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1. Background and definition (1)

- Defining evidentiality
- Previous studies on hearsay evidentials
- Hearsay evidentials in Japanese
Defining evidentiality

• Evidentiality is a phenomenon whereby speakers provide clues about the source of their information (Aikhenvald 2004; *inter alia*). More recent works have also begun to investigate evidentiality phenomena in terms of accessibility to information (Tournadre & LaPolla, forthcoming).

• Virtually all languages have means of marking evidentiality. Evidentiality marking strategies include lexical and adverbial expressions (e.g. English *people say*, *apparently*, *obviously*). Some languages also signal such information through grammaticalized markers, referred to as evidential markers (e.g. Japanese *tte*).
Evidentiality and epistemicity

• Evidentiality marking strategies are also often used to upgrade or downgrade the epistemic claims of speakers, and in conversational discourse, speakers can soften their claims using evidential markers to enhance common ground with their interlocutors (Kim 2006; 2011).
Evidential markers derived from ‘say’ constructions

Crosslinguistically, ‘say’ verbs are known to be quite versatile, and often develop into evidential and pragmatic markers (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004).

In verb-final languages such as Korean and Japanese, these versatile ‘say’ constructions are also often structurally realized as sentence final particles (Ahn & Yap 2012; Tamaji & Yap 2013).

For example, Japanese evidential marker *tte* in sentence final position has developed various pragmatic functions such as marking mirativity, self-teasing and self-mockery (S. Suzuki 1998; R. Suzuki 2007).
‘Say’ constructions in Japanese

Lexical ‘say’

Converbal ‘say’ constructions
- Basic converbals
- Concessive converbals
- Conditional converbals

Attributive ‘say’ constructions
- Headed attributives
- Headless attributives
- Internally-Headed attributives

Shinzato

Tamaji & Yap 2013
The converbal pathway: grammaticalization of tte

(Tamaji & Yap 2013)

Blue arrows = Kanto dialect
Red arrows = Kansai dialect

Attested 8th c., but probably used earlier

Attested 13th c.

Attested 15th c.

Attested 19th c.
Headless attributive ‘say’ constructions facilitates the emergence of conclusive (i.e. finite) structures via ellipsis
Japanese attributive hearsay evidentials

Attributive forms

- Classical Japanese
  - *to ifu ~ to iu*
  - *to iheru*
  - *to ihikeru*
  - *to ihitaru*

- **Attributive & conclusive forms**

- **Modern Japanese**
  - *to iu* (non-past form)
  - *to itta* (past form)
The attributive pathway: grammaticalization of *to iheru*

- VP to iheru (N/n)
  - (attributive construction)
  - (existential construction) VP to iheru (koto) *ari.*
  - (copula cleft construction) VP to iheru *naru beshi.*
  - VP to iheru *nari keri.*
  - (conclusive EVID) VP to iheru *nan.*
  - (conclusive EVID) VP to iheru *nari.*
  - (conclusive EVID without FOC or SFP) VP to iheru.

- VP to nan iheru
  - (kakarimusubi construction) VP to nan iheru
  - (conclusive EVID) VP to iheru *koso,* VP

- Attested 8th c.
- Attested 10th c.
- Attested 12th c.
- Attested 17th c.
The attributive pathway: grammaticalization of to ihikeru

VP to ihikeru (N/n)

(attributive construction)

VP to ihikeru

VP to ihikeri (*N/n)

(kakarimusubi construction)

VP namu/nan to ihikeru.

VP to zo ihikeru.

(conclusive)

VP to

VP to ihikeru nari keri.

(copula cleft construction with SFP)

VP to ihikeru nari.

(copula cleft construction)

VP to ihikeru.

(conclusive EVID without FOC or SFP)

VP to ihikeru.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 10th c.

Attested 11th c.

Attested 13th c.

Attested 13th c.

