

Repetition in Japanese Conversational Discourse

Naoko KUROKAWA

[Abstract]

This paper examines the phenomenon of repetition in Japanese conversation. Some analysis of English conversation, such as the study conducted by Deborah Tannen in 1987, have suggested that repetition in discourse has the functions of production, comprehension, connection, interaction, rapport building as well as interpersonal involvement. While several studies on repetition in Japanese have been conducted in the past, many have focused on its syntactic functions rather than its communicative functions from actual discourse data. In order to examine the forms and functions of repetition in Japanese conversational discourse, I examined transcriptions of conversations from 12 pairs of native speakers of Japanese and culled examples of repetition from the data, then classified them into allo-repetition and self-repetition. The analysis of the data indicates that repetition in Japanese conversation is indeed ubiquitous, and it plays a significant role in communication: self-repetition functions as a strategy of repair and a filler that helps to make speech go smoother, as well as a semantic intensifier that displays engagement in conversation. Allo-repetition, which is used frequently as a replacement for the 'yes' response, has various functions at the interactional level: it functions as a backchannel which indicates agreement and politeness to the interlocutor. It also conducts several speech acts including requesting information, which is employed to negotiate meaning in communication. Finally, it creates rapport between interlocutors, thereby facilitating interpersonal involvement in communication. The result of this study provides groundwork for understanding the importance of repetition for JSL learners to enhance their communicative and interactional competence.

[Keywords]

Repetition Interpersonal involvement Repair Rapport Backchannel

1. Introduction

Repetition is a pervasive phenomenon in ordinary conversation. It is sometimes viewed negatively: for example, as a "redundant phenomenon in syntax," an alternative option for deletion (Hubbard, 1989:3). However, it has been recognized in studies of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis in English that repetition has certain communicative functions. Tannen (1987:46) in fact defines repetition as "the heart of language," which is a fundamental and infinitely useful linguistic strategy (87). Based on her analysis of dinner table conversation, she argues that repetition in discourse has the functions of production,

comprehension, connection, and interaction. Shegloff (1997) uses a framework of conversation analysis to exemplify the functions that repetitions accomplish in conversation, such as a practice for initiating repair on an interlocutor's preceding talk and registering receipt of an interlocutor's turn. Wong (2000) analyzes the phenomenon that occurs in the same turn with insertion, and posits that the repetition is used as a storytelling technique in the accomplishment of the action of resumption.

While those previous studies on the functions of repetition were based on data of American English conversations, several studies of repetition in the Japanese language have also been conducted in the past. Makino (1980, 1982), who discusses repetition from the functional as well as the stylistic perspective, analyzes the phenomenon in relation to the theory of ellipsis. Although he points out several strategic functions of repetition, he focuses mainly on an examination of the "repeatability" of elements, which he bases on the notion of old/new information. He also presents the theory of "packing order of repetition" in Japanese conversation, which proposes that more important information is repeated first and less important information is repeated last.

A study by Hubbard (1989) deals with repetition and ellipsis in Japanese conversational discourse from the perspective of the "cognitive domain" of conversation. In the study, she discusses the mechanism of informational processing and how it affects the production of repetition in conversation. Nakada (1991) studies the phenomenon by analyzing dialogues of Japanese interlocutors, and examines how repeated elements function in conversation. Hayashi (1994) and Fox, Hayashi and Jaspersen (1996) examine the phenomenon of repetition as a strategy of repair. They classify the types of repetition within the same turn-constructive unit and compare the syntactic function of repetition in Japanese and English conversation. Swerts et al. (1997) examines prosodic functions of repetition in Japanese conversation by studying its phonetic features. Most recently, Shimazu (2005), with her analysis of conversation among nonnative speakers of Japanese, explains that interlocutors quote their own utterance or those of others as a means to construct narratives.

While studies done in the past provide a basis for understanding the mechanism of repetition in Japanese conversation, many of these studies have examined the phenomenon from a syntactic perspective, and few have explored this topic in terms of its communicative functions from actual discourse data. According to Tannen (1987), degree and type of repetition may differ with cultural and individual style. She further notes that cultures which place a relatively positive value on silence in interaction do not employ the strategy of repetition to the extent that talk-valuing cultures do. While it has been pointed out by several studies that Japanese is a language that values silence in communication (Hall, 1976; Lebra, 1987; Barnlund, 1989), it is doubtful whether the occurrence of repetition is

infrequent in Japanese conversation. Since repetition is considered to be a universal phenomenon in conversation, it is assumed that repetition is also pervasive in Japanese conversational discourse and thus plays a significant role, as it does in English conversation, at the interactional level.

