QUOTATIVE TOPIC MARKERS IN JAPANESE
by
Satoko Suzuki

This paper examines quotative topic markers in Japanese. They are used when the speaker is detached from the topic or when s/he presents the topic as if it were detached from himself/herself. More specifically, they are used when the topic has just been introduced to the discourse, when the addressee is expected to be more familiar with the topic, or when the topic is recaptured in a new light. In these contexts the speaker signifies, by using quotative topic markers, that the topic represents an entity that is not well incorporated into the speaker's system. Quotative topic markers are appropriate in expressing such conceptual non-incorporation since what is quoted is a grammatically and semantically non-integrated part of a sentence. In addition, the metalinguistic nature of a quotative marker contributes to its emotive effects.

1. Introduction

As has been discussed extensively in the literature (e.g., Mikami 1960; Maynard 1994), the topic-comment relation is prominent in Japanese. The majority of earlier research on topic-marking has focused on the postpositional particle *wa* (e.g., Mikami 1960; Kuno 1972, 1973; Maynard 1980; Hinds, Maynard and Iwasaki 1987). Issues surrounding other morphological markers of topic received much less attention.

However, more recently, scholars have started to examine in detail quotative topic markers – postpositional particles which contain references to quotation (e.g., Niwa 1994; R. Suzuki 1999; Park 2002; Maynard 2002). This paper attempts to provide a comprehensive study of how and why quotative topic markers are used. Most of the discussion will center around the most frequently used quotative topic maker, *tte*, but I will also discuss related expressions, *to wa* and *to iu no wa*.

tte is often considered to be a colloquial version of *wa*. However, speakers seem to differentiate *tte* from *wa* in their usage. For example, in a children's story (Ootomo 1987), five year old Taroo is jealous of his baby sister Megumi. The book is written from Taroo's perspective and discusses how his mother seems to favor Megumi (e.g., the mother spoonfeeds Megumi, but Taroo has to feed himself). Each page has a

description of this 'inequity' and ends with the same sentence, *Megumi wa ii na* 'Megumi is enviable'. After several pages like this, Taroo discovers that while he was breastfed as a baby, Megumi is not. This page ends with *Megumi tte kawaisoo* 'Megumi is pitiable'. *Wa* is repeatedly used in each page to mark the topic, Megumi, except for the last page on which a new discovery is made about Megumi. Here, the topic marker used is *tte*. In this way, the speaker makes a distinction between *wa* and *tte* in the same discourse. There are also contexts in which *tte* occurs but not *wa* and vice versa, which I will discuss later.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 gives an overview of the origins and related functions of *tte, to wa* and *to iu no wa*. It also surveys previous research on these topic markers. Section 3 describes in detail various contexts in which these markers are used. Section 4 summarizes the contexts and explores why quotative topic markers are used in these diverse contexts. The notion of detachment, significance of quotation, and emotivity are explained in this section. Section 5 discusses implications for future studies.

The data for this study are taken from a variety of sources such as taped conversations, transcribed *taidan* (dyadic conversations which take place in public settings), web pages, novels, essays, children's books, and magazine articles. The sources are mentioned at the end of each example and at the end of the paper (in **Data**). No mention of the source at the end of an example means that it is taken from a collection of taped conversations. The collection includes six dyadic conversations among undergraduate students who were enrolled in a Japanese university at the time of the recording. Proper names found in the conversational data have been altered to ensure anonymity. Other researchers' data are used as well. I provided the translations from Japanese to English.

2. Background

Morishige (1954) and Tanaka (1977) describe *tte* as having come from *to itte* 'saying that'. *To* is a quotative particle while *itte* is the non-finite form of the verb *iu* 'say'. The construction *[X] to itte* is typically used for

quotation in which [X] represents what somebody presumably says/said as in the following example.

(1) *Daisan tanjoo o umaku   togeru kotsu wa, 'Koko wa omae*
     third   birth OB[1] successfully achieve key TP   here TP you
     no   uchi   de, kaeru tokoro da yo.   Itsudemo kaette-kite   ii
     GN home CP return place CP IP whenever return-come fine
     n   da kara ne'. **to itte** *dasu   koto desu.*
     NM CP so   IP   CM say put-out thing CP
     'The key to successfully achieving the third birth is to **say** "This is your home and the place for you to return to. You can come home any time" and send your child off.' (Saito and Hisada 1999:16)

tte is also considered as coming from *to te* (the combination of a quotative particle and a connecting particle). An example of *to te* is given below.

(2) *Tachine* **to**   **te**, *zuzu   torikaeshite.*
     leave   CM   and beads retrieve
     'While **saying** "Leave", she retrieved her beads.' (Sei Shoonagon)

Both [X] *to te* and [X] *to itte* can also be used to introduce a name. Niwa (1994) speculates that the origin of the thematic function of *tte* may be paratactic sentences in which *to te* was used to introduce a name. In Modern Japanese *to itte* can have the same function as in (3).[2]

(3) *Ano hito   wa Yamada-san   * **to itte**, *kono machi no*
     that person TP <name>-Mr./Ms. CM say this town GN
     choonai-kai-choo   desu.
     neighborhood-association-president CP
     'He is **called (said)** Mr. Yamada and is the president of the neighborhood association in this town.' (Niwa 1994:104)

The function of the form *tte* is not limited to the marking of a topic. It has various other functions such as the marking of a complement

(example (4)) and expressing interactional meanings in an utterance-final position (example (5)).[3] Most commonly, *tte* follows a quote as in the following examples.

(4) *De ima wa katsuji yori eezoo no jidai na n da **tte**,*
and now TP letter than image GN era CP NM CP CM
aitsu tsune ni itte-ru shi.
he always AV is-saying and
'And he is always saying, "This is the age of visual image rather than that of printed letters".'

(5) *Sasaki no senyoo-sha o moo ichidai katte-morau **tte**.*
<name> GN private-use-car OB more one receive-buy IP
'(Sasaki's friend was saying) Sasaki will have them buy one more car for his private use.'

As this overview of the origins and related functions of *tte* makes clear, the notion of quotation is an important element in understanding *tte*. The same can be said about other quotative topic markers. *To wa* is a combination of *to* (a quotative particle) and *wa* (a topic marker). *To iu no wa* is composed of *to*, *iu*, *no* (a dependent pronoun[4]), and *wa*. I will discuss the significance of quotation later.

Many publications concerned with topic-marking extensively discuss functions of the well-known and more generic topic marker *wa* and simply list *tte*, *to wa*, and *to iu no wa* as additional topic markers. There are some exceptions. Niwa (1994) elaborates on Takubo's (1989) description of *tte* as a 'meta-form', a linguistic form which points only to the name (form) of the linguistic sign, and suggests two main functions: echoic presentation of words and redefinition of topics. He also discusses *to wa* and *to iu no wa*. S. Suzuki (1996) compares *tte* with *to iu no wa*, and notes that the former tends to be used when the topic falls within the addressee's 'territory of information' (Kamio 1990, 1997).

