Book of Abstracts

The Meiji International Symposium 2017

New Directions in Pragmatic Research:

Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives

13:00-19:00, 20 March, 2017

At 6F, Room 602, Nakano Campus,

Meiji University

Sponsored by

Headquarters of International Collaboration, Meiji University, and

the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS)

MEIJI UNIVERSITY

日本学術振興会
Japan Society for the Promotion of Science

Plenary Speaker 1

Historical (Im)Politeness – Why to Study?

Daniel Z. Kádár

University of Huddersfield

Studying historical politeness and impoliteness occurs as an "exotic" academic attempt to many. If one goes to a pragmatics/politeness conference with a paper on this topic, (s)he will soon find that colleagues expect such a study to have little relevance to "up-to-date" research areas, such as research on the features of (im)politeness in naturally occurring face-to-face interaction. But is this really the case? In the present paper I will argue that historical (im)politeness research has a lot to offer for the expert of modern data, and that perhaps no account can be complete without some form of historical thinking. Since this keynote lecture aims to provide a state of the art overview of the field, instead of limiting itself into the analysis of a particular phenomenon, I attempt to overview historical (im)politeness by inquiring into various interrelated topics, which count as very accurate in the field, and through the study of which historical research is capable to make fundamental contributions to politeness research and pragmatics.

1. Historicity and the moral order

Recently politeness researchers have argued that one can only model the operation of (im)politeness by examining the moral order (or the cluster of moral orders) that underlie the interactants' valenced evaluative moments (see Kádár and Haugh 2013). That is, people usually not evaluate an utterance, a set of utterances, or interactional behaviour in a broader sense in arbitrary ways, but rather evaluations are influenced by contextually-situated perceptions of how things should unfold – this is what is often referred to in the field as the moral order of things (or moral orders in plural, as there may be a discrepancy between what interactants regard as the appropriate order of things). While the concept of moral order is becoming increasingly important in the field, we know very little about how moral orders come into existence, that is, the historicity of moral orders. I believe that historical (im)politeness research has a huge potential to help us modelling the birth and life cycle of moral orders (see more in Kádár 2017).

2. Intercultural v. historical

Intercultural and historical politeness research have a lot in common because both of these areas help us to understand the production and evaluation (Eelen 2001) of (im)politeness in (spatially or temporarily) distant cultures. But there is an interesting question that few scholars have touched on, namely: can intercultural and historical politeness research be merged? Even more importantly, are there cases when these areas *have to be* merged? I will point out that the development of certain interactional phenomena can only be understood through a dual intercultural and historical inquiry.

3. Reconstruction

"Historical" tends to be understood as diachronically distant – say, talking about politeness in ancient Egypt and the Heian Period in Japan counts as 'mainstream' historical research. But the question emerges: how can one limit the boundaries of historical research. I will argue that no such a limitation is necessary because we are very often engaged in historical research when we analyse certain present-day datatypes such as narratives. This is because the examination of such datatypes requires the analyst to reconstruct the context of the interaction in the manner of a historian, and also because certain difficulties that the analysis of historical data triggers also emerge in the analysis of such datatypes.

References

Eelen, G. 2001. *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Kádár, D. and M. Haugh. 2013. *Understanding Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kádár, D. 2017. *Politeness, Impoliteness and Ritual: Maintaining the Moral Order in Interpersonal Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plenary Speaker 2

Periphery and Prosody as Determinants of Discourse Marker Functions: A Case in Korean

Seongha Rhee

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

This paper addresses the issues of discourse markers (DMs) with respect to periphery (i.e., non-argument positions) and prosody to identify the extent of their influence on DM functions, focusing on two polyfunctional DMs, i.e., *mwe* (lit. 'what') and *kulssey* (lit. 'at it being so') in Korean.

