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1 Introduction

Evidential markers express the means by which the speaker acquired the information she or 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. Aoki (1986) observes that Japanese has overt evidential markers like hearsay sooda ‘I’m told’ and indirect evidence yooda/rasii ‘seem’ as shown in (1):

(1) a. Ame-ga hutteiru sooda
  rain-Nom fall Evid(ential)
  ‘It is raining (I’m told).’

b. Ame-ga huru yooda/rasii
  rain-Nom fall Evid
  ‘It seems that it is going to rain.’

These evidential markers appear in the clausal right periphery. This paper proposes that Japanese also has an overt hearsay evidential marker tte, which appears in the nominal right periphery, as exemplified by (2):

(2) a. Enniti-e ikuto, okane-o tukaun desu
  temple-fair-to when-go money.Acc use Cop(ula)
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‘When I go to the temple fair, I spend my money.’

(b) Enniti-tte  doko desu ka?
temple-fair-tte where Cop Q
Lit. ‘The temple fair, where is it?’ (Martin 1975: 940)

I will show that the present analysis accounts for hitherto unnoticed puzzling restrictions on the distribution of tte-phrases and gains further support from successive cyclic movement, island constraints, and embedded contexts. I will argue that the distribution of tte-phrases is constrained by syntactic principles, which presents further evidence for the view that there are pragmatically relevant features that are subject to the syntactic computation (Cinque 1999; Speas 2004). The existence of an evidential head in the nominal right periphery reinforces the parallel between a clause and a nominal.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 investigates previous analyses of tte, where it is analyzed as a topic marker. I will present evidence to show that tte is not a topic marker. Section 3 shows that there are hitherto unnoticed puzzling restrictions on the distribution of tte-phrases. I will argue that tte is an overt hearsay evidential marker that appears in the nominal right periphery. It is shown that the present hearsay evidential marker analysis accounts for the distribution of tte-phrases in terms of a licensing condition on tte-phrases and Match-driven movement. Section 4 presents further evidence for the hearsay evidential marker analysis. Section 5 makes concluding remarks.

2 Previous Analyses: Tte as a Topic Marker

Among a variety of uses of tte in Japanese, tte in (2) has been analyzed as a topic marker (Niwa 1994; Akaso 2007). Since tte in (2) can be replaced by the topic phrase to-wa ‘Comp-Top’ or toyuu-no/Noun-wa ‘Comp-Nominalizer/Noun-Top’ as shown in (3), it has been analyzed as a colloquial variant of the topic phrase to-wa ‘Comp-Top’ or toyuu-no/Noun-wa ‘Comp-Nominalizer/Noun-Top’:

(3) a: Enniti-e ikuto, okane-o tukaun desu
   temple-fair-to when-go money-Acc use Cop
   ‘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-Nominalizer-Top where Cop Q
   Lit. ‘The temple fair, where is it?’ (Martin 1975: 940)

There are, however, differences between tte and the topic phrase to-wa ‘Comp-Top’ or toyuu-no/Noun-wa ‘Comp-Nominalizer/Noun-Top’, which indicates that tte is not a topic marker. First, just like the thematic topic marker wa, to-wa ‘Comp-Top’ and toyuu-no/Noun-wa ‘Comp-Nominalizer/Noun-Top’ cannot be attached to indeterminate pronouns. Tte, on the other hand, can be attached to an indeterminate pronoun. In (4), for example, when wa ‘Top’, to-wa ‘Comp-Top’ or toyuu-no-wa ‘Comp-Nominalizer/Noun-Top’ is attached to the indeterminate pronoun dare ‘who’, the result is deviant. When tte is attached to the indeterminate pronoun dare ‘who’, the result is acceptable. This indicates that tte is not a topic marker:
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(4) a: John-ga kooen-de atteita onnano hito-wa dare na no ka sitteru?
   John-Nom park-at met woman-Top who Cop NQ 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
   who-tte/*Top/*C-Top/C-N-Top Mary-Gen speech anyone not-know
   rasii yo seem Part
   Lit. ‘Who, according to Mary, nobody knows who she is.’

