UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Repetitional Agreement and Anaphorical Agreement:

Negotiation of Affiliation and Disaffiliation in Japanese Conversation

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts

in Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language

by

Kaoru Hayano

2007

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS


Repetitional Agreement and Anaphorical Agreement:

Negotiation of Affiliation and Disaffiliation in Japanese Conversation


by

Kaoru Hayano


Master of Arts in

Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language

University of California, Los Angeles, 2007

Professor Charles Goodwin, Chair

Adopting the framework of Conversation Analysis, this study explores interactional motivations and consequences of two alternative formulations of agreement in Japanese conversation: repetitional agreements, which repeat the core word(s) of the first statement, and anaphorical agreements, which refer to the first statement with an anaphor "*soo*". Analyzing tape recorded or videotaped spontaneous conversation between Japanese native speakers, the study demonstrate that parties to interaction deploy the two formulations systematically to accomplish interactional consequences. A

repetitional agreement claims that the view was formulated independently of and/or prior to the first statement, and treats the view of the first statement as have already been shared. On the other hand, an anaphorical agreement presents the view as being formed after the articulation of the first statement and acknowledge the view of the first statement to be a new perspective. By conveying differential relationship of the agreement to the first statement, parties negotiate affiliation and disaffiliation between them. A repetitional agreement is a resource for proposing, negotiating, and establishing affiliation between the parties, whereas an anaphorical agreement is used to project and invite a coparticipant to deal with possible disaffiliation. It is further argued that the negotiation of affiliation and disaffiliation through the different formulations of agreement can be an embodiment of the negotiation of locally relevant social relationship, which should be regarded as interactional achievement. The study empirically illustrates how people handle the dilemma between affiliation and disaffiliation in talk-in-interaction.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Whenever a participant utters an assessment, a view, an observation, or an opinion about an object in everyday conversation, it becomes relevant for another participant to reciprocate with his or her assessment, view, or opinion about the same object. The second participant's statement is understood as either an agreement or disagreement depending upon its compatibility with the preceding statement. The sequence of the adjacent statements by the two participants is a form of joint activity in which they co-experience the object, coordinate their views, and take stances toward the object and toward each other (Pomerantz 1984; Goodwin and Goodwin 1987). Agreements can be characterized as affiliating and preferred enhancing, while disagreements represent disaffiliating and dispreferred (Pomerantz 1984; Sacks 1987).

However, the distinction between agreement and disagreement is not by any means the only concern involved with second assessments (Heritage and Raymond 2005). When (more than) two individual speakers present and coordinate their views about an issue, they take stances in terms of such issues as the following: the degree of agreement or disagreement (Pomerantz 1984), the kind of access to the subject of assessment that the participants' views are based on (Goodwin and Goodwin 1987), which participant has the primary right to discuss the subject (Heritage and Raymond 2005; Raymond and

Heritage 2006; Stivers 2005), and whether the agreeing party formed the view independently or not (Heritage 2002; Heritage and Raymond 2005). Thus, it is quite possible for a speaker to align with a coparticipant at the basic content level and simultaneously disalign in terms of these issues. Diversity in the way first statements and (dis)agreements are formulated in a given language can be regarded as reflections of such concerns.

In this study, I explore interactional motivations for and consequences of the use of different formulations of agreements in Japanese conversation. With Conversation Analysis (CA) as its theoretical and analytical framework, the study focuses on a central and almost obligatory variant of agreement in Japanese—whether a speaker repeats the core word(s) used in the first statement (repetitional agreement) on the one hand, or refers to it with an anaphor "*soo*" (anaphorical agreement) on the other. It will be demonstrated that parties to conversation distinguish the two formulations to differentiate the agreements' relation to the first statements. They choose repetitional agreements to convey that they have had that view independent of the first statement or prior to its articulation. They use anaphorical agreements to convey that they hadn't held the view until they had listened to the first statement. The two formulations will be shown to be a means of negotiating affiliation and disaffiliation between the participants' views and of negotiating and balancing their desires for solidarity and difference in their social relationship. The analysis will exhibit the advantage and robustness of the analytical

framework of CA, which allows us to empirically approach the processes of construction and reconstruction of the social relationships that develop turn-by-turn in everyday conversation.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Chapter 2, I review the relevant background for the study, and in Chapter 3, I introduce the database and the analytical framework the study adopts. Chapter 4 presents the analysis, starting from the description of sequential distribution of the target phenomena, and then demonstrates how speakers utilize the available linguistic resources in interaction. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of the study and discusses their significance in a larger perspective.

# Chapter 2

## Background of the Study

### 2.1    Agreement as a Multidimensional Action

When a speaker makes an assessment, states a viewpoint, or offers an interpretation about an issue in conversation (henceforth, the "first statement"[1]) it becomes relevant for another speaker to reciprocate with his or her view about the same issue (henceforth, the "second statement"). Thus, the consecutive statements compose an "adjacency pair" (Schegloff and Sacks 1973). While the first statement can be a vehicle for various actions such as compliments and complaints, the significance of a second statement is conditioned by the first statement, and it is inevitably understood as either an agreement or disagreement with the first statement (Pomerantz 1984:63). Researchers have investigated characteristics of agreement in contrast with disagreement and have pointed out that they are not symmetrical, unprejudiced alternative responses. Instead, agreement is not only socially but also structurally preferred to disagreement (e.g., Pomerantz 1984; Heritage 1984b; Sacks 1987; Schegloff 2007; Mori 1999). When an agreement is produced, the gap between it and the first assessment is minimized and it contains explicit components of agreement, while disagreements are usually delayed and do not contain explicit components of the action.

The distinction of agreement and disagreement is the most basic and perceptible stance marked by a second statement, but it is not the only relevant stance. Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) call assessment sequences "an assessment activity" to capture diverse types of actions involved other than assessment per se, which may include achievement and display of congruent understanding of the events, achievement of social organization, and achievement of organization of affect and emotion . Agreement, therefore, can be regarded as an action in which a variety of stances of the speaker are embodied.

Heritage (2002) focuses on one aspect of such stances relevant to the design of agreements in English conversation: whether an agreeing speaker claims to have "epistemic independence"—i.e., independent access to an issue on which an evaluation is made—and who claims to be the "epistemic authority"—i.e., relative knowledgeability about an issue. According to Heritage, speakers of agreements tend to be inferred to be "merely agreeing" and epistemically dependent upon the speaker of the first assessment (Heritage 2002:200). A change-of-state token *oh* (Heritage 1984a) prefacing an agreement is shown to be a means of overriding that inference and claiming epistemic independence, or, in some contexts, claiming the epistemic authority. Later, Heritage and Raymond illustrate other English linguistic resources speakers deploy to upgrade or downgrade epistemic stance in first and second assessments, such as tag questions, negative interrogatives, evidential markers, and full or partial repeats with agreement tokens (Heritage and Raymond 2005; Raymond and Heritage 2006). They demonstrate

the multi-dimensionality involved in assessments, claiming that "even within sequences of action designed to achieve agreement (which are preferred) participants can become involved in complex negotiations concerning the management of their relative rights to knowledge and information" (Raymond and Heritage 2006:684). In the same line of research, Stivers (2005) shows repeats in the second position to be a way of claiming primary rights—i.e., socially attributed entitlement to the object.

Another issue has to do with "who is agreeing with whom", as compared with who is in the position to confirm whom (Schegloff 1996; Heritage and Raymond 2005). Schegloff (1996) demonstrates that repeating the previous turn by another speaker can be a practice that he calls "confirming allusions"; a repetition claims that what the other party has just said is what he alluded to in his previous turn, and thus he is not just agreeing with the other party but is also confirming that the other's understanding of his previous talk is correct. In such cases, repetition is shown to be a means of resisting being in a subordinate position and of claiming autonomy.

As these studies propose, agreements involve multi-dimensional interactional concerns, which are reflected by the composition of agreements. Hence, exploration of composition of agreements in a given language allows us to approach the considerations to which its speakers attend as they agree with others in conversation. This study focuses on one of the available variables for formulating agreements in Japanese: repetitional agreements versus anaphorical agreements. As will be illustrated in Chapter 4, the use of

repetition in an agreement in Japanese as opposed to the use of the anaphor resonates with the use of repetitions as opposed to agreement tokens (e.g., "yes" or "yeah) in English conversation.

## 2.2 Formulating an Agreement in Japanese

Japanese has a rich repertoire of grammaticalized resources to mark different affective or epistemic stances, and speakers are required to make a series of choices every time they formulate agreements: the use or non-use of a copula, a nominalizer, turn-initial interjections, and final particles. The choices of these linguistic resources have significant interactional consequences. In this section, I quickly review previous studies on sentence final particles, which are the linguistic resource that has been studied most intensively, and then I identify the variable on which this study focuses.

