

When and why to add *to iu*: A study of the complementizer *to iu* in Japanese noun-modification¹

Yan Wang
Carthage College

Abstract

Although Japanese noun modifying construction involving *to iu* (*te iu*), a complementizer derived from the ‘quotation construction’, has been discussed by linguists for decades (e.g. Josephes, 1976; Terakura, 1983; Maynard, 1992, 1993; Matsumoto, 1998), the simple question from the learners of Japanese “When should we insert *to iu* between the modifying clause and the noun?” seems to remain unanswered. This paper aims to contribute to solving this pedagogical problem.

Based on the examination of naturally-occurring conversations between native Japanese speakers, this paper proposes that in the noun modification construction [X *to iu* Y], when the clause [X] is marked as or as if a quotation to “interpret” the noun [Y], *to iu* is syntactically required; when the discourse invites the speaker to “highlight” or “foreground” the information contained in the proposition of the modifying clause, *to iu* is pragmatically called for. Meanwhile, due to the original connection with quotation, by using *to iu*, the speaker also shows “social distance” from the information that he/she is presenting in the noun-modification utterances. This study suggests the complementizer *to iu* in none-modification is the result of “grammaticalization” (Traugott, 1982), and its newly arising grammatical features and pragmatic functions are derived from its etymological origin as a quotation construction.

¹ This paper is based on a study closely directed by Professor Naomi McGloin, and it is also largely indebted to Professor Maki Shiomotani for her constructive advice as well as generous help in data transcription. I also greatly appreciate Professor Marian Rothstein’s help for editing the draft of this paper.

1. Introduction

Japanese noun modifying construction involving *to iu* (including its variants such as *tte iu* and *tte*), which is composed of the quotation marker *to* and the verb *yuu* “to say,” has been a topic discussed by linguists for decades (e.g., Terakura, 1980,1983; Maynard, 1992, 1993; Matsumoto, 1998).without providing a clear and simple answer to the Japanese learner’s simple question: “When and why should we insert the phrase *to iu* between the modifying clause and the noun?”

The noun modifying structure containing *to iu* can be illustrated as [X *to iu* Y], in which [X] is a modifying clause while [Y] is its head noun. Depending on circumstances, *to iu* may be obligatory, as in example (1), or optional, as in (2):

(1) obligatory *to iu*

Mori-san ga shiken o ukeru daroo toiu/ Ø hanashi*
The story that Mori will probably take the exam

(2) optional *to iu*

Mori-san ga shiken o ukerta toiu/ Ø hanashi
The story that Mori took the exam

(Takahashi, 1997, p.1)

The modified item [Y] may also be a noun-nominalizer such as *no* and *koto* rather than lexical head nouns (3):

(3) *Watakushi wa hooritsu o manabanakatta (to iu/ Ø) koto wo kookaishiteiru.*
I TOP law ACC study-NEG-PST thing ACC regretting
“I regret that I did not study law.”

(Terakura, 1983, p.26)

Some previous studies only examine *to iu* that is prior to “lexical head nouns” (e.g., Terakura, 1983; Maynard, 1992; Matsumoto, 1998), others focus on *to iu* used before noun-nominalizers (e.g., Kuno, 1973; Josephes,1976; Terakura,1980). Here I will consider both these uses of *to iu*. While previous studies generally used constructive sentential data, or data from written literature, this study draws its evidence from

naturally occurring conversations among native Japanese speakers. Based on discourse analysis of such authentic conversational data, my study tests previous arguments on the usages of *to iu* as a complementizer in Japanese noun-modification structure in conversational discourse, proposes a more systematic interpretation of the conditions under which it occurs, as well as considering discourse-pragmatic functions of *to iu*. In particular, the present study claims that the complementizer *to iu* is syntactically required between a modifying clause and a modified noun under certain grammatical constraints. In particular, *to iu* is obligatory when the embedded clause is represented as a “direct quotation”, which is characterized with sentence-final particles, fillers, incomplete endings or expressions of speech acts². In the case of syntactically optional *to iu*, my study supports the claims of Maynard (1992, 1993), and demonstrates that the decision of using or non-using *to iu* is mainly based on discourse-pragmatic preference. That is, when the discourse invites the speaker to highlight or foreground the information contained in the proposition of the modifying clause for various reasons: because it is unknown to the addressee, or new to the speaker, or contrastive to other information, the use of *to iu* is preferred. Furthermore, this paper suggests *to iu* can also show the speaker’s attitude of “social distance” from the information he/she is providing by marking it like a quoted statement.

2. Data of this study

The database of this study includes 12 two-party face-to-face conversations arranged between young native Japanese speakers, who were graduate or undergraduate students at a university in the northwestern part of the United States. A total of 15 participants (8

² The so-called “expressions of speech acts” include invitation expressions such as “*-mashoo ka*”, request expressions such as “*-te kudasai*” “*-nasai*” and suggestion expressions such as “*-hoo ga ii*” and so on.

males and 7 females) in their 20s and 30s participated in this project. All the speakers speak so-called *hyoojun-go* “standard language” or *kyootsuu-go* “common language”.

The data was collected in a semi-natural setting. Two participants were invited to pair together to have a free-form conversation without having a particular topic assigned to the conversation. The participants were aware that their conversations would be used as linguistic data, but they were not informed of the particular focus or purpose of the current research. The researcher set up the recording system before the conversations started, and stayed absent during the recording process. The genders and familiarities of the two speakers in each pair were balanced as much as possible in the arrangement of the conversational pairs. Each conversation lasted between 8 and 15 minutes and all the conversations were audio taped and then transcribed. The occurrences of *to iu* in the transcriptions were highlighted and analyzed in the sequential contexts.

