the so-called ‘polite style’, also referred to as the ‘*desu/masu* style’ because of the affirmative non-past tense form that the copula and the other verbs, respectively, take. The utterances that do not use addressee honorification are often referred to as being in the ‘plain style’, the ‘direct style’, or the ‘*da* style’, based on the affirmative non-past form that the copula takes. Referent honorifics as well as beautification words can be used in both the polite style and the plain style. In ordinary talk exchanges, the polite style is typically explained as a style that is employed towards an addressee that is socially or psychologically distant and is to be shown respect, whereas the plain style is said to be used with intimates and those that do not require exaltation.

The actual use of the plain and polite forms of verbs is, however, not at all as straightforward (see, e.g., Maynard 1991, 1993, 2002, 2007; Dunn 1999, 2010; Okamoto 1999, 2011; Geyer 2008; Jones and Ono 2008; Minegishi Cook 2018). Speakers' choice of verb forms reflects their understanding of the social norms regarding the use of language in different situations, but it is also influenced by a number of other factors that generally seem to relate to the affective stances that they take. In fact, Okamoto (2011:3674), for example, argues that "honorifics and plain forms can be more appropriately regarded as expressions of the speaker's affective stance, or attitude [...] toward a given context rather than as direct indexes, or markers, of contextual features". If we recognize the impact that the affective stances that speakers wish to convey may have on their selection of verb forms in their everyday conversational interactions, the fact that "most speakers are not single speech-level speakers in a given social situation" (Minegishi Cook 2018:630; cf. Maynard 2007:78) becomes far less surprising and confusing. Speakers interacting with particular others in particular situations can generally be described as using a certain style (i.e., the plain style, the polite style, but also a more complex style that involves particular ways of style mixing) as their base style. However, they also commonly mix in forms from a style other than their base style for the purpose of accomplishing particular types of actions and affective-stance-display-related implications.

When a speaker chooses a form of predicate in a style that is not in accordance with the social norms and/or the locally established norms upheld by the participants in the given interaction, it creates markedness and enacts context-dependent affective-stance-display-related implications. For example, by using plain forms towards a person with whom the speaker normally uses polite forms in the context of an argument or an altercation, the speaker may co-construct their negative affective stance displays towards the co-participant, such as their lack of respect, contempt, or disdain for them. By contrast, in friendly conversational interactions that are predominantly carried out in the polite style, the occasional use of plain forms has been found to imply lessening of the psychological distance (Obana 2016), friendliness, warmth, relaxed attitude, sincerity (Okamoto 1999), emotional involvement, rapport (Dunn 1999), solidarity (Geyer 2008), etc. This is so because the plain forms – when contrasted with the polite forms – have become stereotypically associated with informality and casualness, but also directness, impulsiveness, and spontaneity. In fact, only utterances using plain forms are hearable as truly exclamatory and directly expressive of the speaker's affective stances. Polite forms, on the other hand, stereotypically imply not only (a certain degree of) social or psychological distance between the participants, but also qualities such as restraint, deliberateness, refinement, cognitive mediateness and control.

In addition to the two styles that have traditionally been distinguished, we can also identify a ‘semi-polite style’, which involves the use of the plain forms followed by the polite form of the copula *desu* (e.g., Endo Hudson 2008; Uehara and Fukushima 2008). This style, however, presently forms an incomplete paradigm as it appears to be used only with verbs and adjectives in negative forms (e.g., *suru* ‘to do’ > *shinai desu* ‘[I] don’t do’). It is commonly used in conversational interactions that take place in situations that normatively require the speaker to use the polite style but also permit a certain degree of casualness. In the context of an interaction carried out predominantly in the polite style, these forms may be used to co-construct a sense of closeness and familiarity and help speakers convey affective stances more directly owing to their formal structure that places the negative plain form of a verb into focus. Some speakers (it appears that predominantly young men) further make use of an even more colloquial variant of this style, which is formed by adding a clitic-like form *-(s)su* (which can be assumed to have developed from *desu*) to both affirmative and negative plain forms of verbs (e.g., *iku* ‘to go’ > *ikussu* ‘[I]’ll go’). It is stereotypically thought of as rather crude and its employment in interaction that is otherwise carried out predominantly in another style will necessarily evoke affective-stance-display-related implications.

To express affective stances in a way that allows them to communicate their spontaneity, intensity, genuineness, and uncontrollability in interactions during which they predominantly employ the polite style, speakers often use direct speech constructions (see Section 4.7.2) or what could be viewed as ‘embedded soliloquies’, that is, soliloquy-like exclamatory utterances produced in the plain style (e.g., Hirose 1995; Hasegawa 2006). This resource enables them to construct affective stance displays that are morpho-syntactically incompatible with the polite style, bring about a moment of closeness and intimacy, and “[b]ecause such parenthetical soliloquy is embedded but detached from the dialogic mode of communication, [...] avoid the risk of changing the speech style from polite to plain” (Hasegawa 2006:226). The use of an embedded soliloquy is illustrated in excerpt (1.46), which represents a fragment of talk between a male professor (P) and his former female student (S) who came to visit him. Overall, the student uses the polite style in her turns directed at the professor, as the social norm prescribes. However, she also uses the plain style when she produces exclamatory utterances, such as the one represented in line 4. By using the plain form of the predicate (the adjective *sugoi* ‘[that]’s great/amazing’) prefaced by the exclamative interjection *a:*, the speaker is able to display her affective stances as spontaneous, sincere, intense, etc.

(1.46) 1 P: datte mō nijūnen mo mae da mon. ((laughter))

Well, of course, that's now 20 years ago.

- 2 S: konna kichō na shashin o misete itadaite ii n desu ka?:
Is it alright for me to see such precious photos?
- 3 P: u:n betsu ni,
Sure.
- 4 S: a: sugoi.
Oh wow!
- 5 e- kore tte sensei ga ano tīnē- tīnējā no toki desu ka?
Oh, is this when you were a tee- a teenager?
- 6 P: mō hatachi o sugite imashita kedo ne:,
Well, I was already over 20.

(Okamoto 1999:63)

Participants in informal conversational interactions who use plain forms as their base style may use the polite style in order to co-construct their affective stance displays in a variety of contexts. For example, speakers often switch to the polite style when asking their friends for favours or when apologizing to them. Another context in which I repeatedly found this use of polite forms were tellings in which the speakers relate their accomplishments. Such situations might be said to make the speakers feel embarrassed, “vulnerable and hesitant” (Maynard 2005b:20), “cautious, attentive, thoughtful and/or grateful” (Obana 2016:282), which, consequently, represent some of the affective stances that the polite forms in contexts such as those described above may co-construct. In interactions that were otherwise predominantly in the plain style, I also repeatedly encountered polite forms being used when speakers were trying to convince the other party about something or to do something, when they were explaining or confirming something in a way that suggests knowledgeability and definitiveness, when they needed to say something that they wished to be approached and dealt with seriously, and in utterances that were intended to communicate the speaker’s frustration and implicit criticism of their co-participant generally in a humour-eliciting manner. The polite forms in such contexts appear to be used to construct a sense of formality, authority, respectability, seriousness, and/or psychological distance.

(1.47) provides an example. The excerpt captures a fragment from a conversation of Kazuki and Hiroya in a casual dining establishment. Hiroya has recently updated his profile picture but stubbornly refuses to tell Kazuki where it was taken and even suggests that the picture was taken somewhere where it clearly was not. In the extract, we can see Kazuki trying to have Hiroki confirm the location in which the picture was taken, but Hiroki continues to withhold the information (arguably for the purpose of eliciting humour by being annoying).

- (1.47) 1 K: [<<laughing>> niigata da yo ne,]
It's Niigata, right?
- 2 H: [hehehehehehe]
- 3 K: kakujitsu niigata da yo ne,>
Without a doubt, it's Niigata, right?
- 4 (.)
- 5 K: heh <<:-)> chanto itta tokoro oshiete moratte mo ii desu ka?>
Would you be so kind and tell me where you went, please?
- 6 (.)
- 7 K: hhh <<:-)> mō nande kakusu n ka imi ga wakannai ne,>
I really don't get why would you be hiding it.

In line 5, Kazuki – who overwhelmingly uses the plain style during the conversation – produces a highly polite formal form of a request, which involves the polite form of the predicate, and pronounces the turn in a distinctly careful (that is, non-casual) manner. By producing this turn, Kazuki appears to be co-constructing his affective stance of growing frustration with his friend's behaviour, which is further lexically confirmed in his ensuing remark as well (line 7).

The general base style for Mai and Kyōko's conversation, from which the following segment was excerpted, is also the plain style. However, in line 4, we can observe Kyōko switch to the polite style. Kyōko is telling Mai about her relationship troubles. While she jokingly claims that she has been thinking of 'changing' her boyfriend for someone else (in lines 1–2), in line 4, she confesses that, in fact, she is currently quite at a loss. I would argue that she makes use of the polite form of the verb here to add her statement gravity and imply that the affective stance that she communicates through this utterance is genuine and that she wishes it to be approached seriously. This interpretation is further supported by the fact that Kyōko produces a post-expansion of her turn (shown in line 5) in which she claims that the preceding unit of talk represents an honest disclosure.

- (1.48) 1 K: mā atashi mo hoka no hito ni kaechaō kana: to=
2 =<<laughing> omotte->
Well, I was thinking, "Maybe I could also change him for a different guy".
- 3 M: mā demo [ne:,
Hm, but, you know what?
- 4 K: [ima- ima atashi kekkō nayandemasu yo.
now now I quite am.troubled IP

Now, now I am quite unsure what to do.

- 5 [hakkiri itte,
 To be honest.
- 6 M: [datte sa:,
 I mean,
- 7 kaereru mono nara kaete mo ii to omou yo:-
 I think that if you can change a thing, it is ok to change it.
- 8 kaerareru MONO nara ne,
 If it is a THING that can be changed, you know?
- 9 K: un atashi mo mae sō omotteta.
 Yeah, I used to think the same way.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

Excerpt (1.49) comes from a conversation between Okamoto and Shinkai who generally use plain forms of predicates throughout their conversation. After coming back to Japan, Shinkai will have to go directly from the airport to an event to which he is required to wear formal clothes, which he does not have. After a lengthy discussion, Okamoto promises to lend Shinkai his clothes and bring them to him (line 1). In lines 8–9, we can observe Shinkai switch to the polite style, as he promises to pay at least for Okamoto’s travel expenses. I would argue that by doing this, he makes his promise come across as more formal and thus bounding and accountable. At the same time, by switching to the polite form, he also constructs the situation in which they have found themselves as such that requires his display of humbleness and gratitude towards his friend who is doing something for him.

- (1.49) 1 O: ja: mottette ageru yo.
 So, I'll bring them to you.
- 2 S: un ichiō tanomu wa.
 Mm, please do.
- 3 [warui kedo.
 I'm sorry for bothering you, though.
- 4 O: [u:n.
 Nah.
- 5 ii yo [betsu ni.
 It's ok, no big bother.
- 6 S: [un.
 Hm.
- 7 O: sore wa.
 Doing that.

8 S: (.) ja: a? ashidai gurai wa haraimasu yo=
INT INT travel.expenses at.least TOP will.pay IP

9 =watashi ga.
I SBJ

So, oh, I'll pay at least for your travel expenses.

10 O: (.) iya-
Nah.

11 S: e?
Huh?

12 O: ii jan.
It's fine.

(CallFriend JPN6166)

4.1.4.3 Passive form

Traditionally, there are two types of passives distinguished in Japanese: direct passives and indirect passives (based on a syntactic distinction) and the corresponding simple (or pure) passives and adversative passives (based on a semantic distinction). The indirect passives are often called ‘adversative’ because they are frequently used to relay events that have adversative effects on the subject. While their use as resources for negative affective stance display is prevalent, they may also be employed in other contexts. Therefore, Alfonso (1966:946, quoted in Martin 1975:298), for example, argues that it is more accurate to view the indirect passives as related to ‘emotional affect’ in general, Iwasaki (1993:10) notes that “the passive construction is a means to express the affected feeling of a person coded as the subject”, and Martin (1975:299) suggests that a label such as ‘affective’ is more appropriate than ‘adversative’. When we consider the use of passives in actual conversational interactions, however, we find that “the traditional distinction between the direct and indirect, or adversity or neutral passives is not useful” (Iwasaki 2018:551–552), because the distinction between affective-stance-display-related and non-affective interpretation of passive constructions crucially depends on their context of occurrence, rather than purely on their semantic or structural properties.

In everyday conversational interactions, any passive form may be used for affective-stance-display-related purposes. The subject (that is, the patient) in passive constructions that occur in informal conversational interactions is often the speaker and the affective stance displays that these forms co-construct are mostly negative (e.g., Yoshida 1996; Iwasaki 2018). This may be related to the fact that passive constructions imply the subject’s lack of control

over the events, but also to the fact that Japanese provides its speakers with specialized benefactive constructions that allow them to convey that an event is beneficial to the subject (see Section 4.1.4.4). For example, Iwasaki (2018:541–542) thus suggests that “we can safely say that the passive morpheme always potentially expresses negative affect, or adversity. However, actual interpretation may be modified in the discourse context”. The following examples illustrate that it is not the passive form by itself that creates negative affective stance displays, but its deployment together with other resources in the context of particular actions and activities.

The following turn was uttered by Keiko after she and Mika discussed at length a product that they both bought. The product was not only expensive, but it also seems to be dangerous and not even approved for sale in the US, where they reside. Upon realizing that they have most certainly been scammed, Keiko conveys her realization by making use of the passive form of the verb *damasu* ‘to fool, cheat, deceive, bamboozle’, overtly positions herself and Mika as the subject but does not use any phonetically realized postpositional particle (see Section 4.3.1), and further frames her turn by using interjections (see Subchapter 4.5) and the *n(o) da* construction (see Subchapter 4.8). Keiko laughs at the end of her turn, which helps her clarify that what she produces is a display of her embarrassment at falling prey to the scammers.

(1.50
) K: e: ja: atashitachi damasareta n da:- hhh hh
 INT INT we were.scammed NML COP
Oh, so, we were indeed scammed!

(CallFriend JPN6698)

Excerpt (1.51) represents a fragment from a conversation between Nao and Hiroki. Nao complains to Hiroki about a lack of privacy that she and her boyfriend have, as they both live in dormitories. In the segment presented below, we can observe Nao complain that she has even been given a nickname by other occupants of the dormitory which they evidently use when she calls her boyfriend. She uses the passive form of the verb *tsukeru* ‘to label’ to position herself as the person who is being affected by the action which she cannot control. By using the passive form, she is able to convey that she is not happy about the situation. If it were a nickname that she liked and was grateful for, she would have used a benefactive construction instead (see Section 4.1.4.4).

(1.51 1
) N: dakara mō nanka denwa shite mo sa:,

- So now, I mean, when I call,*
- 2 adana tsukerareteru shi sa:,
they even gave me a nickname and such.
- 3 H: hhh
- 4 N: hh <<laughing> mō tamannai yo:,
I can't help it anymore.
- 5 shut up toka itteru mon itsumo no tabi ni toka itte,> hhh
Each time I respond with "Shut up!" or something.
- 6 H: hontō ni?
Really?
- 7 N: u::n.
Mmmm.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

In (1.52), Mai tells Sakura that her flatmate has been taking Halloween very seriously and has even decorated her room. She uses the passive form of the verb *yaru* 'to do' (line 5) to convey the meaning that it was done to her room without her control over the events. Again, if she wished to convey that she is grateful to her flatmate for doing that, she would have used a benefactive construction. By using the passive form instead, she constructs a display of criticism and annoyance. However, by producing the turn with co-occurring mirthful laughter, Mai conveys that her criticism is not intended to be interpreted as serious.

- (1.52)
- 1 S: nanka yatteru?
Are you doing something [for Halloween]?
- 2 M: nanka yatteru tte,
"Are you doing something?" she asks.
- 3 uchi no heya kumonosu darake da yo
My room is covered with spiderwebs.
- 4 S: e?
Huh?
- 5 M: (.) <<laughing> yararera-> hhhh
It's been done to it.
- 6 S: hh <<laughing> usso:::.> hh
No way!
- 7 M: <<:-)> rūmī ni.> hh
By my flatmate.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

4.1.4.4 Verb-verb complexes

Japanese has a wide range of verb-verb complexes, in which the right-hand member is semantically bleached to varying degrees (see, e.g., Kageyama 2021). In this section, we will look at several examples of complex predicates and syntactic compound verbs that are conventionally used as resources for affective stance display. Complex predicates represent constructions that involve a lexical verb in the so-called *-te* form (also known, for example, as the gerundive form or the connective form) and an auxiliary verb. In the constructions, the *-te* form will be represented as *-te*. Compound verbs include a lexical verb in the so-called infinitive form (also known, for example, as adverbial or continuative form and referred to as *ren'yōkei* in Japanese) and a phrasal verb.

The auxiliary construction *-te shimau* functions as an aspectual marker, which indicates the completion of an action (or the perfective aspect), as well as an affective stance marker. In everyday informal conversational interactions, it is typically realized as a contracted form *-chau* (or *-jau* in case of verbs whose stem ends in a voiced consonant)⁶⁰ and the two functions that it fulfils co-exist and inform each other.⁶¹ The construction may create implications such as spontaneity, automaticity, resoluteness, or a sense of relief, however, for the most part, the affective stance displays that it helps build appear to be negative. Depending on the context in which it occurs, it can be used to produce displays of affective stances such as regret, a sense of guilt, surprise, helplessness, disappointment, annoyance, dislike, sadness, etc. In addition to undesirability and negative attitude, the core meanings that have been attributed to this construction include unexpectedness, unintentionality, the speaker's lack of control over the event, and an implication of the inability to undo the event (e.g., Martin 1975:534; Iwasaki 1993:10–11; Ono and Suzuki 1993; R. Suzuki 1999; Maynard 2005b:123; Kageyama 2021:26–27). Interestingly, in her study of verbs inflected with *-chau/-jau* in mother-child interactions, R. Suzuki (1999) found that these forms carry negative connotations and convey the speaker's negative affective stances towards the completion of a given event. The author, therefore, concludes that “*-chau* is a powerful tool of socialization, with which the mother regulates her child's behaviour and teaches the child how to display affect” (R. Suzuki 1999:1424).

⁶⁰ In addition, there is also the contracted variant, *-chimau/-jimau*, which is, however, used far less commonly than *-chau/-jau*.

⁶¹ The lexical meaning of the verb *shimau* is ‘to finish’ or ‘to put away’, but its use as a lexical verb is now rather uncommon. Strauss and Sohn (1998:221) describe the grammaticalization path for the verb *shimau* as follows: the physical domain (*shimau* ‘put away’) > aspectual marker (*-te shimau* ‘to complete’) > emphatic or affective marker (*-te shimau/chau*) > light or no emphasis, a marker of “social dialect” (*-chau*). The phonologically reduced forms are said to have further acquired a function of communicating “informality, camaraderie, and a kind of in-group relationship” (Strauss and Sohn 1998:229).

The following fragments illustrate how *-chau* may contribute to affective stance displays. Before Yuri produces the turn shown in (1.53), she tells Sachiko about her son's skin rash that she was very worried about, but which turned out to be just an allergic reaction. In the first turn-constructural unit of her turn shown below, Yuri uses the complex predicate *asetchatta*, which consists of the *-te* form of the verb *aseru* 'to panic, to make undue haste' and the contracted form *-chau*. It helps the speaker construct a sense of regret and a negative affective stance towards her behaviour. She communicates that she lost control over her feelings and that what happened cannot be undone. As she adds in the second turn-constructural unit, however, she was also relieved that it was just allergies and nothing more serious. To communicate the sense of relief that she experienced, Yuri makes use of the compound verb *hotto suru* 'to feel relieved, to breathe freely again', which derives from a mimetic expression for sighing. In (1.54), Mayumi uses the compound predicate *itchatta* in line 6. It consists of the *-te* form of the verb *iku* 'to go' and the contracted form *-chau*. By using this verb form, she is able to convey that Yumi moved out but also imply that the move is irreversible and that it was beyond her control. By extension, it also helps Mayumi construct her affective stance display towards the event (which may be interpreted as sadness and aversion, for example) as well as the actor (which may, however, be interpreted quite variously, depending on the circumstances).

- (1.53
) 1 Y: kotchi wa asetchatta kedo sa: ,
I panicked but,
 2 mā demo hotto shita yō na nanka-
well, but then I felt a sense of relief or something.

(CallFriend JPN1367)

- (1.54
) 1 M: atashi jūichigatsu to jūnigatsu sa: ,
In November and December, I
 2 K: un.
Mm.
 3 M: senpai to issho ni sumu kara.
I'll live with a senior student from my school.
 4 K: ha?
Huh?
 5 M: dakara yumichan ga sa,
You see, Yumi
 6 nozomi n toko itchatta n da yo mō.
she's left for Nozomi's place.

7 K: a::: yappari.
Oooh, she did after all.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

In example (1.55), the speaker voices criticism of a third party's actions upon hearing that the person – a mutual friend of the participants who now resides in the USA – spends hours on the phone with his family back in Japan, telling them about everything that is happening in his life. In addition to the phrase *sonna koto* 'a thing like that' (see Subchapter 4.2), the turn also contains the adverbial particle *made*, which is used to convey that the preceding unit of talk is viewed by the speaker as an extreme, the contracted form *-chau*, and the *n(o) da* construction (see Subchapter 4.8). Together, the resources build a display of affective stances, such as surprise and incredulity, but also a certain degree of criticism and ridicule.

(1.55) sonna koto made itchau n da.
 such thing even say NML COP
 He even tells them about something like that?!

(Ono and Suzuki 1993:207)

Japanese has several auxiliary verbs that are used in benefactive constructions, that is, constructions that generally, to simplify, convey that a given event has favourable impact on the person that is affected by the event. There are auxiliary constructions that convey the act of giving carried out by the speaker or their ingroup (*-te yaru*, *-te ageru*, *-te sashiageru*), another group of auxiliary constructions that are, among other things, used to communicate the act of giving of which the speaker or their ingroup is the beneficiary (*-te kureru*, *-te kudasaru*), and a third group of benefactive constructions that includes verbs of receiving (*-te morau*, *-te itadaku*). The use of these constructions is quite complex and reflects a range of factors. What is of relevance for our discussion here is that in ordinary conversational interactions, Japanese does not provide resources that would allow speakers to express the event of giving or receiving “neutrally or objectively, disregarding the speaker's empathetic view or subjective evaluation of the event in question” (Hasegawa 2018:510). Benefactive constructions, therefore, serve as an important resource for affective stance display both when used in accordance with the social norms and when used creatively, to accomplish humour, convey criticism, make a threat, and so on.

For example, the *-te kureru* construction is often used to express positive affective stances towards another person, such as the speaker's gratitude to them or their affection for that person. (1.56) represents a fragment from Fumi and Mari's conversation. Fumi told Mari

that she had to retake an exam and that she failed it again. She further relates that there was a counsellor who was trying to console her and her classmates who also failed. In line 3, we can observe Fumi use the complex predicate *hagemashite kureteta*, comprising the *-te* form of the verb *hagemasu* ‘to cheer, encourage, console’ and the auxiliary verb *kureru*, which enables her to co-construct her positive affective stance towards the counsellor. Similarly, in (1.57), we can observe Yoshie make use of the benefactive construction when telling Ayaka how grateful she is to the woman who helped her find a house that she was looking for.

- (1.56)
- 1 F: *nanka ne:*,
Like, you know,
- 2 M: *un.*
Mm.
- 3 F: *minna o hagemashite kuretete,*
[The counsellor] was cheering us up,
- 4 M: *un.*
Mm.
- 5 F: *anō: nanka dokutā kātā wa ne,*
Ehm, like, “Dr. Carter, you know,”
- 6 M: *un.*
Mm.
- 7 F: *kibishikute yūmei da kara,*
“He’s known for being strict, so”
- 8 M: *un.*
Mm.
- 9 F: *ochikomanaide toka tte yutte,*
“don’t feel down about it,” or something like that the counsellor said.
- 10 M: *u:n u:n.*
Mmm mmm.

(CallFriend JPN1758)

- (1.57)
- 1 Y: *isshōkenmei ne:*,
She tried as hard as she could,
- 2 A: *un.*
Mm.
- 3 Y: *kanojo ga ano: (.) ano: furuichi san no ouchi wa: toka itte=*
4 *=sagashite kuretete,*
she helped me find it, saying something like, “Hmm, Mr. Furuichi’s house?”.
- 5 A: *un.*
Mm.

- 6 Y: atashi hitori dattara,
If I were there alone,
- 7 <<laughing> ya: mō wakaranakatta kana:->
I might not have been able to find it.
- 8 A: a::-
I see.
- 9 Y: nita yō na ouchi ga <<laughing> ya: ano:: [toka itte,
There are similar houses, so I was like, "Huh? That one maybe?".
- 10 A: [ya::-
Mmmm.

(CallFriend JPN6805)

In the following excerpt Noriko and Mie express their negative affective stances towards a custom upheld in Japanese traditional corporate culture which requires female employees to serve tea and coffee even to those who are their subordinates. We can observe the use of the auxiliary verb *-yaru* in line 5, where Mie recounts using a direct-speech-like construction to enact how she felt. By using this verb form, the speaker conveys a sense of resoluteness and vigour. It also helps her construct her negative affective stance display towards the company. She further refers to the company as *konna kaisha* ‘this kind of company’, which also serves as a resource for affective stance display here (see Subchapter 4.2).

- (1.58)
- 1 N: nan te iu no,
How to put it,
- 2 nanka sa::,
like, you know,
- 3 (0.3) nanka kuTSUJOKU o kanjinai?=
don't you like feel HUMILIATED?
- 4 M: =KANjita.
I DID.
- 5 ZETTAI konna kaisha yamete yaru tte,
I thought I'm definitely doing this sort of a company a favour and quitting
- 6 [ano asaban ga mawattekuru tabi ni omotteta.
every time my turn for the morning duty came.
- 7 N: [uhh hh hh hh

(Mori 1999:121)

The attitudinal auxiliary construction *-te miseru*, which involves the auxiliary verb that developed from the lexical verb *miseru* ‘to show’, is used to convey the speaker’s strong

determination to show everyone or a specific other that they are capable of doing that which is expressed by the lexical verb it attaches to (e.g., Martin 1975:545; Maynard 2005b:366; Kageyama 2021:20). The aspectual (spatial and temporal) auxiliary constructions *-te iku* (commonly realized as *-teku/-deku* in colloquial speech) and *-te kuru*, which involve auxiliary verbs that developed from the lexical verbs *iku* ‘to go’ and *kuru* ‘to come’, can also be used as resources for affective stance display. In their aspectual use, the former construction is used to refer to a movement away from the speaker’s deictic centre, while the latter construction refers to a movement towards it. Accordingly, Nakayama (1991:101) suggests that *-te iku* is conventionally associated “with a more objective or observational attitude”, while the construction *-te kuru* “is associated with more subjective and vivid feeling” and is preferred when talking about events that “develop[...] toward a favourable result” (Nakayama 1991:102).

Japanese also has a number of phrasal verbs that conventionally evoke affective-stance-display-related implications when used in syntactic compound verbs in the course of an interaction. For example, the phrasal verb *-sugiru* conveys an excess, such as overdoing, *-akiru* can be used to convey that one has grown tired of doing something, *-hateru* can be used to convey that limits have been reached, *-makuru* is often employed to convey that one does a great deal of something, *-kirenai*, the negative potential form of *-kiru*, may be used to communicate that someone is unable to carry something through, and so on. The phrasal verb *-yagaru* can be used to co-construct the speaker’s disapproving and contemptuous affective stance towards an action done by a referent. It can attach both to the infinitive form and to the *-te* form of lexical verbs (see excerpt (5.12) in Subchapter 4.5). According to Maynard (2000:1211), it “expresses an attitude of mockery, hatred, and perhaps even disdain”. According to Martin (1975:454), it “deprecates the verb” (e.g., *Nani o shiyagaru?* ‘What the hell are you doing?’, *Chikushō, doko e ikiyagatta?* ‘Damn, where the hell’s he gone?’).

The following excerpts exemplify the use of this phrasal verb. In (1.59), we can see the phrasal verb *-yagaru* attached to the causative form of the mimetic verb *dokitto suru* ‘to be startled’ (line 1). In (1.60), it is used together with the verb *gomakasu* ‘to dodge a question’ (line 5). Mai is telling Sakura about her interaction with their common American friend, enacting both her question to him and his answer using direct form constructions (see Section 4.7.2). By using the phrasal verb *-yagaru* she is able to more clearly display her affective stance of mockery.

(1.59) 1 A: dokitto saseyagaru ze,
You scared the hell out of me!

2 koko de nani shiteru n da.
 What are you doing here?

(Hasada 2001:231)

(1.60) 1 M: ya: ano kanojo dō natta:,
 "Oh, what happened to the girlfriend,
2 ano hosoi kanojo tte ittara sa:,
 the slim girlfriend?" I asked.
3 S: un.
 Mm.
4 M: mā ne <<laughing> toka itte,
 "Well, you know," or something like that he said,
5 nihonjin mitai ni gomakashiyaga[(tte)> hhhh
 freaking dodging the question just like a Japanese.
6 S: [hahahaha

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Excerpt (1.61) comes from a conversation of Hitomi, Miho, and Aya and illustrates the use of the phrasal verb *-sugiru* forming a compound verb together with the inflecting adjective *omoshiroi* 'funny, interesting' (line 18). Hitomi uses the expression at the end of an assessment sequence in which the three friends engage in an assessment activity focused on their fellow student, Ryū. By using the expression, Hitomi conveys that Ryū is excessively captivating and interesting. Consequently, in the context of their conversation, this contributes to the construction of her display of fascination with Ryū and strongly positive feelings or affection towards him.

(1.61) 1 A: metcha sa:,
 Very much so,
2 saikin kumotten jan.
 it's been clouded recently, wasn't it?
3 H: n:.
 Mm.
4 M: n?
 Huh?
5 A: nanka (.) kumotteru ja nai,
 Like, it's been clouded, right?
6 M: un.
 Hm.
7 A: sora.

- The sky.*
- 8 M: un.
Hm.
- 9 A: ryū dake umi itte,
Only Ryū went to the seaside
- 10 <<:-)> kao MAKka ni natte [(kaettekita no).>
and his face was all red when he got back.
- 11 M: [e:: he[::-
Aaah, hmmm.
- 12 H: [yaBAi.
That's too much.
- 13 M: kyūto [da kedo-
cute COP but
He's cute, though.
- 14 H: [<<laughing> CHŌ kawaii ne ryū ga yaBA:i.>
extremely cute IP Ryū SBJ is.crazy
He's super cute, Ryū, it's insane!
- 15 (0.9)
- 16 ?: hh
- 17 (0.9)
- 18 H: omoshirosugiru.
He's too good to be true.

4.1.5 Nouns

In conversational interactions, nouns (including verbal nouns) contribute to the construction of affective stance displays in various ways. Here, we will consider only some examples of their conventionalized affective-stance-display-related uses. In informal conversational interactions, we regularly encounter certain nouns being used exclamatorily with a view to accomplishing affective stance displays. Some may form one-word exclamatory utterances (e.g., *tanoshimi* ‘anticipation, enjoyment, excitement’ > *Tanoshimi!* ‘I’m looking forward! I’m excited!’, *manzoku* ‘satisfaction’ > *Manzoku!* ‘I’m satisfied! I’m happy!’, *onegai* ‘request’ > *Onegai!* ‘Please! I beg you!’). Some may employ repetition for the purpose of creating emphasis (e.g., *jōdan* ‘joke’ > *Jōdan jōdan!* ‘I’m just kidding!’) or making the affective stance that is displayed come across as, for example, more intense (e.g., *shinpai* ‘worry, concern’ > *Shinpai shinpai!* ‘I’m so worried!’). Another format of exclamatory nominal utterances that we can commonly hear in everyday conversational interactions involves the use of nominal predicates

accompanied by an interactional particle, such as *na:* or *ne:* (e.g., *fuan* ‘anxiety, restlessness’ > *Fuan da na:!* ‘I’m so worried/anxious!’).

Affective-stance-expressive nouns can, of course, also occur in other utterance formats. For example, the following excerpt illustrates the use of the word *tanoshimi* ‘anticipation, enjoyment, excitement’. The speaker is expressing his excitement about a new project. He uses a non-predicate-final utterance construction, which helps him construct the action that his turn implements as affectively charged (see Section 4.7.1.1). The noun *tanoshimi* forms a part of a nominal predicate, which is further followed by the interactional particle *yo* (see Subchapter 4.8). In addition, the speaker also uses the hedging expression *chotto* ‘a bit’ (see Section 4.1.2). Rather than attenuating the strength of the affective stance display, however, I would argue that it helps the speaker construct a surprised stance towards his excitement.

(1.62) *chotto tanoshimi da yo kore wa.*
 a.bit excitement COP IP this TOP
 I’m a bit excited about this.

(CallFriend JPN4164)

Another format that can frequently be encountered in conversational interactions consists of noun phrases that are built around head nouns such as *kanji* ‘feeling, sense’ or *kimochi* ‘feeling’. For example, *ii kanji* literally means ‘good feeling’ and is commonly used to express one’s satisfaction or liking (e.g., ‘I like it!’). The head noun may also be modified by an entire clause which adds content to the head noun, or, to put it differently, explains or enacts the feeling. The clauses often take form of direct speech that are connected to the head noun by means of a complementizer/quotative marker, such as *tte*. For example, *Betsu ni kamawanai tte kanji* consists of the head noun *kanji* which is modified by a clause that is connected to the head noun by means of *tte*. The clause represents the speaker’s thoughts ‘[I] don’t really care/mind’. The resultant noun phrase then conveys the affective stance presented in the clause but is hearable as more objectified and therefore possibly easier to imagine and empathise with, comment on, but also dissociate oneself from.

The following excerpt from a conversation between Eizō and Yasuhiro provides an example. After they jointly assess Yasuhiro’s father as very intelligent, Yasuhiro proceeds to proffer an assessment of his mother (lines 8–10). Using the noun-modifying construction described above, he describes the *kanji* ‘feeling, sense’ that his mother’s qualities evoke rather than directly stating that he feels that his mother is a bumpkin.

- (1.63) 1 E: tōchan sugē shikkari shiteru yo na:-
Your dad is really level-headed.
- 2 Y: (.) tōchan?
My dad?
- 3 E: un.
Mm.
- 4 Y: uchi no chichioya atama ii yo.
My dad is bright.
- 5 E: atama yosasō da yo na.
He seems bright.
- 6 sugē kiten mawarisō da.
He seems really quick-witted.
- 7 (.)
- 8 Y: uchi no kāsān wa ne: ,
My mum, you know,
- 9 chotto ano: nanmo shiranai inakamono tte yū kanji,
a.bit FIL nothing doesn't.know bumpkin QUOT say feeling
she's a bit like, that, she makes you feel like she is a bumpkin that doesn't know anything.
- 10 hakkiri itte.
To say it frankly.
- 11 E: (.) kāchan ima nani yatten no?
What has she been doing lately?
- 12 Y: nanimo yattenai yo.
Nothing.
- 13 kaji.
Chores.

Nouns are also used as terms of abuse (e.g., *baka* ‘idiot’, *boke* ‘retard’, *bakayarō* ‘moron’, *busu* ‘ugly bitch’, *debu* ‘fatso’, *usotsuki/usotsuke* ‘liar’, *yowamushi* ‘coward’) that may be employed to construct both serious and non-serious negative affective stances, such as frustration, anger, annoyance, contempt, disgust, etc., which may further serve other affective-stance-display-related purposes in cooccurrence with other resources in their context of occurrence. The following excerpt allows us to observe the use of the term *usotsuke* ‘liar’ in line 5. In addition, it also includes the term *yatsu* ‘a guy’ in line 3 which also serves here as a nominal resource for affective stance display (see Section 4.4.1). In the segment, Yoshio is asking his friend Atsushi whether he and his girlfriend are going to get married soon. Atsushi evidently does not want to talk about this topic, which is evident from his delayed and curt responses, and before long they abandon it.

- (1.64) 1 Y: kekkon suru no?
Are you guys getting married?
- 2 A: (.) he?
Huh?
- 3 Y: <<:-)> kekkonshiki no hi demo kakusu yatsu?>
wedding GEN day PRT hide guy
Are you one of those guys who hide [the date of] their wedding day?
- 4 A: <<:-)> a sonna kanji kana.>
INT such feeling IP
Yeah, something like this, I guess.
- 5 Y: hh <<:-)> usotsuke.>
Liar!
- 6 (.)
- 7 Y: mō suru?
Are you?
- 8 A: shinai.
No.
- 9 Y: shinē n?
No?
- 10 A: e?
What?
- 11 sō da ne,
That's right.

Of particular interest to this section are two turns produced by Yoshio. The turn shown in line 3 is designed as a question. It consists of a noun phrase that involves the head noun *yatsu* ‘a guy’ preceded by a clausal noun-modifying construction. The word *yatsu* is often used pejoratively to convey at least some degree of negative affective stance towards the referent. As such, it contributes here to the construction of the question as a humorous rebuke of Atsushi whom Yoshio thereby positions as someone who potentially does something as deplorable as hiding his wedding day from his friend. Atsushi’s response to this turn is formulated in a way that clearly suggests that he is lying. He produces a change-of-state token *a*, which might be interpreted here as conveying that he has just realized something, and follows it by a vague confirmation of the implication enacted by Yoshio’s question, using a nominal phrase consisting of the head noun *kanji* ‘feeling’ modified by the adnominal demonstrative *sonna* ‘such’, and finishing off his turn with the interactional particle (or a modal marker) *kana* which implies self-doubt or uncertainty. In his response, in line 5, Yoshio laughs and smilingly produces an exclamatory utterance consisting solely of the noun *usotsuke*, which is a colloquial

variant of *usotsuki* ‘a liar’, as a pseudo term of abuse, whereby he conveys that he does not believe that what Atsushi is claiming is true, but simultaneously shows his amusement and appreciation of the humorous value of his friend’s evasive response.

There are also nouns that are used as secondary interjections. Some of them serve as swear words (e.g., *Kuso!* ‘Shit!’, *Chikushō!!/Chikishō!* [lit. ‘a beast, an animal’] ‘Damn it! Fuck!’), whose use, of course, communicates various negative affective stances, such as frustration, anger, irritation, etc. In informal conversational interactions, the word *kuso* ‘shit’ is also employed as an affectively loaded intensifier in a similar way as the words ‘freaking’ or ‘fucking’ are in colloquial English nowadays (e.g., *tsumaranai* ‘boring’ > *kuso tsumannai* ‘freaking boring’).⁶² In the following excerpt, we can observe the use of the contemptuous derogatory term *kuso babaa* ‘old hag’. Okamoto uses it to refer to a teacher who gave Okamoto and his fellow students a very difficult test.

- (1.65) 1 S: shiken atta no kyō.
Did you have an exam today?
- 2 O: atta yo:--
I did.
- 3 suggē muzukashikatta yo konkai.
It was freakishly difficult, this time.
- 4 S: maji de.
Seriously?
- 5 O: a: hh <<laughing> ano kuso babaa.> hh
INT that old.hag
Mm, that old hag!

(CallFriend JPN6166)

The Japanese language also makes available the suffix *-me* which can be attached to reference terms (e.g., Martin 1975:830–831). It conveys the speaker’s (serious or non-serious) negative affective stance towards the referent, such as contempt and antipathy (e.g., *soitsume* ‘that bastard’, *bakame* ‘damn idiot’, *usotsukime* ‘damn liar’). I have recently encountered a post on social media of one of my Japanese friends that included the expression *koroname* ‘damn covid’. It consists of the colloquial term for COVID-19, that is, the coronavirus that caused the currently ongoing pandemic, and the suffix *-me*. In (1.66), we can observe the use of this suffix in another post on social media. It is a comment that the writer made with regards to his friends

⁶² In some words, it might, in fact, function as a prefix, as it is possible to hear a word modified by *kuso* further modified by another element in the role of an intensifier (e.g., *maji kusodarui* ‘seriously freaking tired’).

when posting a picture which shows them sitting on the ground and drinking beers. The affective stance of contempt that this comment conveys on the semantic level can be pragmatically interpreted as communicating the writer's affection for his friends and manifesting and simultaneously co-constructing their relationship as that of close friends.

- (1.66) この飲みたがりやさんたちめ！！
 kono nomitagariyasantachime!!
 these darn.people.who.want.to.drink
These darn people who just want to drink!

The noun *uso* 'a lie' functions also as an expressive secondary interjection. It is routinely employed as a response token in situations when the speaker wishes to convey their surprise or disbelief (e.g., 'No way! You're kidding me, right?'). In line 4 in the following excerpt, we can observe Maho deploy *Usu!* as a response token to convey her surprise and disbelief, but also to encourage Haruka to tell her something more about the topic. In her response, Haruka uses the word *honto* 'truth', that is, the antonym of the noun *uso* 'a lie', to confirm that the piece of information that she has provided is true.

- (1.67) 1 M: e: de nani ja,
 Ah, so what?
 2 rei toka ni mo attenai no?
 You haven't even met with Ray or anyone?
 3 H: (.) rei ni wa atta.
 I've met with Ray.
 4 M: <<:-)> uso.>
 No way!
 5 H: <<:-)> honto.>
 Yes way.

(CallHome JPN0696)

To make the affective stance displays constructed by means of certain nouns used as secondary interjections come across as more intense, speakers often use phonetic modification, such as emphatic gemination of a word-medial consonant, vowel lengthening, or word-final glottalization (e.g., *Kuso!* > *Kuso?!*, *Kusso:!* 'Shit!').

4.2 Demonstratives

Demonstratives may seem like an unlikely resource for affective stance display but a closer look at their workings not only in Japanese conversational interactions, but across different languages proves that they are, in fact, commonly mobilized and made use of for affective-stance-display-related purposes.⁶³ The system of Japanese demonstratives is usually described as encoding a three-way (person-oriented) distinction between the proximal (*ko-*), medial (*so-*), and distal (*a-*) series.⁶⁴ The two main functions that they are generally said to serve are spatial deixis (*genba shiji*) and reference made within the discourse context (*bunmyaku shiji*). The rules for using the three series in these two functions have been debated extensively. While they are traditionally viewed as quite separate, Maynard (2007:238), among others (some of whom will be introduced below), insists that the two are closely related, as “even in endophora, the potential meaning associated with psychical distance survives”.

Studies concerning other than purely referential uses of Japanese demonstratives have been limited. Most of them have focused on the distal demonstratives serving various discourse-pragmatic functions. Minegishi Cook (1993), for example, examines the interactional uses of the adnominal form *ano* and its elongated variant *ano:* and discusses them as fillers that function as ‘affect markers’ which align the speaker with their co-participant. She regards *ano/ano:* as “a good device for adjusting the relationship between interlocutors who do not share similar assumptions” and “an effective device for tuning in with an addressee before saying something

⁶³ For example, considering demonstratives in English, Lakoff (1974) distinguishes between their three general uses – spatio-temporal deixis, anaphora, and emotional deixis – and shows that both the proximal demonstratives *this* and *these* and the distal demonstratives *that* and *those* can be used to convey affective stances. Lyons (1977:677) briefly considers what he refers to as ‘empathetic deixis’, that is, the use of proximal *this*, *here*, and *now* instead of their distal counterparts, “when the speaker is personally involved with the entity, situation or place to which he is referring or is identifying himself with the attitude or viewpoint of the addressee”. The author states that it is difficult to specify when exactly these are used but insists that “there is no doubt that the speaker’s subjective involvement and his appeal to shared experience are relevant factors” (ibid.). Later, in his discussion of ‘secondary deixis’, Lyons (1995:310–311) further notices a particular use of ‘that’ versus ‘this’ which is markedly expressive, and whose expressivity can be identified as that of emotional or attitudinal dissociation (or distancing). For example, if speakers are holding something in their hand, they will normally use ‘this’, rather than ‘that’, to refer to it by virtue of its spatio-temporal proximity. If they say *What’s that?* in such circumstances, their use of ‘that’ will be indicative of their dislike or aversion: they will be distancing themselves emotionally or attitudinally from whatever they are referring to. Miller and Weinert (1998) also discuss the ‘emotional *that*’ and observe that it may imply either solidarity/sympathy or offensiveness, depending on its context of use. Glover (2000) studied proximal and distal deixis in English negotiation talk and found that the expressions may be used attitudinally, rather than purely deictically. To add one more example, Stivers (2007) shows that the speaker conveys a (genuine or fake) negative affective stance towards a referent by using an ‘alternative recognitional’ that includes a distal demonstrative prefacing a description instead of the name of the referent in situations when the name is known to all participants and otherwise normally used. For example, referring to a neighbour that all participants know by name using ‘that next door neighbour that we’ve got there’ allows the speaker to co-construct a negative affective stance display towards the referent when, for example, voicing criticism or complaint.

⁶⁴ Each series then consists of a range of forms, such as pronominal, adnominal, adjectival, adverbial, etc. The *so-* series and the *a-* series demonstratives are also sometimes grouped together as distal demonstratives.

that may evoke a dispreferred response or may be difficult for the addressee to comprehend” (Minegishi Cook 1993:33). Kitano (1999) and Hayashi (2004) consider several interactional functions of the pronominal form *are*. Hayashi (2003b) explores the use of distal demonstratives in word searches. Hayashi and Yoon (2010) report on the use of distal demonstratives as placeholders and allusive references to something sensitive. They also discuss the use of the adnominal form *ano* as an interjective hesitator.

Several authors have attempted to describe the system of Japanese demonstratives more comprehensively, including or specifically focusing on their affective-stance-display-related functions (e.g., Naruoka 2006, 2014; Maynard 2007; Kataoka 2008).⁶⁵ However, the use of demonstratives for affective-stance-display-related purposes appears to defy straightforward fixed descriptions. It is certainly possible to determine some tendencies in their use, such as the tendency to employ them to co-construct surprise and/or other negative affective stance displays. However, it appears to be the sense of markedness that the speaker’s use of a given demonstrate creates in its context of occurrence and the context in which the demonstrative is used (including the actions and activities in which it is embedded and the co-occurring resources) that enable us to attribute particular affective-stance-display-related functions to it. This claim is not only consistent with my general outlook on resources for affective stance display advanced in this thesis but can also be supported by the findings from Kataoka’s (2008) study, in which the author considered the use of proximal and medial demonstratives in monologic narratives by rock climbers. He found that even though most tellers in his study used *so*-series deictics for the majority of their tellings and shifted to *ko*-series deictics in the parts of their tellings that were meant to create peaks of involvement, there were also tellers who used the opposite pattern. Therefore, Kataoka (2008) concludes that it is the occurrence of the shift from one series to another, rather than the use of a particular series or the direction of the shift, that appears to represent what matters most in the construction of what he calls ‘involved speech style’.

Demonstratives that serve affective-stance-display-related purposes commonly co-occur with other resources for affective stance display. For example, demonstratives often appear in the post-predicate position, whereby they contribute to the establishment of non-predicate-final utterance constructions, which, as we have repeatedly observed, constitute one

⁶⁵ Kitagawa (2006) attempts to offer a radically inclusive analysis of Japanese demonstratives – which includes their spatial deictic uses, anaphoric uses, and interjectional uses – as representing a deixis-driven paradigm. Similarly, Maynard (2007) attempts to describe the system of Japanese demonstratives more comprehensively as part of her exploration of linguistic creativity in Japanese written discourse. She considers “personalized expressive meanings” that selected categories of demonstratives may carry, explaining them as an extension of “the basic potential meaning associated with physical location” (Maynard 2007:233).

of the most popular resources for affective stance display in everyday conversational interactions (see Section 4.7.1.1). As will be shown below, their markedness can then be produced in several ways. For example, demonstratives often seem to be used as resources for affective stance display in utterances that do not require their use from the referential standpoint, which makes them stand out. Likewise, affective-stance-display-related functions of demonstratives tend to be foregrounded when more complex forms are chosen instead of the basic ones, when they are used as modifiers of descriptive recognitional references to refer to those for whom names or other more basic forms of reference are normally employed, or when the speaker breaks their general pattern and uses a demonstrative in a different way than what could have been expected based on their linguistic behaviour so far.

Consider the following example. It was used by Mayes and Ono (1991) in their paper on the reference form *ano hito* ‘that person’, which consists of the adnominal distal demonstrative *ano* ‘that’ and the head noun *hito* ‘person’. Exploring its use in actual conversational interactions, the authors found that it is often employed to communicate the speaker’s negative affective stance, such as their lack of respect, dislike, or scorn for the referent. They concluded that the phrase indexes ‘social/emotional distance’, which they explain as “a metaphorical extension of [the] deictic use [of *ano*] to refer to objects or people which are spatially distant from both the speaker and the hearer” (Mayes and Ono 1991:92). In the turn represented below, the speaker complains about his girlfriend, referring to her as *ano hito*.

(2.1) demo kane mottenē mon ano hito.
 but money doesn’t.have IP that person
 But she doesn’t have any money, that person.

(Mayes and Ono 1991:86)

The use of the distal demonstrative in the phrase can be explained as simply serving the function of marking a referent that both the speaker and their co-participant know, which is the conventional way of marking a shared reference in discourse context. However, the sense of distancing from the referent that the use of the expression here evokes stems from its local markedness. The term *ano hito* represents what Stivers (2007) calls an ‘alternative recognitional’, that is, a term that is assumed to work as a recognitional reference, which, however, clearly departs from the default and more basic term of reference (see also Section 4.4.1). Further markedness is created by the fact that this phrase in its context of occurrence is referentially superfluous. In addition, the phrase is produced in the post-predicate position, whereby the non-predicate-final utterance construction is created, which lends the turn a sense

of even stronger affect-ladenness.⁶⁶ The speaker also utilizes other resources that enable him to construct the strongly negative affective stance that he displays. He realizes the negative suffix *-nai* as *-nē* (see Section 4.1.1), uses the noun *kane* ‘money’ instead of the more neutral-sounding expression *okane* (which comprises the beautification prefix *o-*), opts for the employment of the zero particle after *kane* instead of a phonetically realized one (see Section 4.3.1), and makes use of the post-predicate expression *mon*, which can be viewed as an interactional particle that serves here to convey the speaker’s belief that his negative affective stance towards his girlfriend is only natural and completely justifiable (see Subchapter 4.8). I would, therefore, argue that it is not the phrase *ano hito* that creates the negative implications, but its situated use in the context of the action of complaining or criticising in co-occurrence with other resources for affective stance display.

We can observe the use of *ano hito* in a turn that implements criticism in the following fragment as well. The segment comes from a conversation of Yuki and Kazuko. Yuki tells Kazuko that she went to a birthday party that day and that ‘*ano hito*’ was there as well and kept silent the whole time. In line 1, we can see Yuki produce the critical comment. It is designed as a non-predicate-final utterance construction comprising the reference term *ano hito* in the post-predicate position, just as we saw in the example above. While, as I argued above, it is not the expression *ano hito* by itself that conveys the speaker’s negative affective stance towards the referent, its situated use contributes to the construction of the display. The two participants know the name of the woman who is being referred to as *ano hito* but using her given name in this comment, would completely alter the affective effect that it creates. By using the reference term *ano hito* and placing it in the post-predicate position within a single intonation unit with the preceding unit of talk the speaker is able to construct a sense of heightened affectivity and distancing from the referent, which in turn contribute to the construction of her display of dislike and disdain.

- (2.2) 1 Y: mō hitokoto shaberanai ano hito.
 INT single.word doesn't.say that person
Aah, she doesn't say a thing, that person.
- 2 K: (.) a sō.=
Oh really.
- 3 [=demo yoku i]ku ne:==
And despite that she takes part.

⁶⁶ Interestingly, according to Mayes and Ono (1991:89), when used for affective stance display purposes, the phrase often appears in the post-predicate position.

- 4 Y: [damatte-]
Just keeps silent.
- 5 =kuru ne: yoku ne: [hon:tō ni.
She does, right? Really.
- 6 K: [n:::-
Mmmm.

(CallFriend JPN6688)

Because of their use to mark shared information in discourse context, in addition to conveying a sense of distance, distal demonstratives have also repeatedly been described as communicating a sense of closeness (e.g., Minegishi Cook 1993; Kitagawa 2006; Maynard 2007). Kitagawa (2006), who describes *a*-series demonstratives as referring to things that are spatially and cognitively distal, suggests that they are also used to convey that the speaker and the co-participant are cognitively aligned and share the same perspective. Similarly, Naruoka (2006), with regards the use of distal demonstratives *are* and *ano*, suggests that they may indicate that the referent and the expressed affective stance are shared between the participants, which evokes a sense of a shared point of view and solidarity. However, she also notes that they may be used to convey emotional distance and express negative affective stances by excluding the referent from the speaker's sphere. Maynard (2007:239) maintains that the *a*-series demonstratives are used in situations "when, although the referent and content physically may be far away, the speaker feels a sense of closeness"; their use evokes "[t]he feelings of familiarity, sentiment, regret, and so on".

The use of a medial demonstrative as a resource for affective stance display is illustrated in (2.3). The excerpt features a fragment of conversation between Takuya and Shōta. After Takuya made fun of Shōta, Shōta launches a 'counterattack' by indirectly criticising Takuya's newly grown beard (line 1). He designs his criticism as a question that requests explanation and connects it to the preceding talk by using the topic phrase *omae mo* 'you also' as a means to change the topic and shift their attention to Takuya. His negative affective stance with regards to Takuya's new appearance is especially perceptible in line 3, which Shōta produces in response to Takuya's open-class repair initiator *He?* 'Huh?', whereby Takuya signals to Shōta that the preceding turn is a source of trouble for him and asks him to resolve it in the next turn, while arguably just buying time to devise a clever answer that would advance their banter further. Shōta's turn is designed as a partial repeat of the question that he produced in line 1 with an important modification – the adnominal demonstrative *sono* 'that' added as a modifier of the noun which refers to the object of his implied criticism. His use of the demonstrative here

is perfectly in line with the use of spatial deictics, but it clearly does not serve genuine referential purposes. The negative-affective-stance-related implications that it produces here stem from its markedness created by means of its referential redundancy, the juxtaposition of this turn to his first question, as well as by reference to the activity of banter and the preceding talk in which the two have been engaged.

- (2.3) 1 S: <<laughing> omae mo nande hige hayashiteru n?>
you also why beard have.been.growing Q
Why are you like growing a beard now?
- 2 T: he?
Huh?
- 3 S: <<:-)> nande sono hige hayashiten no?>
why that beard have.been.growing Q
Why are you growing that beard?
- 4 T: sorinikui.
It's difficult to shave.
- 5 S: hehehe <<:-)> nani?>
What?
- 6 T: sorinikui.
It's difficult to shave.
- 7 S: <<:-)> sorinikui kara?>
Cause it's difficult to shave?

