

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Quotatives. Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*.

Edited by Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid Van Alphen.

© 2012. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

On the characteristics of Japanese reported discourse

A study with special reference to elliptic quotation

David Y. Oshima and Shin-ichiro Sano

Nagoya University and International Christian University

This chapter aims to deepen the understanding of Japanese reported discourse by directing particular attention to the phenomenon in which the predicate of communication or attitude is elided (quotative predicate ellipsis, 'QPE'). We will taxonomize and examine varieties of the QPE, and demonstrate that its proper understanding leads to straightforward accounts of two issues that have been taken to evidence the 'idiosyncrasy' of Japanese reported discourse: namely (i) why a quotative phrase may co-occur with a nominal direct object under the same predicate, and (ii) why a quotative phrase may occur under a predicate that is not a predicate of communication or attitude.

Keywords: quotative predicate ellipsis, direct/indirect reported discourse, grammatical status of quotes, idiomatic extension of quotative constructions

1. Introduction

Reported discourse in Japanese has been subject to extensive studies in the past several decades, and emphasis has often been put on its 'idiosyncrasy' in comparison with its counterparts in European languages. This chapter aims to deepen the understanding of Japanese reported discourse, directing particular attention to the phenomenon called quotative predicate ellipsis (QPE), whereby the predicate of communication or attitude in reported discourse is elided.

Whereas the presence of the QPE has been recognized as a major characteristic of Japanese reported discourse, the fact that the QPE manifests itself in a variety of different forms, carrying different semantic and discourse functions, has been largely overlooked. The current work taxonomizes and examines varieties of the QPE, and demonstrates that a proper understanding of the QPE leads to straightforward accounts of two puzzling issues regarding Japanese reported discourse,

namely (i) why a quotative phrase may co-occur with a nominal direct object under the same predicate, and (ii) why a quotative phrase may occur under a predicate that is not a predicate of communication or attitude.

2. Characteristics of reported discourse in Japanese

Reported discourse in Japanese has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention (Kato 2010; Maier 2009; Fujita 2000a; Kamada 2000; Hirose 1995; Kuno 1988; Coulmas 1986). The most extensively discussed type is marked with the so-called quotative marker/complementizer *to* or its stylistic variant *tte*, where the latter is more colloquial.¹

Reported discourse with *to/tte* can either be in the direct or indirect mode, as illustrated below (the sentence forms in (2) also allow for a direct interpretation).²

(1) direct

- a. Yumi-wa “*Zenbu watashi-no sei-yo*” {*to/tte*}
 Y.-TOP all I-GEN responsibility-SFP *to/tte*
 it-te-i-ru.
 say-GER-IPFV-PRS
 ‘Yumi says “It’s all my fault.”’
- b. Yumi-wa “*Anata-ga suki-des-u*” {*to/tte*} it-ta.
 Y.-TOP you-NOM fond-be.POLITE-PRS *to/tte* say-PST
 ‘Yumi said “(I) like you.”’

(2) indirect

- a. Yumi-wa [*zenbu watashi-no sei-da*]
 Y.-TOP all I-GEN responsibility-be.PRS
 {*to/tte*} it-te-i-ru.
to/tte say-GER-IPFV-PRS
 ‘Yumi says that it is all my fault.’

1. *Tte* alternates with *te* when it immediately follows a nasal, as exemplified in the following:

(i) “*Otoosan*” *te* it-ta-no?
 father *te* say-PST-Q
 ‘Did he say “Dad”?’

2. Throughout the chapter, direct quotes in examples are put between double quotation marks and italicized; indirect quotes are put between square brackets and not italicized. Also, where naturally occurring data are cited, the source is specified with a code referring to the list provided as Appendix. Example sentences without a source specification were constructed by the authors.

- b. Yumi-wa [anata-ga suki-da] {to/tte} it-ta.
 Y.-TOP you-NOM fond-be.PRS to/tte say-PST
 'Yumi said that (she) liked you.'

A reported discourse construction with *to/tte* may be headed by a wide variety of communication (speech) and attitude (epistemic) predicates, including *iu* 'say', *tsugeru* 'announce, tell', *hanasu* 'speak, tell', *tazuneru* 'inquire', and *omou* 'believe, think' (Teramura 1982: 173–176). In the following, we will refer to those communication/attitude predicates that select for a *to/tte*-marked quotative phrase as 'quotative predicates'.

Certain communication/attitude predicates, including so-called factive predicates (i.e. those predicates that presuppose the truth of the content of its complement clause, e.g. English *know*, *remember*), select for a nominal clause headed by the nominalizer *koto* and followed by a case particle like *o*. Quotative constructions with *koto* invariably are in the indirect mode.³

- (3) Yumi-wa [watashi-ga mukashi Amerika-ni
 Y.-TOP I-NOM a.long.time.ago America-DAT
 sun-de-i-ta] koto-o shit-te-i-ru.
 live-GER-IPFV-PST koto-ACC know-GER-IPFV-PRS
 'Yumi knows that I lived in the U.S.A. a long time ago.'

Besides *to* and *koto*, the particles *ka*, *kadooka*, and *yoo(ni)* are commonly regarded as markers of reported discourse, which are respectively used to report (i) a (wh- or yes-no) question, (ii) a yes-no question, and (iii) a request, invitation, etc. (Searle's "directives"), and which are only compatible with the indirect mode. There is no broad consensus among scholars as to what else, if any, should be added to the list of reported discourse markers (see Kamada 2000: 14–21).

The discussion in the current chapter concentrates on reported discourse with *to/tte*, which is the only marker that is compatible with both the direct and indirect modes. In this section, we will illustrate some intriguing properties of Japanese reported discourse (with *to/tte*) and critically review previous discussions of them.

2.1 Alleged continuity between direct and indirect reported discourse

As was mentioned above, the same particle *to/tte* can be used to introduce either direct or indirect reported discourse. Furthermore, unlike languages such as

3. Some communication/attitude predicates are compatible both with *to/tte* and *koto*. In such cases, the choice between *to/tte* and *koto* tends to cause a subtle semantic/pragmatic difference (Maynard 1986: 192–193).

English, Japanese indirect quotes do not undergo a change in tense, mood, or word order, which would formally differentiate them from independent clauses and direct quotes. As Coulmas (1986: 172) points out, these conditions contribute to generating “relatively many Japanese sentences that could be given a direct or indirect reading”. The sentence forms in (2), for example, are ambiguous, also allowing the direct interpretation; that is, (2a) can be interpreted as ‘Yumi said “It’s all my fault”’, and (2b) as ‘Yumi said “I like you”’. The direct interpretation is sometimes singled out, however, by features that can be present only in a direct quote or in an independent clause, such as the occurrence of a sentence-final particle – for example, *yo* in (1a) – or a predicate in its polite form – for example, *suki-des-u* in (1b).

Based on such observations, authors like Kuno (1988) and Kamada (2000) argue that in Japanese there is no clear distinction between direct and indirect reported discourse, and that there exist cases of ‘medium’ (or ‘semi-direct’) reported discourse (see also Maier 2009; McClain 1981; Toyama 1981). This claim, which we call the ‘continuum hypothesis’, is at odds with the widely accepted view that the direct and indirect modes of reported discourse differ in kind, the former being about the relation between an individual and a linguistic object and the latter being about the relation between an individual and a semantic object (proposition) (see Clark and Gerrig 1990; Partee 1973, *inter alia*). We will demonstrate that the continuum hypothesis lacks sufficient empirical support.

Two types of data have been claimed to evidence the continuum hypothesis: (i) *imperative morphology in otherwise indirect reports*, and (ii) *partial deictic shift*. The first is exemplified in (4).

- (4) Hiroshi_i-wa boku-ni [yatsu_i-no ootoo-to
 H.-TOP I-DAT he-GEN younger.brother-ACC
 tetsuda-e] to it-ta.
 help-IMP to say-PST
 ‘Hiroshi requested me to help out his younger brother.’

