Role of yone and deshoo in the Construction of Social Actions : From an Epistemic and Affective Point of View

Role of *yone* and *deshoo* in the Construction of Social Actions: From an Epistemic and Affective Point of View

Fumiko NAZIKIAN

Columbia University in the City of New York / Project Collaborator, NINJAL

Abstract

As an interactional principle, Japanese speakers frequently seek and display agreement or mutual consent during social interaction, but the precise mechanisms of this principle are unclear. Building on the notions of epistemic status and stance, this paper examines the Japanese sentence-final particle *yone* and the auxiliary of supposition *deshoo* as interactional markers to show how Japanese speakers construct social actions in speech. Both *yone* and *deshoo* are often used interactionally as sentence-final tags and function to solicit or grant support and induce listener involvement. Interestingly, they can be used by the same speaker to serve different discourse functions. In order to elucidate these, this paper examines 17 instances of natural conversation taken from the BTSJ - Japanese Conversation Corpus. The results show that the use of *deshoo* and *yone* is associated with the speaker's different attitudes towards the interlocutor's epistemic status. *Deshoo* is utilized when the speaker assumes that the listener should take the same epistemic stance as her/him and endorse her/his perspective, and this use is often associated with the speaker justifying her/his position. *Yone* is used when the speaker assumes some type of epistemic discrepancy between the speakers, and this use is associated with a display of empathy. Finally, the socioculturally restricted use of *deshoo* and *yone* as discourse markers is examined.*

Key words: *yone*, *deshoo*, epistemic stance, affective stance, naturally occurring conversation

1. Introduction

It is generally held that speakers construct social interactions by expressing their attitudes towards what is being said or towards the addressee. Presuming that asserting or requesting information is a fundamental feature of various social actions, Heritage (2012) argues that the epistemic status of speakers can be considered "unavoidable" and essential in the construction of social action. During such a social interaction, speakers are assumed to constantly update their assessment of the cognitive relationship between the speakers. The aim of this paper is to clarify how speakers encode their assessments of their epistemic relationship in a variety of linguistic forms while conveying their thoughts, feelings, and judgments. In this paper, I focus on the sentence-final particle *yone* and the auxiliary of supposition *deshoo*, explaining the role that these

two forms play in constructing social actions in ongoing conversations.

Deshoo (as well as *desho* and *daroo*, as variants of *deshoo*) is generally considered to be an auxiliary verb of supposition that indicates the speaker's conjecture. However, it can be attached to the end of a sentence to elicit the hearer's response, such as a confirmation (Asano 2007, Asano-Cavanagh 2011, 蓮沼 1992, 1995, Hayashi 2010, 宮崎 2000, 森山 1992, among others). Despite its frequent occurrence in spoken conversation, its function has not been fully investigated. *Yone* is a sentence-final particle that consists of *yo* and *ne*. Of the various sentence-final particles in the Japanese language, *ne* and *yo* are the most commonly used and have thus been widely studied (e.g., Cook 1990, Hayano 2014, Lee 2007, Maynard 1993, McGloin 1990, Morita 2002, 2005, 2008, Ogi 2017, 大曽 2005, Takubo and Kinsui 1997, Tanaka 2000, 宇佐美 1997). However, although some previous studies have examined *yone* (Asano 2007, Asano-Cavanagh 2011, 張 2009, 蓮沼 1992, 1995, Hayashi 2010, 伊豆原 1993, 2003, McGloin and Xu 2014), this combination of *yo* and *ne* has not received as much attention as *ne* or *yo*.

Supplementing previous studies on *yone* and *deshoo*, this paper examines their discourse functions in creating cognitive and affective relationships between speakers (e.g., rebuking, accusing, empathizing) and discusses the sociocultural constraints associated with these expressions. I make use of the concepts of "epistemic status" and "epistemic stance" (Heritage 2012) to explicate the pragmatic meanings of *deshoo* and *yone* in social interactions. This paper examines 17 instances of natural conversation taken from the BTSJ - Japanese Conversation Corpus (Usami 2011).

2. Background

In order to understand the particular characteristics of *yone* and *deshoo*, it is interesting to analyze when they are interchangeable and when they are not. First, consider the following example taken from 蓮沼 [Hasunuma] (1995: 393).

(1)　　(Showing an instruction to a taxi driver)
　　　Asoko ni yuubin posuto ga mieru <u>deshoo</u>.　　　　　　　(蓮沼 [Hasunuma] 1995: 393)
　　　'You can see a post box over there **deshoo**.'

Hasunuma explains that *desho* is used in (1) to establish a "common understanding" between the interlocutors while drawing attention to the information that "there is a post box over there." Here, the speaker assumes that the interlocutor (a taxi driver) also has the experience of seeing a post box. *Yone* is also possible in this case, as shown in the following example.

(1')　*Asoko ni yuubin posuto ga miemasu <u>yone</u>.*　　　　　　　(蓮沼 [Hasunuma] 1995: 393)
　　　'You can see a post box over there **yone**.'

Based on (1) and (1'), Hasunuma indicates that *yone* and *deshoo* are interchangeable in this context and function in a similar way, although their meaning may not always be exactly the same. For instance, 蓮沼 [Hasunuma] (1995) points out that *yone* cannot be replaced by *deshoo* when the sentence indicates the speaker's uncertainty, while *deshoo* cannot be replaced by *yone* when the the confirmation of the speaker's conjecture is at issue, as evidenced in the following examples.

(2)　*Watashi, yuube, megane, koko ni oita <u>yone</u>.*　　　　　(蓮沼 [Hasunuma] 1995: 391, 397)
　　　'I put my glasses here last night **yone**.'

