

Preemptive Usage of N_1 to *yu* N_2 in Japanese Discourse: Psychological Strategy to Increase the Distance between the Hearer and the Entity

Author(s): Michiko Todokoro Buchanan

Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Phonetic Sources of Phonological Patterns: Synchronic and Diachronic Explanations (2003) pp. 79-90

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Preemptive usage of N_1 to *yu* N_2 in Japanese discourse: Psychological strategy to increase the distance between the hearer and the entity

MICHIKO TODOKORO BUCHANAN
University of Minnesota

0. Introduction

This paper examines the usage of the Japanese NP, N_1 to *yu* N_2 ‘ N_2 called N_1 ’. I introduce the notion of “mutual recognition” of the entity between the speaker and the hearer(s). I define mutual recognition as one’s past experience where he/she shared the process of recognizing the entity with the hearer. This notion concerns whether the speaker and the hearer shared the sense of mutual recognition about the entity prior to the conversation rather than the mutual knowledge about the entity *per se*. This study focuses on what the speaker is aiming to do by using N_1 to *yu* N_2 in the interaction, as well as the mechanism used to accomplish the aim.

The NP, N_1 to *yu* N_2 , is conventionally used when the speaker introduces a new proper noun when he/she does not know if the hearer can recognize it. I refer to this usage as “conventional usage”. In addition to the conventional usage, we also encounter the situation where the speaker uses N_1 to *yu* N_2 knowing that the hearer can recognize the entity, which I refer to as “preemptive usage”. Previous studies on the theories relating to N_1 to *yu* N_2 (Takubo 1989, 1992; Kamio 1990, 1994; Suzuki 1996, Takubo and Kinsui 1997, Suzuki 1998) do not discuss the difference between the conventional usage and the preemptive usage, or what the speaker’s goal is in using N_1 to *yu* N_2 in the interaction.

In the present study, I describe the structural variation of N_1 to *yu* N_2 and review the theories relating to N_1 to *yu* N_2 . Then I examine the conventional usage, and argue that N_1 to *yu* N_2 conventionally implicates the “lack of mutual recognition” between the speaker and the hearer(s). Based on this argument, I further investigate the use of N_1 to *yu* N_2 in the situation where the hearer can recognize the entity, and claim that the use of N_1 to *yu* N_2 in that situation is the speaker’s strategy to preempt conflict; therefore, the term preemptive usage. I argue that the speaker accomplishes the goal of preemptive usage by increasing the psychological distance between the hearer and the entity providing the sense of the lack of mutual recognition, which N_1 to *yu* N_2 conventionally implicates. I

demonstrate that the notion of mutual recognition is pertinent to explain the mechanism of the preemptive usage of N_1 *to yuu* N_2 .

1. Structural variations of N_1 *to yuu* N_2

The NP, N_1 *to yuu* N_2 , whose structure is [Noun₁ + Quotative Particle *to* + Verb *yuu* 'to say' + Noun₂], has some structural variations. The quotative particle *to* has its colloquial form, which is *tte* (Miura 1974:23-24). Thus, the propositions of (1) and (2) are the same.

- (1) *Watasi wa kinoo Tanaka-san to yuu hito ni atta.*
 I TOP¹yesterday Tanaka-Mr. QP say person DAT meet-PERFECT
 'I met a person called Mr. Tanaka yesterday.'
- (2) *Watasi wa kinoo Tanaka-san tte yuu hito ni atta.*
 I TOP yesterday Tanaka-Mr. QP say person DAT meet-PERFECT
 'I met a person called Mr. Tanaka yesterday.'

An N_2 can be replaced with a pronoun *no* 'the one' as in (3). Jorden (1988:171) refers to the pronoun of N_1 *to yuu no*, as "anticipatory *no*", because the hearer can reconstruct the possible original NP, N_1 *to yuu* N_2 , based on the classification of N_1 . In (3), the hearer can know *Tanaka-san to/tte yuu hito* 'a person called Mr. Tanaka' is the original NP of *Tanaka-san to/tte yuu no*, because *Tanaka-san* is classified as a person. Thus, the propositions of (3) and (4) are the same.

