THE INTERACTIONAL FUNCTIONS OF THE JAPANESE
DEMONSTRATIVES IN CONVERSATION

Keiko Naruoka

Abstract

Although a large number of studies are conducted on Japanese demonstratives, most of them explain referential functions of the three demonstrative types (the so-called proximal ko-, medial so-, and distal a-) based on sentence-level analysis, and little previous work has been directed toward the analysis of the demonstrative use in spontaneous interaction. This study employs Japanese conversational data and examines the demonstrative usages whose main function is NOT to refer to some entity in the speech situation or the discourse. From the analysis, the paper shows that the use of Japanese demonstratives can exhibit and emphasize an interactional meaning, such as the speaker’s antipathy, insult, suspicion, surprise, and affection toward the referent, and that it can be selected from among other choices, such as a noun phrase or ellipsis, when the speaker is willing to express these emotions or attitudes. In order to understand the process of expressing these emotions or attitudes, the paper applies Hanks’ (1990, 1992) ‘indexical framework’ and the interactionally defined notion of the speaker’s and addressee’s sphere proposed by Laury (1997) and Enfield (2003). Using these frameworks, this study illustrates that the relationship among the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres and the referent, as well as the context in which the three are projected, are not static or predefined but instead are flexible and do change during ongoing interaction.
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1. Introduction

Japanese demonstratives have been well investigated in literature (e.g., Sakuma 1951; Takahashi 1956; Hattori 1968; Mikami 1970; Kuno 1973; Horiguchi 1978; Kuroda 1979; Ando 1986; Kamio 1990; Kinsui and Takubo 1990). Most of these studies employ constructed sentences in order to establish a theoretical framework for the three types of Japanese demonstratives (the so-called, proximal ko-, medial so-, and distal a-). Moreover, these theories are based solely on the demonstrative’s function to point to some referent - that is, the ‘referential function.’

Contrary to above-mentioned studies, the present study examines, through the close examination of naturally occurring conversational data, how speakers actually use demonstratives, and reveals some points that have not been fully described in existing theories of Japanese demonstratives. Specifically, this study reveals ‘interactional functions’ of demonstratives, in which the use of demonstratives displays and emphasizes the speaker’s emotion or attitude, rather than the function of pointing to some referent. The interactional function has not been thoroughly discussed in the studies of Japanese demonstratives, but it can be easily seen if we pay attention to the use of demonstratives in real interaction. With authentic data, this study illustrates that three demonstrative types (the ko-, so-, and a- forms), which respectively have distinctive relationships among the speaker’s sphere, the addressee’s sphere, and the referent, are creatively applied in conversation and exhibit different processes to express and intensify the speaker’s emotion or attitude, including such things as antipathy, a feeling of insult, suspicion, surprise, and affection in conversation. In order to describe each process, this study employs the dynamic interpretation of the use and meaning of demonstratives that Hanks (1990, 1992), Laury (1997), and Enfield (2003) have proposed.

---

2 Referential function includes demonstrative uses that refer to entities in the speech situation (cf. ‘spacio-temporal deixis’ in Lakoff 1974, ‘exophoric use’ in Halliday and Hasan 1976, ‘situational use’ in Fillmore 1982) or refer to propositions or noun phrases in the discourse (cf. ‘discourse deixis’ in Lakoff 1974, ‘anaphoric use’ in Halliday and Hasan 1976, ‘text reference’ in Fillmore 1982). Himmelmann (1996) and Diessel (1999) further divide the latter, and call it ‘discourse deictic use’ when the demonstrative refers to the proposition in discourse, and ‘tracking use’ (Himmelmann 1996) and ‘anaphoric use’ (Diessel 1999) when it refers to the noun phrase in the discourse.
In this study, the terms ‘interactional function’ or ‘interactional meaning’ are preferred to what is traditionally called the ‘social function’ or ‘social meaning’ of language (e.g. Halliday 1973; Hymes 1974; Silverstein 1976). The two terms are of course similar in that they represent the perspective of taking speakers as social actors who not only convey the propositional meaning but also indicate contextual information, social relationship, and the identities or orientation of the speakers. However, the term ‘social meaning’ has rather fixed parameters in terms of, for instance, ethnicity, social class, and gender that are predefined in a particular society or community. ‘Interactional meaning’ represents more accurately what I wish to focus on in this paper - i.e., the speaker’s orientation or stance, which is somewhat situation-bound and constantly changes during ongoing interaction.

Some researchers have argued that such interactional meaning is a crucial factor in choosing a form among demonstratives and pronouns. For example, Mayes and Ono (1991) examine a particular form to indicate a person in Japanese, ano hito ‘that person,’ and illustrate that this form is chosen when the speaker refers to someone toward whom he or she feels a social or emotional distance. They claim that it is necessary to consider not only the cognitive factor but also the social factor in order to understand referential choice. Also, Duranti (1984) argues that the Italian speaker’s choice between subject pronouns and demonstratives cannot be explained without the speaker’s perspective on the referent. While Italian subject pronouns are often used when the speaker conveys empathy or a positive affect, the use of demonstratives tends to display a lack of empathy or a negative emotion toward the person being referred to. The present study thus compares demonstratives with other forms, such as a noun phrase or ellipsis, used in the surrounding discourse in order to clarify the functional differences between Japanese demonstratives and other linguistic forms.

This paper is organized as follows. After briefly reviewing previous studies of Japanese demonstratives and the interactional functions of demonstratives in Section 2, Hanks’ (1990, 1992) ‘indexical framework’ and Laury’s (1997) and Enfield’s (2003) notion of the interactionally defined perimeter will be described as theoretical frameworks for this study in Section 3. I will then explain the data set and target forms of this study in Section 4. In Section 5, I will describe how demonstratives indicate the speaker’s emotion or attitude by providing examples from our data. This section first shows how each of the three demonstrative types expresses emotion or attitude in conversation. Then, I will present cases in which the speaker employs different demonstrative forms when referring to the same object in a short discourse to clarify that the speaker’s subtle emotional change or intention to emphasize emotion can influence
the choice of demonstratives. Finally, I will summarize the findings and discuss their implications.

2. Previous studies on demonstratives

2.1. Participant’s ‘territory’ in Japanese demonstratives

The Japanese demonstrative system is widely known as the ‘three-term system.’ As with studies in many other languages, the traditional view of demonstratives in Japanese is primarily concerned with the perceptual distance from the speaker to the referent. *Ko-*demonstratives are considered to be proximal, *so-*demonstratives medial, and *a-*demonstratives distal. In particular, typological studies of demonstratives (e.g., Fillmore 1982; Anderson and Keenan 1985; Diessel 1999) explain the use and meaning of Japanese demonstrative with this notion of distance. Anderson and Keenan (1985) show that in the three-term system one term indicates something near the speaker, another indicates something far from the speaker (and the addressee), and the third depends upon whether the system is ‘person oriented’ or ‘distance oriented.’ In Japanese, which has the former system, the third term indicates something that is far from the speaker but near the addressee (1985: 284). In a ‘distance-oriented’ system, such as found in Spanish, the third term refers to an object that is in between the first and second terms with regard to distance from the speaker.

The alternative notion to this perceptual distance is ‘territory,’ first introduced by Sakuma (1951), which has played a crucial role in the study of Japanese demonstratives. Sakuma proposes that the meaning of demonstratives exists in relation to the first/second/third personal pronouns and introduces the concept of the addressee. This theory postulates the existence of the speaker’s and addressee’s territories, in which the two stand facing each other. In this view, *ko-*demonstratives are used for an object in the speaker’s territory, *so-* for an object in the addressee’s territory, and *a-* for an object outside of both territories (See Figure 1). Sakuma’s concept of territory has influenced subsequent studies of Japanese demonstratives, such as Hattori (1968), Ando (1986), and Kamio (1990). Kamio develops the concept of territory and proposes a ‘territory of information’ that can be applied not only to demonstratives but also to the interpretation of other linguistic elements, such as utterance final particles. In addition, he claims that the psychological status between the speaker, the addressee, and the referent determines the use of demonstratives. This notion of ‘territory,’ especially with the concept of psychological status, is crucial for examination of the interactional function of
demonstratives. In this study, however, the notion is replaced by those of Laury (1997) and Enfield (2003) because the notion of territory in the above studies is a rather fixed notion and is not practical when examining the use of demonstratives in ongoing interaction (see Section 3 for details).

