2012

Climactic Effect Markers in Spoken and Written Narrative: Japanese Conditionals Tara and To

Suwako Watanabe
Portland State University, suwako@pdx.edu

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation Details

Climactic effect markers in spoken and written narrative: Japanese conditionals *tara* and *to**

SUWAKO WATANABE

Abstract

This paper compares two Japanese conditional constructions—tara *and* to—*used as nonconditionals for narrative effect in spoken and written narratives collected from five native speakers of Japanese. These two constructions connect clauses where two unrelated past events happened in sequence as in:* Miru to/Mitara, ame datta *'When I looked, it was raining'. Examination of the spoken and written narratives revealed that* tara *is predominantly used in the spoken narratives while* to *is favored in the written narratives. Although both constructions are similar in the unexpected effect, the reason why the teller uses them differently can be attributed to the nature of the two different communicative modes. The teller in spoken narrative uses* tara *to intensify the heightened suspension whereby s/he creates the surprising effect. The speaker-teller exploits the situatedness of the listener's co-presence and recreates a story in the way the listener can share suspenseful moments and a sense of uncontrollability. The teller, when writing, uses the* to *construction to issue a narrator's voice, "Look what happened." The writer takes the omniscient narrator's viewpoint and directs the reader to an unexpected result even when the writer is absent.*

Keywords: climactic effect; tara*;* to*; Japanese narrative; speaking; writing.*

1.   Introduction

Narrative consists of multiple clauses, each of which is strung together to express relational meaning such as cause-and-result and chronological order. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 227) labeled this relational meaning produced through clause-linking conjunction, whose function is "a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before." One of the relational meanings that is observed with significant

frequency in narrative is the chronological order of multiple events. In English clauses representing events in sequence are frequently linked with coordination *and*, and this is exemplified in the following narrative (1) taken from Labov's (1972: 360) study on Black English Vernacular.

(1)   This boy punched me
       <u>and</u> I punched him
       <u>and</u> the teacher came in
       <u>and</u> stopped the fight.

In Japanese narratives, two strategies to express chronological order are often observed: one is coordination with *te*-gerund or *renyookee* (stem form), which is equivalent to 'and' in English. The other is subordination of conditional constructions *tara* and *to*.[1]

   Although *tara* and *to* are categorized as conditionals along with other conditional constructions (*reba* and *nara*), *tara* and *to* both have temporal meaning when they are used to refer to the chronological relation between two past events. Unlike *te*-gerund and *renyookee*, which merely juxtapose two clauses, *tara* and *to* indicate that something noteworthy happened in the main clause. (See Appendix A for a description of the abbreviations in the Japanese gloss.)

(2)   a.   *botan*   *o*   *ositara*   *araamu*   *ga*   *naridasita.*[2]
            button   OB   push-TARA   alarm   SUB   go-off-PF
            '<u>When</u> I pushed the button, the alarm went off.'
      b.   *botan*   *o*   *osu to*   *araamu*   *ga*   *naridasita.*
            button   OB   push-TO   alarm   SUB   go-off-PF
            '<u>When</u> I pushed the button, the alarm went off.'

Both of these sentences mean, "When I pressed the button, the alarm went off," with a connotation of unexpectedness, and they seem almost interchangeable. The narrative data examined in the current study reveal that *tara* is preferred in spoken narratives while *to* is more frequently observed in written narratives. While these two temporal connectives have the same effect of connoting unexpectedness or dramatic surprise, the teller's stance is somewhat different between the spoken and written narration, which corresponds to the different features of the speaking and writing communication modes (Chafe 1982, 1994; Tannen 1982).[3]

   In this study, I will examine how the *tara* and *to* constructions, including the derived connectives *sositara* and *suru to*, are used in the spoken and written narratives and demonstrate that the two constructions are used at similar points in a story to depict a climax, and attempt to address the question of why one is preferred in a certain communicative mode. I contend that the differentiated use between speaking and writing can be attributed to the notion of communicative constraints and their effects in each of the (speaking and writing) modes.

I claim that *tara* tends to be used in spoken narrative because it intensifies the suspended moments and feeling by exploiting the situatedness of the speech event where the listener is co-present; and *to* is found predominantly in written narrative because the writer detaches him/herself from the protagonist's role and, taking the objective observer's view, s/he integrates the past events as a set. The cohesive force of *to* allows the reader to apprehend the drama of a sequence in the communicative setting in which the writer is absent.