### 2.2.1 Sentence Final Particles *Ne*, *Yone*, and *Yo*

Among the variables, final particles have attracted researchers' interest more than any other resource, especially the ones most commonly used in ordinary conversation: *ne*, *yone*, and *yo* (e.g., Kamio 1990, 1998; Kinsui and Takubo 1997, 1998; Morita 2002, 2005; Kanai 2003; Tanaka 2000). Many of these researchers agree that the particles mark some aspect of epistemic stance of the speaker. For instance, Kamio (1990, 1998) says that the particles are used to mark which speaker's "territory" a piece of

information belongs to. For instance, when a speaker describes the inner state of the hearer, the use of *ne*, which is argued to mark information that belongs to the hearer's territory of information, is obligatory. Morita (2002) adopts Goffman's (1981) notion of "authorship", which roughly corresponds to the notion of "epistemic authority" in Heritage (2002) and in later works (Kanai 2003; Morita 2005), and argues that *yo* marks the speaker's strong authority, *ne* marks "weak or incomplete authority in relation to the other speaker" (Morita 2002:226), and *yone* functions as the combination of *yo* and *ne*. These previous studies lead us to reasonably assume that these final particles are used to mark different stances in terms of "socioepistemic authority" (Stivers 2005:132)—i.e., knowledgeability based on social identity or expertise.

However, the final particles are not the only epistemic marker within a turn. Other components such as a copula, nominalization, interjections, and the choice of descriptive words also contribute to the overall stance embodied in the utterance. Thus, although researchers tend to argue about the overall stance of an utterance by examining only these particles, the significance of the turn as a whole is determined by the combination of all the components of it.

As an attempt to fill in this gap, this study focuses on another variable for formulating an agreement in Japanese, which consists of different ways of referring to the core of the first assessment or what it is agreeing with—repetition of a descriptive term used in the preceding first assessment as opposed to the use of an anaphor "*soo*" in

referring to it. Hereinafter, an agreement that includes the former will be called a repetitional agreement, and one with the latter will called an anaphorical agreement. Both repetitional and anaphorical agreements can include all of the three final particles (as will be shown in excerpts (1) through (6) in the next section), which indicates that the choice between the two formulations reflects a stance that is independent of the stance marked by the particles. In what follows, I illustrate how repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements look.

### 2.2.2 Repetitional Agreement

Excerpts (1) to (3) are examples of repetitional agreements, in which the speaker repeats the descriptor adopted in the first statement. Stance markers that follow may or may not be the same as the ones used in the first statement.

(1) Two sisters are talking about how much an orchestra to which their acquaintances belong practices.

04      Mari:    **kowai ne.=**
                scary    FP
                *It's scary.*

05 ->   Nami:    **=kowai yone:. dakara ne=**
                 scary   FP      so    FP
                *It's scary.  So,*

06               **=nanka oga–chan wa nanka soko made yaru no wa=**
                 like     Oga-END  TP  like    that   till     do  N  TP

07          **=nanka chotto,**
             like     a little
            *Like Oga (was) saying like doing that much is like a little, hard,*
            *so, or something, (it's) a little*


(2) Sisters (Kayo and Saki) are driving on a freeway, and a car has just passed them:

01 ->   Kayo:   **sugoi ne.**
                amazing FP
                *(The car that passed them) is amazing.*


02->>   Saki:   **sugoi yo.yappari ano bariki   ni wa=**
                amazing FP   after all    that   horse power DP   TP

03              **=ikura nandemo [kate nai].**
                 no matter how        win   not
                *(It) is amazing. After all, (I/my car) can't beat that horsepower no matter what.*


(3) Sisters-in-law (Aki and Rika) are discussing plum wine that Rika had given Aki when
    they met last time.

01      Aki:    **an dake atta no ni kire::ini non  jatta   no.**
                that much   existed N   but clearly         drink   AUX      FP
                *I drank it all though there was that much (of the wine.)*

02              **sukkarakann da mon.**
                penniless          CP   FP
                *(The bottle) is empty.*

03 ->   Rika:   **oishii mon ne:.**
                delicious  FP  FP
                *(It's) delicious.*

04->>   Aki:    **oishii mon ne:.**
                delicious  FP  FP
                *(It's) delicious.*

As was mentioned in Section 2.1, repetition as a form of agreement in English conversation has been extensively studied by conversation analysts. Heritage and Raymond (2005:23–6) show that repetitions accompanied by agreement tokens can be a way to claim that the view was "previously held". Stivers (2005) focuses on what she calls "modified repeats"—repeats of the prior statement by another speaker with stress on the copula or an auxiliary—and regards them as a means of asserting the primary right to evaluate the issue. Schegloff (1996) shows that by repeating the exact words of a preceding turn, the speaker claims that she is treating the preceding turn not as an independent statement but as a candidate understanding of what she already said. In all of these accounts, repetition is shown as a means of resisting the secondariness or dependence that would otherwise be assigned to the turn because of its sequential position relative to the first statement. The current study, by examining repetition as an agreement, in contrast to anaphorical agreements in Japanese, empirically investigates the cross-linguistic relevance of these arguments. As will be shown in Chapter 4, Japanese speakers are found to accomplish quite similar interactional consequences with repetitions.

### 2.2.3 Anaphorical Agreement

The alternative formulation of agreements involves an anaphor *soo*. It is a variation of a deictic term, *so*, which refers to an object that belongs to the hearer, in contrast with *a*, which refers to an object that does not belong to either the speaker or the hearer, and *ko*, which refers to an object that belongs to the speaker. When *soo* is used as a discursive anaphora, it refers to the other speakers' context (Hayashi 1983), and accordingly it is the only deictic form that is used for response tokens and back-channels (Noda et al. 2002). S*oo* in an agreement is accompanied by various epistemic and affective stance markers, such as a nominalizer, a copula, final particles, or tag question markers, as is illustrated in excerpts (4) to (6). Thus, an anaphorical agreement states the speaker's various attitudes toward what was said in the first assessment (cf. Noda et al. ibid.).

(4) R has told L that she once found a total stranger sleeping in her doorway;

```
12 ->   L:      hehhehhe demo warui hito ja nakute yokatta desu ne.
                       but   bad    person TP not    good    CP   FP
                But it was lucky that (he) was not a bad person.

13->>   R:       n:: honto soo desu ne, un.
                yeah really  that CP   FP  yeah
                Yeah, that really is true.
```

(5) Daughter, Mother, and Aunt are talking about a toy called "bowlingual".

27 ->    Daugh:   **ningen no kotoba ni honnyaku dekiru to iu jite-**
                 human  L  language DP translate  can  QP  say poin-
                 *At the point where (they) think (dogs' language) can be translated into*
                 *human language,*

28                **omou jiten de machigatteru yo[ne**
                 think  point  at  wrong         FP
                 *it's already wrong.*

29->>    Mom:    **maa soo  da yone**
                 well  ANA  CP FP
                 *Well that is true.*

(6) Sisters are talking about lending their children their cars;
06 ->    Kayo :   **nanka, nai to  komaru  no yone.**
                 like      not  then  troubled  FP  FP
                 *Like, (I) get troubled if (the car) is not there.*

07 ->>    Saki:    **iya dakara soo na no yo.**
                 no     so        ANA CP N     FP
                 *No, so, that's true.*

The selection between the alternatives is almost obligatory in most agreement tokens, but there are ways to agree that do not involve this choice, such as the use of an agreement token (e.g., "*hai/un* (yes/yeah)") or a descriptor that is similar to but different from the one used in the first assessment. However, such forms are not recognized as a fully aligning, complete agreement, or are recognized to involve disalignment to some

degree. The majority of agreements include either repetition of or anaphorical reference

to the descriptor in the first assessment.[2]

# Chapter 3

## Methodology and Data

### 3.1    Analytical Framework

This study investigates agreements in Japanese conversation using the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA). Differences between repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements cannot be identified by reference to grammatical or semantic rules, for most of the occurrences of one of the forms could be replaced by another without violating such rules. Nonetheless, speakers constantly make choices as to which form to use in a particular sequential environment. The CA framework relies on detailed examination of the action accomplished by a turn by reference to its position in the sequence organization as well as its composition (Schegloff 2007:20), asking the question "why that now" (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:299). This approach allows us to investigate underlying motivation for the choices made in formulating an agreement, as well as the consequences of the choices with regard to the subsequent interaction, which would otherwise be treated as interchangeable or equivalent.

### 3.2    Data

The data I examine in this study consist of different sets of ordinary conversation: talk between friends, sisters, and family, in natural environments such as at

a family's dinner table or in a students' lounge on campus. Two excerpts (excerpt (4),

reproduced as (15) and (15)' and excerpt (23)), are drawn from a corpus of

semi-spontaneous conversation collected as a part of a large research project[3];

participants in this corpus were asked to talk about a topic specified by

researchers—namely, "the most surprising thing that has happened to you". All

conversations were either tape recorded or videotaped and then transcribed following the

conventions developed by Gail Jefferson. Transcription symbols and abbreviations are

provided in the appendix. In all, 24 cases of repetitional agreements and 20 cases of

anaphorical agreements were analyzed.

**Chapter 4**

**Analysis**

## 4.1 Initial Observations: Interactional Motivations for Repetitional Agreements and Anaphorical Agreements

This section identifies the basic situational and sequential environment in which repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements typically occur. It demonstrates that the key factor that motivates the choice between the two forms of agreement can be accounted for by reference to the kind of significance a first statement has with respect to an agreement.