In order to examine how repetition functions in actual Japanese conversation, I will examine naturally occurring conversational data and classify the forms and functions in the data. As one of the established works on repetition from the communicative perspective, I will utilize the concepts discussed by Tannen (1987; 1989) as a framework for this study. As Tannen did in her study of English conversation, I will attempt to exemplify the pervasiveness of the phenomenon by discussing its form and function. Since repetition is such a multifarious phenomenon, I will not attempt to exhaustively list every form and function of repetition in conversation. Rather, I hope to illustrate the way in which repetition is exercised in ordinary Japanese discourse and how it functions in the interaction between interlocutors.

2. Data and Methodology

The database for the present study consists of transcriptions of conversations of 12 pairs, totaling 24 participants. The length of transcription is approximately 5 minutes per pair, which is about one hour in total. The data was collected and transcribed between 1997 and 2001 at a University located in the Midwestern United States. All participants were native speakers of Japanese in their twenties or thirties. The pairs were acquainted with each other at the time of the data collection, and they were left unattended during the recording. I counted the practices in which all or part of the speech of some preceding turn and within the same turn is repeated. There were 61 examples of repetition in the data, and I classified them into two types: self-repetition and allo-repetition. There were 13 examples of self-repetitions and 47 examples of allo-repetitions.

3. Data Analysis

3.1 Self-Repetition

First I will examine self-repetition, in which the repeated element is produced by the same speaker in the same turn. Observe the following examples:

- (1) san, sanzen, sanzen ikura, sanzen, happyakuen gurai kana.

‘Three, three thousand, three thousand and how much, maybe around three thousand and eight hundred yen’.

- (2) nanka, chotto eGU, egu, egui tte iuka, nante iuka.

‘Well, its’s sort of gro..gro..grotesuque, or what?’

- (3) ha no (.) chiryoo de: (.), honto ni hidokuna- hidokunatte to iuka nanka: (.) shinkee o machigatte yachhau to noo ni (.) sugu chikai janai.

‘When having work done on your teeth, if the cavity gets wor- , well rather than getting worse, if your nerve is damaged, it’s near your brain, you know.’

- (4) A: kurusi nanka:=

‘Like medicine’

B: =un=

‘Yes’ (backchannel response)

A:=tsuyoi kusuri nanka (ano) igusuri to issho ni nomu yone.

‘You take a strong medicine with another medicine that protects your stomach, you now.’

In (1), the speaker attempts to remember the price of a product she is talking about. To reflect the process of recalling the price, she utters *san/sanzen* four times. This repetition functions as a filler, which allows the speaker to formulate what to produce next while keeping the floor of the conversation.

Examples (2) and (3) share a similar function with (1) in the way that the repetition reflects the speakers’ thinking and organizational processes. Notice that both repetitions are followed by *to/tte iuka* “rather...” , indicating that speakers are not satisfied with the choice of word that has just been produced. In (2), the speaker attempts to find an adjective that describes the object she is talking about. In (3), the speaker realizes that the verb *hidokunaru* ‘gets worse’ is not the correct word choice, and cuts off the word and repeats the word with *to iuka*, then changes the subject from ‘cavity’ to ‘a dentist who damages the nerve’. Here, the speaker employs repetition as a strategy of repair, which “enables the speaker to produce fluent speech while formulating what to say next” (Tannen, 1987:582). Such a strategy of repetition is frequently employed in conversation, as illustrated in example (4). The speaker produces *kurusi nanka* ‘Like Medicine’, then realizes that the noun needs to be expanded. He then repeats the previous utterance, inserting the adjective *tsuyoi* ‘strong’ to resume the talk. This oral practice, which Wong (2000) argues is a storytelling technique in the accomplishment of the action of resumption, is frequently observed in narratives.

However, repetition in the same turn does not always function as a filler or a self-repair of the speech. Observe the following examples:

- (5) (A and B are talking about an international calling plan)

A: e, demo sugoi. atashi. (1.0) ippunkan desho?