2. Related literature

In this section, I will review the research studies that are related to the *tara* and *to* constructions as nonconditional use, differences between speaking and writing, and the narrative structure.

2.1. Tara *and* to *as nonconditional use*

Whereas *tara* and *to* are categorized as conditional in Japanese grammar (Maeda 2009; Masuoka 1993; Nihongo Kizyutu Bunpo Kenkyukai 2008), when they are used in reference to past events, as in /S1-*tara*/*to*, S2/, they mean, "When S1 happened, S2 happened." This usage in reference to past events as factual states is called nonconditional use and is distinguished from the regular conditional use. *Toki* 'time' is also used to express "when something happens/ed," but *toki* is different from the conditional constructions in that the latter involves unexpectedness or noteworthiness of the occurrence of the second event. Compare the following sentence containing *toki* with the examples (2a) and (2b) in Section 1.

(2) c. *botan   o   osita   toki   araamu   ga   naridasita.*
        button   OB   push-PF time   alarm   SUB   go-off-PF
        'When I pressed the red button, the alarm went off.'

Sentence (2c) is used in response to the question, "When did the alarm go off?" And it does not convey the same surprise or unexpectedness that is expressed in sentences (2a) and (2b) with the conditional constructs.

In terms of the extent to which the four conditional constructions (*tara*, *to*, *nara*, and *reba*) are used in conversation, Ono and Jones's (2009) empirical study of spoken data is informative. Examining conditionals in data that consisted of 28 audio-recorded spontaneous informal conversations, they found temporal usage accounted for a little over 50% of all the occurrences, while conditional usage accounted for approximately 40%. They also found that *tara* and *to* are predominantly used (*tara* occurred 54.9% and *to* 34.1%). However, the difference in usage between *tara* and *to* is not demonstrated in their study.

While Ono and Jones (2009) label the nonconditional *tara* and *to* as temporal connectives, Maeda (2009: 73) identifies four nonconditional meanings. They are: two actions in succession by the same agent (*renzoku* 'succession'); one event prompting another performed by different agent (*kikkake* 'prompt'); discovery of a state through an event or action (*hakken* 'discovery'); and emergence of a state or event while a certain state continues (*hatugen* 'emergence'). Comparing *tara/to* with *te*-gerund and *toki*, Maeda (2009: 94–95) points out that conditional constructions used in the nonconditional meaning imply an accidental relation between the first and the second event but that the relation is such that the first event prompts the second event. And the relation is not as tight as that of cause-and-result as in *kara* and *node* 'because', but the first event works as a cue for the second event to happen.

Earlier, Kuno (1973) explained the effect of *tara* and *to* separately, devoting an entire chapter for each of the two conditional constructions. When we have /S1-*tara*, S2/ pattern, in which *tara* "is used to refer to past events, the timing between the action or event represented by S1 and that represented by S2" (1973: 183) is not a matter that is self-controllable. He explains the effect of *tara* by describing S2 as an occurrence that "often represents an unexpected or surprising event" (1973: 183). As for S1-*to*, S2 construction, he describes the following features:

When it refers to two specific events:

(i)   The construction lacks any "logical antecedent-consequent" implication.
(ii) The sentence must be amenable to the paraphrase "After/while S1 happened, what do you think happened? I observed/discovered that S2 happened." In other words, S2 must represent an event that the speaker could observe objectively. Consequently, the construction carries with it the connotation of suspense and surprise. (Kuno 1973: 194)

Kuno's explanations of *tara* and *to*, when they are used with past events, indicate that they share a similar effect of unexpectedness or surprise.

Iwasaki's (1993) account of *tara* (in his study *tara* is compared with *te*) supports the connotation of surprise in *tara*. He compares *te* and *tara* in narratives and finds that with the link of *te* the subject does not change between the first and the second clause, while with *tara* the subject changes between the two clauses. For example, the 1st-person subject remains the same in /S1-*te*, S2/. In /S1-*tara*, S2/, the subject of S1 is 1st person, but the subject of S2 is 3rd person. Building on the notion of speaker perspective (where different degrees of an event or a state's accessibility for the speaker are encoded through linguistic devices), he attributes the reference switch with *tara* to information accessibility. He states, "TARA appears when there is a shift in the degree of information accessibility and TE if there is not" (1993: 76). With *tara*, the subject of the first clause does not have access to the event in the sec-

ond clause, and this unknowable state has the effect of "uncontrollability" in a narrative.

