

**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 *to(yuu-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 *to(yuu-no)-wa* ‘C(-N)-Topic’. Just like the thematic topic marker *wa*, (i) *to(yuu-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 *to(yuu-no)-wa* phrases in (2) and (3b) are deviant 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 atteita onnano hito-wa dare na no ka sitteru?  
 John-Nom park-at met woman-Top who Cop N 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 rasiu 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 yone  
**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 yone  
**children-Top/C-Topic/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? b. **John-tte** kaigi-no maeni itumo tabako-o suu  
**apple-tte** already have-eaten Q **John-tte** meeting-Gen before always smoke  
 Lit. ‘Apples, have you already eaten *them*?’ Lit. ‘John, *he* always smokes before a meeting’  
 c. **John-tte** atama-ga ii d. ?\***John-tte** kinoo ringo-o tabeta  
**John-tte** brain-Nom good **John-tte** yesterday apples-to ate  
 Lit. ‘John, *he* is clever.’ 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** [*i*Evid, -author]] kaigi-no maeni itumo tabako-o suu] Evid [*i*Evid, [ ]]]  
**John-tte** meeting-Gen before always smoke

b. [EvidP [EvidP **John-tte** [*i*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) AGREE 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 ([*i*Evid, -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):

(7) **John-tte** (Mary-no hanasidato) kinoo ringo-o {tabeta {**rasii/sooda**} /tabetanda **tte** }  
**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 *hahaoya* ‘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** [hahaoya-ga [EvidP *t*] [*t* 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 that *he* will become a big figure in the future.’

(10)?\*[EvidP **Yamada-san-tte** [hahaoya-ga [EvidP *t*] [*t* 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-ga [EvidP *t*] [*t* 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 hito]-o sagasiteiru 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 hikui 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 hookokusita]  
 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.’