In (4), the third person pronoun *yatsu*, which refers to the secondary speaker – that is, the individual whose speech is reported – indicates that the report is in the indirect mode. The imperative ending, on the other hand, would indicate that it must be in the direct mode, under the assumption that an imperative cannot occur in an indirect quote, as is the case in languages such as English. Kuno (1988: 76) introduces the term ‘blended discourse’ to refer to such putative mixed reported discourse. However, the assumption that universally imperatives cannot be reported in the indirect mode seems dubious. It has been reported that in languages like Korean and Amharic, imperative forms can be used in indirect quotes (Pak, Portner, and Zanuttini 2004: 359; Schlenker 2003: 69). In addition, there seems to be no *a priori* semantic reason that indirect reports of imperatives are impossible. Portner (2005)

speculates that, among the variety of clause types, only (i) declaratives, (ii) interrogatives, and (iii) imperatives are universally attested, and proposes that the first denote propositions, the second denote sets of propositions, and the third denote properties. If we adopt the view that imperatives denote a property, rather than some illocutionary-force bearing entity, it would be intriguing why they cannot be reported in the indirect mode, while the other two universal clause types, declaratives and interrogatives, can. One can even make a case that sentences like the following are ‘indirect imperatives’, although they do not involve imperative morphology.

- (5) The man {told/asked} me to leave.

Considering these points, it seems reasonable to suppose that Japanese allows an imperative form to occur in an indirect quote, while certain languages (including English) do not (see Schwager 2006: 204–221 for relevant discussions and additional references). Consequently, imperative morphology in otherwise indirect quotes is not an unequivocal sign of medium reported discourse.

Let us now turn to the second type of supposed evidence for the continuum hypothesis: partial deictic shift.

- (6) a. Hiroshi-wa [kinoo boku-no ototoo-ga
H.-TOP yesterday I-GEN younger.brother-NOM
kare-no uchi-ni it-ta] to it-te-i-ru.
he-GEN home-DAT go-PST to say-GER-IPFV-PRS
‘Hiroshi is saying that my younger brother went to his place yesterday.’
b. Hiroshi-wa [kinoo boku-no ototoo-ga
H.-TOP yesterday I-GEN younger.brother-NOM
kare-no uchi-ni ki-ta] to it-te-i-ru.
he-GEN home-DAT come-PST to say-GER-IPFV-PRS
‘Hiroshi is saying that my younger brother came to his place yesterday.’

Sentences (6a,b) contain three types of deictic, or viewpoint-sensitive, expressions in the quote: (i) the temporal adverbial *kinoo* ‘yesterday’, (ii) the personal pronouns *boku* ‘I’ and *kare* ‘he’, and (iii) the deictic motion verb *iku* ‘go’ or *kuru* ‘come’. In (6a), all three are anchored to the external speaker’s perspective, so that the quote is canonically indirect. In contrast, in (6b) the deictic predicate ‘remains’ anchored to the secondary speaker’s (Hiroshi’s) perspective, while the other deictic elements are interpreted relative to the external speaker’s perspective. Kamada (2000) argues that, in such a sentence, the ‘degree of indirectness’ is smaller in the sense that the secondary speaker’s perspective is partially maintained (see also Kuno 1988). It is worth noting that the same phenomenon is attested in other languages including English, as illustrated in (7) (Oshima 2006a, 2006b; Hockett 1990):

- (7) John claims that I {went/came} to his place yesterday.

If we adopt the idea detailed in Oshima (2006a, 2006b) that certain viewpoint-sensitive predicates (e.g., English *go* and *come*) can be used as secondary indexicals in the sense of Schlenker (2003), sentences like (6b) can be accounted for without compromising the view that direct and indirect modes of reported discourse are discrete.⁴ In (6b), the verb *kuru* ‘come’ is used as a secondary indexical and is anchored to the context associated with the reported utterance, while the adverb *kinoo* and the pronouns *boku* and *kare*, which are lexically specified to be primary indexicals, are anchored to the external context.⁵ As such, all involved deictic expressions (the deictic motion verb, the pronouns, and the adverb) denote entities/events in the outside world rather than linguistic objects – or in other words, they are used linguistically, rather than meta-linguistically – so that a sentence like (6b) can be treated as a purely (rather than partially) indirect report. Sentences like (6b), therefore, do not serve as valid evidence for the continuum hypothesis either.

In this section, we have argued that the claim made in the literature that Japanese lacks a clear distinction between direct and indirect reported discourse does not hold up to scrutiny. We will turn next to another putative characteristic of Japanese reported discourse: the adverbial-like nature of the quotative phrase.

2.2 Syntactic realization of a quote: Complement or modifier?

The syntactic status of the quotative phrase marked by *to/tte* has been a matter of debate. It has often been treated as a complement of the communication/attitude predicate (Moriyama 1990; Nitta 1982; Okutsu 1974; Teramura 1982 among others), partly because it typically corresponds to a complement clause in a different language such as English, and also because its omission may lead to the unacceptability of the sentence, except where the quoted material is contextually recoverable (# in the examples to follow indicates that the sentence form requires appropriate contextual information to be acceptable).⁶

- (8) a. Yumi-ga #(*“Watashi-ga yari-mas-u”* to) it-ta.
 Y-NOM I-NOM do-POLITE-PRS to say-PST
 ‘Yumi said “I will do it”’

4. Indexicals are those expressions whose contribution to propositional content depends on a context of utterance or attitude. Primary indexicals (e.g. *I*, *here*, *now*) are those indexicals that are interpreted relative to the context of the external utterance. Secondary indexicals are those indexicals that are interpreted relative to the context of a reported utterance or attitude.

5. The same argument applies to a similar phenomenon that involves ‘empathy-loaded’ predicates like *yaru* and *kureru*, which both translate as ‘give’ but reflect different viewpoints, to some extent analogous to *go* and *come* (Oshima 2006a).

6. In Japanese, predicate complements in general, whether being nominal or clausal, may be omitted when they are contextually recoverable. For example, (8a) without the quotative phrase would be acceptable if it is uttered in reply to the question “Did anyone say ‘I will do it’?”

- b. Hiroshi-wa #([watashi-ga kaisha-o yame-ru] to)
 H.-TOP I-NOM company-ACC quit-PRS to
 omot-te-i-ru.
 believe-GER-IPFV-PRS
 ‘Hiroshi believes that I am going to quit my job.’

However, a contrary position is held by authors like Fujita (2000a, 2000b, 1999, 1988), Niwa (1994), Sunakawa (1989, 1988), and Shibatani (1978), who advocate the view that the *to/tte*-marked quotative phrase is better understood as an adverbial modifier. An alleged piece of evidence is the ability of a *to/tte*-marked (direct or indirect) quotative phrase to co-occur with a nominal direct object referring to what is said or thought of under the same quotative predicate; this is illustrated in Examples (9) to (11).

- (9) a. Sono sakka-to at-ta toki, watashi-wa, “*Anata-no*
 that author-with meet-PST when I-TOP you-GEN
sakuhin-wa issatsu-mo yon-da koto-ga ari-mas-en”
 work-TOP one.CLF-any read-PST matter-NOM exist-POLITE-NEG
 to shoojiki-ni hontoo-no koto-o it-ta.
 to honestly true matter-ACC say-PST
 ‘When I met that author, I honestly told him the truth, saying “I have not read any of your books”’
- b. Sono sakka-to at-ta toki, watashi-wa,
 that author-with meet-PST when I-TOP
 [kare-no sakuhin-wa issatsu-mo yon-da koto-ga
 he-GEN work-TOP one.CLF-any read-PST matter-NOM
 na-i] to shoojiki-ni hontoo-no koto-o it-ta.
 not.exist-PRS to honestly true matter-ACC say-PST
 ‘When I met that author, I honestly told him the truth, saying that I had not read any of his books.’
- (10) Kare-wa “*Soo shi-mas-u*” to jikkoo-o yakusoku-shi-ta.
 he-TOP that.way do-POLITE-PRS to execution-ACC promise-do-PST
 ‘He promised to carry it out, saying “I will do it”’

(adapted from Fujita 2000a: 80)

- (11) Hiroshi-wa [watashi-no ootoo-o otoshiire-ta
 H.-TOP I-GEN younger.brother-ACC ensnare-PST
 no-wa jibun-da] to tsumi-o kokuhaku-shi-ta.
 PRO-TOP self-be.PRS to sin-ACC confess-do-PST
 ‘Hiroshi confessed his sin, saying that it was he who ensnared my younger brother.’

