2017

Indexing 'Entrustment': An Analysis of the Japanese Formulaic Construction [N da yo N]

Michiko Kaneyasu
Old Dominion University, mkaneyas@odu.edu

Shoichi Iwasaki

Indexing 'entrustment': An analysis of the Japanese formulaic construction, [*N da yo N*]

Abstract:

Japanese conversations are known to contain a large amount of unexpressed information. When a speaker speaks with elliptical information, he/she assumes that the addressee will understand what is not overtly expressed based on the knowledge that is supposed to be shared either textually, personally or culturally. The addressee, on the other hand, must determine what is not being expressed overtly using such shared knowledge. At the heart of this kind of communication is the existence of trust assumed among the interlocutors. Using the term 'entrustment,' we will examine how one particular Japanese formulaic construction, [*Noun (da) yo Noun*], 'It's Noun, you know Noun,' indexes mutual trust to manage conversational interaction. We will argue this meta-pragmatic awareness needs to be recognized beyond surface interactional patterns identified in conversation.

Introduction

This article explores the form and the indexical function of one particular formulaic construction found in Japanese. The work on formulaic language and grammatical constructions often focuses on their non-compositionality and idiomaticity, i.e., formal anomaly and/or semantic disjunction between form and meaning, but rarely discusses indexical functions they may perform. Exploring indexical functions of formulaic constructions will lead to a new discussion of formulaic constructions in general, and examining a language other than English will expand the range of possibility of such constructions from a broader cross-linguistic perspective.

The construction in question takes the form of *[N (-da) yo N]*.[1] In the first part, *N* (a noun) is followed by the optional copula (*-da*) and the obligatory pragmatic, sentence final particle, *yo*, and in the second part, the same noun used in the first part is repeated. The whole expression is uttered in a particular intonation pattern with two humps on the two nouns. In essence, *[N (-da) yo N]* means '(It's) N, you know, N!' We will examine this construction in conversational discourse contexts, and discuss its function of indexing 'entrustment,' which is defined as a socio-cognitive function that allows a speaker to appeal to his/her interlocutor to evoke textually, personally or culturally shared knowledge. From here on, we use the simplified notation *[N da yo N]* without the parentheses around the optional copula, *da*.

From an interactional perspective, the *[N da yo N]* construction covers a wide range of conversational actions, such as (a) initiation of topic closure, (b) repair, (c) disagreement, and (d) speaker identification. However, a careful examination of local contexts reveals that these disparate functions become operational only when participants share a high degree of trust between them. In the recent development in 'dialogicality,' the notion of 'trust' in conversational interaction has started to gain the attention of researchers (Linell, 2009; Linell and Markova, 2014). 'Trust' is a meta-pragmatic notion which influences behaviors including linguistic ones in interaction.

The current research has gained analytical insights from several different approaches, such as the study of formulaic expressions, Construction Grammar, Conversation Analysis (CA), pragmatics, dialogism, and Indexicality theory. This broad approach is necessary because what the *[N da yo N]* construction achieves in conversational discourse is multidimensional, and pursuing the construction in any one particular framework may cause us to miss other important aspects (see Arundale, 1999, 2005; Fried and Ostman, 2005 for a similar spirit of analysis). In other words, our interest is to understand the range of purposes, from interactional to indexical, that one particular formulaic expression can perform in conversation. This will be a groundbreaking new area of inquiry for formulaic languages in interaction. Procedurally, we develop our argument as follows. First, we present an overview of the types of formulaic expressions we can identify for Japanese, and place the *[N da yo N]* construction within the typology of formulas and constructions in Japanese. Then after presenting one typical case in which the *[N da yo N]* construction is used (or, more accurately, abused) to orient the discussion, we examine attested examples of the constructions in conversations and movie/drama scripts, and identify the range of interactional activities. In the discussion section, we propose that all these activities are local manifestation of a global concept of entrustment that the *[N da yo N]* construction indexes.

Typology of formulaic constructions in Japanese
Formulaic language and grammatical constructions have been classified in many different ways (e.g., Pawley and Syder, 1983; Pawley, 1985, 2009; Fillmore et al., 1988; Goldberg, 2003; Wray, 2013; Wray and Perkins, 2000). A particularly important classification for our purpose is one based on the constructions' grammatical status and functions. Some constructions are grammatically anomalous in the sense that they cannot be produced by general rules of syntax in a particular language. General rules of syntax are language specific basic productive algorithms that arrange words, such as [Preposition] + [Noun], [Noun] + 'and' + [Noun], [Noun] + [Verb] + [Noun] in English. These rules are listed in traditional grammar descriptions, but in Construction Grammar, they are usually treated as general, abstract constructions along with more specific constructions such as the 'let alone' construction (e.g., Barlow, 2000; Goldberg, 2006a, 2006b: 379-380; Dąbrowska, 2014). Grammatical anomaly can be understood as high constructionality of an expression. Examples of high constructionality at the phrasal level from English include 'all of a sudden,' 'first off,' 'by and large' and 'day after day' (e.g., Fillmore et al., 1988: 505), which are the result of lexicalization (Pawley, 1986; Brinton and Traugott 2005). High constructionality can be also observed at the sentential level. The [*the Adj.$_i$-er, the Adj.$_j$-er*] construction (e.g., '*the more carefully you do your work, the easier it will get*') is a productive sentence level formula in which the range of possibilities for adjectives (*Adj.$_i$* and *Adj.$_j$*) is very broad. Compared to these grammatically anomalous formulas, or formulas with high constructionality, there are grammatically sanctioned formulas that conform to the general rule of syntax in the language. One type of grammatically sanctioned formulaic construction exhibits a mismatch between the form and meaning as the meaning is completely conventionalized; e.g., *pull someone's leg* (= trick someone) and *kick the bucket* (= die) (Fillmore et al., 1988: 510).