- (3) *Tanaka-san to/tte yuu no wa dare desu ka.*
 Tanaka-Mr. QP say one TOP who CP Q
 'Who is the one (the person) called Mr. Tanaka?'
- (4) *Tanaka-san to/tte yuu hito wa dare desu ka.*
 Tanaka-Mr. QP say person TOP who CP Q
 'Who is the person called Mr. Tanaka?'

When N_1 *to yuu* N_2 is used as a topic followed by the Topic Marker *wa* as in (3) and (4), N_1 *to yuu* N_2 *wa* can be replaced by N_1 *tte* (Miura 1974:24) as in (5). In (3) and (4), 'the person called Mr. Tanaka' is the topic; therefore, *Tanaka-san to/tte yuu hito wa* 'a person called Tanaka-TOP' can be replaced by *Tanaka-san tte*. Thus, the propositions of (3), (4), and (5) are the same.

¹ The following abbreviations are used in the glosses.

ACC: accusative, CP: copula, DAT: dative, EXT: extended predicate, FP: final particle, GEN: genitive, NEG: negative, PASS: passive, Q: question marker, QP: quotative particle, SUB: subject, TOP: topic marker

- (5) *Tanaka-san tte dare desu ka.*
 Tanaka-Mr. QP who CP Q
 ‘Who is the person called Mr. Tanaka?’

2. Notions relating to N_1 to *yu* N_2 in previous studies

2.1. Takubo’s “Discourse Management”

Takubo (1989, 1992) and Takubo and Kinsui (1997) demonstrate that a linguistic form that the speaker uses to introduce a proper noun into a conversation is one of the examples reflecting how the speaker takes the hearer’s knowledge into account. They refer to the process as “discourse management”. They describe their theory of discourse management in terms of Fauconnier’s (1985) mental space. According to Takubo and Kinsui (1997:748-749), there are two mental domains: D-domain, which is “linked to the long term memory and directly accessible”, and I-Domain, which is “linked to the temporary memory and indirectly accessible”. The information the speaker/hearer obtained prior to the conversation can be directly accessible, that is, the information is set up in the D-domain, and the information that is introduced and processed during the conversation is set up in the I-domain. They claim that the speaker selects a linguistic form according to which domain the information belongs taking not only his/her domains into account, but also the hearer’s.

Takubo and Kinsui (1997:745) argue that even if the speaker and the hearer have mutual knowledge about the entity, the speaker cannot always use bare proper nouns. When “asymmetry in the state of mutual knowledge” exists, the speaker uses “quote marker *to-iu* ‘called’” to reflect the asymmetry, which he refers to as the “metareferential use of a noun phrase” (1997:743).² Takubo and Kinsui’s (1997:749) “Constraint on Information Transfer”, which states that “[i]nformation in the I-domain cannot be transferred to the D-domain during the ongoing discourse session”, explains the reason why B in (6) cannot use a bare proper noun, while A changes from the metareferential form to the bare proper noun. Since the speaker B did not have information about Mr. Tanaka, which put the entity in the I-domain, B cannot change from the metareferential form to the bare proper noun during the conversation because of the constraint. In contrast, the speaker A can change from the metareferential form to the bare proper noun, because A already had information about Mr. Tanaka prior to the conversation, which put the entity into the D-domain.

- (6) A: *Boku no yuuzin ni Tanaka to yuu yatu ga imasu.*-----
 I GEN friends among Tanaka QP say person SUB exist
 ‘Among my friends, there is a person called Tanaka.’
 B: ----*Zya, sono Tanaka to yuu hito ni tanonde kudasai.*
 then the Tanaka QP say person DAT ask-REQUEST
 ‘Then please ask the person called Tanaka.’

² *Iu* ‘to say’ is an orthographical form of *yu*. The word is often colloquially pronounced as *yu*.

A: *Zya, Tanaka-kun ni tanomimasu.*
 Then Tanaka-Mr. DAT ask
 ‘Then [I] will ask Mr. Tanaka.’
 (Takubo 1989:219, modified)

2.2. Kamio’s “Territory of Information”

Kamio (1990) applies his theory of “territory of information” to some NPs. The theory is based on the “notion of psychological distance between a given piece of information and the speaker/hearer” (Kamio 1994:68), and mainly concerns the relationship between linguistic forms and the psychological distance between the information and the speaker/hearer. He claims that in Japanese there are NPs that imply that the information expressed by the NP is not in the speaker and/or the hearer’s territory. He claims that N_1 *to yuu* N_2 is one of them. According to Kamio, the speaker can use N_1 *to yuu* N_2 when the information is outside the speaker’s territory regardless whether the information is inside or outside the hearer’s territory; however, when the information is in the speaker’s territory, the speaker can use N_1 *to yuu* N_2 if the information is outside the hearer’s territory.