(Zawiszová 2018:179)

Using medial demonstratives in conversational interaction in a similar way as illustrated above is quite common. Naruoka (2006), for example, with regards to the medial demonstratives *sono* and *sore* notes that they indicate that the referent is in the co-participant's domain, and, as such, can be used to distance the speaker from the referent, push the referent into the domain of the co-participant, and indicate the speaker's negative affective stance towards the referent and/or the co-participant. Naruoka (2014) also studied the adnominal forms *konna/sonna/anna* using audio and video recordings of naturalistic data and concluded that they appear to “always index some kind of speaker's emotion” (Naruoka 2014:12). The studied forms were reported to mostly occur in situations in which speakers convey their negative affective stances, such as antipathy, humility, suspicion, and/or surprise.⁶⁷ One format that Naruoka (2014) discusses in more detail involves the adnominal forms *konna/sonna/anna* used together with a nominalizer,

⁶⁷ Notice that displays of surprise in Japanese appear to frequently correlate with displays of negative affective stances and are often accomplished using the same verbal means (cf. Suzuki 2006c).

affective stance towards an assignment, which involves reading newspaper articles. He starts by producing an emphatically elongated interjection *e:::* which is conventionally used in response to something that is not consistent with the speaker's expectations and hence surprising, shocking, etc. (see Subchapter 4.5). Here, however, he uses it within an enactment of his thoughts rather than in response to something that has just been revealed in the here-and-now of their interaction. Subsequently, he uses explicitly evaluative predicate *taihen da* 'is hard, difficult' and refers to the articles that they are asked to read using *sonna no*, which further contributes to his negative affective stance display.

- (2.5) 1 S: *iya:: hazukashii yo.*
 INT am.embarrassed IP
No way, it's embarrassing.
- 2 *sonna no dekinai no ore.*
 such NML can't.do NML I
I can't do something like that, I [can't].
- 3 O: *NA:nde,*
Why not?
- 4 S: *nande?*
Why?

(CallFriend JPN6166)

- (2.6) 1 S: *de sore de yomasarete,*
And he makes us read things like that.
- 2 Y: *un.*
Mm.
- 3 S: *E::: sonna no yonde konai to ikenai kara taihen na n=*
 INT such NML must.read.and.come because is.hard NML
- 4 *=da yo.*
 COP IP
"Whaaaat?!" Because we have to read such things it is exhausting.
- 5 Y: *n::.*
Mmm.

(CallFriend JPN6166)

Excerpt (2.7) comes from a conversation between Itsuko and Rumi. The fragment shows Rumi as she expresses her sympathy for the people whose job is to transcribe conversations such as theirs. She first produces the adverb *kawaisō ni* 'pitifully' which serves as a conventionalized means for the expression of pity. By using this expression in the turn-initial position, Rumi is

further able to effectively constrain the interpretation of the following components of the turn. She refers to the practice of transcribing recordings of conversations using the zero-marked *konna no*, which consists of the proximal adjectival adnominal demonstrative and a nominalizer. The verb is in the causative-passive form which is commonly used to convey the speaker's belief that an action expressed by the verb has an adversative effect on its recipient. Finally, she also uses the utterance-final *nante*, which helps her construct her affective stance display by marking the preceding unit of talk as something towards which she feels aversion and contempt.

(2.7) 1 R: *kawaisō ni konna no yarasareru nante.*
 pitifully such NML are.made.to.do PRT
Poor things! Being forced to do something like this.

2 I: *h hhh hh hh*

(CallFriend JPN6666)

Proximal demonstratives have repeatedly been described as creating a sense of emotional involvement and intensity of the speaker's affective stances toward the referent (e.g., Kitagawa 2006; Naruoka 2006; Maynard 2007:39). Kitagawa (2006:97) also notices the recurrent affective-stance-display-related use of the elongated variant of the proximal adnominal demonstrative *kono:*. Based on my observations, it typically seems to occur in situations when the speaker communicates their (serious or non-serious) dislike or disapproval, for example, when engaging in such actions as scolding, warning, threatening, criticising, complaining, etc.

Example (2.8) illustrates this use, but even more so, illustrates how different co-occurring resources interact.

(2.8) 1 A: *nan da kono:,*
 what COP this
What the hell?!

2 *mata konna tokoro ni jitensha okiyagatte-*
 again this.kind.of place at bicycle have.left
Some bastard's left a bicycle in a place like this again.

(Kitagawa 2006:97)

The exclamatory utterance *Nan da kono:* shown in line 1 is conventionally employed to convey negative affective stances, such as frustration, anger, or disgust. As such, it is similar in function to English phrases, such as 'What the hell?!' or 'What the heck?!'. If we were to analyse it, we find that it represents a non-predicate-final utterance construction that involves the elongated variant of the adnominal demonstrative *kono:* in the post-predicate position without any noun

following it.⁶⁹ The affective stance displayed in the initial turn-constructive unit is further complemented by resources employed in the next part of the turn. For example, by using the expression *mata* ‘again’ the speaker communicates that the situation has occurred at least once before and hence it is justifiable for him to get angry or irritated about it. By using the phrase *konna tokoro ni* ‘in a place like this’ (which includes the proximal demonstrative *konna*) instead of simply saying *koko* ‘here’ the speaker displays his disbelief. Finally, the predicate is in the *-te* form (see Section 4.7.4) and further involves the phrasal verb *-yagaru*, which is routinely used to convey the speaker’s negative affective stances, such as dislike, disdain, or disapproval, towards the action referred to by the lexical verb to which it attaches (see Section 4.1.4.4).

The following excerpt likewise exemplifies the use of the elongated proximal adnominal demonstrative *kono*: for affective stance display purposes. We can observe it being employed in the turn shown in lines 10–12. It is used by Kazuko to construct a negative affective stance display towards her husband who does not have any savings. Akin to the preceding example, *kono*: occurs at the end of a turn-constructive unit and there is again no noun that the adnominal form could attach to. The second turn-constructive unit that makes up Kazuko’s turn is again, same as in the example above, formatted as a syntactically incomplete utterance, ending the *-te* form (see Section 4.7.4). Syntactic incompleteness also represents a recurrent resource for affective stance display. Here we can interpret it as suggesting that the fact that he has no savings is just one of his flaws rather than a complete list. As such, it helps Kazuko co-construct her (not entirely serious but) negative affective stance display towards her husband. Finally, notice also Yuki’s assessment represented in line 13. It consists solely of an exclamation used adjective *nasakenai*, which represents a conventional expression used in situations when the speaker finds the assessable pitiable, shameful, pathetic, etc.

- (2.9) 1 K: *ā yatte sa:,*
Like that,
- 2 *atashi wa yappari ano mama zutto iku to omou yo,*
I think I’ll just keep going like this.
- 3 Y: *(.) iku n darō [ne:,*
You probably will, won’t you?
- 4 K: *[zettai ano mama tada mō::-*
Definitely just like that only
- 5 *(.) ano: aikawarazu hora: nanka,*
that, as always, I mean,

⁶⁹ In fact, the construction {*Nan da NP!*}, where NP stands for a nominal phrase, represents a commonly employed recourse for displaying surprise and various negative affective stances, such as irritation, frustration, disgust, etc.

- 6 danna o sa:, hh hhh hh
 my husband,
- 7 Y: kī[pu shinagara-
 while keeping him-
- 8 K: [<<:-)> ano: sapōto shinagara-> hh
 that, while supporting him
- 9 Y: hhhh
- 10 K: <<:-)> nan no kono:->
 what Q this
 What is this?
- 11 Y: hh
- 12 K: <<:-)> chokin mo nakute->
 savings even doesn't.have
 A man who doesn't even have savings...
- 13 Y: hh nasakena:::i.
 How pathetic!

(CallFriend JPN6688)

4.3 Particles

Japanese boasts a broad array of postpositional particles that may be divided into a number of categories based on their functions, positional features, and morphological structure.⁷⁰ While some particles primarily serve grammatical functions, others are used for a variety of pragmatic and interactional purposes. One category of particles in particular – referred to as ‘interactional particles’ here, but also widely known under such labels as ‘(sentence-)final particles’ or ‘pragmatic particles’ – has been discussed extensively as serving the purpose of affective stance display (see Subchapter 4.8). In this subchapter, we will focus on the so-called zero-marking or zero particle and some of the ways in which topic-marking particles can contribute to the affective stance display.

There are, however, many other particles that are regularly deployed for affective-stance-display-related purposes. One category of particles that commonly contribute to the construction of affective stance displays is the category of ‘adverbial particles’ (also known as ‘focus particles’), which includes forms such as *wa* (used for creating emphasis and

⁷⁰ Sho. Iwasaki (2013:66–67), for example, distinguishes case particles, topic marking particles, adverbial particles, conjunctive particles, quotative particles, pragmatic particles (that include sentence-final particles and interjective particles), and complex adjunct phrases and complex postpositional phrases which consist of simple particles and other elements.

foregrounding contrast rather than topic-marking), *mo*, *nado*, *nanka*, *nante*, *gurai*, *datte*, *demo*, *sae*, *koso*, *dake*, *shika*, or *bakari/bakkari/bakka*. They serve functions such as creating emphasis, marking extremes, exemplifying, conveying the meaning of approximation or comparison. Some of them are extremely versatile and occur in a variety of constructions. Some are also routinely used to accomplish particular types of affective stance displays. For example, the use of *datte* in utterances such as *kodomo ni datte wakaru* ‘even kids get it’ implies the speaker’s belittling stance and is used to accomplish such actions as criticism and mocking. Similarly, the particle *gurai* can be used to convey a belittling stance in utterances such as *kore gurai dekiru darō* ‘surely [you/I/etc.] can do something as trivial/insignificant/easy/basic as this’. The particle *shika* represents one of the means that Japanese has for conveying the meaning of the English ‘only’. It co-occurs with predicates in the negative form and can be translated as ‘nothing but’ or ‘no one but’, etc. As such, it frequently occurs in utterances that convey the speaker’s negative affective stances, such as disappointment, dissatisfaction, annoyance, regret, and so on.

We can even find certain uses of case-marking particles that are generally recognized as motivated by affective-stance-display-related concerns. In general, it appears that as long as the speaker can choose between alternatives, their choices can be expected to be motivated by affective-stance-display-related concerns. For example, Japanese speakers can choose between two (phonetically realized) particles when marking the direct object of most verbs in the desiderative form. They can use either the particle *ga* or the particle *o* and their choice is said to be based on the intensity of desire that they wish to communicate: “when the desire to do something is high, *ga* is preferred; when it is low, *o* is used” (Makino and Tsutsui 1986:444). Based on my observations, however, I would argue that in informal conversational interactions, speakers generally do not make this distinction and choose zero-marking (which adds to the intensity of the displayed affective stance, as will be discussed below in Section 4.3.1) unless they need to deal with other more specific discourse-pragmatic concerns. In the context of causative constructions that involve intransitive verbs, speakers can mark the causee either by *ni* or *o*, depending on whether they wish to convey the meaning of the permissive causative or the coercive causative, respectively (Makino and Tsutsui 1986:389).⁷¹

⁷¹ Interestingly, in Old/Middle Japanese, as Iwasaki (1993:8) referring to Aoki (1952:54) mentions, speakers could choose between two particles to mark the genitive case, which is a distinction that is no longer made by the present-day Japanese language. They could either use the particle *no*, which nowadays (among other functions) serves as a genitive case marker, or the particle *ga*, which in present-day Japanese (among other functions) serves as a nominative case (or a subject) marker. While the particle *no* was used to show “respect or psychological distance [...] towards the referent of the noun preceding this particle”, the particle *ga* was chosen to express “a close relationship or a feeling of disrespect, hatred, or disgust” towards the referent (Iwasaki 1993:8).

4.3.1 Zero-marking

The Japanese language is known for making use of postpositional particles to overtly indicate how noun phrases relate to other elements in an utterance. In everyday conversational interactions, however, noun phrases are often left unmarked by any phonetically realized postpositional particle. The phenomenon has mostly been discussed under labels such as ‘particle ellipsis’, ‘particle omission’, or ‘particle deletion’ and has been conceived of as one of the features of colloquial speech. The particles that rank among the most commonly omitted ones are those that belong to the valency structure of the predicate and are relatively easily recoverable. They include the topic-marking particle *wa*, the so-called direct-object-marking or accusative-case-marking particle *o*, and the so-called subject-marking or nominative-case-marking particle *ga* (e.g., Shibatani 1990:367; Lee 2002:649–651). However, it is not always possible to supply a topic-marking or a grammatical (case-marking) particle to the phonetically unoccupied post-nominal position without creating utterances that would sound unnatural and out of place. Consequently, it appears more accurate to regard (at least certain instances of) noun-phrases without phonetically realized postpositional particles as marked with the ‘zero particle’, rather than as having a particle missing (e.g., Hasegawa 1993; Lee 2002; Shimojo 2006). What is significant for this thesis is that the zero particle routinely appears in affectively charged utterances and seems to serve as a resource that contributes to affective stance displays.

The examples provided below were offered by Shibatani (1990:368), who noticed that there are “utterances with missing particles that do not yield complete forms with particles that are appropriate to the context”. He also remarks that the most representative instances of such utterances are those that involve spontaneous direct expression of the speaker’s affective stances. He explains that it is not possible to replace the zero particle (represented as ‘Ø’ in the transcripts included in this section and as ‘ZP’ in the respective glosses) that marks the first-person subjects in utterances such as those show in (3.1) neither with the topic-marking particle *wa*, nor with the subject-marking particle *ga*. If the particle *wa* was used, the utterances would be interpretable as fairly objective and rational judgements regarding the speakers, rather than as their expression of affective stances. If the particle *ga* was employed, the utterances would be hearable as making the subjects the bearers of new information (as, for example, in responses to questions inquiring who the experiencers of the given affective stances are). He considers utterances such as those shown below ‘agrammatical’ “in the sense that the elements constituting a state of an internal feeling are simply juxtaposed without going through the

normal grammatical processes due, perhaps, to the spontaneity of the utterance” (Shibatani 1990:369).

- (3.1) a. watashi \emptyset samishii wa.
 I ZP lonely IP
 I feel lonely, you see.
- b. ore \emptyset suki ya nen.
 I ZP like COP IP
 I like/love it/you/etc.

(Shibatani 1990:368)

Several other scholars have also noticed this phenomenon and likewise described it as connected to affective stance display. Those, who specifically focused on the use of zero-marking in conversational interactions, argue that the zero particle is “a grammatically independent entity with unique properties that are not interchangeable with those of other particles” (Lee 2002:678) and thus should be regarded as a full-fledged paradigmatic choice whose properties can be contrasted with those of other possible choices (Shimojo 2006). Lee (2002) finds that the zero particle does not occur in purely descriptive utterances and that “[a] typical environment for the exclusive use of the zero particle involves a strong presentation of the speaker’s feeling or emotion”, adding that “the stronger the feeling or emotion expressed, the higher the possibility for the use of the zero particle” (Lee 2002:656). He develops an idea that was earlier put forth by Fujiwara (1992:142, quoted in Lee 2002:667) that “by omitting particles the speaker strengthens the involvement with the listener” and suggests that “the zero particle causes a stronger and more direct display of feelings and emotions”, while simultaneously increases the dynamics of conversational interaction (Lee 2002:669). Lee (2002:662) calls this effect of the zero particle “compensatory reinforcement” of the interactive mood and explains it by referring to the loss of “logical involvement” of the zero-marked noun phrases with other elements of the utterance structure. This, in turn, as the author explains, derives from the grammatical property of the zero particle, which he describes as the “absolute specification” of objects or events without making an explicit or implicit reference to other objects or events.⁷²

⁷² Different approaches to zero-marked (also referred to as ‘bare’) noun phrases involve discussions on such notions as focus, prominence, or markedness. Shimojo (2006), for example, concurs with Lee’s (2002) position that the grammatical function of the zero particle is the absolute specification of referents and further observes that, as such, it represents the unmarked option in referent specification and yields the discourse-pragmatic effect of referent defocusing. Suzuki (1995b) concentrates on zero-marked topics in comparison to *wa*-marked topics and

Zero-marked noun phrases are often juxtaposed with affectively loaded predicates (e.g., affective-stance-expressive verbs, evaluative adjectives, verbs in the desiderative form, etc.), which creates a sense of a stronger connection between them and, consequently, makes the affective stance which is thereby displayed come across as more intense. The following example was used by Lee (2002) to illustrate an utterance in which zero-marked noun phrases cannot be replaced with phonetically realized particles without a change in meaning. The example represents an utterance through which the speaker conveys her surprise during a conversational telling. It consists of the zero-marked first-person topic/subject and the predicate formed by the mimetic verb *bikkuri suru* ‘to be surprised, to surprise’ modified with the auxiliary verb *shimau* (see Section 4.1.4.4) in the past tense form. If we were to use the particle *ga*, for example, instead of the zero particle, the interpretation of the *ga*-marked noun phrases as an exhaustive listing or, alternatively, as new (unpredictable) information would emerge (cf. Ono, Thompson, and Suzuki 2000:70–71).

(3.2) *watashi* ∅ *bikkuri shichatta.*
 I ZP was.surprised
 It really surprised me!

(Lee 2002:655)

As the examples shown above also illustrate, one type of zero-marked noun phrases that recur in utterances which are used to convey the speaker’s affective stances are first-person deictic expressions, whose overt expression in utterances that involve affective-stance-expressive predicates is generally redundant from the referential perspective. Other types of noun phrases that are regularly zero-marked in such utterances are second- and third-person deictic expressions and demonstratives, which can likewise be regarded as generally easily recoverable from the context. Consequently, the overt expression of such noun phrases itself can be viewed as a resource for affective stance display (see Section 4.4.2). Interestingly, in their study of first-person deictic expressions in Japanese conversational interactions, Ono and Thompson (2003) found that while most first-person deictic expressions that are used for referential purposes are accompanied by a postpositional particle, those whose overt use is not motivated by referential concerns display strong tendency to be zero-marked. The following example was used by the

zero anaphora and argues that zero-marking serves to downplay the prominence of a referent and mark (minor) discourse boundaries (or topic shifts). Fujii and Ono (2000) and Ono, Thompson, and Suzuki (2000) found that in everyday conversational interactions, zero-marking serves as the most frequent option for marking direct objects and subjects, while the particles *o* and *ga* (traditionally thought of as the direct-object-marking particle and the subject-marking particle, respectively) occur relatively infrequently and their overt use appears to be pragmatically (rather than grammatically) motivated.

authors to illustrate the use of first-person deictic expressions in the “emotive function”. Notice that all components of this turn (that we are able to analyse based on this transcript) routinely serve as resources for affective stance display. The utterance is designed as a non-predicate-final utterance construction that features the overtly expressed zero-marked first-person deictic expression in the post-predicate position. The predicate is an evaluative adjective *warui* ‘to be bad’ in the *-te* form modified by the colloquial adjectival intensifier *sugoi*.

(3.3) *sugoi* *warukute* *watashi* \emptyset .
 terrible bad I ZP
 I feel terrible!

(Ono and Thompson 2003:330)

Hasegawa’s (2010a) findings regarding soliloquy also support the claim advanced here that the zero particle regularly contributes to affective stance display. She notes that in soliloquy, utterances often lack an overtly expressed subject and “[i]f a subject is overtly present, it frequently lacks either *wa* (topic marker) or *ga* (nominative marker)” (Hasegawa 2010a:159). She illustrates this point using the following example in which a person is wandering about the wellbeing of another person.

(3.4) *ano* *hito* \emptyset *daijobu* *kana*,
 that person ZP all.right IP
 I wonder if that person is all right.

(Hasegawa 2010a:159)

Zero particle occurs in many excerpts throughout this thesis. Below, we can observe four more examples which illustrate the use of zero-marked first-person pronominal forms *watashi*, *atashi*, and *ore*. Notice that all turns of which the zero-marked pronominal forms are a part convey some type of affective-stance-display-related implications. (3.5) represents the speaker’s expression of satisfaction with her family life. In (3.6), we can observe the speaker construct a stance of impatience. In (3.7), the speaker admits to having been wrong. Finally, in (3.8), the speaker communicates how unhappy a man made her feel. While the zero-marked first-person pronominal forms are produced in the post-predicate position in excerpts (3.5) and (3.7), the other two excerpts involve their expression in the ‘canonical’ pre-predicate position.

(3.5) K: *iya: tanoshii ie* *dakara: <<laughing>* *watashi* \emptyset .>
 INT happy house so I ZP
 Well, I have a happy home so.

(CallFriend JPN6688)

- (3.6) 1 K: atashi Ø nantenaku gaman nanka mō=
I ZP somehow self-restraint FIL already
- 2 =machikiren de,
cannot.wait-NML COP
- I somehow couldn't wait any longer so*
- 3 M: un.
Mm.
- 4 K: kaisha ni kaettara,
when I returned to the office,
- 5 M: un.
Mm.
- 6 K: ano: mō sugu akete nonde mita.
I, like, immediately opened it and tried it.

(CallFriend JPN6698)

- (3.7) 1 W: kikaku buchō da yo.
He's the head of planning.
- 2 K: (.) a:: sō ka sō ka.
Hmmm right right.
- 3 W: moto kara kikaku buchō ja nakatta kke-
Wasn't he the head of planning from the start?
- 4 K: sō da.
That's right.
- 5 machigaeta ore Ø.
made.mistake I ZP
I had him confused.

(CallFriend JPN4164)

- (3.8) 1 H: sore wa (sō to mō) rokuon sareten kara sa:,
Anyway, this is being recording so
- 2 N: hhh
- 3 H: hottoite:,
let it be.
- 4 N: hh demo atashi Ø suggoi yo.
but I ZP terrible IP
But I was really in a terrible state.
- 5 nankai naita ka wakannai mon sono hito no tame ni:
I don't even know how many times I've cried because of him.
- 6 H: ii kara sono hanashi wa tottoite:-

is.good because that talk TOP set.aside
Enough already, let's set this topic aside.

7 N: hhhh

8 H: sono hoka no gakkō no hō wa junchō?
Other than that, the school is going fine?

(CallFriend JPN1773)

4.3.2 Topic-marking

Topic is a component of the Japanese sentence structure which has been defined in a number of ways. For our discussion, it should suffice to view topic as a constituent that helps the participants in interaction define the object of their talk and achieve shared orientation and perspective. As long as the topic is inferable from the context and there is no pragmatic necessity to overtly express it, it is left unexpressed. In informal conversational interactions, overtly expressed topics may be accompanied by no phonetically realized particle or they may be postpositionally marked by one of the topic-marking devices. In addition to the particle *wa*, which constitutes the most common form of topic marking in formal texts, topics can also be marked by forms such as *tte*, *nanka*, *nante*, *ttara*, or *tteba*, which all in their context of occurrence evoke certain affective-stance-display-related implications. Speakers can further also choose whether to produce the topic in its normative position towards the beginning of an utterance, produce it closer to the predicate for such purposes as emphasis, or place it in the post-predicate position and thereby create a non-predicate-final utterance construction, which, as we have already observed several times, serves as an important resource for affective stance display. In what follows I will briefly consider some of the ways in which some of the abovementioned forms (other than *wa*) can contribute to affective stance display.

Tte is typically viewed as a colloquial variant of a number of forms and, as such, it has a wide range of uses.⁷³ The effects of the topic-marking *tte* seem to be closely related to those of *tte* employed as a quotation marker. Maynard (2002:171), for example, regards the topic-marking *tte* as an expression that “fills in the space somewhere between quotation and topic presentation”, for even when *tte* is used as a topic-marking particle, it “retains the effect

⁷³ For example, it can be used as a colloquial variant of the quotative particle/complementizer *to*, the complementizer *to iu/yuu* (i.e., the combination of the particle *to* and the verb *iu/yuu* ‘to say’), *to iu/yuu no wa* (i.e., the combination of the particle *to*, the verb *iu/yuu*, the nominalizer *no*, and the topic-marking particle *wa*), etc. Suzuki (1998b) discusses the workings of *tte* as a complementizer, a topic-marker, a description marker, a quotation marker, and a sentence-final expression. See also the study by Okamoto and Ono (2008) which considers five different uses of *tte*. For a study focused specifically on the development of the topic-marking function of *tte*, see Suzuki (2008).

associated with quotation” and “adds a sense of conversational interaction to the topic presentation” (Maynard 2002:138). Suzuki (1998b) refers to the use of *tte* as a quotation marker (i.e., a marker that introduces into the discourse information that is not well incorporated neither from the standpoint of the grammatical structure nor the speaker’s psychology) to explain why, according to her research, *tte* in any of its functions indicates the speaker’s “psychological distance” from that which it is employed to mark and, by extension, surprise or negative attitudes towards it. Maynard (2002:180) further suggests that besides being indicative of the speaker’s distance or detachment, *tte* also serves as “a device to introduce an unexpected topic as if it were reflecting someone else’s voice, and therefore, as if it were already familiar”. Referring to this dual effect, she argues that *tte* “indexically signals a particular sense of emotivity, i.e., the speaker’s distance and closeness toward the topic, and consequently, toward the interaction itself” (Maynard 2002:182).

One type of action in which I repeatedly found the topic-marking *tte* to be used in the data that I studied were assessments. More specifically, I found speakers regularly use the topic-marking *tte* to mark the referent in the topic as an assessable which they assess in the comment part of the utterance and, consequently, towards which they display their positive or negative affective stances. Such topics often include a person reference term, a demonstrative pronoun, a repeat of a stretch of talk from the co-participant’s prior turn, etc. In the context of assessment actions, I would suggest that marking topics with *tte* is generally hearable as objectifying the topic and implying the speaker’s reflective attitude with respect to it.

The following excerpts illustrate the use of the topic-marking *tte* in assessments. In (3.9), we can observe Mika proffer an assessment of herself and Keiko, marking the deictic expression *atashitachi* ‘we’ with the topic-marking *tte* (line 1). In the assessment, Mika uses the predicate *mazui* ‘to be foolish, stupid, unwise’ to explicitly convey her negative evaluation. She also starts her turn with the modal adverb *yappa* ‘after all, as could be expected, ultimately, etc.’. It helps her construct the sense of an objective assessment, which *tte* here also implies. It also allows her to claim that her stance is arguably congruent with commonly agreed social norms. Overall, she is thus able to construct a display of self-criticism.

- (3.9) 1 M: yappa atashitachi tte mazui no kana:,
in.the.end we TOP are.foolish NML IP
In the end, maybe we are foolish.
- 2 nanka [sugu shin- ano:-
Like, we straightaway, that,
- 3 K: [nanka sonna ki ga suru:=-

Hm, it feels like that.

- 4 M: shin'yō shichau tteyūka:-
we trust them and all that.
- 5 K: n:::.
Mmm.

(CallFriend JPN6698)

In (3.10), we meet a couple, Mariko and Yasushi. After Yasushi, who is a young medical doctor, fresh out of school, details in length how various vitamins and minerals affect the human body and how difficult it is for doctors to find out what is wrong with a patient, Mariko displays how impressed she is and voices an assessment shown in lines 1–2. She makes use of a non-predicate-final utterance construction and places the *tte*-marked topic in the post-predicate position. In this way, she is able to communicate her positive assessment and create affiliation with Yasushi at the earliest point possible. At the same time, she is able to imply that her assessment is based on giving the matter some thought.

- (3.10) 1 M: taihen ya na:,
difficult COP IP
You have it really difficult,
- 2 oishasan tte.
doctors TOP
you doctors.
- 3 Y: mā (.) chishiki no pīku wa kokka shiken to omou kedo ne,
Well, I think that our knowledge peaks around the state exams, you know?
- 4 M: n:::-
Mmmm.

In (3.11), Mitsuko and Hachiko are talking about Mitsuko's husband. Mitsuko explains that – compared to other people's husbands that she knows of – her husband is managing stress very well, effectively thus communicating her positive affective stance towards him. In her response to Mitsuko's informing (shown in lines 2–3), Hachiko affiliates with Mitsuko at the earliest point possible by first producing an assessment that consists solely of the predicatively used evaluative adjective *ii* 'to be good' followed by the complex interactional particle *yone*. The particle helps her construct her assessment as one that conveys her independent stance which she, however, also believes to be shared with her co-participant (see Subchapter 4.8). Subsequently, she repeats her assessment, but adds the topic phrase consisting of the demonstrative *sore* 'that' and the topic-marking *tte*. By adding the topic phrase marked with *tte*

to her assessment, she is able to convey that she has given the assessable (marked as the topic) some thought and thereby augment the affective stance that she displays in her turn.

- (3.11) 1 M: dakara maipēsu de yatten [ja nai kana:-
So he's doing things at his own pace, I guess.
- 2 H: [ii yone:, =
 is.good IP
That's good, right?
- 3 =sore tte ii yone,
 that TOP is.good IP
That's very good, right?
- 4 M: u:[:n.
Mmm.
- 5 H: [u:[:n.
Mmm.

(CallFriend JPN2167)

Nanka and *nante* can also be employed in different positions and topic-marking is just one of their functions. They are often viewed as colloquial variants of *nado* (whose functions are roughly equivalent to the English general extenders, such as ‘or something’, ‘and things like that’, ‘and so on’, ‘or the like’, and exemplifiers, such as ‘the likes of’). According to Marin (1975:160–161), however, compared to *nado*, *nanka* and *nante* are “informal and lively, hence more susceptible to special connotations, such as sarcasm”. As topic-marking particles, they are often used to convey a sense of belittling, derogation, or devaluation of the referent in the topic position, communicating thereby the speaker’s assessment of the referent as unimportant, unworthy, trivial, beneath them, etc. Suzuki (1998a) explains the sense of belittlement and derogation that they commonly imply by referring to the lack of specification that their use evokes.

This effect can be harnessed when criticising the referent and expressing negative affective stances, such as contempt, dislike, disgust, disdain, ridicule, dissatisfaction, disappointment, or disapproval, but also to self-deprecate in order to convey humbleness, humility, non-serious attitude towards oneself, etc. (e.g., Suzuki 1998a, 1998b, 2001, 2006c; Maynard 2002, 2005b). *Nanka* and *nante* are also commonly deployed in displays of the speaker’s both positive and negative surprise, in which case they may be used not only to trivialize or belittle the referent in the topic (for example, to say that ‘even someone like me’ was able to do it), but also to co-construct the presentation of the referent in the topic as something that seems or seemed unachievable, impossible, unimaginable, etc. According to

Suzuki (1998b), akin to *tte*, *nante* is used to convey a sense of psychological distance but connotes the sense of distance more strongly, as it generally involves pejorative connotations.

In the following excerpt from a conversation between Yorita and Megumi, the expression *nante* occurs four times (in lines 3, 9, 11, and 18), but its occurrence in line 9 does not concern us here. Yorita and Megumi are talking about the use of reference terms. Yorita is the speaker's surname. Megumi is a given name. In the fragment, we can observe Yorita describe how difficult it is for him to choose the right reference term to refer to Megumi, claiming that if they were in Japan, he would not normally call her Megumi. The speakers use *nante* to mark the reference terms which they deem inappropriate or ridiculous. The expression thus helps them construct their affective stances as well as affiliation through matching affective stance displays.

- (3.12) 1 Y: demo (.) are da yone:,
But that, right?
- 2 nihon ni itara zettai sa,
If we were in Japan, I would definitely
- 3 megumi no koto mo megumi nante iwanai shi ne,
 Megumi GEN NML also Megumi TOP don't.call IP IP
not call you "Megumi".
- 4 M: (.) a ienai yone,
Ah, you couldn't.
- 5 Y: futsu: wa ne:,
Normally.
- 6 M: u:n.
Mmm.
- 7 Y: nanka: (.) mae dakara hora: okāsan to otōsan- megumi no ne,
Like, the other day, I mean, when your mum and dad, you know?
- 8 M: un.
Mm.
- 9 Y: kita toki ni ore nante ittara ii ka komatchatta jan datte:-
When they came, I didn't know how to call you.
- 10 M: a:::: sō kamo [ne:-
Hmmm, that might be so.
- 11 Y: [oi megumi nante [<<laughing> ienai=
 INT Megumi TOP can't.say
- 12 M: [hehehee hehe haha ha
- 13 Y: =shi sa:,
 IP IP

Like, I can't say, "Hey, Megumi!" or something.

- 14 M: a: atashi no baai wa raku da kara ii n da kedo ne:,
In my case it's easy so I don't really need to worry about it, you know?
- 15 anma kan- kankei nai kara ne:,
It doesn't really concern me, you know?
- 16 Y: komatchau yo ne: ā yū no.
I'm quite at a loss about things like this.
- 17 M: a::.
Hmmm.
- 18 imasara megumi-chan nante (sushi-) shirajirashikute,
at.this.stage Megumi-DIM TOP barefaced
Calling me something like "Mayumi-chan" at this point would be so blatant that
- 19 kuchi ga sakete mo ienai desho.
you wouldn't be able to say it.
- 20 Y: u:n u:n.
Mmm mmm.

(CallFriend JPN1841)

Example (3.13) illustrates the speaker's use of *nanka* to convey her derogatory attitude towards herself, which cannot be appropriately rendered in the English translation. It is a fragment from a conversation between two friends who were just talking about how bad they both are at learning languages. In the turn represented below, the speaker explains that she decided to take up Spanish out of all languages because she was told that it is easy. By using *nanka* as a topic marker, she co-constructs her self-denigrating attitude towards herself as far as language learning is concerned, which is the affective stance display that is communicated through the interplay of all elements in the turn. While she thereby conveys a sense of contempt towards herself, in its context of occurrence, it is clearly employed for the purpose of inviting humour rather than serious criticism.

- (3.13) 1 A: atashi *nanka* nande supeingo totta ka tte iu to,
I TOP why Spanish took Q QUOT say PRT
As for me, the reason why I took Spanish was
- 2 kantan da yo tte iwarete-
that I was told, "It's easy!"

(Lee and Yonezawa 2008:751)

In (3.14), after Mayumi starts talking about a 'George' as if Kyōko knew him, Kyōko asks who this George is, using *tte* to mark him as the topic (line 2). Mayumi responds in a way that

suggests that she believes that Kyōko knows the man (lines 3–4) to which Kyōko responds with the turn shown in line 6. She produces a non-predicate-final utterance construction, which involves the *nante*-marked topic, consisting of the person reference term ‘George’, in the post-predicate position. In this way, Kyōko is able to convey her mild criticism of Mayumi for not keeping track of their common ground and choosing a reference expression that is not sensitive to the recipient design, that is, choosing a reference term that is not recognizable to her.

- (3.14) 1 M: de jōji ga ne:,
And so George, you know,
- 2 K: (.) jōji tte [dare?
 George TOP who
Who's George?
- 3 M: [oboeteru?
Do you remember him?
- 4 raian no tomodachi na n da kedo,
He's Ryan's friend.
- 5 [jōji-
He-
- 6 K: [atashi attenai yo jōji nante.
 I haven't.met IP George TOP
I haven't met him, the George or whomever.
- 7 M: a: attenai ka:.
Oh, you haven't?
- 8 (.) attenai ja:.
You haven't.
- 9 K: un.
Mm.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

The expressions *ttara* and *tteba* (also pronounced as *tara* and *teba* in certain environments) developed from the quotative use of the conditional forms of the verb *iu/you* ‘to say’ preceded by the quotative particle *to/tte* (Martin 1975:1016). They are both employed as topic markers as well as utterance-final expressions, but *ttara* seems to be more commonly used in the topic-marking function than *tteba* which functions mostly as an utterance-final expression. In both positions, they help construct affective stance displays. As topic-markers, they typically occur in turns that convey the speaker’s criticism of the referent that is marked as the topic. The affective stances that are typically conveyed through the turns in which the topic-marking *ttara* and *tteba* occur include dislike, disgust, disappointment, frustration, indignation, exasperation,

resentment, surprise, embarrassment, and so on (cf. Martin 1975:1016; Sunakawa et al. 1998:229, 233; Suzuki 2006c:157). The following example illustrates this use of the topic-marking *ttara*. By using the expression, the speaker is able to convey their criticism of their mother's behaviour and their embarrassment about it.

(3.15) *kāsan tara zutto kōfunshippanashi na n da kara.*
 mum TOP whole.time keep.excited COP NML COP so
That mother of ours has been excited the whole time! [How embarrassing!]

(Suzuki 2006c:157)

The effect of the use of the topic-marking *ttara* and *tteba* can often be compared to that of a recognitional descriptive term preceded by a distal demonstrative (e.g., *that son of yours*) or a reference realized by a term of abuse modified by a distal demonstrative and an epithet (e.g., *that bloody bastard*), which are used in English.

4.4 Person reference

In Japanese, how we refer to ourselves and others is always a matter of selection between alternatives, none of which is completely devoid of social-indexical meanings. Moreover, the array of forms that speakers routinely choose from is extensive. It includes a variety of pronominal forms,⁷⁴ demonstratives, full and familiarised forms of given names and family names used with or without honorifics, full and familiarised forms of names with a suffix of endearment, nicknames, kin terms, terms referring to the person's position, function, or social role, derogatory terms and terms of abuse, descriptive phrases, etc. Since the Japanese language does not require overt expression of arguments as long as they can be inferred from the context and there is no pragmatic necessity to express them overtly, one of the paradigmatic choices for speakers when deciding on a person reference term in certain contexts is also its non-expression (often referred to as 'zero anaphora' or 'zero pronoun'). Consequently, there is ample potential for creating affective-stance-display-related implications. To illustrate how person reference terms may be used as resources for affective stance display in Japanese conversational interactions, I will focus on two subtopics: the speaker's choice of reference terms and the speaker's choice to overtly express first- and second-person subjects in contexts that do not

⁷⁴ Personal pronouns in contemporary Japanese morphologically and syntactically behave like nouns. Some scholars, therefore, argue that distinguishing this category in Japanese is not reflective of the grammar of the language. See Ono and Thompson (2003:323–234) for a short summary of the debate. I use the terms 'pronominal forms' and 'first/second/third-person deictic expressions' instead.

require their expression from the referential standpoint. Terms of abuse will not be addressed here, but some examples are provided in Section 4.1.5.

4.4.1 Choice of reference terms

The system of person reference terms in Japanese is very rich and quite complex. For example, it is often pointed out that Japanese provides its speakers with multiple forms and formats that can be employed to refer to the first and second person, but there is no ‘I’ or ‘you’ that could be regarded as ‘neutral’ and appropriate to be used in any situation (e.g., Ono and Thompson 2003; Barke and Uehara 2005). Similarly, there are also many ways in which referring to the third person can be accomplished, but again all will have certain socio-relational implications (e.g., Horie, Shimura, and Pardeshi 2006). The speaker’s choice of reference terms reflects a number of factors and concerns, such as the identities that they assume and wish to manifest, the type of relationship between them and their co-participant, their relative social status, age, and power relations, their judgements regarding the level of formality of the encounter, the topic of their talk, the actions that are being accomplished, etc. There are certain ways of using forms and formats of person reference that are thought of as socio-culturally normative. Likewise, particular patterns of use of person reference forms and formats also become perceptible as a norm for particular individuals within particular social groups, such as groups of friends. As a result, markedness in person reference choice can be created on several levels, which then leads to the interpretation of such marked terms of reference as ‘doing more’ (that is, doing something other) than just simple referencing (cf. Schegloff 1996a) and this ‘something more’ can often be connected to affective stance display.

For example, in informal conversational interactions between friends, speakers may choose to refer to their friends using a term of reference that is conventionally associated with formal polite speech style to convey their distancing from the referent in the context of building a display of their critical stance towards them. Heterosexual women who normally make use of reference terms that are stereotypically associated with feminine speech style may opt for a reference term that is stereotypically associated with masculine speech style in order to make use of its stereotypical associations with qualities such as crudeness, roughness, aggression, or assertiveness in the process of constructing displays of affective stances such as resoluteness, anger, disgust, etc. In (4.1), we can see Takuya and Shōta’s interaction on Facebook which illustrates the use of a marked term of reference in the context of a particular social group.

Takuya posted the text shown in line 1 on Shōta’s Facebook profile page in response to Shōta changing his cover picture.

- (4.1) 1 T: お前のカバー写真、犬の頭しか映ってねーから何とかせいや
omae no kabā shashin, inu no atama shika utsuttenē kara nantoka
sei ya
There’s nothing but a dog’s head in your cover photo, do something about it, man!
- 2 S: かわいいだろ
kawaii daro
It’s cute, right?
- 3 T: 嫌いじゃない
kirai ja nai
I don’t hate it.

(Zawiszová 2018:95–96)

Having studied three face-to-face conversational interactions between these two friends as well as their interaction on social media, I am able to say that Takuya does not normally call Shōta *omae* and so his use of this term in line 1 creates markedness. In fact, the style of the whole post is distinctly marked considering Takuya’s default way of using language when interacting with Shōta. Takuya usually refers to Shōta using his name or his nickname that consists of the diminutive suffix *-chan* attached to the first part of his name (i.e., Shotchan). The second-person deictic expression *omae* which he employs in the post to refer to Shōta is stereotypically associated with rough masculine speech style and Takuya makes use of its indexical potential together with other resources to (mock-)aggressively convey his (non-serious) criticism of Shōta’s new cover picture. In addition to the marked reference term, Takuya also uses other resources that enable him to co-construct the desired display. He uses zero-marking of the topic (see Section 4.3.1), realizes the negative morpheme *-nai* as *-nē* (see Section 4.1.1), produces an emphatic direct command which connotes authority, using a non-standard imperative form of the verb *suru* ‘to do’ and the interactional particle *ya*, which indirectly indexes masculinity and indicates his intention to convince Shōta “who is otherwise unlikely to perform an action requested of him” (Hasegawa 2015:298).

By contrast, in the excerpt represented below, we can observe Shōta use a marked term of reference when referring to Takuya. For the most part, Shōta refers to Takuya by means of the expression *omae*. In this fragment of talk, however, he employs the second-person deictic expression *kimi* (line 6) to refer to his friend and this is the only occasion that he uses this term in the studied interactions. Based on my observations, the expression *kimi* does not appear to be normally used as an unmarked form of reference between young male friends, which might

be due to the fact that it stereotypically involves “a ‘respectful distance’ component in its semantic structure” (Onishi 1994:365). The fragment shown below refers to Takuya and Shōta’s previous encounter. Shōta visited Takuya and when he was going back home, taking back roads as suggested by Takuya, he had an accident. In line 1, Takuya tries to shift their attention to the bright side of the day, the fact that they were able to meet. Shōta at first creates a (mock) negative affective stance display towards Takuya but finally confirms that he is glad that they met.

- (4.2) 1 T: <<:-)> demo yokattaro?
But it was good, right?
- 2 kite.>
That you came.
- 3 S: (.) nani ga?
What was good?
- 4 T: <<:-)> kite yokattaro?>
That you came was good, right?
- 5 S: hehhh <<laughing> nande sō,>
 why like.this
Why are you like
- 6 <<:-)> purasu ni mottekō to suru ka ne: kimi wa honto ni.
 plus to try.to.bring Q IP you TOP really
trying to have us focus on the bright side [of the whole thing], you, seriously.
- 7 sugu motteku kara ne.>=
You just focus on the bright side right away, don't you?
- 8 =demo yokatta yo.
But it was good.

(Zawiszová 2018:77–78)

While Shōta’s critical comment (produced over lines 5–7 and prefaced by the other-repair-initiating question in line 3 that forms a part of his negative affective stance display) is evidently not meant to be hurtful, it does involve structures that make it come across as affectively loaded. It involves a rhetorical question (see Section 4.7.3) which communicates what he criticizes Takuya for. The question form is further accompanied by two more elements produced in the post-predicate position (a topic and an adverbial), which co-construct the intensity of the affective stance that Shōta displays by means of both their semantics and their position. The use of the second-person pronominal form *kimi* here is redundant from the referential point of view, but it aids Shōta to imply a sense of distancing himself from his friend and display his affective stance as more intense.

Basic preference principles regarding the choice of reference terms that speakers, according to Sacks and Schegloff ([1979]2007), normally follow include the preference for minimization, which involves using a single reference form rather than multiple expressions whenever possible, and the preference for recipient design, which involves using recognitional reference forms, or the so-called ‘recognitionals’, whenever possible. Recognitionals include reference terms that invite and allow the co-participant to recognize “from some ‘this-referrer’-use-of-a-reference-form’ on some ‘this-occasion-of-use’, who, that recipient knows, is being referred to” (Sacks and Schegloff 2007:24). Non-recognitionals (such as *shiriai* ‘an acquaintance’, *chichi no dōryō* ‘my father’s co-worker’) do not allow the recipient to identify a specific person.⁷⁵ In everyday conversational interactions, these principles can also be exploited for affective stance display purposes.

One way of departing from an unmarked person reference and ‘doing more’ than just achieving reference is described by Stivers (2007) under the label of ‘alternative recognitionals’. They function as alternatives to default recognitional forms of reference in that they use marked forms of reference that are, however, recognitional for the co-participants in their context of use. Stivers (2007) discusses four types of alternative recognitionals in English and argues that “regardless of type, alternative recognitionals are a way for speakers to not only refer to persons *alongside* accomplishing social actions but through the use of a marked form of person-reference speakers also accomplish or account for particular social actions through the form of reference” (Stivers 2007:78). We have already discussed two instances of use of an alternative recognitional in Subchapter 4.2. I argued there that in the context of criticising or complaining about a third person, the reference term *ano hito* ‘that person’ employed to refer to a person that both the speaker and their co-participant know by name functions as an alternative recognitional that helps the speaker construct their negative affective stance towards the referent.

To refer to a third person who is an ingroup member, Japanese people tend to use proper names and other forms of non-pronominal terms of reference. Consequently, Horie, Shimura, and Pardeshi (2006:185) suggest that “referring to a person by a third person pronoun, and failing to refer to him/her by higher empathy markers like a proper name, conveys the speaker’s implication that the referent is not worthy of due recognition and attention”. It might be precisely this implication that one is not worthy of proper recognition that has influenced the development of the pronominal forms *koitsu*, *soitsu*, *aitsu* ‘this/that one’, and *yatsu* ‘a thing, a

⁷⁵ Stivers, Enfield, and Levinson (2007:14–15) further suggest that in some situations there also appears to be in place a preference for association, whereby referents are referred to by means of terms that relate them to the speaker or their co-participant.

person, a guy, he/she/it' into third-person terms of reference that are now commonly (but not at all exclusively) used to construct negative affective stance displays.⁷⁶ Especially in close personal relationships, however, they may also function as terms of endearment which help speakers convey their affection for the referent.

The following fragments illustrate that the terms mentioned above can be used both in negative and positive assessments. Both (4.3) and (4.4) come from the conversation of Kento and Ryō. The two friends are talking about football. In (4.3) we can see them use the term *aitsu* in the context of a positive assessment, while in (4.4) the same term is employed to co-construct a negative assessment. It is thus evident that the terms may be regarded as contributing to affective stance displays but as gaining their affective valence in particular contexts of their occurrence.

- (4.3) 1 K: aitsu ii ne:,
that.guy is.good IP
He's good, right?
- 2 R: u:n aitsu warukunē kedo,
INT that.guy is.not.bad but
Yeah, he's not bad but
- 3 aitsu katto ni natchau kamoshirenai. hhh
that.guy will.be.let.go maybe
he might get cut from the team.

(CallFriend JPN4725)

- (4.4) 1 K: ato nanka kinō ano: ritai shiteta jūnanaban no sono=
2 =namae- imaichi namae o nan da [kke,
Then that, the number 17 who wasn't taking part in the game yesterday, whose name I still, what's his name?
- 3 R: [are wa,
that TOP
He
- 4 are mo katto saren jan? [hhh hh
that also will.be.let.go-NML TAG
He'll also be let go, won't he?
- 5 K: [aitsu hidē yo na::,
that.guy terrible IP IP
He's terrible.
- 6 R: u::n.
Mmm.

(CallFriend JPN4725)

⁷⁶ *Koitsu*, *soitsu*, and *aitsu* represent contracted forms of noun phrases consisting of the head noun *yatsu* modified by an adnominal demonstrative: *kono yatsu*, *sono yatsu*, and *ano yatsu*, respectively.

In (4.5), we can see a fragment from Kentarō and Hiroki's talk about a Japanese baseball player who was at the time playing for an American team. Hiroki uses the pronominal form *kare* 'he' to refer to the player in his positive assessment shown in line 1. In line 7, Kentarō uses *aitsu* and *yatsu* to refer to the same player. Arguably, his assessment is thereby made more affectively charged. It is, however, rather complex as for its affective valence. Kentarō seems to construct a mixed stance of surprise, criticism, and admiration, as he comments on the player's move from Japan to the US, which involved giving up his very substantial Japanese salary. The evaluative adjective *sugoi* is extremely useful in case of assessments such as this, as it can be used to convey evaluations ranging from extremely positive to extremely negative.

- (4.5) 1 H: demo sugoi yo na kare mo na,
but is.great IP IP he also IP
But he's also great, right? The guy.
- 2 K: u:::n,
Mmmm.
- 3 H: iya::-
Hmmm.
- 4 K: sutā natchatta n da:.
He became a star.
- 5 H: mō kanpeki da yo are. [hhhh
already is.perfect IP that
That is quite certain, that.
- 6 K: [demo:-
But-
- 7 demo aitsu mo sugoi yatsu desu yo ne:,
but that.guy also awesome guy COP IP IP
But he's also quite a guy, right?
- 8 H: un u:n.
Mm mmm.
- 9 K: nihon no kyūdan no nenbō datte go- gosenman rokusenman toka=
10 =moratteta no o kette,
He rejected the 50, 60 million salary from the Japanese baseball team
- 11 H: un.
Mm.
- 12 K: kita n desu mon ne,
and came here, right?

(CallFriend JPN4573)

Another format of a third-person reference that is regularly employed in Japanese conversational interactions in order to accomplish something more than a simple reference

consists of a name, a quotative marker/complementizer *tte/to*, the verb *yu* ‘to say’ (which may also be left out in case that *tte* is used as the quotative marker/complementizer), and a noun phrase which functions as a descriptor (e.g., *Yoshida tte (yu) yatsu* ‘a guy called Yoshida’). Maynard (1993) suggests that the *tte yu* construction has an objectifying and distancing effect and enables the speaker to express their personal voice, thereby adding to the description the speaker’s subjectivity. Kushida (2015) discusses this noun-modifying construction as a ‘name-quoting descriptor’ which can function both as a recognitional and a non-recognitional reference, depending on its context of occurrence. He argues that it is employed to claim the referent’s epistemic distance (or mediated access to the named referent), which further allows the speaker to carry out different interactional tasks.

4.4.2 Overt expression of first- and second-person subjects

As was already noted several times, in Japanese, arguments that are recoverable from the context are left unexpressed unless there is some kind of discourse-pragmatic necessity to overtly express them. This characteristic of Japanese argument structure has often been referred to as ‘zero anaphora’ or ‘argument ellipsis/deletion/omission’. However, the terms have also been contested and called misleading (see, e.g., Ono and Thompson 1997; Hayashi, Mori, and Takagi 2002) based on the fact that unexpressed arguments are prevalent and “[t]here is no grammatical requirement for nominal arguments, such as subject and object, to be overt in Japanese” (Nariyama 2003:3). Subjects represent the most likely constituent of the sentence structure to be topicalized and subsequently left unexpressed and unexpressed first- and second-person subjects are especially common. Lee and Yonezawa (2008) found that in their data set comprising face-to-face conversational interactions representing different levels of formality and featuring 1,571 predicates of first-person subjects and 331 predicates of second-person subjects, only 15.5 % of the first-person subjects and 11.5 % of the second-person subjects were expressed overtly. Clearly, in Japanese conversational interactions, there is a marked tendency for first- and second-person subjects to be left unexpressed.

Overtly expressed first- and second-person subjects in everyday conversational interactions may serve referential and disambiguation purposes. They may be employed to create contrast or emphasis and they may also play a role in the turn-taking management. In addition, there are also situations in which they are evidently deployed as resources that contribute to the construction of affective stance displays. This function of overtly expressed first- and second-person subjects has already been pointed out by some previous studies. In

their research focused specifically on the role of overtly expressed first- and second-person subjects, Lee and Yonezawa (2008:741) noticed that the overt expression of first- and second-person subjects may serve “to maximise the speaker’s feeling or emotion associated with the utterance”. Similarly, Ono and Thompson (2003), who considered the use of first-person pronominal forms in conversational interactions, found that those first-person pronominal forms that are not motivated by referential considerations may fulfil an ‘emotive function’ or a ‘frame-setting function’, which involves constructing “a subjective framework for, or stance towards, the rest of the utterance” (Ono and Thompson 2003:332).

Overtly expressed first-person subjects may be used as resources for affective stance display in turns that involve predicates which explicitly express the speaker’s affective stances. Overt expression of first-person subjects in utterances that contain this kind of predicates is redundant from the referential point of view, as, in Japanese declarative utterances, predicates that express affective stances as well as thoughts and sensations can normally co-occur only with first-person subjects (e.g., Iwasaki 1993, 2013; Nariyama 2003). By overtly expressing the subject in such utterances, speakers are able to create a sense of greater commitment to the display and, by extension, seriousness or sincerity of the displays.⁷⁷ Moreover, first-person subjects in such utterances are commonly zero-marked (see Section 4.3.1) and/or produced in the post-predicate position, whereby they contribute to the constitution of non-predicate-final constituent order (see Section 4.7.1).⁷⁸

Consider the following examples, which illustrate the use of overtly expressed first-person subjects realized as pronominal expressions *atashi* and *watashi* in utterances with the affective-stance-expressive predicate *suki* ‘to like, to love’. Both subjects are zero-marked, the subject in (4.7) is further produced in the post-predicate position.

(4.6) *atashi suki.*
 I like
 I like it.

(Ono and Thompson 2003:331)

(4.7) 1 A: *ano (.) sanshō kakeru desho?*
 INT pepper season TAG
 Shall I season it for you with pepper?

⁷⁷ This can be contrasted with the effect that not expressing first person subjects can have. Okamoto (1985), who studied the phenomenon of ‘ellipsis’ in Japanese, found that by not overtly specifying the subject, speakers can avoid attributing the responsibility for an action to themselves.

⁷⁸ Ono and Thompson (2003) found only 10 cases of first-person pronominal forms serving what they refer to as the ‘emotive function’ in their data set totalling 171 tokens, but report that none of them was marked with a postpositional particle and 6 of them occurred in the post-predicate position.

2 B: sanshō ga amari suki ja nai n da watashi.
 pepper PRT not.much like COP NEG NML COP I
I don't like pepper that much.