### 4.1.1 Repetitional Agreements: Presentation of Views as Independently and/or Previously Formed

The most evident difference between the distributions of repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements is that when the object of statements is present in the interactional situation and the interactants evaluate it "here and now", the second statement takes the form of repetitional agreement, with no exception in our data. In each of the examples provided below, parties experience and assess the object together.

(7) Mari, Kay, Yuu, and Yuri are getting ready for their end-of-quarter sushi party. Mari opens the wrapping of the sushi plate and makes an assessment at line 01

01 ->    Mari:    **sugo::i:.**
         *Great*

02                **(1.0)**   ((Kay takes a look at the sushi plate))

03 ->>   Kay:     **sugo::[::i**
         *Great*

04 ->>   Yuri:          **[sugo:::i.=**
                         *Great*

05       Mari:    **ii   kanji jan  yottsu zutsu de.**
                  good  like  TAG  four    each  with
                  *It's nice, four for each (topping).*

(8) Kay, Mari, and two other students have just started to eat sushi;

20 ->    Kay:     **oishii::**
         *Delicious*

21 ->>   Mari:    **oishii:.**
         *Delicious*

(9) Nami and her younger sister Mari are looking at a magazine with pictures of different hairstyles, discussing which one would look good on Nami. The following is about one of the hairstyles:

01       Mari :   **kore toka mo sugoi suteki da kedo.**
                  this   etc. also very  nice  CP  but
                  *This is also nice.*

02 ->             **oneesama kei.[nagai] ne**
                  lady      like   long   FP
                  *Like a lady. It's long ((the model has long hair)).*

```
03      Nami :                    [n=].
                                  yeah


04 ->>          ne   nagai ne
                FP   long    FP
                Yeah, it's long.
```

(10) Sisters (Kayo and Saki) are driving on a freeway. A car going fast has just passed
     them:

```
01 ->    Kayo:   sugoi ne.
                 amazing FP
                 (The car that passed them) is amazing.


02 ->>   Saki:   sugoi yo.yappari ano bariki   ni wa=
                 amazing FP   after all    that   horse power DP TP


03               =ikura nandemo [kate nai].
                   no matter how         win   not
                 (It) is amazing. After all, (I/my car) can't beat that horsepower no matter what.


04       Kayo:                        [(   )]     itte goran.
                                                   go    see
                                                 Try going(    ).


05       Saki:   i kou ka. oshi
                 go AUX QP    fine
                 Shall (I/we) go? All right.
```

In above examples, first and second statements are direct products of the joint activity in
which parties are engaged: opening wrappings of sushi (7), eating sushi (8), looking at
pictures in a magazine (9), and driving on a freeway (10). The speakers of the repetitional
agreements clearly have direct experience of and access to the object being assessed. A

first statement prompts the sequence and the second statement responds to it, but the agreement does not rely on the first statement in terms of its epistemic access to the object or formulation of the view. This type of sequences are consecutive statements of independent views.

However, the presence of the object in the interactional setting is not a necessary condition for the occurrence of a repetitional agreement. A repetitional agreement is also found when its speaker has implied the view prior to the articulation of the first statement and thus has the ground to claim that she had had the view before she listened to the first statement. Excerpt (11) is an example in which sisters-in-law are talking about plum wine that Rika had given Aki when they met last time.

(11)

01     Aki:     **an dake atta no ni kire::ini non  jatta  no.**
                  that much   existed N   but clearly        drink   AUX       FP
                  *I drank it all though there was that much (of the wine).*

02              **sukkarakan da mon.**
                  penniless       CP   FP
                  *(The bottle) is empty.*

03 ->   Rika:    **oishii mon ne:.**
                  delicious   FP   FP
                  *(It's) delicious.*

04->>  Aki:   **oishii mon ne:.**
               delicious  FP  FP
               *(It's) delicious.*

05     Nami :  **demo okayu ni nani ga tsuku no?**
               but  porridge  with what  SP attach     FP
               *But what comes with rice porridge?*


At lines 01 and 02, Aki says that she finished the plum wine although there was a lot in

the bottle. This report clearly suggests that she enjoyed it very much. Rika's statement

about the taste of the wine at line 03 articulates what was "alluded to" (Schegloff 1996)

by Aki. Here, Aki has the ground to claim that she had that view prior to the articulation

of Rika's first statement.[4] In this sequential environment, that is, when the speaker of an

agreement has previously alluded to the view articulated in the first assessment,

repetitional agreements are normatively used. The same pattern is found in excerpts (12)

and (13), both of which are segments from a conversation between sisters Nami and Mari,

who are in their early twenties.


(12) Nami and Mari are talking about their mutual friend Saibaa, who was recently found
     to have gotten married

01     Nami:   **saibaa kekkon yubiwa shiteru shi.**
               Saibaa    marriage  ring      doing    and
               *Saibaa is wearing an wedding ring.*

02             **itsu no(h) ma(h)[ni(h)].**
               when  L        while    at
               *while (I) didn't know.*

03      Mari:                                           **[ (    ) ]**

04      Nami:     **hhh**

05->    Mari:     **hayai na:.**
                  fast      FP
                  *(Time passes) fast.*

06->>   Nami:     **hayai na:.**
                  fast      FP
                  *(Time passes) fast.*

07                **(0.4)**

08      Nami:     **suzukisan mo moo kekkon   shiteru shi.**
                  Suzuki-HT    also already marriage   doing        and
                  *Mr./Ms. Suzuki is already married and.*

(13) Nami has been describing for Mari how much an amateur orchestra some of whose
      members they know practice

01      Nami:     **sonnani renshuu shite >datte<**
                  that much   practice      do        cuz
                  *Practicing that much, because,*

02                **karera umai kuseni so(h)nnani renshuu shite**
                  they      good   despite    that much          practice      do

03                **doo su n da yo tte kanji ja(h)nai.**
                  how   do N   CP FP  QP    like   TAG     not
                  *They are (already) good, it's like "what would they want practicing*
                  *that much," isn't it?*

04                **(.)**

05      Nami:     **.hhh**

```
06 ->    Mari:    kowai ne.=
                  scary    FP
                  It's scary.


07 ->>   Nami:    =kowai yone:. dakara ne=
                  scary    FP        so      FP
                  It's scary. So,
```

In (12), Nami reports to Mari that she found their friend married and wearing a wedding ring while she didn't even know when he or she got married. After the possible completion of the sentential "turn constructional unit" (Sacks et al. 1974) at line 01, in which Nami reports the objective facts she had observed, she adds a phrasal turn constructional unit "*itsu no ma ni* (while (I) didn't know)" (line 02). This is an idiomatic phrase to express surprise that something happened so fast that one didn't even know it. Thus, Nami has established a ground to claim that she already held the view that "time passes fast" before Mari says so.

In (13), Nami tells Mari about an orchestra to which Nami's friend belongs and how much they practice. Both of the sisters play violins, so they have a basis to evaluate the amount of their practice. At lines 01 and 03, Nami expresses her amazement by articulating her internal speech ("*karera umai kuseni sonnani renshuu shite dousun da yo* (what would they want practicing that much, they're already good)"), and this amazement is presented with some flavor of scorn rather than respect (the connective "*kuseni* (despite)" at line 02 often prefaces disrespectful behavior of a person, and the

final particle *yo* is used to make the utterance sound rough and almost complaining in this case). Mari makes a negative assessment, capturing what was implied by Nami. Here again, Nami repetitionally agrees with Mari. There is no way to examine whether or not "*kowai* (scary)" was the exact word that Nami had in her mind, but Nami adopts the word immediately, which seems to indicate that it completely captures the view she previously had.

To sum, repetitional agreements are employed when speakers have a ground to claim that the view was formed independently of the first statement, and/or they had that view prior to the articulation of the first. Such a claim is typically relevant when the object is present in the interaction (excerpts (7) to (10)) or when the view was alluded to prior to the first statement (excerpts (11) to (13)).

In English conversation, a repeat followed by an agreement token (e.g., "yes" and "yeah") can be a resource to claim that the position was previously held or settled, which represents a claim for epistemic rights (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 23). In contrast, none of the repetitional agreements in my Japanese data are followed by an agreement token. Also, many of them (8 cases out of 24) employ the same stance markers as those used in the first statements, and only one of them uses the sentence final particle *yo*, which represents a claim of full epistemic authority. It seems that the use of repetitional agreements in Japanese conversation are oriented toward the achievement of affiliating, symmetrical stances between the interactants, rather than to the superior right

of the speaker compared with the coparticipants. We will come back to this point later in Section 4.2.1.

### 4.1.2 Anaphorical Agreement: Presentation of Views as "Newly Formed"

The sequential environment in which anaphorical agreements are typically found is contrastive with the one in which repetitional agreements are found. Anaphorical agreements are typically used when the first statements have provided a participant with a new perspective that he hadn't had before. Thus, a speaker abandons or withholds the view she has held or presented when she anaphorically agrees, and it is most clearly the case when first statements present views as different from or incompatible with the views that have been alluded to by the agreeing party. For instance, in excerpt (14), Nami states a view at lines 10 to 12 that is different from the one suggested by Mari at line 26. So, Nami's agreement with Mari at line 27 involves a shift in her view.