Recently, there have been attempts to analyze *tte* in terms of its expressive functions. R. Suzuki (1999) observes that there is a sense of unfamiliarity with the topic entity when *tte* is used. Park (2002) focuses on *tte* which follows personal pronouns, and notes that a sense of unexpectedness is present. Maynard (2002) observes that it emotes

contradictory feelings of 'closeness' and 'distance'. Although these studies are insightful and instructive, they only tell partial stories of these topic markers. In the next two sections I hope to give comprehensive descriptions of how they are used and to offer plausible explanations for such uses.

3. Descriptions

In this section I will discuss four major contexts in which *tte* is used. I will also discuss *to wa* and *to iu no wa* at the end.

3.1. Echoic topic

Perhaps the topic marker *tte* is most commonly associated with this usage. See the following examples.

(6) A: *Kono mondai wa genomu no koozoo kara kangaeta*
this problem TP genome GN structure from thought
hoo-ga-ii na.
had-better IP
'As for this problem, you had better think about the structure of the genome first.'
B: *Genomu tte nani?*
genome TP what
'Genome, what is it?' (Niwa 1994:28)

(7) A: *Kinoo Nori to okonomiyaki tabete-tee,*
yesterday <name> with <food name> was-eating
'Yesterday I was eating okonomiyaki with Nori,'
B: *Nori tte ano kite-ru hito?*
<name> TP that is-coming person
'Nori, is she the person who is (often) coming (here)?'

In these examples, speaker B repeats what speaker A said in the immediately preceding utterance and uses that as the topic of his/her

utterance. The topic is marked with *tte*. This use of *tte* directly reflects *tte*'s original function of quotation. The conversational partner's phrase is echoed (quoted) using *tte*. Takubo (1989) describes such usage of *tte* as the 'meta-use' of a linguistic form. He theorizes that there are three elements that constitute a linguistic sign: the name (the form), the semantic properties, and the referent. The meta-use refers to the use of linguistic forms that point only to the name of the linguistic sign. In the above examples, speaker B does not know the semantic properties or the referent of a certain phrase used by speaker A. Speaker B repeats the phrase and asks for the meaning or the referent. The *tte*-marked phrases point to the name of the linguistic signs.

As Maynard (2002) points out, the topic marker *tte* may mark the addressee's utterance as a whole as in the following example.

(8)　A:　*Moteta?*
　　　　　popular
　　　　　'Were you popular?'
　　　B:　*Un?*
　　　　　uh
　　　　　'Uh?'
　　　A:　*Otoko ni.*
　　　　　man　to
　　　　　'(Were you popular) among men?'
　　　B:　*Sore **tte** shinpaishitekureten no*?
　　　　　that TP worry-give　　　NM
　'Does that mean you are worried about me?'　(Maynard 2002:176)[5]

Sore in speaker B's last statement refers to speaker A's preceding utterance as a whole. This is a case of extended meta-use. Rather than echoing specific linguistic expressions, the topic refers to the linguistic act of the addressee. Instead of pointing out the lack of knowledge in semantic property or referent of a particular phrase, the speaker asks for information on the addressee's intention behind the linguistic act. This is related to the prototypical echoic use since the speaker is referring to the addressee's utterance and soliciting information about it.

3.2. The addressee's exceeding familiarity with the topic entity

The following examples illustrate the second usage. This use has not received much attention in the analyses of quotative topics.

(9) A: *Umareta no wa sanfuranshisuko.*
         born   PN TP San-Francisco
         'The place I was born is San Francisco.'

     B: *Aa, soo   na   n   desu ka. Jimii-san tte nisei*
         oh that CP NM CP IP   Jimmy   TP second-generation
         janai   n   deshoo?
         Not-CP NM TG
         'Is that so? You are (lit. Jimmy is) not second-generation Japanese, right?'

(10)   *Kodomo tte yappari   kawaii?*
         child   TP after-all adorable
         'Children, are they adorable after all?' (Kanai 1995:302)

In (9), the topic phrase refers to the addressee and is marked with *tte.* (10) is a question asked by somebody who does not have children. It is addressed to the speaker's sister who does; *tte* marks *kodomo* 'children'. In both of these examples the addressee is expected to be more familiar with the entity encoded by the *tte*-marked phrase. This use of *tte* is similar to the first function (in which what the addressee said is echoed) in that the speaker may consider entities encoded by the *tte*-marked topic phrases as belonging more to the addressee than to him-/herself.

3.3. Recaptured topic (1)

In this usage, which Niwa (1994:34) calles *torae naoshi shudai* 'recaptured topic', the entity encoded by the topic is recaptured from a new[6] perspective. The sentence represents what the speaker newly thought of or discovered about the topic. It often represents something

unexpected by the speaker. The use of *tte* from the children's book in Section 1, above is an example of this usage. In another children's book (Kimura 1995), a child is complaining about his father, who is inactive and does not play with him very often. To describe the father, he says *Papa **wa** nemutte bakari* 'Papa is always sleeping'. Note that *wa* is used as the topic marker. From the speaker's point of view, the sentence does not represent any new discovery. The topic is not recaptured from a new perspective. In the story, the father eventually decides to play with the son and turns out to be great fun. After this surprising turn of events, the son says *Papa **tte** daaisuki* 'Papa, I love him very much'. This time the topic (the father) is recaptured in a new light and is marked with *tte*. As this example shows, something unexpected or surprising about the topic is stated. Other examples of the same usage follow.

(11) *Soo na n   desu ka. Sekkyoosareru   oya   **tte** kodomo no*
      so CP NM CP IP   be-admonished parent TP child   GN
      jiritsu   ni wa   ii   n   desu ne.
      independence for TP good NM CP IP
      'Is that so? Parents who get admonished are good for the independence of their children, aren't they?' (Saito and Hisada 1999:33)

(12) *Hee! Nani, Yamashita **tte** kekkoo sori-ga-awanai   no, ja.*
      really what <name> TP well   not-get-along NM then
      'Really! What, Yamashita doesn't get along (with him) well, then.'

In the above examples expressions such as *soo na n desu ka* 'is that so?', *hee!* 'really!', and *ja* 'then' confirm that the speaker finds the information expressed in the sentence to be surprising.[7]

3.4. Recaptured topic (2)

The fourth usage is similar to the third. The difference is that the topic is recaptured for the sake of the addressee. The speaker is often more familiar with the topic than the addressee is. The sentence represents

information about the topic that is unfamiliar or unexpected for the addressee.