Attested 13th c.
3 types of Japanese hearsay evidentials: attributive & conclusive uses (diachronic perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8th c.</th>
<th>9th c.</th>
<th>10th c.</th>
<th>11th c.</th>
<th>12th c.</th>
<th>13th c.</th>
<th>14th c.</th>
<th>15th c.</th>
<th>16th c.</th>
<th>17th c.</th>
<th>18th c.</th>
<th>19th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To iheru (attributive &amp; later also conclusive)</td>
<td>To iheri (conclusive lexical, QT &amp; EVID)</td>
<td>To ihikeru (attributive &amp; later also conclusive)</td>
<td>To ihikeri (conclusive lexical, QT &amp; EVID)</td>
<td>To ihitaru (attributive only)</td>
<td>To ihitari (conclusive lexical &amp; QT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship between attributive forms and the Japanese kakarimusubi focus system

• Observations from preliminary studies:
  • The extension of attributive forms to conclusive uses contributed to the demise of the *kakarimusubi* focus system.

• Questions to be addressed in this study:
  • What are *kakarimusubi* focus constructions?
  • How did the attributive-to-conclusive development of hearsay evidential constructions affect the *kakarimusubi* focus system?
1. Background and definition (2)

- Focus constructions
- *Kakarimusubi* focus system in Classical Japanese
- Some focus particles in Classical Japanese
- *No desu* cleft-type constructions in Modern Japanese
Focus constructions

• English example:
  • It was an unknown group of militants [that ambushed the embassy].
What is *kakarimusubi*?

- It is the focus system in Classical Japanese.
- It involves the use of focus particles.
- The presence of these focus particles requires the verb in sentence final position to be in attributive form.

(1)hashi wo yattsu watseru niyorite namu
bridge ACC eight stretch.across:CAUS because FOC

yatsuhashi to ihikeru
Eight.Bridges COMP say:ATTR

‘Because (we) stretch eight bridges across (the river),
that is why we call (the place) Yatsuhashi (i.e. Eight Bridges).’

(*Isemonogatari*, p.116, 10th c.)
Example of *kakarimusubi* in Classical Japanese

(1') hashi wo yattsu watseru niyorite namu
bridge ACC eight stretch.across:CAUS because FOC

yatsuhashi to ihikeru
Eight.Bridges COMP say:ATTR

‘Because (we) stretch eight bridges across (the river),
that is why we call (the place) Yatsuhashi (i.e. Eight Bridges).’

(*Isemonogatari*, p.116, 10th c.)
Light nouns (or nominalizers) within a *kakarimusubi* construction can be reanalyzed as a focus particle.

(2) \[Na wo ba, Sakaki no Miyatsuko name ACC EMPH name.of.place GEN name.of.person to namu ihikeru COMP FOC say:ATTR\]

‘His name is said to be Miyatsuko of Sakaki.’

*(Taketori Monogatari, p.29, 9th c.)*
A versatile focus particle within a *kakarimusubi* -- *nan* is perhaps derived from *namu*

(3)  
Wasuregah! hirohishi mo seji  
ype.of.seashell pick.up:PFV CONCESS do:NEG  

shiratama wo kofuru wo dani mo katami to omohan  
white.pearl ACC miss ACC EMPH also keepsake COMP think:NEG  

to **nan iheru**  
COMP FOC say:ATTR  

‘It was said he wouldn’t keep this *wasuregai* shell even though he missed the girl who was as sweet as white pearl.’ (Note: A *wasuregai* shell is good to keep in memory of someone precious.)

(*Tosa Nikki*, p.50, 10th c.)
Attributive evidential in Classical Japanese

(4) Umaruru ko yooboo yoku kokoro yoku naru
be.born child appearance good heart good become
to iheru mono wo ba mairi,
EVID:ATTR ACC EMPH go.to.pray
saranu mono mo sore ni shitagahite shitamafu
not.goog thing also that DAT follow.CONV do:HON

‘She went to pray for things that are said to be good for the newborn baby to become good-looking and have a good personality, and (she) also prayed for other things.’

(Utsubo Monogatari, p.262, 10th c.)
Another attributive evidential in Classical Japanese

(5) Kojin no iheraku wa, ancient.people GEN saying:ADV TOP

shoojin wa tsuchi wo omohi, young.people TOP ground ACC think.of

shinuru kitsune wa Gaku wo obito to su, dead fox TOP name.of.fox ACC leader COMP do

to iheru koto ari.

EVID:ATTR fact EXIST

‘As ancient people seemed to say, “There was an old saying about young people thinking of their homeland and dead foxes making Gaku the head of the group.”’