‘But isn’t it good? It’s per minute, right?’

B: ippun ippun.

‘Yes, a minute.’

Unlike the former examples, the repetition in this example is uttered to convey a certain semantic emphasis. The participants are talking about an international calling plan that charges a certain amount per minute from the U.S. to Japan. In reply to A’s tag-like confirmation question *ippunkan desho?* ‘a minute, right?’, B produces lexical repetition, *ippun ippun*, instead of providing a ‘yes’ answer to A’s question, as in *un, ippun*, in which a core predicate is followed by a ‘yes’ answer. According to Tannen (1987), redublication of the answer serves to intensify the response. In this example, the repetition of *ippun* serves as an intensifier, which emphasizes the cheapness of the rate that she mentioned. Repetition of this type is considered to allow a speaker to display more engagement in conversation compared to a simple ‘yes’ with a predicate response.

Consider another example:

- (6) dakara taipu utte taipu utte taipu utte taipu utte dakara (0.4) nanka a (0.2) konna mon kana::

‘So I keep typing, typing, typing, and typing...so...that’s what it is.’

The participants in this conversation are having discussion about talking to someone on the Internet. Here, the speaker repeats *taipu utte* ‘to type’ four times to intensify the action, indicating the length of time the speaker spent on typing. While the repetition conveys such a semantic intensification, it also functions to create a certain rhythmic pattern, which conveys the “poetic function” observed in the language (Tannen, 1987:574).

It should also be noted that self-repetition is frequently observed in backchannel responses. Observe the following utterances:

- (7) ah::, sokka sokka sokka sokka.

‘Oh, I see.’

- (8) soodayone, soodayone.

‘Yes, indeed.’

The quintuple repetition of *sokka* in (7) serves to intensify the response, which shows listenership, displaying the image that the listener is impressed by what she has heard and is highly involved in the conversation. Similarly, the repetition of *soodayone* in (8) presents a higher degree of agreement and empathy to the previous utterance, compared to the utterance without repetition.

As has been discussed so far, self-repetition has several functions: although it is often

considered simply as a factor of disfluency, it in fact serves as a communication strategy which enables speakers to formulate speech while keeping the floor, to achieve the job of resumption, and to convey semantic emphasis and thereby to allow them to display engagement in conversation

3.2 Allo-repetition

In this section, I will examine the function of repetition in which a part or a whole sentence of the previous turn is repeated. While the scale of fixity in form ranges from exact to paraphrase, I will follow Tannen's definition of allo-repetition and include repetition with variation, such as "questions transformed into statements, or vice versa, and repetitions with changes of person or tense or other change in wording" (Tannen, 1987:586).

Allo-repetition frequently occurs in adjacency pairs of questions and answers. Observe the following examples:

- (9) A: ... e chotto, honto ni keitai ni kakeraren no?

'Hey, can I really call the cell phone?'

B: kakerareru.

'Yes, you can.'

- (10) A: aa jaa nani? dorotto shiten no?

'I see. Then what? Is it thick?'

B: soo. chotto dorotto shiteru.

'Yes, it is a little thick' .

- (11) A: kyuuni?

'Suddenly?'

B: kyuuni.

'Yes, suddenly'

These examples are cases in which interlocutors answer questions by repeating previous utterances. In considering adjacency pairs in Japanese, it is necessary to note that Japanese sentences must end with a core predicate -- that is, either a verb, an adjective or a noun phrase which is followed by a form of the copula (Makino & Tsutsui, 1986). In addition, it should be noted that repetition of core predicate is customary in Japanese; This is unlike English conversation, in which auxiliary verbs and pronouns generally replace elements in the previous turn. However, it is worth noting that B's responses in (9) and (11), as repetitions of the core predicate in the previous turn, are not followed by *una* 'yes' answer. According to Makino and Tsutsui (1986), omission in Japanese conversation is so common that ellipsis of predicates can happen in informal conversation. However, my data in (9) and

(10) represent examples in which a ‘yes’ answer, rather than predicates, are omitted and replaced by a repetition of core predicate.

Makino (1982:165) argues that repetition has a function of politeness, noting that “it is more polite to repeat your questioner’s sentence as much as possible.” To illustrate his point, consider example (9), with no repetition in B’s response.