(13) *Soreni tsuri no sekai* **tte** *daigaku no taiiku-kai mitai ni*
and fishing GN world TP university GN athletic-club like AV
nenkoo joretsu na n desu yo.
seniority hierarchy CP NM CP IP
'And the world of fishing is hierarchical in terms of seniority like athletic clubs in universities.' (Murata et al. 1988:22)

The speaker of (13) is an expert in fishing and is being interviewed on public radio. The topic of the utterance *tsuri no sekai* 'the world of fishing' clearly falls within the speaker's expertise. She is explaining something with which she is more familiar than the addressee is.

The speaker does not necessarily have to be more familiar with the topic in this usage. If the sentence represents information that is unfamiliar or unexpected for the addressee, *tte* can mark the topic, as shown in (14). This example is taken from a magazine article about marriages in which a wife is older than a husband. One of the interviewed wives utters (14). Even though the topic *nenrei* 'age' is a neutral entity, the whole utterance expresses an idea that goes against the conventional wisdom that maturity correlates with age and therefore is considered by the speaker to be a piece of unexpected information for the addressee (the interviewer and/or readers of the article).

(14) *Nenrei* **tte** *zenzen kankei nai desu yo.*
age TP at-all relation not-exist CP IP
'Age does not have anything to do with it (how mature one is).' (Kobayashi and Yamashita 1995: 227).

Note that in both (13) and (14), the speakers use the utterance-final particle *yo*, which is often associated with the interactional function of presenting new information for the addressee (e.g., Makino and Tsutsui 1986; Maynard 1990).[8]

The notion of 'recapturing the topic' mentioned in this section and the previous one is somewhat elusive, but examples constructed by Niwa (1994) to compare *tte* and *wa*[9] may illuminate the usage.

(15) A: *Taroo   wa masutaa no ninen-me   datta kke.*
           <name> TP Master   GN second-year CP   IP
           'Is Taroo in his second year of his Master's?'
      B1: *Ee, soo desu.   Taroo ?**tte**/**wa** shuushi no*
           yes right CP   <name>   TP   Master GN
           nikaisei   desu
           second-year-student CP
           'Yes, that's right. Taroo is a second year student in the Master's program.' (Niwa 1994:41)

In this exchange, speaker B merely repeats (albeit with some rephrasing) in the comment what speaker A said in the question. In such a context no recapturing or redefining of the topic takes place and thus the use of *tte* is not appropriate. However, if speaker B's answer betrays speaker A's expectation as in (16), the use of *tte* is acceptable. The topic *Taroo* is recaptured in new light for the sake of the addressee.

(16) A: *Taroo   wa masutaa no   ninen-me   datta kke.*
           <name> TP Master GN second-year CP   IP
           'Is Taroo in his second year of his Master's?'
      B2: *Ie ie.   Taroo **tte/wa** moo   dokutaa desu yo.*
           no no <name> TP   already doctor CP IP
           'Oh no. Taroo is already a doctoral student.' (Niwa 1994:41)

Lastly, it is possible for a topic to be simultaneously echoic and recaptured, as in the following example.

(17) A: *Moo   kondo no   kinyoobi ni nyuuyooku e itchau n da   tte nee.*
           already next GN Friday on New-York to go NM CP QT
           IP
           'I hear that he is going to New York next Friday.'

B: *Kinyoo!?*
    Friday
    'Friday!'
A: *E?? Chigatta!?*
    what wrong
    'What? Am I wrong?'
B: *Kinyoo **tte** … hayasugiru yo!*
    Friday TP   too-early IP
    'Friday, that is too early!' (Maynard 2002:172)[10]

In (17), *tte* marks *kinyoo* 'Friday', which is echoed from the addressee's preceding utterance. The topic also serves as a recaptured topic.

3.5. *to wa* and *to iu no wa*

Other quotative topic markers related to *tte* (*to wa* and *to iu no wa*) can be used in similar contexts. *to wa* is the most formal of the three. It could occur in the first two contexts discussed above. However, since these contexts tend to involve conversational exchange, the occurrence of the formal *to wa* is limited. When the topic is recaptured or (re)defined in a formal setting, *to wa* is used as shown in the following example.

(18) *Kyoosan-shugi-sha no iu puroretaria no dokusai   **to wa** jitsu*
     communists   SB say proletariat GN dictatorship TP reality
     wa kyoosan-too   no dokusai   dearu.
     TP communist-party GN dictatorship CP
     'The dictatorship of the proletariat that communists talk about is really the dictatorship of the communist party.' (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo 1951:106)

to iu no wa is often considered to be a more formal equivalent of *tte*. It can occur in all four contexts discussed above. Some examples are given below:

(19) A: *Kimi mo bochibochi nengu   no osame-doki   janai no.*
you also soon   land-tax GN time-to-pay TG NM
'Isn't it about time for you to pay the land tax?'

     B: *Nengu   no osame-doki* **to iu no wa**, *doo iu imi   da.*
land-tax GN time-to-pay TP   how say meaning CP
'Time to pay the land tax, what do you mean?' (Takubo 1989:226)

(20)   *Kodomo* **to iu no wa**, *otoosan   ga kigen warukattari-suru-to,*
children TP   father   SB mood if-bad
jibun ga warui n   da mitai ni   omoimasu yo.
self SB bad NM CP like AV think   IP
'Children, they think it is their fault when their father is in a bad mood.' (Saito and Hisada 1999:35)

In (19), the *to iu no wa*-marked phrase is used to echo what the addressee has just said. In (20), the topic is recaptured in a new light for the sake of the addressee. The speaker is a psychiatrist who has been dealing with issues of child abuse. He assumes that the addressee is less familiar with the topic and expects her to be surprised by the information presented in the sentence.

    to iu no wa is not always interchangeable with *tte*, as the following example constructed by Niwa (1994) illustrates.

(21) *Taroo* **tte/?to iu no wa** *makudonarudo   de baitoshiteru*
<name> TP   McDonald   at is-working-part-time
n   da tte
NM CP QT
'I hear that Taroo is working part-time at McDonald's.' (Niwa 1994:39)

Niwa (1994) attributes the unacceptability of *to iu no wa* to the transitory nature of the comment. The content of the comment (the topic referent is working part-time at a fast food restaurant) likely refers to a temporary state. The original lexical meaning of [X] *to iu no wa* 'the one that is called [X]' may require that the comment part be a more

categorizing information about the topic than merely indicating a transitory state of affairs.

to iu no wa also cannot replace *tte* if the preceding noun phrase is a nominalized clause, as shown below.