(Shinzato 2018:55)

In the following fragment Kento and Ryō talk about a music album. We can observe them use the first-person reference term *ore* multiple times during the segment, even though their utterances involve explicitly affective-stance-expressive predicates. In line 1, Ryō uses *ore* together with the predicate *ki ni iranakatta* ‘did not fancy/like’. In Kento’s turn shown in lines 2–5, we can observe him use the first-person deictic expression *ore* twice (line 3 and 5) in connection to the affective-stance-expressive predicate *suki ja nakatta* ‘didn’t like’. In Ryōta’s subsequent multi-unit turn, we can again see him use *ore* (line 7) together with a verb form that does not allow other than first-person subjects, namely, *ii to omou* ‘think [it] is good’ (line 14). By overtly producing the first-person deictic expressions, the participants are able to emphasize their respective stances and their commitment to them. We can also see that none of the first-person subjects that they overtly express is marked with a phonetically realized postpositional particle, which can be said to augment the affective stances that they display even further.

- (4.8) 1 R: ore kono kyoku dake wa dōmo ki ni iranakatta n da.
 I this song only TOP very did.not.fancy NML COP
I really did not like just this one song.
- 2 K: (.) tteyūka ne,
I mean,
- 3 ore saishokkara:-
 I from.the.beginning
I, from the beginning
- 4 (.) rokkyoku gurai-
 sixth.song approximately
the sixth song or something like that,
- 5 nani saigo no hō wa demo ore anma suki ja nakatta na.
 INT last.part TOP but I not.much didn't.like IP
ehm, I didn't really like the last part of it.
- 6 R: sō ka.
I see.
- 7 ore saigo no hō dattara,
 I last.part if.was
I, as for the songs towards the end,
- 8 take me home toka,
for instance, "Take me home",
- 9 still we go toka,

- or “*Still we go*”,
- 10 (in in) bara:do,
(xxx) *ballade*,
- 11 K: a [a:--
Mm mmm.
- 12 R: [topical of happy da kke,
“*Topical of happy*” or *something like that?*
- 13 K: u:n u:n u:n u:n.
Mm mm mm mm.
- 14 R: (kore) demo ii to omou kedo na,
I think those are also good, though.
- 15 K: (.) warukunai yo ne,
Yeah, they're not bad.

(CallFriend JPN4725)

Assessments represent another type of action commonly implemented by turns in which first- and second-person subjects are overtly expressed for the purpose of affective stance displays. First-person subjects are overtly expressed in self-assessments, while second-person subjects occur in the context of the speaker’s assessments of their co-participant. When proffering assessments of others, speakers make use of overtly expressed second-person subjects both in case of positive and negative affective stance displays. In positive assessments, speakers often convey how impressed they are by their co-participant’s qualities, abilities, accomplishments, etc. Through negative assessments, they often criticise, tease, make fun of, or challenge their co-participants. Overt expression of the second-person subjects in such assessments can be viewed as a strategy to make the affective stances that speakers display come across as more intense and sincere, but also very direct and personal, which can be exploited in case of both positive and negative affective stance displays. Overt expression of second-person subjects in such assessments is generally redundant and thus marked as doing something other than simple reference-making. In addition to the very act of overtly expressing the subjects, speakers may further contribute to their affective stance display by means of their choice of a term of reference, its position within a turn, as well as the form of a postpositional marking that they choose.

Consider the following excerpt from a conversation between Mayumi and Kyōko.

- (4.9) 1 M: chotto atashi umaku ittara doitsu ni ikeru n da kedo,
a.bit I well if.goes Germany to can.go NML COP but
Like, if everything goes well, I'll be able to go to Germany, but
- 2 kore mo mada mada (.) [wakannai.

this, too, I don't really know yet.

- 3 K: [a sore tte shigoto de:?=
Oh, you mean for work?
- 4 M: =sō.
Yeah.
- 5 K: doitsu ii jan [mayumi-san sugoi jan.=
Germany is.good IP Mayumi-HON is.great IP
Wow, Germany! That's good, Mayumi, that's great!
- 6 M: [zenzen wakannai no.
I don't really know yet.
- 7 =ima ii toko made itten no.
I've gone quite far, though.
- 8 K: (.) ōdishon?
At auditions?
- 9 M: un.
Mm.
- 10 K: sugoi ne:: [(mayumi-san,)
is.impressive IP (Mayumi-HON
That's impressive (Mayumi)!
- 11 M: [demo wakannai kedo ne,
But I don't know yet, you know?

(CallFriend JPN1684)

In line 1, we can observe Mayumi use the zero-marked pronominal form *atashi* to refer to herself. In its context of use, it is necessary from the referential standpoint, as it clarifies the referent and shifts the topic of their talk to Mayumi, as they were talking about other people before. At the same time, however, it also seems to be serving a frame-setting function. More importantly for the topic at hand, however, in line 5, we can observe Kyōko refer to Mayumi by name when producing an assessment, though which she expresses her happiness and excitement for her friend and simultaneously also conveys how impressed she is with her accomplishment. By displaying such affective stances, she also affiliates with Mayumi who was clearly displaying excitement and happiness through her turn (to a large extent using vocal resources). By inserting Mayumi's name into her assessment and thus making Mayumi as the referent of her assessment overt, Kyōko makes the positive socially engaging emotions that she displays come across as even stronger. In addition, it seems that she produces an overt reference to Mayumi again in her assessment shown in line 10, but due to the overlapping speech, it is not very clear.

Kana then produces the zero-marked second-person deictic expression *kimi* in the subject position (even though it is referentially superfluous) and the explicitly evaluative predicate *yabasugiru*, which can be analysed as a compound verb that consists of the base of the adjective *yabai* ‘crazy/insane/extreme’ and the phrasal verb *-sugiru*, which adds to the evaluative meaning conveyed by the adjective *yabai* the sense of being excessive (see Section 4.1.4.4). It is therefore not just the overtly expressed second-person subject, but the interplay of a variety of resources that jointly co-construct Junko’s affective stance display of amazed incredulity and non-serious criticism of her friend.

- (4.11) 1 K: *nanda kke,*
What was it?
- 2 *nanda kke are.*
What was that?
- 3 *etto:-*
Ehm...
- 4 *oshōgatsu ni dasu yatsu.*
The thing we send at New Year’s.
- 5 *nengajō.*
New Year’s greeting card.
- 6 ((both laughing))
- 7 J: [*ya:bai:-*]
That’s insane!
- 8 K: [(X X X)]
- 9 J: [*kimi yabasugiru sore wa.*]
you too.insane that IP
That is seriously insane!
- 10 K: [((l a u g h t e r))]
- 11 *wasureta dake datte dowasure.*
It just slipped my mind, come on.

(Naruoka 2006:493–494)

Interestingly, there is a marked tendency for self-deprecating comments and other forms of negative self-assessments to include overtly expressed first-person subjects and thereby make the negative affective stances that the speaker displays hearable as even more intense. In Lee and Yonezawa’s (2008) study, approximately one in three first-person subjects whose expression was not compulsory from the referential point of view occurred in turns in which speakers communicated negative affective stances towards themselves in the process of

commenting on their own character flaws, lack of talent, knowledge, abilities, etc. Lee and Yonezawa (2008) illustrate this use of overt first-person subjects using the following example.

- (4.12) 1 A: ore ne,
 I IP
I'm like
- 2 gogaku dame na n da.
 study.of.languages hopeless COP NML COP
hopeless when it comes to studying languages.

(Lee and Yonezawa 2008:750)

In (4.12), we can observe the speaker produce the first-person deictic expression *ore* followed by the interjectively used interactional particle *ne* in a separate intonation unit from the explicitly negatively evaluative predicate *dame da* ‘to be no good/useless/hopeless’, which is further embedded in the *n(o) da* construction, which is commonly used to accomplish the action of explaining (see Subchapter 4.8). Lee and Yonezawa (2008:750) assume that by overtly expressing first-person subjects in turns such as the one shown above speakers specify “the location of responsibility for negative events, and thereby intensify[...] the attitude of devaluing the self”. By contrast, Ono and Thompson (2003) would describe this use of the first-person pronominal form as exemplifying the ‘frame-setting’ (rather than the ‘emotive’) function.

In addition to zero-marking, speakers may also postpositionally mark the overtly expressed first- and -second-person subjects employed for the affective-stance-display-related purposes using phonetically realized devices, such as, for example, the topic-marking *nanka*, *nante*, *ttara*, or *tte*, which further contribute to the constitution of their affective stance displays (see Section 4.3.2). In my data, I also found instances of clearly affectively motivated uses of overtly expressed first- and second-person subjects that were postpositionally marked by the particle *ga* (typically thought of as a nominative-case-marking or a subject-marking particle) or the topic-marking *wa*. The following excerpt demonstrates one such case. The fragment represents a particular form of highly collaborative conversational humour which I call ‘*manzai*-like humour sequence’ (Zawiszová 2021) because of its close resemblance to the contemporary Japanese duo stand-up comedy *manzai*, in which one participant has the role of the *boke* ‘the fool’ and the other that of the *tsukkomi* ‘the straight man’. *Manzai*-like humour sequences form an important part of Takuya and Shōta’s conversational interactions and, at the time when the recordings that I studied were made, the distribution of the two character roles between them was fixed: Takuya played the *boke*, while Shōta the *tsukkomi*. In the excerpt, we

can observe Takuya provoking Shōta into criticising him and Shōta accepting the invitation and criticising Takuya in a mock-aggressive manner, just as their respective roles require.

- (4.13) 1 S: ja hizuke dake kimete kuretara sa:-
So, if [you guys] just picked a date, you know...
- 2 T: yasumi toreru no?
You'll be able to take a day off?
- 3 S: yasumi (.) onegai suru kara.
I'll ask for it.
- 4 (7.6)
- 5 T: sore ja (.) <<:-)> asatte yaru ne.>
Well then, we'll do it the day after tomorrow, ok?
- 6 S: <<:-)> <<f> BAKA ka> [omae ga.>
 idiot Q you SBJ
Are you nuts, you idiot?!
- 7 T: [hhhh]
- 8 (1.2)
- 9 S: <<laughing> IKKAgetsu> <<:-)> mae gurrai ja BOke.>
 one.month ahead about COP stupid
[You must tell me] about one month ahead, stupid!
- 10 T: hahahaha
- 11 ((pause))

(Zawiszová 2018:62–63)

It is Shōta's turn represented in line 6 that is of main interest to us here. In order to produce an affectively loaded rebuke of Takuya and put him down, Shōta produces his turn as a non-predicate-final utterance construction, in which he first issues the rhetorical question *baka ka* 'Are [you] stupid?' consisting of nominal adjectival predicate and the question particle *ka*, and subsequently follows it with the grammatical subject phrase, *omae ga*, which consists of the second-person deictic expression *omae* and the particle *ga*. By overtly expressing the subject, he is able to build the non-predicate-final utterance construction, which helps him to create a sense of high intensity of the affective stance displayed in the turn. In addition, it makes his negative comment unequivocally concerning Takuya as the subject, which is the implication further underscored by the overt expression of the particle *ga*, which conveys the pragmatic meaning of exhaustive listing.

Zero-marking, however, is more prevalent. Moreover, zero-marked first- and second-person pronominal forms that are produced in the post-predicate position within a single

intonation unit as the preceding unit of talk strongly resemble both in their function and in their position the category of interactional particles (see Subchapter 4.8). The post-predicate position in Japanese utterance structure represents the most prominent location for the expression of elements that are systematically and methodically made use of specifically for the purpose of carrying out a variety of (inter)subjective functions. The zero-marked first- and second-person pronominal forms that occur in this position are generally referentially superfluous and clearly serve affective-stance-display-related purposes. In fact, according to Fujiwara’s (1982, 1985, 1986, quoted in Ono and Thompson 2003:331) large-scale study of Japanese dialects, the diachronic development of first- and second-person pronominal forms into interactional particles is quite common. Moreover, a variety of other linguistic elements also seem to be presently undergoing the process of recategorization into interactional particles (see Section 4.7.4 and Subchapter 4.8).⁷⁹

In the examples provided below, we can observe Shōta accomplish different actions, while always using the zero-marked second-person pronominal form *omae* in the role of the subject in the post-predicate position and produced within the same intonation contour as the predicate. None of the three subjects had to be overtly expressed for the purpose of reference, but they clearly contribute to the affective stance displays carried out by the given turns. In (4.14a), Shōta expresses his admiration for Takuya while scrolling through his hiking pictures. In (4.14b), he communicates his (mock) disgust with Takuya’s behaviour (see excerpt (1.16) for contextualization). Finally, in (4.14c), Shōta conveys negative affective stances, such as irritation and disgust, using a rhetorical question to criticise and reprimand his friend (see Section 4.7.3) when he starts feeding him food that has fallen off the plate.

- (4.14) a. kekkō nobotta na: omae.
 quite climbed IP you
 Wow, you did some proper climbing!

(Zawiszová 2018:68)

⁷⁹ In their discussion of the emotive function of first-person pronominal forms, Ono and Thompson (2003:331–332) also notice that the pronominal forms expressed in the post-predicate position may be undergoing a process of grammaticalization into interactional particles. However, they only studied 6 instances of first-person pronouns serving the emotive function that occurred in the post-predicate position and because they “found no occurrences of *ore* and *boku* [that is, the pronominal forms stereotypically viewed as masculine] in this emotive function”, they suggest that “this usage appears to be confined to (*w*)*atashi*” and argue that this is “evidence that the emotive function may be a gender-linked use, since (*w*)*atashi* is strongly correlated with female speakers” (Ono and Thompson 2003:331–332). The data that I studied as well as excerpts provided in various other studies, however, do not support this conclusion at all. Both male and female speakers commonly produce first- and second-person pronominal forms in the post-predicate position for affective-stance-display-related purposes. The reason why Ono and Thompson (2003) reached the conclusion they did might have something to do with the fact that their data consisted of more female-only than male-only conversations and possibly more female speakers in general – but that would only be a guess, as we are not provided with detailed information on the gender make-up of the groups.

- b. <<laughing> kimoi omae.> hhh
 is.disgusting you
You're disgusting!

(Zawiszová 2018:120)

- c. 1 nande kuwasen no omae.
 why feed.me Q you
Why are you feeding it to me, man?!
- 2 ochita yatsu.
 fallen piece
A piece that fell off [the plate].

(Zawiszová 2018:163)

The following excerpts likewise illustrate this phenomenon, this time, however, as occurring in a conversation between two female friends, Mai and Sakura.⁸⁰ All three instances of the post-predicatively used *omae* shown here were uttered by Mai. In (4.15), Mai uses the resource to co-construct a turn through which she jokingly reprimands Sakura who employed markedly higher pitch and softer voice to enact a performance of a ‘good girl’ in response to Mai’s question about her relationship (line 4). In (4.16), Mai uses the utterance-final *omae* in her enactment of Sakura’s hatred of another woman (line 3). In (4.17), she also employs it within a direct speech construction (see Section 4.7.2). This time, however, she enacts her own affective stances towards a man, whom she also ‘quotes’ (in lines 1–2). By means of the turn that comprises the post-predicatively used *omae* (line 4), Mai displays a certain amount of annoyance but also amusement.

- (4.15) 1 S: <<h> mō majimekko da shi-> hhh
“I’m an earnest girl.”
- 2 M: E::?
Whaaat?!
- 3 S: <<h> E::?>
Whaaat?!
- 4 M: <<laughing> dōiu koto da omae.> hehehe h
 what thing COP you
What the heck, you.
- 5 S: u::n.
Hmmm.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

⁸⁰ Sakura is actually called Mihoko and Mai is called Mayumi. Because their names start with the same letter, I wanted to rename just one of them to make referring to them in the transcripts easier. However, at the point when I started working with their conversation, I already had both Miho and Mayumi and so I decided to rename both. In line 1 in excerpt (4.16), I therefore changed ‘Mihoko’ to ‘Sakura’ to reflect the name that I gave the participant.

- (4.16) 1 M: <<:-)> sakura ga kirai na keshi.> [hhh hh=
Cathy that you hate.
- 2 S: [hh daikirai.
I detest her.
- 3 M: [=hhh <<laughing> fuzaken na omae.=
 don't.kid.around you
"Piss off, you!"
- 4 S: [daikirai. hhh hh h h
I detest her.
- 5 M: =jindotten na yo tte kanji.>
"Get lost!" or something like that.
- 6 S: hhh hh sō sō sō sō.
Yeah yeah yeah yeah.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

- (4.17) 1 M: <<:-)> omae wa honmono da.
"You're the real one.
- 2 fēku ja nakatta toka itten.> [hh
You're not a fake," or something like that he said.
- 3 S: [hh
- 4 M: <<:-)> fuzaken na omae.> hhh
 don't.kid.around you
"Stop taking the piss, you!"
- 5 S: (.) <<:-)> yo:ku oboeteru ne sonna koto:->
It's impressive how well you remember such a thing!

(CallFriend JPN1722)

4.5 Interjections

Interjections are probably among the first means of communication that come to mind when one thinks of verbal resources for affective stance display regardless of a language that one considers. Interjections form a large, easily extendable, and extremely heterogenous category that consists of both single-word and phrasal expressions. According to Ameka (1992:111), we can divide interjections into 'primary interjections', that is, words and non-linguistic vocalizations that "can constitute an utterance by themselves and do not normally enter into construction with other word classes", and 'secondary interjections', which include words and phrases that belong to other word classes but are also "used conventionally as utterances by themselves to express a mental attitude or state". In addition, there are also interjections that

take form of lexical prefabs consisting of primary interjections and words that belong to other word classes as well as interjections that take form of multiple sayings.

Ameka (1992) further proposes a classification of interjections based on their communicative functions and meanings that they predicate into ‘expressive interjections’, which include emotive and cognitive interjections, ‘conative interjections’, which are directed at someone to get their attention or to demand or provoke an action, and ‘phatic interjections’, which express the speaker’s attitudes towards the ongoing communication and establish and maintain communicative contact. Individual forms, however, may fulfil different functions in different contexts (that is, they may be grouped into more than one category) and even forms that primarily serve conative, phatic, or cognitive functions in their context of occurrence may also simultaneously be employed as resources that help speakers construct their affective stance displays.

Japanese is rich in conventionalized expressions that are routinely used as expressive interjections which serve the purpose of affective stance display. Interjections that we commonly encounter in Japanese informal conversational interactions include, for example, a wide range of non-lexical vocalizations (e.g., *A?!*, *E?!?!*, *Wa:*, *He:*, *Ho:*), some swear words (e.g., *Kuso!* ‘Shit!’, *Shimatta!* ‘Damn it! Oh no!’), and a great variety of other lexical expressions, many of which we can observe in the excerpts included in this thesis. They can be derived from adverbs, adjectives, nouns, demonstratives, pronouns, and even verbs (e.g., *Mō!* ‘I’ve had enough! Come on!’, *Nani?!!* ‘Whaat?!’, *Ussou:!* ‘You’re kidding me, right? No way (that is true)!’, *Honto?* ‘Really?’, *Maji?!!* ‘Seriously?!’, *Maji ka yo!* ‘Seriously?! Holy shit!’, *Itai!* ‘Ouch! It hurts!’, *Nani sore?!!* ‘What the heck is that?!’, *Masaka!* ‘No way! That can’t be!’, *Sonna!* ‘No way’, *Aruaru!* ‘Same here! I can relate to that!’). All interjections can function as free-standing tokens, while some of them may also occur in larger turns. When occurring within larger turns, they often constitute the turn-initial element which effectively serves as a preface that provides the co-participant with the initial cues regarding the affective stances that the speaker is going to display and thus constrains the interpretative possibilities of the turn. Expressive interjections also commonly occur within direct speech constructions (see Section 4.7.2).

In responding actions, interjections may fulfil the role of response tokens (or *aizuchi* in Japanese) and, depending on factors such as their context of occurrence and phonetic-prosodic delivery, they may also serve a number of affective-stance-display-related as well as other discourse-interactional functions. For example, they may be employed to show attentiveness, engagement, interest, understanding and a lack thereof, yield conversational floor to the co-participant when they imply that there is more talk to come, signal a change of state (in the

speaker's knowledge, awareness, orientation, etc.), convey (dis)agreement, and so on. Since the momentary listeners' turns that consist of interjections are typically more compact and "can attend more narrowly to emotive displays" than the momentary speakers' turns, their prosody tends to be more dramatic than that of the speakers' turns, which are often lengthier at least in certain types of activities, such as news delivery sequences (Freese and Maynard 1998:213).

Certain types of interjections can also function as what Goffman (1978) calls 'response cries'. According to Goffman (1978:811), response cries are conventionalized, discrete, ejaculatory expressions that are not primarily addressed to anyone, but represent "signs meant to be taken to index directly the state of the transmitter". They represent "a natural overflowing, a flooding up of previously contained feeling, a bursting of normal restraints, a case of being caught off-guard", even though they "routinely come to be employed just in order to give a desired impression" (Goffman 1978:800). Indeed, as Bolden (2006:664) writes, response cries constitute "interactional (rather than mental) objects employed to communicate the speaker's public orientation to the particular issue – an orientation that may or may not correspond to whatever psychological reality the markers are designed to index". They are used to express affective stances and sensations, such as surprise, fear, excitement, revulsion, pleasure, or pain, not only in response to the situations that directly evoke them, but also in response to verbally or visually mediated situations, including those that concern someone else, such as the co-participant (for an example, see line 35 in excerpt (9.1) in Subchapter 5.1). When deployed in responding actions in interaction, response cries typically function as resources for accomplishing affiliation with the co-participant. Heritage (2011b:176) explains this tendency in the following way:

By responding to reports of events non-propositionally, they advance closer to the lived reality of the feelings the reported events have (or may have) aroused in others. By not discriminating between feelings that the teller associated with the event, and the sentiments the telling is arousing in the respondent, response cries evoke and claim a degree of empathic union and affiliation between teller and recipient.

Nonetheless, after producing a response cry, speakers often proceed to specify and reinforce their affective stance display and create affiliation with their co-participant more overtly by means of a more verbally explicit response (e.g., Sorjonen 2001; Couper-Kuhlen 2012a; Heritage 2011b).

Japanese speakers utilize a broad spectrum of non-lexical vocalizations as primary interjections.⁸¹ While it appears possible to determine certain core meanings of the individual forms and tendencies in their use, their significance is contingent on their context of occurrence and their phonetic-prosodic realization. Moreover, the distinction between certain forms when employed in certain types of contexts is not always clear. Accordingly, as Tanaka (2010:304), who refers to Japanese primary interjections as particles, observes, the multitude and variability of factors that influence their use and interpretation, “coupled with the abstractness of any apparent semantic core associated with them, renders the prospect of differentiating among the myriad uses of the particles – both individually and as a gestalt – a formidable task”. The matter is further complicated by the fact that researchers represent these items using different transcriptions and pay attention to their phonetic-prosodic characteristics and the context in which they occur to varied degrees.⁸²

In the following excerpt, we can observe Shōta construct a display of surprise and incredulity in response to Takuya’s telling by means of repeatedly using the secondary interjection *Maji de?* ‘Seriously? For real?’ (lines 13, 15) and also the markedly lengthened primary interjection *He::::?* (line 16) produced with a high flat pitch contour. He finishes off his response by producing the rhetorical question *Maji ka?* (line 17), which also functions as a secondary interjection and can be interpreted here as signalling that he has accepted the piece of information and takes a negative affective stance towards it, which in informal English conversational interactions could be rendered through phrases such as ‘Shit’ or ‘That sucks’.

- (5.1) 1 T: kono mae sa,
The other day, you see,
- 2 senshū jan.
last week, in fact.
- 3 (3.1)

⁸¹ For example, the English primary interjection *oh* has been found to serve a variety of functions in different contexts (e.g., Heritage 1984a; Local 1996; Reber 2012), whereas in Japanese, we can find a number of more narrowly specialized primary interjections that seem to correspond to the various uses of the English *oh*, such as *a:*, *e:*, *ha:*, *ho:*, *he:*, *u::n* (Tanaka 2010:304), which, too, however, can have different functions based on their position and composition. An interesting perspective on the topic is also offered by Greer (2016) who studied how Japanese learners of English use *oh* for the purpose of affective stance display in English conversational interactions.

⁸² Iwasaki (1997), for example, distinguishes between bimoraic interjections in which the first mora has a high tone and is accented while the second mora has a low tone, and those which do not include a pitch accent and whose prosodic pattern is taken over by the intonation. The author transcribes the former type of interjections using repetition of the letter which is used to represent the given sound (e.g., *aa*, *ee*, *nn*) and the latter type of interjections using the lengthening symbol (e.g., *e::*, *hn::n*, *ha::*). Other authors, however, generally do not seem to make this kind of distinction and no consensus exists over the way in which to transcribe the interjections.

- 4 T: kakedenwa,
A missed call.
- 5 (0.9)
- 6 T: oyaji kara denwa kakete kita kara,
I had a missed call from my old man, so
- 7 kakete,
I called [him back],
- 8 (1.4)
- 9 T: nanda denē yo.
[and I was like,] “What the heck? He’s not picking up.”
- 10 (1.0)
- 11 T: de shingōmachi shitara,
And when I was waiting at the traffic lights,
- 12 keisatsu ga ano: sakki denwa ga atta ne: tte.
the cops [drove up to me and were] like, “You’ve just been on your phone, haven’t you?”
- 13 S: maji de?
Seriously?
- 14 T: un rokusen bakkin.
Yeah, got fined 6,000.
- 15 S: maji de?
Seriously?
- 16 he::::?
Whaaaaat?!
- 17 maji ka.
Shit.
- 18 (1.9)

(Zawiszová 2018:181–182)

The interjection *he:* (also transcribed as *hee*), which he saw Shōta use in line 16 in excerpt (5.1) above, is predominantly realized as a free-standing token produced with different degrees of elongation and a high flat or gradually rising pitch contour, but it can also be used as a turn-initial element prefacing other components of the turn. It routinely occurs in responding turns, where it is employed as a resource to construct an immediate as well as somewhat delayed and non-impulsive response to an informing. By using this interjection, speakers often quite enthusiastically convey affective stances such as surprise, amazement, disbelief, but also engagement, appreciation, etc. In existing literature, it has been described as an expression of interest (Szatrowski 1993:70, quoted in Mori 2006:1176), a news-receipt token (Iwasaki

1997:667), a response token which “is used to register a just-preceding utterance as an ‘informing’” (Hayashi 2001:326), and as a highly multifunctional non-lexical token that can be employed and interpreted as a continuer, a newsmark, an assessment, and a repair-initiator, depending on the turn shape, its sequential position, and phonetic-prosodic realization (Mori 2006). The relationship that holds between the prosodic features of the interjection *he:* and the meaning it conveys appears to be indexical. In other words, “[t]he more surprising or significant a piece of news is, the more likely it seems for the recipients to extend and raise the pitch of *hee*” (Mori 2006:1191).

The interjections *e* (also commonly transcribed as *eh* in anglophone literature) and *e:* (also transcribed as *ee* or *eh:*) are used both as stand-alone tokens and as prefacing elements to other components of a turn. *E* is normally produced in a rising pitch contour or in a flat pitch contour and often with final glottalization; *e:* can be realized with different degrees of elongation and either with a flat (and often high) pitch contour or in a rising pitch contour, ranging from a slight to a sharp rise (cf. Hayashi 2009:2109–2110). Hayashi (2009:2101) suggests that they are both used “to propose a noticing of something in the talk or in the interaction’s environment that departs from [the speaker’s] pre-existing knowledge, supposition, expectation, or orientation”. Consequently, the elongated variant *e:* is, for example, often used in responding turns in the course of conversational tellings to convey the speaker’s surprise and disbelief, which may be positive as well as negative, and may also help co-construct other affective stance displays. Just as in case of *he:*, the form of the interjection *e:* appears to be indexical in that the longer it is the more intense is the stance that it displays.⁸³ Furthermore, the interjection *e:* commonly co-occurs with lexicalized expressions of surprise and disbelief, such as *maji de*, *uso*, or *masaka*.

Extracts (5.2) and (5.3) illustrate the use of the interjection *e:*. (5.2) reproduces a fragment from Fumiko and Kaori’s conversation. They both live in the USA. While Fumiko claims that she cannot live without Japanese food and prepares it every day, Kaori discloses that she does not miss Japanese food at all. Before the transcript starts, Fumiko told Kaori that she cooks Japanese food every day, which Fumiko found surprising. Later, however, as shown in line 4, she seems to have realized that it is rather common for Japanese people to eat Japanese food even when living abroad. Kaori, however, differs from what appears to be the norm and

⁸³ Hayashi (2009:2111), in fact, speculates, that “at least for nonlexical response tokens in Japanese, the combination of lengthening and high flat or rising pitch contour is a rather generic, cross-situational resource to index a particular (i.e., surprised) stance toward prior talk or events in the physical environment to which they are used to respond”. My observations confirm this as well. Even forms that have not yet been as conventionalized as, for example, *he:* or *e:*, appear to be realized in this way.

discloses that she, for one, does not miss Japanese food at all (line 6), which Fumiko orients to as something that is unexpected (line 8). To display her surprise, she makes use of the significantly elongated interjection *e:::* as a turn-prefacing device and follows it with the secondary interjection *hontō* ‘really’ produced with a rising pitch contour. After Kaori provides further explanation of her stance, Fumiko claims that she has understood, but continues to display her surprise (lines 9–10).

- (5.2) 1 F: u:n ototoi wa shabushabu da shi,
Yeah, the day before yesterday, I had shabushabu [= a Japanese hotpot dish],
- 2 sono mae wa oden da shi,
before that I had oden [= a Japanese one-pot dish],
- 3 sō iu fū yo.
like that.
- 4 K: a: yappari.
Hmm, just as one would expect.
- 5 F: sō yo:.,
Yeah.
- 6 K: a::: [wata]shi wa mō zenzen nihonshoku wa koishikunai kara,=
Hmmm I don't miss Japanese food at all so.
- 7 F: [un.]
Mm.
- 8 =E::: hontō?
Whaaaat?! Really?
- 8 K: u:n amerika ni kite kara mō amerika no shokuji de kekko.
Yeah, ever since I came to the US, I'm fine with just American food.
- 9 F: a sō sugo:i.
Oh, is it so? Wow.
- 10 hontō:?
Really?
- 11 K: n:::
Mmmm.

(CallFriend JPN6739)

Similarly, in excerpt (5.3), we can observe the interjection *e:* being used to help the speaker construct his display of surprise, disbelief, and incredulity. Upon hearing Fumio’s retelling of a commercial in which a beautiful woman drinks up a bottle of coke and burbs loudly, Daisuke

makes use of the interjection *e*: alongside the secondary interjection *maji de* ‘Seriously? For real?’ to convey his surprise and disbelief (line 8).

- (5.3) 1 F: ikkinomi shite:,
She chugs it
- 2 hh [de:,] hh (.)
and
- 3 ?: [u:n.]
Mmm.
- 4 F: de GEE:: tte ya(h)tt(h)e [heh heh heh heh heh heh heh=
and she goes, “Gehhh! [= burping sound]”.
- 5 B: [ahuh [huh hunh un hunh un
- 6 A: [ahah hah hah
- 7 F: =[heh heh (XXXX)]
- 8 D: =[E: ma:ji de::?]
INT seriously
Seriously?!

(Hayashi 2009:2101)

The following excerpt exemplifies the use of *e*. Taku and Emi are having dinner in a *gyūdon* (‘beef bowl’) restaurant when Emi asks Taku the question shown in line 1. She constructs her informing as containing an unexpected revelation and Taku responds to it accordingly, making use of *e* to display that what Emi told him is a piece of news to him and that he finds it surprising.

- (5.4) 1 E: demo it(.)chiban umai tamagokakegohan no tabekata shittoru?
But do you know the tastiest way to eat tamagokakegohan [= rice with raw egg]?
- 2 konaida netto de shirabeta n da kedo sa,
I’ve found it online the other day.
- 3 T: un.
Mm.
- 4 E: mazenai.
You don’t mix it in.
- 5 rashii.
They say.
- 6 T: E?
Huh?
- 7 sō na no.
Really.

E which forms a turn by itself can function as an open-class repair initiator similar to ‘Huh?’ in English. It can signal a problem of hearing, understanding, or expectation, even though not all instances of its use make the action of repair in the next turn conditionally relevant. This form of repair initiation is regularly affectively charged. In addition to surprise, *e* used in this way may thus help speakers convey a variety of other affective stances as well, such as irritation and annoyance. When used turn-initially as a prefacing element, *e* may be employed to indicate as early as possible that the speaker’s stance differs from that which was displayed by their co-participant, for example, in responding turns to assessments, in which the speaker communicates their disagreement with the prior assessment. Likewise, *e*-prefaced responses to an inquiry typically appear to problematize the inquiry and convey their producer’s disaffiliation, marking the question as unexpected and inapposite, contesting, resisting, or rejecting the presuppositions it is based on, and so on (Hayashi and Hayano 2018).

In (5.5), we see a fragment from talk of Aiko and Nozomi. Aiko uses the primary interjection *e* (in line 4) as a prefacing element in a turn that implements her response to Nozomi’s positive assessment. By using the interjection *e* in the turn-initial position, Aiko is able to show as early as possible that her stance differs from that of her co-participant and that her action is going to be a disaffiliating one. In her turn, Aiko problematizes the assessment proffered by Nozomi in the prior turn by voicing her doubts about it, which effectively conveys her disagreement with the assessment, albeit in a highly modulated way.

- (5.5) 1 A: shigoto iku no mo kuruma.
I also drive to work.
- 2 (0.8)
- 3 N: ii:: ne:[:::: ja ameri]ka mitai janai=
 is.good IP then America like TAG
That’s so goood. It’s like in America, isn’t it, then?
- 4 A: [e ii: kana-]
 INT is.good IP
Hm, I’m not sure if it’s good...
- 5 =jūtai demo suru yo::,
 traffic.jam and.such happen IP
There are traffic jams and so on, you know.

(Hayashi and Hayano 2018:215–216)

The interjection *a* (sometimes transcribed as *ah*), typically produced in a flat pitch contour and often with final glottalization, is conventionally used as a change-of-state token, that is, as an item that indicates that its “producer has undergone some kind of change in his or her locally

current state of knowledge, information, orientation or awareness” (Heritage 1984b:299). It often occurs as a turn initiator followed by other components in responses to informings, where it is frequently employed to co-construct displays of surprise, as in *A hontō?* ‘Oh really?’ or *A sō?* ‘Oh, is it so?’ (Endo 2018:154; Hayashi and Hayano 2018:196). The following fragment illustrates this use. After Fumiko tells Kaori that there are many Americans who can speak Japanese and then adds the information shown below, Kaori responds in a way that shows her surprise.

- (5.6) 1 F: kanji made kakeru wa yo datte.
I mean, they can even write kanji [= Chinese characters].
- 2 K: a hontō:::.
Oh really?

(CallFriend JPN6739)

Another environment in which *a* routinely occurs as the turn-initial element are responses to inquiries, where it seems to be usually employed to mark the preceding questions as unexpected, but – unlike *e* prefacing responses to questions – not inappropriate, irrelevant, or otherwise problematic (Hayashi and Hayano 2018). Rather, *a*-prefaced responses to inquiries seem to predominantly embody pro-social moves and communicate their producers’ affiliative stances with the prior speakers. For example, by means of an *a*-prefaced response to an inquiry that implies self-deprecation, speakers can mark the self-deprecation as unexpected and thereby undermine it and create affiliation with the co-participant (Hayashi and Hayano 2018:205).

The interjection *aa/a:* can be produced with different pitch contours and different degrees of elongation. Accordingly, it can be employed to co-construct different affective stance displays, further depending on its context of occurrence. For example, when produced with substantial elongation and a flat or rising pitch contour, it can often be hearable as showing the speaker’s surprise at something that they have just learned and understood. When produced with a falling pitch contour, it is commonly used to communicate the speaker’s understanding of what their co-participant is saying. As such, it can also be used to convey their empathy, create a sense of affiliation with their co-participant, etc. There are many examples that include the interjection scattered across this thesis.

The free-standing interjection *n:::* (also represented as *hn::n*, *huun*, *hu::n*, *fuun*, *mmm*, etc.) produced in a flat or rising pitch contour and ending in a plateau often occurs, for example, in responsive turns in conversational telling sequences, where it can display a certain degree of involvement, attentiveness, appreciation, and, as Tanaka (2010) discusses in detail, the state of

going into thought without explicitly making any particular affective stance display. Choosing *n:::* over a response format that conveys the speaker's affective stance more overtly constitutes a move that may be motivated by a number of factors, including "lack of knowledge concerning the subject of the telling, lack of interest" or the speaker's unwillingness to fully affiliate with the co-participant, choosing instead "to distance oneself from the possible moral implications of actively joining in the talk, as in gossiping" (Tanaka 2010:311). The use of *n:::* might also be preferred in certain environments in which the use of markedly more enthusiastic and upbeat response tokens, such as *he:*, for example, would be considered inappropriate (Tanaka 2010:305). We can observe such use of this interjection, for example, in excerpt (9.1) in Subchapter 5.1, where Takuya as the recipient of a telling in which Shōta recounts about his trouble uses *n:::* towards the end of the telling. Just as in case of other elongated primary interjections, the phonetic-prosodic features of its realization habitually contribute to the affective stance displays.

Consider the use of *n::* and *n:::* in lines 6 and 11 in excerpt (5.7) below. The fragment comes from the conversation between Hitomi, Aya, and Miho, whom we have already met before. They are sitting in the university cafeteria and gossiping about Ryū, their fellow student. The transcript shows an assessment sequence which was initiated by Hitomi upon learning from Miho that Ryū occasionally sleeps outside. In the first part of the segment (lines 1–4) we can observe Miho and Aya unequivocally agree with Hitomi's positive assessment of Ryū (see excerpt (7.14) in Section 4.7.1.2 for a more detailed look at this part). However, in the second half of the segment, we can see Aya produce an additional assessment of Ryū (line 5) without receiving a clearly affiliative response. Miho produces a few quiet laugh tokens while Hitomi responds with *n::*.

- (5.7) 1 H: ryū wa kowai mono nai mitai.
It seems like Ryū is not afraid of anything.
- 2 A: [ne:::-
Right!
- 3 M: [nai ne,=
 is.not IP
He's not, right?
- 4 =are ga ne:::-
 that SBJ IP
There's nothing he'd fear, right?
- 5 A: chō tekitō ni ikitesō.
He seems to be living super carelessly.

- 6 H: [n::.
Mmm.
- 7 M: [hhh
- 8 A: a demo: ikeru hito mitaina.
But he's like a person who can live.
- 9 (1.4)
- 10 A daijōbu na hito mitaina.
Like a person who's ok.
- 11 H: n:::
Mmmm.
- 12 ((pause))

Aya evidently interprets her co-participants' responses in lines 6–7 as non-affiliative, as she attempts to solicit their affiliation by modifying her initial assessment (line 8). While her assessment shown in line 5 may be interpreted as somewhat negative (due to the use of the evaluative adverb *tekitō ni* 'carelessly' modified by the intensifying prefix *chō-* 'extremely, absolutely, super'), in line 8, she makes use of the utterance-initial interjection *a* and the connective expression *demo* 'but' to make clear that the unit of talk that follows provides a different perspective on the matter at hand which she has just realized. Her co-participants, however, do not offer any response to her re-assessment and so, motivated by their lack of uptake, Aya tries to provide one more rephrasing of her assessment (line 10), but it is also received unenthusiastically, as only Hitomi produces the response token *n:::*.

The interjection *iya* may be used as a negative response token akin to the English 'no' or 'nah' when used in response to polar questions. However, it is also regularly used, for example, as a prefacing element in responsive turns to content questions as well as various forms of informings, in which case it communicates its producer's affective stance towards the question or the informing. Hayashi and Kushida (2013) examined the use of *iya*-prefacing in responses to content questions and found that speakers use it in this context to convey to the inquirer that they find some aspect of the question (such as the presupposition it is built on, the larger action it is a part of, the epistemic stance that it invokes, the response type it solicits, its relevance, appropriateness, etc.) problematic and indicate their resistance to it. When employed as a prefacing element in response to informings, it routinely conveys that the speaker finds some aspect of the informing problematic. For example, in line 3 in excerpt (5.8), we can observe Takuya use the elongated interjection *iya:* as a prefacing element in his response to Shōta, who specializes in bicycles, telling him that he cannot wait to have a look at Takuya's

old bicycle. By prefacing his turn with *iya*:, Takuya communicates to Shōta as early as possible that he finds something about what he has just communicated to him problematic and commences the construction of a negative affective stance display that he subsequently specifies through the other components of the turn.

- (5.8) 1 S: <<:-)> chotto hayaku sono:,
I can't wait to have a look at that,
- 2 ano: kekkō (.) kegareta (.) kurosu baiku o mitemitai yo.>
that quite filthy cross bike.
- 3 T: iya: okoraresō na ki ga suru n da [kara sa:-
But I feel like you'll get mad at me, so, you see...
- 4 S: [hehehe he
- 5 T: me ni mieteru [mon datte,]=
I mean, I can clearly see it.
- 6 S: [<<all> (mattero chotto.)>]
(Wait a sec!)
- 7 T: =<<f> <<len> fuzaken na> omae.>=
"Are you freaking kidding me, man?!"
- 8 S: =kirei ni suru yo.
I'll fix it.

(Zawiszová 2018:161)

In (5.9), we can observe Takuya use *iya*-prefacing as a means to communicate self-mockery (line 15). Takuya informed Shōta that he used a certain product ('55-6') to lubricate his bicycle chain, which Shōta, from the position of an expert, strongly criticises and further explains what he should have done. Having learned about his mistake, Takuya laughs and smilingly produces the self-mocking comment shown in line 5, in which he summarizes what he did and prefaces it with the interjection *iya* to communicate that he finds his actions, of which he informed Shōta, problematic and laughable.

- (5.9) 1 T: koguto ne:,
The chain, you know,
- 2 garigari garigari tte iu kara,
was making a grinding noise, so
- 3 kono mae gogoroku o pushū tte yatta.
the other day I sprayed it with 5-56.
- 4 S: ano: (.) jitensha ni gogoroku tte (.) dame na n da yo.
Uhm, 5-56 is not good for bicycles.

((lines 5-14 omitted))

15 T: hh <<:-)> iya chari ni wa gogoroku.>
Well, using 5-56 for a bike.

16 (4.5)

(Zawiszová 2018:165–166)

Mō is another prolific interjection. It is often used in longer turns, where it mostly occurs turn-initially or turn-finally, but it may also be used as a free-standing token that produces a turn on its own. It is systematically employed to co-construct affective stance displays, such as frustration, irritation, a sense of resignation, and a sense of powerful – both positive and negative – emotions taking over one’s ability to control themselves. In example (5.10), we can observe the speaker communicate her frustration and resignation, making use of a direct speech construction (see Section 4.7.2) in the course of a conversational telling. She uses the interjection *mō* both at the beginning and at the end of the enactment of her thoughts. In addition, she also uses the interjection *aa* which is routinely employed to communicate that the speaker’s patience has run out.

(5.10) aa mō nandemo ii yo mō: mitaina.
INT INT whatever is.fine IP INT QUOT
I was like, “Argh, whatever, I don’t care anymore!”.

In the following excerpt, consider the use of the expression *nani* in line 6. The transcript represents a fragment of a telephone call between Manabu and Atsushi.

(5.11) 1 M: ja: ano: ore: (.) ato de mata denwa kakenaosu wa.
Well, eh, I’ll call you later then.

2 A: a ore mō neru kara ii yo.
Oh, I’m going to bed so.

3 M: a honto ni?
Oh, really?

4 A: u:n.
Yeah.

5 M: un.
Mm.

6 A: nani benkyō shiteru no mada:.
what are.studying Q still
What, are you still like studying or something?

7 M: un.

Yeah.

8 A: itsu na no kimatsu.
When are your exams?

9 M: (.) raishū.
Next week.

(CallFriend JPN4549)

Nani is primarily thought of as an interrogative pronoun akin to ‘what’ in English, but it also functions as an interjection. When Manabu implies that he is going to be up for a while, Atsushi responds with the *nani*-prefaced turn shown in line 6, through which he conveys his surprise at and negative affective stance towards what he understood that his friend is doing. Notice that the turn in which *nani* occurs represents a polar question (that is, the type of question that does not require a question word). Moreover, it is a confirmation-seeking question by means of which Atsushi asks Manabu to confirm whether his understanding of the situation is correct. The expression *nani* thus clearly does not function here as a grammatical resource (an interrogative pronoun) but as a resource for affective stance display (an interjection).

The use of *nani* illustrated above is quite routinized. This *nani* typically occurs turn-initially but may also be produced as an insert elsewhere in the turn. It is often followed by a micro pause and a pitch reset but may also be produced under a single intonation contour with other elements. Since the turn it is a part of is formatted as a question, it may be followed by the co-participant’s response, but it may also function as a rhetorical question that does not make a response in the next turn conditionally relevant. Endo, Yokomori, and Hayashi (2017) discuss the use of interjectional *nani* in confirmation-requesting polar questions in relation to epistemic stance, but also reach a conclusion that it is used as an interactional resource that, for example, indicates the speaker’s surprise or negative affective stance towards what the co-participant has just said and may be employed, for example, to tease the co-participant.

In her exploration of expressive (i.e., non-interrogative) uses of *nan(i)*, Maynard (2000) also notices the use of *nani* in “expletive and exclamatory expressions” (Maynard 2000:1211), such as the one represented below. In is an example taken from a comic book in which the affective-stance-display-related implications of *nani* are compounded with those created by the complex predicate that consists of the *-te* form of the verb *nebokeru* ‘to be half asleep’ modified by the phrasal verb *-yagaru* which represents a conventionalized resource for the expression of negative affective stances, such as contempt, disdain, dislike, hatred, etc. (see Section 4.1.4.4).

(5.12) nani nebokete yagaru.
 INT have.the.nerve.to.be.half.asleep
What the hell are you doing?!

(Maynard 2000:1211)

There are many other routinized affective-stance-display-related uses of *nani* that we can commonly encounter in informal conversational interaction.⁸⁴ For example, the free-standing *Nani?!* ‘What?!’, produced with a rising intonation contour and a higher tone on the second mora (as opposed to the interrogative *nani* which is pronounced with a higher tone on the first mora), can be used in responding turns to convey a variety of affective stances, such as surprise, puzzlement, disapproval, irritation, contempt, etc., depending on its context of occurrence. A multiple saying, such as *Naninani*, can be employed to communicate affective stances, such as excitement and curiosity in anticipation of something being revealed. We can observe the use of *naninani* in line 2 in excerpt (5.13). Kikuchi tells Watari that he has heard something interesting and Kikuchi responds by uttering *naninani* to show his curiosity and interest in hearing more (line 3).

(5.13) 1 K: nanka omoshiroi hanashi ga ki- kita n desu kedo,
 FIL interesting story SBJ came NML COP but
An interesting story has, like, has reached me but...

2 W: naninani.
 INT
Tell me tell me.

3 [dareka kekkon suru?=
Someone’s getting married?

4 K: [daitai-
Roughly-

5 =u::n yosō dekiru n ja nai?
Mmm, I think you can guess.

(CallFriend JPN4164)

Multiple sayings represent a common format that Japanese speakers employ to build their responding actions in conversational interactions (e.g., *so so so* ‘exactly exactly exactly’, *iya iya iya* ‘no no no’, *muri muri muri* ‘no way no way no way’, *matte matte matte* ‘wait wait wait’,

⁸⁴ Maynard (2000:1211) describes *nan(i)* as “a Discourse Modality indicator that functions as ‘anti-sign’” which “indexes unspeakable moments of language” and serves at least “nine expressive functions associated with three different levels of communication, i.e., cognition, emotion, and interaction”. She notes that it “facilitates the creation of a shared emotion among participants” (Maynard 2000:1235) and may be used to “mark one’s attitudes of anticipation, recognition, surprise, criticism, exclamation, as well as confrontation. It also functions as a device for replacing utterance, marking negative response, and for signalling vocative expression” (Maynard 2000:1211).

sonna koto nai sonna koto nai ‘it’s not like that it’s not like that’). Formally, multiple sayings “(a) involve a full unit of talk being said multiple times, (b) are said by the same speaker, (c) have a similar segmental character, (d) happen immediately in succession, and (e) are done under a single intonation contour” (Stivers 2004:261). As for the number of repeats, Stivers (2004) found that across typologically different languages, including Japanese, the practice typically involves a repetition of an item from two to seven times, with longer items being repeated fewer times.⁸⁵ Multiple sayings are always hearable as being affectively charged, as their very form implies. Some of them appear to have also developed into fixed interjectional expressions. For example, the expression *aru aru*, which consists of the reiterated verb *aru* ‘to be’ produced with unified prosody, is routinely employed to convey that the producer of the turn feels that they can relate to their co-participant based on what they have just said, that they feel the same, that the same thing happens to them as well, and so on.⁸⁶

In excerpt (5.14), we can observe Mayumi use *wakaru wakaru* ‘I understand I understand, I know what you mean I know what you mean’ in line 3 to convey her empathy with Kyōko, who is telling her about feeling exasperated, using a direct speech construction in which she enacts her affective stance by means of an interjection *ha::* (line 2).

- (5.14) 1 K: de: (.) nanka mō:,
And like,
- 2 (.) ha:: tte tama ni fu tte omotchau deshō?
sometimes you just feel like, “Haaa? [= a sigh of exasperation]”, right?
- 3 M: n: [wakaru wakaru.
 INT understand understand
Yeah, I know what you mean, I know what you mean.
- 4 K: [ima made isshōkenmē ne:,
Up till now, with all my might,
- 5 (dakara) hoka no hito ga hito nante me ni mienakatta no ne:,
(I mean,) I did not see other people, you know?
- 6 M: u:n un un.
Mmm mm mm.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

⁸⁵ According to Stivers (2004:280), multiple sayings serve as “a resource for interactants to display that their turn is addressing not only the just prior unit of talk, but rather the larger preceding course of action. Beyond this, multiple sayings work to convey that the speaker has found the prior speaker’s course of action to have perseverated needlessly and proposes that the course of action be halted”. Some occurrences of multiple sayings in Japanese conversational interactions neatly fit this description, but other instances do not.

⁸⁶ See Ono and Suzuki (2018) for a study focused on the use of verbs as reactive tokens in Japanese conversational interactions.

4.6 Connective expressions

Encoding semantic relations between units of talk, connective expressions⁸⁷ routinely contribute to the construction of affective stance displays carried out by the turns in which they occur. For example, *noni* ‘even though’ regularly occurs in turns in which the speaker conveys regret, *okagede* ‘thanks to’ is often found in turns through which the speaker communicates positive feelings, such as their gratitude or relief, *seide* ‘because of’ can be employed to put blame on someone or something and so it often co-constructs turns which implement actions that involve the speaker’s negative affective stance displays. In line 6 in excerpt (6.1) below, we can observe the speaker use the connective expression *shikamo* ‘moreover, on top of that’ in the (post-predicate) turn-final position (instead of its ‘canonical’ utterance-initial position), whereby it acquires a function similar to a discourse marker or an interactional particle and contributes regressively to the affective stance display constructed in the preceding part of the turn. Junko tells Kanae about New Year’s greeting cards that people can make on their computers and subsequently have them printed at the post office. In line 6, Junko uses the connective expression *shikamo* to emphasize her positive affective stance towards the cards when listing an additional attribute of the cards that she evaluates positively.

- (6.1)
- 1 J: minna pasokon de tsukuru jan?
Everyone’s making [their New Year’s greeting cards] on their computer, right?
- 2 K: sonna no aru n da:.
I’ve never heard of something like that.
- 3 J: u:n.
Yeah.
- 4 K: sore e- futsū ni yūbinkyoku ga uridashite,
Are those like sold at the post office like the regular ones?
- 5 sore.
The cards.
- 6 J: sō sō onaji nedan shikamo.
yes yes the.same price moreover
Yeah, and they’re even the same price.

(Naruoka 2014:13)

⁸⁷ In Japanese, two types of connective expressions have traditionally been distinguished: ‘connective particles’ (*setsuzokujoshi*), such as *kara* ‘because’ and *kedo* ‘but’, which have been described as bound morphemes that are used clause-finally after tensed predicates, and ‘connectives’ (*setsuzokushi*), such as *dakara* ‘because of that’ and *demo* ‘but’, which are typically viewed as free-standing connective expressions that occur at the beginning of an utterance. In actual conversational interaction, however, as Mori (1999:38), for example, points out, this distinction is far from clear-cut and both types of connective expressions represent “significant resources for constructing turns and accomplishing interactional activities”.

Certain connective expressions (e.g., *dakara* ‘so’ and *de* ‘and (also/then/so)’) are regularly produced as stand-alone tokens with a rising pitch contour to accomplish particular types of actions and create particular affective stance displays. For example, the connective expression *De?* can be employed to prompt the co-participant to continue their telling or to offer an explanation, while, simultaneously – depending on its prosodic realization, the co-occurring facial expressions, the preceding action, and the ongoing activity – convey the speaker’s affective stance, such as impatience, annoyance, irritation, and so on (e.g., ‘And? So what? Why would you bother me with this?’).

Certain connective expressions can also function as discourse markers that “bracket units of talk” (Schiffrin 1987:31). To illustrate how such expressions can contribute to the construction of affective stance displays, I will focus on three examples, namely, *dakara*, *datte*, and *teyūka*, in whose use we can observe their logical functions being combined with their affective-stance-display-related functions.⁸⁸ They typically occur at the boundaries of conversational actions to whose constitution they contribute. Most commonly, they occur in the turn-initial (or utterance-initial) position. However, we can also frequently encounter them in the post-predicate position. Both the utterance-initial position and the utterance-final position are generally regarded as typical loci for the expression of (inter)subjective meanings in Japanese (see, e.g., Shinzato 2006).

Dakara has been predominantly viewed as a connective expression which is used to convey a result or a consequence (akin to the English connective expressions ‘therefore’, ‘so’, etc.), but it also has non-causal and non-consequential uses (see, e.g., Maynard 1993:67–98; Mori 1999:158–168; Matsui 2002; Ono, Thompson, and Sasaki 2012:257–269). For example, *dakara* can be encountered in situations when the speaker produces a turn in which they repeat, rephrase, or further explain something that has already been said or say something that they feel is self-evident or should already be known to their co-participant. By using *dakara* in such situations, the speaker is able to communicate their irritation or frustration caused by their feeling that they have to produce the turn of such content. This use is exemplified in the following fragment. Tomo and Kaoru talk about their mutual acquaintance who Kaoru claims is going to quit his job and take an exam for government employees. Having talked about this for a bit, Tomo produces the question shown in line 1 below. In line 2, Kaoru repeats what he has already said before, using the *n(o) da* construction (see Subchapter 4.8) and prefacing his

⁸⁸ For an in-depth discussion on selected discourse markers in Japanese, see, for example, Onodera (2004) and Mori (1999).

turn with *dakara* to convey a sense of irritation and frustration about having to again explain something that he has already explained.

