

From Quotative Conditionals to Emotive Topic Markers:
A Case of *tteba* and *ttara* in Japanese

With the rise of discursual linguistics, the scope of the study of the Japanese topic markers increased to include *tte* (S. Suzuki 1998, R. Suzuki 1999, and Maynard 2002), *nante* (S. Suzuki 1998), *tteba* (Saegusa 1999) and *ttara* (Hayes and Shinzato 2001). Of these, this study focuses on the latter two, which share their diachronic origins as quotative conditionals and their synchronic layering (Hopper 1991) of abbreviated and non-abbreviated variants.

Diachronically, both *tteba* and *ttara* incorporated the quotative particle, *to*, the speech act verb, *ihe/ihi* ‘say’ and the conditional particle, *ba* as below (see examples):

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
X <i>to ihe-ba</i> Y X <i>to ihi-tara-ba</i> Y	X <i>to ie-ba</i> Y X <i>to it-tara-(ba)</i> Y	X <i>tteba</i> Y X <i>ttara</i> Y
X= direct quote of others X could be a clause	X=prompted by others X could be a phrase	X= is not a quote X is a noun (mostly human)
conditional relation		topic/comment relation

As grammaticalization progressed, phonological reduction, syntactic scope increase (sentence-internal > sentence-initial), functional change (conditional > topic) have all occurred. We argue that these grammaticalization paths (stages 1 > 2 > 3) conform to the unidirectionality hypothesis (Traugott 1982) and subjectification (Traugott 1995), and they also serve as counterexamples to a generally held view of scope decrease (Givón 1979, Lehmann 1995[1982]).

Synchronically, the unreduced forms (Stage 2) and the reduced forms (Stage 3) coexist as topic markers (see examples 3-7). Our corpus data reveal the following tendencies between them:

- X *to ieba/it-tara* Y: (1) X has been recently introduced (or evoked) in the discourse.
(2) The X-Y relationship is pre-established. Y is expected.
- X *tteba/ttara* Y: (3) X may or may not have been recently introduced in the discourse.
(4) Y is counter to expectation.

“X *to ieba/it-tara* Y” is typically used following the introduction of X in the immediately preceding discourse (see e.g. 3, 4). In such contexts, “X *to ieba/it-tara*” serves as a metalinguistic expression, highlighting and calling attention to a specific word or a phrase selected from the previous discourse.

In contrast, “X *tteba/ttara* Y” has no such contextual restrictions (e.g. 6, 7). However, “X *tteba/ttara*” retains the basic characteristics of highlighting and attention-calling seen in “X *to ieba/ittara*” (cf. ‘persistence’ as in Hopper 1991). Thus, it is like highlighting an item without a prior reference and it yields the following inference: there must be a reason to call attention to this item > this item must be something newsworthy > something unusual > unexpected (often in a negative sense). Expressions like “X *to ittara nai* (Speaking of X, nothing comparable to *that* X exists)” which highlights newsworthy-ness of X are commonly seen at the transitional stage (e.g. 5).

Putting synchrony and diachrony together, these pairs could be considered a case of semantic bifurcation (Vance 2002).

Examples

Stage 2

- (1) きも「打遣ツておきやれ。心がけのいゝ盲だ」
あば民「心がけのといへば、あの盲都ほど勘の能者はあるめへ。マア」
(浮世風呂 1809)
- (2) 「…稽古の入らねへ物にして、足らずめへは見取にするといふ物か…
「立會も稽古のかゝらん物といふたら、忠臣藏、ひらがな、菅原…」
(浮世風呂 1809)
- (3) A: その先生が多分環境経済学ってことでやるから […]
B: 環境経済といえ、なかなか難しいんでしょう。(conversational data)
- (4) 今月のテーマが「春」ということなので、「春」といったらやっぱりこの曲は外せない。<doblog.com/weblog/myblog/33727/1211308>

Stage 3 (transitional)

- (5) 「そりや貴方の心配もさうでせうけれど、私の心配と云つたら、本当に無かつたの。」(金色夜叉 1897)

Stage 3

- (6) この先生ってば、小学校の教師なのに、すげえ B コンシャスな服着てんだよね。
<cx.sakura.ne.jp/~sbiten/art/cg/fcol/03/k_cv9904.txt>
- (7) 夕香にはそういう気はないからって断つたのに、ハルエさんたら非常識に写真まで置いて行って。(恋愛太平記 1、金井美恵子著 1995)

References

- Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hayes, Sono Takano and Rumiko Shinzato. 2001. Jooken no setsuzoku joshi kara danwa/taijin kinoo no joshō e -- *tara, ttara* no bunpoo ka, *New Directions in Applied Linguistics 2*, eds. by Masahiko Minami and Yukiko Sasaki Alam, 127-142. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17-36. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995[1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München: LINCOM.
- Maynard, Senko. K. 2002. *Linguistic Emotivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Suzuki, Ryoko. 1999. Multifunctionality: The developmental path of the quotative *tte* in Japanese. *Cognition and Function in Language*, eds. by Barbara A. Fox, Dan Jurasky & Laura A. Michaelis, 50-64. Standard: CSLI Publications.
- Saegusa, Reiko. 1999. Teidai no *tteba* and *ttara*. *Hitotsubashi Daigaku Ryugakusei Sentaa Kiyoo 2*: 1-11.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1998. *Tte* and *nante*: Markers of psychological distance in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics 29*: 429-462.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic effects of grammaticalization. *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, eds. by Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, 245-271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. Subjectification in grammaticalization. *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*, eds. by Diester Stein and Susan Wright, 31-54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vance, Timothy. 2002. Semantic bifurcation Japanese compound verbs. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 10*, ed. by Noriko M. Akatsuka and Susan Strauss, 365-377. Stanford: CSLI.