(14) Nami has just finished telling Mari a hearsay story about the sisters' common acquaintance Mr. Soga, a conductor of an orchestra. Nami has told Mari that a part leader of Soga's orchestra is so enthusiastic that s/he turns down Soga's suggestion for a break, and other members are unhappy about it. We know from their previous conversation that Soga is an overweight person who sweats a lot during a practice.

| 10 | Nami: | **de: sousuruto sono funniki o sacchi shite: nanka** |
| | | and then that atmosphere O feel do like |
| | | *Then (Mr. Soga) senses it (that other members need a break), and like* |

11          **gofun gurai toka i(h)tteh .hh mou hontoni**
            five min. about   etc   say                    like   really

12          **jaa,toire   iku dake**de **o(h)wa(h)[ri ja:n mitaina]**
            then bathroom go   only   over                TAG    like
            *(he says) "Well, (let's take a break) for about 5 min," but (she's) like, "it'll be*
            *just over if we go to the bathroom,"*

((11 turns omitted, during which they talk about how much they practice and about their next concert))

24     Mari:     **soo na n da::.**
                 that  CP N   CP
                 *Is that so.*

25     Nami:     **un.=**
                 *Yeah*

26 ->  Mari:     **>demo< Sogasan ga ichiban yasumi tai   n janai?**
                  but    Soga-HT  SP  most      rest    want N  TAG
                 *But Mr. Soga needs a break more than anybody, doesn't he?*

27 ->> Nami:     **soo da yo[ne].**
                 that  CP  FP
                 *That's true.*

28     Mari:                 **[hehhe]**

29     Nami:     **tsurai to omou [yone (     )**
                 tough   QT think    FP
                 *(I) think it's tough (for him).*

30     Mari :                          **[annani   ase kaite(h)hehhe=**
                                        that much   sweat   get
                                        *Getting sweaty that much.*

At lines from 10 to 12, as she tells the hearsay story, she indicates that Soga suggests a

break because he feels that other members need it. The view Mari suggests at line 26 is an alternative to this, which says that it's Soga himself who needs a break more than anyone else. Thus, Nami has to abandon what she said before in order to align with this newly proposed idea. This is an environment in which an anaphorical agreement is recurrently found.[5] In this case, as well as some of the cases we will examine later (excerpts 15 and 16), the speaker of the first statement designs the turn to be disjunct from and disaligning with the coparticipant by prefacing it with "*demo* (but)". Therefore, both parties are oriented to the fact that the first statement addresses a view that is not shared by the agreeing party. In that sense, Mari and Nami in this excerpt are taking matching, aligning stances, while dealing with the disalignment at the same time.

In excerpt (14) above, Nami completely abandons her previous view (that Mr. Soga suggests a break for the sake of other members) in favor of Mari's alternative view suggested by Mari; she supplies an account for the view, which shows her understanding of and commitment to it (line 29). In other cases, however, a speaker merely withholds her original view as she agrees with the different view, but soon goes back to it. That is the case with excerpt (15), in which R has been telling L that she once found a drunk stranger sleeping in her doorway inside her apartment. She explained that the stranger turned out to be a neighbor living in the same apartment building, and he was so drunk that he took R's room to be his. R is finishing her story, summing it up by saying that "well, such a scary experience or a surprising experience, I had" (lines 16 and 18). In

response to this story, L suggests an alternative, positivistic way of seeing the event, which does not really match R's description of it ("*kowai* (scary)" or "*bikkurisita* (surprising)"). This first statement is again prefaced by "*demo* (but)".

(15) R has told L that she once found a total stranger sleeping in the doorway inside her apartment

```
13      R:      [de oshiire no oku no hoo de:, .h katama(.)ttete:,
                and closet    L  deep L  way at            hardened
                and (the cat) was (sitting deep inside the closet as firm
                as firm as a rock,
```

```
14              n:, hh na[(h)nka sugoku:].hh
                uhm      like         very
                Uhm, like, very,
```

```
15      L:                    [hhh hhh]
```

```
16      R:      ano souiu kowa(h)i kei(h)ke(h)n, [te iuka:(h),
                well that  scary   experience        QP  or
                well, such scary experience, or
```

```
17      L:                                      [a- na(h)ruhodo(h)
                                                oh   indeed
                                                Oh I see.
```

```
18              bikkurishita keiken   o shimasita:(h)=
                surprising          experience O  did
                surprising experience, I had.
```

```
19 ->   L:      =.h[hhh<demo warui] hito  ja nakute=
                        but  bad     person TP not
                But that (he) was not a bad person,
```

31

```
20      R:          [u n .h h h]
                        yeah


21 ->   L:          =[yokatta desu ne. ehhehhehhe.hhhh u::n]
                     good      CP   FP
                   it was fortunate.


22 ->>  R:          [aa ^honto soo desu nee:, un:, demo sono ato]=
                     oh really  that CP   NE    yeah but   that  later
                   Uhm, that really is true. But later,


23                  =nanka keisatsu kara iroiro,[kochira]ga kikareru no
wa,
                     like   police   from various  this side SP  heard     N TP
                   like the police    asked us various questions,


24      L:                                              [hai]
                                                        Yes.


25      R:          chotto, iya- iya da(h)tta de(h)su yone, na(h)nka,=
                     little      annoying          CP     FP    like
                   It was a little annoying, like
```

Note that in both excerpts (14) and (15), the speakers of anaphorical agreements have better epistemic access to the objects that they are discussing than their coparticipants. In (14), Nami is the teller of the hearsay story, and she heard it from her friend whom Mari knows through Nami. In (15), R is the one who experienced the event and L has just heard about it. Thus, what is at stake seems not their relative access to the object of the statements itself, but is the access to the view on it.

Below is another example from conversation between two female graduate students, Kay and Jay. Jay is thinking about getting a new cell phone. She tells Kay that

she has been using the one from a company called Tuka because its monthly fee is cheaper than other companies, and asks Kay which company has good cell phones. At line 07, Kay suggests that Jay get a new cell phone from Tuka again, so that she won't have to change her phone number. Jay turns down this suggestion, explaining that someone— who turns out to be her boyfriend— told her that she shouldn't get a phone from Tuka because she would get the same, bad connection that she has had (lines 09–13).

(16)

01      Kay:      **kore wa nan  datta? Tsuuka:?**
                   this    TP   what   CP        Tuka
                   *What's this one (that you are using now)? Tuka?*

02      Jay:      **Tsu:ka: da yo.**
                   Tuka         CP FP
                   *(It's) Tuka.*

03                **(0.2)**

04      Jay:      **Tsu:ka: yasui n da yo.**
                   Tuka         cheap  N CP   FP
                   *Tuka is cheap.*

05      Kay:      **datte denwa sa:, (0.2) bangoo kae taku nai jan.**
                   because phone    FP              number   change want not    TAG
                   *Because (you/we) don't want to change the phone number.*

06      Jay:      **kae   taku nai yo[ne:].**
                   change want   not   FP
                   *(I/We) don't want to change (it).*

07      Kay:     **dakara Tsuukaa ni shi na yo.**
so      Tuka     DP do  IMP FP
*So, get a (cell phone from) Tuka.*

08             (0.8)

09 ->   Jay:     **demo dakara <u>ne</u>,**
but       so      FP
*But because,*

10 ->          **Tsuukaa no onaji kishu-onaji: kaisha datta ra:,**
Tuka     L     same   kind     same    company CP     then
*if (I get) a kind same with Tuka-, (one) from the same company,*

11 ->          **kae   temo:,<imi nai toka iu no.**
change though    sense not   etc.    say FP
*Ø says it would be useless.*

12             **(0.7)**

13 ->   Jay:     **tsuuji nai kara.=**
connect   not     so
*Because it wouldn't have a (good) connection.*

14 ->>  Kay:     **=a a:: sokka sokka so- aa soo da yone[:]soo da yone:.**
 oh oh    that Q    that Q that  oh  that  CP FP       that  CP  FP
*Oh, oh, (I) see (I) see, that's true, that's true.*

15      Jay:                                            **[un.]**
*Yeah.*

16      Jay:     **un.**
*Yeah.*

17             **(0.9)**

```
18 ->     Kay:    soo da yone:.ii  jan   betsuni:.=
                  that CP FP     fine  TAG  particularly
                  That's true. It's fine, really (you don't need to change your cell phone).


19 ->>    Jay:    =ii yone::. [atashi (    )]
                   fine FP        I
                  (It is) fine. I,



20        Kay:                [nande] kaeru no?
                               why     change  FP
                               Why would (you) change (your cell phone)?


21        Jay:    chiga- [atashi]
                  no        I
                  No, I


22        Kay:          [dare ga] kae   ro tte iu no?
                         who  SP    change IMP QP   say FP
                         Who tells (you) to change (it)?


23        Kay:    kareshi ga kae   ro tte iu no?
                  boyfriend  SP change IMP QP   say FP
                  Does (your) boyfriend tell (you) to change (it)?
```

Although Jay's utterance (lines 09–13) presents the view (that it would be useless to get a phone from the same company) not as her own idea but somebody else's, it is relevant for Kay to agree or disagree with it. At line 14, Kay expresses that she has just understood and is convinced by the quoted view through "*a a:: (oh, oh,)*", a "change-of-state token" (Heritage 1984b), followed by a news receipt token "*sokka sokka ((I) see (I) see)*". Then she gives an anaphorical agreement, conveying that she has shifted her opinion after listening to the preceding turn. At line 18, Kay makes an anaphorical

agreement once again, and then— now that she understood that Jay would have to pay more and change her phone number in exchange for better connection— suggests that Jay really does not have to get a new phone after all. Jay repetitionally agrees with this (line 19); although she hasn't clearly alluded to this view, she has implied a preference for keeping the current phone by saying that Tuka is cheap (line 04) and that she wouldn't want to change her number (line 06).[6] Thus, she has a ground to claim that she has had that view prior to Kay's first statement.

