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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Problem

Japanese adverbs are categorized into several groups based on their grammatical characteristics and functions. Yamada (1936) categorizes them into three groups: *zyootai hukusi* (‘adverb of manner’), *teedo hukusi* (‘adverb of degree’) and *tinzyutu hukusi* (‘modal adverb’). According to Yamada, *zyootai hukusi* has its specific attributive conceptions and modifies other attributes expressed by verbs and adjectives. *Teedo hukusi* expresses degree as a meaning, and modifies other adverbs, verbs and adjectives which express certain attributes. Examples of *zyootai hukusi* and *teedo hukusi* are shown below respectively:

1. **Hito ga yukkuri aruku.**¹

   a person Sub slowly walk

   ‘A person walks slowly.’

2. **Ame ga totemo tuyoi.**

   rain Sub very strong

   ‘Rain is very strong.’

In (1), the *zyootai hukusi* *yukkuri* modifies the verb, *aruku (= walk), and

¹ Kenrei-siki romanization is used.
expresses how the person is walking. In (2), the *teedo hukusi* *toremo* modifies the adjective, *tuyoi* (= strong) and expresses the degree of the rain’s power. Different from the former two types of adverbs, which primarily modify verbs and adjectives, *tinzyutu hukusi* the ‘modal adverb’ freely modifies nouns as well as verbs and adjectives. In *Hokusii no Imi to Yoohoo* (*The Meaning and the Usage of Adverbs*) (1991) compiled by Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyu-jo, the function of *tinzyutu hukusi* is to supplement and to emphasize the modal meanings of predicates such as negation, supposition and hypothesis. “It is common to consider that this modality means ‘speaker’s feelings expressed in linguistic forms’”(1991:31). Examples for *tinzyutu hukusi* include *doose, zitu wa, musiro, sasuga ni, yahari/yappari, semete*. They are unique, in that even if these words are omitted from the phrases in which they are used, the propositional content of these sentences does not change. The following examples illustrate this point:

(3) **Ano hito wa yappari zi ga umai.**
    
    that person Top letters Sub skilled
    
    ‘That person yappari has good handwriting.’

(4) **Ano hito wa zi ga umai.**
    
    that person Top letters Sub skilled
    
    ‘That person has good handwriting.’

---

*I will leave *yahari/yappari* as it is in the translation, because its conveyance changes depending on the environment in which it is used.*
Between (3) and (4), there is a certain difference in nuance; however, the propositional content expressed by both sentences is the same. The question is, then, why a *tinzyutu hukusi* is used here: more precisely, what the function of *tinzyutu hukusi* is. Suleski and Masada (1982:iv) discuss the difficulty of describing *tinzyutu hukusi*’s function by stating, “it is almost impossible to find adequate explanations of their use and the nuances they carry”. Among many *tinzyutu hukusi*, I will focus on *yahari/yappari*. According to Shogakkan’s *Kokugo Dai-Jiten*, this word originates in the word *yawara* or *yaora*, and its original meaning is ‘to leave something or someone as it is without moving, to remain quietly without moving’. In the modern usage, the meaning of *yahari/yappari* is more diverse. This word is quite frequently used in Japanese conversation. However, it seems that the reason for its use has not been clearly explained. Kawasaki (1989:30) describes the function of this word. She refers to words like *tyotto* and *yappari* as “lubricating oil for human relationships or conversations”, meaning that these words facilitate smooth human relationships or smooth conversations. Nevertheless, how *yahari/yappari* achieves this goal is not demonstrated. Itasaka comments on this word in *Nihon-jin no Ronri Kozo* (*The Logic Structure of the Japanese*) (1971), stating that it is difficult to translate *yahari/yappari* into English. Without a description of how *yahari/yappari* supplements and emphasizes “speaker’s feelings expressed in linguistic forms”, it must be difficult for native English people to
understand what effect this word produces and how it should be used. This question about the usage of yahari/yappari is a pragmatic problem, because its usage changes depending on the contexts it is in. Since this is a pragmatic problem, it is important to examine contexts in which yahari/yappari is used. In this thesis, I will analyze how yahari/yappari is used in the interactional contexts and attempt to clarify its function. In Chapter II, I will review the studies done in the past concerning yahari/yappari. In Chapter III, in the first part, I will discuss problems in the previous studies, pointing out that categorizing functions of yahari/yappari into many categories is not helpful for the interpretation of naturally spoken data. In the second part, I will analyze the use of yahari/yappari in interactional contexts in an attempt to discover its fundamental function which covers every context. Also, I will examine yahari/yappari used in written discourse and compare the function with that in the interactional contexts. In Chapter IV, I will conclude that in the interactional contexts, yahari/yappari functions to bring out conformity between two participants of dialogues, and that a similar function is observed in the written discourse.

Since functions of many tinzyutu hukusi have not been clearly described thus far, it is important to analyze their uses and understand their functions. By this attempt, we would be able to understand not only tinzyutu hukusi itself, but also how the Japanese communicate using this
linguistic form.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, I will review previous studies which discuss the use of やはり/やっぱり. The studies include: (1) dictionary definition, (2) Kiso Nihongo ('Basic Japanese') by Morita, (3) "Discourse and Interactional Functions of the Japanese Modal Adverb やはり/やっぱり" by Maynard, and (4) "Wasya no zentee - やはり/やっぱり no baai" ('Presupposition of a speaker - in case of やはり/やっぱり') by Nishihara. Discussion on these studies is presented with other related works below.

2.1. Dictionary Definition

According to Kadokawa's Kokugo Dai-jiten, やはり/やっぱり has four different meanings. Following examples are from Kokugo Dai-jiten:

(1) State which has not changed from state in the past

(5) Osumai wa やはり Tokyo desu ka.
    house  Top  Cop  Qu
    "Is your house やはり in Tokyo?"

(2) State which does not differ from other state

(6) Watasi mo やはり hantai desu.
    I  too  against  Cop
‘I am yahari against it, too.’

(3) As expected, as one thought

(7) Umaku iku kasira to omotta no ni yahari dame
    well go might Com thought instead no good
datta.

Cop

‘I thought it might go well (contrary to the original pessimistic impression), but yahari it did not work out.’

(4) Even with some differences, essentially the same

(8) Ikura atatakakute no yahari huyu da.
    however warm winter Cop

‘No matter how warm it is, it is yahari winter.’

While these definitions describe differences in meaning, the speaker’s motivations for the use of yahari/yappari is not explicated.

2.2 Description by Morita

Morita (1977) explains in Kiso Nihongo (‘Basic Japanese’), that yahari/yappari is used when reality matches the speaker’s belief. He analyzes that there are five different criteria which support the speaker’s belief: (1) past conditions; (2) conditions of contrasting situations; (3) belief that reality reflects the way things are supposed to be; (4) conditions which the speaker imagined/guessed/presupposed; and (5) existing rules. Morita describes each criterion providing examples.
2.2.1. Past conditions

In this category, speaker expresses his belief in terms of propositional content. This belief is based on conditions in the past. The examples he gives are as follows:

(9) Ina de mo yahari kokugo no sensee o site irassyaru
    now even Japanese of teacher DO do
    no desu ka.
    Nom Ccp Qu

'Are you yahari a teacher of Japanese?'

(10) Otona ni natte mo yahari mukasi no kuse wa
    adult Loc become even past of habits Top kawaranai.

    not change

'Even after coming of age, one's habits yahari do not change.'

He notes that this yahari/yappari means "inferring from the state in the past, as one expected it would be so (= the reality)", and "a case where the reality has not changed as a continuation of one state in the past". In this sense, the hidden meaning of (9) would be "Since you were a Japanese teacher before, I surmise you still must be a Japanese teacher, am I right?". The example (10) reveals the speaker's belief that 'Since s/he had the habits in the past, it is surmised that s/he still has these habits, as well as the fact that this imagination based on knowledge from the past matches the reality.'
2.2.2. Conditions of contrasting situations

This refers to cases where reality matches the inference made from the conditions of other contrasting entities. Examples of this follow:

(11) Ani mo yuusyyu datta ga, ootoo mo elder brother also excellent Cop but younger brother also yahari syusai da.

smart Cop

‘The elder brother was excellent, and the younger brother is also yahari smart.’

(12) Kyonen mo dantoo datta ga, kotosi mo yahari last year also warm winter Cop but this year also dantoo de yuki ga sukunai.

warm winter Cop snow Sub little

‘We had a mild winter last year, this year also yahari is mild and we have little snow.’