![Three-term Demonstrative System](image)

Figure 1. Sakuma’s (1951) model of the Japanese three-term demonstrative system

### 2.2. The interactional function of demonstratives

Demonstratives not only have the referential (exophoric and anaphoric) function but also have the interactional function of expressing the speaker’s emotion or attitude. This function has been noted by Lakoff (‘emotional deixis,’ 1974), Lyons (‘empathetic deixis,’ 1977), Fillmore (‘social deixis,’ 1982) and others. While most of them mention the function briefly, Lakoff in particular calls attention to this function in English demonstratives and argues that it is just as important as the referential function. Her main arguments are that the use of *this/these* creates emotional closeness and expresses vividness in the utterance, as in (1) below, and that the use of *that/those* indicates emotional solidarity between the speaker and the addressee, as in (2).

(1) He kissed her with *this* unbelievable passion. (Lakoff 1974: 347)

(2) *That* Henry Kissinger sure knows his way around Hollywood! (Lakoff 1974: 352)

Lakoff (1974) explains that the emotional deixis is an extended sense of referential function, and that *this* can be expressive as it implies psychological closeness between the speaker and the referent. Also *that* can create emotional solidarity because it enables the speaker and addressee to relate to each other spatially - and psychologically - through the intermediacy of the object referred to. After Lakoff’s study, various roles in interaction have been reported in studies based on the actual use of demonstratives. Kirsner (1979) shows in his study of Dutch demonstratives that the use of demonstratives displays whether the information indicated is in high focus or low focus. Following Kirsner’s (1979) research, Strauss (1993) illustrates the same point in the use of *this, that, and it* in American English - i.e., that they mark high, mid, and low focus.
respectively. Strauss also argues that the speaker’s stance toward the referent or addressee involves the use of demonstratives. She proposes that this, which signals new or non-sharedness, on the one hand, indicates separateness and disagreement between the speaker and the addressee, and that that and it, which signal sharedness, on the other hand, indicate solidarity between the participants. Mithun (1987) examines the use of demonstratives in Tuscarora, a Native American language in North America, and claims that demonstratives focus the attention of the audience toward the referent and thus have a powerful orientating role. She also finds that due to this focusing function, the use of demonstratives distinguishes characters in narrative.

For Japanese demonstratives, there has been no extensive work done on the interactional function. However, the function of a- demonstratives has been noted in some literature (Horiguchi 1978; Kitagawa 1979; Shibatani 1990; Ono 1994). For instance, Kitagawa’s argument, which is based on the Lakoff’s (1974) ‘emotional deixis,’ pays attention to the fact that there is only one form, that, to indicate a proximal referent in English, whereas there are two, so- and a-, in Japanese. He argues that a- demonstratives are more effective than the English that in establishing solidarity between the speaker and addressee because a- demonstratives “typically refer to an item equally (at least in a psychologically relevant sense) away from both the speaker and the addressee” (240, emphasis and parentheses in original) and “[put] both the speaker and the addressee in the same perspective point” (240). Kitagawa’s discussion clearly indicates that Japanese demonstratives have the interactional function. However, Kitagawa and other researchers limit their description of the interactional function to only the a- demonstratives. In addition, these studies, like Lakoff (1974), are based on examination at the sentence level and do not look into larger discourse.

Recently, researchers have paid more attention to actual usage and the diverse roles of Japanese demonstratives have been revealed using the method of Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis. Cook (1993) investigates the use of ano as a filler and demonstrates how it functions as a turning device, attention getter, highlighter of information, and introduction marker for a new topic. She argues that the filler ano shares the same role as the adnominal demonstrative ano, which aligns the speaker and addressee on the ‘same side’ (cf. Kitagawa 1979; Ono 1994; Shibatani 1990), and that ano works to get the addressee’s cooperation by creating the feeling that the interlocutors are on the same side with respect to the subsequent utterance (1993: 31). Kitano (1999) reveals the various roles of the Japanese pronominal demonstrative are, such as word search, holding the turn for further elaboration, and avoiding verbalization. Hamaguchi (2001), who focuses on the use of are in family conversation, claims that the use of are creates a collaborative process among participants. Mayes and Ono (1991) examine a
phrase *ano hito* ‘that person,’ which is used to refer to someone toward whom the speaker feels a social or emotional distance. Hayashi (2004) demonstrates that utterances with *are*, such as *are nan desu yo* ‘it’s are’ or *are desu yo ne* ‘it’s are, isn’t it?’ are used as ‘action-projection’: With the cataphoric *are* projecting a specification of the referent later in his or her utterances, the speaker keeps his or her turn longer or obtains the floor in conversation. As we can see, although these studies reveal a number of functions of demonstratives in interaction they all limit their target to the use of *a*- demonstratives and pay no attention to *ko*- and *so*- demonstratives. This lack of scope suggests the need for further study examining all three types of demonstratives in conversation in order to achieve a better understanding of the Japanese demonstrative system.

3. Theoretical frameworks

In this study, I apply Hanks’ (1990, 1992) ‘indexical framework’ and the flexible notion of speaker’s and addressee’s perimeters proposed by Laury (1997) and Enfield (2003) in order to illustrate the processes of expressing and emphasizing the speaker’s emotion or attitude with demonstratives. These studies interpret the use and meaning of demonstratives by focusing on ongoing interaction, criticizing the theories that are based on the concrete notion of physical proximity. Instead, they have employed a dynamic approach in explaining demonstrative use. This approach is essential for the present study because the speaker’s inner state - i.e., emotion and attitude - changes constantly and subtly during interaction.

Hanks (1990, 1992) makes a number of important observations in his study of Mayan deixis. First, he applies the notion of ‘figure and ground’ (Talmy 1978) to explain that the relationship between the referent and the indexical ground - the base point of the deixis (i.e., the speaker or the addressee) - is in the figure/ground relationship. That is, the relationship between the referent and the indexical ground is not fixed but flexible and changes during interaction. He also proposes the notion of ‘indexical framework,’ onto which the use of deixis is projected. He emphasizes that the ‘indexical framework’ can be mobilized in discourse. For example, in ‘She said, “come here,” so I went there’ it is clear that the demonstrative *here* in quoted speech does not mean the region where the speaker is standing at the time of speaking the utterance but rather indicates the region in which the original speaker of the quote was standing. It is also obvious that the speaker’s use of *there* means the same region that was previously indicated by *here*. The different choice of demonstratives is motivated by the different indexical framework: The use of *here* is projected in the original place in which the quotation is uttered, while *there* is projected in
the current speech situation. This flux nature of indexical framework is especially useful in explaining the speaker’s motivation for choosing more than one referential form to indicate the same referent within a short discourse, as we will see in examples below.

Laury (1997) proposes the notion of the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres, which “are determined by social and interactive factors” (1997: 55) in her analysis of Finnish demonstratives. Her notion of sphere is similar to the notion of ‘territory’ that Japanese researchers have described (e.g., Sakuma 1951; Kamio 1990; see details in 2.1.), but the original points of her notion of sphere are as follows: (1) the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres are not only indicated but also constituted by the use of demonstratives, and (2) the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres are constantly redefined during ongoing interaction. Enfield (2003) employs the ‘speaker’s here-space,’ which corresponds with the above ‘sphere’ in his research on Lao demonstratives. The ‘here-space’ is a “conceptually defined area” (2003: 89), and it is not defined by physical reality but rather “is simply the place or area which one considers as ‘here’ at a particular moment for a particular purpose” (2003: 89). This study, applying these flexible notions of perimeter, regards the use of the ko- demonstratives as referring to the object that is inside the speaker’s sphere, the a- demonstratives as referring to the object outside of both the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres, and the so- demonstratives as referring to the object outside of the speaker’s sphere but inside the addressee’s sphere.

These frameworks help us to understand how the interactional meaning comes about from the use of demonstratives in conversation. In addition, these studies put their stress on looking at context as something not static but dynamic, which can constantly change during ongoing interaction. This view is crucial when dealing with both demonstratives and their interactional meanings because context is essential to interpret them.

4. Methodology

4.1. Data

The data set that my colleagues and I collected consists of naturally occurring informal conversation in Japanese. Nine different settings of conversation were audio-taped and transcribed, with the total length of the data being three and a half hours. Conversations were taken from daily events, such as family dinner conversation, conversation with visiting relatives, and chats with siblings and close friends.
4.2. Targets of the study

The forms I investigate in this study are the Japanese pronominal demonstratives kore/sore/are ‘this one/that one/that one’ and adnominal demonstratives kono/sono/ano ‘this/that/that (+ noun phrase).’ These forms are considered as typical demonstratives and used most frequently among other forms of demonstratives in conversation.³ In order to carefully examine the interactional functions of demonstratives, I focus on the usages in which the referential function is not primary. Specifically, our target usages are as follows: (1) the pronominal demonstrative or adnominal demonstrative with a noun phrase (hereafter ‘NP’) is used when ellipsis usually occurs (3-Y1, Y2)¹; and (2) the adnominal demonstrative is added to an NP when only NP is normally used (4-1, 2). A demonstrative (with NP) sometimes comes at the end of sentence in these cases (3-Y2, 4-2)⁵. As for the post-position of demonstratives, Ono and Suzuki (1992) reveal that one of the motivations for non-canonical word order in Japanese is to express the speaker’s emotion and that the post-posed element is often a demonstrative (1992: 439). Also, Fujii (1995) argues that one of the functions of this reversed word order is to emphasize the referred item when a post-posed element may be omitted (1995: 190). As we will see in the analysis, the frequency of reversed word order in our target usages is quite high, and the usages all serve emotional or emphasizing functions.

