

# The Japanese Adverbial DOOSE\*

Michiko Takeuchi

Japanese has a number of notorious adverbs whose meaning is hard to pin down in other languages and therefore difficult for non-native speakers to grasp. Some examples are *yahari/yappari* (as expected), *sasuga* (indeed, justifiable), *shosen* (as might be expected), *semete* (at least, at most, at best), *doozo* (please, sure), *dooka* (please, I wish), and *doomo*. The meanings these adverbials convey depend heavily on the specific contexts in which they occur, and since dictionaries do not usually include information about possible contexts, they can only give limited meanings. As for *doomo*, for example, it is almost impossible to provide an equivalent meaning that adequately explains when it is appropriate to use.

In this paper I will be concerned with one of these notorious adverbials, DOOSE, whose meanings, according to the *National Language Research Institute* (1951), express a 'negative sense of bad result or evaluation.' I will give a systematic account of the meaning and function of DOOSE. First, I will provide some Japanese grammarians' treatments of this adverbial, introducing Maynard (1992) in some detail, and show that little analysis of DOOSE has been made and what has been done is far from satisfactory. Next, looking in detail at the behavior of this adverbial, I will clarify its semantic meaning and pragmatic function, using the Relevance-based approach of Sperber and Wilson (1995/1986). I shall draw two conclusions. First, DOOSE signals a pragmatically significant linkage between the two propositions expressed, P and Q in "DOOSE P. Q," in which Q is presented as a justification for P. In section 3, I will argue that DOOSE does not encode conceptual information, but encodes procedural information by manipulating

the choice of context, and imposes constraints on implicature rather than explicature.

### 1. Previous studies

Japanese grammarians agree that these "notorious" adverbials differ significantly from so-called manner adverbs, which have a direct bearing on the propositional content in which they occur. They state that these adverbs reflect the style of how the speaker perceives, characterizes and contextualizes the propositional content. These adverbs have often been referred to as modal adverbs, the Japanese term being "chinjyutsu hukushi" (predicating adverb), (Yamada 1922, Watanabe 1971, cf. Haga 1982, Kudo 1982). Although Yamada and Haga do not list DOOSE, it seems that it falls into the modal adverb category. According to Yamada(134-135), 'a modal adverb bears no relation at all with the meaning of the verbal element; it explains the manner of stating or predicating.' Haga seems to state that his "chuushaku no hukushi" (adverbs for evaluation and interpretation) function as adding the speaker's thoughts to what is to be stated. It seems likely that Haga would associate DOOSE with the adverbs of evaluation/interpretation. Kudo, introducing "jyohoo hukushi" (modal adverbs) as one of the three categories of predicating adverbs, includes DOOSE in this class.

In the attempt to categorize adverbs and adverbial phrases traditional Japanese language grammarians agree that these adverbs do not modify verbs, but rather express the speaker's subjective and emotional attitude and feeling toward what is to be stated. The previous studies, however, are lacking in that they do not view these adverbs as discourse connectives. They do not include information about contexts and therefore offer little explanation for their functions and meanings. Through the studies, every grammarian has only a classification of adverbs and where to list DOOSE type adverbs in his classification. Nor do these grammarians try to

categorize such connective adverbs separately. Their classification itself is problematic. Yamada indicates, for example, *kesshite* (never) in his modal adverb list, while Haga's evaluative/interpretive adverb includes *mochiron* (of course, naturally), *ainiku* (unfortunately) and so on.

Maynard's (1992) is the only study that has provided pragmatic analyses of DOOSE independently, along with *yahari/yappari* (see Tanaka(1997)). She treats DOOSE as a 'discourse modality indicator.' She states that the interpretation process of the DOOSE sentence requires evoking its appropriate situational context and its attitudinal meaning (140).

Maynard starts her discussion with the distributional constraints that DOOSE has. The first constraint is illustrated by (1) and (2)<sup>1)</sup>:

- (1) DOOSE sono paatii-wa hayaku owaru da-roo  
           that party-NOM early end COP-FUT  
           どうせそのパーティは早く終わるだろう。  
           'DOOSE the party will end early.'
- (2) sore-wa yoku aru koto de minnna shoochi-shitei-ru  
      it-TOP often there is fact COP everyone, is aware-PRE  
      それはよくあることでみんな承知している。  
      'That happens often and everybody knows it.'