Recent studies of DMs have shown that their functions are sensitive to their location (Left- and Right-Periphery; LP/RP) as well as their prosodic features. For instance, a large body of literature addresses functional asymmetries at LP and RP (notably Adamson 2000; works in *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 17.2, 2016). In particular, LP is hypothesized to carry the turn- or topic-management functions as well as dialogual and subjective functions, whereas RP is thought to have turn-management functions as well as dialogic and intersubjective functions. There are also an increasing number of studies that address prosody of DMs (Song 2013; Kim and Sohn 2015).

This paper begins with a historical exploration of the development of the two DMs. The DM *mwe* emerged from the interrogative pronoun *mwe* 'what' in a rhetorical context. A diachronic investigation reveals that it shifted from its original argument position to non-argument positions including LP, and then later to RP. At LP, it carries such functions as

marking challenge/surprise, perspective shift, elaboration, disparaging/deprecating attitude, submission/resignation, pause-filling, hesitation, etc. On the other hand, at RP, it carries the functions of marking common-ground, disparaging/deprecating attitude, mitigation, etc. Furthermore, such functions as challenge, surprise, common-ground, etc. tend to occur in LH rising intonation contours, whereas others, such as disparaging/deprecating, tentative example, mitigation, etc. are realized with L flat intonation contours. Pause-filling and hesitation, as expected, are typically uttered with a slow, stretched vocalization.

The DM *kulssey* emerged from a construction *kuleha-l-ssay(-ey)* 'at the time (it) being so'. Largely occurring at LP, it carries diverse functions such as hesitation, mitigation, emphatic negation (and irritation), agreement, etc. When it occurs at RP, it almost invariably marks the emphatic negation (and irritation). In terms of prosody, hesitation and mitigation are typically associated with HL contours, whereas emphatic negation and agreement are realized with a H pitch. The function of softening illocutionary forces is also associated with a slow, stretched vocalization.

From analyses with respect to (inter)subjectification, and exchange and action structures (Schiffrin 1987), this paper argues that even though peripheries are associated with (inter)subjectivity, the hypothesized correlation between LP versus RP and subjectivity versus intersubjectivity (Beeching and Detges 2014) is not supported. Nor is the hypothesis supported that subjectified linguistic elements will shift their positions leftward in OV languages (Traugott 2010). It is argued here that there is an intricate interaction between periphery and prosody, and that, despite the strong influence of the LP/RP positions, the functions of DMs are often more strongly correlated with their prosodic features.

References

Adamson, S. 2000. A Lovely Little Example: Word Order Options and Category Shift in the Premodifying String. In O. Fischer, A. Rosenbach and D. Stein (eds.), *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, 39–66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Beeching, K. and U. Detges. 2014. Introduction. In K. Beeching and U. Detges (eds.), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*, 1–23. Leiden: Brill.

Kim, Stephanie H. and S.-O. Sohn. 2015. Grammar as an Emergent Response to Interactional Needs: A Study of Final *kuntey* 'but' in Korean Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 83: 73–90.

Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Song, I. 2013. Functions and Prosodic Features of Discourse Marker 'mweo'. *Korean Linguistics* 58: 83–106.

Traugott, E. C. 2010. (Inter)subjectivity and (Inter)subjectification: A Reassessment. In K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte and H. Cuyckens (eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, 29–71. Berlin: Mouton.

The Clause-Initial Use of Complex Connectives in Japanese:
The Case of *da-to-shite-mo* 'even though/if'

Yuko Higashiizumi
Tokyo Gakugei University

This study discusses the recent use of the complex connective *da-to-shite-mo* as a clause/utterance-initial pragmatic marker of concession in present-day Japanese, as in example (1).

(1) "*Yappari o-ai-shita-koto-ga arimasu-wa.*"
surely POL-saw- NOML-NOM exist-FP
"*Da-to-shite-mo, watashi-wa oboete-imasen.*"
DA-TO-SHITE-MO I-TOP remember-not
'Surely, (I) met you (before).' 'Even though (you say so), I don't remember.'
(2005, *BCCWJ*, LBt9_00183)

The complex connective *da-to-shite-mo* consists of "*da* (copula) + *to* (particle, or the infinitive form of the older copula *tari*) + *shite* (the conjunctive form of the verb *suru* 'do') + *mo* (focus particle)". It is typically used with an adverb meaning "hypothetically" and attached to a finite clause without the initial copula and functions as the clause-final connective, meaning 'even though/if', as in example (2).