2.3. Suzuki’s “Incorporation of Information”

Based on the analysis of *tte* and *to yuu no wa* (Suzuki 1996), and *tte* and *nante* ‘the likes of’ (Suzuki 1998), Suzuki claims that the use of these linguistic forms reflects the distance between the speaker and the entity. Her focus is on the relationship between the linguistic forms and the entity that the speaker uses as a topic. She proposes the notion of “incorporation of information”, which refers to the “process by which the speaker acquires a piece of information and internalizes the information” (Suzuki 1998:431). Suzuki’s notion is built on Kamio’s theory of territory of information, and she claims that “the degree of incorporation is high when the speaker has digested and integrated information into his/her belief system” and “the degree is lower when the process of incorporation is blocked for some reason” (Suzuki 1998:431). In the analysis of *N tte*, Suzuki notes that the “speaker’s detachment” (19998:440) is present in all cases of *N tte*. She argues that “detachment” is a psychological distance from the entity rather than recognizability of the entity. In (7), although the speaker can recognize *kimi* ‘you’, the speaker uses *tte* because the information about *kimi* belongs to the hearer’s territory.

- (7) *Fushigina onna da naa, kimi tte onna wa.*
 Strange woman CP FP you QP woman TOP
 ‘you are a strange woman, you (lit. a woman called you).’
 (Suzuki 1998:443, cited from Martin 1975:1017, modified)

3. Conventional usage of N_1 *to yuu* N_2 and notion of mutual recognition

I introduce the notion of mutual recognition to describe the conventional usage of N_1 *to yuu* N_2 . By mutual recognition, I mean the speaker’s past experience of

sharing the process of recognizing the entity with the hearer. For entities that are commonly known, the mutual recognition of the entity is considered to be tacitly established prior to the conversation. I claim that when the speaker believes that he/she and the hearer did not share the process of recognizing the entity prior to the conversation, which I refer to as “lack of mutual recognition”, the speaker uses N_1 to yuu N_2 to introduce the proper noun. Thus, for example, when the speaker does not believe that prior to the conversation he/she and the hearer have talked about Mr. Tanaka, he/she uses N_1 to yuu N_2 , *Tanaka-san to yuu hito* ‘a person called Mr. Tanaka’. The state of lack of mutual recognition includes the case where the speaker is not sure whether or not he/she shared the experience of process of recognition in the past. Also, even when the speaker knows that he/she and the hearer can recognize the entity, the speaker uses N_1 to yuu N_2 if the speaker does not believe that the speaker and the hearer shared the experience of recognizing the entity prior to the conversation. Thus, the speaker uses N_1 to yuu N_2 if the speaker does not believe that the hearer knows that the speaker can recognize the entity. The state of mutual recognition is one of the conditions that determine whether the state of mutual knowledge is symmetrical or not. In that sense, the notion of mutual recognition is parallel to Takubo’s theory of discourse management.

3.1. Introduction of a proper noun and the speaker’s judgment

When the speaker believes that he/she and the hearer have not shared the process of recognition of the entity, the speaker uses N_1 to yuu N_2 to introduce a new proper noun as in (8). This is a case of lack of mutual recognition.

- (8) *Watasi wa kinoo Tanaka-san to/tte yuu hito ni atta.*
 I TOP yesterday Tanaka-Mr. QP say person DAT meet-PERFECT
 ‘I met a person called Mr. Tanaka yesterday.’

If the speaker’s judgment is correct, that is, if he/she and the hearer actually have not shared the experience of recognizing Mr. Tanaka, the hearer accepts the use of N_1 to yuu N_2 .

In contrast, (9) and (10) the cases where the speaker misjudged the state of the mutual recognition. In (9), the speaker uses *Tanaka-san to yuu hito* to refer to a person even though he/she and the hearer already shared the process of recognizing the person prior to the conversation. This might cause the hearer to respond in such a manner that he/she questions the speaker’s judgment as in B in (9).

