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1. Introduction

A Japanese modal adverb, *yahari* ‘as expected/after all’ has a number of phonetic variants such as *yappari* and *yappa* in Modern Japanese. Many researchers have examined this modal adverb and its variants in a range of frameworks (Itasaka 1971, Kato 1999, Nishihara 1988, Maynard 1991, Takeuchi 2003, Tanaka, 1997). However, past studies have not systematically analyzed these forms as separate words in naturally occurring spoken discourse.

The paper aims to go beyond these previous studies by analyzing *yahari*, *yappari*, and *yappa* separately in natural spoken discourse, where the intricate connection between linguistic forms and cognitive factors is manifested.

---

1 I am grateful to Rumiko Shinzato and Tim Vance for their comments on my early draft. My thanks go to the editors of J/K 17 and the audience at UCLA. All errors are my responsibility.
(Chafe 1994). Following the recent movement toward corpora study as a tool for examining exemplar representations (Bybee 2002, Bybee and Ed- dington 2006), I explore the functional, semantic, and syntactical characteristics of the modal adverb and its variants in spoken corpora. I will argue that the distinctive characteristics of these forms at multiple levels are best accounted by in the Usage-based Approach of Bybee (2006).

2. Data

Table 1 shows the multiple sets of spoken discourse that were analyzed in this study. There are two reasons for choosing these data sets. First, there is a possibility that differences in genres/topics of discourse might exhibit different distributional patterns of the target forms (Biber 2000). Second, there might be an interaction between the formality and the choice of yahari, yappari, and yappa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpora</th>
<th>Contents &amp; Formality</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Japan Corpus (JC)</em></td>
<td>31 sets of informal talk among friends and family</td>
<td>2.9 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Josei no Kotoba: Shokuba Hen, Dansei no Kotoba: Shokuba Hen</em> ‘Women’s Language at Work, Men’s Language at Work’ (<em>WP</em>)</td>
<td>93 sets of a mixture of informal talk during coffee breaks or lunch breaks at work and formal talk from corporate and school meetings</td>
<td>17.7 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tetsuko no Heya</em> ‘TV Interview Shows’ (<em>TK</em>)</td>
<td>5 shows of a semi-formal TV interview show, aired from September through October 2007</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NHK Nichiyoo Tooron</em> ‘Sunday Debate’ (<em>SD</em>)</td>
<td>4 shows of formal debate, aired on TV from December 2006 through March 2007</td>
<td>2.9 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Spoken Discourse with Different Degrees of Formality

*JC and SD make a sharp contrast in terms of formality. WP is more informal than TK because WP includes informal conversation at coffee/lunch breaks at work. The TV shows TK and SD were recorded and transcribed by myself. I counted all relevant tokens, yahari and its variants.*

---

2 Abbreviations in the parenthesis in Table 1 will be used throughout this paper.
3 Formality here is defined by the styles the speakers use (either distal style, desu/masu or casual style da) and setting (public or private) and psychological distance between speakers.
4 See Shinzato and Masuda (ms.) for the individual preferences of yahari and its variants in WP.
3. Data Analysis 1: Formality

The data analysis shows that formality plays an important role in the selection of a form. As shown in Table 2, *yahari*, the original form, was most frequently used in formal talk, *SD* (39 percent), and was least frequently used in informal talk, *JC* (2 percent).Interestingly, *yappari*, a variant with consonant germination, was found to be the norm regardless of the type of spoken discourse, registering occurrence ratios from 55 to 77 percent. In contrast to *yahari*, *yappa*, a short form, had stronger affinity with informal discourse, *JC* (28 percent), than formal discourse, *SD* (6 percent). The distributional patterns in *TK* are similar to the ones in *SD*, while those in *WP* are closer to those in *JC*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yahari</th>
<th>Yappari</th>
<th>Yappa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>JC</em></td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>66 (70%)</td>
<td>26 (28%)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>WP</em></td>
<td>24 (8%)</td>
<td>241 (74%)</td>
<td>59 (18%)</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>TK</em></td>
<td>14 (13%)</td>
<td>83 (77%)</td>
<td>11 (10%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td>98 (39%)</td>
<td>140 (55%)</td>
<td>15 (6%)</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>138 (18%)</td>
<td>530 (68%)</td>
<td>111 (14%)</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Distribution of *yahari* and its Variants in Spoken Discourse

