SUBJECTIVE AND INTERSUBJECTIVE USES OF JAPANESE VERBS OF COGNITION IN CONVERSATION

Misumi Sadler

Abstract

The present study examines two commonly-used Japanese verbs of cognition, WAKARU and SHIRU, in naturally occurring conversation, and demonstrates that these verbs are expressions of position and attitude that are relevant both to individual speakers (i.e., subjective uses) and to relational activities among participants (i.e., intersubjective uses). My naturally occurring conversation data supports Lee (2006) that there seems to be a general principle that speakers' lexical choices are governed by information type, but the link between speakers' lexical choices and information type is not so absolute but fluid. In fact, while 24% of my data are those where only WAKARU is expected to be used or only SHIRU is expected to be used, 74% are those in which both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible regardless of information type. A closer analysis of such 'fluid' examples suggests that speakers choose one expression over another to express their personal attitudes and emotions toward the content of information and toward the other conversation participants. More specifically, their choice for WAKARU manifests such features as experiencer perspective and speaker empathy, and in contrast, their choice for SHIRU is characterized as observer perspective. The study is firmly in keeping with a usage-based perspective on language (e.g., Barlow and Kemmer 2000; Bybee 2006), which takes as its starting point the idea that language use shapes language form and meaning, and offers new insights into the interactional and performative nature of language by addressing the two commonly used verbs of cognition in Japanese conversation from a viewpoint of discourse pragmatics.

Keywords: Subjectivity; Intersubjectivity; Possession of knowledge; Discourse; Experiencer perspective; Observer perspective; Empathy; Detachment.

1. Introduction

Japanese has two commonly used verbs describing the cognitive activity of possessing knowledge: *wakaru* and *shiru*. According to Miura (1983), *wakaru* expresses the meaning of "(something) is or become clear" which "represents an event that is not controllable by the speaker" (1983: 210-211). *Shiru* ('get to know') is a transitive verb expressing the future possession of knowledge as in *sekai-no-genjoo-o shiru* '(I) will know (or look into) the current state of the world'. For describing the current possession of knowledge, the nonpast progressive form of *shiru*, *shitte(i)ru* ('(I) am in the state of having gotten to know' in Miura 1983: 178) is used. Examples (1) and (2) show the use of these verbs in conversation. For terminological convenience, hereafter I will use "WAKARU" as the umbrella term of all forms of *wakaru* - nonpast or past, affirmative or negative - and "SHIRU" as the umbrella term for all forms of *shiru*.

> (1)   a.   *nantonaku*   ***wakaru***   *ore*
>   somewhat   WAKARU   I

'I sort of understand (the feeling that one could get nervous about making a phone call)'   (Telephone 3)

b.   *nihongo*   **_wakannai_**-*n-da*   *yone=*
Japanese   WAKARU: NEG-NOM-COP[1] FP
'it's that (the returnee students or the children of Japanese expatriates who take part of their education outside of Japan) don't understand Japanese' (Ryuugaku 6)

(2)   a.   *minna-ga*   **_shitteru_**-*n-da*   *tte*
everyone-GA   SHIRU-NOM-COP   QUO
'I hear everyone knows (that she had an accident and can no longer walk)'   (Accident 4)

b.   *atashi   nannimo   **_shiranai_**   wa*
I   anything   SHIRU: NEG   FP
'I know nothing (about exchanging betrothal gifts)'
(Yuinoogaeshi 3)

In (1a), the nonpast affirmative form *wakaru* expresses the speaker's understanding of the feeling that one could get nervous about making a phone call. (1b) contains the nonpast negative form *wakannai*, i.e., the contracted form of *wakaranai*, used to describe the returnee students' inability to understand Japanese. In (2a), *shitteru*, the contracted, nonpast, affirmative progressive form of *shitteiru*, expresses that everyone knows the fact that their mutual friend had an accident and can no longer walk. In (2b) the nonpast negative form *shiranai* describes the speaker's lack of knowledge about exchanging betrothal gifts.

While in many bilingual dictionaries and Japanese textbooks, *wakaru* is typically translated as 'to understand' and *shitte(i)ru* as 'to get to know', as discussed in prior literature (e.g., Kato 2002; Lee 2006), the semantic and functional distinction between the two verbs is not at all clear-cut. In fact, in many cases, either verb can express a lexical meaning similar to English 'to know', as is shown in the following example:

(3)   M and K are housemates.   M tries to recall the name of the very expensive sports car her younger brother bought.

1   M: … *n nantoka .. Zekkusu   da   ka,*
such and such   Zex   COP   Q
2   *nan   da   [ka   **_shiranai_**   kedo],*
what   COP   Q   SHIRU: NEG   FP
'(I) don't know such and such Zex or what (it) is'
3   K: *[Aaru Ekkusu Se]bun?*
'(you mean) RX7?'

---

[1] The following abbreviations are used as glossing symbols: COP (copula), FP (final particle), GER (gerund), HESI (hesitation), LK (linker), NEG (negative), NOM (nominalizer), PROG (progressive), Q (question), QUO (quotative), and TEN (tentative). Note that the so-called case markers such as *ga* ('subject' marker) and *o* ('direct object' marker) as well as other particles which are often referred to as 'topic' markers, or *kakari* ('emphatic' or 'focus') particles such as *wa* and *tte*, will not be glossed on the basis of their syntactic functions, but will be glossed in capital letters like GA, O, WA and TTE.

4	M:	... *nan= da*	*ka*	***wakannai.***
		what COP	Q	WAKARU: NEG

5	***shiranai***	*atashi .. mada-,*
	SHIRU: NEG I	still

6   *.. oboekirenai.*
cannot memorize completely
'(I) don't know what (it) is. (I) don't know, I still can't memorize (it) completely'   (Zeitaku 1)[2]

(3) contains two instances of the nonpast negative form *shiranai* in lines 2 and 5 and one instance of *wakannai*, the contracted, nonpast negative form of *wakaranai* in line 4. All three instances describe M's non-possession of information referring to the name of the very expensive sports car her younger brother bought. Note that as Miura (1983) points out, English 'I don't know' does not always corresponds to *shiranai* in Japanese but may be compatible with *wakaranai/wakannai* as in the case of line 4.