DOOSE's meaning is excluded from what is anaphorically referred to by *sore* in (2). The second constraint is that DOOSE assumes shared information among speaker/hearers, and therefore DOOSE cannot occur in an unexpected announcement as in (3)<sup>2)</sup>:

- (3) \*DOOSE kaji da!  
           fire COP  
           どうせ火事だ!  
           'DOOSE fire!'

The third constraint is that DOOSE is used only in direct discussion. Look at (4):

- (4) DOOSE Sasaki-wa kane-o hoshigattei-ru ni-chigainai  
           Sasaki money-ACC want-PRE must  
           どうせ佐々木は金を欲しがっているに違いない。  
           'DOOSE Sasaki must be in need of money.'

According to Maynard, if we interpret DOOSE within the subordinate clause only, the utterance becomes inappropriate. It means that DOOSE reflects the speaker's own perspective. From these three constraints she concludes that DOOSE is an expression used to signal the speaker's speculative attitude that propositional content P happens as 'predetermined fate'.

Here the blurring of the boundaries between semantics and pragmatics is seen. By Maynard's account, (4) is structured as a complex sentence, and the DOOSE clause is not a subordinate clause. However, what she means by subordinate clause is not clear. She might mean that the structure of sentence (4) is: DOOSE it must be [Sasaki is in need of money]. If so, we must ask what the function and meaning of DOOSE is in a main clause. Is it a sort of manner adverbial with some concept? I will argue later that in Relevance-theoretic framework DOOSE indicates how the proposition with DOOSE contributes to the interpretation of the utterance, establishing the connection between the DOOSE utterance and the implicit content which DOOSE triggers. For utterance (4) this is something like "he will accept it if paid more," for example.

Next, Maynard proceeds to try to answer the question of what DOOSE means: that is, DOOSE's semantics. She states that the semantic source of DOOSE is 'the speaker's fatalistic speculation that P (in DOOSE P) will conform to the world defined by P-W.' As I understand it, by P-W she means our knowledge of the state of affairs in the world. Then in actual discourse, that is,

pragmatically, DOOSE offers three related but distinguishable meanings: surrendering unto fate, facing fate bravely and conforming to fate.

Maynard's study only suggests that DOOSE functions between the linguistically coded information and the actual contexts. She repeatedly states that DOOSE expresses the speaker's view or her attitudinal information toward an event or state. This is definitely true. What the encoded meaning, however, is not clear enough, and such questions as to how context is selected and what type of information it communicates are not answered. Though she tries to distinguish semantics from pragmatics, her analysis and explanations are not clearly distinct. It is not always clear whether she believes that this adverbial expression affects truth-conditional content, though it seems that she holds negative belief for truth-conditionality by "fatal speculation". The remarks that DOOSE is not included in *sore* in example (2) and that it belongs to the higher-level clause, independently of the propositional content as shown in (4), suggest that she maintains that the adverbial is non-truth-conditional. DOOSE is intuitively considered to be non-truth-conditional, not contributing to the proposition expressed. So we have to clarify the non-truth-conditional semantics of this expression and then we must explain what type of information it carries.

Furthermore, what is the pragmatically determined meaning of (1), for example, out of the three possibilities? Is it "surrendering unto fate" or "confirming fate"? Her example for "surrendering unto fate", 同じことだよ、どうせ俺は若い女向きじゃない。(All the time, DOOSE women don't see me as suitable.) could be interpreted in any of the three ways: facing fate bravely or confirming fate as well as surrendering unto fate according to the contexts. That is to say, these meanings are not the one DOOSE intrinsically carries.

The point is that the speaker chooses to use DOOSE in a particular instance. The question is what makes the speaker choose it. The speaker's decision does not affect the content of the message, but

has some effect on the overall communication. I will try to show what this effect is, and to clarify the difference between the utterances with and without DOOSE.

## 2. Context

Understanding of context is crucial in accounting for the various uses of DOOSE. I will demonstrate that the hearer of DOOSE P would be directed to add to the context an assumption compatible with the content of P and then be encouraged to interpret P as justification, rejection, resignation, etc. for another assumption Q.

