15 Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics

SENKO MAYNARD

One tends to simplistically think that the speaker is in the center of place, and the place passively receives the effect from the speaker. But this view is contrary to how the place of talk functions. The speaker is the one influenced by place; place is acting and the speaker is receiving. The place influences, and in fact defines, the speaker. Speaker does not merely speak "in" the place; the speaker is defined "by" the place.

Mio 1948: 21, my translation

0 Introduction: Definition and Organization

Discourse analysis is usually defined in two related ways. First, discourse analysis examines linguistic phenomena of real-life communication beyond the sentence level. Second, discourse analysis views functions of language as primary rather than its form. These two aspects are emphasized in two different books (both bearing the title *Discourse Analysis* and published in 1983). Stubbs (1983: 1) aligns with the first position by saying that discourse analysis refers "mainly to the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected spoken or written discourse" and it "attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause." G. Brown and Yule (1983: 1) take the second position, stating that discourse analysis is "the analysis of language in use," and "it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs."

Although discourse analysis is notoriously broadly defined, embedded in even the fluctuating definitions are the insistence on analysis of naturally occurring language and a desire to understand the functions of language. Studies introduced in this chapter all adopt this position, although in differing varieties and degrees.

A note on the term "discourse" should be added here. I use this term in the broadest sense referring to a piece of written, spoken (including nonverbal) communication created in a particular sociocultural context. Although some linguists use the term "text" as synonymous with discourse, I use "text" primarily in reference to the written versions of communication. "Text" also appears in reference to past studies using this term in their theories (e.g. text linguistics and textual tie).

The basic tenet of discourse analysis and pragmatics (and other humanistic/ social research such as sociolinguistics) notably fills in the gap created by formal analysis dominating the field of linguistics since 1960s. Given the current academic milieu of postmodernism, however, to view language as socially situated – both being created in context and creating its context – and to view language as functioning in multiple ways in human cognition and connection seem to be more readily accepted today than ever before. The history of linguistics is rife with contests between obedient and rebellious students. Shifts from American behaviorism to Chomskyan formalism and on to humanistic paradigms seem to follow this inevitable cycle of academic dissent followed by new insurgent moves challenging the now-established former rebels.

This chapter is organized as follows. In section 1, I trace the theoretical sources in the West as well as in Japan that form the background for contemporary discourse analysis and pragmatics research on Japanese. Then, sections 2–4 divide the research effort into three related agendas: discourse structure, language in fact-to-face interaction, and functions of language in discourse. These three concerns reflect some of the key issues of discourse analysis – discourse organization, discourse as interactional event, discourse as language in use, discourse functions, and discourse as being both context-defined and context-defining.

I should add that this chapter touches upon only a limited number of studies in Japanese discourse analysis and pragmatics, primarily focusing on publications available in English. Accelerated developments in Japanese discourse studies conducted in Japan in recent years are not included; the reader is encouraged to consult *Gengo*, *Nihongogaku*, *Nihongo Kyooiku*, and other scholarly journals for additional information concerning current discourse-related research.

The study of discourse structure in Japanese is limited at this point, but the research within contrastive rhetoric has produced interesting results. Research in face-to-face interaction in Japanese has proliferated in recent years and it offers a fertile ground where one can begin to ask the question of how language interacts with culture and society as well as with the identity of self and other. Conversation analysis in Japanese has revealed many ways in which language plays a role in giving meaning to human interaction and vice versa.

The third agenda, examination of language's functions, has been the interest of many linguists with varied theoretical backgrounds. Although discourse researchers are not the only group of scholars pursuing this path, functions on

the level of discourse have become the territory charted by discourse researchers. Many of the Japanese language phenomena – thematic *wa*, connectives, interactional particles, to mention a few – function not only within a sentence, but across and beyond sentences in critical ways.

Since discourse analysis and pragmatics incorporate varied views, perspectives, and methods for analyzing data drawn from varied genres, under the heading "functions of language in discourse" I introduce six areas of research with different methodological orientations. The study of discourse function is inherently pragmatics-oriented, and research in Japanese pragmatics has become an important ingredient in Japanese discourse studies.

After reviewing past and current research activities, in section 5 I share some of the concerns and hopes of discourse analysis and pragmatics in Japanese. As a researcher one needs to reflexively ask the rationale for conducting one's own research. Accordingly, I hope to provide some answers, if only to raise more meaningful questions.

1 Background

1.1 Theoretical sources

Discourse analysis and pragmatics in Japanese as we see them today can be traced back to several of the linguistic schools in both the West and Japan. One of the most important is the Prague School, whose work has influenced both European and Japanese contemporary discourse analysis. Earlier studies of Japanese grammar by Kuno (1972a) and my own work on the theme marker *wa* (Maynard 1980), for example, have been influenced by the Praguean concept of functionalism (especially Functional Sentence Perspective) which has necessitated the study of Japanese beyond the sentence.

In Europe, text grammar emerged in the 1970s (e.g. van Dijk 1972) and so did text linguistics in the early 1980s (e.g. Beaugrande and Dressler 1981), though, in retrospect, they produced only limited results. Text grammar influenced by generative grammar was unable to account sufficiently for nonformal aspects of text, and text linguistics seems to have suffered from awkwardness stemming from complex network models. Perhaps more influential is the functional systemic grammar led by M. A. K. Halliday. Halliday and other linguists who find text analysis their main interest (e.g. Halliday and Hasan 1976, P. H. Fries 1983, J. R. Martin 1992) have continued analyzing primarily English texts and produced (often pedagogically) useful results.