Given that *yahari* occurred in informal talk and *yappa* in formal talk, however, formality alone cannot explain away all of the usage of *yahari* and its variants in the datasets examined. Understanding of a speaker’s choice of these forms at a given moment necessitates a close examination of the usage of these forms in discourse. Consequently, it is useful to examine the marked usage (i.e. a deviant case that formality cannot explain) of *yahari* and *yappa* in detail so as to gain insight into the functions of these forms in discourse.

3. Data Analysis 2: Speaker’s Involvement

Excerpt (1) is one of the two cases where *yahari* is deployed in *JC*.

(1) Discussing the evaluation system in T’s profession.

---

5 The number of *yappari* in Table 2 includes a few instances of *yappari=*, where a speaker used the latching technique denoted by the equal sign ‘=’. The number also includes a few instances of *yappashi*, which is one of regional variations. See Inoue (1998: 86-115)

6 Other examples of consonant germination from /h/ to /pp/ are *happa* ‘leaf’ for *ha* ‘id’ reduplication, and *nippon* ‘Japan’ for *nihon* (Miller 1967: 216).

7 The abbreviations used in this paper are: ACC accusative, NOM nominative, TOP topic marker, QT quotation, Q question, COP copula, GEN genitive, FP final particle, NML nominalizer, PST past tense, NEG negative, PSV passive.
T utters *yappari* twice before and once after this excerpt. His speech style is consistent throughout the talk. In line 3, T acknowledges R’s conjecture by saying *un*. Then he attempts to modify R’s conjecture by stating *demo*. The usage of *yahari* and an interactive particle *yone* in line 5 exhibit T’s stance toward R in the context. The deviant usage of *yahari* in informal talk, where high involvement is the norm, seems to be motivated by his intention for lower involvement in the interaction. Observe excerpt (2), an example where *yappa* is uttered in SD.

(2) Toward the end of the Sunday Debate show, a moderator asks a psychologist, W, to summarize his opinion on the government’s responsibility for educational reform in Japan.

1. W: *demo yahari*,  
   but
2. kekkyoku *yappari*,  
   after all
3. → *kikai no kintoo dake wa yappar*,  
   opportunity GEN equality at least TOP
4. dooshitemo mamo n nakya ikenai.  
   by all means maintain NML must
   ‘But *yahari* after all *yappari* (the government) must secure at least *yappa* equal opportunity (for education) by all means.’

Note the transitions from *yahari* in line 1 to *yappari* in line 2 to *yappa* in line 3 in a single turn. W uses formal style prior to this excerpt. Along with W’s style shift from formal to casual *mamon na kya ikenai* in line 4, the use of *yappa* indicates that W is emotionally charged toward the end of his utterance. These transitions nicely display the association between W’s emo-

---

8 *Yone* functions to assert one’s opinion while displaying a stance of harmony with the other participant (Cook 1988).
tional state at the given moment and his choice of the forms. W’s choices of 
yahari, yappari, and yappa best fit his emotional states at each moment. The 
marked usage of yappa depicts the speaker’s higher involvement.

Section 4 and Section 5 focus on the co-occurrence of interactional 
particles (semantics/pragmatics) and the postpredicate position (syntax) respectively. Both of these are associated with the speaker’s stance during the in-
teraction.

