

Linguistic Creativity in Japanese Discourse

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series (P&BNS)

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series is a continuation of *Pragmatics & Beyond* and its Companion Series. The New Series offers a selection of high quality work covering the full richness of Pragmatics as an interdisciplinary field, within language sciences.

Editor

Andreas H. Jucker

University of Zurich, English Department
Plattenstrasse 47, CH-8032 Zurich, Switzerland
e-mail: ahjucker@es.uzh.ch

Associate Editors

Jacob L. Mey

University of Southern
Denmark

Herman Parret

Belgian National Science
Foundation, Universities of
Louvain and Antwerp

Jef Verschueren

Belgian National Science
Foundation,
University of Antwerp

Editorial Board

Shoshana Blum-Kulka
Hebrew University of
Jerusalem

Jean Caron
Université de Poitiers

Robyn Carston
University College London

Bruce Fraser
Boston University

Thorstein Fretheim
University of Trondheim

John C. Heritage
University of California at Los
Angeles

Susan C. Herring
Indiana University

Masako K. Hiraga
St.Paul's (Rikkyo) University

David Holdcroft
University of Leeds

Sachiko Ide
Japan Women's University

Catherine Kerbrat-
Orecchioni
University of Lyon 2

Claudia de Lemos
University of Campinas, Brazil

Marina Sbisà
University of Trieste

Emanuel A. Schegloff
University of California at Los
Angeles

Deborah Schiffrin
Georgetown University

Paul Osamu Takahara
Kobe City University of
Foreign Studies

Sandra A. Thompson
University of California at
Santa Barbara

Teun A. van Dijk
Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona

Richard J. Watts
University of Berne

Volume 159

Linguistic Creativity in Japanese Discourse: Exploring the multiplicity of self,
perspective, and voice

Senko K. Maynard

Linguistic Creativity in Japanese Discourse

Exploring the multiplicity of self,
perspective, and voice

Senko K. Maynard

Rutgers University

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



TM The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Maynard, Senko K.

Linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse : exploring the multiplicity of self, perspective, and voice / Senko K. Maynard.

p. cm. -- (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, ISSN 0922-842X ; v. 159)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Creativity (Linguistics) 2. Discourse analysis. 3. Language and languages--Style. 4. Japanese language--Discourse analysis. 5. Japanese language--Style. I. Title.

P37.5.C74M39 2007

495.6'0141--dc22

2007009736

ISBN 978 90 272 5402 3 (Hb; alk. paper)

© 2007 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

To Michael

Table of contents

Preface and acknowledgments	XIII
-----------------------------	------

PART I Preliminaries

CHAPTER 1

Introduction	3
--------------	---

1. Introductory remarks: creativity in language and discourse 3
2. Creativity, language, and thought 6
 - 2.1 Tokieda: the speaking subject's expressivity and linguistic creativity 6
 - 2.2 Vygotsky: fluid thought and linguistic creativity 9
3. Creating personalized expressive meanings 10
4. Theoretical framework: the place of negotiation theory 13
5. Methodology and interpretive approaches 16
 - 5.1 Methodology 16
 - 5.2 Concepts of selves, perspectives, and voices 17
6. Data 18
7. Organization of the book 20

CHAPTER 2

Background	23
------------	----

1. Studies on linguistic creativity 23
 - 1.1 Linguistic creativity in ordinary conversation 25
 - 1.2 On language play 26
 - 1.3 Linguistic creativity in cognitive approaches 29
 - 1.4 Toward exploring linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse 31
2. Linguistic creativity in Japanese rhetoric and culture 32
 - 2.1 Selves-in-transit: *mojiri* and mimicry 33
 - 2.2 Perspective taking: *mitate* and *futaku* 35
 - 2.3 Echoing voices: *honkadori* and linking 37
3. Linguistic creativity and rhetorical views toward language and discourse 40
 - 3.1 Miki and the spirit of rhetoric 41
 - 3.2 Rhetoric of *Pathos* 43

CHAPTER 3

Approaches

45

1. Self and multiple selves 45
 - 1.1 Self in the place of negotiation theory 45
 - 1.2 Multiple selves in Japanese studies 47
 - 1.3 In between self and other: Miki and Bakhtin 49
 - 1.4 Divided selves and the relational sublime 51
2. Self and linguistic subjectivity 53
 - 2.1 Linguistic subjectivity across languages 54
 - 2.2 Japanese as a subjectivity-prominent and ego-centered language 55
 - 2.3 Self and linguistic subjectivity in Japanese discourse 57
3. Perspective and perspectivization 59
 - 3.1 Perspective in linguistics and literature 60
 - 3.2 Perspective and cognitive approaches 61
 - 3.3 Joint attention and sharing the perspectivized appearance 63
4. Multiple voices and intertextuality 66
 - 4.1 Bakhtin and multiple voices 66
 - 4.2 Intertextuality 68
5. Linguistic creativity: a source for realizing selves and identities 69

PART II Discourse creativity: Styles and genres

CHAPTER 4

Style mixture and the use of rhetorical sentences

75

1. Introduction: creative use of style mixture 75
2. Background 76
3. Basic styles 80
4. Mixing the emotive *da* style 81
5. Mixing the emotive *desu/masu* style 84
6. Mixing the supra-polite style 86
7. Mixing rhetorical sentences 90
 - 7.1 Rhetorical sentences and linking 90
 - 7.2 Rhetorical sentences and the story-telling effect 91
8. Reflections: speaking in multiple voices 94

CHAPTER 5

Borrowing others' styles and manipulating styles-in-transit

95

1. Introduction 95
2. Background 96
3. Borrowing others' styles 98
 - 3.1 Styling the other 99
 - 3.2 Manipulating imagined styles 104

4. Styles-in-transit: concurrent styles and *mojiri* 107
 - 4.1 The drama: *Tiger & Dragon* 107
 - 4.2 Concurrent styles and multiple selves 109
 - 4.3 Styles-in-transit and *mojiri* 113
5. Reflections: presenting selves through styles 116

CHAPTER 6

Genre mixture between conversation and text 119

1. Introduction: creative use of genre mixture 119
2. Background: quotation and dialogicality 122
3. Sentence-final *mitaina*: acting out the conversation 124
 - 3.1 On sentence-final *mitaina* 124
 - 3.2 *Mitaina* in conversation 126
 - 3.3 *Mitaina* in text 130
4. Conversation as a modifier 133
5. Conversational commentary in text 137
6. Reflections: manipulating multiple voices and selves 138

PART III Rhetorical creativity: Humor and figures

CHAPTER 7

Puns and intertextuality 143

1. Introduction: linguistic creativity and playfulness 143
2. Background: on puns and humor 145
3. Types of puns 146
4. Puns in satire 147
5. Puns in conversation 150
6. Puns in advertising 152
 - 6.1 The JARO ad 152
 - 6.2 Multiple and overlapping puns 152
7. Intertextual puns: playing with the prior text 155
 - 7.1 Playing with poetic lines 156
 - 7.2 Playing with *tanka* 158
8. Reflections: playing with multiple voices and perspectives in and across discourse 159

CHAPTER 8

***Mitate*, *futaku*, and the macro-metaphor 161**

1. Introduction: metaphors and rhetorical effects 161
2. Background 162
 - 2.1 On metaphor 162
 - 2.2 Metaphor and culture 164

3. *Mitate* and *futaku* 165
4. The flower/blossom macro-metaphor as a cultural icon 168
5. The *yuusuge* flower in a poem 171
6. The theatrical flower in a *Noh* manual 174
7. The flower in a popular song 177
8. The cherry blossom story in an essay 180
9. Reflections: metaphor, culture, and linguistic creativity 184