This contrasts, for instance, with the situation in English, where a communication or attitude predicate cannot co-occur both with a complement clause and a nominal object referring to what is said or thought of within a single clause.⁷

- (12) a. He told me the good news.
- b. He told me “The job is yours”.
- c. *He told me a good news “The job is yours”.

In sentences (9) to (11), one may omit either the quotative phrase or the direct object, but not both. Examples (13) to (15) illustrate this point:

- (13) Watashi-wa #(hontoo-no koto-o) it-ta.
I-TOP true matter-ACC say-PST
‘I told (him) the truth.’
- (14) Kare-wa #(jikkoo-o) yakusoku-shi-ta.
he-TOP execution-ACC promise-do-PST
‘He promised to carry it out.’
- (15) Hiroshi-wa #(tsumi-o) kokuhaku-shi-ta.
H.-TOP sin-ACC confess-do-PST
‘Hiroshi confessed his sin.’

In sum, the *to/tte*-marked quotative phrase behaves like an adverbial modifier in that it may co-occur with a nominal direct object referring to the content of speech or thought while also having a characteristic of an argument in that its absence may lead to unacceptability. This issue will be revisited in Section 3.1.

2.3 Elliptic quotation

In Japanese (as well as many other languages; see below), quotative constructions are attested where the quotative predicate is not explicitly present (elliptic quotation). Fujita (1988 and subsequent works) extensively discusses a particular type of elliptic quotation, which is exemplified in (16) (see also Maynard 1986: 186–7; Shibatani 1978: 83).

7. One may suspect that the quotative phrases in sentences (9)–(11) modify the object nominal as an appositive, analogous to the *that*-clause in the English sentence below.

(i) John told me the fact that Bob resigned as chairman.

There is, however, no reasonable basis to believe that the quotative phrases in question form a constituent with the object nominal co-occurring with them. For example, the sequence of a *to/tte*-marked quotative phrase followed by a nominal cannot serve as a clause subject as can a nominal followed by an appositive clause, as in (ii).

(ii) The fact that Bob resigned as chairman surprised me.

- (16) a. Makoto-ga “*Ohayoo*” to hait-te-ki-ta.
 M.-NOM good.morning to enter-GER-come-PST
 ‘Makoto came in, saying “Good morning”’
 (lit. ‘Makoto came in, “Good morning”’)
- b. Emiko-wa, “*Masaka*” to furikaet-ta.
 E.-TOP it.can’t.be to look.back-PST
 ‘Emiko looked back, thinking to herself “It can’t be true”’
 (lit. ‘Emiko looked back, “It can’t be true”’)
- (adapted from Fujita 2000a: 74)

Fujita (2000a) argues that sentences like (16a,b), which lack an element like ‘saying’ or ‘thinking (to oneself)’, are instances of one of the two major types of Japanese quotative constructions, which he labels as ‘Type II’.

- (17) *Type I*: The matrix predicate describes an action or state that matches the speech or thought described by the quotative phrase. (e.g. (1), (2), (9))
Type II: The matrix predicate describes an action or state that accompanies the speech or thought described by the quotative phrase. (e.g. (16))

Fujita (2000a) claims that it is not appropriate to analyze the Type II quotative construction as involving ellipsis of a quotative predicate, on the grounds that, in Japanese, ellipsis of a predicate is rather rare and tends to result in a sentence that sounds ‘defective’.⁸ This argument is sensible, but it overlooks one crucial point: unlike ellipsis of other kinds of predicates, ellipsis of a quotative predicate (QPE) is rather common and attested in a variety of environments. The following sentence exemplifies a different type of the QPE, where a quotative predicate in the matrix environment is (or at least appears to be) elided.

- (18) A: Hiroshi-mo ku-ru-no?
 H.-also come-PRS-Q
 ‘Will Hiroshi come too?’
- B: Iya, [kyoo-wa isogashi-i] tte.
 no today-TOP busy-PRS tte
 ‘No, he said that he would be busy today.’

It is also worth noting that ellipsis of a communication or attitude predicate is attested in other languages such as Korean (Baek 2006: 193–202; H. Sohn 1999: 325–326) and African languages, including Ewe (Kwa, Niger-Congo) and Kera

8. Fujita also notes that if a constituent is elided (or ‘missing’) in a Type II construction, there must be a unique way to syntactically recover it, whilst also noting that there seems to be no such way. See Section 3.1 for discussion on this point.

(Chadic, Afro-Asiatic) (Güldemann 2008: 160–161 et passim, this volume; Dimmendaal 2001: 132; Frajzyngier 1996: 125–141), and less prominently in European languages like Spanish and English (Buchstaller 2011; Cameron 1998).⁹

Considering these points, it seems sensible to hypothesize that Fujita's Type II construction does indeed involve ellipsis of the quotative predicate. In the next section, we will examine varieties of the QPE phenomenon, which is to be regarded as a major characteristic of Japanese reported discourse, and argue that the Type II construction is a kind of elliptic quotation.

3. Varieties of elliptic quotation

This section has two aims: Firstly, it will argue that QPE is a key to solving the two puzzles regarding Japanese reported discourse, namely (i) why a quotative phrase may co-occur with a nominal direct object under the same predicate, and (ii) why a quotative phrase may occur under a predicate that is not a predicate of communication or attitude. Secondly, this section will offer detailed descriptions of a variety of QPE phenomena. We will examine the forms, functions, and licensing conditions of five types of the QPE: (i) suspensive QPE, (ii) sentence-final QPE, (iii) QPE in noun-modifying constructions, (iv) QPE in topic phrases, and (v) QPE in concessive constructions. The first two types involve ellipsis of a quotative predicate in its ordinary, literal use, while the next two involve ellipsis of *iu* 'say' occurring as part of an idiomatic phrase. The fifth type involves ellipsis of *iu* both in the literal use and as part of an idiomatic phrase.

3.1 Suspensive QPE

We propose that the type of QPE exemplified in (16) above, which we term the suspensive QPE, is generated through ellipsis of *iu* 'say' or *omou* 'believe, think' in their *te*-form, or gerund form in Bloch's (1946) terminology, heading a dependent clause.

A dependent clause headed by a *te*-form (gerund clause) may engage in a variety of semantic relations with the main clause (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 464–467), among which the most canonical are: (i) simultaneous occurrence, (ii) sequential occurrence, (iii) manner, and (iv) cause.¹⁰

9. The two types of QPE illustrated in (16) and (18), which are to be labeled below as the suspensive QPE and the sentence-final QPE, may be regarded as instances of 'non-clausal, quote-oriented quotative index' in Güldemann's (2008: 516, this volume) typology of quotative indexes (his term referring to expressions that indicate reported discourse).

10. One may find it more appropriate to group the first two uses under the label of 'simultaneous or sequential occurrence'.

(19) (simultaneous occurrence)

- a. Migite-de ten-o sashi-te, hidarite-de
 right.hand-by sky-ACC point.at-GER left.hand-by
 chi-o sashi-ta.
 ground-ACC point.at-PST
 'He pointed at the sky with his right hand, and at the ground with his left hand.'
- b. Hiroshi-ga chizu-o mi-te, Ken-ga unten-shi-ta.
 H.-NOM map-ACC look-GER K.-NOM drive-do-PST
 'Ken drove while Hiroshi looked at the map.'