(3)   *Okaasan, asobi ni ittemo ii <u>deshoo?</u>*　　　　　　　　　(蓮沼 [Hasunuma] 1995: 395)

      'Mom, can I go outside to play **deshoo**?'

In (2), the speaker is uncertain if her/his memory is correct or not, allowing for *yone*, but not *deshoo*, as such a sentence would have a different meaning. Hasunuma explains that the use of *deshoo* here would indicate that the speaker is reminding the hearer of information that the speaker presupposes the hearer should know. Example (3) shows the converse. Here, a child is requesting permission from her/his mother. According to Hasunuma, the use of *deshoo* here indicates that the speaker assumes the hearer has the authority to make a final decision and grant permission.

三宅 [Miyake] (2010) argues that *deshoo* can denote two types of confirmation depending on the status of the information: (1) proposition-based and (2) knowledge-based. The former involves an evaluative comment or information that the speaker assumes the hearer does not know. While the latter serves to create a common epistemic domain between the speaker and the hearer, the former implies that the speaker is imposing her/his judgment on the hearer. This distinction is useful for understanding the meanings of *deshoo*, as Miyake's analysis may suggest that *deshoo* is used when the speaker presupposes that the hearer already has knowledge of the information or when the speaker presupposes that the hearer will agree with her/him. This function of *deshoo* suggests that its use can evoke particular imposing affective meanings, such as rebuking or challenging.

Based on the natural semantic metalanguage theory (e.g., Wierzbicka 1996, 2006), Asano (2007: 9) compares *deshoo* and *janai ka* through the use of cognitive scenarios and characterizes *deshoo* as indicating the speaker's attitude of "I think I can say that I know this" and "I think that you know the same." Along the same line, Asano-Cavanagh (2011: 17) identifies the meanings encoded in *yone* as:

(4)   a.　I know this
     b.　I think that you know the same
     c.　Because of this, I think you will say: I want to say the same
     d.　I want you to say it
     e.　I don't know it

    Deshoo, on the other hand, is characterized by:

(5)   a.　I think that I can say: I know this
     b.　I think that you know the same
     c.　Because of this, I think that you will say: I want to say the same
     d.　I want you to say it
     e.　I think that you will say it

Asano-Cavanagh's characterizations of *yone* and *deshoo* are useful for identifying the key differences between the two expressions. For example, the (4a) components mean that *yone* implies the speaker's access to the information (i.e., "I know this"), whereas *deshoo* concerns the speaker's conjecture "I think." Moreover, by comparing the (5e) components, the speaker's different expectations of the interlocutor's response are evident. While a speaker using *deshoo* expects the hearer to give the response she/he expects, one using *yone* implies the possibility of a discrepancy

between the speaker's expectation and the interlocutor's response.

Based on previous studies on *yone* (伊豆原 1993, 2003, 蓮沼 1995), McGloin and Xu (2014) argue that *yone* implies some incongruence between the speaker and the addressee(s), which can reside (a) within the speaker her- or himself, (b) between the speaker and the hearer, or (c) between the speaker's expectation of the addressee's response and the actual response. Examples (6) through (8) below are examples of (a), (b), and (c), respectively, taken from McGloin and Xu (2014).

(6)   *Watashi, koko ni megane oita yone.*
       'I put my glasses here **yone**.'
(7)   *Ashita irasshaimasu yone.*
       'You are coming tomorrow **yone**.'
(8)   A: *Kyoo wa atatakai desu, ne.*
       B: *E? Soo desu ka. Watashi wa samukute, samukute.*
       A: → (to C) *Atatakai desu yone.*

       A: It is warm today ne.
       B: Is that so? I feel very cold.
       A: → (to C) It is warm **yone**.

In (6), the speaker is not quite sure where she left her glasses, so she requests confirmation from the addressee that she left them "here." In (7), the speaker confirms that the addressee "will come tomorrow" because she is unsure. In (8), A seeks agreement from C because B disagrees with A. McGloin and Xu suggest that this use of *yone* is a way for the speaker to solicit a hearer's verification and thereby achieve greater hearer involvement.

Although *yone* generally signals the speaker's uncertainty, there are cases where this is not so, such as in the following example.[1]

(9)   (The interlocutor says she feels depressed and has no interest in anything. She seeks advice.)
       Tashika-ni, soo-yuu toki tte aru yone. Hontoni, hiteitekina kimochi ni natchaun da yone.
       'We all have moments like that **yone**. Really, one can't help thinking negatively **yone**.'

Here, the speaker is not seeking confirmation because she is unsure about what she is saying, but expressing empathy towards the addressee, with *yone* signifying that the speaker has experienced something similar. Through this use of the particle, the speaker asserts her equal right to express her feelings. In this context, *deshoo* would be inappropriate because that sentence would mean that the speaker is imposing her assessment about the interlocutor's epistemic state. The *deshoo*-attached sentence would signal the speaker's attitude of "you should remember" or "you should know."

These observations made in previous studies suggest critical differences between *yone* and *deshoo*. *Yone* may indicate the speaker's uncertainty over the validity of the information as well as congruence with the interlocutors' knowledge or judgment. *Deshoo* expresses the speaker's position with respect to whether or not the hearer already knows the information as well as who has a right to know the information or the authority to make a decision about the matter at question. However, some aspects of their use remain unclear. For example, Asano's (2007) and Asano-

---

[1] Example (9) was generated by the author.