(2) *Tatoe/Karini/Moshi tenchi-ga hikkurikaetta-to-shite-mo*
hypothetically/hypothetically/if heaven.earth-NOM turn.over-*to-shite-mo*
watashi-no kangae-wa kawari-masen.
I-of thought-TOP change-not
'Even if the heaven and earth turns over, my thought will not be changed.'
(Adapted from the *Digital Daijisen* dictionary)

The copula *da* is used when the connective attaches to a nominal. The new use as in (1) appears to have developed from the more complex connective with the anaphor *soo* 'so, that', as in example (3).

(3) "*Anokotachi, isshoni kurashiteiru-wake-ja-nai-n-yo.*"
they together live-NOML-COP.TOP-not-NOML-FP
"*Soo-da-to-shite-mo, kusuri-toka nan-toka, Shogokun-ga*
SOO-DA-TO-SHITE-MO medicine-or something-or *Shogokun*-NOM
yooi-shite-kureteru-yo."
prepare-do-give-FP
'(It) is not that they live together.' 'Even though (it is) so, *Shogokun* prepares medicine

or something (for her).' (2002, *BCCWJ*, PM21_00200)

I will illustrate that the more complex connective with an anaphor as in (3) is a precursor of the clause/utterance-initial pragmatic marker. I will suggest that the connective under investigation is taking one of the regular paths already taken by some other clause/utterance-initial pragmatic markers such as *dakedo* 'but', *demo* 'but', *datte* 'because', and *dakara* 'so' (e.g. Matsumoto 1988; Onodera 2014 and elsewhere).

References

Matsumoto, Y. 1988. From Bound Grammatical Markers to Free Discourse Markers: History of Some Japanese Connectives. In S. Axmaker, A. Jaisser and H. Singmaster (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, February 13–15, 1988. General Session and Parasession on Grammaticalization (1988)*, 340–351.

Onodera, N. O. 2014. Setting Up a Mental Space: A Function of Discourse Markers at the Left Periphery (LP) and Some Observations about LP and RP in Japanese. In K. Beeching and U. Detges (eds.), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*, 92–116. Leiden: Brill.

Corpus

BCCWJ=*the Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese*.

Concessive Constructions and the Development of Discourse Management Function: The Case of *having said that*

Hiroshi Ohashi

Kyushu University

Semantic change from concession, which was once regarded as "a dead end street for interpretative augmentation" (König 1985), has recently drawn growing interest, as exemplified by studies like Tabor and Traugott (1998), Hilpert (2013), and Narrog (2014). The development of a new function from concessive constructions provides an interesting research question for whether the "structural scope expansion" discussed in Tabor and Traugott (1998) and Hilpert (2013) is observed in general and if so, what motivates it.

This paper examines the emerging discourse management function of topic shift marking in the English concessive construction *having said that*. *Having said that* is "used to say that something is true in spite of what you have just said" (LDOCE[5]), as in the example (1):

(1) The diet can make you slim without exercise. *Having said that*, however, exercise is important too.

Interestingly, in examples like the following, the main clause does not serve to convey concessive meaning:

(2) But the bottom line is, if you want to be a better driver, you must practice with your driver. *Having said that*, what if you hit so many balls with your driver that it became as comfortable to you as a 6-iron? (COCA)
(3) SONYA OK. *Having said that*, let me just stop you. (COCA)

Instead of expressing an opposing statement to what he has just said, the speaker of (2) is shifting the topic by adding a new assumption to the current discourse. In (3), *that* refers to the addressee's, not the speaker's, utterance and the speaker is suggesting to leave the current topic.