M's lexical choice in (3) seems to imply that speakers don't simply rely on the lexical meanings of words when choosing a certain expression over another. Rather, I propose that they may be more susceptible to discourse-pragmatic meanings/usages. The present study examines Japanese verbs of cognition - WAKARU and SHIRU - in naturally occurring conversation, and demonstrates that these verbs are expressions of position and attitude that are relevant both to individual speakers (i.e., subjective uses) and to relational activities among participants (i.e., intersubjective uses). My primary claim is that, as Lee (2006) observed in her constructed data (which will be discussed in the subsequent section), there seems to be a general principle that speakers' lexical choices are governed by information type in my naturalistic data, but at the same time the link between speakers' lexical choices and information type is not so absolute but fluid. In fact, for 74% of my data, both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible, and speakers choose one expression over another to express their position and attitude that are relevant both to individual speakers (i.e., subjective uses) and to relational activities among participants (i.e., intersubjective uses). I propose that the use of WAKARU is closely associated with such features as experiencer perspective, speaker empathy and involvement, directness, and immediacy, whereas the use of SHIRU is characterized as observer perspective, speaker detachment, and indirectness. Such form-function relationships roughly parallel such notions as 'ego vs. non-ego' (Akatsuka 1979), 'experiencing self vs. observing self' (Lyons 1982; Shinzato 2003), '*uchi* (= in groups) vs. *soto* (out-groups)' (Quinn 1994), 'S-perspective (= the first person perspective) vs. O-perspective (= the third person perspective)' (Iwasaki 1993; cf. Koyama-Murakami 2001), and 'private vs. public' (Dahl 2000).

This study is firmly in keeping with a usage-based perspective on language (e.g., Barlow and Kemmer 2000; Bybee 2006), which takes as its starting point the idea that language use shapes language form and meaning. Usage-based approaches in linguistics, in general, view language structure as rooted in actual usage, and the frequency/repetition of linguistic expressions in natural discourse is regarded as an important factor in the conventionalization of linguistic form. Investigation of language

---

[2] The transcription conventions used for this study are adapted from Du Bois et al. (1993). Each line corresponds roughly to a prosodic unit with a comma indicating the continuity of prosody, and a period indicating the finality of prosody. Two hyphens indicate the prosodic unit was broken off. The equals sign means lengthening, and the brackets mean overlap. The "@" signs indicates laughter. A sequence of dots represents a pause.

use in naturalistic contexts - in the current study, in naturally occurring conversation - focuses attention on the crucial role of context in the operation of linguistic system and on conversation participants themselves. Analytical consideration of the context-dependent nature of linguistic production and understanding offers new insights into the interactional and performative nature of language by addressing the two commonly used verbs of cognition in Japanese conversation from a viewpoint of discourse pragmatics.

2. What has been said about WAKARU and SHIRU?

There have been some attempts to account for the speaker's lexical choice between WAKARU and SHIRU. *Wakaru* is explained as something that has become clear in a speaker's mind, and *shiru* as the acquisition of new knowledge and value through information, experience, and learning (Tien, Izuhara, and Kim 2007: 725). In other words, while both *wakaru* and *shiru* express the possession of information, *wakaru* is associated with the process of acquiring information, and *shiru* is related to the point-in-time when the information is acquired (Kato 2002). However, such semantic information does not seem to permeate Japanese learners' minds easily, rather learners of Japanese often rely on simplistic and inadequate translations, which may create unintended and unpleasant interactional situations. For example, examine the following exchange between a native speaker of Japanese (=A) and a learner of Japanese (=B):

(4) A: *Nichiyoobi-ni   eiga   minai?*
         Sunday-on   movie   see: NEG
         'Would you like to go see a movie next Sunday?'
     B: *Un,   ii   ne.*
         yeah   good   FP
         'Sure'.
     A: *Nani-ga   mitai?*
         what-GA   want to see
         'What would you like to see?'
     B: *Shiranai.*
         SHIRU: NEG
         'I don't know'   (slightly modified from Kato 2002: 98; glosses
                                     and English equivalents are mine)

(4) shows a typical pragmatic error made by learners of Japanese. Kato (2002: 98) points out that B's use of *shiranai* (i.e., the use of the nonpast negative form of *shitte(i)ru*) can cause miscommunication, as it implies that B does not want to go see a movie, is not interested in movies, and is rejecting A's invitation. Kato (2002: 100) maintains that the linguistically and culturally competent answer would be *wakaranai/wakannai* (i.e., the nonpast negative form of *wakaru*) since speaker A, who is seeking a particular piece of information (i.e., what movie B wants to see), expects B to answer the question. Similarly, Miura (1983: 211-212) gives a more concise description of each expression: *wakaranai/wakannai* implies "I should know the answer, but I'm sorry I don't," but *shiranai* may indicate "This sort of thing has nothing to do with me."

Lee (2006) takes Miura's and Kato's observations a step further. Utilizing Kamio's 'The territory of information theory' (e.g., 1979, 1990, 1997, 2002), Lee

(2006) provides an account of linguistic choice between WAKARU and SHIRU. In Kamio's theory (e.g., 1979, 1990, 1997, 2002), the territory of information refers to a conceptual category when a given piece of information falls into one's general storage of information, and there are two such conceptual categories: The speaker's and the hearer's territory of information. This conceptual notion can be applied to account for many aspects of human communication such as evidentiality, politeness, and modality. For example, Kamio accounts for the use and non-use of evidential forms as in (5) and (6) under this framework.

(5) a. *Taroo   wa   taiin   shimashita.*
         Taro   TM   released-from-hospital   did-F[3]
         'Taro was discharged from the hospital'.
     b. *Kanai   wa   46   desu.*
         my wife   TM   is-F
         'My wife is 46 years old'.

(6) a. *Taroo   wa   taiin   shita-rashii   desu.*
         Taro   TM   released-from-hospital did seem   is-F
         'It seems that Taro was discharged from the hospital'.
     b. *??Kanai   wa   46   rashii.*
         my wife   TM   seem
         'It seems that my wife is 46 years old'.   (Kamio 1997: 9)

The utterances in (5) do not contain evidential markers and make a direct assertion or statement, whereas those in (6) appear with the evidential marker *rashii* 'seem'. According to Kamio (1997: 10-11), when a given piece of information is considered close to the speaker - the speaker is Taro's father in (5a) and husband of the woman in (5b), and the hearer is an acquaintance in both cases - no evidential markers are used; when the information is not close to the speaker, evidential markers are used. Accordingly, the use of *rashii* 'seem' in (6a) indicates that the speaker may be Taro's acquaintance who hasn't seen him discharged from the hospital. The use of evidential markers sounds awkward in (6b), however, since the speaker has to be the husband of this woman under discussion, and the information regarding her age is considered close to the speaker.