In total, in the 140 minutes of Japanese conversations 49 cases of *to iu* occurred and were examined.

3. Three previous theories on the functions of *to iu*

As a starting point of the studies of *to iu*, Josephs (1976), who has employed Kuno’s (1973) concept of “factivity” to account for the complementation, claims that *to iu* essentially marks “nonfactivity”. Josephs suggests that *to iu* always occurs with nouns such as *uwasa* (rumor) that connote less convicted propositions. Casting doubt on Josephs’ claim, McCawley (1978) and Terakura (1980, 1983) point out that *to iu* can be found in embedded clauses, which represent things that the speaker knows or is certain are true. We have already seen example (3), one of the counter examples against the hypothesis of “nonfactivity” given by Terakura (1983, P.26)

(3) *Watakushi wa hooritsu o manabanakatta (to iu/ Ø) koto o kookaishiteiru.*

I TOP law ACC study-NEG-PST thing ACC regretting
“I regret that I did not study law.”

Terakura argues that even though the speaker regrets something about his own past that is absolutely “true” for him, the insertion of *to iu* is still acceptable. This suggests that the truth condition of the proposition and the speaker’s epistemic belief about the proposition are not the only elements that drive the use of *to iu*.

Rather than focusing on the meaning of *to iu* itself, Teramura (1969) claims a “content-theme” relationship between the modifying clauses prior to *to iu* and the modified nouns following *to iu*. That is, the modifying clause represents the content of the lexical nouns, or explains the relevant noun in some way. Therefore, Maynard calls it an “explanatory clause” (1992, P.171).

However, Teramura’s “content-theme” hypothesis (1969) can neither distinguish the difference between obligatory and optional *to iu*, nor does it clarify the motivation to add *to iu* when it is optional. In addition, in the case of the noun-nominalizer that generally lacks concrete propositional meaning, it seems improper to call it a “theme”. Furthermore, Terakura (1983, P.25) points out that in the following sentence, *to iu to iu* is not placed at the point where the modifying sentence and the modified noun that are in a “content-theme” relationship.

(4)

moo sukoshi de mokutekichi ni tsuku to iu toki ni, ame ga furi-dashite bishyonure ni natta.

“At the time just before I would be arriving at my destination, it began to rain and I got drenched.”

Terakura argues that since the noun *toki* is unable to function as the topic of the “topic-predicate” sentence, as shown below, the modifying sentence and the modified noun in

the following sentence are not in what Teramura (1969) called “content-theme” relationship³:

**toki wa [moo sukoshi de mokutekichi ni tsuku] koto/mono/tokoro da*

* “Time is that I’ll be arriving at my destination.”

Instead, Terakura (1980) proposes a notion of “subjectivity” to interpret the occurrence and non-occurrence of *to iu*, by emphasizing the reflection of the speaker’s attitude in the choice of the complementizer. In Terakura’s interpretation, *to iu* indicates that the embedded predication is not a fact, but a *subjective* proposition.

Compare the following contrastive examples from Terakura (1983, P.44)

(5)

a) *kore wa gohan ga kogeteiru (*to iu) nioi da.*

“It smells of rice burning. [lit. It smells that rice is burning.]”

b) *kore wa gohan demo kogeteiru to iu nioi da.*

“It smells like rice or something is burning.”⁴

Although agreeing with Teramura (1969) that nouns such as *nioi* (smell) designating sensations normally do not allow the presence of *to iu*, Terakura (1983) points out that in (5b) *to iu* may occur since the modifying sentence *kore wa gohan demo kogeteiru* “This is rice or something is burning” represents the speaker’s “subjective approximation” of a unidentified smell (Terakura, 1983, P.41). In other words, the embedded sentence in (5b) represents the speaker’s *personal proposition* rather than a *fact*. Similarly, in (4), it may be argued that *moo sukoshi de mokutekichi ni tsuku* (lit. “A little more (I) will arrive at the destination”) can be considered as the speaker’s subjective prediction or judgment, which calls for the occurrence of *to iu*.

³ However, I would argue that the modifying clause does “explain” what kind of time it was. So I think rather than the strict “content-theme” notion, Maynard’s concept of “explanatory clause” is more appropriate to describe the circumstance in which *to iu* occurs.

⁴ Terakura’s translation was “It smells like rice is burning or something”, which I think is not as appropriate as the translation shown in the text above.

However, I would argue that Terakura's (1983) notion of "subjectivity" fails to effectively explain the usages of *to iu* in other cases like (6) and (7) that appear in my database. In example (6), *akusent ya kotoba o oshieru* "to teach accent and language" is obviously an objective description of an action, which is unlikely to be treated as a personal proposition. The same argument can also be applied to (7), in which T gives an objective description of the speed of his summer course. In both cases, the complementizer *to iu* appeared in the noun-modification constructions even though there seems no "subjectivity" involved.

(6)

1. T: ano:: akusent(.) ya kotoba o:: oshieru te iu koto ga::
FI accent and language ACC teach toiu thing NOM
2. F: un un
3. T: *daiji mitai dakara::: ano :: chuui saremashita ne::*
important seems because FI was warned FP
"Because it seems important to teach accent and language, I was warned."

