University of Alberta

The multifunctionality of the Japanese connective *dakara* and diachrony

by

Yumi Sasaki

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Japanese Language and Linguistics

Department of East Asian Studies

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2008

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-46982-8
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-46982-8

ABSTRACT

This study presents a functional analysis of the use of Japanese connective *dakara* 'therefore/so' in naturally occurring conversations, taking on an interaction-and-grammar approach to grammar (See Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996). The close examination of its use in everyday interactions reveals that *dakara* is more than just a consequential connective as has been widely believed; it also displays interaction-oriented functions at the discourse level. Subsequently, *dakara*'s multifunctionality is examined in relation to a type of diachronic language changing process – grammaticization. Based on a careful examination, the paper argues that *dakara* is not an example of grammaticization, but of a more general semantic change – pragmaticization. Such findings confirm the ever-changing nature of language, which, in turn, underscores the importance of studying grammar in its natural home environment, that is, everyday conversation.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Framework

Traditionally, syntax has been viewed as a static, autonomous, self-contained entity. Thus, the efforts to gain insight into grammar have also been made in isolation from other elements involved in language. Schegloff, Ochs, and Thompson (1996) explain this perspective as follows:[1]

> [The] proper understanding [of grammar] would then be equally internally shaped, and only marginally affected by our understanding of, for example, other 'mental capacities,' or the cultures which are irremediably intertwined with the semantics and the lexicon of a language, let alone its pragmatics and the contexts in which language develops and is used. (p. 2)

In contrast to such a view of syntax, the "interaction and grammar" approach has a different outlook on syntax. Proponents regard grammar as "part of a broader range of resources – organizations of practices, if you will – which underlie the organization of social life, and in particular the way in which language figures in everyday interaction and cognition" (p. 2). Under such a scenario then, it is believed that studying grammar out of context (that is, outside of everyday interactions) would only lead to a partial understanding. In order to gain a full understanding, grammar needs to be studied at work in its natural home environment (Schegloff, 1989).

The present paper takes the latter approach towards grammar and analyzes the use of Japanese *dakara* 'therefore/so' in naturally occurring conversations. The close examination of its use in interactions reveals that *dakara* is more than just a consequential connective as has been widely believed; it also displays interaction-oriented functions at the discourse level. This multiplicity of the connective's function will be discussed in relation to grammaticization phenomena, which refers to "the steps whereby particular items become more grammatical through time" (Hopper & Traugott, 2003, p. 2). Given that grammaticization is a functionalist theory that is concerned with interaction between language and its use (Hopper & Traugott, 2003), analyzing the use of *dakara* in everyday interactions suits the nature of the theory as well.

1.2 Previous Studies

Japanese connective *dakara* 'therefore' is said to have developed from the bound grammatical morpheme sequence of the copula *da* and what Traugott (1995a) calls the "subordinating clitic" *kara* 'because' (Matsumoto, 1988). The following is the examples that Matsumoto used to describe the change:

(1) Matsumoto (1988, p. 341)

```
Taro-wa  mada  kodomo-da-kara     sore-wa   muri-da
Taro-TOP still child-COP-because that-TOP  unreasonable-request-COP
```

'Since Taro is still a child, he is not equal to that task.'

[1] "Syntax" and "grammar" are used interchangeably here.

According to Matsumoto, the bound sequence *da-kara* in (1) detached itself from the rest of the clause over time and began to function as an independent connective *dakara* 'therefore' as in (2).[2]

(2) Matsumoto (ibid.)

Taro-wa mada kodomo-da. ***Da-kara*** *sore-wa muri-da*
Taro-TOP still child-COP therefore that-TOP unreasonable-request-COP
'Taro is still a child. Therefore, he is not equal to that task.'

Regarding the example (2), Matsumoto takes a special note on the first copula *da* in "*kodomo-da*" because it highlights the lexicalized status of the following *dakara*: *dakara* has been reanalyzed as a complete, single word unit, which means *da* in *dakara* is no longer perceived as a copula; hence the necessity to end the first sentence in *da*.

Traditionally, *dakara* such as in (2) has been described as a connective that logically relates preceding material, a reason or a cause, with following material, a result or a consequence. Indeed, Martin (2004) calls *dakara* a "consequential conjunction" (p. 818). Following him, I will call this usage of *dakara* "consequential" hereafter. Below is an example of the typical consequential usage of *dakara*:

(3) Maynard (1993, pp. 69-70)

(3-1) *Kodomo ga ookega o shita.*
'The child was seriously injured.'

(3-2) ***Dakara*** *hahaoya wa sugu byooin ni tsureteitta.*
'***Dakara*** the mother took the child to the hospital immediately.'

According to Maynard (1989, 1993), (3-1) is the cause while (3-2) serves as the result. In this manner, *dakara* is said to be found in an environment such as [X. *dakara* Y.], where [X] represents a cause/reason, and [Y] a result/consequence. In fact, this is the only function of *dakara* found in books such as dictionaries (E.g., *Kojien*, 2004; *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*, 1972), grammar references (E.g., Martin, 2004; Makino & Tsutsui, 2007), and Japanese language textbooks that are widely used in North America (E.g., *Nakama*, *Yookoso*, and *An Integrated Approach to Intermediate Japanese*).

However, my casual observation of native speaker's usage of *dakara* contradicts such a claim. Consider the following example from a naturally occurring conversation:

(4) High School Boys: Two high school boys are talking about smoking.[3]

[2] This *da* + *kara* sequence will always be written as *da-kara* in the present paper, as opposed to the independent connective *dakara*, hereafter.
[3] All the conversations are transcribed according to Du Bois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming, and Paolino (1993). The list of conventions is available in Appendix 2.

(4-1) *L: oyaji no mae de wa suenai n da kedo=*
father LK front at Cont smoke-Neg Nom Cop but
'(I) can't smoke in front of my dad, but'

→(4-2) *uchi no oyaji* ***dakara****,*
my LK father
'my dad ***dakara***'

(4-3) *hontoo,*
really
'really'

(4-4) *R: (Hx) <X inai to[ki suen no] X>.*
exist-Neg when can-smoke Q
'when (he) is not there, can you smoke?'

(4-5) *L: [kodomo ga ko]domo ga dekita toki ni,*
child S child S pregnant time at
'when my mom got pregnant'

(4-6) *R: un.*
yeah
'yeah'

(4-7) *L: yameta rashii kara tabako.*
quit QT because cigarette
'(he) quit smoking, I heard.'

(4-8) *kekko i- <@ ikatten da yo @>.*
fairly angry Cop FP
'(he) is fairly angry (about his children smoking).'

In (4-1), L tells R that he cannot smoke in front of his dad. In (4-2), he starts his utterance with "my dad" and then inserts *dakara*. He then continues his talk saying "really" in (4-3); however, the turn is taken up by R in (4-4) who asks for clarification whether L can smoke when his father is not around. In (4-5), L interrupts R's question and continues with his talk about his father being angry about his children smoking in spite of the fact that he quit smoking for them. Using Maynard's [X. *dakara* Y.] structure, this sequence can be summarized as follows:

[X]: 'I can't smoke around my dad,'
dakara
[Y]: '(He) quit smoking when my mom got pregnant, I heard. (He) is fairly angry (about his children smoking).'

Clearly, the reason why the speaker's father is angry is not because his son cannot smoke around him. Instead, the cause-and-result relation is reversed: the speaker cannot smoke because his father is angry. In other words, what seems to be happening in this sequence is that the speaker delivers a statement in [X], and he provides further background information in [Y] regarding the statement. Maynard (1989, 1993) also identifies this type of *dakara* as "explanatory" usage whose function is "to signal the starting point for additional explanatory information felt necessary and assumed relevant by the speaker in a single turn as well as across speaker turns" (p. 82). Borrowing her terminology, this type of *dakara* will be referred to as "explanatory" *dakara* hereafter.

Besides the explanatory usage, Maynard (1989, 1993) proposes additional non-consequential usage of *dakara*: turn-claiming function. Below is an example:

(5) Maynard (1993, p. 90)[4] A and B discuss their mutual acquaintance Mr. Kaku who, according to B, is soon going to resign from the company he works for.[5]

(5-1) A: [*Kaku-san kaisha yamete doo sun no?*]
Mr. Kaku company leave what do IP
'What is Mr. Kaku going to do after leaving the company?'

→(5-2) B: [***Dakara****/* *koomuin/* *daisotsu*
so/therefore government employee college-graduate

de shiken ukete/ koomuin.]
as exam take govrnment employee
'So (he'll be a) government employee. He will take an exam once he gets his college degree and will be a government employee.'

(5-3) A: [*Shokyuu ja saa/*
lowest rank T IP
'But if it's the lowest rank,'

(B: *Un.*)
uh huh
'Uh huh.'

(5-4) *saitei demo chuukyuu ukara-nakya*
at least even middle rank pass-NEG

hanashi ni naranai jan./]
meaningless IP
'it will be meaningless unless he passes at least the middle rank exam, right?'

[4] To maintain the accuracy of the transcription, I cited others' conversational data as it is except for the typographical modifications (i.e., font) to be consistent in the presentation.
[5] '/'= pause, '[ ]'= the boundaries of the speaking turn, '( )'= listener back channels, and the specific linguistic units under discussion are underlined.

(5-5) B: [*Un ukaru desho?/*]
Yeah pass BE
'Yeah, I think he will pass.'

(5-6) A: [*Kokka koomuin?/*]
federal government employee
'(Will he be a) federal government employee?'

(5-7) B: [*Un.*]
Yeah
'Yeah.'

(5-8) A: [*Ano hito yamete doo sun no jaa/*]
that person leave what do Nom then
'What's he going to do after leaving (the company) then?'

→(5-9) B: [***Dakara*** *shiken uken da yo.*]
so exam take Cop FP
'So he'll take the exam.'

According to Maynard (1989, 1993), the *dakara* in (5-2) is an example of the turn-claiming function. There is no obvious [X] that represents a reason, nor does the speaker add explanatory information to the point he previously made. Rather, Maynard explains, he "answers a question as if claiming that his answer is somehow connected to the prior move," and thus, this *dakara* is a marker of "the speaker's claim of turn" (p. 92). Mori (1999) shares this view of *dakara*'s turn-taking function as well: "the employment of ... *dakara* could be related to the perceived pressure to maintain or regain one's speakership" (p. 168).

The *dakara* in (5-9) on the other hand, marks the reluctant repetition of an earlier utterance (Mizutani and Mizutani, 1981; Maynard, 1989, 1993; Hasunuma, 1991; Karatsu, 1995; Mori, 1999). In spite of the fact that B already gave the answer that Mr. Kaku will take the exam and become a government employee in (5-2) to A's question on what he will do after leaving the company in (5-1), A asks the same question again in (5-8), which puts B in a position to have to repeat what he said in (5-2). Maynard points out that there is a trace of irritation in B's voice in (5-9). She explains that this use of *dakara* conveys the meaning of "something related to [Y] is already mentioned elsewhere, so I am TELLING you [Y] (again)" (p. 92). Mizutani and Mizutani (1981), too, share a similar view on this type of *dakara*: "[w]hen the speaker feels irritated about having to repeat an explanation, he often starts his explanation with this word" (p. 113). I will refer to this usage as the "repetitive" function hereafter.

Maynard (1993) adds to the turn-claiming usage described above turn-yielding usage and together calls them "participatory control" function (p. 97). Below is an example of the turn-yielding use:

(6) Maynard (1993, p.94) Speaker A takes a long turn explaining how many university courses he is taking this year. He mentions that he is taking eight courses, but two are half courses—one meeting during the first part of the year and the other meeting during the second half. So, in terms of credit hours he is taking seven full-year courses.

(6-1) A: [*Sono uchi hutatsu nee/zenki dake no to/*
that among two IP first half only one and

kooki dake no to aru wake yo./
second half only one and there are reason IP
'It is...among them, two of them are courses for only half a year, one for the first and the other for the second semester.'

→ (6-2) [Ne/ ***dakara***/
IP and/therefore
'See, so...'

(B: *A soo ka soo ka soo ka.*)
ah so Q so Q so Q
'Ah, I see, I see, I see.'

wakatta?/]
understood
'do you understand?'

(6-3) B: [*NODDING*]

As Maynard puts it, this use of *dakara* "may be interpreted as 'that's why' in this position, giving a conclusive tone to the turn" (p. 93). As well, the recognizable pause after *dakara* (represented by a slash '/') maximizes the negotiability of the next turn, suggesting the speaker's willingness to yield the turn.

Mori (1999) adds another usage of *dakara* to the explanatory, the repetitive, and the participatory control functions. In contrast to the explanatory, she explains that while the explanatory *dakara* precedes "new" information which is given to the recipients as "'supporting evidence' for what has already been said" (p.165), the *dakara* she found in her data set precedes rephrasing or replacement of a previously made proposition in order to pursue agreement from the listener(s). Consider Mori's description of this usage:

> [I]n the target sequences investigated in this study, speakers negotiate their opinion or evaluation of a person, object, event, or circumstance, about which their recipients are assumed to have some knowledge. In this environment, *dakara* does not necessarily introduce "new" or "unknown" information to elaborate the prior utterance. Rather, *dakara* often prefaces the speaker's rephrasing of the prior utterance or replacing of a portion of the prior utterance. Such remedial work appears to be performed as an attempt to clarify what they said earlier and to pursue the recipient's affirmative response. (p. 160)

As well, she clarifies that this usage differs from the repetitive *dakara* in that "speakers are motivated to rephrase their earlier utterances" (p. 161), whereas the repetitive *dakara* marks "reluctant, exact repetition" of what has been said earlier. Let us examine an example of this usage:

(7) Mori (1999, pp. 161-162)[6]

> [T]he participants discuss the use of different terms referring to one's own wife ... While Mari suggests that *kanai* (a more traditional, potentially discriminatory term), on certain formal occasions, maybe still considered more appropriate than *tsuma* (a more neutral term), Tae asserts that *kanai* is no longer used today, especially among younger generations.