Utilizing this theory, Lee (2006: 204) proposes a more systematic and comprehensible account of the felicity conditions that facilitate the use of WAKARU and SHIRU:

(7) a. When a piece of information a speaker possesses falls within the speaker's territory of information, *wakaru* is the choice over *shitte-iru* to express his/her possession of the information.
     b. When a piece of information sought falls into the speaker's territory of information, and the speaker does not have that information at the time of inquiry, *wakaranai* is the most appropriate choice to express the lack of the information.

---

[3] TM stands for 'Topic Marker' and –F stands for 'formal form' in Kamio (1997).

    c. When the speaker assumes that a piece of information he/she is seeking is within the hearer's territory of information, *wakaru* is used over *shitte-iru* in an interrogative sentence.

(7a) is the general principle for the speaker's choice between *wakaru* and *shitte-iru* to express his/her possession of a given piece of information, (7b) is for expressing non-possession of the information, and (7c) is for interrogative utterances. In order to determine if a given piece of information is considered close to the speaker/hearer, Lee refers to the following set of conditions proposed by Kamio (1997: 39):

    a.   Information obtained through the speaker's/hearer's internal direct experience;

    b.   Information embodying detailed knowledge which falls into the range of the speaker's/hearer's professional or other expertise;

    c.   Information obtained through the speaker's external direct experience;

    d.   Information about persons, objects, events and facts close to the speaker/hearer, including such information about the speaker/hearer him/herself.

The following examples support Lee's claim outlined in (7b) in terms of the choice of *wakaranai/wakannai* over *shiranai*:

(8)   Q: *Natsu-yasumi-ni   nani-o   suru-tsumori?*
               Summer-vacation-in   what-ACC   do-plan
               'What are you planning to do in the summer vacation?'
    A: *Mada   **wakara-nai**/****shira-nai***.
               yet   know-not
               'I don't know yet'.

(9)   *Donna-hito-to   kekkonshi-tai-ka zenzen **wakara-nai**/****shira-nai**.*
        what-kind-person-with marry-want-Q   at all   know-not
        'I don't know what kind of person I want to marry at all'. (Lee 2006: 192)

In both (8) and (9), the information under discussion is close to the speaker and thus falls within the speaker's territory - the speaker's plan for the summer in (8) and the type of person the speaker wants to marry in (9). In both examples, the speakers do not have the information at the time of inquiry, and thus *wakaranai/wakannai* is more appropriate to express the lack of information.

    Lee (2006: 197) further points out that while the conditions outlined in (7) explain the choice between WAKARU and SHIRU most of the time, the boundary of a speaker's territory is not definite but fluid and is determined by the speaker subjectively. The following example shows that although both *wakaranai/wakannai* and *shiranai* are possible, they are not necessarily interchangeable; the speaker's lexical choice differs depending on his/her perspective as to where the information is located:

(10)   A: *Amerika-tairiku-wa   itsu   hakken-sare-mashita-ka.*
               American-continent-top   when   discover-passive-Q
               'When was the American continent discovered?'
    B: *Saa   **wakarimasen/shirimasen***.

           well   know-not
           'Well, I don't know'.   (Lee 2006: 197)

Either *wakarimasen* (i.e., the nonpast polite negative form) or *shirimasen* (i.e., the nonpast polite negative form) is possible in (10). *Wakarimasen* would be the most appropriate choice if, for example, a teacher is asking a student to recall something they had learned in class. The information would, therefore, be considered within B's (the student's) territory of information, yet beyond memory recall at the time of inquiry (Lee 2006: 197). *Shirimasen* would be appropriate if this exchange were taking place in a more general situation such as between peers outside the classroom.

     Further, Lee (2006: 191) identifies several instances of boundary fluidity whereby speakers "manipulate the boundary to locate the information within or outside their territory." According to Lee, this boundary fluidity is intentionally used for emotive expressions. The speaker's manipulation of the boundary is seen in the following example:

(11)   *Sensei,*   *Yamada-san-no*   *denwa-bangoo*
           Professor   Mr.Yamada-of   telephone-number
           ***gozonji-desu**-ka/??**o-wakari-ni narimasu**-ka*
           know (honorific)-Q
           'Professor, do you know Mr. Yamada's phone number?' (Lee 2006: 201)

Under the general principle of Lee's claim (2006: 201), if a speaker assumes that the professor has the requested information within his/her territory, *wakaru* would be the most appropriate choice; if, however, the speaker does not assume that the professor has that information, *shitteiru* would be more appropriate. In (11), however, although the speaker deduces that the professor possesses the information, he chooses *gozonji desu* (i.e., the nonpast honorific expression of *shitteiru*) over *o-wakari-ni-narimasu* (i.e., the nonpast honorific expression of *wakaru*). That is, the speaker is intentionally placing this particular information outside the professor's territory of information. Lee (2006: 202) explains that by moving the territory boundary and thus "by pretending that Yamada's phone number is not within the hearer's territory of information, an embarrassing situation can be avoided if the professor does not possess this information."

     Speakers can also manipulate the territory boundary to express empathy or anger as shown in the following example:

(12) A: *Tookyoo-iki-no*   *nozomi-wa*   *nanban-sen-kara*
              Tokyo-bound-of   Nozomi-top   which-track-from
              deru-n-deshoo.
              leave-NOML-probably
              'From which track would the Nozomi bound for Tokyo leave?'
        B: *Saa*   ***wakari-masen**/**shiri-masen**.*
              well   know-not
              'Well, I don't know'.   (Lee 2006: 202)

(13) A: *Goshujin-wa*   *itsu-goro*   *o-kaeri-ni-narimasu-ka.*
              your husband-top   when-about   come-home   (honorific)-Q
              'What time will your husband be home?'
        B: *Sonna-koto*   *watashi*   ***shiri-masen**.*

        such-a-thing   I   know-not
        'I don't know such a thing (and why should I care?)' (Lee 2006: 203)

According to Lee, two potential scenarios are subsumed for (12). If B is a train station clerk, *wakarimasen* would be the most appropriate choice, because knowledge of the train schedule will be considered professional expertise and within B's territory of information. On the other hand, if B is a mere passer-by, *shirimasen* would be appropriate. However, *wakarimasen* could be appropriate in the latter scenario if the information sought is not considered to be within B's territory of information. Lee (2006: 202) suggests that by intentionally placing the information inside his/her territory and choosing *wakarimasen* instead of *shirimasen*, speaker B expresses empathy - "I am sorry, I don't have that information although I ought to know." In (13), under the general principle of Lee's claim, *wakarimasen* would be the most appropriate choice since in Japanese culture a family member like a wife (=speaker B) is generally expected to know other family member's schedules, and thus the information regarding her husband's schedule is considered to be within her territory of information (Lee 2006: 203).   However, in (13), the wife (=B) intentionally places the information outside her territory, thereby manipulating the assumed boundary and expressing emotion, in this case anger.