(3) X: Atarashii Harii pottaa no eiga mita?
‘Have you seen the new Harry Potter movie?’
Y0: Sugoku omoshirokatta yo ne. <Subject is omitted>
very very was interesting IP IP
Y1: Are sugoku omoshirokatta yo ne. <Pronominal demonstrative is added>
are very very was interesting IP IP

³ The Japanese demonstrative system is lexically complex and has many varieties in terms of parts of speech as well as what is referred to. Variations other than the target forms of this study include pronominal forms for location kokosokolasoko ‘this/that/that place,’ for person or object in vulgar usage koitsusotsualitsu ‘this/that/that person or one,’ and for direction in formal usage kochirusochiralachira ‘this/that/that way’ and informal usage kochhboschhlaacchi ‘this/that/that way’; adnominal forms for characteristics of an object konnalsonnalanna ‘this/that/that kind of’; and adverbial forms koooloolaa ‘in this/that/that manner.’ The interactional functions of these variations are discussed elsewhere (Naruoka, in press, on konnalsonnalanna, Naruoka 2004 on konnalsonnalanna and kooloolaa).

¹ Japanese speakers usually omit the subject and/or topic when it is obvious from the context or discourse.

⁵ It is widely known that Japanese is a verb-final language and that its word order is usually regarded as strictly fixed.
Y2: Sugoku omoshirokatta yo ne are. < Pronominal demonstrative is added in non-canonical word order>
‘It (are) was very interesting.’

(4)-0 Mata Kitajima senshu kin-medaru totta yo. <No demonstrative is applied>
again Kitajima swimmer gold medal got IP

-1 Mata ano Kitajima senshu kin-medaru totta yo. <Adnominal demonstrative is added>
again ano Kitajima swimmer gold medal got IP

-2 Mata kin-medaru totta yo ano Kitajima senshu. <Adnominal demonstrative is added>
again gold medal got IP ano Kitajima swimmer in non-canonical word order
‘That (ano) Mr. Kitajima got the gold medal again.’

5. Analysis

This section illustrates how Japanese demonstratives express and emphasize the speaker’s emotion or attitude in conversation. From section 5.1 to 5.3, I will exhibit examples to explain the process of each demonstrative form that indicates the interactional meaning. Then, section 5.4 provides cases in which the speaker uses more than one demonstrative form to refer to the same object in a short discourse as strong evidence for the link between the interactional meaning and demonstrative choice.

5.1. Interactional functions of ko- demonstratives

Let us look at examples of ko- demonstratives. Ko- demonstratives are used to refer to an object that is inside the speaker’s sphere. I will illustrate that the speaker intensifies his or her emotion to the referent and also puts focus on the referent by presenting a referent inside the speaker’s sphere using ko- demonstratives. Example (5) indicates that the use of kono emphasizes the speaker’s feeling, antipathy in this case, toward the person being referred to. This emotion is emphasized effectively by presenting the person (who is not in the speech situation) as if she is in the current speech situation. It is taken from a dinner conversation among four friends, a female and three males. The speaker J (female) is talking about Mika-chan, a mutual female friend of all the participants. The speaker confesses that when she first met Mika-chan, she did not like her at all.

(5)
   ‘My first impression of Mika-chan was horrible.’
2. T: ®@®@®.
3. J: \textit{Honto ne},
   ‘Really,’
4. : \textit{kono onna nani tte gurai omotteta n da yo ne.} \textit{kono woman what QT like was thinking NOM COP IP IP}
   ‘I was thinking like, “who in the world is this (kono) woman?!?”’
5. : \textit{Demo=},
   ‘But,’
6. : .. \textit{wakatteru kedo=},
   ‘I understand now,’
7. : \textit{moo ..daijoobu dakedo=},
   ‘it is alright now, but,’
8. : \textit{saisho wa moo saiaku datta kara=}.
   ‘it was horrible in those days.’
    ‘It’s true.’
11. : \textit{Sore wa Mika-chan mo shitteru shi=},
    ‘Mika-chan knows about it too,’
12. : \textit{nani kono onna tte omotta yo ne.} \textit{what kono woman QT thought IP IP}
    ‘I really thought “who in the world is this (kono) woman?!?”’

The speaker J uses two different forms, *Mika-chan* and *kono onna*, to refer to the same person in this excerpt, and they seem to be motivated by the speaker’s two different perspectives. J refers to the friend with her nickname *Mika-chan* in lines 1 and 11 (dotted line), whereas she refers to the same friend as *kono onna* ‘kono woman’ in lines 4 and 12 (solid line). When we closely look at J’s utterances, we can detect two different perspectives of the speaker when commenting on the friend. Observing from the contents of utterances, when she uses the friend’s nickname *Mika-chan*, the speaker’s perspective stays in the current speech situation and describes the past rather objectively. In line 1, she mentions that her ‘first impression’ of the friend was terrible, implying that it is not her current impression but that of the past. In line 11, J reveals that *Mika-chan* herself now knows that J did not like her at first. This also indicates that her negative impression of the friend was in the past.
On the other hand, when J uses kono onna ‘kono woman’ she seems to express her feeling directly to the friend, as if she had gone back to the time she first met the friend. This is because employing a ko- demonstrative, which locates the referent inside the speaker’s sphere, helps to create the imaginary context where the friend is around. In both lines 4 and 12, the parts that include kono onna are expressed in a sort of quotation form of her own words in the past: Kono onna is followed by the quotation maker tte, and then, omotteta ‘I was thinking’ in line 4 and omotta ‘I thought’ in line 12. Of course this quote-like utterance provides vividness and functions to stress the speaker’s feeling. However, adding ko- demonstrative in the quotation further emphasizes the speaker’s feeling by presenting the object explicitly and closely to the speaker. The contrast between the two perspectives (from current circumstances and from the time the speaker met the friend for the first time) indicated by different referential forms (full NP ‘Mika-chan’ and demonstrative plus noun ‘kono onna’) highlights the negative impression of the past and displays the emotion vividly to the addressees.⁶

These contrasting perspectives can be explained by the transposition of ‘indexical framework,’ which Hanks (1990, 1992) proposes. Although the utterances in lines 4 and 12 might not be the speaker’s actual quotation of the past, a vivid effect is created by the shift of the indexical framework from the narrative one (when Mika-chan is used) to the scene when they first met (when kono onna is used). Quote-like utterances, which include kono in lines 4 and 12, stand out in the narrative mode and bring out her strong feeling in the past.

The repetition of the similar utterances in lines 4 and 12 further intensifies the speaker’s strong negative emotion. Also, the non-canonical word order functions as a syntactic strategy to express stronger emotion. In line 12 nani kono onna ‘what-this-woman’ is non-canonical word order (nominal predicate nani ‘what’ precedes the subject), as opposed to the Japanese canonical word order kono onna nani ‘this-woman-what.’ As Ono and Suzuki (1992: 439-440) argue, the utterance in which the nominal predicate nani ‘what’ and the demonstrative pronoun (such as nani kore) or demonstrative plus NP (such as nani kono onna) as a chunk often imply the speaker’s surprise, antipathy or insult rather than a question asking for information. Thus, the second use of kono onna in line 12 expresses the stronger feeling of the speaker toward the woman, and the rise of the speaker’s emotion as her narrative goes on can be observed in the discourse. As we have seen, by applying different perspectives, the

---

⁶ It is true that the word choice of onna ‘woman’ itself has a negative connotation to the person in this context. However, the more neutral term kono hito ‘kono person’ could have been used instead of kono onna and still would have conveyed the speaker’s negative impression toward the friend in this interaction. In both cases, the use of kono stresses the speaker’s strong feeling, antipathy in this case, toward the friend.
repetition of similar structural utterances and the use of non-canonical word order express the interactional meaning clearly and effectively. Revelation of this kind of interactional function cannot be conducted by examining a single utterance but requires the observation of the larger scope of discourse in conversation.