CHAPTER 9

Metaphors in multimodal discourse

187

1. Introduction 187
2. Background: multimodal approaches to discourse 187
 - 2.1 Between text and visual image 188
 - 2.2 Visual metaphors 189
3. Visual images in an essay 192
 - 3.1 The cartoon illustration 192
 - 3.2 Illustration as metaphorical thematic presentation 193
4. Metaphorical framing of “silence” 194
 - 4.1 The Kurinappu ad 194
 - 4.2 Between text and visual metaphor 196
 - 4.3 Multimodal analysis 198
5. Visual metaphorization of “freedom” 199
 - 5.1 The SMFG ad 199
 - 5.2 Between text and visual metaphor 202
 - 5.3 Multimodal analysis 202
6. Multilevel metaphors in a singing spectacle 204
 - 6.1 The song: *Manjuushaka* 204
 - 6.2 Between lyrical and visual metaphor 205
 - 6.3 The performer-metaphor metamorphosis 207
7. Reflections: presenting multiple perspectives in metaphorical discourse 208

PART IV Grammatical creativity: Sentences and phrases

CHAPTER 10

Negatives for non-negative effects

211

1. Introduction: negating creatively 211
2. Background: on the use of negatives 212
3. From contrast to denial 214
 - 3.1 Contrast as context 214
 - 3.2 Denial as an act 216
 - 3.3 Effects of double and repeated denials 217

4. Expressive functions of negatives in advertising and poetry 219
 - 4.1 The HONDA ad 219
 - 4.2 The poem: *Do not bundle me* 220
5. Expressive functions of negatives in novels 222
 - 5.1 Negatives and character portrayal 223
 - 5.2 Repeated denials and undeniable feelings 229
6. Reflections: grammar as a source for linguistic creativity 231

CHAPTER 11

Demonstratives and the perspectivization of discourse worlds 233

1. Introduction: more than physical locations 233
2. Background: on demonstratives in discourse 234
3. Between *ko*-series demonstratives and *so*-series demonstratives 235
4. Discourse functions of *ko*-, *so*-, and *a*-series demonstratives 238
5. *Ko*-series demonstratives: emotive proximity and narrative perspectives 240
6. The world of *ko* and the world of *so* 244
7. Anaphora, cataphora, and the boundaries of discourse 248
8. *A*-series demonstratives: emotivity and the perspectivized appearance 251
9. Reflections: locating discourse worlds in emotive places 255

CHAPTER 12

First-person references and the perspectivization of multiple selves 257

1. Introduction: linguistic creativity and the presentation of selves 257
2. Background: first-person references in cognitive approaches 259
3. First-person references in Japanese discourse 261
 - 3.1 Characteristics of *watashi* and its variants 262
 - 3.2 On the non-use of *watashi* 265
 - 3.3 *Watashi* and the particle use 267
4. From self as locutionary agent to self-identifying objectified self 268
 - 4.1 Mixing the zero form and *watashi* 269
 - 4.2 Shifting perspectivized appearances and presenting multiple selves 270
5. *Jibun*: the presentation of reflexively projected self 272
 - 5.1 On *jibun* 272
 - 5.2 Presenting multiple selves by mixing the zero form, *watashi*, and *jibun* 274
 - 5.3 *Jibun* in conversation and interpersonal effects 277
6. Reflections: identifying divided and embedded selves 279

PART V Reflections

CHAPTER 13

Linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse and beyond 283

1. Linguistic creativity, expressivity, and identity 283

2. Linguistic creativity and cultural context 284

3. *Nihonjinron*, criticism, and the practice of Japanese discourse 287

4. Linguistic creativity and linguistic theory 289

Appendix: Presentation of data in Japanese orthography 293

Notes 325

References 333

Data references 345

Author index 349

Subject index 353

Preface and acknowledgments

We live every day speaking in a language. Although to each of us, our language seems as natural as breathing, linguists and pragmatics researchers have long known the complexity of its system and its pragmatics. Despite the complexity, or perhaps because of it, we delight in using language, or interacting through language, in many creative ways.

Language communicates information, but at the same time, we feel in language, and we participate in social interaction by living it. On a daily basis, we create new and meaningful ways to mean, only to experience varying emotions and to share our identities. We engage in creating multiple senses of self, discover meanings from many shifting perspectives, and invite many voices echoing in ourselves and others.

In this volume, I explore the theme of linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse. Linguistic creativity refers to the use of language and discourse in specific ways to foreground personalized expressive meanings beyond the literal proposition-based information. Personalized expressive meanings include psychological, emotive, interpersonal, and rhetorical aspects of communication, encompassing broad meanings and effects realized in discourse, such as feelings of intimacy or distance, emotion, empathy, humor, playfulness, persona, sense of self, identity, rhetorical effects, and so on.

The current volume is a further study pursuing my fundamental approach to language and discourse as presented by two previous volumes published under the same series: *Discourse Modality: Subjectivity, Emotion and Voice in the Japanese Language* (1993, P&B NS, Vol. 24) and *Linguistic Emotivity: Centrality of Place, the Topic-comment Dynamic, and an Ideology of Pathos in Japanese Discourse* (2002, P&B NS, Vol. 97). Linguistic creativity is most prominently observed not in the proposition-based information, but in the modality on the discourse level, and various kinds of emotive expressions.

In this work, I explore the meanings, functions, and effects observable in the indices of linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse. This book touches upon only limited cases of linguistic creativity, but I have made an effort to incorporate different aspects of language. In nine analysis chapters I examine indices focusing on discourse creativity (style mixture, borrowing others' styles, genre mixture), rhetorical creativity (puns, metaphors, metaphors in multimodal discourse), and grammatical creativity (negatives, demonstratives, first-person references). I also have strived to include contemporary data (both verbal and visual) taken from current Japanese cultural discourse.

In my exploration of linguistic creativity, I have learned much from previous works available both inside and outside of Japan. Many of the scholars are no longer

with us, and many others are my contemporaries and friends. I express my deep respect and admiration for those scholars who have had an influence on my thinking as well as those scholars whose works are cited in this volume.

In the fall of 2004, I had the opportunity of visiting the University of Tsukuba in Ibaraki, Japan. I was invited to give a lecture as a part of the university/community-wide research project, and Yuriko Sunakawa was instrumental in arranging this occasion. Through Dr. Sunakawa's hospitality and generosity, on those beautiful autumn days on the Tsukuba campus, I met many young students and scholars who shared my interest in conversation analysis, discourse studies, and pragmatics research based on extensive Japanese data. It was a special occasion for me to meet Japanese colleagues who are familiar with my work, and I thank the University of Tsukuba and Yuriko Sunakawa for the memorable exchange.

During the same trip I returned to my hometown *furusato*, to Yamanashi in central Japan. In a town nestled among mountains along the Fuefuki River, a group of friends gathered to welcome me home. It was heartwarming to spend time with dear old friends I grew up with through my junior high school years. I thank them for their unchanging friendship and tender kindness. I treasure those memories of the now gone but not forgotten Kanoiuwa Junior High School, where for the first time I was exposed to English as a foreign language.

In November 2005, during a brief visit to Tokyo, I had the opportunity of meeting with Fumiaki Saito and Mariko Ichikawa of Kuroshio Shuppan (Publishers). Over perfectly brewed herbal tea and cake served at a cozy Italian café, they introduced me to the then popular television drama series *Tiger & Dragon*, which eventually became one of the data sources for this volume. For more than a decade, I have enjoyed working with Toshihiro Fukunishi, the editor-in-chief, and the team at Kuroshio Shuppan, and I thank them for their unwavering support and encouragement.

For many years I have enjoyed teaching Japanese language and linguistics at American institutions (in chronological order, the University of Hawai'i, Connecticut College, Harvard University, and Princeton University), and especially at Rutgers University. I thank the students and colleagues I have met at various places for their friendship, inspiration, and encouragement.