(9) A: ... e chotto, honto ni keitai ni kakeraren no?

B: un.

While the response is not ungrammatical, the answer may sound rather blunt, therefore, it sounds more polite to respond with the verb *kakerareru*. With this “Main Verb repetition strategy” in which a speaker displays politeness to a questioner (Makino, 1982:165), it is considered more polite to repeat the verb, even if the response is not preceded by a ‘yes’ response. It is considered that the strategy can be applied to forms other than main verbs. For example, in (11) the speakers A and B are talking about B’s having a cavity. A asks B an adverbial question *kyuuni* ‘suddenly’ as the ellipsis of *kyuu ni itaku nattan* ‘started to feel sore’. While B can simply answer “yes” to the question, she instead repeats the adverb, which sounds more polite and also indicates more involvement in the conversation.

Such strategic repetition is employed not only for questions which elicit yes/no answers, but for other types of questions as well. Look at the following examples:

(12)(A hears the price of a product)

A: sonna mon dakke.

‘Was it like that?’

B: sonna mon deshita kke.

‘Was it like that?’

(13) A: n, nankane, nande, dokkara, nyuushu ruuto wa nan nan [daroo,

‘Well, I wonder what is the root of their getting the product.’

B:

[nan nan deshou ne.

‘I wonder what it is.’

In (12), A wonders if the price of the product that she just heard about is adequate. The question with *dakke*, which functions to confirm certain things to the interlocutor and also to self, does not necessarily seek an answer. Instead of replying that she does not know, B in fact repeats the question by modifying the sentence ending from the plain form *dakke* to the distal (polite) form *deshitakke*, which reflects the social position between the interlocutors. Similarly in (13), B repeats A’s question *nan nan daroo* by altering the speech style. Based on

the theory that has been discussed, it is believed that the repetition of these types also functions on the interactional level and indicates politeness to the interlocutor. It should be noted that B's repetition is not necessarily an answer to A's question. Rather, it functions to provide back-channel responses to A's response, serving as a "receipt token" (Shegloff, 1997) of what an interlocutor has said. At the same time, B's repetition indicates involvement in the conversation by creating a common ground that shares the same standpoint toward a particular issue.

Repetitions with an interactional function are also observed in the exchanges in which interlocutors seek others' agreement. Consider the following examples:

(14) A ha:: soo[nanda, ma sore soo oo ni mieru ne=

'Oh, I see. Well, he does look like a man of his age.'

B: [un

= sore soo oo ni mieru. un.

'Yeah, he looks like a man of his age.'

(15) A nnn, [osoroshii yo

'(They are) scary.'

B: [onna no ko (.) osoroshii yo ne::

'Girls...scary indeed'.

In (14), the speakers are talking about the age of a man that they know. Here, A seeks agreement with B by putting the sentence final particle *ne*, which indicates "the speaker's request for confirmation or agreement from the hearer about some shared knowledge" (Hubbard, 1989:202). Instead of *un* or *un, soo da ne*, which are common backchannel responses to *ne*-marked utterances, B responds by repeating the previous utterance without *ne*. The repetition here is considered to indicate a higher degree of agreement than such answers, and thus creates rapport between interlocutors. A case opposite to that in (14) can be found in example (15), a conversation about high school girls, in which B repeats the previous utterance by putting *ne* at the end of the statement. By repeating A's utterance *osoroshii yo* 'scary', B presents a high degree of agreement and acceptance of the previous utterance. Accordingly, the repetition indicates higher involvement in the conversation, linking one speaker's idea to another (Tannen, 1987:584). Such repetition is frequently observed in sentences even without the particle *ne*.

(16) A: monku itte iru, urusai.

'They complain, how annoying.'

B: soo soo, monku, monku itte kuru.

'That's right, they complain.'

(17) A: suggoi yasui.

'That's very cheap.'

B: suggoi yasui to omoimasu.

'I think that's very cheap.'

In both examples, the allo-repetitions produced by B function as agreement to A's previous utterance. As in the former examples, the repetition here functions to indicate interpersonal involvement while showing listenership and providing a back-channel response. In this sense, repetition of this type has a similar function to the particle *ne* in terms of the way it indicates the hearer's confirmation or agreement.