Two key concepts that emerge in analyzing discourse are "cohesion" and "coherence." "Cohesion occurs when the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another" (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 4). Cohesion is usually limited to the connection (or textual tie) that can be traced through some surface forms. Accordingly, Halliday and Hasan (1976) list the

following five types of cohesion: substitution, ellipsis, reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. This surface-dependent view of cohesion has become the target of criticism (e.g. G. Brown and Yule 1983). Interpretation of text requires more than mere surface connection; it depends on the reader's broad-based knowledge of how things work, including presupposition, analogy, and logical relations. This knowledge outside the text itself is "coherence." Halliday and Hasan (1976) did not fully discuss coherence, although they suggested that text requires "macrostructure of the text that establishes it as a text of a particular kind" (1976: 324).

More recently, Halliday and Hasan (1989) discuss the concept of "cohesive harmony" where similarity chains and identity chains displaying different ties of cohesion are displayed, and coherence is identified in the way chains are developed and interconnected. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) take a broad view of text comprehension and include cohesion and coherence as members of seven criteria for textuality (cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, situationality, and intertextuality). Scholars such as J. E. Martin (1992) and Renkema (1993) adopt these criteria for defining and analyzing discourse.

In the United States, the field of sociolinguistics has offered a place where traditional ethnomethodology, anthropology, and sociology are embraced and their views toward language and their analytical frameworks welcomed. Although the interests of ethnomethodologists, anthropologists, and sociologists do not lie in the analysis of language *per se*, many studies (e.g. Goffman 1955, 1981, Sacks et al. 1974, Gumperz 1982a, 1982b) influenced future conversation analysis (and what later came to be called "interactional sociolinguistics").

Issues that have attracted ethnomethodologists' attention include the system of turn-taking, cases of other- and self-repair, the concept of adjacency pair (such as greeting–greeting, question–answer), and the idea of conditional relevance (certain utterances are relevant because they offer what is preferred and expected in the current interactional sequencing).

Out of this context, Tannen (1984) offers a new direction in the study of conversation with a greater attention given to linguistic expressions and strategies. Tannen (1984) microanalyzes extended conversational discourse and identifies an overall conversation style called "high-involvement style." Using interview data, Schiffrin (1987) analyzes chunks of verbal interaction by focusing on discourse-segmenting devices. Rather than identifying conversational style as evidenced in turn-taking and narrative participation as Tannen (1984) does, Schiffrin (1987) concentrates on the analysis of discourse markers (connectives and interjections such as *because*, *well*, and *I mean*) in an interactional context. Like a series of Tannen's works (1984, 1989), Schiffrin's works (1987, 1994) continue to influence contemporary discourse analysis in the United States, including their students who conduct research on Japanese discourse.

More recently, the study of discourse in Europe has focused on socially and politically significant data, such as political debates, mass media, and professional discourse. Critical discourse analysis, as it is called, refers to a special

approach to the study of text and talk, with an aim of discovering discourse structures and strategies of dominance and resistance in social relationships (of class, gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, religion, age, nationality, etc.) (van Dijk 1995).

1.2 Japanese traditional studies

Although researchers of Japanese discourse outside Japan (or trained outside Japan and currently working in Japan) have generally followed theoretical frameworks similar to those mentioned above, it is important to recognize that the Japanese *bunshooron* (in a broad sense resembling discourse analysis) has had a long tradition. In fact *bunshooron* had become a serious concern to Japanese language scholars by the late 1940s, as represented by Mio's work (1948). Mio (1948) emphasized the importance of *hanashi no ba* "place of talk," resonating with the tenet of contemporary sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and pragmatics. It was Tokieda (1950), however, who endorsed language study beyond the level of sentence in his book on Japanese grammar.

Unfortunately, Tokieda (1950) fails to provide actual analysis of text, and despite his aspiration, Japanese *bunshooron* (as Tokieda envisioned it) did not come into existence. In fact in his next significant work on *bunshooron* titled *Bunshoo Kenkyuu Josetsu* (1977 [1960]), the idea of *bunshooron* becomes somewhat muddled. As indicated by the title *bunshoo kenkyuu*, the contents of this book resemble those earlier studies of *kokugogakusha* (national language studies scholars), concentrating on the interpretation of classical literature. Despite the lack of vigorous textual analysis, Tokieda's ideas of how *bunshoo* should be viewed and studied within his theory of language (i.e. *gengo kateisetsu* "theory of language as process") offer inspiration and motivation.

Following but going beyond Tokieda (1977 [1960]), in a series of publications, Nagano (1972, 1986, 1992) proposes what he refers to as *bunpooronteki bunshooron* (grammar-based discourse analysis). Nagano approaches Japanese discourse (mostly written text taken from school textbooks) from three perspectives, i.e. *rensetsuron* (connection), *rensaron* (chaining), and *tookatsuron* (organization). For example, Nagano makes explicit discourse development (*tenkai*) through the chaining of predicate types based on Mio's (1948) *genshoobun* "sentences of immediate description" and *handanbun* "sentences of judgement."

Recent developments in the study of Japanese discourse include Kaneoka (1989), Sakuma (1981, 1992), and Morita (1995), among others. Briefly, Kaneoka (1989), using the narrative voices of *The Tale of Genji*, analyzes the author's three different positions – observer, teller, and narrator. Sakuma (1981, 1992) uses the discourse unit *bundan* (or *dan*) for the interpretation of discourse. Sakuma points out that one understands the thread of discourse (*bunshoo no bunmyaku*) more accurately and efficiently by noting the connection between *bundan* rather than noting the connection between sentences. Morita (1995)

emphasizes the importance of understanding the perspective the language user takes toward the description, and analyzes strategies (e.g. Japanese tense shift and connectives) as a marker of perspective. These three research directions offer significant insight into discourse studies in the West, i.e. narrative voice, discourse units, and discourse functions.