Second, to-wa ‘Comp-Top’ and toyuu-no-wa ‘Comp-Nominalizer/Noun-Top’ cannot appear more than once within a clause as shown in (5b). It should be noted that (5b) is deviant under the intended interpretation that the two topic phrases both receive a thematic (not contrastive) topic interpretation. A tte-phrase, on the other hand, can appear more than once within a clause as shown in (5a). In (5a), the two tte-phrases kodomo-tte ‘children-tte’ and omaturi-tte ‘festival-tte’ appear within the same clause. This fact also indicates that tte is not a topic marker:

(5) a. Kodomo-tte omaturi-tte suki da yone
   children-tte festival-tte love Cop Part
   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
   Lit. ‘Children, festivals, it seems that they love them.’

3 A Proposal

This section proposes that tte is a hearsay evidential marker that is an overt realization of the evidential head in the nominal right periphery. Assuming that tte is syntactically valued as [-author], I argue that the distribution of tte-phrases can be captured by a licensing condition on tte-phrases and Match-driven movement. It is shown that the present hearsay evidential marker analysis accounts for hitherto unnoticed puzzling restrictions on the distribution of tte-phrases.

3.1 Tte as an Evidential Marker

I argue that tte in (3-5) is a hearsay evidential marker in the nominal right periphery. This is based on the insight that tte in (3-5) should be connected to the use of tte as a hearsay evidential marker in the clausal right periphery (6):

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

Following Cinque (1999), Rooryck (2001), Speas (2004), Speas and Tenny (2003), and Tenny (2006), I assume that there exists an evidential head in the clausal periphery. In Japanese, which is a head-final language, I claim that an evidential head appears in the clausal right periphery as
represented in (7). Tte in (6) is an overt realization of the evidential head in the clausal right periphery:

(7) Evidential Head in the Clausal Right Periphery
    [EvidP [Evid’ [Clause ... ] tte (=Evid)]]

I also claim that we have an option of projecting an evidential head within a nominal structure, which appears in the right periphery of the Japanese nominal structure. Tte in (3-5) is an overt realization of the evidential head in the nominal right periphery as represented in (8):

(8) Evidential Head in the Nominal Right Periphery
    [EvidP [Evid’ [Nominal ... ] tte (=Evid)]]

3.2 Syntactic Feature Composition of Tte

As argued by Rooryck (2001) and Speas (2004), although there are many possible pragmatic categories of ‘source 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’ features are syntactically represented. I claim that the Japanese evidential system syntactically marks whether ‘source of information’ involves the speaker (1st person) or not. I assume the binary decomposition of person into [+/- author] and [+/- participant] as advocated by Noyer (1992) and Halle (1997):

(9) Binary Decomposition of Person into [+/- Author] and [+/- Participant]
    (Noyer 1992; Halle 1997)
    a. 1st person = [+author, +participant]
    b. 2nd person = [-author, +participant]
    c. 3rd person = [-author, -participant]

I claim that the Japanese evidential head is syntactically valued 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. Under this feature system, tte is syntactically valued as [-author]:

(10) Tte, a hearsay evidential marker, is syntactically valued as [-author].

3.3 Licensing Condition on Tte-Phrases and Match-Driven Movement

An evidential head in the clausal right periphery has the whole clause as its scope. It is then reasonable to assume that when a tte-phrase appears, its ‘source of information’ feature, i.e. [-author], should match the syntactic ‘source of information’ feature value of a clausal evidential head in order to be properly interpreted at LF. Hence, I propose the licensing condition on tte-phrases (11), where the definition of Match is defined as in (12):
(11) Licensing Condition on Tte-phrases
A tte-phrase is licensed when its syntactic ‘source of information’ feature value, i.e. [-author], matches the syntactic ‘source of information’ feature value of a clausal evidential head.

(12) Match
Match is a relation holding of two items sharing a feature value.

When matching takes place between a clausal evidential head and a tte-phrase with respect to their [-author] features, the tte-phrase moves to the Spec of the clausal evidential head as represented in (13):

(13) Match-driven Movement of Tte-phrase to the Spec of Evid
a. [EvidP [ ... [EvidP XP-tte[-author]] ... ] Evid[-author]]
   Match
b. [[[EvidP [EvidP XP-tte[-author]]] [ ... t ... ] Evid[-author]]]