(22) *sonna   fuu ni shinpuru ni   hitotsu no mokuhyoo ni mukatte-iku*
      that-kind way AV simple AV one GN goal   to go-towards
      *no **tte/?to iu no wa** , ningen o   sugoku genki   ni shite- kureru*
      NM TP   human OB very   energetic AV give-make
      n   desu.
      NM CP
      'Going towards one goal in a simple way like that, that makes one feel very energetic.' (Higuchi 1999)

to iu no wa in (22) becomes acceptable if the nominalizer *no* is removed. The above two examples show that *tte* and *to iu no wa* are not necessarily functionally equivalent.

4. Discussion

4.1. Detachment

The following is a summary of the contexts in which the quotative topic markers, *tte*, *towa*, and *to iu no wa* are used.

[1]   when the topic has just been introduced to the discourse;
[2]   when the addressee is expected to be more familiar with the topic;
[3]   when the topic is recaptured in a new light;
[4]   when the topic is recaptured in a new light for the sake of the addressee.

What is common to all of the above is that the speaker is detached from the referent of the topic in one way or another. In context [1], the referent has just been introduced to the speaker in the immediately preceding discourse. The speaker has not had time to incorporate the

topic into his/her representation of the world. In context [2], the referent is closer to the addressee than to the speaker. In this sense, the speaker is distanced from the referent. I will discuss this notion of detachment in more detail below.

In context [3], unexpected information for the speaker is presented. Because of this new perspective, the speaker is taking a step back from the topic entity and viewing it from this bit of distance as if seeing it for the first time. In this sense, the speaker is detached from the topic. For example, in (12) the speaker already knew the referent of the topic, Yamashita, but now that he found unexpected information about Yamashita (that he does not get along with another acquaintance), the speaker is viewing Yamashita in a new light. In this revising process, the speaker is momentarily detached from Yamashita,

In context [4], the speaker is already familiar with the information presented in the sentence. However, the topic entity is newly (re)defined for the sake of the addressee. Using the linguistic form otherwise reserved for contexts in which the speaker is detached from the topic, usage [4] may be interpreted as the speaker's strategy of acting as if s/he were viewing the topic entity momentarily from the addressee's point of view to show solidarity with the addressee. Such a display of solidarity with and sensitivity to the addressee is not uncommon in Japanese and other languages.[11]

Other researchers have noticed this rhetorical use of quotative topics. Park (2002:122) says that when *tte* marks the first person pronoun as the topic, *jibun o kyakkanteki ni toraenaosoo to suru shinri sayoo* 'the psychological function of recapturing the self objectively' is at work. The objective, rather than subjective, perspective obviously involves detachment. Maynard (2002:182) also notes that when *boku* 'I' is marked with *tte*, the speaker 'refers to the self as if it were referred to from someone else's perspective'. Viewing oneself from another's point of view necessarily distances the speaker from the topic.

In contexts [1] and [2], the referent of the topic has the element of 'newness', so to speak. In context [1], the referent is only introduced in the immediately preceding discourse. In context [2], it is 'new' to the speaker since it belongs more to the addressee's territory than to the speaker's. This sense of 'new' is distinct from the adjective 'new' that is

used in the literature concerning the notion of topichood. For example, Prince (1981:235) defines 'new' in the following manner:

> When a speaker first introduces an entity into the discourse, that is, tells the hearer to 'put it on the counter', we may say that it is **new**. (Emphasis in original)

The topic referents in contexts [1] and [2] are not 'new' in this sense since they are, well, topic referents. They are not introduced into the discourse for the first time. In general, one cannot introduce an entity and mark it as a topic in the same sentence. The topic referents are often texually evoked (i.e., the entities have been previously mentioned in the text) or situationally evoked (i.e., the entities refer to discourse participants or to salient features in extralinguistic context).[12]

The notion of newness I use in this paper refers to the sense that the referent is not assimilated into the speaker's representation of the world. I use the term 'assimilation' in the sense used in the following quote from Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1986:163):

> It is well known in psychology that information that has been stored for some time becomes assimilated to one's own stock of knowledge, [...].

Although 'information' in the above quote refers to propositional information and not to referent information, I think it is relevant to the latter as well.

In context [1], the referent is introduced to the conversation in the immediately preceding discourse. The introducer of the referent may be the addressee, a third person, or a piece of written text. Either way, the speaker has only been introduced to the referent recently. S/he has not had time to assimilate the entity. In context [2], the referent is closer to the addressee than to the speaker. The referent is 'new' to the speaker in the sense that it is not an integrated part of the speaker's world. In both contexts, the speaker is detached from the referent.

This sense of 'newness' (and thus the sense of detachment) is also relevant in contexts [3] and [4]. In these contexts, 'newness' is not attributed to the topic referent but to the information conveyed in the

sentence. As mentioned earlier, the topic is recaptured from a new perspective. The information represents something that is surprising. Surprise arises when information is not consonant with the speaker's current state of mind. The speaker is detached from such information since an unprepared mind cannot assimilate unexpected information readily. In this regard, it is useful to cite Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1986: 164) again:

> When a mind is unprepared, [...], events cannot be assimilated at once. [...] An unprepared mind has not had normal premonitory consciousness of the event in question. The event [...] is radically different from the consciousness that preceded the experience. The speaker feels distant from the situation he or she is describing.

'Event(s)' or 'situation' in the above quote can be changed to 'information' in order to be relevant here.

It is interesting to see that the same topic markers are used in these different contexts. In [1] and [2], the element of newness and therefore the speaker's sense of detachment are attributed to the topic referent. In [3] and [4], the newness and the speaker's detachment are relevant to the information conveyed in the sentence. How can this be accounted for?

I would assume that [1] represents the most basic usage of quotative topic markers, since the speaker quotes a prior utterance. [2] is an extended use of the basic function, since the sense of detachment towards the topic referent is also present. [3] and [4] are also extensions of [1], but in a different manner. By using a quotative topic marker in context [1], the speaker emphasizes the newness of the topic referent. In contexts [3] and [4], the topic referent is not new. Using a quotative topic marker, which is associated with highlighting the newness of the topic referent in contexts in which the topic is not new, yields the following inference: there must be a reason to treat this item as if it were new > this item must be something newsworthy. By evoking this inference, the speaker brings attention to the fact that something new about the topic is presented in the sentence.

This sort of 'transfer' or 'pragmatic extension' of meanings /associations may not be limited to quotative topic markers. Makino

(1996) makes an interesting observation about the postpositional particle *ga*, which is often discussed in contrast to *wa* and is associated with 'newness' in the sense of Prince (1981), discussed above (which is distinct from the sense of newness discussed in relation to *tte* in this paper). The 'newness' is usually attributed to the referent of the noun phrase that *ga* marks. However, Makino gives an example in which *ga* marks a noun phrase which is not new, when the sentence as a whole presents something that is surprising (and thus has news value) for the addressee. His example is given below.