Observe the following example:

- (5) A: isoge ba kyuukouni maniaü      kamoshirenai  
       hurry if express      be in time may  
       B: iya, DOOSE maniai soumo-nai      wa. yukkuri ikima-shoo yo  
               be likely-not SFP slowly go(POL)-let's  
       A: 急げば急行に間に合うかもしれない。  
       B: いや、どうせ間に合いそうもないわ。ゆっくり行きましょうよ。  
       A: If we hurry, we can catch the express train.  
       B: No, I'm afraid not. DOOSE we are not in time for the train.  
           Let's walk slowly.

In example (5), the hearer of (5) B is encouraged to search for a background assumption to optimize relevance and he would find and add (6) to the context :

- (6) Even if we hurry, we cannot catch the express train.

The assumption (6) is easily accessible, being part of the earlier discourse, and processed in a context containing assumption (6), the utterance with DOOSE would yield contextual effects, which makes some justification for going slowly.

Example (7) is from a popular nursery rhyme:

- (7) donnani kame-ga isoi demo, DOOSE ban-made kakaru  
 how turtle hurry no matter evening-until take  
 da-roo kokora - de chotto hitonemuri shiyoo  
 COP-FUT here for a short time a nap let's  
 どんなに亀が急いでも、どうせ晩までかかるだろう。ここらでちょっ  
 と一眠り (しよう)。

No matter how the turtle hurries, DOOSE it will take until the evening. I'll have a short nap here.

In example (7), the hearer would look for and find the background assumption such as (8) and add it to the context:

- (8) It is well known that the turtle is a slow walker.

In this case, without the preceding utterance, assumption (8) is easily accessible in the context, because people, including the speaker herself, know that the turtle is a slow walker and it will take long for him to reach the finish. The use of DOOSE in (7) would encourage the hearer to look for the assumptions as general knowledge. These assumptions might be that people are right, that my judgement for the turtle is reasonable, that I am by far a faster runner, and these assumptions give some justification for the speaker's taking a nap. These assumptions would not be so strongly suggested without the use of DOOSE, and therefore the justification would not necessarily follow.

The following examples may show a slightly different relation between DOOSE P and Q:

- (9) (1 couldn't decide what to buy and didn't buy anything after spending a lot of time at a sale.)



(a) To my friend I say: DOOSE watashitte kechi desu yo  
 I stingy be SFP  
 どうせ私ってけちですよ  
 DOOSE I am stingy.

(b) Friend: anatatte kechi ne  
 You stingy SFP  
 I: DOOSE  
 友人: あなたってけちね  
 私: どうせ。  
 Friend: You ARE stingy.  
 I: DOOSE.

(10) A: nani-o shiteirassharu no-desu ka  
 what-ACC be doing(POL) COP SFP  
 B: DOOSE kiite-itadaku yoona shokugyou jaarimase-n  
 have someone hear such occupation COP(POL)-not  
 A: 何をしていらっしゃるのですか？  
 B: どうせ聞いていただくような職業ではありません。  
 A: What are you doing?  
 B: DOOSE it's not the kind of job you ask about.

In these examples Q's are not encoded. But the use of DOOSE enables implicit communication something like "You want to say?" for (9a) and "You said it" for (9b). The hearer of (9) would find it relatively easy to find assumptions about my stinginess, because they are shared by the speaker. What the speaker is communicating with the use of DOOSE could be that I am aware of my stinginess, and DOOSE carries the implication that I know you want to say so. The implicit Q is supposed to be a hint of refusal to continue talking any more.

In (10), as the response to A, by adding DOOSE, the speaker evokes some sympathy from the hearer and conveys something like “I’m not going to answer your question” or “Don’t ask me such a



question." Here the implicit Q is a feeling of rejection. The hearer's choice of context would be:

- (11) A knows what kind of job B has.

Now look at examples (12) and (13):

- (12) (After several attempts in which the fox backed up, made a running approach and sprang high into the air, but didn't get any grapes.)