Our preliminary investigation confirms that the different types of formulaicity described above are also useful to identify formulaic expressions in Japanese, but due to the typological difference between the two, the details are naturally different (cf. Okamoto, 1994). In what

follows, we provide some examples of Japanese formulaic expressions in order to give a broad overview of Japanese formulaic language before we analyze the *[N da yo N]* construction. First, the grammatically sanctioned formula exemplified by *pull someone's leg* and *kick the bucket* in English can be found relatively easily in Japanese as well; *ashi o hipparu* '(lit.) pull someone's leg; (conv.) drag down, get in someone's way,' and *hone o oru* '(lit.) break a bone; (conv.) go to trouble.' Many of this type of formula have both literal and figurative meanings, but speakers normally know which meaning is signaled from the context. There are some that have only a figurative meaning: *atama ni kuru* '(lit.) (something) comes to the head; (conv.) It makes me mad.' This type of formula is the result of language users' creative intervention using such cognitive operations as metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/2008). Third, the type of English formula exemplified by 'all of a sudden,' i.e., formulas with high constructionality, can also be found in Japanese. Some examples are *to yuu no wa* 'What it means is' and *ka to itte* 'On the other hand.' These are used as discourse markers (cf. Heine, 2013), but internally *to yuu no wa* is composed of a complementizer (*to*), a verb (*yuu* 'say'), nominalizer (*no*), and a topic marker (*wa*), and *ka to itte* is composed of a complementizer/question marker (*ka*), a complementizer (*to*), a verb in the medial form (*itte* 'saying'). Just as English speakers do not attempt to analyze *all of a sudden* as a congregate of four separate words, Japanese speakers do not analyze, for example, *to yuu no wa* as being composed of four separate words. This type of formula is the result of conventionalization through repeated use of collocations. Fourth, the other type of formula with a high level of constructionality, exemplified by *the X-er, the Y-er* can be also found in Japanese. This is the area in which productive rules for formulaic constructions contrast sharply with the general rule of syntax, and is the area where more research is needed to identify language specific grammatical constructions. Consider *naki ni naku* 'cry to the utmost extent' ([V$_{ADV}$ *ni* V]) (Okamoto, 1994; Noro, 2009) and *oki-tara okita de* '(he) finally gets up, but…,' [V$_{tara}$ V$_{PAST}$ *de*]. The first example combines the adverbial form of a verb (*naki* 'crying') before the postpositional dative particle (*ni*) and the repeated verb *naku* 'cry,' and the second example combines the conditional form (*okitara* 'if one gets up') and the past tense form (*okita* 'got up') followed by the locative case particle (*de*). These sequences of a verb and a case particle (*naki ni* and *okita de*) are not allowed in modern Japanese except in limited contexts. These constructions are uninterpretable if one only knows the meaning of each morpheme and the general rules of syntax. That is, these constructions package the form and meaning inseparably, making compositional analysis impossible and unnecessary.

The formulaic construction, *[N da yo N],* belongs to this type of expressions although each component of the construction seems to be sanctioned by the general grammar of Japanese. The first part, *[N da yo],* is the normal way of saying '(X) is N,' where the slot for N is completely open. What is unique about this part is that while (X) is anticipated, it cannot be overtly coded (Ajioka et al., 2014). We will come back to this point shortly. Another is the repetition of N in the second part. Though not usually found in general rules of syntax, repetition has been noted to have an augmentative function (Okamoto, 1994; Sperber and Wilson, 1986/1996).

The [*N da yo N*] construction – a preliminary example and its formulaicity
As a way of introducing the formulaic expression, *[N da yo N],* and its interactional import in context, we present the following exchange. This is a made-up example, but the content of the

3

exchange is familiar to most adult speakers in Japan. The expression is *ore da yo ore* ('It is me, you know, it is me'), which has been used by telephone scammers who call elderly people to have them transfer money to their bank account. [2] Here G is a grandmother and S a scammer. G has just picked up the phone and issued a greeting.

(1) Telephone scam

1	G:		*moshi moshi*
			'Hello?'
2	S:		*baachan, ore, ore*
			'Grandma, (it's) me, (it's) me.'
3	G:		*e? dochira?*
			'Huh? Who?'
4	S:	→	***ore da yo ore***.
			'(It's) me, you know, me!'
5	G:		(.) *e?* (.) *takashi kai?*
			'(.) Huh! (.) Is that you, Takashi?'
6	S:		*soo, takashi.*
			'Yeah, yeah, (it's) Takashi.'

As soon as an elderly female voice answers the phone, a male scammer addresses the owner of the voice with *baachan* 'grandma' – a common term of endearment for a grandmother, and presents himself with *ore ore* 'It's me, me' in line 2. The victim may be puzzled initially and ask who the caller is, as done in line 3. The scammer then proceeds to produce the crucial line *ore da yo ore* '(It's) me, you know, (it's) me,' which is more forceful than *ore ore* 'It's me, me' in line 2. If the victim cooperatively interacts with the caller, she will attempt to identify the voice. If she happens to have a grandson, she may proceed to ask the caller if he is the one she has in mind. If she does that, the scammer's task is almost complete. He just needs to give her some story ('I am in a traffic accident'; 'I have to pay back some debt to a loan shark' etc.) to convince her to deposit money to someone's account. What *ore da yo ore* does here is to make the recipient try hard to search her long-term, relevant knowledge to identify this person. A simple *ore da yo* 'It's me' without a repetition of *ore* does not have the convincing tone, and the recipient may interpret that the caller called a wrong number. We identify the source of the convincing tone signaled by *ore da yo ore*, or [*N da yo N*] in general, with the term 'entrustment.'[3]

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to establish [*N da yo N*] is a formulaic expression, and not a sentence produced by a general rule of syntax. The syntactic rule most relevant to this construction is a non-verbal, topic sentence, [*N1 wa N2 (da)*] 'NP1 is NP2.' Though the [*N da yo N*] construction appears similar to this sentence type, it is actually quite different in several respects. The most important, as mentioned in passing above, is the fact that though the first part of [*N da yo N*] may be conceived to be a reduced form of [*N1 wa N2 da yo*], the topic phrase, *N1 wa,* can never appear though it is assumed to be accessible to the addressee. In case of *ore da yo ore*, the assumed topic is something like 'the person talking with you now,' but it cannot be expressed. To put it differently, the first part of [*N da yo N*] is not a

result of ellipsis of [*N1-wa*] from [*N1-wa N2 da yo*], but is a self-sufficient component of the construction (cf. Thompson et al., 2015: 6-7; Evance, 1993; Heine, 2011).