(Utsubun, p.473, 8th c.)
Attributive evidential in Classical Japanese—with the head noun *nomi* reanalyzed as an emphatic sentence final particle

(6) Sunawachi, Kamizai no Goo
    in.other.words name.of.place GEN name.of.place

to ifu beki wo
COMP say should CONCESSIVE

ima no hito nao ayamarite Kamihara no Goo
now GEN person still mistake:CONV name.of.place GEN name.of.place

‘In other words, although we should call this place Kamizai no Goo, people nowadays may still mistakenly just call it (<just say that it is) Kamihara no Goo.’

(*Izumokoku Fudoki*, p.237, 8th c.)
A versatile focus particle within a *kakarimusubi* -- with no known lexical source

(7) Kano tsuka no na wo ba shojoduka
that mound GEN name ACC EMPH name.of.place
to zo ihikeru
COMP FOC say:ATTR

‘The name of that mound is called Shojozuka.’

(*Yamato Monogatari*, p.315, 10th c.)
Focus particle *zo* in sentence final position — in a non-*kakarimusubi* construction

(8) “Nanji nani no yuhe wo motsute ka furo ni wa
2SG what GEN reason ACC by.means.of Q bath LOC TOP

hitori hitori to ihikeru zo”
one.person one.person COMP say:ATTR.PFV FOC

to tohi tamaheba
COMP ask HON:HYPOTHETICAL

‘(Shiyanto) said to (Isoho),
“Why did you say take a bath one person at a time?”’

(*Isoho Monogatari*, p.368, 17th c.)
No desu cleft constructions in Modern Japanese
From nominalizer to sentence final particle

(1) Light head nouns (n) functioning as a nominalizer
(2) Nominalizer reinterpreted as a sentence final particle

- Headed relative clause structure:

  [Relative clause] **N** (can be followed by existential verbs, etc.)

- Headless relative clause structure:

  [Relative clause] **n** (can also be followed by existential verbs, etc.)
  > [Insubordinated clause] **SFP** (SFP can be fused with other SFPs)
Insubordination strategies in Classical Japanese:

- Existential verb (ari) ellipsis
- Copula (nari) ellipsis
- Fusion with focus particle (namu, ya, zo) in sentence final position
- Fusion with other sentence final particles (naru beshi, nari keri)
2. Objectives of this study

- To examine the role of hearsay evidential constructions in the rise and fall of *kakarimusubi* focus constructions in Japanese.

- More specifically, we will examine how non-finite 'say' constructions develop into finite structures.

- We will focus on how attributive evidential forms are reanalyzed as conclusive evidential markers.

- We will illustrate this phenomenon by tracing the diachronic developments of *to ihikeru* and *to iheru* attributive evidential constructions.
3. Data and methodology

• Tokens of *to iheru* and *to ihikeru* constructions were extracted from the Taikei Honbun Database.

• This database comprises 466,574 words from narratives, historical documents and poems from the 8th to 19th century.

• 699 tokens of *to iheru* constructions were extracted and categorized according to their functions over time.

• 265 tokens of *to ihikeru* constructions were categorized in a similar way.
4. Analysis of 3 attributive hearsay constructions in Classical Japanese

- Tokens of *to iheru* and *to ihikeru* constructions were extracted from the Taikei Honbun Database.

- This database comprises 466,574 words from narratives, historical documents and poems from the 8\textsuperscript{th} to 19\textsuperscript{th} century.

- 699 tokens of *to iheru* constructions were extracted and categorized according to their functions over time.