(7)

4. T: [=ma natsu wa sugoku (.) ma- yappa benkyoo no sutairu ga chigaimasu node:::
well summer TOP very well still study GEN style NOM different because
"Well, because the summer is very...the study style is different"
5. F: [= ()
6. T: ma- ni shuukan de san tan i o:: ano ::: owaraseru te iu::::=
well two weeks with three credits ACC um finish-make to iu
"finishing three credits in two weeks"
7. F: a:: *soo nan desu ka.*
such COP-NML COP Q
"Oh, is that so?"
8. T: = supiido de yaru node:::
speed with do because
"Because we study with the speed of [finishing three credits in two weeks]"

To sum up, previous studies have proposed various notions such as "non-factivity", "content-theme relationship" and "subjectivity" to explore the meanings and the functions of the complementizer *to iu* in noun modification construction. Nevertheless, as discussed above, none of them consistently and adequately answers the question raised by learners--when and why Japanese native speakers insert *to iu* between the modifying sentence and modified noun in conversations? The next section gives a part of the answer

to that question by summarizing the syntactic conditions in which the presence of *to iu* is obligatory.

4. Syntactic conditions requiring *to iu*

In an extended study of *to iu*, Teramura (1981) summarizes the characteristics of the modified noun and the modifying clause regarding the usage of *to iu*. He (1981, Pp.109-119) claims: 1) if the noun is related to “saying or thinking”, *to iu* is obligatory;⁵ 2) if the noun refers to facts or concepts of action, event and state, *to iu* is optional; 3) if the noun designates objects of perception, or expresses relational concepts, *to iu* is unacceptable⁶. This classification seems possible to apply to most of cases of *to iu* in the data of the present study. For instance, *to iu* in (8) is obligatory according to Teramura’s (1981) theory, since the lexical noun *kimari* (rule) is regarded as a propositional noun.

(8a)

- 1 H: *Hyoojunngo* o *oshie nakyaikenai tte iu kimari ga aru n desu ka?*
 standard language ACC teach must toiu rule NOM there-is NML COP Q
 “Is there a rule that you must teach standard language?”
- 2 Y: *un*
 Yeah

It is worth stressing that in such cases of “propositional nouns”, only in the modifying clauses representing the “content” of the nouns is *to iu* required. In (8a), the clause, *hyoojungo o oshie nakereba ikenai* (must teach standard language) displays the specific requirement of the *kimari* (rule). Otherwise, in a sentence such as (8b) where the modifying clause does not represent the specific content of the *kimari*, *to iu* is not acceptable.

(8b)

*kore wa sensee kara kiita (*to iu) kimari da.*

⁵ Terakura (1983) further generalizes the first category as the nouns “designating propositions”.

⁶ Terakura (1980, 1983) basically agrees with Teramura’s classification except that she argues that the sensation nouns may co-occur with *to iu* when the speaker’s subjectivity is involved in the proposition of the embedded clause.

this TOP teacher from heard rule COP
“This is the rule that I heard from the teacher.”

Nonetheless, the noun “speed’ in the previous example (7) that designates a state and thus is supposed to be optional according to Teramura’s (1981) rules, is yet regarded by native Japanese speakers as necessary in that discourse. Therefore, we cannot rely solely on the semantic meaning or features of the noun to determine whether to add *to iu* or not. Besides, noun-nominalizers such as *koto* in (6) are obviously beyond the Teramura’s classification of modified nouns.

In addition to the modified noun, Teramura (1981, p.110) also characterizes the following syntactic features of a clause that require *to iu*:

1. It may contain the topic marker *wa*;
2. It is a sentence expressing strong assertion ending with *da/desu* (be);
3. It expresses a demand or request with phrase such as *-shiro/nasai* (do it), and *-shite, -kudasai* (please do it);
4. It expresses an invitation or suggestion such as “let’s do it”;
5. It contains particles such as *ka, na, kana*, or it ends with similar sentence-final expressions.

In addition to what Teramura lists, Tokuda (1989) further points out the *to iu* is obligatory when the noun modifying clauses are incomplete sentences or complex sentences. However, all their arguments are based on examination of written data. Also, those previous studies have merely focused on the cases of *to iu* that introduce clauses to modify head-nouns, leaving out the cases of noun nominalizers such as *koto, no*. The present study, which investigates *to iu* in conversational discourse, found that in such a situation the syntactic conditions requiring the insertion of *to iu* in noun modification constructions are typically shown in the following segments:

In (9), F explains the subject of his major by giving an example. In (10), F tells T how he chose the current university.

(9)

- 1 F: *tatoeba ma ano:: kou doifuuna machidsukuri o sureba*
for instance well FI thus what kind city-construction ACC do-if
- 2 *hitobito no syuunyuu ga yoku naru ka tte iu koto mo[fukumete::*
people GEN income NOM good become Q to iu thing also include
“It also includes what kind of city construction may improve people’s income”
- 3 M: *[he:::*
woo
- 4 *syuunyuu ga yoku naru ka. omoshiroi [desu ne*
income ACC good become Q interesting COP FP
“Improve income? It is interesting.”
- 5 F: *[ss:::sou desu ne*
that COP FP
“That is right.”
- 6 *nanka keizaiteki::ni ? dooiu u:::n (.) kooka? ga > tatoeba koo < shigoto koyoo*
like economically what kind of effect NOM for example thus job employment
- 7 *o (0.) umu toka [tte iu] no o*
ACC produce FI to iu NML ACC
- 8 M: *[u:::n*
- 10 F: *doifuuni machidsukuri no naka de ikashite iku ka tte iu no mo aru n de*
how city-construction GEN inside at let-alive go Q to iu NML also there-is NML COP
“It also includes like economic effect; for example, how to make the best use of the city construction to produce job employment opportunities.”