However, allo-repetition does not necessarily indicate strong agreement with the previous utterance. Look at the following statement.

(18) (two speakers are talking about the treatment of a cavity)

A: n: (0.5) taihen dayo nee, =nedan mo (.), takai yone [(hhh)

'It's painful. Besides, it costs you a lot, right?'

B: [(soo), nihon kara oofuku

dekirunda kedo(mone)=

'Yeah, I can get an airline ticket to Japan with the money.'

A: aa, mani awanai. (h [hhhh)

'Sure, but it's too late.'

B: [(h)mani awanai.

'Too late.'

(omit)

B: ja, okane oshimanai hoo ga [ii kamo shirenai.

'Then, maybe I shouldn't be frugal with my money.'

A: [a:, amari (.), hh (.) hh. kane o oshimazuni [yappari

kenkoo o

'Yeah, you shouldn't be frugal with your money. You see. After all, health is important.'

B: [(yappari)

'After all.'

These examples are the type of repetition which Tannen defines as "shadowing" : repeating what is being heard with a split-second delay (Tannen, 1987:592). Unlike the examples discussed earlier, A is not asking questions nor seeking agreement. Also, B does

not seem to show strong agreement with the previous utterance. What, then, is the function of this type of repetition?

According to Tannen, repetition is a resource for producing ample and overlapping talk, the sequence of interaction in which a speaker starts his or her turn while another participant is speaking. Her previous study indicates that overlapping talk can be constructive and rapport-building rather than interruptive (Tannen, 1987:593). The “shadowing” repetition in the above examples, in which the onset of simultaneous talk is observed in each turn, in fact shares the characteristics of overlapping talk that Tannen discusses. The repetition here is considered to be a cooperative collaboration, based on the idea that “communication is teamwork that involves the active participation of all conversants” (Swerts, 1997:111). In (18), in response to B’s utterance that she paid more for the treatment of a cavity in the U.S. than for a return airplane ticket to Japan, A elaborates on B’s utterance that it is too late for her to buy the ticket, which in fact completes the sentence and functions as co-construction of conversation.

It should also be noted that the repetition of A and B carries a certain poetic effect in the conversation by creating a patterned rhythm, weaving each other’s words together into a coda. Consequently, repetition of this type builds rapport between the communicators, who thereby experience shared communicative convention (Tannen, 1987:585).

So far I have examined allo-repetitions as a device to facilitate interaction. However, it also has a completely different function. Let’s look at the following example:

(19) B: are tabeta? ano: nandakke: kyarameru ringo.

‘Did you eat that? Let’s see, what was it? Kyarameru-ringo (caramel-coated apple).’

A: a ringo kyarameru aruyo.

‘Oh, I have ringo-kyarameru (apple-flavored caramel).’

(1.0)

B: ho? dokoni?

‘What? In where?’

A: dokoni,

‘Where’

B: ringo kyarameru tte? e kyarameru ja nai n da yo.

‘What is ringo-kyarameru? Oh, it’s not caramel.’

A: aa (hh) nanda (hhhh)

‘Oh, I see.’

In (19), the participants are talking about a kind of sweet. A misunderstands the product B asked about, and responds that she has the product with her. In reply to B’s question *dokoni*?

'Where?' , A repeats B's question with falling intonation. Unlike the repetition of yes/no questions discussed earlier, the repetition of wh-questions does not function as an affirmative response to a previous utterance. Instead, it indicates that A does not comprehend B's question. This is what Hubbard defines as an "echo question," which is a sign for "uncodable" words, signaling that the speaker cannot conceptualize the word (Hubbard, 1989:198). At the same time, the repetition performs the speech act of requesting more information: Hearing A's repetition *dokoni*, B elaborates on her question from her previous turn by providing the name of the product in question, and A realizes her misunderstanding. In this way, the repetition is employed as a strategy to negotiate meaning between interlocutors. Now observe other examples:

(20) (A and B are talking about B's experiences in Africa)

A: he: (1.3) donna toki ni ko: ko: a! afurika daNAtte yu:ka ko: karucha:shokku janai kedo
so: yu: no tte (.) omoigakenai (.) koto (.) tte (.) donna toko deshita?

'On which occasion did you feel African, or like culture shock, you know, what kind of unexpected experience did you have?'