This paper explores the development of this discourse-pragmatic function of topic shift by examining corpus examples, especially focusing on varying degrees of opposition expressed by the main clause of this construction.

References

Hilpert, M. 2013. *Constructional Changes in English: Developments in Allomorphy, Word Formation, and Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

König, E. 1985. On the History of Concessive Connectives in English: Diachronic and Synchronic Evidence. *Lingua* 66: 1–19.

Narrog, H. 2014. Beyond Intersubjectification: Textual Uses of Modality and Mood in Subordinate Clauses as Part of Speech-Act Orientation. In L. Brems, L. Ghesquière and F. Van de Velde (eds.), *Intersubjectivity and Intersubjectification in Grammar and Discourse*, 29–51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tabor, W. and E. C. Traugott. 1998. Structural Scope Expansion and Grammaticalization. In A. G. Ramat and P. J. Hopper (eds.), *The Limits of Grammaticalization*, 229–272. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Corpus and Dictionary

COCA=*the Corpus of Contemporary American English 1990–2015*.

LDOCE=Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 5th ed., 2009. Harlow: Pearson Educational Limited.

Development of Pragmatic Routines in a Study Abroad Context

Naoko Osuka
Meiji University

The importance of formulaic language in second language acquisition has been argued by many researchers (e.g. Schmitt 2004; Wray 2008). It has also been pointed out that the

acquisition of formulaic language is closely related to pragmatic competence (Wood 2010). Formulaic language in pragmatics is called by different names. This study calls it pragmatic routines and investigated how Japanese learners of English change their use of pragmatic routines through their study abroad experiences. It also examined the factors that help or hinder their mastery of pragmatic routines.

While some previous studies have supported a common assumption that learners may gain advantages from study abroad experience, others have reported that even in a study abroad context learners acquire pragmatic routines at a later stage. These studies mainly focused on the comprehension of routines in a cross-sectional design.

This study focused on the productive aspect of learners' development of pragmatic routines in a longitudinal design. 22 Japanese college students who studied in the U.S. for one semester participated in this study, along with 22 native speakers of English as a baseline data and 20 Japanese college students who studied in Japan as a control data. A multimedia elicitation task (MET), which was developed by the researcher, was used to elicit oral data.

The results showed that although the students with study abroad experience showed a high dependence on particular pragmatic routines, they newly acquired only a few routines. Follow-up interviews and further data analysis indicated that syntactical complexity, a lack of equivalent expressions in L1, dependence on familiar expressions, sociopragmatic dissonance as well as a lack of sufficient input could be the factors that hinder their acquisition of pragmatic routines.

References

Schmitt, N. 2004. *Formulaic Sequences: Acquisition, Processing and Use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wood, D. 2010. *Formulaic Language and Second Language Speech Fluency: Background, Evidence and Classroom Applications*. London: Continuum.

Wray, A. 2008. *Formulaic Language: Pushing the Boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

On the Rate of Language Change at the Edge of Clause: English WH-Cleft Constructions at Left and Right Peripheries

Reijirou Shibasaki

Meiji University

This paper examines WH-cleft constructions at either left or right periphery (LP and RP, henceforth) of main clausal information in Late Modern through Present-day English, with a special focus on those with verbs of saying, e.g. *what I'm saying*. While the LP use of WH-clefts as in (1) has been studied in a variety of research fields (e.g. Collins 1991, 2006;

Hopper and Thompson 2008; Patten 2012; Guz 2015), the RP use of WH-clefts as in (2) remains unexplored.