(7-1) Tae: >*demo shitara*< *sore tte sa:::,*
but then that Top FP

(7-2) ·(*nan te iu no*)·
what QT say Q

(7-3) [*goJUUDAI gurai no- ue [tte kanji shinai?=*
Fifties about LK above QT feeling Tag
'but then that's, how can I say it, that's like for people in their fifties or above, don't you think?'

(7-4) Mari: [*tsuma tte sa::*
wife Top FP
'As for "tsuma"'

(7-5) Shinji: [((clear throat))

(7-6) Mari: =*aa soo:::,*
oh so
'oh yea:::h?'

→ (7-7) Tae: *wakan nai.* >***dakara***< *nijuudai no hito*
know Neg twenties LK people

(7-8) *toka iu no soozoo tsuku?*
like say Nom imagine can
'I don't know. ***Dakara*** can you imagine people in their twenties using that term?'

---

[6] Mori's (1999) transcription conventions: '><'= increase in temp, as in a rush-through, ':'= noticeably lengthened sound, ','= continuing intonation, '( )'= unintelligible stretch, '· ·'= a passage of talk which is quieter than the surrounding talk, '['= the point at which the current talk is overlapped by other talk, CAPS= relatively high volume, '-'= sudden cut-ff of the current sound, '?'= rising intonation, '='= "latched" utterances, with no interval between them, underlining= relatively high pitch, '(( ))'= comments by the transcriber, '.'= falling intonation

Between (7-1) and (7-3), Tae delivers her opinion that *kanai* is used just among older generations, which is received with hesitant reactive token in (7-6). Upon receiving the reluctant response, Tae first "attenuates her stance" by saying 'I don't know' but attempts again to convince others on her point in (7-7) and (7-8) by "shifting the focus from older generations to younger generations" (Mori, 1999, p. 162). In other words, Tae is rephrasing her earlier utterance about `goJUUDAI gurai no- ue` "people in their fifties above" in (7-3) with `nijuudai no hito` "people in their twenties" in (7-7), and this conversational move is preceded by *dakara*. I will call this use of the connective, the "remedial" function hereafter for the convenience of discussion.

In addition to identifying these non-consequential usages of *dakara*, Maynard (1993) conducted a quantitative study. She compared the occurrence of consequential, explanatory and turn-yielding *dakara* in two different discourse types, namely naturally occurring causal conversations and dialogues in written fictions (hereafter written dialogues).[7] The study revealed that in the written dialogues the consequential function was the majority. On the other hand, in the naturally occurring casual conversations, non-consequential uses of *dakara* (i.e., explanatory and turn-yielding) are almost as frequent as the consequential counterpart, the result of which underscores the importance of interaction-oriented usages of *dakara* in everyday conversations.

While Maynard (1989, 1993) and Mori (1999) focused on describing *dakara*'s synchronic functional variations, Matsumoto (1988) investigated the connective's multifunctionality from a diachronic point of view. As mentioned earlier, the connective *dakara* is assumed to have derived from the sequence of the copula *da* and the causal subordinating clitic *kara*. In modern Japanese, Matsumoto explains, the connective *dakara* is used not only as a consequential marker at the textual level, but also as a discourse marker that delivers that meaning of "I'm telling you!" In sum, his proposed development of the connective can be summarized as:

bound morpheme sequence *da+kara* > independent consequential connective *dakara* > discourse marker (i.e., "I'm telling you!").

In comparison to the diachronic language changing process of grammaticization, which is characterized by the unidirectionality of increasing syntactic bondedness and increasing semantic abstractness over time (Hopper & Traugott, 2003; Traugott, 1995a, 1995b, 1982; Heine & Reh 1984; Givon, 1979), Matsumo concludes that, although semantic-pragmatic aspect of the change resembles the grammaticization process in its semantic bleaching and pragmatic strengthening, *dakara*'s development does not follow the morphosyntactic change of grammaticization.[8] Thus, *dakara*'s development is not grammaticization, but a more general semantic change, namely, pragmaticization.

1.3 Limitations of the Previous Studies and the Purpose of the Present Study

Among the previous studies that are described above, Maynard's studies (1989, 1993) are the most comprehensive analyses in terms of the functional variations of *dakara*. One drawback, however, is that her analyses were partly based on written

[7] It is not clear from her writing whether she limited the target functions on purpose to the three (i.e., consequential, explanatory, and turn-yielding), or those were the only three she found in all of the occurrences of *dakara* in both discourse types.

[8] Hopper and Traugott (2003) explain syntactic bondedness as "the degree of cohesion of adjacent forms that goes from loosest ('periphrasis') to tightest ('morphology')" (p. 7).

dialogues from novels. Although such dialogues simulate spontaneous conversations, they are still, in essence, constructed data. Thus, they may not reflect the actual usage of *dakara* in everyday conversation.

Maynard's work is also the only one that combined a qualitative analysis of the usage of the connective with a quantitative analysis as mentioned above. Although this was an attempt to grasp a more accurate picture of how *dakara* is used in daily interactions, the numbers of *dakara* the quantitative study was based upon was rather small (77 in naturally occurring conversations and 349 tokens in written dialogues), not to mention it only dealt with the three functions, that is, consequential, explanatory, and turn-yielding.

Mori (1999), on the other hand, focused only on the qualitative analysis using all naturally occurring conversations; however, her study is only concerned with *dakara*'s usage in the specific conversational act of delivery and pursuit of agreement. Thus, her study does not address the general functions of the connective.

As pointed out earlier, Matsumoto (1988) is the only study that explored the diachronic aspect of the development of *dakara*. It should be noted, however, that his comparison of the multifunctionality of *dakara* and the grammaticization process were made on the grounds of a small number of criteria: semantic bleaching, pragmatic strengthening and syntactic bondedness. As well, one major drawback of his study was that the study was based on constructed data.[9] Put in Hopper and Traugott's (2003) terms, it was an analysis "based on the linguist's private introspection" (p. 35). Given that grammaticization, or for that matter any language change theory in general, is a functionalist theory that focuses on the interaction of language and its use (Hopper & Traugott, 2003), it is indispensable to examine how the language is used in actual discourse.

Based on these limitations of the previous studies, the purpose of my study is two fold: First is to reanalyze the functions of *dakara* using a larger corpus of all naturally occurring conversations (234 tokens of *dakara* as opposed to 77 tokens in Maynard (1989, 1993)) in order to gain a better understanding of how the connective is used in daily interactions. Unlike Maynard's (1989, 1993) quantitative study, the present study takes all the functions that are described above into consideration. In addition, all forms of *dakara* are included in the analysis: the independent connective *dakara*, the bound grammatical morpheme sequence, *da-kara*, as well as forms such as *da=*, *daka=*, and *da=ra*, which are phonologically reduced forms of *dakara*. As has been suggested, everyday talk is the primordial as well as the primary form of language. Studying all forms of *dakara* in this context should help us understand how the connective is actually used by speakers.

The second purpose of this study is to explore the relation between the multifunctionality of *dakara* and language change based on the theory of grammaticization. In comparison to Matsumoto (1988), this study will examine the similarities and dissimilarities with grammaticization in more detail and, more importantly, based on the actual usage of *dakara* in naturally occurring conversations as opposed to constructed examples.

---

[9] Although I used the word "drawback," I should mention that it was normal at the time when the paper was written to use constructed data for analysis.

1.4 Data

The corpus for the present study consists of parts from ten naturally occurring conversations of standard Japanese that were collected between 1989 and 2008.[10] [11]The total length of the data used for analysis is approximately two hours and ten minutes, during which 234 tokens of *dakara* were found. Table 1 shows the breakdown of the occurrence of dakara according to each conversation.

Table 1: Number of *dakara*'s Occurrence According to Conversations

I Gaikogugo	II Kinkyoo Hookoku	III Otooto	IV S & Y	V Bukatsu	VI Hatachi	VII Ryokoo	VIII High school boys	IX Arasoi	X Zeitaku	Total
13	38	13	32	16	31	20	11	13	47	234

It should be noted that the definition of "naturally occurring conversations" in this paper encompasses nine that were recorded by the speakers themselves or by a researcher at locations of their daily lives (e.g. house, university mall, etc.) and one (Conversation IV) that was recorded by a researcher in a pseudo-natural setting. By pseudo-natural setting, I mean that the conversation between two friends was set up by researchers for the purpose of recording. Although this is not the most ideal setting to collect natural data, every effort was made to simulate natural conversations by asking two volunteers who were close friends and interacted on regular basis at the time of recording (See Appendix 1 for more details). All the conversations are audio recordings that have been transcribed according to the conventions set by Du Bois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming, and Paolino (1993). Appendix 2 lists the transcription conventions. Although my data is limited in its size and dialectal, sociolinguistic varieties, I believe it is still sufficient to gain the basic understanding of the language use in question.

1.5 Overview of the Study

Chapter 1 has discussed so far the framework of this study, the previous literature, the purpose of this study, and the data. Chapter 2 will describe the recategorization of *dakara*'s functions as a result of the qualitative analysis. Subsequently, the results of the quantitative study based on the new categorization will be presented and discussed. Chapter 3 will be designated to the further discussion of the results of the quantitative study as it relates to language change including the theory of grammaticization. In Chapter 4, I will revisit the significance of studying grammar using naturally occurring conversation. I will also discuss the limitations of the study and the direction of future studies.

---

[10] I used the sections of the conversations that had been already transcribed and were available for analysis.

[11] A few participants displayed some characteristics of Kansai dialect (the area to the west of Tokyo); nonetheless, their conversations were included in the corpus since they seemed to accommodate themselves to the standard Japanese spoken by their interlocutors.

Chapter 2: Analysis

2.1 Qualitative Analysis

I first counted all the occurrences of *dakara* in my database (234 tokens) including the connective *dakara*, the bound grammatical morpheme sequence *da-kara*, as well as phonologically reduced forms of *dakara* such as *da=*, *daka=*, and *da=ra*. Second, I attempted to categorize them based on the aforementioned functional categories proposed in the literature: consequential, explanatory, remedial, repetitive, and participatory control (turn-claiming and turn-yielding). In doing so, however, the need to reorganize the categories arose. Table 2 summarizes *dakara*'s functional categories proposed in various earlier studies on the connective (see Chapter 1 for the descriptions of the functions); Table 3 summarizes the functional categories employed in the present study as well as the subcategories within a category (separated with small dashed lines). The correspondences between the two categorizations (from the previous studies and the present study) are indicated by the big dashed lines in between the tables. The following sections will describe the changes that are made to the previous categorization: the consequential, the explanatory, and the discourse-organizational functions.

Table 2: Summary of *dakara*'s functions from previous studies

Da-kara	***Dakara***				
Consequential	***Consequential***	***Explanatory***	***Repetitive***	***Remedial***	***Participatory Control***

	Consequential			***Explanatory***			***Discourse-Organizational***	
Consequential	Proto-typical	[X] = the prior discourse/ mutual understanding	[X] = other speaker's utterance	Exp	Rep	Rem	Participatory Control	Topic-Resuming

Table 3: Summary of *dakara*'s functions from the analysis of the present study

2.1.1 The Consequential *Da-kara* and *Dakara*

As Table 3 indicates, my data supports the consequential function of the *da-kara* sequence as has been described in the previous literature. The consequential function of the connective *dakara*, on the other hand, needs to be redefined. That is, the consequential *dakara* in the present study subsumes three subcategories as illustrated in Table 3. The distinctions were made based on the scope of the consequential relationship that *dakara* marked. The first subtype is the prototypical consequential usage in which [X] and [Y] are produced by the same speaker, and [Y] immediately follows [X], fitting nicely into the formula that Maynard (1989, 1993) suggested: [X. *dakara* Y.]. Example (3), which is repeated below, represents this type.

(3) Maynard (1993, pp. 69-70)

(3-1) *Kodomo ga ookega o shita.*
'The child was seriously injured.'

(3-2) ***Dakara*** *hahaoya wa sugu byooin ni tsureteitta.*
'***Dakara*** the mother took the child to the hospital immediately.'

The consequential relationship between [X] and [Y] in this sequence can be summarized as follows:

[X]: 'The child was seriously injured.'
dakara ('Therefore')
[Y]: 'the mother took the child to the hospital immediately.'

As seen, the scope of the consequential relationship that *dakara* marks is immediate and within the same speaker.

In comparison, the scope for the other two subtypes is larger: the entire discourse unit for the second subtype and across speakers for the third subtype. More concretely speaking, for the second subtype, a previous discourse as a whole (or conversationalists' shared understanding from the previous discourse) seems to serve as [X]. Below is an example:

(8) Arasoi 'Fight': R has been complaining about H not phoning her about a change in plan throughout this conversation. Prior to this excerpt, H explains that the stadium that he was at was not equipped with pay phones and thus, he couldn't phone her. In this sequence, R continues to blame him, in response to which H fights back saying R is selfish.