        Although the findings reported in previous studies (e.g., Miura 1983; Kato 2002; Lee 2006) are quite valuable, there exist some serious limitations to the past approaches, which seem to originate from the methodological problem of using constructed data as the object of analysis. Obviously, the use of naturally occurring talk has almost no place in the frameworks of previous studies, and little attention was paid to questions such as how frequently these verbs actually occur in everyday conversation, how rigidly speakers' lexical choices are governed by a facture such as information type in more naturalistic data, and how frequently "boundary fluidity" (Lee 2006) occurs. By building on the findings reported in prior literature (e.g., Miura 1983; Kato 2002; Lee 2006), the current study extends both the scope and the depth of the research. Specifically utilizing naturally occurring conversation as a primary source of data, my usage-based approach provides a better understanding of WAKARU and SHIRU in that these verbs are expressions of position and attitude that are relevant both to individual speakers (i.e., subjective uses) and to relational activities among participants (i.e., intersubjective uses).

3. Database

The data consist of 30 audio-taped casual conversations (Aoki et al., to appear) recorded in private homes and restaurants in Japan and the U.S. The data include 13 single-sex groups and 17 mixed-sex groups of two to five participants each and ranging in age from 15 to 50 years of age. The participants are mostly friends, couples, and family, and all use standard Japanese. Each conversation is 2 to 18 minutes long. The total amount of data analyzed is approximately 3 hours 10 minutes.

4. Results

4.1. *Overall token and type frequencies*

An examination of 30 naturally occurring conversations yields 129 tokens of WAKARU (76) and SHIRU (53). Table 1 presents the token and type frequencies of WAKARU and SHIRU in the data.

Table 1: Overall token and type frequencies of WAKARU and SHIRU

	WAKARU		**SHIRU**	
Nonpast affirmative	*wakaru*	17% (13)	*shiru*	4% (2)
Nonpast negative	*wakaranai/wakannai*	65% (49)	*shirana/shinnai*	64% (34)
Nonpast progressive	*wakatteru*	7% (5)	*shitteru*	19% (10)
Past affirmative	*wakatta*	7% (5)	*shitta*	0% (0)
Past negative	*wakannakatta*	4% (3)	*shiranakatta*	13% (7)
Past progressive	*wakatteta*	1% (1)	*shitteta*	0% (0)
Total		100% (76)		100% (53)

Overall a similar distribution is observed in terms of the token and type frequencies. One fact that emerges clearly from the data is that for both WAKARU and SHIRU, nonpast negative forms are used most frequently - 65% (49 times out of 76) for WAKARU and 64% (34 times out of 53) for SHIRU. In fact, nonpast tense forms are overwhelmingly more frequent than past tense forms in my data:

```
                 WAKARU          SHIRU
      ---------------------------------------------------------------------
      Nonpast    88% (67/76)     87% (46/53)
      Past       12% (9/76)      13% (7/53)
```

Also of note is that negative forms occur more frequently than affirmative forms:

```
                 WAKARU          SHIRU
      ---------------------------------------------------------------------
      Negative    68% (52/76)     77% (41/53)
      Affirmative 32% (24/76)     23% (12/53)
```

The results presented here coincide with Iwasaki (1993) in that there is a strong tendency for negative predicates to co-occur with nonpast tense forms. The fact that 64~65% are nonpast negative forms indicates that the majority of WAKARU and SHIRU in my data are low in Transitivity and exhibit relatively low degrees of information accessibility since negative forms of these verbs indicate no existence of situation, and speakers cannot access a non-existent situation. Interestingly, as will be demonstrated in 4.3, the majority of negative forms are those in which both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible whether or not a given piece of information falls within the speaker's territory of information.

By appearance these two verbs show a similar distribution in terms of their overall token and type frequencies, but that doesn't mean that their distributions are totally identical. For example, a closer examination of the most frequently occurring forms - nonpast negative forms of these two verbs - reveals that the contracted form *wakannai* (40 out of 49) is used more frequently than *wakaranai*, whereas the non-contracted form *shiranai* (31 out of 34) is far more frequent than the contracted form *shinnai* in my data. As will be demonstrated shortly, the differences between the two verbs become more apparent when we closely look at how and for what purposes they are used.

4.2. *WAKARU/SHIRU and information type*

In this sub-section, I present the results as to if the speaker's lexical choice is governed by where a piece of information is located, and if so, to what extent it is governed. For this analysis, I consulted Lee's general principle of felicity conditions (2006: 200), which determine whether the information is considered close to the speaker/hearer (Kamio 1997: 39), both of which are repeated here:

(14)   a. When a piece of information a speaker possesses falls within the speaker's territory of information, *wakaru* is the choice over *shitte-iru* to express his/her possession of the information.
b. When a piece of information sought falls into the speaker's territory of information, and the speaker does not have that information at the time of inquiry, *wakaranai* is the most appropriate choice to express the lack of the information.
c. When the speaker assumes that a piece of information he/she is seeking is within the hearer's territory of information, *wakaru* is used over *shitte-iru* in an interrogative sentence.

(15)   a. Information obtained through the speaker's/hearer's internal direct experience;
b. Information embodying detailed knowledge which falls into the range of the speaker's/hearer's professional or other expertise;
c. Information obtained through the speaker's external direct experience;
d. Information about persons, objects, events and facts close to the speaker/hearer, including such information about the speaker/hearer him/herself.

Based on (14) and (15), all 129 instances of WAKARU and SHIRU are coded as either 'Information within the speaker's territory' or 'Information outside the speaker's territory'. Table 2 summarizes the results.