4. Data Analysis 3: Interactional Particles

The meanings of interactional particles (e.g. ne, yo, sa, na, and kana) are 
part of semantic/pragmatic knowledge in Japanese, because these particles 
play important roles in establishing interpersonal relationships between the 
speaker and the addressee in the process of their interactions (Cook 1988, 
Maynard 1993). Ne and sa are especially important for turn-management 
operations or coordination of speakership (Morita 2005, Tanaka 2000). The 
first half of this section examines the occurrence patterns of the target forms 
with subjective interactional particles such as na(=) and kana(=) in the 
same clause or in one unit. The second half of this section examines occur-
rence patterns of the target forms with intersubjective interactional particles 
such as ne(=) and sa(=) in one unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yahari</th>
<th>Yappari</th>
<th>Yappa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With subjective particles, kana and na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(95%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Relation between kana/na and yahari/yappari/yappa

As shown in Table 3, there is a skewed distribution relating the subjec-
tive interactional particles and the target forms. In the entire dataset, the 
majority (95 percent) of the co-occurrence of subjective interactional parti-
cles was found with yappari, while the remaining five percent co-occurred 
with yappa. Yahari never occurred with any subjective interactional particles in 
the same clause or in one unit for the datasets examined. Admittedly, the 
total number of tokens of co-occurrence with the subjective interactional 
particles is small for unequivocal generalization (n=20); however, the data 
do show functional trends. Accompanied by the subjective intersubjective

9 Na is used to soften a statement or invite confirmation from the hearer with more rustic 
impression than ne. Na is often used in self-directed speech. Kana is used when talking to 
oneself with other invited to listen (Martin 1975). Due to the nature of the datasets examined, 
yappari na was observed only once in the dataset. The other 19 cases are marked by the occurrence of kana and yappari/yappa in the same clause.
particles, *yappari/yappa* can function as an adverb as well as a hedge in conversation. Observe (3) from TK.

(3) The TV host T asks E about his schooling.

1. T: kookoo wa nanto
   high school TOP to surprise

2. tsuushin de oyari-ni-natta n desu tte
   correspondence through do NML CP QT
   ‘I heard you finished high school through correspondence courses, to my surprise!’

3. E: e= soo desu ne.
   yeah so COP FP.
   ‘yeah, that’s right.’

4. → *yappari* tsuushin sei no kookoo ja-nai-to,
   correspondence courses GEN high school is-NEG if

5. ma= chotto muri *kana* to iu [tokoro ga] arimashite
   Well a bit impossible FP QT say thing NOM there is
   ‘*yappari*, if it wasn’t for correspondence courses, it would have been impossible for me to finish high school’

6. T: [u=n]
   uh huh.

From *yappari* in line 4, both the modal adverbial meaning of ‘expectedly/after all’ and a sense of hedging are simultaneously available. Functioning as the modal adverb, *yappari* conveys his realistic attitude toward the proposition of completing the correspondence courses, rather than attending high school like others his age do. If *yappari* is replaced with a hedge word ‘*ano=*, the sequence from line 3 to line 4 is still natural. Thus, this functions as a hedge.

Table 4 demonstrates that *yappari/yappa*, but not *yahari*, form an emerging schematic unit with highly intersubjective particles, such as *ne* and *sa* as in *yappa ne(=) and yappa sa(=).*10  *Yappa* has a slightly stronger affinity with *ne* and *sa* (seven percent) than with subjective particles *kana* and *na* (five percent). *Yappa(ri) sa(=) was found in informal talk such as JC and WP, and mostly in turn-initial or toward turn-initial positions. *Yappa(ri) ne(=) appeared in various places in turn-relevant position. By uttering *yappa(ri) ne(=)*, a speaker seems to accomplish various acts including taking the floor, marking acknowledgment, and signaling possible Transition-

---

10 There were two cases where *yahari* co-occurred with *ne*. However, these cases seem to be accidental since the speaker kept using *ne* at the end of almost all clauses; therefore, these two cases are not included in the analysis below.
Relevant Place. Observe excerpts (4) and (5) where yapari does not function as an adverb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With intersubjective particles</th>
<th>Yahari</th>
<th>Yappari</th>
<th>Yappa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Relation between ne and sa and yahari/yappari/yappa

(4) K and T in their early twenties are chatting about dating.

1. K: isogashii toki wa moo, busy when TOP
2. nanka, yappa, well
3. mokuteki motte-nai to, goals have-NEG if
4. [daremo] yotte ko-nai to omou, Nobody approach come-NEG QT think ‘When one is busy, well yappa, I believe that nobody approaches you, if you float through life without goals’.