Rutgers University, founded in 1766, is located along the Raritan River in central New Jersey. It was where, at the end of the nineteenth century, Japanese foreign students came to study Western sciences. Notable among them was Taro Kusakabe, a young samurai from Echizen (Fukui), who in 1867 arrived in New Brunswick. Kusakabe excelled in mathematics and physics at Rutgers College, and was elected to the Phi Beta Kappa honor society. Due to overwork and tuberculosis, however, he tragically passed away only weeks before graduation. After his death, William Elliot Griffis, who had taught Kusakabe, traveled to Fukui to deliver to his father the Phi Beta Kappa key and the Rutgers College diploma, posthumously awarded in 1870. I came to Rutgers University in 1983 to establish the Japanese language program. Through the years,

the program which started with 20 some students has grown into a large program which attracts more than 400 students each fall.

The fall semester of 2006 was particularly exciting for the Rutgers University community. The Scarlet Knights football team achieved a 10–2 record in the Big East Conference, and as I write this, the Rutgers' win over Kansas State at the Texas Bowl is making news. This is the first bowl win in the 137-year football history of Rutgers University where the first ever college football game was played against Princeton University in November, 1869.

I thank Rutgers University for providing me with a place to grow as a teacher and a scholar. My special thanks go to the Dean's office for the research funds granted to me, and to Yurio Miyazawa, our departmental computer specialist, for his technical assistance.

In developing the concept of linguistic creativity, I sometimes reached into my experience in watercolor painting and Japanese calligraphy. I have enjoyed these activities over the years under different teachers to whom I am thankful. My special gratitude is expressed to Master Hiroyuki Oohashi of Gen'en Calligraphy in Yamaguchi, Japan. It is his mastery of pure and powerful calligraphy strokes that continue to teach me the spiritual depth of the creative life.

I express my gratitude to the following organizations for permission to reproduce three print advertisements contained in this volume: Japan Advertising Review Organization, Inc. for the JARO print advertisement in *Shuukan Asahi* (2004 April 6 issue, p. 115), Cleanup Corporation for the Kurinappu Silent Kitchen print advertisement in *Orenji Peeji* (2004 September 2 issue, p. 6) and Sumitomo Mitsui Financial Group for the Mitsui Sumitomo Visa Card print advertisement in *Kurowassan* (2004 July 25 issue, p. 93).

Last but not least, I thank Andreas H. Jucker, editor of *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*, for his continuing faith in me, and Isja Conen at Benjamins for her warm support and assistance.

SKM

December, 2006

“On the Banks of the Old Raritan”

PART I

Preliminaries

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1. Introductory remarks: creativity in language and discourse

Creativity involves all aspects of human life. According to Mayer, “creativity involves the creation of an *original* and *useful* product” (1999: 449, original emphasis). In other words, creative activity produces novelty and value recognized by someone else, who may be a single person, or society at large. Language is a primary tool for this creativity. Language allows us to create something original and useful on a daily basis. It is original because it always carries our own voice. Linguistic creativity is useful because it facilitates effectively relating our thoughts and feelings to others.

We know that the creative act involves the breaking, re-forming, and transforming of established patterns. Through creativity, the speaker constructs an alternative world and generates multiple ways of seeing things. Although creativity realized through language is only one of creativity’s many forms, linguistic creativity is both prominent and ubiquitous in our lives.

In the history of mainstream linguistics, notions related to creativity in language were discussed in the context of Chomsky (1957). As represented by Chomsky’s words, “(T)he grammar of L will thus be a device that generates all of the grammatical sequences of L and none of the ungrammatical ones” (1957: 13), creativity in language was understood in terms of generating endless numbers of sentences by applying a set number of syntactic rules. This, however, is not the linguistic creativity addressed in this volume.

The phenomenon of linguistic creativity to be focused in this volume has been largely ignored except in studies appearing under the headings of language play and word play. However, creativity realized through language is so fundamental to linguistic activity, it is difficult to ignore. In our everyday lives, we witness jokes or puns, or some curious manipulations of language that catch our attention. Take the expression *The guy is a bulldozer*. Why does the speaker choose a metaphor rather than a descriptive adjectives, such as, *The guy is pushy*? Although *pushy* itself carries with it a metaphorical element, *The guy is pushy* is more ordinary than *The guy is a bulldozer*. Using a metaphor requires rhetorical knowledge, imagination, and inventiveness on the part of the speaker, and it assumes an equal measure on the part of the partner. Although it is considered more taxing to interpret metaphorical expressions, those who engage in these expressions experience a shared sense of something extra. Consider the rhetorical figure of punning. When a speaker delivers a silly pun, those around him or her often respond with disapproving groans. These groans are proof that puns receive special attention, and that puns continue to hold a curious, if not always appreciated status.

Why do we engage in these and other creative activities at all? Perhaps as humans we have a need to do so. Our desire for playfulness and creativity appears to be universal, with linguistic creativity being one manifestation. Although language follows certain rules and patterns, it has the potential to go beyond established rule-governed and patterned forms. Precisely because language follows commonly shared rules and patterns, paradoxically, when we use language, we make an effort to personalize it and make it our own. And in this expressive and creative process we realize new meanings particular to each specific interaction. In this regard, it is important to recognize that when we talk about linguistic creativity, we do not refer to the creativity in the sense of the “creation of life.” Linguistic creativity does not create something from nothing. Rather, it creates first by going beyond the expected, and second by generating something new.

Linguistic creativity refers to the use of language and discourse in specific ways to foreground personalized expressive meanings beyond the literal proposition-based information. Personalized expressive meanings include psychological, emotive, interpersonal, and rhetorical aspects of communication. While these aspects fall into the broad definition of modality and Discourse Modality (Maynard 1993a), linguistic creativity encompasses broader meanings and effects realized in discourse, such as feelings of intimacy or distance, emotion, empathy, humor, playfulness, persona, sense of self, identity, rhetorical effects, and so on.

In this study I place the phenomenon of linguistic creativity front and center. I explore the meanings, functions, and effects observable in the indices of linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse. I use the term “indices” to mean all kinds and varieties of linguistic devices and discourse strategies that bring about the effects of linguistic creativity. The term “discourse” is used in a general sense, including both spoken and written discourse. I sometimes refer to spoken discourse as “speech” or specifically as “conversation.” Also I use the term “text” to refer to a specific written discourse. By examining and qualitatively analyzing real-life discourse available in contemporary Japan, I aim to understand how language and creativity interact, and how the potential of language interacts with our own potential for creativity. As an interpretive guide for my study, I draw from approaches available in other fields, i.e., the concepts of self, perspective, and voice. In procedural terms, I examine linguistic indices on three levels of language and communication, i.e., discourse, rhetoric, and grammar.

Linguistic creativity has typically been associated with rhetorical figures such as metaphors, with language play such as puns, and with certain discourse types such as poetry. It is true that language is sometimes used creatively for the sake of creativity, foregrounding figurative and poetic aspects. It is also known that certain linguistic activities are less original and creative than others. A manual for assembling a bookcase offers a straightforward prosaic direction. Such discourse is usually less original and the writer’s linguistic creativity is mostly muted. Although the intensity of linguistic creativity is expected to differ across genres, my contention is that linguistic creativity is virtually omnipresent. As I explore in the course of this volume, not only poetic language but also everyday language makes full use of all creative resources to realize

multiple meanings and effects. These creative expressions come to life in the act of language use, that is, the practice of language in interpersonal encounters where participants negotiate meanings.

As mentioned earlier, I explore the practice of linguistic creativity on three levels. Linguistic creativity on the discourse level includes style and genre mixtures. For example, as I explore in Chapter 5, a writer may borrow speech styles stereotypically associated with others. One may use *Kekkoona koto de gozansu* 'How very nice it is' by borrowing the polite predicate *de gozansu* 'is', a form today considered obsolete. This "creative" borrowing playfully conjures up the era and atmosphere of an historical context where *de gozansu* was once used. Linguistic creativity on the rhetorical level includes figures and language play such as metaphorical expressions and puns. For example, Chapter 8 explores Japanese rhetorical figures *mitate* and *futaku* as they facilitate metaphorical discourse.