I adopt the view of Kitahara (2002) and Boeckx (2003) that Move need not be triggered by Agree; ‘pure Match’ (Match without Agree) is enough for triggering movement. They argue that there are two types of movement; Agree-driven movement and Match-driven movement. I argue that tte-phrase movement is an instance of Match-driven movement. In (14), for example, the tte-phrase reizooko-ni atta suika-tte ‘the water melons in the fridge-tte’ must appear in the clause-initial position before the topic phrase, which I assume is adjoined to TP (Saito 1985), since it undergoes Match-driven movement to the Spec of the clausal evidential head:

(14) a. Reizooko-ni atta suika-tte kimi-wa moo tabeta no?
   fridge-in be.Past watermelon-tte you-Top already have.eaten Q
   Lit. ‘The watermelons in the fridge, have you already eaten them?’
b. ??Kimi-wa reizooko-ni atta suika-tte moo tabeta no?
   you-Top fridge-in be.Past watermelon-tte already have.eaten Q

3.4 Restrictions on the Distribution of Tte-Phrases

The hearsay evidential marker analysis accounts for hitherto unnoticed puzzling restrictions on the distribution of tte-phrases. Sentences with tte-phrases must be interrogatives as shown in (15a) or generics as shown in (15b), or they must contain an individual-level predicate as shown in (15c). When a tte-phrase appears in a declarative non-generic sentence with a stage-level predicate, however, the result is deviant as shown in (16). It should be noted that (16) becomes acceptable when it is interpreted as an interrogative, i.e. a yes/no question, with rising intonation:
(15) a. Reizooko-ni atta suika-tte moo tabeta no?
fridge-in be.Past watermelon-tte already have.eaten Q
Lit. ‘The watermelons in the fridge, have you already eaten them?’
(Akaso 2007: 122)

b. John-tte kaigi-no maeni itumo tabako-o suu
John-tte meeting-Gen before always cigarette-Acc smoke
Lit. ‘John, he always smokes before a meeting.’

c. John-tte atama-ga ii
John-tte brain-Nom good
Lit. ‘John, he is clever.’

(16)*John-tte kinoo ringo-o tabeta
John-tte yesterday apples-Acc ate
Lit. ‘John, he ate apples yesterday.’

Under the present analysis, the derivations of (15a-c) proceed as in (17-19):

(17) Derivation of (15a)
   a. [EvidP [[EvidP Reizooko-ni atta suika-tte-author] moo tabeta no]
      fridge-in be.Past watermelon-tte already have.eaten Q

   b. [EvidP [EvidP Reizooko-ni atta suika-tte-author]] [[if moo tabeta no] Evid-author]]

(18) Derivation of (15b)
   a. [EvidP [[EvidP John-tte-author] kaigi-no maeni itumo tabako-o suu]
      John-tte meeting-Gen before always smoke

   b. [EvidP [EvidP John-tte-author]] [[if itumo kaigi-no maeni tabako-o suu]

(19) Derivation of (15c)
      John-tte brain-Nom good

   b. [EvidP [EvidP John-tte-author]] [[if atama-ga ii] Evid-author]]

Let us first consider (15b). Generic sentences like (15b) express generally shared cultural knowledge. Since a speaker conveys common knowledge, the ‘source of information’ does not involve the speaker. It is then reasonable to claim that the clausal evidential head of a generic sentence is valued as [-author] as represented in (17a). Let us next consider (15c). Chierchia (1995) argues that individual-level predicates are inherently generics, since they express
properties of individuals that are permanent. If we adopt Chierchia’s view, it then follows that the clausal evidential head in (15c) is also valued as [-author] as represented in (18a). Finally, in interrogatives like (15a), it is the hearer (2nd person) who is the ‘source of information’ relevant to evaluating an utterance, as argued by Speas and Tenny (2003). The ‘source of information’ does not involve the speaker; the clausal evidential head in (15a) is valued as [-author] as represented in (19a). In (17-19a), the clausal evidential head and tte-phrase match in their syntactic ‘source of information’ feature value [-author]. This satisfies the licensing condition on tte-phrase (11). Because of this matching, the tte-phrase moves to the Spec of the clausal evidential head by Match-driven movement as represented in (17-19b). Hence, we can derive (15a-c).

