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1. Introduction
This paper advocates in-depth investigation of soliloquy (i.e. uttering one’s thoughts without addressing anyone) as a new approach in pragmatics research. Language has been recognized as an instrument of communication and thought. The research exploring the former is enormous, and our understanding of various linguistic devices for effective communication has advanced significantly in recent decades. By contrast, exploration of the latter is scarce, with the study of private speech in psycholinguistics a notable exception. Studies of soliloquy provide valuable data for examination of how linguistic structures differ between communicative and non-communicative settings.

Japanese is especially appropriate for this kind of investigation, as its native speakers appear to have a categorical awareness of soliloquy. Speakers of English, by contrast, normally do not have the same clear distinction. For example, when asked whether a phrase such as I see is in dialog or soliloquy, their answers vary considerably. This difference is likely due to the fact that the soliloquy mode of discourse has been grammaticized in Japanese, but not in English. Consequently, soliloquy plays a more significant role in Japanese, although it has pragmatic significance in both languages.

Some researchers consider that speech and thought are always dialogic; that is, the speaking-self and the talked-to-self exist in soliloquy, and they mirror normal conversational exchanges. This idea is consistent with Vygotsky’s (1934/1986) thesis of the social origins of private speech. Even if this is the case, however, there should be profound differences between the two modes of discourse. We can easily speculate, for example, that linguistic politeness is absent in soliloquy because no addressee and, in turn, no face-threatening acts are involved. The information structure of soliloquy inevitably differs from normal, dialogic

---

1 I would like to thank Russell Lee-Goldman and Wesley Leonard for their comments and criticism. This project was supported in part by a grant from the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

1 See Hasegawa (2005) for a discussion on morphosyntactic cues to soliloquy in Japanese.
conversations because the speaker does not have to consider an addressee’s knowledge and perspective. In order to investigate how communicative and non-communicative intentions influence utterances, an experiment was conducted in which soliloquies of native speakers of Japanese were examined. The present study reports a preliminary analysis of these soliloquy data and discusses the findings in order to suggest further directions for research on this topic. The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 provides a brief outline of the research on private speech. Section 3 presents some examples of how soliloquy data have been utilized in previous studies in Japanese linguistics. Section 4 discusses our experiment results and their implications. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Private Speech
The study of soliloquy was originated by Piaget (1923/2002), who observed kindergarten children talking to themselves. For example, a child sitting alone at his table said, “I want to do that drawing, there … I want to draw something, I do. I shall need a big piece of paper to do that” (p.15). He named this phenomenon egocentric speech, arguing that it was due to young children’s cognitive immaturity. That is, while communicating with others, they are unable to take the listener’s perspective into consideration, and thus, their utterances are incomprehensible to others. Children frequently use, for instance, deixis and pronouns without clear referents. However, as the child’s cognitive maturity and social experiences grow, Piaget contends, egocentric speech disappears.

Vygotsky (1934/1986), on the other hand, interpreted the same phenomenon in a totally different manner. For him, the developmental direction is not from egocentric and autistic utterances to social, communicative utterances, as Piaget had claimed, but rather, from social speech to subvocalized inner speech, i.e. to thoughts. In other words, Vygotsky contends, young children often think aloud because they have not yet learned to control their thoughts internally. Today, Vygotsky’s perspective is commonly referred to as private speech, although he himself retained Piaget’s term, egocentric speech. In Vygotsky’s theory, private speech is the link between early socially communicative speech and mature inner speech. He hypothesized that during the early school years, the development of inner speech stabilizes, and, as a consequence, private speech disappears.

Vygotsky contended that private speech serves as a self-guidance and self-direction function; therefore, the frequency of soliloquy should increase significantly when an obstacle is introduced into children’s activities. For example, when a child was ready to draw, he would suddenly find something needed was missing. The child would then try to comprehend and to remedy the situation by talking to himself: “Where’s the pencil? I need a blue pencil. Never mind, I’ll draw with the red one and wet it with water; it will become dark and look like blue” (pp.29-30).