Second, what is crucial is the insertion of *yo* and repetition of N. The expression without *yo* (i.e., *ore da, ore*) will not work at all in the telephone scam example above. This is a different formula that indexes discovery (e.g. upon finding oneself in a group picture from the past, a male speaker may utter, *a! (kore) ore da, or*e 'Oh, this is me, me!'), similarly the expression without the repeated noun (i.e., *ore da yo* 'It's me') will not have the special inference evoking tone. The special inference evoking tone may be encoded with an emphatic intonation over the entire expression, *ore da yo!* 'It's me!,' but *ore da yo ore* does not need such intonational augmentation. Matsui (2000) in her Relevance Theoretic account of the Japanese pragmatic particle *yo* notes that the particle shares common features with some repetitions, such as 'guid(ing) the hearer to accept the speaker's confidence in the truth of the assumptions communicated in the utterance' and 'encourag(ing) the hearer to expand the context so that the further implicit assumptions can be derived' (p. 162). By inserting *yo* and repeating N, the [*N da yo N*] construction strongly appeals to the addressee to find the relevance of the current utterance. Third, the construction cannot be equated with the [*N yo N*] construction. The latter was employed by a wicked step-mother in the translation of the Cinderella story: *kagami yo kagami* 'Mirror-*yo*, mirror. (Who is the most beautiful woman in the world?'). This Cinderella construction will not allow insertion of *da* after the first N. In other words, *da* is an integral part of the construction though it may be deleted in some cases. Fourth, [*N da yo N*] must be framed in a particular intonation contour with two humps, the first part with a high pitch followed by the repeated N with a much lower pitch (Ajioka et al., 2014). In sum, [*N da yo N*] and its derived form [*N yo N*] (i.e., not the intrinsic Cinderella construction) appear with a specific intonation contour, and most importantly this entire construction is strongly tied to the notion of entrustment.

Now we are in the position to analyze several attested examples of the [*N da yo N*] construction in the data. We will first show a range of non-homogeneous local tasks that the construction performs in interactional context and then show that these local tasks are related to different layers of a higher function of entrustment.

Data

We used two different data sets for this study. The first is the *CALLHOME* audio-recorded data (Canavan and Zipperlen, 1996). Conversations in this data set are between close friends or family members who talked casually over an international telephone line. We examined 120 telephone conversations, totaling 18 hours. We read all the transcripts and found five cases of the [*N da yo N*] construction. The second data set consists of various TV dramas and feature films.[4] For this data set, both audio and video recordings are available, and we found four cases. We repeatedly listened to all nine cases in context, and analyzed them for both the prosodic and functional features. The number of attested tokens is small. It is surprising, therefore, that the native speakers can identify it as formulaic, and can produce it accurately when needed. The nine attested tokens are listed below.

From *CALLHOME*

- *mikan yo mikan*   '(It's) tangerines, you know, tangerines.'
- *ranchi da yo ranchi*   '(It's) lunch, you know, lunch.'

- *ESL yo ESL*   '(It's) ESL, you know, ESL (English as a Second Language).'
- *papa da yo papa*   '(It's) your dad, you know, your dad.'
- *1,400 en da yo 1,400 en*   '(It's) 1,400 yen, you know, 1,400 yen.'

From TV dramas and feature films
- *atashi yo atashi*   '(It's) me, you know, me.' [*Magerarenai Onna* – a TV drama]
- *kao da yo kao*   '(It's) the face, you know, the face.' [*Zatoichi* – a feature film]
- *hanako yo hanako*   '(It's) Hanako, you know, Hanako. (a female name)' [*Suupaa no onna* – a feature film]
- itaria da yo itaria   '(It's) Italy, you know, Italy.' [*Hotaru no hikari* – a feature film]

Conversational actions performed by [*N da yo N*]

The [*N da yo N*] construction is deployed to achieve various types of sequential actions in conversation. The sequential action types we have identified are: (a) initiation of topic closure, (b) repair (third position self-initiated self-repair), (c) disagreement, and (d) identification (self or mediated identification). These are not an exhaustive list of actions associated with the [*N da yo N*] construction, but represent several key actions.

Initiation of topic closure

In some cases, [*N da yo N*] is used to make a move towards closing a current topic of conversation. Prior to the production of *mikan yo mikan* 'Tangerines, you know, tangerines!' in the following excerpt, two friends, Mari and Kei, were talking about how fruits and vegetables were very expensive in Japan compared to the U.S., and listed some items as examples. Mari says in line 3 *orenji nante taberarenai yo* 'we cannot eat oranges (in Japan because they are very expensive).' In the next turn, Kei shows her alignment to Mari's remark by saying *taberarenai* 'we cannot eat (oranges).' Then, suddenly, Kei utters *mikan yo mikan* 'Tangerines, you know, tangerines!' From a broader sequential point of view, Kei's proposal for something they <u>can</u> afford in Japan is a move towards initiating topic closure. It functions as a kind of conclusion as it summarizes the topical matter by shifting a viewpoint from non-affordability to affordability (i.e. except *mikan* (tangerines) none of the fresh produce they had mentioned collaboratively are affordable in Japan).

(2) Tangerine (callhome ja_1263)[5]
1	Mari:	*yappa serori wa takai. heh heh heh heh ((laughter))*
		'Celery is really expensive. Ha ha ha.'
2	Kei:	*takai no.*
		'(It's) expensive.'
3		(0.5)
4	Mari:	*gya::: (1.0) orenji nante taberarenai yo?*
		'Aargh. (1.0) (We) certainly can't eat oranges, you know?'

5	Kei:		*taberarenai.*
			'(We) can't eat (them).'
6		→	***mikan yo mikan.***
			'(It's) tangerines, you know, tangerines.'
7	Mari:		*hh heh heh heh heh .hhh hu::n.*
			'Ha ha ha ha. Yeah.'
8	Kei:		*u:n.*
			'Yeah.'

This use of [*N da yo N*] is similar to the use of summary assessments as resources for closing topics (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987: 38-42). In response, Mari simply laughs (*heh heh heh heh*). Laughter is often viewed as an interactional resource and conversational activity (Jefferson, 1985; Jefferson et al., 1987). In this segment, Mari's laughter expresses her appreciation of Kei's wit, and at the same time indicates her willingness to bring the topic to a close. Holt (2011) states that laughter 'respond[s] to a prior turn without adding further talk, thus conveying a willingness to contribute to closing' (p. 404). In fact, in the subsequent exchange after Mari's laughter in line 7, the participants exhibit turn-exchange behaviors to indicate withdrawal from the current topic and initiation of a new activity (pre-request) in line 21, as shown below.