(20) (sequential occurrence)

- a. Ha-o migai-te, hige-o sot-ta.
 tooth-ACC brush-GER beard-ACC shave-PST
 'He brushed his teeth and (then) shaved.'
- b. Hiroshi-ga booru-o nage-te, Ken-ga uketome-ta.
 H.-NOM ball-ACC throw-GER K.-NOM receive-PST
 'Hiroshi threw the ball and Ken caught it.'

(21) (manner)

- Basu-ni not-te, kaisha-ni it-ta.
 bus-DAT ride-GER company-DAT go-PST
 'He went to work by bus.'

(22) (cause)

- Ishi-ni tsumazui-te, koron-da.
 stone-DAT stumble-GER fall-PST
 'He stumbled on a stone and fell.'

A suspensive QPE construction may carry out any of these four functions, as shown in (23) to (26); this agrees well with our claim that this construction is generated through ellipsis of a quotative predicate in its *te*-form.¹¹

11. As sentences like (19b) and (20b) illustrate, the subject of a gerund clause does not need to match that of the superordinate clause. The same observation holds for a suspensive QPE construction, as illustrated by Example (i) (note that the predicate *kireru* 'hang up' is intransitive and selects for an inanimate subject); see Fujita (2000a: 77–79) for similar remarks.

(i) "Urusee, bakazaru-ni-wa kankei nee" tte kire-ta.
 annoying stupid.appe-DAT-TOP relation not.exist.PRS tte hang.up(intr.)-PST
 'She said "It's none of your business, you stupid ape", and the phone hung up.'

[Ikebukuro: 134]

- (23) (simultaneous occurrence)
“Dareka i-mas-en-ka?” to (it-te) doa-o tatai-ta.
 anybody be-POLITE-NEG-Q to say-GER door-ACC knock-PST
 ‘He knocked on the door, saying “Is anybody here?”’
- (24) (sequential occurrence)
“Soredewa mata ashita” to (it-te) heya-o de-te-it-ta.
 then again tomorrow to say-GER room-ACC exit-GER-go-PST
 ‘He said “Okay, then I will see you tomorrow”, and left the room.’
- (25) (manner)
 a. *“Omae-ga ik-e”* to (it-te) Hiroshi-ni shorui-o
 you-NOM go-IMP to say-GER H.-DAT document-ACC
 tori-ni ik-ase-ta.
 get-DAT go-CAUS-PST
 ‘He made Hiroshi fetch the document, saying “You go”.’
 b. *“Dare-ni-demo machigai-wa ar-u”* to (omot-te) jibun-o
 who-DAT-any mistake-TOP exist-PRS to think-GER self-ACC
 nagusame-ta.
 console-PST
 ‘He consoled himself, thinking “Anyone can make a mistake”.’
- (26) (cause)
“Moo doose mania-w-ana-i” to (omot-te) hashir-u no-o
 already anyway be.on.time-NEG-PRS to think-GER run-PRS PRO-ACC
 yame-ta.
 stop-PST
 ‘He stopped running, thinking “I won’t make it anyway”.’

Interestingly, it appears that ellipsis of *it-te* ‘say’ is only compatible with the first three interpretations of the *te*-form (‘simultaneous occurrence’, ‘sequential occurrence’, and ‘manner’), and ellipsis of *omot-te* ‘think’ is only compatible with the ‘manner’ and ‘cause’ interpretations. It is impossible, for example, to elide *it-te* on the ‘cause’ interpretation in (27), and *omot-te* on the ‘simultaneous occurrence’ interpretation in (28).

- (27) *“Ore-igai-wa minna munoo-da”* to *(it-te) hankan-o
 I-except-TOP all incompetent-be.PRS to say-GER antipathy-ACC
 kat-ta.
 buy-PST
 ‘He incurred hostility, saying “Everyone except me is incompetent”.’

- (28) “Kitto taikutsu-daroo” to *(omot-te)
 probably boring-probably to think-GER
 yomi-hajime-ta-ga, igai-to omoshirokat-ta.
 read-begin-PST-although unexpectedly interesting-PST
 ‘I started to read it, thinking “Probably it will be boring”, but it turned out
 to be more interesting than I expected.’

Another interesting restriction on the suspensive QPE construction (for which we cannot offer an explanation) is that it cannot be accompanied by an adverbial modifier (Fujita 2000a: 75). To put it simply, a quotative predicate in its gerund form cannot be elided when it is modified by an adverbial.

- (29) Oogoe-de “Dareka i-mas-en-ka?” to *(it-te) doa-o
 loud.voice-by anybody exist-POLITE-NEG-Q to say-GER door-ACC
 tatai-ta.
 knock-PST
 ‘He knocked on the door, saying “Is anybody here?” in a loud voice.’

As is the case for the ordinary quotative construction, *to* in the suspensive quotative construction may alternate with its stylistic variant *tte*.

- (30) “Shachoo, okuruma dashi-mash-oo-ka ...” tte Ueda-ga
 president car take.out-POLITE-VOL-Q *tte* U.-NOM
 makuramoto-ni tats-u kamoshiremasen-na.
 bedside-DAT stand-PRS it.may.be.the.case.POLITE-SFP
 ‘[The ghost of the deceased chauffeur] Ueda may appear by your bedside,
 saying “Do you need a ride, boss?” [naname: 137]

The suspensive QPE construction is typically in the direct mode, but is compatible with the indirect mode, too (Fujita 2000a: 108–109, 2000b: 99).

- (31) [Zettai-ni kimi-ni make-taku-na-i] to,
 certainly you-DAT lose-want-NEG-PRS to
 moorensyuu-shi-te-i-ru-yo.
 practice.hard-do-GER-IPFV-PRS-SFP
 ‘He has been practicing hard, saying that he definitely does not want to
 lose to you.’

Considering the discussion so far, we can now give a straightforward solution to the previously puzzling syntactic status of a *to/tte* quotative phrase (illustrated in Section 2.2). We propose that quotative constructions like (9a,b), (10) and (11)

involve the suspensive QPE. (10) (repeated below with the elidable predicate *it-te*), for example, can be analyzed as having the structure in (33).¹²

- (32) Kare-wa “Soo shi-mas-u” to (it-te) jikkoo-o
 he-TOP that.way do-POLITE-PRS to say-GER execution-ACC
 yakusoku-shi-ta.
 promise-do-PST
 ‘He promised to carry it out, saying “I will do it”’
- (33) [_S Kare-wa [_S “Soo shi-mas-u” to (it-te)] jikkoo-o yakusoku-shi-ta]

This analysis implies that a *to/tte* quotative phrase and a nominal direct object do not co-occur under a single quotative predicate, and thus a *to/tte*-quotative phrase may well be treated as a complement.¹³

When the main predicate is *iu* ‘say’, as in (9) – repeated below as (34) – the non-elliptic version of a suspensive quotative construction sounds awkward or marginal:

- (34) a. Sono sakka-to at-ta toki, watashi-wa,
 that author-with meet-PST when I-TOP
 “Anata-no sakuhin-wa issatsu-mo yon-da
 you-GEN work-TOP one.CLF-any read-PST
 koto-ga ari-mas-en” to (?it-te)
 matter-NOM exist-POLITE-NEG to say-GER

12. Note that Fujita (2000a) considers sentences like (9a,b), (10) and (11) as instances of the Type I quotative construction. That is, what we call the suspensive QPE construction does not exactly correspond to but subsumes Fujita’s type II construction.

13. Under a predicate describing a gesture or facial expression, a *to/tte* quotative phrase representing the conveyed message may co-occur with a direct object, without implying that there actually was a verbal utterance.

- (i) Kare-wa “Acchi-ni ik-e” to te-o fut-ta.
 he-TOP there-DAT go-IMP to hand-ACC wave-PST
 a. ‘He waved his hand, saying “Go away”’
 b. ‘He waved his hand, to convey the message: “Go away”’

This type of sentence (e.g. (i) on interpretation (b)) cannot be paraphrased with the version with *it-te*, which would imply that the gesture was actually accompanied by an utterance, or with the version with *omot-te* (*Kare-wa ... to {it-te/omot-te} te-o fut-ta*). The reason that a pseudo-quotative construction like this is possible may have to do with the fact that the direct object in it is not a canonical object in that it denotes a body part of the referent of the subject, so that the combination of the predicate and the direct object is construed as a single unit (which then can be combined with a *to/tte* quotative phrase).

shoojiki-ni hontoo-no koto-o it-ta.

honestly true matter-ACC say-PST

‘When I met that author, I honestly told him the truth, saying “I have not read any of your books.”’