(8-1) R: *...ja saisho kara yoku kangaetokya ii jan*
then first from well think-if good Tag

(8-2) *dekinai n dattara dekinai tte,*
can-Neg Nom Cop-if can-Neg QT
"Then, you should have thought through the scenario when you can't (phone me) beforehand."

(8-3) : ...[*doo datta XXXXXXX.*]
How was
"How was..."

→(8-4) H: [***dakara*** *katte] da ttsutte n da yo omae,*
selfish Cop saying Nom Cop FP you
"***Dakara*** I'm telling you that you're selfish, man."

(8-5) : *jibun no omoidoori ni ikanai kara tte omae,*
self LK the-way-you-like in go-Neg because QT you
"Because (things) don't go the way you like,"

(8-6) : *...iitai koto ittari=.*
want-to-say thing say-and-such
"(you) say whatever you want to say and stuff."

Upon hearing H's excuse that the stadium was not equipped with pay phones, R in (8-1) tells H that he should have thought about the scenario beforehand. As R tries to continue speaking, H interrupts with *dakara* and argues back that R is selfish in (8-4). This *dakara* does not seem to be anaphorically referring to one specific utterance or conversational move that either H or R made. Rather, it appears to be alluding to the entire discourse that leads up to the point during which R has been repeatedly complaining at H for forgetting to phone her. In short, the consequential relationship can be encapsulated as follows:

[X]: R has been repeatedly complaining without considering H's excuse
Dakara ('So/That's why')
[Y]: 'I'm telling you that you're selfish,'

As summarized above, having implicitly referred to the reason why he thinks she is selfish with *dakara*'s anaphoric reference, H, this time, explicitly verbalizes the reason in (8-5) and (8-6). Clearly, this usage is a departure from the prototypical consequential usage in which a previous specific utterance by the speaker serves as [X].

For the third subtype, the consequential relationship is established across speakers. In other words, [X] is found in the interlocutor's utterance. Consider the following example:

(9) Arasoi 'Fight': A couple, R (Female) and H (Male) are arguing about how H does not carry out what he said he would. In this particular sequence, R says that in the past when he did not do what he had promised to do, there was no outsider involved. This time, she compares, he causes trouble for an outsider (as opposed to just R who is an insider to H), implying that this is a worse scenario.

(9-1) R: *...tanin ga haittenai desho itsumo no toki wa=.*
outsider S involved-Neg Tag usual LK time Top
"Outsiders are usually not involved."

(9-2) : *tanin ga haitteru n da yo.*
outsider S involved Nom Cop FP
"An outsider is involved (this time), you know."

→ (9-3) H: *...**dakara** nan da yo.*
what Cop FP
"***Dakara*** what?"

(9-4) R: ...*da=*,
da=
"*Da=*,"

(9-5) jibun ni tanin= --
self to outsider
"to yourself outsider..."

(9-6) jibun ga tanin= ni sa nani nani suru ne ttsutte,
self S outsider to FP what what do FP QT-say
"you yourself say to others 'I will do so and so' and"

(9-7) ja= dame dattara,
then cannot Cop-if
"then, if you couldn't do it,"

(9-8) <Q dame datta Q> tte yuu no itsumo.
Cannot Cop QT say Q always
"do you always say 'I couldn't'?"

In (9-1) and (9-2), R, by saying *tanin ga haittenai desho itsumo no toki wa=. tanin ga haitteru n da yo.* 'Outsiders are usually not involved. An outsider is involved (this time), you know', implies that this time is worse than before because H is causing trouble to an outsider. H, not understanding the intention of R's utterance, asks for clarification in (9-3) by saying ***dakara*** *nan da yo* '***Dakara*** what?' Upon receiving this request, R rephrases her earlier utterance in (9-2), *tanin ga haitteru n da yo* 'An outsider is involved (this time), you know', with a more concrete hypothetical question, starting from (9-4): *da=*, jibun ni tanin=, jibun ga tanin= ni sa nani nani suru ne ttsutte, ja= dame dattara, <Q dame datta Q> tte yuu no itsumo "*Da=*, to yourself outsider..., you yourself say to others 'I will do so and so' and then, if you couldn't do it, do you always say 'I couldn't'?" This rephrasing of R's earlier utterance is preceded by another *dakara*, or more precisely, a phonologically shortened form, *da=*. This is an example of Mori's (1999) remedial function, which precedes rephrasing or replacement of a previously made proposition in order to pursue agreement from the listener(s) as described in Chapter 1.

The *dakara* in (9-3), on the other hand, is an example of the consequential function across speakers. The consequential relationship between R's utterance in (9-2) and H's utterance in (9-3) can be summarized as follows:[12]

[X]: 'an outsider is involved (this time).'
Dakara ('So')
[Y]: 'what?'

[12] It is possible to argue that [X] is both (9-1) and (9-2), instead of just (9-2). In that case, it is another departure from the traditional view of *dakara* in that the [X] consists of more than one sentence. However, since this type of dakara was low in occurrence, I will not pay particular attention in the present study.

Evidently, as this example demonstrates, the scope of the consequential relationship that *dakara* marks is not only within a speaker as has been traditionally described, but also across speakers.

Certainly, these types of *dakara* are not congruous with the traditional description of consequential *dakara*. Nonetheless, in the present study, as long as the consequential relationship between [X] and [Y] is observable, regardless of the nature of [X] – a prior specific utterance by the same speaker (prototypical), a preceding discourse as a whole or the shared understanding of it (second subtype), or an interlocutor's utterance (third subtype) – I have categorized them as the consequential function. Having said that, since the existence of the variations within the consequential function is a departure from the traditional notion of *dakara*, I will come back to this issue later.

2.1.2 The Explanatory Category

Table 3 illustrates that the explanatory, the repetitive, and the remedial functions have been merged under the heading of "explanatory". Although they were introduced as separate categories in the prior studies, the close examination of their usages in everyday conversations indicates that they all share the same speech action of "explaining". They may differ in specific ways in which the speakers use to carry out the action (i.e., unknown information to the recipients for the explanatory, the repetition of a prior utterance for the repetitive, and rephrasing/replacement of a prior utterance for the remedial function); nevertheless, the speakers' purpose of using *dakara* is still the same – to proffer explanations whether voluntarily or reluctantly on the point previously made. My data also suggests that *dakara*'s repetitive usage, now a subcategory in the explanatory function, needs to be redefined. Some previous studies give an impression that the repetitive *dakara* necessarily entails reluctant or irritated attitude of the speaker. On the contrary, my corpus presents numerous instances of non-repetitive *dakara* with a trace of reluctance/irritation as well as uses of repetitive *dakara* without any sign of such emotional attitudes. Therefore, it may be the case that the speaker's emotional attitude of reluctance/irritation is not necessarily specific to the repetitive usage. The following is an excerpt from my corpus that is not an example of repetitive *dakara* but nonetheless displays irritation of the speaker:

(10) *Hatachi* 'Twenty years old': A and K are talking about what happened to their common friend, Chika, who flew back to Japan from the States when a big earthquake hit Japan. In the sequence, K tries to deliver her point that Chika might have had great difficulty going home from the airport in Japan due to the destruction that the earthquake had caused. However, A does not follow her and instead misunderstands that K thinks Chika might have been killed in the earthquake.

(10-1) K: *demo chikachan,*
but Chika-chan
"but Chie,"

(10-2) ... *saa,*
you-know
"you know,"

(10-3) *ga kaetta toki ni jishin ga atta*
S returned time at earthquake S existed

(10-4) *[tte shitteta=]?*
QT knew
"Did you know that there was an earthquake when she went back (to Japan)?"

(10-5) A: *<HI<F [a=tta] <A so so so so*
existing yeah yeah yeah yeah

(10-6) *shitte[[ru wa yo]]A>F>HI>.*
know FP FP
"Riiiight, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, I know."

(10-7) K: *<A[[**daka** ch-]] **da da** chikachan wa **daka***
Ch- Chika-chan Top

(10-8) *doo natta n yaro A>.*
how become Nom I-wonder
"*Daka*, ch- *da, da*, I wonder *daka* what happened to Chika."

((31 lines omitted))

(10-9) A: *a demo ikiteru <@ yo chikachan @>.*
oh but alive FP Chika-chan
"Oh, but Chika is alive."

(10-10) *@@[@ @@ nani i-],*
what sa-
"what sa-"

→ (10-11)K: *[iya **dakara dakara** shinanai yo]*
no die-Neg FP

(10-12) *[[shinanai kedo]],*
die-Neg but
"No, ***dakara, dakara***, not dead, not dead, but,"

(10-13)A: *[[shi o nega]]tteru mitai <@ janai @>.*
death O wishing seem Tag
"(You) sound like you're wishing her death, hey?"

(10-14) *[3 @@ @@ 3]*

(10-15)K: *[3 cha- shinanai ke 3]do=,*

no die-Neg but
"No, not dead, but,"

(10-16) *shinanai kedo kuukoo kara ie ni kaeru no*
die-Neg but airport from home to return Nom

(10-17)*ga taihen datta n ja[nai]?*
S hard was Nom Tag
"Not dead, but, it was hard for her to get home from the airport, wasn't it?"

(10-18)A: *[aa] soo yo,*
yeah right FP
"Yeah, right."

(10-19) *un.*
yeah
"Yeah."

→ (10-20)K: ***daka*** *doo shita no yo,*
how did Nom FP
"***Dakara*** how did she do it?"

(10-21) *kuukoo hitoban?*
airport one-night
"(She) stayed at the airport over night?"

(10-22)A: *hitoban shita n ja-nai?*
one-night did Nom Tag
"(She) stayed overnight, didn't she?"

In the first four lines, K asks A if she remembers that there was an earthquake when their common friend, Chika, flew back to Japan from the States. To this question, A excitedly answers in (10-5) and (10-6) that she remembers it. Before A ends her utterance, K interrupts with *dakara* (we will come back to this *dakara* later) and continues to speak. After some figuring out of the day of the earthquake between K and A (whose lines are omitted), A insists that Chika is alive by saying *demo ikiteru yo chika chan* 'but Chika is alive' in (10-9). Upon A's insistence, K attempts to clarify that she does not think Chika is dead. In this clarification in (10-11) and (10-12), K uses *dakara*. This is a remedial usage in that K, learning that A misunderstood K's concern, rephrases her earlier utterance *chika chan wa doo natta n yaro* 'I wonder what happened to Chika' in (10-7) and (10-8), with the more specific description in (10-11)-(10-12) and (10-15)-(10-17): *iya* ***dakara dakara*** ((omitted)) *shinanai kedo kuukoo kara ie ni kaeru no ga taihen datta n ja nai?* 'No, *dakara*, *dakara* ... not dead, but it was hard for her to get home from the airport, wasn't it?' What should be pointed out here is that despite the fact that the *dakara* is used for the remedial function, there is a trace of frustration in her explanation. This frustration probably stems from having to explain the same concern again. It might also be that K took offence in A's utterance in (10-9), a demo ikiteru <@ yo chika chan @> 'but Chika is still alive' with laugher, which might have come across as mocking K's concern. K's frustration seems to be heightened further when A says in (10-13), shi o negatteru mitai <@ ja nai @> 'you sound like you are wishing Chika's death,' which is a gross misunderstanding and might also be embarrassing to K. Notice that starting from (10-11), K repeats *dakara* and the phrase shinanai 'not dead' twice and four times respectively in an attempt to clarify what she meant. This repetition may be indicative of her frustration.

Similarly, *dakara* in (10-20) is not a repetitive usage but exhibits the speaker's irritation. After K clarified her earlier statement, A agrees with K in (10-18) and (10-19) with aa soo yo, un 'yeah, right, yeah' on the point that Chika must have had difficulty going home from the airport. Upon finally receiving A's affirmative response, K asks another question in (10-20): dakara doo shita no yo, 'so what did she do?' This *dakara* is a consequential use since the relationship can be summarized as follows: [X: it was difficult to go home from the airport.] *dakara* ('so') [Y: "what did she do?"]. The [X] here is built upon the conversationalists' shared understanding of Chika's difficulty with going home which was established at the moment A agreed with K, saying aa soo yo, un 'yeah, right, yeah' in (10-18) and (10-19). As is the case for the remedial *dakara* in (10-11), this consequential *dakara* is produced with a trace of irritation. Note that (10-20) ends in the emphatic final particle, *yo* (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo (hereafter KKK) [The National Institute for Japanese Language], 1951). It is intriguing to find KKK (1951) explaining that *yo* when it is combined with a question word adds reproaching tone to the question. It is reasonable then to surmise that the speaker was irritated at the time of the utterance. Interestingly enough, this same emphatic final particle *yo* is found after the *dakara* in (10-11). *Yo* in this case expresses insistence on the speaker's claim (KKK, 1951).

Based on these recurrent examples of non-repetitive *dakara* with a trace of frustration, it seems to be fairly safe to conclude that the "reluctance" in the "reluctant repetition" (Mori, 1999, p. 160) is not a required element in what this study calls, "repetitive" *dakara*. Maynard (1989) appears to be supportive of this perspective judging from her parenthesizing the word "reluctant" when explaining the repetitive usage: this type of *dakara* adds "(reluctantly) an explanatory statement Y relevant to X" (p. 410). Karatsu (1995), too, takes the same point of view: "this use of *dakara tends to* express an emotional attitude such as irritation" (p. 122) (the emphasis mine). Frustration can occur in any of the subcategories of the explanatory function simply because the speaker has to explain the same point again in one way or another.