Table 2: WAKARU/SHIRU and the speaker's territory of information

Within speaker's territory		Outside speaker's territory	
WAKARU	72% (71)	WAKARU	17% (5)
SHIRU	28% (28)	SHIRU	83% (25)
Total	100% (99)	Total	100% (30)

Out of 129 instances, 77% (99 tokens) are identified as information within the speaker's territory and 23% (30 tokens) are identified as information outside the speaker's territory. As Lee (2006) claims, when the information under discussion is located within

the speaker's territory of information, WAKARU (72%) is chosen more frequently than SHIRU (28%), and when it is not located within the speaker's territory, SHIRU (83%) is chosen more frequently than WAKARU (17%).

(16)   Speaker P reveals an unpleasant experience with a teenage girl.
 1   P: … *<X tonari X>-no-hoo-o*   *mite*   *ne=,*
          next-LK-direction-O   look at: GER   FP
 2   *... kuchi-n-nakade*   *ne=,*
          mouth-LK-inside   FP
 3   *... bosotto,*
          in a whisper
 4   *hitokoto,*
          one word
→ 5   *... tsubuyaita-no-ga*   **wakatta**   *wake.*
          mutter: PAST-NOM-GA   WAKARU: PAST   FP
 6   *... <WH ya,*
              well
 7   *... hakkiri   kuchi-n-nakade,*
          clearly   mouth-LK-inside
 8   *... ojisan,*
          old fart
→ 9   *<@ ttsutten-no*   **wakatta**   *wake @>WH>.*
          COP-say: PROG-NOM   WAKARU: PAST   FP
          '… (I) realized that (this girl) looked toward the person who was standing next to her and muttered one word under her breath. Well, (I) realized that (she) was clearly saying 'Old fart' under her breath'.
 10   A: *... @@ [@@]*
          Laughter
 11   P: *[@@]@@@@*
          @@@@ @@
          Laughter   (Saikin no ko 'Current teenagers' 3)

(17)   K tells her housemate, M, why she is taking an evening course called "Recreation."
 1   K: *... <X furatto X>*   *kyanpu-toka*   *shita= toshitemo=,*
          leisurely   camp-TOKA   do: PAST even if
 2   *gaijin-no-tomodachitachi-to   shi- .. shita   toshitemo,*
          foreign-LK-friends-with   do: PAST   even if
 3   *nanimo chishiki   nai   deshoo.*
          anything knowledge   not have   COP: TEN
          '… Even if (I) go camping with foreign friends, (I) probably have no knowledge (of wild flowers and plants)'.

 4   M: *.. un.*
          'Right'.
 5   K: *... dakara,*
          so
 6   *.. ii   kana   [=to   omotte].*
          good   FP   QUO   think: GER
          'That's why (I) thought (taking a recreation class) would be good…'

	7	M:		*[kotchi-no-hi]to,*		
				this side-of-people		
⟶	8			***shitteru***	*mon ne [2 = 2].*	
				SHIRU: PROG FP	FP	
				'People here (in the U.S.) know (the name of wild flowers and plants), don't they?'		
	9	K:			*[2 un 2].*	
				'Yeah'.		
⟶	10	M:		*... nank=a/*	***shitteru***	*yone=.*
				HESI	SHIRU: PROG	FP
				'Somehow (they) know (the name of wild flowers and plants)'.		
				(Zeitaku 'Luxury' 11)		

In (16), friends exchange personal experiences with teenagers. In this excerpt, P, who is 30 years old, discloses a rather unpleasant incident; at a beach, he was called "Old fart" by a teenage girl. *Wakatta*, the past tense form of *wakaru*, appears twice in P's turn in lines 5 and 9 and expresses his realization that the teenaged girl muttered "Old fart" and that she was referring to P. The choice of WAKARU makes sense since the information is obtained through direct experience. In (17), K tells M, both of who are college students in the U.S., that she is taking a 'Recreation' class so she can learn some wild flowers and plants. *Shitteru*, the contracted form of *shitteiru*, occurs in M's turn in lines 8 and 10, both instances referring to the fact that people in the U.S. know the names of wild flowers and plants well. K's choice for SHIRU is consistent with the speaker's territory of information boundary; 'the name of wild flowers and plants' is not located in the range of her territory of information, and thus SHIRU is chosen over WAKARU.

4.3. *Subjective and intersubjective uses of WAKARU and SHIRU*

Beyond the overview Table 2 provides, it is important to point out that out of 129 occurrences of WAKARU and SHIRU in my data, 26% (34 instances out of 129) are those where only WAKARU is expected to be used or only SHIRU is expected to be used under Lee's conditions outlined in (14), but much more common types are those in which both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible whether or not the information falls into the speaker's territory of information (74% ; 95 instances out of 129) as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Cases where either WAKARU or SHIRU is possible

Within speaker's territory		Outside speaker's territory		Total
Only WAKARU	27% (27)	Only SHIRU	23% (7)	***26% (34)***
WAKARU & SHIRU	73% (72)	WAKARU & SHIRU	77% (23)	***74% (95)***
	100% (99)		100% (30)	***100% (129)***

Table 3 indicates that in my naturally occurring conversation data, there are more cases where both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible regardless of information type. These instances are manifestations of what Lee (2006) refers to as "boundary fluidity" in which speakers intentionally manipulate the assumed boundary to express politeness,

empathy, or anger as shown in Lee's examples (9)-(11). In other words, while there seems to be a correlation between speakers' lexical choices and a conceptual category like the territory of information theory, information type is not the only factor that influences speakers to decide which verb to use in a given context. This sub-section shows that speakers' lexical choices are not just subjective but also intersubjective to encode their voice, personal attitude, and emotion toward the content of information and toward the other conversation participants.

Language is inundated with subjective expressions which encode the speaker's mental state, affect, evaluation, preference, etc. (e.g., Iwasaki 1993; Thompson and Mulac 1991; Lyons 1994; Scheibman 2000, 2001, 2002; Maynard 1993, 2002, 2005; Suzuki 2006). In a study of American English conversation, for example, Thompson and Mulac (1991) propose that the first person form *I* with the main clause predicates such as *think* and *guess* are grammaticized as epistemic parentheticals in the form of *I think* and *I guess*. Scheibman (2000) reports on the use of *I don't know* as an epistemic downtoner or politeness marker in English conversation. Maynard (1993) examines how devices such as Japanese discourse connectives (*dakara* 'so' and *datte* 'but/because') and modal adverbs (i.e., *yahari/yappari* 'as expected' and *doose* 'anyway') are used to express the speaker's attitudinal stance, voice, and emotion in modern Japanese discourse. In his study of Japanese narrative, Iwasaki (1993) characterizes subjectivity in terms of a speaker's choice of tense and clause-linking devices.