(10)

- 1 F: *jibun no yaritai koto(.)ga dekiru kadooka tee iu koto o erande*
self GEN do-want thing NOM possible Q or not to iu NML ACC choose
- 2 T: *u:::n*
- 3 F: *de- ma:: nankooka:: uketemite:: tee iu katachi desu kedo:::*
so well several school take-try to iu shape COP FP
“I chose whether what I want to do is possible or not, and then applied to several school”

Note that the modifying clauses in Line 2, 10 of Example (9) and Line 1 of Example (10) all contain the question-marker *ka*; the embedded clause in the Line 8 of (9) includes a colloquial filler *toka*, which only occurs in causal oral communications; and the third line of (10) ends with *te*, which marks the clause as an incomplete sentence. Those syntactic features of the modifying clause [X] in [X *to iu* Y] construction correspond to the constraints summarized by Teramura (1981) and Tokuda (1989) that mechanically determine the occurrence of *to iu*.

Upon further analysis of the syntactic features of the embedded clauses that require *to iu*, I agree with previous propositions of the previous studies such as Tokuda (1989) and

Masumoto (1998) that all the noun-modification clauses that display any kind of features of direct quotation syntactically require the complementizer *to iu*. As Matsumoto says (1998, P.246), “the complementizer *to iu* MAY be used in noun complement construction when and only when the semantic content of the head noun may be represented by the speaker by means of a quotation.” However, I suggest changing the word “MAY” in Matsumoto’s statement to be “MUST,” since *to iu* is syntactically obligatory in such conditions. For example, sentence-final particles and fillers are only used in face-to-face conversations, and speech acts such as questions, requests and invitations are also productions of interpersonal talk. When those syntactic items appear in the modifying clause [X] in [X *to iu* Y] structure, the speaker is presenting the clause as if it were direct quotation, and in such cases, *to iu* is obligatory. As evidence, Matsumoto revises Josephs’ example as in (11 a), in which the insertion of *to iu* is unacceptable, in contrast to sentence (11 b) that obligatorily requires it.

(11)

- a) *Boku wa [biiru ga nomi-tai {*to iu / Ø} ki] ga suru.*
 I TOP beer NOM drink-want feeling NOM do
 “I feel like drinking some beer.”
- b) *Boku wa [aa, biiru ga nomi-tai naa {to iu / *Ø} ki] ga suru.*
 I TOP oh beer NOM drink-want SFP feeling NOM do
 “I have the feeling that oh, I want to drink some beer.”

Matsumoto observes that by including elements that normally appear in face-to-face conversations such as the exclamatory interjection, *aa*, and the exclamatory sentence-final particle *naa* in the complement clause, the sentence becomes ungrammatical without *to iu*.

Although the previous studies have offered detailed descriptions of the grammatical constraints for the use and non-use of *to iu*, questions remain about why speakers choose to add or not to add *to iu* when it is optional. What discourse pragmatic functions does

this grammatical item carry in the conversation? The next section will analyze more cases in conversational contexts with the methodology of discourse analysis to provide an interpretation by referring to Maynard's (1992, 1993) proposition that *to iu* has a "foregrounding effect".

5. Discourse-pragmatic functions of *to iu*

Based on investigation of the data taken from modern Japanese fiction, which include dialogues among the characters as well as written texts, Maynard (1992, p. 175) proposes the following characterization of *to iu*:

In the Japanese clause-noun combination, when *to iu* is optional, the [X *to iu* Y] structure appears when X is foregrounded due to its newness or unexpectedness of information or due to its relative importance in discourse and the speaker finds it necessary to add dramatic effect.

As Maynard (1993) claims, the consideration that allows the speaker to determine whether or not to use *to iu* in a noun-modification construction is "not syntactic but fundamentally a discourse pragmatic." Maynard emphasizes that because of the literal meaning of the phrase *to iu*, i.e., "to say", the choice of [X *to iu* Y] structure strongly echoes the speaker's or the text producer's personal "voice." Consistent with our discussion of the syntactic constraints of the occurrence of *to iu* in the prior section, Maynard (1992, P.179) also argues that in the structure of clause combination with *to iu*, the clause "[X] bears many features of direct discourse" and *to iu* functions to bridge the two narration modes "saying" and "describing." However, rather than focusing on speech itself, Maynard mainly discusses how the complementizer *to iu* strategically introduces a "hidden dialogue" into written discourse where "host of voices proliferate" (1992, P.188).

Maynard's arguments, especially the claim of the "foregrounding" effect of *to iu*, introduce fresh thoughts into the study of the Japanese complementizer. Following Maynard, Matsumoto (1998, P.251) suggests that with the presence of *to iu*, the complement clause is presented as "report-worthy," while without *to iu*, the clause lacks the characteristics of a quotation or report and thereby would merely be regarded by the interlocutors as the description of established information. Interestingly, Matsumoto (1998, P.251) compares the contrast between occurrence and non-occurrence of *to iu* in clause-noun modification with the contrast between the noun phrases such as *Tanaka to iu hito* "someone named Tanaka" and *Tanaka-san* "Mr. /Ms. Tanaka." As Takubo (1989) has pointed out, *Tanaka-san* is used when the identity of *Tanaka* is known by both interlocutors, *Tanaka to iu hito* is chosen when it is not established knowledge between the interlocutors yet. Likewise, when the information contained in the modifying clause is new or report-worthy, which belongs to the category of non-established knowledge, *to iu* tends to be inserted between the modifying clause and the modified noun.