2.1.3 The Discourse-organizational Category

As indicated in Table 3, the discourse-organizational function is also a departure from the previous studies. It consists of the participatory control (i.e., turn-claiming and turn-yielding) and the topic-resuming function. I have put them together under this category because they differ from the others in that they operate purely as a discourse device to organize coherent interactions.

2.1.3.1 The Participatory Control Function

This section will only focus on the turn-claiming function since the examples of the turn-yielding use from my data are virtually the same as those in Maynard (1989, 1993). As for the turn-claiming function, however, my data offers clearer examples in comparison to Maynard (1993)'s example (5) which was presented earlier. The relevant part of the example is repeated below for convenience.

(5) Maynard (1993, p. 90) A and B discuss their mutual acquaintance Mr. Kaku who, according to B, is soon going to resign from the company he works for.

(5-1) A: [*Kaku-san kaisha yamete doo sun no?*]
Mr. Kaku company leave what do IP
'What is Mr. Kaku going to do after leaving the company?'

→ (5-2) B: [***Dakara***/ *koomuin*/ *daisotsu*
so/therefore government employee college-graduate

de shiken ukete/ koomuin.]
as exam take government employee
'So (he'll be a) government employee. He will take an exam once he gets his college degree and will be a government employee.'

I have explained earlier that Maynard (1993) believes the *dakara* in (5-2) to be an example of the turn-claiming function since there is no obvious [X] that represents a reason, nor does the speaker add explanatory information to the point he previously made. Rather, Maynard argues, the speaker is claiming his turn by answering the question with *dakara* and implying that "his answer is somehow connected to the prior move" (p. 92). Though her argument is not entirely untenable, in this particular example, the turn-claiming aspect of *dakara* is somewhat obscured by two factors: One is the smooth transition of the turn from A to B; the other is the fact that B's utterance in (5-2) is virtually a required element in the question-and-answer interaction (i.e., adjacency pair). In other words, there is no need for B to "claim" the turn since his turn is expected as part of the natural course of the interaction.

On the other hand, my example of turn-claiming function demonstrates a more competitive turn-taking action, which serves as a more credible evidence for the turn-claiming function of the connective. Below is the same sequence as (10-1)-(10-8):

(10) Hatachi 'Twenty years old': A and K are talking about what happened to their common friend, Chika, who flew back to Japan from the States when a big earthquake hit Japan.

(10-1) K: *demo chikachan,*
but Chika-chan
"but Chie,"

(10-2) ... *saa,*
you-know
"you know,"

(10-3) *ga kaetta toki ni jishin ga atta*
S returned time at earthquake S existed

(10-4) *[tte shitteta=]?*
QT knew
"Did you know that there was an earthquake when she went back (to Japan)?"

(10-5) A: *<HI<F [a=tta] <A so so so so*
existing yeah yeah yeah yeah

(10-6) *shitte[[ru wa yo]]A>F>HI>.*
know FP FP
"Riiiight, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, I know."

→ (10-7) K: *<A[[**daka** ch-]]* ***da da*** *chikachan wa* ***daka***
Ch- Chika-chan Top

→ (10-8) *doo natta n yaro A>.*
how become Nom I-wonder
"*Daka*, ch- *da, da*, I wonder *daka* what happened to Chika."

The repetition of *dakara* in (10-7) does not appear to identify any obvious consequential relationship. The purpose of the repeated use of *dakara* becomes clearer when we focus on what is taking place in the surroundings.

In the first four lines, K asks A a prefatory question (to (10-7) and (10-8)) whether A knows that there was an earthquake when Chika flew back to Japan. To this question, A excitedly responds *a=tta so so so so shitteru wa yo* 'Riiiight, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, I know' in (10-5) and (10-6). Her eagerness to take the turn is evident in the fact that A, in (10-5), starts to talk midway through K's question, resulting in an overlap between K and A. Additionally, A's response is produced with high pitch (represented by '<HI HI>') and loudness (represented by '<F F>') as well as a sudden increase in the speed of utterance (represented by '<A A>') in the post-overlap talk, the characteristics of which are often observed in turn-competitive environment (Jefferson, 1983).

Upon receiving such a turn-claiming response from A, K, who is not yet ready to completely relinquish the floor of the conversation, interrupts A's response with *dakara* in (10-7), resulting in another overlap. This utterance in (10-7) and (10-8), ***daka*** *ch-* ***da da*** *chikachan wa* ***daka*** *doo natta n yaro* '*Daka*, ch- *da, da*, I wonder *daka* what happened to Chika', is uttered fast with repeated uses of *dakara*. These observable facts (i.e., A's excited response in (10-5) and (10-6), the overlap in (10-6) and (10-7), the sudden increase in the speed of K's utterance in (10-7) and (10-8), and the repetition of *dakara* in (10-7)) suggest that *dakara* may be used as a discourse organization device to obtain the next turn. This example nicely exemplifies and supports Mori's (1999) view that was presented earlier: "the employment of ... *dakara* could be related to the perceived pressure to maintain or regain one's speakership" (p. 168). Furthermore, this example of turn-claiming *dakara* in a turn-competitive environment builds on the instances of a smooth transition of turn in Maynard's (1993) data that is presented in (5) above.

2.1.3.2 The Topic-resuming Function

Table 3 shows that along with the turn-claiming and the turn-yielding uses, the topic-resuming usage comprise the discourse-organizational category. The topic-resuming usage refers to *dakara*'s function to resume the topic that was interrupted. Below is an example of such use:

(11) *Otooto* 'younger brother': When B is talking about the location of his house, which is *Hiyoshi* in *Keioo* area, A interrupts his talk and starts talking about his brother who went to the Hiyoshi campus by mistake to write an university entrance exam. When A finally comes to the end of his story, B resumes his earlier talk.

```
(11-1)B:    keioo no   eki  nanda shitteru?
          Keioo LK station Cop   know
```
"It's the train station in Keio area, do you know?"

```
(11-2)A:    un.
            yeah
```
"Yeah."

```
(11-3)B:    ... hiyoshi -
                Hiyoshi
```
"Hiyoshi..."

```
(11-4)    hiyoshi ga keioo ni atte,
           Hiyoshi S Keioo in exist-and
```
"Hiyoshi is in Keioo, and,"

```
(11-5)A:    hiyoshi kyampasu -
             Hiyoshi campus
```
"Hiyoshi campus..."

```
(11-6)B:    ... so so [so].
               yeah yeah yeah
```
"Yeah, yeah, yeah."

```
(11-7)A:               [ano] uchi no    otooto        sa=,
                        um    my   LK younger-brother FP
```
"Um, my younger brother, you know"

((49 lines omitted))

(11-8)A: *nde nimanen haratte,*
and twenty-thousand-yen pay-and
"And, (he) paid twenty thousand yen and,"

(11-9)B: *u=n.*
yeah
"Yeah."

(11-10)A: *de dasshu de,*
and dash in

(11-11) *... itta toka itte.*
went something said-and
"he said he something like he had dashed off (to the other campus) an such"

(11-12)B: *... soo.*
yeah
"Yeah."

→(11-13) *uchi **daka** sono hiyoshi nanda=.*
home that Hiyoshi Cop
"My house ***dakara*** is in that Hiyoshi."

From (11-1) to (11-4), B talks about the train station called Hiyoshi in Keioo area in an attempt to explain the location of his house. In (11-5), A mumbles to himself *hiyoshi kyampasu* 'Hiyoshi campus,' associating the name of the station Hiyoshi and Hiyoshi campus of Keio University. In (11-6), B affirms that A's association is correct in that they are the same Hiyoshi. Upon receiving the affirmative response, A interrupts B's response and begins to talk about his brother who went to Hiyoshi campus by mistake instead of the other campus to write a university entrance exam. He continues to narrate what happened to his brother until he finally comes to the end of his story in (11-11). In (11-12), there is a pause as if B is confirming that A has finished his story. Then, B says *soo* 'yeah' and resumes the interrupted topic about the location of his house in (11-13). In doing so, B inserts *dakara* referring anaphorically to the interrupted topic, the connection of which enables the smooth, logical (as opposed to abrupt and disjunctive) transition to the previous topic.

This topic-resuming function of *dakara* is briefly mentioned in Maynard (1993); however, her argument is based on a written dialogue. My findings, then, not only substantiate her claim with data from naturally occurring conversations as in example (11), but also reveal that *dakara* can resume a topic across two different conversations, in contrast with topic resumption across two discourse segments in the same conversation as Maynard posited. Consider the example below.

(12) *Kinkyoohookoku* 'recent news': This excerpt is a conversation between a mother (M) and a daughter (D) over the phone. Prior to this sequence, they were discussing how the English translation "I am a cat" of the famous Japanese novel "*Wagahai wa neko de aru*"

does not carry the same connotation as the original Japanese title. Thus, they agree that it is difficult to translate one language to another. Then, the daughter switches the topic and starts explaining the reason that she missed her mother's call the night before.

(12-1) D: *dakara sono hen wa (H),*
therefore that around Top
"therefore, something like that"

(12-2) *dooshitemo ya=kushikirenai n janai no ka*
any-way can-Neg-translate Nom Cop-Neg Nom Q

(12-3) *naa to wa omou kedo ne.*
FP QT Top think but FP
"can't be translated in any way, I think, but..."

((6 lines omitted))

(12-4) M: *maa sore mo benkyoo de.*
well that also learning Cop
"Well, that's a learning experience, too."

(12-5) D: *maa ne.*
well FP
"Well, yeah."

(12-6) *soo nan da kedo.*
so Nom Cop but
"It is, but..."

→ (12-7) *... soo kinoo at- ano* ***dakara*** *ansonii to*
Yeah yesterday u- um Anthony with

(12-8) *hanashishiteta no yo.*
was-talking Nom FP
"Yeah, yesterday, we- well, ***dakara***, I was talking to Anthony."

(12-9) *tabun kyatchi de haitta no*
probably call-waiting with came-in Nom

(12-10) *kizukanakatta n da to omou.*
notice-Neg Nom Cop QT think
"I think I probably didn't notice the call-waiting coming in."

(12-11)M: *aa= iya betsu-ni kizuitekurenakute mo ii n*
Oh no particular-in noticing even okay Nom

(12-12) *da kedomo=,*
Cop but
"Oh, no, it was not particularly a big deal that you didn't notice, but,"

(12-13) *un,*
yeah
"Yeah,"

(12-14) *ano= dekaketa no ka naa demo yoru osoi shi*
well went-out Nom Q FP but night late and

(12-15) *naa doo shita n daroo to wa omotteta kedo.*
FP how did Nom I-wonder QT Top was-thinking but
"Well, I was wondering whether you went out, but it's late at night, and so (I was wondering) what happened, but..."

In (12-1)-(12-3), the daughter expresses her opinion that subtle nuance in one language cannot be expressed in the exact precision in another language. The mother agrees with her (this segment is omitted) and says such difficulty in translating is also a learning experience, *maa sore mo benkyoo de,* in (12-4). Then, in (12-7), the daughter suddenly changes the topic to explain why she did not notice the phone call from her mother the night before. In response to this, the mother says it was okay that the daughter did not notice except that she was slightly worried that the daughter might be out late. What is interesting here is that the daughter inserts *dakara* immediately after she changes the topic to what happened the night before in (12-7). Because they had not talked about this topic earlier in the present conversation, it seems as if she is abruptly changing the topic. However, the fact that she knows her mother called tells us that they had this discussion prior to the present conversation one way or the other. Thus, this is an example of topic-resuming function across two different conversations. Based on *dakara*'s usages in written dialogues, Maynard (1993) states that *dakara* has the ability to "anaphorically ... bring into the interpreter's consciousness the relevant information from the prior text" (p. 84). In the context of naturally occurring conversations, as the findings indicate, "the relevant information" is retrieved from a prior discourse segment within the same conversation or from a previous conversation.

The use of *dakara* in seemingly abrupt topic resumption may also serve to mitigate the impression of disjunctive conversational move. In reference to Jefferson (1987), Morita (2005) expounds on the presence of "a normative expectation of *interactional cohesiveness* to which the participants [in conversation] orient" (p. 171).[13] "In other words," she continues, "conversationalists expect that their talk is 'connected' unless specified otherwise" (ibid.). In this light, the favorable topic transition is most likely the one that is smooth, gradual, and unobtrusive. Hence, when the speaker makes a seemingly disjointed topic transition as in the case of (11) and (12), he/she utilizes *dakara* for its implied logical connection in order to lesson the disjointedness of the move

[13] The emphasis is original.

and to organize a coherent discourse. In this light, *dakara* functions as a device to justify the out-of-the-norm conversational move, i.e., disjunctive topic transition.

2.1.4 Ambiguous Examples

Although I made the aforementioned changes to the categorization based on naturally occurring data, these categories are by no means absolute, complete or clear-cut. As a matter of fact, my corpus included various examples of *dakara* that displayed more than one functional characteristic, suggesting that *dakara*'s functional variations are a continuum. For example, I have categorized the *dakara* in (12-4) as a consequential usage. The example is repeated below for convenience.