Linguistic creativity on the grammatical level includes a number of sentential and phrasal phenomena. Consider negation. Although negation is often used to negate facts, it may be used in a positive way. Jordan offers an example of advertising copy, which lists the product's benefits: "No strenuous dieting. No pills. No nervousness. No frantic exercises" (1998: 717). Chapter 10 analyzes negation in Japanese discourse and illustrates that negatives may be creatively used without negative effects. Yet another case of linguistic creativity can be found on the phrasal level. In the first-person references in Japanese, for example, the same male speaker may choose *ore* 'I', *atashi* 'I', and *jibun* 'self' within a single speaking turn. As explored in Chapter 12, by manipulating self-referencing terms, the speaker presents multiple selves.

In real life communication, we often share our thoughts and feelings by appealing to linguistic creativity, and this holds true even when the partner is not physically present. In our everyday lives the creative use of language leads to a variety of effects. It may provide a source for entertainment, or conversely, it may encourage confrontation and threat. Either way, our interpersonal experiences constantly support and are supported by our appreciation of linguistic creativity.

Given that linguistic creativity is closely associated with interpersonal encounters, the question of its universality/particularity comes into play. In this volume, Japanese indices of linguistic creativity are analyzed in the context of its culture, often being guided by Japanese intellectual tradition such as philosophy as well as cultural and literary studies. The significance of this study, however, goes beyond these analyses. Discovering how linguistic creativity is indexed to cultural and social situations leads to an understanding directly connected to how a particular language and creativity interact. In addition, understanding how linguistic creativity is understood in Japanese scholarly traditions offers insight to the universality/particularity issue in the practice of linguistic creativity.

2. Creativity, language, and thought

Viewing language as a creative activity raises an old and new question about language and thought. If we view linguistic signs as being stable and sufficient for signifying whatever we want them to mean, we assume a one-to-one relationship between language and thought, or more specifically, between the signifier and the signified (de Saussure 1966). Naturally, this traditional position encourages and endorses certain positions toward linguistic theory as well. In contrast, placing creativity front and center as I do in this work seriously challenges the traditional view. It means taking a position against this one-to-one relationship.

As expected, I am not alone in taking this position. Others have challenged the universality of the one-to-one relationship between the signifier and the signified. Although often pushed aside or simply ignored, this position has been a persistent undercurrent of resistance against the dominant structuralist/positivist view toward language. Among those sharing this view, most relevant to our concern are Tokieda (1941) and Vygotsky (1962 [1934]). Although the lives of these scholars were separated in space, Motoki Tokieda (1880–1967) in Japan and Lev Semenovich Vygotsky (1896–1934) in Russia, they shared similar themes, and they approached language and thought in ways whose similarities cannot be ignored. Tokieda founded his theory of language in opposition to the Saussurean structuralism (or structure-based semiotics), while Vygotsky founded his theory against vulgar behaviorism. Both were interested in the psychological processes of language. However, their approaches differ; Tokieda was more interested in the intentionality of the speaking subject, while Vygotsky approached the issue in the ontogenesis of a higher mental plane. These two scholars' philosophical approaches to language offer insight for my understanding of language as a creatively expressive activity.

2.1 Tokieda: the speaking subject's expressivity and linguistic creativity

Tokieda is known for his theory of language, *Gengo katei-setsu* 'Language-as-process theory'. Tokieda (1941, 1950) takes the view that language is the very process in which the speaker, whom Tokieda labels as *shutai* 'speaking subject', expresses ideas by using linguistic sound. Instead of viewing language as a product (or an object) with its internal structure, Tokieda insists that language is the very "psychological process" (*shinteki katei*) (1941: 86).

Tokieda develops his theory on the basis of three necessary elements for the linguistic event to take place. They are the speaking subject (*shutai*), material/object/referent (*sozai*), and situated place (*bamen*). Language occurs when someone (speaking subject) speaks to someone (situated place) about something (material/object/referent). These three elements are tightly related, and if one element is missing, the linguistic event fails to take place. Tokieda's speaking subject is the person who engages in the

linguistic activity. The situated place refers to the place filled with the speaking subject's feelings and attitudes. In addition, the situated place includes the speaking subject's perception and intention toward the object being described. By material/object/referent, Tokieda means what is expressed through language, the things and scenes, and the so-called meanings associated with linguistic signs.

According to Tokieda, these three elements are held in the following relationship. Imagine the situated place of communication as a circular space. The situated place is bordered by objects and scenes of the objectified world. In the center, we find the speaking subject. From the speaking subject, a line is directed out toward the circumference. This line represents the speaking subject's *shikoo sayoo* 'intentional operation'. Intentional operation involves the thought process, including perception, orientation, and intention. When the intentional operation meets the material/object/referent, personalized meanings are realized.

When we communicate, we always express our personal attitude and feelings experienced in a situated place. Because of this, we must understand that meanings of words and sentences are not identifiable in totality in terms of their *a priori* meanings. Tokieda's position is best summarized when he writes "(W)ords do not first reproduce objects per se and convey them," but rather, "words express the speaking subject's signification toward objects" (1941: 421–422).¹

Although Tokieda emphasizes the importance of the speaking subject, obviously, language is social, and it is not something entirely left up to the whim of each speaker. What Tokieda insists is that the speaker creates meanings beyond those conventionalized meanings that are directly associated with linguistic signs. The speaker, in the process of expression, personalizes the meaning.

To clarify his position further, let me cite examples from Tokieda (1941: 412). Compare (1) with (2).

- (1) Konoha ga **mau**.
Leaves fly (as they fall down).
- (2) Konoha ga **chiru**.
Leaves fall.

The word *mau* 'fly' does not alter what is meant in referential terms, but, according to Tokieda, it illustrates how the speaking subject has "captured the object with a special significance" (1941: 412).² Seeing the leaves "fly" emanates from the speaking subject's perspectivization and accompanying attitude. The metaphorical use of *mau* represents a rather clear case where the meaning involves the speaking subject's creative act of personalization. Tokieda's position implies that language in general serves whatever purpose the speaker has in mind.

Let me cite another example. Criticizing the structural view toward language, Tokieda (1941) illustrates how a view that assumes a one-to-one relationship between language and thought cannot be sustained when faced with irony. When we hear ex-

pressions such as *orikoo* ‘smart’ and *hito ga ii* ‘good(-natured) person’, we are able to interpret them as irony (Tokieda 1941: 133). If we strictly follow the structuralist’s position, it is impossible to explain why *orikoo* and *hito ga ii* do not really mean what they signify. One cannot help but interpret these expressions as irony simply because the speaker’s attitude and tone are in conflict with what the words signify.

We communicate our thoughts, information, images, feelings, and attitudes, among other things, by way of language. At the same time, to communicate these elements as precisely as possible, we create new expressions, or use old expressions in new ways. Here lies the potential space where our linguistic creativity can flourish. In other words, Tokieda’s Language-as-process theory allows us to recognize the gap between what one aims to communicate and what the words actually signify (in the Saussurean sense). It is often in this gulf that we play with language and create subtle but important personalized expressive meanings.

From the perspective of the Language-as-process theory, and based on various observations regarding thought and how thought relates to language, Tokieda makes the following statement.

One must think foremost that what is expressed by language is not the object itself, nor is it the reproduction of the object, but it is the thought process associated with the object. Accordingly, language does not refer to objective truth only. In fact, even on the day that is not cold, it is possible to say “It is cold today.”³ (Tokieda 1941: 133, my translation)

And Tokieda adds:

It is important to recognize the following points when we understand language; what language expresses does not directly correspond to objective facts, it is rather an expression that has undergone the speaking subject’s thinking process; and more strictly speaking, it is an expression that communicates the way of thought itself.⁴ (Tokieda 1941: 134, my translation)

Tokieda concludes that “signification unifies different objects by way of language through subjective activity,” and “at the same time, signification adds different and new words toward the same objects” (1941: 429).⁵

I should also add here that Tokieda (1941), following Suzuki’s (1979 [1824]) work, resurrects the concept of “voices from the heart” (*kokoro no koe*). Voices from the heart are expressed by *ji* or *te-ni-o-ha* particles. These linguistic devices contrast with *shi* ‘referential words’ whose primary function is referential. *Ji* in Japanese has no referential function; it represents voices of the speaker. Given this distinction, Tokieda, and Suzuki as well, find *ji* to be especially important because it expresses the speaker’s thoughts, feelings, and attitudes.⁶ These expressions, because they realize personalized meanings, provide a source for linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse.⁷

2.2 Vygotsky: fluid thought and linguistic creativity

Tokieda's (1941) position has not been fully recognized in modern linguistics in Japan. Neither has it been recognized in the West. Even when the issue of a possible gulf between language and thought has been suggested, this threatening view has been pushed aside. Such deep skepticism toward language does not agree with the formalists' and positivists' view toward language.