6	Kei:	→	***mikan yo mikan.***
			'(It's) tangerines, you know, tangerines.'
7	Mari:		*hh heh heh heh heh .hhh hu::n.*
			'Ha ha ha ha. Yeah.'
8	Kei:		*u:n.*
			'Yeah.'
9	Mari:		*nakitakunaru ne:¿*
			'(It makes us) want to cry, doesn't it?'
10	Kei:		*ne:¿*
			'It does.'
11			(0.2)
12	Mari:		*u:n, chotto hidoi ne:¿*
			'Yeah, (it's) a bit harsh, you know.'
13	Kei:		*u:n.*
			'Right.'
14	Mari:		*u:↑:n,* (0.2) *heh* [*heh heh*]
			'Yeah. Ha ha ha.'
15	Kei:		[*heh heh*]
			'Ha ha.'
16	Mari:		*u:n tte waraigoto ja nai ne::¿ heh heh*
			'Yea, but (it's) not a laughing matter, you know. Ha ha.'
17	Kei:		*soo,* (0.2) *taihen da yo:?*
			'(That's) right. (0.2) (It's) tough.'
18	Mari:		*u::n,* (0.3) *soo da ne:¿*

			'Yeah, (0.3) you are right.'
19	Kei:		*u:n.*
			'Yeah.'
20			(0.3)
21	Mari:	→	***tokorode henna koto kiite ii?***
			'By the way, can I ask you something odd?'
22	Kei:		*un.*
			'Yeah.'

The successful use of the formulaic expression as a topic closure initiator owes to the achievement of collaborative work around entrustment. We will return to this mechanism in the 'Discussion' section.

Repair
Repair refers to the processes through which conversational participants deal with troubles in speaking, hearing, or understanding talk (Schegloff et al., 1977). In our data, *ranchi da yo ranchi* 'It's lunch, you know, lunch!' shown below is an instance of third position self-initiated self-repair.

(3) Lunch (callhome ja_2231)

1	Sae:		*kekkoo ranchi toka mo sa:,*
2			[*shuu*] *1.5 kai gurai ittari shiteru no ne:¿*
			'(I)'m eating out for lunch (lit. going to lunch) about 1.5 times a week.'
3	Emi:		[*un.*]
			'Yeah.'
4			[*ranchi::?*]
			'Lunch?'
5	Sae:		[*ippai aru kara*] *sa:, un ranchi toka ne:, hora okusangata to sa:,*
			'There are so many (occasions), yeah, like lunch, you know, with those wives,'
6	Emi:		*a- a-* [*ano:*] *kaado o tsukau tte koto ka.*
			'Uh, uh umm you mean you use your card (there).'
7	Sae:		[*u:n*].
			'Yeah.'
8			(0.5)
9	Emi:		*un?*
			'Huh?'
10	Sae:		*so-* (.) *iya cha cha cha cha chau,*
			'Righ- (.) oh no no no no no.'
11		→	*dakara* (0.3) ***ranchi da yo* [*ran*]*chi.***
			'You know (0.3) (It's) lunch, you know, lunch.'
12	Emi:		[*a-*] *un.*
			'Uh, yeah.'

8

In this phone conversation, two friends Sae and Emi are talking about a brand-name (Gucci) bag that they both own. Sae is the caller from the U.S. and Emi is the receiver who lives in Japan. Prior to the segment presented above, the topic had been initiated by Sae who said to Emi 'I read (in your letter) that you haven't used the bag. Why?' To Sae's question, Emi responded that she had not had a chance to use it because she always had to carry things for her child. There were a couple of sub-topic shifts after that. Just prior to the segment above, Sae and Emi were discussing another sub-topic: Sae is a special registered customer at the Gucci boutique because she bought many bags there. In line 1, Sae suddenly shifts the sub-topic again to occasions in which she takes her bag with her, i.e., to lunches with other housewives.

By producing line 6 (*kaado o tsukau tte koto ka* 'you mean you use the Gucci special card when you eat lunch at the store?'), Emi checks her understanding of Sae's utterance in line 1. This understanding turned out to be incorrect. Thus, Sae, in a third positioned turn from the trouble source (line 1), initiates a repair with a repair-initiating component (Schegloff, 1992), (line 10: *iya cha cha cha cha chau* 'oh no no no no no') and repairs the trouble source, using the discourse marker, *dakara*, followed by the [*N da yo N*] construction in the form of *ranchi da yo ranchi*. It is interesting that the conceptual information provided in the repair proper (i.e., 'lunch') is no more than what was already given in the speaker's previous turn. Rather than explicitly stating what she meant, the speaker uses the expression to index the equal epistemic status of the speaker and the addressee concerning *ranchi* 'lunch.' The speaker is doing more than just solving the problem in understanding for the addressee but inviting and demanding the addressee to jointly figure out the meaning of the utterance based on their shared knowledge. In this excerpt, the addressee, Emi, says *un* 'yeah' in line 12 to display her compliance and collaboration even though it turns out later in the sequence that she has not fully grasped what the speaker meant.

Disagreement
In the previous two examples, the speaker initiated some sequential actions via the use of [*N da yo N*] (i.e., topic closure or repair). In the following example, the speaker expresses disagreement with what the other person says using [*N da yo N*].

(4) Face (film 'Zatoichi' (2003))
(Shin (a male) and Osei (a male disguising a female) are facing each other in a small bath-tub.)
1   Shin: *.hh shikashi suge: yo na::¿*
                    'But it's amazing.'
2   (1.0) *doo mitemo onna ni shika miene: mon na::¿*
                    '(1.0) You look just like a woman.'
3   ((1 second pause while Shin staring at Osei.))
4   Shin: *otoko demo (.) keshoo surya: kirei ni naru n da na::¿*
                    'Men could look beautiful if they put on makeup.'
5   ((1.5 second pause while Osei shaking her/his head.))
6   Osei: *daredemo koo iku to wa kagiranai yo.*
                    'Not everyone can become like this (i.e., look beautiful).'
7   →   ***kao da yo kao****.* ((Osei points to his face as he says *kao da yo kao*.))

'(It's) the face, you know, the face.'
8   Shin: ((4 second pause while Shin staring at Osei's face without saying
                      anything.))