Regarding its formal properties, Vygotsky assumed that as private speech develops into internal thought, it becomes more abbreviated and cryptic. He
speculated that, whereas syntactic constituents are more thoroughly expressed in social speech, inner speech consists solely of predicates because the topic of an utterance (typically encoded as the grammatical subject) is already known to the speaker. Private speech initially is similar to social speech, but it is gradually restructured toward the syntax of inner speech. Although this is certainly a commonsensical hypothesis, it has not been verified by experimental studies (Berk 1992). Feigenbaum (1992) reports that between ages 4 and 8, private speech tends to be more fragmented than social speech, but it does not become increasingly fragmented. Rather, his data show that private speech becomes longer and more complex with increased age.

Gradually, private speech becomes less noticeable. However, this fact does not guarantee that children stop producing it. In our society, private speech is so stigmatized that we may become embarrassed if caught while soliloquizing. Private speech by elderly persons is frequently regarded as an awkward form of self defense against stress or as a sign of withdrawal from the social world (Fry 1992). Most children come to realize this social inhibition and gradually relinquish private speech in the presence of others. Nevertheless, private speech does continue throughout an individual’s lifetime (John-Steiner 1992). It only becomes more challenging for researchers to observe under traditional methods of study in psychology (Diaz 1992).

3. Utility of Soliloquy Data in Linguistics Investigation
What has not been dealt with in private speech research is the fact that although it is addressed to nobody, soliloquy can be intended to be heard by others. That is, soliloquy can be used strategically to convey communicative intention. This is a totally different phenomenon from the type of private speech that embarrasses us if overheard. Hasegawa (forthcoming) recognizes that soliloquy is frequently embedded in Japanese discourse with polite register. For example, in conversation (1), speaker B (a student) normally uses polite forms towards speaker A (her teacher). However, in the last line in (1), she uses a plain form.

(1)  A: *Honto ni eego de wa kuroo shimasu.*
    ‘English sure is a pain in the neck!’
    B: *Eee, honto desu kaa?*
    ‘Oh, really?’

---

2 Wesley Leonard (p.c.) provides the following episode to illustrate how soliloquy is used in English: A customer is in a check-out line late in the evening and a clerk is ringing up the purchases. The clerk declares the total amount, and the customer notices that the clerk has forgotten to scan one item. The customer points this out, and the clerk, who is just finishing a 12-hour shift, shakes his head slightly and without making eye contact with the customer says *I need to go home*. In this case almost everybody would recognize the *I need to go home* as soliloquy, and its significance here is to get the customer to recognize the speaker’s hard work while not directly complaining, which would be inappropriate professionally.
This type of mixture of polite and plain forms is labeled as speech style/level shift (cf. Ikuta 1983). I argue, however, that this is not an instance of speech style shift per se because the utterance is not directly addressed to speaker A. Rather, it is a metapragmatic shift between dialogic and soliloquial discourses. In Japanese, where linguistic politeness has been grammaticized, deference and distancing are predominantly associated together, causing a dilemma for its users when they wish to express intimate exaltation (i.e. deference without distancing). To resolve this problem, insertion of soliloquy into a dialogic discourse is commonly used to index simultaneously these morphosyntactically incompatible affective stances. Soliloquy supposedly expresses one’s private thoughts, and revealing one’s private thoughts is to be interpreted as a sign of trust, loyalty, or psychological closeness. Because such parenthetical soliloquy is embedded in but detached from the dialogic mode of communication, the speaker is able to avoid the risk of changing the speech style from polite to plain, the latter risking being considered disrespectful.

Analyzing language used in non-canonical settings can be inspirational. Therefore, a considerable number of studies have mentioned or made use of soliloquy data, e.g. Kuroda (1979/1992), Nitta (1991), Shinzato (2004). However, to my knowledge, soliloquy has never been treated as a focus of investigation. The present paper aims at stirring up this area of research.

4. Experiment

In order to understand the nature of soliloquy in Japanese, an experiment was conducted. Each of 11 subjects (3 males and 8 females, all native speakers of Japanese) spoke out his/her thoughts for 10-15 minutes while alone in an isolated room. They were instructed not to speak to an imaginary person, but rather, to verbalize forthrightly whatever came to their consciousness. Their soliloquies were recorded on audio tapes and subsequently transcribed. A total of 1,428 utterances and utterance fragments were obtained.3 (Hereafter, the term utterances will be used in this experiment to refer to utterances and utterance fragments.)