- b. Sono sakka-to at-ta toki, watashi-wa,

that author-with meet-PST when I-TOP

[kare-no sakuhin-wa issatsu-mo yon-da

he-GEN work-TOP one.CLF-any read-PST

koto-ga na-i] to (?it-te) shoojiki-ni

matter-NOM not.exist-PRS to say-GER honestly

hontoo-no koto-o it-ta.

true matter-ACC say-PST

‘When I met that author, I honestly told him the truth, saying that I had not read any of his books.’

We believe, however, that this does not necessarily constitute a counter-argument against our analysis, as syntactic or morphological ellipsis is often not merely an optional process, but a *pragmatically obligatory* one (McShane 2005: 24–25), and is required for the sentence to be felicitous and natural. The following pair of English sentences illustrates this point; (35b) is arguably the non-elliptic version of (35a), and yet it sounds less natural.

- (35) a. John has been feeling depressed, but he doesn’t know why.
b. ?John has been feeling depressed, but he doesn’t know why he has been feeling depressed.

The awkwardness of (34a,b) without ellipsis may be analogized with that of (35b). We will now turn to another type of QPE, where a quotative predicate in the sentence-final position is elided.

3.2 Sentence-final QPE

As illustrated in (18) above, a quotative predicate heading a main clause can also be elided. This phenomenon, which we call the sentence-final QPE, has been widely considered as one of the peculiar characteristics of the Japanese quotation, evidenced by the fact that it is often mentioned in textbooks and reference books for learners of Japanese (e.g. Banno et al. 1999: 97; Sunakawa et al. 1998: 232; Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 510–511).

In the sentence-final QPE, typically, the elided predicate corresponds to some form of *iu* ‘say’, such as *it-ta* (perfective past), *it-te-i-ru* (imperfective present), and

it-te-i-ta (imperfective past).¹⁴ Unlike in the case of the suspensive QPE construction, the sentence-final QPE construction may be accompanied by an adverbial modifier.

- (36) Yamada-san-wa hakkiri “*Watashi-wa iki-mas-en*” tte
 Y.-SUFFIX-TOP clearly I-TOP go-POLITE-NEG tte
 (it-te-i-ru/ it-ta/ ...).
 say-GER-IPFV-PRS say-PST
 ‘Yamada {says/said} “I won’t go” in a clear tone.’

An interesting constraint on the sentence-final QPE is that a communication predicate referring to an eventuality in the future cannot be elided; for example, (36) cannot be interpreted as ‘Yamada will say “I won’t go” in a clear tone’.

The quote in a sentence-final QPE construction is typically a direct quote, but can also be indirect.

- (37) [Omae-ga ik-u-nara ik-ana-i] tte.
 you-NOM go-PRS-COND go-NEG-PRS tte
 ‘He says he won’t go if you are going.’

The sentence-final QPE typically involves the form *tte*, rather than *to* (most examples of the sentence-final QPE in the aforementioned references are with *tte*). A sentence-final QPE construction with *to*, however, is not impossible.

- (38) Watashi, Takigawa-ni it-te izoku-no
 I T.-DAT go-GER surviving.family-GEN
 kata-to omenikakat-te ohanashishi-ta ori-ni,
 person-with meet.HON-GER talk.HON-PST time-DAT
 “*Jisatsu-nasar-u zenya soshite toojitsu*,
 suicide-do.HON-PRS previous.night then same.day
donna goyoosu-deshi-ta-ka” tte
 what.kind.of appearance-be.POLITE-PST-Q tte
 ukagat-tara, “*Futsuu-to kawari-mas-en-deshi-ta*” to.
 ask.HON-after usual-with differ-POLITE-NEG-POLITE-PST to
 ‘When I went to Takigawa and talked to a family member of the high school student who committed suicide, I asked him “How was he on the night before and on the day when he committed suicide?”, and then he said “He looked just the same as usual”’ [Diet: 165th session]

14. The sentence-final QPE is also possible in speech in the polite style (characterized by the use of polite predicate forms); this means that *iu* in polite forms, e.g. *ii-mashi-ta* (polite perfective past), can be a target of ellipsis.

In addition, there are cases where the elided predicate corresponds to some form of *omou* ‘believe, think’. Ellipsis of *omou* heading a matrix clause is more restricted, however, in that (i) the matrix subject must be first person, and (ii) the quote cannot represent just any mental process, but must represent either an inference or an intention. (39) exemplifies ellipsis of *omou* with quote describing the speaker’s inference, and (40) with quote describing the speaker’s intention.

- (39) [Mitarai-san-nara kyoomi-o omochininar-u nja-na-i-ka] to.
 M.-SUFFIX-COND interest-ACC have.HON-PRS AUX-NEG-PRS-Q *to*
 ‘I thought you might be interested, Mr. Mitarai.’ [dance: 14, modified]
- (40) (In reply to “Oh, weren’t you asleep?”)
 [Kore-kara nemur-oo-ka] to, nanika?
 this-from sleep-VOL-Q *to* something
 ‘I was just thinking of getting some sleep. Any news?’
 [dance: 246, modified]

3.3 Extensions of sentence-final QPE

The forms *to* and *tte* are often used as a sentence-final particle or part of an idiomatic phrase occurring at the end of a sentence. It is natural to hypothesize that such uses of *to/tte* emerged from the sentence-final QPE construction, through reanalysis. However, it is beyond the scope of the current work to fully examine all such extended uses of *to/tte*; here, we will just offer three representative examples (see Kato 2010; Sunakawa et al. 1998: 197, 232–233; Okamoto 1995 for relevant discussions).

Firstly, *tte* (but not *to*) may be used as a sentence-final particle that indicates the speaker’s eagerness to convince the hearer to accept or comply with the content of the utterance.¹⁵

- (41) a. Zettai muri-da-*tte*.
 certainly impossible-be.PRS-*tte*
 ‘It’s definitely impossible, I’m telling you.’
- b. Yame-ro-*tte*.
 stop-IMP-*tte*
 ‘Stop it!’

It is quite natural to hypothesize that *tte* in this usage emerged from the idiomatic construction ‘P *to/tte* iu n(o)da’ (exemplified in (42); P is a placeholder for a clause

15. *Tte* as a sentence-final particle, as well as the ‘P *to/tte* iu n(o)da’ construction to be mentioned below, may be regarded as an instance of the cross-linguistic tendency for quotative markers/constructions to acquire the function of ‘illocution reinforcement’ (Güldemann 2008: 411–417 and references therein).

and *n(o)da* is an auxiliary verb with varied functions including emphasis), through QPE and reanalysis.¹⁶

- (42) [Yame-ro] tte i-u nda.
 stop-IMP tte say-PRS AUX.PRS
 'I'm telling you to stop!'

Secondly, the sequence of (some form of) the copula *da* and *to/tte* functions to indicate the speaker's incredulity or amazement. The expression preceding *dato/datte* is typically a repetition of (part of) the immediately preceding utterance by a different interlocutor, and does not need to be a complete clause.

- (43) a. Yuurei *datte*?
 ghost *datte*
 'Did you say "ghost"? (I can't believe my ears.)'
 b. Boku-ga uso-o tsui-te-i-ta *datte*?
 I-NOM lie-ACC tell-GER-IPFV-PST *datte*
 'Did you say that I was lying to you? (I can't believe my ears.)'