In terms of the differences between *tara* and *to*, Maeda (2009) states that when the succession usage with the same subject takes place in reference to two past volitional activities, *to* is used but *tara* in such usage entails many constraints. She presents the following example (Maeda 2009: 76).

(3)   *Isizuka wa   udedokee o   miru<u>to</u>|??miti<u>tara</u>*
      Ishizuka TOP wristwatch OB   see-TO/??see-TARA
      'When Mr. Ishizuka saw his wristwatch,
      razio   no   ongaku   o   ookiku   sita.
      radio   LK   music   OB   big   do-PF
      he turned up the music on the radio.'

In this example, both seeing a wristwatch and turning up the volume are volitional acts performed by the same subject (Ishizuka), and *to* is acceptable but *tara* is not because *tara* requires that the second event is nonvolitional or involves a low level of volition in order to represent accidental occurrence of two events in succession. This resonates with Kuno's (1973) point of uncontrollability of the timing between two events in *tara*.

Another constraint on *tara* noted by Hasunuma (1993) is that the speaker must be the one who experienced the cognitive change represented by /S1-*tara*, S2/. In other words, when conveying a cognitive change experienced by someone else, the speaker needs to add a modal expression indicating how the change has come to his/her knowledge. The first sentence in (4a) shows that the speaker is the person who directly experienced the encounter with Ken at school.

(4)   a.   *Gakkoo   ni   ittara   Ken   ga   ita*.
           school   to   go-TARA Ken   SUB exist-PF
           'When I went to school, Ken was there.'
      b.   ?*Mari ga   gakkoo   ni   ittara   Ken   ga   ita*.
           Mari   SUB   school   to   go-TARA Ken   SUB exist-PF
           ?'When Mari went to school, Ken was there.'
      c.   *Mari ga gakkoo   ni   ikuto   Ken   ga   ita*.
           Mari SUB school   to   go-TO Ken   SUB exist-PF
           'When Mari went to school, Ken was there.'

Hasunuma (1993) argues that (4b) is not acceptable when the speaker is not Mari unless the speaker somehow experienced Mari's unexpected encounter with Ken or the speaker marks the sentence with a modal expression such as *tte* (a quotation marker) 'she said' indicating how the occurrence of the two events has become known to the speaker. In contrast, *to* is acceptable as in (4c) because the speaker describes two events in succession as an objective observer's

point of view. She notes that *to* is often observed in the genres of novel and literary narrative and contends that there is a premise in those genres that the narrator is omniscient and is not required to use modality expression when describing someone else's cognitive change.

Uehara (1998) draws our attention to the same phenomenon with *to* and calls it perspective transfer. He examined whether the pronoun is retained in two connected clauses in a novel in English and the Japanese translation of the same novel, and found that while in Japanese the subject switches between two clauses as in (4c) from Mari to Ken, the subject remains the same in English as in "When *Mari* went to school, *she* saw Ken." He argues that in English the narrator objectively describes the protagonist's actions, whereas in Japanese the narrator "identifies him/herself with one of the characters in the story and describes the events from the character's perspective" (1998: 287). Thus switch reference is more likely in Japanese—as in (4c).

Examining the use of *to* in retold narratives based on a story book, Fujii (1993) found that *to* is associated with noticing a change in state. She analyzes data consisting of narratives written by native Japanese based on a story book,[4] and finds that *to* is frequently used to describe scenes in which the protagonist discovers some change in the state or context. By referring to uncontrollability and the aspectual constraint of the *to* construction, she argues that the second clause in the *to* construction contains a change encountered by the protagonist or some new state that is brought to the protagonist's perception. The first clause sets up a stage for discovery. She writes, "the first clause establishes a new setting (or sets up a new scene), while the second clause provides descriptions of the state of affairs made perceivable within the new setting or scene established by the first clause" (1993: 9). In her study, only *to* was examined, but she speculates that semantic/syntactic properties and a conceptual scheme of *tara* and *reba* are "analogous to those of the *to* construction" (1993: 16).[5]

The nonconditionals *tara* and *to* have a similar effect of unexpectedness in the second clause based on some change that enters into the cognition of a subject. The slight difference between the two is that while *tara* expresses uncontrollability based on an unknowable state, *to* forces a direct focus on a cognitive or perceptive change, implying that something noteworthy took place. Hasunuma (1993) and Maeda (2009) have associated the difference between *tara* and *to* with the difference in genre, where *tara* occurs frequently in conversation while *to* is frequently found in novels and literary narratives. Many studies have found that *to* and *tara* reveal subjectivity, the subject's cognitive state, attitude, and evaluation (Fujii 1993; Iwasaki 1993; Hayase 2009; Maeda 2009; Uehara 1998). It should be noted, however, that examples of *to* in many studies (Fujii 1993; Hasunuma 1993; Maeda 2009; Uehara 1998) are taken from written narratives in which the storyteller, who is often a professional writer, is not the protagonist. How differently the two constructions

function in terms of the way the narrator orients to the story world in which s/he was the protagonist is yet to be explicated.