### 4.1.3    Summary and Implications of Initial Observations

These initial observations suggest that the distribution of repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements is not arbitrary but systematic and contrastive. Speakers employ the two formulations of agreements to embody differential relationships of agreements to the first statements. With a repetitional agreement, a speaker claims that the agreement is not dependent upon the first statement but was formed independently of and/or prior to the first statement. With an anaphorical agreement, a speaker claims that he did not have that view until listening to the first statement, thus treating the view as something new to which she hadn't had an independent access.

This analysis is compatible with the compositions of the two types of agreements. A repetitional agreement does not syntactically rely on the preceding first assessment in order to convey its content. Nothing but its sequential positioning presents

it as a secondary response to the first assessment, corresponding to its basis on the speaker's independent access to the assessable object. On the other hand, the composition of an anaphorical agreement itself reflects its indexical and dependent relationship with regard to the first assessment; one needs to have access to the first assessment in order to understand the referent of the anaphora "*soo*".

Our analysis is supported also by the distribution of upgrading and downgrading modifiers. While anaphorical agreements are often upgraded or downgraded (see excerpts (17) through (19) below), no repetitional agreement in our data accompanies an upgrader or downgrader. This uneven distribution can be accounted for by reference to the action accomplished by them. Because a repetitional agreement marks the accordance of the first and second statements, if a repetitional agreement involves upgrading or downgrading of the first statement, it conveys that the first statement did not exactly captures the agreeing party's view. Thus, upgrading and downgrading a repetitional agreement can be a disaligning move, which is incompatible with the action accomplished by a repetitional agreement. On the other hand, it is relevant to upgrade or downgrade an anaphorical agreement, for it accepts the first statement as a new view that the speaker has not previously held. Upgrading an anaphorical agreement simply marks a stronger alignment, while downgrading marks a weaker alignment.

(17) "*honto* (really) upgrades the agreement:

21 ->    L:       **hehhehhe demo warui hito janakute yokatta desu ne.**
                          but    bad    person  not        good    CP    FP
                 *But it was lucky that (he) was not a bad person.*


22 ->>   R:       **[aa ^honto soo desu nee:, un:, demo sono ato]=**
                   oh   really  that  CP   NE   yeah   but   that  later
                 *Uhm, that really is true. But later,*


(18) "*maa* (well)" marks hesitation, thus downgrading the agreement:

27 ->    Daugh:   **ningen no kotoba ni honnyaku dekiru to iu jite-**
                  human    L   language to  translate    can   QP  say  poin-

28 ->             **omou jiten de machigatteru yo[ne**
                  think  point  at   wrong              FP
                 *It's already wrong at the point where (they) think it can be*
                  *translated into human language.*

29 ->>   Mom:                                      **[maa soo da yone**
                                                    well  that CP  FP
                                                   *Well that is right.*


(19) "*ma* (well)" marks hesitation, thus downgrading the agreement. the sentence-final
     connective "*kedo* (but)" also indicates some reservation about the view:

10 ->             **an- maa somosomo      kookoo  no toki kara**
                  well   in the first place high school  L  time  from
                 *Well, when (she was) a high school student.*


11 ->             **sono soyou wa atta yone.**
                  that    talent  TP was    FP
                 *she (already) had that talent (to live freely)*


38

```
12 ->>   Mari:      ma soo da kedo [ne].
                    well that CP   but    FP
                    Well, I guess, but

13       Nami:                          [n=].
                                        Yeah.
```

It should also be pointed out that first statements preceding repetitional agreements and those preceding anaphorical agreements tend to exhibit different characters. When repetitional agreements occur, the preceding first statements tend to be very short, often consisting of only a descriptor followed by particles (see excerpts (11), (12), and (13)). I argue that first statements preceding repetitional agreements can be short and simple because the agreeing party's preceding turn gives the first statement speaker a ground to presuppose alignment between them, and therefore they do not find it necessary to give accounts or support for their views in pursuit of an agreement. On the other hand, first statements preceding anaphorical agreements tend to include accounts and specifications of the object, and thus they tend to be much longer because the speakers do not have a basis for presupposing alignment or have a basis for presupposing disalignment. Therefore, the speakers of the first statements and those of anaphorical agreements in excerpts (14), (15), and (16) share the same stance toward the current state of their alignment. In short, speakers of first statements seem to be oriented toward whether their views are already shared by their co-participants or not

However, parties to conversation do not always use the formulations of agreements conformingly in accordance with the sequential context, nor do they always agree on the relative stances between the first and second statements. Instead, as will be demonstrated in the following section, they can mobilize these formulations as linguistic resources to negotiate and coordinate relevant stances.

## 4.2 Interactional Consequences: Negotiation of Affiliation and Disaffiliation Through Repetitional Agreements and Anaphorical Agreements

By selecting either a repetitional agreement or an anaphorical agreement as they align with the first statements, speakers indicate their stances toward the views presented by their coparticipants. However, in interaction, stances are not always the matter of individual speaker's attitudes that are determined prior to utterances. Instead, they are subject to interactional negotiation. In this section, I demonstrate that repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements can be deployed as linguistic resources through which interactants negotiate and coordinate their stances in terms of affiliation and disaffiliation between their views.

### 4.2.1 Repetitional Agreements as a Resource for Negotiating Affiliation

It has been demonstrated that a repetitional agreement is used to claim that the view was formed independently of and/or prior to the articulation of the first statement,

whereas an anaphorical agreement presents its view as being formed after the first statement. It was also shown that the use of a repetitional agreement is found to be recurrently relevant when its speaker has alluded to his view in his previous turn. In this section, we will see that the use of a repetitional agreement and marking such a stance can be a resource for negotiating strong affiliation with a coparticipant.

To claim that the agreeing party has had the view before the other party articulates the first statement can be a way of accentuating her commitment and upgrade the agreement. Consequently, the use of a repetitional agreement can propose strong affiliation with a coparticipant. That is demonstrably the case when a speaker alludes to her stance as she gives a report or a story and repetitionally agrees with the recipient's responsive comment on it. Let us see how that is the case with excerpt (12), seen earlier and reproduced here as (12)'.


(12)'

01  Nami:  **saigaa kekkon yubiwa shiteru shi.**
        Saigaa  marriage ring   wearing  and
        *Saigaa is wearing a wedding ring.*

02        **itsu no(h) ma(h)[ni(h)].**
        when L  while  at
        *(I didn't know)when(he/she got married/started to wear the ring).*

03  Mari:           **[(  )]**

```
04      Nami:   hhh

05 ->   Mari:   hayai na:.=
                fast  FP
                (Time passes) fast.

06 ->>  Nami:   =hayai na:.
                 fast  FP
                (Time passes) fast.

07      (0.3)

08      Nami:   suzukisan mo moo  kekkon  shiteru shi.
                Suzuki-TL  also already marriage  doing      and
                Mr./Ms. Suzuki is already married and.
```

Nami's report about their friend's marriage (lines 01–02) does not include an explicit

descriptor, although, as was illustrated earlier, it implicitly expresses Nami's surprise at

how fast things can change. Instead, Nami invites Mari to articulate the view first. Mari's

first statement at line 05 ("*hayai na:* (Time passes fast)") incorporates and aligns with

Nami's implicitly conveyed view. Therefore, at this point, Nami has already gotten Mari

oriented toward establishing affiliation between them Yet, the final particle "*na*" makes

the utterance sound spontaneous and thus makes a claim that the view was independently

formed. Then Nami repetitionally agrees with it using the same final particle (line 06),

conveying that Mari's first assessment exactly captures the position Nami has

independently had. This pattern of exchange consisting of the three turns (i.e., a report or

story with an implicit display of a stance, a responsive first statement, and a repetitional

agreement) can be a way of negotiating and establishing strong affiliation between two parties.

Similarly, in excerpt (13), reproduced here as (13)', a repetitional agreement follows Mari's response to the story, which is designed as her spontaneous reaction to what she has just heard but displays alignment with Nami's view allusively embedded in the story.