In (11), an inference is made about the intelligence of the younger brother based on the smartness of his elder brother, and the reality matches this inference, therefore, yahari is used. In (12), in the same way, an inference is made about this winter based on the situation of last winter, and the reality matches that inference.

2.2.3. Belief that reality reflects the way things are supposed to be

This is the case where reality does not essentially differ from the way
things are supposed to be. The following are its examples:

(13) **Rikoo so de mo yahari kodomo da.**

smart appear but child Cop

'S/he looks smart, yet s/he is yahari a child.'

(14) **Suzusikute mo yahari nata da.**

cool even summer Cop

'Though it is cool, it is yahari summer.'

In (13), the speaker has a certain expectation or an idea about how a child is supposed to behave, and s/he observes it in the behavior of the child. This is contrasted with the initial observation that would have contradicted the speaker's belief about children. In (14), the speaker expects certain qualities about summer, and s/he finds them in the reality, therefore yahari is used. This is contrasted with the uncharacteristic cool weather.

2.2.4. Condition which the speaker imagined/guessed/presupposed

This is the case where specific example of things and situations match the speaker's expectation about these things and situations in general.

(15) **Gogaku no gakusei wa yahari muzukasii.**

language of study Top difficult

'The language study is yahari difficult.'

(16) **Yahari hakurai-hin wa tigaimasu ne.**

imported goods Top different particle

'Yahari imported goods are different.'
In (15), the speaker who expects that language learning is difficult, discovers it to be so in the specific instance. In (16), imported products are expected to be different, and they are different in reality.

2.2.5. Existing rules

In the case of existing rules, situations are fixed with regulations of the society, and therefore cannot be changed. The following are examples of this use.

(17) Ikura tanonde mo yahari dame na mono wa dame da.
how much ask even not good things Top no good Cop
‘No matter how many times you ask, things we are prohibited to do, yahari do not change.’

(18) Donna ni minna ga hitee-site mo tikuw wa yahari
however everyone Sub deny even earth Top
mawatte iru.
revolve.
‘No matter how everyone denies it, the earth is yahari revolving.’

In Affective Expressions in Japanese, Suleski and Masada (1982) present a similar analysis of yahari/yappari. Their unique observation is the use of yahari/yappari as a conversational interjection. Their examples follow:

(19) Sukina eega wa yahari myuuzikaru desu ne.
favorite movie Top musical Cop particle

Suleski and Masada defines affective expressions as “short words or phrases which impart a particular nuance to the sentences in which they are used.” (1982:iii)
‘My favorite movie is yahari musicals.’

(20) **Kyuuzitu desu ka. Yappari uti de terebi nanka**

holiday Cop Qu home Loc TV things like

mite iru koto ga ooi desu.

watching thing Sub many Cop

‘On holidays? Yappari there are many occasions that I watch TV or things like that at home.’

Suleski and Masada explain this use as “not absolutely necessary to the meaning of the sentence, except to the degree that it helps the flow of conversation.” In Rules for Conversational Rituals in Japanese, Aoki and Okamoto (1988) examine Japanese ritual expressions in a movie script and propose that yahari/yappari is used “when one wishes to minimize the impact of news”. They state that, “one possible way to dull the impact of news is to say that it was somehow expected. This effect is achieved by using yahari or yappari.” They illustrate this point using following example.

(21) **Kinya:** **Saikin okyaku-san ooi no?**

recently customers many Nom

‘Do you have many customers recently?’

A maid: **Iie, madamada desu.**

no not enough Cop

‘No, we haven’t have enough.’
Kinya: **Yappari samui kara daroo ne.**

cold because might particle

"Yappari because it is cold, isn’t it?"

Except this remark by Aoki and Okamoto, neither Morita nor Suleski and Masada discuss what effect **yahari/yappari** has upon the addressee. In this sense, their descriptions of this word do not go beyond the dictionary definitions, though theirs are a little more elaborate than dictionary definitions. It is necessary to further analyze the use of **yahari/yappari** in order to understand the motivations behind its use. Senko Maynard (1991) discusses motivations for the use as well as the meaning differences of **yahari/yappari**. Next, I will examine her account.

2.3. Account by Maynard (1991)

Maynard examines **yahari/yappari** from several perspectives:

(1) semantic source of **yahari/yappari**; (2) discourse functions of **yahari/yappari**; and (3) interactional functions of **yahari/yappari**.

2.3.1. Semantic source of **yahari/yappari**

Maynard proposes that the semantic source of **yahari/yappari** is best characterized when we view **yahari/yappari** "as a device to signal the pragmatically and semantically significant linkage the speaking subject identifies between the propositional content (P-1) and the relevant knowledge (K-1)". She introduces four different types of knowledge that may be associated with (P-1): (1) Textual Knowledge; (2) Social
Knowledge; (3) Knowledge for Conclusion; and (4) Knowledge for Selection. Maynard explains how *yahari/yappari* functions in each case.

2.3.1.1. Textual Knowledge

(K-1) is information specifically provided in prior text, and (P-1) presents a case similar to (K-1).

(22) **“Okusan, orusu desu yo. Ima, okusan ni denwa ga arimasita ga, [amado ga simatte-imasu]* yo.**

Sub exist but [shutter Sub close ] particle

Sakuya mo denwa ga arimasita ga, *yahari* [amado
ga simatte-imasita...].”

Sub close

“The wife is not home.

‘There was a phone call for her just now, but the shutters are closed.

‘Last night also there was a call, but then the shutters were also
closed as expected.’”

(Maynard’s example (7))

In the example (22), *yahari* appeals to the information given in prior text, i.e., the shutters were also closed on the previous day.

2.3.1.2. Social Knowledge

Here, *yahari/yappari* links (K-1), which is the information.

---

*According to Maynard, brackets indicate an item in prior text, which is referred back by *yahari.*
acknowledged as Social Knowledge, to (P-1).

(23) "Ima no yatu wa okusan no ryoosin to dookyositete
     now of guy Top wife of parents with co-habit
     ne, yappara kigane na n da yo."
     particle feel constrained Nom Cop particle
     "The fellow I just talked to lives with his in-laws and, as expected
     he feels constrained."

     (Maynard’s example (9))

Maynard claims that in (23) a reference is made to socioculturally shared
information, i.e., a married man feels less than totally relaxed if he lives
with his in-laws.

2.3.1.3. Knowledge for Conclusion

According to Maynard, (P-1) is a logical conclusion expected to be
drawn on the basis of specified or suggested evidence made available by
(K-1).

(24) Sikasi yahari situnai ni kare no iru kehai wa
     but inside the room Loc he exist sign Top
     nakatta.
     not exist.
     ‘But as expected, there was no sign of him being in the room.’

     (Maynard’s example(10))

In (24), the conclusion is based on thoughts presented or suggested in
previous discourse. *Yahari/yappari* is used in reference to this thought process which leads to (P-1).

2.3.1.4. Knowledge for Selection

In this type, (K-1) conforms to the speaker’s judgement against a pool of possibilities, or (P-1) conforms to the speaker’s judgement in contrast to (K-1).

(25) "...Sorenisite mo, *yahari itiban komatte-iru no* wa,

nevertheless most troubled Nom Top

*keesatu daroo na.*"

police probably particle

"...After all, the one that is most troubled (out of all possible parties involved) must be the police.”"

(Maynard’s example(11))

In (25), *yahari* indicates a selection of an item from a pool of identified or assumed items.

As Morita categorizes the use of *yahari/yappari* according to the criteria which the speaker has for his/her belief, Maynard categorizes it according to the relationship between propositional content and relevant knowledge. Although they use different terminologies, they propose a similar view in that *yahari/yappari* indicates something which is not expressed by propositional content. While Morita’s study does not go beyond the descriptions of meaning differences of *yahari/yappari*, Maynard
attempts to explicate other functions of *yahari/yappari*, i.e., discourse functions and interactional functions.

2.3.2. Discourse functions of *yahari/yappari*

Maynard proposes that speakers find it necessary to use *yahari/yappari* because it has functions in discourse. She states that these functions are to mark (1) speaker subjectivity, (2) discourse cohesion, (3) cohesiveness in the discourse[^1]. However, from her explanation, it is not clear if *yahari/yappari* always signals all these three functions simultaneously or not. Since she does not discuss how various functions of *yahari/yappari* are determined, her discussion falls short of clearly explaining why speakers use *yahari/yappari*. I will discuss this point in more detail in Chapter III.