Thirdly, the sequence of (some form of) the auxiliary *n(o)da* and *to/tte* can be used as a hearsay expression, which can roughly be translated as 'I hear that' or 'they say that'.¹⁷

- (44) Kono yama-ni-wa kitsune-ga i-ru ndato.
 this mountain-DAT-TOP fox-NOM be-PRS *ndato*
 'I hear that there are foxes on this mountain.'

The expression preceding *n(o)dato/n(o)datte* must be a clause, and cannot be a nominal or some other kind of utterance fragment.

The 'P *n(o)dato/n(o)datte*' construction needs to be distinguished from the regular sentence-final QPE construction. This is evident in contexts where the segment *n(o)da* is turned into the polite form *n(o)desu*, as in (45); the construction is thus interpreted as indicating deference of the (external) speaker towards the (external)

16. It is also possible to elide the segment *iu* in the 'P *to/tte iu n(o)da*' construction and leave the rest as it is.

(i) [Yame-ro] tte nda.
 stop-IMP tte AUX.PRS
 'Stop it!'

17. Functional extension of a quotative marker/construction into a hearsay/evidential expression is attested across languages, including Tibeto-Burman (Saxena 1988), Papuan (de Vries 1990: 294), and a number of African languages (Güldemann 2008: 406–410). See also Spronck (this volume) and Buchstaller (2011) for relevant discussions.

hearer, rather than of the ‘original’ speaker (i.e., the person from whom the speaker of (45) heard that Suzuki would meet Tanaka) towards the reporter-speaker.

- (45) Suzuki-san-ga ashita Tanaka-san-ni a-u ndesutte.
 S.-SUFFIX-NOM tomorrow T.-SUFFIX-DAT meet-PRS *ndesutte*
 ‘I hear that Suzuki will meet Tanaka tomorrow.’

In other words, (45) conveys that the speaker is being polite to the hearer, rather than some other person being polite to the speaker.¹⁸ This implies that the part preceding *to/tte* is not a quote. (The same point holds for the aforementioned ‘X *dato/datte*’ construction.)

3.4 QPE in a noun-modifying construction

The sequence of the quotative particles *to/tte* and *iu* ‘say’ has an idiomatic use as an adposition occurring in the noun-modifying construction: ‘X *toiu/tteiu* N’. The exact function and distribution of this construction have been a matter of extensive debate (Matsumoto 1998; Terakura 1983 *inter alia*). In most typical cases, the relation between the two constituents linked by *toiu/tteiu* is [X: name, N: entity], [X: content, N: information-bearing entity], or [X: characterization of form, N: linguistic or auditory entity].¹⁹

- (46) [X: name, N: entity]
 Ozu Yasujiro {*toiu/tteiu*} hito
 O. Y. *toiu/tteiu* person
 ‘the person called Yasujiro Ozu’

18. (45) can be contrasted with a direct report like (i), where the polite form in the quote indicates that the original speaker (= Suzuki) spoke in a polite manner.

- (i) Suzuki-san-wa “Watashi-wa ashita Tanaka-san-ni ai-mas-u” to it-ta.
 S.-SUFFIX-TOP I-TOP tomorrow T.-SUFFIX-DAT meet-POLITE-PRS *to* say-PST
 ‘Suzuki said “I will meet Tanaka tomorrow”.’

19. Of these three relations indicated by *toiu*, the [X: name, N: entity] is probably the most basic; this can be inferred from the fact that *iu* as a main predicate may represent this relation, but not the other two.

- (i) Kono hito-wa Ozu Yasujiro {*to/tte*} ii-mas-u.
 this person-TOP O. Y. *to/tte* say-POLITE-PRS
 ‘This person is called Yasujiro Ozu.’

It is also worth noting that cross-linguistically it is quite common for a quotative marker/construction to be also used in a ‘naming construction’ (Güldemann 2008: 398–406 and references therein).

- (47) [X: content, N: information-bearing entity]
 raion-ga nige-ta {toiu/tteiu} nyuusu
 lion-NOM escape-PST *toiu/tteiu* news
 ‘the news that a lion escaped’
- (48) [X: characterization of form, N: linguistic or auditory entity]
 “*Tetsu-wa atsu-i uchi-ni ut-e*” {toiu/tteiu} kotowaza
 iron-TOP hot-PRS while-DAT strike-IMP *toiu/tteiu* proverb
 ‘the proverb “Strike while the iron is hot”’

Tteiu occurring in this noun-modifying construction can be shortened into *tte* (National Institute for Japanese Language 2006: 65; Sunakawa et al. 1998: 231). This process may be regarded as a variant of the QPE.

- (49) a. Ozu Yasujiro *tte* hito
 b. raion-ga nige-ta *tte* nyuusu
 c. “*Tetsu-wa atsu-i uchi-ni ut-e*” *tte* kotowaza

Unlike *tteiu*, *toiu* cannot undergo this reduction process (recall that *to* is a more formal variant of *tte*; as quotative markers, their difference is purely stylistic). Thus, the segment *tte* in (49a–c) cannot be replaced with *to*.

3.5 QPE in topic phrases

The topic markers *towa* and *tte*, which are illustrated in (50), can be analyzed as having emerged through the etymological processes shown in (51) and (52), which involve ellipsis of *iu* ‘say’ (among other things).

- (50) a. Guusuu-towa ni-de warikir-e-ru
 even.number-*towa* two-by divide.without.remainder-POT-PRS
 kazu-no koto-des-u.
 number-GEN matter-be.POLITE-PRS
 ‘Even numbers are those numbers that can be divided by 2 without a remainder.’
- b. Yamada-san-tte shinsetsu-des-u-ne.
 Y.-SUFFIX-*tte* kind-be.POLITE-PRS-SFP
 ‘Yamada is nice, isn’t he?’
- (51) [X *toiu* no] wa > X *towa*
 X *toiu* PRO TOP X *towa*
- (52) [X *tte(iu)* no] wa > X *tte*
 X *tte(iu)* PRO TOP X *tte*

We hypothesize that the topic marker *towa* emerged from ‘X *toiu* no *wa*’, where *toiu* is the adposition mentioned in Section 3.4, *no* is a pronoun that roughly translates as ‘(the) one’, and *wa* is a so-called topic marker. While the sequence ‘X *toiu* no *wa*’ is interpreted in the expected way from the functions/meanings of its sub-parts, the phrase ‘X *towa*’ has a more specialized function; typically, it is used as a part of a sentence that explains the meaning/identity of a word or name (Iori et al. 2001: 333–334; Sunakawa et al. 1998: 354–355).

Similarly, the topic marker *tte* can be regarded as having emerged from ‘X *tte(iu)* no *wa*’, which consists of a noun modifier ‘X *tte(iu)*’, a pronoun, and a topic-marker. The exact function of the topicalization construction with *tte* is hard to pin down, but it can be characterized approximately as ‘to take up an entity or concept, and make an emotive judgment or evaluation on it’ (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 509–510; Sunakawa et al. 1998: 231–232).

3.6 QPE in concessive constructions

The concessive adverbial clauses in the forms of ‘P *kara* {*to/tte*} *itte*’ and ‘P {*to/tte*} *ittatte*’, which are exemplified in (53) and (54) respectively, may undergo shortening that involves ellipsis of (a form of) *iu* ‘say’.

- (53) a. Fuhei-o iw-ana-i kara {*to/tte*} *it-te*
 complaint-ACC say-NEG-PRS because *to/tte* say-GER
 manzoku-shi-te-i-ru wakede-wa-na-i.
 satisfaction-do-GER-IPFV-PRS AUX-TOP-NEG-PRS
 ‘He is not satisfied, even though he does not complain.’
- b. Kodomo-da kara {*to/tte*} *it-te* yurus-u koto-wa
 child-be.PRS because *to/tte* say-GER forgive-PRS matter-TOP
 deki-na-i.
 able-NEG-PRS
 ‘I cannot forgive him, even though he is a child.’
- (54) a. [Ku-ru-na] {*to/tte*} *it-tatte*, ku-ru-daroo.
 come-PRS-NEG.IMP *to/tte* say-even.if come-PRS-probably
 ‘He would come even if you tell him not to.’
- b. [Isog-e] {*to/tte*} *it-tatte*, kore-ijoo-wa
 hurry-IMP *to/tte* say-even.if this-more.than-TOP
 muri-da-yo.
 impossible-be.PRS-SFP
 ‘You tell me to hurry up, but I can’t go any faster.’