(13)'
```
01      Nami:   sonnani renshuu shite >datte<
                that much  practice    do     cuz
                Practicing that much, because,


02              karera umai kuseni so(h)nnani renshuu shite
                they    good  despite  that much        practice   do


03              dou su n da yo tte kanji ja(h)nai.
                how do N CP FP QP   like  TAG   not
                They are (already) good, it's like what would they want practicing
                that much, isn't it?


04              (.)


05      Nami:   .hhh


06 ->   Mari:   kowai ne.=
                scary  FP
                 It's scary.


07 ->>  Nami:   =kowai yone:. dakara ne=
                 scary  FP      so      FP
                 It's scary. So,
```

43

In both (12)' and (13)', Nami, the teller of the report or the story, chooses not to provide an "initial characterization" (Sacks 1974) or a "prospective indexical" (Goodwin 1996) — i.e., her stance relative to the event she describes that would provide an interpretive framework for the story to the recipient. Instead of expressing her own stance, she invites Mari to "voluntarily" come up with the view and articulate it first ("*hayai na* (fast)" in (12)' and "*kowai ne* (scary)" in (13)'). In other words, she yields to Mari the first statement position, which inherently makes a claim for the primary right to evaluate the issue (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 16). Then Nami immediately gives repetitional agreement, claiming that she had independently had the same views. Through this exchange, the sisters establish that they "respectively" and "spontaneously" come to share the same view about the issue, producing a sense of strong affiliation.

For the majority of the occurrences of repetitional agreements, the speaker's claim that the view was formed independently of or prior to the first statement is grounded either on the situational context (i.e., co-presence of the object) or the sequential context (previous allusion to the view). However, there are cases when a repetitional agreement is used with neither of these contextual grounds. Such ungrounded claims for an independent access to the view in such cases are vulnerable to the other participants' challenge and attack. In some such cases, the speaker preempts the challenge by demonstrating or claiming his independent access to the view (e.g., excerpt (20)). In other cases, she does confront a challenge and eventually gives the stance up

(e.g., excerpts (21) and (22)).

Excerpt (20) is an example of the former cases; Mari repetitionally agrees with Kay's first statement that a cup of soup would be nice to have with their sushi (line 03) and she claims independent access to the view by adding that she thought about the same thing before she heard Kay say it (line 04). Such "coincidental" agreement allows participants to share a sense of affiliation.

(20) Kay and Mari are eating sushi with two other graduate students.

```
03 ->   Kay:    aa kappu- kappu osuimono toka hoshii ne.=
                   oh  cup     cup    soup      etc.  want   ne
                Oh, cup-, cup soup would be nice.

04 ->>  Mari:   =hoshii ne [atashi mo [omotta sakki.]
                    want   ne  I       also  thought  a while ago
                 Nice, I thought so, too, a while ago.

05      Kay:                        [n:        [nanka ma- ma   o] toru
tameni.=
                                     yeah.     like   int- interval O take   for
                                 Yeah, in order to take, like, intervals.

06      M:      =nhhhhh
```

In other cases, an agreeing party faces a challenge by a coparticipant and is prompted to give up the claim for independent access to the view. Such a negotiation process can be observed in excerpt (21), in which Mari seems to be rejecting Nami's repetitional agreement.

(21)

38 ->     Mari**:**   **mas- masuda to sa:,**
               Mas-    Masuda and   FP

39 ->             **aizawa[san] mo honto nagai shi sa:.**
               Aizawa  HT   also   really   long      and FP
               *Mas- Masuda and, Ms./Mr.Aizawa have been dating long, too.*

40     Nami:             **[n:].**
                   *Yeah.*

41 ->>           **nagai yone:.**
               long    FP
               *(They have been dating) long.*

42 ->     Mari:   **ma ikkai wakaretari shiteta kedo ne.**
               well once   break up      doing     but   FP
               *Well, (they) broke up once, but*

43     Nami:   **n:**
               *Uh-hum*

44     Mari:   **( )[( )].**

45 ->>   Nami:       **[a] soo  na n [da].**
                  oh   that   CP  N  CP
                  *Oh really.*

46     Mari:                      **[un un].**
                         *Yeah yeah*

As the sisters discuss the fact that many of their friends are getting married, Mari

mentions a couple, "Masuda" and "Ms./Mr. Aizawa" (lines 38–39), commenting on how

long they have been together. Nami knows the couple as well, but Mari seems to be closer to them. Although she has not alluded to her view, at line 41 Nami agrees with Mari with a repetitional agreement ("*nagai yone* ((They have been dating) long.)"), claiming that she has independently had that view and treating Mari's first statement to have already been shared. This move is not treated as affiliating by Mari. Mari's utterance at line 42 can be seen as her challenge to Nami's stance; by providing a new piece of information that conflicts with or at least modifies her own previous utterance—i.e., the news that the couple once broke up and got back together—Mari seems to be undermining the validity of Nami's view (line 41) as well as her own previous statement (lines 38–39). It turns out that Nami didn't know that the couple had broken up before. She admits her ignorance by giving a news receipt token (line 45), which makes the sisters' knowledgeability of the couple clearly asymmetrical and thus makes disaffiliation rather than affiliation more relevant.

Excerpt (22) below is another such example. It is a segment from a conversation between the sisters-in-law, Rika and Aki. Rika is agreed to be a better cook than Aki is, and Aki often learns new recipes from Rika. Here, Rika has been teaching Aki how to cook Ratatouille. The segment starts after Rika has gone through steps of the recipe. The relationship between Rika and Aki during the instruction can be characterized as one between an instructor and a student—Rika provides information and, Aki receives it, sometimes checking her understanding.

(22) Rika has been introducing a new recipe to Aki. Rika and Aki are sisters-in-law, and
Mari is a daughter of Rika.

01      Rika:      **soide (o.2) ko:u yatta ra ohiru ni ne:,**
                   and           this   did   and  lunch for  FP
                   *And when (I) did (it) like this, for lunch,*


02                 **sore yatta ra papa oishii ttsutte kore [kaketeta].**
                   that  did   and  dad   tasty  QP say    this    put on
                   *(I) did that, then Papa ((husband of Rika)) was saying (it's) delicious and was*
                   *putting it on ((a toast)).*

03      Aki:                                                        **[n::**
                                                                    *Um-hum*

04      Mari:                                                       **[a::**
                                                                     *Oh*

05      Rika:      **oishii tte, yasai,**
                   delicious QP   vegetable
                   *(He said it was) delicious, vegetables,*

06 ->              **sorede sugoi herushii janai?**
                   and      very   healthy    TAG
                   *And it's very healthy, right?*

07 ->>  Aki :      **a:: herushii da yo[ne:].**
                   oh   healthy   CP  FP
                   *Oh, (it's) healthy.*

08      Rika :                                  **[u:n] . oriibuoiru dake da mon.**
                                                 yeah    olive oil     only CP FP
                                                *Yeah, (it) only (uses) olive oil.*

09      Aki :      **un.**
                   *Yeah*

| 10 | Rika : | **ato wa suibun iranai [shi::],** |
|---|---|---|
| | | rest TP water unnecessary and |
| | | *Other than that, (it) doesn't need water, and* |

| 11 | Aki : | **[a  sou da yone.** |
|---|---|---|
| | | oh that CP FP |
| | | *Oh that's right.* |

| 12 | Rika : | **yasai no s- (.) aji.** |
|---|---|---|
| | | vegetable L s- taste. |
| | | *The taste of vegetables.* |

Rika's statement that the dish is healthy at line 06 is followed by Aki's repetitional agreement—Aki is treating Rika's statement as something she already shared, not something new to learn. Thus, Aki now seems to be oriented toward affiliation with Rika, abandoning the asymmetrical relationship of an instructor and a student that had been relevant. Aki refuses to align with this stance, however. At line 08, she gives the reason why Ratatouille is healthy, referring to the recipe again (that it only uses olive oil) which shows that she is still giving Aki instructions and that their stances haven't shifted to more affiliating symmetrical ones. Aki's anaphorical agreement at line 11 seems to indicate that she gave up the affiliating stance and went back to the "student" stance.

### 4.2.2    Anaphorical Agreements as a Resource for Negotiating Disaffiliation

In the last section, we found that a repetitional agreement and its claim for independent access to a view can be utilized as a linguistic resource for negotiating and establishing affiliation with a coparticipant. When a coparticipant accepts the stance, the

affiliation is established, but when the coparticipant does not, the use of repetitional agreement can be regarded as an intrusive move, and its speaker may be urged to give up the stance.

These interactional consequences of repetitional agreement become clearer once we compare them with those of anaphorical agreements. It was shown that an anaphorical agreement presents its view as being newly formed after prompting by the preceding first statement. In other words, it treats the view of the first statement as something new and previously not shared. Such a stance can be a means of acknowledging that the view of the first statement is new and credible, if the speaker completely accepts the view and abandons the position she had previously held, if any (see excerpt (14) for example). However, in other cases, it can also be a means of dissociating one's view from the other's, and marking disaffiliation from the other. Let us examine excerpt (15).