(23) *Boku no kookoo   no toki ni   suugaku   ga baka*
I   GN high-school GN time in mathematics SB unusual
ni dekiru   tomodachi **ga** *ita   n   da yo. Sono tomodachi* **wa,**
AV is-good   friend   SB was NM CP IP that friend   TP
tonikaku, sensei   yori suugaku   ga yoku wakatteiru   n
anyhow teacher than mathematics OB well understand NM
janai ka to   iwareteita   n   da. Tokoroga, sono tomodachi **ga**
TG IP CM was-said NM CP but   that friend   SB
aruhi   suugaku   no   shiken   de reiten   o   totta
one-day mathematics GN examination in zero-point OB took
n   da
NM CP
'When I was in high school, I had a friend who was unusually good at math. That friend was rumored to understand math better than teachers. But one day that friend scored zero in a math exam.' (Makino 1996:94-95)

When *tomodachi* 'friend' first appears, it is marked with *ga* because the noun phrase is new. In the second sentence, the same noun phrase is marked with *wa*, since it has been mentioned already. When *tomodachi* appears again in the third sentence, it is marked with *ga* even though it is not new any more. Makino explains that because the third sentence presents information that is unexpected by the addressee (that a math genius scored zero in a math test), the noun phrase is marked with *ga*. Even though the noun phrase per se is not new, it is possible to use the marker associated with newness if the sentence as a whole presents new or unexpected information.[13]

Going back to the analysis of quotative topic markers, as mentioned earlier, [1] represents the most basic use since it directly reflects the quotative nature of these topic markers. If this is the case, then it makes sense that while it is possible to imagine the more generic topic marker *wa* replacing a quotative topic marker in contexts [3] and [4] (and even in [2] in some instances), it is quite awkward if *wa* replaces a quotative topic marker in context [1], as shown below (example 7, repeated here for convenience).

(7)   A: *Kinoo   Nori   to   okonomiyaki   tabete-tee,*
              yesterday <name>   with   <food name>   was-eating
              'Yesterday I was eating okonomiyaki with Nori,'
        B: *Nori   ?wa / tte ano kite-ru   hito?*
               <name> TP   that is-coming person
              'Nori, is she the person who is (often) coming (here)?'

Even in the recaptured topic use, however, Niwa (1994) notes that *wa* is quite awkward if the topic is abruptly introduced to the conversation. In the following constructed example, both the speaker and the addressee know Mr. Yamada. They neither have been talking about him nor regularly talk about him.

(24)   *Nee,   Yamada-san   tte/?wa omoshiroi   hito   da nee.*
        Hey   <name>-Mr.   TP   interesting person CP IP
        'Hey, Mr. Yamada is an interesting man, isn't he?' (Niwa 1994:43)

Here, even though the topic is familiar to both speakers, it has an element of 'newness', since the addressee was not prepared for it (or rather the speaker assumes that the addressee was not prepared for it). The 'newness' associated with *tte* makes it appropriate in this context.

If *wa* can replace *tte* in the recaptured topic use, does that mean that *wa* and *tte* have the same functions? For example, the topic *Yamashita* in example (12) could be marked with *wa* instead of *tte*. Also, in the example from a children's book mentioned in Section 1, above *Megumi tte kawaisoo* can be replaced by *Megumi wa kawaisoo*. Does this mean that *tte* is just a variant of *wa*?

I would like to argue that this is not the case. It is of interest that in both of these examples, which are taken from naturally occurring data, the speaker (or the writer, in the case of the latter) chose to use *tte* despite the fact that the more common topic marker *wa* is available to them. I interpret this as the speaker's strategy to convey a sense of unexpectedness with regard to the information presented in the sentence. The choice between *wa* and *tte* is not arbitrary. The emotive effect of the sentence is different when the topic marker is *tte*, compared to when it is *wa*. The sense of new discovery is highlighted when *tte* is used. This is especially apparent when the speaker/writer uses *wa* in certain sentences and *tte* in others in the same discourse. In the children's book example, the expected information (from the protagonist's point of view), *Megumi wa ii na* ('Megumi is enviable'), is expressed with *wa*, while the newly discovered information, *Megumi tte kawaisoo* ('Megumi is pitiable') is expressed with *tte*. If the speaker did not wish to call attention to the unexpectedness of the information, *wa* could be used.

The association of quotative topics and newness of information has been mentioned by other researchers. Park (2002) looks at *tte* with person topics and notes that *tte* is used when new or re-recognized information about the person is added to 'the file' (which I assume refers to the speaker's representation of the world). I chose to use the notion of detachment[14], rather than newness, as the overall character of quotative topics since it captures the essence of quotative topics in not only contexts [1], [3], and [4], but also in context [2], in which the speakers' unfamiliarity, rather than newsworthiness, is involved.

To recapitulate the contexts in which the speaker's detachment is relevant, the speaker may be detached from a topic referent because it has been recently introduced into the discourse (context [1]), because it belongs more to the addressee's territory of information (context [2]), or because it is redefined from a new perspective (context [3]). The speaker may present the topic referent as if s/he were detached from it in order to show solidarity with the addressee, who is expected to view it from a distance (context [4]).

4.2. Distinction between assimilated and non-assimilated information

To summarize the above discussion, quotative topic markers are used when the speaker is detached from the topic or when the speaker presents the topic as if it were detached from himself/herself. What the topic represents is presented as the entity not incorporated into the speaker's system. Why does the speaker especially need to mark a non-incorporated topic? Yamada's (1997) observation of Japanese communication styles is interesting in this regard. She notes that Japanese speakers tend to preface the introduction of a new topic into the ongoing conversation with what she calls 'talk about talk'. She says:

> Japanese players [speakers] comment on their own talk or *hanashi* to address the process of changing topics, and note the transition of how what they are about to say fits into the ongoing conversation. Talk about talk can be as short as a sentence or much longer, especially if the topic is intellectually or socially difficult. […] by and large, talk about talk and *maeoki* (preludes) are necessary for grounding a topic in Japanese communication. (Yamada 1997:72)

The use of quotative topic markers may be seen as a metalinguistic marking of non-incorporation. Such topics may be 'talk about talk' at the sentence level, telling the addressee that the topic they mark has not quite been grounded/assimilated.