A preliminary analysis has revealed several interesting characteristics of soliloquy in Japanese, two of which will be discussed in this paper. First, the feminine speech style, common in casual conversation, occurs rarely in soliloquy. Second, the sentence-final particle ne, considered one of the most salient communicative markers in Japanese, frequently occurs in soliloquy.

3 To determine where the boundary between utterances are located, a procedure was developed based on syntactic considerations, the duration of silence, and intonational contours.
4.1. Gendered Speech Styles

Of the 1,428 utterances obtained in this experiment, 994 were uttered by the 8 female speakers (ages between late 20’s and early 50’s), and 434 were uttered by the 3 male speakers (two in their early 20’s, one in his late 30’s). Out of the 994 female utterances, only 42 (4.2%) involved so-called female language, as summarized in (2). (The numbers in square brackets indicate frequencies of occurrences.)

(2) Female Style Expressions

a. *watashi/atashi* (female 1st person pronoun in casual speech) [12]

> *Watashi* wa anmari nihon ni kaeranai kara …
> ‘Since I don’t go back to Japan so frequently …’

> *Atashi*-tachi mo jikan ga attara ikerun dakedo ne.
> ‘We can go there too if we have time.’

b. *o-NP* (the beautifier prefix *o* + NP) [10]

> Nan te iu *o-hana* nan daroo.
> ‘I wonder what this flower is called.’

> *O-uchi* no naka mo sukoshi katazuketai shi.
> ‘I also want to organize a little inside the house.’

c. NP + *(yo)* ne (sentence-final particle) [9]

> Nandaka minna onaji yoo na **kakko ne**.
> ‘Somehow they all look the same.’

> Nanka shizuka ni shiteru to **ironna oto ga kikoeru no ne**.
> ‘It seems like I can hear various sounds when I remain quiet.’

> *Kotchi de wa are yone.*
> ‘It’s like that here.’

d. *kashira* (sentence-final particle) [5]

> Konshuu wa atsuku naru no **kashira**.
> ‘I wonder if it’s going to be hot this week.’

> Demo amerika no baajon de yomitoren no **kashira**.
> ‘But I wonder if the American version can read it [a DVD].’

e. *wa* (sentence-final particle) [3]

> A, kore da *wa*.
> ‘Oh, this is it.’

f. *soo ne* (interjection) [2]

> Ato wa, **soo ne**, ano hen no seeri shiyoo kana.
> ‘And then, well, I may want to clean there.’

g. *koto* ‘thing’ [1]

> Konaida moratta kiku no hana, maa, yoku motta **koto**.
> ‘How long the chrysanthemums they gave me lasted,’

Male speakers in this experiment used gendered speech in their soliloquies slightly more frequently than female speakers did, although the current sample population of 3 is too small to make any reliable generalizations. The number of occurrences of male style expressions is 32, or 13.4%, of the total of 238 male
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utterances.

(3) Male Style Expressions
   a. *ore* (male 1st person pronoun)
      \[\text{Ore mo shodoo wa kirai da shi.}\]
      \[\text{‘I don’t like calligraphy either.’}\]
   b. Vowel Coalescence
      \[\text{Aa, maguro ga kuitee. (\textless{} kuitai)}\]
      \[\text{‘I want to eat tuna.’}\]
      \[\text{Mendokusee naa. (\textless{} mendokusai)}\]
      \[\text{‘It’s troublesome.’}\]
   c. *yona* (sentence-final particle)
      \[\text{Chanto haitteru yonaa.}\]
      \[\text{‘I hope it’s been recorded okay.’}\]
   d. Suppletion
      \[\text{Kono gurai dekai tsukue ga hoshii. (\approx{} ookii)}\]
      \[\text{‘I want a big desk like this.’}\]

Women’s soliloquies rarely contained feminine style expressions, cf. (4-5). The forms in bold face in (4-5) are traditionally labeled as masculine forms (e.g. Mizutani & Mizutani 1987, McGloin 1991), or what Okamoto (1997) refers to (with scare quotes) as “moderately masculine” sentence-final forms.