Nevertheless, like most of the previous studies of *to iu*, both Maynard (1992) and Matsumoto (1998) have only examined cases involving lexical nouns and overlooked the cases where *to iu* occurs prior to abstract nominalizers. In a noun-modification construction [X *to iu* Y], I argue that regardless of the syntactic differences of the modified items [Y], *to iu* itself has the same function of foregrounding or to highlighting the information contained in the modifying clause [X]. Furthermore, both Maynard (1992, 1993) and Matsumoto (1998) merely rely on literary texts as their database and focus on the usage of *to iu* in written discourse. Although some of the examples in their studies are taken from dialogues in such texts, usage in literature may potentially differ from usage

in the natural conversations of daily life. As a supplementary study, this paper analyzes the syntactically optional *to iu* in clause-noun (including noun nominalizer) modification structures in authentic conversations to test and demonstrate Maynard's (1992, 1993) hypothesis of foregrounding function of the complementizer *to iu*.

Furthermore, inspired by Suzuki (1998), this study suggests that *to iu* also functions to show a sense of psychological distance between the speaker and the information that he/she presented in the modifying clause. In the investigation of the colloquial expressions of *tte* and *nante*, both of which result from the grammaticalization of the quotation markers *to*, Suzuki (1998) demonstrated that *tte* and *nante* are used when the speaker feels psychologically distanced from the information; in particular, (i) when the information is acquired from an outside source, (ii) when the speaker is not strongly convinced of the truth or credibility of information, and/or (iii) when the speaker feels emotionally detached from information. Since the syntactic form *to iu* also includes the quotation marker *to*, I hypothesize that the complementizer *to iu* in noun-modification has the same function as the sentence final *te* to some degree.

First of all, in the database of my study, I observed that in the majority of the cases of noun-modification sentences where *to iu* is employed, the information contained in the proposition of the complement clause is not established knowledge between the conversationalists. It is worth re-examining the previous examples (7) in the light of this idea.

(7)

1. T: [=ma natsu wa sugoku (.) ma- yappa benkyoo no sutairu ga chigaimasu node:::
well summer TOP very well still study GEN style NOM different because
“Well, because the summer is very...the study style is different”
2. F: [= ()
3. T: ma- ni shuukan de san tan i o:: ano ::: owaraseru tte iu:::==
well two weeks with three credits ACC um finish-make to iu
“finishing three credits in two weeks”

4. F: *a:: soo nan desu ka.*
such COP-NML COP Q
“Oh, is that so?”
5. T: = *supiido de yaru node:::*
speed with do because
“Because we study with the speed of [finishing three credits in two weeks]”

In (7), the speaker T conveys information about the pace of his summer program, which is obviously new to the addressee F, who is studying in a different major and has just heard about that program from T. In fact, in the sequence prior to (7), F just questioned T about this summer program. Therefore, recognizing the information about this program is unknown to the addressee F, T chooses to use *to iu* to introduce the new information. Although the T himself took the summer course, it is quite unusual or abnormal compared to the classes in regular semesters. Using the originally direct quotation marker *to iu* to indicate that the pace of the summer program is something like hearsay, T suggests that he himself also feels such a quick pace (three credits in two weeks) is incredible, and thereby distances himself from the information.

The following is another example, which occurs in a context where T tells F about his past experiences teaching Japanese.

(12)

1. T: *ano:: akusent(.) ya kotoba wo:: oshieru te iu koto ga::*
FI accent and vocabulary ACC teach toiu thing NOM
 2. F: un un
 3. T: *daiji mitai dakara::: ano :: chuui saremashita ne::*
important seems because FI was warned FP
“Because it seems important to teach accent and vocabulary, I was warned (by my supervisor).”
- T assumes that F, whose major is civil engineering, does not have much knowledge

about the important elements of teaching Japanese. Thus it is not surprising that T chooses to insert the complimentizer *to iu* to draw F’s attention to the new information-- “it is important to teach accent and vocabulary.” By using *to iu*, T also shows his distant stance from the fact that “teaching accent or vocabulary” in Japanese-language teaching is important. In fact, he purposely uses *to iu* to indicate that this claim is quoted from his

supervisor, instead of from his own established knowledge. Therefore, *to iu* indicates that the information presented by the speaker is new to the addressee, and at the same time does not fall into the speaker's "informational territory" (Kamio, 1997).

However, the so-called "new information" does not have to be absolutely new to the addressee. In some cases, the fact that the "newly learned" information (Akatsuka, P.1985) is also new to the speaker him or herself also drives the speaker to mark it with the complementizer *to iu*. In other words, when a piece of information has just been conveyed to the speaker, but has not been fully absorbed into his/her consciousness as established knowledge, the speaker also tends to choose to highlight it with *to iu* to show the speaker's sense of surprise or amazement towards this newly learned information. For instance, in the following sequence, T told K that he had found a job, and then in the following 7 lines that have been omitted here, he talked about his plan for the future. In Line 12, K provided positive comment responding to T's self-report with a *to iu* noun-modification construction: *sugoi na :: ima no dankai de soko made kimatteru tte iu no wa* "It is great that you have already decided so far at this (early) stage."

(13)

1. T: *sono -sono tsugi no aki moo shigoto kimatta n desu yo.*
that that next GEN fall already job decided NML COP FP
"For next fall, I have found a job."
2. K: \uparrow *aa omedetoogozaimasu(.) [=doko iku n desu ka ?*
oh, congratulations! where go NML COP Q
"Oh, congratulations! Where are you going?"
.....
9. K: *sugoi dandori yoi desu ne.*
really arrangement good COP FP
"Your plan is so good."
10. T: *nanka ne :: umaku:: korokoro mawarimashita ne:: [rakki deshita ne::*
FI FP smoothly over-and-over went- round FP lucky COP-PST FP
"Well, everything smoothly turned around. I was lucky."
11. K: *[u::::n hu::::n*
12. *.hhhh sugoi na :: ima no dankai de soko made kimatteru tte iu no wa*
great FP now GEN stage at there till decided to iu NML TOP
"It is great that you have already decided at this stage."