- (9) A: *Kinoo Tanaka-san to/tte yuu hito ni atta.*
 yesterday Tanaka-Mr. QP say person DAT meet-PERFECT
 ‘[I] met a person called Mr. Tanaka yesterday.’

B: *Tanaka-san, sitte ru yo.*
 Tanaka-Mr. know-PROGRESS FP
 ‘[I] know Mr. Tanaka, I tell you.’

In (10), the speaker uses a bare proper noun, *Tanaka-san*, to refer to a person even though he/she and the hearer have not shared the process of recognition. This might cause the hearer to ask for more explanation about Mr. Tanaka as in B in (10).

- (10) A: *Kinoo Tanaka-san ni atta.*
 yesterday Tanaka-Mr. DAT meet-PERFECT
 ‘[I] met **Mr. Tanaka** yesterday.’
 B: *Tanaka-san. Dare sore?*
 Tanaka-Mr. who that
 ‘Mr. Tanaka. Who is that?’

3.2. Lack of mutual recognition and asymmetry in the state of mutual knowledge

In the following example, Takubo’s theory of discourse management describes the situation better than Kamio’s theory of territory of information. In (11), the speaker is going to talk about Mr. Tanaka whom the speaker met at a party where he/she found out that Mr. Tanaka is an acquaintance of the hearer. Although the speaker knows that the hearer can recognize Mr. Tanaka, the speaker uses *N₁ to yuu N₂* because the speaker believes that the hearer does not know that the speaker was acquainted with Mr. Tanaka, which is a case of lack of mutual recognition.

- (11) A: *Kinoo Tanaka-san to/tte yuu hito ni atta.*
 yesterday Tanaka-Mr. QP say person DAT meet-PERFECT
Kimi no siriaina n da tte?
 you GEN acquaintance EXT QP

‘[I] met a person called **Mr. Tanaka** yesterday. [I] heard it’s that [he] is your acquaintance.’

This situation can be described as asymmetry in the state of mutual knowledge by Takubo (1989), and Takubo and Kinsui (1997). They argue that the speaker uses *N₁ to yuu N₂* in the situation where the speaker’s knowledge does not agree with what the hearer thinks about the speaker’s knowledge. In other words, the speaker and the hearer have not shared the process of recognizing Mr. Tanaka prior to the conversation.

3.3. Lack of mutual recognition and Constraint on Information Transfer

The theory of discourse management also explains the following example well. Takubo and Kinsui’s (1997:749) Constraint on Information Transfer hinders

B in the following dialogue (12), which is same as (6), from using a bare proper noun. In this dialogue, speaker B, who heard about Mr. Tanaka for the first time from speaker A, is processing the information in I-domain. During this processing period, the information cannot be transferred to D-domain; therefore, B continues referring to Mr. Tanaka as *Tanaka to yuu hito* 'a person called Mr. Tanaka'. I describe this period as a period of sharing the process of recognizing the entity. After this period, the state of mutual recognition is established.

- (12) A: *Boku no yuuzin ni Tanaka to yuu yatu ga imasu.*-----
 I GEN friends among Tanaka QP say person SUB exist
 'Among my friends, there is **a person called Tanaka.**'
 B: ----*Zya, sono Tanaka to yuu hito ni tanonde kudasai.*
 then the Tanaka QP say person DAT ask-REQUEST
 'Then please ask **the person called Tanaka.**'
 A: *Zya, Tanaka-kun ni tanomimasu.*
 Then Tanaka-Mr. DAT ask
 'Then [I] will ask **Mr. Tanaka.**'
 (Takubo 1989:219, modified)

4. Preemptive usage: use of N_1 to *yuu* N_2 as a strategy

In this section, I examine the case where the speaker uses N_1 to *yuu* N_2 to refer to an entity that the speaker and the hearer can both recognize. I demonstrate that when the speaker uses N_1 to *yuu* N_2 knowing that both the speaker and the hearer can recognize the entity, the speaker uses N_1 to *yuu* N_2 as a strategy to preempt conflict. The speaker uses this strategy when he/she expresses his/her subjective opinion to make the opinion sound objective or when he/she describes his/her action to downgrade the action. By using N_1 to *yuu* N_2 , the speaker creates a sense of lack of mutual recognition the conventional usage implicates, which results in increasing the distance between the hearer and the entity. I demonstrate that the sense of lack of mutual recognition N_1 to *yuu* N_2 conventionally implicates plays a significant role in explaining the mechanism of preemptive usage.