(4) \[\text{A, ano, hawai ni atta zenmai mo oishikatta nee. Chotto nihon no, nihon de te ni hairu zenmai to chotto chigaun da kedo, ano zenmai oishikatta nee.}\]
\[\text{Aa, demo, hawai de ichiban oishikatta no wa, aaaa, hawai no papaiya. Sorekara mango. Nee, hawai de toreru mango tabetai naa. Un, maa, papaiya wa kotchi demo, ma, mekishiko-san no papaiya dattara te ni hairu kedo, yappa, chotto chigaun da yonee.}\]
\[\text{‘That flowering fern I ate in Hawaii was also delicious. It’s a little different from the flowering fern we can buy in Japan, but it was delicious. But the most delicious foods in Hawaii were papayas. And mangoes. I want to eat a mango from Hawaii. Yes, we can buy papayas from Mexico here, but they are a little different.’}\]

\[\text{‘Pottery … I made only some when I was in elementary school, during summer camps. I guess I’m not exposed to art nowadays. Oh, I went to a museum. When was that? Two weeks … it was three weeks ago. That’s right. We went there when they visited us.’}\]

It is odd to say that women normally soliloquize in male speech. Therefore, these
forms should not be labeled as gendered forms at all.

It is by now widely agreed upon that no direct indexing between linguistic form and gender exists. Ochs (1993) contends that linguistic forms can directly index their pragmatic meanings and indirectly index certain contextual information. For example, she considers the so-called feminine sentence-final particle wa to not directly index femininity. Rather, it directly indexes affective stance of delicate intensity and, in turn, indirectly indexes gender and gender images.

Subscribing to Ochs’ indirect indexicality, Okamoto (1997) points out that Ochs’ formulation lacks an explicit mechanism relating the pragmatic meaning of a linguistic form to social, contextual information. Okamoto argues that the selection of indexical expressions is a strategy based on the speaker’s consideration of multiple social aspects of the context and on his/her linguistic ideology (i.e. beliefs and attitudes concerning language use). Women sometimes use “masculine” forms not because they want to sound stereotypically masculine, but because the directness or assertiveness (i.e. the pragmatic meanings) of such forms indirectly indexes intimacy rather than roughness or the absence of femininity.

I certainly agree that ideologies influence selection of linguistic forms. However, I do not believe that selection of forms in soliloquy is strategically made. Without explicit evidence showing a conscious use of such forms, it is more reasonable to interpret our experimental data in such a way that at a subconscious level, female speakers do not consider these forms as masculine at all. Rather, they are unmarked, default forms for women to use when freed up by soliloquy. This is an interesting issue to explore further in future research.

4.2. Sentence-Final Particles
Sentence-final particles appear very frequently in soliloquy. The following table summarizes the occurrences of 10 such particles. As can be seen, more than 50% of all utterances in our experimental data ended in one of these particles.

It has been recognized widely that the particle na can occur in soliloquy (e.g. Inoue 1972, Cheng 1987). Our data confirm this attribute (cf. (6) below). The total number of occurrences of na, kana, and yona combined is 381, appearing in 27% of all utterances.

---

4 Okamoto (1997:808) cautions that Japanese women’s language is “a constructed category based on … the idealized speech style of traditional women in the upscale Yamanote area of Tokyo. It is what ‘proper’ women are expected to use. It is thus class-based and normative, representing the hegemonic linguistic and gender ideology.” Therefore, she reports, most of her subjects do not use such language in daily conversations; rather, they normally use the “moderately masculine” speech style (“default speech style” in my terminology). By contrast, according to my casual observation, the female subjects of the present experiment do not use the “moderately masculine” speech style often in dialogic conversations.