The utterance in Line 12, would be totally grammatical if K took *to iu* away. Why does the speaker K bother to insert a complementizer *to iu* between the clause and the nominalizer *no*? I argue that it is because the piece of information-- T has found a job and made a clear career plan--is newly learned by K, and therefore is not yet established knowledge in K's mind. By foregrounding the newly learned information with the quotation-like complementizer *to iu*, K is able to show stronger surprise and thereby intensify her compliment toward T's job-hunting progress.

In addition, I found that a piece of information could be highlighted by marking with *to iu* not only because it is new to the addressee or the speaker him or herself, but because it is new to a third party (Mori, 1999), who is mentioned in the conversation but is absent from the setting where the conversation is going on. The following shows such a case.

(14)

1. H: *boku wa dochira ka tte yu to sono(.) hayaku neru hoo datta n desu yo [hhhhhh*
I TOP which Q QM say if sono early sleep side COP-PST NML COP FP
“If you ask me which one, I belonged to the early-sleeping type.”
2. Y: [hhhhh *sokka*
really
3. H: *ruumumeeto wa sore ni yowatteta kamoshirenai (.) desu kedo*
roommate TOP that to perplexed maybe COP but
“Maybe my roommates were perplexed to that.”
4. Y: *a::: soi na no, sokka, sokka sokka u:::n = naruhodo ne::: ja- doo shiteta no?*
that COP Q that Q I see FP then How were doing Q
5. *denki toka koo ::*
light like like this
“Oh, is that so? Really? Really? I see. So what did you do? (Cover the light) like this?”
6. H: *↑iya- [e:::tto::: kekkoo keesu bai keesu desu kedo::: =*
well FI quite case-by-case COP FP
No. Well, it is really case-by-case...”
7. Y: *[sonnani ki ni shi nakatta? umaku itteta no ne*
so be-careful-NEG-PST smoothly got along FP FP
“You did not pay attention? You got along well (with your roommates), right?”
8. H: *soo desu ne [kihontekini wa::: itte=*
so COP FP basically TOP go
“Right. Basically we got along well.”
9. Y: *[u:::n = a:::ja yokatta ne:::*
so good-PST FP
“So it was good”
10. H: *= demo nanka- koohan ni nattekuru to[hayaku neru tte iu no shiraretekuru to, [hhh*
but FI the latter half to become once early sleep to iu NML was known once

- “But later once (my roommate) got to know that I went to bed early
11. Y: [u:::n [un un un
12. H: *ma- sooiu- sore demo ii yo tte iu yoona [kurai shika*
 well such that even okay FP to iu like about only
 “Only those who said that it’s okay (continued to live together)”
13. Y: [a:::a:::sokka sokka sou da yone:::
that Q that COP FP
 “Is that so? That is right.”

In the beginning of this sequence H told Y that he is an early riser. In line 10, he mentioned that his roommate began to notice his sleeping habits. To stress that the information that he went to bed early was new to his roommate at that moment, H chooses to mark it with the complementizer *to iu*. Compared to the sentence without *to iu*, “*koo han ni natte kuru to, hayaku neru no o siraretekuru to*”, which sounds more like a detached description, the clause marked by *to iu* has the function of “zooming-in”⁷(Masunaga, undated) to draw the addressee, Y’s, attention to the information which H assumed to be a new discovery to his roommate. Although the information about his own sleeping habits is nothing new or report-worthy to the speaker H himself, by choosing [X *to iu* Y] structure, H takes his roommate’s perspective and indicates this fact was not established or easily (physically and psychologically) accepted information to his roommate.

However, as Maynard (1992, P.175) points out, “whether the information is new or shared cannot be the only distributional characteristic for the [X *to iu* Y] structure.” For instance, in (15), even though the information that the dorm filled up quickly is already shared between speaker F and addressee M, F still inserts a complementizer *to iu* between the modifying clause and the noun *jootai* “situation” in Line 6.

⁷ The notion of “zooming-in”, that is, the camera first focuses on one subject, then it “zooms in” on another subject, is used by Kiyoko Masunaga to interpret the presence of anaphoric demonstrative adjectives. McGloin (1989) also employs the concept of “zooming in” vs. “telescopic” photo to interpret the difference between *aida* and *toki*.

(15)

- 1 F: *de kyonen wa tyotto hairinakatta n de*
do last year TOP a little enter-NEG-PST NML COP
“So last year I did not get in (the dorm)”
- 2 M: *a kkekou hayaku nanka umattayau kara.*
Oh quite early FI filled-up because
“It fills up very early.”
- 3 F: *Sou desu ne. mou.*
that COP FP already
“That is right. It is already...”
- 4 M: *adomissyonzu ga ofaa kita toki ni wa mou [maniawanai desu yone.*
admission NOM offer came time at TOP already too late COP FP
“When admission or offer came, it is already too late, right?”
- 5 F: *[mou umatteru umatteru*
already filled-up filled-up
- 6 *tte iu jootai de*
to iu situation COP
“The situation was that it was already full.”
- 7 M: *he:::*

In the beginning of this sequence, F told M that he could not get into the dorm when he first came to the university, and M cooperatively provided a piece of supportive information that the dorm was generally already full by the time new students were admitted (Line 2, 4). Although M has already shown her awareness of the situation that the dorm fills very quickly, F still chooses to add *to iu* to mark the complement clause *umatte ru* “(it) fills up (early).” Here the complementizer *to iu* is not used to highlight new information but to pursue what Maynard (1992, 1993) called--“dramatic effect.” Without *to iu*, the sentence would sound merely like a description of a piece of fact; with *to iu*, the intense and helpless situation is vividly illustrated. As Maynard (1992, P.175) states, in such case, by using [X *to iu* Y] structure, the speaker’s “personal voice” echoes more strongly than in the [X Ø Y] structure. Meanwhile, *to iu* helps show the speaker’s shocked, puzzled, disbelieving or unaccepting feeling toward this information. Even if F is one of the victims of this situation, this [X *to iu* Y] shows his attitude of distancing himself from this piece of shocking and unpleasant information.