- 265 tokens of *to ihikeru* constructions were categorized in a similar way.
3 types of Japanese hearsay evidentials: attributive & conclusive uses (diachronic perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To iheru (attributive &amp; later also conclusive)</th>
<th>To iheri (conclusive lexical, QT &amp; EVID)</th>
<th>To ihikeru (attributive &amp; later also conclusive)</th>
<th>To ihikeri (conclusive lexical, QT &amp; EVID)</th>
<th>To ihitaru (attributive only)</th>
<th>To ihitari (conclusive lexical &amp; QT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 9th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 10th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 11th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 12th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 13th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 14th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 15th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 16th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 17th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 18th c. | ![Diagram](chart)
| 19th c. | ![Diagram](chart) |
Functions of *to iheru* constructions over time
—Quantitative analysis (summary table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>ATTR ‘say’</th>
<th>ATTR QT</th>
<th>ATTR EVID</th>
<th>CONV QT</th>
<th>CONV EVID</th>
<th>Conclusive QT (+FOC or +SFP)</th>
<th>Conclusive QT (-FOC or -SFP)</th>
<th>Conclusive EVID (+FOC or +SFP)</th>
<th>Conclusive EVID (-FOC or -SFP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th c.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th c.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th c.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th c.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th c.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th c.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Functions of *to ihikeru* constructions over time
—Quantitative analysis (summary table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTR ‘say’</th>
<th>ATTR QT</th>
<th>ATTR EVID</th>
<th>CONV QT</th>
<th>CONV EVID</th>
<th>Conclusive QT (+FOC or +SFP)</th>
<th>Conclusive QT (-FOC or -SFP)</th>
<th>Conclusive EVID (+FOC or +SFP)</th>
<th>Conclusive EVID (-FOC or -SFP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th c.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th c.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th c.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th c.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Functions of *to iheru* constructions over time

ATTRIBUTIVE VOCATIVE (headless) with *wa* in topic position
(Referential use in focus construction)

(9a) 古の人、常世の國といへるは、蓋し疑ふらくは此の地ならむか。

*Inishie no hito, tsukuyonokuni to iheru wa,*
ancient GEN people, *tsukuyonokuni* COMP say.:ATTR TOP

*kedashi utagafuraku ha kono chi naramu ka.*
probably doubt.ATTR NOM this place may Q

‘I wonder if this might be *(the place) that ancient people called Tsukuyonokuni country.*’

*(Hitachikoku Fudoki, p.37, 8th c., probably 715-717)*
• ATTRIBUTIVE VOCATIVE (headless) with optional wa (REFERENTIAL)
• (Manyoshuu, 720 AD, p.139)

• (9b) 更の名を置始多久美といへる、この人なり。

• Sara no na wo Oshida Kumi to iheru, kono hito nari.
  other GEN name TOP PN VOCATIVE this person COP

• Lit. ‘It is this person, his other name is that which is called/said to be Oshida Kumi.’ > finite structure originating from headless to iheru constructions
• ‘It is this person whose other name is called Oshida Kumi.’
ATTRIBUTIVE ‘say’ (headless) in existential construction
(Referential use in focus construction)

(10) 此に馮馬子に遇ひて、乃ち更に活くること得たりといへるは是なり。

Koko ni Mamako ni ahite,
here LOC PN DAT meet-CONV

sunawachi sarani ikuru koto etari
therefore further live NMLZ get-PFV

to iheru wa kore nari
COMP say TOP this be:PFV

‘This was what she (the wife of Jogenho) said, “I met Mamako here, and so I got this thing which makes me live longer.”’

(Manyoshuu, p.109, 8th c.)
ATTRIBUTIVE QT (double-marking) in topic position
(Referential use in focus construction)

(11) 初の章に云へらく、上下和ひ諧れ、
といへるは、其れ亦是の情なるかな。

'As it was said (< That which was said) in the first chapter, higher rank people and lower rank people should cooperate with each other. Might not that also be this kind of sympathy?'

(Nihonshoki, 8th c., p.185)
(12)=(4) Kojin no iheraku wa, ancient.people GEN saying:ADV TOP

shoojin wa tsuchi wo omohi, young.people TOP ground ACC think.of

shinuru kitsune wa Gaku wo obito to su, dead fox TOP name.of.fox ACC leader COMP do

to iheru koto ari.

EVID:ATTR fact EXIST

‘As ancient people seemed to say, “There was an old saying about young people thinking of their homeland and dead foxes making Gaku the head of the group.”’

(Utsubun, p.473, 8th c.)
ATTRIBUTIVE EVIDENTIAL (headless)
(Non-referential use in *ari*-existential construction)

[Some people were reciting a poem, and someone said there was a missing phrase, and it was said to be this: “white sleeves and red flowing skirt”.