Cavanagh's (2011) account of the meanings of *yone* via cognitive scenarios does not explain why the speaker would seek confirmation from the addressee about information the addressee already knows. It is also unclear what the determining factors of the differences between the semantic components of *yone* and *deshoo* are (e.g., "I know this" vs. "I think I know this"). Furthermore, previous studies have failed to explain cases where *yone* does not signal the speaker's uncertainty. ln order to articulate the semantic and pragmatic differences between *yone* and *deshoo*, I will take an epistemic approach to clarify their meanings and functions in constructing social interactions.

3.　Theoretical background

As argued in the previous section, the choice between *yone* and *deshoo* depends on the speaker's relationship to the information and her/his expectations of the addressee's response. In this paper, I adopt the notions of epistemic status and epistemic stance in order to explain the semantic and pragmatic differences between *deshoo* and *yone*.

Stivers *et al.* (2011: 7) claim that there are three primary dimensions of knowledge concerning epistemic asymmetry in conversation: (1) epistemic access, (2) epistemic primacy, and (3) epistemic responsibilities. Each dimension concerns different cognitive states. Epistemic access concerns knowing vs. not knowing, degree of certainty, source of knowledge, and directness of knowledge; epistemic primacy concerns relative rights to know, relative rights to claim/assert/inform, and relative authority of knowledge; and epistemic responsibility concerns one's responsibilities/obligations with respect to knowledge. Stivers *et al.* (2011: 16) conclude that "in social interactions conversationalists attend not only to who knows what, but also to who has a right to know what, who knows more about what and who is responsible for knowing what." For example, one has a right as well as an obligation to know things such as one's age, name, what one did or is doing, and how one is feeling. It is presumed that speakers assess themselves and others in terms of these issues while engaging in social interactions.

Along the same lines, Heritage (2012) argues that the epistemic statuses and stances of speakers play an important role in the construction of a social act. Epistemic status concerns the speaker's cognitive relationship to others, such as "knowing more" or "knowing less" than them. For example, one is presupposed to know more and have more of a right to know about one's own pets, jobs, relatives, friends, and hobbies. Individuals with external expertise and epistemic authority are considered more knowledgeable than amateurs. Moreover, speakers are considered more knowledgeable about recent experiences than less recent ones.

Whereas epistemic status concerns the cognitive relationship between speakers, epistemic stance concerns the "moment-by-moment" expressions of this relationship. During conversation, speakers constantly evaluate one another's epistemic access or rights to specific domains of knowledge and information, which is encoded in and displayed through various linguistic forms. For example, consider the following examples taken from Heritage (2012: 6).

(10) a. Are you married?
　　　b. You are married, aren't you?
　　　c. You're married.

As the three examples all talk about the addressee's marital status, the information is considered to be within the addressee's epistemic domain. However, Heritage argues that the epistemic stance encoded in each of the examples is quite different. Example (10a) implies the

largest incongruence between the speakers in terms of knowledge, while (10c) expresses the least incongruence. Example (10b) falls somewhere between (10a) and (10c). Example (10a) signifies that the speaker is taking an "unknowing" epistemic stance; examples (10b) and (10c) display the speaker's "increasing commitment to the likelihood" of the information, with (10c) implying "more knowing" than (10b). Heritage argues that, as a principle, a speaker's epistemic stance normally corresponds to her/his epistemic status relative to the topic and the recipient (e.g., "unknowing" speakers ask questions while "knowing" speakers make assertions). Based on previous studies (e.g., Raymond 2010, Stivers 2010), Heritage states that "more knowing" formats such as examples (10b) and (10c) tend to be used when the speaker tries to confirm or reconfirm the information.

These observations by Stivers *et al.* (2011) and Heritage (2011, 2012) are useful for describing the semantic differences between *yone* and *deshoo*, which can be summarized as follows.

1) *Deshoo* is used to express the speaker's epistemic stance with respect to the interlocutor's responsibilities to know. The use of *deshoo* concerns the speaker's assessment about the interlocutor's epistemic state rather than the relative epistemic states of the speaker and the hearer. The speaker presumes that the interlocutor should know the information. Through the use of *deshoo*, the speaker seeks to confirm or reconfirm her/his assessment.

2) *Yone* concerns the speaker's assessment about the relative epistemic states of the speaker and the interlocutor. The particle has two types of meaning. Type 1 presupposes some epistemic incongruence between the speakers, implying the speaker's uncertainty over her/his assessment about the likelihood of the information as well as the interlocutor's epistemic state. Type 2 is used to signify the speaker's claim for equal epistemic primacy, wherein the speaker presupposes that she/he has an equal depth of knowledge of the information and hence equal rights to tell or assert the information.

While previous studies on *yone* and *deshoo* have focused on their semantic characterizations, they have not examined the role that these expressions play in naturally occurring conversations in various sociocultural settings. In the following section, I will analyze natural conversations taken from the BTSJ - Japanese Conversation Corpus to demonstrate how *yone* and *deshoo* are used in constructing social interactions.

4. Analysis of *deshoo* and *yone*
4.1 Data
The study examines 17 pairs of natural conversations in different social contexts obtained from the BTSJ - Japanese Conversation Corpus (Usami 2011). I have chosen interactions from four different situations, paying special attention to the relationship between speakers (social status, gender) and formality (formal or casual). The four interactions under consideration are 1) a thesis consultation between a student and a thesis advisor, 2) a discussion between friends, 3) a chat between friends, and 4) a first meeting. Table 1 summarizes the number of occurrences of *yone* and *deshoo* in each type of social interaction.