The use of *kono* in this excerpt represents a different process in expressing the speaker’s negative emotion from the use of *ano*, which can also be used to show negative emotion. In fact, it is acceptable when the speaker uses *ano onna* instead of *kono onna* in the above-mentioned situation (example 5). Mayes and Ono (1990) describe a number of cases in which the term *ano hito* ‘*ano* person’ is applied, and illustrate that the term expresses the social/emotional distance (most frequently, the speaker’s negative emotions) toward the person in question. This social/emotional distance arises from *a*-demonstratives that put the referent outside of the speaker’s perimeter (see example 13). The use of *kono*, on the other hand, creates a situation in which the speaker engages closer to the referent. This involving perspective enables the speaker to create an imaginary context in which the speaker expresses the emotion in front of the friend. In other words, by using *kono onna* the speaker is projected as if she could not suppress her feeling, which makes us realize how strong her feeling is.

The following example illustrates the use of a *ko*- demonstrative that emphasizes the speaker’s surprise by bringing attention to the referred item. It is taken from the same conversation as (5). Speaker A is telling friends that he wears Japanese traditional clothes for around-the-house called *jimbee* when he goes to bed. He is struggling to find the word *jimbee* and his friends are trying to help him find the word. *Chanchan(ko), dotera, samue,* and *jimbee* are all Japanese traditional casual kimono-type clothes. *Jimbee* can be worn during summer, which is the season when this conversation takes place, but *dotera*, which A first says he is wearing, is a padded jacket for winter time.

(6)

1. A: *Itsumo ore chanchan- nante yuuno,*
   ‘I always wear chanchan-, how do we call it?’
2. : *Dotera ka=,*
   ‘I think it is dotera.’
   ‘Yeah.’
4. A: .. *kite neru- kite ne XXX tte=,*
   ‘I wear it when I go to bed, and,’
5. : *o- okitara= .. hadaketeta n da.*
   ‘by the time I wake up, the clothe is untied and my belly is exposed.’
6. J: *Asarin nande kono fuyu ni sa dotera nan da yo?*
Asarin (A’s nickname) why kono winter at IP dotera NOM COP IP

‘Why do you wear dotera (padded jacket) in this (kono) winter time?’

7. : Fu- fuyu janai natsu ni.
   ‘Not “winter time,” I mean “summer time.”’

8. A: Dotera tte no?
   ‘Is it dotera?’

9. : Nan te no?
   ‘What do you call it?’

10. : [1XXX1]
11. J: [1 Chanchanko.1]
   ‘It’s chanchanko.’

12. : [2 Samue.2]
   ‘It’s samue.’

13. T: [2 Jimbee.2]
   ‘It’s jimbee.’

In line 6, J orients attention to the current season by adding kono as in nande kono fuyu ni sa dotera nan day yo ‘why do you wear dotera (padded jacket) in this (kono) winter time?’ and focuses on the current season. (As the speaker restates in line 7, kono fuyu ‘kono winter’ is an erroneous statement because she actually means kono natsu ‘kono summer.’) In this case, the utterance can be perfectly understood without the demonstrative kono, and the propositional content would be the same without kono. However, by inserting kono and bringing attention to the speaker’s sphere, the speaker can lead the addressees’ focus to the referent ‘winter’ (in fact, the speaker means ‘summer’) and emphasizes the fact that it is now summer time. This emphasizing role of kono creates a clear mismatch between summer and the warm jacket dotera, and the contrast is interpreted as the speaker’s strong feeling of surprise in this interaction. Also, with the highlighting function of kono, the speaker is able to throw out the image of ‘summer’ (i.e., very hot) to the addressees, which stresses the contrast and displays the speaker’s feeling, such as ‘why in the world do you wear such warm clothing in this hot summer?’

5.2. Interactional functions of a- demonstratives

Next, we will observe examples of a- demonstratives. It has been discussed in the literature that an a- demonstrative establishes solidarity between the speaker and the
addressee (Horiguchi 1978; Kitagawa 1979; Shibatani 1990; Ono 1994) because it locates the referent outside of both the speaker’s and the addressee’s perimeters, which leads the speaker and the addressee to see the referent from the same viewpoint. With the following examples, I will illustrate that the solidarity is effectively and creatively expressed by the use of an a- demonstrative. In the excerpt (7), the repeated use of are explicitly shows solidarity between the speaker and the addressee by indicating their shared feeling toward the referent. It is taken from a conversation between close female friends K and J. Prior to the excerpt, K introduced a particular postcard that has a cartoon character on it with which both K and J are familiar.

(7)  
1. K: Gomai setto de kacchatta [shi= ikka= ],  
   ‘I already bought five postcards as a set, so I guess it’s alright (to send one to somebody),’  
2. J: [@@@].  
   ‘I was like that.’  
4. J: Atashi mo kacchatta= are.  
   I too have bought are  
   ‘I bought them (are) too.’  
5. K: Kawaii yo ne= are.  
   cute IP IP are  
   ‘They (are) are cute, aren’t they?’  
6. J: Uchi no chikaku no yuubinkyoku narandeta yo= are de.  
   my neighborhood GEN post office lined up IP are because of  
   ‘People are lined up for buying them (are) at my neighborhood post office.’  
7. K: [Uso]?  
   ‘Really?’  
   ‘When they started to sell.’  
   ‘Really.’

Both K and J use the demonstrative are to indicate postcards from lines 4 to 6. As previous studies have described, the use of are put the referent outside of both speaker’s and addressee’s spheres, which gives the participants the same viewpoint toward the referent. In this example, ares show that each speaker assumes her interlocutor has the same stance (favoring the postcards), which leads them to have solidarity with each other.
However, what we want to pay attention to here is the repeated use of the demonstrative by the two participants. I argue that this repeated use of *are* brings J’s and K’s spheres closer to each other as the interaction goes on and creates a great mutuality of perspective in interaction.

In line 4, J joins in the interlocutor’s perspective by applying *are* to the referent that was introduced by K earlier. Then, the referent is made to be explicit again with *are* in line 5 by K, and in line 6 by J. Note that all three *ares* have little referential meaning but have a strong interactional meaning. It is obvious that the referent, the postcards with a cartoon character, is the topic of conversation, and there is no difficulty interpreting the referent even when the speakers omit a referential form in these utterances, especially when we see the interaction prior to this excerpt. Prior to line 1, K was talking about the postcards, such as to whom she had sent them. The referential forms that are used in the previous interaction are: NPs *Doraemon no hagaki* ‘Doraemon (cartoon character)’s postcards’ and *Doraemon no ‘Doraemon NOM’ three times, the demonstrative *are* three times, and ellipsis three times. As to line 4, we are also sure that addressee can understand perfectly what the referent is from the J’s utterances: *watashi ‘I’ mo ‘too’* indicates that J is commenting on the same topic, and *kacchatta ‘have bought’* is an echo expression of K’s in line 1. Thus, adding *ares* to these utterances seems to have little referential meaning, and they are used to intensify their favoring stance toward the postcards as well as the bond between the two speakers.

In addition, all *ares* in lines 4, 5, and 6 are post-posed and uttered in a similar sentence pattern that further emphasizes the two speakers’ shared emotion. In line 4, *are* is an object of the sentence, in line 5 a subject, and in line 6 a modifier indicating the cause of the predicate, but all *ares* appear at the end of utterances. Ono and Suzuki (1992) reveal that the Japanese non-canonical word order is employed when expressing the speaker’s emotion, and Fujii (1995) argues that this kind of reversed word order functions to emphasize the referred-to item. According to Fujii (1995: 191), having little anaphoric meaning validates the interpretation of emphasis rather than indicating the referent, and in the case of (7) participants emphasize their shared stance toward the referent. In addition, when *are* is repeatedly employed in similar sentence patterns it works as a ‘discourse marker’ that enhances the discourse cohesion (cf. Schiffrin 1987) and also enhances psychological cohesion between the two speakers by confirming their shared emotion toward the referent. Similar to this example, when a demonstrative is used instead of ellipsis the motivation is usually to emphasize the speaker’s attitude or emotions rather than to indicate or clarify the referent in many cases in the present study’s data.
The uses of *are* in example (7) demonstrate the similar function of the Japanese interactional particle *ne*, which is frequently used in Japanese conversation. Cook (1992), for instance, states that the use of *ne* indicates the agreement in feeling between the speaker and addressee and that the solidarity between them can thus be enhanced. It should also be pointed out that the use of *ares* in this example, as well as many other *a*-demonstrative uses in my data, share the linguistic characteristic with the interactional particle *ne* in terms of syntactic slot, the final position of the utterance. This is consistent with the claim by Maynard (1989: 39) and Ono and Suzuki (1992: 438) that in Japanese conversation, the utterance-final slot is often used for linguistic items that indicate speaker’s stance or solicit rapport. The interactional particle *ne*, because it does not possess any referential meaning, is often discussed in terms of its interactional meaning. The present study tries to clarify that demonstratives, which are usually treated as forms with an explicit referential meaning, can still play a role in displaying interactional meaning.