This excerpt comes from a *samurai* film called *Zatoichi* (Kitano, 2003). In the story, Kiyotaroo and his sister Okinu have come to a small town to find the gang responsible for their parents' murder and avenge their parents. Kiyotaroo is disguised as a woman named Osei, and the two siblings are traveling as *geisha* entertainers. They befriend a local gambler Shinkichi and a blind swordsman Zatoichi. In the scene above, Shin(kichi) and Kiyotaro (as disguised as Osei) are bathing in a small, outside bath. In lines 1-4, Shin expresses his admiration of how Kiyotaro as Osei looks just like a woman, and attributes his beauty to makeup. In the next turn, Kiyotaro (= Osei) disagrees with Shin and says in line 6 'not every man would look like this (with makeup).' This is a partial disagreement, which is regularly used by conversational participants to mitigate their disagreement and suggest partial agreement (Mori, 1999). Immediately following the partial disagreement, in line 7, Osei points out a qualification, *kao da yo kao* '(It's) the face, you know, the face' pointing to his own face. Upon receiving this utterance, Shin becomes completely silent, and simply stares at Osei's face with admiration. Unlike other examples, the interlocutors in this example are neither close friends nor family members; the use of the construction for entrustment activity is possible because it refers to the socio-cultural common ground that the natural features of one's face are considered crucial to how beautiful the person would look with makeup. [6]

Identification (self or mediated)
In the next two examples, the speakers use [*N da yo N*] to identify the speaker herself or a third person through the use of a personal pronoun or a kinship term. In the first drama segment titled *Magerarenai onna* (The Unbending Woman) (NTV, 2010), Riko runs into her old high school classmate Saki in a supermarket.

(5) Me (drama 'Magerarenai onna' (2010))
1   Riko: *are?*
                      ((2.5 second pause while Riko and Saki looking at each other.))
                      moshikashite saki?
                      'Oh? (2.5) Are you Saki by any chance?'
2   ((1 second pause while Saki staring at Riko.))
3   Saki: *ee.*
                      'Yes.'
4   Riko   →   ((0.5 second pause while Riko smiling.)) **atashi yo atashi**.
                      '(0.5) (It's) me, you know, me.'
5   *.h niigata ichiritsu de onnaji kurasu datta.*
                'You and I were classmates at Niigata Ichiritsu (High School).
6   *.h ya:da nan nen buri?*
                'Oh my, how many years has it been?'

In identifying herself in line 4, Riko does not mention her name, but only uses the first person female pronoun *atashi* in the [*N da yo N*] expression. This way of self-identification seems to go against the preference for 'effortless' recognition (Schegloff, 1979: 63) in identification-recognition practice, especially when the two parties have not met for more than a decade. Nonetheless, the overtly communicated entrustment in the addressee that she should be able to identify the speaker pressures her to search through the personal directory to determine the speaker's identity. Upon the production of *atashi yo atashi*, it becomes inappropriate for the addressee to express uncertainty about the speaker's identity even if she is not sure who the speaker is. The scammer in the *ore ore sagi* example discussed earlier abuses the pragmatic force of this construction.

The second example of identification is similar to the one examined just above, but the identification is done through an intermediary; the mother mediates between her husband, who is on the phone with her, and her toddler son, Hiro, who is at home with her.

(6) Dad (callhome ja_1032)

1	Dad:	*de ashita ireyoo kana to omotten da kedo sa.*
		'And (I'm) thinking of calling them tomorrow.'
2	Mom:	*an, fu:[:n].*
		'Uh, okay.'
3	Dad:	[*un*].
		'Yeah.'
4	Mom: →	*(.) hiro kun **papa da yo papa**.*
		'(.) Hiro, (it's) your dad, you know, your dad.'
5		*hiro kun, (.) hiro kun,*
		'Hiro, Hiro.'
6		(2.0) ((The child comes to the phone.))
7	Child:	*papa?*
		'Daddy?'
8	Dad:	*moshimoshi?*
		'Hello?'

In this segment, the identification could have been done by simply saying *papa da yo* 'It's your dad.' The use of the construction seems to be motivated by its pragmatic effect of conveying the entrustment in the addressee to interpret the message appropriately based on the relevant shared knowledge. Since the father is not physically present, the child has to infer that the person on the other end of the line is his father. The mother uses [*N da yo N*] to encourage this simple inference.

In this section, we described various activities in which the [*N da yo N*] construction takes an active part in conversation. Embedded in the particular local sequences, the construction is used to accomplish many types of actions. However, as we have alluded to in passing and as we will see in the next section clearly, these interactional activities represent only a partial picture of what the [*N da yo N*] is doing in the interaction.

Discussion: entrustment indexicality

As shown in the previous section, the [*N da yo N*] construction is employed to perform a variety of sequential actions in conversation. We propose in this section that the disparate local actions all link to a higher pragmatic notion of trust. It is important to note that this level of communication is not directly observable from simply analyzing the sequential actions in conversational transcripts. Trust is a socio-cognitive meaning that saddles affective and epistemic stances, and entrustment is an indexing process to point to this meaning. Interlocutors rely on entrustment when certain information is, ought to be, or needs to be, shared.[7] Allwood (2014) notes, 'trust is so basic to dialogue that it can be said to be a kind of default mode' (p. 197). However, we underscore the fact that the *[N da yo N]*'s main mission is to index this socio-cognitive meaning forcefully when the pertinent information may not be completely obvious. Thus, once the addressee achieves understanding, the speaker and the addressee renew their strong personal bond. It should also be noted here that the indexicality function is something that gradually accumulates through repeated use of a construction in a specific context, such as the entrusting context, and a speaker may take advantage of the (emerging) indexical function of a particular construction to further strengthen what is indexed (in this case entrustment).

Indexing of entrustment via [*N da yo N*] is somewhat similar to the function that is performed by 'recognitional' demonstratives (Himmelmann, 1996). The bold-faced ***that*** in 'Do you still have ***that*** radio that your aunt gave you for your birthday?' (Diessel, 1999: 7) is an example of the recognitional demonstrative, which marks information as discourse new and hearer old (cf. Prince, 1992), or unactivated information in the mind of the recipient (Chafe, 1987, 1994). One difference between the recognitional demonstrative and [*N da yo N*] is that for the former the information such as 'that radio' in the above example must be personally shared ('specific' by Himmelmann (1996: 230) or 'private' by Diessel (1999: 106)). What the *[N da yo N]* indexes, however, may be shared culturally or textually as well as personally. By using this construction, a speaker is able to forcefully create a context of assumed mutual understanding. This is true even if such a context is unwarranted from the addressee's point of view.