Given the general background mentioned above, research in Japanese discourse analysis and pragmatics continues to grow and change. In the following three sections, I discuss some of the prominent issues the field has concentrated on in recent years.

2 Discourse Structure

The earliest effort in Japanese discourse structure outside Japan is offered by Hinds in his 1976 book. Using what he calls the "reticulum" model, Hinds schematically displays how both written and spoken discourse samples are structured. This schematic model combines the top-down hierarchy for topic development and the linear approach for showing participants in conversation by plotting them along the performative line, story line, and event line.

In his 1983 article Hinds shifts his focus on the structure of expository writings within the field of contrastive rhetoric. Arguing against Kaplan's (1972) work, which has spurred the field of contrastive rhetoric ever since, Hinds analyzes the *Tensei Jingo* column and argues that Japanese rhetorical structure in expository discourse differs from that of English in that it follows the traditional *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu* principle.

More recently, again using *Tensei Jingo* and its English translation as data, Hinds (1990) contrasts expository writings in Japanese, Chinese, Thai, and Korean and concludes that these writings follow an organizational pattern of "quasi-inductive." In quasi-inductive discourse, (i) the thesis statement appears in the final position, (ii) the presentation of the writer's purpose is delayed, (iii) pieces of information contained in the writing are related loosely to a general topic, and (iv) the concluding statement does not necessarily tightly follow the direction of the preceding statements.

English readers usually assume deductive discourse, and if that assumption fails, they will assume that the discourse follows the inductive process. "[I]nductive writing is characterized as having the thesis statement in the final position whereas deductive writing has the thesis statement in the initial position" (Hinds 1990: 89). Hinds (1990) further suggests that the purpose of writing in Japanese may sometimes be simply to introduce a set of observations related loosely to a general topic, leaving a rather heavy burden for readers who are to evaluate those observations on their own terms.

Some empirical evidence supports Hinds's view, one example of which is Kobayashi (1984). On the basis of an examination of 676 writing samples written by 226 Japanese and American students, Kobayashi reports the following.

US students use the general-to-specific rhetorical sequencing, while Japanese students in Japan show a tendency to follow the specific-to-general sequencing. Japanese ESL (English as Second Language) students studying in the US follow a style somewhere between these two sequencing preferences.

Kubota's (1992) analysis of ESL discourse offers an interesting critical view. Kubota compares expository and persuasive essays of both American and Japanese students, incorporating how the writers themselves evaluate their own writings. Although some Japanese ESL students use Hinds's quasi-inductive style, they intimated that they actually prefer (in fact evaluate highly) the deductive style. Students reportedly learned to devalue the Japanese style writing for being ambiguous, roundabout, illogical, digressive, and so on. Kubota points out that students' judgments reflect the West's hegemony over Japanese rhetoric, endorsed, in fact, by Japanese people through the superiority/inferiority complexes they experience in the modernization process. These complexes are in part results of social, political, and academic relations of power within and between Japan and the West.

Discourse structure is a topic whose serious study has only begun. Since strategies of discourse organization are expected to differ from one genre to another, and from one communicational mode to the next, much more attention is required in the future. Other studies that discuss sequencing of information in discourse include Honna (1989), Nishilhara (1990), and Maynard (1996b).

3 Language in Face-to-Face Interaction

3.1 Conversation analysis

Linguistics-oriented analysis of face-to-face interaction began with the publication of Tannen's (1984) book. Using a tape-recorded Thanksgiving dinner conversation as data, Tannen identifies "conversational style," which broadly includes linguistic expressions and interaction-managing strategies. Tannen's analytical steps are: (i) tape-recording of conversation, (ii) transcription, (iii) observation and analysis of data, (iv) hypothesis, (v) incorporation of input from conversation participants and others, and (vi) verification of hypothesis. After observing the New York Jewish style (called the machine-gun question) and analyzing how it functions in narratives, Tannen characterizes this conversation style as "high-involvement style."

Given that Tannen's study concentrates on a particular occasion of talk (a single event of conversation with multiple participants including Tannen herself), in my own work (Maynard 1986, 1987a, 1989b, 1993b) I examine multiple Japanese (and American English) conversations by using video- and audio-taped casual conversations (20 pairs of Japanese and 20 pairs of American) among college students. Both qualitative and quantitative methods are used

for analysis, and both global and local levels of structure and conversation management are investigated. From the global perspective I examine thematic structure by focusing on strategies such as mode of reference and repetition which help structure the interaction-based themes of conversation. I also analyze narratives appearing in the data and show that the narrative is emergent in the conversation, and it is co-created by both story teller and story recipient. Focus is placed on interactional management strategies, turn-taking, back-channeling, and head movement. Functions and frequencies of these interactional behaviors are identified and discussed, and it is emphasized that all are significant in structuring the self-contextualization processes of Japanese interaction.

In general, conversation analysis adopts the analytical method developed by ethnomethodologists. Rather than sentences or utterances, conversation analysis considers primary the units of interaction (e.g. turns, back-channels) and their sequencing in conversation. Particularly useful are related concepts of adjacency-pair, conditional relevance, and preference organization. Interaction in conversation is locally organized as a connected pair, such as a question followed by an answer. This expected preferred sequencing of action (i.e. one example of preference organization) creates a place in the conversational sequence where a certain response becomes relevant. Thus, conditional relevance means that "given the first, the second is expectable; upon its occurrence it can be seen to be a second item to the first; upon its non-occurrence it can be seen to be officially absent – all this provided sheerly by the occurrence of the first item" (Schegloff 1968: 1083). The concept of sequenced and situated action is the key for analyzing conversational interaction.