- (6.2) 1 T: ano hito yamete dō sun no ja:.
What's he going to do after leaving [the company] then?
- 2 K: dakara shiken uken da yo,
DM exam take-NML COP IP
He'll take the exam [as I said before].

(Maynard 1993:91)

Dakara is often used in turns that implement affectively charged justifications or explanations. Consider, for example, the use of *dakara* in excerpt (6.3). It comes from a conversation of Kyōko and Mayumi. Kyōko, who is in a difficult relationship, tells Mayumi about a special friend that she has. *Dakara* occurs in her turn represented over lines 12–15.

- (6.3) 1 M: <<len> matte:,>
Wait!
- 2 sore nansai?
How old is he?
- 3 K: sore ikko shita na n desu yone:,
He's a year younger than me.
- 4 M: a:.
Hmm.
- 5 K: ikko shita da kedo- mā,
He's a year younger, but, well, ...
- 6 M: shikkari shiteru?
He's mature?
- 7 K: shikkari shiteru no wa shikkari shiteru.
That he is.
- 8 M: un un un.
Mm mm mm.
- 9 K: n:..
Mmm.
- 10 M: (.) chotto demo sa:,
But a bit, you know,
- 11 otomodachi to shite tsukiatte mireba sono hito to.
how about you tried going out with him as with a friend?
- 12 K: a dakara:- [hhh (XXX)]
INT DM
Ah, as you know,

- 13 M: [tsukiatтеру [(no ka toku ni-)
(*Just casual dating.*)
- 14 K: [tomodachi de yatte tomodachi na n=
If you do it with a friend, you do it with a friend,
- 15 =desu kedo ne:,
though, right?
- 16 M: un un un.
Mm mm mm.
- 17 K: mō nanka.
I mean, like...
- 18 M: (.) tama ni furatto itchau?
Do you sometimes do it just casually?
- 19 K: e:?
What?
- 20 M: [furatto.
Casual sex?
- 21 K: [furatto itchau toka tte iu ka,
I mean, rather than casual sex,
- 22 ano: watashi wa zenzen hora tomodachi toka inakatta kara,
ehm, look, I didn't have any friends so
- 23 zutto ie ni ita n desu yo:.
he was staying with me all the time.
- 24 M: u:n.
Mmm.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

The turn in which Mayumi uses *dakara* functions as a justification for her position. She is not repeating anything previously stated in the ongoing conversation. However, by means of *dakara*, she is able to convey her belief that what she is saying is something that can be regarded as self-evident and that should not require explanation. To further communicate that she expects Kyōko to agree with her and affiliate with her stance regarding the matter at hand, Mayumi uses the elongated variant of the utterance-final interactional particle *ne* (see Subchapter 4.8).

In addition to its functions as a causal and contrastive connective expression akin to ‘but’ and ‘because’ in English, *datte* is also regularly used as a discourse marker that may be employed to co-construct affectively charged actions of justifying, challenging, agreeing, and disagreeing. It often occurs in turns that the speaker produces to provide self-justification for their opinions, affective stances, or actions, or to offer their support for a certain position (held, for example, by the co-participant) and their justification for that position in the course of a

conversational interaction when that position is challenged, there is an implication or a possibility of it being challenged, when that position is not or can be expected not to be generally accepted, or when one is challenging someone else's position and thereby expressing their disagreement with it, reservations about it, objections to it, and so on (see, e.g., Maynard 1993:98–119; Mori 1994, 1999). We have already encountered *datte* being used in this function, for example, in excerpts (1.46), (1.48), (3.12), (4.11), and (5.8). When employed in turns that implement agreement or disagreement with the co-participant, *datte* may help participants construct strongly affiliative or strongly disaffiliative actions.

Let us first consider an example of the use of *datte* which contributes to the constitution of an action of self-justification. Ryōma is telling Yuka that it seems impossible to find a certain brand of perfume in the USA, where he resides. In lines 1–2, Yuka claims that she was thinking of bringing the perfume with her but did not, leaving open the reason for her failure to do what she was thinking of doing. Ryōma responds by expressing his regret about the situation and simultaneously reproaching Yuka for not carrying through what she intended (line 3). Yuka laughs at first but then provides a self-justification shown in line 6. In addition to *datte*, she also makes use of the *n(o) da* construction and the utterance-final *mon* (see Subchapter 4.8) which both further help her construct her defensive affective stance and stress that she believes that her reasons for not bringing the perfume over are sound and understandable.

- (6.4) 1 Y: ne:::,
Riiiiight?
- 2 u:n motte ikitakatta n da kedo chotto ne:::,
 INT wanted.to.bring NML COP but a.bit IP
I wanted to bring it with me but somehow, you know?
- 3 R: motte ikeba yokatta [deshō.
You should have brought it with you.
- 4 Y: [h hhh h h h [h h h h
- 5 R: [sō.
Yeah.
- 6 Y: <<:-)> DA:tte omotakatta n da mon. hhh
 DM was.heavy NML COP IP
I mean, [my luggage] was heavy.

(CallFriend JPN4044)

Excerpt (6.5) illustrates the use of *datte* in a turn through which the speaker implements other-justification. The fragment comes from a conversation of a young couple, Taku and Emi. They are in a *gyūdon* ('beef bowl') restaurant and they have just received their orders and are getting

ready to eat. When Emi mixes in an egg into her *gyūdon*, they start talking about different eating styles. This leads Taku to recall his father and an incident that involved his father making his mother very angry. Taku uses *datte* in the first turn-constructural unit of his multi-unit turn through which he provides justification for his mother getting angry at his father (lines 11–24). After he provides the explanation, Emi is the first one to voice an empathic comment by means of which she shows that she has understood the reason why Taku’s mother got angry (line 26). Subsequently, Taku affiliates with her by stating that what Emi said is exactly the same thing as what he was thinking (lines 27–28). By using *datte*, Taku conveys that he empathises with his mother and feels that her anger was completely natural and justifiable.

- (6.5) 1 T: uchi no tōsan wa metcha mazeru yo.
My father stirs in [the egg] like crazy.
- 2 E: he:::[:..
Mmmmmm.
- 3 T: [MET(.)CHA mazeru yo.
Seriously crazy.
- 4 E: un. hh huhu hh
Mm.
- 5 T: nde shikamo mondō muyō de: [(.)] ajimi sezu sōsu o kakeru.
And what’s more, without even thinking about it or tasting it, he pours over the sauce.
- 6 E: [un.]
Mm.
- 7 hhhe hh hhhh
- 8 T: sore de ikkai okāsan ga[:] metcha okotta koto ga atte,
Because of that mum once got really angry.
- 9 E: [un.]
Mm.
- 10 nande? hhh hh
Why?
- 11 T: iya datte sa:,
Well, I mean,
- 12 are da yo,
it’s that.
- 13 mā omise no karē nara ii kedo.
Well, in case of the ready-made curry, it’s ok, but
- 14 E: un.
Mm.
- 15 T: ie de ne,

At home,

- 16 E: un.
Mm.
- 17 T: karē tsukuru jan.
she prepares curry.
- 18 E: un.
Mm.
- 19 T: okāsan ga.
My mum.
- 20 jibun no ajitsuke de.
Using her own seasoning.
- 21 E: un un un un.
Mm mm mm mm.
- 22 T: de sore o ajimi SEZU NI[:] sōsu o [BUA::::: tte kakeru no=
- 23 E: [un.] [a:::::-
Mm. Ooooh, I see.
- 24 T: =ni tai shite,
So when he would pour sauce over her curry without even tasting her curry first...
- 25 (.)
- 26 E: chotto kanashikatta n ya na,
a.bit was.sad NML COP IP
That must have made her a bit sad.
- 27 T: kanashii-
is.sad
Yeah.
- 28 kanashii darō na to omotte,
is.sad MOD IP QUOT thought
I thought, "She must be sad".
- 29 E: un.
Mm.

In the following excerpt, we can observe two women, Noriko and Emi, talk about a practice in traditional Japanese corporate culture that involves female employees serving tea and coffee to their colleagues. Noriko expresses her negative affective stance towards this practice (line 1) and Emi expresses her agreement with Noriko, further providing a justification for her negative evaluation of the practice (lines 2–8). In line 9, Noriko co-constructs Emi's turn and the argument, cementing thereby the sense of strong agreement and affiliation between them (line 9). The expression *datte* forms an intonation unit together with the elongated interactional

particle *sa* (line 3), which further contributes to the construction of her stance on the matter as strong and non-negotiable (Morita 2005).

- (6.6) 1 N: demo oyatsu no jikan mendokusai ne are NE,
But coffee break, that's a bother, right?
- 2 E: sō da yo:::-
Exactly.
- 3 datte sa::,
I mean,
- 4 hito ni yotte sa::,
everybody
- 5 chigau jan konomi ga.
has different preferences, right?
- 6 kōhī wa burak[ku toka sa::,
Coffee, for instance, black or
- 7 N: [sō sō.
Right right.
- 8 E: miruku dake toka [sa::,
only with milk, or
- 9 N: [SO usume no kōhī toka,
Right, lighter, or...

(Mori 1999:60–61)

The remaining excerpts included in this subchapter illustrate some of the uses of one more connective expression that I wish to mention here, the expression *tteyūka* (also pronounced and transcribed as *teyūka*, *toiuka*, *teiuka*, *teka*, *chūka*, *tsūka*, etc.). It derives from the combination of the quotative particle/complementizer *to/tte*, the verb *iu/yyu* ‘to say’, and the particle *ka* which can be used as a question marker or as a marker of alternatives (akin to the conjunction ‘or’ in English). It was originally used only utterance-medially as a parenthetical expression in situations when the speaker could not decide on or was uncertain about their word choice (Tanno 2017). It has, however, gradually developed new uses and nowadays occurs in different syntactic positions and serves different functions depending on its context of occurrence. It is commonly viewed as a resource for repair which indexes the speaker’s evaluative stance towards the given unit of talk, marking it as inadequate, inaccurate, or in need of some modification (e.g., Rosenthal 2008; Laury and Okamoto 2011; Hayashi, Hosoda, and Morimoto 2019). It can help carry out a variety of actions, such as downgrading or upgrading one’s previous claim, communicating one’s disagreement, introducing a counterargument, etc.

One of the most encountered functions of the utterance-initial *teyūka* is the initiation of a topic change, or rather a shift onto a subtopic. In the excerpt provided below, a male interviewer (I) is talking to a female high school student (S) about the practice of *enjo kōsai*, which involves older men paying high school students for companionship, which may include sex. The interviewer criticises the practice and the student agrees with him. She explicitly evaluates the people who engage in it as ‘stupid’ (line 3) and further elucidates her stance by producing rhetorical questions by means of which she communicates her negative affective stance towards the practice as such (lines 4–5). She prefaces her questions with *tteyūka* to suggest that her prior assessment was not completely adequate, arguably in its focus on students that are currently engaging in the practice rather than the practice itself. In this way, the expression *tteyūka* contributes to the construction of her affective stance display.

- (6.7) 1 I: demo ijō wa ijō da yone,
But it's really abnormal, right?
- 2 konna koto yatteru no nihon dake da yo,
It's only in Japan that people do such things.
- 3 S: baka da ne::.
They're stupid, right?
- 4 tteyūka nande konnan natta n ka ne.
 DM why such-NML became NML Q IP
I mean, why have things become like this?
- 5 dare da,
Who was it
- 6 ichiban saisho ni yatta no.
that started it first?

(Laury and Okamoto 2011:230)

In excerpt (6.8), we can observe two instances of *tteyūka*. The first one occurs in line 4, the second one is shown in line 8. The fragment comes from a conversation between Mayumi and Kyōko. Mayumi is telling Kyōko about her relationship, enacting her talk exchanges with her special someone, whom she says she loves but who tells her that he does not know what he wants from their relationship, etc. In the excerpt shown below, we can observe Kyōko proffer her assessment of the man's behaviour (lines 1–6).

- (6.8) 1 K: n:: kekkō ne: na:n mā ma demo-
It's quite, hmm, mm, but...
- 2 hakkiri n:- <<all> nante yū no,>

follows will involve a straightforward and honest disclosure of his thoughts. In line 9, he then employs the utterance-initial *tteyūka* to suggest that what will follow will provide an even more accurate account of his thoughts. Overall, Makoto seems to be constructing a display of mild regret upon hearing about Tomo's exciting projects.

- (6.9) 1 M: u:n ore kekkō: shōjiki iu to::,
Mm, to be quite honest,
- 2 (MNC) de (kok-) soreppoi koto shitakatta nā nanka=
I wanted to do something like that at (the MNC [= the university where he studies]),
- 3 =shinbusshitsu no sa: ,
I mean, something with new materials,
- 4 T: un.
Mm.
- 5 M: nante rō: ,
how to say it.
- 6 mā ima wa mō:- hhh
Well, now I've already
- 7 <<laughing> zenzen chigau koto ni nattechatta kara: , >
ended up doing something totally different so
- 8 T: u:n.
Mmm.
- 9 M: hh tteyūka: kanji toshite nanka shōrai-
DM feeling as FIL future
But I mean, I feel like, well, in the future,
- 10 ore no shōrai kangaeta toki ni,
when I think about my future,
- 11 soreppoi no tte nanka yaku ni tachisō na (XX) ironna sa,
something like that, something that would be useful, different things
- 12 T: u::n.
Mmm
- 13 M: nanka (.) gijutsu toka minitsukete sa,
like, technology, I [think I should] learn to use.
- 14 mā mā.
Anyway.
- 15 T: u::n.
Mmm.

(CallFriend JPN4608)

Similarly to what we noticed with regards to the use of *tteyūka* in excerpt (6.9) above, Maynard (2001, 2005b) also points out that the utterance-initial *teyūka* regularly occurs in “emotionally

vulnerable moments” (Maynard 2001:319) in interaction where it serves as a prefacing device that suggests sincerity and honesty in utterances that rather straightforwardly communicate the speaker’s “deeper, often closer-to-true, thoughts and feelings” (Maynard 2001:317; cf. Maynard 2005b:245). To exemplify this use, the author provides, for example, the following fragment from a television drama in which the speaker compliments the co-participant and uses the expression to preface the part of the compliment that conveys even more specific positive attributes than the part expressed first.

- (6.10) 1 A: omae wa jitsuryoku ga aru.
You handle the job excellently.
- 2 teyūka sensu mo sainō mo aru.
I mean, you have both good sense and talent.

(Maynard 2001:319)

4.7 Linguistic-interactional practices related to syntactic form

Syntactic form is one of the components of turn design and, as such, it can also serve affective-stance-display-related purposes. Probably the first thing that comes to mind when one considers the role of syntax in the construction of affective stance displays are exclamatory utterance constructions, that is, various syntactic formats that are conventionally employed together with other semiotic resources to implement an exclamation. The most frequently encountered exclamatory utterance constructions in Japanese conversational interactions include those that consist of free-standing interjections (e.g., *E?* ‘Huh?’, *Kusso!* ‘Shit!’), adjectival predicates and independent adjectival stems (e.g., *Sugoi!* ‘Awesome!’, *Yaba?* ‘Damn! That’s insane!’, *Muri!* ‘No way!’), certain verbs in their past or non-past tense form as well as verbs in imperative, hortative, or desiderative forms (e.g., *Yatta!* ‘Yay!’, *Deteke!* ‘Piss off!’, *Ganbarō!* ‘Let’s do our best!’, *Ikитай!* ‘I want to go!’), nominal expressions (e.g., *Onegai!* ‘Please!’, *Bikkuri!* ‘Oh, you startled me!’), combinations of interjections and other forms (e.g., *Wa:: sugo::i!* ‘Wow! That’s awesome!’, *Mō muri!* ‘I can’t take it anymore!’), as well as constructions that involve the use of certain interactional particles (e.g., *Ii na:!* ‘Oh, that’s great! I envy you!’, *Urusē yo!* ‘Shut up!’). Exclamations that occur in conversational interactions are generally designed as very short (often just one-word- or one-phrase-long) turn-constructive units, which can be viewed as iconic, in that their form is connected to the affective-stance-display-related meanings that they convey. There are, however, also longer formats available. For example, we noticed the

use of the adverb *nante* in exclamatory utterance constructions, such as *Nante omoshiroi n darō!* ‘How funny!’.⁸⁹

In what follows, we will focus on four categories of linguistic-interactional practices that relate to the syntactic form of a turn, namely, the use of non-predicate-final constituent order, direct speech, various question forms employed to do more or something other than seeking information, agreement, or confirmation, and syntactically incomplete utterance formats.

4.7.1 Non-predicate-final constituent order

Japanese is traditionally regarded as a predicate-final language. However, as we have observed in a number of excerpts included in the preceding subchapters, non-predicate-final constituent order is extremely common and clearly can serve as a resource for affective stance display.⁹⁰ In Japanese conversational interactions, we can find several patterns of post-possible turn completion. In this section, I will first concentrate on those instances that involve forms of turn-constructural unit continuation which follow syntactically complete units of talk but are prosodically integrated with them, which suggests that speakers conceive of them as a part of the given turn-constructural units from the start. Couper-Kuhlen and Ono (2007) call this type of turn-constructural unit continuation a ‘non-add-on’, because “the two parts form a single perceptual (auditory) gestalt” (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007:515). I call the clausal turn-constructural units that involve a non-add-on ‘non-predicate-final utterance constructions’. The second part of this section then deals with other types of post-possible turn expansions.

4.7.1.1 Non-predicate-final utterance constructions

Non-predicate-final constituent order represents one of the most significant resources for affective stance display in Japanese conversational interactions. However, most researchers who have addressed the phenomenon explain it as cognitively or interactionally motivated and view the units of talk produced in the post-predicate position as right-dislocations, postpositions, or increments, which function as afterthoughts, repairs, clarifications, etc. In this respect, two studies in particular stand out as they point out that non-predicate-final constituent order in

⁸⁹ See Iwasaki (2014) for his observations regarding ‘internal expressive sentences’, that is, egocentric expressions of the speaker’s ongoing or lingering internal experiences, such as emotions, feelings, or perceptions.

⁹⁰ Reordering of constituents that come before the predicate (often referred to as ‘scrambling’ or ‘fronting’ when it comes to Japanese) is also a common practice in Japanese (see, e.g., Yamashita 2002) and may function as a resource for affective stance display in that it may be used to create salience and emphasis. However, because of the relatively high freedom of constituent order in Japanese, the markedness created in this way is not very strong.

Japanese may also be motivated by affective-stance-display-related (or ‘emotive’, to use the term that they employ) concerns. During their exploration of utterances with ‘non-canonical constituent order’, Ono and Suzuki (1992) found that some of the utterances that they collected exhibited substantial prosodic cohesiveness and repeatedly involved a limited set of elements in the post-predicate position, which they viewed as indicative of these utterance structures undergoing the process of grammaticalization. They divided the examples that they found into two categories: ‘discourse-pragmatic’ and ‘emotive’. They are exemplified by (7.1) and (7.2), respectively. In the former type, the post-predicate elements were found to “indicate or emphasize the speaker’s stance toward the proposition, referent or topic being discussed, or create discourse cohesiveness” (Ono and Suzuki 1992:438). The authors did not pay much attention to the utterances of the latter type but suggested that they generally involve affective-stance-expressive adjectival or nominal predicates and contain demonstrative pronouns in the post-predicate position. Importantly, they also noticed that in case of utterances of this type, “non-canonical order seems to be preferred and sounds more natural than canonical order” (Ono and Suzuki 1992:439).

- (7.1) 1 H: okashi na ie da na honto ni.
 funny house COP IP really
You are a funny family, really.
- 2 waratchau yo mō.
 end.up.laughing IP INT
I can't help laughing.

(Ono and Suzuki 1992:436)

- (7.2) ya: da na kono kokonatsu.
 disgusting COP IP this coconut
This tastes awful, this coconut [drink].

(Ono and Suzuki 1992:439)

The other study was penned by Ono (2006) alone who now focused specifically on “emotionally charged utterances” that involve “an emotively motivated post-predicate constituent order”. He notes that “the non-predicate-final order [...] seems to be the basic order for the type of utterances” that he considers (Ono 2006:148) and maintains that, as such, they have “a legitimate place in the grammar of Japanese” (Ono 2006:149) and might, in fact, “be counter-examples to the predicate finality of Japanese” (Ono 2006:142). He abandons the classification of non-predicate-final utterances that he and Suzuki proposed earlier and suggests that pragmatics rather than distribution of word classes may help us better understand the

phenomenon. He divides non-predicate-final utterance constructions into two parts, the host and the tail, and proposes that “[t]he element in the host expresses some emotion or feeling of the speaker or it is expressed with some emotion” (Ono 2006:145), while “[t]he element in the tail: a) relates the attribute expressed in the host to a certain referent (demonstratives, pronouns, proper nouns) or b) presents the speaker’s re-framing of the attribute (adverbs)” (Ono 2006:146). Relatedly, he points out that “the encoding principle of the post-predicate order may be described as iconic because what is internal, or closer, to the speaker is expressed before that which is external, or farther away” (Ono 2006:147). In a note, Ono (2006:152) himself, however, admits that there are cases that do not fit the above-mentioned pattern, such as non-predicate-final utterances that involve clausal tails. Nonetheless, he insists that the pragmatic principle and the role of the host as “a slot for expressing emotion” still applies.⁹¹

As we observed in excerpts provided in previous subchapters and as ensuing excerpts will also demonstrate, turn-constructive units that involve non-predicate-final utterance constructions are often very short and are produced with phonetic-prosodic features that create an effect which in their context of occurrence is hearable as affect-ladenness. The syntactically complete utterances to which the prosodically integrated extensions are added could function as turns by themselves and even without the post-predicate elements they could generally implement affectively charged actions and accomplish affective stance displays. They often consist of predicates which may be viewed as resources for affective stance display based on their semantics and grammatical form. These are further commonly accompanied by interjections (see Subchapter 4.5), interactional particles (see Subchapter 4.8), and/or adverbs (see Section 4.1.2) which likewise contribute to the speaker’s construction of their affective stance displays. If any arguments are expressed before the predicate, they are often zero-marked, which enhances the effect of affect-ladenness that these constructions produce even further (see Section 4.3.1). The post-predicate elements most commonly represent arguments or adverbials, which – in their context of occurrence – are typically not required from the grammatical or referential perspective. Leaving them out, therefore, does not yield ungrammatical or unnatural-sounding utterances.

By producing non-predicate-final utterance constructions, speakers thus evidently do something more in their turns than what they could do using predicate-final utterances, including short exclamatory utterances that consist only of affective-stance-expressive

⁹¹ Without going into details, Maynard (2005b:264) also comments on the phenomenon in a similar way and proposes that “[i]nverted word order is most likely to happen when a speaker feels the high degree of surprise, excitement, enthusiasm, admiration, strong criticism and so on”.

predicates. Non-predicate-final utterance constructions allow speakers to bring the most affectively loaded part of the turn (that is, the predicate (part)) to the turn-initial position and maximize the effect that this interactional move creates by emphasizing the fact that this part of the utterance was brought to this position by following it with a post-predicate extension. Consequently, the practice allows speakers to produce an implication that they are overcome with powerful emotions which they cannot control, and hence they express them at the earliest point possible and without any delay. The actions that the turn which consists of a non-predicate-final utterance construction implements are thereby constructed as affectively loaded and the affective stances that the speaker displays through the given turn are implicitly characterized as intense, cognitively unmediated, urgent, sincere, serious, etc. Moreover, the post-predicate elements are not necessarily just empty placeholders either. As we discussed in the previous subchapters, demonstratives, personal reference forms, adverbs, or interjections, that is, elements whose frequent occurrence in the post-predicate position has been repeatedly noted, also regularly serve as resources for affective stance display.⁹²

Consider the form of the following non-predicate-final utterance constructions.

- (7.3) dō shiyō ore:-
 what do-HOR I
 What should I do?

(Zawiszová 2018:181)

- (7.4) <<len> hayaku ie yo> sore.
 fast say-IMP IP that
 Why wouldn't you say that earlier!

- (7.5) <<f> <<len> fuzaken na> omae.>
 kid.around-NEG-IMP you
 Quit kidding around!

⁹² Interestingly, similar practices can be found in typologically different languages. For example, Quirk et al. (1985:1310) talk about ‘postponed identification’ in English, which involves “placing a pro-form earlier in the sentence, while the noun phrase to which it refers is placed finally as an amplificatory tag” (e.g., *He’s a complete idiot, that brother of yours*). Geluykens (1994) discusses the phenomenon of ‘right dislocation’ in English and describes it as a proposition that includes a gap which is followed by a co-referential referent. He notices attitudinal or emotive use of non-repair right dislocations, in which the referent is referentially superfluous but represents an entity towards which the speaker takes either markedly positive or negative attitude (e.g., *That was a bit of a swine that!, She’s brilliant that girl!, It’s nice that!*). The author also notes that the affective stances that the speaker displays through this construction are mostly negative and that these utterances are generally produced without a pause between the proposition and the referent.

(7.3) was uttered by the speaker as a turn-constructive unit by means of which he initiated a troubles-telling. It consists of a rhetorical question that serves as a conventionalized means for expressing that one feels at a loss and does not know what to do. It involves the hortative form of the verb *suru* ‘to do’ as the predicate and the first-person deictic expression *ore* produced with final lengthening in the post-predicate position. (7.4) was produced by the speaker to jokingly reprimand and criticize his friend for not telling him a piece of relevant information earlier. The predicate of this utterance is in the imperative form and is followed by the interactional particle *yo*, which adds to the strength of the imperative. The post-predicate position is occupied by the demonstrative *sore*, which refers to the piece of information that his friend has only just relayed to him. Excerpt (7.5) features a conventionalized crude expression of frustration, irritation, annoyance, etc., *Fuzaken na!*, which is used in a similar way as English expressions, such as ‘Are you kidding me?!’, ‘Quit messing around!’, ‘Knock it off!’, etc. It consists of the negative imperative form of the verb *fuzakeru* ‘to kid around’ as the predicate and the second-person deictic expression *omae* expressed in the post-predicate position, which, as we observed in Section 4.4.2, appears to be in the process of acquiring the functions of an interactional particle. The expression occurred repeatedly in my data. This particular transcript comes from the fragment of talk represented as excerpt (5.8) in Subchapter 4.5.

The following examples come from posts on social media. The fact that non-predicate-final utterance constructions are used in written asynchronous mode of communication is quite significant. It offers support to the claim that people systematically and methodically make use of this syntactic format with a view to accomplishing particular affective-stance-display-related actions.

- (7.6) また突然の湿疹ーなんだこれー。
mata totsuzen no shisshin: nan da kore:
again sudden eczema what COP this
Sudden rash again! What the heck?!

(Barešová and Zawiszová 2012:127)

- (7.7) いいな～親子で
ii na:: oyako de
is.good IP parents.and.children PRT
That's so nice! Parents and kids together.

- (7.8) すごいねこの人👍
sugoi ne kono hito
is.impressive IP this person
This guy's impressive, right?!

action can be expedited to the very opening of a turn through non-canonical predicate-initial word order by taking advantage of word order variability and ellipsis” (Tanaka 2005:389). By extension, non-predicate-final constituent order can be seen as a resource that serves the purpose of expediting the accomplishment of affiliation (Tanaka 2005:408).

In the following excerpt, we can observe two friends, Haruto and Makoto, talk about a new work system that has been implemented at Haruto’s workplace after the great earthquake and tsunami that hit East Japan in 2011. The new system involves working shifts, but no overtime work.

- (7.10) 1 H: asa wa (.) shichijihan kara (.) sanjihan made.
The morning shift is from 7:30 till 3:30.
- 2 M: (.) sanjihan kara wa?
And what happens from 3:30?
- 3 H: sanjihan kara wa (.) kōtai no hito ga.
From 3:30, the other shift starts.
- 4 M: omae wa dō suru n?
What about you?
- 5 H: <<all> dakara ore ga-> ore to mō hitori in da yo,
As I said, I, I and one more guy
- 6 futari de hitotsu no mashin o (.) motten no.
we operate one machine together.
- 7 M: a ja: sanjikan kara wa mō jiyū na n.
So you’re free from 3:30.
- 8 H: <<all> chigau chigau chigau.>
No no no.
- 9 ma: sō.
Well, yeah.
- 10 ore wa ne,
I, you know,
- 11 zangyō nai yo.
there are no overtimes.
- 12 M: zangyō wa [nai kedo,
There are no overtimes, but...
- 13 H: [zangyō wa nai kedo,
There are no overtimes, but...
- 14 kōtai da kara.
It’s because we work shifts.
- 15 M: he: ii jan.
Mmm, that good, right?

- 16 H: n:: ii no ka.=
Hmmm, I don't know.
- 17 =ma: jibun no jikan wa (.) [tsukureru.
Well, time for yourself, you can make.
- 18 M: [tsukureru.
you can make.
- 19 (.)
- 20 H: tada KIT(.)tsui kedo ne:,
only is.tough but IP
But it's tough, you know.
- 21 nikin toka da to.
If you've got two shifts and such.
- 22 yappari (.) seikatsu no rizumu ga-
As you can imagine, your lifestyle...
- 23 M: kudzureru.
Gets thrown out of whack.
- 24 H: un.
Yeah.
- 25 M: e sore wa ano: (.) hayaban osoban hayaban osoban mitai na kanji?
Ehm, it's like that, like early shift, late shift, early shift, late shift?
- 26 H: sō sō sō isshūkan goto ni kōtai.
Yeah yeah yeah, changing every week.
- 27 M: a isshūkan goto ni kōtai na no.
Oh, changing every week.
- 28 H: un.
Yeah.
- 29 M: osoban tte nani,
Late shift, that's what,
- 30 sanji kara nanji made?
from 3 till?
- 31 H: sanji kara: yonaka no jūniiji made.
From 3 till midnight.
- 32 M: nani sore.
what that
What?!
- 33 <<len> kittsu?.>
is.tough
That's tough!

In line 15, we can observe Makoto make a positive assessment of the new system at Haruto's workplace, using the interjection *he:* (see Subchapter 4.5), the evaluative adjectival predicate *ii*

‘good’, and the expression *jan*, which can be regarded as an interactional particle that developed from the colloquial negative tag question *ja nai ka* (see Subchapter 4.8). Haruto, however, does not fully agree with his friend’s assessment, as we can see in lines 16–17, and constructs his negative assessment of the new system in lines 20–22. Makoto completes Haruto’s turn (line 23), showing thereby that he understands what his friend is saying, but then, instead of producing an explicitly affiliative action, which could be expected at this point, he produces and has Haruto answer two ancillary questions (cf. Heritage 2011b) that help him better understand the situation. Finally, having fully understood what Haruto is talking about, he creates an unequivocally affiliative response (lines 32–33). He conveys his agreement with Haruto’s assessment of the system as *kitsui* ‘tough, exhausting’, first by using the exclamatory non-predicate-final utterance *Nanda sore*, which functions as a conventionalized means for accomplishing a display of surprise and/or negative affective stances, such as shock, disgust, and dislike, and subsequently, by using the independent adjectival stem of the same evaluative adjective as Haruto used in his assessment in line 20. Both produce the adjective with word-internal gemination, but Makoto further augments the intensity of his affective stance display by omitting the conjugal ending and replacing it with a glottal stop (see Section 4.1.1).

The non-predicate-final utterance *Nani sore*, which Makoto uses in line 32 in excerpt (7.10) shown above, represents the most clearly grammaticized type of non-predicate-final utterance constructions. The format involves the nominal predicate consisting of *nani* ‘what’ with the copula *da* overtly expressed or left unexpressed and a demonstrative pronoun, such as, for example, *sore*, *kore*, *sorya*, or *korya*, produced in the post-predicate position. The utterances of this kind are regularly employed to display the speaker’s surprise and negative affective stances. The existence of utterances of this type was noticed already by Ono and Suzuki (1992:440), who suggest that “[t]he combination seems to have been grammaticized in its non-canonical order, since it has acquired the connotation of surprise, disgust or insult as a whole chunk” (cf. Maynard 2005b:264; Ono 2006:148–149). To render the exclamations that follow this pattern into English, we would need to use expressions, such as ‘What?!’, ‘What the?!’, ‘What the hell?!’, ‘What the heck is this?!’, and the like. If we were to rearrange the elements that make up these exclamations into the predicate-final constituent order, we would not be able to accomplish the same actions and affective stance displays.

The following excerpt illustrates this use. We can observe Ryōta use the question form *Nan da sora!* in line 6 to jokingly express his shock and criticism of Masato’s behaviour. The two friends are getting ready to order food at a restaurant. The restaurant offers an all-you-can-drink option that is called a ‘drink bar’.

- (7.11) 1 R: dorinkubā wa?
Do you want the drink bar?
- 2 M: (.) dorinkubā iranai.
I'm good.
- 3 R: ii yo.
It's fine.
- 4 ore ogoru yo,
I'll treat you.
- 5 M: ja:: morau.
In that case, I do.
- 6 R: nan da sora.
what COP that
What the heck is that?!
- 7 M: hhh
- 8 R: hh <<laughing> sono tsuide [imi wakannē.]>
I don't get that sequence of events.
- 9 M: [<<:-) > moratchau.>
I'll accept your offer.

While the two preceding excerpts illustrated the use of this construction in response to an informing and the speaker's action, respectively, the following excerpt from a conversation between Takuya and Shōta allows us to observe how the non-predicate-final utterance construction can be employed in a first action in response to an object in the physical world. As Shōta returns to the table, he notices that Takuya is making something out of a wet hand towel and restarts their conversation by asking what he is making, using, however, not the 'unmarked' format of an information-seeking question, but the non-predicate-final utterance construction (line 2). Thereby, he is able to not only ask for information, but also convey his (mock) negative affective stance towards the referent that he is asking about.

- (7.12) 1 ((pause))
- 2 S: nani kore,
what this
What's this?
- 3 sakana?
A fish?
- 4 T: ha?
Huh?
- 5 S: kore,
This,

6 sakana?
 is it a fish?

7 T: (1.5) <<:-)> oppai.>
 Boobs.

8 S: hh <<laughing> oppai ja nē yo.>
 It's no boobs!

9 <<:-)> urrusē yo.>
 Shut up!

10 (2.8)

11 S: <<:-)> daibu tamatten na: omae.>
 quite is.pilled.up IP you
 You haven't been getting any, have you?

12 T: hhh

13 ((pause))

(Zawiszová 2018:65–66)

Notice that Shōta uses the non-predicate-final utterance construction in line 11 as well. Here, he teases his friend – whose girlfriend has recently moved to a different town and who has just claimed that he made ‘boobs’ out of a wet towel – by producing an assessment of him as sex-starved. He first expresses the most affectively laden part of the utterance framed by the elongated interactional particle *na:* which effectively makes the utterance hearable as an exclamation that verbalizes his “subjective judgement in the ‘here and now’” (Shinoda 2013:150). Subsequently, in the post-predicate position, he adds the second-person deictic expression *omae* to complete the construction and arguably also make the tease come across as more direct and biting.

4.7.1.2 Post-possible completion of turns

A turn can have two or more endings if the speaker decides to add more elements to their turn after it has reached a point in which it can be viewed as syntactically, prosodically, and pragmatically complete. The elements added to a turn that is marked as complete following a clear prosodic break are referred to as ‘add-ons’ in Couper-Kuhlen and Ono’s (2007) classification. They may be employed to repair (i.e., replace) an element from the host, or they may function as increments, which can further be divided into ‘insertables’, that is, elements that belong to the prior unit of talk, and ‘glue-ons’, that is, elements that form grammatically fitted continuation of the turn (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007). Because of the properties of the Japanese grammar, replacements and insertables are common, while glue-ons are relatively rare.

Consequently, by continuing their turns beyond the point of possible completion, speakers often create turns that exhibit non-predicate-final constituent order, in which I also include the phenomenon of the so-called ‘subordinate’ clauses being produced after the ‘main’ clauses.

Speaking beyond the point of possible completion of turns represents one of the most conspicuous features of Japanese conversational interactions. As such, the phenomenon has received considerable attention. Most studies, however, have focused on formal properties of utterances with what they would typically regard as right-dislocated or postposed elements and would discuss them in light of such notions as the givenness of information, theme/rheme or focus/background structure, information packaging, etc. Studies that consider functions that the post-predicate elements serve usually mention repair and afterthought. Martin (1975:1043), for example, notices that ‘afterthoughts’ are a common feature of everyday conversational interactions, which allow the speaker to “provid[e] additional information without turning back and reediting an entire sentence that has already been put into words”. Shibatani (1990:259) remarks that “this type of expression is best considered as something that has been appended to the end of a sentence as an afterthought”. Ono and Suzuki (1992) consider examples of post-predicate elements serving the purpose of repair, clarification, specification, elaboration, and emphasis. In her study of Japanese turn-taking, Tanaka (1999) refers to the post-predicate additions as ‘recompleters’, while Morita (2005), for example, discusses cases in which turn-constructive units marked with the interactional particle *ne* can serve the purpose of “retroactive elaboration”.

While I do not contest these findings, I would like to add that add-ons can also be connected to affective-stance-display-related concerns. In other words, in addition to being caused by such factors as lapses in speakers’ memory, judgements, or speech planning, I would argue that they may also be pragmatically and affectively motivated and may play a part in affective stance display. There are a few patterns of their affective-stance-display-related usage that can be distinguished. Here, I will consider two ways in which turns that include non-repairing and non-repetitional add-ons that create non-predicate-final constituent order can contribute to the construction of affective stance displays. Most significantly, just like the non-predicate-final utterance constructions that were discussed above in Section 4.7.1.1, add-ons allow speakers to produce the most affectively loaded or affective-stance-expressive part of their utterance first and delay the expression of other components until later without producing ungrammatical or unnatural-sounding utterances. Both turns consisting of non-predicate-final utterance constructions and turns that involve add-ons thus, for example, commonly occur in

- 11 T: [tano- tanondenai noni,
Even though you didn't a- didn't ask [for them],
- 12 S: <<:-)> uea sanman da ze.>
"It's 30,000 for the clothes."
- 13 T: tano- tanondenai noni,
Even though you didn't a- didn't ask [for them],
- 14 tsuku- tsukutta kara,
"I ma- made [them], so
- 15 kane harae tte.
pay up!" [he says].

In various interactional environments, minimizing the time between an action and a response to it as well as designing the response turn as short and structurally simple can produce an effect of the response being hearable as affectively charged. Specifically in the context of assessment sequences, minimizing the gap between the first assessment and the response to it and using a simple turn design have been repeatedly found to be associated with the production of preferred responses to assessments, that is, with agreements (Tanaka 2016:11). In Japanese, the predicate components are usually the main carriers of evaluative and affective meanings in assessments. Moreover, as we noticed in Section 4.1.1, in Japanese conversational interactions, repetitional second assessments are extremely common and are generally understood as fully affiliative (Hayano 2011). Consequently, to produce fully affiliative second assessments speakers tend to use predicate-only or predicate-initial turn formats, whereby they can signal their agreement with the co-participant at the earliest point possible. In her discussion on lexico-grammatical structures of assessments, Tanaka (2016:14), therefore, calls “the selection of the predicate-initial construction with the assessment term positioned turn-initially [...] an essential strategy in Japanese for maximizing affiliation by enabling an early indexing of an agreement”.

The fragment shown below already appeared as a part of excerpt (5.7) in Subchapter 4.5, where we, however, concentrated on a different part of the segment. We meet again the three female friends gossiping about their fellow male student, Ryū. The fragment represents an assessment sequence initiated by Hitomi who has just learned from Miho that Ryū sometimes sleeps outside.

- (7.14) 1 H: ryū wa kowai mono nai mitai.
 Ryū TOP scary thing is.not seems
It seems like Ryū is not afraid of anything.
- 2 A: [ne::-
 INT

Riiight!

- 3 M: [nai ne,=
is.not IP
He's not, right?
- 4 =are ga ne::-
that SBJ IP
There's nothing he'd fear, riiight?

Producing their turns in overlap, both Aya and Miho agree with Hitomi's assessment. Aya uses the elongated particle *ne::* (line 2) which serves here as an expressive interjection that is conventionally employed as a means for communicating the speaker's agreement (Onodera 2004:127ff.). As we can see in line 3, Miho first produces a turn-constructural unit that consists of the same predicate as that which Hitomi used in her assessment. She follows it with the interactional particle *ne*, which contributes here to the construction of Miho's turn as expressing unequivocal agreement with Hitomi's assessment. However, as shown in line 4, she continues her turn past the turn's point of possible completion and produces the subject phrase, consisting of the distal demonstrative *are* and the particle *ga*, followed by an elongated particle *ne::*, which auditorily matches Aya's prior realization of the particle (shown in line 2) and can be described as a 'marker of rapport', that is, a marker of "the agreeable situation based on the concordant meta-knowledge status" of the co-participants (Onodera 2004:144). The expansion is not necessary from the grammatical or semantic perspective, but it helps the speaker construct her assessment and the attendant affective stance display as matching her co-participants' and, at the same time, as being constructed by her independently (cf. Hayano 2011). This may be important for her, since she is the one who supplied the informing in response to which this assessment sequence was initiated.

The components expressed in the turn expansion can be phrasal (including single words) as well as clausal and there can be multiple post-expansions of a single turn-constructural unit as well. One of the roles that the components may play is the affective-stance-display-related (re)framing of the preceding unit of talk. Such 'stanced post-expansions' often take form of adverbials or 'subordinate' clauses. They may specify, intensify, qualify, or otherwise modify and modulate the affective stance displays accomplished via the preceding unit of talk. In Japanese, in the so-called 'canonical' constituent order, the 'subordinate' clauses precede their 'main' clauses. However, in conversational interactions, the 'main' clauses may be produced first and their 'subordinate' clauses may be added to them only afterwards, typically following a clear prosodic break. The 'subordinate' clauses that frequently occur as add-ons are those that

appear to be developing into independent clauses, as their clause-final ‘subordinating’ markers are developing uses of (utterance-final) interactional particles (see Section 4.7.4), and include *-kedo* ‘but’ clauses, *-kara* ‘because’ clauses, *-noni* ‘even though, if only’ clauses, and clauses ending in conditionals *-tara* or *-ba*.⁹³

Consider the use of the clausal post-expansion in line 11 in the following excerpt. The fragment comes from a conversation between Daichi and Masashi. Daichi is showing Masashi a video of his co-worker doing moonwalking.

- (7.15) 1 D: kore da yo.
This is it!
- 2 kono:: kono mūn’uōku ga shi- hetakuso na hito.
The, the guy who do- who’s really shitty at moonwalking.
- 3 (.)
- 4 M: hehe[he hehe hh ha ha ha h
- 5 D: [hahahaha hh hah hhh
- 6 M: <<:-)> sore ii ne.>
That’s good!
- 7 D: <<laughing> sore (.) fu- futsuka no (.) ano toshiake no (.)
That’s, the se- second of, that January, in um,
- 8 ano: asa ni (.) mō okyakusan konai n de,
in the morning, there’re no customers coming in so,
- 9 toriaezu ano kingashinnen toka iinagarra,
anyway, um, while saying something like, “Happy New Year!”,
- 10 toshiake no (.) ano: (.) kotoshi hatsu no mūn’uōku toka itte,>
and something like, “The New Year’s-”, uhm, “The first moonwalk of the year”.
- 11 <<:-)> maitoshi yattenē kuse ni.>
every.year does.not.do as.if
As if he were doing that every year.

⁹³ In Japanese conversational interactions, we can also commonly encounter what could be referred to as ‘stanced pre-expansions’ that are produced by the speaker in order to make clear to their co-participant as early as possible what affective stances they are taking with respect to the unit of talk that is to follow. Some stanced pre-expansions that seem to be highly conventionalized take form of derived adverbials (e.g., *Arigatai koto ni ...* ‘Happily enough/Fortunately ...’, *Zannennagara* ‘I’m sorry but ...’), but most take form of ‘subordinate’ clauses (e.g., *Onegai da kara ...* ‘As a favour to me ...’, *Zannen da kedo ...* ‘I’m sorry but ...’, *Shiite ieba ...* ‘If forced to say ...’, *Yokei na koto da kedo ...* ‘What I’m going to say may be uncalled for, but ...’). Some of them may also appear as post-expansions. Interestingly, by employing the Japanese cleft (*no wa*) construction, speakers may also accomplish a similar effect. As Mori (2014) points out, in conversational interactions, the *no wa* constructions often do not end in a noun or a nominalizer followed by the copula, as described in reference grammars, but rather serve as prospective indexicals that prepare the co-participant for extended talk to come and provide them with an interpretive framework. In addition, speakers may also use stanced turn inserts or brief side sequences that break off an ongoing multi-unit turn in order to clarify to their co-participant what affective stances they are taking towards that which they are talking about.

- 12 M: sore ii ne.
That's good!
- 13 ii na:.
I like it.
- 14 omoshiroi na:.
It's funny!

Daichi shows the video to Masashi because he evaluates it as funny and interesting. As we can see in lines 4, 6, and 12–14, Masashi agrees with his assessment and the two clearly take a congruent affective stance towards it. Daichi, however, also ridicules his co-worker, explicitly calling his skills ‘lousy’ (line 2) and using the add-on consisting of a *kuse in* ‘even though, in spite of, as if’ clause, which represents a conventionalized expressive format for communicating negative affective stances, such as contempt or criticism. The post-expansion thus offers an affective framing for the preceding unit of talk to which it is appended.

In (7.16), we can see a fragment from Mayumi and Kyōko’s conversation. Mayumi has been hurt by a man and she asks Kyōko for advice how to deal with heartbreak.

- (7.16) 1 M: dō shitara ii no,
What should I do?
- 2 kyōko.
Kyōko.
- 3 akaruku kangaeru no?
Think positively?
- 4 K: (.) hhhhhh° akaruku tteyūka:-
I mean, “positively” [might not be the right way to put it]...
- 5 M: (.) mō wasureru? hhh
Should I forget him already?
- 6 K: iya wasureru no wa muri.
INT forget NML TOP is.impossible
Well, forgetting him is impossible.
- 7 M: (.) [muri da yo:,
is.impossible IP
It's impossible.
- 8 K: [zettai.
Definitely.

(CallFriend JPN1684)

In line 8, we can observe Kyōko produce an add-on, through which she implements an affective framing of her preceding unit of talk. Effectively, it serves as an intensifier that adds intensity to the affective stance that she displays in line 6.

4.7.2 Direct speech constructions

Using direct speech represents another linguistic-interactional practice that holds an important place among Japanese resources for affective stance display.⁹⁴ In the course of conversational interactions, Japanese speakers readily transition into direct speech and back, using a range of direct speech constructions that allow them to enact not only speech, but also thoughts, which may include verbalizations of speakers' affective stances as well as their interpretations of and affective stances towards own as well as other people's actions, appearance, behaviour, etc. By using direct speech in conversational interactions, speakers may 'show' rather than 'tell' their co-participants what they believe happened, is happening, or what they think will or might happen and what affective stances they took or take towards things, people, ideas, actions, events, and so on. In other words, speakers make their co-participants "into an interpreting audience to the drama" (Tannen 2007:132). They do not need to describe, explain, or name the affective stances that they experienced or are experiencing. Instead, they can enact the scenes in which they directly express their affective stances or perform actions by means of whose type, form, contents, and embeddedness in context they construct their affective stance displays.

When doing the enactments of speech or thoughts, speakers simultaneously construct their affective stance displays towards that which is being enacted, making use of all semiotic resources (see, e.g., Holt 2000, 2007; Niemelä 2005, 2010). Many have noticed this conspicuous feature of direct speech use in interaction and discussed it in terms of dialogicality in language and multiplicity of voices in interaction. For example, Voloshinov (1971:149, quoted in Christodoulidou 2014:157) notes that "[r]eported speech is speech within speech, message within message, and at the same time also speech about speech, message about message". Pointing out the dialogic nature of transporting words of others into the context of own speech, Tannen (2007:111) famously argued that the term 'reported speech' is a misnomer, because

⁹⁴ Studies focusing on the use direct speech in interaction in different languages have dealt with the phenomenon under a number of labels, including 'constructed dialogue' (e.g., Tannen 2007), 'direct quotation' (e.g., Fujii 2006), 'represented discourse' (e.g., Oropeza-Escobar 2011), 'reported talk' (e.g., Holt and Clift 2007), 'enactment' (e.g., Arita 2018), 'reenactment' (e.g., Sidnell 2006; Thompson and Suzuki 2014), 'constructed speech' (e.g., Matsumoto 2018), etc.

when a speaker represents an utterance as the words of another, what results is by no means describable as ‘reported speech.’ Rather it is constructed dialogue. And the construction of the dialogue represents an active, creative, transforming move which expresses the relationship not between the quoted party and the topic of talk but rather the quoting party and the audience to whom the quotation is delivered.

Maynard (1996:210) assumes that “language cannot help but reflect multiple voices” and “direct/indirect speech and thought representation, through various devices of quotation, offer unique instances where the many ‘voices’ of discourse converge” (cf. Maynard 2005a). Niemelä (2010:3258) explains the dialogic nature of direct speech as being “reflected in the reporting speaker’s capacity to simultaneously assign a stance to and take a stance on the reported speaker and event”.

In Japanese conversational interactions, direct speech can be variously interwoven into the ongoing interactions. The boundaries between the enactments and the dialogic interaction in the here-and-now may be marked quite overtly, including explicit lexical framing devices and verbs of saying or thinking, lexical choice, grammar, changes in prosody and voice quality, as well as other semiotic resources (cf., e.g., Couper-Kuhlen 1996; Günthner 1999; Niemelä 2005, 2010; Sidnell 2006; Couper-Kuhlen 2007; Haakana 2007; Holt 2007; Sunakawa 2010; Thompson and Suzuki 2014; Arita 2018). However, the boundaries may also be virtually non-existent and so the distinction between direct and indirect speech in Japanese is not always clear-cut. The grammatically most explicit format for direct speech constructions involves the following components: {subject of the verb of saying/thinking/etc.} + {enacted speech/thoughts} + {quotative marker} + {verb of saying/thinking/etc.}. However, the subject component as well as the verb are often omitted, leaving thus open to interpretation whether the enacted material is to be taken as speech or thoughts and sometimes also leaving unclear whose speech/thoughts are being enacted. Speakers may also choose not to use any lexical quotative marker, which can further augment the effect of affect-ladenness, animateness, and immediacy that the use of direct speech in interaction creates.

The devices that I refer to here as ‘quotative markers’ have also been discussed under such terms as ‘quotative particles’, ‘quotation markers’, ‘complementizers’, ‘enactment markers’, etc. In informal conversational interactions, Japanese speakers can nowadays choose between multiple quotative markers, including forms such as *tte*, *to*, *mitai*, *mitaina*, *toka*, *tsutte*, *datte*, *dato*, *ttara*, or *tteba*. Most of the quotative markers that I listed above can only be used in specific types of direct speech constructions, typically such that do not involve the use of a verb and place the quotative marker in the utterance-final position. The most versatile quotative marker nowadays is *tte* (see, e.g., S. Suzuki 1996, 2007; Okamoto and Ono 2008; R. Suzuki

2008, 2011). Another highly popular marker is *mitai(na)*, which represents a relatively recent addition to the Japanese repertoire of quotative markers (see, e.g., S. Suzuki 1995a; Maynard 2005a, 2007; Fujii 2006; Matsumoto 2018).⁹⁵ It cannot, however, be used in the construction introduced above. It can be employed either utterance-finally or as a part of a noun modifying construction, such as: {{enacted speech/thoughts} + {*mitaina/tte*} + {noun}}. The most used head noun in this construction is arguably *kanji* ‘feeling, sense, impression’, which is, furthermore, often used utterance-finally. The construction allows speakers to convey their judgements and opinions as feelings or impressions that they directly express through the means of direct speech (see also a mention of this and a similar format in Section 4.1.5).⁹⁶

Consider the use of direct speech constructions in the following excerpt. It was used by Naruoka (2006) to demonstrate the rhetorical effect created by the speaker’s use of different demonstratives to display the same affective stance towards a referent, namely, her antipathy towards her company (lines 5 and 14). What is of particular interest to us in this section, however, is one of the speakers’ use of direct speech constructions through which she enacts her negative affective stances. The excerpt features two sisters in their twenties, Naoko and Madoka, talking about ways to meet men. Naoko is a graduate student, so Madoka tells her that there are still new encounters awaiting her. By contrast, as a person who works in a small office, she presents her own situation as quite hopeless and displays strongly negative affective stances towards her workplace.

- (7.17) 1 N: demo igaito kō hora shōgeki no deai ga aru kamoshirenai shi.
But we may like that, you know, unexpectedly meet someone.
- 2 M: sō da yo.
That’s right.
- 3 n-chan wa gakusei dakara deai ga aru yo.
You’re a student so surely you have a chance.
- 4 N: aru kana:?
You think so?
- 5 M: watashi nante mō ano [heisa sareta kaisha no naka de=
I TOP INT that closed company PRT inside
As for me, in that closed office,

⁹⁵ As many new quotative constructions in languages around the world (cf. Buchstaller and Van Alphen 2012:xiv), quotative *mitaina* has developed from a comparative construction which conveys similarity, approximation, or exemplification. It has been repeatedly compared to the quotative use of *like* in contemporary colloquial English (e.g., Maynard 2005a).

⁹⁶ See Maynard (2005a, 2007) for a discussion on other constructions that involve direct speech used as a modifier of a noun and Oshima and Sano (2012) who focus on various cases of direct speech usage with the “quotative predicate ellipsis”, that is, the verb of communication or attitude omitted.

- 6 N: [h::n.
Hmmm.
- 7 M: [=daremo] INAI chūno,
nobody is.not QUOT
there's no one, I'm telling you,
- 8 N: [<<laughing> uso.]
Come on!
- 9 M: mitai[na.
QUOT
[I feel] like [that's how it is].
- 10 N: [((laughter))
- 11 M: <<laughing> inai tsūno.>
is.not QUOT
"There's no one", I'm telling you.
- 12 daremo ya da [tsūno mitaina.
nobody don't.want QUOT QUOT
Something like, "I don't want anyone from the office!" I'm telling you.
- 13 N: [((laughter))
- 14 M: nan da yo [kono kaisha tte kanji.
what COP IP this company QUOT feeling
I feel like, "What the hell is wrong with this office?!".
- 15 N: [hn::n.
Hmmm.