5 If other final particles, e.g. –kke, kashira, kedo are included, the percentage is even higher.
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(6) (S: subjects; TU: total utterances; TP: total particles; T: total occurrences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>ne</th>
<th>ka</th>
<th>kana</th>
<th>kane</th>
<th>yone</th>
<th>yona</th>
<th>ya</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>wa</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surprising in these data is the frequent use of *ne*. When combined with *kane* and *yone*, it occurs 269 times, or in 19% of all utterances. Examples of *ne* can be found in (4). The utterances in (7) exemplify *kane* and *yone*. (Many of the tokens of these particles in the data are a variant with vowel lengthening.)

(7) *De, tashika, are wa aipotto to chigatte, eezoo o, nanka, ga utsushidaserun da kedo, waityaresu nan da yonee. Buruutsusu ka nanka tsukatten no kanaa. Sugoi yonee. Demo maa, saikin no tekunoroji wa sugoi kedo, takai no ga tama ni kizu da yonee. Kono deru no doo nano kanee. Takasoo da yonee.*

‘Then, I think that one can project images, but unlike iPod, it’s wireless. I wonder if it uses Bluetooth or something. That’s awesome. Recent technologies are fabulous but prices are too high. That’s the problem. I wonder how this Dell works. It certainly looks expensive.’

The frequent occurrences of *ne* was unpredicted because *yo* and *ne* are always characterized in terms of information sharing between the speaker and the addressee. That is, these particles are believed to occur only in the presence of an addressee. *Yo* is said to be used when the speaker considers the information to be novel to the addressee or known but outside the addressee’s current awareness. By contrast, *ne* is said to be used when the speaker believes that the information is known to the addressee, and its supposed function is to request confirmation or to seek or show agreement. These usages of *ne* are exemplified below (Ohso 1986):

(8) A: *Kyoo wa kinyoobi desu ne.* (requesting confirmation)

‘Today is Friday, isn’t it?’

B: *Ee, soo desu.*

‘Yes, that’s right.’

(9) A: *Kyoo wa kinyoobi desu ne.* (seeking agreement)

‘Today is Friday, isn’t it?’
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B: Soo desu ne. Yatto isshuukan owarimashita ne. (showing agreement)
‘Yes. Finally, the week is over.’

To my knowledge, none of the previous works recognize that *ne* can occur in the absence of an addressee. Our soliloquy data include abundant tokens of *ne* and suggest that the essential function of *ne* is independent of the alleged (speaker’s assumption of) shared knowledge with the addressee.

One might argue that the subjects of our experiment actually split themselves into the speaking-self and the spoken-to-self and performed pseudo conversations. If that were the case, the absence of *yo* would call for explanation. One might then argue that all information in soliloquy is necessarily accessible to both selves of the speaker, so that the use of *yo*, which typically marks unshared information, is unnatural. However, as mentioned earlier, *yo* need not mark new information. For example, one would say to a Japanese person, *omae wa nihon-jin da yo* ‘you are a Japanese’. This kind of remark is a reasonable occurrence in soliloquy, yet such utterances are completely absent in our data.

The only hitherto proposed analysis that can be extended to accommodate *ne* in soliloquy is Takubo and Kinsui’s (1997) discourse management model. Although still assuming that *ne* is used only in the presence of an addressee (Kinsui & Takubo 1998), they attempt to explain its function without recourse to addressee’s knowledge. They posit a cognitive interface between speech forms and the speaker’s knowledge, consisting of two psychological domains: the direct experience domain (*D-domain*) and the indirect experience domain (*I-domain*). These domains contain indices, or pointers, to the data in the speaker’s permanent memory. As the name suggests, the *D-domain* contains indices to information obtained by direct experience. As such, each item in the *D-domain* can theoretically be described in indefinitely many ways. For example, I can describe my mother by her physical appearance, age, predispositions, interests, skills, health, etc. By contrast, the *I-domain* contains data points whose information is obtained by indirect means, e.g. via hearsay or inference. Such data in the *I-domain* are inevitably conceptual, or linguistic; i.e. information conveyed by some communicative means. For example, if you say to me *My high-school friend Alice called me yesterday*, I acquire the knowledge that a person named Alice, who went to the same high school as you did, telephoned you yesterday, but nothing more.