(13) 或いはこの句、白栲の袖ふりかはし
紅の赤裳裾引きといへるあり

*aruiwa* *kono* *ku,* *shiro* *eri* *no* *sode* *furikawashi*
perhaps this phrase, white color GEN sleeve flow:ATTR

*kurenai* *no* *akamosusohiki* *to iheru* *ari*
red GEN skirt EVID EXIST

‘perhaps there was this phrase, it was something like
(lit. it was something that was said to be)
“a red skirt with flowing white sleeves”’

*(Manyooshuu,* p.85, 759 AD)
A versatile focus particle within a *kakarimusubi* -- *nan* is perhaps derived from *namu*

(14)=(3) Wasuregahi hirohishi mo seji ype.of.seashell pick.up:PFV CONCESS do:NEG

shiratama wo kofuru wo dani mo katami to omohan white.pearl ACC miss ACC EMPH also keepsake COMP think:NEG
to **nan** iheru COMP FOC say:ATTR=>EVID:CONCLUSIVE

‘It was said he wouldn’t keep this *wasuregai* shell even though he missed the girl who was as sweet as white pearl.’ (Note: A *wasuregai* shell is good to keep in memory of someone precious.)

( *Tosa Nikki*, p.50, 10th c.)
(15) なにはづにさくやこののはな冬ごもり
いまははるべとさくやこの花、といへるなるべし。

Saku ya kono hana fuyu gomori
bloom FOC this flower winter take.rest

Ima wa harube to saku ya kono hana
now TOP spring.around EPIST bloom FOC this flower

to iheru naru beshi.
COMP say:ATTR PFV should

‘This flower that is now blooming rests in winter;
since now spring is here, this flower should be blooming.’

(lit. it should be said that the flower would be blooming
< it is said that the flower should be blooming).’

(Kokin Wakashuu, p.95, 905 AD)
ATTRIBUTIVE QT ‘say’ (headless) + perfective evidential SFP nari keri > CONCLUSIVE EVID

From attributive > finite structure

(16) 「御かたのなやましげにおはして、とまらせ給ひぬれば、
なしにかなは。いとつれ※なるをなん、慰めつべくておはせ。
ありとの給ひしに、織必ずもておはせ」といひたるは、
「女御どのの御かたにこそ、いみじくおぼく候へ。君おはしかよば、
見給（ひ）てんかし」といへるなりけり。

“Nyoogo dono no onkata ni koso,
third.ranking.queen HON GEN HON-place LOC FOC

imijiku ohoku soorohe.
very many exist-EPIST

Kimi ohashikayohaba,
mitsama hitenkashi”
2SG HON-go.and.visit-HYPOTHETICAL show-HON-please

to iheru nari keri.
COMP say:ATTR PFV EVID

‘There seems to be many (pictures) in the palace of the third queen; if you go and visit this

palace,

please bring and show the pictures (to Princess Ochikubo),” the lady-in-waiting was

reported
to have said (to Shooshoo no Kimi, who was interested in the princess)”.

(Ochikubo Monogatari, p.53, 10th ed.)
ATTRIBUTIVE ‘say’ (headless) with particle *mo*

(17) 判云、左和歌、うるわしくよまれてはべり。されど、
「くまもなき月に心を」といへるこそ古めかしくや。

*Hidari waka, uruwashiku yomarete haberi.*
left poem beautifully compose.PASS exist.PFV

*saredo, “Kumo mo naki tsuki ni kokoro wo”*
however cloud even exist.NEG moon DAT mind ACC

*to iheru koso furumekashiku ya.*
COMP say FOC old.fashioned FOC

‘The left poem has been composed beautifully. However, it is
old-fashioned to say “thinking of moon surrounded by no clouds”.’

(Utaawaseshuu, p.355, 12th c.)
EVIDENTIAL with interrogative particle
(Interrogative context)

(18) これは十悪五逆の軽重をしらせんがために、
一念十念といへるか、滅罪の利益なり。

Kore ha juu aku go gyaku no keichoo wo
this TOP ten bad.thing five betrayal GEN light.heavy ACC

shirasen ga tameni, ichi nen juu nen to iheru ka,
know.CAUS TOP for.the.sake.of one wish ten wish COMP say.ATTR Q

genzai no riyaku nari.
redemption GEN benefit COP

‘Is this said to be (< Is this that which is said to be) one wish
or ten wishes in order for people to know the significance of sin
and betrayal? This is the benefit of redemption.’