- c. [Ryokoo-ni ik-u] {to/tte} it-tatte,
 trip-DAT go-PRS to/tte say-even.if
 mikkakan-dake-des-u.
 for.three.days-only-be.POLITE-PRS
 'I'm indeed going to make a trip, but (contrary to what you might think) it's only for three days.'

'P kara {to/tte} itte' is an idiomatic construction that literally consists of a clause, *kara* 'because', *to/tte*, and the gerund form of *iu*. It must be subordinate to a clause in the negative polarity and roughly translates as 'even though P' (Makino and Tsutsui 1995: 103–105). The segment 'kara {to/tte} itte' may be shortened into 'karatte', as illustrated in (55), without a discernable difference in the meaning.

- (55) a. Fuhei-o iw-ana-i karatte manzoku-shi-te-i-ru
 wake-de-wa-na-i. (≈(a))
 b. Kodomo-da karatte yurus-u koto-wa deki-na-i. (≈(b))

The presence of the variant form *karattutte* (or *karattatte*), which is used in a very colloquial style, suggests a reduction process along the lines of (56) (phonological descriptions are presented between slashes, where Q represents a special phoneme that turns the following consonant into a geminate).

- (56) kara tte itte /karaQteiQte/ > karattutte /karaQtuQte/ >
 karatte /karaQte/
 (The segment /Qtei/ changes into /Qtu/, and then the segment /Qtu/ drops.)

This analysis implies that the formation of the form *karatte* involves not only ellipsis of the communication predicate, but also ellipsis of the quotative marker.

Let us next turn to 'P {to/tte} ittatte'; this adverbial construction consists of a clause *P*, *to/tte*, and the infinitive form of *iu* followed by the particle *tatte* 'even if, even though'.²⁰ As a whole it roughly translates as 'even if X says P' (as in (54a)), 'even though X says P' (as in (54b)), or, idiomatically, 'contrary to what you might expect from (X's saying) P' (as in (54c)). (Note that the third use does not necessarily involve actual saying, while the first and second use do.)

20. It is interesting to note that similar ambiguity between 'even if' (concessive conditional) and 'even though' (concessive) is exhibited by the English (*even*) *if* construction. Sweetser (1990) presents examples like the following, referring to them as 'speech-act concessive conditionals'.

- (i) a. (Even) if there are ten beers in the fridge, we gotta work.
 b. (Even) if he's a stuffed shirt, he's not a fool. (Sweetser 1990: 138)

Analogous to ‘P kara {to/tte} itte’, the ‘P {to/tte} ittatte’ construction may be shortened into ‘P ttuttatte’ and ‘P ttatte’, as illustrated in (57) (Makino and Tsutsui 2008: 597–99).

- (57) a. [Ku-ru-na] ttatte, ku-ru-daroo. (≈ (54a))
 b. [Isog-e] ttatte, kore-ijoo-wa muri-da-yo. (≈ (54b))
 c. [Ryokoo-ni ik-u] ttatte, mikkakan-dake-des-u. (≈ (54c))

The formation of the form *ttatte* is illustrated in (58); as is the case of *karatte*, it involves not only ellipsis of *iu*, but also ellipsis of the quotative marker *tte*.

- (58) tte it tatte /QteiQtaQte/ > ttuttatte /QtuQtaQte/ >
 ttatte /QtaQe/
 (The segment /Qtei/ changes into /Qtu/, and then the segment /Qtu/
 drops.)

4. Conclusion

It was demonstrated that in Japanese the basic communication predicate *iu* (either in its literal use or as part of idiomatic constructions) may be elided in a variety of configurations through similar but distinct processes. In addition, it was shown that ellipsis of the basic attitude predicate *omou* is also possible, though under more limited circumstances.

Considering that quotative predicate ellipsis (QPE) is a rather common phenomenon in Japanese, it appears reasonable to conclude, contra Fujita, that the so-called Type II quotative construction (the construction where a quotative phrase appears to occur under a predicate that is not a predicate of communication or attitude) is generated through QPE. The same type of QPE also accounts for the interesting observation that a *to/tte* quotative phrase may co-occur with a nominal direct object under the same predicate; it only appears so because a subordinate predicate that selects for a quotative phrase (namely the gerund form of *iu* ‘say’ or *omou* ‘think, believe’) may be elided. In sum, the apparent ability of the *to/tte* quotative phrase to co-occur with a nominal direct object and to occur under a predicate that is not a predicate of communication or attitude – this having been regarded as evidence of the alleged idiosyncrasy of reported discourse in Japanese – can be understood as an effect resulting from the elidability of a quotative predicate. We conclude by mentioning two issues that are in need of future research. First, the relations and connections between varieties of the QPE are yet to be clarified. Diachronic investigation is called for, e.g. to determine whether the suspensive QPE historically preceded the sentence-final QPE or vice versa, and

whether one of them was etymologically derived from the other. Second, it would be interesting to investigate other languages in which the QPE is attested, and more generally, how conditions differ across languages under which the QPE is possible. In Korean, which is known to have a great deal of grammatical similarities with Japanese, varieties of ellipsis phenomena are attested that are analogous to the suspensive QPE, the sentence-final QPE, and other forms of QPE in Japanese (Baek 2006: 193–202; H. Sohn 1999: 325–326; S. Sohn 1994: 396–401; Martin 1992: 331–333). It has also been reported that a communication predicate in a main clause is often dropped in some African languages (Güldemann 2008: 160–161, this volume; Dimmendaal 2001: 132; Frajzyngier 1996: 125–141), and that a similar phenomenon is observed in European languages such as English and Spanish (Buchstaller 2011; Cameron 1998). Cross-linguistic research is called for to determine how elliptic quotative constructions in Japanese and other languages such as Korean contrast with each other, and to identify universals and the range of variation regarding elliptic quotation.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the editors Ingrid Van Alphen and Isabelle Buchstaller and two anonymous reviewers for valuable comments and discussions which helped us improve this work in a number of ways. Thanks also to Chiemi Fujiwara for valuable comments on a previous version of this work. All remaining errors are our own.

