**Evidential Markers in the Nominal Right Periphery: The Japanese Hearsay Marker *tte***

**Introduction:** Evidential markers express the means by which the speaker acquired the information s/he is conveying (like personal experience, direct evidence, indirect evidence, and hearsay). They represent ‘source of information’ relevant to evaluating an utterance, which is pragmatic in nature (Rooryck 2001;Speas 2003). It has been claimed that Japanese has evidential markers like hearsay-sooda ‘I’m told’ and indirect evidence-yooda ‘seem’ which are overt instantiations of a functional head for evidentiality (evidential head, Evid) in the clause right periphery (i.e. clausal Evid) (Tenny 2006). This paper proposes that Japanese also has an overt evidential marker within a nominal projection. It is shown that its distribution is constrained by syntactic principles, which constitutes further evidence for the view that there are pragmatically relevant features that are subject to the syntactic computation (Cinque 1999;Speas 2003). The existence of an evidential head in the nominal right periphery reinforces the parallel between a clause and a nominal.

**Evidential Marker *tte***: Among various uses of *tte* in Japanese, this paper deals with the so-called “topic marker” *tte* (1B) (Niwa 1994; Akaso 2007). Since the “topic marker” *tte* is very often interchangeable with *toyuu-no-Noun*-wa ‘C(-N)-Topic’ as in (1B), *tte* has been analyzed as a colloquial variant of the latter:

(1) A: Enniti-e ikuto, okane-o tukaun desu
   temple-fair-to when-go money-Acc use Cop(ula)  
   ‘When I go to the temple fair, I spend my money.’
B: Enniti-tte/to-wa/toyuu-no-wa doko desu ka?
   temple-fair-tte/C-Top/C-N-Top where Cop Q
   Lit. ‘The temple fair, where is it?’  (Martin 1975:940)

There are, however, differences between *tte* and *toyuu-no-wa* ‘C(-N)-Topic’. Just like the thematic topic marker *wa*, (i) *toyuu-no-wa* ‘C(-N)-Topic’ cannot be attached to indeterminate pronouns like *dare* ‘who’ (2), and (ii) its multiple occurrences within a clause are not allowed (3b). Note that the *toyuu-no-wa* phrases in (2) and (3b) areivalent under the intended interpretation that they receive the thematic topic (not contrastive) interpretations. On the other hand, *tte* can be attached to an indeterminate pronoun (2) and its multiple occurrences within a clause are possible (3a). These facts indicate that *tte* is not a topic marker:

(2) A: John-ga kooen-de atetaa onnano hito-wa dare na no ka sitteru?
   John-Nom park-at met woman-Top who Cop Q know
   ‘Do you know who the woman John met at the park is?’
B: Dare-tte/*wa*/to-wa/*toyuu-no-wa* Mary-no hanasidato dare-mo siranai rassii yo
   who-tte/*Top*/C-Top/C-N-Top Mary-Gen speech anyone not-know Evid (hearsay) Part
   Lit. ‘Who, according to Mary, nobody knows who she is.’

(3) a. Kodomo-tte omaturi-tte suki da youne
   children-tte festival-tte love Cop Part(icle)
   Lit. ‘Children, festivals, it seems that they love them.’
   b. * Kodomo-wa/to-wa/toyuu-no-wa omaturi-wa/to-wa/toyuu-no-wa suki da youne
      children-Top/C-Top/C-N-Top festival-Top/C-Top/C-N-Top love Cop Part
      I argue that *tte* in (1-3) is a hearsay evidential marker which is an overt realization of the evidential head in the nominal right periphery (nominal Evid). This is based on the insight that *tte* in (1-3) should be connected to the use of *tte* as a hearsay evidential sentence-final particle (an overt realization of clausal Evid) (4):

(4) John-ga Suzy-to kekkon suru *tte*
   John-Nom Suzy-with marry Evid (hearsay)
   ‘John is going to marry Suzy (I’m told).’