4.1. Preemptive usage: use of N_1 to *yuu* N_2 to make the speaker's subjective opinion sound objective

The following are examples where the speaker uses N_1 to *yuu* N_2 to increase the distance between the entity and the hearer to make her opinion sound objective. By doing so, the speaker preempts the hearer's disagreement.

Both examples are from my conversation data. The data was videotaped at a workshop for Japanese teachers in Japan. The speaker in (13) is talking about Japanese people and culture, and the speaker in (14) is talking about education. Both speakers are participating in the group discussion where all participants met for the first time at the workshop. For both examples, the speaker uses N_1 to *yuu* N_2 to refer to a recognizable entity.

- (13) *Demo zentaitekini ano (.)nihon no: (.)hito tte yuu no wa*
 but generally uhm Japan GEN people QP say the oneTOP
*hakkiri iwanai:desu yo ne.*³
 clearly say-NEG FP FP

'But generally, uhm, (.) **the ones called Japanese** (.) **people** don't say (things) clearly, right?'

- (14) *N: demo nanka koo: (1.0) kyooiku toka tte yuu no wa (.)*
 uh but somehow uhm education or QP say the oneTOP
hitotu no zikan de kanketus-areru mono zyanakutte (.)
 one GEN time at complete-PASS thing CP-NEG-and
yappari gakusyusya ni totte mo soko de kanketu-suru
 as you expect learner for also there at complete
mono zyanakute ---
 thing CP-NEG-and

'Uh, but somehow, uhm, (1.0) **the one called education** or (something) is (.) not the thing completed at one time, and, (.) as you expect, for learners also, it is not the thing that completes there, and ---.'

Since the workshop is for Japanese teachers in Japan, the entity, Japanese people in (13) and education in (14), should be recognizable to the speaker and the hearer. For these common entities, it is assumed that the speaker and the hearers had a chance to recognize them at some point in the past; thus, the state of mutual recognition has been established prior to the conversation. However, the speakers used N_1 *to yuu* N_2 , *nihon no hito tte yuu no* 'the ones (people) called Japanese people' and *kyooiku tte yuu no* 'the one (thing) called education'. The speakers could have used a bare noun, *nihon no hito* 'Japanese people' and *kyooiku* 'education' based on the recognizability of the entity.

Since the speakers had a choice of using a bare noun, the use of N_1 *to yuu* N_2 is their strategy to induce the sense of lack of mutual recognition, which is conventionally implicated by the linguistic form. The speakers used N_1 *to yuu* N_2 to induce the sense of lack of mutual recognition, which N_1 *to yuu* N_2 conventionally implicates, to increase the distance between the hearer and the entity. The sense of lack of mutual recognition conveys the message that the speaker and the hearer have not mutually recognized the entity, which increases the distance between the hearer and the entity. Through the sense of lack of mutual recognition, the speaker aims to avoid making her point too clear. By

³ In the excerpts from the conversation data, colons indicate prolongation of vowels, periods in parentheses indicate short pauses, and the numbers in parentheses show the approximate number of seconds of pause.

doing so, the speaker makes her opinion sound objective to preempt the hearer's disagreement.

In both examples, there are some indications that the speaker hesitates to make her statement clear cut. Both speakers pause, prolong vowels, and use fillers, such as *ano*: 'uhm', *n*: 'uh', and *ko*: 'uhm'. These behaviors also show that the speaker intends to avoid making a clear statement. To the speaker, the topic is broad and difficult to discuss, and she knows that the other participants, who are also Japanese teachers, might have different opinions, which motivates her to use the strategy.

Although Suzuki claims that the use of *tte* and *tte yuu no wa* reflects the distance between the speaker and the entity, the mechanism is not clear. For the following example (15), which is same as (7), Suzuki claims that *kimi* 'you' is in the hearer's territory, and the speaker uses the metareferential form, *tte*. This does not explain the mechanism of reflecting the distance between the speaker and the entity, or the speaker's goal in the interaction. In contrast, based on the claim that the form conventionally implicates the lack of mutual recognition, I argue that *tte* in (15) induces the sense of lack of mutual recognition, which results in making the statement sound more objective, which is the speaker's strategy to avoid the hearer's disagreement.