B: omoigakenai? (1.9) afurika o kanjita: ko(to) desuka?

'Unexpected? You mean, the things that I felt about being in Africa?'

A: (un) ryo:ho: kana?

'Well, maybe both'

(21) A: ima nani? hoken wa nani haitten no?

'So what kind of insurance plan are you covered with now?'

B: wakan nai (h) desu=

'I don't know.'

A: =waka (h) n nai [(h)?

'You don't know?'

B: [gakkoo no, (.) gakkoo[(de haitte iru)

'The school... it's a plan of my school.'

A: [a:, gakkoo de?

'Oh, the school?'

In (20), B repeats a part of A's utterance *omoigakenai* with rising intonation, which shows that she does not comprehend the question. Since A does not respond to B's speech act of requesting clarification, there is a pause after the utterance. B then continues her turn and explicitly asks A for clarification. In (21), A asks about the insurance plan under which B is covered. Then B responds to the question by saying that she does not know. A then repeats the utterance with rising intonation, indicating that he does not fully comprehend what B

said. B then expands her answer that she does not know the type of insurance because it is taken care of by her school. Notice that A's repetition is the first step in the process of expansion. As Tannen argues, the question is used as a scaffold on which to construct ongoing talk (1987: 591). With all these functions, speakers cooperatively negotiate meanings and create a discourse.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented some forms and functions of repetition in ordinary Japanese conversation to illustrate its pervasiveness. In spite of the general perception of repetition as a mere redundancy, the examples presented in this paper indicate that repetition in fact plays a significant role in communication: it was found that self-repetition functions not only as repair but also as a semantic intensifier and a filler that helps to produce fluent speech. Allo-repetition has various functions at the interactional level: it functions as a backchannel response which displays engagement in conversation. It also carries a poetic function and creates rapport between interlocutors, thereby facilitating interpersonal involvement in communication. Moreover, it serves as a strategy to negotiate meanings between interlocutors, by signaling a problem in understanding and by requesting clarification or elaboration of the preceding talk. Although not observed in my data, it can accomplish many other tasks, including initiation of repair on an interlocutor's preceding talk (Shegloff, 1997). With all these functions, repetition serves as a means of keeping talk going in interaction.

While Tannen suggests that degree and type of repetition differ with cultural style, it was found that repetition is ubiquitous in both Japanese and English conversations. The data suggested that the practices in both languages' discourse share many similar functions. At the same time, several functions that are salient in Japanese conversation, such as the politeness strategy of main verb repetition and usage of repetition as a replacement of a 'yes' were also discussed. It is expected, however, that there are a considerable number of variables affects the frequency of repetitions, such as individual speech habits, intimacy level and possibly the social hierarchy of the interlocutors. For instance, Makino argues that the emotive type of allo-repetition, which is a repetition indicating sympathy to the interlocutor, is spoken only by socially superior persons. While this type of repetition was not found in my data, I encountered many examples of repetitions which conflict with Makino's theory: the data contains several examples in which a lower status person repeats a superior's utterance by altering the speech style from the plain form to the addressee honorific form. Unfortunately, I do not have strong enough evidence to generalize the examples, since few pairs in my data had social hierarchical differences. I should also note that all the participants in this study were acquaintances and that their style of talk was

relatively informal. Therefore, further research can clarify the correlation between the type of repetitions and the characteristics of interlocutors, such as age, gender, and social positions, formality and intimacy level.

Lastly, I would like to note that the results of this study provide groundwork for understanding the importance of repetition as a communicative competence for learners of Japanese as a second language. Even though this kind of practice is rarely taught explicitly in the second language classroom, learners may be given an opportunity to become aware of this strategy that is employed in NS/NS interaction. In fact, Wong (2000) points out that the practice of self-repetition with insertion was absent from the data collected from non-native speakers of English. Therefore, future studies can examine how the practice of repetition is exercised by non-native speakers of Japanese, and how it correlates with proficiency level.

As Tannen puts it, “repetition is a resource by which conversationalists together create a discourse, a relationship, and a world” (1987:601). As in English conversation, echoes in Japanese conversation certainly create coherence in discourse as they strengthen interpersonal involvement.