In declarative non-generic sentences with stage-level predicates like (16), however, the ‘source of information’ is the speaker; the clausal evidential head is valued as [+author] as represented in (20):

(20) Derivation of (16)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{[EvidP \ Evid\ John-tte\ [-author]] \ kinoo \ ringo-o \ tabeta \ Evid\ [+author]} \\
\text{John-tte \ yesterday \ apples-Acc \ ate} \\
\text{Lit. ‘John, he ate apples yesterday.’}
\end{array}$$

(20) violates the licensing condition on tte-phrases (11); (16) is deviant. Hence, the hearsay evidential analysis can account for the puzzling contrast between (15) and (16).

It should be noted that if we add a hearsay evidential marker such as sooda/tte or an indirect evidential marker such as rasii to (16) as shown in (21a-c), the clausal evidential head is valued as [-author]. The clausal evidential head and tte-phrase match in their syntactic ‘source of information’ feature value [-author]; this satisfies the licensing condition on tte-phrases (11). The tte-phrase moves to the Spec of the clausal evidential head by Match-driven movement. Hence, we can correctly predict that (21a-c) are acceptable:

(21) a. John-tte (Mary-no hanasidato) kinoo ringo-o tabeta sooda
John-tte (Mary-Gen speech) yesterday apple-Acc ate Evid (hearsay)
Lit. ‘John, (according to Mary,) he ate apples yesterday (I’m told).

b. John-tte (Mary-no hanasidato) kinoo ringo-o tabetanda tte
John-tte (Mary-Gen speech) yesterday apple-Acc ate Evid (hearsay)

b. John-tte (Mary-no hanasidato) kinoo ringo-o tabeta rasii
John-tte yesterday apple-Acc ate Evid (indirect evidence)
Lit. ‘John, he ate apples yesterday, it seems.’

4 Further Evidence

The previous section has first shown that tte is a hearsay evidential marker and syntactically valued as [-author]. I have then proposed that a tte-phrase is licensed by a clausal evidential head with [-author] and then undergoes Match-driven movement to the Spec of the clausal evidential head. This section presents further evidence for the present hearsay evidential marker analysis of tte, especially for the claim that tte-phrases undergo Match-driven movement to the Spec of a clausal evidential head.
4.1 Successive Cyclic Movement

First, there is evidence to show that *tte*-phrases undergo successive cyclic movement through intermediate Spec of a clausal evidential head. All the clauses that the *tte*-phrase has passed must have a clausal evidential head whose ‘source of information’ feature is valued as [-author]. For example, as a response to (22), while (23a) is acceptable, (23b, c) are not:

(22) Sengetu Puuketto-ni ittan da
    last month Phuket-to went Cop
    ‘I went to Phuket last month.’

(23) a. [EvidP *Puuketto-tte* [John-ga [EvidP *t’*[t totemo kirei da to]]
        Phuket-tte   John-Nom         very beautiful be C
        itumo    hanasiteiru]]
    always say
    Lit. ‘Phuket, John always says that it is very beautiful.’

b. ?? [EvidP *Puuketto-tte* [John-ga [EvidP *t’*[t totemo kirei da to]]
        Phuket-tte   John-Nom         very beautiful be C
        kinoo   Mary-ni hanasita]]
    yesterday Mary-Dat said
    Lit. ‘Phuket, John said to Mary yesterday that it is very beautiful.’

c. ?? [EvidP *Puuketto-tte* [watasi-ga [EvidP *t’*[t totemo kirei da to]]
        Phuket-tte   I-Nom           very beautiful be C
        itumo    hanasiteiru]]
    always say
    Lit. ‘Phuket, I always say that it is very beautiful.’

In (23a), since the matrix clause is generic, its clausal evidential head is valued as [-author]. Rooryck (2001) argues that the person feature in the embedded clausal evidential head is anaphoric and therefore takes the matrix subject as its ‘source of information’. The embedded clausal evidential head takes the matrix subject John as its ‘source of information’; its ‘source of information’ does not involve the speaker. The embedded clausal evidential head is also valued as [-author]. Hence, (23a) is acceptable. In (23b), however, the matrix clause is a declarative with a stage-level predicate; its ‘source of information’ involves the speaker. The matrix clausal evidential head is valued as [+author]. Hence, (23b) is deviant. In (23c), the embedded evidential head takes the matrix subject *watasi* ‘I’, i.e. the speaker, as its ‘source of information’; it is valued as [+author]. Hence, (23c) is deviant.