A number of researchers have noted the distinction between assimilated and non-assimilated information at the level of sentence grammar. In her study of conditionals and complementizers, Akatsuka (1985:632) observes that 'Japanese grammar is sensitive to the cognitive distinction between "newly learned information" and the "state of knowledge"'. She notes that newly learned information first enters the domain of *irrealis* and that only after a certain amount of processing does it enter the domain of *realis*. Kamio (1997:41) observes a similar pattern in the distinction of direct and indirect sentence-final forms and notes that 'new information conveyed to the speaker is generally considered less close to him/her until considerable processing has taken place'. Such sensitivity is not limited to (Modern) Japanese. Slobin and Aksu (1982) discuss Turkish evidential systems in which

newly learned, unexpected information is expressed in the same manner as are hearsay and inference (i.e., information that belongs to the domain of *irrealis*). Shinzato (1991) reports a similar system in Old Japanese. DeLancey (1986:212) observes that in Lhasa Tibetan, there is a distinction between information that 'is an integral part of the speaker's knowledge of the world' and information 'which has yet to be assimilated into one's representation of the world'. Lee (1993) and Dickinson (2000) discuss mirativity in Korean and Tsafiki, respectively. The prevalence of mirative systems is noted by DeLancey (1997). Quotative topic markers in Japanese are yet another representative of this sensitivity that distinguishes assimilated and non-assimilated information.

4.3. Significance of quotation

Why are these topic markers chosen to represent non-incorporated information? The key notion here is that of quotation. *tte*, *to wa* and *to iu no wa* all contain the quotative particle *to*. *to* usually follows a quote. In other words, what precedes these topic markers is presented as a quote. It is not coincidental that quotative expressions mark non-assimilated information. In her cross-linguistic survey, Munro (1982) observes that quotation-ascribing verbs have some intransitive characteristics and that the quotations they introduce are often very different from normal objects. In other words, what is quoted is not well integrated into the matrix sentence as one of its arguments, the object of the verb. Munro's work is inspired by Partee (1973:418), who concludes that 'the quoted sentence is not syntactically or semantically a part of the sentence which contains it'. In his discussion of directly quoted materials in English, Haiman (1989:134) says that quotation is 'a process whereby auditory material is included (rather than incorporated) into a linguistic performance, like raisins in a pudding'. S. Suzuki (1998) and others point out independent characteristics of quotes in Japanese as well.[15] What is quoted is thus a grammatically non-integrated part of a sentence. This means that quotative forms are iconically appropriate in expressing non-assimilated information.

Quotative forms are also semantically relevant to non-assimilated information since quotation is related to the speaker's detachment. Vološinov (1986:116) observes: 'reported speech is regarded by the speaker as an utterance belonging to **someone else**' [emphasis in original]. What is quoted, thus, represents what the speaker finds distant from himself/herself. Macaulay (1987) and Maynard (1996) argue that this distancing effect of quotation is present even in self-quotation. Forms related to quotation are thus suited for representing conceptual non-assimilation.

4.4. Emotivity and metalinguistic function of *tte*

Several researchers have noted emotive effects of *tte*. Makino and Tsutsui (1986:509) state that if the comment part of a sentence 'does not express the speaker's emotive judgment/evaluation', *tte* cannot be used. R. Suzuki (1999:55) observes that when *tte* is used to repeat another's utterance, it may indicate 'the speaker's surprise or suspicion'. Park (2002) notes that when *tte* marks the second person pronoun topic, it may communicate emotions such as accusation and surprise. These descriptions do not apply to all the instances of *tte*. It is more appropriate to use the broader notion of detachment to characterize the wide range of functions associated with *tte*.[16] However, these references to emotivity do ring true and capture some of the essence of *tte*. Also, the sense of detachment in general is a kind of emotive effect. How is it that *tte* is associated with evoking affect?

In this regard, it is instructive to look at a use of *tte* which is considered to be transitional.

(25) A: *Hito   ga   ii   n   da kara, okaasan wa.*
        person SB good NM CP so   mother TP
        'You are (lit. mother is) such a good person.'
     B: *Hito   ga   ii   **tte**, fuufu   de,   hito   ga   ii   mo*
        person SB good QT couple between person SB good also
        warui mo aru   mon   desu ka.
        bad also exist thing CP IP

'A good person [marked by tte]!? There is no such thing as being a good or bad person between a married couple.' (Niwa 1994:55)

(26) A: *Mainen   itteru desho?*
Every-year going TG
'You go every year, don't you?'

B: *Mainen   **tte**, date kyonen   haitta   bakari da kara.*
Every-year QT but last-year entered just   CP so
'Every year, you say [marked by tte], but I just joined this club last year.'

In the above examples, what follows *tte* is a metalinguistic commentary about what is marked by *tte*. In (25), speaker B does not think it is appropriate to use the phrase *hito ga ii* 'being a good person' in that particular context and makes a comment on it. Similarly in (26), speaker B points out the inappropriateness of the word *mainen* 'every year.' Maynard (2002:171) considers that such a use of *tte* 'fills in the space somewhere between quotation and topic presentation, illustrating the transitional process'.

Common to all instances of this transitional *tte* is that the speaker is not pleased with the way the addressee used the word or phrase in question. By repeating the addressee's words, the speaker signals that there are some problems with what the addressee said. This use of *tte* is metalinguistic and directly reflects *tte*'s original function of marking a quotation. However, I would argue that the more ordinary topic-marking *tte* also retains this metalinguistic nature. That is, the topic-marking *tte* in general indicates that there are some problems in relation to the topic entity.

The relationship between the use of *tte* in context [1] and the metalinguistic function is obvious. *tte* in such a context is also echoing what the addressee has just said. By using *tte*, which is associated with the metalinguistic function, the speaker indicates to the addressee that there are some problems with the addressee's perception of the topic (e.g., the addressee's misjudgments of the speaker's knowledge with regard to the topic), and that the definition of the topic is necessary. In context [1], the comment part is often a question asking for more

information about the topic. *tte* in context [2] is similar. By using *tte*, the speaker indicates that the addressee has more information about the topic and asks for clarification or more information.

How about contexts [3] and [4]? Even though the relationship between the recaptured topic use and the metalinguistic function is not as obvious, it is still relevant. In context [3], the speaker indicates that there are problems with what the speaker has thought of the topic up to this point. By using the metalinguistic *tte*, the speaker calls attention to this fact, and the comment part of the sentence provides a new characterization of the topic. Similarly, in context [4], the use of *tte* highlights that there have been some problems with the addressee's ideas about the topic, while the comment part of the sentence re-defines or re-characterizes the topic.

From this perspective, we can see how *tte* has been associated with emotive effects. Makino and Tsutsui's (1986) claim that the comment part of the sentence with a *tte*-marked topic must involve the speaker's emotive judgment or evaluation stems from the fact that *tte* is fundamentally metalinguistic and is thus evaluative. R. Suzuki's (1999) and Park's (2002) observation that *tte* may express the speaker's emotions such as suspicion, disbelief, and accusation with regard to the topic entity is also related to *tte*'s metalinguistic nature, since it implies that there are some problems with the topic entity.