Hayashi and Yoon (2006) also discuss similar uses of demonstratives in the context of word-formulation trouble in several languages: the 'place holder,' 'the avoidance' and the 'interjective hesitator' uses. Among them, the avoidance use has the closest function to the [*N da yo N*] construction. *Are* 'that thing' in Japanese is one such pronoun in ***are*** *motte-kita?* 'Did you bring **that thing**?' where the speaker actively avoids mentioning a specific name for some reason. The motivation of this type of demonstrative is to 'point to, and allude to, some unspecified yet inferable referent, and thereby **avoid an explicit mention** of it that might run the risk of creating an uncomfortable social situation.' (Hayashi and Yoon, 2006: 506) (emphasis in original). According to Enfield (2003), English expressions such as *WHAT-d'you-call-it* (John, where is *WHAT-d'you-call-it*?) and *you-know-WHAT* (John, where is *you-know-WHAT*?) are similar to recognitional demonstratives whose uses are motivated by what Sacks and Schegloff (1979) call 'recipient design.' Behind all these conversational activities is seen the existence of trust among interlocutors. With this interactional design for invited inference based on trust, recognitional and other special uses of demonstratives, *WHAT-d'you-call-it*, *you-know-WHAT* and [*N da yo N*], all become possible.

Unlike 'knowledge,' 'trust' is a notion related to 'expectation, belief and faith,' which do not require epistemic examination: 'Trust replaces certainty in practical life... (and) enables, facilitates, and simplifies life' (Allwood, 2014: 209). Enfield (2011) also notes, 'Showing that I don't feel the need to "prove" that I know something is a sign that I expect to be trusted by the other, or indeed that the other knows what I know' (p. 299; see also Enfield, 2006). The [*N da yo N*] construction is a forceful means to index trust which leads the addressee to agreeing that he/she has the equal epistemic statuses with the current speaker. Recall that the victim in the telephone scam was forced to accept the equal status of (false) family relation between her and the scammer when the scammer used the construction.

In what follows, we reexamine two of the conversational examples discussed in the previous section in order to describe how entrustment is indexed by the speaker and understood and acted upon by the addressee. The source of entrustment for (7) is personally shared knowledge between the two speakers.

(7) Lunch (callhome ja_2231) (originally numbered (3); lines 1 through 9 are omitted)
10   Sae: *so-* (.) *iya cha cha cha cha chau,*
                      'Righ- (.) oh no no no no no.'
11   →   *dakara* (0.3) **ranchi da yo [ran]chi.**
                      'You know (0.3) (It's) lunch, you know, lunch.'
12   Emi: [*a-*] *un.*
                                               'Uh, yeah.'

In (7), even though Sae clearly indicates in line 10 that Emi's understanding of *ranchi* 'lunch' (line 6) is incorrect, in line 11, she insists on providing no further information. Hypothetically, if she simply wanted to address the trouble in understanding, she could have explained what she meant by *ranchi* 'lunch.' What she did instead was to explicitly index the mutual trust, which further indexes shared epistemic status with the [*N da yo N*] construction concerning *ranchi* 'lunch' between herself and Emi from their past encounters and shared knowledge. This creates a powerful pragmatic effect as it brings their long-term social and cognitive relationship into relevance. What Sae is saying implicitly through *ranchi da yo ranchi* is something like this: 'I know you know what I mean by "lunch." We are close friends and we talked about it before. I want you to get it without any elaboration because I trust you as my friend and that you remember what we talked about!' Such entrustment has a strong emotional appeal to the addressee. Emi's utterance *un* (yes) in line 12 is a display of her compliance and reciprocal rapport with Sae. It is important to note that Emi's response does not elaborate on her understanding because doing so would endanger the collaborative achievement of entrustment (Enfield, 2006: 416). The successful achievement of entrustment work has an effect of strengthening the solidarity between the participants. Recall our earlier reference to Allwood ('Trust ... simplifies life') and Enfield ('Showing that I don't feel the need to "prove" that I know something is a sign that I expect to be trusted by the other, or indeed that the other knows what I know.')

The second example, (8), represents a much different conversational context where there is no trouble in understanding between the participants. (8) also differs from (7) above in that the source of entrustment is culturally shared knowledge for the two speakers.

13

(8) Tangerine (callhome ja_1263) (originally numbered (2); several lines omitted)
4   Mari: *gya::: (1.0) orenji nante taberarenai yo?*
                       'Aargh. (1.0) (We) certainly can't eat oranges, you know?'
5   Kei: *taberarenai.*
                       '(We) can't eat (them).'
6   →   **mikan yo mikan***.*
                       '(It's) tangerines, you know, tangerines.'
7   Mari: *hh heh heh heh heh .hhh hu::n.*
                       'Ha ha ha ha. Yeah.'

        In line 6, Kei utters *mikan yo mikan* '(It's) tangerines, you know, tangerines.'
Sequentially, this initiates a topic closure as we discussed in the previous section, but this is not
the only action Kei is initiating here. Though the context is different, Kei is indexing entrustment
just like Sae was doing with *ranchi da yo ranchi* '(It's) lunch, you know, lunch.' In (7), the
relevant knowledge domain was exclusively interpersonal. In (8), the domain is both
interpersonal and socio-cultural. When people come to interact, they have assumptions about
each other's long-term knowledge, i.e., dialogicality (Du Bois, 2007; Linell, 2009). However, they
make assumptions not only from their personal history, but also from social and cultural
experiences that they can expect to share because of where they grew up or lived in the past
(Clark, 1996; Iwasaki and Horie, 1998). In the case of *mikan yo mikan* '(It's) tangerines, you
know, tangerines,' Kei and Mari may have shared personal experiences related to *mikan*
'tangerines' in the past, but more importantly they can also assume that they share certain
cultural knowledge about them (e.g., it's an affordable, popular winter fruit in Japan) because
they know that they both grew up in Japan. Mari's laughter in line 7 accepts and embraces Kei's
communicated entrustment and assumption. In both (7) and (8), the successful achievement of
mutual entrustment through the use of *[N da yo N]* is an indication of (willingness to build)
personal and/or social affinity.
        The difference between personally and culturally shared knowledge can be further
appreciated by examining discourse markers, such as *dakara*, *yappari* and *hora,* that can
selectively co-occur with the *[N da yo N]* construction. These discourse markers are indexical
for the type of shared knowledge or instruction to activate shared knowledge, and not
interchangeable among themselves. The discourse marker *dakara* 'so, therefore' normally
appears after a reason for the statement that follows. When the reason is not expressed
overtly, it urges the addressee to access the knowledge that is personally and textually shared
and retrievable, as in the case of *dakara, ranchi da yo ranchi* 'so, (it's) lunch, you know, lunch,'
and urges the addressee to access the knowledge that is personally and textually shared and
retrievable. When the information is culturally shared, *yappari* 'as expected, as you/we know' is
used. This is compatible with *mikan yo mikan* '(it's) tangerines, you know, tangerines' and *kao
da yo kao* '(it's) the face, you know, the face.' The discourse marker, *hora* 'Look!,' is different
from *dakara* and *yappari* in that it is a marker of request for activating information that is
shared in a particular context, whether personal or cultural. To *atashi yo atashi* '(it's) me, you
know, me' and *papa da yo papa* '(it's) your dad, you know, your dad,' *hora* can be added to