Although it is not clear how to integrate the notion of phase into the cartography of syntactic structure, I present a way of accommodating the successive cyclic movement effects in (23) under the phase theory. Let us consider the so-called “CP domain.” The cartographic view claims that C dissolves into Force, Topic, Focus, and Finite. Evidential head has also been assumed to belong to the CP domain. A question arises as to which one of these heads functions as a phase head. I adopt the insight of the relativized phase system suggested by Bošković (2002) and Chomsky (2004), claiming that within a CP domain, Force functions as a phase head for
force-related operations, Topic functions as a phase head for topic-related operations, and so on. Under the relativized phase system, it is reasonable to claim that Evidential head functions as a phase head for evidentiality-related operations. Then, the derivation of (23a) proceeds as represented in (24):

(24) a. Matching and Licensing in the Embedded Clause
   \[ \text{Evid} [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}] \text{ totemo kirei da to} \text{ Evid}\text{-author} \]
   \[ \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{very beautiful be C} \]

b. Match-driven Movement to the Spec of the Embedded Evid
   \[ \text{Evid} [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}] [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}] \text{ totemo kirei da to} \]
   \[ \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{very beautiful be C} \]
   \[ \text{Evid}\text{-author} \]

c. Transfer
   \[ \text{Evid} [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}] [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}] \text{ totemo kirei da to} \]
   \[ \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{very beautiful be C} \]
   \[ \text{Evid}\text{-author} \]

d. Matching in the Matrix clause
   \[ \text{Evid} [\text{John-ga} [\text{Evid} [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}] [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}]
   \text{John-Nom} \quad \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{Phuket-tte} \]
   \[ \text{totemo kirei da to} \quad \text{Evid}\text{-author} \quad \text{itumo hanasiteiru} \quad \text{Evid}\text{-author} \]
   \[ \text{very beautiful be C} \quad \text{always say} \]

e. Match-driven Movement to the Spec of the Matrix Evid
   \[ \text{Evid} [\text{Puuketto-tte} [\text{John-ga} [\text{Evid} [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}] [\text{Puuketto-tte}\text{-author}]
   \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{John-Nom} \quad \text{Phuket-tte} \quad \text{Phuket-tte} \]
   \[ \text{totemo kirei da to} \quad \text{Evid}\text{-author} \quad \text{itumo hanasiteiru} \quad \text{Evid}\text{-author} \]
   \[ \text{very beautiful be C} \quad \text{always say} \]

In (24a), matching takes place between the [-author] value of the \textit{tte}-phrase \textit{puuketto-tte} ‘phukettete’ and that of the embedded clausal evidential head. This satisfies the licensing condition on \textit{tte}-phrases (11). The \textit{tte}-phrase \textit{puuketto-tte} ‘phukettete’ moves to the Spec of the embedded clausal evidential head by Match-driven movement as represented in (24b). The complement of the embedded clausal evidential head, which is assumed to be a phase head, undergoes Transfer as shown in (24c). It is worth noting that matching between the \textit{tte}-phrase \textit{puuketto-tte} ‘phukettete’ and the embedded clausal evidential head must take place at stage (24a); otherwise the \textit{tte}-phrase within the transferred domain would not be licensed and crash at LF. We then come to stage (24d), where the matrix clausal evidential head is introduced into the derivation. If we assume that Matching applies freely, Matching may take place between the [-author] value of the \textit{tte}-phrase \textit{puuketto-tte} ‘phukettete’ and that of the matrix clausal evidential head. It should be noted that since the \textit{tte}-phrase has already been licensed within the embedded clause, Matching is not required to take place here. In other words, matching is optional at this stage. In (24d), we take the option of applying Match. The \textit{tte}-phrase \textit{puuketto-tte} ‘phukettete’ then undergoes Match-driven movement to the Spec of the matrix clausal evidential head. Hence, we can derive (23a).