In Western scholarship, perhaps the most prominent and relevant to the present discussion on thought and language is Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist and semiotician. Vygotsky (1962 [1934]) addresses the relationships among language, thought, and society in the context of child development. According to Vygotsky, the cognitive development of a child is accomplished through a process of internalization of language – the result of which is “inner speech” – which is first used by the child for the purpose of socialization. Vygotsky emphasizes that a person's higher psychological processes and higher mental functions are related to early childhood. Particularly through the dialogic use of language in the early stages of development, a person attains a greater capacity for higher mental functions.

Once speech is internalized, it continues to interact with human consciousness and continues to regulate cognitive activity. The dialogic nature of language is self-generating and renewing. According to Vygotsky:

The structure of speech does not simply mirror the structure of thought; that is why words cannot be put on by thought like a ready-made garment. Thought undergoes many changes as it turns into speech. It does not merely find expression in speech, it finds reality and form. (Vygotsky 1962 [1934]: 126)

As did Tokieda (1941, 1950), Vygotsky recognizes the gulf between words and thought. One's thought is in a constant process of change as it turns into speech. More precisely, Vygotsky states:

The relation of thought to word is not a thing but a process, a continual movement back and forth from thought to word and from word to thought. In that process the relation of thought to word undergoes changes which themselves may be regarded as development in the functional sense. Thought is not merely expressed in words; it comes into existence through them. Every thought tends to connect something with something else, to establish a relationship between things. Every thought moves, grows and develops, fulfills a function, solves a problem. (Vygotsky 1962 [1934]: 125)

Insisting that “(T)hought and word are not cut from one pattern” and “(I)n a sense, there are more differences than likenesses between them” (1962 [1934]: 126), Vygotsky recognizes a gap between what is expressed in one's words, and what is housed in one's thoughts.

Vygotsky (1962 [1934]) illustrates this gap by citing stage cues Stanislavsky instructed his actors. For example, when the text of the play specifies Sophya's words: "Chatsky, but I am glad you've come," the parallel motives are that she tries to hide her confusion (1962 [1934]: 151). Likewise, when Chatsky responds "You are glad, that's very nice; But gladness such as yours not easily one tells," the motives are that Chatsky tries to make Sophya feel guilty by teasing her, and so on (1962 [1934]: 151). In other words, "(E)very sentence that we say in real life has some kind of subtext, a thought hidden behind it" (1962 [1934]: 149). We must be able to understand our partner's words to understand him or her, but that is not sufficient. We must understand his or her thinking. And on top of that, we must also know the motivation for that speech. Thought and motivation are not fully presented through words, and therefore, there is always some meaning that remains hidden somewhere in between. In Vygotsky's words:

The relation between thought and word is a living process; thought is born through words. A word devoid of thought is a dead thing, and a thought unembodied in words remains a shadow. The connection between them, however, is not a pre-formed and constant one. It emerges in the course of development, and itself evolves. (Vygotsky 1962 [1934]: 153)

Perhaps I am not the only one who finds parallel approaches to thought and language in Tokieda and Vygotsky. The relationship between language and thought is a fluid process, where personalizing and motivational meanings operate. We must acknowledge that words do not convey everything, and the formal rules of language fail to overtly account for the expression of personal thought and motivation. Because of this incapacity of language to sufficiently express our thoughts and feelings, we find other means to compensate. This other means is linguistic creativity. Language comes alive when through linguistic creativity we create meanings that meet our own fluid thoughts and feelings.

Endless linguistic creativity is played in the schism between words and thoughts. We creatively manipulate a broad range of indices such as discourse strategies, rhetorical figures, or grammatical/phrasal expressions. The realization of this creative potential for language leads to a view of language that is different from traditional structural and/or formal paradigms. To account for this creatively expressive language, one must build a linguistic theory to support it. At this point, it suffices to mention that the Place of Negotiation theory I proposed in my earlier works (Maynard 2000, 2002a) can accommodate this need.

3. Creating personalized expressive meanings

To further advance my view about personalized expressive meanings, let me refer to some recent studies. I focus on the works of two scholars, Harris (1980, 1981, 2002) and Satoo (1986). Harris (1980) insists that we are "language-makers," and through language we construct our personal and cultural identities. Satoo (1986) emphasizes,

by the term “elasticity of meaning,” the multiple and fluid nature of meaning itself. Similar to my central point, both approaches reject the one-to-one relationship between the signifier and the signified.

Harris (1981) presents what he calls a “language myth,” a seriously misconceived view toward language that has dominated Western scholarship for too long. Language myth is explained in the following way.

(...) the language myth assumes that a language is a finite set of rules generating an infinite set of pairs, or which one member is a sound-sequence or a sequence of written characters, and the other is its meaning; and that it is knowledge of such rules which unites individuals into linguistic communities able to exchange thoughts with one another in accordance with a prearranged plan determined by those rules. (Harris 1981: 11)

More concretely, the model of linguistic communication supported by this language myth assumes the following. Individuals are able to accurately and fully exchange their thoughts using words. This is because sentences and words belong to a body of knowledge shared by all members of the community. The recipient of words is capable of fully grasping the thoughts conveyed. This straightforward model (message sent intact from sender to receiver, and received intact) is what Reddy (1993) calls “the conduit metaphor.”

Lamenting the strong and blind trust linguists have sustained toward the language myth, Harris (1980, 2002) presents how Western intellectual traditions and cultures have contributed to its making. Compilation of language dictionaries, such as the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, for example, has reinforced the language myth. Consider that each dictionary entry identifies certain meanings accompanied by a list of several separate (often numbered) meanings. This gives an impression that words and their meanings are compact, separate, and possibly combining. People successfully communicate among themselves simply by “using” these words, or simply by transferring these words. Harris (1980) likens the difference in linguistic psychology between pre-dictionary and post-dictionary Europe to the differences in commercial psychology before and after the introduction of standard national currencies.

Harris insists that the idea of language as an objectivized something “out there” is seriously flawed. He writes that “(L)anguages do not come ready-made,” and “(T)hey are what men make them” (1980: preface). We are not language-users, but “language-makers.” For Harris, language encompasses far more than a system of signs. Language is something that we participate in, that is, languaging. Languaging involves much more than information, or whatever is signified by a system of signs. Meanings beyond information are created and appreciated by participants of the communication in the interaction process. They are personal, expressive, and interpersonal, as well as cultural. In other words, meanings are not “kept” in the dictionary for us to “use.” We actively, and individually, engage in the creative process of meaning. For this reason, in the language that undergoes the process of language-making, words and meanings are

not in one-to-one relationships. Ultimately, through languaging we construct our identities, as made explicit in the following statement.