request to activate the shared information regarding the speaker or a third person which the addressee is not at the moment attending to (Oshima, 2001; Takubo and Kinsui, 1997)

The conversational actions such as repair and topic closure, and the indexing of entrustment as detailed in this section, represent two layers of communication delivered through the use of *[N da yo N]*. While the speakers do not have to use *[N da yo N]* to achieve the various conversational actions, indexing entrustment based on textual, personal, and cultural, shared knowledge is the central function of the *[N da yo N]* as a formulaic expression.

Summary and conclusion

This paper examined two levels of function associated with the formulaic construction *[N da yo N]* found in Japanese conversation. At the level of interaction, it performs various functions such as (a) initiation of topic closure, (b) repair, (c) disagreement, and (d) speaker identification. However, these interactional actions are backed by the meta-pragmatic notion of entrustment. 'Entrustment' can been seen as part of the Gricean cooperative principle (Grice 1989).[8] More specifically, the construction violates one or more of the Gricean maxims of quantity, relation (relevance) and manner, at least on the surface. There is an extra burden on the addressee to understand its (conversational) implicature. 'Entrustment' requests and encourages the addressee to bear this extra burden in conversation.

We used the term, 'entrustment,' to refer to the dynamic indexing process with which the *[N da yo N]* construction is associated. Since trust is a fundamental assumption that the conversational participants must accept a priori, most, if not all, utterances in friendly conversations (and even in not-so-friendly conversations – (see Linell and Markova, 2014: 230)) are backed by trust. In fact, entrustment marking is a fairly widespread phenomenon in language use. In Japanese, sentence final particles such as *ne* and *yo* and discourse markers such as *dakara* and *yappari* discussed earlier are such resources. What we want to emphasize in this paper is that entrustment can be indexed not only at the level of lexicon but also at the level of a larger construction. The *[N da yo N]* construction we examined here foreground and take advantage of this notion in order to reaffirm close mutual relationship. Since studies on formulaic constructions tend to focus on the deviant form and the form-meaning mismatch, we hope our focus on their indexical function will lead to a new paradigm for future research on such constructions, and in diverse languages.

References

Ajioka M, Kaneyasu M, Kawanishi Y and Iwasaki S (2014) "Mikan yo, Mikan": Formulaic constructions and their implicature in conversation. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 21: 199-213.

Arundale R (1999) An alternative model and ideology of communication for an alternative to politeness theory. *Pragmatics* 9: 119-154.

Arundale R (2005) Pragmatics, conversational implicature, and conversation. In: Fitch KL and Sanders RE (eds) *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. New Jersey/London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, pp. 41-63.

Allwood J (2014) Trust as a communicative and epistemic simplifier and fascilitator. In: Linell P and Markova I (eds) *Dialogical Approaches to Trust in Communication*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc., pp. 189-211.

Barlow M (2000) Usage, blends, and grammar. In: Barlow M and Kemmer S (eds) *Usage Based Models of Language*. Stanford: CSLI, pp. 315-345.

Brinton LJ and Traugott EC (2005). *Lexicalization and language change*. Cambridge University Press.

Canavan A and Zipperlen G (1996) *CALLHOME Japanese Speech*. Linguistic Data Consortium, Philadelphia.

Chafe W (1987) Cognitive constraints on information flow. *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse* 11: 21-51.

Chafe W (1994) *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark H (1996) Communities, commonalities, and communication. In: Gumperz JJ and Levinson CS (eds) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 324-355.

Dąbrowska E (2014) Recycling utterances: A speaker's guide to sentence processing. *Cognitive Linguistics* 25(4): 617-653.

Diessel H (1999) Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Du Bois JW (2007) The stance triangle. In: Englebretson R (ed) *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 139-182.

Enfield NJ (2003) The definition of what-d'you-call-it: Semantics and pragmatics of recognitional deixis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35(1): 101-117.

Enfield NJ (2006) Social consequences of common ground. In: *Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research*, Symposium 134, Berg.

Enfield NJ (2011). Sources of asymmetry in human interaction: Enchrony, status, knowledge and agency. In: Stivers T, Mondada L and Steensig J (eds) *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 285-312.

Evance N (1993) Code, inference, placedness and ellipsis. In: Foley WA (ed) *The Role of Theory in Linguistic Description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 243-280.

Fillmore CJ, Kay P and O'connor MC (1988) Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of let alone. *Language* 64(3): 501-538.

Fried M and Ostman J-O (2005) Construction grammar and spoken language: The case of pragmatic particles. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(11): 1752-1778.

Goldberg AE (2003) Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7(5): 219-224.

Goldberg AE (2006a) *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxfrd: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg AE (2006b) Syntactic constructions. In: Brown K (ed) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edition. Elsevier, pp. 379-383.

Goodwin C and Goodwin MH (1987) Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 1(1): 1-55.

Grice HP (1989) Logic and conversation. In: *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 22-40.

Haugh M (2008) Utterance-final conjunctive particles and implicature in Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics* 18(3): 425-451.

Hayashi M and Yoon K-E (2006) A cross-linguistic exploration of demonstratives in interaction: With particular reference to the context of word-formulation trouble. *Studies in Language* 30(3): 485-540.