References

- Baek, Bongja. 2006. *Oegugeoroseoui hangugeo munbeop sajeon* [A reference grammar of Korean as a foreign language]. Seoul: Hau, 2nd edn.
- Banno, Eri, Ohno, Yutaka, Sakane, Yoko, Shinagawa, Chikako and Tokashiki, Kyoko. 1999. *Genki: An Integrated Course in Elementary Japanese*, vol. 2. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Bloch, Bernard. 1946. "Studies in colloquial Japanese I: Inflection." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66: 97–130.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2011. "Quotations across the generations: A multivariate analysis of speech and thought introducers across 5 generations of Tyneside speakers". *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 7: 59–92.
- Cameron, Richard. 1998. "A variable syntax of speech, gesture, and sound effect: Direct quotations in Spanish". *Language Variation and Change* 10: 43–83.
- Clark, Herbert H., and Gerrig, Richard J. 1990. "Quotations as demonstrations." *Language* 66 (4): 764–805.
- Coulmas, Florian. 1986. "Direct and indirect speech in Japanese." In *Direct and Indirect Speech*, F. Coulmas (ed.), 161–178. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dimmendaal, Gerrit J. 2001. "Logophoric marking and represented speech in African languages as evidential hedging strategies." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21(1): 131–157.
- de Vries, Lourens. 1990. "Some remarks on direct quotation in Kombai." In *Unity in Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th Birthday*, Harm Pinkster and Inge Genée (eds), 291–308. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1996. *Grammaticalization of the Complex Sentence: A Case Study in Chad-ic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fujita, Yasuyuki. 1988. "Inyooron no shikai [The scope of research on quotation]." *Nihongogaku* 7(9): 30–45.
- Fujita, Yasuyuki. 1999. "Inyoo koobun no koozoo [The quotative structure in Japanese]." *Kokugogaku* 198: 1–15.
- Fujita, Yasuyuki. 2000a. *Kokugo inyoo koobun no kenkyuu [A Study of the Quotative Structure in Japanese]*. Osaka: Izumi Shoin.
- Fujita, Yasuyuki. 2000b. "Bunpooron to shite no nihongo inyoo hyoogen no kenkyuu no tame ni: Futatabi Kamada Osamu no shoron ni tsuite [A note for the syntactic analysis of quotative expressions in Japanese: A second criticism on Kamada Osamu's theory]." *Memoirs of the Faculty of Education, Shiga University: Humanities and Social Science* 50: 85–104.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hirose, Yukio. 1995. "Direct and indirect speech as quotations of public and private expression." *Lingua* 95(4): 223–238.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1990. "bring, take, come, and go." *Journal of English Linguistics* 23(1/2): 239–244.
- Iori, Isao, Matsuoka, Hiroshi, Nakanishi, Kumiko and Yamada, Toshihiro. 2001. *Chuujookyuu o oshieru hito no tame no nihongo bunpoo handobukku [The Handbook of the Japanese Grammar for Teachers of Intermediate/Advanced Classes]*. Tokyo: 3A Corporation.
- Kamada, Osamu. 2000. *Nihongo no inyoo [Quotation in Japanese]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Kato, Yoko. 2010. *Hanashi kotoba ni okeru inyoo hyoogen: Inyoo hyooshiki ni chuuumoku shite [Quotative Expressions in Spoken Language: With Special Attention to Quotative Markers]*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1988. "Blended quasi-direct discourse in Japanese." In *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*, W.J. Poser (ed.), 75–102. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Maier, Emar. 2009. "Japanese reported speech: Against a direct-indirect distinction." In *New Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence: JSAI 2008 Conference and Workshops, Asahikawa, Japan, June 11–13, 2008, Revised Selected Papers*, vol. 5447 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, H. Hattori, T. Kawamura, T. Ide, M. Yokoo, and Y. Murakami (eds), 187–200. Berlin: Springer.
- Makino, Seiichi and Tsutsui, Michio. 1986. *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Makino, Seiichi and Tsutsui, Michio. 1995. *A Dictionary of Intermediate Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Makino, Seiichi and Tsutsui, Michio. 2008. *A Dictionary of Advanced Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Korean: A Complete Guide to the Grammar and History of the Korean Language*. Tokyo: Tuttle.

- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1998. "The complementizer *toyuu* in Japanese." In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, vol. 7, N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, S.O. Sohn, and S. Strauss (eds), 243–255. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1986. "The particle *-o* and content-oriented indirect speech in Japanese written discourse." In *Direct and Indirect Speech*, F. Coulmas (ed), 179–200. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McClain, Yoko M. 1981. *Handbook of Modern Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: Hokuseido Press.
- McShane, Marjorie J. 2005. *A Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moriyama, Takuro. 1990. *Nihongo dooshi jutsugo bun no kenkyuu* [A Study of Verb Constructions in Japanese]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- National Institute for Japanese Language. 2006. *Nihongo hanashi kotoba koopasu no koochikuhoo* [Construction of the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese], no. 124 of NIJLA Reports.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1982. "Kaku no hyoogen keishiki: Nihongo [Case-marking expressions: Japanese]." In *Gaikokugo to no taishoo: I* [Comparison with Foreign Languages: I], vol. 10 of *Kooza nihongogaku*, Y. Miyaji, H. Teramura, and Y. Kawabata (eds), 118–138. Tokyo: Meiji syoin.
- Niwa, Junko. 1994. "Fukushiteki shuushoku seibun "to" o seiri suru: Gutaika no "to", inyoo no "to", jootai fukushi no "to" o megutte [An analysis of adverbial element "TO": on TO of specification, of quotation, and of manner adverbs]." In *Tsukuba daigaku ryuugakusei sentaa nihongo kyooiku ronshuu*, vol. 9: 19–28.
- Okamoto, Shigeko. 1995. "Pragmaticization of meaning in some sentence-final particles in Japanese." In *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics. Festschrift for Charles Fillmore*, M. Shibatani and S.A. Thompson (eds), 219–246. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Okutsu, Keiichiro. 1974. *Seisei nihon bunpooron* [Generative Japanese Syntax]. Tokyo: Taisyukan.
- Oshima, David Y. 2006a. *Perspectives in Reported Discourse*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Oshima, David Y. 2006b. "Motion deixis, indexicality, and presupposition." In *Proceedings of SALT*, vol. 16, Masayuki Gibson and Jonathan Howell (eds), 172–189. Ithaca: CLC Publications.
- Pak, Miok D., Portner, Paul and Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2004. "Deriving clause types: Focusing on Korean." In *Proceedings of the Linguistics Society of Korea 2004*, 359–368. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
- Partee, Barbara. 1973. "The syntax and semantics of quotation." In *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky (eds), 410–418. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Portner, Paul. 2005. "The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types." In *Proceedings of SALT*, vol. 14, Kazuha Watanabe and Robert B. Young (eds), 235–252. Ithaca: CLC Publications.
- Saxena, Anju. 1988. "On syntactic convergence: The case of the verb 'say' in Tibeto-Burman." In *Proceedings of BLS*, vol. 14, Shelley Axmaker, Annie Jaisser and Helen Singmaster (eds), 375–388. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. "A plea for monsters." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(1): 29–120.
- Schwager, Johanna M. 2006. *Interpreting Imperatives*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Frankfurt.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1978. *Nihongo no bunseki* [Analyses of the Japanese Language]. Tokyo: Taisyukan.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sohn, Sung-Ock S. 1994. "Phonological reduction and reanalysis in modern Korean: A case of incipient grammaticalizations." In *Proceedings of CLS*, vol. 30(1), K. Beals, J. Denton, R. Knippen, L. Melnar, and H. Suzuki (eds), 391–404. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Sunakawa, Yuriko. 1988. "Inyoo koobun ni okeru ba no nizyuusei ni tsuite [On the duality of the field in quotative constructions]." *Nihongogaku* 7(9): 14–29.
- Sunakawa, Yuriko. 1989. "Inyoo to wahoo [Quotation and reported discourse]." In *Nihongo no bunpo/buntai: Joo [Syntax and Style of Japanese: Part 1]*, vol. 10 of *Kooza nihongo to nihongo kyooiku*, Y. Kitahara (ed.), 355–387. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Sunakawa, Yuriko, Komada, Satoshi, Shimoda, Mitsuko, Suzuki, Mutsumi, Tsutsui, Sayo, Hasunuma, Akiko, Bekes, Andrej and Morimoto, Junko (eds). 1998. *Kyooshi to gakushuusha no tame no nihongo bunkei jiten [A Dictionary of Japanese Phrase Patterns for Teachers and Learners]*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Sweetser, Eve E. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Terakura, Hiroko. 1983. "Noun modification and the use of to yuu." *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 18(1): 23–55.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1982. *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi [Syntax and Semantics of Japanese]*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Toyama, Shigehiko. 1981. *Nihongo no sugao [The True Face of Japanese]*. Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha.

Appendix: Sources of data

- [dance]: *Mitarai Kiyoshi no dansu* (a novel; author: Shimada Soji, publisher: Kodansha, year of publication: 1993)
- [Diet]: The on-line full-text database of the Minutes of the National Diet of Japan (administered by National Diet Library; <http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/>)
- [Ikebukuro]: *Kudoo Kankuroo kyakuhon: Ikebukuro uesto geetopaaku* (A collection of scripts for a TV series; author: Kudo Kankuro, publisher: Kadokawa Shoten, year of publication: 2005)
- [naname]: *Naname yashiki no hanzai* (a novel; author: Shimada Soji, publisher: Kodansha, year of publication: 1992)