**Proposal:** Our hearsay evidential marker analysis explains a hitherto unexplained puzzling restriction on the *tte*-phrase (nominal EvidP); sentences with the *tte*-phrase must be interrogatives (5a) or generics (5b), or they must contain an individual-level predicate (5c). When the *tte*-phrase appears in a declarative non-generic sentence with a stage-level predicate, the result is deviant (5d). Note that (5d) becomes acceptable when it is interpreted as an interrogative (a yes/no question) with rising intonation:

(5) a. Ringo-tte moo tabeta no?
   apple-tte already have-eaten Q
   Lit. ‘Apples, have you already eaten them?’
   b. John-tte kaigi-no maeni itumo tabako-o suu
   John-tte meeting-Gen before always smoke
   Lit. ‘John, he always smokes before a meeting’
   c. John-tte atama-ga ii
   John-tte brain-Non good
   Lit. ‘John, he is clever.’
   d. *John-tte kooen ringo-o tabeta
   John-tte yesterday apples-to ate
   Lit. ‘John, he ate apples yesterday.’

As argued by Rooryck (2001) and Speas (2003), although there are many possible pragmatic categories of ‘sources of information’, only its restricted class is syntactically represented in the evidential system of a language, and languages vary as to which ‘source of information’ is syntactically represented. I claim that the Japanese evidential system syntactically marks whether ‘source of information’ involves the speaker (1st person) or not. Given the binary decomposition of person into [+/- author] and [+/- participant] (Noyer 1992; Halle 1997) (i.e. 1st person=[+author, +participant], 2nd person=[-author, +participant], 3rd person=[-author, -participant]), I claim that the Japanese Evid is syntactically specified as either [+author] (1st person) or
[-author] (non-1st-person). Since the evidential marker tte is of the hearsay evidential type, its ‘source of information’ does not involve the speaker; the nominal Evid tte is syntactically specified as [-author]. Under our analysis, the derivation of generic sentence (5b), for example, proceeds as in (6):

6. a. [EvidP [TP [EvidP John-tte[Evid, -author]] kaigi-no maeni itumo tabako-o suu] Evid [i[Evid, []]]]  
   John-tte meeting-Gen before always smoke  

b. [EvidP [EvidP John-tte [[Evid, -author]] [TP t itumo kaigi-no maeni tabako-o suu] Evid[i[Evid, -author]]]  
I adopt Pesetsky & Torrego’s (2007) system of features: (i) Both interpretable and uninterpretable features may come as valued or unvalued; (ii) AGRE involves valuation and feature sharing. In (6), given that an unvalued feature functions as a probe, the unvalued interpretable evidential feature ([i[Evid, []]]) of the clausal Evid functions as a probe. It undergoes Agree with the valued interpretable evidential feature ([iEvid, -author]) of the nominal Evid tte, and attracts the tte phrase (nominal EvidP) to the Spec of the clausal Evid. The clausal Evid shares the [-author] value with tte as in (6b). Generic sentences like (5b) provide generally shared cultural knowledge. In other words, a speaker conveys common knowledge; the ‘source of information’ does not involve the speaker. The pragmatic evidential category of a generic sentence is thus compatible with the syntactic [-author] evidential feature of the clausal Evid; (5b) is acceptable. If we take Chierchia’s (1995) view that individual-level predicates are inherently generics in the sense that they express properties of individuals that are permanent, it also follows that (5c) is acceptable. In interrogatives like (5a), it is the hearer (2nd person) who is the ‘source of information’ relevant to evaluating an utterance (Speas and Tenny 2003); the ‘source of information’ does not involve the speaker, and thus (5a) is acceptable. In declarative non-generic sentences with stage-level predicates like (5d), the ‘source of information’ is the speaker; its pragmatic evidential category is not compatible with the syntactic [-author] feature of the clausal Evid. Hence, (5d) is anomalous. If we add hearsay evidential markers like sooda/rasii/tte to (5d), and make its evidential category compatible with the syntactic [-author] feature, (5d) becomes acceptable (7):

   John-tte (Mary-Gen speech) yesterday apple-Acc [ate hearsay / ate hearsay]  
   ‘Lit. John, (according to Mary,) he ate apples yesterday (I’m told).’