5. T: [un] yeah (pause 2.0)
6. T: yappa sa=, nani, What?
7. isogashii to, tsukiau no muzukashii ka, toka Busy if seeing NML difficult Q something ‘yappa sa= what? When busy, seeing each other is difficult’
8. K: demo, isogashii hoo ga ii But busy rather NOM better ‘but I rather prefer being busy.’

The sequences from line 5 through line 7 are interesting to note; hearing what K says, T acknowledges K’s idea by saying un in line 5. A short pause follows. Then, T tries to accommodate speakership by uttering yappari sa= in order to express her own view, which is different from K’s view.11 A hedge word, nani immediately after yappa sa= implies that T does not seem to be completely sure about how to express her thoughts when she initiates her speakership in line 6. But when T is about to present her own view, K

11 Sa typically appears in the turn-initial position along with a connective demo ‘but’, indicating the action of contrasting is best not negotiated at the moment of the implementation of the emerging action (Morita 2005: 216).
immediately takes the floor and insists on her own view by saying demo. Observe (5).

(5) Chatting about T’s new American boyfriend.

1. T: kawaii yo, ano hito wa.
   Cute that person
   ‘he’s cute!’

2. K: mata ne=, Maaku ka.
   Again Mark
   ‘You again? Mark!’

3. T: nan chuu no, n
   what say NML hmm

4. → n yappari ne, n
   Hum?
   ‘how shall I put it? Hum yappari ne humm’

5. K: amerikajin da to omou toko wa?
   American think point
   ‘In what way do you think he’s American?’

T uses filler words, nan chuu no and n in lines 3 and 4. Yappari ne also indicates hedging, implying that T is in process of searching for an expression to make a comment on her boyfriend. Unlike excerpt (3), what yappari indicates is not an ostensible semantic content. Rather, it functions as a discourse maker, indexing the speaker’s attitudinal stance. I assume that by making a unit with interactional particles, the discourse function of yappari/yappa has become, in part, ‘ritualized’ in our daily life (Haiman 1994). In this ritualized sense, only the emphatic form yappari and the short form yappa, not the original form yahari, appear.

5. Data Analysis 4: Postpredicate Position

Japanese postpredicate elements are motivated by pragmatic factors such as afterthought and repair in order to highlight expressions in discourse (cf. Hinds 1982). This position conveys the speaker’s subjective voice when the elements in this slot are uttered with affectively-loaded intonation and without any intonation break after the predicate (Ono and Suzuki 1992). Recently, Ono (2006a, 2006b) advanced the analysis of post-predicate elements by proposing the non-predicate-final order. Under this analysis, the speaker plans both the predicate (host) and post-predicate elements (tail) in advance, from the beginning of his first utterance, to maximally express his emotion and to reframe the attribute most effectively.12 (For the sake of

---

12 Yappari is one of the six adverbs for non-predicate-final order (Ono 2006a).
convenience, the term ‘postpredicate’ is used.) Table 5 demonstrates that only *yappari* and *yappa*, but not *yahari* occurred in the postpredicate position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yahari</th>
<th>Yappari</th>
<th>Yappa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postpredicate</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(82%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Relation between syntactic position and *yahari/yappari/yappa***

In my datasets, *yappari/yappa* occurred in both the non-predicate-final order and postpredicate order. Excerpt (6) from *JC* represents the former case, while excerpts (7) and (8) from *TK* represent the latter case.

(6) A couple is talking about writing a research paper over a dinner table.

1. K: noru koto wa,
   publish NML TOP
2. tai- daini ni da yo.
   secondary COP FP
3. →Kaku koto ga tanoshii n da yo *yappari*
   write NML NOM fun NML COP FP
   ‘publication is secondary, you know. Writing IS fun! *yappari.*’
K disagrees with his wife, who believes that what is important is publishing. Then, in line 3 he presents his view without pausing between *tanoshii n da yo* (the host) and *yappari* (the tail), perhaps because he knows his point when he starts his utterance. Here *yappari* functions as an emotive marker.