Table 1: Frequencies of *yone* and *deshoo* in different situations

Situation	Conversation #[2]	*deshoo*		*yone*	
Professor (P) and student (S) thesis consultation	43	S: 0	P: 16	S: 8	P: 3
	47	S: 0	P: 5	S: 2	P: 2
	50	S: 0	P: 45	S: 2	P: 41
	52	S: 0	P: 8	S: 18	P: 21
Discussion / Female (F) and male (M) speaker / Friends	234	F: 9	M: 17	F: 15	M: 15
	236	F: 2	M: 1	F: 18	M: 1
	237	F: 3	M: 2	F: 10	M: 13
Chat / Female speakers F1 and F2 / Friends	40	F1: 11	F2: 4	F1: 9	F2: 7
	41	F1: 5	F2: 2	F1: 14	F2: 13
	42	F1: 1	F2: 0	F1: 17	F2: 18
	207	F1: 15	F2: 7	F1: 12	F2: 17
First meeting / Female speakers F1 and F2 / F1 is older than F2	23	F1: 2	F2: 0	F1: 32	F2: 7
	196	F1: 4	F2: 0	F1: 21	F2: 25
	198	F1: 3	F2: 0	F1: 23	F2: 32
First meeting / Male speakers M1 and M2 / The same age group	176	M1: 6	M2: 0	M1: 16	M2: 15
First meeting / Male speakers M1 and M2 / M1 is older than M2	206	M1: 6	M2: 0	M1: 8	M2: 9
First meeting / Female (F) and male (M) speaker / The same age group	175	F: 2	M: 0	F: 13	M: 19
Total number	**17**	**176**		**496**	

The following is a summary of the findings based on Table 1:

1) Overall, *yone* is used more frequently used than *deshoo* (specifically, 2.8 times more).
2) Compared to *yone*, *deshoo* isn't typically used at the first meeting. When it is used, there is usually an inequality between the speakers in terms of age, level of knowledge, or specialty.
3) *Deshoo* is used equally by male and female speakers if they are familiar with each other.
4) *Yone* is used equally by both speakers if they are 'unfamiliar' with each other or if there is some inequality in terms of social position or age.

4.2 *Deshoo*

4.2.1 Imposing one's judgment or opinion

Deshoo imposes the speaker's assumption about the addressee's epistemic status of "knowing or not knowing." Sentences containing *deshoo* imply speaker attitudes such as "you should know" or "you should agree," as in example (11).

---

2 Conversation number indicates the consecutive number of conversations contained in the corpus.

(11) (Student (S) is consulting professor (P) about her thesis)
    1. → P: *Un, kanoo wa kanoo dakedo, sore wa saa, kyooji-ron janai <u>desho</u>.*
    2.   S: *Janaku, janai desu.*
    3.   P: *Hai.*
    4. → P: *Taihi shiteru wake <u>desho</u>.*
    5.   S: *Hai.*
    6. → P: *Kyooji, taihi, taishoo-gengogaku ni natchau <u>desho</u>, mittsu no jidai no.*
    7.   S: *A, hai*

<div align="right">[Conversation # 43]</div>

    1. → P: Yes, it is possible, but that's not synchrony **desho.**
    2.   S: No, it's not.
    3.   P: Yes.
    4. → P: You are supposed to be comparing **desho**.
    5.   S: Yes.
    6. → P: Then it will be synchronic, contrastive, comparative linguistic, across the three periods of time **desho.**
    7.   S: Oh, yes.

In this example, only the advisor uses *desho* in order to elicit a response from his student. This use indicates the advisor's presupposition about the advisee's knowledge, such as "you should know this because it concerns your specialty." In example (12), speaker 1 (female) and speaker 2 (female) are friends; speaker 1 says she is looking for a job in her hometown, which she goes on to talk about.

(12) 1.   Sp. 1: *Demo choonai ni konbini nai kedo.*
    2.   Sp. 2: *Hee?*
    3. → Sp. 1: *Chotto <rea> <u>desho</u>?*
    4. → Sp. 2: *Sakaya toka <u>desho</u>? Jaa.*
    5.   Sp. 1: *Sakaya? Sakaya wa aruyo <chuckling>.*
    6. → Sp. 2: *Sakaya-san toka de okashi kaun <u>desho</u>?*
    7.   Sp. 1: *Sakaya de okashi wa kawanai kedo <laughing>.*
    8.   Sp. 2: *Soo <laughing>.*

<div align="right">[Conversation # 40]</div>

    1.   Sp. 1: But there is no convenience store in this town.
    2.   Sp. 2: Yeah?
    3. → Sp. 1: It's a bit unusual **desho**?
    4. → Sp. 2: There might be a liquor store, then **desho**?
    5.   Sp. 1: Liquor store? Yes, there is one <*chuckling*>.
    6. → Sp. 2: At the liquor store you buy snacks **desho**?
    7.   Sp. 1: I do not buy SNACKS at the LIQUOR store, though <*laughing*>.
    8.   Sp. 2: Okay <*laughing*>.

The *desho*-attached sentence in line 3 suggests speaker 1's attitude 'you must be thinking that places with no convenience stores are 'rare' because convenience stores can be seen everywhere in Japan.' In line 4, speaker 2 is expressing a conjecture that liquor stores serve the role of con-

venience stores in such a small place. This is a natural conclusion for speaker 2. The use of *desho* suggests that speaker 2 expects that speaker 1 will certainly agree. Since speaker 1's response in line 5 is not what speaker 2 expected, she restates her assumption more clearly in line 6. The use of *desho* in lines 3,4 and 6 show that the speaker valuates the addressee's epistemic stance with respect to possession of information or judgment.