Takubo and Kinsui claim that the act of speaking is to manipulate indices in both domains by means of registering, searching, computing, inferring, etc. At the beginning of discourse, information regarding the discourse situation (direct experience) and general information which the speaker considers relevant to the coming discourse is stored in the *D-domain*. For the purpose of each discourse, an *I-domain* is constructed. The speaker may interpret information in the *D-domain* into conceptual terms and store it in the *I-domain*.

---

*6 It is the indices that are stored in the *D-domain*, but for the sake of exposition, the idea is simplified and stated as if information itself is stored in the *D-domain*.**
Takubo and Kinsui contend that sentence-final particles are directives or monitoring devices in information processing on the part of the speaker. Therefore, they do not rely on assumed knowledge held by the addressee. When the addressee hears such a device, however, s/he can infer the ongoing progress of the speaker’s internal information processing and can plan or make an appropriate move. In their analysis, the essential function of *ne* is *matching* of information between two sources. These two sources may be knowledge obtained from two different persons, or different data points within a single person. For example, they explain conversation (10) as follows: speaker B first looks at her watch and finds that the little hand is pointing to 7, and then she judges that her watch is accurate so that what it tells is the correct time.

(10) A: *Nan-ji desu ka.*
    ‘What time is it?’
→ B: *Eeto, shichi-ji desu ne.*
    ‘It’s seven o’clock’

This explanation captures well the different nuances between the utterances with and without *ne* in (10). Without *ne*, the utterance would merely indicate that the time is 7:00 AM or PM, without implying any type of computation or confirmation on the part of the speaker.

If no matching between two sources is involved, the use of *ne* is anomalous, e.g.:

(11) #*Watashi no namae wa tanaka desu ne.*
    ‘My name is Tanaka.’

This idea of matching, or concordance, seems to apply to most occurrences of *ne* in soliloquy. *Ne* occurs frequently with such adverbials as *yappa/yappari* ‘as expected, of course’ and *naruhodo* ‘reasonable, that explains why something is in such a state’, which indicate that the speaker has compared the current situation with a piece of information in his/her permanent memory.

(12) a. *Demo, yappa, zasshi-tte nihon no zasshi no hoo ga ii nee.*
    ‘But yeah, with magazines, Japanese ones are better.’

b. *Hee, naruhodo ne.*
    ‘Oh, that makes sense.’

Furthermore, 70 out of 141 occurrences of *ne* follow *shi, mono, or kara* and indicate some sort of reasoning.

    ‘I never really talk to myself. And I have a roommate too — in the
same room, so …’
b. *Natsuyasumi gurai da mon ne, soo iu koto dekin no.*
   ‘It’s only during summer vacation I can do things like that, so …’
c. *A, soo ieba, bairo shinaito naa. Kane nai kara nee.*
   ‘Oh, that reminds me, I’ve got to work. Since I don’t have money.’

Takubo and Kinsui’s contention that *ne* is a monitoring device for the speaker, rather than for the addressee seems valid. However, they also consider *yo* to work in a similar way, which our data do not support. The complete absence of *yo* in soliloquy implies that *yo* is a communicative device, not a self monitoring one. Again, a fact that awaits further investigation.

5. **Concluding Remarks**

Following a brief introduction to the study of private speech in relation to soliloquy, this paper has analyzed experimentally-obtained soliloquy data and discussed two issues. First, our data contradict the traditional characterization of gendered speech styles. When such a framework is applied to our data, an incongruous conclusion is inevitable: women normally soliloquize in the “masculine” speech style. Consequently, this paper suggests that those so-called masculine forms should be reconsidered as gender neutral.

Second, both sentence-final particles *yo* and *ne* have traditionally been described only in terms of information sharing or lack thereof between the speaker and the addressee. In our data, *yo* is completely absent, whereas *ne* appears frequently. This fact suggests that these two particles should be characterized on different grounds.

The purpose of the present paper is to promote investigation of soliloquy. Needless to say, the primary function of language is to communicate with other people. However, language is also used to “communicate” with one’s self. Soliloquy provides a cornucopia of precious data accessible for a variety of linguistic investigations that deserve attention.
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