(To himself) DOOSE budoo-wa suppai nichigainai  
grapes-TOP sour must

「どうせブドウは酸っぱいに違いない」と独り言を言った。

He said to himself, "DOOSE the grapes are sour."

- (13) sutechae, sutechae. DOOSE hiro-tta koi da  
throw away(IMP) get by chance—PAST love COP  
mono  
because

捨てちゃえ、捨てちゃえ。どうせ拾った恋だもの。

I can throw it away. For, DOOSE it was a chance love.

The hearer of (12) would find such assumption as the grapes or fruit in general on a tree might not be ripe enough to eat, because such information is likely to be shared by people as common knowledge. However, the use of DOOSE in (12) requires a relatively greater effort than that in (5) or (7), that is, the speaker is getting her addressee/reader to make a greater effort. One of the extra-contextual effects she might be communicating in return could be that anyone who does not know this information is a silly person, that it is silly of me not to share common knowledge and that I didn't really want these grapes. The speaker might be weakly communicating these implicatures, which make us detect the speaker's

feeling of resignation and despondency.

In example (13) the Q precedes, and the second utterance which DOOSE introduces makes a causal relation with *mono* as sentence final particle: the cause-consequence relation is held between two utterances. We also have a thoroughly acceptable cause-consequence interpretation by reversing the two utterances: DOOSE it was a chance love; therefore, I can throw it away. The explicit indication of determination for giving up being given, the resignation enrichment can be made by the use of DOOSE. In both (12) and (13) a feeling of resignation leads to that of justification.

The following example is more sophisticated:

- (14) A: konban eiga-o mini-iku nda  
           this evening movie-ACC go to see COP  
       B: DOOSE darekasan-to issho deshoo  
           we know who-with be with I suppose  
       A: 今晚映画を見に行くんだ。  
       B: どうせ誰かさんと一緒でしょう。  
       A: I'm going to watch a movie this evening.  
       B: DOOSE I suppose you'll be going with we know who ?

The speaker (14)B is indicating by the use of DOOSE that her hearer should look for a context in which A is going out for a movie with his girlfriend and the hearer would add to the context (15):

- (15) The speaker knows that I always go out on a date with my girl friend.

Furthermore, the speaker is communicating that she is not deeply interested in the reply: that is to say, what she is implicitly communicating is something like "You don't have to answer me." Here the speaker implicitly, but nevertheless ostensibly, conveys a hint of politeness with a feeling of teasing by using DOOSE. The

use of DOOSE does not place the hearer under any pressure to spend the evening with the girlfriend.

I have shown that DOOSE indicates P to be processed as a piece of justification for Q or equivalently as rejection for Q. I have demonstrated how the adverbial works and how context is selected. The next question is what type of information does DOOSE encode?

### 3. Constraints on implicature

#### 3-1 Truth-conditionality

It appears that DOOSE does not contribute to the truth-conditional content of the utterance. According to Wilson & Sperber (1993: 6) it is assumed that a construction is truth-conditional if and only if it contributes to the proposition expressed. I will demonstrate the non-truth-conditionality of DOOSE by two points.

First, the adverbial is excluded from being an antecedent of proforms as in the following example:

(16) A: DOOSE watashi-wa baka desu yo  
                                   I                  fool          SFP

B: soo-wa omotte nai kuseni  
           such      think  not though

A: どうせ私は馬鹿ですよ。

B: そうは思っていないくせに。

A: DOOSE I'm a fool.

B: (Don't say such a thing) when you don't really think so.

In (16), the antecedent of the proform *soo* (so, such) does not include DOOSE. If DOOSE is not part of an antecedent, then it is not part of the propositional content of an utterance. And if it is not part of the propositional content of an utterance, it is not truth-conditional.

Second, let me apply a test of truth-conditionality (Ifantidou-Trouki, 1993). The sentence with DOOSE is embedded into a conditional to see if it falls within the scope of the *if*-clause. Look at

(17), where sentence (7) is embedded into the *if*-clause:

- (17) moshi DOOSE kame-ga tsukunoni ban-made kakaruno  
 if turtle-NOM to reach evening-until take  
 nara, kokode hitonemuri shiyoo  
 then here nap let's  
 "If DOOSE it takes until evening for the turtle to reach the  
 finish, I'll have a nap here .