The next example also shows the use of an *a*-demonstrative. In contrast to the previous example, the sharing of emotion between the speaker and the addressees is implicit. Yet, the use of the demonstrative *ano* creates the context in which the participants share the same feeling toward the referent. The context is a family dinner conversation among the father (F), mother (M), and their daughter, who is in her mid-20s (D). They are talking about baseball games, and the father is disappointed that his favorite baseball team is not doing well. (They are not watching or listening to a game on TV or radio during this conversation.)

(8)

1. F: *Kooshien de Hanshin ga kusen shiten no.*
   ‘The Hanshin Tigers (baseball team) are having a close game at Kooshien Stadium.’
2. D: <LO *Konna jikan ni yatten no? LO*>  
   ‘Are they playing a baseball game this late at night?’
3. F: *Konna jikan tt yatteru sa, [X-].*  
   ‘This late at night?’ Of course they are!’
4. D:  
   *[Na]itaan yatten no?*  
   ‘Are they having a night game?’
5. F: *Naitaان da yo mochiron.*  
   ‘Of course they are having a night game.’
6. : *Kono jiki naitaan ni kimatten no moo.*  
   ‘They always have night games at this time of the year.’
7. F: *...Hontto *ano* Hanshin no kuriinnappu tte no wa*
really *ano* Hanshin GEN batting line-up QT NOM T
<VOX utenai n da yo na omae wa moo,
cannot hit NOM COP IP IP you T well

‘That *(ano)* Hanshin’s batting line-up cannot hit at all!’

‘Third batter Kataoka (=player’s name), fourth batter Arias (=player’s name).’

9. M:                  [De] mata maketen no?
‘Are they losing again?’

In line 7, the father shows his disappointment regarding his favorite team’s batting line-up, and he adds the demonstrative *ano* to the referent. In this case, even when *ano* is deleted, the utterance still has the same propositional meaning. Thus, there is little referential meaning in the use of *ano* in line 7. While example (7) shows the use of *are* in a situation in which the participants share the same feeling toward the referent, in example (8) it is uncertain whether the addressees, mother and daughter, share the same view as the father. However, the father’s use of *ano* creates a context in which the three participants are in the same position toward the referent and share the same disappointment about it. In other words, this use of *ano* shows that the speaker wishes to invite (or forces) the addressees to adopt the same view toward the referent. This use of a demonstrative requires a dynamic view, as seen in Laury’s (1997) claim: The meaning of the demonstratives should be viewed “not as straightforward descriptions of states of affairs, but rather as creative displays of understanding of a certain sort” (59).

5.3. Interactional functions of *so*-demonstratives

Now, let us look at examples of *so*-demonstratives. *So*-demonstratives refer to an object that is outside of the speaker’s sphere but inside the addressee’s sphere, and they can be used when the speaker wants to prevent the referent from being in his or her sphere or wants to push it into the addressee’s sphere. This leads to expression of the speaker’s negative emotion or attitude toward the referent, which is brought into the conversation by the addressee, or expression of a negative emotion toward the addressee. As described in 2.2, studies on the interactional function in Japanese demonstratives so far have discussed only *a*-demonstratives, which strengthen the solidarity between the speaker and addressee (Horiguchi 1978; Kitagawa 1979; Shibatani 1990; Ono 1994). However, most emotions or attitudes expressed with demonstratives in this study’s informal conversational data are negative, such as antipathy, feeling of insult, or counterview, and the use of *so*-demonstratives greatly contributes to the expression of these negative feelings. Kamio (1990: 147) states that the use of *so*-demonstratives
indicate the speaker’s neutral ground when used anaphorically. However, as we will see below, the use of so- demonstratives often expresses the speaker’s strong emotion or attitude.

In the following example (9), the speaker shows her feeling of insult toward the addressee by using the demonstrative sore, which makes a distinction between the speaker’s and the addressee’s position (though the laughter in this conversation makes the insulting comment seem as teasing). The interactants are close female friends, the same pair as in example (7). Prior to the excerpt, they were saying that K often forgets the word she is looking for. She is trying to say the word nengajoo ‘New Year’s greeting card’ for the new topic, but the word does not come to her right away, and J teases K for not remembering such a simple word.

(9)
1. K: Nandakke,
   ‘What was it?’
2. : Nandakke, are.
   ‘what was that?’
3. : Etto=.
   ‘Well…’
4. : Oshoogatsu ni dasu yatsu,
   ‘The thing we send at New Year’s.’
5. : Nengajoo.
   ‘Nengajoo (New Year’s greeting card).’
6. J: @ [1 @@ 1].
7. K: [1 @@ @ 1].
   ‘That’s bad (that you cannot remember such a simple word)!’
10. J: [3 Kimi yaba sugiru  sore wa 3].
    you bad too much sore T
    ‘That (sore) is really bad!’

7 In the discussion of so- demonstratives being neutral, some of Kamio’s (1990) examples, such as the one described below, do not give the impression that the speaker is in neutral ground. The speaker Y, who chooses the form sonna, can be surprised or suspicious when he or she heard the name of the city. This example clearly illustrates that observation at the sentence level is not sufficient to discuss the speaker’s attitude.

X: Hokkaidoo ni ne, Furano to ia machi ga atte, soko wa sukii-jo de yuumei nan da.
   ‘There is a place called Furano in Hokkaidoo, and it is famous for its ski site.’
Y: Hee, sonna machi kiita koto mo nai na.
   ‘Really, I have never heard of such (sonna) a city.’ (Kamio 1990: 147)
11. K: [3@@@3],
12. : *Wasureta dake datte dowasure.*
   ‘It just slipped my mind.’

In line 10, the speaker J uses *sore* to refer to the fact that K could not come up with the word *nengajoo* right away. The topic of utterance 10 - i.e., the fact that K could not say the word ‘*nengajoo*’ - is obvious, and the speaker could omit it and does not need to explicitly mention it using *sore wa ‘sore*-theme marker.’ However, this use of *sore* indicates the speaker’s stance of not accepting the referent (her interlocutor’s behavior) in her sphere, as a *so*- demonstrative locates the referent outside of the speaker’s sphere and inside of the addressee’s sphere. This leads to the expression that J could not believe K’s behavior - or, even more, it expresses an insult towards K’s behavior or toward K. In addition to the use of demonstrative, J also explicitly mentions the second person pronoun *kimi* ‘you’ to indicate the addressee, which would normally be omitted in Japanese conversation. The use of this pronoun also helps to make a clear distinction between the speaker’s and the addressee’s stance. It must also be noted that the word order is reversed in this utterance, which can be interpreted as evidence of expressiveness.

In the following example, the speaker is surprised and suspicious about the rumor his interlocutor told him, and his emotion is intensified by the repeated use of *so*-demonstratives. Two close male friends, K and H, are talking about a rumor about a famous actress. K has heard that the actress was so indecent that she ate food using her hands when she was in junior high school.

(10)

1. K: *Aitsu datte sa= aitsu to issho no.. cyuugaku no yatsu ga ita no=.*
   ‘That person (=a famous actress), well, I know someone who went to the same junior high school as the person (=the actress).’

2. H: *Un.*
   ‘Uh-huh.’

3. K: *Kyuushoku no.. nanka.. kuimon te de kutteta toka itteta yo.*
   ‘I heard that she ate food with her hands when having lunch in a classroom.’

4. H: *Ha?*
   ‘What?’

---

The demonstrative *aitsu* in line 1 is translated into ‘that person.’ The demonstrative is one lexicon, meaning ‘that person’ with vulgar connotation, and it is distinct from *ano hito* ‘that person,’ which does not have any connotation itself.
   ‘Well.’
6. H: Ha?
   ‘What?’
7. ![Dooyuu koto sore](how thing sore)
   ‘What does it (sore) mean?’
   ‘Spaghetti or something.’
9. H: Te de kutteta=?
   ‘She ate with her hands?’
    ‘She grabbed food and ate.’
11. H: [1 @@@ <@ asso @> @@ 1].
    ‘No way!’
12. K: [1 Wakan nai yo demo 1].
    ‘I don’t know though.’
13. H: So- sore wa [2 = 2],
    so- sore T
    ‘That- that (sore) is…,’
    ‘I don’t know if it is true or not.’
    sore T what NOM sono hand with ate QT
    ‘What is that (sore), that (sono) eating with her hands?’
    ‘I don’t know.’
17. H: Sore okashiku nai?
    sore weird NEG
    ‘Isn’t that (sore) weird?’
    ‘Yeah, it is weird.’
19. H: Sore nanka kokooshiten ja nai no?
    sore something exaggerated IP NEG IP
    ‘Don’t you think that (sore) is exaggerated?’
20. ![Te de kuttte sore okashii yo](hand with ate QT sore weired IP)
‘That (sore) is really weird that she ate food with her hands.’