Further Evidence: First, there is evidence to show that the tte-phrase undergoes successive cyclic movement through intermediate Spec-(clausal) Evid; all the clauses that the tte-phrase has passed must have a ‘source of information’ compatible with the syntactic [-author] feature of their clausal Evid. As a response to (8), (9) is acceptable whereas (10, 11) are not. Rooryck (2001) argues that the person feature in the embedded Evid, being anaphoric, takes the matrix subject as its ‘source of information’. In (9), the matrix clause is of the hearsay evidential type and the ‘source of information’ of the embedded clause is the matrix subject hahaya ‘mother’; their ‘sources of information’ do not involve the speaker; (9) is acceptable. In (10), however, the matrix clause is a declarative with a stage-level predicate; its ‘source of information’ involves the speaker. In (11), the ‘source of information’ of the embedded clause is the matrix subject watasi ‘I’, who is the speaker:

8. Yamada-san-ni kinoo atta yo  
   Mr. Yamada-Dat yesterday met Part ‘I have met Mr. Yamada yesterday.’

9. [EvidP Yamada-san-tte [hahaya-o ga [EvidP t’[r syoorai oomono-ni naru to]] omotteiru] rasii ne]  
   Mr. Yamada-tte mother-Nom future big-figure-Dat become C think hearsay Part  
   Lit. ‘Mr. Yamada, (someone said) his mother thinks he will become a big figure in the future.’

10. [EvidP Yamada-san-tte [hahaya-o ga [EvidP t’[r Suzy-to kekkon sita to] kinoo minna-ni hanasita]  
    Mr. Yamada-tte mother-Nom Suzy-with married C yesterday everyone told  
    Lit. ‘Mr. Yamada, his mother told everyone yesterday that he married Suzy.’

11. [EvidP Yamada-san-tte [watasi-o ga [EvidP t’[r syoorai oomono-ni naru to] wakatteiru]]  
    Mr. Yamada-tte I-Nom future big-figure-Dat become C know  
    Lit. ‘That actor, I know that he will become a big figure in the future.’

Second, the tte-phrase exhibits island effects, which shows that it undergoes movement:

11. John-tte (Mary-no hanasidato) Suzy-ga [Complex NP t sitteiru hiatus-o o sasageituru rasii]  
    John-tte (Mary-Gen speech) Suzy-Nom know person-Acc look-for hearsay  
    Lit. ‘John, (according to Mary) Suzy is looking for the person who knows him.’

12. John-tte (Mary-no hanasidato) Suzy-ga [Adjunct t se-ga hikou node] tigau hito-to kekkonsita rasii  
    John-tte (Mary-Gen speech) Suzy-Nom height-Nom short because different person-with married Evi  
    Lit. ‘John, (according to Mary) Suzy married a different person because he is short.’

Third, Miyagawa (2011) argues that the Japanese politeness verbal affix -masu only occurs when there is a speech act phrase (saP), showing that its limited distribution in an embedded context can be explained by his claim that to nonfactive C occurs with saP whereas koto/no factive C does not. The distribution of tte-phrase in an embedded context (13) can be explained if we assume that both saP and EvidP, being ‘periphery pragmatic projections’, occur in nonfactive complements but not in factive complements:

13. Mary-wa [John-tte atama-ga ii [to] itta / *?koto]-o hoookokusa]  
    Mary-Top John-tte brain-Nom good |C said / fact-Acc reported}  
    Lit. ‘Mary said that John, he is clever./Mary reported the fact that John, he is clever.’