In recent years, some aspects of Japanese conversation have continued to be investigated. One of the topics often discussed (especially in Japan) is the back-channel. For example, Kita (1996) elaborates on back-channel-like utterances jointly sent by participants during the inter-turn pause. Ikeda and Ikeda (1996) offer a descriptive system in which different degrees of head nods as well as the duration of eye gaze are plotted along with the transcript, making it easier to describe both verbal and nonverbal behavior.

Another topic in conversation analysis involves the phenomenon of co-construction. Conversation researchers have often emphasized the collaborative nature of utterance production in English (e.g. conversation as "achievement" as explained by Schegloff 1982). Following this line of inquiry, Ono and Yoshida (1996) investigate co-construction in Japanese informal conversation. It turns out that the co-construction of syntactic units is rare in Japanese, perhaps leaving the collaboration strategies to means other than syntax.

3.2 *Specific interactional context*

Analysis of face-to-face interaction in Japanese has also led to the investigation of specific situations of talk. Three areas in particular have produced

interesting results – business negotiation, conflict situation, and the invitation-refusal process.

H. Yamada (1990, 1992) examines communication strategies used in Japan–US business discourse. On the basis of tape-recorded multi-party conversations of American, Japanese, and American–Japanese business meetings, Yamada contrasts topic-opening strategies, talk distribution, and back-channel strategies across these settings. Using the idea of "cross-talk," Yamada analyzes data by adopting interpretive, comparative, and quantitative methods.

According to H. Yamada (1990, 1992), in cross-cultural business communication Japanese and Americans optimize different cultural strengths – the Japanese strength is shown in the group and the American strength in the individual. For example, "American participants take long monologic turns, distribute their turns unevenly among participants, and take the highest proportion of turns in the topics they initiate; Japanese participants take short turns, distribute their turns relatively evenly among participants, and continue to distribute their turns evenly regardless of who initiates a topic" (1990: 271). Yamada's study illustrates the difficulties arising from cross-cultural talk where meaning-in-context is created in the mutually interactive context of culture, encounter and conversation.

Jones (1990, 1992) examines how Japanese people linguistically handle conflict situations. Using audio- and video-taped conversations between friends and acquaintances, Jones identifies occasions of conflict and microanalyzes three such conversations – television debate, father–daughter conflict in a family, and office communication between co-workers. Jones (1990, 1992) reports that Japanese conflicts often occur in "ratified" situations, and when the conflict is not socially ratified, participants must work hard to ratify it.

A case in point: after a few minutes of strained conversation the co-workers in conflict abruptly stopped talking and turned away from each other. But even under this circumstance, participants strove for a playful tone, introducing laughter and jokes. Co-workers placed the conflict situation into a framework of "play" by using strategies such as style-switching, repetition, parallelism, and laughter. If the conflict is still not ratified after all reframing strategies, Jones (1990: 306) concludes that "it seems . . . impossible for the participants to dispute with each other comfortably," suggesting that perhaps the Japanese themselves have bought into the "myth of harmony."

Szatrowski (1992, 1993) concentrates on the Japanese invitation and refusal interaction taken from recorded telephone conversations, and offers detailed analysis of 13 conversations of invitation. Using the concept of *wadan*, similar to *bundan*, Szatrowski shows that, instead of simple adjacency-pair, Japanese invitation-refusal negotiation is enacted by the invitation *wadan* stage and the response *wadan* stage, which may take several turn exchanges.

Szatrowski (1993) reports that when compared with the English invitation-refusal exchange, Japanese participants rely more on their co-participants in the conversation, which results in co-produced stages. For example, Szatrowski (1992, 1993) provides interaction examples in which an invitee, whose goal

may be to refuse, leaves open the possibility of accepting while developing the conversation toward a refusal. A Japanese inviter will go through several "invitation stages;" he or she shows sympathy for the invitee by always leaving some option for a refusal. In the invitee's "answer stages," he or she gradually develops a story, always gauging the inviter's response, trying to convince the inviter that he or she cannot accept the invitation after all. Through this prolonged give-and-take negotiation process, both participants successfully avoid losing "face" (Goffman 1955).

The three studies mentioned above represent analysis of real-life conversation with related but differing contributions – insight into cross-cultural communication, language understood within a larger interactional frame (e.g. play), and the use of discourse units (e.g. *wadan*) for understanding the meaning of utterance clusters.

4 Functions of Language in Discourse

Researchers in Japanese discourse and pragmatics have identified varied functions in various genres of contemporary Japanese. Since methodological frameworks vary, this section develops around major methods along with example representative research. I must point out that topics covered in the following are limited and I do not mean in any way that those studies omitted here are insignificant.

4.1 Conditions and effects in discourse: thematic marker **wa**

Japanese *wa* has been extensively studied in Japan and elsewhere. Earlier research on Japanese *wa* within Western linguistics tradition was conducted by Kuno (1972a). Kuno (1972a), appealing to the Praguean concept of given/new information and the Functional Sentence Perspective, offers four hypotheses regarding *ga* and *wa*, two of which are particularly relevant. Hypothesis 1 states that "*-[g]a* as subject marker in matrix clauses always signals that the subject conveys new information" (1972a: 296), and hypothesis 4 states that "[t]he thematic NP-*wa* in the subject position in embedded clauses becomes NP-*ga* obligatorily" (1972a: 296). Since then Japanese *wa* and *ga* have been associated with given and new information, and are understood to be theme marker and subject marker, respectively.