- (15) *Fushigina onna da naa, kimi tte onnna wa.*
 Strange woman CP FP you QP woman TOP
 'you are a strange woman, you (lit. a woman called you).'

(Suzuki 1998:443, cited from Martin 1975:1017, modified)

4.2. Preemptive usage: use of N_1 to yuu N_2 to downgrade the speaker's action

The followings are examples where the speaker uses N_1 to yuu N_2 to increase the distance between the hearer and the entity to downgrade her action. By doing so, the speaker preempts her potential embarrassment.

These examples are also from the same conversation data as I discussed in the preceding section. In (16), the speaker is talking about her occupation, and in (17), the speaker is talking about her thesis. For both examples, the speaker uses N_1 to yuu N_2 to refer to the entity that is recognizable to the speaker and the hearer.

- (16) *N: tandaisee (.) ni taisite nihongo (.) to yuu (.) mono o*
 uh junior college students to Japanese QP say thing ACC
osie:ru to yuu koto wa site iru n desu ne.
 teach QP say thing at least doing EXT FP

'Uh, it's that [I]'m doing at least the thing called teaching **the thing called Japanese**, you know.'

- (17) *Siyootiiki toka* (.) *sirabasu no tigua kyookasyo o* (1.0)
 using area or syllabus SUB different textbooks ACC
toriagete (2.0) *hikaku kentoo to yuu koto o yatta*
 investigate-and comparative study QP say thing ACC do-PERFET
n desu kedo
 EXT but

‘It’s that I investigated textbooks that different (geographical) areas are using and whose syllabi are different, and did **the thing called comparative study**, but.’

Like the examples in the preceding section, the speakers in (16) and (17) had a choice to use a bare noun, but they chose to use N_1 *to yuu* N_2 as a strategy. Since the participants of the workshop are Japanese teachers who have the experience of conducting research, both entities, *nihongo* ‘Japanese language’ in (16) and *hikaku kentoo* ‘comparative study’ in (17), should be recognizable to the speaker and the hearers. However, the speakers chose to use *nihongo to yuu mono* ‘the thing called Japanese language’ and *hikaku kentoo to yuu koto* ‘the thing called comparative study’, respectively. By using N_1 *to yuu* N_2 , which conventionally implicates the lack of mutual recognition, the speaker aims to increase the psychological distance between the entity and the hearer, which results in making the action sound vague. The speaker downgraded her action, because she knows that other participants are also teaching and researching Japanese. By downgrading her action, the speaker preempted possible embarrassment.

In (16), the speaker pauses, prolongs vowels, and uses a filler. In (17), the speaker pauses. These hesitations, like the preceding examples, demonstrate that the speakers avoid making their statement clear.

4.3. Hearer’s cognitive process: preliminary explanation

Although the purpose of this study is describing the use of N_1 *to yuu* N_2 as the speaker’s strategy, the notion of mutual recognition plays a significant role on the hearer’s side, as well as on the speaker’s side. The following is a potential explanation.

From the hearer’s view point, the following cognitive process is possible. In the preemptive usage, “what is said” is true, but “what N_1 *to yuu* N_2 implicates about the entity” is not true. For instance, in (16), the information that the speaker is teaching the thing called Japanese language is true, that is, “what is said” is true. However, lacking mutual recognition of Japanese language between the speaker and the hearers is not true, that is, “what N_1 *to yuu* N_2 implicates about the entity” is not true. In the sense that the speaker uses the linguistic form that implicates the wrong state of mutual recognition of the entity, the speaker violates Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principle. Because of this violation, the hearer is urged to detect “what the speaker is aiming to do”, which is in this case increasing the psychological distance between the hearer and the entity.

Borrowing Fauconnier's (1985) term, the linguistic form, N_1 to yuu N_2 , plays the role of a "space builder" to form a mental space where the entity expressed with N_1 to yuu N_2 is identified as one that the hearer does not share the experience of recognizing with the speaker. In the preemptive usage of N_1 to yuu N_2 , the identification of the entity expressed with N_1 to yuu N_2 is not true, and the hearer is urged to reset the mental space.