(15)'

16      R:      **ano souiu kowa(h)i kei(h)ke(h)n, [te iuka:(h),**
                  well    that      scary       experience        QP   or
                  *well, such scary experience, or*

17      L:                                           **[a- na(h)ruhodo(h)**
                                          oh    indeed
                                          *Oh I see.*

```
18              bikkurishita keiken   o shimasita:(h)=
                surprising         experience O   did
                surprising experience, I had.


19 ->  L:       =.h[hhh <demo warui] hito janakute=
                           but  bad    person  not
                But that (he) was not a bad person.


20     R:          [u n .h h h]
                    Yeah.


21 ->  L:       =[yokatta desu ne. ehhehhehhe.hhhh u::n]
                  good      CP  FP                      yeah
                  was fortunate.


22 ->> R:        [aa ^honto soo desu nee:, un:, demo sono ato]=
                  oh  really that CP  NE    yeah  but  that  later
                  Uhm, that really is true. But later,


23              =nanka keisatsu kara iroiro,[kochira]ga kikareru no
wa,
                 like  police    from various  this side SP  heard    N TP
                 like the police asked us various questions,


24     L:                                       [hai]
                                                 Yes


25     R:       chotto, iya- iya da(h)tta de(h)su yone, na(h)nka,=
                little       annoying          CP     FP    like
                It was a little annoying, like
```

As we saw earlier, the first statement at lines 19 and 21 is prefaced with "*demo* (but)",

which presents the view to be disjunct from the one R showed in her story. Accordingly,

at line 22, R treats this view as not having been shared, and gives an anaphorical

agreement. In the same turn, R adds a negative assessment "*iya* (annoying)" with a report

of an annoying consequence of the event, which disaligns with the positive view

proposed by L. This addition is again prefaced with "*demo* (but)" (line 22), indicating

that R as well as L is aware of and attending to the disalignment between them. Thus, R's

anaphorical agreement is pre-disalignment as well as post-disalignment—through an

anaphorical agreement, R disaffiliates herself from the view that she is agreeing with.

Here is another example. Excerpt (23) is an exchange between female college

students. They were requested by researchers to talk about "what was most surprising",

and L has told R that it was surprising to her to see more than one brides in their wedding

dresses at the same time at the cafe where she works. To the story, R responds to the

story by saying, "How nice" (line 06).


(23)

```
05      L       he[hhe u(h)h soo]=
                          Yeah.

06 ->   R          [.hh e::::::::: ]ii na:[:=
                              good   FP
                             How nice ((I envy you)).

07      L                                   [u-=

08      L       =[e-
                  What,

09 ->   R       =[atashi hanayome-san toka sugoi akogareru
```

|  |  | I            bride        HT   etc.    very     long for |
|---|---|---|

                   *I dream of brides.*

10       L       **niai soo(h)[da mo(h)n.**
                    suit    seem    CP   FP
                    *(It) would suit you ((You would make a pretty bride)).*

11       R                  **[ehe n:(h)n¿**
                               *No.*

12 ->   R       **[.hh]demo dakara, ii  na:, (.) <u>mi</u> rete.=**
                    but     so      good FP      see   can
                    *But so, it's nice that you can see (brides).*

13       L       **[.hhh]**

14 ->> L       **=a:[a:, soo da ne:]**
                 oh  oh    that  CP FP
                 *Oh, oh, that's true.*

15       R            **[u::::::n]**
                     *Yeah.*

16       R:     **uhhuhhu[hh h h h h h h**

17       L             **[n demo, nanka ne–=**
                     but      like    FP
                   *But, (it's) like,*

18       R:     **=^<u>e</u>[hhe**

19       L:         **[nan[ka–**
                    *like,*

20 ->   R            **[bikkuri suru=**
                   suprise     do

21       R       **=<u>yo</u>(h)ne[:.**
               FP

*(It's) surprising (to see brides in the cafe)*

```
22 ->>   L              [bi(h)kkuri su(h)ru yo[(h) hhh]
                         surprise      do        FP
                       (It is) surprising.


23        R                                     [.hhh kafe]=
                                                      cafe


24              =ni i nai mon ne [fu(h)tsuu(h) hehhe
                at  be not FP FP      usually
                There aren't brides at a cafe usually.


25        L                      [kafe (h) hhh
                                  cafe
                                  (Not at) a cafe.


26        L     shikamo(h)hhh、a, aisukoohii de, toka
                moreover            oh  iced coffee   with  etc.
                (They are) like, "(Uhm, I'll have) iced coffee,"
```

L, responding to R's comment on the story, first initiates a repair, showing that she is having difficulty in understanding (lines 07 and 08). An other-initiated repair can be a precursor to a disagreement, and it gives its recipient an opportunity to adjust his or her position in order to get an alignment (Schegloff 2007:100–106). R deals with this possible disalignment by offering a personal reason for her statement (that she dreams of brides) and indicates that she does not expect everyone to share her view (lines 10 and 12). At line 14, L anaphorically agrees with R, conveying that she hadn't previously shared that view but is now agreeing with it. But then she starts to present a disaligning

view at line 17, prefacing it with "*demo* (but)". Given these signs of disalignment, R aligns with L by co-completing the sentence referring to L's earlier characterization of the story, "*bikkuri suru yone* (it is surprising)" (lines 20-21). This time, R repetitionally agrees and alignment between them is restored. In this example, an anaphorical agreement is deployed to take a non-committal, disaffiliating stance, allowing its speaker and recipient to implicitly negotiate and deal with possible disalignment between them.

### 4.2.3 Summary and Implications: Negotiation of Locally Relevant Social Relationship

In this section, we have explored interactional motivations for the use of repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements in Japanese, and illustrated how speakers utilize them as resources for negotiating affiliation and disaffiliation between them. A repetitional agreement is used when a speaker has a ground to claim that her view has been independently formed and/or was formed prior to the articulation of the first statement. It can thus be a resource for suggesting, negotiating, and establishing affiliation. On the other hand, an anaphorical agreement is used when the first statement provides a view that the speaker of the agreement did not previously hold. By treating the first statement as being new, it can suggest that there was a gap between the speakers' views, which allows interactants to deal with the disaffiliation and sometimes negotiate and restore affiliation without making the process explicit.

Stivers (2005) suggests that interactants' concerns about relevant interactional or social roles motivate them to attend to who has the primary right to evaluate the issue in question. This also provides us with an insight into the practices on which this study has focused. That is, by negotiating affiliation and disaffiliation with regard to an issue, parties to talk negotiate whether or not they are in a symmetrical, affiliating relation or an asymmetrical, disaffiliating relation. If that is the case, then repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements can be regarded as linguistic resources through which they negotiate and reconstruct social relationship that is relevant by reference to what they are discussing at a given moment of interaction. In everyday conversation, parties negotiate and establish intersubjectivity with regard such issues as whether they are being a teacher and a student or two housewives (excerpt 22), or, whether they are equally close friends with another person or not (excerpt 21).

**Chapter 5**

**Conclusion**

Interactants are observed to be motivated to enhance solidarity or affiliation while avoiding disaffiliation (Heritage 1984b: 265-280, Heritage and Raymond 2005: 15–16). Agreements are preferred over disagreements, compliance with a request is preferred over rejection, and acceptance of an offer or invitation is preferred over refusal. Brown and Levinson (1987) call this orientation "positive face". However, people also have a want to be different from others and to not be impeded by them: "negative face", to use Brown and Levinson's terminology. Heritage and Raymond (2005) argue that the dilemma between affiliation and disaffiliation is practically handled in interaction. Parties to talk are shown to be sensitive to "the distribution of rights and responsibilities regarding what participants can accountably know, how they know it, whether they have rights to describe it, and in what terms is indirectly implicated in organized practices of speaking" (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 16). The findings of the current study provide an empirical basis for proposing that there is a cross-linguistic relevance to their argument. It was demonstrated that Japanese speakers handle the dilemma involved in agreements by employing practices very similar to those used in English conversation.

Parties to talk are concerned about whether they are in an affiliating position with respect to their coparticipants in terms of the current topic in an asymmetrical and

disaffiliating position, and this concern significantly influences the composition of an agreement. However, it is not constantly predictable or predetermined which one of the orientations is relevant at a given moment and with regard to a particular topic. As we have seen, parties negotiate such matters turn by turn in interaction, and therefore the locally relevant stances and their social relationships are in a reflexive relationship with their social conducts. The distinction between repetitional agreements and anaphorical agreements in Japanese conversation is one of the resources through which parties negotiate, construct and reconstruct social relationship between them.

**Notes**

1　While many of the previous studies on agreements and disagreements that this study draws upon have focused on assessment sequences (Pomerantz 1984; Heritage 2002; Heritage and Raymond 2005; Raymond and Heritage 2006), I included in the scope of this study those sequences in which a first speaker makes an assessment, expresses a view, or offers an interpretation of an issue and a second speaker agrees or disagrees with it.

2　Some first statements do not have a repeatable descriptor (e.g., single-word adjective, adverb or verb phrase) available for a repetitional agreement, and in such cases the agreeing speakers seem to have an option to adopt a contracted form of agreement that allows them to avoid the use of the anaphor "*soo*". Such turns have only a final particle with or without a copula and are regarded as incomplete and casual as sentences. Although it will require an empirical study to establish this point, it should be suggested here that the option between a repetition and anaphora does not seem to be contingent upon the existence of a repeatable descriptor.

3　This example is drawn from "Mr. O Corpus", which was collected as a part of the project "Practical and Theoretical Studies on Culture, Interaction, and Languages in Asia," Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research(B) (1) (2003–2005)

supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture, Project No. 15320054, in which I participated as a research assistant. The example this study addresses is a dyadic conversation between a college teacher (R) and a college student (L). Both of them are female, and they met for their first time for the data collection.