5. Conclusions and implications

Ono and R. Suzuki (1992) note that Japanese morphemes that express pragmatic meanings tend to occur clause-finally. While this observation is accurate, as attested by many studies, the present study shows that even in a clause-medial position, certain pragmatic meanings are expressed. This paper looked at quotative topic markers. They are used when the speaker is detached from the topic or when s/he presents the topic as if it were detached from himself/herself. This sense of detachment may derive from the fact that the topic has just been introduced to the speaker. It may arise if the topic is regarded as being closer to the addressee. It may also be evoked if the topic is recaptured from a new perspective. The speaker takes a step back from the topic

in order to redefine it. In any of these contexts, quotative topic markers are used when the speaker treats the topic as an entity that has not yet been assimilated into the speaker's system. To represent this non-incorporation, quotative topic markers are suitable, since what is quoted is a grammatically and semantically non-integrated part of a sentence.

As was mentioned in the previous section, the Japanese language is sensitive to distinctions between integrated and non-integrated information. As noted by Yamada (1997), the need to mark non-assimilated information is present in discourse larger than a sentence as well; Japanese speakers tend not to change conversational topics abruptly and prefer using 'talk about talk' to ground a new topic. In a future study, it would be interesting to explore the origins of such sensitivity.

Macalester College
1600 Grand Avenue
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55105, USA

Notes

1. Note the abbreviations used in the literal glosses: AV (adverbial marker), CM (complementizer), CP (copula), GN (genitive maker), FL (filler), IP (interactional particle), NM (nominalizer), OB (direct object marker), PN (pronoun), QT (quotation marker), SB (subject marker), TG (tag-like expression), TP (topic marker).
    The conversational data, as is typical, contained instances of false starts, repetitions, overlaps, etc. To facilitate analysis and smooth presentation, the transcripts have been 'cleaned up' to some extent. The following conventions are used in the transcription.
    .   falling intonation followed by noticeable pause
    ?   rising intonation followed by noticeable pause
    ,   continuing intonation which may contain slight rise or fall and which may be followed by a short pause
    ... noticeable pause without falling intonation.

2. A recent study (Aoki 2001) hypothesizes that tte comes from te, an Old Japanese Eastern dialect form of the quotative to. The thematic tte is likewise considered to come from to iu no wa, since the former and the latter are often interchangeable. Investigating the exact origin of tte is beyond the scope of this paper. What is relevant to this paper is that whether tte is derived from to te, to itte, te, or to iu no wa, it is related to the quotative particle to and thus to the function of quotation as discussed below.

3. See Morishige (1954); Itani (1994); Horiguchi (1995); Okamoto (1995); Maynard (1996, 2002); Suzuki (1996, 1998) for discussions of the central as well as other functions of the utterance-final *tte*.

4. Whether *no* after *to iu* is a dependent pronoun or a nominalizer is not always clear. However, in the topic marking expression *X to iu no wa*, in which X is a noun, *no* seems to be a dependent pronoun since *X to iu no wa* (e.g., *Tanaka-san to iu no wa* 'the one called Mr. Tanaka') can be paraphrased as *X to iu* Noun *wa* (e.g., *Tanaka-san to iu hito wa* 'the person called Mr. Tanaka').

5. The presentation of the example is slightly modified.

6. The adjective 'new' has been used in various ways in linguistics. In this section I use 'new' to mean, simply, 'different from before'. I will discuss the notion of newness later in the paper.

7. The adverb *yappari* 'as expected, after all' may co-occur with the *tte*-marked topic as in the following example.

    Yappashi   mama **tte** *ii   na.*
    as-expected mom TP good IP
    'Mothers are nice, after all.' (Hara 2003:79)

The meaning of *yappashi* (a colloquial equivalent of *yappari*) 'as expected, after all' may seem to contradict the function of *tte* as marking sentences which represent what the speaker newly thought of or discovered about the topic. However, the above utterance is made after an incident which made the speaker re-realize the virtue of mothers. Although the speaker had already thought that mothers are nice, the incident made him re-discover the idea anew. The sentence is a re-characterization of the topic in this sense.

8. For an alternative analysis of the particle, see Matsui (2000).

9. Niwa (1994) discusses other types of contexts in which *tte* is not appropriate, but this discussion is not immediately relevant here.

10. The presentation of the example is slightly modified.

11. See, for example, Kamio's (1990:234-236) discussion of *joohoo no dokusenka* 'monopolization of information'.

12. The terms 'textually envoked' and 'situationally envoked' are taken from Prince (1981).

13. Lambrecht (1988) also discusses a similar kind of 'pragmatic extension'. He observes that while the presentational cleft construction in spoken French is 'a syntactic construction which is normally reserved for brand-new or unused referents', it 'can come to be used for referents which are accessible topics in the context, provided that the information expressed by the sentence is assumed to have a high degree of news-value' (Lambrecht 1988:171).

14. The notion of detachment, or distance, has been briefly mentioned by Hayashi (1997), R. Suzuki (1999), and Maynard (2002), but has not been explained in depth.

15. Quinn (1994) makes an interesting observation with regard to the Japanese quotative particle *to*. He attributes *to*'s function as a marker of quotation to its lexical meaning, 'with'. He argues that if one entity Y is related to another entity X in a relation mediated by *to*, 'Y does not co-occupy an identical locus but rather takes a position alongside, that is, outside X' (Quinn 1994:275). This association with 'outsideness' makes *to* ideal for marking a quote and thus non-assimilated information.

16. R. Suzuki (1999) does use a broader notion of 'distance' (in addition to 'reproduction') in discussing *tte*.

References

Akatsuka, Noriko. 1985. Conditionals and the epistemic scale. Language 61 (3).625-639.

Aksu-Koç, Ayhan A. & Dan I. Slobin. 1986. A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish. In: Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.), Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 159-167.

Aoki, Keiko. 2001. Historical analysis of the colloquial quotative marker *tte*. Journal CAJLE (Canadian Association for Japanese Language Education) 4.75-91.

DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In: Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.), Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 203-213.

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. Linguistic Typology 1.33-52.

Dickinson, Connie. 2000. Mirativity in Tsafiki. Studies in Language 24 (2).379-421.

Haiman, John. 1989. Alienation in grammar. Studies in Language 13 (1).129-170.

Hayashi, Makoto. 1997. An exploration of sentence-final uses of the quotative particle in Japanese spoken discourse. In: Ho-ming Sohn & John Haig (eds.), Japanese/Korean Linguistics, VI. CSLI, Stanford, 565-581.

Hinds, John, Senko K. Maynard & Shoichi Iwasaki (eds.). 1987. Perspectives on topicalization: The case of Japanese *wa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Horiguchi, Junko. 1995. Kaiwa ni okeru inyoo no 'tte' ni yoru shuuketsu ni tsuite. Nihongo Kyooiku 85 (3).12-24.

