

From Justification to Modulation: Procedural Constraint of After all and Datte

大津, 隆広
九州大学大学院言語文化研究院

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/2004808>

出版情報 : 2015-07-26. International Pragmatics Association
バージョン :
権利関係 :

From Justification to Modulation: Procedural Constraint of *After all* and *Datte*

Takahiro Otsu

Faculty of Languages and Cultures

Kyushu University, Japan

This paper attempts to formulate the meaning of the discourse marker *after all* and its Japanese counterpart *datte* as a modulation marker within a relevance-theoretic procedural framework. Traditionally, accounts of these two discourse markers have been dealt with in a similar discourse-analytic framework: the proposition following the discourse markers gives a reason or justification to the preceding utterance. Relevance Theory has consistently viewed *after all* as confirming an existing assumption (cf. Blakemore (2002); Carston (2002)). However, dichotomous accounts in the discourse-analytic framework and the Relevance-theoretic framework do not seem to succeed in elucidating its multiple occurrence. On the other hand, the unified accounts of *datte* (cf. Takiura (2003), Oki (1996, 2006)) also take the dichotomy between what justifies and what is justified and define the function of *datte* as justification or giving a reason. The use of *datte* exhibits a variety of contrasting aspects: monologic or dialogic in context, disagreement or agreement, or logic or emotion. These contrasting aspects seem to make it difficult to propose a monosemy account with dichotomous representations. Although *after all* and *datte* encode different lexical information, the development of these two discourse markers suggests that they might share common cognitive ground involved in the interpretation of the utterance including them. In the development of *after all*, the potential adversativity of justification (cf. Traugott (2004: 557)) suggests that a conversational implicature might further link a concessive meaning to a justificatory meaning. In the case of *datte*, derived via phonological change from the combination of the assertive copular verb *da* and the quotation-linking particle *tote*, the adversativity conveyed by the clause-final *datte* — “O but P *datte*” — essentially induces a further pragmatic inference “because Q”. Thus, I claim that *after all* and *datte* involve a common inferential schema “O but P *after all/datte* Q” in the interpretation of the utterance in which they emerge.

In this framework, *after all* and *datte* are indicators that manipulate some conflict between the two different assumptions. Both discourse markers encode a constraint: their respective clauses Q settle a contradiction between previous assumption O and conclusion P as one. The multiple uses of these two discourse markers involve a diverse range of modulations according to their distinctive sentence positions: initial, medial and final. In clause-final use, what conforms to the conclusion is a previous assumption regarding the speaker; in clause-medial use, it is a general assumption that is shared between speaker and addressee; and in clause-initial use, it is a counter-argument that is assumed to belong to the addressee himself. *Datte* also has an utterance-initial use that exhibits a more direct interaction, such as opposition and agreement between speaker and addressee. This occurs in such a way that the addressee’s assumption conforms to the *datte*-user’s assumption in the case of opposition, and the *datte*-user’s assumption conforms to the addressee’s assumption in the case of agreement.

<https://cdn.ymaws.com/pragmatics.international/resource/collection/C57D1855-A3BB-40D8-A977-4732784F7B21/14th%20IPC%20abstracts-Antwerp.pdf>