4.2.2 Justifying one's position or action

The use of *desho* can also indicate that the speaker is trying to justify her/his position or previous action through reminding the hearer of given information. In example (13), speaker 1 (female) and speaker 2 (male) are discussing who has more of an advantage, women or men. Speaker 1 had previously stated her opinion that men have more advantages when it comes to getting a job.

(13)   1.   Sp. 1: (three seconds of silence) *Nan ka soo yuu no tte mawari, mawari da yone.*

  2.   Sp. 1: *Mawari ga saa, doo mirukatte kanji da yone.*

  3. → Sp. 1: *Datte, yappa shuukatsu de otoko no hoo ga yuuri datte mieruno wa saa, sugu ya-meru to omowarete nai kara <u>desho</u>?*

  4. → Sp. 1: *Onna wa sugu yameru to omowarete irukara <u>desho</u>.*

  5.   Sp. 2: *Yappa, sore wa sa nandaro, kodomo o umanakereba naranai kara, ne, soo yuu tokoro de sa ga dete kitchatte.*

<div align="right">[Conversation # 236]</div>

  1.   Sp. 1: (three seconds of silence) It is, after all, the people around you.

  2.   Sp. 1: It may be up to the way they perceive you.

  3. → Sp. 1: Men have the advantage in job-hunting because they are considered unlikely to quit their jobs right away **desho**.

  4. → Sp. 1: It's because they think women will quit right away **desho**.

  5.   Sp. 2: In the end, it is, well, because women are the ones who give birth, so, in that sense, an inequality may arise.

The *desho*-attached sentence in line 3 functions to justify the speaker's opinion that "men have more advantages than women" by directing the hearer to a view that is commonly held in Japan, that men do not quit their jobs lightly. In line 4, speaker 1 refers to another commonly held view, that "women quit their jobs lightly." Her point is that men get jobs more easily based on these commonly held beliefs. The *desho*-attached sentences in lines 3 and 4 indicate that the speaker expects the hearer to have knowledge of these views, functioning to justify the speaker's previous assertion.

Deshoo is also used as a response to reconfirm the speaker's position or opinion, implying attitudes such as "see, I told you so" or "you should have known this." In the following example, speaker 2 (female) told speaker 1 (male) that, when she was in elementary and junior high school, she felt lucky to be a woman because the distance in the marathon competition is shorter for girls.

(14)   1.   Sp. 1: *A, demo ne, urayamashii to omotta koto aru ne.*

  2.   Sp. 2: *Un.*

  3.   Sp. 1: *Datte, doo kangaetemo, 5 kiro to 3 kiro dattara ne, 3 kiro no hoo ga ii yone.*

  4. → Sp. 2: *<u>Deshoo</u>?*

5.　　Sp. 1: *Nn…*

[Conversation # 234]

1.　　Sp. 1: Ah, but I used to feel envious of that.
2.　　Sp. 2: Yes.
3.　　Sp. 1: Because, no matter how you think of it, when comparing 5 km with 3 km, 3 km is better.
4. →　Sp. 2: **Deshoo**?
5.　　Sp. 1: Yeah...

Speaker 1 says that he was once envious of girls because they ran shorter distances than boys in gym class, which matches what speaker 2 stated previously, so the use of *deshoo* in line 4 functions to justify her position by expressing the attitude of "see, I told you so."

4.3 *Yone*

In contrast to the unilateral nature of *deshoo*, *yone* suggests a bilateral relationship between speakers. When *yone* is used, the speaker invites the hearer to make a decision or judgment. For example, *yone* can be used where the speaker is not quite sure of the information and seeks confirmation.

4.3.1 Inviting the addressee to make a decision or judgment

Consider example (15), where P is the thesis advisor and S is the advisee.

(15) 1.　　P: *Hai, sorekara, ano soko kara nani ga dete kisoo desuka, rironteki ni, moshi soo yuu kijutsu o yatta to shite.*
　　2. →　S: *Soo suru to, yappari, sono, gogakuteki na men desu yone.*
　　3.　　S: *Sono... Ano gairaigo no bunpooteki na koto da toka, koozoo da toka koo yuu, maa, bunpooteki na men deshoo nee.*
　　4.　　P: *Un, de, sore wa ima made wakatte nakatta koto nan desu ka?*

[Conversation # 43]

1.　　P: Yes, then, what could arise out of it, hypothetically, if you described in that way?
2. →　S: In that case, hmm, I assume it would be the linguistic aspect **yone**.
3.　　S: Well, (Hmm), like the grammatical part of loan words, or the structure, or something like, this aspect of grammar, I guess.
4.　　P: Yes, and is that what has not yet been discovered?

In line 2, the student expresses what she thinks while seeking agreement from the advisor. In seeking confirmation from the advisor, it can be said that the student is inviting him to join in making a decision. *Deshoo* would be inappropriate here as a response to someone socially superior because that would communicate an attitude of "you should know this." Examples (16) and (17) also show this function of *yone*. In (16) the student seeks agreement with or confirmation of his judgment.