Examination of *wa* in discourse, however, reveals that the concept of given/new information by itself cannot adequately explain the use (thematization) and nonuse of *wa*. In my own work (Maynard 1980, 1987b), I contrast how characters are marked in similar narratives. For example, in the beginning of Japanese old tales, *Momotaroo* and *Urihimeko*, the "old woman" is marked first

by *ga* and consequently by *wa* in the former, but the "old woman" continues to be marked by *ga* in the latter.

Observe data (1) and (2). The data are presented in English; Japanese particles *wa* and *ga* are inserted immediately following the phrases (that are underlined) marked by these particles. (The original Japanese version is available in Maynard 1987b.)

(1) a. Once upon a time there lived an old man and an old woman (*ga*).
b. Now, it happened one summer day.
c. The old man (*wa*) went to the mountain to collect firewood.
d. "See you later."
e. The old woman (*wa*) saw the old man off,
f. and (said), "Well, I'll go to the river to get some washing done,"
g. and went out to the river carrying a washing tub.
h. Scrub, scrub, scrub.
i. The old woman (*wa*) worked hard washing clothes.
j. After a while, something came floating down the stream. (Tsubota 1975: 24)

(2) a. Once upon a time there lived an old man and an old woman (*ga*).
b. One day the old woman (*ga*) went to the river to do the washing.
c. From upstream, two boxes approached floating down the stream.
d. They came bobbing down the river.
e. Seeing this, the old woman (*ga*) called out,
f. "Hey, the box filled with things, come this way! Empty boxes, go away from me!"
g. The box with content approached her.
h. So the old woman picked it up and returned home.
i. That evening when the old woman opened the box with the old man, a cucumber came out of the box. (Tsubota 1975: 18)

In (2c) and (2e), despite the fact that "the old woman" appears as given information, it continues to be marked with *ga*. This cannot be explained by Kuno's (1972a) hypotheses, since *ga* is shown to mark given information (as well as new information) in matrix clauses.

Methodologically, the following steps are taken: (i) paragraphs in which relevant linguistic devices appear are contrasted, (ii) distributional differences are identified, (iii) in order to solve the inadequacies of available models, a new framework/perspective is introduced, (iv) other cases are examined to find out if the proposed framework adequately explains the use and nonuse. In this process one is able to discover the conditions in which relevant linguistic devices appear as well as the related effects these forms bring to discourse.

Concretely, after identifying different ways in which characters are thematized and nonthematized, I conclude that the *wa*/*ga* marking strategy, although

often coinciding with the given/new distinction, involves more than the given/new status of information. I present the concept of "staging" strategy through which the narrator expresses his or her perspective toward the narrative event. The narrator places the thematized participants on the stage for a longer period of time, and consequently thematized characters provide points of reference for the development of the thematic flow. Thematized participants remain activated, evoked, and stored in the reader's consciousness, and they provide a flow of thought to which new and unexpected information may be integrated along the way. The examination of thematization in the unit larger than sentence has led to the new understanding of the thematic *wa* unavailable otherwise.

4.2 *Information and action in conversation: connectives* **dakara** *and* **datte**

Studies of Japanese connectives reveal the importance of analyzing linguistic devices in interactional context. The traditional view of connectives as logically connecting clauses has been shown to be untenable once conversations are examined. The methodology adopted here is that of conversation analysis, especially the idea of conditional relevance. This is most clearly presented in Schiffrin's (1987) analyses of discourse markers which include English connectives *and*, *but*, *or*, *so*, *because*, and *then*.

In my own work (Maynard 1989a, 1992b, 1993a), I analyzed the use of Japanese connectives *dakara* and *datte* in casual conversation and in dialogues of fiction. *Dakara* in [X. *dakara* Y] connects discourse segments [X] and [Y] in that [X] provides semantic and/or interactional reason for [Y]. *Dakara*'s function connecting the cause/result semantic relationship is limited to approximately 63 percent in conversation and 87 percent in fiction dialogues, respectively. Elsewhere, *dakara* functions as a marker for explanation related to [X], the turn claim and the turn yield, as well as repetition of already mentioned information.

Datte in [X. *datte* Y] signals that the speaker intends to justify position [X] in the context of opposition/contrast. The "but" and "because" readings usually associated with *datte* are then explained in terms of the turn-taking context (if [X] is the position taken across turns, "but" reading; if [X] is within the turn, "because" reading).

Japanese connectives in conversation have been analyzed by more than a few scholars since. For example, Mori (1994) examines *datte* in multi-party conversation and concludes that *datte* is used across speakers in collaboration when they together face a third party. On such an occasion, a speaker employs *datte* as a device for displaying alignment with another speaker, while disagreeing with the third party. Karatsu (1995) contrasts connectives *dewa*, *dakara*, and *shikashi*. Karatsu reports that *dakara* functions to (i) add an explanation

and (ii) reiterate what the speaker has mentioned previously, while *dewa* (i) paraphrases, (ii) introduces a new topic, or (iii) summarizes the previous discourse, and *shikashi* interrupts the conversation and initiates the topic's conclusion in a certain context. Other studies on Japanese connectives include Takahara (1990) and Hudson (1996).

