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One of the foundational assumptions of the three-tier model of language use is the distinction between private and public expression. Focusing on the notion of private expression, which is a direct linguistic correlate of the situation construal tier of the three-tier model, I argue that the category of private expression actually enjoys an independent grammatical status both in Japanese and English. Although each of the arguments presented may be exceptional in light of the general grammatical properties of the two languages, this strongly suggests the significance of private expression in the sense that the category is distinguished even in phenomena located at the grammatical periphery.*
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1. Introduction

The three-tier model of language use (see Hirose (2013, this issue) for details) presupposes Hirose’s (1995, 1997) decomposition of the speaker into private and public self and his distinction of linguistic expressions in terms of private and public expression. The private/public distinction of linguistic expressions is so essential for the three-tier model that it is worth reexamining whether the distinction, or the category of private expression in particular, receives any empirical support (for analyses utilizing notions that, though in different terms, basically correspond to private expression, see Kuroda (1973), Masuoka (1991: 76ff.), Nitta (1991: 185ff.), Moriyama
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This paper offers some empirical arguments for the dichotomy in question and argues that the pragmatic category of private as opposed to public expression actually enjoys an independent status and is grammatically significant in Japanese and English. It is also argued that the phenomena to be discussed have certain implications for the three-tier model, especially for its hypothesis that “the unmarked mode of expression is private expression in Japanese and public expression in English” (Hirose (this issue: 127f.)). In the following, I will first give a brief review of Hirose’s (1995, 1997) interrelated notions of private/public self and private/public expression, and then proceed to a discussion of the grammatical significance of private expression and its implications for the three-tier model.

2. The Private/Public Dichotomy of Linguistic Expressions

In any speech event, the speaker makes some recognition of a state of affairs and verbalizes that recognition. Furthermore, the speaker usually (but not always) intends to communicate his/her verbalized recognition to the hearer in that same speech event. The three-tier model of language use captures these two aspects of the speaker by postulating two types of self proposed by Hirose (1995, 1997): private and public self. Private self corresponds to the speaker as a conceptualizer and verbalizer and public self to the speaker as a communicator, the most important difference between the two selves being that the private self is defined without any reference to the hearer and the public self only with reference to the hearer. The private/public decomposition of self is coextensive with what Searle (1983) calls the representing/communication intention held by a self. To quote the relevant part of Searle’s remarks:

1. We need to have a clear distinction between representation and communication. Characteristically a man who makes a statement both intends to represent some fact or state of affairs and intends to communicate this representation to his hearers. But his representing intention is not the same as his communication

---

1 To be more specific, the following notions have been proposed by the previous studies mentioned and correspond to Hirose’s private expression: Kuroda’s (1973) non-reportive style, Masuoka’s (1991) hitaiwabun ‘nondialogic sentence,’ Nitta’s (1991) kikite fuzai hatsuwa ‘utterance without a hearer,’ Moriyama’s (1997) hitorigoto ‘soliloquy,’ and Hasegawa’s (2010) soliloquy. See also Hasegawa (2010: Ch. 1) for a relevant summary.
intention. Communicating is a matter of producing certain effects on one’s hearers, but one can intend to represent something without caring at all about the effects on one’s hearers….

(Searle (1983: 165))

The speaker as private self intends to represent, while the speaker as public self intends to (represent and) communicate (cf. Hasegawa and Hirose (2005)).

Linguistic expressions are accordingly categorized into two types, private and public, depending on which role the speaker plays in a given linguistic act (Hirose (1995, 1997)). Imagine here a situation where someone hits you on the head. In this situation your private self could shout, “Ouch!” while your public self could tell the villain, “Stop it!” Linguistic expressions employed by the speaker as private self (e.g. the interjection Ouch!) function as private expressions, which do not have any communicative intention on the part of the speaker, while those employed by the speaker as public self (e.g. the imperative Stop it!) count as public expressions, ones that do involve a communicative intention on the part of the speaker. Note here that in self-directed speech the speaker is simultaneously the one who speaks and the one who is spoken to; you are playing the dual role of the interrogator and the interrogatee when you ask yourself, “Where am I?” for instance. In such a situation the linguistic expression employed is regarded as a public, not private, expression, even in the actual absence of other individuals than the speaker him/herself.