- (18) (a) It will take until evening for the turtle to reach the finish.  
 (b) DOOSE it will take until evening for the turtle to reach the  
 finish.

The question here is whether the speaker of (17) is saying that she is going to have a nap under (18a) or (18b)? The answer is (18a), not (18b), and the speaker of (17) is saying that she is going to have a nap if it takes until the evening for the turtle to reach the finish. Therefore, DOOSE does not contribute to the truth-condition of the utterance and so it is non-truth-conditional.

### 3-2 Procedural encoding

Given that a linguistically encoded expression does not contribute to the proposition expressed by the utterance, it may be a case in which encoded content does not enter into the explicit level of communication, but plays its role at the level of what is implicitly communicated.

Blakemore(1987, 1988) put forward the idea that there is a class of expressions whose encoded meanings are procedural rather than conceptual: they indicate, guide, constrain, direct, rather than enter into representations. For example, the use of *but* as a denial of expectations in the following:

- (19) She doesn't like cats but she has agreed to look after my cat while I'm away.

In (19) *but* tells the hearer to process the following clause in such a way that it contradicts and eliminates a proposition held by the hearer ; that is, something like "She would not look after the speaker's cat." It acts like a direction to the hearer on some pragmatic inference to carry out, and hence, minimizing the overall processing efforts, achieving the cognitive effects.

It has been shown that DOOSE is employed to help the hearer to select the correct context for the interpretation of the utterance it contains. The context should contain an assumption that the proposition expressed is consistent with some grounds for justification or rejection for another proposition expressed. DOOSE is one of the linguistic forms which contribute to the recovery of the interpretation intended by the speaker by indicating how the proposition expressed is to be interpreted as relevant. It imposes constraints on the hearer's choice of context, thus minimizing his processing effort.

Note that there are two semantic distinctions, truth-conditional vs. non-truth-conditional, and conceptual vs. procedural. Blakemore (1987, 1989, 1992) considers that discourse connectives such as *but*, *so*, and *after all* are procedural and non-truth-conditional. However, as Wilson & Sperber (1993) argue, the two distinctions crosscut each other<sup>3)</sup>.

Within Relevance Theory, one further contribution in understanding the function of DOOSE is made clear: Does DOOSE imply constraints on explicature or implicature? As shown in section 2, the adverbial imposes on implicature, since it helps the hearer to recover contexts and contextual effects intended by the speaker. Look at example (20) (an extended version of (9b)):

- (20) A: anatatte kechi ne  
 B: DOOSE  
 A: soo omotteiru nda / wakatteiru nda  
       so think       COP       realise  
 A: You ARE stingy.  
 B: DOOSE  
 A: You think you are! / You realise it!

The speaker of (20)B has intended her utterance as an addition to A's first utterance. This has the effect of indicating the appropriate context for the interpretation of B's utterance. The hearer A would recover the implied conclusion, which may indicate (21):

- (21) The speaker B admits that she is stingy.

The implicature triggers a response on the part of the hearer of B, that is, A's second utterance, confirming that the speaker thinks herself to be stingy. The fact that DOOSE contributes only to implicature would allow the speaker of (20)B a way out in response to the hearer A. She could attribute her stinginess to the hearer A.

The hypothesis that DOOSE encodes procedural information rather than conceptual information explains our intuition that the expression is hard to translate into another language or explain to non-native speakers. It is interesting enough to note that when decoding takes place, what matters is conceptual vs. procedural distinction<sup>4)</sup>.

### Conclusion

My major concern in this study has been the relation between linguistic form and pragmatic interpretation, how the speaker uses a particular form to achieve pragmatic effects. My specific concern is the use of connective expressions. The linguistic form I have considered here is classified as an adverb according to the traditional grammatical labels. However, I have looked at the data involving

DOOSE, realizing it to be "connective" in referring to a function which this adverbial has.

I have argued that this adverbial is a linguistic device whose function is to relate two propositions, P and Q, in such a way that P is a justification or equivalently a rejection for Q. It has non-truth-conditional content which does not contribute to the representation of P and it may be seen as encoding no concept. My claim is that DOOSE carries semantic constraints on relevance, indicating how the utterance crowned by it is to be processed in a given context.