Heine B (2013) On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else?. *Linguistics* 51(6): 1205-1247.

Heine L (2011) Non-coordination-based ellipsis from a construction grammar perspective: The case of *coffee* construction. *Cognitive Linguistics* 22(1): 55-80.

Himmelmann N (1996) Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In: Fox BA (ed) *Stuides in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 205-254.

Holt E (2011) On the nature of "laughables": Laughter as a response to overdone figurative phrases. *Pragmatics* 21: 393-410.

Iwasaki S and Horie PI (1998) The Northridge earthquake conversations: Conversational patterns in Japanese and Thai and their cultural significance. *Discourse & Society* 9(4): 501-529.

Jefferson G (1985) An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter. In: van Dijk T (ed) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 3, Discourse and Dialogue*. London: Academic Press, pp. 25-34.

Jefferson G (2004) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Lerner GH (ed) *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 13-31.

Jefferson G, Sacks H and Schegloff EA (1987) Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In Button G and Lee JRE (eds) *Talk and Social Organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 152-205.

Lakoff G and Johnson M (1980/2008) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Linell P (2009) *Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically: Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Linell P and Markova I (eds) (2014) *Dialogic Approaches to Trust in Communication*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Matsui T (2000) Linguistic encoding of the guarantee of relevance: Japanese sentence-final particle yo. In: Andersen G and Fretheim T (eds) *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 145-172.

Matsumoto Y (1989) Politeness and conversational universals – observations from Japanese. *Multilingua* 8(2/3): 207-221.

Mori J (1999) *Negotiating Agreement and Disagreement in Japanese: Connective Expressions and Turn Construction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Noro K (2009) Gendai Nihongo no dooitsu dooshi hanpuku hyoogen "V ni V" ni tsuite [On modern Japanese identical verbal repetitive expression "V ni V"]. *Kotoba to Bunka* [*Language and Culture*] 10: 45-58, Nagoya University.

Okamoto S (1994) Argumentative verbal repetitive constructions in Japanese. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5(4): 381–404.

Oshima H (2001) "Hora" no kinoo ni tsuite [On the function of "hora"]. *Nihongo Kyooiku* [*Japanese Language Education*] 108: 34-41.

Pawley A (1985) Lexicalization. In: Tannen D and Alatis JE (eds) *Languages and Linguistics: The Interdependence of Theory, Data, and Application*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, pp. 98-120.

Pawley A (1986) On speech formulas and linguistic competence. *Lenguas Modernas* (Chile) 12: 84-104.

Pawley A (2009) Grammarians' language versus humanists' languages and the place of speech act formulas in models of linguistic competence. In: Corrigan R, Moravcsik EA, Ouali H and Wheatley K (eds) *Formulaic Language: Volume 1. Distribution and Historical Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 3-26

Pawley A and Syder FH (1983) Natural selection in syntax: Notes on adaptive variation and change in vernacular and literary grammar. *Journal of Pragmatics* 7(5): 551–579.

Sacks H and Schegloff EA (1979) Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In: Psathas G (ed) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp. 15-21.

Schegloff EA (1979) Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In: Psathas G (ed) *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp. 23-78.

Schegloff EA (1992) Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology* 97(5): 1295-1345.

Schegloff EA, Jefferson G and Sacks H (1977) The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53(2): 361-382.

Sperber D and Wilson D (1986/1996) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Takubo N and Kinsui S (1997) *Ootooshi/kandooshi no danwateki kinoo* [Conversational function of response tokens and interjections]. In: *Bunpoo to Onsei* [*Grammar and Sound*], Kuroshio Publisher, pp. 257-279.

Thompson SA, Fox BA and Couper-Kuhlen E (2015) *Grammar in Everyday Talk: Building Responsive Actions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wray A (2013) Formulaic language. *Language Teaching* 46(3): 316-334.

Wray A and Perkins M (2000) The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model. *Language and Communication* 20(1): 1-28.

---

[1] In Ajioka, Kaneyasu, Kawanishi, and Iwasaki (2014), the construction was specified as [*N yo N*]. After an extensive re-analysis of the data, we have concluded that [*N yo N*] is a variant form of [*N da yo N*]. See further discussion below. Thus we believe [*N (-da) yo N*] is the proper representation of the construction.

[2] This technique was initially called *ore ore sagi* ('Me, me' Scamming), but since now a variety of techniques are being used, a new term *furikome sagi* ('Deposit to my account' Scamming) is widely used. This technique has been unfortunately very effective. In 2012, the total amount of money cheated out of people by such telephone scams amounted to more than 1.25 million US dollars, averaging $21,000 per victim. *Ore* in this expression is one of several first male person pronouns which may be used by both young and old speakers. Compared to other personal pronouns such as *boku* and *watashi*, *ore* is informal and rough sounding.

[3] Maggie Camp reminded us that the difference between the two expressions here is similar to 'It's me' and 'Come on! It's me!' in English.

[4] It is reasonable to use non-authentic data for investigating the [*N da yo N*] construction. First, this construction appears, though not abundantly, in natural conversation, and its use in drama and film scripts is a reflection of authentic use. If the construction only appeared in scripts, then it might be problematic to assess its genuine status in natural language. Second, we will be able to gain richer understanding of the formula by analyzing even a small additional number of examples from the scripts, which may be otherwise not accessible. Third, we should not abandon our efforts when the number of examples in natural discourse is small.

[5] Transcription conventions used in the examples are based on Jefferson system (Jefferson, 2004):

(.)	short pause	(1.0)	timed pause	:	prolongation of prior sound
[ ]	Overlap	wor-	truncated word	.hh	in-breath
hh	out-breath	heh	laugh pulse	((words))	comments
.	falling or final intonation	?	rising intonation	,	continuing intonation
¿	slightly rising intonation	↑	rise in pitch		

[6] We should note that *kao da yo kao* 'it's the face, you know, the face' is a culturally based formulaic expression which appears in this precise form, i.e., a filled idiom. In contrast, *mikan yo mikan* 'it's tangerines, you know, it's tangerines' was created on the fly using the [*N da yo N*] construction, i.e., partially idiomatic. In other words, certain phrasings are more fixed than others though both are based on the same construction.

[7] The notion of 'interactional implicature' (Matsumoto, 1989; Haugh, 2008) is relevant here.

[8] We would like to thank the anonymous reviewer of the previous version of paper for directing our attention to this point.