2.3.3. Interactional functions of *yahari/yappari*

Maynard recognizes three interactional functions of *yahari/yappari*, namely, a rapport seeker, a filler/planner[^2], and a hesitation marker. The rapport seeking function is exemplified in (26).

(26) A: *Doo siyoo ka na.*

how do Qu particle

‘What should I do...’

[^1]: Maynard claims that this is different from discourse cohesion, raising the example of Knowledge for Conclusion association type. According to her, in this example, *yahari* functions to signal logical cohesiveness traceable in the speaker’s thought process.

[^2]: Maynard uses a filler/planner as a function “to occupy an otherwise silent space in speech to plan speech and/or to warrant participation by signaling to the other participant that the speaker is involved in interaction and some utterance is anticipated.”
B: Sore wa yappari mazun yza nai?
that Top bad Nom is not

'Don't you think (lit. after all) that's bad, though?'

(Maynard's example (13))

Here B assumes that A also has a doubt, and this assumed sharing of common knowledge acts to sustain interpersonal rapport. Maynard explains that "the shared-knowledge-based identity enhances similarity among participants and, therefore, encourages interpersonal rapport and empathy (49)".

The second interactional function is to signal the speaker's involvement in the interaction. The third is the function of a hesitation marker. Maynard states that all three cases mentioned above can be represented in the following example.

(27) A: Doko ga yuuysuu-suru to omoimasu ka?
which Sub win Com think Q2

'Which team do you think will win?'

B: Pa-riigu wa yappari Seibu desyo.
Pacific league Top probably

'For the Pacific league, I think (lit. after all) it will be Seibu.'

(Maynard's example (14))

She claims that if A and B are Seibu fans, yappari functions as a filler or a planner or a rapport seeker. However, if they are the fans of Seibu's rival
team, and if it was said hesitantly, yappari here functions as a hesitation marker.

2.3.4. Yahari/yappari as a discourse modality indicator

Maynard claims that yahari/yappari indicates ‘Discourse Modality’, which she defines as “the speaker’s personal epistemological stance and evaluative attitudes”. She integrates all the functions that she has discussed and explains theoretically how yahari/yappari indicates ‘Discourse Modality’. According to her, a central meaning of yahari/yappari is the semantic source which, in actual discourse, is activated by four different types of knowledge association. The semantic source is realized to bring about interactional functions on the interactional level. It offers three discourse functions on the discourse level. However, she also states that “searching for an appropriate prototype context” is necessary to interpret specific yahari/yappari. In other words, without finding the prototype context it would be difficult to use her theory to interpret specific yahari/yappari.

2.4. Account by Nishihara (1988)

Nishihara examines yahari/yappari as an example of one prototype of pragmatic presupposition. She proposes that yahari/yappari has a conventional implicature7 which “remits a speaker’s presupposition of

7 When Grice’s cooperative principle (1975) is working, there are two types of implicature: one is conversational implicature and the other is conventional implicature. Conventional implicature contains elements which a language form conventionally possesses as a part of its meaning.
which the speaker thinks true or reasonable™. Also, she states that yahari/yappari has a function to indirectly appeal to this presupposition as a special form of self-appeal, at the same time causing an effect of cohesion in the discourse. Nishihara divides functions of yahari/yappari into three categories based on the scope of its functions.

2.4.1. Functions of yahari/yappari within the scope of a propositional content

According to Nishihara, when yahari/yappari is used with the particle mo, the scope of its function is within a propositional content. Yahari/yappari is used to intensify or to supplement mo’s function, i.e., information addition. Example (28) indicates this function.

(28) **Sonna koto de mo yappari kokoro itan zya**

like that thing Cop also feelings hurt Gerund-finish

Nom Cop particle

‘Isn’t it that even that kind of (trifle) things also yappari would cause heartache?’

(Nishihara’s example (17))

In (28), yappari modifies the predicate and, at the same time, relates to sonna koto (‘that kind of (trifle) things’). Here, sonna koto is added information to a more serious presupposed things. Both mo and yappari contain presupposition that more serious things apparently cause heartache.
This presupposition is not explicitly expressed.

Nishihara argues that yahari/yappari not only intensifies or supplements mo’s function, but also confirms that the information addition is a reasonable logical consequence for a speaker. She uses this argument as a basis for the unnaturalness of the example sentence (30) as opposed to the natural example sentence (29).

(29) (Taro ga kita.) Ato kara Ziroo mo kita no de, (Sub came) later from also came Nom Cop
boku wa bikkuri-site simatta. I Top surprise finished
‘(Taro came.) Later Jiro also came, so I was surprised’

(Nishihara’s example (18))

(30) #(Taro ga kita.) Ato kara Ziroo mo yahari kita no (Sub came) later from also came Nom
de boku wa bikkuri-site simatta. Cop I Top surprise finished
‘(Taro came.) Later Jiro also yahari came, so I was surprised.’

(Nishihara’s example (19))

According to the argument by Nishihara, in (30), Jiro’s coming is added information confirmed by yahari as a reasonable logical consequence. Therefore, the speaker’s surprise expressed in the maï clause contradicts the yappari’s use, causing the unnaturalness as a result.
Nishihara discusses the use of *yahari/yappari* only when it is used with the particle *mo*. However, in the naturally spoken discourses, there are many cases of *yahari/yappari* which are used in different environments. 

2.4.2. Functions of *yahari/yappari* within the scope of a discourse* 

Nishihara proposes that *yahari/yappari* also function: (a) to make a synoptic confirmation about what is being said by a speaker or an addressee within a discourse, and (b) to make a judgement and to express speaker’s viewpoint about what is being said within a discourse. According to her, a speaker expresses the reasonable consequence of his/her presupposition. The following examples (31) and (32) illustrate functions (a) and (b) respectively.

(31) A: Anoo, kekkoo konna ii seedo ga atta no ka well relatively this kind good system Sub exist Nom Qu to, siranai to son-suru to ka tte no, Com not know Com lose Com Qu Com Nom takusan aru u desu ne. many exist Nom Cop particle ‘Well, there are many cases where you realize that you have been missing out because you did not know the good system like this.’

B: Soo desu ne.
so Cop particle

---

*Nishihara defines a discourse as “a process where propositional contents continue retaining a cohesion” (1980b:92)."
'That's true.'

A: **Yappari** anoo, riyou dekuru mono wa go-riyou nasatta
   well use can thing Top use
   hoo ga yorosii to omoimasu desu ne.
   side Sub good Com think Cop particle

‘**Yappari** well, I think it is better to use the systems you are
entitled to use.’

(a part of Nishihara’s example (25))

In (32), after A explains the availability of the system, he repeats and
confirms his point using **yappari** that one should utilize this system.

(32) **Da kara kore wa ne, yappari sonoo keezai-teki to ka**
therefore this Top particle well economic Com Qu
ironna imi de nakute, **yappari** seezi-teki ni kangaete
various meaning Cop politically think
ne. Ni-sen zikan wa kitta hoo ga ii to watasi wa
particle two thousand Top cut side Sub good Com I Top
omotte iru n desu.
think Nom Cop

‘Therefore, as for this problem, **yappari** not from the economic or
other stand points, but **yappari** from the political stand point, I think
it is better (for labor hour) to be less than two thousands hours.’

(a part of Nishihara’s example (26))
According to Nishihara, in (32), the speaker is emphasizing his opinion by inserting *yappari* in his discourse.

2.4.3. Functions of *yahari/yappari* beyond the scope of a discourse

The most frequently used function of *yahari/yappari*, according to Nishihara, is to indicate a reasonable consequence of a logical presupposition held by a speaker, which exists beyond the scope of a discourse. Although the basic functions are the same as in the former two cases, here the speaker’s logical presupposition coincides with common sense widely accepted by the society.

(33) **Ano, wain mo soo desu ne. Mottomo kono wain ni**

*well wine also so Cop particle indeed this wine Loc kansite wa, itiban nomu no wa doko ka,*

*about Top best drink Nom Top where particle syoohirititu no toppu desu wa, *yahari* santi*

*consumint rate of top Cop particle producing area de arimasu. Doitu toka Huransu, eee, tuide Yooroppa*

*Cop Germany or France well then Europe no kakkoku to iu koto na n desu.*

*of various nations Com say fact Cop Nom Cop*

‘Well, in the case of wine, it’s the same way. In fact, about wine, where it is drunk most, I mean, the top consuming countries are *yahari* producing countries. Germany or France, then various*
countries are the ones.'