4    Aki's utterance at lines 1 and 2 seems to be a compliment to Rika, who made the tasty plum wine. Thus, it is somewhat unusual that Rika, the recipient of a possible compliment articulates the statement at line 3. On the other hand, lines 1 and 2 can also be understood to have a flavor or self-mockery, for Aki confesses that she drank a lot in a short period of time. That makes it relevant for a recipient to volunteer an excuse for Aki, which explains the Rika's first statement. The final particle in the first and second statements "*mon*", which is often attached to an excuse, makes this account reasonable.

5    Mari's statement at line 26 does not include a descriptive word that could be repeated in the next turn. However, an anaphorical agreement is not the only option for Nami at line 27, because there are forms in Japanese that seem functionally equivalent to repetitional agreements. They consist of copula (*da/desu)* and final particle(s), or the final particle by itself, without the anaphor *soo*. Although am empirical study would be needed to confirm this point, they

seem to be used to present a view as being independently formed, just as a repetitional agreement is. Examples are provided here; in (24), Aunt has described a toy that translates dogs' barks into human language, and both Mom (i.e., the sister of Aunt) and Daughter (i.e., niece of Aunt) start to voice their suspicion sabout the toy. Mom's turn at line 07 is an agreement with Daughter's preceding statement, but Mom has already stated to state her negative position at line 05, which is in overlap with line 06. Thus, Mom has a ground for claiming previous and independent access to the view when she agrees using the self-standing final particle "*ne*".

(24)

| 01 | Aunt: | **[kou]nanda yo tte oshiete kureta no.** |
| | | this CP    FP QP    teach    AUX    FP |
| | | *(She/He) taught me "(it's like) this."* |

01      Aunt:    **[kou]nanda yo tte oshiete kureta no.**
                    this CP    FP QP   teach   AUX      FP
                    *(She/He) taught me "(it's like) this."*

02                    **(0.4)**

03      Mom :    **fu:[:::n. ]**
                    *uh-huh*

04      Aunt :    **[(cough)**

05      Mom :    **do[no teido？]**
                    which extent
                    *to what extent?*

06 ->　　　Daugh :　　**[mayutsu]ba da yone::=**
　　　　　　　　　　doubtful　　CP　FP
　　　　　　　　　　*(It's) doubtful.*

07 ->>　　Mom :　　**=ne.[dono=**
　　　　　　　　　　FP　which
　　　　　　　　　　*Yeah. which*

08　　　　　Aunt :　　　　**[n::**
　　　　　　　　　　　uhm

09　　　　　Mom :　　**=dou na n da rou nee.**
　　　　　　　　　　how　CP N CP　AUX　FP
　　　　　　　　　　*(I) wonder how (good) it is.*


In (25), Mari uses the form of a copula followed by the final particle *yone* in order to indicate that what Nami tells her as a news report at lines 01 and 02 is not really a news to her (line 05).


(25)

01　　　Nami:　**sou ano ni rittoru gurai no:, ano=**
　　　　　　　　yeah that　two　litter　　about　L　　that

02　　　　　　　**=pettobotoru o mottekiteru rashii n da yone(h).=**
　　　　　　　　pet bottle　　O　bringing　　　AUX　N CP　FP
　　　　　　　　*(I hear) (he) brings that, that pet bottle of about 2 litters.*

03　　　Mari:　**=a:[:_**
　　　　　　　　*yeah*

04　　　Nami:　　**[itsumo**
　　　　　　　　*Always*


62

```
05->>    Mari:    da yone::_=
                  CP   FP
                  He does.

06       Nami:    =u:n
                      Yeah.
```

6        Jay's turn at line 06 in excerpt (16) can also be seen as a repetitional agreement. Here, Jay has not alluded to her view that she wouldn't want to change her phone number, but nonetheless, her repetitional agreement does not result in any interactional problem. This repetition occurs in the environment in which Kay and Jay have been discussing what Jay should do with her cell phone. Thus, when Kay says that Jay or people in general do not want to change their phone numbers (line 05), she seems to be speaking on behalf of Jay rather than stating her personal view. This explains why it is relevant for Jay to confirm or disconfirm whether that (i.e., she wouldn't want to change her phone number) is what she has had in her mind; in this case, she utters a repetitional agreement relevant.

(16)'

```
05 ->    Kay:    datte denwa sa:,(0.2) bangoo kae taku nai jan.
                 because phone    FP         number  change want not  TAG
                 Because (you/we) don't want to change the phone number.

06 ->>   Jay:    kae    taku nai yo[ne:].
                 change want  not  FP
                 (I/We) don't want to change (it).
```

# APPENDIX

## 1       Transcript Symbols

| | |
|---|---|
| [ | starting point of overlapping talk |
| :: | lengthened syllable |
| , | continuing intonation |
| . | falling intonation |
| ? | rising intonation |
| ¿ | semi rising intonation |
| (0.0) | length of silence in tenths of a second |
| hh | audible outbreath |
| .hh | audible inbreath |
| = | latched utterances |
| - | glottal stop |
| >   < | increase in tempo |
| < | hurried start |
| <u>words</u> | relatively stressed |
| (   ) | inaudible word(s) |
| (words) | words that do not appear in the original data but are supplied to make English translation grammatical or intelligible |
| ((words)) | contextually relevant information supplied by the author, or, a rather free translation by the author to capture the implication of an utterance |

## 2    Abbreviations used for gloss

AUX          auxiliary

DP           dative particle

CP           copula

DP           dative particle

END          term of endearment

FP           final particle

HT           honorific title

IMP          imperative particle

L            nominal linking particle

N            nominalizer

O            object particle

PL           plural marker

QP           quotative particle

SP           subject particle

TAG          tag question

TP           topic particle

# References

Brown, P. and S. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C. 1992. Assessments and the construction of context. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon,* 147-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----. 1996. Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff and S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 370-404. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----. and M.H. Goodwin. 1987. Concurrent operation on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPRA Papers in Pragmatics* 1 (1).1-54.

Hayashi, S. 1983. Daimeishi ga sasu mono, sono sashi kata [what a pronoun refers to, how it refers]. In S. Mizutani (ed.), *Asakura nihongo kouza 5: un'you* [*Asakura Japanese Course 5: Usage*], 1-45. Tokyo: Asakura.

Heritage, J. 1984a. A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 299-345. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----. 1984b. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

-----. 2002. Oh-prefaced responses to assessments: A method of modifying agreement/ disagreement. In C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, and S. A. Thompson (eds.) *The language of turn and sequence*, 196-224. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-----. and G. Raymond. 2005. The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 6 (1).15-38.

Kamio, A. 1990. *Joohoo no nawabari riron* [The theory of territory of information]. Tokyo: Taishuukan.

-----. 1998. An analysis of Japanese *ne* in terms of the theory of territory of information. In H.

Hoji (ed), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 231-242.

Kanai, K. 2004. Kaiwa ni okeru ninshikiteki ken'i no koushou: Shuujoshi *yo*, *ne*, odoroki hyouji no bunpu to kinou [Negotiation of epistemic authority in Conversation: On the use of final particles *yo*, *ne* and surprise markers.] *Studies in Pragmatics* 6.17-28.

Kinsui, S. and Y. Takubo. 1997. Discourse management in terms of mental spaces. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28.741-758.

-----. and Y. Takubo. 1998. Danwa-kanri ni motozuku *yo, ne yone* no kenkyuu [A study on *yo*, *ne*, and *yone* based on the theory of discourse-management]. In S. Doumoto et.al. (eds.), *Onsei ni yoru ningen to kikai no taiwa* [*Vocal Dialogue between the Human and the Machine*], 257-271. Tokyo: Ohmsha.

Kuroda, S. 1979. (Ko)/So/A *ni tsuite: Eigo to Nihongo to* [*On (*Ko*)/So/A: English and Japanese*]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Mori, J. 1999. *Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese: Connective expressions and turn construction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Morita, E. 2002. Stance marking in the collaborative completion of sentences: Final particles as epistemic markers in Japanese." In N. M. Akatsuka and S. Strauss (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics vol. 10*, 220-223. Stanford: CSLI.

-----. 2005. *Negotiation of contingent talk: The Japanese interactional particles* ne *and* sa. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Noda, H., T. Masuoka, M. Sakuma and Y. Takubo. 2002. *Fukubun to danwa* [*Complex sentences and discourse*]. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Pomerantz, A. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some Features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raymond, G. and J. Heritage. 2006. The epistemics of social relations: Owning grandchildren. *Language in Society* 35.677-705.

Sacks, H. 1987. On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button and J.R.E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*, 54-69. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

-----. 1974. An analysis of a course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, 337-353. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----, E.A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson. 1974. A simplest sistematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50.696-735.

Schegloff, E.A. 1996. Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology* 104.161-216.

-----. 2006. *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----. and H. Sacks. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 7.289-327.

Stivers, T. 2005. Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from second position. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38 (2).131-158.

Tanaka, H. 2000. The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (8).1135-1176.