Moreover, I found that the complement *to iu* could be employed for the purpose of making a contrast between the information in the modifying clause and other relevant information. Observe example (16), in which K and H are discussing the Pizza Hut in Japan.

(16)

1. K: *ato tabehoodai dattara, sono mae kara ano::: sono:::e::to:: (0.) pizza hatto ga::↓*
 next buffet COP-if that before from FI that FI Pizza Hut NOM
 “Then talking about buffet, that Pizza Hut ...”
2. H: *Fun fun pizza hatto nihon to issyo::?*
 mm Pizza Hut Japan with same
 “Pizza Hut? Is it the same as that of Japan?”
3. K: *nihon to (0.) nihon de pizza hatto tabeta kamo °shirenai°*
 Japan with Japan at Pizza Hut ate maybe
 “Same as Japan? Maybe I ate Pizza Hut in Japan”
4. *ma-aji wasuretyatta n de [oboetenai.*
 Well taste forgot NML COP remember-NEG
 “I have forgotten the taste. I don’t remember.”
5. H: [hhhhh
6. K: *docchinishiro taishite umaku nai [tte iu]koto dake oboetemasu [kedo*
 Anyway very delicious NEG to iu thing only remember FP
 “Anyway, I only remember that it was not so delicious.”
7. H:
 [hhhhh

K uses *tte iu* which is the colloquial variation of *to iu*, to emphasize that his memory about the Pizza Hut in Japan was only of his distaste for it. The employment of *to iu* highlights the information in the clause *taishite umaku nai* “It is not very tasty” in a way to make contrast between what he remembers and what he does not remember. Without the complementizer *to iu*, the structure of the sentence would become “I forgot A (its taste), but only remember B (it is not very tasty)” where B would be marked as a similar level of importance with A. However, by adding the complementizer *to iu* prior to the clause B, the internal content of B is foregrounded, and thereby B is “zoomed-in” or focused on and thus displayed as a piece of more critical information than A. As a matter of fact, what the speaker K is attempting to declare in his response to B’s questions is contained in the clause B; that is, Pizza Hut’s product in Japan is not very tasty.

The usage of *to iu* as a contrastive marker in a certain sense, is similar to the usage of the case marker *wa*. In their study of *wa*, Clancy and Downing (1987) claim that *wa* is primarily used as a locally motivated “contrastive marker” as shown in (17a), and that the thematic effect, as shown in (17b)-- which is generally regarded as the essential usage of *wa*--is actually derived from the contrastive usage.

(17a) *Taroo wa paati ni iku ga, Hanako wa ikanai*
 TOP party to go but TOP go-NEG
 “Taroo is going to the party, but Hanako is not going.”

(17b) *Taroo wa patti ni iku.*
 TOP party to go
 “Taroo is going to the party.”

Clancy and Downing (1987) claim that by only marking one member of the group with *wa*, the speaker can also imply that the others in the pool did not engage in the same activity. For instance, in (17b), marking Taro with *wa* may emphasize that Taro is the only one going, while other people are not going to the party. Likewise, in (16) by marking *umaku nai* “not delicious” with *to iu*, speaker F implies that he does not remember other things about Pizza Hut, and consequentially singles out the marked information; that is, what he remembered is that the Pizza Hut did not taste good.

On the other hand, by using *to iu*, the speaker K also indicates a kind of physical and psychological distance, primarily uncertainty, toward this piece of negative information, by presenting the information as if something quoted from someone else.

This section has discussed how the complementizer *to iu* highlight or to foreground the information contained in the embedded clause for various discourse-pragmatic purposes. One noteworthy observation is that whether to foreground a certain piece of information or not is the speaker’s personal choice. In a certain context, one piece of unshared or unexpected information is highlighted, while in another context, the speaker

may choose not to focus on it. The same information could be regarded as crucial in one context while treated as ordinary piece in another different context. Therefore, although this study has demonstrated that *to iu* carries a foregrounding effect in conversational discourse, it does not mean that all the modifying clauses containing unshared or new information would be all automatically focused on or highlighted, which means they do not obligatorily include *to iu*. This study also demonstrates that *to iu* can also show the speaker's distance from the information presented in the clause by marking it as if it were a quoted statement.