(8) Arasoi 'Fight': R has been complaining about H not phoning her about a change in plan throughout this conversation. Prior to this excerpt, H explains that the stadium that he was at was not equipped with pay phones and thus, he couldn't phone her. In this sequence, R continues to blame him, in response to which H fights back saying R is selfish.

(8-1) R: *...ja saisho kara yoku kangaetokya ii jan*
then first from well think-if good Tag

(8-2) *dekinai n dattara dekinai tte,*
can-Neg Nom Cop-if can-Neg QT
"Then, you should have thought through the scenario when you can't (phone me) beforehand."

(8-3) : *...[doo datta XXXXXXX.]*
How was
"How was..."

→ (8-4) H: *[**dakara** katte] da ttsutte n da yo omae,*
selfish Cop saying Nom Cop FP you
"***Dakara*** I'm telling you that you're selfish, man."

(8-5) : *jibun no omoidoori ni ikanai kara tte omae,*
self LK the-way-you-like in go-Neg because QT you
"Because (things) don't go the way you like,"

(8-6) : *...iitai koto ittari=.*
want-to-say thing say-and-such
"(you) say whatever you want to say and stuff."

The consequential relationship, which the *dakara* in (8-4) marks, is encapsulated as follows:

[X]: R has been repeatedly complaining without considering H's excuse
Dakara ('So')
[Y]: 'I'm telling you that you're selfish,'

However, since the *dakara* is used in a turn-competitive environment that is indicated by the overlapped utterances in (8-3) and (8-4), it is possible to perceive the turn-claiming aspect of *dakara* as well. For this type of instance that is difficult to determine the function, I attended to two criteria: first is to categorize as conservatively as possible; second is to choose the dominant function. The first criterion, in principle, only applies when the consequential function is involved. Because the consequential usage is considered prototypical, *dakara* that exhibits both the consequential and other characteristics at the same time were always included in the consequential category. The *dakara* in (8-4) is a good example of such a case: Although the *dakara* in question appears to assume a discourse-organizational feature, it was still categorized as the consequential usage. In sum, the aforementioned rule of thumb for determining the scope of the consequential relationship that *dakara* identifies is pertinent here as well: as long as there is an observable consequential relationship between [X] and [Y], it is regarded as a consequential usage. As for the instances where *dakara* manifests more than one non-consequential usage, the second principle of dominancy was applied: whichever functional characteristic that was dominant was deemed to be the main function.

Even with these guidelines for categorization, seven tokens of *dakara* still remained unclear as to which function they belonged to. Thus, they were categorized as "Others". The reasons for this ambiguity are twofold: first is a self-motivated relinquishment of the utterance that contains *dakara*; second is a forced relinquishment of the utterance due to the interruption from the other participant. When the utterance is relinquished immediately after *dakara* in these manners, the relationship between [X] and [Y] remains unclear, and thus, the function is indeterminate. The following section introduces the results of the quantitative analysis based on the categorization and guidelines established through the qualitative analysis.

2.2 Quantitative Analysis

Table 4 summarizes the occurrence of the bound grammatical morpheme sequence *da-kara* and the connective *dakara*:

	Morpheme Sequence *da-kara*	Connective *dakara*	Total
Occurrence	23%(54)	77%(180)	100%(234)

Table 4: Summary of *dakara*'s occurrence

The table indicates that *da-kara* accounts for 23% of the whole occurrence in my corpus, whereas *dakara* accounts for 77%. Put differently, in my data of everyday conversations, *dakara* as a connective, which originates in the copula *da* and the clitic *kara* sequence, is far more frequent than the original *da-kara* sequence. Furthermore, dichotomizing the connective *dakara*'s functions into the consequential usage (consequential *dakara*) and the non-consequential usages (explanatory and discourse-organizational) reveals an even more interesting result: The non-consequential usage (42% (99)) outnumbers the consequential usage (32% (74)). Table 5 illustrates this finding:

	Da-kara	*Dakara*				
	Consequential	Consequential	Explanatory	Discourse-Organizational	Others	Total
Occurrence	23%(54)	32%(74)	33%(77)	9%(22)	3%(7)	100%(234)

Consequential	Non-consequential
32%(74)	42%(99)

Table 5: Comparison of consequential and non-consequential without *da-kara*

As mentioned before, *dakara* is known as a "consequential" connective (Martin, 2004, p. 818). Similarly, dictionaries (E.g., *Kojien*, 2004; *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*, 1972), grammar references (E.g., Martin, 2004; Makino & Tsutsui, 2007), and Japanese language textbooks that are widely used in North America (E.g., *Nakama*, *Yookoso*, and *An Integrated Approach to Intermediate Japanese*) only introduce the consequential usage of the connective. The finding that the non-consequential usage outnumbers the consequential usage is significant because it points to this discrepancy between what people think the function of *dakara* is and how it actually functions in everyday interactions. On a more global level, this finding underscores the importance of using naturally occurring conversations as a data source in order to capture the accurate picture of language.

Chapter 3: Language Change

So far, we have seen a variety of ways in which the Japanese connective *dakara* is used in everyday conversation in spite of the fact that *dakara* is often described as a consequential connective. Moreover, the close analysis of naturally occurring conversations has revealed that *dakara* is utilized more frequently for non-consequential functions such as the explanatory and discourse-organizational uses.

This chapter will focus on the diachrony of such functional variations of *dakara*. I will first point out that aforementioned varieties of functions are, in fact, all semantically related, which is a phenomenon that Hopper (1991) calls "persistence" – a tendency often associated with grammaticization. According to Hopper and Traugott (2003), grammaticization is a type of diachronic language change "whereby particular items become more grammatical" (p. 2). One of the typical examples of grammaticization is the development of the future marker *be going to* from the content verb *go*. Bybee et al. (1994) explain the process as follows: the construction *be going to* "at one time had its full semantic value of movement in space, and the construction meant '[the subject] is on a path moving toward a goal'" (p. 5). Now, however, that specific meaning has been "eroded," and the same construction means "the subject is in any sense (spatial or otherwise) on a course toward a particular endpoint in the future" (ibid). In this change, the form in question has become more grammatical in a sense that the content word *go* has become a function word, that is, an auxiliary verb (Hopper & Traugott, 2003).

In addition to this general unidirectionality toward increasing grammaticality and the phenomenon of persistence, grammaticization is also characterized by many other universal phenomena. Among them are "semantic bleaching", a tendency in which meanings become more weakened or more abstract (cf. Hopper & Traugott, 2003); "pragmatic strengthening", the acquisition of more contextual meanings (cf. Hopper & Traugott, 2003); a more specific type of pragmatic strengthening, "subjectification", in which "[meanings] become increasingly associated with speaker attitude" (Traugott, 1995b, p. 2); and "phonological reduction" in which forms become shorter (cf. Hopper & Traugott, 2003).[14] In the theory of grammaticization, some of these phenomena are said to closely interact with each other. For example, it is believed that the further the form in question advances in semantic bleaching, the more phonological reduction it undergoes. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994) name this hypothesis the "parallel reduction hypothesis" (p. 107).

Based on these tendencies underlying grammaticization, I will discuss the similarities between the change involving *dakara* and grammaticization, followed by the discussion on the dissimilarities. In the end, I will conclude that *dakara* is not undergoing the grammaticization process. Instead, it is a case of lexicalization, a process of "creating a new lexeme out of two or more existing ones" (Himmelmann, 2004, p. 27), and pragmaticization, "[a] kind of diachronic change where elements ... assume functions on the discourse-pragmatic level" (Günthner and Mutz, 2004, p. 99).

[14] For the more detailed descriptions of the universal principles, see Hopper & Traugott (2003); Lehmann (1995); Hopper (1991); Heine, Caludi and Hünnemeyer (1991); and Heine and Reh (1984).

3.1 Similarities with Grammaticization

3.1.1 Persistence

As briefly mentioned above, the close analysis of the occurrence of *dakara* in my data suggests that even though the various types of usages are observed, all of them seem to have a certain degree of adherence to the traditionally acknowledged function of the connective, i.e., "a logical connector representing the relation of 'cause-and-result'" (Mayanrd, 1993, p. 69). Let us first consider the explanatory *dakara* and its connection to the traditional meaning. The common characteristic among the three subcategories (i.e., explanatory, remedial, and repetitive) of the explanatory use is that *dakara* in each usage has a function to refer back to a previous conversational move, [X]. After identifying the [X], the speaker proffers an explanation for it, whether that takes the form of new information (explanatory), rephrased information (remedial), or the same information (repetitive). Thus, the explanatory *dakara* actually has something in common with the long-acknowledged consequential function – specifically, they both make some sort of anaphoric reference. More concretely speaking, in the original consequential usage, *dakara* anaphorically refers to the material prior to *da* on the semantic (i.e., cause-and-result) level. The explanatory use, on the other hand, points back to the earlier conversational move (namely, that something similar to [Y] has already been mentioned) on the pragmatic level (Maynard, 1993).

The discourse-organizational function of the connective, too, can be traced back to the consequential function. As for the turn-claiming usage, *dakara*'s attribute as a "logical connector" seems to be at work. In other words, when a speaker is in a turn-competitive environment, he/she may use the connective to assert his/her rightful acquisition of the next turn because the next utterance is presented as "logically" relevant to the prior discourse. In contrast, the turn-yielding function most likely derives from its association with introducing something conclusive such as a result after a cause or consequence after a reason. Indeed, this is the very reason why turn-yielding *dakara* has a "conclusive tone" (Maynard, 1993, p. 93).

The topic-resuming function is in essence the same as the explanatory function in its adherence to the widely-claimed consequential function of the connective: It is making an anaphoric reference on the pragmatic level to the interrupted on-going topic in expectation of resuming the conversation. Additionally, the topic-resuming usage takes advantage of *dakara*'s attribute as a "logical connector" just as the turn-claiming usage does. The logical connection that *dakara* implies mitigates the disjointedness of a topic transition so that the speaker does not explicitly violate the conversational norm that topics be interconnected.

According to Van Dijk (1979), these different functions of the connective can be categorized as either "semantic connective" or "pragmatic connective". In the case of *dakara*, consequential *dakara* is a "semantic connective" since it expresses "relations between denoted facts" (p. 449). Explanatory and discourse organizational *dakara*, on the other hand, are both "pragmatic connectives" since they express "relations between speech acts" (ibid.). Thus, borrowing Van Dijk's terminology, what appears to be taking place in *dakara*'s multifunctionality is that the consequential meaning of the semantic connective (or semantic usage of the connective) constrains the later pragmatic development of the connective *dakara*. As it happens, Van Dijk himself agrees with this point by saying "[o]ne of the difficulties in the analysis of pragmatic connectives lies in the fact that, even when they are used as expressions for relations between speech acts, there may remain traces of their semantic meanings" (p. 449). This semantic-functional constraint on the pragmatic uses of the connective can be construed as synchronic evidence that the consequential use is the original function. This, in turn, serves as indirect evidence to the diachronic language change of the connective.

In fact, Hopper (1991) names the phenomenon "persistence", which is one of the principles underlying the process of grammaticization that he proposed. He describes the principle as follows:

> When a form undergoes grammaticization from a lexical to a grammatical function, so long as it is grammatically viable some traces of its original lexical meanings tend to adhere to it, and details of its lexical history may be reflected in constraints on its grammatical distribution. (p. 22)

Although *dakara* is not a lexical item in a sense that it does not have substantial content to it, the phenomena in question is essentially the same.[15] Hopper and Traugott (2003) describe the same concept in a different way: "later constraints on structure or meaning can only be understood in the light of earlier meanings" (p. 96). Since grammaticization is a diachronic language changing process, this similarity in the phenomenon is supportive of *dakara*'s multifunctionality as synchronic evidence of a diachronic change.

3.1.2 Semantic Bleaching and Pragmatic Strengthening

Matsumoto (1988) considered the relation between *dakara*'s functional variations and grammaticization based on *dakara*'s unidirectional change at the semantic and the pragmatic levels: the semantic change involves increasing abstractness of the meaning (i.e., semantic bleaching) and the pragmatic change involves increase in contextual meaning (i.e., pragmatic strengthening). Based on constructed examples, he argues that the *dakara*'s shift from the consequential connective to the discourse marker that adds the meaning of "I'm telling you!" is a case of semantic bleaching and pragmatic strengthening, which are both typical tendencies in grammaticization (cf. Hopper and Traugott, 2003).

The findings from my data also support the semantic bleaching and pragmatic strengthening of the connective. As the connective moves from the consequential usage to the explanatory and the discourse-organizational usages, the meaning becomes more abstract (cause-and-result > explaining > turn control/topic-resuming) and grounded in the speech context.