(Naruoka 2006:504)

Madoka complains that there is no one suitable for her at her office, using a great deal of direct speech constructions. In lines 5, 7, and 9, we can observe her first frame her claim that there is no one suitable for her with utterance-final *chūno*, which is a colloquial quotative marker that seems to have developed from the utterance-final quotative construction *tte yuu/yutteru no* ‘[I am saying]’. It is commonly employed to emphatically convey that one insists on that which is communicated in the unit of talk that is postpositionally marked with it. However, as shown in line 9, she subsequently produces an add-on consisting solely of the expression *mitaina*, whereby she further frames the preceding unit of talk as an approximation of her thoughts, feelings, impressions, etc. In line 11, she repeats the negative predicate and frames it with *tsūno*, that is, another variant of the marker *chūno* that she used earlier. While it is impossible to tell (based solely on grammar) whether these two utterances were designed as constructions that involve ‘direct’ or ‘indirect’ speech, the following two turn-constructive units involve exclamatory utterances followed by quotative markers, and hence, more obviously represent instances of direct speech constructions. In line 12, Madoka again uses both *tsūno* and *mitaina*

to frame her affectively charged utterance in which she overtly expresses her dislike for the men in her office. Finally, in line 14, she uses the noun-modifying quotative construction framed by *tte kanji*. The unit of talk that is produced as direct speech represents a question form that functions as an exclamation (see Section 4.7.3). It is formatted as a non-predicate-final utterance construction. The predicate part, *nan da yo*, is routinely used exclamatorily to convey negative affective stances, such as dislike, disdain, exasperation, etc. In the post-predicate position, the speaker expresses the referent which she criticises, further using the proximal demonstrative *kono* to strengthen the negative affective stance that she displays (Naruoka 2006:505).

Being less grammatically constrained than indirect reporting, direct speech constructions can include affectively loaded forms, such as imperatives, interrogatives, and exclamations, they can consist solely of interjections, and they can enact speech and thoughts, using utterances that include interactional particles, utterance-final hedging expressions, and so on. As such, they are particularly useful for constructing affective stance displays. They are regularly used in the context of conversational tellings, such as first- and third-person humorous stories or complaint stories, which they make more dramatic, dynamic, lively, vivid, animated, and engaging (see, e.g., Günthner 1999; Holt 2000; Niemelä 2005; Tannen 2007; Sunakawa 2010). In non-narrative contexts, direct speech constructions often occur in assessments, when the speaker is complaining, criticising, accusing, blaming, boasting, making fun of someone (including oneself), providing accounts for one's actions and lack thereof, and so on (see, e.g., Clift 2007; Couper-Kuhlen 2007; Haakana 2007). In Section 4.1.4.2, we also noticed the phenomenon referred to as 'embedded soliloquy' (Hasegawa 1996), which involves private expressions that can be described as direct speech constructions containing no lexical framing devices.

Consider the use of direct speech in the following fragments. In (7.18), we can see the end of Hiroki's telling in which he tells Nao that he went somewhere only to be told that they need his passport. He uses direct speech, consisting of a verb in the imperative form, to convey his exasperation and annoyance. In (7.19), we can see a fragment from talk between Kyōko and Mayumi, during which Kyōko tells Mayumi about her relationship. In the quoted fragment, we can observe Kyōko make use of an alternative question format as part of a direct speech construction to express how confused and unsure she feels. In (7.20), Yuri deploys a direct speech construction to display her surprise and confusion upon finding a certain inscription in Chinese characters (line 1). The direct speech part of her turn consists of an emphatically elongated secondary interjection *uso*, which represents a conventionalized means for the

expression of incredulity, surprise, or disbelieve (see Section 4.1.5). Observe that in her response to Yuri's turn, Sachiko displays a matching affective stance, making use of the non-predicate-final utterance construction *nani sore*, which functions as a conventionalized expression of surprise and various negative affective stances (see Section 4.7.1.1). In (7.21), we can observe Kento make use of a direct speech construction to display his surprise upon finding a certain CD in a shop. He produces an interjection *a* to enact his discovery and follows it with a rhetorical question that conveys his disbelieve that *konna tokoro* 'a place like that' would have it (lines 1–2).

- (7.18) 1 H: soko made itte.
 Having gone up there.
- 2 N: [e::::-
 Whaaaat?!
- 3 H: [<<len> yamero> yo mitaina.
 quit-IMP IP QUOT
 Like, "Give me a break!"

(CallFriend JPN1773)

- (7.19) 1 K: watashi ganbatta hō ga ii no ka:,
 I should.better.persevere NML Q
- 2 mō gibuappu shichatta hō ga ii no ka:, hh
 already should.better.give.up NML Q
- 3 mitai na kanji.
 QUOT feeling
 I feel like, "Should I continue trying, or should I give up?"
- 4 M: iya datte (kō) demo hoka no hito o mitsukeru ki ni narenai=
 5 =desho datte.
 Well, but you wouldn't really feel like looking for somebody else, would you?

(CallFriend JPN1684)

- (7.20) 1 Y: usso:::: toka [omotte,
 lie QUOT thought
 I thought something like, "No way!"
- 2 S: [nani sore un.
 what that INT
 What the? Mm.

(CallFriend JPN1367)

- (7.21) 1 K: un dakara ore mo,
 Yeah, that's why I also

- 2 a konna tokoro utten no kayo toka omotte,
 INT such place is.selling NML IP QUOT thought
thought something like, "What? They're selling them in a place like this?".
- 3 R: a::.
Mmm.

(CallFriend JPN4725)

One of the reasons why speakers seem to enact speech in the course of their conversational interactions is to position their co-participants as witnesses to the events that occurred and let them take affective stances towards them ‘independently’ of themselves, that is, instead of just agreeing or disagreeing with their explicit assessments. Even though any enactment is necessarily coloured by the speaker’s stance, speakers regularly appear to capitalize on the fact that the use of direct speech in reporting is conventionally associated with objectivity and detachment, which can be viewed “as a means of heightening evidentiality” (Couper-Kuhlen 2007:82). Consequently, speakers’ role in the enactments can be purported to be that of mere ‘sounding boxes’ or ‘animators’ (Goffman 1981:226). The recipients of enactments then need to “analyze those enactments both in the context of the there-and-then interaction and in that of the here-and-now interaction [...] so that they can provide responses [...] at the appropriate time” (Arita 2018:78). Speakers thus give their co-participants access to the scene and let them assess it for themselves, while guiding them towards taking an affective stance that will match the affective stance that they are themselves taking. In this sense, enactments play an important role in the management of stance-taking as well as affiliation.⁹⁷

The following excerpt represents the final part of a conversational telling about an absent third party. It forms a second story in a story round that consists of three stories dealing with the theme of working inhumane hours. It was told by Takuya in response to the preceding story, which was told by Shōta and represented a complaint story regarding his employer. By means of the telling, Takuya evidently attempts to defuse the negative emotions that the foregoing complaint story elicited. He recounts about their common friend Ueno whom he depicts as being subjected to even more abhorrent working conditions than Shōta. In the fragment shown below, we can observe Shōta display a critical stance towards Ueno who has not yet quit the job, a moment of shared laughter at the expense of Ueno, which was occasioned by Takuya’s enactment of Ueno’s whining, and finally, Shōta’s overt assessment.

⁹⁷ See Arita (2018) for an exploration of the sequential organization of enactments in Japanese talk-in-interaction. Sunakawa (2010) explores the ways in which a Japanese teller makes use of prosody and voice quality when using direct speech during a conversational telling. The study by Thompson and Suzuki (2014) then offers insight into the ways in which the story recipients’ gaze directions contribute to the construction of reenactments in Japanese.

- (7.22) 1 S: aitsu tanoshii no,
He enjoys it?
- 2 sore de.
In spite of that?
- 3 T: e?
Huh?
- 4 S: sore de tanoshii no,
In spite of that, he enjoys it?
- 5 shigoto.
His job.
- 6 T: iya: mō yada tte itteta yo.
Nah, he said he doesn't want to do it anymore.
- 7 S: a itteta.
Oh, he said that.
- 8 T: un.
Yeah.
- 9 mae.
Earlier.
- 10 kekkō mae da kedo ne.
But it's quite some time ago, you know?
- 11 <<:-)> mō ya da yo:.
INT don't.want IP
"I don't want to do this anymore!"
- 12 okinawa de minshuku keiei shitai yo:.> [hahahaha haha hh
Okinawa in B&B want.to.run IP
I want to run a bed-and-breakfast in Okinawa!"
- 13 S: [hehehe hh
- 14 <<:-)> baka ja nē n.
What an idiot!
- 15 sotchi no hō ga taihen da yo.>
That's even harder.

(Zawiszová 2018:141–142)

Even though he answers Shōta's question in line 6, in lines 11–12, Takuya switches to a higher pitch and manipulates his voice quality (while using no lexical quotation framing devices) to depict Ueno whining and complaining that he does not want to work for his employer anymore, further adding that he wants to run a bed-and-breakfast in Okinawa instead. He produces the enactments with a smile and bursts into laughter immediately after he finishes. Regardless of whether the enactment is based on what Ueno said or not, it was clearly meant to elicit humour

at the expense of their friend and provoke Shōta into voicing his (non-serious) criticism towards their friend, which is exactly what he does, even calling Ueno ‘an idiot’ (lines 14–15).

In (7.23), we can observe Kaoru telling Tomoya how his father made a motorbike and made him ride it for the first time even though he was still a little kid. According to Kaoru, his father took him to training grounds, sat him on the motorbike, and told him to go. He uses a direct speech construction to depict the moment in which his father let him go instead of describing it (line 7). He marks the direct speech with the quotative marker *tsutte*, which can probably be assumed to have developed from *tte yutte*, a combination of the complementizer/quotative marker *tte* and the verb *yuu* ‘to say’ in the *-te* form. He depicts his father as shouting *Omē hashire?!*, which consists of a crude variant of the second-person pronominal expression *omae* and the verb *hashiru* ‘to ride’ in the direct imperative form with the word-final glottalization. The ‘quotation’ creates an image of the situation in which a father behaves rather coarsely and carelessly. It seems to have been used by Kaoru to have Tomoya imagine how a boy would feel in such a situation. He does not express his feelings overtly at this point but displays his affective stance towards the events through the use of the direct speech construction.

- (7.23) 1 K: chichioya ga nanka roppyaku shīshī no baiku tsukutte kite,
My old man, uhm, made a 600cc bike [one day],
- 2 de (.) ano: jieitai no ue no sa:, (.)
and, that, on top of that of self-defence forces...
- 3 T: aramahara?
Aramahara?
- 4 K: sō sō aramahara no (.) ue de,
Yeah yeah, on top of Aramahara,
- 5 jieitai ga yoku renshū shiteru (.) kōsu ga an da yo.
there is a track where the self-defence forces often train.
- 6 T: a:.
Mmm.
- 7 K: soko de (.) <<f> OMĒ hashire?> tsutte,=
 there you go-IMP QUOT
There he said, “Go!”.
- 8 T: =roppyaku tte nani?
600cc, that’s what?
- 9 (.)
- 10 T: ofurōdo?
An off-road bike?

- 11 K: roppyaku shīshī (.) motokuro.
600cc, a motocross bike.
- 12 T: motokuro,
A motocross bike?
- 13 K: un motokuro da to omou.
I think it was a motocross bike.
- 14 roppyaku tte itteta.=
He said it was 600.
- 15 =sore datta[ra,
Because of that
- 16 T: [dekē na:.
That's huge!
- 17 K: dekē kara hashiren be tsutte,
is.huge because can't.ride IP QUOT
Because it's huge, I said, "I can't do it!"
- 18 <<f> chō koē> mō maji de pawā arisugite,
extremely terrifying INT seriously power has.too.much
I was sooo scared, like, it was seriously too powerful.
- 19 issoku de <<f> bua::: > tte mō-
first.gear on MIM QUOT INT
On first gear, I was like, "Vroooooom," man...
- 20 T: nani,
What?
- 21 tsukutta?
He made it?
- 22 K: tsukutta.
He did.
- 23 T: sugoi ne,
That's impressive, right?
- 24 K: aru yatsu de tsukutta.
He made it from another one.

As we can observe, Tomoya, does not respond to Kaoru's enactment in line 7 in any way and, instead, produces an ancillary question (lines 8–10), which “[i]n addition to declining affiliative engagement with the experience described by the teller”, also makes “the teller address the agenda raised in the [...] question” (Heritage 2011b:164). Only after learning more information, Tomoya produces an assessment by means of which he creates affiliation with Kaoru as he recognizes the fact that the motorbike must have been extremely big for a boy (line 16). Kaoru then repeats Tomoya's evaluative term in his ensuing turn in a clause that provides a reason for the affective stance that he is taking in this telling and again enacts his affective stance via

another direct speech construction (line 17). In lines 18–19, he develops his affective stance display even further, this time, however, making use of overtly evaluative lexical devices. Nonetheless, Tomoya does not seem to be moved by his friend’s display, as he seems to be more impressed by his father’s ability to build a motorcycle, which he evaluates as ‘impressive’.

Enactments of thoughts are always interpretive and involve affective stance displays. Speakers can perform thoughts that occurred to them at specific occasions as well as their habitual way of thinking, they can directly express their affective stances, but also perform ‘screaming in silence’, that is, things that they wished to have said or to say but did not or probably will not say. For example, in the context of complaint stories, enactments of thoughts can be “used as an evaluation device”, which serves not only to show how speakers “evaluated the other’s words and actions in the narrated interaction” but also to “guide the current recipient in evaluating the story” (Haakana 2007:176). Enacting one’s own thoughts is also recurrent in the environment of providing assessments or accounts. In assessment sequences, it can serve to show what one thought “on an earlier occasion which substantiates and authenticates the assessment by adding strategic detail and attesting to its historicity” (Couper-Kuhlen 2007:119). When employed in the context of constructing accounts, it “can be a means to warrant some accountable action, or the report of some accountable action or lack of it”; moreover, “[q]uoted thoughts can, and often do, incorporate expressive displays of affect, hallmarking the inner state which accompanies or accompanied the taking of a decision” (Couper-Kuhlen 2007:110).

One type of format that recurs in enactments of thoughts are affectively loaded rhetorical questions (see Section 4.7.3), as illustrated in the following examples. All were used to convey the speaker’s negative affective stances towards the referent. Instead of describing how they felt and what they thought, the speakers enact their affective stances at the time and thereby make their thought processes and their state of mind at the time accessible to their co-participants. As we can observe in the excerpts, to maximize the intensity of the affective stances that they display, speakers often use non-predicate-final constituent order, interjections, demonstratives, and marked person reference terms when designing their rhetorical questions.

(7.24) a. nani yatten no aitsu mitaina.
 what is.doing Q that.guy QUOT
 Like, “What the hell is he doing?!”.

 b. e? nani kono hito tte kanji.
 INT what this person QUOT feeling
 A feeling like, “Huh?! Who the hell is this guy?!”.

- c. mō nande ore konna koto o suru no yo: mitaina.
 INT why I such thing OBJ do Q IP QUOT
Like, “Urgh! Why do I do such things?!”.
- d. e:: maji kayo:: tte omotte,
 INT seriously IP QUOT thought
I thought, “What the! Seriously?!”.
- e. nani kono ko tte omotchatte sa:,
 what this girl QUOT thought IP
I thought, “Who the hell is this girl?!”.

On the one hand, affective stance displays achieved in this way are extremely straightforward and engaging. On the other hand, this practice allows speakers to avoid labelling and explaining the affective stances that they took. It also makes it possible for speakers to display their negative affective stances without using explicitly evaluative lexical items.

Speakers may also strategically leave open the question of whether they actually said something or just thought it, using certain direct speech constructions that do not involve a predicate. We can find this strategy being employed, for example, when speakers are criticising an absent third party or recounting about their arguments and altercations. The following fragment, for example, occurred during a conversation between two female friends. The speaker produced the quotative turn-constructive unit to display her annoyance and frustration with her boyfriend during an argument that they had.

- (7.25) mō kiite kure mitaina.
 INT listen.to.me-IMP QUOT
Like, “Come on! Shut up and listen to what I am saying!”.

The speaker accomplishes her affective stance display using the interjection *mō*, which is commonly employed in displays of annoyance and frustration (see Subchapter 4.5), and an informal direct request expression *-te kure* which is stereotypically associated with a coarse (masculine) speech style. She frames the direct speech with the utterance-final quotative marker *mitaina*, which is particularly useful here as it can be employed as a framing device in enactments of speech as well as thoughts and – owing to its propositional meaning (marking approximation, exemplification, or similarity) – it “can present not only the repetition of something actually said (i.e., re-presented dialogue) but also the speaker’s virtual reconstruction

of somebody's inner monologue, which represents [their] attitude, reactions, feelings, emotions, etc. (interpretive thought) but was not actually uttered" (Fujii 2006:61).

Mitaina represents a quotative marker that has been repeatedly described as serving affective-stance-display-related purposes. Both in its adnominal and utterance-final position, the expression *mitaina* has often been explained as facilitating the speaker's expression of affective stances but also as signalling the speaker's distancing from the unit of talk marked by it. For example, Suzuki (1995a:56) states that "by using *mitai na* speaker signals to the addressee that s/he is distancing him/herself from the content of the unit". Satake (1997:59) proposes that it might be used to present one's feelings as if from the perspective of a third person. According to Maynard (2005a:866), using direct speech foregrounds emotivity, but "the speaker/writer also creates distance by framing it with *mitaina* or simply by framing it". In another work, Maynard (2007:119) suggests that *mitaina* "conveys an approximate objectification of what is being said" and "[i]ts use facilitates communicating the speaker's attitude toward others (e.g., noncommittal, disclaiming, hesitant)". Fujii (2006:54) observes that *mitaina* constructions represent "powerful host constructions for expressing attitudinal and emotive stances in Japanese discourse", whose use "yields heightened emotional poignancy" (Fujii 2006:89), but also notes that by using *mitaina* "the speaker signals to the addressee that the speaker is distancing him/herself from the authenticity of the quoted speech or thoughts" (Fujii 2006:91). By contrast, Matsumoto (2018:82) explicitly disagrees with the idea that *mitaina* has a distancing effect, asserting that "the construction invites addressee involvement, rather than indicating objectification or distance" and argues that it "is used to indicate the speaker's (or writer's) stance by marking the preceding component as the depiction of his or her personal impression regarding the situation presented in the ongoing discourse" (Matsumoto 2018:76). The implication of non-exactness and approximateness of the enactments framed by *mitaina* is unquestionable. As for the distancing or objectifying effect of the use of *mitaina* constructions, I would suggest that it emerges only in certain contexts, for example, when the speaker enacts somebody else praising them.

The following excerpt also illustrates the affective-stance-display-related use of direct speech constructions framed by the utterance-final *mitaina*. While in line 4, it is used to mark the speaker's enactment of her thoughts (rather than speech), in line 5, it is employed to mark a unit of talk presented as reported speech attributed to someone else. The excerpt also exemplifies how speakers may use direct speech constructions to substantiate their assessments, complaints, or criticism. The fragment comes from a conversation of four friends, but shows only two of them, Kana and Mako. It was analysed by Akita (2018:88–91) as an example of

enactments of there-and-then interaction without any responses from the co-participants in the here-and-now interaction intersecting the enactment sequence. Kana, who works at a large pharmacy, complains about an incompetent colleague who works at the cash register and is supposed to call for help when there are too many customers waiting in line. To substantiate her explicit construction of negative affective stance towards her colleague, Kana depicts a scene in which she is confronted by an angry customer when she is busy doing something else.

- (7.26) 1 K: metcha isshōkenmei betsu no shigoto shiteru toki ni,
When I'm working really hard on something else,
- 2 okyakusan ni:,
by a customer
- 3 O:::I tte iwaren ne yan ka,
 hey QUOT am.told NML IP Q
I'm called, "Heeey!"
- 4 h E? (.) <<laughing> mitaina,>
 INT QUOT
I'm like, "Huh?"
- 5 <<f> rreji kondoru yarro::[: mitaina.
 cashier is.crowded TAG QUOT
Like, "The cash register's crowded!"
- 6 M: [a:::-
I see.

(Arita 2018:82)

Kana overtly marks the first enactment (line 3) as reporting the customer's angry speech directed at her and, as Akita (2018:90) notes, "by opening her eyes and mouth very wide", she "presents an infuriated look" of the customer. In the second enactment (line 4), she displays her surprise at being summoned by an angry customer using the interjection *e?* which conventionally serves as a means for displaying surprise (see Subchapter 4.5). Importantly, by laughing during the realization of the quotative marker following this enactment, she further "indicates her here-and-now stance toward the enacted utterance" (Akita 2018:90). Finally, in the third enactment (line 5), Kana again assumes the role of the customer and, using a combination of not only verbal, but also vocal and visual resources (as described by Akita 2018:91), conveys the customer's anger. As soon as Kana finishes her enactment, Mako produces a response token *a:::-* whereby she arguably conveys that she has understood the significance of the depicted situation as providing support for Kana's negative assessment of her colleague (line 6).

4.7.3 Question forms

Just as “questioning can be accomplished by linguistic forms other than questions”, so “the question form can be used for actions other than questioning” (Schegloff 1984:34).⁹⁸ Question forms, in fact, perfectly exemplify the multi-functional nature of linguistic forms. In this section, we will consider some of the ways in which question forms are routinely employed by participants in Japanese conversational interactions to accomplish affective stance displays. While some scholars, such as Maynard (2002:247), try to distinguish between functional questions (or informational interrogatives) and emotive interrogatives, question forms can do both at once: they can seek answers and be responded to and, simultaneously, serve as resources for affective stance display. Some question forms primarily serve affective-stance-display-related purposes. In case of other question forms, affective stance displays may constitute the secondary actions that the speaker wishes their co-participant to recognize alongside the primary actions that the given turn accomplishes, including the action of questioning, but also other types of actions, such as seeking confirmation, requesting clarification, offering, inviting, etc.

For example, consider the use of the question form in line 9 in the following excerpt. The fragment comes from a conversation between Takuya and Shōta but I have not yet used it elsewhere. Takuya points out that Shōta has dirty hands and after Shōta replies that he is aware of it and that he tried washing his hands, Takuya gives him advice, using a direct imperative form (lines 7–8). By giving Shōta advice, Takuya positions Shōta as an advice recipient, which “is a potentially unwelcome identity to occupy because it implies one knows less than the advice giver and indeed that one may be somehow at fault” (Shaw and Hepburn 2013:345).

- (7.27) 1 T: <<f> te kittanē.>
Your hands are filthy!
- 2 (.)
- 3 S: shikata nē daro.
There's nothing I can do about it.
- 4 sakki mo sa:,
Earlier
- 5 ore jibun de (.) te arattete sa:,
when I was washing my hands

⁹⁸ For an overview of the major types of functional question formats in Japanese face-to-face conversational interactions, see Hayashi (2010). Various types of questions are also explored by Tanaka (2015) in her book-length study of the use of questions in different communicative settings.

- 6 KITTANĒ toka omoinagara,=
are.dirty QUOT was.thinking
I was thinking something like, “[My hands] are dirty!”.
- 7 T: =are shiro yo,
Use that.
- 8 pātsukurinā.
Parts cleaner.
- 9 S: NANde da yo.
why COP IP
Why would I do that?
- 10 T: iya honto honto honto.
No, really really really.
- 11 S: <<h> ippai yogore ga ochiru ne:> tte.
all dirt SBJ come.off IP QUOT
Like, “All dirt washes off, right?”.
- 12 ITTĒ n da yo kore.
hurts NML COP IP this
It hurts, this.
- 13 warechatta n da yo.
My skin cracked.
- 14 T: chigau YATte,
No, try it.
- 15 (.) pātsukurinā de yat(.)te,
Try washing them with parts cleaner,
- 16 de (.) sono ato ni futsū ni te arau jan.
and then you just wash your hands as you normally do.
- 17 S: [chō kirei.
Absolutely clean.
- 18 T: [sekken de.
With soap.
- 19 de (.) kirei ni nan jan.
And they’ll be clean.
- 20 kurīmu nure,
Put some cream on.
- 21 S: hahaha <<:-)> kōtingu shite ne,>
Do the coating, right?
- 22 chanto arenai yō ni.
So that they don’t get chapped.
- 23 T: <<:-)> sō sō sō.>
Yeah yeah yeah.
- 24 (.)

25 T: iya pātsukurinā ii yo.
Well, parts cleaner is good, I'm telling you.

Shōta's response to Takuya's advice-giving shown in line 9 is clearly not an unmarked question requesting an explanation or an elaboration (i.e., *Nande?* 'Why?' produced with unmarked prosody), but an affectively loaded question form by means of which he asks Takuya to provide support for his advice and at the same time conveys his negative affective stance and resistance to the advice. Using the non-past plain form of the copula *da* followed by the interactional particle *yo* in Q-word questions is generally associated with negative affective stance displays. This effect probably stems from the fact that both *da* and *yo* are recurrently used in contexts where they convey the speaker's adamance, assertiveness, uncompromisingness, firmness and definiteness of their stance, etc.⁹⁹ Shōta works in a bicycle shop and often gets his hands dirty, therefore, by advising him on the matter of cleaning his hands, Takuya can be viewed as undermining his identity. As we can observe, Shōta proceeds to prove his prior knowledge of the product and hence his competence (line 11). To do that, he uses a direct speech construction in which he enacts what I would call a 'voice of common knowledge'. He produces the enactment in markedly higher pitch and softer voice and punctuates it with the elongated particle *ne*: which further contributes to the construction of the preceding unit of talk as communicating shared knowledge (see Subchapter 4.8). While he does not explicitly agree with Takuya, he implicitly assesses the basis for his advice as legitimate by means of the enactment.

Question forms are often used as a resource for negative affective stance displays. The question forms that are employed to assert or to claim (rather than to ask) have often been called 'rhetorical questions' (Koshik 2005:2). They are routinely used to criticize, challenge, insult, accuse, tease, mock, ridicule, belittle, complain, lament, show disgust, dislike, surprise, regret, and so on. The most conspicuous formats of rhetorical questions that are used in Japanese informal conversational interactions for the purpose of negative affective stance displays involve question forms ending in $\{n(o) da yo\}$, $\{(n(o)) kayo\}$, and $\{mon ka\}$,¹⁰⁰ but other formats are also common. A typical environment in which rhetorical questions are regularly employed for the purpose of accomplishing negative affective stance displays are serious as

⁹⁹ See Maynard (1999a, 1999b) for an exploration of a variety of expressive uses of *da*. The interactional particle *yo* is among the forms discussed in Subchapter 4.8.

¹⁰⁰ Without going into details, we can characterize the *n(o) da* construction as consisting of the nominalizer *n(o)* appended to the predicate of the preceding unit of talk and followed by the non-past form of the copula *da*. *Ka* functions as a question particle, *yo* is an interactional (pragmatic) particle, *kayo* can be regarded either as a combination of two particles (*ka yo*) or as a single complex particle (*kayo*), *mon* is a formal noun that functions as a nominalizer, but also seems to have acquired the function of an interactional particle (see Subchapter 4.8).

well as humour-oriented arguments. While pseudo-aggressive talk produced by participants within a play frame (cf. Bateson 1972) commonly occurs in my data, researchers are rarely lucky enough to get a serious argument talk on tape. Takagi (1999) is one of the few exceptions and her study confirms that question forms in arguments are pervasive and are used to perform accusations and challenges, but also other actions.

Observe the use of question forms in the following fragment from the argument between a couple that Takagi (1999) recorded. I call the female participant Mariko and the male participant Keiichi. The couple promised to record some of their conversations for the researcher. Just before the transcribed segment starts, Mariko accuses Keiichi of not keeping the promise he made and not doing the recording by using a direct speech construction to enact his broken promise. In lines 1–2, we can see Keiichi’s response to the accusation.

- (7.28) 1 K: sonna koto jibun ga YAtte kara yuu n da yo,
 such thing yourself SBJ do after say NML COP IP
You should say such a thing only after you have done it yourself.
- 2 jibun [ga yatTA] no kayo::.
 yourself SBJ did NML IP
Have you done it?
- 3 M: [NA(h)ni o-]
 what OBJ
What?
- 4 (0.8)
- 5 M: nani O:?
 what OBJ
What?
- 6 K: da::kara rekōdingu demo nandemo yatTA [no kayo::.]
 DM recording TOP everything did NML IP
Have you done the recordings and everything?
- 7 M: [SHITA YO::.]
 did IP
I have!
- 8 K: (0.6) nani itten DA yo:,
 what are.saying-NML COP IP
What are you saying!
- 9 i- (.) doko ni an da yo.
 where at exists-NML COP IP
Where is [it, the tape]?
- 10 M: aru mon.
 exists IP
There is [a tape].
- 11 motteru mon.

have IP
I have [it].

12 K: <<p> nani itten da yo.>
what are.saying-NML COP IP
What are you saying?

(Takagi 1999:416)

Keiichi counters Mariko's accusation by accusing her of not doing it herself. In the turn-constructive unit shown in line 2, he uses a question form through which he performs the accusation. As he does not specify the object of the verb *yaru* 'to do' that he uses, Mariko uses a question form that makes relevant a type-conforming response to initiate other-repair and have Keiichi specify the object of the verb, which, I would argue, serves as a confrontational move, whereby she asks him to explicitly verbalize what he accuses her of. In line 6, we can observe Keiichi produce another question form in response to Mariko's repair initiation. He begins his turn using the connective expression *dakara* to convey affective stances such as irritation and annoyance because of being asked to repeat and clarify what he finds to be obvious (see Subchapter 4.6). He marks the 'recordings' with the topic-marking phrase *demo nandemo* which may be said to function as a general extender that contributes to the construction of his negative affective stance display (see Section 4.3.2). It may be used to convey his disdain for the referent, but also – by means of despecifying the referent – to suggest that the recordings are not the only thing that Mariko does not do. While the question form that he thereby produces is responded to by Mariko, it also conveys his negative affective stance and serves as an elaboration on his counteraccusation of Mariko. In lines 8 and 9, Keiichi again uses question forms to respond to Mariko and to communicate his negative affective stance towards her by accusing her of not telling the truth. After Mariko insists that she is telling the truth (lines 10–11), Keiichi repeats the same question form that he produced earlier (in line 8) to again express his accusation that she is not telling the truth (line 12). However, this time he realizes it in a markedly quieter voice.

While the format of *no*-marked Q-word questions is often used to request explanation, the request may be variously affectively coloured and the turn formatted in this way may also be hearable as a rhetorical question that does something other than questioning. Speakers may, for example, ask their co-participant to explain why they are doing something (e.g., *Nani yatten no?* 'What are you doing?') or why they are saying something (e.g., *Nani itten no?* 'What are you saying?') that they find irritating, annoying, stupid, surprising, etc. Such question forms may, consequently, be oriented to either as functional questions that convey the speaker's

(serious or non-serious) negative affective stance displays but also make a provision of a response in the next turn conditionally relevant or as rhetorical questions that communicate the speaker's negative affective stances, perform actions such as criticism, and do not require a response.

In the following excerpt, Mai uses a *no*-marked question to jokingly reprimand Sakura for enthusiastically suggesting that she and her relatively new boyfriend will be getting married soon (line 2). Sakura produced the question shown in line 1 in response to Mai's telling in which she details how lovingly her boyfriend was treating her when she was ill and how she was behaving towards him. To do that, she used direct speech constructions through which she enacted their exchanges. By modifying her voice quality, she performed the role of a cute girl who wants to be taken care of. Sakura's suggestion, therefore, is not completely off as it shows that she understood the affective stances whose display Mai constructed through her telling.

- (7.29) 1 S: hh mō kekkon shichaisō ja na:i?
It looks like you're getting married soon, no?
- 2 M: nani itteru no. hhh
What are you saying?!
- 3 S: ue::,
Haaa!
- 4 M: kawaii n da kedo,
He's cute, but
- 5 kao fuketen da. hhh
he looks old.
- 6 S: hhh hhh

(CallFriend JPN1722)

In line 4 in excerpt (7.30), we can observe Seiji convey his disgust towards a referent by means of a *no*-marked question.

- (7.30) 1 F: a? to- tottori ni ne,
Oh, I heard that in To- in Tottori,
- 2 rakkyo chokorēto tte atta rashii n desu yo mukashi.
there was a thing called pickled shallot chocolate a long time ago.
- 3 nde ne,
And...
- 4 S: nna getemon dare ga taben no.
like.that bizarre.thing who SBJ eat Q
Who would eat bizarre things like that?

- 5 F: naka ne,
The inside [of the pickled shallot chocolate]
- 6 kari tto suru tte yuu shokkan ya,
should have a crispy feel,
- 7 tte yuu imēji de futsū taberu ja nai desu ka.
I'll imagine, so people just normally eat them, I guess?
- 8 (.)

(Koike 2015:499)

Seiji produces his turn in response to Fujio's remark that there used to be something called 'pickled shallot chocolate' in one region in Japan. He constructs his negative affective stance display towards the pickled shallot chocolate not only by using the question form that questions the very reason for its existence, but also by using the explicitly negative evaluative term *getemono* (realized as *getemon*) 'strange/bizarre thing' to refer to it and by further modifying the term using the demonstrative form *sonna* (realized as *nna*) 'such', which – as pointed out in Subchapter 4.2 – is often deployed when constructing negative affective stance displays. Koike (2015:500), who used this extract in her study, further mentions Seiji's use of non-linguistic resources: upon hearing the word referring to the chocolate, he "immediately frowns, lowers the corner of his mouth, and shifts his gaze away from the storyteller and looks down" and, subsequently, when he produces his question, "he looks forward with a wry smile on his face". While the question form clearly serves as a resource for affective stance display, we can also see that Fujio treats it as a question that makes a response on his part relevant, as he provides his answer to the question "Who would eat bizarre things like that?" in lines 5–7.

Rhetorical questions used for the purpose of negative affective stance display commonly occur on social media as well. (7.31) was used to jokingly criticise the writer's cat whose picture was included in the post. It involves a non-predicate-final utterance construction with the topic phrase including the proximal demonstrative *kono* in the post-predicate position. To augment the intensity of the affective stance displayed in the post even further, the speaker also adds the interjection *mō* in the utterance-final position. (7.32) occurred as an initial part of a status update which included a photo of the author's hands and arms. In the status update, the speaker ridiculed his strange sunburn, as he was wearing gloves, but also laments how badly it hurts. (7.33) involves a rhetorical question with the structure *{-te dō suru}*, which involves the *-te* form of a verb followed by the question word *dō* and the verb *suru* 'to do' (cf. Maynard 2005b:133). It occurred as part of a status update in which the speaker used this question form to criticize herself.

- (7.31) : 何やってるのこのこはもう！
 nani yatteru kono ko wa mō!
 what is.doing this girl TOP INT
What the heck is she doing, this girl?!
- (7.32) : 何だよこの日焼け 🤦
 nan da yo kono hiyake
 what COP IP this sunburn
What the hell should I do about this sunburn?!
- (7.33) : 緊張してどうすんのよ！！
 kinchō shite dō sun no yo!!
 be.nervous what do Q IP
What good will it do to be nervous now?!

The question word *nani* ‘what’ is used as a nominal predicate in a number of exclamatory expressions that are routinely employed for particular types of affective stance display.¹⁰¹ For example, in Subchapter 4.5, we noticed the use of *nani* as an interjection that occurs mostly turn-initially and makes the turns it is a part of into question forms that are commonly used as means for constructing displays of negative affective stances and surprise. In Section 4.7.1.1, we observed that speakers frequently use the non-predicate-final utterance construction (exemplified by exclamations such as *Nani sore!* or *Nan da kore!*) which involves the nominal predicate consisting of *nani* ‘what’ and the copula *da* overtly expressed or left unexpressed and a demonstrative pronoun, such as *sore* or *kore*, realized in the post-predicate position. Unlike the pitch accent of *nani* when used to produce a ‘non-surprised’ information-seeking questions, the predicate *nani* or *nan da* in this construction is typically realized with a higher pitch on the final mora. The expressions formatted in this way are conventionally employed to convey affective stances such as surprise, criticism, disgust, etc. in a similar way as expressions like ‘What?!’, ‘What the?!’, ‘What the hell?!’, or ‘What the heck is this?!’ can do in English. In fact, as I mentioned when discussing this format in Section 4.7.1.1, the predicate part (i.e., *Nani!* and *Nan da!*) can serve as a resource for affective stance display on its own as well. The predicate in such exclamations is also, however, commonly followed by the interactional particle *yo*, which results in exclamations *Nani yo!* and *Nan da yo!*. All four can be employed to challenge, criticise, or confront the co-participant in the course of an argument or a banter.

¹⁰¹ Maynard (2000) observes that *nan(i)* is used more often in expletive, exclamative, and otherwise emotive contexts than in interrogative utterances. See her study for a discussion on the ‘non-interrogative’ or ‘expressive’ *nan(i)* occurring in contemporary Japanese comics and fiction.

In the following excerpt, we can observe Yorita use the rhetorical question *Na:n da*, which consists of the question word *nani* produced with the elongation of the first vowel and the copula *da* (line 4). Yorita and Megumi are talking about Ayumi. In the fragment shown below, Yorita expresses his positive affective stance towards Ayumi by means of using direct speech to enact his surprise and a sense of relief upon finding out that she is a much more complex person than he initially thought. In the enactment, he first produces the interjection *a:*, whereby he performs his realization of something unexpected (line 2). Subsequently, as shown in line 4, he produces a non-predicate-final utterance construction that consists of the nominal predicate *na:n da*, which represents a conventionalized expression of a sense of relief upon realizing something new, and the zero-marked topic phrase *kono ko* ‘this girl’ produced in the post-predicate position. He finishes off his enactment with one more question form, as the utterance he enacts in line 5 comprises the utterance-final tag-like element *ja nai* ‘isn’t she?’. The whole enactment is framed with the quotative marker *tte*.

- (7.34) 1 Y: *yoru to iroiro iidasu kara sa:*,
In the evening, she starts bringing up various things,
- 2 a:-
 INT
“Oh!”
- 3 M: *n:.*
Mm.
- 4 Y: *na:n da kono ko.*
what COP this girl
- 5 *omoshiroi koto iroiro iu n ja nai tte.*
interesting things various says NML TAG QUOT
Like, “Whaaat?! This girl is saying a lot of interesting things, isn’t she?!”.
- 6 M: *sō sō sō sō.*
Yeah yeah yeah yeah.

(CallFriend JPN1841)

Other types of expressions that involve the question word *nani* and are routinely employed for affective stance display purposes include, for example, quotative constructions, such as *Nan da to?* or *Nan da tte?*, by means of which speakers can communicate affective stances such as surprise, puzzlement, resistance, or defiance in response to the content of the co-participant’s prior turn. Maynard (2000:1220) further notes, for example, the confrontational use of the syntactic construction *Nani ga X (da) (yo)!*, produced with the phonological prominence on the

first mora of *nani*, as a rhetorical question that draws the attention to the ‘X’, which is a part from the co-participant’s prior turn which the construction repeats.

The affective-stance-display-related uses of *nani*, as described above, can probably be linked to its function as an open class repair initiator *Nani?* ‘What?’, which does not specify neither the source nor the kind of trouble that the speaker claims to be experiencing. Other-initiation of self-repair by means of open class repair initiators (e.g., *Ha?* ‘Huh?’) as well as reference repair initiation forms that locate the specific repairable (i.e., the source of trouble) in the prior turn (e.g., *Nande?* ‘Why?’, *Dare ga?* ‘Who?’, *Nani o?* ‘What?’) can be produced in their context of occurrence with marked prosodic qualities and visual cues in order to construct the speaker’s affective stance displays. Probably the most common affective stance display that these question forms help constitute is the display of surprise or astonishment, which may further be mixed with other affective stances. In her study of German conversational interactions, Selting (1996) concentrates on a form of repair initiation that she refers to as ‘astonished questions’, which are used to signal a problem of expectation (rather than hearing or understanding). According to the author, astonished questions are produced with systematically marked prosody, featuring “high global pitch and greater loudness (with possibly further local marking)” or “the combination of at least one of the global parameters, high pitch or increased loudness, with at least one locally marked accent constituted by a larger pitch range or markedly greater loudness in an accented syllable” (Selting 1996:239). While their specific prosodic features will have to be properly investigated, Japanese speakers can also be said to commonly employ repair initiating questions that are hearable as signalling a problem of expectation, therefore, as ‘astonished questions’.¹⁰²

We can observe an instance of an astonished question in the following excerpt. The transcript shows a fragment from Daisuke’s telling about his summer job. He boasts to Hikaru how much his job paid. When Daisuke confirms that the amount that he earlier stated was per month, Hikaru produces the question form shown in line 2. He realizes the utterance using higher pitch and greater loudness than are those employed in the surrounding units of talk. His display of astonishment is further constructed by his repeated use of the secondary interjection

¹⁰² In her study of the use of multimodal resources in what she calls ‘affect-loaded questions’ in the context of Japanese conversational storytelling, Koike (2015) repeatedly describes the affective stance displays that the questions are employed to convey as surprise or disbelief. Her conceptualization of affect-loaded questions is, however, very broad and could probably subsume all the uses of question forms that are included in this section. In the context of conversational storytelling, the author defines affect-loaded questions as “questions layered with affect, [which] function either to elicit the storyteller’s affective stance or to display the unknowing story recipients’ own affective stance as they request elaborated factual information about the events being relayed” (Koike 2015:488).

maji de ‘seriously?’ (lines 3, 5), which is conventionally used to convey incredulity, surprise, astonishment, or amazement, as well as by his claim shown in line 4, in which he compares Daisuke’s pay to his year-end bonus.

- (7.35) 1 D: ikkagetsu rokujūman.
60,000 a month.
- 2 H: <<f> rokujūman? >
60,000?!
- 3 maji de.
Seriously?
- 4 bōna- ore no bōnasu yori katte n jan.
It’s more than my year-end bonus!
- 5 maji de.
Seriously.
- 6 D: iya sugokatta n da tte.
Yeah, I’m telling you, it was great!
- 7 H: e:::-
Mmmm.

The combination of the question word *nani* ‘what’ and the subject- or nominative-case-marking particle *ga* seems to have further developed a particular function similar to an open-class repair initiator (rather than a reference-repair initiator which helps locate the specific repairable in the prior turn) as a non-analysable chunk, which seems to recur in responses to understanding checks. In this particular sequential position, as Hayashi and Kim (2015:212) point out, the question form *Nani ga?* ‘What?’ systematically conveys the speaker’s puzzlement with respect to “where what the prior speaker has just said is coming from”. (7.36) represents a fragment from a telephone conversation that is included in the CallFriend corpus, but it was also used by Hayashi and Kim (2015:210–211) to illustrate the use of this form. I use the names that they provided but base my transcript on the recording. Naoki and Akira are both living in the USA. After hearing that Naoki needs to graduate within a year, Akira makes an assumption that that means that he will not be going back to Japan in summer and formats it as an understanding check (line 2). In response, after a pause, Naoki produces the question form *Nani ga?* (line 3), which clearly is neither intended nor oriented to as a reference-repair initiator. Rather, it is used to convey that the conjecture that Akira made surprised Naoki. After Naoki corrects the record, Akira communicates his surprise and amusement at his mistaken presumption by means of laughter and the interjections *e:?* and *are?* (shown in lines 6 and 8).

- (7.36) 1 A: n:: sokka:.
Hmm, I see.
- 2 natsu kaerenai ne ja:.
So you can't go back this summer then.
- 3 N: (.) nani ga?
 What SBJ
What?
- 4 A: natsu nihon ni kaerenai ne.
You can't go back to Japan in summer.
- 5 N: natsu kaeru yo. hh
I will go back in summer.
- 6 A: <<laughing> E:,>
What?!
- 7 N: hhh
- 8 A: hh <<laughing> are?>
Huh?
- 9 N: iya hachigatsu ne,
Well, in August, you know?
- 10 A: a:.
I see.

(CallFriend JPN6166)

The last type of question form that I wish to point out here represents a polar question that comprises the negative non-past form of a predicate (most commonly an adjective, but also a verb or a nominal predicate) produced with a specific rising pitch contour that does not embody any observable pitch falls (e.g., Tsai 1996; Wakita 2003; Sugiura 2017).¹⁰³ This question form is used by speakers to convey their assessments in a way that invites the co-participant to affiliate with them by taking a congruent stance towards the assessable by means of expressing their agreement with the assessment in the next turn. Despite the formal properties of this format, assessments expressed through it are usually hearable as relatively strong assertions. As Sugiura (2017) suggests, the format can thus be compared to that of ‘reversed polarity questions’ (Koshik 2005).

In the following excerpt, we meet again the three female friends gossiping about Ryū. The fragment shown below represents the initial part of their gossiping activity. Ryū appears in

¹⁰³ Tsai (1996) refers to this question form as an ‘agreement requesting question form’ (*dōi yōkyūteki gimonbun*), while Wakita (2003) approaches it as an ‘agreement request’ (*dōi motome*). Both consider the emergence of this form in relation to the lexical accent change (the so-called ‘pitch accent flattening’ or *akusento no heibanka*) observable especially in young people’s pronunciation of adjectives. Sugiura (2017), as will be explained below, approaches this form using conversation analysis.

the university cafeteria where the three friends are chatting after having finished their lunch. When Hitomi notices him, she makes the assessment represented in line 1. She designs her turn as the negatively formatted reversed polarity question produced with the specific type of rising intonation contour. By producing her assessment in this way, she effectively states that she thinks that ‘Ryū looks like a papa’ and invites her friends to agree with her assessment.

- (7.37) 1 H: ryū ga nanka papa mitai ja nai?
 Ryū SBJ FIL papa like COP NEG
Doesn't Ryū, like, look like a papa?
- 2 A: [ō:~::~:-]
Aaaaah.
- 3 M: [<<laughing> Hitomisa:n.>]=
Hitomi!
- 4 H: =<<:-> YABai yone::,>=
 is.insane IP
It's insane, right?
- 5 A: =sotchi mo kawaii n da [kedo-
 that also is.cute NML COP but
That's also cute [in its own way], though.
- 6 H: [hhha hh
- 7 M: [hahahaha

Aya and Miho respond simultaneously (lines 2–3). While Aya produces an elongated interjection *o:~::~:-* to show that she received the assessment and is considering it, Miho laughs and calls Hitomi out as if to reproach her. Even though neither of her co-participants explicitly expressed agreement with the assessment, Hitomi evidently understood their responses as affiliating, as she proceeds to elaborate on her assessment, using the evaluative adjectival predicate *yabai* (here similar to the English colloquial terms, such as ‘is insane/crazy’) followed by the interactional particle *yone*,¹⁰⁴ which is commonly used when making assessments to convey the speaker’s expectation that the co-participants will agree with their assessment (see Subchapter 4.8). By comparing Ryū to a papa, Hitomi can be viewed as making fun of him, as that probably is not the stereotypical quality that young women look for in men. Aya’s subsequent assessment and the other participants’ responses to it, however, makes it clear that

¹⁰⁴ *Yone* can either be regarded as a complex particle or as two independent particles (*yo* and *ne*) produced side by side. Since the combination appears to be used in specific sequential environments to accomplish specific tasks, I prefer to view it as a single unit.

they actually do not make fun of him but rather like him and find his papa-like quality cute (lines 5–7).

In his study, Sugiura (2017) focuses specifically on the use of negatively formatted reverse polarity questions in responses to initial assessments and observes that in this particular sequential environment, they are deployed to “convey the speaker’s alternative view to the prior speaker’s assessment by appealing to the participants’ common sense or knowledge, while they index symmetrical epistemic access to a particular assessable relative to the prior speaker” (Sugiura 2017:295). By using this format, the speaker shows disaffiliation with the prior speaker but, at the same time, invites them to express their agreement with the new assessment expressed through the reversed polarity question. The following excerpt illustrates this use. It features two friends, whom I call Tomoko and Mami, talking about a man that they met at a party. Prior to what is represented in the transcript, they “attended to a large bag [full of books and lists] that [the] man brought to the party and wondered in a contemptuous tone why he had brought the bag to the party” (Sugiura 2017:298). While Mami uses direct speech construction to enact her thoughts and display a somewhat contemptuous attitude towards the men (line 3), Tomoko makes use of the reversed polarity question to shift their focus from his behaviour to his appearance, proffer her assessment, and make Tomoko’s response to her assessment in the next turn conditionally relevant (lines 4–5).

- (7.38) 1 M: *nanka ne::,*
Like, you know,
- 2 T: *hon toka.*
Things like the books.
- 3 M: *kawatta hito da na:: to omotte.*
I thought like, “What a strange person!”.
- 4 T: *nanka ikken mitame wa sa,*
Like, at first glance,
- 5 *ichiban (.) futsūppokunai?*
most is.not.ordinary
doesn't he look most ordinary of all?
- 6 M: *n- e: [sō] kana::..*
Yeah, hmm, does he?
- 7 T: *[sō.]*
I think he does.

(Sugiura 2017:299)

Even though the negatively formatted reverse polarity question form is said to heavily rely on its prosodic realization, it is also used in written form of technically mediated communication. For example, (7.39) appeared in a post together with a photo of the writer holding a huge ice cream cone. (7.40) appeared as a comment on a video that one of the writer’s friends shared. (7.41) appeared as a comment on a post featuring a picture of the status updater holding an oversized knife and joking that he finally found the knife that he has been looking for.

- (7.39) : これ、まじやばくない？
 kore, maji yabakunai?
 this seriously is.not.insane
Isn't this insane?!
- (7.40) : 何この人！！歌うますぎない？！
 nani kono hito!! uta umasuginai?!
 what this person song is.not.too.skilled
Wow! Isn't this person too good at singing?!
- (7.41) : いや、でかすぎないそれ？🐱
 iya, dekasuginai sore?
 well is.not.too.big that
Hmm, isn't that too big?

4.7.4 Syntactically incomplete utterance formats

Syntactically incomplete utterances in Japanese conversational interactions frequently function as pragmatically complete turns whose format was purposefully chosen with a view to help participants deal with specific interactional and interpersonal concerns, including construction of affective stance displays. Traditionally, grammatically incomplete turns in Japanese have been referred to as elliptical utterances. Certain types of utterances that involve clausal ellipsis have also been approached as suspended clauses, suspended clause constructions (e.g., Ohori 1995, 1997), or as utterances that end in dangling connectives or conjunctive particles (e.g., Maynard 2005b; Haugh 2008; Matsumoto 2018). Ohori (1995:201) defines suspended clauses as “clauses that bear markers for subordination (or more broadly interclausal dependency) and yet are not accompanied by main clauses” and are not treated as problematic or incomplete. Defined in this way, suspended clause constructions may end in a range of elements, such as the conditionals *-ba* and *-tara*, the connective expressions *kara*, *kedo*, *noni*, *shi*, the clause-linking *-te* form, the quotative complementizers *toiu*, *teyūka*, etc.

While their pragmatic effects depend on their realization in the context of particular actions and activities which they co-construct, suspended clause constructions generally appear to serve certain affective-stance-display-related functions. Ohori (1997:473) observes that suspended clause constructions “are not mere declarative utterances, but carry directive and expressive functions, for example calling for sympathy, giving directions, or expressing emotion”. Some of them have developed highly idiomatic uses. For example, suspended clause constructions that end in conditionals *-ba* and *-tara* are conventionally used to accomplish actions such as giving advice or suggestions (e.g., *Yamereba?* ‘Why don’t you quit?’), while utterances ending in the *-te* form of verbs may function as imperative constructions used to make requests that are hearable as direct but softer than those conveyed by means of the imperative forms of verbs (e.g., *Kiite!* ‘Listen!’). Other constructions may be employed to routinely construct specific types of affective stance displays. For example, suspended clause constructions that involve the concessive connective expression *noni* ‘even though’ are regularly used to co-construct displays of affective stances such as regret, disappointment, and sadness. The effect of open-endedness, indeterminateness, and indirectness that suspended clause constructions may give rise to in their context of occurrence is also routinely exploited by speakers for the purpose of politeness and affiliation management.

For example, when used as a clause-linking element, the *-te* form of verbs and adjectives (also called the gerundive form, connective form, conjunctive form, participial form, etc.) “exhibits an extreme degree of semantic unspecificness” (Hasegawa 1996:768), as it can convey temporal chronology, causal relations, contrast, manner, circumstances, etc. In conversational interactions, verbs and adjectives in this form commonly occur turn-finally both as part of turn-constructive units that serve as post-expansions of turn-constructive units that comprise their corresponding ‘main clauses’ and as part of suspended clause constructions that function as independent turn-constructive units. Okamoto (1985:203–204) notices the use of utterance-final *-te* form in affective-stance-expressive predicates and observes that it may be used to augment “the emotionality of the utterance”, as it adds the utterances meanings, such as “I don’t know what to do”, “it’s unbearable”, or “I can’t help feeling this way”. Ohori (1997:476) suggests that the *-te* form “mainly has a reason reading in the suspended frame”. Maynard (1989:38) contends that the utterance-final *-te* form is “used not to indicate the continuation of talk but primarily to soften the statement by leaving the propositional content with a feeling of incompleteness”. Utterances ending in *-te* form occur in several excerpts throughout this thesis. Consider, for example, the use of utterance-final *-te* form in excerpts (2.8) and (2.9) in Subchapter 4.2.

Based on their frequent occurrence and the manner in which they are employed and dealt with in everyday conversational interactions, it is apparent that different types of suspended clause constructions are in the process of gaining the status of independent clause constructions. Put differently, their clause-final elements, which used to be regarded as textual markers of subordination or clausal dependency, appear to be undergoing the process of recategorization into the utterance-final elements, which – if not yet always formally, then at least functionally – are comparable to interactional particles that serve the purpose of stance-taking and stance-negotiation (see, e.g., Ohori 1997; Haugh 2008; McGloin and Konishi 2010; Ono, Thompson, and Sasaki 2012; Izutsu and Narita Izutsu 2013; Narita Izutsu and Izutsu 2014).¹⁰⁵ *Kara* ‘because’ and *kedo* ‘but’ rank among the connective expressions that occur in the utterance-final position most frequently. Unlike older forms that are used in this position, “the interactional work they perform”, as Ono, Thompson, and Sasaki (2012:255) point out, is shaped by “their lexical meanings [which] persist”.