( Nishihara's example(30))

Nishihara argues that it is clear that in (33) A has a presupposition that wine is consumed more in the producing countries. According to her, a speaker uses yahari/yappari expecting that the addressee will admit that the speaker's presupposition is reasonable. In this process, Nishihara states that the speaker is not demanding a confirmation, but s/he is indirectly emphasizing his/her viewpoint and that the repetition of the speaker's belief causes a kind of cohesion in the discourse because the presupposition comes from common sense which the speaker believes to be true.

Different from Morita and Maynard, Nishihara does not categorize the differences of yahari/yappari's function. She suggests that yahari/yappari has one essential role, though it appears to have several according to where it functions. Nishihara's account differs from others in that she proposes that yahari/yappari has a function which appeals to the speaker's presupposition to addressees.

In this chapter, I reviewed previous studies on the use of yahari/yappari. Dictionary definitions and Morita's study categorize the meaning differences of this word. Maynard proposes that yahari/yappari signals the linkage between a propositional content and knowledge, and presents the four categories of knowledge. She also claims that yahari/yappari has discourse functions and interactional functions.
Nishihara proposes that *yahari/yappari* has one function by which a speaker appeal to his/her belief to the addressee. The problem of the dictionary definition and Morita’s description is that they only describe different meanings which *yahari/yappari* expresses without discussing reasons or functions behind the use. The accounts by Maynard and Nishihara explain more about the functions of *yahari/yappari* and the motivations of its use. In Chapter III, I will examine if these explanations are useful for the interpretation of the naturally spoken discourse data.
CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS OF YAHARI/YAPPARI'S FUNCTIONS

The first part of this chapter focuses on whether the previous studies on yahari/yappari are applicable to the naturally spoken discourse data. As reviewed in Chapter II, Maynard's and Nishihara's studies attempt to explain yahari/yappari's functions. I will question the usefulness of these accounts, presenting some counter-examples. In the second part, I will analyze the interactional contexts in which yahari/yappari can be used and cannot be used. Based on this analysis, I will propose that the function of yahari/yappari is interactional, and that it works to bring two parties in a dialogue to conformity. In the context in which two parties do not share the same opinions or impressions, and when one party expresses his/her opinions or the impressions, yahari/yappari creates an effect that there is a legitimacy in the opinions or the impressions of the speaker, even though the existence of the legitimacy is not substantiated. With this effect, yahari/yappari implicitly persuades the addressee to conform to the speaker's opinions or impressions. When the two parties share the same opinions or impressions, the speaker who uses yahari/yappari confirms this fact and intensifies the feeling of sameness.
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3.1. Problems with previous studies

If previous studies have described the functions of yahari/yappari accurately, they must be useful for the interpretation of data including those taken from the naturally spoken discourses. However, there are some examples which cannot be explained by these studies. In the following section, I will discuss these cases in greater detail, using data taken from TV programs, "Tetsuko no Heya"**, "Waratte ii tomo", and interview scripts from magazines**.

3.1.1. Account by Maynard

Maynard divides the knowledge (K-1) which is linked to the propositional content (P-1) and functions of yahari/yappari in many categories. In the attempt to interpret data, it is difficult to assign one specific (K-1) or one specific function to that data.

The first example demonstrates the difficulty of determining (K-1). Second example illustrates the difficulty of determining the function.

Maynard uses the term anaphora in the broad sense and assumes an anaphoric relationship between the propositional content (P-1) and the relevant knowledge (K-1) to that propositional content. She states, "the item to which the yahari statement relates may be given in prior text, or may be simply suggested in reference to socio-culturally based knowledge or yahari may merely trigger presupposedly shared thought process, all

**The program from "Tetsuko no Heya" is transcribed from the segment broadcast on 1991 and 1992 (and years for others, too).

** Strictly speaking, this is not naturally spoken, because it could have been edited.
cases being discourse anaphora.” In the following naturally spoken
discourse data, there are examples which illustrate her point.

(34) A: Yatte ikeru n da mon nee.
    manage can go Nom Cop thing particle
    ‘You can still manage, right?’
B: Iyaaa. Nan to ka yattemasu ne.
    well somehow manage
    ‘Well. Somehow I am managing.’
A: Yappari kurusii koto wa kurusii?
    hard fact Top hard
    ‘Yappari (the life) IS hard, isn’t it?’
B: Kurusii koto wa nai desu kedo ne.
    hard fact Top not Cop but particle
    ‘It’s not that hard, but...’

(from an interview in “Waratte ii tomo”)

In (34), B mentions in the prior section that he had been out of job for
several months. Yappari signals the linkage between the commonly
accepted knowledge that people suffer from unemployment, and (P-1): B
suffers.

(35) “Syussin wa Simane no Iki-sima to in koto desu ga
    home Top of Com say fact Cop but
yappari umi de asobu koto ga ookatta no kasira?

"I heard that you are originally from Iki-island of Shimane prefecture. I wonder if you yappari often played at the beach."

(from an interview in the magazine GO TO MORE)

In (35) also, the speaker makes a logical conclusion that the addressee used to play at the ocean, from the knowledge that she was born on an island, and was therefore close to the sea.

However, depending on the data, there are examples where it is hard to see an anaphoric relationship between (K-1) and (P-1). Example (36) is one such instance:

(36) Yappari inaka ni sumu to kekkoo yoozi ga aru

countryside Loc live relatively chores Sub exist

Nom Cop particle particle

‘Yappari when you live on the countryside, there are many things you have to take care of, you know.’

(from an interview in “Tetsuko no Heya”)

The fact that the speaker is living in the countryside is mentioned in the prior text. However, it is difficult for the addressee to link this knowledge with the (P-1): “in countryside, there are many chores to take care of.” It seems that there is not any social knowledge which supports this belief, nor
can there be a logical thinking procedure which leads the addressee to this
(P-1). It is difficult to assume that all the addressees have the same social
knowledge or the same logical thinking procedure. If (K-1) changes based
on the addressee, it is difficult to determine the category of knowledge
which yahari/yappari links to the propositional content.

In the theoretical model of Maynard, the functions are clearly divided
into two groups: discourse functions and interactional functions. She
recognizes the central meaning of yahari/yappari as the semantic source,
and she states that this semantic source is realized both on the interactional
level and on the discourse level. However, when we face naturally
occurring data, it is difficult to tell which functions at issue are working.
This is illustrated in the following example:

(37) Desukedo yappari maa zibun ga kodomo no toki ni
      but    well self  Sub child of time Loc
sodatta kankyoo no sono hen no tokoro tte no
      grow up environment of that around of aspect Com Nom
wa natukasii desu ne.”
      Top miss     Cop particle
‘However, yappari people miss that kind of thing about the
environment in which they were brought up.’

(from an interview in “Tetsuko no Heya”)

Based on Maynard’s distinction, this yappari can be interpreted as a
hesitation marker since the speaker is opposing the partner's view, as shown in desukedo (= but). However, at the end of the sentence the speaker uses the sentence particle ne which is "a confirmation seeker; with rising intonation seeks confirmation of an assumption made by the speaker."

From this fact, it is possible to interpret this yappari as a rapport seeker, making the interpretation of yappari's function ambiguous.

Maynard divides the functions of yahari/yappari in many categories; however, when we attempt to assign specific function to each data, the deciding factors are not clear.

3.1.2. Account by Nishihara

Many of Nishihara's examples are taken from naturally spoken discourse. Although they are relevant in supporting points that Nishihara makes, there are cases in which Nishihara's account is not sufficient. The first example questions the validity of the notion that a presupposition tends to be supported by the common sense. The second example is a borderline case which does not fit Nishihara's classification of yahari/yappari, and it questions the plausibility of this classification. First example follows.

(38) A: Zya otomodati o syookai-site kudasai.
   then friend Acc introduce please
   'Then, please introduce your friend.'

---

B: **Yappari haruyasumi desu kara Zyanizuka kanke o**

spring break Cop because relation Acc
to omoimasite...