Notes:

1. The original version of this article was written for a graduate seminar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. I wish to thank Professor Naomi H. McGloin for her advice. I would also like to thank an anonymous reviewer of the ICU Studies in Japanese Language Education for valuable comments and suggestions. All errors are mine.
2. I used Jefferson's transcript symbols in transcribing dialogues.

[A left bracket indicates the point of overlap onset.
(0.0)	Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time by tenths of seconds.
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a brief interval within or between utterances.
:	Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation.
(h)	Parenthesized 'h' indicates plosiveness. This can be associated with laughter, crying, breathlessness, etc.
CAPITALS	Capital Letters mark speech that is louder than surrounding speech.
=	'Equals' signs mark the immediate 'latching' of successive talk, whether of one or more speakers, with no interval.

References

- Barnlund, Dean C. 1989. *Communicative Styles of Japanese and Americans*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- Fox, Barbara A., Hayashi, Makoto and Jasperson, Robert. 1996. Resources and repair: a cross-linguistic study of the syntactic organization of repair. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff & S. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. 185-233.
- Hall, Edward T. 1976. Context and Meaning. *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press. 74-93
- Hayashi, Makoto. 1994. A Comparative Study of Self-Repair in English and Japanese Conversation. In Shoichi Iwasaki, Tsuyoshi Ono, Hongyin Tao, and Hyo Sang Lee (eds.), *East Asian Linguistics* Volume 5. Santa Barbara: University of California at Santa Barbara. 77-93.
- Hubbard, Maki Hirano. 1989. Repetition and Ellipsis in Japanese Conversational Discourse: A Study of the Cognitive Domain of Conversational Interaction. Madison: the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Lebra, Takie. 1987. The cultural significance of silence in Japanese communication. *Multilingua* 6 (4), 343-357.
- Makino, Seiichi. 1982. Japanese Grammar and Functional Grammar. *Lingua* 57, 125-173.
- Makino, Seiichi and Tsutsui, Michio. 1986. A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar. Tokyo: Japan Times.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. Practices and Actions: Boundary Cases of Other-Initiated Repair. *Discourse Processes* 23. 499-545.
- Swerts, M., Koiso, H., Shimojima, A., and Katagiri, Y. 1997. Echoing in Japanese Conversations. *IPO-Annual-Progress-Report* 32, 111-118.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1987. Repetition in Conversation: Toward a Poetics of Talk. *Language* 63:3. 574-605.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, Jean. 2000. Repetition in Conversation: A Look at "First and Second Sayings". *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(4), 407-424.
- 嶋津百代. 2005. 「異言語話者のナラティブを研究する」. 西口光一編『文化と歴史の中の学習と学習者』. 東京: 凡人社. 234-255.
- 牧野成一. 1980. 『くりかえしの文法』. 東京: 大修館.
- 中田智子. 1991. 「会話にあらわれるくり返しの発話」. 『日本語学』 10:10. 東京: 明治書院. 52-62.

日本語の談話における繰り返しの考察

黒川 直子

本稿は日本語の会話に現れる繰り返しの機能や効果を考察したものである。Tannen (1987) はアメリカ英語の会話の分析を通し、会話に現れる繰り返しは単なる冗長な要素ではなく、相互の理解を促し対話における関わりあいを築きあげる機能があると指摘している。日本語の繰り返しに関する過去の研究の多くは統語論に焦点をおいた分析を行っているが、本研究では日常会話においてどのように繰り返しが起こりどのような機能が働いているか調査するため、24名(12ペア)による談話の録音データを発話のタイプにより分類し、分析を行った。調査の結果、会話における繰り返しの頻度の高さとともにコミュニケーションを円滑に進めるための様々な機能が確認された。同じターンの中での繰り返しは強調、言い換えのストラテジーや発話をスムーズに行うためのフィラーとしての使用が見られた。相手の発話の繰り返しはあいづちとしての機能の他に、肯定や同意の意志を表す際に「ええ」や「はい」に代えて相手の発話を繰り返す待遇的使用が見られた。その他に、情報の要求などのスピーチアクトや意味の交渉など、相互に会話を築きあげ発展させる上での機能が確認された。日本語教育の現場でこのような現象について取り上げる機会は少ないが、自然な言語運用能力を伸ばすために適宜指導に織り込んでいくことも有意義であると考えられる。

キーワード

繰り返し 対話 関わりあい 言い換え あいづち