Let us now consider (23b). In (23b), matching cannot take place between the \textit{tte}-phrase \textit{puuketto-tte} ‘phukettete’, which has [-author] value, and the matrix clausal evidential head, which has [+author] value. There is no way of moving the \textit{tte}-phrase \textit{puuketto-tte} ‘phukettete’ to
the Spec of the matrix clausal evidential head in terms of Match-driven movement as shown in (25); (23b) is deviant:

(25) No Match-driven Movement to the Spec of the Matrix Evid  
\[ \text{EvidP Puuketto-tte} [\text{John-ga EvidP Puuketto-tte-[author]} [\text{Puuketto-tte-[author]} \text{Phuket-tte John-Nom Phuket-tte totemo kirei da to}] \text{Evid-[author]}] \text{kinoo Mary-ni hanasita} \text{Evid[+author]}] \text{very beautiful be C yesterday Mary-Dat said} \]

In (23c), the embedded clausal evidential head is valued as [+author]. This does not satisfy the licensing condition on tte-phrases (11); the tte-phrase puuketto-tte ‘phuket-tte’ is not licensed in the embedded clause. When the complement of the embedded clausal evidential head is transferred, the derivation crashes at LF as represented in (26); (23c) is deviant:

(33) No matching or licensing in the embedded Clause  
\[ \text{EvidP [Puuketto-tte-[author] totemo kirei da to] Evid[+ author]} \text{Phuket-tte very beautiful be C} \]

Hence, we can account for the contrast between (23a), on the one hand, and (23b, c), on the other, in terms of the notion of phase.

4.2 Island Constraints

Second, tte-phrases are subject to the island constraint. In (27), the tte-phrase sono supai-tte ‘that spy-tte’ is extracted out of the complex NP. In (28) the tte phrase John-tte ‘John-tte’ is extracted out of the adjunct clause. Both (27) and (28) are deviant, which shows that the tte-phrase undergoes movement:

(27)*Sono supai-tte keisatu-ga [Complex NP itumo t renraku-o totteiru nakama]-o that spy-tte police-Nom always contact-Acc get accomplice-Acc sagasiteiru rasii look for seemLit. ‘That spy, the police are looking for the accomplice who always gets in touch with him, it seems.’

(28)*John-tte Suzy-ga [Adjunct t otokorasiku nai node] tigau hito-to kekkonsita John-tte Suzy-Nom manly not because different person-with married rasii seemLit. ‘John, Suzy married a different person because he is not manly, it seems.’
4.3 Embedded Contexts

Third, Miyagawa (2012) argues that the Japanese politeness verbal affix -masu only occurs when there is a speech act phrase (saP). The distribution of -masu in an embedded context can be accounted for by his claim that the nonfactive complementizer to occurs with saP whereas the factive complementizer koto/no does not, and that the complements of Hooper and Thompson’s (1973) Class B and E verbs lack saP regardless of whether the complementizer is koto/no or to. The distribution of tte-phrases in an embedded context (29, 30) is the same as that of -masu. This straightforwardly follows if we assume that saP and EvidP, being ‘periphery pragmatic projections’, occur together in clauses:

(29) a. Mary-wa [John-tte atama-ga ii to] itta  (Class A)
    Mary-Top John-tte brain-Nom good C said
    Lit. ‘Mary said that John, he is clever.

    b. *Mary-wa [John-tte atama-ga ii koto]-o hookokusita (Class A)
    Mary-Top John-tte brain-Nom good fact-Acc reported
    Lit. ‘Mary reported the fact that John, he is clever.

(30)?*Mary-wa [John-tte atama-ga ii to] sinziteiru/satotta (Class B and Class E)
    Mary-Top John-tte brain-Nom good C believe/realized
    Lit. ‘Mary believes/realized that John, he is clever.’

5 Conclusion

This paper has argued that tte, a hearsay evidential marker, is an overt realization of the evidential head in the nominal right periphery. It was shown that the hearsay evidential marker analysis accounts for the puzzling restrictions on the distribution of tte-phrases and gains further support from successive cyclic movement, island constraints, and embedded contexts. I have shown that the distribution of tte-phrases is constrained by syntactic principles, which presents further evidence for the view that there are pragmatically relevant features that are subject to the syntactic computation. The existence of an evidential head in the nominal right periphery reinforces the parallel between a clause and a nominal.

References

Niwa, Tetsuya. 1994. Syudai teizi no “tte” to inyoo (Topic marker “tte” and quotation), Zinbun Kenkyuu (Journal of Humanities), 79-109, Osaka City University.
Speas, Margaret and Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles, in Asymmetry in grammar, ed. by Anna-Maria Disciullo, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 315-344

Toru Ishii
School of Arts and Letters
Meiji University
1-1 Kandasurugadai, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo, 101-8301 JAPAN
tishii@kisc.meiji.ac.jp