(16) 1.　　P: *De, maa nerai toshite wa yosasoo nan desu kedo, ano, motto tsumeru hitsuyoo ga aru.*
　　2.　　S: *Soo desu ne.*
　　3. →　S: *De, ano yahari sono docchi ni shitemo, ima aru bubun mo mochiron ikashite itta hoo ga ii tte yuu koto desu yone.*

4. P: *Soo desu ne.*
5. → S: *Yappari ima aru ryuukooka no tokoro kara shuppatsu shite miruno ga ii desu <u>yone</u>.*
6. P: *Hai.*

[Conversation #43]

1. P: And, the intention might be good, but we need to elaborate on it.
2. S: You're right.
3. → S: Then, regardless, it is of course better to make the best of what we have now **yone**.
4. P: Yes.
5. → S: I think it is good to start from the popular songs that are on hand now **yone**.
6. P: Yes.

In (17), speakers A and B have met for the first time. B currently teaches in China, and A has never lived in China. B is older than A. This example indicates that there is a discrepancy between A and B in access to information.

(17) 1. → A: *E, mukoo e itchattara, mukoo no okyuuryoo de seikatsu surun' desu <u>yone</u>.*
2. B: *Soo da ne… Genchi saiyoo ni naru kara ne…*
3. A: *Uun.*
4. B: *Uun.*
5. A: *Sore mo taihen da na.*

[Conversation # 198]

1. → A: If you go there, you will live with a salary by their standards **yone**?
2. B: Yeah, because I would be a local employee.
3. A: Hmm.
4. B: Hmm.
5. A: That's tough.

In line 1, A seeks B's confirmation of what she believes, which is that "you need to live with a salary based on the Chinese standard." The use of *yone* suggests that A is not sure of her belief because she does not have sufficient information, and she presupposes B may know better, so she invites B to make a judgment. Examples (16) and (17) show that *yone* is used when the speaker lacks sufficient knowledge or information, and therefore lacks the right to assert it.

4.3.2 Sharing experiences and expressing emotional involvement

Another function of *yone* is to signal the speaker's support or empathetic attitude. This function is based on shared experiences, thoughts, perceptions, or judgments between the speakers; in other words, the speaker claims that she/he has equal access to the information as the hearer. This affective involvement of the speakers stands out in example (18), where speakers 1 and 2 have met for the first time, both having studied Chinese, and are talking about their experiences in China.

(18) 1. Sp. 1: *Yappari, maa, chikai kara tteyuu no mo aru to omoimasu kedo ne.*
2. Sp. 2: *Uun.*
3. Sp. 2: *Ookii-shi ne.*
4. → Sp. 1: *Soo desu <u>yone</u> <laughing>.*
5. → Sp. 2: *<laughing> Honto hiroi <u>yone</u>.*

6.   Sp. 1: *Moo nee, nanka, nandemo kangaekata demo kibo ga ookii kara, "Ee?" mitaina koto ga.*

7. → Sp. 2: *Soo soo, yappari nanka koo sodatta kankyoo tte okkii <u>yone</u>.*

8.   Sp. 1: *Kangaekata ga moo hontooni, sore gurai taishita koto nai toka iwarete, iya, taishita koto aru toka itchau.*

9.   Sp. 2: *Hontoo* XXXXXXX (in Chinese) *toka iware chau mon ne.*

10. → Sp. 1: *Hontoo,* YYYYYYY (in Chinese) *toka tte iitaku narun' desu <u>yone</u>.*

11. → Sp. 2: *Hontooni ano kishitsu wa sugoi <u>yone</u>.*

12.   Sp. 1: ########³ *nanka <laughing>.*

13. → Sp. 2: *Soo da <u>yone</u> <laughing>.*

14. → Sp. 1: *Sonna kanji desu <u>yone</u>.*

15.   Sp. 2: *Chuugoku no hanashi de moriagatchatta kedo <laughing>.*

16.   Sp. 2: *Sonna no mo atte.*

17.   Sp. 1: *Hai.*

18.   Sp. 2: *Un, arigatoo gozaimashita.*

[Conversation # 196]

1.   Sp. 1: I think it is partly because we are so close, after all.

2.   Sp. 2: Hmm.

3.   Sp. 2: It's big too.

4. → Sp. 1: It is **yone** *<laughing>*.

5. → Sp. 2: *<laughing>* It's really large **yone**.

6.   Sp. 1: You know, whatever they are thinking is always on a large scale, so it's like, "whaaat?"

7. → Sp. 2: I know, the environment where you are brought up matters a lot **yone**.

8.   Sp. 1: The way of thinking, for sure…Some say "Oh, that's not a big deal," but I tell them, "Oh, but it IS a big deal."

9.   Sp. 2: Seriously, I'm told things like XXXXXXX.

10. → Sp. 1: Indeed, it makes me want to say YYYYYYY **yone**.

11. → Sp. 2: That disposition is really something **yone**.

12.   Sp. 1: like ######## *<laughing>*.

13. → Sp. 2: Yeah, it is **yone** *<laughing>*.

14. → Sp. 1: It seems that way **yone**.

15.   Sp. 2: We got excited talking about China *<laughing>*.

16.   Sp. 2: We did have such an experience.

17.   Sp. 1: Yes.

18.   Sp. 2: Yeah, thank you very much.

In this example, *yone* is used 7 times in total, 3 times by speaker 1 and 4 times by speaker 2. They are talking about China and Chinese people based on their own first-hand experiences. In this sense, both speakers are in a position to claim epistemic primacy. During the conversation, not much new information is exchanged. The speakers are basically sharing their feelings by agreeing with each other, repeating, restating, or elaborating on the information. In line 4, *yone* indicates that speaker 1 is expressing her agreement with speaker 2's statement that "China is a big country." In line 5, speaker 2 restates what she said in line 3, that "China is large." The use of

---

³ ######## means this part was not audible.

yone in this restatement marks the speaker's involvement with the matter, which is intensified by the use of *honto* 'really' in line 5. In line 7, speaker 2 elaborates on what speaker 1 said in line 6, that "Chinese people think on a large scale." The use of *yone* is indicative of speaker 2's support of speaker 1. Their agreement also manifests in lines 9 and 10, when the speakers describe their feelings by using Chinese expressions. Their feelings are shared in lines 13 and 14 once again: *soo da yone* 'yeah, it is' in line 13 marks speaker 2's agreement, and speaker 1 basically repeats speaker 2's response by slightly restating it in line 14. As speaker 2's comment in line 15 *moriagatchatta* 'we got excited talking' suggests, the use of *yone* in example (18) indicates the speakers' empathy towards each other. The speakers express their affective attitudes through claiming equal epistemic primacy of "I have an equal right to say this."