These functions of connectives are not semantic (or logic-based) but interaction-related. Herein lies the importance of examining linguistic devices in conversational interaction, which allows identification of functions otherwise unexplained.

Another interesting piece of research on Japanese connectives takes a historical perspective. Onodera (1993), on the basis of analysis of Japanese spanning over 1,200 years – from *Kojiji*, *Noo*, and *Kyoogen* scripts to *Shinjuu ten no Amijima*, to conversation segments from modern novels (such as *Ukigumo* and *Yukiguni*) and present-day conversation – explores the pragmatic change that conjunctions (*demo* and *dakedo*) and interjections (*ne* and its variants) underwent. According to Onodera, changes in these connectives and conjunctions roughly follow the direction from ideational, to textual, and to more expressive. Her findings confirm Traugott's (1982) hypothesis on semantic change, i.e. less to more personal. The understanding that language foregrounds different aspects of meaning through time offers insights to diachronic discourse analysis.

4.3 Between grammar and pragmatics: clause chaining and complex noun phrases

Some of the studies that fall under Japanese pragmatics and discourse analysis explore the theoretical boundaries of where grammar and discourse interact. Often these studies aim to explain traditionally unexplainable grammatical process by appealing to pragmatic concepts. Two such studies are introduced here; S. Iwasaki's (1988, 1993) analysis of *te* and *tara* clause connection and Yoshiko Matsumoto's (1989a, 1993) analysis of complex noun phrases.

S. Iwasaki (1993), using the concept of the switch reference (whether or not the subject of the following clause is the same as that of the current clause), explains the choice between *te* and *tara* clause chaining. Iwasaki appeals to the concept of "speaker subjectivity" in discourse and introduces the "perspective principle," which distinguishes two types of speaker subjectivity, S-perspective (speaker describes own experience) and O-perspective (speaker describes the other person's experience). After statistically examining *te* and *tara* appearing in 16 personal narratives, Iwasaki concludes that *te* is used when the first person continues to be the subject in the next clause, *tara* when the subject changes in the next clause, i.e. *tara* marks the shift from S- to O-perspective (this also involves change from a higher to a lower degree of information accessibility). For example, observe (3) taken from S. Iwasaki (1993: 61).

(3) soshite hairenakute, okoshite, de hai . . . haittara yakkosan moo . . . shikata nai ttena kanji-de nee
and (I) couldn't enter (*te*), (I) woke him up (*te*), and (I) entered (*tara*), the guy, appearing annoyed, came (*te*)

S. Iwasaki (1993) finds the perspective principle to be relevant for the selection of internal state predicate forms and tense forms as well. By contrasting *te* and *tara* in discourse, and by appealing to the pragmatics-motivated concept of perspective, Iwasaki explicates the grammar of Japanese clause chaining. Statistical analyses accounting for the speaker's grammatical choice are included in the research design, shedding light on pragmatics/discourse-based factors in grammar.

Japanese complex noun phrases offer another problematic area, especially in accounting for seemingly unexplainable ways of their production and use. Unlike English, Japanese relative clauses and noun complement constructions seem to more extensively involve pragmatics-based principles. Yoshiko Matsumoto (1993) makes this point by analyzing commonly used Japanese expressions such as *atama no yoku naru hon* "the book (by reading) which (one's) head improves" from Fillmore's frame semantics. Matsumoto identifies the condition for the Japanese complex noun phrases (i.e. her adnominal clauses) in terms of the frame evoked by the clause. These frames (or scenes) offer a pragmatic context in which the clause and the head noun can be appropriately connected. This study again illustrates that grammatical structure is not explainable in terms of grammar alone. Instead it is determined by semantic and pragmatic forces as well.

4.4 Rhetorical effects and their sources: repetition

Study of repetition in Japanese began in the early 1980s (Makino 1980, Maynard 1983), but interest in repetition among American discourse researchers in the 1990s has added renewed impetus. M. Ishikawa (1991), analyzing a 30-minute conversation among four students, concentrates on self-repetition and allo-repetition of exact word(s) within the same turn or in the immediately following turns. Functions of repetition are identified as intensity, iteration, and continuation (for self-repetition), and as joint idea construction (for allo-repetition).

The significant point of Ishikawa's study is the iconicity she observes not only of the linguistic sign of repetition – argumentation in form (i.e. repetition) iconically represents argumentation of degree (intensity) – but also between the form and interactional function. The latter is what Ishikawa refers to as "interactional iconicity," which is supported by the iconic meaning of identification of the idea and stance toward that idea between participants (i.e. self and other). The observed correspondence between form and interactional

meaning, along with many other studies on iconicity (e.g. Haiman 1985), offers evidence to refute the commonly accepted arbitrary nature of signs.

Nishimitsu (1990) contrasts repetition in Japanese writings and in their (multiple versions of) English translations. Although the original repetition is translated into English repetition to varying degrees, the closer to the semantic effect of Japanese original the translation is, the more repetition appears. Given the well-known tendency toward deletion, Nishimitsu raises the question of observed frequent repetition in Japanese, and speculates that the Japanese language's high dependency on context allows frequent deletion of various elements, and at the same time, leaves some room for repetition for the purpose of subjective emphasis.

Indeed, repetition and deletion are two sides of the same coin, and as Makino (1993) emphasizes, it is important to recognize positive reasons for repeating and deleting. It is not enough to find conditions for ellipsis; rather it is necessary to identify rhetorical effects of these strategies in discourse.

4.5 Manipulating information across participants: sentence-final forms

How sentences and utterances end in Japanese has caught discourse and pragmatics researchers' attention. Frequently studied are the interactional (sentence-final) particles and the nominal predicate (*no da*, *wake da*, etc.).