   ‘Yeah.’

22. : Ma .. kedo shinjite nai kedo na.
   ‘Well, I don’t believe it though.’

   ‘Well.’

In this excerpt, H is surprised and suspicious about K’s story in line 3: There is a rumor that the actress ate food with her hands when she was in junior high school. H uses the pronominal demonstrative sore and the adnominal demonstrative sono to refer to the rumor. As I mentioned above, so- demonstratives locate the referent outside of the speaker’s sphere but inside the addressee’s, so H’s use of so- demonstratives puts the referent, the rumor, outside of his sphere. A feeling of surprise and a suspicious and unbelieving attitude are expressed when one does not or cannot accept certain information. Thus, the use of the so- demonstrative, which puts the referent outside of the speaker’s sphere, is used in these utterances. But what is interesting about this excerpt, again, is the speaker’s repeated use of the demonstratives.

Repetition of so- demonstratives surely emphasizes the speaker’s surprise and his attitude of not believing the rumor. As is seen in Table 1, in which H’s utterances after he has heard the rumor are extracted, he uses so- demonstratives seven times. Interestingly, all of the demonstratives can be removed, as in the middle column of Table 1, and the utterances still make perfect sense. In these utterances, the so- demonstratives possess little referential meaning, and the same propositional content is conveyed with or without them. What is different between the left and middle columns in Table 1 is the degree of expressiveness. By adding so- demonstratives and explicitly excluding the referent from the speaker’s sphere, the speaker clearly casts doubt on what the interlocutor has said.

In addition, when we investigate each of H’s utterances closely, H’s suspicion toward the rumor increases in the course of repeating the so- demonstratives. First, H says Dooyuu koto sore? ‘What does it mean?’ as if he does not really understand what K meant or might have misheard what K said. In the next utterance, he repeats what K said and confirms that what he has just heard is correct. In lines 13 and 15, it seems that he is still not sure whether he understands what K told him and is trying to figure out what it really means. Then, in line 17, he uses the adjective okashii ‘weird’ to express his feeling. Yet, he applies it in an interrogative sentence to make his statement rather soft. The last utterance of H again uses okashii ‘weird,’ and this time it is in an affirmative sentence and
he is more definite in his opinion. It is apparent that the degree of his suspicion about the story increases as he repeatedly uses so- demonstratives.

Table 1. H’s utterances with and without so- demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Original words of H</th>
<th>Without so- demonstratives</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td>“What?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td>Ha?</td>
<td>“What?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dooyuu koto sore?</td>
<td>Dooyuu koto</td>
<td>“What does that mean?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Te de kutteta=?</td>
<td>Te de kutteta=</td>
<td>“She ate with her hands?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>@@@ &lt;@ usso @&gt; @@.</td>
<td>@@@ &lt;@ usso @&gt; @@.</td>
<td>“No way!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>So-so=re wa=,</td>
<td></td>
<td>“That- that is…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>sore wa nanna no sono te de kutteta tte,</td>
<td>Nanna no te de kutteta tte.</td>
<td>“What is that, that eating with her hands?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sore okashiku-nai?</td>
<td>Okashiku-nai?</td>
<td>“Isn’t that weird?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sore nanka kchoooshiten ja nai no?</td>
<td>Nanka kchoooshiten ja nai no?</td>
<td>“Don’t you think that is exaggerated?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Te de kutta tte sore okashii yo.</td>
<td>Te de kutta tte okashii yo.</td>
<td>“That is really weird that she ate food with her hands.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, we can observe that the repetition of so- demonstratives affects the interlocutor’s attitude. K has brought the rumor into the conversation, but as interaction continues he is losing his confidence concerning the information he has provided. Until line 10, K simply reports what he has heard from his acquaintance, but from line 12 his comments indicate that he is not sure whether the rumor is true or not, as he says, Wakan nai yo demo ‘I don’t know though’ in line 12, Honto ka doo ka wa wakan nai ‘I don’t know if it is true or not’ in line 14, and Shirai nai ‘I don’t know’ in line 16. Eventually, he aligns himself with H’s opinion and says Okashii y na ‘Yeah, it is weird’ in line 18, and shinjite nai kedo na ‘I don’t believe it though’ in line 22. As mentioned, H’s use of so-demonstratives implies that the rumor is in K’s sphere, and H’s gesture of repeating so-demonstratives emphasizes it. When we follow K’s utterances, it appears that K is trying to avoid the responsibility of having the rumor in his sphere.

So far, I have shown the processes that the use of each demonstrative type (ko-, so-, and a-) expresses and emphasizes the interactional meaning, such as antipathy, feeling of insult, suspicion, surprise, and affection, toward the referent or the addressee. Moreover, we have seen the case in which the use of a particular demonstrative creates a new context concerning participants’ stances, or a case in which the use of demonstratives influences the stance of the interlocutor. We also observed that reversed...

---

9 In the case of sore in lines 13 and 15, the theme marker wa is also taken out.
word order and repetition of the demonstrative are often used in the utterances, making them more expressive. The next section will illustrate the instances in which more than one demonstrative form is used to describe the referent in a short discourse, and we will show the more dynamic aspect of the demonstrative use which convinces the link between the use of demonstratives and the speaker’s emotion or attitude.

5.4. Transformation of demonstrative forms in interaction

This section examines cases in which the speaker changes one demonstrative form to another when indicating the same referent in a short discourse. I argue that the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres mobilize depending not just on the physical movement of the referent or participants but also on the change of the speaker’s emotional status or on the speaker’s rhetorical strategy for expressing a certain emotion.

People do not always use the same demonstrative for the same referent. This has already been discussed in previous studies. For example, Kamio (1990) uses the notion of the ‘territory of information’ to explain the change in demonstratives when referring to the same object:

(11) (Kamio 1990: 145)
1 X: *Kono* hon sutete ii yo.
   ‘You can throw this (*kono*) book away.’
2 Y: *E, sono* hon sutechatte ii no?
   ‘Really? Can I throw that (*sono*) book away?’
3 X: Un.
   ‘Yes.’
   (Y throws the book away into the dust can.)
4 X: *Ano* hon wa moo mitaku nai n da.
   ‘I don’t want to see the (*ano*) book again.’

X uses *kono* to indicate the book in line 1 because the book is in X’s hand - i.e., in X’s territory. At this point, Y uses *sono* because for Y the book is in the addressee’s territory. Then, in line 4, the book is indicated by *ano* since it is thrown away and now is outside of both X’s and Y’s territories (Kamio 1990: 145). Similar to this example, previous studies have dealt with cases in which the movement of the referent is involved. However, the following examples from our conversational data illustrate that different demonstratives are used to indicate the same referent WITHOUT any movement of the
referent or the participants. I will claim that such cases can be explained only when we understand that the speaker’s and the addressee’s spheres, as well as the relationship among the two spheres and the referent, are flexible as proposed by Laury (1997) and Enfield (2003). These examples also support Hanks’ (1990, 1992) claim that the indexical framework is transferable rather than fixed in ongoing interaction.

In the following example, the same speaker uses two different pronominal demonstrative forms, *are* and *sore*, in a short discourse, but contrary to the above (11), there is no physical movement of the referent or participants. This example illustrates the case in which the speaker applies different demonstrative forms depending upon her emotional status at the time of utterance. The same female close friends as in examples (7) and (9) are talking about postcards with another cartoon character. This excerpt starts right after example (9).

(12)

1. K: *Sazae-san no nengajoo shitteru?*
   ‘Do you know the New Year’s card with Sazae-san’s (cartoon character) picture on it?’
2. J: *A shitteru.*
   ‘Yes, I know.’
3. : .. *are demo su- moo sugu urikireta n desho.*
   ‘But they (*are*) were immediately sold out, right?’
   ‘Yes.’
5. J: .. *Kaeta no?*
   ‘Were you able to buy (them)?’
6. K: *Atashi no ojisan ne=,*
   ‘My uncle,’
   ‘Uh-huh.’
8. : *[Kaeta no?]*
   ‘Was he able to buy (them)?’
9. K: [@] *Narande katta te tta @.*
   ‘He said he bought (them) after he waited for a line.’
    ‘Wow.’
11. : *Dashite [kureta no?]*
    ‘Did he send (one) to you?’
12. K: [1 Kurata yo.]
   ‘Yes, he gave me (some).’