3. Possible Skepticism about the Grammatical Significance of Private Expression

One might wonder at this point whether the private/public distinction of linguistic expressions, and the notion of private expression in particular, is grammatically significant. It might appear that the grammatical importance of private expression, compared to that of public expression, would not be straightforward. Such skepticism, if any, seems to stem from the following three pieces of “common sense.” First, it is widely assumed, especially in the functional linguistic and developmental psychological traditions (cf. Heine and Kuteva (2007: 319ff.) and Hamada (1999: Ch. 5)), that the main function of language is communication, not expression of thought per se (see also Hasegawa (2010: Ch. 1) for an overview of developmental psychological notions related to the linguistic notion of private expression). This assumption is in sharp contrast with the one held by formalists
in the Chomskyan camp: “language serves essentially for the expression of thought” (Chomsky (1979: 88)).

Second, it is sometimes the case that a given linguistic expression is essentially ambiguous between public and private expression. Consider the following example from Japanese:

(2) Kono koto-wa hayaku wasure-yoo. (Masuoka (1991: 81))
   this thing-Top quickly forget-I.will/let’s
   ‘I must forget about this right away/Let’s forget about this right away.’

The single surface form in (2) is used either as a mere expression of the speaker’s will, a private expression, or the speaker’s suggestion to the hearer(s), a public expression, as pointed out by Masuoka. This is because of the lexical ambiguity inherent in the auxiliary *yoo*.

Third, as Moriyama (1997: 173) claims (see also Hirose (1997, this issue)), linguistic devices ostensively signaling the presence of the communicative intention of the speaker are relatively abundant (e.g. Japanese sentence final particles like *yo* ‘I tell you’ (cf. Ikarashi (2013, 2014)), English and Japanese address terms like *hey* and *oi* ‘hey,’ imperative sentences, etc.), whereas those used to indicate the absence of the speaker’s communicative intention are not.

All these general remarks may appear sufficient to cast doubt on the grammatical significance of private expression. Upon closer scrutiny, however, it becomes evident that the notion of private expression is not a mere taxonomic artifact but counts as an independent pragmatic category in the grammars of Japanese and English, as demonstrated below.

4. The Adjectival Conjugational Ending Drop Construction in Japanese

The grammatical significance of private expression is confirmed most
straightforwardly when it is shown that there exist grammatical constructions which do not have hearer-orientation and are used exclusively as private expressions. There are indeed such cases of functional specialization both in Japanese and English. Interestingly, their existence is verified when we look at the “periphery” (as opposed to the “core”) of the two languages. The phenomena discussed below are “peripheral” in the sense that they involve some grammatical irregularities or idiosyncrasies.

The first case is concerned with the use of Japanese adjectival stems as independent utterances. Japanese is an agglutinative language where adjectival stems, when used as the main predicate of a sentence in the present tense, are normally followed by the conjugational ending -i, which is the morphological realization of present tense:

(3) Heya-ga kitana-i.
    room-Nom dirty-Pres
    ‘This room is dirty.’

In contrast to this general grammatical property, Japanese also has a special construction exemplified by utterances such as the following (Nitta (1991), Sasai (2005), Sugiura (2006), Togashi (2006), Konno (2012), Tateishi (2013), among others):

(4) (Heya) kitanaʔ.
    room dirtyʔ.
    ‘(This room is) dirty.’

This construction, which Konno (2012) calls “the Japanese adjectival conjugational ending drop construction (abbreviated as ‘ACED’),” consists solely of an optional caseless subject NP and an adjectival stem followed by a glottal stop (represented by “ʔ”), and constitutes an independent utterance without any sense of ellipsis.

According to Konno, the ACED construction “expresses” (as opposed to “communicates”) the speaker’s immediate reaction to a given situation in which (s)he is involved at the time of utterance, and is used exclusively as a private expression, unlike unmarked adjectival constructions like the one in (3) (see also Nitta (1991: 195), Sasai (2005), and Togashi (2006), among others, for relevant observations). The pragmatic specialization of the ACED construction and the pragmatic flexibility of the unmarked adjectival construction are demonstrated by the following contrast from Konno (2012: 20, 26):
The ACED utterance Kitanaʔ can function as a direct speech complement to yuu ‘say,’ but not to tsutaeru ‘tell,’ while the unmarked adjectival utterance Kitana-i (yo) as a direct speech complement is compatible with either of the two utterance verbs.