3.1.3 Subjectification

Recently, a more specific type of pragmatic strengthening, namely "subjectification", has been widely discussed, often in relation to grammaticization (e.g. Onodera & Suzuki, 2007; Hopper & Traugott, 2003; Traugott & Dasher, 2002; Traugott 1995a, 1995b; Traugott and König, 1991). In the framework of grammaticization, Traugott (1995b) explains subjectification as grammaticization entailing semantic shift "toward greater subjectivity, that is, [meanings] become increasingly associated with speaker attitude, especially metatextual attitude toward discourse flow" (p. 2). By "metatextual", Traugott refers to "those properties of language that comment on

[15] Hopper and Traugott (2003) categorize connectives as "function words" or "grammatical words" as opposed to "content words" or "lexical items" (p. 4).

interpretation of text" (p. 21). Furthermore, items that undergo subjectification come to serve "increasingly abstract, pragmatic, interpersonal and speaker-based functions" (Traugott, 1995a, p. 32). To exemplify the process of subjectification, Traugott (1995b) cites Onodera (1993, 1995)'s example of the change involving the Japanese connective *demo* 'but'.[16] The change is described in the following three steps:

> **Stage I** from 11th century on; adversative, within one turn
>
> **Stage II** from 16th century; [connective] used by Speaker B to refute interlocutor (Speaker A)'s claim
> **Stage III** contemporary; discourse particle used to claim floor and change sub-topic (as cited in Traugott, 1995b, pp. 3-4)

Traugott, commenting on the correlation between the progression of the stage and increasing subjectivity, writes: "Note the overall development illustrates ... increased subjectification from an already weakly subjective concessive to an interpersonal (addressee-oriented) marker and finally to a marker of the speaker's self-oriented attitude to her turn" (p. 4).

Correspondingly, similar increase in subjectivity is observed as *dakara* moves towards the right in Table 6 (excluding "others"). The bound grammatical morpheme sequence *da-kara* and the consequential usage of the connective *dakara* are both "weakly subjective" as in the case of *demo* in Stage I (Traugott, 1995b, p. 4). As one of the criteria of subjectivity, Traugott and Dahser (2001) propose that subjective expressions involve "explicit markers of [speaker/writer's] attitude to the relationship between what precedes and what follows, i.e. to the discourse structure" (p. 23). According to this description, *da-kara* and the consequential *dakara* are the explicit markers of speaker's attitude, and the encoded attitude toward the discourse structure is that of cause and result. Similarly, in studying English causal expressions, Halliday and Hasan (1976) claim that "the notion of cause already involves some degree of interpretation by the speaker," and thus, causal conjunctions often mark an "internal" conjunctive relation (p. 257). In other words, they seem to be suggesting that some degree of subjectivity is inherent in causal expressions.

It is worth reminding ourselves here of the different types of consequential *dakara*, as they seem to be related to different degrees of subjectification. I have briefly explained in Chapter 2 that in addition to the prototypical type ([X] and [Y] produced by the same speaker, with [Y] immediately following [X]), there are two other types of consequential usage: 1) [X] is the previous discourse as a whole or the mutual understanding that was established in the preceding discourse; 2) [X] is the other speaker's utterance that precedes '*dakara* [Y]' sequence in which case *dakara* is marking a consequential relationship across speakers. The subjectivity involved in the prototypical usage of consequential function has already been outlined above. The other two variations are even more subjective: The first type is because the anaphoric reference is broader in scope and abstract in nature;[17] the second type is because it is more interpersonal, which

[16] Traugott (1995b) calls clause-initial discourse-marking *demo* a "discourse particle." I will nevertheless refer to it as "connective" to be consistent with the rest of the paper.
[17] Pagliuca (1994) has proposed the semantic tendency in grammaticization in which meanings move "away from original specific and concrete reference" and move "toward increasingly general and abstract

actually corresponds to Step II of *demo*. These increasing abstractness and interpersonal quality are in accordance with Traugott (1995a)'s definition of subjectification presented earlier: items become "increasingly abstract, pragmatic, interpersonal and speaker-based" (p. 32).

In contrast with *da-kara* and consequential *dakara*, the explanatory and discourse-organizational functions are further advanced in subjectification. Obviously, the speech actions of explaining, turn-controlling and topic-resuming are both more interpersonal and pragmaticized than the consequential *dakara* that is simply concerned with textual cohesion. The discourse-organizational uses, in particular, express the speaker's attitude toward "discourse flow" more explicitly (Traugott, 1995b, p. 2). Coincidentally, its functions are almost identical to those of *demo* in the last stage of development (floor-claiming and subtopic-changing), which happens to be, according to Traugott (1995b), the most advanced in subjectification, too.

In short, the progression of subjectification in *dakara* can be summarized as Table 6. As said, according to Traugott and Dasher (2002), Traugott (1995a, 1995b), and Traugott and König (1991), this tendency toward subjectification is a robust phenomenon in the process of grammaticization.

Da-kara	*Dakara*				
Consequential	Consequential[18]			Explanatory	Discourse-Organizational
	[X] and [Y] produced by the same speaker, and [Y] immediately following [X]	[X] = the prior discourse/ mutual understanding of the prior discourse	[X] = other speaker's utterance		
Subjectification →					

Table 6: Subjectification in *dakara*

3.1.4 Phonological Reduction

So far, it has been argued that the change involving *dakara* corresponds to the process of grammaticization at the pragmatic-semantic level: semantic bleaching, pragmatic strengthening including subjectification. In this section, we will see that the correspondence is observable at the phonological level, too.

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the correlation between semantic bleaching and phonological reduction are often said to be a characteristic of grammaticization (Wiemer & Bisang, 2004; Traugott & Dasher, 2002; Nakayama & Nakayama, 1997; Traugott, 1982, 1995a, 1998; Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca, 1994; Heine

---

reference" (as cited in Traugott, 1995b, p. 14). The variation of consequential *dakara* in question seems to accord with this suggested unidirectionality.

[18] The middle and the right subcategories within the consequential function are in no particular order.

& Reh, 1984). Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994) in particular believe in a strong correlation between them:[19]

> It ... seems natural to look for a direct, and even causal, link between semantic and phonetic reduction in the evolution of grammatical material, beginning with the earliest stages of development from lexical sources and continuing throughout the subsequent developments [grammatical morphemes] undergo. Our hypothesis is that the development of grammatical material is characterized by the dynamic coevolution of meaning and form. (p. 20)

They name this hypothesis "parallel reduction hypothesis" (p. 107). It should be mentioned that although they only talk about semantic reduction or bleaching, behind it exists an indirect reference to pragmatic strengthening. That is because, just like the development of *dakara*, the semantic bleaching entails pragmatic strengthening in the process of grammaticization (Traugott and König 1991; Traugott 1995a, 1995b). As Traugott (1995a) puts it, "in the process of [grammaticization], certain semantic properties maybe reduced, but they are replaced by pragmatic strengthening" (pp. 48-49).

Let us now shift our attention to the phonologically reduced forms of *dakara* including *daka* and *da* that were found in some of the examples from my data (see examples (10) and (11)). Out of the 234 tokens of *dakara* in my entire corpus, 45 of them have undergone phonological reduction, making the phonological reduction rate 19%. That is, one in five *dakara* is phonologically reduced in my corpus. The significance of this tendency becomes more explicit when the phonological reduction is broken down according to the functions. Table 7 represents the distribution of phonological reductions according to the functions.

Table 7: Summary of phonological reductions

	Da-kara	*Dakara*				
	Consequential	Consequential	Explanatory	Discourse-Organizational	Others	Total
Reduced forms	2%(1/54)	19% (14/74)	26% (20/77)	45% (10/22)	0% (0/7)	19% (45/234)

The lowest rate of phonological reduction, 2% or only once out of 54 occurrences, is found in the primordial form of the connective, *da-kara*. As the table moves towards the right, the frequency of phonological reduction steadily increases, ending in 45%, or 10 out of 22, in the discourse organizational use of the connective. It was argued in earlier sections that the semantic abstractness and pragmatic meanings such as subjectivity increase as the function moves toward the right of the table, making the discourse-organizational function the most pragmaticized and semantically bleached usage. That means, we find the same correlation between semantic bleaching (and pragmatic strengthening) and phonological reduction for *dakara* as described above for grammaticization. In other words, the change involving *dakara* can be summarized as

[19] Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994) do not seem to differentiate phonological reduction and phonetic reduction.

follows: the more abstract or pragmaticized the meaning of *dakara* becomes, the higher the frequency of phonological reduction is.

3.2 Dissimilarities with Grammaticization

As has been described, the multifunctional development of *dakara* shares various characteristics with the grammaticization process, namely persistence, semantic bleaching, pragmatic strengthening including subjectification, and phonological reduction. Based on these commonalities, it appears to be reasonable to conclude that *dakara* is an example of grammaticization. However, at the core, grammaticization "is concerned with such questions as how lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions or how grammatical items develop new grammatical functions" (Hopper & Traugott, 2003, p. 1). According to this definition, the fundamental unidirectionality of grammaticization can be summarized as follows (p. 16):

less grammatical > more grammatical

They have then illustrated the steps in more concrete terms as follows (p. 7):

content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix

The question that needs to be addressed here is whether *dakara*'s change complies with this unidirectionality of increasing grammaticality. According to the cline, the original *da-kara* sequence is most likely to fall under the "clitic" category due to *da*'s status as an clitic (Matsumoto, 1988) and subordinating clitic *kara* (Traugott, 1995a). The more specific question we need to address, then, is whether *da-kara* has developed an inflectional affix. The answer is clearly "no": *Da-kara* has developed into the independent consequential connective *dakara*, which is, as mentioned before, a grammatical word. In other words, this change from "clitic" to "grammatical word" runs directly counter to the cline.

In addition, as Matsumoto (1988) pointed out, more evidence for decreasing grammaticality in the change involving *dakara* comes from "syntactic bondedness", which is "the degree of cohesion of adjacent forms that goes from loosest ('peripherals') to tightest ('morphology')" (Hopper & Traugott, 2003, p. 7). In the studies of grammaticization, increase in syntactic bondedness is considered as one of the evidence for increasing grammaticality. Hopper and Traugott use English possessive expressions to illustrate this phenomenon: In English, possession can be expressed as a peripheral expression, "the household of the queen", or through an affix, "the receptionist's smile" (ibid.). In the latter case, they state, "the categories are bound to a host and are said to be expressed 'morphologically' or 'affixally'" (ibid). It follows that the English possessive marker "'s" is more grammaticized than the other counterpart due to its stronger cohesion to the adjacent form, that is, the preceding noun.

Let us now consider the development of syntactic bondedness from *da-kara* to the discourse-organizational *dakara*. Matsumoto (1988) explains *da* as "a relatively bound morpheme or an enclitic, attached directly to a noun [and nominalized forms] with or without a case marker" (p. 341). The following examples are formulated to illustrate his point.

(13)

a) gakusei da-kara okane ga nai "Because (I am a) student,
student Cop-because money S Neg I don't have money."

b) yasui no da-kara kowareyasui "It's easy to break because (it's)
cheap Nom Cop-because break-easy cheap"

c) shumi wa taberu koto da "My hobby is eating"
hobby Top eating Nom Cop

As illustrated, copula *da* cannot stand alone: it has to follow a noun (a) or nominalized expressions (b & c). Notice also that (a) and (b) include *kara*, and needless to say, they are attached to *da*. On the other hand, the most pragmaticized function of *dakara*, the discourse-organizational usage does not have such constraint. Example (10), which is repeated below, demonstrates the point.

(10) Hatachi 'Twenty years old': A and K are talking about what happened to their common friend, Chika, who flew back to Japan from the States when a big earthquake hit Japan.

(10-1) K: *demo chikachan,*
but Chika-chan
"but Chie,"

(10-2) ... *saa,*
you-know
"you know,"

(10-3) *ga kaetta toki ni jishin ga atta*
S returned time at earthquake S existed

(10-4) *[tte shitteta=]?*
QT knew
"Did you know that there was an earthquake when she went back (to Japan)?"

(10-5) A: *<HI<F [a=tta] <A so so so so*
existing yeah yeah yeah yeah

(10-6) *shitte[[ru wa yo]]A>F>HI>.*
know FP FP
"Riiiight, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, I know."

→ (10-7) K: *<A[[**daka** ch-]]* ***da da*** *chikachan wa* ***daka***
Ch- Chika-chan Top

→ (10-8) *doo natta n yaro A>.*
how become Nom I-wonder
"*Daka*, ch- *da, da*, I wonder *daka* what happened to Chika."

The *dakara* in (10-7) does not follow any noun or nominalized form while the last occurrence of *dakara* in (10-8) is inserted in between the topic, *chika chan wa* 'As for Chika,' and the predicate, *doo natta n yaro* '(I) wonder what happened.' Even from this one excerpt, the discourse-organizational does not appear to be constrained by such a consideration on the cohesion with adjacent forms. It follows then that, just as Matsumoto (1988) argued based on his constructed data, the development of *da-kara* to discourse-organizational *dakara*
is characterized with its decreasing syntactic bondedness, illustrated in its use as a syntactically independent connective

"Structural scope" is another piece of evidence that indicates the decreasing grammaticality involved in the change of *dakara*. Lehmann (1995) explains that "structural scope of a grammatical means is the structural size of the construction which it helps to form" (p. 143). He continues to say "[t]he structural scope of a sign decreases with increasing grammaticalization" (ibid.). To illustrate the point, he gives examples of English "have" and "be". According to him, as main verbs, their structural scope is at the clause level. As auxiliaries, however, the scope shrinks to the verb phrase level, thus indicating the grammaticalized status of the auxiliaries.

Let us now examine *dakara*. Since the original *da-kara* connects two clauses, the structural scope is at the clause level. On the other hand, the scope of the prototypical consequential *dakara* that connect two sentences is at the sentential level. The more pragmaticized usage of dakara such as the topic-resuming function connects two units of discourse, and thus, functions at the discourse level. Evidently, the structural scope in the development of *dakara* is expanding, which is contrary to the direction that is proposed in the grammaticization theory.