(...) language-making involves much more than merely the construction of a system of signs. It is also the essential process by which men construct a cultural identity for themselves, and for the communities to which they see themselves as belonging. (Harris 1980: preface)

Quoting Harris (1980), the point about “language-makers” in particular, Satoo (1986) emphasizes the importance of not identifying meaning as something concrete, independent, stable, and constant. Satoo (1986) attempts to capture the kind of meaning ignored in the language myth, and calls it “elasticity of meaning” (*imi no daisei*). Satoo (1986) explains the elasticity of meaning in the following way. When we interpret the word *bara* ‘rose’ as a flower and also as a woman, say in a poetry, we do not identify two separate meanings. It is not the case that the sign *bara* has two separate meanings, but the possible distance of a particular meaning from the center either lengthens or shortens. Satoo (1986) quickly warns that this center is not something we can look up in a dictionary. It refers to “an existence that can be presumed only vaguely” (Satoo 1986: 273).⁸

It is not that the sign *bara* has multiple meanings. It is, instead, that because of the elasticity of meaning, *bara* can be associated with multiple ideas. Meanings move in the semantic space around a center, and although elasticity causes meanings to fluctuate, meanings tend to return to the center. Those meanings that extend too far from the center are not feasible; multiple meanings are distributed somewhere toward the center. These elastic fluctuating meanings are not identifiable in dictionary entries. So like Harris (1980), Satoo (1986) takes the position that a one-to-one relationship cannot be established between words and meanings.

I have just emphasized the importance of personalized expressive meanings that escape the one-to-one correlation between the signifier and the signified. Still, the question remains as to how we create meaning from the rule-based and patterned elements of language. To explore this line of thinking, Ooe (Ooe, et al. 2002) offers useful examples of linguistic creativity. Ooe points to the creative use of ordinary words such as *sarada* ‘salad’ and *kanchuuha* ‘canned cocktail drink’ used in Machi Tawara’s *tanka*.⁹ In her *tanka* collection titled *Sarada Kinenbi* ‘Salad Anniversary’, Tawara (1987) chooses a contemporary vocabulary in line with ordinary lives. For example, (3) is a *tanka* from which the title *Sarada Kinenbi* is drawn.

- (3) “Kono aji ga ii ne” to kimi ga itta kara shichigatsu muika wa sarada kinenbi.
Because you said, “This has a nice taste”, July 6th is our salad anniversary.
(Tawara 1987: 125)

Up until it appeared in this popularized *tanka*, the word *sarada* did not have a special quality to it. But Tawara used the ordinary word in an extraordinary text so that “ordinary words appear as brilliant words” (Ooe, et al. 2002: 110).¹⁰

Linguistic creativity involves meanings appealing to unexpected and unusual activation of ordinary and common knowledge. These personalized expressive meanings are purposefully created by the speaker, and it is to these meanings that I direct special attention in this volume.

Returning to the question raised earlier, why do we choose metaphorical expressions in the first place? It is because metaphorical expressions bring forth certain perspectives that non-metaphorical expressions do not. It is possible to rephrase a metaphorical expression with something else, although it may require a ridiculously long explanatory counterpart. However, the metaphorical expression is never the “same” as its non-metaphorical counterpart. Indeed, metaphorical expressions cannot be fully interpreted by the one-to-one relationship between the metaphor and its meaning. The meaning is not in the metaphor itself. What is conveyed by metaphor are perspectives toward our worlds, expressions of our selves, and expressions of our voices.

To go a step further, it is not just the so-called metaphor that expresses our perspectives, selves, and voices. Ordinary words behave likewise. Metaphorical expressions, because they are figuratively used, make us realize the absence of the one-to-one relationship. But ordinary expressions also become meaningful in a metaphorical way. The word-meaning relationship involves something beyond what is described in a dictionary. To go even further, metaphorically speaking, language as a whole is a gigantic metaphor. Linguistic expressions, metaphorical or otherwise, are sources for expressing personalized expressive meanings in a non one-to-one relationship between the signifier and the signified. By examining indices of linguistic creativity from this perspective, we come closer to understanding what language does, and what we do by living it. And by exploring personalized expressive meanings associated with linguistic creativity, we come closer to appreciating the true motivations for our creative participation in language and discourse.

4. Theoretical framework: the place of negotiation theory

The theoretical framework for analyzing and interpreting linguistic creativity is the Place of Negotiation theory as presented in detail in my earlier studies (Maynard 2000, 2002a). As will be evident throughout this book, the Place of Negotiation theory approach to language and discourse is essential for analyzing and interpreting the practice of linguistic creativity in Japanese discourse. The Place of Negotiation theory provides a framework for explicating and accounting for the realization of creative meanings shared by speakers and partners.

According to this theory, meaning is negotiated and interpreted in the place of communication. Upon this place, bounded and defined as a meaning-negotiating space, three different dimensions of place, i.e., cognitive, emotive, and interactional, are projected. Different angles, shades, and strengths of these projections define the three spatial dimensions differently. The place where these projections come together

and overlap is the locus of the *topica*, i.e., the negotiative place, the place where ultimate semantic negotiation occurs.

The first of the three projections defines the cognitive place where the primary concern is the choice of lexical items and the propositional structure. The second projection defines the emotive place, where the speaker comes into focus. The emotive place foregrounds the speaker's broad emotional attitudes; it is the space primarily concerned with the psychological and emotional aspects of communication. What is relatively important here is the speaker who expresses emotional attitudes and feelings, as he or she incorporates social as well as personal emotions. These attitudes and feelings are expressed through multiple strategies including lexicon, grammar, rhetoric, and discourse structure.

The third projection defines the interactional place, where the partner comes into sharp focus. Within this interactional place, an interactional social atmosphere is created, coordinated, and managed; at the same time, it incorporates personal interests. In the interactional place, special attention is paid toward partners as well as participants of speech events. Here the main concern centers around how speaker, partner, and other participants (if any) express, understand, and manage interpersonal relations among themselves.

Associated with these places, the Place of Negotiation theory embraces five kinds of meanings. These include: (1) the potential meaning assigned to each sign, (2) informational meaning, (3) emotive meaning, and (4) interactional meaning; all of these contribute to the process of instantiating (5) negotiative meaning. The potential meaning refers to the conventionalized meaning, and it typically appears in a dictionary definition. Taken by itself, the potential meaning fails to communicate; it needs to be instantiated in actual interaction. The informational meaning, presented in the cognitive place, is synonymous with referential meaning and propositional meaning. It primarily describes the proposition with little emphasis placed on modality and aspect. The emotive meaning, enacted in the emotive place, refers to the speaker's emotional attitudes, aroused emotional responses, and the broad range of general feelings associated with the linguistic expression. The interactional meaning, instantiated in the interactional place, refers to the socially motivated feelings and attitudes primarily associated with how speaker, partner, and other participants (if any) express, understand, and manage interpersonal relations among themselves.

The negotiative meaning is reached through negotiation in the *topica*. It is a result of a combination, competition, and integration of potential meaning, informational meaning, emotive meaning, and interactional meaning. In addition, this negotiation process also brings into focus all relevant cotextual as well as contextual information, along with broader cultural and social factors. Negotiative meaning, frequently polysemous and imaginative, is often interpreted metaphorically and ironically. Its interpretation is dependent on the cotextual and contextual information, and therefore, it is prototypically indexically linked to the actual place of communication. Just as the context changes from one moment to the next, so does negotiative meaning, constantly

undergoing transformations. Overall, the Place of Negotiation theory enables us to view the linguistic experience as a negotiative process, incorporating all aspects of cognition, emotion, and interaction.

Associated with the three different dimensions of place are six related, distinguishable, but not mutually exclusive functions. These are: (1) recognition of objects and (2) construction of proposition (related to the cognitive place); (3) expression of emotional attitude and (4) communication of attitudes toward others (related to the emotive place); and (5) management of participatory action and (6) coordination of joint utterances (related to the interactional place). The dimensions of place, types of negotiation, types of meaning, and related functions are summarized in Figure 1.

Dimensions of place	Types of negotiation	Functions
(Types of meaning)		
cognitive place (informational meaning)	informational negotiation	recognition of objects construction of proposition
emotive place (emotive meaning)	emotive negotiation	expression of emotional attitude communication of attitudes toward others
interactional place (interactional meaning)	interactional negotiation	management of participatory action coordination of joint utterances

Figure 1. Types of place, meaning, negotiation, and function in the Place of Negotiation theory

As indicated in Figure 1, different meanings come into focus in different places. Each meaning is realized as a result of negotiation among participants, as it incorporates contextual and contextual information. The meaning realizes a number of functions associated with a particular place. For example, in the emotive place, emotive negotiation foregrounds the emotive meaning that realizes the function of expressing emotional attitude. And ultimately, the totality of meaning (i.e., negotiative meaning) is arrived at (in the *topica*), as the sum of meanings resulting from multiple negotiations. To be noted is that negotiation occurs at multiple levels, not only among participants, but also among different types of meaning, and among different dimensions of place. Furthermore, the negotiation process is manifest in the interaction itself, verbal and otherwise.