The verb yuu, as with its English counterpart say, simply describes a speech event and remains silent with respect to whether the speaker intends to communicate with the addressee. On the other hand, the verb tsutaeru, like tell in English, entails not merely the existence of a speech event but also that of the speaker’s communicative intention. Thus, in terms of the private/public dichotomy of linguistic expressions, the direct speech complement to yuu (and say) can involve either a private or a public expression, and that to tsutaeru (and tell) must be a public, not private, expression. This shows that the ACED construction functions exclusively as a private expression (and the ordinary adjectival construction functions either as a private or a public expression).

Note that, as pointed out by Yukio Hirose (personal communication), yuu and say can be used as verbs of communication like tsutaeru and tell when they take, or at least imply, indirect objects marked by the dative particle ni ‘to’ and the preposition to. Otherwise, they are used simply in the sense of “utter (or make a sound),” and it is in this use that they allow private expressions as direct speech complements.

Interested readers are referred to Konno (2012) for a comprehensive description of the ACED construction and an iconic motivation for why the functional specialization revealed by (5) and the one discussed in the next section should obtain. Iwasaki (2006: 334), Sugiura (2006), and Togashi (2006) also deal with the ACED construction from different functional perspectives than Konno. I only mention them here without further comment, since the details of their analyses do not have direct bearing upon the discussion in the present paper.
Note in passing that the functional specialization in question does not preclude the use of the ACED construction in the presence of others (see Konno (2012: 22f.) for details). For instance, if you hear the ACED utterance Kitanaʔ, you will inevitably understand that the speaker truly thinks that something is very dirty. This interpretation on the part of the hearer is a secondary effect which derives from using a private expression “in public.” It is thus independent of the ACED construction’s function per se and does not indicate that the ACED construction can also function as a public expression (cf. Searle’s remarks mentioned in Section 2). The private/public nature of a given expression must be determined on the basis of grammatical evidence such as (5).

5. The Mad Magazine Construction in English

There is also an English construction with an exclusively private function. The English case concerns what Akmajian (1984) calls, after a famous American satirical magazine, “Mad Magazine (‘MM’ for short) sentences,” which consist of a subject NP in the default accusative case and a verb in its bare stem form. The MM construction is exemplified by the italicized part of Speaker B’s utterance in the following:

(6)  Speaker A: I hear that John may wear a tuxedo to the ball …
     Speaker B: Him wear a tuxedo?! He doesn’t even own a clean shirt.
     (Akmajian (1984: 3), emphasis mine)

According to Akmajian (1984: 2), the MM construction is “used by speakers to express surprise, disbelief, skepticism, scorn, and so on, at some situation or event.” Here the following question arises in relation to the present discussion: is the MM construction used merely to express such

---

7 Likewise, an anonymous reviewer observes that upon hearing an ACED utterance, the hearer supposes that “the speaker belongs to a certain group of people who are younger, light-hearted and somewhat carefree.” It is not the case that the ACED construction is always interpreted in this way. There are also ACED utterances such as Itaʔ (‘Ouch’) and Atsuʔ (‘Hot’) which are very common and tell nothing about the social and personal characteristics of the speaker.

8 This is similar, for example, to the fact that just because forks can be used to hurt people, that does not alter their function per se (an observation I owe to Yukio Hirose).

9 If the verb is the copula be, it can be omitted leaving its AP, NP, or PP complement behind (e.g. Bronsky (be) clever?! (Akmajian (1984: 5))). For functional differences between MM sentences with and without be, see Akmajian (1984: 5f.). See also Lambrecht (1990) for a Construction Grammar account of the MM construction.
emotions of the speaker or to communicate them? The MM construction exhibits an interesting behavior when embedded in a context similar to the one in (5), as Konno (2012: 28) observes:

(7) Hearing from Tom that Bronsky went to the party in a tuxedo,
    a. Mary said “Him wear a tuxedo?!”
    b. ??Mary told him “Him wear a tuxedo?!”

As with the ACED construction, the MM utterance *Him wear a tuxedo?!!* can function as a direct speech complement to *say*, but not to *tell*. Note here that the verb *tell* itself can take a direct speech complement, as in *When he replied that it was, she told him “Come this way, your auntie wants to have a talk with you”* (The British National Corpus). For the same reason as in the case of (5), the grammatical contrast in (7) shows that the MM construction functions exclusively as a private expression.  