2.2. *Spoken and written language*

Chafe (1994) outlines the different features and nature of speaking and writing as follows. First, while a speaker and a listener are co-present at the time of communication (except for communication using some technological device such as telephone), a reader is not physically present when a writer writes a text. Chafe calls this "situatedness," observing that the speaker and listener(s) share time and space. Secondly, Chafe (1982: 39) states that the storyteller when writing can pack "more information into an idea unit than the rapid pace of spoken language would normally allow." This dimension he calls "integration" and contrasts it with the fragmentation that characterizes spoken language. He speculates that when speaking "each idea unit represents a single 'perching' of consciousness" (1982: 37)—when speaking we are constrained to one idea unit at a time. The fragmentation caused by physical and cognitive constraints, however, produces spontaneity and liveliness in spoken communication. In writing, we have time to integrate more idea units to form a coherent linguistic unit, which, in turn, is compatible with the rapid pace at which the reader processes written information.

2.3. *Narrative*

The view of narrative adopted here is based on Labov (1972: 359–360) who defines narrative as "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred." A fully developed narrative structure consists of six components: Abstract, Orientation, Complicating action, Evaluation, Result or Resolution, and Coda. The teller begins with a summary (Abstract) of the story s/he is about to tell and then provides basic information about the setting in which the story took place (Orientation). The teller develops the story by telling what happened in a sequence in which events actually happened (Complicating action), and the complicating action usually ends with a result (Result or Resolution). Optionally the teller signals the end of the story (Coda). As the teller tells the story, s/he might insert information (Evaluation) that the teller finds necessary for the audience to properly evaluate the story. The evaluation may be added almost at any point in the entire story telling and as often as the teller finds appropriate.

Both *tara* and *to* are used to refer to the succession of two unrelated past events, and both have the effect of unexpected and surprising sentiment in the second event. While the two constructions share a similar effect, where and

how they are used seems to differ. One such difference is found in the narrative data in this study, where *tara* was predominantly used in the spoken narratives and *to* appeared in the written narratives. If the effect of the unexpectedness is the same, why do storytellers differentiate the use of the two communicative modes? If *tara* and *to* appear in complementary fashion, what accounts for the difference?

3.   Data and methods

The data in the current study consist of five people's stories about their unusual experiences traveling abroad; the stories were rendered in both spoken and written narratives.[6] The subjects were five Japanese native speakers who were graduate students at a university in the United States. The stories were first elicited individually in a face-to-face interview, in which I was the interviewer asking for interesting, unusual experiences while they were traveling abroad. It was obvious that I was perceived as an instructor, and all the participants used the distal (so-called *desu/masu*) speech style when talking with me. During the interview, each Japanese speaker related more than one episode. The interviews were audio-recorded. After eliciting several episodes, I selected one that seemed most dramatic and asked each subject to write the episode as if they were writing an article for a newsletter of an extracurricular circle or club.[7]

   After the data collection, the recorded spoken narratives were transcribed, and predicates, excluding those that were judged as occurring as direct quotation, were counted and classified first into (i) main clause final ending, (ii) subordinate clause, and (iii) other forms (e.g., fragments). Among the subordinate clauses, predicates that end in *tara* or *to*, whether they were used as conditional or temporal, were identified. In addition to the predicate ending forms, connective words *suru to* and *sositara* at the sentence initial position were counted for each narrative.

4.   Analyses and discussion

4.1.   *Frequency of* tara *and* to

Table 1 shows the frequency counts of *tara*, *sositara*, *to*, and *suru to* in the spoken and written narratives. There is a clear contrast between the spoken and written narratives: In spoken narratives, *tara* and *sositara* are favored while *to* and *suru to* are predominant in written narratives. It is also noted that *tara* and *sositara* were never used in the written narratives, but *to* and *suru to* appeared sporadically in the spoken narratives.