Ever since Tokieda (1951) advanced the idea that the fundamental function of sentence-final particles is "*taijinkankei o koosei suru*" "to form an interpersonal relationship," studies of particles have led to the expansion of analysis from the formal framework to the interpersonal expressive domain. In Tokieda's view, *ne* represents a subjective expression seeking to make the addressee a sympathizer, while *zo* and *yo* are expressions forcing upon the addressee the speaker's will and judgment.

In recent years, many scholars have analyzed the functions of interactional particles (e.g. Tsuchihashi 1983, Oishi 1985, Cook 1988). C. Kitagawa (1984) points out that *ne* marks the fact that the utterance is related to the second person, as opposed to *na* which is related to the first person, and *yo* marks the new information, as opposed to *sa* which marks old information.

Kamio (1979, 1990), on the basis of the "theory of the territory of information," summarizes the use of *ne* as the following: (i) *ne* is a marker for *kyooooteki taido* "co-responding attitude," and the speaker actively encourages the listeners to adopt an identical cognitive state toward the relevant information; (ii) when the speaker assumes that the speaker and the listener possess the identical information as already learned information, the speaker's utterance must accompany *ne*; (iii) when the speaker especially wants to express a co-responding attitude by one's own expression, the speaker's utterance can be accompanied by *ne*; (iv) but *ne* cannot be used when the information provided by the speaker is more deeply involved with the speaker than it is with the listener.

While Kamio's study is based on the types of information status (within or outside of the speaker's and the listener's territory), Masuoka (1991) focuses more closely on the speaker–listener communication. Masuoka states that *ne* and *yo* mark the agreement and the opposition, respectively, of the inner (cognitive) world between the speaker and the listener. By this characterization, Masuoka explains why *yo* and *ne* can be used for both emphasis and softening purposes (*Mini kite kudasai yo*. vs. *Mini kite kudasai ne*.).

The information status and the speaker–listener alignment, however, are not the only ways the information across speakers plays a role in determining some use of *ne*. In my own work (Maynard 1993a, 1993b), I point out that *ne* and *yo* foreground different aspects of communication, interaction versus information. Observe the following conversation (taken from data collected for Maynard 1989b) where originally *yo* appears. *Ne* can appear instead – *Eh, uso, itte nai ne* – although this response is interpreted as an offensive or defiant answer.

(4) A: Okuyama ga itta n ja-nai no, are.
Didn't you, Okuyama, say that?
B: Eh, uso, itte-nai yo. (Eh, uso, itte-nai ne.)
What, no, not at all, I didn't say that.

A similar question *Okuyama ga itta n daro?* can also be answered either affirmatively – *Aa, itta yo* or *Aa itta ne* – or negatively – *Eh, itte nai yo* or *Eh, itte nai ne*. In all these answers the use of *ne* adds the speaker's defiant attitude. This use of *ne* does not mark Kamio's co-responding attitude and in fact seems to violate its condition described under (4) above. This use of *ne* also does not align the speaker and listener with the sense of agreement as suggested by Masuoka.

Noting the complementary distribution of *ne* and *yo* in conversation (*ne* and *yo* followed by back-channels approximately 58 percent and 33 percent, respectively; followed by new turns approximately 31 percent and 45 percent, respectively), and introducing the scale of relative degree of information availability and accessibility between the speaker and the addressee, I propose (Maynard 1993a, 1993b) that *ne* and *yo* emphasize different aspects of communication (i.e. Discourse Modality), interaction versus information. In answer to a yes/no question, under normal circumstances information is to be foregrounded since that is something being sought. The use of *ne* fails to meet the expectation since it foregrounds the interpersonal feelings instead, and thus resulting in a disengaged interaction.

Researchers will continue investigating the functions of these and other particles in various interactional contexts. Such effort will also necessitate analyses of nominal predicates such as *no da* and *wake da* as well as other sentence-final complementizers (e.g. *koto*) and particles (e.g. *tte*). Other studies investigating sentence-final forms include McGloin (1983), Noda (1990), C. Kitagawa (1995), Okamoto (1995), and Maynard (1992a, in press).

4.6 Acquisition of pragmatic competence: directives and style shifts

Some aspects of Japanese discourse have been studied from the psycholinguistic perspective (especially first-language acquisition). Particularly significant is the role of language in the children's socialization process. For example, Clancy (1986) examines the mother's communicative style in socializing Japanese children into important cultural values. Based on examination of tape-recorded interactions between five mother–child pairs (children approximately two years old), Clancy (1986) concludes that Japanese mothers strongly emphasize sensitivity to the needs, wishes, and feelings of others through what Clancy calls empathy training and conformity training.

The mothers used indirect expressions for making and refusing requests toward two-year-olds. In fact some directives were extremely indirect; for example, in response to the child who said there was nowhere for him to write (on a piece of paper that still had some room), the mother said, *Omeme aru n ja nai* "You have eyes, don't you?" (Clancy 1986: 227). Mothers also incorporated direct instruction or "lessons" of how to use and interpret language.

The close observation of mother–child interactions has revealed a variety of directives used in communication, and more importantly, it has brought into the open how sentences such as *Omeme aru n ja nai* function as a directive in real-life communication.