Com think

"Yappari this is spring break, so I thought (I would introduce somebody) related to Janizu "

(from an interview in "Waratte ii tomo")

If we follow Nishihara’s account, *yappari* in this example belongs to the third function, i.e., to indicate a reasonable consequence of a logical presupposition held by a speaker which exists beyond the scope of a discourse. She also proposes that this presupposition tends to be supported by socially accepted common sense. However, in (38), what B actually means is that ‘because this is spring break, and many young people are watching this show, it would be nice if I introduce somebody from Janizu agency who is popular among youngsters.’ It would be difficult to claim that this presupposition is supported by common sense. The presupposition would be understood among a particular group of people who knows what *Janizu* is and what the audience of this particular show wants. I propose that *yappari* here does not indicate a reasonable presupposition which is supported by the common sense, rather it functions to create the feeling as if there is a presupposition common to both the speaker and the addressees. With the creation of this feeling of common understanding, participants

---

13 The name of an agency which promotes young singers popular among Japanese youngsters
achieve a sense of camaraderie of the group.

Nishihara divides the function of yahariiyappari according to where it functions: (1) within the scope of a propositional content; (2) within the scope of a discourse; and (3) beyond the scope of a discourse. However, in her examples which support this hypothesis, there is a borderline case.

(39) A: Anoo,  hizyoo ni nani ka,  tyuugakusee  no kaita
e  tte  iu  to,  koo,  soozoo  dekimasu  no  wa
picture  Com  say  Com  this  way  imagine  can  Ncm  Top
nobinobi-sita egara zya nai ka to  omotte orimasu
care-free  pattern  Cop  not  Qu  Com  think
ga.
but
‘Well, really somewhat, speaking of pictures drawn by junior high students, what I can imagine is that I think, they are care-
free’
B: Soo desu ne.
so  Cop  particle
‘That’s right.’
A: Anoo,  hizyoo ni desu ne,  koo  kotee kannen ga
well  extremely  Cop  particle  this  way  fixed  idea  Sub
nakute desu ne  yappari nobinobi to site, koo
not exist Cop particle care-free Com do this way
kaitte arimasu no de...
draw exist Nom Cop

‘Well, extremely, they do not have any fixed ideas, and yappari
they draw in a care-free fashion...’

(a part of Nishihara’s example (29))

As an explanation of this example, Nishihara states that yappari indicates
the presupposition which exists beyond the scope of the discourse, i.e.,
pictures drawn by junior high students are care-free. However, in the
example, this idea is mentioned in its earlier discourse. It would be more
in accordance with Nishihara’s classification if this function of yappari is
classified into the second category: yappari which functions within the
scope of a discourse. The second category functions “to make a synoptic
confirmation about what is being said by a speaker (94)”, yet yappari in
(39) does not fulfill this function. This discrepancy makes it difficult to
support the plausibility of Nishihara’s classification.

3.2. Yahari/yappari as a conformity seeker

Maynard’s and Nishihara’s studies categorize yahari/yappari’s
functions. Because of this categorization, in the attempt to interpret
data from naturally spoken discourses, there are ambiguous cases which
have several possible functions and cannot be determined as having a
specific one. In order to avoid this problem, I will attempt to find one fundamental function of *yahari/yappari* which covers every context.

Maynard discusses four kinds of knowledge acknowledged by a speaker and an addressee. Nishihara discusses presupposition assumed between the participants of the dialogues. In order to clarify how information could be shared among participants in a dialogue, and how this affects the use of *yahari/yappari*, in this first section, I will examine three logically possible contexts in which *yahari/yappari* could be used. Based on this analysis, I will claim that *yahari/yappari* seeks conformity. When a speaker expresses his/her own opinions or views to an addressee who does not have the same opinions or views, *yahari/yappari* implicitly persuades the addressee to conform to the speaker's opinions or views. When a speaker and an addressee share the same opinions or views, *yahari/yappari* confirms this sameness and intensifies the feeling of saneness. While Maynard recognizes the signaling of linkage between propositional content and knowledge as a central meaning, I will emphasize more the interactional function of *yahari/yappari*. While Nishihara claims that a speaker appeals to him/her presupposition by using this word, I will claim that its function is to attract and involve an addressee, and eventually to influence his/her opinions. I will focus on the interactional context between two people. In the later section, I will also examine if this claim is applicable to *yahari/yappari* in the written discourses.
There are three conceivable contexts in which *yahari/yappari* could be used. These are (1) when one party involved in the interaction does not have any view on the matter which is being discussed, (2) when two parties have different views, and (3) when two parties share the same view.

First, I will examine the situation in which one party of the two involved in the interaction does not have any view on the subject matter. In this context, naturalness of the *yahari/yappari* use varies. Consider the examples below:

(40) A: *Anpori tte nan desu ka?*
   
   Com what Cop Qu
   ‘What is Anpori?’

B: *Yappari anzen hosyoo rizi kai no koto desu yo.*
   
   Security Council of thing Cop particle
   ‘Yappari it is the Security Council.’

In (40) where A does not have any idea of *Anpori*, the use of *yappari* is inappropriate. In the following example, A does not know what B’s problem is. The use of *yappari* in this context is also inappropriate.

(41) A: *Doo sita no?*
   
   how do Nom
   ‘What’s up?’

B: *Yappari kagi ga mitukaranai no yo.*
   
   key Sub not found Nom particle
‘Yappari I can’t find the key.’

It appears that yahari/yappari cannot be used in the context where A does not have any view on the subject matter. However, there are cases where yahari/yappari can be used naturally in the similar context. The following are these examples:

(42) A: Kore, doo omou?
    this how think
    ‘What do you think about this?’
B: Yappari tyotto hade zya nai?
    a little loud Cop not
    ‘Yappari isn’t it a little bit loud?’

(43) A: Donna onna no ko ga suki desu ka?
    what kind woman of child Sub like Cop QU
    ‘What type of girl do you like?’
B: Yappari kami no nagai ko ga ii desu ne.
    hair of long child Sub good Cop particle
    ‘Yappari (I) like a girl with long hair.’

In (42), despite the fact that A does not know how B is feeling about kore (a dress, shoes, etc.), B’s use of yappari is acceptable. In the same way, in (43), although A does not know B’s preference for girls, yappari in B’s utterance is perfectly acceptable.

In the above examples, we see one difference between the two
situations. In the examples (40) and (41), B is stating facts (giving the abbreviation). In the examples (42) and (43), B is expressing his/her opinions. Here, yappari functions to indicate that there exists some basis for B’s opinions elsewhere, although they are not explicitly expressed in the context. In (42), yappari might indicate that the color is too bright or the shape is too eccentric. In (43), yappari might indicate the common assumption that many men like girls with long hair. I hypothesize that the yahariiyappari’s function is to appeal to the legitimacy of one’s opinions in order to implicitly persuade, so that he/she conforms to the same opinions. If this is the case, the unnaturalness of yappari in examples (40) and (41) can be explained. These examples sound unnatural because the speaker need not emphasize his/her legitimacy and persuade the addressee when s/he states facts different from the time when s/he expresses opinions. Therefore, when the speaker states facts in the interactional context where the addressee does not know facts, yahariiyappari cannot be used. For instance, one does not use yappari speaking to A, who had fainted and came to himself, to inform where he is.

(44) A: Koko doko desu ka?

    here where Cop Qu

  ‘Where am I?’

    B: #Yappari Yuurakutyoo desu yo.

    Cop particle
‘It is yappari Yurakucho.’

However, if A and B are looking at a post-card and guessing where it is, the use of yappari is appropriate.

(45) A: Koko doko desu ka?

here where Cop Qu

‘Where is this?’

B: Yappari Yuurakutyyoo desu yo.

Cop particle

‘It is yappari Yurakucho.’

In (45), B is making a judgement based on the features appeared on the post-card, and expressing his/her opinions.

A minimal pair of (40’) and (40’”) also support this point.

(40’) A: Anpori tte nan desu ka?

Com what Cop Qu

‘What is Anpori?’

B: Yappari anzen hosyoo rizi kai no koto desyo?

Security Council of thing Cop

‘Yappari it is the Security Council, isn’t it?’

(40’”) A: Anpori tte nan desu ka?

Com what Cop Qu

‘What is Anpori?’
B: **Yappari** anzen hosyoo rizi kai no koto *zya nai desu ka?*

Security Council of thing not Cop Qu

‘Isn’t it **yappari** the Security Council?’