Linguistic creativity involves more than the presentation of information. Language as creatively expressive activity requires functions beyond the recognition of objects and the construction of proposition. As I emphasized in my presentation of the Place of Negotiation theory (Maynard 2000, 2002a), emotive and interactional meanings are critical for appreciating how language functions in actual discourse. Linguistic creativity makes use of language in all three dimensions of place, but particularly so in emotive and interactional places. Expressing emotion and attitude toward partners as well as toward the

interaction itself is a way of expressing linguistic creativity. The view toward language and discourse characterized in the Place of Negotiation theory is supportive of this fact about linguistic creativity, because, unlike traditional formal theories of language, it offers places where expressive meanings are legitimized and appreciated.

5. Methodology and interpretive approaches

As stated above, the theoretical background of this study is the Place of Negotiation theory. The analytical methods under this framework are drawn from disciplines of discourse analysis (including functionalism, pragmatics, and contrastive analysis) and conversation analysis. In addition, as I explain in the next section and further in detail in Chapter 3, this study makes use of approaches available in different fields for qualitative interpretive processes (i.e., self, perspective, and voice).

5.1 Methodology

From the perspective of discourse analysis, the concept of distributional constraint is useful when identifying the creative effects of certain linguistic indices. A researcher can identify the pragmatic constraints of given indices as they occur (or do not occur) in real-life discourse segments on the basis of discourse principles such as cohesion, coherence, and other organizational structures. Based on the discourse behavior of the investigated devices and strategies, a researcher is able to identify whether or not certain creative effects are more observable, or, foregrounded than others.

From the perspective of discourse functionalism, based on use and non-use of certain indices, the semantic and rhetorical effects can be contrasted. Particularly when the use of a certain strategy violates norms, the researcher interprets the speaker's intended creative effect as it relates to personalized expressive meanings. In this interpretive process, pragmatics-based cotextual and contextual information provide clues. In certain genres, the narrator's comment on the character's feelings provides additional clues for interpreting the intended effects. From the perspective of contrastive discourse analysis (see Maynard 1997a), a contrast may be made between the original and translation texts, where it is possible to study which effects are or are not communicated across languages. The contrast often reveals language-internal subtle expressive meanings difficult to identify otherwise.

Conversation analysis offers a variety of means for identifying the cases of linguistic creativity. By observing prior and ensuing turn shapes and contents, the reciprocal effect of a particular strategy can be interpreted. Turn-taking rules, adjacency pairs, back-channeling strategies, hesitation, fillers, preference organization, and so on, help define the conversation context in normative and systematic ways. When the expected interaction takes place, the function of the interaction can be interpreted accordingly,

and when the expected interaction does not take place, the motivation for such action can be sought. This motivation often involves personalized expressive meanings, which are manifestations of linguistic creativity.

Although discourse analysis and conversation analysis take advantage of both qualitative and quantitative analyses, studies reported in this volume are interpretive in nature. Accordingly, no quantitative analyses are attempted. The claims I make in this volume are not characterized in terms of likelihood or frequency, but rather, observation-based findings and preferences based on qualitative analyses.

5.2 Concepts of selves, perspectives, and voices

Language, when used creatively in discourse, realizes different aspects of selves and identities, reflects (and evokes) different perspectives, and speaks in different voices. In this study, I approach the practice of linguistic creativity from the perspective of these interpretive concepts: (1) the concept of self and selves as conceived in a number of studies (e.g., Merleau-Ponty 1962; Miki 1967b, 1967c; Lebra 1992, 2004), (2) perspectives that include points of view, viewing positions, and perspectivized appearances (Miyazaki and Ueno 1985), and (3) the concept of voice characterized by Bakhtin (1981, 1986) along with the concept of intertextuality (Kristeva 1980). Additionally, I include the concept of linguistic subjectivity in the discussion, as it reveals how selves surface (or not) in language.

Although these concepts are introduced in detail later on, perhaps, at this point, it is helpful to offer a rough outline of the close relationship among them. I emphasize, in particular, the fact that these three concepts form a circularly inter-connected relationship; the self places itself in perspective of what is communicated, the perspective is reflected in voice, which in turn expresses a perspective, which leads to the self's expressive motivation. The self starts once again the process of conveying perspective and voice. The speaker may reveal a multiplicity of selves, presenting different aspects of his or her selves. Corresponding to the multiplicity of selves, multiple perspectives are recognized. The moment a speaker engages in linguistic activity, the speaker inevitably places himself or herself in perspective with what is communicated. The speaker's positioning, or point of view, is expressed through a variety of linguistic devices and discourse strategies. These indices echo multiple voices. Voices are multiple because the speaker speaks in voices, the voices reflecting his or her own as well as of others in society. These voices reflect different selves who place themselves in different perspectives.

In other words, the speaker positions himself or herself in perspective with what he or she expresses, and uses voice as a device to identify that perspective. The partner, in turn, based on the provided information, locates the speaker in perspective. Hearing the speaker's voice (which always responds to and addresses the partner), the partner in turn interprets the meaning in perspective. In this reciprocal manner, the relationship among self, perspective, and voice form a partial circle which is supplemented by another partial circle formed by the partner's receiving process of voice, perspec-

tive, and self. These concepts form a continuing spiral, eventually reaching the level where the speaker and the partner share personalized expressive meanings.

Although these relationships play important roles in all cases of communication, linguistic creativity is intimately involved with them, more so than primarily information-centered communication. Accordingly, I explore the practice of linguistic creativity focusing on the mutual relationships among selves, perspectives, and voices.

Before proceeding, I should clarify a few terms associated with self and participants in languaging. “Speaker” is a person, a “locutionary agent,” who engages in linguistic activity with an intention to communicate. I use the term “speaker” to include the writer as well, although in regard to written text I use the term “writer” (and “narrator” in narrative discourse) as well. In indirect discourse such as fiction, a locutionary agent is different from the physical person who is behind the work of fiction. For example the novelist is the actual author, and is not identical to the locutionary agent in a strict sense. “Author” (essayist, poet, etc.) is a flesh-and-blood, real person who is behind the writer, and the writer engages in writing as a locutionary agent of a specific text. In indirect discourse, speaker refers to the person who speaks as a “character.” For example, in a conversation appearing in a novel, a character who engages in the conversation is the locutionary agent for that utterance. The locutionary agent is the “self,” or more accurately, an aspect of self (who engages in a linguistic activity). This self continuously sends out messages, signaling things such as information, emotion, or just the desire to participate in communication.

I use the term “partner” to represent the person the speaker addresses. Again, when certain aspects of the partner’s behavior are in focus, I use terms such as “reader,” “audience” and so on. Obviously, communication is not complete without a partner. Whatever the speaker does is addressed to the partner, and it must be supported or responded to by the partner in interaction. One sided speech absent of the partner’s participation is not communication at all. The speaker always speaks to someone. In written text, even when that someone is not present in the immediate situational context, the writer addresses the assumed reader. The speaker may also speak to oneself who serves as a partner. In any event, the speaker is not totally independent of the other, or of the social and situational contexts.