Language is not only subjective but also intersubjective as Benveniste (1971: 209) maintains that "every utterance assumes a speaker and a hearer, and in the speaker, the intention of influencing the other in some way." Similarly Maynard (1993: 4) points out:

> … when speaking Japanese, one simply cannot avoid expressing one's personal attitude toward the content of information and toward the addressee. Such personal voice echoes so prominently in Japanese communication that often in Japanese, rather than information-sharing, it is subtextual emotion-sharing that forms the heart of communication.

These 'emotion-sharing' as well as 'information-sharing' components are aspects of intersubjectivity and show the speaker's attention not just to the content of information but also to the addressee in interactive contexts. The data demonstrates that the speaker's lexical choice cannot be labeled as either subjective or intersubjective; rather, the speaker's beliefs and attitudes encoded in his or her lexical choice evince his/her awareness of interactional needs, namely, sharing his or her perceptions and evaluations with other conversation participants. As will be illustrated in the examples from my conversational data, the speaker's choice for WAKARU manifests such features as experiencer perspective and speaker empathy, and in contrast, his/her choice for SHIRU is characterized as observer perspective, and such subjective stances are shared and elaborated by other conversation participants in interactive contexts.

Take a look at the following examples for which either WAKARU or SHIRU are possible, but speakers choose one verb over another to express their emotion:

> (18)   Three friends are talking after dinner. Speaker K discloses her discomfort for making phone calls; in fact she doesn't even like to call her boyfriend.
> 1   K: *… suggoi   nakaiihito-ni   kakerundemo=,*
>   very   close friends-to even if (I) make a phone call

2   *betsuni*   *sonna* *koto* *kangaenakutemo=,*
     especially   such thing even if (I) don't think

3   *nanka,*
     for some reason

4   *kakezurai*   *no.*
     difficult to call   FP

5   *... dame*   *dokidokishichau.*
     not good   get nervous
     '… even if (I) make a phone call to (my) very close friends, especially even if (I) don't think about such things (as how I should initiate a conversation, etc.), for some reason, it's hard (for me) to make a phone call. Nope, (I) get nervous'.

6 M: *[ha=].*
     Sigh

7 T: *[aa=],*
     oh

⟶ 8   *nantonaku* **_wakaru_** *ore.*
     somehow   WAKARU I
     'I somehow understand/know (how you feel, or your disliking telephone calls)'. (Telephone calls 3)

(19) Two housemates are talking. Speaker K (30 years old female) asks C (18 years old male) about his relationship with the so-called "girlfriend" in Japan.

1 K: *... dakedo,*
     but

2   *... anta mada* *[gakusei* *deshoo?*
     you still student   COP: TEN

3   *.. mukoo]* *hataraiten* *da* *yo.*
     other side work: PROG COP FP
     '… But you are still a student, aren't you? She (lit. 'that side over there)' is working'.

4 C: *[so*   *da* *yo <X na= X>].*
            disadvantage COP FP

5   *(H) demo* *kane* *mottenee* *mon* *anohito.*
     but   money not have: PROG FP that person

6   *(TSK)*
     '(It)'s disadvantage (for me), but she (lit., 'that person over there') doesn't have money'

7 K: *ha=* *[(TSK)]*
     Sigh

8 C: *[(TSK)]*   *chittomo.*
            even a little
     'Even a little'

9 K: *.. nande* *ano ..* *shokugyoo* *de,*
     how come that job   with
     'How come, with that job?'

⟶ 10 C: *... (H)* **_shiranai_**.
     SHIRU: NEG

11   *tsukatte-n-janai.*
     Use: PROG-NOM-COP: NEG
     '(I) don't know. Isn't that (she)'s using (money for herself)?'
     (Girlfriend 5)

In (18), three friends are talking after dinner. In lines 1-5, K discloses her discomfort in using the telephone; apparently she gets nervous even when she calls her close friends. Following M's sigh in line 6, the nonpast affirmative form *wakaru* appears in T's utterance in line 8. This *wakaru* expresses T's empathy toward K's discomfort with telephone calls. Evidently getting nervous about calling someone is not so farfetched for T, as evidenced by his disclosure of feeling similarly toward writing letters, which is stated directly after this excerpt. *Shitte(i)ru* could be possible here, but would not carry the same emotive effect as *wakaru* does and would also lack sincerity with a hint of detachment like 'oh, I've heard about someone like you or that sort of feeling'.[4]

In (19), two housemates are talking about C's so-called "girlfriend" in Japan. Throughout the conversation, K makes fun of C's relationship with his girlfriend, who evidently had relationships with other boys while going out with C. K also argues that C's girlfriend has a new boyfriend while C is away studying in the U.S. C has been somewhat embarrassed and passively resistant to K's grilling and accusations, and, in fact, he tried to stop recording the conversation at one point over the course of the conversation. C, however, eventually starts to admit that he is not satisfied with the relationship. For example, C complains that he always pays when they go out. In lines 1-3, K points out that C is still a student and, therefore, has limited income, whereas his girlfriend has a job, and, in line 9, questions why she has no money despite her decent job. The nonpast negative form *shiranai* appears in C's utterance in line 10. *Wakaranai/wakannai* would be possible here to express his lack of knowledge and imply that 'I should know the answer, but I'm sorry I don't'. Instead, C's choice for *shiranai* carries the nuance of 'it has nothing to do with me' and thus expresses his emotion - detachment, passive resistance, even anger to some extent. His lack of empathy toward his girlfriend and the topic in discussion is also shown in his use of *anohito* 'that person over there' in line 5 to refer to his girlfriend, thereby isolating her in this context.