(1) BOB-BECKEL-FOX-NE: …And what Obama is saying is "I make a lot of money…"
(2011 *Fox_Five*, SPOK, COCA)

(2) EDWARDS: "So there's an ethic there, is what I'm saying."
(2001 *NPR_Morning*, SPOK, COCA)

The WH-cleft construction can either precede or follow the main clausal information, showing a mirror-image discourse-syntactic structure, i.e. *What X is Ying is, CLAUSE* as in (1) and *CLAUSE, is what X is Ying* as in (2) (cf. Norén and Linell 2013; Du Bois 2003). However, the rate of language change is not the same. According to some corpus surveys, the LP use of the WH-clefts can be found in the mid-nineteenth century, increasing from the early twentieth century onward, while the RP use seems to be established in the past three decades or so albeit with some exceptional cases earlier in the twentieth century. Furthermore, the WH-cleft at LP has started to take on a quoting function as in (1): the main clausal information is treated as a 'direct quote' as enclosed in double quotes. On the other hand, the WH-cleft at RP has yet to develop such a quoting function. In a nutshell, LP and RP are discourse-syntactic positions that facilitate language change and constructional developments (e.g. Beeching and Detges 2014; Traugott 2015), but the rate of change as well as the differentiation of discourse-pragmatic functions differs between LP and RP.

References

Beeching, K. and U. Detges (eds.) 2014. *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*. Leiden: Brill.

Collins, P. C. 1991. *Cleft and Pseudo-Cleft Constructions in English*. London: Routledge.

Collins, P. C. 2006. *It*-Clefts and *Wh*-Clefts: Prosody and Pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (10): 1706–1720.

Du Bois, J. W. 2003. Discourse and Grammar. In Michael Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language*, vol. 2, 47–88. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Guz, W. 2015. The Structural Non-Integration of Wh-Clefts. *English Language and Linguistics* 19 (3): 477–503.

Hopper, P. J. and S. A. Thompson. 2008. Projectability and Clause Combining in Interaction. In Ritva Laury (ed.), *Cross-Linguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, 99–123. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Norén, N. and P. Linell (eds.) 2013. Special Issue: *Pivot Constructions in Talk-in-Interaction*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 54.

Patten, A. L. 2012. *The English it-Cleft: A Constructional Account and a Diachronic*

Ivestigation. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
Traugott, E. C. 2015. Investigating "periphery" from a functionalist perspective. *Linguistic Vanguards.* ISSN (Online) 2: 119–130.

Corpora
COCA=*the Corpus of Contemporary American English 1990–2015*.
COHA=*the Corpus of Historical American English 1810–2009.*

A New Direction in Historical Pragmatics: Impoliteness in Historical Data

Michi SHIINA
Hosei University

In present-day English, the default form of vocative is first name, unless the speaker wishes to add some particular implications to the utterance, such as threat, humour or deference. Likewise, *you* is the default form of the second person pronoun, and *thou* is limited to religious register and some local dialect. In the past, however, it seems that social status and roles as well as age and gender influenced the choice of address terms. The range of common vocative form was much wider than today and *thou* was still used, in order to accommodate hierarchically complicated relationships, and to convey the speaker's attitude and feelings towards the addressee.

In this presentation, I will analyse the co-occurrence between nominal and pronominal address terms in a corpus of selected English gentry comedies in the 17th and 18th centuries. By gentry comedies, I refer to comedies written by and for the gentry around the restoration period. I have been analysing vocatives in the Early Modern English period, and here I will enlarge my perspective to investigate how vocatives co-occur with *thou* and *you* in relation to the interlocutors' power and solidarity as well as emotional relationship. I replicate Busse (2002) and see whether Brown and Gilman's (1989) power and solidarity semantics are valid in my data. I would like to see whether *thou* forms occur at all in my corpus. If they do, I would like to know which vocatives co-occur with *thou* in what relationships and what context. I would also like to see whether and how impolite implication is embedded in the use of address terms.

References

Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1960. The Pronouns and Power and Solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 253–276. New York: The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley & Sons.
Busse, U. 2002. *Linguistic Variation in the Shakespeare Corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Leech, G. 1999. The Distribution and Function of Vocatives in American and British

English Conversation. In H. Hasselgård and S. Oksefjell (eds.), *Out of Corpora: Studies in Honour of Stig Johansson*, 107–118. Amsterdam: Rodopi.