6. Data

Studies reported in this volume are based on analyses of contemporary Japanese discourse. Data consist of examples drawn from multiple genres. For spoken sources, three types are chosen: (1) interview dialogues appearing in weekly magazines (Hayashi with guests 2003–2006), (2) television dramas (*Long Vacation* 1996 and *Tiger & Dragon* 2005), and (3) a collection of dialogues (Piiko and Agawa 2005). For written sources, the following types are chosen: novels, mystery novels, essay collections, explanatory books, narratives, satirical cartoons, print advertising, poems, and magazine

articles. In addition, songs and Internet postings appear as examples. Obviously, examining as broad a discourse as possible is a must in discourse studies such as this one. I have made attempts to include different kinds of discourse created by a variety of Japanese speakers and writers. It goes without saying that the examples selected in this study contain indices of linguistic creativity. In this sense, the data are limited to those that are creative in nature. I include explanations about specific data when they appear for the first time.

For presentation of data, the following methods are used. When presenting discourse segments, only when mentioned in the text, individual sentences are separately numbered. Conversation examples are normally divided by speaker turns and are numbered accordingly. Examples are first given in Romanized transliteration, followed by English translation. English translation is mine unless otherwise noted. The transliteration is given in phonetic orthography referred to as the Hepburn style with the following alternations. In presenting double consonants, before *cha*, *chi*, *chu*, and *cho*, *t* is added, thus instead of *icchi* ‘agreement’, *itchi* is used. Syllabic *n* is written *n* unless it immediately precedes a vowel, in which case it is written *n’*. The glottal stop, written as small *tsu* in Japanese, is spelled out as *tt*. For long vowels, unless conventionalized otherwise, double consonants are used. Proper nouns also follow the transliteration method unless conventionalized otherwise. Division of words in transliteration is based on usefulness only. Although some morphemes appear attached to words and some do not, those decisions are made for convenience purposes only. I made every effort to maintain consistency regarding the word division, however. Examples are also presented in Japanese orthography in the Appendix.

In Chapter 6, grammatical information is important, and critical parts are glossed for clarification. For glossing, the following conventions are used: BE (various forms of the ‘be’ verb), COND (conditional), INTER (interjection), EMPH (emphatic marker), IP (interactional particle), LK (linker, linking nominals), NEG (negative morpheme), NOM (nominalizer), O (direct object), Q (question marker), QT (quotation marker), S (subject marker), and T (topic marker).

In the presentation of conversation, # indicates a recognizable pause, and ##, a prolonged pause. Statements bordered by < > explain situations relevant to the conversation-in-progress. Utterances bordered by (()) are back-channel expressions made by the partner.

Depending on the focus of each chapter, certain expressions are presented in bold letters, so that the reader’s attention can be easily directed. Those phrases in bold letters appear underlined in Japanese orthography presentation in the Appendix. Additionally, certain aspects under discussion are added in parentheses accompanying the examples. For example, in Chapter 4, for each of the verb-ending sentences, the style designation is given in parentheses. Further explanations on data presentation are given where relevant.

7. Organization of the book

Part I, Preliminaries, consists of three chapters, Introduction, Background, and Approaches. I offer a rationale for writing this volume in the Introduction. Chapter 1 also introduces the central issue of this study, that is, the definition of linguistic creativity and how the concept of linguistic creativity necessitates certain views toward language and linguistic theory. As evident through the entire volume, I take the position that creativity of language is enabled by the fact that there is a gulf between what words signify (in the Saussurean sense) and what the speaker aims to communicate. Personalized expressive meanings realized by using or not using words in creative ways are interpreted in the negotiative process between the speaker and the partner. Chapter 1 also discusses the Place of Negotiation theory, the theoretical framework within which this study is pursued, along with methodological issues.

In Chapter 2, Background, I review past studies on the concept of creativity as understood and investigated in linguistics, applied linguistics, and cognitive approaches. I also review how linguistic creativity has been understood as it relates to the Japanese language, particularly in terms of traditional rhetorical figures. The study of linguistic creativity also reflects an understanding of the field of rhetoric, and its general characteristics. Particularly relevant to the present study is the position where one understands language, not as a form, but as a rhetorical expression. This rhetorical view toward language and discourse is reflected in Japanese linguistic and philosophical studies. Along this line, Chapter 2 introduces the spirit of rhetoric (Miki 1967c) and Rhetoric of *Pathos* (Maynard 1997a, 2000, 2002a).

Chapter 3 introduces three approaches that serve as an interpretive guide to the current study. These are the concepts of self, perspective, and voice. Self and multiple selves are discussed in relation to Miki (1967a, 1967b) and Bakhtin (1981, 1984, 1986). Concepts of point of view and perspectives are introduced along with perspectivized appearances advocated by Miyazaki and Ueno (1985). Then, the concept of multivoiceness is discussed along with the phenomenon of intertextuality. Also, Chapter 3 discusses why the concept of linguistic subjectivity is important for understanding how selves are represented (or not) in the Japanese language.

Part II, Discourse creativity: Styles and genres, consists of three chapters. These three chapters focus on three related phenomena, i.e., style mixture, borrowing styles, and genre mixture. Chapter 4 reveals that we mix different speech styles and what I call “rhetorical sentences” to express our multiple voices, as a part of our linguistic creativity. Chapter 5 discusses cases where we borrow someone else’s styles and where we manipulate what I call “styles-in-transit.” In Chapter 6, genre mixture is approached in terms of conversation and text. This chapter discusses the relationship between conversation and written text, with special attention given to the sentence-final *mitaina*.

Rhetorical creativity: Humor and figures is the theme of Part III. Humor has always played a part in communication, and some linguistic expressions are specifically used for this creative purpose. Among them, puns are most significant in Japanese, which serve

the topic of Chapter 7. By expanding the traditional lexical puns to the level of discourse, I examine some cases where prior text serves as a source for humor. Inviting and transforming some well-known lines (which are often taken from literature) into current discourse is a rhetorical strategy that adds to the creative expressivity.

Chapter 8 examines a rhetorical figure of metaphor. Studies on metaphor have increased exponentially in recent years, and many approaches and research reports are available. Using the effect of Japanese rhetorical figures *mitate* and *futaku*, I make a case that Japanese metaphors differ from the so-called metaphors in English in some important ways. Given that contemporary communication often involves visual signs, in Chapter 9, I investigate metaphors in multimodal discourse. Through the analysis of verbal and visual signs, this chapter illustrates how metaphors function beyond the boundaries of sentence and of verbal text.

Part IV, Grammatical creativity: Sentences and phrases, consist of three chapters, which concentrate on the practice of linguistic creativity on the grammatical level. In Chapter 10, based on the examination of negative sentences in advertising and novels, I make a case that negatives are used far beyond the purpose of straightforward negating. For example, the writer creatively makes use of negatives to emphasize non-negative meanings, and to purposely portray certain characters in a novel.

Japanese demonstratives have been extensively studied. However, past studies have mostly concentrated on the types of information associated with demonstratives, while their creative meanings in discourse were pushed aside. Chapter 11 characterizes demonstratives as a creative tool that defines different distances in emotive places. I make a case that demonstratives are used in multiple levels of discourse, and they function to organize discourse in such a way as to locate the speaker and objects in different emotive distances.

Chapter 12 investigates first-person expressions such as *watashi* 'I' and *jibun* 'self'. Self and selves are most directly expressed through use and non-use of these expressions. Various self-referencing terms contribute to different kinds of self-presentation including nonrepresentation of the self and the embedding of divided selves. Through these manipulations, we create the fluid images about ourselves. As in the case of discourse strategies examined in Part II and rhetorical strategies examined in Part III, sentential and phrasal aspects analyzed in Part IV foreground personalized expressive meanings, which are resultant of the practice of linguistic creativity.

In the final part, Part V, Reflections, Chapter 13 offers some food for thought regarding linguistic creativity. Particularly significant is the issue of culture and how it may play a role in the linguistic creativity observed in Japanese discourse. The particularity of language and culture is a theme constantly debated, and I explore this issue in relation to the so-called *Nihonjinron* debate. Finally, in light of the findings on linguistic creativity presented in this volume, I conclude Chapter 13 with my view toward language and linguistic theory which embraces the creative discursive practice.

At the end of the volume, the reader will find two types of references. Data references include sources of examples separately presented from the text. They also include references mentioned as data source in my and other studies. All others are listed in References.