Cook (1996) studies the language of the school and analyzes polite forms in the Japanese classroom. She finds that third- and fourth-grade teachers shift between *-masu* and plain forms, using *-masu* forms mainly when addressing the entire class to present important information and introduce class activities, and plain forms to address an individual child. The phenomenon of Japanese style and style mixing has been studied extensively (S. Martin 1964, Makino 1983, Maynard 1991, 1993a), but Cook's study documents in detail the classroom interaction and provides statistical results of the *masu* vs. plain forms used by the teachers. Cook also incorporates Rosenberger's (1989) modes of self, i.e. "disciplined" mode, and concludes that "*masu* form used in elementary schools indexes the disciplined mode of self, which is contrasted with the spontaneous mode indexed by the plain form" (Cook 1996: 79). Again, as in Clancy's study, close observation of interaction has led to an understanding of the interactionally regulated style shifts in Japanese.

5 Discourse Analysis: Concerns and Directions

As is made evident by the preceding discussion, discourse analysis and pragmatics adopt data-based analyses. Language is not out there *a priori*; it is given life when used in real human communication. Consequently it becomes

important to investigate language in use in interaction and in context, and to build the kind of theory answerable to whatever we find. I maintain that observation of data – and the more of it the better– must be the starting point for linguistic research. Moreover, its theoretical and analytical adequacy must ultimately be evaluated against the data.

The relationship between data and theory in linguistics has evolved through different stages in the latter half of the twentieth century. During the 1950s and early 1960s, observation of data was considered a virtue; in the 1970s, linguists avoided the criticism of being "data-centered;" and in the 1980s, critics complained that there was simply too much theory in linguistics. Today, data and theories seem to go hand in hand; and we witness a variety of interpretive theories thriving in the field.

The instantiation (that is, the utterance) of language is observable, whereas the system of language is not. The system lies somewhere unseen, hiding behind the data. And yet, the data, in turn, are not truly observable without evoking some system-based analytical framework. There is a certain amount of circularity involved in this relationship between data and analytical framework. And yet, the parts of the process – (i) data analysis, (ii) theory building, and (iii) discovering significance in the research – must go hand in hand, in a spiral of repeated inquiries.

Provided that the observation is guided by some emerging analytical framework, and provided that this framework is answerable to data, the results are expected to be meaningful. Obviously, one must not indulge oneself with *ad hoc* observations. Such observations are little more than a mass of unorganized facts, which contribute little, if anything, to our understanding of language and its use.

Yet, we must remain cautious not to be lured into a neat "theory" – however elegant and appealing it may be. Given that theory building sometimes involves ignoring certain aspects of real-life language phenomena, we must remind ourselves that what we discard along the way may turn out to be critical for understanding language.

The nature of meaning and function revealed through discourse analysis and pragmatics suggests that a theory of meaning must in some way be able to account for nonreferential semantics, interpersonal expectations, and discourse effects. Establishing a general theory to account for all these simultaneously is indeed a formidable, if not impossible, task. This is partly because once one rescues and (re)introduces the concept of the social person into the study of linguistics, his or her sociocultural diversity comes into play. Sweeping generalizations that were once possible at the expense of the obscured speaker now become almost impossible.

More to the point, the linguistic theory itself is conceived by each researcher bound by his or her time and space. Thus, ultimately theory building must be conducted in such a way as to answer possible diverse views toward language. Forcing a ready-made theory on another language can invite a distorted view of that language. Since researchers are products of different cultures and

academic philosophies of the time, linguistic theories are themselves embedded within culture and society. For this reason, differing views toward language – including the view discussed in this chapter – ought to be considered fairly, with a mind toward openness.

And yet, studies of Japanese discourse have a long way to go. Serious studies in many subfields have only begun. The current trends in critical discourse analysis (representative works including van Dijk 1987, 1993, 1995, Fairclough 1989, Hodge and Kress 1993) offer potential for Japanese discourse (Maynard in preparation). Analysis of personal narrative has also been a major field of discourse analysis, and Japanese contribution in this field has only begun (see, for example, Matsuki 1995 and Kinjo 1996, in which the concept of a narrating self is explored). Ultimately, linguistic research must add to our understanding of how one understands oneself in relation to the other, that is, how language interacts with our concepts of self and society. Incorporating literary criticism is another potential approach in the analysis of Japanese discourse, especially quotation in relation to textual voices (Maynard 1996a).

Research in discourse analysis and pragmatics necessitates the understanding of the Japanese culture and society as context (e.g. Tokunaga 1988 and Maynard 1997, among others). Here, for understanding the Japanese language as a part of the cultural semiotic system, Ikegami's (1981, 1991) works are relevant. Ikegami notes the Japanese language's preference for describing events as "become"-ing (in contrast with English being a "do" language), and identifies a Japanese poetics of "become" not only in the language but in aesthetics, literature, and culture. Understanding language in this way may lead to the understanding of culture from the linguistic perspective. It is also true that through discourse analysis one appreciates that language (which is a part of culture) provides context for itself. Linguistic expressions sharpen the contour of context while the very context encourages the use of expected expressions, resulting in their reciprocal interaction (see Maynard in press for a case study).

As a final note I should point out that Japanese research in discourse analysis and pragmatics should not be an end in itself, and instead, it should develop a critical perspective that goes beyond discovering particularities of the Japanese language. Theories of language nurtured by analyzing Japanese should contribute to a general understanding of language and communication. One possibility lies in typological discourse analysis (Myhill 1992), in which certain parameters (e.g. referential distance, topic persistence) are used to examine discourse across languages. Still, generalizing universal discourse features requires discovery of parameters based on analysis of an individual language. Japanese discourse research is likely to put to the fore some of the features not prominently observed in other languages, thereby expanding the scope of parameters for achieving a fuller understanding of language universals and the nature of language in general.