Table 1. *Frequency of* tara/sositara *and* to/suru to

Spoken	*tara/sositara*	17
	to/suru to	4
Written	*tara/sositara*	0
	to/suru to	16

Table 2. *Type of event to which* tara/to *constructs refer*

			J-1 Jiro	J-2 Rikako	J-3 Masako	J-4 Mikiko	J-5 Keiko
Spoken	*tara*	10	0	0	6 = Past	2 = Past	2 = Past
	sositara	7	1 = Past	0	3 = Past	1 = Past	2 = Past
	to	2	0	0	0	0	2 = Non-past
	suru to	2	1 = Past*	0	0	0	1 = Non-past
Written	*tara*	0	0	0	0	0	0
	sositara	0	0	0	0	0	0
	to	10	0	2 = Past	5 = Past / 1 = Non-past	1 = Past	1 = Non-past
	suru to	6	1 = Past	0	3 = Past	1 = Past	1 = Past

* At first glance, Jiro's use of *suru to* is used to describe a past event, but this needs closer examination.

Table 2 shows whether an event being referred to by the *tara/to* construction is past or non-past. In all seventeen cases of *tara* and *sositara* in the spoken narratives, the event that is described is one that happened in the past. With regard to *to/suru to* constructions in the spoken narratives, they are used to describe non-past events. Among the four tokens of *to* and *suru to* in the spoken narratives, at least three are used to refer to non-past events rather than past events. Thus, the contrast between *tara* and *to* constructions according to the communication mode seems decisive.

4.2. To *in spoken narrative*

As shown in Table 2, a closer look at the way in which *to* and *suru to* are used in the spoken narrative reveals that they are not used to connect two past events that happened in the story world. Rather, they are either used in a nontemporal fashion or used to present a regular occurrence of two events in a sequence. The following segment is an example of Keiko's use of *to* that is interpreted here as nontemporal. (See Appendix B for the transcription conventions used.)

(5)
1   *A-   sore   ga   ittokimasu to*
    Oh   that   SUB   tell-TO
    'Oh, the thing is, <u>to tell</u> you this in advance

2   *eetoo   Bankoku   kara zyuu-zikan   na   n   desu yo*
   FL   Bangkok   from ten-hour   LK   NOM   BE   IP
   Let's see, it's ten hours from Bangkok, you know,
3   *kuruma   de*.
   car   by
   by car.'

Example (5) shows that *to* is used as a conditional *if*-clause to express a meta-communicative message. The phrase, *Ittokimasu to* 'if I am to say this in advance' (literal translation), functions to signal that the speaker is inserting additional background information as if adding a footnote into a narrative. The insertion is initially signaled by the prefacing discourse marker, *A* 'Oh', which indicates a shift in the speaker's orientation to the information (Schiffrin 1987). The phrase, *Ittokimasu to*, functions essentially as a discourse marker with a meaning of 'by the way'. This is close to what Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) call a lexical phrase in that the use of *to* is not a free choice.

   Example (6) is taken from Keiko's narrative, the point of which was that Thai people are not bound by time. She realized how much she and her life were driven by time when her Thai friend, in response to her innocent question of what time it was, answered by asking why she wanted to know the time. The segment contains the use of *to* in describing a regular occurrence of two events as a set.

(6)
1   *Tai   no ryokoo . .   no koto   o   kangaeru to*
   Thailand   LK trip   LK thing   OB   think TO
   'It's that <u>whenever</u> I <u>think</u> of the trip to Thailand
2   *sugu   sono koto   ga   omoiukabu n   desu*.
   immediately   that thing   SUB   come up   NOM BE
   that [experience] immediately comes up to my mind'

In (6), *to* is used to refer to "a regular, recurring" association between the two propositions (Jorden and Noda 1990: 52). The first proposition refers to thinking of her trip to Thailand, and the second to the episode of being asked why she asked the time. Through the use of *to*, she expresses not only the order in which one event evokes the second but also that evocation has occurred repeatedly. Thus, the association between the two propositions does not refer to a particular single occurrence in the past, rather it has formed a regular association.

   Turning next to the two tokens of the connective *suru to* in J-1 and J-5 spoken narratives, a close examination of each token reveals that association between two events forms some degree of regularity. In the following example,

Jiro recalls a memorable episode of miscommunication in France—he was ignored by salespeople at a duty-free shop when he used English instead of French.