In embarking on this study, I had two aims. On the one hand, I expected that the analysis of DOOSE would reveal an interesting aspect of language. I wanted to provide semantic and pragmatic analysis of one of the most notorious expressions in Japanese. Japanese teachers have found it impossible to explain the use and the meaning of the adverbial to their students in detail, and in spite of this fact, or due to this fact, little study has been made by Japanese grammarians. On the other hand, I hoped that Relevance Theory would enable us to achieve an integrated analysis of the different usage's of the extremely subtle expression. The use of DOOSE is quite effectively explained by the Relevance-theoretic procedural account.

It is expected that this contribution will provide an account for other Japanese "connective" adverbials. Especially, the analyses of *doomo*, *doozo* and *dooka* in addition to DOOSE, which have barely been noted as discourse connectives, could shed insightful light into pragmatics of the Japanese language.

\*This paper partly owes its existence to the symposium at the 12th World Congress of Applied Linguistics held in Tokyo in August 1-6, 1999. I would like to express my appreciation to the contributors, especially to Seiji Uchida and Tomoko Matsui who took time to



discuss the data with me and give comments during the preparation for the symposium.

#### Notes

- 1) Examples are given in three ways for the convenience of both Japanese and non-Japanese: (1) in roomaji transcription with gloss, (2) in Japanese characters and (3) English translation with DOOSE.
- 2) Here the exclamation mark is important. Without it, the utterance is an ordinary statement and it could be interpretable, though the context might be not easy to imagine. For example, "It happens to be a fire: you don't have to be bothered by it."
- 3) Wilson & Sperber (1993) discuss the four possibilities of linguistic expression, reflecting two semantic distinctions in play: truth-conditional vs. non-truth-conditional and conceptual vs. procedural. Further, Takeuchi (1998) argues that there are such linguistic forms as encode both procedural and conceptual meanings.
- 4) In the symposium at the 12th World Congress of Applied Linguistics titled "Translation and Relevance Theory" the significance of procedurally encoded information for translation was discussed. Considering DOOSE, I argued that once the translator has recognized the procedural nature of a linguistic form, the best way of translating it is to recognize that expression is different from the translation of conceptual information.

#### References

Blakemore, D.

- 1987 *Semantic constraints on relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 1988 "Denial and contrast: a relevance-theoretic analysis of *but*." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, 15-37.
- 1992 *Understanding utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Haga, Y.

1982 *Shinnteï nihonbunpoo kyooshisu*. Tokyo: Kyooiku Shuppan.

Ifantidou-Trouki, E.

1993 "Sentential adverbials and relevance." *Lingua* 90(1/2), 69-90.

Kudoo, H.

1982 "Jyohoo hukusi no imi to kinoo - kijyutsu houhouwo motomete." In *Kenkyuu hookokusho* 3. Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyusho(ed.) 45-92.

Maynard, S. K.

1994 *Discourse Mmodality: Subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

National Language Research Institute

1951 *Adverbs in modern Japanese - uses and examples*. Tokyo: Shuuei Shuppan.

Sperber, D. & D. Wilson.

1986/ *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford:

1995 Blackwell.

Tanaka, K.

1998 "The Japanese adverbial *Yahari* or *Yappari*." In *Relevance Theory: Applications and implications* (eds. B. Carston and S. Uchida, Amsterdam: John Benjamin) 23-46.

Takeuchi, M.

1998 "Conceptual and procedural encoding: Cause-consequence conjunctive particles in Japanese." In *Current Issues in Relevance Theory*, (eds. V. Rouchota and A. Jucker. Amsterdam: John Benjamin) 81-108.

Watanabe, M.

1971 *Kokugo kokubunnron*. Tokyo: Hanawa Shoboo.

Wilson, D. & D. Sperber.

1993 "Linguistic form and relevance." *Lingua* 90 (1/2), 1-26.

## Abbreviations used in glosses

ACC	accusative
COP	copula
FUT	future
IMP	imperative
NOM	nominative
PAST	past
POL	polite
PRE	present
SFP	sentence final particle
TOP	topic