Kara has not yet grammaticized to an interactional particle to the same degree as *kedo*, and so it clearly retains the implication of a result (e.g., Higashiizumi 2011; Ono, Thompson, and Sasaki 2012). It is commonly employed when offering justifications or accounts for one’s actions or positions, which may only be implied. Mori (1999), for example, found that speakers use *kara*-marked clauses in agreeing turns to provide elaboration through which they convey their weak or partial agreement and in disagreeing turns to provide accounts rather than to explicitly assert their disagreement. Ohori (1997:474) notes that *kara*-marked clauses may be produced for the purpose of “giving justification to the speaker’s emotional commitment to whatever s/he is facing”. In the following excerpt, we can observe two uses of *kara*-marked clauses. The segment features Takuya and Shōta recalling a trip that they took together with two other friends. During the trip, it seems that Suzuki, one of their friends, somehow ended up paying for much of their common expenses. They both find the fact very amusing, as we can see from their smiling and laughter. However, Shōta also evidently feels sorry for Suzuki, which he conveys in his *kara*-marked assertion in lines 15–17 as well as by means of the *kara*-marked explicit assessment that he produces in line 19. The *kara*-marked utterance shown in line 19 ties back to his assertion shown in lines 15–17 and provides a justification for the assertion by explicitly stating how he feels about their friend. On the other hand, the *kara*-clause in line 16

¹⁰⁵ Izutsu and Narita Izutsu (2013) and Narita Izutsu and Izutsu (2014) report on the utterance-final use of coordinating conjunctions in several Japanese dialects, including *demo* ‘but’ in Tokyo (‘Standard’) Japanese, *soshite* ‘and’ in Hokkaidō dialect, *hoide* ‘and’ in Hiroshima dialect, and *shikashi* ‘but’ in Ōsaka dialect. They argue that in utterance-final position they have acquired new discourse-pragmatic (inter)subjective meanings, such as a display of surprise, irritation, dissatisfaction, or emphasis.

does not link to any earlier utterance but may be viewed as constructing a condition under which Suzuki and others will agree to go on a trip together again, which Shōta thereby marks as an activity that he desires.

- (7.42) 1 T: <<:-)> kono mae suzuki ga,>
Last time, Suzuki,
- 2 S: nani?
What?
- 3 T: <<:-)> suzuki dake son shiteru.>
only Suzuki made a loss.
- 4 S: heheha [haha hhh
- 5 T: [<<:-)> aru imi de.>
In a way.
- 6 S: <<laughing> owatta ne.>
He did, didn't he?
- 7 T: hhh
- 8 S: <<:-)> son shita ne.>
He made a loss, didn't he?
- 9 T: <<:-)> aitsu dake.>
Only he did.
- 10 (1.4)
- 11 T: hh <<:-)> muyami ni kōsokudai=
He ended up paying for the expressway toll,
- 12 [= (.) gasorindai (.) (xxxxxx) harattete,>]
the gas, ().
- 13 S: [hhh hh hehaha haha ha a a a] [a a a]
- 14 T: [<<:-)> sugē jan.>]
Just wow!
- 15 S: <<:-)> tsugi ore- ore dasu.>
Next time I, I'll pay.
- 16 hh <<:-)> tsugi ore dasu kara.
next.time I give because
Next time I'll pay.
- 17 zettai.>
Definitely.
- 18 (1.0)
- 19 S: <<:-)> suzuki mo kawaisō da kara.>
Suzuki also pitiable COP because
I feel sorry for Suzuki.

At present, *kedo* functions not only as a connective particle but also as an interactional (pragmatic, utterance-final) particle that conveys the speaker’s non-committal stance (see, e.g., Suzuki 1990; Mori 1999; Ono, Thompson, and Sasaki 2012). It is often used by speakers when expressing opinions, making assessments, and putting forward suggestions. For example, in the preceding section in excerpt (7.37), we observed Aya make a *kedo*-marked second assessment (reproduced below as (7.43) for the sake of convenience) that conveyed a certain degree of disagreement with Hitomi’s initial assessment by pointing out a different perspective to the evaluation. However, by using the utterance-final particle *kedo*, Aya softens the force of her claim, whereby she avoids being heard as disaffiliating. This use is fully congruent with Mori’s (1999:202) findings regarding the use of *kedo*-marked clauses in disagreements, as she concludes that the particle *kedo* in this context “mitigates the disaffiliative force while creating an inference of unstated partial agreement”.

(7.43) A: =sotchi mo kawaii n da [kedo-
 that also is.cute NML COP but
That’s also cute [in its own way], though.

Similarly, in the following excerpt from the phone call of Akira and Naoki, we can see Naoki use the utterance-final *kedo* in his non-affiliative (but also not disaffiliative) response to Akira’s assessment (line 2). In line 5, we can also observe Akira make a *kedo*-marked clause in order to qualify his preceding assessment by implying that the woman was cute but not cute enough for him to remember her name. This stance display is subsequently jokingly criticised by Naoki, who employs the interjection *mattaku*, which developed from the degree adverb *mattaku* ‘completely’ (see Tanno 2018), to convey his negative affective stance.

(7.44) 1 A: kawaii onna no ko datta yone nanka.
It was a cute girl, right?

2 N: hh sore wa wakaranai kedo. hh
 that TOP don’t.know but
That I wouldn’t know.

3 A: ore n toki wa.
When I was there.

4 N: a sō na no.
Oh, really.

5 A: namae wasurechatta kedo.

- name forgot but
I forgot her name, though.
- 6 un.
Yeah.
- 7 N: (.) <<:-) mattaku ne:,> hh
Geez, come on.
- 8 A: shindī toka sonna namae datta.
I think it was Sidney or a name like that.
- 9 N: hhh hh

(CallFriend JPN6166)

Another connective expression that seems to have been undergoing a functional change into an interactional particle is *shi*. Nowadays, it is used not only as a coordinative and causal connective expression (roughly equivalent to the English ‘and’ and ‘and so’) but also as an utterance-final pragmatic marker. Earlier studies have noticed that it might be used as a softening device that mitigates the force of the utterance that it attaches to. For example, Maynard (2005b:326–327) observes that it is used to “make an utterance sound soft” and, therefore, “more accommodating to the partners feelings”. Ohori (1997:475) found that it may be used to solicit the co-participant’s “sympathy for what the speaker would assert in the given context”. However, I found it being used mainly in utterances that convey the speaker’s negative affective stances in the context of turns that implement actions, such as both serious and non-serious criticism, complaining, or blaming, teasing, etc. Importantly, the turns in which the utterance-final *shi* occurs generally seem to involve also other resources that are conventionally used for affective stance display purposes, such as evaluative predicates, interjections, and intensifiers, which then jointly construct the pragmatic effect of the given utterances being hearable as affectively loaded. This use is illustrated in the following examples. (7.45) occurred when the speaker was complaining about her job, while (7.46) appeared as part of a series of tweets that the writer posted as she was travelling to an event.

- (7.45) mō ya da shi.
 INT is.detestable IP
I can’t deal with it anymore.

- (7.46) すごい人が乗ってきてマジきまづいし。
 sugoi hito ga notte kite maji kimadzui shi.
 extreme people SBJ got.on seriously unpleasant IP
So many people got on, it’s seriously unpleasant.

My observations are, therefore, congruent with those of McGloin and Konishi (2010:567), who suggest that the utterance-final *shi* “encodes the speaker’s emotional stance toward the proposition or toward what [the speaker] has just noticed at the discourse site”, while “[t]he emotional stance” it conveys “is overwhelmingly a negative one”. More specifically, the authors distinguish three sub-functions of the utterance-final particle *shi*, namely “emotional emphasis”, “display of negative sentiment”, and “enactment of complaining/teasing tone”. Over time of repeated use, the particle thus seems to have developed a negative overtone and when coupled with other resources, it may be employed to co-construct displays of affective stances such as dislike, disgust, contempt, frustration, irritation, worry, etc. McGloin and Konishi (2010) use to following excerpt to exemplify the “emotional emphasis” function of the utterance-final *shi*. The excerpt features three friends in a restaurant. In lines 3–4, we can observe Aki produce a negative assessment of her food, stating that it is extremely lukewarm and punctuating her assessment with the utterance-final *shi*. Her turn is further designed as comprising non-predicate-final constituent order, which adds to the affective stance display (see Section 4.7.1.2). In utterances such as this, which involve “predicates expressing the speaker’s feeling or subjective evaluation”, the interactional particle *shi* can be said to have “the effect of adding emphasis to this feeling or evaluation” (McGloin and Konishi 2010:567).

- (7.47) 1 ((long pause))
- 2 I: a? atsui.
 Wow, it's hot.
- 3 A: metcha nurui shi,
 extremely is.lukewarm IP
 That's like extremely lukewarm,
- 4 kore.
 this
 this thing.
- 5 I,N: honto?
 Really?
- 6 A: atsuatsuppoi?
 Is yours like really really hot?

(McGloin and Konishi 2010:567)

Utterances that involve ellipsis proper also commonly serve affective-stance-display-related purposes. For example, turns designed as short elliptical questions or answers can co-construct various affective stance displays, such as impatience or irritation as well as excitement, curiosity, or surprise, depending on their context of occurrence, manner of realization, as well

as content. In her seminal study of ellipsis in Japanese, Okamoto (1988:181–186) discusses the use of verbal and clausal ellipsis for the purpose of intensification of affective speech acts, such as apology, condolence, and thanking, by mitigating the force of assertions or requests. The author argues that the elliptical – that is, the ‘imperfect’ or ‘incomplete’ – form of utterances appears to convey more sincere affective stances than the syntactically complete form and, as such, often appears to be more effective and polite. She also focuses specifically on elliptical utterances that are used to express affective stances (Okamoto 1985:201–205). She comments on the frequent use of elliptical utterances to express the speaker’s surprise, anger, or gratitude, and again suggests that the reason why syntactically incomplete utterances constitute an effective resource for communicating these affective stances as genuine and intense is precisely their form, which implies that the speaker is too shocked or too upset “to compose a ‘full’ sentence” or that their affective stance is such that it cannot be expressed verbally. I am inclined to agree with this explanation and in Section 4.7.1.1, I suggested that this effect of an ‘ill-formed’ utterance might also play a role in the workings of the non-predicate-final utterance constructions.

4.8 Utterance-final elements

In Japanese, the utterance-final position represents the key locus for the expression of elements that serve the main purpose of co-constructing displays of the speaker’s stances. In addition to copulas and verbal and adjectival affixes, utterance-final elements also include interactional particles, quotative markers, tag-like elements, hedging expressions, nominalizers, evidential markers, and other modal markers. All these forms contribute to the construction of affective stance displays in various ways depending on their context of occurrence. They are also crucial for other interactional tasks, such as the management of turn-taking and affiliation. According to Kindaichi (1957:170, quoted in Martin 1975:914), “the speaker of Japanese hates to let a sentence end on a note of finality” and studies on turn-taking in Japanese conversational interactions overall support this claim, confirming that the imminent turn completion is massively signalled by the above-mentioned utterance-final elements (see Tanaka 1999).¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ Turns that do not end in utterance-final elements are also common. They represent what Tanaka (1999) refers to as the *ikiri* ‘truncated’ format and instead of the utterance-final elements they seem to involve “a variety of relatively intense prosodic features on the terminal item(s) of the turn” (H. Tanaka 2004:64). They occur in a wide range of contexts and can also contribute to the construction of affective stance displays. For example, the sense of abruptness that this turn format may connote is used in displays of sudden and powerful emotions, such as anger and surprise. The implication of the apparent lack of consideration for the co-participant, which may arise from the non-use of utterance-final elements, may be harnessed for the purpose of manifesting closeness and solidarity

In this subchapter, I wish to focus on the category of utterance-final elements that I refer to as ‘interactional particles’.¹⁰⁷ Other labels that the expressions included in this category are also commonly given include ‘(sentence/utterance-)final particles’¹⁰⁸ and ‘pragmatic particles’. They do not contribute to the grammatical structure of an utterance and do not affect its truth-conditional value but are used to deal with various subjective, interactional, and interpersonal concerns. The central members of the category are simple forms, such as *ne*, *na*, *yo*, *sa*, *no*, *wa*, *zo*, *ze*, *ya*, as well as forms that are composed of different particles, such as *yone*, *kana*, and *kayo*. The category is, however, relatively accepting of new members. For example, as discussed in Section 4.7.4, certain conjunctive particles, such as *kedo*, *shi*, *noni*, and *kara*, appear to be in different stages of the process of developing into the utterance-final interactional particles. In Section 4.4.2, we observed the use of first- and second-person pronominal forms in the post-predicate position that strongly resembles that of interactional particles. In this section, we will further notice the interactional-particle-like utterance-final uses of the formal noun *mon(o)*, the abbreviated form of a tag-like expression *jan*, the abbreviated form of an epistemic stance marker *kamo*, and several quotative markers.

Interactional particles are pervasive in Japanese everyday conversational interactions and represent resources that are of key significance for the interpretation and progression of talk as well as for the participants’ management of their relationships and identities. The use of interactional particles appears to be closely connected with the use of both verbal and non-verbal response tokens, the so-called *aizuchi* (see, e.g., Kogure 2007). Together, they arguably represent the most prominent resources that make Japanese manner of engagement in pro-social conversational interactions come across as highly involved. Interactional particles have attracted a great deal of scholarly attention and have been approached from a variety of perspectives (see, e.g., Ogi 2017). Many scholars have tried to provide an account of the workings of the individual particles and elucidate their use. However, little consensus yet exists on what exactly it is that they do in and across different contexts and how they can be studied and described.

when talking with friends, but also for the purpose of constructing negative affective stance displays, such as indifference, dislike, contempt, or antipathy, when engaged in an argument. Discussing the effect of the copula *da*, Maynard (1999b:227) notices that it “brings to its discourse the effect of conclusive assertion – the speaker’s intentional, conclusive, and assertive attitude toward his or her own verbal performance”.

¹⁰⁷ The term is used, for example, by Maynard (1993 and elsewhere) and Morita (2005 and elsewhere).

¹⁰⁸ Certain interactional particles, notably *ne* and *sa*, also occur at the end of phrasal and clausal turn-constructive units, in which case they have traditionally been referred to as ‘interjective (interjectional or insertion) particles’. However, the practice of making the distinction between ‘utterance-final particles’ and ‘interjective particles’ has also been criticized (see, e.g., Morita 2005).

The particles have often been discussed as serving the purpose of indexing the speaker's affective stances. Martin (1975:914), for example, suggests that they "add a personal touch to what one is saying" and "impart some additional hint of the speaker's attitude toward" the content of their speech, while Maynard (1997:87) argues that "Japanese provides these particles so that the speaker and listener may communicate with each other in an emotional and empathy-creating way". At the same time, they have also been approached as markers of the speaker's epistemic stances and discussed in relation to issues such as epistemic access, epistemic rights, authority, the territory of information, or information state and processing. Other topics that have repeatedly been brought up in studies focusing on these particles include illocutionary force, speech style, turn-taking and communication management, the negotiation of social identities and interpersonal relations, politeness, gender, social status, etc. Suzuki (1990), for example, claims that "[t]hese particles, interacting with other linguistic and non-linguistic cues, convey the speaker's attitudes towards their utterances" (322), "index the speaker's affective and epistemological stance toward the statement he or she is making" (315), and "play an important role in negotiating the participants' social distance as well as their stance differences" (323).

Lee (2007) and Ogi (2017) propose to view interactional particles from the perspective of 'involvement' (see Subchapter 2.3) as signalling the speaker's attitude to invite the co-participant's involvement either in an incorporative manner or in a monopolistic manner.¹⁰⁹ Incorporative markers signal "the speaker's attitude of inviting the partner's involvement through which he/she is committed to align with the partner with respect to the content and feeling conveyed in the utterance", whereas monopolistic markers signal "the speaker's attitude of inviting the partner's involvement through which he/she is committed to enhance his/her position as the deliverer of the utterance content and feeling toward the partner" (Lee 2007:364). Consequently, it is said to be "this function of inviting the partner's involvement [that] drives certain effects that influence the force or tone of the utterance" (ibid.). While Lee (2007) specifically considers only two particles, *ne* and *yo*, Ogi (2017) applies the framework to a wider range of particles (or 'interactive markers' in her terminology) and discusses *ne* and *na* as incorporative markers and *yo*, *sa*, *wa*, *zo*, and *ze* as monopolistic markers. Overall, she suggests that interactional particles "express the speaker's 'more-than-normal' or 'marked' interactional attitude towards the hearer" (Ogi 2017:53–54).

¹⁰⁹ Referring to the distinction drawn by Arndt and Janney (1987) between 'emotional involvement' and 'interpersonal involvement' (see Subchapter 2.7), Lee (2007) suggests that interactional particles are more closely related to the latter.

The heretofore proposed explanations of the workings of individual particles are highly variegated and, at times, even at least seemingly contradictory. Studies of the actual use of the particles in naturalistic data convincingly show that the particles may, in fact, serve different functions, depending on their phonetic-prosodic realization, their sequential position, and the actions and activities in which they are embedded. Accordingly, the more interactionally oriented studies now often criticise the practice of approaching the individual particles as discrete single-meaning affective and/or epistemic stance markers that directly index specific psychological or cognitive states and offer the speaker's meta-commentary on the units of talk to which they are appended. Morita (2015), for example, argues that the particles should rather be viewed as content-independent resources that are employed by the participants in interaction for the purpose of dynamic "stance building display", which involves the moment-to-moment negotiation of and communication about the participants' respective positioning within the ever-changing context of the developing talk and the participation framework. Consequently, she maintains, it is only from their deployment in particular interactional contexts in coordination with other verbal, vocal, and visual elements that their stance-meanings become interpretable and a variety of affective and epistemic hearings, which may further be linked to such notions as affect or evidentiality, are evoked.

In what follows, I concentrate on several interactional particles with a view to illustrating some of the ways in which this category of utterance-final elements may be mobilized and made use of for affective-stance-display-related purposes. Without going into details, I always briefly introduce some of the most often adopted explanations of their core workings and then consider excerpts that involve actual instances of their use. Throughout this section, it must be kept in mind that it is not just by appending a particle to the end of an utterance that the speaker conveys an affective stance of a certain type. As pointed out above, interactional particles can serve different functions in different context and so their effects, as Morita (2015) also stresses, are fully interpretable only in their context of occurrence and when viewed as working in coordination with other resources. The particles should thus be viewed as both context-sensitive (in that their situated meanings and functions are particularized in specific contexts of their use) and context-co-creating (in that they co-construct the context for the interpretation of other resources as well as larger spates of talk).

The particle *ne* represents one of the most used and studied interactional particles. It occurs in a wide variety of contexts and can be realized with different phonetic-prosodic qualities, including substantial elongation. The descriptions of its use frequently revolve around notions such as sharedness, rapport, mutual understanding, involvement, empathy, and

harmony. Minegishi Cook (1990:42), for example, famously describes the particle as a tool for cooperation that “indicates affective common ground between the speaker and the addressee”, marks and advances intimate relationship between them, and “indirectly indexes various conversational functions that require the addressee’s cooperation” (Minegishi Cook 1992:507). It has been explained as a marker of empathy and shared feelings and emotions that can be used to signal as well as to solicit agreement, approval, or confirmation (e.g., Suzuki 1990; Maynard 1993, 1997, 2005b). From a more cognitively oriented or information-centred perspective, it has often been described as a marker of shared (access to) information or knowledge about a referent (e.g., Kamio 1997; Hayano 2013; Yokomori, Yasui, and Hajikano 2018).

The particle has further been described as signalling the speaker’s assumption, desire, and/or expectation that their co-participant will understand and readily accept the contents and affective stances that their utterance conveys (e.g., Lee 2007; Saigo 2011; Ogi 2017). Morita (2005, 2012a, 2015) approaches the particle as an interactional resource for participants to overtly draw attention to what she calls ‘alignment’ as a relevant concern at the given moment in interaction. More specifically, she views the particle as creating spaces for the negotiation of interactive alignment by marking the given units of talk as ‘alignable’ and in need of the participants’ joint attention.¹¹⁰ In addition, the particle *ne* has also been explained as a turn-management device that – depending on its position and composition – accomplishes a wide range of interactional as well as social actions, such as the creation and invitation of affiliation (e.g., Tanaka 2000). By contrast, when deployed as a self-confirmation marker in certain contexts, the particle may also be hearable as impolite and as signalling the speaker’s detachment (Endo Hudson 2018).

In example (8.1) below, we can observe the use of the particle *ne* in an assessment sequence both in the sequence initiating and in the responding turn. The participants share their positive assessment with regards the referent and the particle clearly serves as a resource that helps them accomplish affiliation. Tomoko issues the first assessment and finishes her turn with the particle *ne* produced with a rising pitch contour. Thereby, she invites Nanae to take up the next turn and, simultaneously, expresses her expectation that Nanae will agree with her and that

¹¹⁰ Morita (e.g., 2005, 2012a, 2015) does not use the term ‘alignment’ in the same way as it is currently used in CA (see Subchapter 3.2). For Morita (2005:97), “[i]n the large sense, *alignment* refers to the accomplished work of co-participants in displaying that all present parties are participating in or building a framework to include both themselves and each other in the same interactional activity”. Referring to the distinction drawn in CA between structural alignment and interpersonal affiliation, Morita (2012a:305) explains that the particle *ne* can be used to explicitly mark alignment as an interactionally relevant concern at the given moment in talk, but “it can also become a resource for displaying interpersonal affiliation when the building of an aligned participation framework itself becomes the agenda of the ongoing activity”.

the affective stance that she conveys through her utterance will be shared by her friend as well. In response, Nanae communicates her agreement with the assessment, using the elongated variant of the particle. In both turns, the particle cannot be dropped without changing the nuances conveyed. Tomoko's utterance would come across as an assertion, while Nanae's utterance would be hearable as a confirmation of the accurateness of Tomoko's statement. By using the particle, they are able to signal their intention to be friendly, create rapport, and achieve affiliation.

- (8.1) 1 T: demo: are tte sugoi ne,
 but that TOP is.impressive IP
But that's impressive, right?
- 2 N: un sō ne:.
 yes so IP
Yeah, it is, isn't it?'

The following excerpt comes from a conversation between Yuki and Kazuko. They are badmouthing a woman that they both know. They criticise and ridicule her, pointing out, for example, that she likes to pretend to read. In the sequence of talk from which the following segment was excerpted, Kazuko tells Yuki that the other day the woman bought the same book as she did and was pretending to be reading it. Lines 1–3 represent the final part of her telling. In response to the telling, Yuki produces the turn shown in line 4. It represents an assessment and consists of the expressive nominal predicate *baka da* 'is stupid', produced with emphatic gemination (see Section 4.1.1), and the emphatically elongated interactional particle *ne*. The particle *ne* clearly helps her to construct her turn as communicating an affective stance that fully matches Kazuko's prior affective stance display. It helps her achieve affiliation and create a strong sense of rapport and engagement.

- (8.2) 1 K: zenzen pēji mekuttенаide sa:,
She didn't turn the pages of the book at all,
- 2 nanka mek- n n: (XXXX) sugu nechau n da yone a- ano ko ne, hh
and like, she () falls asleep immediately, that girl, right?
- 3 moji o mireba nechau mitai de <<laughing> sa:,>
It's like the moment she sees letters, she just falls asleep.
- 4 Y: <<len> bakka da ne:::,>
 stupid COP IP
What a fool, right?

5 K: sore de nanka,
And then, like,
 ((the sequence continues))

(CallFriend JPN6688)

Excerpt (8.3) comes from the same conversation as the one presented above. It illustrates not only the use of the particle *ne* but also *yo*. The segment represents an assessment sequence. In line 1, we can observe Kazuko make an assessment formatted as a non-predicate-final utterance construction that conveys her negative affective stance towards the person that they are talking about.

- (8.3) 1 K: chotto are wa: (.) chotto hōpuresu da yo: hontō.
 a.bit that TOP a.bit hopeless COP IP really
It's a bit, a bit hopeless, really.
- 2 Y: hōpuresu da yo[:-=
 hopeless COP IP
It's hopeless.
- 3 K: [n:.
Mm.
- 4 Y: =nanka minikui tteyūka <<laughing> ne mō::.>
 like hard.to.look.at DM IP INT
Like, it's hard to look at, right?
- 5 K: n:::
Mmmm.

(CallFriend JPN6688)

Kazuko marks her assessment in line 1 with the particle *yo* and uses both the downtoning expression *chotto* ‘a bit’ and the intensifier *hontō* ‘really’. In her response, Yuki produces a second assessment using the same predicate as Kazuko did and marking her assessment with *yo* as well (line 2). In this way, Yuki is able to claim her unequivocal agreement with Kazuko, but also her epistemic access to the assessable and hence construct her assessment as made independently of her friend based on her own prior knowledge (cf. Hayano 2011). Furthermore, Yuki does not use any intensity modulating expressions. This makes her assessment come across as very direct, which, in turn, contributes to her affective stance display. In line 4, we can then observe Yuki elaborate on the assessment by proposing another assessment term as more accurate. She uses the expression *tteyūka* (see Section 4.6) to emphasize that she is modifying their initial assessment and marks her turn-constructural unit with the particle *ne* to invite Kazuko to affiliate with her in the next turn (line 4).

The interactional particle *na* has received considerably less scholarly attention than *ne*. It has repeatedly been described as closely related to *ne* but restricted to the speech of men and/or making the utterance that it is attached to come across as rather crude (e.g., McGloin 1990; L. Tanaka 2004; Ogi 2017). My observations, however, are congruent with those of Miyazaki (2002) who points out that there are two types of *na* that can be distinguished. One of them is similar to *ne* in its use but – compared to *ne* when used in the same types of interactional contexts – connotes a sense of roughness. The other is essentially monologic in nature and is commonly used regardless of the speaker’s gender. It is the latter *na* that I will focus on here, as it can frequently be encountered in utterances that quite overtly express the speaker’s affective stances. It marks the unit of talk that it is attached to as communicating “the speaker’s subjective judgement in the ‘here and now’” (Shinoda 2013:150). It “generally lacks interactivity and expresses the speaker’s emotion [...] without expecting the hearer’s response” (Hasegawa 2010b:23). The utterances that the particle *na* is a part of typically come across as exclamatory and strongly affectively loaded. In the data that I studied, most instances of *na* appeared in direct speech constructions in enactments of the speaker’s thoughts (see Section 4.7.2). In correspondence with the iconic principle of quantity, the elongated variant of the particle seems to be used to convey a greater intensity of the affective stances that are being constructed in the given turn than the one-mora-long variant (cf. Shinoda 2013:155).

Both *ne* and *na* commonly co-occur with the evaluative adjectival predicate *ii* ‘to be good’ to form exclamatory utterances that function as assessments (i.e., *Ii ne!*, *Ii na!*). The following example, which represents a Facebook comment, neatly illustrates the difference in the affective stances that the two particles can be employed to display in this context. The comment was posted in response to a status update in which a young father posted a photograph of his sleeping baby accompanied by a short text in which he recounts about seeing his child after being away from home for a while and realizing that she now sleeps without waking up for the whole night. The comment presented below was written by a female friend of the status updater. We can observe her exploit the affordances of the Japanese grammar, as she produces a strongly affiliating response *Ii ne!* ‘[That’s] so good, isn’t it?’ first, but subsequently includes the exclamation in a comparative construction, through which she admits that it is not really *Ii ne!* that she feels but the *Ii ne!* of the *Ii na*: ‘[That’s] so good [I wish my baby was like that, too]’ kind. Thereby, she effectively conveys that she feels happy for him, but also feels envious of him. *Ii ne!* by itself would have conveyed a sense of shared affective stance and her agreement with his implied assessment. *Ii na*., on the other hand, allows the speaker to convey her affective stance towards the situation as experienced by her in the here-and-now. It allows

her to construct her independent assessment of the assessable as if in her head just for herself without presuming that it will be shared by her co-participant.

- (8.4) イイね! というより 「いいなあ…」 のイイね! (笑)
 ii ne! toiuyori "ii naa:..." no ii ne! (wara)
 is.good IP rather.than is.good IP GEN is.good IP (laugh)
Rather than 'ii ne!' [that's great, isn't it?] I feel it's more like the 'ii ne!' of the 'ii na:...' [that's great, but I envy you] kind :D

(Zawiszová 2016:41)

In (8.5), we can observe Sakura communicate how impressed she is with Mai's university. Mai describes how big the school is in a way that demonstrates how impressed she is with it. Line 2 in the transcript represents Sakura's response to Mai's informing that is not shown in the transcript, but it contributes to her affective stance display which she builds over multiple turns. The exclamation in line 2 implements an assessment and consists solely of the predicatively used evaluative adjective *sugoi* 'is impressive' produced with substantial vowel elongation. In line 4, Sakura then proffers another assessment, this time using a non-predicate-final utterance construction (see Section 4.7.1.1). She voices the most affectively loaded part of her evaluation (i.e., the evaluative predicate) first, marking it with the elongated particle *na*, and only then adds the topic phrase marked with *tte* (see Section 4.3.2) in the post-predicate position. In the topic phrase, she specifies the referent of her assessment and describes it using the evaluative adjective *dekai* 'huge', whose expressive value is further augmented by means of expressive gemination (see Section 4.1.1). By using *na* in her assessment, Sakura is able to construct an affective stance display that is hearable as a genuine expression of her thoughts. By means of the non-predicate-final utterance construction, she is able to display her affective stance which matches that of Mai at the earliest point possible, thereby expediting the accomplishment of affiliation.

- (8.5) 1 M: gak[kō hashitteru monorēru mo chanto medikaru tte iu eki ga=
 There even is a monorail station called Medical.
- 2 S: [sugo:::::i.
 is.impressive
 Wooooooow.
- 3 M: =aru shi sa.
 is PRT IP
- 4 S: hhh nanka ii na: sono dekkai daigaku tte.
 FIL is.good IP that huge university TOP
 I kind of like it, this huuuge university.

- 5 M: dekai yo: uchi wa:,
It's huge, our uni.
- 6 datte toshokan yattsu aru mon. [hhh
I mean, it has three libraries.
- 7 S: [hhhh

(CallFriend JPN1722)

The following excerpts exemplify the use of the particle *na* in direct speech constructions (see Section 4.7.2). They represent a very common practice which allows speakers to express their affective stances in a performative rather than descriptive manner. Since the *na*-marked units of talk are hearable as directly expressive of the speaker's thoughts, they serve as a highly effective means for affective stance display. In (8.6), we can see Yuji use the direct speech construction when explaining to Goro how he feels about Texas steaks. In (8.7), we can observe Keiko construct her negative affective stance towards her tiny room.

- (8.6) 1 Y: sōiu mono tabetai na: toka tte omotte,
 such thing want.to.eat IP something.like QUOT think/thought
I've been thinking something like, "I want to eat something like that!"
- 2 G: a::.
I see.

(CallFriend JPN6221)

- (8.7) 1 K: nanka atashi ne: asoko ni ne:,
I, like, in there, you know,
- 2 nanka kotatsu demo areba nanka mada ii na: to=
 FIL kotatsu or.something were FIL yet is.good IP QUOT
- 3 =omou n ya kedo:,
 think NML COP IP
If there at least were a kotatsu [= a table with a heater] I would have thought, "It's not that bad".
- 4 Y: a:::
Mmmm.
- 5 K: na::nnimo nai kara:: nanka (.) zenzen ne,
There's absolutely nothing, though, so, like,
- kutsuroge nai n.
there's no space to relax.

(CallFriend JPN6698)

The interactional particle *yo* has often been discussed in relation to epistemic stance, the participants' epistemic rights and access, their state of knowledge, or the territory of

information (e.g., Masuoka 1991; Maynard 1993, 1997; Kamio 1997; Katō 2001; Katagiri 2007; Hayano 2011, 2013). It has been viewed as a marker that conveys a sense of insistence, assertiveness, emphasis, strong conviction, authority, dominance (e.g., Cook 1988; Suzuki 1990; Kataoka 1995; Morita 2002; L. Tanaka 2004; Maynard 2005b), and the speaker’s monopolistic attitude of making sure that the co-participant understands the content and the affective stances conveyed in the utterance (Lee 2007; Ogi 2017). According to Lee (2007:382), the main concern of the speaker using *yo* is “to enhance the[ir] position [...] as the deliverer of contents and feeling conveyed in the utterance” and “to denote an implied message”. Minegishi Cook (1988:126) compares the particle to the gesture of pointing in that it is used to draw the co-participant’s attention to the content of the utterance. Maynard (2005b:291–292) notes that the particle is often used to directly appeal to the co-participant, make them focus on the given unit of talk, and signal the speaker’s “strong desire to reach the partner’s heart”. Matsui (2000:161) suggests that the particle “overtly encodes a guarantee of relevance” and effectively “guides the hearer to pay more attention to the informational content of the utterance” (Matsui 2000:169). Similarly, Morita (2012b:1726) proposes that the particle “explicitly marks that the current action or move needs to be interactionally registered as an instance of x [...] by explicitly creating a place for the recipient to display a response that appropriately completes the interaction, ratifying the original utterance as an instance of x” (cf. Saigo 2011:25).¹¹¹

The particle *yo*, for example, often occurs in turns through which speakers convey their negative affective stances, such as criticism, dislike, or disapproval. If the target of their negative affective stances is their co-participant, they also often at least implicitly ask them to do something about that which they are unhappy about. In Section 4.7.3, we noticed the use of *yo* and the complex particle *kayo* (which consists of the particles *ka* and *yo*) in question forms that are employed to communicate the speaker’s negative affective stances. This use is also exemplified by (8.8) and (8.9) below. (8.8) was produced as a (non-serious) rebuke of a friend who took out his camera and started to set it up in order to take a picture. Similarly, (8.9) was produced as a (non-serious) criticism of a friend who was fidgeting and almost knocked down a glass as he was trying to find a comfortable position when sitting on the floor in an izakaya. In both cases, the particle *yo* clearly contributes to the negative affective stance display that the turns convey. It draws the co-participant’s attention to the critical remark and makes it clear to

¹¹¹ The pragmatic effects of *yo* have been paraphrased as “I want you to know”, “Believe (you) me”, “I tell you”, “I’d say”, “Let me tell you” (Martin 1975:919), “Listen. I want to ensure that you understand what I say and how I feel”, and “I recognise you as my conversation partner and wish to continue the conversation with you” (Ogi 2017:137–138).

them that the speaker wants them not only to register what they are doing through the turn but also understand its affective implications.

(8.8) 1 N: omae koko de nani yatten da yo.
you here at what are.doing-NML COP IP
What the heck are you doing here?!

2 H: hhh hhh hh

(8.9) 1 A: nani shiten da yo.
what are.doing-NOM COP IP
What are you doing?

2 R: hh h

Example (8.10) includes the particle *yo* twice. Once at the end of an enactment that verbalizes the speaker's thoughts and once at the of the speaker's turn (line 1). In the turn, the speaker expresses his criticism of certain bookshops that charge for something that elsewhere is free of charge. The enactment consists of the *-te* form of the negative form of the verb *fuzakeru* 'to kid around', which is a verb form that conventionally functions as an informal direct negative request form, followed by the particle *yo*. Through the enactment, the speaker depicts a scene where he directly criticises and rebukes the bookshops. The particle *yo* thus co-constructs the strength of his speech act, augments the intensity of the affective stance that he displays, and helps him create an image of himself taking the position of a moral authority. The turn-final *yo* then marks the assessment that the turn produces. This *yo* appeals to the co-participant and helps the speaker convey his assessment as something that he insists on and that he wishes his co-participant to take notice of and understand.

(8.10) 1 I: fuzakenaide yo tteyū kanji da yo.
don't.kid.around IP QUOT feeling COP IP
It's like, "Are you kidding me?!"

2 K: hhh

3 I: kotchi tada de moratteru kara sa:.
here for.free are.getting because IP
Here you're getting it for free, so...

(CallFriend JPN4621)

The interactional particle *sa* has been described as "vigorous and ego-assertive" (Martin 1975:918), marking the speaker's assertive, insisting, even imposing or scornful stance (e.g.,

McGloin 1990; Suzuki 1990), effecting “a personal view on the information conveyed in the utterance” (Squires 1994:1), and signalling the speaker’s attitude towards the contents of the preceding utterance as natural, obvious, or a matter of course (e.g., Martin 1975; Suzuki 1990; Ogi 2017). In her detailed exploration of the workings of the particle, Morita (2005) further found that most units of talk that are marked with the particle are non-sentential fragments or non-lexical words in multi-unit turns. The particle at the end of such turn-constructive units emphasizes “the interactional salience of each element within a talk” and marks “each unit as something ‘not meant for negotiation at this point’” (Morita 2005:195). By using the particle in this way, the speaker is able to signal their wish to keep the floor and carry a given action to completion by temporarily closing down the potential space for interactional negotiation.

One type of action that the particle *sa* regularly helps construct is accounting for one’s actions or lack thereof. By using the particle, the speaker is able to construct the grounds for an action or lack of it as obvious or only natural and hence as embodying a reason that everyone can relate to, can empathize with, and can understand. The following fragment occurs in the course of Yukio and Asuka’s talk about Asuka’s healthy lifestyle. What is missing in her lifestyle, however, as Asuka readily admits, is exercise. Yukio, as shown in line 1, implies that he has a similar problem, to which Asuka responds with a multi-unit turn in which the first turn-constructive unit is marked with the particle *sa* (line 2). In her turn, Asuka constructs an account for not exercising. In the first turn-constructive unit, she explains that after coming back home from work she is tired and marks the utterance with the particle *sa* to suggest that this is something obvious and understandable and at the same time to signal that she wishes to continue holding the floor. In the second turn-constructive unit, she depicts a habitual scene from her life. She describes what regularly happens after she returns home, making use of the interjection *A:!* ‘Phew!’ to enact how tired she habitually feels. Yukio first responds with a tease, calling Asuka a ‘couch boy’ (line 6), but then assesses her behaviour as completely understandable (line 8), using the adverb *yappa* ‘as can be expected’ (see Section 4.1.2) and the formal noun *mon*, whose pragmatic effects can be rendered as “it is only natural (appropriate) that ...”, “it is in the nature of things that ...”, “it stands to reason that (naturally) ...”, etc. (Martin 1975:725; cf. Fujii 2000). Both thus help him construct his stance towards that which Asuka describes as natural and inevitable.

(8.11) 1 Y: nanka boku mo shigoto: owatte kara jimū toka ni ikeba ii.
Like, I should also go to a gym after work or something.

2 A: (.) demo nanka tsukaretechatte sa:,
 but FIL get.tired IP

But, like, I feel tired, you know,

3 Y: a: [<<laughing> sō.> hhhhh
Mm, I see.

4 A: [gohan tabete A: tte terebi no mae ni suwattara mō oshimai.=
After I eat, I'm like, "Phew!" and once I sit in front of the TV, that's it.

5 =hh

6 Y: <<:-)> kauchiboi.>
Couch boy!

7 A: hh hh hh

8 Y: <<:-)> yappa sonna mon ka.>
I guess this is only natural after all.

(CallFriend JPN0921)

The particles *zo* and *ze* have often been described as “forceful particles” (Martin 1975:922) that convey a sense of insistence, determination, emphasis, or coarse affective intensity (e.g., McGloin 1990; Ochs 1992; L. Tanaka 2004; Ogi 2017). According to Sho. Iwasaki (2013:326), *zo* conveys “strong assertion”, whereas *ze* is used to communicate “strong appeal”. Most instances of these two particles that I encountered in the data, were employed in direct speech constructions and in humour-oriented sequences. Even though *zo* and *ze* have been generally regarded as part of the stereotypically masculine speech style, I did not notice any gender-based differences in the frequency of their use. Both following examples come from a conversation between two female friends, Kana and Chikako. In (8.12), we can observe the use of the particle *zo* in direct speech construction through which Kana enacts her past thoughts. She uses the construction to explain why she is living on her own. By using the particle, Kana co-constructs her past stance of determination.

(8.12) 1 K: mō isshō ni ichido shika hitorigurashi wa dekinai zo,
INT lifetime once only living.by.oneself TOP can't IP
“This is the once in a lifetime opportunity to live on my own!”

2 tte iu koto de.
QUOT say thing PRT
I thought, so...

3 C: ne: shitai n da kedo sa:,
Right? I want to live on my own [too], but, you see,

4 K: un.
Mm.

5 C: tomuchan no ato o neratteru n da kedo,
I'll like to take over the place after Tom leaves, but

6 tomuchan n toko TAKAI n da yo:-
Tom's place is EXPENSIVE!

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Excerpt (8.13) represents a fragment of talk between Kana and Chikako during which Chikako brags about her academic success and expresses her self-satisfaction and happiness. Throughout the sequence, Chikako is playfully boastful, while Kana plays along. As one of the strategies that Chikako employs to construct her affective stance display, she makes use of direct speech and enacts her affective stances using interjections that are meant to be interpreted as enactments of her affective stances, as we can, for example, see in line 1 below. By using the particle *ze* in her self-praising comment in line 5, Chikako is able to further enhance the boastful tone of her utterance and thereby contribute both to the construction of her display of self-satisfaction and to the creation of humour.

- (8.13) 1 C: (.) <<f> yatta:::.>
 Yay!
- 2 K: yoshi yoshi.
 Good girl!
- 3 C: yoshi yoshi.
 Good girl!
- 4 K: junchō da ne,
 is.smooth IP
 All's going smoothly, right?
- 5 C: a: junchō da ze.
 INT is.smooth IP
 Yeah, all's going smoothly.
- 6 K: hh yokatta yokatta.
 That's good. That's good.

(CallFriend JPN1722)

Certain combinations of particles – such as *yo* and *ne*, *ka* and *na*, and *ka* and *yo* – routinely occur in particular types of interactional contexts where they appear to be employed to accomplish particular goals. I view such combinations of particles as representing single units or complex interactional particles. In Section 4.7.3, we noticed the use of *kayo* in rhetorical questions that serve the purpose of negative affective stance displays. *Kana* consists of the question particle *ka* and the interactional particle *na*. It is commonly used to co-construct displays of affective stances, such as doubt, wonder, worry, curiosity, or uncertainty, which may further be harnessed when dealing with various interactional concerns, such as the need to

tone down a sense of assertiveness, mitigate an imposition, disagreement, refusal, criticism, etc. It is for this reason that Matsugu (2005) terms one of the functions of the particle a ‘mitigation marker’.

Yone is often treated as compounding the effects of the two particles that it is composed of (e.g., Takubo and Kinsui 1997; Katō 2001; Morita 2002, 2005). Taking this approach, Maynard (2005b:292), for example, suggests that the particle expresses both the focus on the informational content of the utterance and the speaker’s concern for the co-participant’s feelings and opinions. Others propose to view *yone* as a particle in its own right. Saigo (2011:22–23), for example, argues that in *yone*, “*yo* falls within the scope of *ne* so that the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee’s acceptance of this situation (sequential function)”. Similarly, Hayano (2013b:166) asserts that, like the particle *ne*, *yone* is used to claim shared knowledge of or epistemic access to a referent, but “marks a stronger, older or more independent stance than *ne* does”.

We can observe the use of *yone* in the following excerpt. Fumiko and Kaori talk about the conditions of seniors seeking work in Japan. After Fumiko informs Kaori about some further details that clearly show her negative affective stance towards the Japanese system of employment, Kaori makes an assessment shown in line 3. The turn consists of an overtly negatively evaluative predicate, the expression *mon*, whose workings are described below, and the interactional particle *yone*. By using the particle *yone*, Kaori is able to convey her independent stance on the matter at hand and at the same time express her belief that the stance that she takes is shared with her co-participant.

- (8.14) 1 F: de shōganai kara minna: (.) ie ni ite nenkin de kurashiteru=
There’s nothing they can do about it, so they all stay home and live on their pension
- 2 =tte yutteta wa,
they’re saying.
- 3 K: hidoi mon yone::-
 is.awful NML/IP IP
It’s awful, isn’t it?
- 4 F: n:::
Hmmm.

(CallFriend JPN6739)

As I mentioned at the outset of this section, the category of interactional particles appears to be relatively open to new members. Formal nouns, which include forms such as *no*, *koto*, *mono*,

or *wake*, constitute one category of words that are particularly prone to developing into interactional particles.¹¹² For example, the colloquial contracted form of the formal noun *mono*, *mon*, nowadays commonly occurs in the utterance-final position. As an utterance-final element, *mon* seems to occur mainly in turns that implement the speaker's self-justification or other-justification of positions that are either implicitly or explicitly being challenged (e.g., Fujii 2000; Wang 2007). In such environments, *mon* communicates the speaker's judgement of the contents of the unit of talk that it attaches to as natural, inevitable, generally acceptable, a part of common ground knowledge, etc. It marks such statements as "effectively non-challengeable [...] and expressive of 'general consensual truths'" (Fujii 2000:102). Ultimately, *mon* in the context of self-justification, stating, elaborating on, and accounting for one's positions, typically conveys affective stances such as defensiveness, helplessness, resignation, and the speaker's appeal to the co-participant's understanding. When used in turns that provide support for the co-participant's positions, it co-construct affective stances, such as empathy and solidarity with the co-participant, defensiveness, criticism of and other negative affective stances towards the third party that challenges the co-participant's position, etc.

We already saw a fragment from the following transcript in Section 4.1.3. Here, however, we will focus on Nao's use of *mon* in line 9 where it helps her construct a justification for her assessment and affective stance display. Nao tells Hiroki that she started to date someone but he insists on keeping it a secret. Hiroki responds to this informing by assessing it extremely positively as something fun and exciting (lines 3–5). Nao, however, strongly disagrees with his assessment and conjecture. She overtly tells him that he is wrong (line 6) and expresses how unhappy she is about the situation, assessing it as extremely difficult (line 7). When Hiroki asks her to explain why she feels this way, she justifies her stance by explaining what keeping their relationship a secret entails (lines 8–10). By furnishing her turn-constructive unit in line 9 with the utterance-final *mon*, she marks the contents of this unit of talk as self-explanatory and providing support for her position. Without *mon*, the utterance would not convey her defensiveness and insistence on having her affective stance acknowledged as justified. Hiroki responds by showing his surprise (line 11), whereby he effectively confirms that his initial assessment was not correct.

¹¹² Both *no* and *koto* have utterance-final uses that have been widely acknowledged and discussed. The utterance-final uses of *wake* are discussed by R. Suzuki (2006). She found that the most common contexts for the occurrence of *wake* as an interactional particle include storytelling, information seeking questions, and clarification requests, where it "serves very interactive functions, almost equivalent to 'do you mean/you mean...?' (in question/clarification) and 'you see' (in narrative-telling)" (R. Suzuki 2006:46). She further finds that even though "there is no clear indication of causality or conditionality involved", the content of the clause that ends in *wake* is presented as if it were "the logical, natural consequence of a situation described in the prior discourse" (ibid.).

convey a stance that the speaker did not expect to take or was not expected to take, in which case *jan* may further co-construct a sense of surprise. It also appears in situations when the speaker expresses a stance that is incongruent with that of their co-participant or a stance that the speaker presumes to be incongruent with that of their co-participant, in which case it helps the speaker convey that they wish to persuade the co-participant to accept their assessment.

For example, in (8.15) above, we observed Hiroki use *jan* in his positive assessment in line 3. Below, we can observe how *jan* works together with other elements in single turns. In (8.16), Shōta expresses his surprise and amusement while commenting on Takuya’s pictures from a hiking trip. His turn takes form of a non-predicate-final utterance construction and includes the colloquial expressive adjective *kibi* ‘tiny’. In (8.17), Shōta uses *jan* in a direct speech construction by means of which he ‘quotes’ Takuya making an assessment as well as at the end of his turn, where *jan* functions in a similar way as *no da yo* in rhetorical questions that are employed to criticize the co-participant (see Section 4.7.3). In the enacted speech, Shōta uses an explicitly evaluative predicate modified by an intensifier. Since I have the part to which Shōta refers here on tape, I can say with certainty that this is not a direct quotation of Takuya’s speech, but Shōta’s dramatic enactment of his own impression of Takuya’s affective stance display. By using *jan* at the end of the enactment of speech attributed to Takuya, Shōta is able to construct Takuya’s insistent attitude on the contents of his assessment as well as his own stance towards Takuya’s assessment as not being fully congruent with his own.

(8.16) *kibi* *jan mawari.*
 is.tiny IP surroundings
 It looks so tiny, everything around!

(Zawiszová 2018:68)

(8.17) <<laughing> *zenzen yokatta jan mitai ni itteta* *jan.>* hh
 totally was.fine IP QUOT were.saying IP
 Weren’t you saying something like, “It’s all fine!”?!

(Zawiszová 2018:84)

Jan also commonly occurs in the context of opinion negotiation sequences. Excerpt (8.18) shows a fragment of Aiko and Kenji’s discussion on the topic of films. In this fragment, we can see Kenji explain what he believes is the essence of good films (lines 1–3). In response (lines 4–7), Aiko expresses her reservations and challenges him by bringing up Charlie Chaplin’s films to support her dissenting view, using a direct speech construction. Kenji, however,

disagrees with her point and – using *jan* and the discourse marker *datte* (see Subchapter 4.6) – constructs a turn that provides a justification for his disagreement with Aiko and support for the point that he is making (line 8). In response, Aiko counters by also using a *jan*-marked statement (line 9–10), but Kenji insists on his opinion (lines 11–14).

- (8.18) 1 K: *kō eizō to eizō no tsunagari ga igai dattari toka sa:,*
In this way, when the connection between images is unexpected and such, you know,
- 2 A: *n::.*
Mm.
- 3 K: *sōiu no ga eiga no genten da to omou n da yone:,*
that is the essence of film, I think.
- 4 A: *(.) n:::: mā: hito ni yorikeri ja nai,*
Mmmmm, well, it depends on everyone's taste, doesn't it?
- 5 *sonna koto ittara,*
If we just used this logic,
- 6 *chārī chappurin dō suru no,*
"What about Charlie Chaplin's films?"
- 7 *mitaina.*
I mean.
- 8 K: *chārī chappurin mo sō jan datte.*
Charlie Chaplin also like.this IP DM
His films fit what I am saying.
- 9 A: *sō da kedo kare (de XXXX) messēji- jūyō na messēji ga*
so COP but he message important message SBJ
- 10 *atta jan.*
had IP
Yeah, but he (), a message, there was an important message in his films.
- 11 K: *(.) are messēji mo atTE RYŌHŌ ga kō natte iru no kō-*
His films had BOTH, not only a message, so that's why they are like that.
- 12 A: *a [naruhodo ne,*
Hm, I see.
- 13 K: *[tōitsu sareteru kara omoshiroi tte iu.*
They're interesting because they unite the two.
- 14 A: *n::.*
Hmm.

(CallFriend JPN1841)

Kamo is a colloquial abbreviated variant of the epistemic modality marker *kamoshirenai*, which has traditionally been described as marking a low (but existent) degree of certainty, possibility,

or probability (see Pizziconi 2009). Both variants are also used as pragmatic mitigators. They can be employed to tone down the directness or imposition of one’s assessments, opinions, advice-giving, disagreements, criticism, etc. In addition, in conversational interactions of young people, we can also encounter *kamo* being used in utterances that explicitly express the speaker’s affective stances. In other words, *kamo* sometimes also occurs in utterances that would normally constitute an unlikely environment for an epistemic stance marker to be used. Wang (2018) suggests that this use of *kamo* as an ‘emotional mitigator’ is motivated by speakers’ intersubjective considerations. By using *kamo*, speakers are able to express their “emotions or feelings in a less ego-focused manner” and “to reduce the potential pressure for the addressee to respond to the speaker’s feeling” (Wang 2018:188).

In my data, I found instances, such as *Suki kamo* ‘I think I like it’, *Ii kamo* ‘I think it’s fine’, and *Chotto ittemitai kamo* ‘I think I’d like to (try to) go’, used to convey the speaker’s positive affective stances towards referents. The following example was discussed by Wang (2018). It comes either from a blog or a post on the writer’s social media page. In the post, *kamo* is employed together with *nanka* ‘somewhat’ and *chotto* ‘a bit’ (see Section 4.1.2) as a resource that enables the writer to downgrade the intensity of the affective stance that she displays. Wang (2018:191) notes that it may show the writer’s “reluctance to bother other cyber readers with her personal feeling on trivialities” and, at the same time, it “may block potential criticism from readers toward her trivial sharing”.

- (8.19) 1 kyō kaimoto o shitara okaikei ga 666 datta.
 When I shopped today, the bill was 666.
- 2 nanka chotto ureshii kamo.
 somewhat a.bit am.happy IP/mayby
 I was somehow a little happy, maybe.

(Wang 2018:190)

In colloquial Japanese, there are currently several expressions that may be used as quotative markers or complementizers that may occur utterance-finally. They include form such as *tte*, *to*, *datte*, *dato*, *tsutte*, *toka*, *mitaina*, *toyū*, *ttara*, and *tteba*. For example, the quotative marker *datte* may be employed to co-construct the speaker’s surprise, amazement, shock, and various other negative affective stances towards other people’s speech (e.g., Adachi 1996; S. Suzuki 1999, 2000; Oshima and Sano 2012:162). In Japanese, a quotative construction can also be used to implement the action of self-mockery. Suzuki (2001) describes the practice and points out that the utterance-final expression *nanchatte* appears to have “been grammaticalized to be the

marker of self-mockery” (Suzuki 2001:179). *Nanchatte* is the contracted form of *nante itte shimatte*, which consists of *nante* ‘something like’ (see Section 4.3.2), the *-te* form of the verb *iu* ‘say’, and the *-te* form of the auxiliary verb *shimau* (see Section 4.1.4.4). Speakers add the expression to the end of a unit of talk that they wish to mock, turning thus the given unit of talk into a self-quotation. Speakers may use this strategy to qualify their own speech when, for example, feeling awkward, insecure, or embarrassed.

The conditional forms *-ba* and *-tara* have developed not only into topic markers (see Section 4.3.2), but also into addressee-oriented utterance-final quotative markers *ttara* and *tteba*, which are used for affective-stance-display-related purposes. Martin (1975:1016) observes that *ttara* and *tteba* in utterance-final position are deployed to add intensity to a statement or a command. Following imperative forms, quotative conditionals may be used to convey the speaker’s irritation or annoyance; when “preceded by the finite form [they may] indicate the speaker’s insistence and strong assertive stance on the comment” (Shinzato 2015:160). Both uses are exemplified below. Both *ttara* and *tteba* function as devices that reinforce the action that the ‘quoted unit of talk’ implements. The turn-constructive units that consist of a direct speech construction that includes them can be paraphrased as “I’m telling you ...”.

- (8.20) a. tameiki tsuku no yamete ttara.
 sigh breathe NML quit-IMP QUOT
 Quit sighing!
- b. uchi ni wa nai tteba!! kudoï na.
 our.house in TOP aren’t QUOT pest IP
 We don’t have one at our house! What a pest!

(Shinzato 2015:165)

The most ubiquitous of quotative markers that can occur utterance-finally in everyday conversational interactions is *tte*. The expression has many different uses (see, e.g., Okamoto and Ono 2008; Suzuki 2008) and we already encountered it, for example, in Sections 4.3.2 and 4.7.2. Due to frequent ellipsis, it may occur in the utterance-final position in its function as a topic marker or a quotative marker. It may also occur at the end of turns if produced within a turn-expansion (see Section 4.7.1.2). What I wish to concentrate on here, however, is its use that makes it similar to utterance-final interactional particles. In different contexts of use, *tte* can help co-construct different affective stance displays. For example, the use of the utterance-final *tte* has been repeatedly explained as the expression of the speaker’s strong insistence or emphasis (e.g., Okamoto 1995:226; Suzuki 1998b:446–448; Okamoto and Ono 2008:223–224)

or their “eagerness to convince the hearer to accept or comply with the content of the utterance” (Oshima and Sano 2012:161). Akin to *ttara* and *tteba*, it may be used to stress a point that the speaker has already previously made and reinforce the strength of the action that the turn in which it occurs implements.