   ‘Uh-huh.’

   ‘He gave me (some) before he sent (them as a New Year’s greetings).’

15. J: Honto [1 ni 1]?
   ‘Really?’

16. K: [1 Un 1].
   ‘Uh-huh.’

17. J: [2 Teka soo ja nakute sa=2],
   ‘But, not like that,’

   ‘Uh-huh.’

19. J: Dasu n ja naku te morai taku nai .. [3 sore 3],
    send NOM IP NEG and receive want NEG sore
    ‘Don’t you want to receive it (sore) rather than sending (it) to someone?’

    ‘Oh, I also received (it from him as a New Year’s greetings).’

21. : [4 Un 4].
    ‘Uh-huh.’

    ‘Really?’

23. : Kawaii yo ne= [5 are 5],
    cute IP IP are
    ‘They (are) are cute, aren’t they?’

24. K: [5 Takusan 5] katta kara ageru yo=,
    ‘I bought many (of them), so I will give you (some),’

25. : toka itte.
    ‘My uncle said something like that.’

In this excerpt, demonstratives are used three times to indicate a particular New Year’s card with a cartoon character after it is first introduced in the conversation in line 1. Despite the fact that all demonstratives are used to refer to the same object by the same speaker (J), the choice changes from are to sore, and then back to are again in lines 3, 19, and 23 respectively. Furthermore, when we examine how the postcard is referred to throughout the excerpt we find that the term for the postcard is also omitted in some
utterances. Thus, we need to discuss the factors of the three different choices: are, sore, and ellipsis.

Examining these three choices within this interaction reveals the link between the referential choice and the speaker’s emotion toward the referent and/or the interlocutor. Specifically, the choice of are relates to the affection toward the referent and an emotional sharedness with the interlocutor, whereas sore relates to the opposing attitude toward the interlocutor in this excerpt. When the speaker applies ellipsis, it seems that the speaker does not indicate any distinctive emotion or attitude - i.e., unmarked state. First, let us look at the first use of are. After K introduces the card in line 1 using a full NP Sazae-san no nengajoo ‘Sazae-san’s New Year’s card,’ J uses are to refer to the card for the first time in line 3 as a reply to K. In this utterance, J could have uttered without are because it is obvious that J and K share the topic of the conversation, and also because J mentions explicitly that she knows about the card in line 2, Shitteru ‘I know.’ However, in this part, adding are can emphasize that J and K have the same informational status in terms of the referent.

In line 19, J’s use of sore appears. In the utterance, J expresses that she has a different opinion from K’s about when to be given the card. (K said she was given the blank card by her uncle prior to the New Year holidays, but J thinks it is nicer to receive the card as the uncle’s New Year greetings.) This utterance in lines 17 and 19 is the only part within this excerpt in which J has a disagreement with K. In other words, the two participants who have been sharing emotions with each other suddenly have different attitudes (although it is J’s one-sided reaction). It is still clear that the topic has not changed, and there is no need to clarify the referent. However, the application of the demonstrative sore, which locates the referent outside of the speaker’s sphere but inside the addressee’s sphere, singles out the speaker’s contradicting stance toward her interlocutor.10

J switches back to the demonstrative are in line 23 right after J realizes that her interlocutor in fact thinks in the same way as she does. In line 20, K mentions that she also received the card from her uncle as a New Year greetings, which was just what J said she would want in line 19. Again, there is no need for the speaker to apply any referential term in this utterance, as the topic of conversation remains the same. However, the speaker J explicitly mentions the referent with the demonstrative are. The motivation of using are might be to mend ties with the interlocutor. As we have just seen,

10 Although the speaker expresses her opposing view in lines 17 and 19, her utterance does not sound aggressive, and consideration for the interpersonal relationship can be observed. She uses a rather indirect way of opposing her interlocutor, using the interrogative expression morai taku nai ‘don’t you want to receive…?’
J once changes the referential form to *sore* and shows her disagreement with the interlocutor. Then, J realizes that the interlocutor has the same idea on the referent. At the time, J must want to go back to the previous state in which the two speakers were sharing their emotions. Thus, in this case, the application of *are* has the function of forcing the context back to the previous state, in which they see the referent from the same side. Also, what J is saying in line 23, *Kawaii yo ne* ‘They are cute, aren’t they?’ is most likely to be agreed to by K and gain empathy from K. In addition to the use of *are*, the interactional particle *ne* in this utterance functions in the same way because *ne* is usually used when the speaker thinks the addressee shares the information or even the feeling (e.g., Cook 1992), which leads to regaining the solidarity between the two in this example. Reversed word order is also applied to the lines 19 and 23, which indicates that a stronger emotion is involved in these utterances.

Referential forms are omitted by both of the speakers: J’s lines 5, 8, and 11, and K’s lines 9, 12, 14, 20, and 24. These ellipses mostly occur after J’s first use of *are* in line 3 until her use of *sore* in line 19, which is the part where the two participants are asking and answering detailed points, such as how K’s uncle bought the card, and where there is no significant focus or change in the speaker’s attitude or emotion. Contrasting the part where the speakers omit the use of referential forms with the parts where the speaker J uses demonstratives shows that ellipsis occurs in a less-marked situation in terms of the speaker’s emotional state, whereas a demonstrative is used when it is more marked, more significant, or worth noting about her inner state.

Demonstrative choices in example (12) confirm the flux nature of the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres. As an example, the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres and the relationship to the referent in lines 19 and 23 are illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, respectively. At the moment of line 19, when J and K have different opinions concerning the referent, the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres are rather independent, and the referent is only in the addressee’s sphere. On the other hand, in line 23, when the two have the sharing emotion, their spheres largely overlap with each other, and the two participants share the perspective toward the referent. As shown in these figures, the speaker’s and addressee’s spheres transfer constantly during the interaction. In addition, in what we described as unmarked, ellipsis occurs in the situation where the relationships among the speaker, the addressee, and referent are not focused.
The next example also shows the use of different demonstratives when referring to the same object in a short discourse. In the previous example (12), different demonstratives were applied depending upon the change in the speaker’s attitude. In example (13), on the other hand, the same speaker uses different demonstratives to express the same feeling, and altering demonstrative form functions as a more powerful expression of the speaker’s feeling. In the example, two sisters in their mid-20s are talking about how to meet a nice man in their daily lives. N is a graduate student and M is working at a small office. M is complaining about her office, saying there are no nice men there. From line 5, M starts expressing her negative feeling toward her office because she does not have any hope of meeting a nice man at the office and does not even have a desire to meet a man there.
1. **N:** Demo igaito kooro shoogeki no deai ga aru kamo shirenai shi.
   ‘But we may be able to unexpectedly meet a nice guy.’

2. **M:** Soo da yo.
   ‘That’s right.’

3. **N:** 'N-chan wa gakusei dakara deai ga aru yo.
   ‘You must have chances to meet a guy because you are a student!’

4. **N:** Aru ka na?
   ‘Do you think so?’

5. **M:** Watashi nante moo= ano [1 heisa 1] sareta kaisha no nakade
   I PR aw ano closed company GEN inside
   [2 daremo 2] !inai ccyuuno,
   nobody exist I would say
   ‘I could never find a nice guy at that (ano) closed office,’

6. **N:** [1 Nn= 1] [2 @ @ uso=2].
   ‘Well…’

7. **M:** mitai [3 na 3].
   ‘or something like that.’

8. **N:** [3 @ @ 3],

9. **M:** <@ Inai ttuuno@ > @ @ @.
   ‘There is no (nice guy there at all).’

10. **M:** Dare mo yada [4 ttuuno mitaina @ @ @ 4].
    ‘I don’t want anybody in the office, or something.’

11. **N:** [4 @ @ @ @ @ @ 4],

    what COP IP kono company QT seems like
    ‘What in the world is this (kono) office, or something like that.’

13. **N:** [5 Nn= 5].
    ‘Well.’