(7)

1 *Sorede   ano: . .   kore   mo*
  And then   FL   this   too
  'And then uhm. . this too

2 *atokara   sono   toki   wa   sitta   n   desu   kedomo*
  later   that   time   TOP know-PF   NOM   BE   but
  I learned [it] afterward at that time but

3 *etto   furansu   de   kaimono-suru   toki   ni*
  FL   France   in   shopping-do   time   at
  Uhm when [I] do shopping in France,

4 *ikinari   boku   wa   koo   eego   de*
  suddenly   I   TOP like English in
  The thing is that I suddenly spoke in English,

5 *koo   dadada tte   syabettyatta wake   desu yo*.
  like ONO   QT   speak-PF   NOM   BE   IP
  spoke like a machinegun, you know.

6 *Soo   suruto   mukoo   ga   zenzen   koo*
  that way   do-TO   the other SUB at all   like
  <u>Upon doing</u> so, the thing is that they

7 *hannoo-site   kurenai   wake desu   ne*.
  reaction-do   give-NEG   NOM BE   IP
  would not respond at all, you know.'

The association between the first event *eego de koo dadada tte syabettyatta* 'speaking like a machinegun to a clerk in English' (line 5) and the second event *hannoo-site kurenai* 'they would not respond' (line 7) in this particular context is treated as a recurring occurrence. Notice that before telling these two events, Jiro frames the events as a formula that he learned after the episode. In lines 1 and 2, he states, *. . . kore mo ato kara sitta n desu kedomo* '. . . this too I learned it afterward at that time but', where *kore* 'this' indicates some kind of routine that a tourist should expect to happen as a rule. In line 3, he refers to the act of shopping using the non-past tense, *suru toki ni* 'when [I] do shopping', and it partially reveals that his orientation to the episode at the moment of interaction was more of sharing a lesson he learned than telling a story of what happened in the past. And the lesson he learned is that if one uses English to speak to a salesperson in France, one gets ignored. In addition, it can be inferred that his attempt at addressing a salesperson was not just a one-time occurrence but that he attempted more than once. In line 7, he uses non-past tense in reference to the sales clerk's lack of response: *hannoo site kurenai* 'would not respond',

which indicates he framed the resulting event as regularized occurrence. More-over, later in his narrative he frames the incident with the perfective, saying, *Nankai eego de itte mo koo . . ano zenzen ripurai <u>nakatta</u> n desu yo* 'No matter how many times I spoke to them in English, there <u>was</u> no reply'. Thus, in (7), although Jiro was referring to two past events that happened in a certain sequence, he was framing the two events as a regularized and recurring se-quence and as a generalized event that people can expect to see when they go to France.

   Suru to was also used by Keiko (J-5) in her spoken narrative, but again when we examine the context in which it is used, it is not used to connect past events that happened in the story. Prior to the following excerpt, Keiko had told that her Thai friend invited her to go on a picnic with his friends, and she talks about her expectation when one is invited to go on a picnic.

(8)
1 *De   tomodati:*
   And   friend
   'And other friends,
2 *hoka   no   tomodatitati   mo   sasotte   iku   kara*
   other   LK   friends   too   invite-GER go   CAU
   [he] would invite other friends too, so,
3 *tte iu   koto   de*
   QT say   thing   BE-GER
   he said, and
4 *A   wakatta   toka   itte*
   Oh   understand-PF   like   say-GER
   "Oh, okay," [I] said, and
5 *ano: de   <u>suruto</u>   hutuu   wa   toozen   ano:*
   FL   and   do-TO   usual   TOP naturally FL
   Uhm, and then, [if that's the case] usually naturally uhm
6 *nan-zi   ni   zya   syu-   koko   ni   atumatte*
   what-time at   then   *syu*   here   at   gather-GER
   we would get together at such and such time and
7 *nan-zi   ni   syuppatu-site*
   what-time at   leave-GER
   leave at such and such time,
8 *tte   iu   no   ga . .   kimatteru   daroo   to . .*
   QT   say   NOM   SUB   decided   TNT   QT
   things like that would have been arranged,
9 *omou   zya   nai   desu   ka.*
   think   BE   NEG   BE   Q
   one would think so, wouldn't you.'

Lines 1–4 in (8) refer to the exchange between Keiko and her Thai friend that actually happened, but lines 5–9 (when to gather and leave) express the expected process of arrangement based on her experience. She expected that her Thai friend would arrange a time and location to meet her, but we can tell that it did not happen. She confirms and justifies the expectation with the interviewer by adding, *omou zya nai desu ka* 'one would think, wouldn't you' (line 9). Thus, *suru to* in this case connects a premise and an expected course of action according to the speaker's normal experience.