When agreeing with a statement, *yone* is often used in the form of *desu yone* or *da yone* in a response turn. Consider example (19), where speakers 1 and 2 are both foreign language teachers.

(19) 1.　　Sp. 1: *Mata iroiro nanka koo, tsunagaru tokoro wa watashi aru to omoun' desu yone.*
　　2.　　Sp. 2: *Uun.*
　　3.　　Sp. 1: *Un*
　　4. →　Sp. 2: *Desu <u>yone</u>.*
　　5.　　Sp. 1: *Ne.*
　　6.　　Sp. 2: *Nanka, sugoi, ii ohanashi o kikasete itadaite.*
　　7.　　Sp. 1: *Iya, watashi no hoo koso, nanka, igai na tokoro de,*
　　8. →　Sp. 2: *Desu <u>yone</u>.*
　　9.　　Sp. 1: *Setten ga arimashita yone <laughing>.*
　10.　　Sp. 2: *Uun.*

[Conversation # 196]

　　1.　　Sp. 1: I think there can be, like, many kinds of ties, I guess yone.
　　2.　　Sp. 2: Hmm...
　　3.　　Sp. 1: Yes.
　　4. →　Sp. 2: It's true **yone**.
　　5.　　Sp. 1: Right.
　　6.　　Sp. 2: You know, thank you for the good story.
　　7.　　Sp. 1: No, it is like unexpectedly…
　　8. →　Sp. 2: Yeah **yone**.
　　9.　　Sp. 1: We had something in common yone *<laughing>*.
　10.　　Sp. 2: Hmm.

In this example, the independent use of *desu yone* in lines 4 and 8 functions to signal the speakers' shared or equal sentiment, which contributes to creating an empathetic relationship between the speakers.

5. Conclusion

This paper investigates the differences in the meanings of *yone* and *deshoo*, focusing on their roles in constructing social interactions. The following points were discussed:

1.　　There are clearly epistemic differences between *yone* and *deshoo* in constructing social interactions.

2. *Yone* is used to express one's empathy through claiming equal or shared epistemic primacy. This use of *yone* contributes to creating empathy between the speakers.

3. *Yone* is also used to elicit the interlocutor's confirmation or agreement when some epistemic inequality is presupposed to exist between the speaker and the hearer due to insufficient evidence, knowledge, memory, etc. In social interactions where social inequality is implied (e.g., seniority, social status, gender), this use of *yone* may be strategically used to make an assertion or express an assessment less assertively (especially in formal situations).

4. *Deshoo* is used to display the speaker's position concerning the interlocutor's epistemic state ("knowing" or "not knowing"); *deshoo* exhibits the speaker's assumption that the interlocutor already has knowledge of the information.

This paper explains how the use of these expressions may affect the interaction between speakers. A better understanding of their meanings will also be useful for Japanese language learners in interacting with Japanese speakers. In this paper, I examined how epistemic status works in four social contexts, and it may be useful for future studies to investigate the role of *yone* and *deshoo* in other contexts (e.g., group discussions with more than 2 speakers, variety of topics, native speakers vs. non-native speakers).

References

Asano, Yuko (2008) Semantic analysis of tag questions in Japanese: *Deshoo* and *janai ka*. *Selected papers from the 2007 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, 1–14.

Asano-Cavanagh, Yuko (2011) An analysis of three Japanese tags, *ne*, *yone*, and *daroo*. *Pragmatics & Cognition* 19(3): 448–475. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cook, Haruko M. (1990) The sentence-final particle *ne* as a tool for cooperation in Japanese conversation. In: Hajime Hoji (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 1, 29–44. Stanford: CSLI.

蓮沼昭子（1992）「終助詞の複合形「よね」の用法と機能」筑波大学つくば言語文化フォーラム（編）『対照研究　第二号：発話マーカーについて』63–77．つくば：筑波大学つくば言語文化フォーラム．

蓮沼昭子（1995）「対話における確認行為「だろう」「じゃないか」「よね」の確認用法」仁田義雄（編）『複文の研究（下）』389–419．東京：くろしお出版．

Hayano, Kaoru (2011) Claiming epistemic primacy: *Yo*-marked assessments in Japanese. In: Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.) (2011), 58–81.

Hayashi, Makoto (2010) An overview of the question-response system in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2685–2702.

Heritage, John (2011) Territories of knowledge, territories of experience: Emphatic moments in interaction. In: Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.) (2011), 159–183.

Heritage, John (2012) Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(1): 1–29.

伊豆原英子（1993）「終助詞「よ」「よね」「ね」の総合的考察─「よね」のコミュニケーション機能の考察を軸に─」『名古屋大学日本語・日本文化論集』1: 21–34．名古屋大学留学センター．

伊豆原英子（2003）「終助詞「よ」「よね」「ね」の再考」『愛知学院大学教養部紀要』51(2): 1–15．

Lee, Duck-Young (2007) Involvement and Japanese interactive particles 'ne' and 'yo'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 363–388.