4.4. Other usage of *tte*

In addition to the preemptive usage that I have discussed, there is another usage where the speaker uses *tte* knowing that the hearer can recognize the entity as in (18). Unlike the preemptive usage, where the speaker expresses his/her subjective opinion, in (18) the speaker is providing factual information about Mr. Tanaka. Furthermore, although *tte* is derived from N_1 to yuu N_2 , *tte* in (18) cannot be replaced with N_1 to yuu N_2 -TOP as in (18)', while *tte* in the preemptive usage can be replaced with N_1 to yuu N_2 -TOP as in (19). Also this usage of *tte* seems to often occur in the situation where the speaker provides hear-say information. I assume that a different mechanism is involved in this usage, and I have excluded this usage from the present study.

- (18) *Tanaka-san tte amerika de umareta-soo da ne.*
 Tanaka-Mr QP America in was born-I heard CP FP
 '[I] heard Mr. Tanaka was born in America.'
- (18)' ? *Tanaka-san to yuu hito wa amerika de umareta-soo da ne.*
 Tanaka-Mr. QP say person TOP America in was born-I heard CP FP
 '[I] heard a person called Mr. Tanaka was born in America.'
- (19) *Tanaka-san tte / to yuu hito wa henna hito da yo.*
 Tanaka-Mr QP/QP say person TOP strange person CP FP
 'A person called Mr. Tanaka is a strange person, I tell you.'

5. Conclusion

I have introduced the notion of mutual recognition to describe the conventional usage of N_1 to yuu N_2 , and demonstrated that N_1 to yuu N_2 conventionally implicates lack of mutual recognition. Then I have explained that in the situation where the speaker can use a bare noun, the use of N_1 to yuu N_2 is the speaker's strategy to increase psychological distance between the hearer and the entity. The speaker utilizes the sense of lack of mutual recognition, which N_1 to yuu N_2 conventionally implicates. In situations where the speaker expresses his/her opinion, or the speaker describes his/her action, the speaker uses N_1 to yuu N_2 to preempt the hearer's disagreement or the speaker's embarrassment, thus, I refer to this usage as preemptive usage.

To understand what the speaker aims to do by using N_1 to yuu N_2 in the interaction, the notion describing what the linguistic form implicates is needed in addition to the notion describing the location or the amount of information. I have

demonstrated that the notion of mutual recognition is useful to describe what the speaker is doing by using N_1 *to yuu* N_2 in the interaction.

References

- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1985. *Mental spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in natural language*. Cambridge: MIT press.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (eds) *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Jorden, Eleanor Harz with Mari Noda. 1987. *Japanese: The spoken language, Part 1*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kamio, Akio. 1990. *Zyooahoo no nawabari riron: Gengo no kinooteiki bunseki (Theory of territory of information: Functional analysis of language)*. Tokyo: Taishuukan.
- Kamio, Akio. 1994. The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 67-100.
- Martin, Samuel E., 1975. A reference grammar of Japanese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Miura, Akira. 1974. 'To' to 'tte' ('To' and 'tte'). *Nihongo Kyooiku* 24: 23-28.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1996. An analysis of *tte*- and *to yuu no wa*-marked phrases in Japanese discourse. *Word* 47: 321-337.
- Suzuki, Satoko. 1998. *Tte* and *nante*: Markers of psychological distance in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29: 429-462.
- Takubo, Yukinori. 1989. *Meesiku no modalitii* (Noun phrase modality). In Y. Nitta & T. Masuoka (eds) *Nihongo no modalitii (Japanese modality)*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Takubo, Yukinori. 1992. *Danwa kanri no riron: Taiwa ni okeru kikite no tisiki ryooiki no yakuwari* (Discourse management: Role of the hearer's territory of information in discourse). *Gengo* 21: 52-58.
- Takubo, Yukinori and Satoshi Kinsui. 1997. Discourse management in terms of mental spaces. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 741-758.

Michiko Todokoro Buchanan
Department of Asian Languages and Literatures
University of Minnesota
453 Folwell Hall
9 Pleasant St. SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455

buch0119@umn.edu