Such use of *tte* can be observed in (8.21). The fragment comes from a longer telling in which Shōta tells Takuya about a cycling race in which he participated. Encouraged by Takuya’s receptiveness, Shōta boastfully relates how well he placed and how hard it was. However, at one point, arguably in response to Shōta indulging in self-pride for too long, Takuya starts interrupting him with funny comments and makes it impossible for Shōta to continue. Having tried to make Takuya listen to him using different resources, Shōta finally produces the critical comment shown below.

- (8.21) 1 S: <<:-)> KIKE tte.> hahahaha
listen-IMP QUOT
Listen! [I’m telling you]
- 2 <<laughing> nanda kono yaritori da yo.>
What the hell is this exchange?!
- 3 <<:-)> zenzen hanashi susumanai.
We’re not getting anywhere.
- 4 fuzaken na.>
Knock it off!

(Zawiszová 2018:164)

Shōta uses *tte* to co-construct a command (line 1). It consists of the direct imperative form of the verb *kiku* ‘to listen’ and the utterance-final *tte*, which communicates that this is not the first time that Shōta tries to make Takuya listen, reinforces the command, and helps Shōta construct a display of his frustration caused by Takuya’s behaviour. The effect that *tte* produces here can be paraphrased in the same way as that of *tteba* and *ttara* when used with imperatives, that is, “I’m telling you ...”. Shōta’s ensuing utterances further contribute to the construction of his display of frustration. In line 2, he uses a rhetorical question to criticize Takuya’s actions, while in line 4, he makes use of the negative imperative form of the verb *fuzakeru* ‘to kid around’ to harshly request that he stops. While the verbal resources that Shōta uses build a strongly negative affective stance display, he smiles and laughs throughout, whereby he communicates that even though Takuya’s behaviour is annoying and frustrating, it is also funny.

In the following excerpt, we meet again with Nao and Hiroki. Nao recounts that both she and her boyfriend live in dormitories and that she does not live on her own. In the fragment

shown below, Nao uses *tte* to empathically proffer an assessment and communicate her negative affective stance towards her situation. It is not a reiterated assessment of the situation. However, *tte* is again used here to convey the speaker's insistence and its effect can again be rendered as similar to "I'm telling you". To co-construct her affective stance in this utterance, Nao further uses the interjection *mō*, an explicitly evaluative predicate, and an intensifier (line 3). Incidentally, we could observe this utterance-final use of *tte* in the preceding excerpt from the conversation of these two friends as well (see line 12 in excerpt (8.15)).

- (8.22) 1 N: heya (.) hitori ja nai yone,
I have roommates, right?
- 2 H: un.
Mm.
- 3 N: (.) sugGOI taihen da tte mō::.
 terrible is.awful QUOT INT
It's really terrible, like seriously.
- 4 (XXXX) mō tsugi no hi suggoi atsumatta tteyūka ne:,
 () the next day, they all like gather, you know?
- 5 mō omoshirogatte sawagu n da: ,
and are all curious and noisy.
- 6 H: un
Mm.
- 7 N: kotchi no kō- daigakusei no kotachi ga.
The girls, the students who live here.

(CallFriend JPN1773)

One more form that may constitute the final element of a sentential turn-constructive unit should be mentioned here. It consists of the nominalizer/sentence extender *n(o)* and the non-past affirmative form of the copula *da*, which may also be left unexpressed, but then the pragmatic effect changes. *N(o) da* can not only be used utterance-finally, but it can also be followed by certain other utterance-final elements. It is extremely common in conversational interactions, but its functions are not easy to pinpoint. Maynard (1992) views *n(o) da* as a 'commentary predicate' and explains it as a strategy that allows the speaker to 'objectify' and 'statisfy' an event through nominalization, make the expression more subjective through the use of the nominal predicate *da*, and organize information through the topic-comment structure. Cipris and Hamano (2002:165) argue that "it reinforces mutual understanding about a certain situation" and can be paraphrased as: "The circumstance (that I would like you to understand) is that ..." or "I'm saying that ...". It is regularly used in turns that provide or ask for explanation

or clarification, convey one's conclusions or inferences, try to persuade others, or create emphasis. In the context of informings, as Hayano (2013:123–126) points out, it may also be used by the teller to mark the most surprising or unexpected information. We can observe *n(o) da* in many examples throughout this thesis, as it contributes to the construction of various affective stance displays.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion and conclusion

The goal of this final chapter is to summarize the key findings of this study, discuss its contributions to relevant research fields, and offer some suggestions for future investigation.

5.1 Illustration of the interplay of verbal resources

First, I wish to bring together some of the points made in the preceding chapter during the discussion of individual verbal resources and show how they can be employed by participants in a longer stretch of talk to jointly construct affective stance displays in specifiable sequential contexts and as part of specific actions and activities. The excerpt, which I divided into several parts to make the orientation in the analysis easier, comes from a conversational interaction between Takuya and Shōta, the two close male friends whose interactions we have already encountered in the preceding chapter. The fragment that is shown here was preceded by a lengthy conversation regarding various matters related to money. What is of relevance for the excerpt at hand is that just moments before Shōta makes the first turn represented below, he reveals that he has been trying to save money.

- (9.1) 1 S: <<:-)> chotto aniki ni (.) kongetsu wa damasareta kedo.>
I was a bit tricked by my older brother this month.
- 2 T: damasareta?
You were tricked?

Shōta designs his turn as a statement that ends in the particle *kedo* delivered with a falling intonation contour (line 1). In the turn in question, the particle seems to be used to convey Shōta's non-committal stance with regards to the evaluation of the implications that the *kedo*-marked assertion carries and to invite Takuya to take the next turn. Shōta's turn is further designed as a sentential turn-constructive unit that involves a passive voice construction in which Shōta positions himself as the victim of his brother's actions that impacted him negatively. The passive verb form *damasareta* '[I] was played' further serves here as a lexical resource for affective stance display because it works as a prospective indexical (Goodwin 1996) which indicates that something that made Shōta feel like he was cheated happened to him but

leaves the full significance of the implication to be uncovered only if and when the projected talk progresses. As a result, Takuya is invited to engage in the projected activity and closely monitor the upcoming talk in order to find out what precisely the expression *damasareta* is referring to. At the same time, Takuya's interpretation of whatever follows as well as his manner of participation in the projected activity is effectively constrained by this term.

In addition, Shōta initiates his turn by using the degree adverb *chotto* 'a bit, a little' which serves here as a hedging device that further contributes to the co-construction of his non-committal stance and marks the situation as being of limited seriousness and hence as something that does not require Takuya to genuinely worry. The affective stances that Shōta conveys by the turn-initial and turn-final verbal means are further complemented by his smiling throughout the turn. In sum, by designing his turn in the way described above, Shōta communicates that he wishes to tell Takuya about something bad (but not too serious and maybe even a bit humorous) that happened to him, as long as Takuya shows that he is interested in hearing about it in the next turn. In this way, the turn effectively serves as a preface to the activity that Shōta evidently wishes to engage in, namely, a troubles-telling or a complaint story, which guides Takuya's orientation to the projected activity and intimates the likely requirements and expectations of him as a participant.

In line 2, we can then observe Takuya aligning himself with the proposed activity. By constructing his turn as a repeat of the expressive predicate from Shōta's utterance, producing it with greater loudness than the prior turn and a rising intonation contour, Takuya accomplishes a form of repair initiation that can be interpreted as an astonished question (Selting 1996), that is, a question format whereby he displays his astonishment or surprise, but also curiosity. At the same time, his reponse makes Shōta's elaboration on what happened to him in the next turn conditionally relevant. As a result, the participants have jointly established their participatory roles as those of a prospective teller and a prospective recipient and created the initial general affective characterization of the projected telling.

By definition, both complaint stories and troubles-tellings involve the teller's displays of negative affective stances towards the 'complainable' or the 'trouble'. In cases of interactions between friends, they both make an affiliative response on the part of the recipient of the telling conditionally relevant. In other words, the recipient is expected to recognize the complainable or the trouble and affiliate with the teller by displaying affective stances of the kind that will be interpretable as supportive of the affective stances displayed by the teller. The recipient's task, however, is further complicated by the fact that the tellers of conversational complaint stories and troubles-tellings in informal conversational interactions often employ laughter and smiling

as means for making their tellings come across as lighter and less imposing by modulating and mitigating the negative affective stance displays that they communicate. The recipients are therefore expected to discern which parts of the tellings they should take as humorous and which they should treat seriously (see, e.g., Jefferson 1984).

Having had his role as a teller ratified, Shōta commences his telling (line 3).

- 3 S: <<:-)> jitensha no fuku tsukutta kara,
"I've made cycling wear, so
- 4 omē no bun mo tsukutta kara,
I've made yours, too, so
- 5 kane harae toka iwarete,>
pay up!" or something like that he says.
- 6 T: hahaha[haha haha ha]ha
- 7 S: [<<:-)> sanman da yo.>]
"It's 30,000!"
- 8 T: <<:-)> okashii desho [sore.>
That's not normal, that, right?
- 9 S: [<<:-)> uea sanman-
"30,000 for the clothes."
- 10 [uea sanman da yo.>
"It's 30,000 for the clothes."
- 11 T: [tano- tanondenai noni,
Even though you didn't a- didn't ask [for them],
- 12 S: <<:-)> uea sanman da ze.>
"It's 30,000 for the clothes."
- 13 T: tano- tanondenai noni,
even though you didn't a- didn't ask [for them],
- 14 tsuku- tsukutta kara,
"I ma- made it, so
- 15 kane harae tte.
pay up!" [he says].

In lines 3–5, Shōta uses a direct speech construction with the colloquial quotative marker *toka* followed by the passive form of the verb *iu* ‘to say’ to enact his brother’s speech. In the enactment, he includes a direct command made by means of the direct imperative (*harae* ‘pay up!’ in line 5). Thereby, he indirectly conveys his negative affective stance towards his brother’s actions and his evaluation of them as unexpected, inapposite, deplorable, etc. By resorting to the use of direct speech (that is, the mimetic mode of telling) rather than making use of

descriptive utterances (or the diegetic mode of telling), he is able to convey his affective stances without overtly specifying them. Taking advantage of the claim of objectivity that is stereotypically associated with the so-called ‘reported speech’, Shōta further asks Takuya to imagine how the situation made him feel and to make an independent judgement of Shōta’s brother’s actions himself, rather than just to agree with Shōta’s explicitly communicated evaluative comments. Shōta produces these three lines in smile voice and finishes the third line in the *-te* form, after which he pauses for a moment to let Takuya respond and Takuya takes this opportunity to produce loud laughter (line 6). Through this, Takuya joins Shōta in co-constructing the telling as at least partly humorous.

In overlap with Takuya’s laughter, Shōta produces an utterance through which he conveys the amount of money that his brother asked him to pay (line 7). He does not overtly describe how he feels about the amount but goes on to repeat the utterance with some variation three more times (in lines 9, 10, 12) within the segment presented above (and, as we will see in the following segment, two more times afterwards), which clearly shows that he found the amount shocking and, by extension, his brother’s behaviour as preposterous, frustrating, and despicable. It is ambiguous whether the reiterations are meant to be interpreted as zero-framed enactments of his brother’s action of asking him to pay or as exclamative utterances made by Shōta himself in the here-and-now of the ongoing conversational interaction. In any case, their endings – *da yo* (lines 7 and 10) and *da ze* (line 12), which consist of the copula and an interactional particle – further co-construct Shōta’s affective stance display towards his brother’s actions by implying the coarseness, strength, and conclusiveness of the demand and his complete lack of control over the situation. Overall, by means of the reiterated utterances, Shōta appears to be constructing displays of his shock, frustration, indignation, and the feeling of hopelessness due to the lack of control.

In line 8, immediately after he finishes laughing, Takuya produces an explicit assessment of Shōta’s brother’s behaviour through which he achieves affiliation with Shōta. He designs his turn as comprising a non-predicate-final utterance construction, which allows him to augment the intensity of affective stances, such as shock and indignation, that he displays. In the turn-initial position, he produces the overtly negatively evaluative adjectival predicate *okashii* ‘[it]’s strange, [it]’s not normal’ and marks it with the tag-like element *desho* by means of which he indicates that he expects that the affective stance that he displays in his turn is shared. In the post-predicate position, Takuya produces the zero-marked demonstrative pronoun *sore* ‘that’, which functions here as the topic of the utterance. It is easily recoverable from the context and so it is referentially superfluous and could have been left unexpressed.

However, by making it explicit and placing it in the post-predicate position, Takuya is able to construct his utterance as particularly affectively loaded and fully affiliating.

There is substantial overlap happening at this point in the interaction, as Shōta keeps repeating how much money his brother asked him to pay, while Takuya attempts to create an even stronger sense of affiliation with his friend. Having proffered the explicitly evaluative comment (line 8), Takuya goes on to overtly specify the topic for the predicate *okashii* ‘[it]’s strange, [it]’s not normal’ in lines 11 and 13–15, which thus effectively function as a ‘replacement’ (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono 2007) for *sore* ‘that’, which he used in line 8. Takuya first uses a *noni* ‘although’ adverbial clause to show his understanding of the situation and to convey that the content of the upcoming clause is unexpected (lines 11 and 13). Subsequently (in lines 14–15), he uses a verbatim repetition of a part of the ‘quotation’ that Shōta attributed to his brother (lines 4–5) and frames it by the quotative marker *tte* to convey that he feels that there is something wrong with the action that is (re)enacted in the repeated bit of the ‘quotation’ (Suzuki 2007). Thereby, he expresses his negative affective stance towards it.

Having secured Takuya’s affiliation, Shōta proceeds to elaborate.

- 16 S: tsukuru n da kedo sa: [toka it]te,
He said something like, “Look, I’m going to make [cycling wear].”
- 17 T: [a::..]
Oh, I see.
- 18 S: un tsukureba: ii n ja nai tte.
I was like, “Cool, go for it”.
- 19 ja: omae esu to emu daro?
“Well, you’re [size] S and M, right?”
- 20 T: hahaha
- 21 S: <<:-)> e::: tsutte.>
I was like, “Whaaaat?!”.
- 22 de (.) saisho nima:n nisen gurai datta n da yo.
And, at first it was about 22,000.
- 23 T: un.
Mm.
- 24 S: sore ga (.) nanka (.) daigaku n toki ni besuto kitete,
Well, like, when I was at university, I used to wear a vest,
- 25 T: a:.
Right.
- 26 S: besuto mo kekkō tsukatteta n da yo.
I also used to wear a vest a lot.

- 27 T: un.
Mm.
- 28 S: besuto are tsukaeru yone,
I can use the one [that I wore back then], right?
- 29 T: un.
Mm.
- 30 S: kore kyūsen gurē da kedo sa: ,
“Look, this one is about 9,000.
- 31 omē mo tsukau daro?
You, too, are going to need one, right?”
- 32 T: e::[:-
Whaaaat?!
- 33 S: [sanman.
“30,000.”
- 34 sanman ssu.
“[It]’s 30,000.”
- 35 T: itatatata-
Ouch!

In the segment represented above, Shōta explains what happened, repeatedly using direct speech constructions to show (rather than to tell) Takuya how the events unfolded. In other words, he transforms his telling into a dramatic performance and positions Takuya as “an interpreting audience to the drama” (Tannen 2007:132) who is expected to display affective stances that will be supportive of those that Shōta implicitly conveys. The enactments are postpositionally framed by the colloquial quotative marker *toka* followed by the verb *iu* ‘to say’ (line 16), the colloquial quotative markers *tte* (line 18) and *tsutte* (line 21), and by no lexical quotation framing device at all (lines 19, 30–31, and possibly 33 and 34), which enhances the dramatic and engaging effect of the enactments even further. In line 34, he further uses the stylistic colloquial variant of the polite form of the copula *ssu*, which effectively represents a momentary shift from the plain style in which the conversation is conducted to the (semi-)polite style, which Shōta is arguably using here as a resource for affective stance display that allows him to further distance or separate himself from his brother whose behaviour is presented as unbrotherly, commanding, uncompassionate, indifferent, and egotistic and, as such, befitting a stranger and not a person with whom he enjoys a close personal relationship.

Throughout the segment, Takuya behaves as a highly receptive and empathetic listener. When Shōta signals that such a response is relevant by means of a combination of resources from different modalities, Takuya offers minimal response tokens to signal that he is following

what Shōta is saying, agrees with him, and/or that he understands and that Shōta may continue (lines 17, 23, 25, 27, 29). He also responds with laughter to show his appreciation of the more unexpected and dramatic bit of the telling (line 20).

Owing to the considerably less grammatically constrained nature of direct speech constructions than that of indirect reporting, in line 21, Shōta is able to display his surprise, disbelief, and indignation with regards to his brother's actions by enacting an exclamation consisting of a non-lexical vocalization *e:::* 'whaaaat?!' instead of describing his emotions. Interestingly, in line 32, after Shōta reveals the final bit of information that Takuya needs in order to understand how Shōta ended up being asked to pay his brother thirty thousand yen for sportswear, Takuya makes use of the same stand-alone interjection as Shōta did in line 21, *e:::* 'whaaaat?!', delivered in a high pitch and flat intonation contour, to convey his surprise and disbelief upon learning of "something that departs from what would be regarded as 'normal'" (Hayashi 2009:2111). In effect, this move can be viewed as strongly affiliating, as it allows Takuya to express his unequivocal endorsement of the affective stances that Shōta has previously expressed.

In addition, in line 35, after Shōta reiterates how much he was asked to pay two more times, Takuya exclaims *itatatata*, which is an expression that was created by repeating a part of the base morpheme of the adjective *itai* '[it] hurts' and functions as an expressive interjection that serves the purpose of affective stance display (similarly to *ouch* in English). The expression can also be conceived of here as a 'response cry', which fits Goffman's (1978:805) explanation of the term perfectly: it is an exclamative expression "employed thrice-removed from the crisis to which [it is] supposed to be a blurted response: a friend tells us about something startling and costly that happened to him, and at the point of disclosure we utter a response cry – on his behalf, as it were, out of sympathetic identification and as a sign that we are fully following his exposition". By that point in the telling, Takuya understands what happened and how Shōta feels about it and uses this expression to construct an empathic moment in interaction (Heritage 2011b:174). In other words, by using the expression, Takuya shows Shōta that he understands his feelings, feels his pain, and is fully sympathetic about his trouble and supportive of him.

Once again, having been assured of Takuya's full affiliation, Shōta proceeds to bring the telling to a close.

36 S: kono aida haratte kita.
I went to pay him the other day.

37 <<:-)> <<len> fuzaken na yo tte.>>
[I was] like, "Are you freaking kidding me?!".

- 38 T: hehehehehe h
- 39 S: <<:-)> <<len> nande da yo.>>
“Why the hell [are you doing this to me]?!”
- 40 honto wa kore:(.) chokin suru hazu datta n da yo.> hhhhh
“I was going to put this into my savings!”
- 41 T: n::::.
Hmmmm.
- 42 S: <<:-)> yarareta yo aitsu ni.>
He really got me, bastard.

(Zawiszová 2018:113–115)

After setting the stage in line 36, Shōta again makes use of direct speech constructions to show what happened and to display his affective stances at the time when the events were taking place. In line 37, he employs direct speech framed by the colloquial quotative marker *tte*. In the enactment, he slows down the tempo of his speech and performs the colloquial idiomatic phrase *fuzaken na yo*, which consists of a direct negative imperative form of the verb *fuzakeru* ‘to kid around’ and the interactional particle *yo*. The particle *yo* can be interpreted here as enhancing Shōta’s “position as the deliverer of the utterance contents and feeling” (Lee 2007:386) and, as such, it clearly contributes to the construction of his affective stance display. The force of this expression can have varying interpretations depending on the context of its use and the manner of its delivery. Here, further compounded by the markedly slower rate of speech and careful articulation, Shōta clearly makes use of the expression to display powerful negative affective stances, such as irritation, annoyance, anger, impatience, etc. Takuya responds to this strongly affectively loaded enactment with hearty laughter (line 38).

In line 39, Shōta continues the enactment of his emotions (or possibly speech) at the time when the events were unfolding by using another colloquial idiomatic phrase that is used to convey negative affective stances, this time leaving out any lexical quotation framing device. The rhetorical question form *Nande da yo?!* that he produces may be interpreted here as a means used to convey his shock, frustration, and a feeling of helplessness. In the following line, he produces another enactment without any quotation framing device in which he emphatically explains to his brother (using the *n(o) da* construction) the reason why he is so upset, which helps define the affective stances that he has displayed throughout the telling further. Interestingly, while Shōta produces these enactments in smile voice and follows them by laughter, Takuya orients to the trouble that his friend has shared with him by using the

interjection *n:::* (line 41) to “exhibit the process of ‘taking in’ an informing” and “going into thought” (Tanaka 2010:305) and help bring the topic to a closure (Tanaka 2010:326).

Just as he starts his telling by using a passive voice construction and an explicitly evaluative lexical item as a prospective indexical that provides an interpretive framing for the telling, Shōta also closes his telling by proffering an affect-loaded non-predicate-final utterance construction with an overtly evaluative predicate in passive voice, whereby he effectively delivers an evaluative summary of the telling (line 42). The passive verb form *yarareta* ‘[I] was played, [I] was deceived’ enables Shōta to express a negative feeling of defeat and reiterate that he feels that his brother ‘played him’. He constructs the utterance by expressing the affectively loaded predicate followed by the interactional particle *yo* first and adding the agent phrase *aitsu ni* ‘by him, by the bastard’ in the post-predicate position. The overt expression of the agent phrase in this utterance is entirely superfluous from the referential standpoint. Its expression, however, allows Shōta to produce the utterance with non-predicate-final constituent order, which helps him create a sense of heightened affect-ladenness. In addition, it also allows him to again overtly refer to his brother as the agent of the actions that had an adverse effect on him and to express his negative affective stance towards him by referring to him as *aitsu*. The term *aitsu* bears pejorative connotations that are further accentuated by the fact that Shōta earlier referred to his brother as *aniki* ‘big brother’ (line 1) as well as by the context in which it is employed here. It can, therefore, be interpreted as contributing to the construction of Shōta’s display of negative affective stances towards his brother, such as disdain and dislike. Just as in the case of the sequence-initiating utterance, however, Shōta delivers the utterance in line 42 with a smile, which modulates the meanings expressed by the verbal resources and makes the utterance come across as lighter and less serious.

Throughout the sequence, we could observe how the two participants closely monitor, influence, and respond to each other’s behaviour, including their affective stance displays. Shōta provides Takuya with a wide range of cues as to how he feels and what responses he expects from him and when. Takuya, on the other hand, behaves in a highly affiliative as well as structurally cooperative manner, whereby he encourages Shōta to continue the telling and indulges his desire to share his experience and complain about his brother. Together they mobilize and make use of a great variety of verbal resources in order to jointly construct the affectivity of the telling as well as their displays of affective stances towards the recounted events. Especially owing to the ample use of direct speech constructions, the telling is delivered in a highly engaging manner and represents a complaint story or a troubles-telling that is produced to also elicit some humour. Throughout the telling, Shōta smiles a lot and produces

some laughter as well, whereas Takuya appears to be balancing between showing receptiveness to Shōta's negative experience and appreciation of the humour that the telling occasions.

5.2 Diversity of resources for affective stance display

The objectives that I pursued in this thesis involved (1) finding out about the diversity of linguistic forms and formats that are systematically and methodically deployed as verbal resources for affective stance display in Japanese informal conversational interactions; (2) creating an inventory of the major types of such resources; (3) describing and exemplifying them using especially the findings from my long-term research on spontaneous conversational interactions of Japanese young adults; and (4) demonstrating some of the ways in which they are used in ordinary informal conversational interactions, using excerpts from face-to-face conversational interactions, telephone calls, and occasionally also technically mediated interactions on social media between Japanese young people in close personal relationships. The Japanese language has long been regarded as a language that is endowed with many lexicogrammatical resources that index social-relational meanings. The present study showed not only how some of these linguistic forms that have long been recognized as serving 'non-referential' purposes may be employed alongside other verbal resources in the course of conversational interactions as resources for affective stance display but also demonstrated that there are many other linguistic forms and formats that are regularly used for affective-stance-display-related purposes.

The types of verbal resources that this thesis deals with were chosen because of their high frequency of use in the studied data. At the same time, the selection illustrates the great diversity of verbal resources that Japanese speakers routinely employ. To summarize, we considered some of the affective-stance-display-related uses of lexical categories, verbal morphology, demonstratives, zero-marking, topic-marking particles, person reference, connective expressions, non-predicate-final constituent order, direct speech constructions, question forms, syntactically incomplete utterance constructions, and various utterance-final elements. In the excerpts, we also repeatedly encountered several other types of verbal resources that commonly participate in the construction of affective stance displays. Repetition is one such example. We saw it being used in a variety of ways and with a view to accomplishing quite diverse affective-stance-display-related tasks. Repetition forms a part of a number of formats that were discussed, such as astonished questions, enactments of speech and thoughts, self- and other-repetition framed with *tte*, other-repetition marked with *dato* or *datte*,

multiple sayings, etc. We also observed instances of prosodic, lexical, and syntactic matching or parallelisms.

Stylistic variation beyond the use of the so-called plain and polite forms, which were considered during the discussion on verbal morphology, is also commonly used for constructing affective stance displays in Japanese. As we saw in a couple of excerpts, when speakers make use of expressions that seem anomalous or out of the ordinary for them, the relationship between them and their co-participant(s), the ongoing interaction, or the speech situation – that is, when they use a style or a variety that is marked in its context of occurrence –, this behaviour triggers potential affective-stance-display-related implications. Besides the plain, polite, and honorific forms, the Japanese language enables its speakers to also choose, for example, between expressions that make up (in)formal registers, are thought of as stereotypically masculine or feminine, or as indexing certain regional or social identities. In addition, speakers also use foreign words (especially from English) which have not yet been integrated into the Japanese lexicon for the purpose of constructing affective stance displays. Some other topics related to the use of verbal resources for affective stance display that have only been touched lightly in the preceding chapter but are worthy of further exploration include humour and serious as well as mock or jocular impoliteness. For example, we noticed instances of mock-aggressive affective stance displays as well as instances in which orientation to humour alters the interpretation of verbally constituted affective stance displays.

Everyday informal conversational interactions are replete with different kinds of affective stance displays. In the introduction, I mentioned that affective stance displays can form primary actions (when we, for example, produce a turn that consists solely of a phrase used to express our gratitude), secondary actions (when we, for example, colour our refusal with a display of an affective stance such as contempt), as well as the defining components of a number of actions (such as apologizing or complimenting) and activities (such as arguing or storytelling). In any case, affective stance displays are deeply consequential for the development of the ongoing social interaction and may be oriented to by the co-participants either directly or indirectly through the design of their turns. At the same time, they are also crucial for the maintenance and further advancement of the attendant social relations. In the context of conversational interactions, affective-stance-taking represents an ever-present, organized, coordinated, situated activity that involves all levels of language and communication. Closely monitoring each other's talk for affective stance displays, participants in interaction produce, negotiate, and incrementally modify and modulate their affective stance displays and manage affiliation. Knowing how to use linguistic forms and formats to perform and interpret

affective stance displays in social interaction is one of the things that characterises speakers as members of a speech community.

We observed that affective stance displays may be constructed quite explicitly as well as in a fairly subtle way through resources that evoke affective-stance-display-related interpretations rather than mark affective stances overtly. Verbal resources may play various roles in affective stance display processes and their affective-stance-display-related uses may be conventionalized or fixed to different degrees. Some are used to express or index affective stances. Some serve the purpose of affective contextualization, making a unit of talk come across as affectively coloured or affectively charged. Some modify the intensity of affective stances displayed by means of other resources. Some co-construct affective stance displays by helping to specify the kind or category of otherwise produced displays. Certain resources have intrinsic affective-stance-display-related meanings. Some linguistic forms and formats have developed specific affective-stance-display-related uses and functions owing to their repeated deployment in particular types of interactional contexts for the purpose of accomplishing particular types of tasks, while other resources may have more generic uses. Affective-stance-display-related meanings and functions may constitute the core meanings and functions of a linguistic form or format, or they may be of a more peripheral significance for them. Affective stance displays are often achieved by using resources that have more affectively neutral alternatives (which were not chosen by the speaker), and/or are referentially superfluous in the given context (and yet were produced), and/or are unexpected and create markedness on any level of language and social interaction in the given environment with respect to the surrounding turns and the entirety of the situational context.

Throughout this thesis, I emphasized the importance of a positionally-sensitive approach to language and the importance of differentiating between language ideology and actual language use. Through my analyses of excerpts from spontaneous conversational interactions, I tried to shed some light on the process of affective stance display construction, showing how various resources are mobilized by the participants in interaction to jointly build affective stance displays. The excerpts clearly demonstrate that affective stance displays in conversational interactions are accomplished via the interplay of co-occurring resources from different modalities in their contexts of occurrence. Furthermore, certain resources also habitually cooccur to jointly construct affective stance displays, thereby forming sets, bundles, or complexes of resources that may be viewed as practices characterized by different degrees of fixity. Members register and keep track of the affective-stance-display-related uses of particular linguistic forms and formats in particular types of contexts and commit to memory

the particular forms and formats together with the situated affective-stance-display-related implications that they bear (cf. Bybee 2006:722). The context of actions and activities within which individual verbal forms and formats are deployed is, therefore, crucial for their interpretation as resources for affective stance display because it considerably constrains the potential implications that the individual resources carry. In other words, there are potential context-dependent, affective-stance-display-related meanings and functions conventionally associated with individual forms and formats, which are then actualized and particularized in the specific contexts of their occurrence in systematic ways, which are, however, many and have not yet been fully elucidated.

In addition to the language we speak and the interactional context of actions and activities, what affective stances we display, how we use language to display them, and how we interpret and feel about affective stance displays performed by others is contingent on a number of factors, including our sociocultural background, our identity concerns, the social relation that we believe to hold between us and our co-participant(s), the situation in which the interaction takes place, the goals we pursue at any given point in the interaction, and so on. In this thesis, I considered common types of verbal resources that are used by Japanese speakers in their informal spoken conversational interactions and exemplified them mainly by focusing on linguistic forms and formats that are regularly employed in informal talk exchanges between Japanese young adult friends. If we were to examine informal conversational interactions between Japanese people in their seventies, for example, we would likely find the individual types of resources being realized with different frequencies and by means of different linguistic forms and formats. Japanese formal interactions generally involve different types of resources than those discussed in this thesis. They are typically more descriptive and objectifying rather than directly expressive; they tend to convey cognitively processed affective stances rather than imply spontaneity.

Our interactions and their constituent parts can always be defined in terms of what I refer to as ‘affectivity’, that is, a scalar and continuously variable property of talk-in-interaction that is collaboratively accomplished by the participants in interaction by means of situated multimodal displays of affective stances and negotiations of their significance. This thesis concentrated only on verbal resources for affective stance displays. In face-to-face spoken conversational interactions, verbal resources are compounded with vocal resources – such as intonation, loudness, voice quality, speech rate and rhythm, pauses, lengthening and shortening of sounds, palatalization, laughter, audible outbreaths, whispering, stammering, and so on – as well as visual resources – such as facial expressions, gaze, head and body movement, gestures,

or posture – which both form an integral part of affective stance display mechanism in this channel. In technically mediated primarily text-based conversational interactions on social media, participants build their affective stance displays by combining verbal resources with various types of visual resources, including punctuation marks, spelling, emoticons, emojis, special use of graphemes (such as Chinese characters or alphabetical characters), images, videos, gifs, or hashtags, but also by making use of other features that the media provides, such as reaction buttons¹¹³ or the segmentation of text into separate posts, etc. However, as we saw in the preceding chapter, the individual types of verbal resources that were discussed here occur not only in face-to-face conversational interactions but also in telephone calls and many of them can also be encountered in primarily text-based technically mediated conversational interactions on social media. Their affective-stance-display-related uses thus seem to be conventionalized enough for speakers to be able to use them even without the visual cues in telephone conversations and vocal cues in written conversational interactions on social media.

Even though I did not pay systematic, detailed attention to vocal resources that are used to co-construct affective stance displays in Japanese conversational interactions in this thesis, during the analyses I noticed a number of recurring phonetic-prosodic features. For example, we observed various uses of pitch (including prosodic matching and upgrading or the use of a specific pitch contour in negative question forms that convey assessments), the use of vowel lengthening, gemination of word-medial consonants, word-final glottalization, modification of loudness and speech rate, pausing, overlaps, smile-voice, laughing voice, phonological simplification, etc. Some of the phonetic-prosodic features that we encountered appear to have fairly conventionalized affective-stance-display-related uses in specific contexts and some even form relatively fixed complexes with certain verbal forms and formats. Prosody is clearly used to co-construct affective stance displays and laminate units of talk with affective-stance-display-related implications, including the implication of vividness and intensity. It is even able to override the co-occurring verbal resources in case of disjunctive displays. However, what we could also observe is that phonetic-prosodic features in and of themselves do not index specific affective stances and there is no straightforward one-to-one correspondence between vocal

¹¹³ For example, the Japanese-language version of Facebook currently offers its users an option to react to any post using one of seven reaction buttons whose labels are all formulated as short responding actions that may be used in actual conversational interactions as well, namely: *ii ne* ‘Nice/good!’, *chō ii ne* ‘Fantastic/perfect!’, *taisetsu da ne* ‘[That’s] precious [isn’t it?]’, *ukeru ne* ‘[That’s] so funny!’, *sugoi ne* ‘Awesome/amazing/impressive!’, *kanashii ne* ‘[That’s] sad [isn’t it?]’, and *hidoi ne* ‘[That’s] awful/terrible!’. Using a reaction button is a form of an affective-stance-displaying responding action that can be either affiliating or disaffiliating, depending on the context. Interestingly, the English-language version of the options includes only two forms that could be used as actual responding actions (i.e., ‘haha’ and ‘wow’), whereas other options (i.e., ‘like’, ‘love’, ‘care’, ‘sad’, and ‘angry’) do not constitute possible response formats in English spoken interaction.

features and their functions, but rather they are highly multifunctional and work holistically with resources from other modalities and in their specific contexts of occurrence (see, e.g., Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 1996; Freese and Maynard 1998; Couper-Kuhlen and Ford 2004; Ogden 2006; Local and Walker 2008; Couper-Kuhlen 2009; Selting 2010; Couper-Kuhlen 2012a, 2012b; Thompson, Fox, and Couper-Kuhlen 2015).

5.3 Contributions of this thesis and future research perspectives

This thesis represents a data-driven endeavour to contribute to the variegated body of research on language, social interaction, and affective stance display. It illustrates the great diversity of verbal resources that are routinely mobilized and made use of in Japanese informal spoken conversational interactions to accomplish various affective-stance-display-related tasks. It stresses the importance of an interactional approach which views the individual verbal forms and formats as being deployed together with other resources in particular contexts, including the sequential positions as well as actions and activities in which the individual resources are embedded and which they simultaneously co-construct. The approach that this thesis adopts is significant because it enables it to both offer a survey of a broad range of verbal resources and – being based on naturalistic data and using numerous excerpts from spontaneous conversational interactions – to discuss and demonstrate some of the possibilities of their actual situated use in co-occurrence with other resources. Prior studies that list a wide range of resources typically discuss them in a largely decontextualized and intuition-based manner, while interactional studies generally focus on either the context-dependent (selected) workings of a single resource (or a set of resources) or consider specific kinds of affective stance displays in particular contexts.

The major contribution of this thesis is undoubtedly to the study of the Japanese language and social interaction. It advances our understanding of the ways in which Japanese people use language to communicate and provides new insights into the workings of various linguistic forms and formats, some of which have often been studied and described without paying close attention to the actions and activities in which they occur. By considering the possible situated uses of the verbal forms and formats that it concerns itself with, this thesis broadens our understanding of how they may be employed in interaction with a view to accomplishing certain goals. Through a number of excerpts, it shows the wealth of verbal resources that Japanese speakers regularly employ for affective-stance-display-related purposes in their everyday informal conversational interactions, exemplifies them with specific forms of

expression that are commonly used by contemporary Japanese young adults, and illustrates how they may be mobilized together with other resources to accomplish different affective stance displays. Even though ordinary conversational interactions are the primary mode of interpersonal communication and investigating linguistic forms and formats as they occur in actual social interactions is the only way to find out about their full potential, research into everyday conversational interactions in Japanese and interactional studies of the Japanese language are still quite rare compared to other approaches to the language.

The approach developed in this thesis and the results it may yield if adopted in larger research projects have potential applications in multiple fields, including foreign language teaching and learning, studies of cross-cultural communication, artificial intelligence and human-computer interaction, translation studies, politics, advertisement design, etc. The thesis itself can be particularly useful to students and teachers of Japanese as a foreign language. It offers more realistic descriptions of the Japanese language as it is used in everyday social interactions and illustrates how informal conversational interactions in Japanese may be organized. The excerpts can be read as examples of conversational Japanese, whose structures are quite different from those that are normally taught in Japanese language textbooks and classrooms. The ability to produce, interpret, and respond to affective stance displays in specific contexts in social interactions represents a vital part of the pragmatic competence of speakers of any language and is of fundamental significance for successful interpersonal communication and the development of social relations. Since it is seldom addressed in foreign language textbooks and classrooms, students may often be able to “produce grammatically flawless speech that nonetheless fails to achieve its communicative aims” (Fraser 2010:15). The social-relational behaviour of such students (in part because of their high grammatical and lexical competence) may then be judged by their co-participants as odd, unnatural, unfriendly, distancing, confusing, inappropriate, impolite, and even rude or offensive. Mastering methods and means for affective stance display is not an easy task even for advanced students of a language. However, without being aware of at least the basics regarding the mechanisms for affective stance display in a given language, smooth interpersonal communication is hardly possible.

There are many ways in which the line of research that this thesis develops can be further expanded. Future research could build on the present one by studying other types of resources for affective stance display that are commonly used by Japanese young adults, focus on the cooperation of the participants in interaction and the interplay of verbal resources with resources from other modalities with a view to elucidating the ways in which affective stance

displays in interaction can be built and negotiated, or investigate the ways in which Japanese young people construct their affective stance displays in technically mediated conversational interactions on social media. Future research could also explore affective stance displays in conversational interactions of people who fall into social categories other than young adults. Investigation of affective stance displays in different situational contexts, including situations characterized by different levels of formality and participants in different types of social relations, might also bring interesting results. One particularly important avenue for future research then involves studying affective stance displays in relation to the management of affiliation in different sequential positions and as part of different actions and activities. We should also continue the important work that is being done by interactional linguists and other researchers who examine collections of specific affectively charged actions or activities with a view to finding out about the resources used in their construction or concentrate on specific resources in order to describe their workings in different contexts. I also hope to see research conducted in a similar vein as this thesis and described in this paragraph but on different languages and cultures. Finally, L2 users' or language learners' use of language for affective-stance-display-related purposes represents one more possible focus for further research that seems worthy of our attention (see Prior and Kasper 2016).

Overall, studying affective stance displays (under any label) in a context-sensitive manner enables us to gain a fuller understanding of the “social and pragmatic nature of language, as it is used by actual speakers or writers to act and interact in the real world” (Englebretson 2007b:1). Moreover, as Du Bois and Kärkkäinen (2012:434–435) emphasize, “[i]f we want to understand the powerful engines of social life [...], then emotion, affect, and the rest must be in the mix”. Even though the body of research to which this thesis contributes has been growing steadily over the past two decades or so, we still know remarkably little about the mechanisms involved in the construction and interpretation of affective stance displays and much remains to be explored.

Appendix A

Transcription Conventions

The transcription conventions that are adopted in this thesis are based on GAT 2 (Selting et al. 2009) but include certain modifications. I developed the conventions for my earlier publication and so the description provided below is close to identical with that which I provided there (Zawiszová 2018:7–9). The system of romanization of conversational Japanese that I use is introduced in Subchapter 3.4.

Temporal and sequential features

- [] overlapping or simultaneous speech is marked by square brackets; opening brackets are inserted at the point in speaking where the overlap begins in the respective successive lines; closing brackets are used to indicate the end of an overlap when relevant
- = latching or contiguous talk (by the same or by another speaker) is marked by equal signs placed at the end of one line (representing an intonation phrase) and at the start of the successive one
- (.) audible, but not readily measurable, micro-pauses of approximately up to 0.8 second are indicated by a dot in parentheses
- (3.1) timed pauses are provided as numerals in parentheses in seconds

Aspects of speech delivery

- . a period indicates a falling intonation contour
- ; a semicolon indicates an intonation contour falling to mid-low
- , a comma indicates a slightly rising intonation contour
- ? a question mark indicates a high rising intonation contour
- a hyphen is used to indicate a cut-off or a self-interruption, as well as a level pitch contour at the end of a turn
- CAP capitalization is used to indicate an especially loud part of a word
- <<f> talk> a stretch of talk that is delivered in markedly louder (*forte*) voice than the surrounding talk is marked by the descriptor <f> and included in angled brackets

- <<p> talk> a stretch of talk that is delivered in markedly quieter (*piano*) or softer voice than the surrounding talk is marked by the descriptor <p> and included in angled brackets
- <<all> talk> a stretch of talk that is delivered markedly faster (*allegro*) than the surrounding talk is marked by the descriptor <all> and included in angled brackets
- <<len> talk> a stretch of talk that is delivered markedly slower (*lento*) than the surrounding talk is marked by the descriptor <len> and included in angled brackets
- <<h> talk> a stretch of talk that is delivered in a pitch register that is markedly higher than the speaker's usual register
- <<:-> talk> a stretch of talk that is auditorily identified as clearly being delivered in a smile voice (i.e., while smiling) is marked by the descriptor <:-> and included in angled brackets
- <<laughing> talk> a stretch of talk that is delivered with interspersed laugh tokens (i.e., while laughing) is marked by the descriptor <laughing> and included in angled brackets
- << > talk> interpretive comments on speech delivery (such as <as if angry>) are generally avoided; when considered necessary, however, they are provided as a descriptor within angled brackets and placed in front of the stretch of talk that they concern, which is delimited by being included in another set of angled brackets

Other markings

- (xxx) letters 'x' in parentheses are used to mark unintelligible speech, with each 'x' representing approximately the length of a mora as identifiable
- (talk) words and parts of words included in parentheses represent hearing approximations
- ((coughs)) descriptions of locally relevant non-verbal vocal actions and other kinds of comments are provided in double parentheses
- hhh laughter is represented using 'h', 'he', 'ha', 'a', 'hu', 'hi', 'ho' as approximations of audible laugh tokens
- °hhh/hhh° significant inbreaths/outbreaths are represented using 'h' and a degree sign

Appendix B

Abbreviations used in the interlinear glosses

COP	copula
DIM	diminutive suffix
DM	discourse marker
FIL	filler, hesitation marker, etc.
GEN	genitive-marking particle
HON	honorific suffix
HOR	hortative
IMP	imperative
INT	interjection
IP	interactional particle
MIM	mimetic/onomatopoeic expression
NEG	negative
NML	nominalizer
OBJ	object-marking particle
PRT	particle
Q	question marker
QUOT	quotative marker
SBJ	subject-marking particle
TAG	question-tag-like element
TOP	topic marker
ZP	zero particle

Bibliography

- Adachi, Takanori. 1996. Sarcasm in Japanese. *Studies in Language* 20(1): 1–36.
- Akatsuka, Noriko. 1991. Affect and Japanese conditionals. In *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 3: Asian Discourse and Grammar*, edited by Patricia M. Clancy and Sandra A. Thompson, 1–8. Santa Barbara: University of California.
- Alba-Juez, Laura, and Geoff Thompson. 2014. The many faces and phases of evaluation. In *Evaluation in Context*, edited by Geoff Thompson and Laura Alba-Juez, 3–27. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ameka, Felix. 1992. Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 101–118.
- Andersen, Gisle, and Thorstein Frethaim, eds. 2000a. *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Andersen, Gisle, and Thorstein Frethaim. 2000b. Introduction. In *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*, edited by Gisle Andersen and Thorstein Frethaim, 1–16. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Arita, Yuki. 2018. Enactment in Japanese talk-in-interaction: Interrelationship between there-and-then and here-and-now sequential organizations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 123: 78–101.
- Arndt, Horst, and Richard W. Janney. 1987. *InterGrammar: Toward an Integrative Model of Verbal, Prosodic and Kinesic Choices in Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Arndt, Horst, and Richard W. Janney. 1991. Verbal, prosodic, and kinesic emotive contrasts in speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15: 521–549.
- Athanasidou, Angeliki, and Elżbieta Tabakowka, eds. 1998. *Speaking of Emotions: Conceptualisation and Expression*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Athanasidou, Angeliki, Costas Canakis, and Bert Cornillie, eds. 2006. *Subjectification Various Paths to Subjectivity*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Auer, Peter, and Aldo Di Luzio, eds. 1992. *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter. 1992. Introduction: John Gumperz' Approach to Contextualization. In *The Contextualization of Language*, edited by Peter Auer and Aldo Di Luzio, 1–37. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Baba, Junko. 2003. Pragmatic function of Japanese mimetics in the spoken discourse of varying emotive intensity levels. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1861–1889.
- Baider, Fabienne, and Georgeta Cislaru, eds. 2014. *Linguistic Approaches to Emotions in Context*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bally, Charles. 1913. *Le langage et la vie*. Geneve: Atar.
- Barešová, Ivona, and Halina Zawiszová. 2012. *Současná hovorová řeč mladých Japonců* [Contemporary Japanese Youth Language]. Olomouc: Palacký University Olomouc.
- Barke, Andrew, and Satoshi Uehara. 2005. Japanese pronouns of address: Their behavior and maintenance over time. In *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*, edited by Robin T. Lakoff and Sachiko Ide, 301–314. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar, Elisabeth Reber, and Margret Selting, eds. 2010. *Prosody in Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar. 2008. Interactional Linguistics. In *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*, edited by Gerd Antos and Eija Ventola, 77–106. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bednarek, Monika. 2008. *Emotion talk across corpora*. London/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Belczyk-Kohl, Yvonne. 2016. Some remarks on transcript translation in discourse analysis. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4(1): 139–164.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1971. Subjectivity in Language. In *Problems in General Linguistics*, edited by Émile Benveniste, 223–230. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.
- Berman, Ruth A., Hrafnhildur Ragnarsdóttir, and Sven Strömquist. 2002. Discourse stance. *Written Language and Literacy* 5: 255–290.
- Besnier, Niko. 1990. Language and Affect. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 419–451.
- Besnier, Niko. 1994. Involvement in linguistic practice: An ethnographic appraisal. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 279–299.
- Biber, Douglas, and Edward Finegan. 1989. Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text* 9(1): 93–124.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1986. *Intonation and Its Parts: Melody in Spoken English*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle, and Ingrid van Alphen. 2012. Preface: Introductory remarks on new and old quotatives. In *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, edited by Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid van Alphen, xi–xxx. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: Fischer. Available at: https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/faces/ViewItemFullPage.jsp?itemId=item_2305592_5.
- Bybee, Jean. 2006. From usage to grammar: the mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82(4): 711–733.
- Caffi, Claudia, and Richard W. Janney. 1994. Toward a pragmatics of emotive communication. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 325–373.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1982. Integration and Involvement In *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*, edited by Deborah Tannen, 35–53. Norwood: Ablex.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1985. Linguistic differences produced by differences between speaking and writing. In *Literacy, Language, and Learning: The nature and consequences of reading and writing*, edited by David R. Olson, Nancy Torrance, and Angela Hildyard, 105–123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christodoulidou, Maria. 2014. Patterns of reporting speech and feelings. In *Analyzing Greek Talk-in-Interaction*, edited by Maria Christodoulidou, 157–183. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Cipris, Zeljko, and Shoko Hamano. 2002. *Making Sense of Japanese Grammar: A Clear Guide through Common Problems*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Clancy, Brian. 2016. *Investigating Intimate Discourse: Exploring the spoken interaction of families, couples and friends*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Clancy, Patricia M. 2020. To Link or Not to Link: Clause Chaining in Japanese Narratives. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10: Article 3008. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03008>.
- Clancy, Patricia M., Sandra A. Thompson, Ryoko Suzuki, and Hongyin Tao. 1996. The conversational use of reactive tokens in English, Japanese, and Mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 355–387.
- Clayman, Steven E. 2012. Address terms in the organization of turns at talk: The case of pivotal turn extensions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(13): 1853–1867.

- Clayman, Steven E., and Douglas W. Maynard. 1995. Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. In *Situated Order: Studies in the Social Organization of Talk and Embodied Activities*, edited by Paul ten Have and George Psathas, 1–30. Washington: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Clift, Rebecca. 2007. Getting there first: non-narrative reported speech in interaction. In *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift, 120–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clift, Rebecca. 2016. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth. 1996. The prosody of repetition: on quoting and mimicry. In *Prosody in Conversation*, edited by Elisabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting, 366–405. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth, and Cecilia E. Ford, eds. 2004. *Sound Patterns in Interaction: Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth, and Margret Selting, eds. 1996. *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth, and Margret Selting. 2001. Introducing Interactional Linguistics. In *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, edited by Margret Selting and Elisabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 1–22. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth, and Margret Selting. 2018. *Interactional Linguistics: Studying language in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth, and Tsuyoshi Ono. 2007. ‘Incrementing’ in conversation. A comparison of practices in English, German and Japanese. *Pragmatics* 17(4): 513–552.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth. 2007. Assessing and accounting. In *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift, 81–119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth. 2009. A sequential approach to affect: The case of ‘disappointment’. In *Talk in Interaction: Comparative Dimensions*, edited by Markku Haakana, Minna Laakso, and Jan Lindström, 94–123. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth. 2012a. Exploring Affiliation in the Reception of Conversational Complaint Stories. In *Emotion in Interaction*, edited by Anssi Peräkylä and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 113–146. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elisabeth. 2012b. On affectivity and preference in responses to rejection. *Text & Talk* 32(4): 453–475.