To conclude, in spite of the fact that *dakara*'s change corresponds with some of the principles in grammaticization (parallel reduction at the phonological and semantic level, subjectification, and persistence), it does not conform to the core definition of grammaticization (i.e., the unidirectionality toward increasing grammaticality), which is evident in the decreasing syntactic bondedness and the increasing structural scope. [20] Therefore, I conclude that the change involving *dakara* is not a case of grammaticization.

3.3 Lexicalization and Pragmaticization

Given that the change involving *dakara* is not a case of grammaticization, the next focus is to explore what type of change it is. The answer can be sought in similar examples of language change from various languages. First, Günthner and Mutz (2004) record the development of pragmatic marker in German and Italian. German examples are the subordinate conjunction *obwohl* 'although' and the pronominal adverb *wobei* 'whereby'. The authors explain that both *obwohl* 'although' and *wobei* 'whereby' have

[20] Traugott (1995b) has put forward arguments that the syntactic bonding and structural scope should not be perceived as rigid criteria to determine whether or not a change in question is a case of grammaticization. However, the present study will adhere to more traditional interpretations of grammaticization in which they are considered as important unidirectional characteristics of grammaticization.

developed the same discourse-pragmatic functions as a correction marker as well as a disagreement marker. A similar change is observed in Italian: from modifying suffixes with quantifying meaning to discourse markers of downgrading and affective marker. Günthner and Mutz argue that both German and Italian examples document increasing subjectivity, which is a characteristic of grammaticization (Hopper and Traugott, 2003; Traugott & Dasher, 2002; Traugott, 1995a, 1995b; Traugott & König, 1991). On the contrary, however, as is the case of *dakara*, the direction of the change is from more grammatical to less grammatical. Thus, Günthner and Mutz conclude that these are instances of pragmaticization, "[a] kind of diachronic change where elements ... assume functions on the discourse-pragmatic level" (p. 99), not of grammaticization. These changes in German and Italian are essentially in line with what *dakara* is undergoing. Before drawing a conclusion that pragmaticization is what *dakara* is going through based on one example, however, let us examine a few more examples.

Spanish *pues* 'because, therefore' is another case that demonstrates a similar change to *dakara*. Páez-Urdaneta (1981) explains that what is widely known as a textual cohesion marker *pues* also functions at the discourse-pragmatic level as an emphatic interpersonal marker, a turn-taking and a turn-ending signal, a topic-resuming device, and a marker of in-group solidarity. Again, just as *dakara* and the German and Italian examples are, the change that *pues* has undergone is characterized by increasing subjectivity and decreasing grammaticality. Notice, too, that the pragmatic uses of *pues* share many commonalities with those of *dakara*: a turn-taking and a turn-ending signals and a topic-resuming device. These similarities may not be unexpected considering that *pues* and *dakara* both mean "therefore". This correspondence in the steps of language change could be an indication of the cross-linguistic tendency of language change for consequential markers.

Yet another similar pattern of change is found in Japanese. Traugott and Dasher (2002) define *sate* in modern Japanese as "a global discourse particle that typically signals a topic shift" and also as "a mild hedge" that carries expressive value and can be translated as English "well" (p. 178). This *sate* in modern Japanese (hereafter MdJ) originates in the deictic adverb, an equivalent of English 'thus' (for the meaning of 'in this way') in old Japanese (hereafter OJ).[21] By late old Japanese (hereafter LOJ), *sate* had developed connective functions that mark relationships, such as cause-and-result and additive, between preceding and following material. In addition, in LOJ, *sate* already exhibits a discourse-pragmatic function of topic control: topic change and topic resuming after an interruption. In late middle Japanese (hereafter LMJ), *sate*'s exclamatory function is documented, and in MdJ, *sate* is also used in a letter as a formulaic expression

[21] Approximate stages in the history of Japanese (Jp.):

Language Stage	Beginning	Ending	Corresponding Historical Period	
OJ Old Jp.	710	800	Nara Period	710-794
LOJ Late Old Jp.	800	1100	Heian Period	794-1192
EMJ Early Middle Jp.	1100	1330	Kamakura Period	1192-1333
LMJ Late Middle Jp.	1330	1610	Muromachi Period	1333-1603
EMdJ Early Modern Jp.	1610	1870	Edo Period	1603-1868
MdJ Modern Jp.	1870	1970	from Meiji Period	1868-present
PDJ Present Day Jp.	1970	present		

(Traugott and Dasher, 2001, pp. xv-xiv)

to mark the beginning of the body (epistolary usage). Not unlike *dakara* and the German, Italian, and Spanish instances of language change, *sate*, too, is a change with increasing subjectivity and decreasing grammaticality.[22]

Additionally, it is intriguing to notice that the new functions that *sate* has developed are comparable to those of *dakara*: *sate*'s connective functions including a consequential connective and topic resuming and changing function. The exclamatory usage is not found in *dakara* in my corpus; however, my informal observation of everyday talk by Japanese native speakers suggest that *dakara* is sometimes used as an interjectory expression similar to English "I know!".[23] [24]The following example simulates the interjectory use of *dakara* in everyday conversation:[25]

(14)

(14-1) A: *nee, nee, nee, ano hito kakkoyokunai?*
hey hey hey that person good-looking-Neg
"Hey, hey, hey, isn't that person good-looking?"

→(14-2) B: ***!dakara=.***
"***Dakara***=!"

(14-3) A: *!deshoo.*
Tag
"Right?"

(14-4) *metcha kakkoii yo ne.*
so good-looking FP FP
"He's so good-looking."

As in (14-2), the connective is used on its own in order to express a strong agreement with the statement that the other speaker has just made. Interestingly, although this usage of *dakara* is not present in my corpus, I have found extremely similar usage of *dakara* in one of the Okinawa dialects that is introduced on several internet websites ("Okinawa Hoogen," n.d.; "Okinawa hoogen kooza," n.d.; "Okinawa no hanashi," n.d.; "Okinawa no kotoba," n.d.).[26] [27]Moreover, one of the websites that introduces the Okinawa dialect

---

[22] Although *sate* is called an "deictic adverb," it essentially functions as a deixis, which is a grammatical category. Thus, *sate*'s change still follows the direction of decreasing grammaticality.

[23] This observation has taken place mainly in the southeast part of Fukushima prefecture. Thus, this tendency may be regional.

[24] I will use "interjection" instead of "exclamation" because the latter may give readers a false impression that the only emotion involved is of surprise.

[25] The exclamation mark in (14-2) represents "a high 'booster' – very roughly, a higher than expected pitch on a word" (Du Bois et al., 1993, p. 58).

[26] Okinawa is a southernmost prefecture in Japan. It consists of numerous islands. According to these websites, the dialect is called "uchinaa-guchi" and is heavily influenced by so-called "standard Japanese" or Tokyo area dialect.

[27] In four different websites introducing the Okinawa dialect, the phrase *dakara yo* (*yo* is an emphatic final particle) is presented as an expression that is used to proffer an agreement to what the other speaker has

points out that the same expression is used outside of Okinawa: Kagoshima prefecture and the south part of Sendai city in Miyagi prefecture ("Okinawa no kotoba," 2008). Added to the list is the southeast part of Fukushima prefecture in which the frequent use of the interjectory use of *dakara* was observed. These findings of the interjectory usage of *dakara* in dialects may be indicating that such usage is actually regional phenomena.

As for the epistolary usage, *dakara* does not have such function. It is not surprising that *sate* and *dakara* share the similar changing process when we take into account some of the definitions of *sate* as connectives by Rodriguez (1604-8): "for that reason" and "and (so)" (as cited in Traugott & Dasher, 2002, p. 183). It is evident in these definitions that *sate* as connectives functioned in like manner as *dakara*. These similarities in language changing process between *sate* and *dakara* as consequential conjunctions shed further light on the general tendency of language change for consequential markers, just as the correspondence between Spanish *pues* and *dakara* did.

Although the cross-linguistic study on unidirectional change of causal markers is far beyond the scope of the present study, the last two examples of Spanish *pues* and Japanese *sate* along with *dakara* are perhaps indicators of the regularity in causal markers' semantic-pragmatic change. By regularity I mean the tendency for causal markers to develop discourse-pragmatic functions such as turn control (turn-claiming and turn-yielding) and topic control (topic-resuming and topic-changing). Nonetheless, in order to make such a strong claim, more data from a variety of languages are needed.

On the more general level of change, namely of increasing subjectivity and decreasing grammaticality, these four examples that exhibit the same direction of change as *dakara* signify that the kind of functional shift that *dakara* is undergoing is not unique. Grammaticization being a widely acknowledged theory, cases of language change that do not comply with its characteristics give us false impression that they are "exceptions". However, the presence of these examples attests that *dakara*'s case is an example of a more general trend of semantic change, that is, pragmaticization just as Günthner and Mutz (2004) and Matsumoto (1988) proposed in their studies. The one thing that differs from their findings, however, is that the pragmaticization of *dakara* is preceded by lexicalization. Lexicalization is often used synonymously with a phenomenon called univerbation. Himmelmann (2004) explains univerbation as a process of "creating a new lexeme out of two or more existing ones, which may continue to exist independently" (p. 27). According to him, univerbation is motivated by frequent collocations of two or more items. The standard examples of lexicalization he provides include "cupboard", "brainstorming", and "necklace" (ibid.). In the same manner, it is possible to consider *dakara* as a lexicalized form of the frequently collocated items, namely copula *da* and clitic *kara* 'because'. Thus, the initial stage of *dakara*'s development involved lexicalization, which created a free (not as bound as *da-kara*) consequential connective

---

said. Below are examples of the expression drawn from two of the websites ("Okinawa hoogen kooza," n.d.; "Okinawa no kotoba," n.d.):

(15)		(16)	
(15-1)	A: *omae kaisha yamereba?*	(16-1)	A: *saikin wa fukyoo de dokomo mo taihen ya ssa=*
(15-2)	B: ***dakara yo***=.	(16-2)	B: ***dakara yo***=.

Some of the translations into so-called standard Japanese include *sono toori* 'Exactly,' *soo rashii ne* 'I heard,' *soo na no yo* 'That's right.' Clearly, this expression in the Okinawa dialect is analogous to the interjectory function of *dakara* in question: Both of them are used to proffer an agreement to what the other speaker has said.

that functions at the textual level. Following that, the connective has continued to be pragmaticized and now functions as a pragmatic connective at the discourse level. *Dakara*'s development is summarized in Table 8 below:

Da-kara	*Dakara*		
Consequential	Consequential	Explanatory	Discourse-Organizational

Lexicalization

Pragmaticization

Table 8: Summary of *dakara*'s development

Chapter 4: Conclusion

4.1 Summary

Japanese *dakara* has been widely known as a connective that marks a consequential relationship between preceding material [X] and following material [Y]. My close analysis of naturally occurring conversations reveals that *dakara* is more than just a consequential connective: in everyday conversations, speakers employ *dakara* when providing an explanation to the point that is previously made. In such occasion, the explanatory information may take any of the following forms: new information (explanatory), rephrasing of the previous utterance (remedial), or repetition of the previous utterance (repetitive). In addition to this explanatory usage of *dakara*, the connective also has the discourse-organizational function: participatory control (turn-claiming and turn-yielding) and topic control (topic-resuming and topic-changing). Borrowing Van Dijk's (1979) words, the consequential function reflects *dakara*'s usage as a "semantic connective" and the explanatory and discourse-organizational functions reflect its usage as a "pragmatic connective".

The results of the analysis also uncovered phonological reduction correlating with semantic bleaching. Additionally, the specific type of pragmatic strengthening, that is, subjectification and the phenomenon called persistence were observed. What all of these phenomena have in common is that they are all characteristics of grammaticization – a type of diachronic language change. Regardless of these commonalities between *dakara*'s development and grammaticization, I have concluded that change involving *dakara* is not an example of grammaticization because its functional shift does not comply with the fundamental definition of grammaticization which is increasing grammaticality. Instead, *dakara* is a case of lexicalization (univerbation of copula *da* and subordinating clitic *kara* 'because') and pragmaticization.

4.2 Change in Progress

Having used the word "change" numerous times so far, let us be reminded that *dakara*'s pragmaticization is an on-going process. This on-going nature of the change is evident in a number of examples that display more than one functional characteristic as presented in Chapter 2. The variations of *dakara* that are described here are by no means absolute, clear-cut categories: Change in progress entails gradual functional variations and "various degrees of fixedness" (Ono, 2006, p.382). Ono summarizes this point as follows:

> What is observed by linguists is simply what is captured at one point in the everlasting change of a particular language, and thus it exhibits variation. This is an obvious fact considering that human language constantly changes and thus in principle can never be fixed. (ibid.)

This very definition of language as an ever-changing entity brings our attention back to the importance of using naturally occurring conversations as the data source when studying the nature of grammar. In the traditional view of grammar as a static, self-contained entity, relying on linguists' introspection as a data source may have been acceptable. However, the same is not true if one views grammar as "provisional, incomplete and emerg[ing] in discourse" (Hopper, 1991, p. 118). Schegloff (1989) shares this view in the following quote:

> If the conduct of language as a domain of behavior is biological in character, then we should expect it (like other biological entities) to be adapted to its natural environment. What is the primordial natural environment of language use, within which the shape of linguistic structures such as grammar, have been shaped? Transparently, the natural environment of language use is talk-in-interaction, and originally ordinary conversation. (p. 143)

In short, discourse is "home" to grammar: that is where grammar is negotiated through interactions among conversationalists and where, according to Maynard (1989), "language's potential is realized ... and a linguistic sign [attains] what it means in many ways" (p. 411). This is the very reason why linguists should look to naturally occurring conversations in order to gain insight into grammar. Indeed, had I not used conversational data for this study, the subtle distinctions among the different types of *dakara* or phenomenon such as phonological reduction could not have been uncovered. Thus, this case study of Japanese *dakara* confirms and underscores the importance of studying grammar in its natural environment – everyday conversation.