In this section, the analyses of *to* in the spoken narratives revealed that *to* is used to refer to non-past events and that, even when it is used to refer to past events, the speakers view the association between the two events as a regularly occurring one.

4.3.   Tara *and* to *in spoken and written narrative*

When we closely examine the place of *tara* and *to* (including the connective construction of each) in spoken and written narratives, they appear in similar points in the stories. Both *tara* and *to* express some kind of surprise and they appear close to a point in the narrative where an unexpected event is about to happen. Both *tara* and *to* referring to past events express that the first event + (*sosi*)*tara*/(*suru*) *to* is followed by the event that is unexpected or contrary to what the protagonist had expected or knew. We might say that the event following (*sosi*)*tara*/(*suru*) *to* constitutes a punch line.

Masako's spoken and written narratives about her trip to Venice present a perfect parallel of the two modes depicting the dramatic scene in her episode. When Masako arrived at the hotel in Venice, she was told to go to another hotel because the original hotel was overbooked. In examples (9) and (10) she relates her surprise when she got to the second hotel room in spoken and written narratives, respectively.

(9)
1   *Ano: itte   mitara*
    FL   go   see-TARA
    'Well <u>when</u> we went up and saw,
2   *san-gai made   wa   erebeetaa ga   atta   n   desu   kedo*
    3rd floor up to TOP   elevator SUB exist-PF NOM   BE   but
    up to the third floor, there was an elevator, but
3   *yon-kai made wa   rasen-kaidan . . de*
    4th floor up to TOP   spiral staircase BE-GER
    up to the fourth floor, it was a spiral staircase, and
4   *agatte   mitara*
    go up-GER   see-TARA
    <u>when</u> we went up and saw

5 *yaneurabeya   datta   n   desu*
   attic   BE-PF   NOM   BE
   it was an attic.
6 [Interviewer] *Ara   ma:*
                Oh   wow
   [Interviewer] Oh, my.'

(10)
1 *Tokoroga   erebeetaa   wa   san-gai made sika   naku*
   however   elevator   TOP   3rd floor up to   only   NEG
   'However, the elevator only goes up to the third floor, and
2 <u>*miruto*</u> *yon-kai   ewa nazeka*
   see-TO 4th floor to   somehow
   <u>when</u> we looked around, to the fourth floor
3 *rasen-kaidan   ga   tuzuiteiru   no   desu!*
   spiral staircase SUB   lead-GER   NOM   BE
   leads a spiral staircase!'
4 *Omoi   suutukeesu o   motiagete*
   heavy   suitcase   OB   lift-GER
   'Lifting up our heavy suitcases and
5 *nantoka   yon-kai   no   heya   ni   <u>tadoritukuto</u>,*
   somehow   4th floor LK   room   to   reach-TO
   <u>when</u> we managed to reach the room on the fourth floor,
6 *soko wa   nanto,   yaneurabeya de wa arimasen ka*!
   there TOP surprisingly attic   BE   NEG   Q
   isn't it indeed an attic!'

The two examples (9) and (10) clearly illustrate the parallel between the spoken and written narratives in terms of how *tara* and *to* are used in a similar place in a story. Both *tara* and *to* are used right before an unexpected, dramatic turn of event happens. Notice that Masako in her oral narrative creates a suspenseful feeling in the scene by presenting the degree of disappointment in two steps: First she introduces her slight disappointment when she saw a spiral staircase instead of an elevator (lines 1–3 in [9]). And then in lines 4 and 5 in (9), she presents the bigger surprise when she found out her hotel room was going to be an attic. Both *tara* and *to* are used immediately before betrayal of her expectation.

   Similarly Jiro's uses of *sositara* in the spoken narrative and *suru to* in the written narrative demonstrate a perfect parallel in that they share the same function, i.e., the connectives lead to revelation of a newsworthy event (or information). In examples (11) and (12), Jiro relates that a French man approached and asked him what was going on when he was having a terrible time getting a salesperson's attention. To the French man Jiro vents his resentment

and frustration. Then, Jiro uses *sositara/suru to* to present a punch line delivered by the French man.