To sum up, the observations on the ACED and the MM constructions have made it clear that both Japanese and English have constructions with an exclusively private function. I conclude from this that the pragmatic category of private as opposed to public expression deserves an independent grammatical status in at least these two languages.

In this regard, one might wonder, as suggested by an anonymous reviewer, whether the ACED and the MM constructions constitute evidence for the grammatical significance of private expression, because they are “peripheral” or “minor” phenomena. It is true that they are exceptional with respect to the general grammatical properties of Japanese and English. The predicate of the ACED construction only contains an adjectival stem without the adjectival conjugational ending –*i*, and the main verb of the MM construction occurs uninflected, irrespective of the grammatical person of the subject and the tense interpretation of the clause as a whole (note that in (7) the party, where Bronsky was in a tuxedo, took place before Mary’s MM utterance). I, however, take this fact to mean that the pragmatic category of private expression has an influence even on the grammatical periphery of

---

10 This is closely related to the fact that the MM construction is a non-finite clause which lacks person and tense marking. As pointed out by Hirose (this issue: Section 3), person and tense marking in every finite clause in English are attributed to the public self. Thus the non-finiteness of the MM construction guarantees that no public self is involved. I thank Yukio Hirose (personal communication) for bringing this connection to my attention.

11 Thus, the ACED and the MM constructions, as argued by Konno (2012, 2013b) and Lambrecht (1990), respectively, are regarded as independent constructions in the Goldbergian (1995: 4, 2006: 5) sense.
the two languages. The importance of peripheral phenomena in considering the general grammatical architecture is, though in different contexts, also emphasized by Fillmore, Kay, and O’Connor (1988) and Culicover and Jackendoff (1999), among others. These considerations lead to the following view: the minor status of the ACED and MM constructions does not weaken but rather strengthens my conclusion.

6. Default Preference Override

The observations in Sections 4 and 5 have certain implications for the three-tier model of language use. Let me briefly review the relevant properties and hypotheses of the three-tier model. According to the three-tier model, language use consists of (i) the situation construal tier, “in which the speaker as private self construes a situation, forming a thought about it,” (ii) the situation report tier, “in which the speaker as public self reports or communicates his construed situation to the addressee,” and (iii) the interpersonal relationship tier, “in which the speaker as public self construes and considers his interpersonal relationship with the addressee” (Hirose (this issue: 123)). In addition, languages are different with respect to how the three tiers are combined; in Japanese the situation construal tier is normally dissociated from the situation report and interpersonal relationship tiers, which are combined, while in English the situation construal and situation report tiers are normally associated to the exclusion of the interpersonal relationship tier (Hirose (this issue: 123–125)). As a consequence of this difference in tier association, Japanese and English show distinct default preferences: “the unmarked mode of expression is private expression in Japanese and public expression in English” (Hirose (this issue: 127f.)).

Given the normal independence of the situation construal tier and the concomitant default preference for private expression in Japanese, the existence of the ACED construction is just expected or fully motivated. For the ACED construction is functionally specialized as a private expression, which can be seen as a direct grammaticalized reflex of the default independence of the situation construal tier in Japanese.

This raises the question of whether English, which, unlike Japanese, normally associates the situation construal and situation report tiers, has any constructions like the ACED construction. My answer has been that the
MM construction is just such a case. What, then, does the MM construction's functional specialization as a private expression mean to the three-tier model, especially to the default preference for public expression in English? I argue that the MM construction instantiates a case of *default preference override*, where the specialized (as in the MM construction) or preferred (see Section 7) pragmatic function of a given construction overrides the general pragmatic tendency of the language. That is to say, the MM construction’s functional specialization indicates that the construction only involves the situation construal tier to the exclusion of the situation report (and interpersonal relationship) tier(s), which can be seen as an override of the default association of the situation construal and situation report tiers in English.

7. The Adverbial Use of the Japanese Adjective *Yabai* ‘Dangerous’

The above characterization of the MM construction suggests that Japanese also allows default preference override, precisely because its preference for private expression is default in nature (see above). Since the situation construal tier is normally dissociated from the situation report and interpersonal relationship tiers in Japanese, Japanese default preference overrides should be observed in linguistic expressions which associate the situation construal tier with the situation report (and interpersonal relationship) tier(s) and normally function as public expressions without overt markers encoding the communicative intention of the speaker. As shown below, there is indeed such a case. Again, it comes from the realm of the periphery.