4.3 Limitations of the Study and Future Studies

It should be pointed out that the diachronic implication of this study has limitations due to its reliance on synchronic data. For future studies, historic written texts may be utilized to validate (or to invalidate) the diachronic language change that was suggested in this study. In the same manner, researching the etymology of the subordinating clitic *kara* 'because' may lead to a better understanding of the development of *dakara*. As well, regarding the interjectory use of *dakara*, it may be worth considering whether it is regional phenomena and also, whether or not it is regional, how it fits into the bigger picture of *dakara*'s language changing process. Another possibility for a future study on this interjectory use of *dakara* is its sociolinguistic implications. As cited in Section 3.3, Páez-Urdaneta (1981) reports the case in which Chicano speakers regard Spanish *pues* 'because, therefore' as "a feature signaling 'in-groupness' and differentiating them from other Hispanic groups among which the use of *pues* is less intense" (p. 338). If the use of *dakara* as an interjection is found to be regional, it may be worth exploring its relevance with sociolinguistic factors.

Another limitation of this study comes from the data used for this study. The corpus is comparatively small, consisting of ten conversations with two hours and ten minutes in the total length. As well, the participants in the ten conversations do not by any means represent the linguistic behaviour of all speech communities. Therefore, the results of this study indicate merely a tendency that requires further validation with larger and more comprehensive data. On that note, a cross-linguistic study on functional change of causal markers may be worth considering. It would be a major discovery if such a cross-linguistic study could find a universal principle underlying the semantic change of causal markers.

Lastly, due to the on-going nature of *dakara*'s language change, there were a number of examples that could be taken as one category or another. Although I have strained to be as objective and consistent as possible as described in Chapter 2, the categorization is far from being complete. In the future, it may be interesting to conduct another study based on up-to-date data to see if there is any change in the functions of *dakara*.

Appendix 1: Description of the Conversations Used for the Present Study

	Name of the recording	Year	Participants	Dialect (Hometown)	Relationship	Location	Length used for analysis
I	Gaikogugo	2008	Y: 21 M Student, D: 21 M Student, S: 20M Student	Standard (Chiba) Standard (Osaka) Standard (Tokyo)	Friends	In a common room in a residence at a university, Canada	00:07
II	Kinkyoo Hookoku	2003	D: 27 F student, M: 51 F company employee	Standard (Tokyo) Standard (Tokyo)	Mother & daughter	Telephone	00:19
III	Otooto	2000	A: 20s M student, B: 20s M student	Standard/Kansai (Nagoya) Standard (Kanagawa)	Friends	At a university mall, the States	00:20
IV	S & Y	1999	S: 22 M student, Y: 21 F student	Standard (Tokyo) Standard (Chiba)	Friends	Two friends were asked to get together and chat freely in a room at a university, the States	00:15
V	Bukatsu	1995	U: 24 M student, M: 24 F student	Standard (Tokyo) Standard (Yamagata)	Friends	U's home, the States	00:13
VI	Hatachi	1995	A: 21 F student, K: 20 F student	Standard (Tokyo) Standard/Kansai (Osaka)	Friends	At A's house, the States	00:14
VII	Ryokoo	1995	R: 24 F housewife, H: 33 M company employee	Standard (Chiba) Standard (Chiba)	Husband & wife	At the participants' house, Japan	00:06
VIII	High school boys	1995	Two high school boys	Standard (Unknown) Standard (Unknown)	Friends	Walking outside, Japan	00:19
IX	Arasoi	1990	H: 44 M company executive, R: 30 F receptionist	Standard (Tokyo) Standard (Kanagawa)	Couple	The speakers' house, Japan	00:06
X	Zeitaku	1989	M: 27 F student, K: 24 F student	Standard (Sapporo) Standard (Tokyo)	Friends	kitchen in M & K's house, the States	00:10

Appendix 2: Transcription Conventions

1) Unless the focus is on the structure as in example (3), all excerpts consist of three lines: the first is Japanese transliteration in alphabets, the second is morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, and the third is approximate English translation.
2) Lines (Hereafter, the "line" refers to the first line with Japanese transliteration until explained otherwise.) are divided based on intonation units. Du Bois et al. (1993) explain intonation units as follows:

    > Roughly speaking, an intonation unit is a stretch of speech uttered under a single coherent intonation contour. It tends to be marked by cues such as a pause and a shift upward in overall pitch level at its beginning, and a lengthening of its final syllable. (p. 47)

    Since this definition is based on English, the detailed characteristics of intonation units may differ in Japanese; however, the general description seems to apply to Japanese as well.
3) Each line is followed by a period, a comma, a question mark, a double hyphen or nothing.
    - The period '.': "a class of intonation contours whose transitional continuity is regularly understood as *final*" (p. 54).
    - The comma ',': "a class of intonation contours whose transitional continuity is regularly understood as *continuing*" (ibid.).
    - The question mark '?': "a class of intonation contours whose transitional continuity is regularly understood as an *appeal* ... 'Appeal' here refers to when a speaker, in producing an utterance, seeks a validating response from a listener" (ibid.).
    - The double hyphen '--': a truncated intonation unit due to a false start, an interruption from the listener, or for other reasons.
    - If there is nothing at the end of the line, that means the intonation unit continues to the next line. In other words, the unit was too long to be fitted within one line.
4) Square brackets '[ ]' represent speech overlap. If there is another speech overlap nearby, double square brackets '[[ ]]' for the second one, and numbered square brackets '[3 3]' from the third one on were used in order to avoid confusion.
5) Three dots '...' indicate an easily identifiable pause, whereas two dots '..' represent a shorter pause.
6) Equal sign '=' indicates lengthening of a syllable.
7) Hyphen '-' indicates a truncated word.
8) The capital letter 'X' is used for each syllable of inaudible speech. Alternatively, the utterance enclosed in '<X X>' indicates uncertainty of the accuracy.
9) The '@' symbol represents each "syllable" of laughter. The text that is enclosed in '<@ @>' indicates the laughing quality of the utterance.
10) (H) symbolizes inhalation; (Hx) symbolizes exhalation.
11) The text that is enclosed in '<Q Q>' is a quotation of somebody else's utterance.
12) '<F F>' indicates a particularly loud (forte) segment.
13) '<CR CR>' indicates a segment that becomes gradually louder (crescendo).
14) '<HI HI>' indicates a segment with higher pitch level.
15) '<A A>' indicates a particularly rapid speech (allegro).

16) Double parentheses '(( ))' represent comments by the transcriber or the author.
17) The linguistic unit in discussion is bolded.
18) The following abbreviations are used for the Japanese gloss[28]:

Cop:	various forms of copula verb *be*
FP:	final particle
LK:	linking nominal
Neg:	negative morpheme
Nom:	nominalizer
O:	object marker
S:	subject marker
Q:	question marker
QT:	quotative marker
Tag:	tag-like expression
Top:	topic marker

[28] I followed Mori (1999, p.X) for the abbreviations for the glossing.

References

Bybee, J. L., Perkins, R., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Givón, T. (1979). *On understanding grammar.* New York: Academic Press.

Günthner, S., & Mutz, K. (2004). Grammaticalization vs. pragmaticalization?: The development of pragmatic markers in German and Italian. In W. Bisang, N. P. Himmelmann, & B. Wiemer (Eds.), *What makes grammaticalization?: A look from its fringes and its components* (pp. 77-107). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hasunuma, A. (1991). The function of 'dakara' in dialogue. *Journal of the College of Foreign Languages, 4,* 137-153. Himeji: Dokyoo University.

Heine, B., & Reh, M. (1984). *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in African languages.* Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Heine, B., Claudi, U., & Hünnemeyer, F. (1991). *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Himmelmann, N. P. (2004). Lexicalization and grammaticization: Opposite or orthogonal? In W. Bisang, N. P. Himmelmann, & B. Wiemer (Eds.), *What makes grammaticalization?: A look from its fringes and its components.* (pp. 21-42). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hopper, P. J. (1991). On some principles of grammaticization. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (Eds), *Approaches to grammaticalization* (Vol. 1: pp. 17-35). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK ; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (1983). Another failed hypothesis: Pitch/loudness as relevant to overlap resolution. *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature, 38,* 1-24. Tilburg: Tilburg University.

Karatsu, M. (1995). A functional analysis of DEWA, DAKARA and SHIKASHI in conversation. *Japanese Discourse, 1*, 107-130.

Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo. (Ed.). (1951). *Gendaigo no joshi jodooshi: yoohoo to sono jitsuree [Particles and auxiliaries in modern Japanese: usages and examples]*. Tokyo: Shuueisha.

Lehmann, C. (1995). *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. München: Lincom Europa.

Makino, S. & Tsutsui, M. (1989). *A dictionary of basic Japanese grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Makino, S., Hatasa, A. Y., & Hatasa, K. (1998). *Nakama : Japanese communication, culture, context*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Martin, S. E. (2004). *A reference grammar of Japanese* (3rd Ed.). Hawaii: University of Hawai'I Press.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). From bound grammatical markers to free discourse markers: History of some Japanese connectives. In S. Axmaker A. Jaisser, & H. Singmaster (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 340-351.

Maynard, S. K. (1989). Functions of the discourse marker *dakara* in Japanese conversation. *Text, 9*(4), 389-414.

Maynard, S. K. (1993). Discourse Modality: Subjectivity, emotion, and voice in the Japanese language. In J. L. May, H. Parret & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Pragmatics and beyond new series, 24*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Miura, A., & McGloin, N. H. (1995). *An integrated approach to intermediate Japanese*. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Mizutani, O., & Mizutani, N. (1981). *Nihongo notes*. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Mori, J. (1999). Negotiating agreement and disagreement in Japanese: Connective expressions and turn construction. In S. A. Thompson & P. J. Hopper (Eds.), *Studies in discourse and grammar, 8*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Morita, Emi. (2005). *Negotiation of Contingent Talk: The Japanese Interactional Particles Ne and Sa*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved September 30, 2006, from Ebrary database.

Nakayama, T., & Nakayama, K. I. (1997). Japanese kedo: Discourse genre and grammaticization. In H. Sohn & J. Haig (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, 6*, 607-618. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Nihon Daijiten Kankōkai. (1972). Nihon kokugo daijiten. Tōkyō: Shōgakkan.

Okinawa hoogen. (n.d.). Retrieved April, 2008, from http://www.geocities.jp/okinawa_porktamago/chosaku/fougen.htm

Okinawa hoogen kooza. (n.d.). Retrieved April, 2008, from http://my.internetacademy.jp/~s1201132/hogen/jissen.htm

Okinawa no hanashi. (n.d.). Retrieved April, 2008, from http://www.coara.or.jp/~yamataka/okinawa2.htm

Okinawa no kotoba. (n.d.). Retrieved April, 2008, from http://wiki.chakuriki.net/index.php/%E6%B2%96%E7%B8%84%E3%81%AE%E8%A8%80%E8%91%89

Ono, T. (2006). Postpredicate elements in Japanese conversation: Nonmodularity and panchrony. In T. J. Vance & K. Jones (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics, 14*, 381-391. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Onodera, N., & Suzuki, R. (2007). Historical changes in Japanese: With special focus on subjectivity and intersubjectivity: Introduction. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, *8*(2), 153-169.

Urdaneta, I. P. (1981). Conversational '*pues*' in Spanish: A process of degrammaticalization? In A. Ahlqvist (Ed.), *Papers from the 5the International Conference on Historical Linguistics* (pp. 332-340). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Schegloff, E. A. (1989). Reflections on language, development, and the interactional character of talk-in-interaction. In M. H. Bornsein & J. S. Bruner (Eds.), *Interaction in human development* (pp. 139-153). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Schegloff, E. A., Ochs, E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Introduction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Shinmura, I. (1998). Kōjien (5th ed.). Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

Tohsaku, Y. (1999). *Yookoso!: An invitation to contemporary Japanese.* Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill.

Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2002). *Regularity in Semantic Change.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved April, 1, 2008, from Ebrary database.

Traugott, E. C., & König, E. (1991). The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In E. C. Traugott & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* (Vol. 1: pp. 189-218). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Traugott, E. C. (1982). From propositional to textual and expressive meanings; some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In W. P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (Eds.), *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics* (pp. 245-271). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Traugott, E. C. (1995a). Subjectification in grammaticalization. In S. Wright & D. Stein (Eds.), *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation* (pp. 31-54). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, E. C. (1995b). The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1979). Pragmatic connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 3*, 447-456.

Wiemer, B., & Bisang, W. (2004). What makes grammaticalization? An appraisal of its components and its fringes. In W. Bisang, N. P. Himmelmann, & B. Wiemer (Eds.), *What makes grammaticalization?: A look from its fringes and its components.* (pp. 3-20). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.