A close examination of examples like (18) and (19), in which both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible, reveals a clear contrast in the form-function relationship for the two emotive expressions: WAKARU for speaker empathy and SHIRU for speaker detachment. Such a dichotomous relationship may also be characterized in terms of some epistemological parameters such as 'ego vs. non-ego' (Akatsuka 1979), 'experiencing self vs. observing self' (Lyons 1982; Shinzato 2003), '*uchi* (= in groups) vs. *soto* (out-groups)' (Quinn 1994), 'S-perspective (= the first person perspective) vs. O-perspective (= the third person perspective)' (Iwasaki 1993; cf. Koyama-Murakami 2001), and 'private vs. public' (Dahl 2000). Iwasaki (1993), for example, maintains, using Lyons' term (1982: 107), that "the speaker is both a 'subjective experiencing self' and an 'objective observing self' for S-perspective (i.e., the first person perspective) sentences, and he is only an 'objective observing self' for the O-perspective (i.e., the third person perspective) sentence" (Iwasaki 1993: 18). According to Koyama-Murakami (2001), the narrator in first-person novels has two roles - the role of the experiencer and the role of the reporter. As the experiencer, the narrator goes "back and forth between the story world/*story-now* and the real world/*speaker-now*," revealing her inner thoughts and feelings (Koyama-Murakami 2001: 161). As the reporter, however,

---

[4] It should be noted that one of the reviewers suggested another view that the use of *shitte(i)ru* (as opposed to *wakaru*) in (18) might convey "unexpected emotive effect", and the same thing can be said about (19).

the narrator "is being strictly the narrator - someone who narrates or reports story events" in the story world (Koyama-Murakami 2001: 161).

These epistemological parameters can be applied to the form-function contrast observed in the use of WAKARU and SHIRU as emotive expressions. Take the use of *wakaru* in (18) for example. T expresses empathy toward K, as if he also experiences telephone calls with similar nervousness from an 'experiencer' point of view. This 'experiencer perspective' draws the other conversation participants into what T is experiencing now and gives them a sense of ongoingness, directness, immediacy, and sharedness. Contrastingly, in (19), *shiranai* is used as if he were simply an observer, a reporter, a non-related person, or as if he obtained the information second-hand. His 'observer/reporter perspective' provides speaker detachment and indirectness. Whether the speaker engages in experiencer perspective or observer perspective, the speaker's beliefs and attitudes encoded in his or her lexical choice reveal that he/she is sensitive not just to share the content of information but also to share his/her perceptions and evaluations with other conversation participants.

The sharing of the speaker's subjective stance is also observed in the following excerpt where two conversation participants choose differing perspectives and emotive expressions:

(20)   Two ESL students (T and K) are talking. T tells K that she went to the restaurant where her boyfriend works and ate a fabulous salad.

1   T: *... moo moo   chitchai,*
           really really   tiny
2   *.. itari[an   resutoran],*
           Italian   restaurant
           '(it's) a really really tiny restaurant'
3   K: *[ne= ..   watashi mo],*
                   HESI   I   also
4   T: *[2 doose   supagetii 2]   de   mo,*
           in any case   spaghetti   COP   also
5   K: *[2 soo omotteta 2].*
           so   think: PROG: PAST
           'I was also assuming (that the restaurant that your boyfriend works at is quite tiny).'
6   T: *tabeten   daroo   na to   omotteta-ra,*
           eat: PROG   COP: TEN   FP QUO think: PROG: PAST-if
7   *... sugoi no   nanchuuka   ne.*
           great   FP   what can say?   FP
8   *... nanka   sa= ..   sarada-no-   [ue-ni,*
           HESI   FP   salad-LK-   top-on
           'I was thinking (my boyfriend) was just eating spaghetti or something, but (the salad) was really amazing, what do you call? ... well, on top of salad...',
9   K: *[ii   na=].*
                                                    good   FP
           '(I)'m jealous/(that) sounds good'.
10 T: *.. pan   notteru]   jan.*
           bread   appear: PROG   FP
11   *[2 nan   te   iu 2] –*
           what   QUO   say
           '... there's some bread, isn't there? What do (you) call –'

12	K:	*[2 a= 2].*
		'Oh!'

⟶ 13   T: *.. nante iu   ka   **shinnai**   kedo.*
what   QUO   Q   SHIRU: NEG   but
'(I) don't know what to call, but …'

⟶ 14   K: *... watashi-mo   **wakannai**   kedo.*
I-also   WAKARU: NEG   but
'I also don't know (what to call), but …'   (Ryuugaku 20)

T went to the restaurant where her boyfriend works and had a fabulous salad. In (20), she describes how tiny the restaurant was and she was expecting that her boyfriend always eats spaghetti there in lines 1, 2, 4 and 6, which are partially overlapped with K's comment that she, too, assumed the restaurant where T's boyfriend works is quite tiny. T continues to describe the "bread" on top of her salad in lines 7, 8, and 10. Overlapped with these utterances, K expresses her feeling that she wishes she would have had the same experience with *ii naa* '(I)'m jealous/(that) sounds good'. T's attempt to say 'what do you call--' is broken off in line 11 and overlapped with K's 'Oh!' in line 12, which seems to imply that she has seen or knows that sort of 'bread'. The use of *shinnai* - the contracted form of *shiranai* - appears in T's utterance in line 13, expressing her lack of information as to what to call the 'bread' in English (i.e., crouton). Note that T could use *wakannai* here under the assumption that K may expect that T knows that piece of information. The use of *shinnai* instead shows that T is speaking from an observer/reporter perspective, and seems to imply that it does not matter what to call that 'bread' on the salad, but what matters most is her visiting the restaurant where her boyfriend works. While T uses *shinnai* to express her detachment from the information, in line 13, K uses *wakannai* speaking from experiencer perspective, and expresses her empathy and involvement toward T and her whole experience. In both cases, their subjective stances are shared by other conversation participant in this interactive context.

Such subjective and intersubjective functions of WAKARU and SHIRU are also seen in (3), which is repeated here as (21):

(21)   1   M: *… n nantoka .. Zekkusu   da   ka,*
such and such   Zex   COP   Q

⟶ 2   *nan   da   [ka   **shiranai**   kedo],*
what   COP   Q   SHIRU: NEG   FP
'(I) don't know such and such Zex or what (it) is'

3   K: *[Aaru Ekkusu Se]bun?*
'(you mean) RX7?'

⟶ 4   M: *... nan= da   ka   **wakannai**.*
what   COP   Q   WAKARU: NEG

⟶ 5   ***shiranai**   atashi .. mada-,*
SHIRU: NEG   I   still

6   *.. oboekirenai.*
cannot memorize completely
'(I) don't know what (it) is. (I) don't know, I still can't memorize (it) completely'   (Zeitaku 1)

M and K are housemates. M tries to recall the name of the very expensive sports car her younger brother bought despite the fact that he does not make much money. Two

instances of the nonpast negative form *shiranai* in lines 2 and 5 and one instance of the nonpast negative form *wakannai* in line 4 appear. All instances are used by speaker M and in reference to the name of the very expensive sports car. M's variation in lexical choice clearly indicates that she shifts perspectives from 'experiencer' to 'observer/reporter' to share her subjective stance. She chooses *shiranai* from an observer point of view and thereby expresses her emotion and attitudinal stance of detachment, disapproval, and anger, to some extent, toward her brother's car and possibly toward his decision to buy it. In line 4, she speaks from experiencer perspective to express her engagement toward the information and seek empathy from K. The use of *wakannai* draws the conversation participant, K, closer to what M is experiencing, providing a sense of ongoingness, immediacy, and sharedness. The use of *shiranai* in line 5, however, encodes her detachment, disapproval, or even 'anger' (as observed in Lee (2006)), from observer/reporter perspective.