(7) Discussing E’s struggle in getting accepted to college.

1. T: daigaku wa chanto hair-e-ta no ga ne
   college TOP manageably enter-POT-ASP NML NOM FP
   ‘Being able to manage to get accepted to college is (great)….’
2. E: taihen deshi-ta kedo ne (laugher)
   Hard COP-PST but FP
3. →*yappari* ne FP
   ‘It was hard, though (laughter), *yappari* ne’
While T brings up the topic of E’s experience in getting into college, E initiates his speakership by making an assessment of his experience with the adjective *taihen*. His light laughter immediately follows. His reframing attitude is expressed by *yappari ne* in line 3. He reframes with *yappari* perhaps because he did not receive any uptake from T in line 2 (Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002).

(8) U (a comedian), her husband N, and the host T are talking about U’s embarrassing scene on a past TV show.
1. **T:** demo ma=, sorya= soo desu, soo desu  
   but well, that’s so COP so COP

2. → demo ma, goran ni nattara [yappari] (tone down)  
   but well, take a look
   ‘but well, that’s right, right, but if you take a look at yappari’

3. **N:** [Amerika dewa] zettai,  
   U.S. is no exception

4. oppai nanka dasa-nai desu  
   breasts such show off-NEG COP
   ‘In the US, no comedian ever shows off her breasts (on a TV show).’

Prior to this excerpt, U said that what motivates her in an embarrassing scene is to draw the audience’s attention. When T utters *yappari* in line 2, she is hesitating to complete her utterance due to the sensitive nature of topic. Thus, T tones down her utterance. Getting a message from E, N takes the floor by making his comments on the situation in question.\(^{13}\) Note that there is an overlap between T’s and N’s utterances in lines 2 and 3, as the brackets indicate, implying N’s understanding of projected turn (Ford & Thomson 1996). The use of *yappari* here is more akin to what Maynard (1993) calls a ‘reluctance marker’ since T was embarrassed about the topic and hesitated to continue.\(^{14}\)

### 6. Usage-based Account

- **Phonological Shape**
- **Association**
- **Function**

\[ 
\text{yahari}\]  
Original form  
adverb

\[ 
\text{Yappari}  
/Q/ insertion\(^{15}\)  
discourse marker

\[ 
\text{yappa}  
/Q/ + deletion
\]

**Figure 1:** Phonological Shape and Function of *yahari/yappari/yappa*

\(^{13}\) This turn-taking point can be referred to as Transition-Relevant-Place.

\(^{14}\) This also can be seen as ‘turn-ender’ because it created the opportunities for co-construction (Tanaka 2000).

\(^{15}\) /Q/ indicates a mora obstruent. See see Vance (1987), Chapter 5.
The skewed distributional patterns and excerpts presented so far point to distinctive characteristics among three forms. Semantically, *yahari* is the least subjective while *yappari/yappa* are (inter)subjective. Syntactically, *yapari/yappa* often appear in the so-called postpositional position, while *yahari* does not. Functionally, *yahari* behaves as an adverb, while *yappari/yappa* can behave as discourse markers too, serving the turn-change function. I argue that the functional differences are mapped onto the phonological shapes (Figure 1). The size of the circle corresponds to the frequency of the exemplar. The thick lines indicate strong association between the phonological shape and functions, while the thin lines indicate weak associations between them (See Bybee 2006: 726).

| Lengthening | | |
| Shortening | | |
| Number of moras | three | four | Three |
| Accent pattern | *ya.hä.rí* | *ya.ppa.rí* | *ya.ppa* |

**Table 6. yahari, its Variants, and their Phonological Processes**

As shown in Table 6, the variants underwent the two different phonological processes. These processes are related to the known diachronic change: *yahari > yappari > yappa* (Hamada 1986, Inoue 1998, Matsumura 2006). Note that there is an increase in (inter)subjectivity observed in the direction of *yahari > yappari > yappa*. From the perspective of sound symbolism, Hamano (1998) argues that words with the mora obstruent /Q/ sound emphatic or forceful. Given this point, it is natural to conclude that *yappari/yappa* are more (inter)subjective than *yahari*, which lacks /Q/. Due to its frequent use, *yappari* took on functions increasingly breached relative to the original adverbial meaning. This breaching process motivates the