M uses ano to refer to the office as in ano heisasareta kaisha ‘ano closed office’ in line 5. (Note that this is the first time when this referent, M’s office, appears in this conversation.) Then, in line 12, she indicates the same office with kono as in nan da yo kono kaisha ‘what is kono office.’ Even though M uses different demonstrative forms for the office in these two utterances, she is expressing and emphasizing the same emotion - that is, antipathy toward the office. First, let us look at the use of ano. A- demonstratives
are used when the referent is outside of both speaker’s and addressee’s spheres. In this case, the focus is on the fact that the referent is excluded from the speaker’s sphere, rather than the participants having the same standpoint toward the referent as in example (7). This exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere creates what Mayes and Ono (1990) call ‘social/emotional distance’ and consequently expresses the speaker’s negative emotion toward the referent in this example.11

On the other hand, the ko- demonstrative locates the referent within the speaker’s sphere. Even though the referent, M’s office, is not physically located around M, using kono in the quote-like utterance creates the imaginary context where the office is in M’s sphere and she is complaining about the office directly. Of course making the utterance like a quotation provides a certain emotional effect in this example. In fact, even when one deletes kono kaisha ‘kono office’ and says Nan da yo tte kanji ‘What in the world (is this), or something like that,’ one can still convey the same meaning with a certain negative feeling toward the office. However, explicitly mentioning the referent with kono in the quotation establishes the context where the referent is inside the speaker’s sphere, and the speaker is able to be more expressive while showing her emotion toward the referent.

This example shows that the alternating demonstrative forms display an interesting rhetorical effect by shifting the ‘indexical framework’ (Hanks 1990, 1992). On the one hand, when ano is used, the speaker’s viewpoint stays focused on the current speech situation in which she is having chat with her sister, complaining about the referent that is in her mind. On the other hand, when kono is used, the speaker’s viewpoint is as if she is in the office, complaining at that site. Changing the use of demonstrative from ano to kono involves a shift of the indexical framework from the narrative (when ano heisasareta kaisha ‘ano closed office’ is used) to real life (when kono kaisha ‘kono office’ is used). We have already seen examples (5) and (12) in which the speaker’s different emotional states or orientations toward the referent are expressed by the use of different forms, such as a full NP, an ellipsis, or demonstratives. However, the interesting point of example (13) is that the same emotion (rather than the different emotions) is expressed from the distinct viewpoints by employing the different demonstrative forms. The speaker intensifies her negative emotion from multiple perspectives and consequently conveys it powerfully.

11 In this utterance, the adjective heisasareta ‘closed’ is added between ano and the object kaisha ‘office.’ This adjective certainly adds a negative connotation to the utterance by presenting one of the reasons for having a feeling of antipathy toward the office. Yet, from the context, this utterance could indeed be interpreted as meaning that the speaker has a negative attitude without this adjective. Thus, it is worth comparing the use of ano heisasareta kaisha in line 5 and kono kaisha in line 12.
Previous studies of Japanese demonstratives have been based on sentence-level analysis rather than on examination of larger discourse in naturally occurring data. The present analysis has chosen the latter approach, which leads us to clearly see that examining usage at the sentence level is not enough to provide an understanding of the use and meaning of demonstratives. In particular, examples (12) and (13) bring attention to the importance of presenting more flexible theory in discussing the use and meaning of demonstratives. Previous studies have mentioned that the speaker can use different demonstratives in referring to the same referent if the physical situational differences (such as the movement of the referent) occur, as in (11). However, we have illustrated that the choice of demonstratives can be accounted for by the subtle changes in the speaker’s emotional status, as in example (12), and the rhetorical strategy used to stress the speaker’s emotions, as in (13). In order to encompass these creative sides of demonstratives, the theory should be more dynamic in nature.

Summing up this section, through the examination of the interactional functions of Japanese demonstratives we have found that each demonstrative type has a different process for expressing and emphasizing the speaker’s emotion or attitude. Ko-demonstratives, which indicate the referent inside the speaker’s sphere, express a strong emotion toward the referent by creating a context in which the referent is near the speaker even when it is not. We have also seen the case where a ko- demonstrative is used to put a strong focus on a particular referent in the current situation to stress the speaker’s surprise. As for a- demonstratives, we saw that they indicate not only the sharedness of information but also sharedness of emotion between the speaker and addressee, and that they strengthen the solidarity between the two. My example illustrates that the solidarity is emphasized by repeating the use of demonstratives when they are usually omitted. In addition, an a- demonstrative is used as the speaker’s strategy to gain solidarity from the addressee even when it is not sure that the addressee feels the same way. A-demonstratives can also imply the emotional distance between the speaker and the referent and express negative emotion because the use of a- demonstratives exclude the referent from the speaker’s sphere. Finally, the so- demonstrative, which indicates the referent outside of the speaker’s sphere and inside of the addressee’s sphere, is used when the speaker does not believe or accept what the addressee has mentioned, which leads to an expression of the speaker’s antipathy or opposing attitude.

As we have seen, what we called ‘sphere’ in this study or what is called ‘territory’ in previous studies is an important concept for explaining not only the referential functions but also the interactional functions of demonstratives. However, this study reveals that the sphere or territory is not something already defined and stable but
rather that it is flexibly moved and is focused or unfocused during interaction (cf. Figures 2 and 3).

We have also observed that repeated use of the same demonstratives and reversed word order frequently occur and emphasize the interactional meaning along with the demonstrative use. Ochs and Schieffelin (1989) argued that “languages dedicate phonological, morpho-syntactic, and discourse features to intensify and specify attitudes, moods, feelings, and dispositions” (1989: 7), which means that there are many elements to indicate the interactional meaning and that a demonstrative is merely one of the elements in the Japanese language. However, demonstratives are the element that has been discussed almost exclusively within the scope of referential function, and examining such an element within the scope of interactional function could bring researchers’ attention to other elements that have the interactional function yet to be discovered.

6. Conclusion

This study has examined the Japanese pronominal demonstratives kore/sore/are and the adnominal demonstratives kono/sono/ano in naturally occurring conversational data. In particular, it has focused on the ones that have the interactional function as a primary factor of their use. The three types of Japanese demonstrative forms (ko-, so-, and a-) have different relationships among the speaker’s sphere, the addressee’s sphere, and the referent, and by indicating these relationships creatively in conversation the speaker expresses or intensifies his or her emotion or attitude. Flexible concepts are indispensable for explaining the process of indicating such interactional meaning with demonstratives. Hanks (1990, 1992) proposes the mobile nature of ‘indexical framework.’ This concept helps us to understand that the context, on which demonstrative usage is based, can transform from a narrative one to the actual (past) one to add vividness to the utterance. I have also employed the speaker’s and the addressee’s spheres that are defined within interaction at any given time (Laury 1997; Enfield 2003). This notion of a flux perimeter is essential when the relationships among the speaker, addressee, and referent are changing within a short discourse because of the subtle emotional changes of the participants. In addition, by observing other referential forms such as NPs and ellipses, and also transitions to other demonstrative forms, I have revealed how the speaker’s emotion or attitude relates to the referential choice he or she makes and how demonstratives are applied in marked situations in terms of the speaker’s inner state.
A demonstrative is traditionally considered to be a typical linguistic form that requires contextual information in order for its meaning to be understood. However, the traditional view of ‘contextual information’ is rather static, such as ‘who is the speaker/addressee?’ or ‘where are they standing?’, and thus it does not provide sufficient information to allow understanding of what a demonstrative really means in a real interaction. This study has revealed that a more dynamic view of context that captures all of the subtle elements in interaction is needed to provide understanding of the whole meaning - i.e., referential/semantic meaning as well as interactional meaning - of the demonstrative. Hanks (1992), in his explanation of indexical framework, makes this point explicit:

A basic property of the indexical context of interaction is that it is dynamic. As interactants move through space, shift topics, exchange information, coordinate their respective orientations, and establish common grounds as well as non-commonalities, the indexical framework of reference changes. (1992: 53)

I believe that this dynamic property of context must be essential not only for examining the use of demonstratives but also for the analysis of other deictic terms and even other elements of language in interaction. Therefore, this study not only supports the new stream of demonstrative studies but also contributes to the new approach to the examination of language use that pays attention to non-concrete elements in interaction and to the dynamic property of context.
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Appendix

The conversational data for this study employs a broad version of the system of transcription described in Du Bois et al (1993). Free translation is added in the next typed line, and for target utterances, Japanese glossing is also given between Japanese transcription and free translation.

Symbols for Discourse Transcription:
[words]: Overlap (brackets indexed with numbers [2 words 2] are used for distinguishing bracketing); =: Lengthening; -: Truncated word; …: Pause; ..: Short pause; X: Indecipherable syllable; !: High pitch on a word; @: Laughter; <@ words @>: Laugh quality; <LO words LO>: Lowered pitch level; <VOX words VOX>: Distinctive voice quality.

Abbreviations for Japanese glossing:
COP: Copula; GEN: Genitive marker; IP: Interactional particle; NEG: Negative marker; NOM: Nominalizer; PR: Particle; QT: Quotative marker; T: Theme marker.