McGloin, Naomi H. and Jun Xu (2014) An analysis of the functions of the sentence-final particle *yone* in natural conversation. A paper presented at American Association of Teachers of Japanese Conference in Philadelphia, PA.

三宅知宏（2010）「「推量」と「確認要求」─"ダロウ"をめぐって」『鶴見大学紀要 第一部 日本語・日本文学編』47: 9–55．

宮崎和人（2000）「確認要求の体系性」『日本語教育』106: 7–16．日本語教育学会．

Morita, Emi (2002) Stance marking in the collaborative completion of sentences: Final particles as epis-

temic markers in Japanese. In: Noriko Akatsuka and Susan Strauss (eds.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10, 220–233. Stanford: CSLI.

Morita, Emi (2005) *Negotiation of contingent talk: The Japanese interactional particles ne and sa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Morita, Emi (2008) Highlighted moves within an action: Segmented talk in Japanese conversation. *Discourse Studies* 10(41): 513–537.

森山卓郎（1992）「日本語における「推量」をめぐって」『言語研究』101: 64–83.

Ogi, Naomi (2017) *Involvement and attitude in Japanese discourse interactive markers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

大曽美恵子（2005）「終助詞「よ」「ね」「よね」再考―雑談コーパスに基づく考察」鎌田修・筒井通雄・畑佐由紀子・ナズキアン富美子・岡まゆみ（編）『言語教育の新展開』3–15．東京：ひつじ書房．

Raymond, Geoffrey (2010) Grammar and social relations: Alternative forms of yes/no-type initiating actions in health visitor interactions. In: Alice F. Freed & Susan Ehrlich (eds.) *"Why do you ask?": The function of questions in institutional discourse*, 87–107. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stivers, Tanya (2010) An overview of the question-response system in American English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2772–2781.

Stivers, Tanya, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (2011) Knowledge, morality and affiliation in social interaction. In: Tanya Stivers, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.) (2011), 3–26.

Stivers, Tanya, Lorenza Mondada & Jakob Steensig (eds.) (2011) *The morality of knowledge in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takubo, Yukinori and Satoshi Kinsui (1997) Discourse management in terms of mental spaces. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 741–758.

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

宇佐美まゆみ（1997）「「ね」のコミュニケーション機能とディスコース・ポライトネス」『女性のことば・職場編』241–268．東京：ひつじ書房．

Wierzbicka, Anna (1996) *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna (2006) *The English language: Meaning and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

張　惠芳（2009）「自然会話における「ヨネ」の意味類型と表現機能」『言語学論叢』オンライン版 2: 17–32. http://www.lingua.tsukuba.ac.jp/ippan/TWPL0/TWPL02_28/2_zhang.pdf

Data Sources

宇佐美まゆみ監修（2011）「BTSJ による日本語話し言葉コーパス（2011 年版）」『人間の相互作用研究のための多言語会話コーパスの構築とその語用論的分析方法の開発』平成 20–22 年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 B（課題番号 20320072）研究成果.

Usami, Mayumi (2011) *BTSJ ni yoru Nihongo-hanashikotoba Koopasu (2011-nen ban). Ningen no soogo-sayoo kenkyuu no tame no tagengo-kaiwa koopasu no koochiku to sono goyooronteki bunseki hoohoo no kaihatsu*. Heisei 20–22-nendo kagaku kenkyuu-hi hojokin kibankenkyuu B (20320072) kenkyuu-seika. [The Corpus of Japanese Spoken Language by 'Basic Transcription System for Japanese (2011 edition). The project entitled *"Development of the Corpus of Multi-language Conversations for the Study of Human Interactions, and Construction of Pragmatic Analysis of the Corpus"* funded by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (no. 20320072), directed by Mayumi Usami.]

* In this paper, we refer this corpus as 'the BTSJ - Japanese Conversation Corpus (Usami 2011).'

「よね」と「でしょう」のディスコース機能について
——認識的，心的観点から——

ナズキアン富美子

ニューヨーク・コロンビア大／国立国語研究所 共同研究員

要旨

　日本語話者が頻繁に相手に同意・確認を求めたり表明したりしながらインターアクションを行うことは多くの研究で指摘されている。同意・確認表明はインターアクションにおいて引き込みを促す機能であるが，そのメカニズは十分に解明されているとは言えない。本研究では文末に使用される「よね」と「でしょう」に焦点を当て，認識的観点から両者の意味的違いを分析し，さらにその違いが実際の自然会話におけるインターアクション遂行における両者の使い分けとどのように関係しているか調べた。『BTSJ による日本語話し言葉コーパス（トランスクリプト・音声）2011 年版』（宇佐美 2011）から 17 ペアの会話を調べたところ，次の結論が得られた。「でしょう」は相手の知識所有とその所有に関する責任に対する話者の認識的スタンスを表すのに対して，「よね」はインターアクションの相手との間に認識的差を認識し，相手に情報を確認する場合と，情報の所有に関する権利の共有を主張する場合に使われることがわかった。本研究では，このような話者の認識的スタンスの違いが，実際のインターアクションにおいて共感を表す（「よね」），話者の立場や言語行為を正当化する（「でしょう」）という機能の違いをもたらすこと，さらに，「よね」と「でしょう」の社会・文化的制約の違いにつながることを示唆した。

キーワード：「よね」，「でしょう」，認識的態度，心的態度，自然会話