---

16 Inoue (1998: 96-102) hypothesizes that another phonetic variant *yappashi* was involved: *yahari > yappari > yappashi > yappa*. *Yappashi* is derived from *yappari* by alternating form a glide to a palatal due to avoidance of moving a vocal code. Furthermore, *yappa* is derived from *yappashi* via the deletion of the palatal sound due to the nature of weak perceptual saliency. There are some words which share similar patterns in sound changes as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Q-insertion</th>
<th>change r-sh</th>
<th>deletion of /shi/</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bakari</em></td>
<td><em>bakkari</em></td>
<td><em>bakkashi</em></td>
<td><em>bak</em></td>
<td>‘only but’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sappari</em></td>
<td><em>sappashi</em></td>
<td><em>sappa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘completely’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nikori</em></td>
<td><em>nikkori</em></td>
<td><em>nikkoshi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pitari</em></td>
<td><em>pittari</em></td>
<td><em>pittashi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘tightly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kore kiri</em></td>
<td><em>korekkiri</em></td>
<td><em>korekkishi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘only this time’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 See Shinzato and Masuda (ms) for in-depth discussions on the grammaticalization of *yahari*.
form to undergo the phonological process: shortening, which is similar to the ‘reduction effect’ that is often applied to words or phrases of high frequency, such as ‘I don’t know’ (Bybee and Scheibman 1999, Scheibman 2000) and English final t/d deletion in high-frequency words (Bybee 2002). Note that the form with a full vowel in ‘I don’t know’ is strongly associated with the literal meaning, whereas the reduced form ‘I dunno’ is associated with a pragmatic sense as a conventionalized hedge of turn-organization. This is parallel to the speakers’ choice of yahari and its phonological variants discussed here because the original form functions as the adverb and because more grammaticalized forms acquire pragmatic functions. The fact that deletion is part of the general mechanism of grammaticalization is crucial to the relationship between frequency and the formal reduction process.18 Furthermore, I believe that the accent patterns in the Tokyo dialect are another piece of evidence for yappa as a further grammaticalized form, rather than a simple truncation form from yappari. Both yahari and yappari have an accent on the second syllable, whereas the accent has been shifted to the first syllable in yappa.19

In the usage-based approach, grammar is the cognitive organization of one’s experience with language.20 As an important part of language experience, the frequency of use of certain constructions has influence on representation that is evidenced in a speaker’s knowledge of conventionalized phrases and in language variation and change (Bybee 2006: 711). The speaker’s use of yahari and its phonological variants in a given moment reflect his/her experience with the use of language, including the association of phonological forms with functions, as well as his/her communicative intention to act during interaction.

7. Concluding Remarks

By looking at spoken discourse, I have argued that the Japanese modal adverb yahari and its phonological variants show that semantic/functional and phonological processes go hand in hand. Both the original modal adverb yahari and its phonological variants express the lexical meaning ‘after all/expectedly,’ but only the emphatic form and the shortened form occur in the expression when they function pragmatically or subjectively. The co-

18 This is supported by Fowley and Houseum (1987) who demonstrate that speakers in general reduce their productions of words when they encounter them in the second time in single discourse.
19 While yahari/yappari are pronounced with the same Tokyo accent patterns, yappa has different accent patterns depending on the region (c.f. ya.ppá (e.g. Shimane prefecture).
20 I adopt Langacker’s (1987) view that grammar is the conventionalized symbolization of semantic and conceptual units paired with phonological units to form a symbolic unit.
occurrence with interactional particles and the postpredicate position provide are some examples of their subjective in nature, which may be viewed as support for the usage-based approach. Further study should include systematic investigation of intonation in naturally occurring spoken discourse.
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