Our case concerns the Japanese vulgar adjective *yabai* ‘dangerous.’ Some brief background information on *yabai* is in order before we enter into the main discussion (see Sano (2005) for details). *Yabai* is originally used to express a negative evaluation of something by the speaker. Today,

---

12 An anonymous reviewer wonders whether the other two tiers, the situation report and interpersonal relationship tiers, can also be justified independently. Phenomena related exclusively to the interpersonal relationship tier do exist, which is shown clearly by Hirose (this issue: Section 5) in the analysis of English address terms. As for phenomena related solely to the situation report tier, it is predicted that they do not exist; according to the three-tier model, in order for the speaker to report a situation to the hearer, (s)he must first construe that situation (see Section 2 of the present article). Empirical justification for this prediction will be left for future research.

13 The motivation(s) for a given override must be examined case by case, which is, as mentioned in footnote 6, beyond the scope of this paper.
it is also commonly used to express a positive, exactly opposite, evaluation by the speaker. Thus, the example in (8) is interpreted, depending on the context, either negatively or positively:

(8) Kore-wa yabai.
    this-Top dangerous.Pres
    ‘This is bad/good.’

Based on this fact, Sano (2005) characterizes yabai as a degree adjective the nature of whose scale, i.e. positive or negative, is determined contextually. In addition to the usage as a degree adjective, yabai has recently acquired an adverbial usage where it directly modifies another adjective and intensifies the degree of that adjective:¹⁴

(9) Yabai oishii.
    dangerous delicious.Pres
    ‘(This is) very delicious.’

Note that in this usage yabai is not conjugated as yabaku, against the normal usage of Japanese adjectives used adverbially (e.g. {*hayai/hayaku} hashiru ‘run fast’).

Let us return to the discussion of default preference override. To tell the conclusion first, the adverbial yabai represents a case of default preference override in Japanese. The address term nee(-nee) ‘look’ and the sentence final particle yo indicate the existence of the communicative intention of the speaker and hence are markers of public expression (cf. Hirose (1997: 7)). The exclamatory interjection waa ‘wow’ and the exclamatory sentence final particle naa signal the lack of the speaker’s communicative intention and hence are markers of private expression (Hasegawa (2010: 160)). Thus, the combinations nee(-nee) plus yo and waa plus naa are acceptable, while the associations of nee(-nee) with naa and waa with yo sound inconsistent:¹⁵

¹⁴ This situation is similar to, if not the same as, what is the case with the adverbial use of the English adjective wicked (cf. Heine and Kuteva (2007: 326, 334f.)), as exemplified in (i):

(i) He’s a wicked good kid. (Corpus of Contemporary American English)

¹⁵ According to an anonymous reviewer, (10b) sounds acceptable on the reading where the speaker starts with a noncommunicative expression act and then switches to a communicative one.
The adverbial *yabai* can occur with the combination *nee-nee* plus *yo*, as seen in (11a). By contrast, when the sentence contains the combination *waa* plus *naa* with the adverbial *yabai* in between, as in (11b), some speakers (three out of eight informants) accept it, while others (five out of eight informants) do not (the question marks in parentheses in (11b) indicate that speakers’ judgments vary in the sense just described):

(11) a. Nee-nee, kore yabai umai yo.  
    look this dangerous delicious.Pres SFP  
    ‘Look, this is very delicious.’

b. (??)Waa, kore yabai umai naa.  
    wow this dangerous delicious.Pres SFP  
    ‘Wow, this is very delicious.’

Given that *nee-nee* and *yo* lexically render the sentence a public expression and *waa* and *naa* a private expression, the contrast in (11) suggests the following implication: the usage of the adverbial *yabai* as a public expression, as in (11a) (accepted by all the informants), takes precedence over its usage as a private expression, as in (11b) (not accepted by all the informants). This means that the adverbial *yabai* is used as a public expression by default, contrary to the general preference for private expression in Japanese. Thus, the adverbial *yabai* counts as another case of default preference override (see also Hirose (2013: 18–20), Ikarashi (2013, 2014),

---

16 An anonymous reviewer points out that without the sentence final particle -*naa*, (11b) sounds acceptable as a private expression of surprise:

(i) Waa, kore yabai umai!