In these examples, despite the fact that B is asked a question, B asks back to A behaving as if B assumes A already knows the fact. In such cases, the use of *yahari/yappari* is acceptable. Here, B is not stating the fact but expressing his/her view.

The second context is where two parties have different views. It seems *yahari/yappari* can be used with less constraint in this context. The following are such examples.

(46) A: **Lazarus ga** ii *yo.*

Sub good particle

‘Lazarus would be good.’

B: **Soo? Yappari** JC Penny no hoo ga ii to *omon*

so of side Sub good Com think

**kedo...**

but

‘Is that so? **Yappari** I think JC Penny is better, but...’

(47) A: **Yamamoto-san kyou kuru desyoo?**

today come Cop

‘Mr. Yamamoto is coming today, right?’
B: Iya, yappari konai desyo.
   no not come Cop
   ‘No. Yappari he is not coming.’

Here, yappari functions to suggest that B has reasons for his opinions. By using this word, B appeals to these reasons to induce the same opinion in A. If A does not get the message and asks why yappari, B can explicitly demonstrate the reasons as follows:

(46') A: Doo site?
   how do
   ‘Why?’

B: Tikai si nedan mo yasui si...
   close price also cheap
   ‘It is closer and the price there is low...’

(47') A: Doo site?
   how do
   ‘Why?’

B: Kinoo seki o site ita si kaoiro mo warukatt
   yesterday cough DO do to face colour also bad
   si...
   also
   ‘He was coughing yesterday, and he looked pale...’

Therefore, yappari in this context has the same function as in the context in
which one party does not have any view, that is, to appeal to the legitimacy of one's opinions by implying reasons for the opinions through the use of yappari. A similar function is expressed by a different linguistic form in English. Deborah Schiffrin discusses the English discourse marker *y'know* in her book, *Discourse Marker* (1987). She states that "*y'know* appeals to shared knowledge as a way of converting an opponent to one's own side in a dispute." There is a similarity between the two.

Thus far, I have examined examples of yappari in the interactional contexts where one party does not have a view, and where two parties have different views, then have hypothesized that the function of yahari/yappari is to appeal to one's opinions or views. Next, I will examine whether this function of yahari/yappari will hold in the third interactional context where two parties share a view.

In this context where two parties share a view, yahari/yappari seems to take on a different function. In the following examples, A and B share the same view.

(48) A: **JC Penny ga ii yo.**

Sub good particle

' I think JC Penny would be good.'

B: **Soo ne. Yappari JC Penny ga ii wa ne.**

so particle Sub good particle particle

'Yeah. *Yappari* it would be good.'
(49) A: **OSU ga itiban tuyoi to omou yo.**

Sub most strong Com think particle

‘I think OSU is the strongest.’

B: **Soo da ne. Yappari OSU da ne.**

so Cop particle Cop particle

‘Yeah. **Yappari** OSU is the strongest.’

In these examples, because A and B totally agree with each other, B has no need for appealing to the legitimacy of his opinions or views to influence the addressee. **Yappari** here appeals to A’s opinions or views themselves, not other reasons which exist elsewhere. It means something like ‘as you stated’. In this context, **yahari/yappari** is used to confirm that A and B agree on the same opinions or views. This function works even when B is stating facts. This is illustrated in the following examples.

(50) A: **Anpori tte anzen honyoo rizi kai no koto desyo?**

Com Security Council of thing Cop

‘Anpori means the Security Council, isn’t it?’

B: **Ee. Yappari soo desu yo.**

yes so Cop particle

‘Yes. **Yappari** it means that.’

(51) A: **Mitukaranai no?**

not being found Nom
'(Is it that) you can't find it?'

B: **Yappari** mitukaranai no yo.
    not being found Nom particle

'Yappari I can't find it.'

In (50), where A has some view on *Anpori*, B can use **yappari** recognizing that view of A. Similarly, in (51), when A knows that B is searching for something and inquires about the outcome of the search, **yappari** is used in B's utterance, and it recognizes A's view. Therefore, **yapari/yappari** is used with less constraint in the context where two parties share views. Maynard states that **yappari** cannot be usually used in a sentence like (52).

(52) *Yappari kazi da
    fire Cop

'Yappari it's a fire!'

(Maynard's example(6))

However, in the situation where A and B heard the siren sound and B looked out the window and saw black smoke and flame, an interaction like (53) is perfectly acceptable.

(53) A: **Kazi?**
    fire

'(Is it) a fire?'

B: **Un. Yappari kazi da.**
    yes fire Cop
‘Yeah. It is a fire.’

_yappari_ is acceptable here because A and B share the same view (or expectation, in this case, from the siren sound). Using _yappari_, A and B are confirming their shared view.

From the above analysis, there are two findings: first in the context where two parties do not share the same view, _yahari/yappari_ is used except in cases in which viewpoints are stated as facts, and its function in this context is to appeal to one’s opinions or views so that the addressee would conform to the speaker. Secondly, in the context in which two parties share the same view, _yahari/yappari_ is used with less constraint, and its function is to confirm their view. The underlying force for the both functions is to lead two parties to a conformity. In other words, when two parties have different opinions, _yahari/yappari_ attempts to bring them into one. When two parties share the same opinion, it confirms its sameness in a felicitous manner.

When we apply this hypothesis to naturally spoken discourse data like example (23), repeated below, the hypothesis is useful in explaining what is happening in the interaction between A and B.

(23) A: _Doko ga yuusyou-suru to omoimasu ka?_

                      which  Sub  win          Com think  Qu

‘Which team do you think will win?’
B: Pa-riigu wa yappari Seibu desyo.

Top Cop

‘For the Pacific league, I think yappari it will be Seibu.’

(Maynard’s example (14))

Maynard proposes two situations in which this dialogue would take place: one is when A and B are Seibu fans, the other is when they are the fans of Seibu’s rival team. She claims that yappari here is either a filler, a planner, a rapport seeker or a hesitation marker. This labeling of functions does not explain exactly why B uses yappari. The above hypothesis is applicable to this example. In the situation in which A and B are Seibu fans, the hypothesis explains that B uses yappari because B wants to emphasize the legitimacy of his view as a fan. If B knows that A is also a Seibu fan, this yappari emphasizes the shared feeling and creates the feeling of camaraderie. When both A and B are the fans of Seibu’s rival team, yappari is still used as an intensifier of the view that Seibu will win, even though, in this case, B uses it to reluctantly persuade A and also B himself. If B knows that A is also a Seibu’s rival fan, yappari creates the feeling of commiseration. In Maynard’s explanation, yappari’s function is referred to as a hesitation marker which “marks speaker’s dispreferred statements” in case A and B are Seibu’s rival fans, however, it does not explain how it affects the interaction between the two participants in the dialogue.
3.3. Apparent counter-examples

There are some apparent counter-examples which the above functions fail to explain. The first one occurs in the context in which two parties share a view.

(54) A: O-taku no bottyan, Toodai desu ka?
your family of son Cop Qu
‘Does your son go to Tokyo University?’
B: #Ee, uti no wa yappari Toodai desu.
yes my family Nom Top Cop
‘Yes, my son yappari goes to Tokyo University.’

In (54), A and B are simply confirming their view, therefore, the use of yappari should be acceptable. However, B sounds somehow concealed. Without yappari, this air of conceit is lost.

(55) A: O-taku no bottyan, Toodai desu ka?
your family of son Cop Qu
‘Does your son go to Tokyo University?’
B: Ee, uti no wa Toodai desu.
yes my family Com Top Cop
‘Yes, my son goes to Tokyo University.’

Thus, the effect must be caused by yappari. The possible cause of this effect is the positive quality of the comment made by A. In Japan, Toodai is considered to be one of the prestigious universities. In (54), asking if
B's son goes to that school, A is implying that B's son is intelligent enough to enter the school. The use of *yappari* on B's part emphasizes this positive quality in her son, who is her in-group member. Similar examples follow:

(56) A: Nee, sono daiya, honmono desyo?
    say that diamond real Cop
    'Say, that diamond (of yours) is real, isn't it?'

B: *Yappari* honmono yo.
    real particle
    'Yappari it is real.'

(57) A: *Kimi no kami-san, ryoori ga umai na!*
    your of wife cooking Sub well particle
    'Your wife is a good cook.'

B: *Aa, Yappari umai yo.*
    yeah well particle
    'Yeah, she is a good cook.'