(Shinranshuu Tanishoo, 14th c., p.206)
ATTRIBUTIVE EVIDENTIAL (headless) in emphatic focus construction > CONCLUSIVE EVIDENTIAL with contrastive focus reading via main-clause ellipsis
From attributive > finite structure

(19) 唐にも文體三度變はるといへるとなむ。

Too ni mo buntai san do kawaru
name.of.country(=China) LOC also writing.style three time change
to iheru to namu
EVID:ATTR CONCESSIVE:EMPH

‘It was even said that writing styles changed three times in China as well.’

(Rengashuu Sasamegoto, p.134, 1463 AD)
ATTRIBUTIVE EVIDENTIAL (headless) in emphatic focus construction > CONCLUSIVE EVIDENTIAL with contrastive focus reading
From attributive > finite structure

(20) 杜子美が詩をも知る人かたし、といへるとやらむ。

Tooshibi ga shi wo mo shiru hito katashi,
name.of.poet GEN poem ACC even know person difficult

to iheru to ya ramu.
EVID:ATTR. COMP FOC ASSUMPTIVE

‘It is said to be difficult (to find) people who know poems of Tooshibi.’

(Reangashuu Sasamegoto, p.144, 1463 AD)
Reanalysis:

• ‘it was that which was said to be X’  >  ‘it was said to be X’
  ATTRIBUTIVE  >  CONLUSIVE

• Focus constructions involving nominalized clauses
  > insubordinated as new main clauses

• 3 types of focus constructions identified among the Japanese ‘say’ attributive evidential constructions:
  - Existential-type
  - *Kakarimusubi*-type
  - Copula-type
Reanalysis:

- VP to iheru naru beshi > VP to iheru naru beshi
  ‘should be said that VP’ > ‘should be that (NP) VP’

ATTRIBUTIVE inferential EVID > CONCLUSIVE inferential EVID
Reanalysis:

- to iheru nari keri > to iheru nari keri
  ‘was reported to have said X’       ‘was believed to have said X’

ATTRIBUTIVE lexical ‘say’ in EVID construction
> CONCLUSIVE inferential EVID
How the attributive-to-conclusive development of hearsay evidentials contribute to the demise of the *kakarimusubi* system

**Phase I**

- Stand-alone nominalization in *kakarimusubi* constructions
- Nominalizers reanalyzed as sentence final focus particles
- Use of focus particles in non-sentence final position

**Phase II**

- Attributive form can have converbal uses.
- Main-clause ellipsis triggers reanalysis of converbal attributives as sentence final particles with pragmatic functions.
- Stand-alone converbal attributive constructions are reanalyzed as conclusive (hence finite) constructions.
5. Conclusion (1)

• Our analysis reveals that the fall of the *kakari musubi* system (see Ono 1993), which makes a distinction between attributive and conclusive forms, was affected by a chain of events in which attributive (non-finite) quotative and evidential ‘say’ forms came to also be used as conclusive (finite) structures.

• Among the syntactic mechanisms responsible for the loss of the attributive-conclusive distinction were:

  1. Reinterpretation of nominalizers as focus particles
     • [relative clause with *attributive* form] N/n >
     • > [insubordinated clause with the attributive form reinterpreted as *conclusive* form] + FOC
     • > the focus particle becomes optional

  2. Existential verb ellipsis

  3. Copula ellipsis

• Note that both types of ellipsis facilitate the insubordination of the complement clause (in this case the attributive construction) into a new main clause (which inherits the finite features of their ‘parent’ constructions).
Conclusion (2)

• From a typological perspective, it is worth noting that the extended uses of attributive forms as conclusive ones provides additional insight into strategies by which relativization and nominalization constructions develop into finite clauses (see DeLancey 2011).
Acknowledgments

• This research is supported by a grant from the Department of Chinese and Bilingual Studies (CBS) and the Department of English (ENGL) at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and for the projects entitled “Insuborodination of ‘Say’ Constructions: Implications for the Relationship between Evidentiality and Finiteness” (HKPU 1-ZVAY) and “Evidentiality, Epistemicity and Politeness Marking: A Crosslinguistic Perspective” (HKPU G-UB76).

• We thank Professors John Whitman, Yasuhiro Kondo, Futoshi Kawamura, Kaoru Horie and participants at the National Institute of Japanese Linguistics (NINJAL), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS) and Nagoya University for valuable feedback in earlier stages of our research on the Japanese evidentiality system.
References


References (contd.)