6. Conclusion

In sum, based on discourse analysis of authentic conversational data, this study claims that a Japanese speaker's decision on whether or not to insert the complementizer *to iu* between a modifying clause and a modified noun, in other words, whether to choose the noun-modification construction [X *to iu* Y] or not, is determined by the speaker's interactive intention or preference toward the information that he/she presents in the utterance. First, if the speaker is actually quoting something as a direct quotation or would like to present information as if "direct quotation," *to iu* is syntactically required between the modifying clause [X] and the modified noun [Y]. In such a case, the speaker often includes other syntactic features such as sentence final particles, incomplete sentences, question markers, imperative sentences etc. to assist the effect of "direct quotation." Second, the speaker can choose to highlight or foreground information that is new to the addressee or newly learned by the speaker, or even new to a third party, or because the speaker would like to "zoom in" and single out the information by making a contrast with other elements; third, by using *to iu*, the speaker can also distance

himself/herself from the information presented in the noun-modification utterances, due to the original relation between *to iu* and quotation. That is, by presenting the information as if it were a “quotation,” the speaker indicates that the information is not from his/her territory, and may show his disbelieving, uncertain, or disapproving attitude toward the information.

In short, when the modifying clause is marked as or as if it were a quotation to “interpret” the modified noun, *to iu* is syntactically required; when the information contained in the clause is something newsworthy that the speaker chooses to highlight or foreground, *to iu* is pragmatically called for. In the latter case, the speaker often shows physical or psychological distance from the information.

Therefore, this study shows that the complementizer *to iu* is the result of the grammaticalization of the quotation structure: *to* (quotative marker) + *iu* (verb “to say”). In any case, *to iu* remains connected to its etymological origin-- the quotation structure-- in a certain way. That is, direct quotation is something learned from others, and therefore, has the effect of newyness, newsworthiness and vividness, as well as uncertainty, doubt etc. The function of quotation that is rooted in the syntactic original form of *to iu*, leads to the usage of *to iu* as a complementizer. Therefore, by adding the complementizer *to iu* in a noun-modification structure, the speaker achieves his/her interactional goals for presenting a certain piece of information in a certain way. This study suggests that, for linguistic sources which have undergone a process of a “grammaticalization”⁸ (Traugott, 1982), their newly arisen grammatical features and interactional functions are derived

⁸ I hypothesize that the complementizer *to iu* is the result of the grammaticalization of the quotation structure: *to* (quotative marker) + *iu* (verb “to say”).

from their etymological origins, and while the relationship between them may become loose, is unlikely to vanish completely.

List of abbreviations

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-----|--------------|
| ACC | accusative | COP | copula |
| FP | sentence final particle | FI | filler |
| GEN | genitive | NEG | negative |
| NML | nominalizer | NOM | nominative |
| PST | past | Q | question |
| QM | quotation | T | tag question |

Transcript symbols

| <u>Symbol</u> | <u>Interpretation</u> |
|---------------|---|
| (.) | A short, untimed pause |
| (0.0) | A timed pause |
| hh | Audible breath |
| :: | Lengthened syllable |
| - | Glottal stop self-editing marker |
| = | Latched utterances |
| [| The point where overlapping talk starts |
|] | The point where overlapping talk ends |
| ↑ | Notable shift up in pitch |
| ↓ | Notable shift down in pitch |
| ◦◦ | A passage of talk quieter than the surrounding talk |
| ? | High rising intonation |

References:

- Akatsuka, N.(1985) Conditionals and the epistemic scale. *Language*, 61(36), 625-639.
- Clancy, P. M., & Downing, P. (1987). The use of wa as a cohesion marker in Japanese oral narratives. In Hinds, John, S. Maynard & S. Iwasaki (Ed.), *Perspectives on topicalization: The case of japanese wa*. (pp. 3-56). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kamio, A. (1997). *Territory of Information*. John Benjamins Publishing

- Kuno, S. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Josephs, L. S. (1976). Complementation. In M. Shibatani (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 307-369). New York: Academic Press.
- Masunaga, K. *Undated. Nihongo no shijishi nit suite*. Unpublished draft. Cited by Michio Tsutsui. A study of Demonstrative Adjectives before Anaphoric Nouns in Japanese.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1998). The complementizer *toyuu* in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, 7, 243-255.
- Maynard, S. K. (1992). Where textual voices proliferate: The *to yuu* clause-noun combination in Japanese. *Poetics*, 21, 169-189.
- (1993). *Discourse Modality, Subjectivity, Emotion and Voice In the Japanese Language*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- McCawley, N. A. (1978). Another look at *no*, *koto*, and *to*: Epistemology and complementizer choice in Japanese. In J. Hinds and I. Howard (Ed.), *Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics*, (pp. 178-21). Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- McGloin, N. H. (1989). *A students' guide to Japanese grammar*. Tokyo: Taishukan Publishing Company.
- Mori, J. (1999). *Negotiating Agreement and Disagreement in Japanese: Connective Expressions and Turn Construction*. John Benjamins Publishing
- Suzuki, S. (1998). *Tte and nante*: Markers of psychological distance in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29.4: 429-462.
- Takahashi, S. (1997). On The Use and Function Of Optional *to iu* in Japanese Clausal Noun Modification¹, *Asian Review* 11 (1997/1998):1-33
- Takubo, Y. (1989). *Meisi no modaritii* (modality of nouns). In T. Nitta and T. Masuoka (Ed.), *Nihongo no modaritii* (pp. 211-233). Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Tokuda, Y. (1989). "*To iu*" no tsukawarekata no kenkyuu (A study of usage of "to yuu"). *Tokyo gaikokugo daigaku nihongo gakka nenpoo* (Department of Japanese Studies Annual Report) 11: 47-58.
- Terakura, H. (1980). *Some Aspects of Complementation in Japanese: A Study of To yuu* Unpublished dissertation
- (1983). Noun modification and the use of *to yuu*. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 18(1), 23-55.

Teramura, H. (1969). The syntax of noun modification in Japanese. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 6(1), 64-74.

----- (1981). *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Traugott, E. (1982). On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change *Language*, 65(1), 31-55.