In examples (56) and (57), B's response sounds conceited. One thing is common among the examples (55), (56) and (57), speaker B is making a positive statement about him/herself or about his/her in-group members. If a positive statement is made about a third party, *yappari*’s use is acceptable. Following examples illustrate this point.
(55’) A: **Yamamoto-san no bottyan, Toodai desu ka?**
    of son
    Cop Qu
    ‘Does Mr. Yamamoto's son go to Tokyo University?’

B: **Ee, yappari Toodai desu.**
    yes
    Cop
    ‘Yes, he yappari goes to Tokyo University.’

(56’) A: **Nee, Mitiko no daiya, honmono desyo?**
    say
    of diamond real
    Cop
    ‘Say, Mitiko’s diamond is real, isn’t it?’

B: **Yappari honmono yo.**
    real
    particle
    ‘Yappari it is real.’

(57’) A: **Yamada no kami-san ryoori ga umai na!**
    of wife
    cooking Sub well
    particle
    ‘Yamada's wife is a good cook.’

B: **Aa, Yappari umai yo.**
    yeah
    well
    particle
    ‘Yeah, she is a good cook.’

The use of *yappari* in these examples is not inappropriate. In (55’), B uses *yappari* implying reasons for Yamamoto’s son to be in Toodai such as Mr. Yamamoto himself is also a graduate from that school, or Yamamoto’s son is the top student in his high-school. In (56’), *yappari* is used in the
contexts in which B knows that Michiko is recently engaged or that Mitiko's husband is a jeweler. Similarly, in (57'), B is aware of reasons for Yamada's wife to be a good cook, for example, Yamada is a picky eater, or Yamada's wife goes to cooking school every week. As shown in the above examples, when the speaker makes comments about a third party, the use of yappari is appropriate. Therefore, the inappropriateness in the examples (55), (56) and (57) is caused by the use of yappari which emphasizes positive comments made by the speaker about him/herself or his/her in-group members, which conflicts with Japanese culture which values humbleness. A comparison is made with the examples using sorya (= sore wa) instead of yappari.

(56'') A: Nee, sono daiya, honmono desyo?
   say that diamond real Cop
   'Say, that diamond (of yours) is real, isn't it?'

   B: Sorya honmono yo.
      real particle
      'Of course, it is real.'

(57'') A: Kimi no kami-san, ryoori ga umai na!
   your of wife cooking Sub well particle
   'Your wife is a good cook.'

   B: An. Sorya umai yo.
      yeah well particle
'Yeah, of course she is a good cook.'

Different from yahari, the use of sorya is appropriate. This is because with the use of sorya, the speaker has an intention to boast from the beginning.

Another case which contradicts with my claim will be discussed below. In the context in which two parties share the same view, yappari can be used when one is stating facts as in example (50) which is repeated below:

(50) A: Anpori tte anzen hosyou rizi kai no koto desyo?

    Com Security Council of thing Cop

    'Anpori means the Security Council, isn't it?'

    B: Ee. Yappari soo desu yo.

        yes so Cop particle

        'Yes. Yappari it means that.'

However, there are cases where yappari is inappropriate. The following are such examples:

(58) A: Okosan, yottu gurai desu yo ne.

        your child four about Cop particle particle

        'Your child is about four years old, right?'

    B: Ee, yappari yotta desu.

        yes four Cop

        'Yes, yappari yotta desu.'
(59) A: **O-tanzyoobi, itigatu zyuusiti-niti desyo.**

your birthday January seventeenth Cop

'Your birthday is Hanuary the seventeenth, right?'

B: **Ee, yappari soo desu.**

yes so Cop

'Yes, yappari it is so.'

A possible explanation for the above unnaturalness is that because *yappari* works to imply basis for B's knowledge, although there is no need for it. In both (58) and (59), B is supposed to know about the information which A is confirming. Naturally, in (58), B knows how old his/her own child is. In (59), B knows his/her own birthday. B does not need any basis which supports this knowledge. However, the use of *yappari* implies some basis which are not needed. This discrepancy causes unnaturalness.

3.4. Analysis of written discourse where *yahari/yappari* is used

In this section, I will examine whether the claims which I made in the former section are applicable to the use of *yahari/yappari* in written discourse. Again, the claim is that *yahari/yappari* functions to seek conformity. Specifically, when two parties involved in an interaction do not share opinions or views, the speaker uses this word to implicitly persuade the addressee to conform to the speaker's opinions or views. When two parties share opinions or views, *yahari/yappari* functions to confirm them and emphasize the sameness.
Data are taken from the following prose: *Ki no Saki ni te* ('At Kinosaki'), *Koo Zinbutu no Hushu* ('A Nice Couple'), *Zyuuiti-gatsu Mikka Gogo no Koto* ('About the Afternoon of November Third'), and *Ryuukoo Kanboo* ('Influenza') by Shiga Naoya, and *Sigoto-beya* ('A Workroom') and *Kakiubata* ('Irises') by Ibuse Masuji.

In the examples which I examined, I observed two different uses: *yahari* is used first in the description of an objective states of being or certain occurrences; second it is used in the description of psychology or belief of the characters in the prose. In the first category, *yahari* connects one piece of information introduced in an earlier discourse to that in later discourse, and the relationship between the two is apparent. However, in the second category, the relationship between two pieces of information is not clearly shown. The examples of the first category follow.

(60) **Nakaniwa no ume no huruki no nemoto ni Inbe-yaki no**

courtyard of plum of old tree of base

Loc

**mizu-gane ga suete atta. *******14 Yahari kame wa**

water jar Sub set exist jar Top

**nakaniwa no ume no ki no seba ni atta.**

courtyard of plum of tree of side Loc exist

'At the base of the old plum tree in the courtyard, the Inbe-yaki water jar was set. ****** **Yahari** the jar was at the side of the plum tree in the courtyard.'

---

14 Several years pass. During these years, the hero makes an attempt to get this water-jar.
Kanzyo wa ikamino kyōsyuku sute iru rastii hyōzyū
she Top indeed regret exist appear expression
de kiyamete kogoe de sasayaita no de aru.
Cop extremely small voice Cop whisper Nom Cop

kaih ni oriru to okami-san wa yahari
downstairs Loc descend landlady Top
sasayaki-goe de syabetta.
whisper with speak

'The landlady, with an expression that she appears really feeling sorry for (what is happening), whispered with extremely small voice. ...... when I descended to downstairs, she yahari spoke with whispering voice.'

(62) Kanata no yotukado de tizu o motto sikan ga
far away of intersection Loc map Acc have officer Sub
ni, san- nin no heetai to manika oogoe de
two three people of soldier with something loud voice Cop
miti no koto o kiite ita. Tisai ta hitotu
street of thing Acc ask exist small rice field one
hedateta kamo-ya no baasan ga yahari ookii koe
apart duck store of old woman Sub loud voice
de sore ni henzi o site ita.

with that Loc reply ACC do exist

'At the intersection far away, an officer holding a map, with several soldiers, was asking something about street in a loud voice. An old woman of duck store beyond a small rice field was responding to them yahari in a loud voice.'

(from Zyuniti-gatu Mikka Gogo no Koto by Shiga Naoya)

In (60), the author first describes where the water-jar is placed. After he describes hero's several attempts to get the water-jar from the owner, the author again tells the reader where the water-jar is. He uses yahari to indicate the unchanging state of the water-jar. The second mention of the water-jar's location with yahari confirms its state which is already mentioned and understood by the readers. In (61), yahari is used to indicate that the landlady continues to speak in a whisper all through the characters' locational change i.e. shift from upstairs to downstairs. As observed in (60), this yahari also confirms the description of the landlady's manner of speech in the earlier discourse with that in the later discourse. In (60) and (61), there is a time lapse between two states connected by yahari. However, in (62), there is not a time lapse between the inquiry by the officer and the response by the old woman. Yahari connects the officer's manner of speech and that of the old woman. Although the old woman's loud voice is not caused by that of the officer, yahari reminds
readers of the officer’s manner of speech introduced earlier and emphasizes the similarity between the two. In (60) and (61), the author describes one object or one person at different time. In (62), however, yahari functions to connect the action by two people. In this first category, yahari functions to indicate the unchanging state or the sameness between the two pieces of information. This function is similar to the original meaning of yahari: “to leave something or someone as it is without moving, to remain quietly without moving.” The similarity between the two suggests a possibility that yahari in this context retains its original meaning. Also, the above examples are easily explained by Morita’s description. In (60) and (61), the author uses yahari basing his belief on past conditions i.e., the location of the water-jar at one point in time and that at later time in (60), and the landlady’s whispering upstairs and downstairs in (61). In (62), the character bases his belief on conditions of contrasting situations or items i.e., the officer’s loud voice and the old woman’s loud voice. I suspect that Morita’s analysis is based on yahari in written discourse. As a result, it is useful for explaining its use in the written discourse.