Itani, Reiko. 1994. A relevance-based analysis of hearsay particles: Japanese utterance-final *tte*. University College London Working Papers in Linguistics 6. 379-400.

Kamio, Akio. 1990. Joohoo no nawabari riron: Gengo no kinooteki bunseki. Tokyo: Taishuukan.

Kamio, Akio. 1997. Territory of information. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo. 1951. Gendaigo no joshi, jodooshi. Tokyo: Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo (National Language Research Institute).

Kuno, Susumu. 1972. Functional sentence perspective: A case study from Japanese and English. Linguistic Inquiry 3.269-320.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. The structure of the Japanese language. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1988. Presentational cleft constructions in spoken French. In: John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), Clause combining in grammar and discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 135-180.

Lee, Ho Sang. 1993. Cognitive constraints on expressing newly perceived information, with references to epistemic modal suffixes in Korean. Cognitive Linguistics 4.135-167.

Macaulay, Ronald K. S. 1987. Polyphonic monologues: Quoted direct speech in oral narratives. IPrA Papers in Pragmatics 1 (2).1-34.

Makino, Seiichi. 1996. Uchi to soto no gengo bunkagaku. Tokyo: Aruku.

Makino, Seiichi & Michio Tsutsui. 1986. A dictionary of basic Japanese grammar. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Matsui, Tomoko. 2000. Linguistic encoding of the guarantee of relevance: Japanese sentence-final particle *yo*. In: Thorstein Fretheim & Gisle Andersen (eds.), Pragmatic markers and propositional attitude. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 145-172.

Maynard, Senko K. 1980. Discourse function of the Japanese theme marker *wa*. Unpublished dissertation, Northwestern University.

Maynard, Senko K. 1990. An introduction to Japanese grammar and communication strategies. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Maynard, Senko K. 1994. The centrality of thematic relations in Japanese text. Functions of Language 1 (2).229-260.

Maynard, Senko K. 1996. Multivoicedness in speech and thought representation: The case of self-quotation in Japanese. Journal of Pragmatics 25.207-226.

Maynard, Senko K. 2002. Linguistic emotivity: Centrality of place, the topic-comment dynamic, and an ideology of *pathos* in Japanese discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mikami, Akira. 1960. Zoo wa hana ga nagai. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Morishige, Satoru. 1954. 'Te, tte' 'teba, tteba', 'tara, ttara' ni tsuite. Kokugo Kokubun 23 (11).51-62.

Munro, Pamela. 1982. On the transitivity of 'say' verbs. In: Paul J. Hopper & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), Studies in transitivity [Syntax and Semantics 15]. New York: Academic Press, 301-318.

Niwa, Tetsuya. 1994. Shudai teiji no tte to inyoo. Jinbun Kenkyuu: Osaka Shiritsu Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyoo 46 (2).27-57.

Okamoto, Shigeko. 1995. Pragmaticization of meaning in some sentence-final particles in Japanese. In: Masayoshi Shibatani & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), Essays in semantics and pragmatics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 219-246.

Ono, Tsuyoshi & Ryoko Suzuki. 1992. The development of a marker of speaker's attitude: The pragmatic use of the Japanese grammaticized verb *shimau* in conversation. In: Laura A. Buszard-Welcher, Lionel Wee & William Weigel (eds.), Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 204-213.

Park, Seo-kyong. 2002. Shudai teiji to shite no 'tte' no danwa kinoo: Nishoo daimeishi ni koosokusuru tte. Kotoba no Kagaku 15.113-133.

Partee, Barbara H. 1973. The syntax and semantics of quotation. In: Stephen R. Anderson & Paul Kiparsky (eds.), A Festschrift for Morris Halle. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 410-418.

Prince, Ellen F. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In: Peter Cole (ed.), Radical pragmatics. New York: Academic Press, 223-255.

Quinn, Charles J. 1994. Uchi/soto: Tip of a semiotic iceberg? 'Inside' and 'outside' knowledge in the grammar of Japanese. In: Jane M. Bachnik & Charles J. Quinn (eds.), Situated meaning: Inside and outside in Japanese self, society, and language. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 249-294.

Slobin, Dan I. & Ayhan A. Aksu. 1982. Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In: Paul J. Hopper (ed.), Tense-aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 185-200.

Shinzato, Rumiko. 1991. Where do temporality, evidentiality and epistemology meet? A comparison of Old Japanese *-ki* and *-keri* with Turkish *-di* and *-miş*. Gengo Kenkyuu 99.25-57.

Suzuki, Ryoko. 1999. Multifunctionality: The developmental path of the quotative *tte* in Japanese. In: Barbara A. Fox, Dan Jurafsky & Laura A. Michaelis (eds.), Cognition and Function in Language, CSLI, Stanford, 50-64.

Suzuki, Satoko. 1996. An analysis of *tte-* and *to yuu no wa*-marked phrases in Japanese discourse. Word 47 (3).321-337.

Suzuki, Satoko. 1998. *Tte* and *nante*: Markers of psychological distance in Japanese conversation. Journal of Pragmatics 29.429-462.

Takubo, Yukinori. 1989. Meishiku no modaritii. In: Yoshio Nitta & Takashi Masuoka (eds.), Nihongo no modaritii. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan, 211-33.

Tanaka, Akio. 1977. Joshi (3). In: Ono, Susumu et al., Nihongo 7, Bunpoo II. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten [Iwanami Kooza], 359-454.

Vološinov, V. N. 1973. Marxism and the philosophy of language. (Trans. by Ladislav Matejka & I.R. Titunik). New York: Seminar Press.

Yamada, Haru. 1997. Different games, different rules. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Data

Hara, Yutaka. 2003. Kaiketsu zorori no daikyooryuu. Tokyo: Popurasha.

Higuchi, Kanako. 1999. Interviewed online. http://www.asahi.com/goraku/lady/higuchi.html (viewed on September 11, 2000).

Kanai, Mieko. 1995. Ren'ai taiheiki, 1. Tokyo: Shuueisha.

Kimura, Yuuichi. 1995. Papa to asoboo. Tokyo: Keiseisha.

Kobayashi, Motoko & Chinami Yamashita. 1995. Kekkonsuru nara toshishita no kare ga daiseikai!? More, August, 216-228.

Saito, Satoru & Megumi Hisada. 1999. Kowakare ressun. Tokyo: Gakuyoo Shoboo.

Sei Shoonagon, Makura no sooshi: Susamajiki mono (A classic collection of essays written around 1000).

Murata, Sachiko et. al. 1988. Shigoto o kataru onna tachi, Joo. Tokyo: Kanoo Shoboo.

Ootomo, Noriko. 1987. Megumi wa ii na. In: Kumon Kyooiku Kenkyuukai (ed.), Kumon no dokusho koosu 5A. Tokyo: Kumon Shuppan, 81-103.