If so, the unacceptability of (11b) might not necessarily mean that the adverbial *yabai* is a public expression by default, as noted by the reviewer. Example (i) can, however, also be analyzed as involving an utterance break between *waa* and *kore yabai umai* and as consisting of two expression acts, i.e. a private expression of surprise with *waa* and a public expression of evaluation with *kore yabai umai* (cf. footnote 15). It is not possible at present to decide which interpretation of (i) is correct. I will leave this issue for further research.
and Shizawa (this issue) for further cases of default preference override).\(^{17}\)

Adverbials in general cannot be regarded as markers of public expression. Consider the following acceptable examples, where the adjective *sugoi* ‘great’ occurs unconjugated and is used adverbially like *yabai*:

(12) a. Nee-nee, kore sugoi umai yo.

‘Look, this is very delicious.’

b. Waa, kore sugoi umai naa.

‘Wow, this is very delicious.’

Especially of note here is the fact that in the case of the adverbial *sugoi*, even those who do not accept the private adverbial *yabai* in (11b) do accept (12b), where the grammatical context forces *sugoi* to function as a private expression. Thus, just because an adjective can be used adverbially does not mean that it tends to function as a public expression, which supports my characterization of the adverbial *yabai* as a genuine case of default preference override.

A final comment before closing this section: it also seems to be the case that the default preference override in the adverbial *yabai* involves the association of the situation construal tier not only with the situation report tier but also the interpersonal relationship tier. This is because the adverbial *yabai* sounds more vulgar than the adjectival *yabai* to the author, who accepts the latter but not the former. This judgment, if correct, is clearly sociolinguistic in nature and pertains to the interpersonal relationship tier. Given this, an interesting (but yet to be explored) possibility presents itself; that is, in Japanese, where the situation report and interpersonal relationship tiers are normally connected, default preference override always combines all of the three tiers (see also the discussion in Section 5 of Hirose (this issue)). I, however, do not have enough data at present and will leave the investigation of the possibility for future research.

\(^{17}\) See Konno (2013a) for a neo-Gricean motivation for the adverbial *yabai*’s override. Note here that the overrides exemplified by the MM construction and the adverbial *yabai* are not exactly the same: the override is complete in the former, but not in the latter. I merely point out the difference here without further comment.
8. Conclusion

Japanese and English both have grammatical constructions used exclusively as private expressions, which means that the pragmatic category of private as opposed to public expression is grammatically significant in at least these two languages. Hasegawa (2010), independently of the three-tier model of language use, argues for the utility of private expression in linguistic investigation (see also Iwasaki (2006) and Sadanobu (2011) for related discussion). My conclusion lends support to her methodological standpoint.

My conclusion also has a certain implication for one of the general assumptions introduced in Section 3, i.e., that language is used for communication. Hamada (1999: 219), for instance, characterizing language from a developmental psychological perspective, claims that language is dialogic in nature. If my argument is on the right track, it is possible to say that the dialogic nature of language, even if it is true, does not exclude the possibility that language also involves non-dialogic aspects.\(^{18}\) This apparently contradictory situation is easily captured in the three-tier model: the dialogic nature of language is captured by associating the situation construal tier with the situation report (and interpersonal relationship) tier(s), and the non-dialogic nature of language by dissociating the situation construal tier from the situation report and interpersonal relationship tiers.

As argued by Hirose (this issue), in Japanese the situation construal tier is dissociated from the other two tiers by default, while in English the situation construal tier is associated with the situation report tier by default. In relation to these default cases, I have adduced instances of default preference override. As I have shown, though in special circumstances, English allows dissociation of the situation construal tier from the situation report tier, and Japanese allows association of the situation construal tier with the situation report and possibly interpersonal relationship tiers. This means that the relation between the three tiers is both independent and interdependent.

It seems that the kind of investigation offered in this paper is only viable

\(^{18}\) Similar remarks apply to the other two assumptions in Section 3, i.e., that a given linguistic expression is sometimes ambiguous between public and private expression and that linguistic devices used to indicate the absence of the speaker’s communicative intention are sparse. In light of what I have shown in this paper, these assumptions do not diminish the grammatical significance of private expression.
with the notion of private as opposed to public expression. The notion of private expression, as part of the three-tier model, offers a way to approach various linguistic phenomena from a fresh perspective.
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