- Daneš, František. 1994. Involvement with Language and in Language. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 251–264.
- Day, Dennis, and Johannes Wagner. 2008. Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. In *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*, edited by Gerd Antos and Eija Ventola, 33–52. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2013. How to get a grip on identities-in-interaction: (What) Does ‘Positioning’ offer more than ‘Membership Categorization’? Evidence from a mock story. *Narrative Inquiry* 23(1): 62–88.
- Drew, Paul, and John Heritage. 1992. Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*, edited by Paul Drew and John Heritage, 3–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, Paul. 2013. Turn Design. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 131–149. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Du Bois, John W. 2007. The stance triangle. In *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, edited by Robert Englebretson, 139–182. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Du Bois, John W., and Elise Kärkkäinen. 2012. Taking a stance on emotion: Affect, sequence, and intersubjectivity in dialogic interaction. *Text & Talk* 32(4): 433–451.
- Dunn, Cynthia Dickel. 1999. Public and Private Voices: Japanese Style Shifting and the Display of Affective Intensity. In *Languages of Sentiment: Cultural Constructions of Emotional Substrates*, edited by Gary B. Palmer and Debra J. Occhi, 107–127. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dunn, Cynthia Dickel. 2010. Information structure and discourse stance in a monologic “public speaking” register of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 1890–1911.
- Endo Hudson, Mutsuko. 2008. *Riyuu* ‘reason’ for *nai desu* and other semi-polite forms. In *Style Shifting in Japanese*, edited by Kimberly Jones and Tsuyoshi Ono, 131–159. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Endo Hudson, Mutsuko. 2018. *Ne* as an “impoliteness” (“detachment”) marker? In *Pragmatics of Japanese: Perspectives on grammar, interaction and culture*, edited by Mutsuko Endo Hudson, Yoshiko Matsumoto, and Junko Mori, 197–215. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Endo, Tomoko, Daisuke Yokomori, and Makoto Hayashi. 2017. Kakunin yōkyū ni mochiirareru kandōshiteki yōhō no ‘nani’: Ninshikiteki sutansu hyōshiki no sōgokōijō no hataraki [Interjectional *nani* ‘what’ in confirmation requests: An epistemic stance marker

- used as an interactional resource]. *Shakaigengokagaku* 20(1): 100–114. Available at: https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/jajls/20/1/20_100/_article/-char/en.
- Endo, Tomoko. 2018. The Japanese change-of-state tokens *a* and *aa* in responsive units. *Journal of Pragmatics* 123: 151–166.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2006. Social Consequences of Common Ground. In *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction*, edited by Nicholas J. Enfield and Stephen C. Levinson, 399–430. Oxford/New York: Berg.
- Englebretson, Robert, ed. 2007a. *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2007b. Stancetaking in discourse: An introduction. In *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, edited by Robert Englebretson, 1–26. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2007c. Grammatical resources for social purposes: Some aspects of stancetaking in colloquial Indonesian conversation. In *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, edited by Robert Englebretson, 69–110. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Finegan, Edward. 1995. Subjectivity and subjectivisation: an introduction. In *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: Linguistic perspectives*, edited by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, 1–15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E. 2004. Contingency and units in interaction. *Discourse Studies* 6: 27–52.
- Ford, Cecilia E. 2010. Questioning in meetings: Participation and positioning. In *‘Why do you ask?’: The function of questions in institutional discourse*, edited by Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich, 211–234. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In *Interaction and grammar*, edited by Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson, 134–184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox, and Sandra A. Thompson, eds. 2002. *The Language of Turn and Sequence*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, Barbara A., Makoto Hayashi, and Robert Jasperson. 1996. Resources and repair: a cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In *Interaction and grammar*, edited by Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson, 185–237. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fox, Barbara. 1999. Directions in Research: Language and the Body. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 32(1/2): 51–59.
- Fraser, Bruce. 2010. Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Hedging. In *New Approaches to Hedging*, edited by Gunther Kaltenböck, Wiltrud Mihatsch, and Stefan Schneider, 15–34. Bingley: Emerald.
- Freese, Jeremy, and Maynard W. Douglas. 1998. Prosodic features of bad news and good news in conversation. *Language in Society* 27(2): 195–219.
- Fujii, Noriko, and Tsuyoshi Ono. 2000. The occurrence and non-occurrence of the Japanese direct object marker *o* in conversation. *Studies in Language* 24(1): 1–39.
- Fujii, Seiko. 2000. Incipient decategorization of *MONO* and grammaticalization of speaker attitude in Japanese discourse. In *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*, edited by Gisle Andersen and Thorstein Fretheim, 85–118. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fujii, Seiko. 2006. Quoted thought and speech using the *mitai-na* ‘be like’ noun-modifying construction. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 53–95. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fujii, Yasunari. 2008. ‘You must have a wealth of stories’: Cross-linguistic differences between addressee support behaviour in Australian and Japanese. *Multilingua* 27: 325–370.
- Gardner, Rod. 2001. *When Listeners Talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Geluykens, Ronald. 1994. *The Pragmatics of Discourse Anaphora in English: Evidence from Conversational Repair*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. Positioning in style: Men in women’s jointly produced stories. In *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*, edited by Peter Auer, 393–443. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Geyer, Naomi. 2008. *Discourse and Politeness: Ambivalent Face in Japanese*. London: Continuum.
- Glover, Kelly D. 2000. Proximal and distal deixis in negotiation talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(7): 915–926.
- Goffman Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goffman, Erving. 1978. Response Cries. *Language* 54(4): 787-815.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Golato, Andrea. 2012. German *oh*: Marking an Emotional Change of State. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(3): 245–268.
- Goodwin, Charles. 1996. Transparent vision. In *Interaction and grammar*, edited by Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff, Sandra A. Thompson, 370–404. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2000. Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(10): 1489–1522.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2007. Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse & Society* 18: 53–73.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2010. Constructing meaning through prosody in aphasia. In *Prosody in Interaction*, edited by Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Elisabeth Reber, and Margret Selting, 373–394. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goodwin, Charles. 2013. The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46: 8–23.
- Goodwin, Charles, and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 1987. Concurrent Operations on Talk: Notes on the Interactive Organization of Assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 1(1): 1–54.
- Goodwin, Charles, and Marjorie Harness Goodwin. 1992. Assessments and the construction of context. In *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, edited by Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 147–190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie H., and Charles Goodwin. 2001. Emotion within Situated Activity. In *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*, edited by Alessandro Duranti, 239–257. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, Asta Cekaite, and Charles Goodwin. 2012. Emotion as stance. In *Emotion in Interaction*, edited by Anssi Peräkylä and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 16–41. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Greer, Tim. 2016. On doing Japanese awe in English talk. In *Emotion in Multilingual Interaction*, edited by Matthew T. Prior and Gabriele Kasper, 111–130. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1992a. Contextualization and understanding. In *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, edited by Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 228–252. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gumperz, John J. 1992b. Contextualization Revisited. In *The Contextualization of Language*, edited by Peter Auer and Aldo Di Luzio, 39–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gumperz, John J. 2015. Interactional Sociolinguistics: A Personal Perspective. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 2, edited by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, 309–323. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Günthner, Susanne. 1997. The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues. In *Language of Emotions: Conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation*, edited by Susanne Niemeier and René Dirven, 247–275. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Günthner, Susanne. 1999. Polyphony and the ‘layering of voices’ in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 685–708.
- Günthner, Susanne. 2011. The construction of emotional involvement in everyday German narratives: Interactive uses of ‘dense constructions’. *Pragmatics* 21(4): 573-592.
- Haakana, Markku. 2007. Reported thought in complaint stories. In *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction*, edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift, 150–178. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haakana, Markku. 2012. Laughter in Conversation: The Case of “Fake” Laughter. In *Emotion in Interaction*, edited by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 174–194. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haddington, Pentti. 2006. The organization of gaze and assessments as resources for stance taking. *Text & Talk* 26(3): 281–328.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Margret Selting, eds. 2005. *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 2009. Designing utterances for action: Verb repeat responses to assessments in Finnish. In *Talk in interaction: Comparative dimensions*, edited by Markku Haakana, Minna Laakso, and Jan Lindström, 124–151. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen. 2012. Being Equivocal: Affective Responses Left Unspecified. In *Emotion in Interaction*, edited by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 147–173. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1975. *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Halliday, M.A.K. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th edition. Revised by Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. London: Routledge.
- Harkins, Jean, and Anna Wierzbicka, eds. 2001. *Emotions in Crosslinguistic Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hasada, Rie. 1998. Sound symbolic emotion words in Japanese. In *Speaking of Emotions: Conceptualisation and Expression*, edited by Angeliki Athanasiadou and Elżbieta Tabakowska, 83–98. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hasada, Rie. 2001. Meanings of Japanese sound-symbolic emotion words. In *Emotions in Crosslinguistic Perspective*, edited by Jean Harkins and Anna Wierzbicka, 217–254. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 2018. Benefactives. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, edited by Yoko Hasegawa, 509–529. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 1996. The (nonvacuous) semantics of *TE*-linkage in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(6): 763–790.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 2006. Embedded soliloquy and affective stances in Japanese. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 209–229. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 2010a. *Soliloquy in Japanese and English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 2010b. The Sentence-final particles *ne* and *yo* in soliloquial Japanese. *Pragmatics* 20(1): 71–89.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 2015. *Japanese: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasegawa, Yuri. 1993. Hanashi kotoba ni okeru ‘mujoshi’ no kinō [The function of the zero particle in spoken language]. *Nihongo Kyōiku* 80: 158–168.
- Haugh, Michael. 2008. Utterance-final conjunctive particles and implicature in Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics* 18: 425–451.
- Hayano, Kaoru. 2011. Giving support to the claim of epistemic primacy: *yo*-marked assessments in Japanese. In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, edited by Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig, 58–81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayano, Kaoru. 2013. *Territories of Knowledge in Japanese Conversation*. Ph.D. thesis. Radboud University, Nijmegen. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-001M-0000-000E-E392-A>.

- Hayashi, Makoto, and Junko Mori. 1998. Co-construction in Japanese revisited: We do ‘finish each other’s sentences’. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 7*: 77–93.
- Hayashi, Makoto, and Kaoru Hayano. 2018. A-prefaced responses to inquiry in Japanese. In *Between Turn and Sequence: Turn-initial particles across languages*, edited by John Heritage and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 193–223. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hayashi, Makoto, and Kyung-Eun Yoon. 2010. A cross-linguistic exploration of demonstratives in interaction: With particular reference to the context of word-formulation trouble. In *Fillers, Pauses and Placeholders*, edited by Nino Amiridze, Boyd H. Davis, and Margaret MacLagan, 33–66. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hayashi, Makoto, and Shuya Kushida. 2013. Responding With Resistance to *Wh*-Questions in Japanese Talk-in-Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46(3): 231–255.
- Hayashi, Makoto, and Stephanie Hyeri Kim. 2015. Turn formats for other-initiated repair and their relation to trouble sources: Some observations from Japanese and Korean conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 87: 198–217.
- Hayashi, Makoto, Geoffrey Raymond, and Jack Sidnell, eds. 2013. *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayashi, Makoto, Junko Mori, and Tomoyo Takagi. 2002. Contingent Achievement of Co-Tellership in a Japanese Conversation: An Analysis of Talk, Gaze, and Gesture. In *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, edited by Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox, and Sandra A. Thompson, 81–122. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hayashi, Makoto, Yuri Hosoda, and Ikuyo Morimoto. 2019. *Tte Yuu Ka* as a Repair Preface in Japanese. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 52(2): 104–123.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 1999. Where Grammar and Interaction Meet: A Study of Co-Participant Completion in Japanese Conversation. *Human Studies* 22: 475–499.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2001. Postposition-initiated utterances in Japanese conversation: An interactional account of a grammatical practice. In *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, edited by Margret Selting and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 317–343. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2003a. *Joint Utterance Construction in Japanese Conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2003b. Language and the Body as Resources for Collaborative Action: A Study of Word Searches in Japanese Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 36(2): 109–141.

- Hayashi, Makoto. 2004. Projection and grammar: notes on the ‘action-projecting’ use of the distal demonstrative *are* in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1337–1374.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2005. Joint turn construction through language and the body: Notes on embodiment in coordinated participation in situated activities. *Semiotica* 156: 21–53.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2009. Marking a ‘noticing of departure’ in talk: *Eh*-prefaced turns in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 2100–2129.
- Hayashi, Makoto. 2010. An overview of the question–response system in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2685–2702.
- Heritage, John. 1984a. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 299–345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John. 1984b. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, John. 2011a. Conversation Analysis: Practices and Methods. In *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*, 3rd edition, edited by David Silverman, 208–230. London: SAGE.
- Heritage, John. 2011b. Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: empathic moments in interaction. In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, edited by Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig, 159–183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Higashiizumi, Yuko. 2011. Are *kara* ‘because’-clauses causal subordinate clauses in present-day Japanese? In *Subordination in Conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective*, edited by Ritva Laury and Ryoko Suzuki, 191–207. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hirose, Yukio. 1995. Direct and indirect speech as quotations of public and private expression. *Lingua* 95: 223–238.
- Holt, Elizabeth, and Rebecca Clift, eds. 2007. *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 2000. Reporting and Reacting: Concurrent Responses to Reported Speech. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(4): 425–454.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 2007. ‘I’m eyeing your chop up mind’: reporting and enacting. In *Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction*, edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift, 47–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horie, Kaoru, Miya Shimura, and Prashant Pardeshi. 2006. Overt anaphoric expressions, empathy, and the *uchi-soto* distinction: A contrastive perspective. In *Emotive*

- Communication in Japanese*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 173–190. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hübler, Alex. 1998. *The Expressivity of Grammar*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hunston, Susan, and Geoff Thompson, eds. 2000. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hutchby, Ian, and Robin Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation Analysis*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, edited by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 35–71. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 2005. Indices of a ‘subjectivity-prominent’ language: Between cognitive linguistics and linguistic typology. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 3(1): 132–164.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1982. Language and affect: Some cross-cultural issues. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1982 (Contemporary Perceptions of Language: Interdisciplinary Dimensions)*, edited by Heidi Byrnes, 31–47. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Irvine, Judith T. 2009. Stance in a Colonial Encounter: How Mr. Taylor Lost His Footing. In *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspective*, edited by Alexandra Jaffe, 53–71. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Iwasaki, Noriko, Peter Sells, and Kimi Akita, eds. 2017. *The Grammar of Japanese Mimetics: Perspectives from structure, acquisition, and translation*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Iwasaki, Shimako. 2011. The multimodal mechanics of collaborative unit construction in Japanese conversation. In *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*, edited by Jürgen Streeck, Charles Goodwin, and Curtis LeBaron, 106–120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iwasaki, Shimako. 2013. Emerging units and emergent forms of participation within a unit in Japanese interaction: Local organization at a finer level of granularity. In *Units of Talk – Units of Action*, edited by Beatrice Szczepek Reed and Geoffrey Raymond, 243–275. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 1993. *Subjectivity in grammar and discourse: Theoretical considerations and a case study of Japanese spoken discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 1997. The Northridge earthquake conversations: The floor structure and the ‘loop’ sequence in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 661–693.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2013. *Japanese*. Revised edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2014. Grammar of the internal expressive sentences in Japanese: Observations and explorations. In *Usage-based Approaches to Japanese Grammar: Towards the understanding of human language*, edited by Kaori Kabata and Tsuyoshi Ono, 55–83. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2018. Passives. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, edited by Yoko Hasegawa, 530–556. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Izutsu, Katsunobu, and Mitsuko Narita Izutsu. 2013. From discourse markers to modal/final particles: What the position reveals about the continuum. In *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Categorization and description*, edited by Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie, and Paola Pietrandrea, 217–235. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jacobsen, Wesley M. 2018. Tense and Aspect. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, edited by Yoko Hasegawa, 332–356. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaffe, Alexandra, ed. 2009a. *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, Alexandra. 2009b. Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Stance. In *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, edited by Alexandra Jaffe, 3–28. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1960. Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In *Style in Language*, edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, 350–377. Cambridge: Technology Press of MIT.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1984. On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies of Conversational Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John C. Heritage, 346–369. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation*, edited by Gene H. Lerner, 13–31. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jones, Kimberly, and Tsuyoshi Ono, eds. 2008. *Style Shifting in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kageyama, Taro. 2021. Between lexical verbs and auxiliaries: The architecture of Japanese verb-verb complexes. In *Verb-verb complexes in Asian languages*, edited by Taro Kageyama, Peter E. Hook, and Prashant Pardeshi, 15–43. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kamio, Akio. 1997. *Territory of Information*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Kangasharju, Helena. 2009. Preference for disagreement? A comparison of three disputes. In *Talk in Interaction: Comparative Dimensions*, edited by Markku Haakana, Minna Laakso, and Jan Lindström, 231–253. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2006. Stance taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk* 26(6): 699–731.
- Katagiri, Yasuhiro. 2007. Dialogue functions of Japanese sentence-final particles ‘yo’ and ‘ne’. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1313–1323.
- Kataoka, Kuniyoshi. 1995. Affect in Japanese women’s letter writing: Use of sentence-final particles ‘ne’ and ‘yo’ and orthographic conventions. *Pragmatics* 5(4): 427–453.
- Kataoka, Kuniyoshi. 2008. “Involved” speech style and deictic management of spatio-temporal and textual reference: A case of *ko/so*-deictics in Japanese. In *Style Shifting in Japanese*, edited by Kimberly Jones and Tsuyoshi Ono, 251–284. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Katō, Shigehiro. 2001. Bunmatsu joshi ‘ne’ ‘yo’ no danwa kōsei kinō [Pragmatic functions of the sentence-final particles ‘ne’ and ‘yo’]. *Toyama Daigaku Jinbun Gakubu Kiyō* 35: 31–48. Available at: <http://www.hmt.u-toyama.ac.jp/kenkyu/kiyo35/katoh35.pdf>.
- Kaukomaa, Timo, Anssi Peräkylä, and Johanna Ruusuvuori. 2013. Turn-opening smiles: Facial expression constructing emotional transition in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 55: 21–42.
- Kaukomaa, Timo, Anssi Peräkylä, and Johanna Ruusuvuori. 2015. How Listeners Use Facial Expression to Shift the Emotional Stance of the Speaker’s Utterance. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48(3): 319–341.
- Keisanen, Tiina, and Elise Kärkkäinen. 2014. Stance. In *Pragmatics of Discourse*, edited by Klaus P. Scheider and Anne Barron, 295–322. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kern, Friederike, and Margret Selting. 2013. Conversation Analysis and Interactional Linguistics. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 2, edited by Carol A. Chapelle, 1012–1016. Chichester: Willey-Blackwell.
- Kiesling, Scott F. 2009. Style as Stance: Stance as the Explanation for Patterns of Sociolinguistic Variation. In *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, edited by Alexandra Jaffe, 171–194. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kita, Sotaro, and Sachiko Ide. 2007. Nodding, *aizuchi*, and final particles in Japanese conversation: How conversation reflects the ideology of communication and social relationships. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1242–1254.

- Kitagawa, Chisato. 2006. Interjectional Demonstratives are Demonstratives. In *Gengokagaku no shinzui o motomete: Nakajima Heizō kyōju kanrenki kinen ronbunshū* [In Search of the Essence of Language Science: Festschrift for Professor Heizō Nakajima on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday], edited by Yūbun Suzuki, Keizō Mizuno, and Ken'ichi Takami, 79–100. Tōkyō: Hitsuji Shobō.
- Kitano, Hiroaki. 1999. On interaction and grammar: evidence from one use of the Japanese demonstrative *are* ('that'). *Pragmatics* 9(3): 383–400.
- Kogure, Masato. 2007. Nodding and smiling in silence during the loop sequence of backchannels in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1275–1128.
- Koike, Chisato. 2015. Affect-Loaded Questions in Japanese Storytelling: An Analysis of Grammar, Prosody, and Body Movements of Story Recipients' Questions. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 5: 481–510. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2015.55043>.
- Konno, Hiroaki. 2012. I-ochi: Katachi to imi no intāfeisu no kanten kara [The Japanese adjectival conjugational ending dropping construction: From the perspective of the syntax-semantics interface]. *Gengo Kenkyū* 141: 5–31. Available at: http://www.ls-japan.org/modules/documents/LSJpapers/journals/141_konno.pdf.
- Koshik, Irene. 2005. *Beyond Rhetorical Questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1987. *Functional Syntax*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1973. Where epistemology, style, and grammar meet: A case study from Japanese. In *Festschrift for Morris Halle*, edited by Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 377–391. New York: Holt.
- Kushida, Shuya. 2015. Using Names for Referring without Claiming Shared Knowledge: Name-Quoting Descriptors in Japanese. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48(2): 230–251.
- Labov, William. 1984. Intensity. In *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin, 43–70. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Lakoff, Robin T. 1974. Remarks on this and that. In *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, edited by Michael W. La Galy, Robert A. Fox, and Anthony Bruck, 345–356. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Lakoff, Robin. 1973. The Logic of Politeness; or, Minding Your P's and q's. In *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 9(1): 292–305.
- Laury, Ritva, and Shigeko Okamoto. 2011. *Teyuuka* and *I mean* as pragmatic parentheticals in Japanese and English. In *Subordination in Conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective*, edited by Ritva Laury and Ryoko Suzuki, 209–238. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lauwereyns, Shizuka. 2002. Hedges in Japanese conversation: The influence of age, sex, formality. *Language Variation and Change* 14: 239–259.
- Lee, Duck-Young, and Yoko Yonezawa. 2008. The role of the overt expression of first and second person subject in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 733–767.
- Lee, Duck-Young. 2002. The function of the zero particle with special reference to spoken Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 645–682.
- Lee, Duck-Young. 2007. Involvement and the Japanese interactive particles *ne* and *yo*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 363–388.
- Lee, Seung-Hee, and Hiroko Tanaka. 2016. Affiliation and alignment in responding actions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 100: 1–7.
- Lerner, Gene H., and Tomoyo Takagi. 1999. On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 49–75.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2013. Action Formation and Ascription. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 103–130. Malden/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1976. Subject and topic: A new typology of language. In *Subject and Topic*, edited by Charles N. Li, 457–489. New York: Academic Press.
- Lindström, Jan. 2009. Interactional linguistics. In *The Pragmatics of Interaction*, edited by Sigurd D'hondt, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren, 96–103. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Linell, Per. 2005. *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics: Its nature, origins and transformations*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Linell, Per. 2009. *Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically: Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-making*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Local, John, and Gareth Walker. 2008. Stance and affect in conversation: On the interplay of sequential and phonetic resources. *Text & Talk* 28(7): 723–747.

- Local, John. 1996. Conversational phonetics: some aspects of news receipts in everyday talk. In *Prosody in conversation*, edited by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting, 177–230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. 1982. Deixis and subjectivity: *Loquor, ergo sum*. In *Speech, Place, and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics*, edited by Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang H. Klein, 101–124. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Lyons, John. 1995. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacWhinney, Brian. 2007. The TalkBank Project. In *Creating and Digitizing Language Corpora*, edited by Joan C. Beal, Karen P. Corrigan, and Hermann L. Moisl, 163–180. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, J. R., and P. R. R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, Samuel. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Marty, Anton. 1908. *Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der allgemeinen Grammatik und Sprachphilosophie*. Halle a. S.: Verlag von Max Niemeyer. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/untersuchungenz00martgoog>.
- Masuda, Kyoko. 2009. A Usage-based Account of the Japanese Modal Adverb *Yahari/Yappa(ri)* in Spoken Discourse. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 17: 439–454.
- Masuoka, Takashi. 1991. *Modariti no bunpō* [*The grammar of modality*]. Tōkyō: Kuroshio.
- Mathesius, Vilém. 1983[1929]. Functional Linguistics. In *Praguiana: Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School*, edited by Josef Vachek and Libuše Dušková, 121–142. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matsugu, Yuka. 2005. Japanese epistemic sentence-final particle kana: Its function as a ‘mitigation marker’ in discourse data. *Pragmatics* 15(4): 423–436.
- Matsui, Tomoko. 2000. Linguistic encoding of the guarantee of relevance: Japanese sentence-final particle YO. In *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*, edited by Gisle Andersen and Thorstein Fretheim, 145–172. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matsui, Tomoko. 2002. Semantics and pragmatics of a Japanese discourse marker *dakara* (*so/in other words*): a unitary account. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 867–891.

- Matsumoto, David, Seung Hee Yoo, Satoko Hirayama, and Galina Petrova. 2005. Development and Validation of a Measure of Display Rule Knowledge: The Display Rule Assessment Inventory. *Emotion* 5(1): 23–40.
- Matsumoto, Kazuko. 2003. *Intonation Units in Japanese Conversation: Syntactic, informational and functional structures*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1988. Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12(4): 403–426.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 2001. *Tyotto*: Speech Act Qualification in Japanese Revisited. *Japanese Language and Literature* 35(1): 1–16.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 2018. The form and meaning of the dangling *mitaina* construction in a network of constructions. In *Pragmatics of Japanese: Perspectives on Grammar, Context and Culture*, edited by Mutsuko Endo Hudson, Yoshiko Matsumoto, and Junko Mori, 75–98. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mayes, Patricia, and Tsuyoshi Ono. 1991. Social factors influencing reference in Japanese: With special emphasis on *ano hito*. In *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 3: Asian Discourse and Grammar*, edited by Patricia M. Clancy and Sandra A. Thompson, 84–93. Santa Barbara: University of California.
- Maynard, Douglas W. 2003. *Bad News, Good News: Conversational Order in Everyday Talk and Clinical Settings*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Maynard, Douglas W., and Jeremy Freese. 2012. Good News, Bad News, and Affect: Practical and Temporal “Emotion Work” in Everyday Life. In *Emotion in Interaction*, edited by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 92–112. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1989. *Japanese Conversation: Self-Conceptualization through Structure and Interactional Management*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1991. Pragmatics of discourse modality: a case of *da* and *desu/masu* forms in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15: 551–582.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1992. Cognitive and pragmatic messages of a syntactic choice: The case of the Japanese commentary predicate *n(o) da*. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 12(4): 563–614.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1993. *Discourse Modality: Subjectivity, Emotion and Voice in the Japanese Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1996. Multivoicedness in speech and thought representation: The case of self-quotation in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 207–226.

- Maynard, Senko K. 1997. *Japanese Communication: Language and Thought in Context*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1999a. On rhetorical ricochet: Expressivity of nominalization and *da* in Japanese. *Discourse Studies* 1(1): 57–81.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1999b. Grammar, with attitude: On the expressivity of certain *da*-sentences in Japanese. *Linguistics* 37: 215–250.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2000. Speaking for the unspeakable: Expressive functions of *nan(i)* in Japanese discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1209–1239.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2001. Mitigation in disguise: *Te-yuu-ka* as preface to self-revelation in Japanese dramatic discourse. *Poetics* 29(6): 317–329.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2002. *Linguistic Emotivity: Centrality of place, the topic-comment dynamic, and an ideology of pathos in Japanese discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2005a. Another conversation: expressivity of *Mitaina* and inserted speech in Japanese discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 837–869.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2005b. *Expressive Japanese: A Reference Guide to Sharing Emotion and Empathy*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2007. *Linguistic Creativity in Japanese Discourse: Exploring the multiplicity of self, perspective, and voice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- McGloin, Naomi H., and Yumiko Konishi. 2010. From connective particle to sentence-final particle: a usage-based analysis of *shi* 'and' in Japanese. *Language Sciences* 32(5): 563–578.
- McGloin, Naomi Hanaoka. 1990. Sex differences and sentence-final particles. In *Aspects of Japanese women's language*, edited by Sachiko Ide and Naomi H. McGloin, 23–41. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Miller, Jim, and Regina Weinert. 1998. *Spontaneous Spoken Language: Syntax and Discourse*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Minegishi Cook, Haruko. 1988. *Sentential particles in Japanese conversation: A study of indexicality*. Ph.D. thesis. University of Southern California. Available at: <http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/digital/collection/p15799coll36/id/217911/rec/1>.
- Minegishi Cook, Haruko. 1990. The sentence-final *ne* as a tool for cooperation in Japanese cooperation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 1: 29–44.
- Minegishi Cook, Haruko. 1992. Meanings of non-referential indexes: a case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne*. *Text* 12(4): 507–539.

- Minegishi Cook, Haruko. 1993. Functions of the filler *ano* in Japanese. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 3: 19–38.
- Minegishi Cook, Haruko. 2018. Speech Style Shift. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, edited by Yoko Hasegawa, 628–648. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miyazaki, Kazuhito. 2002. Shūjoshi ‘ne’ to ‘na’ [A Study of the Sentence-final Particles *ne* and *na*]. *Handai Nihongo Kenkyū* 14: 1–19. Available at: <https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/repo/ouka/all/3607/14-01.pdf>.
- Mori, Junko. 1994. Functions of the connective *datte* in Japanese conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4: 147–163.
- Mori, Junko. 1999. *Negotiating Agreement and Disagreement in Japanese: Connective expressions and turn construction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mori, Junko. 2006. The workings of the Japanese token *hee* in informing sequences: An analysis of sequential context, turn shape, and prosody. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 1175–1205.
- Mori, Junko. 2014. The re-examination of so-called ‘clefts’: A study of multiunit turns in Japanese talk-in-interaction. In *Usage-based Approaches to Japanese Grammar: Towards the understanding of human language*, edited by Kaori Kabata and Tsuyoshi Ono, 193–222. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Morita, Emi. 2002. Stance marking in the collaborative completion of sentences: Final particles as epistemic markers in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10: 220–223.
- Morita, Emi. 2005. *Negotiation of Contingent Talk: The Japanese Interactional Particles ne and sa*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Morita, Emi. 2012a. Deriving the socio-pragmatic meanings of the Japanese interactional particle *ne*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 298–314.
- Morita, Emi. 2012b. “This talk needs to be registered”: The metapragmatic meaning of the Japanese interactional particle *yo*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1721–1742.
- Morita, Emi. 2015. Japanese interactional particles as a resource for stance building. *Journal of Pragmatics* 83: 91–103.
- Naito, Masako. 2006. *Tokieda’s Language Process Theory*. MPhil. thesis. Department of Linguistics, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/334948385.pdf>.
- Nakamura, Kanae. 2018. “Late projectability” of Japanese turns revisited: Interrelation between gaze and syntax in Japanese conversations. In *Pragmatics of Japanese: Perspectives on*

- grammar, interaction and culture*, edited by Matsuko Endo Hudson, Yoshiko Matsumoto, and Junko Mori, 99–122. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nakayama, Toshihide. 1991. Grammaticization of viewpoint: A study of Japanese deictic supporting verbs. In *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics 3: Asian Discourse and Grammar*, edited by Patricia M. Clancy and Sandra A. Thompson, 94–105. Santa Barbara: University of California. Available at: <https://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/sites/secure.lsit.ucsb.edu/ling.d7/files/sitefiles/research/papers/Working%20Papers%20Vol%203.pdf>.
- Narita Izutsu, Mitsuko, and Katsunobu Izutsu. 2014. Truncation and backshift: Two pathways to sentence-final coordinating conjunctions. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 15(1): 62–92.
- Nariyama, Shigeko. 2003. *Ellipsis and Reference Tracking in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2005. On defining modality again. *Language Sciences* 27(2): 165–192.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2009. Modality, *Modariti* and Predication – the Story of Modality in Japan. In *Japanese Modality: Exploring its Scope and Interpretation*, edited by Barbara Pizziconi and Mika Kizu, 9–35. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2012. *Modality, Subjectivity, and Semantic Change: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Naruoka, Keiko. 2006. The interactional functions of the Japanese demonstratives in conversation. *Pragmatics* 16(4): 475–512.
- Naruoka, Keiko. 2014. Toward meanings of expressive indexicals: The case of Japanese demonstratives *konna/sonna/anna*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 69: 4–21.
- Niemeier, Susanne, and René Dirven, eds. 1997. *The Language of Emotions: Conceptualization, Expression, and Theoretical Foundation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Niemelä, Maarit. 2005. Voiced Direct Reported Speech in Conversational Storytelling: Sequential Patterns of Stance Taking. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 18: 197–221.
- Niemelä, Maarit. 2010. The reporting space in conversational storytelling: Orchestrating all semiotic channels for taking a stance. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 3258–3270.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1991. *Nihongo no modariti to ninshō* [Modality and person in Japanese]. Tōkyō: Hitsuji shobō.
- Obana, Yasuko. 2016. Speech Level Shifts in Japanese: A different perspective. The application of Symbolic Interactionist Role Theory. *Pragmatics* 26(2): 247–290.

- Occhi, Debra J. 1999. Sounds of the Heart and Mind: Mimetics of Emotional States in Japanese. In *Languages of Sentiment: Cultural constructions of emotional substrates*, edited by Gary B. Palmer and Debra J. Occhi, 151–170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi Schieffelin. 1989. Language has a heart. *Text* 9(1): 7–25.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Transcription as Theory. In *Developmental Pragmatics*, edited by Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin, 43–72. New York: Academic Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1986. From feelings to grammar: a Samoan case study. In *Language Socialization Across Cultures*, edited by Bambi B. Schieffelin and Elinor Ochs, 251–272. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1989. Introduction: The Pragmatics of Affect. *Text* 9(1): 1–5.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1992. Indexing gender. In *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, edited by Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 335–358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, edited by John J. Gumperz and Stephen C. Levinson, 407–437. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogden, Richard. 2006. Phonetics and social action in agreements and disagreements. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(10): 1752–1775.
- Ogi, Naomi. 2017. *Involvement and Attitude in Japanese Discourse: Interactive markers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ohori, Toshio. 1995. Remarks on Suspended Clauses: A Contribution to Japanese Phraseology. In *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics: In Honor of Charles J. Fillmore*, edited by Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson, 201–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ohori, Toshio. 1997. Framing Effects in Japanese Non-final Clauses: Toward an Optimal Grammar-Pragmatics Interface. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Structure*: 471–480. Available at: <https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/BLS/article/view/1270>.
- Okamoto, Shigeko, 1985. *Ellipsis in Japanese Discourse*. Ph.D. thesis. University of California, Berkeley. Available at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4zx1c0rg>.
- Okamoto, Shigeko, and Janet S. Shibamoto Smith, eds. 2004. *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology: Cultural Models and Real People*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Okamoto, Shigeko, and Tsuyoshi Ono. 2008. Quotative *tte* in Japanese: Its multifaceted functions and degrees of “subordination”. In *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining*:

- The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, edited by Ritva Laury, 205–230. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Okamoto, Shigeiko. 1995. Pragmaticization of meaning in some sentence-final particles in Japanese. In *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics: In honour of Charles J. Fillmore*, edited by Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson, 210–246. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Okamoto, Shigeiko. 1999. Situated Politeness: Manipulating Honorific and Non-Honorific Expressions in Japanese Conversations. *Pragmatics* 9(1): 51–74.
- Okamoto, Shigeiko. 2011. The use and interpretation of addressee honorifics and plain forms in Japanese: Diversity, multiplicity, and ambiguity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3673–3688.
- Onishi, Masayuki. 1994. Semantic Primitives in Japanese. In *Semantic and Lexical Universals: Theory and Empirical Findings*, edited by Cliff Goddard and Anna Wierzbicka, 361–386. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi, and Ryoko Suzuki. 1992. Word order variability in Japanese conversation: Motivations and grammaticization. *Text* 12(3): 429–445.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi, and Ryoko Suzuki. 1993. The development of a marker of speaker's attitude: The pragmatic use of the Japanese grammaticized verb *shimau* in conversation. In *Proceedings of the Eighteen Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, edited by Laura A. Buszard-Welcher, Lionel Wee, and William Weigel, 204–213. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. Available at: <https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/BLS/article/view/1595/1370>.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi, and Ryoko Suzuki. 2018. The use of frequent verbs as reactive tokens in Japanese everyday talk: Formulaicity, floescence, and grammaticization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 123: 209–219.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi, and Sandra A. Thompson. 1997. Deconstructing “Zero Anaphora” in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Structure*: 481–491. Available at: <https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/BLS/article/view/1259>.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi, and Sandra A. Thompson. 2003. Japanese (*w*)*atashi/ore/boku* ‘I’: They’re not just pronouns. *Cognitive Linguistics* 14(4): 321–347.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi, Sandra A. Thompson, and Ryoko Suzuki. 2000. The pragmatic nature of the so-called subject marker *ga* in Japanese: evidence from conversation. *Discourse studies* 2(1): 55–84.

- Ono, Tsuyoshi, Sandra A. Thompson, and Yumi Sasaki. 2012. Japanese Negotiation Through Emerging Final Particles in Everyday Talk. *Discourse Processes* 49: 243–272.
- Ono, Tsuyoshi. 2006. An emotively motivated post-predicate constituent order in a ‘strict predicate final’ language: Emotion and grammar meet in Japanese everyday talk. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 139–153. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Onodera, Noriko O. 2004. *Japanese Discourse Markers: Synchronic and diachronic discourse analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Oropeza-Escobar, Minerva. 2011. *Represented Discourse, Resonance and Stance in Joking Interaction in Mexican Spanish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Osgood, Charles E., William H. May, and Murray S. Miron. 1975. *Cross-Cultural Universals of Affective Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Oshima, David Y., and Shin-ichiro Sano. 2012. On the characteristics of Japanese reported discourse: A study with special reference to elliptic quotation. In *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, edited by Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid Van Alphen, 145–172. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Palmer, F. R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, Gary B. and Debra J. Occhi. 1999b. Introduction: Linguistic Anthropology and Emotional Experience. In *Languages of Sentiment: Cultural Constructions of Emotional Substrates*, edited by Gary B. Palmer and Debra J. Occhi, 1–22. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Palmer, Gary B., and Debra J. Occhi, eds. 1999a. *Languages of Sentiment: Cultural Constructions of Emotional Substrates*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Peräkylä, Anssi, and Johanna Ruusuvuori. 2012. Facial Expression and Interactional Regulation of Emotion. In *Emotion in Interaction*, edited by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 64–91. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peräkylä, Anssi, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, eds. 2012. *Emotion in Interaction*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pizziconi, Barbara, and Mika Kizu, eds. 2009. *Japanese Modality: Exploring its Scope and Interpretation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pizziconi, Barbara. 2009. The interactional Consequences of Epistemic Indexicality – Some Thoughts on the Epistemic Marker *-kamoshirenai*. In *Japanese Modality: Exploring its Scope and Interpretation*, edited by Barbara Pizziconi and Mika Kizu, 259–286. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Pomerantz, Anita, and John Heritage. 2013. Preference. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 210–228. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1986. Extreme Case formulations: A way of legitimating claims. *Human Studies* 9: 219–229.
- Prague Linguistic Circle. 1983[1929]. Theses Presented to the First Congress of Slavists Held in Prague in 1929. In *Praguiana: Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School*, edited by Josef Vachek and Libuše Dušková, 77–120. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Prior, Matthew T., and Gabriele Kasper, eds. 2016. *Emotion in Multilingual Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pritzker, Sonya E., Janina Fenigsen, and James M. Wilce, eds. 2020. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Emotion*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Reber, Elisabeth. 2012. *Affectivity in Interaction: Sound objects in English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Robinson, Jeffrey D. 2013. Overall Structural Organization. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 257–280. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rosenthal, Benjamin M. 2008. A Resource for Repair in Japanese Talk-in-Interaction: The Phrase TTE YUU KA. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(2): 227–240.
- Ruusuvuori, Johanna, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2009. Facial and Verbal Expressions in Assessing Stories and Topics. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42(4): 377–394.
- Ruusuvuori, Johanna. 2013. Emotion, Affect and Conversation. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 330–349. Malden/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey, and Emanuel A. Schegloff. 2007. Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives*, edited by N. J. Enfield and Tanya Stivers, 23–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language* 50(4/1): 696–735.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1984. Notes on methodology. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 21–27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1995. *Lectures on Conversation*, vol. 1 and 2, edited by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Saft, Scott. 2007. Exploring *aizuchi* as resources in Japanese social interaction: The case of a political discussion program. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 1290–1312.
- Saigo, Hideki. 2011. *Japanese Sentence-Final Particles in Talk-in-Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sandlund, Erica. 2004. *Feeling by Doing: The Social Organization of Everyday Emotions in Academic Talk-in-Interaction*. Ph.D. thesis. Karlstad University, Division for Culture and Communication, Department of English. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266672154_Feeling_by_Doing_The_Social_Organization_of_Everyday_Emotions_in_Academic_Talk-in-Interaction.
- Sano, Shinichiro. 2005. On the Positive Meaning of the Adjective *yabai* in Japanese. *Sophia linguistica: Working papers in linguistics* 53: 109–130. Available at: <https://digital-archives.sophia.ac.jp/repository/view/repository/00000024398>.
- Sapir, Edward. 1927. Speech as a Personality Trait. *American Journal of Sociology* 32 (6): 892–905.
- Sapir, Edward. 2008[1927]. Language as a form of human behavior. In *The Collected Works of Edward Sapir, Vol. I*, edited by Pierre Swiggers, 204–218. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Satake, Hideo. 1995. *Wakamono kotoba to retorikku* [Youth language and rhetorics]. *Nihongogaku* 14: 53–60.
- Satake, Hideo. 1997. *Wakamono kotoba to bunpō* [Youth language and grammar]. *Nihongogaku* 16: 55–64.
- Sawada, Osamu. 2018. *Pragmatic Aspects of Scalar Modifiers: The Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1968. Sequencing in Conversational Openings. *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075–1095.

- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1984. On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 28–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996a. Some Practices for Referring to Persons in Talk-in-Interaction: A Partial Sketch of a Systematics. In *Studies in Anaphora*, edited by Barbara Fox, 437–485. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996b. Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In *Interaction and grammar*, edited by Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson, 52–133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2004. Whistling in the Dark: Notes from the Other Side of Liminality. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 48: 17–30.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*, vol. 1. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2011. Word repeats as unit ends. *Discourse Studies* 13(3): 367–380.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., and Harvey Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8: 289–327.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., Gail Jefferson, and Harvey Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53(2): 361–382.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, Margret, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, eds. 2001. *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Selting, Margret, Peter Auer, Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Jörg Bergmann, Pia Bergmann, Karin Birkner, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Arnulf Deppermann, Peter Gilles, Susanne Günthner, Martin Hartung, Friederike Kern, Christine Mertzlufft, Christian Meyer, Miriam Morek, Frank Oberzaucher, Jörg Peters, Uta Quasthoff, Wilfried Schütte, Anja Stukenbrock, and Susanne Uhmann. 2009. *Gesprächs-analytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2)*. *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 10: 353–402. Available at: <http://www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de/heft2009/px-gat2.pdf>.
- Selting, Margret. 1994. Emphatic speech style – with special focus on the prosodic signalling of heightened emotive involvement in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22(3/4): 375–408.
- Selting, Margret. 1996. Prosody as an activity-type distinctive cue in conversation: The case of so-called ‘astonished’ questions in repair initiation. In *Prosody in conversation*, edited by

- Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting, 231–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, Margret. 2001. Probleme der Transkription verbalen und paraverbalen/ prosodischen Verhaltens [Problems in the transcription of verbal and para-verbal/ prosodic behaviour]. In *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik / Linguistics of Text and Conversation: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*. In *An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, vol. 2, edited by Klaus Brinker, Gerd Antos, Wolfgang Heinemann, and Sven F. Sager, 1059–1068. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Selting, Margret. 2010. Affectivity in conversational storytelling: an analysis of displays of anger or indignation in complaint stories. *Pragmatics* 20(2): 229–277.
- Selting, Margret. 2012. Complaint stories and subsequent complaint stories with affect displays. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 387–415.
- Shaw, Chloe, and Alexa Hepburn. 2013. Managing the Moral Implications of Advice in Informal Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46(4): 344–362.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shimojo, Mitsuaki. 2006. Properties of particle “omission” revisited. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 26: 123–140. Available at: <https://twpl.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/twpl/article/view/6178/3167>.
- Shinoda, Yutaka. 2013. Japanese Particle *Na* as a Marker of the Speaker’s Subjective Judgement ‘Here and Now’. In *Grammar in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: The Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics of Japanese and Chinese*, edited by Teruhiro Ishiguro and Luke Kang-kwong, 149–174. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Shinzato, Rumiko. 2006. Subjectivity, intersubjectivity, and grammaticalization. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 15–33. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shinzato, Rumiko. 2014. Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and Japanese grammar: A functional approach. In *Usage-based Approaches to Japanese Grammar: Towards the understanding of human language*, edited by Kaori Kabata and Tsuyoshi Ono, 85–108. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
- Shinzato, Rumiko. 2015. Two Types of Conditionals and Two Different Grammaticalization Paths. In *Final Particles*, edited by Sylvie Hancil, Alexander Haselow, and Margje Post, 157–180. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shinzato, Rumiko. 2018. *Amari/anmari/anma* and *totemo/tottemo* in history and discourse: Interaction of negative polarity and positive polarity. In *Pragmatics of Japanese:*

- Perspectives on grammar, interaction and culture*, edited by Mutsuko Endo Hudson, Yoshiko Matsumoto, and Junko Mori, 49–73. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sidnell, Jack. 2006. Coordinating talk, gaze, and gesture in reenactments. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39: 377–409.
- Sidnell, Jack. 2010. *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidnell, Jack. 2013. Basic Conversation Analytic Methods. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 77–99. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Soga, Matsuo. 1983. *Tense and Aspect in Modern Colloquial Japanese*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2012. Introduction. In *Emotion in Interaction*, edited by Anssi Peräkylä, and Marja-Leena Sorjonen, 3–15. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sorjonen, Marja-Leena. 2001. *Responding in Conversation: A study of response particles in Finnish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Squires, Todd. 1994. A Discourse analysis of the Japanese particle *sa*. *Pragmatics* 4(1): 1–29.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1964. Problems of emotive language. In *Approaches to Semiotics*, edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, Alfred S. Hayes, and Mary C. Bateson, 239–264. The Hague: Mouton.
- Steensig, Jacob. 2013. Conversation analysis and affiliation and alignment. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, edited by Carol A. Chapelle, 944–948. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Steensig, Jakob, and Paul Drew, eds. 2008. Special Issue on Questioning. *Discourse Studies* 10(10): 1–133.
- Stein, Dieter, and Susan Wright, eds. 1995. *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: Linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stenström, Anna-Brita, Gisle Andersen, and Ingrid Kristine Hasund. 2002. *Trends in Teenage Talk: Corpus compilation, analysis and findings*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stivers, Tanya, and Jack Sidnell. 2013. Introduction. In *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers, 1–8. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stivers, Tanya, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig. 2011. Knowledge, morality, and affiliation in social interaction. In *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*, edited by Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada, and Jakob Steensig, 3–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Stivers, Tanya, N. J. Enfield, and Stephen C. Levinson. 2007. Person reference in interaction. In *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives*, edited by N. J. Enfield and Tanya Stivers, 1–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2004. “No, no, no” and Other Types of Multiple Sayings in Social Interaction. *Human Communication Research* 30(2): 260–293.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2007. Alternative recognitionals in person reference. In *Person Reference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives*, edited by N. J. Enfield and Tanya Stivers, 73–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, Tanya. 2008. Stance, Alignment, and Affiliation During Storytelling: When Nodding Is a Token of Affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 41(1): 31–57.
- Strauss, Susan, and Sung-Ock Sohn. 1998. Grammaticalization, aspect, and emotion: The case of Japanese *-te shimau* and Korean *-a/e pelita*. *Japanese/Korean linguistics* 8: 217–230.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1986. ‘A Matter of Prolonged Field Work’: Notes Towards a Modal Grammar of English. *Applied Linguistics* 7(1): 1–25.
- Sugita, Yuko. 2012. Minimal affect uptake in a pre-climax position of conversational “scary” stories. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1273–1289.
- Sugiura, Hideyuki. 2006. ‘*Samu?*’, ‘*uma?*’ nado ni mirareru bunpōka ni kansuru kōsatsu: Kōbunbunpō no shiten [Grammaticalization of adjectives such as *samu?* ‘[I’m] cold’ and *uma?* ‘[it’s] delicious’: From the perspective of construction grammar]. *Nihon ninshiki gengogakukai ronbunshū* 6 [*Proceedings from the 6th Annual meeting of the Japanese Cognitive Linguistics Association*]: 382–389.
- Sugiura, Hideyuki. 2017. Expressing an alternative view from second position: Reversed polarity questions in everyday Japanese conversation. *Discourse Studies* 19(3): 291–313.
- Sunakawa, Yuriko, Satoru Komada, Mitsuko Shimoda, Mutsu Suzuki, Sayo Tsutsui, Akiko Hasunuma, Andrej Bekes, and Junko Morimoto. 1998. *Nihongo Bunkei Jiten* [*A Dictionary of Japanese Sentence Structure*]. Tōkyō: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Sunakawa, Yuriko. 2010. Manipulation of voices in the development of a story: Prosody and voice quality of Japanese direct reported speech. In *Storytelling across Japanese Conversational Genre*, edited by Polly E. Szatrowski, 23–59. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Ryoko. 1990. The Role of Particles in Japanese Gossip. In *Proceedings of the Sixteen Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*: 315–324. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v16i0.1723>.

- Suzuki, Ryoko. 1999. Language socialization through morphology: The affective suffix *-CHAU* in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: 1423–1441.
- Suzuki, Ryoko. 2006. How does ‘reason’ become less and less reasonable?: Pragmatics of the utterance-final *wake* in conversational discourse. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 35–51. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Ryoko. 2008. Quoting and topic-marking: Some observations on the quotative *tte* construction in Japanese. In *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, edited by Ritva Laury, 231–246. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Ryoko. 2011. A note on the emergence of quotative constructions in Japanese conversation. In *Subordination in Conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective*, edited by Ritva Laury and Ryoko Suzuki, 149–164. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Satoko, ed. 2006a. *Emotive Communication in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1995a. A Study of the Sentence-Final *mitai-na*. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 29(2): 55–78.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1995b. The functions of topic-encoding zero-marked phrases: a study of the interaction among topic-encoding expressions in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 607–626.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1996. The discourse function of the quotation marker *tte* in conversational Japanese. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on The Role of Learnability in Grammatical Theory*: 387–393. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. Available at: <https://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/BLS/article/view/1350/1134>.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1998a. Pejorative Connotation: A Case of Japanese. In *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, edited by Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv, 261–276. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1998b. *Tte* and *nante*: Markers of psychological distance in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29: 429–462.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1999. Marker of Unexpected Statements: An Analysis of the Quotative Particle *Datte*. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 33(1): 44–67.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 2000. Surprise and animosity: The use of the copula *da* in quotative sentences in Japanese. In *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*, edited by Gisle Andersen and Thorstein Fretheim, 239–253. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Suzuki, Satoko. 2001. Self-mockery in Japanese. *Linguistics* 40(1): 163–189.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 2006b. Emotive communication in Japanese: An introduction. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese.*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 1–13. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 2006c. Surprise and disapproval: On how societal views of the outside correlate with linguistic expressions. In *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, edited by Satoko Suzuki, 155–161. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 2007. Metapragmatic function of quotative markers in Japanese. In *Metapragmatics in Use*, edited by Wolfram Bublitz and Axel Hübler, 73–85. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Szatrowski, Polly E. 1987. “Pastness” and “narrative events” in Japanese conversational narratives. In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, edited by Russell S. Tomlin, 409–433. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Szczepek Reed, Beatrice. 2010. Prosody and alignment: a sequential perspective. *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 5: 859–867.
- Takagi, Tomoyo. 1999. “Questions” in Argument Sequences in Japanese. *Human Studies* 22: 397–423.
- Takubo, Yukinori, and Satoshi Kinsui. 1997. Discourse management in terms of mental spaces. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 741–758.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 1999. *Turn-taking in Japanese Conversation: A Study of Grammar and Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2000. The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(8): 1135–1176.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2001a. Adverbials for Turn Projection in Japanese: Toward a Demystification of the “Telepathic” Mode of Communication. *Language in Society* 30(4): 559–587.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2001b. The implementation of possible cognitive shifts in Japanese conversation: Complementizers as pivotal devices. In *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, edited by Margret Selting and Elisabeth Couper-Kuhlen, 81–109. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2004. Prosody for marking transition-relevance places in Japanese conversation: The case of turns unmarked by utterance-final objects. In *Sound Patterns in Interaction: Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*, edited by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Cecilia E. Ford, 63–96. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2005. Grammar and the “timing” of social action: Word order and preference organization in Japanese. *Language in Society* 34: 389–430.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2010. Multimodal expressivity of the Japanese response particle *Huun*: Displaying involvement without topical engagement. In *Prosody in Interaction*, edited by Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Elisabeth Reber, and Margret Selting, 303–332. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, Hiroko. 2016. Lexico-grammatical structures of agreements with assessments in English conversation: From a Japanese perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 100: 8–24.
- Tanaka, Lidia. 2004. *Gender, Language and Culture: A study of Japanese television interview discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tanaka, Lidia. 2015. *Japanese Questions: Discourse, Context and Language*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tannen, Deborah, ed. 1993. *Framing in Discourse*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1985. Relative Focus on Involvement in Oral and Written Discourse. In *Literacy, Language, and learning: The Nature and Consequences of Reading and Writing*, edited by David R. Olson, Nancy Torrance, and Angela Hildyard, 124–147. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2005. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends*. 2nd edition. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2007. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanno, Koji. 2017. Expanding to the peripheries: A corpus-based study of the development of the Japanese discourse marker *toiuka*. *Ampersand* 4: 58–72.
- Tanno, Koji. 2018. The Emergence of the Japanese Expletive *mattaku* through the Discourse Strategy of Upgrading in Showing Agreement. *Japanese Language and Literature* 52(1): 25–56.
- ten Have, Paul. 2007. *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE.
- Thompson, Geoff, and Laura Alba-Juez, eds. 2014. *Evaluation in Context*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Thompson, Geoff, and Susan Hunston. 2000. Evaluation: An Introduction. In *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, edited by Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson, 1–27. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

- Thompson, Sandra A. and Ryoko Suzuki. 2014. Reenactments in conversation: Gaze and reciprocity. *Discourse Studies* 16(6): 1–31.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Barbara A. Fox, and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2015. *Grammar in Everyday Talk: Building Responsive actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Togashi, Jun'ichi. 2006. Keiyōshi gokan tandoku yōhō nitsuite: Sono seiyaku to shinteki tetsudzuki [On the independent use of adjectival stems]. *Nihongo gakkai 2006 nendo shunki taikai yokōshū*: 165–172. Available at: <http://www.ic.daito.ac.jp/~jtogashi/articles/togashi2006c.pdf>.
- Tono, Yukio, Makoto Yamazaki, and Kikuo Maekawa. 2013. *A Frequency Dictionary of Japanese: Core vocabulary for learners*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Tsai, Ya-yun. 1996. Dōiyōkyūteki gimonbun no akusentokaku hakai onchō [The ukiagari-intonation in the end of the sentence of Tokyo Japanese]. *Tōhoku Daigaku Bungakubu Nihongo Gakka Ronshū* 6: 35–46. Available at: <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110004625925>.
- Uehara, Satoshi, and Etsuko Fukushima. 2008. *Masen* or *Nai Desu* – That is the question: A case study into Japanese conversational discourse. In *Style Shifting in Japanese*, edited by Kimberly Jones and Tsuyoshi Ono, 161–184. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ueno, Mieko, and Andrew Kehler. 2016. Grammatical and pragmatic factors in the interpretation of Japanese null and overt pronouns. *Linguistics* 54(6): 1165–1221.
- Volek, Bronislava. 1987. *Emotive Signs in Language and Semantic Functioning of Derived Nouns in Russian*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Voutilainen, Liisa, Pentti Henttonen, Mikko Kahri, Maari Kivioja, Niklas Ravaja, Mikko Sams, and Anssi Peräkylä. 2014. Affective stance, ambivalence, and psychophysiological responses during conversational storytelling. *Journal of Pragmatics* 68: 1–24.
- Wakita, Miho. 2003. 'i-keiyōshi + nai' no inritsuteki tokuchō: Akusento, intonēshon, jizoku jikan no sokumen kara [Prosodic Features of 'i-adjectives + nai': With the focus on pitch, intonation, and duration]. *Waseda Daigaku Nihongo Kyōiku Kenkyū* 3: 125–139. Available at: <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110004627862/en>.
- Wang, Yan. 2007. A Functional Study of the Final Particle Mono in Japanese Conversational Discourse. *The Linguistics Journal* 2(1):162–183.
- Wang, Yan. 2018. From subjectivity to intersubjectivity: A discourse-pragmatic study of the Japanese epistemic marker *kamo* (*shirenai*). In *Pragmatics of Japanese: Perspectives on grammar, interaction and culture*, edited by Mutsuko Endo Hudson, Yoshiko Matsumoto, and Junko Mori, 173–196. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Ward, Nigel, and Wataru Tsukahara. 2000. Prosodic features which cue back-channel responses in English and Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1177–1207.
- Weber, Tilo. 2003. There Is No Objective Subjectivity in the Study of Social Interaction. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 4(2): Article 43. Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/716/1551>.
- White, Peter R. R. 2011. Appraisal. In *Discursive Pragmatics*, edited by Jan Zienkowski, Jan-Ola Östman, and Jef Verschueren, 14–36. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- White, Peter R. R. 2015. Appraisal Theory. In *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, edited by Cornelia Ilie and Todd Sandel, 1–7. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Wierzbicka, Anna, and Jean Harkins. 2001. Introduction. In *Emotions in Crosslinguistic Perspective*, edited by Jean Harkins and Anna Wierzbicka, 1–34. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1999. *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilce, James M. 2009. *Language and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkinson, Sue, and Celia Kitzinger. 2006. Surprise as an Interactional Achievement: Reaction Tokens in Conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(2): 150–182.
- Wootton, A. J. 1989. Remarks on the methodology of conversation analysis. In *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective*, edited by Derek Roger and Peter Bull, 238–258. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Wu, Ruy-Jiuan Regina. 2004. *Stance in Talk: A conversation analysis of Mandarin final particles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Yamashita, Hiroko. 2002. Scrambled sentences in Japanese: Linguistic properties and motivations for production. *Text* 22(4): 597–633.
- Yokomori, Daisuke, Eiko Yasui, and Are Hajikano. 2018. Registering the receipt of information with a modulated stance: A study of *ne*-marked other-repetitions in Japanese talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 123: 167–191.
- Yonekawa, Akihiko. 1996. *Gendai wakamono kotoba kō [A Study of Contemporary Youth Language]*. Tōkyō: Maruzen.
- Yoshida, Eri. 1996. *A discourse study of passives in Japanese conversation*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of California. Available in ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Zawiszová, Halina. 2012. K popularitě prostředků oslabujících ilokuční sílu výpovědi v konverzačních interakcích mladých Japonců [On the popularity of means for weakening

of the illocutionary force in Japanese young people's conversational interactions]. *Dálný východ* 2(2): 31–47.

Zawiszová, Halina. 2016. Short Responding Action Formats Deployed to Achieve Affiliation in Japanese Young People's Responses to Tellings on Facebook. *Orientaliska Studier* 147: 29–52.

Zawiszová, Halina. 2018. *On 'doing friendship' in and through talk: Exploring conversational interactions of Japanese young people*. Olomouc: Palacký University Olomouc.

Zawiszová, Halina. 2021. *Manzai-like humor sequences: Exploring a particular form of highly collaborative conversational humor in Japanese interactions*. *The Gakushuin Journal of International Studies* 7: 41–69.