In the second category, yahari is used in the contexts in which the author describes the psychology or the beliefs of characters. It is difficult to identify the basis of their psychology or their beliefs in the discourse. For this use of yahari, the claims I made in earlier discussion remain
applicable. By the use of *yahari*, readers become persuaded to have empathy with the characters’ feelings or beliefs, although their basis are not demonstrated in the discourse. The following examples illustrate this point.

(63) Otto wa kore wa *yahari* zibun kara iidasanakereba husband Top this Top himself from start speaking ikenai to omotta. must Com think ‘The husband thought that as for this, *yahari* he himself must start speaking (to his wife).’

(from *Koozinbutu no HuuHu* by Shiga Naoya)

(64) Saisyo no ko ga sinda no de, watasi-tati ni wa first of child Sub die Nom Cop we Loc top myoo ni okubyoo ga simikonda. Kenzen ni sodatu no strangely timidity Sub soak into healthily grow Nom ga toozen de sinu no wa reegai da to iu mae Sub proper Cop die NomTop exception Cop Com say before kara no kangae wa kawaranai ga tyotto byooki o from of idea Top not change but a little sickness Acc sarete mo watasi wa sugu sini wa simai ka to iu done even I Top soon die Top might Qu Com say
huan ni osowareta. Sore de igaku no tikara wa
anxiety Loc assaulted that Cop medicine of power Top
sireta mono da to ii ii yahari sugu isya o
known thing Cop Com say say soon doctor Acc
tayori ni sita.
depend.

'Because first child died, we got strangely timid. The idea from
before that it is proper (for a child) to grow healthily and that it is an
exception to die did not change. However, even a child got a little
sick, I was assaulted by the anxiety that the child will soon die.
Therefore, while saying that the power of medicine is undependable,
yahari (I) depended on a doctor.'

(from Ryuukoo Kanbo)

Example (63) is the beginning sentence of a chapter. In the preceeding
chapter the husband tells his wife that he cannot guarantee her his fidelity
once he is away from home. After this dialogue, the husband finds out that
one of the maids is pregnant. He thinks that his wife might suspect him.
He admits to himself that he had a desire for the maid in the past, but it was
not serious enough to destroy his family life. In (63), yahari makes
readers think that after some thinking the husband determines to speak
before his wife does, although the reason for this determination is not
described in the text. Similarly, in (64), although the death of the couple's
first child or their timidity about the child’s sickness or their anxiety does not prove the dependability of a doctor, yahari makes readers think that the father’s dependance on a doctor is somehow supported by these facts.

As discussed above, yahari in written discourse is used in two different contexts. One context describes an objective state of being or a certain occurrence, and yahari in such a contexts functions to indicate the unchanging state or the sameness between two pieces of information. This function retains the element of yahari’s original meaning: ‘to leave something or someone as it is without moving, to remain quietly without moving.’ In this context, readers are aware of two states or two pieces of information, and yahari works to confirm the sameness between the two. In this sense, there is a relationship between this function and my claim. Another context describes the psychology or the beliefs of characters in the prose. In this context, the authors succeed, with the use of yahari, in inducing in readers the same feelings or beliefs which the characters have. This function is in accordance with my claim.

3.5. For future studies

In Fukushi no Imi to Youhoo, Hatake mentions, from the perspective of function, that there are similarities between certain adverbs and interjections. He lists adverbs such as tyotto, ziti wa, naruhodo, maa, yappari as prospective candidates for interjections. This thesis alluded to the similarity between yahari/yappari and English discourse marker
y’know. Schiffrin discusses functions of this word in detail in *Discourse Marker* (1987). According to her, the function of y’know is informational and interactional: a speaker uses y’know (1) to check to see if there is shared knowledge between the speaker and the addressee (2) in a dispute, to appeal to shared knowledge as a way of converting an opponent to one’s own side (3) in narrative context, to enlist the addressee’s attention as a participant of the storytelling, and (4) to focus addressee attention on the same information on which the speaker is currently focusing. The function of yahari/yappari does not necessarily overlap with all of the above functions of y’know. Yahari/yappari does not seem to have the function similar to (1). By comparing the apparently similar function of y’know and yahari/yappari, and by discovering the similarities and the differences between the two, the functions of yahari/yappari would be defined more precisely. Also we would understand how different languages use different linguistic forms to express similar functions.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSION

In this thesis I described the functions of a Japanese tinzyutu hukusi ('modal adverb'), yahari/yappari.

In Chapter I, tinzyutu hukusi is described as having a function to supplement and to emphasize the modal meanings of predicates. Yahari/yappari originally expressed a meaning: “to leave something or someone as it is without moving, to remain quietly without moving.” In modern usage, the meaning is more diverse. Although there is a claim that this word makes conversation smooth, there is not clear explanation of how this is achieved.

In Chapter II, I reviewed (1) dictionary definition, (2) Morita’s description, (3) Account by Maynard, and (4) Account by Nishihara. The dictionary definition as well as Morita’s description list the meaning differences of yahari/yappari. Most of the meanings which Morita describes overlap with the dictionary definition. According to Morita, yahari/yappari is used when reality matches the speaker’s belief, and it expresses five different criteria which support the speaker’s belief.

Maynard examines yahari/yappari from three perspectives:
(1) its semantic source (2) its discourse functions, and (3) its interactional functions. She claims that 
*yahari/yappari* signals the linkage between a propositional context and a relevant knowledge identified by a speaker. She identifies four different types of knowledge: (1) Textual Knowledge, (2) Social Knowledge, (3) Knowledge for Conclusion, and (4) Knowledge for Selection. As discourse functions of *yahari/yappari*, Maynard lists three functions, each marks; (1) speaker subjectivity, (2) discourse cohesion, and (3) cohesiveness in the discourse. She also recognizes three interactional functions, namely a rapport seeker, a filler/planner, and a hesitation marker. She integrates all the above functions, and proposes that *yahari/yappari* indicates 'Discourse Modality'.

Nishihara divides functions of *yahari/yappari* into three categories based on the scope of its functions: (1) within the scope of a propositional content, (2) within the scope of a discourse, and (3) beyond the scope of a discourse. She claims that the essential function of this word which transcends the above three categories is to indicate a reasonable consequence of a logical presupposition held by a speaker. At the same time, the speaker appeals to this presupposition.

In Chapter III, first, I examined whether the above studies were useful for the interpretation of *yahari/yappari* in naturally spoken discourse. There are some examples in which the function of *yahari/yappari* is ambiguous and cannot be explained by any of the three
analyses. Next, I analyzed the use of *yahari/yappari* in three logically conceivable contexts in regard to information sharing between the participants of a dialogue. Based on the analysis, I made a claim that when two parties have different opinions, *yahari/yappari* is used when a speaker expresses his/her opinions or views, and it works to implicitly persuade an addressee to conforms to the speaker’s opinions. When two parties share the same opinions, it confirms its sameness and creates a close feeling between the two. Next, I examined *yahari/yappari* in written discourse to see if my claim is applicable to them. In the written discourse, *yahari* is used (1) in the description of objective states of being or certain occurrences, and (2) in the description of psychology or belief of the characters in the prose. In the former cases, *yahari* functions to indicate the unchanging state or the sameness between two pieces of information. In the latter, *yahari* shares a function in my claim. With the use of *yahari*, authors involve readers in creating the same feelings or beliefs which characters in the prose have.

For future studies, a suggestion is made to compare the use and function of *yapari/yappari* with those of English discourse marker, *y'know* which is discussed extensively by Deborah Schiffrin.

Although I focused on *yahari/yappari* in this thesis, in the future I would like to study other *tingyatu hukusi* and clarify their functions. It is important because few pragmatic studies has been done on *tingyatu*
hukasi thus far. Also, I am interested in comparing these forms with their counterparts in other languages and discover how the modality is universally expressed.
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