This sub-section has demonstrated the subjective and intersubjective functions of WAKARU and SHIRU. Specifically the close analysis of examples in which both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible suggests that speakers choose WAKARU instead of SHIRU to express empathy (or to seek empathy) toward the content of the information and the other conversation participant(s). In contrast, they use SHIRU instead of WAKARU to encode their emotion and attitudinal stance as passive resistance, disapproval, and anger. Based on the examples found in my data, I have proposed a form-functional contrast between WAKARU and SHIRU. The use of WAKARU is characterized as experiencer perspective, drawing other conversation participants into what the speaker is experiencing and the use of SHIRU is perceived as observer/reporter perspective, speaker detachment, second-handedness, and indirectness.

5. Conclusion

The current study investigated how speakers use two commonly used verbs which describe a cognitive activity of possessing knowledge - WAKARU and SHIRU - in naturally occurring conversation. An examination of 30 conversations reveals that although there is a general principle that speakers' lexical choices are governed by whether or not a given piece of information is located within their territory of information, the link between speakers' lexical choices and information type is not always definite but fluid. In fact, 74% of my data are such 'fluid' ones in which both WAKARU and SHIRU are possible, and encode speakers' voice, personal attitude, and emotion toward the content of information and toward the other conversation participants. More specifically, the use of WAKARU is closely associated with such features as experiencer perspective, speaker empathy and involvement, directness, and immediacy, and the use of SHIRU is characterized as observer/reporter perspective, speaker detachment, and indirectness. The patterns that emerged in my data suggest that speakers' lexical choices are intended for the sharing of their subjective and intersubjective stance with other conversation participants in interactive contexts. It is my hope that this study has also highlighted the importance of considering the form-function relationship from the point of view of data drawn from actual everyday interactions.

References

Akatsuka, Noriko (1979) Epistemology, Japanese syntax, and linguistic theory. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 6: 7-28.

Aoki, H., Y. Matsugu, M. Miyashita, T. Ono, and M. Sadler (To appear) *Japanese corpus*. University of Arizona: Department of East Asian Studies.

Barlow, Michael, and Suzanne Kemmer (eds.) (1999) *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford: CSLI.

Benveniste, Emile (1971) *Problems in general linguistics*. Trans. by M.E. Meek. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.

Bybee, Joan L (2006) From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82.4: 711-733.

Dahl, Östen (1997) Egocentricity in discourse and syntax. *Functions of Language* 7.1: 37-77.

Du Bois, J., S. Schuetze-Coburn, S. Cumming, and D. Paolino (1993) Outline of discourse transcription. In J. Edwards & M. Lampert (eds.), *Talking data: Transcription and coding in discourse research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 45-89.

Iwasaki, Shoich (1993) *Subjectivity in grammar and discourse: Theoretical considerations and a case study of Japanese spoken discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kamio, Akio (1979) On the notion speaker's territory of information: A functional analysis of certain sentence-final forms in Japanese. In G. Bedell, E. Kobayashi, M. Muraki (eds.), *Explorations in linguistics: Papers in honor of Kazuko Inoue*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha, pp. 213-231.

Kamio, Akio (1990) *Joohoo no nawabari-riron: Gengo no kinooteki bunseki* [The territory of information theory: A functional analysis of language]. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Kamio, Akio (1997) *Territory of information*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kamio, Akio (2002) *Zoku joohoo no nawabari-riron: Gengo no kinooteki bunseki* [New territory of information theory: A functional analysis of language]. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Kato, Yukiko (2002) "Chigai-ga wakaru otoko" wa donna otoko ka [What kind of person is someone who is called "chigai-ga wakaru otoko"]. *Bulletin of the International Student Center Gifu University,* pp. 97-109.

Koyama-Murakami, Nobuko (2001) Grounding and deixis: A study of Japanese first-person narrative. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.

Lee, Kiri (2006) Territory of information theory and emotive expressions in Japanese: A case observed in *shiranai* and *wakaranai*. In S. Suzuki (ed.), *Emotive communication in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 191-207.

Lyons, John (1982) Deixis and subjectivity: *Loquor, ergo sum?* In R.J. Jarvella & W. Klein (eds.), *Speech, place, and action: Studies in deixis and related topics*. New York: Wiley, pp. 101-124.

Lyons, John (1994) *Subjecthood and subjectivity*. Paris: Ophrys.

Maynard, Senko K. (1993) *Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion, and voice in the Japanese language*. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Maynard, Senko K. (2002) *Linguistic emotivity: Centrality of place, the topic-comment dynamic, and ideology of pathos in Japanese discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Maynard, Senko K. (2005) *Expressive Japanese: A Reference Guide for sharing emotion and empathy*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Miura, Akira (1983) *Japanese words & their uses*. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Quinn, Charles J. (1994) *Uchi/soto*: Tip of a semiotic iceberg? 'Inside' and 'outside' knowledge in the grammar of Japanese. In J.M. Bachnik & C.J. Quinn (eds.), *Situated meaning*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 247-294.

Scheibman, Joanne (2000) *I dunno* ... A usage-based account of the phonological reduction of *don't* in American English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 105-124.

Scheibman, Joanne (2001) Local patterns of subjectivity in person and verb type in American English conversation. In J. Bybee and P.J. Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 61-89.

Scheibman, Joanne (2002) *Point of view and grammar: Structural patterns of subjectivity in American English conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Shinzato, Rumiko (2003) Experiencing self versus observing self: The semantics of stative extensions in Japanese. *Language Sciences* 25: 211-238.

Suzuki, Satoko (ed.) (2006) *Emotive communication in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Thompson, Sandra A., and Anthony Mulac (1991) A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In E.C. Traugott & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization vol. II: Focus on types of grammatical markers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 313-329.

Tien, C., S. Izuhara, and S. Kim (eds.) (2007) *Ruigigo tsukaiwake jiten* [Synonym "How to chose" Dictionary]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.