(11)   (Jiro's oral narrative)
1   *Koo otoko no hito   ga   koo yottekite*
    Like male LK person SUB like come close-GER
    'Like, a man like came close to us,
2   *de   "Doo sita   no:?" toka   itte*
    and how   do-PF   NOM   QT   say-GER
    and, "What's the matter?" he said, and
3   *"Ya" a   ano eego   de*
    well   oh FL   English in
    "Well," oh, you know, in English,
4   *de   "Zitu wa   koo eego   de . .*
    and fact   TOP   like English in
    so, "The thing is like in English,
5   *ma Furansugo syaberenai   n   de*
    well Franch   speak-NEG   NOM BE-GER
    well, I can't speak French, so
6   *eego de itteru   n   da kedomo*
    English in say-PRG NOM   BE but
    I've been talking to them in English, but
7   *dakara zenzen hannoo-site   kurenai   kara*
    so   at all   reaction-do-GER give-NEG   CAU
    so, they wouldn't respond to us at all, so
8   *koo atama kiteru   n   da"*
    like head   come-PRG NOM   BE
    we're like angry."
9   *mitai na koto   itta   n   desu yo.*
    like   LK thing say-PF NOM   BE IP
    I said something like that.
10 <u>*Sositara*</u>   *"A sokka:" toka   itte*
    SOSITARA oh   so-Q   QT   say-GER
    <u>Then</u>, he goes, "Oh, I see,"
11 *"Yoku aru   n   da yone koko wa ne" toka   itte*
    often exist NOM BE IP   here TOP IP   QT   say-GER
    "Things like that often happen here, you know," he said.'

(12)   (Jiro's written narrative)
1   *Nihongo de, "Anona:" to   kutibasitteimasita.*
    Japanese in C'mon   QT   blurt out-PRG-PF
    'I was blurting out in Japanese, "C'mon."

2   *Sonna toki yasasi-soo   na*
     that   time kind-looking LK
     At such a moment, a kind-looking

3   *furansu-zin   no   dansee   ga   yattekite*
     France-person LK   man   SUB   came-GER
     French man came to us, and

4   *kono   ken'aku na   zyootai   o   sassite   ka*
     this   tense   LK   situation   OB   discern-GER   Q
     maybe discerning this tense situation

5   *zyookyoo   o   kiite-kite   kuremasita.*
     circumstance   OB   ask-come   give-PF
     asked us about the circumstance.

6   *Motiron   eego   desita.*
     of course English BE-PF
     Of course, it was in English.

7   *Wareware   wa   ikki   ni   makusitatemasita.*
     We   TOP one-breath   in   spout-off-PF
     We spouted off in one breath.

8   *"Wareware wa   furansugo   ga   syaberenai   si,*
     we   TOP French   SUB   can speak-NEG   and
     "We cannot speak French, and

9   *koko wa   yuumee   na   kesyoohinten   na node*
     here TOP famous   LK cosmetic store   LK CAU
     this place is a famous cosmetic store, so

10 *eeigo   ga   tuuziru   daroo   to   omotte*
     English SUB communicable   TNT   QT   think-GER
     thinking that they'd probably understand English,

11 *hazime   kara eego   de   hanasikaketa   n   desu   yo!"   to*
     beginning   from English in   talk-PF   NOM BE   IP   QT
     we talked to them in English right from the start!" we said.

12 *Suruto   sono   dansee   wa   niya   tto   waratte*
     SURUTO that   man   TOP ONO   QT   laugh-GER
     Then, that man grinned, and

13 *yoku sonna   koto   ga   aru   n   desu   yo,*
     often that kind thing   SUB   exist   NOM   BE   IP
     That sort of thing often happens, you know,

14 *furansu   de   wa   to.*
     France   in   TOP   QT
     in France, he said.'

In both the spoken and written excerpts, Jiro conveys how frustrated he was before the French man appeared. He uses in line 8 of (11) *Atama kiteru n da*

'we're . . . angry' in his spoken narrative, and in the written narrative, *Ano naa* 'C'mon' (line 1, [12]) and *Ken'aku na zyootai* 'tense situation' (line 4, [12]), both of which denote that his anger was about to reach the boiling point. However, the French man replied that it often happened, implying that Jiro was not the first and only victim. The connectives *sositara* and *suru to* function to signal a pivotal point where the person who is to blame shifts from the salesperson who had been ignoring him to Jiro who had naively assumed that he could get by with English. In Jiro's story, *sositara* and *suru to* link to the answer of the question, "Why did the salesperson ignore Jiro and his friend?" Although the answer does not immediately follow, the French man's initial utterance that what Jiro went through happened a lot leads us to expect an explanation to follow.

In sum, both (*sosi*)*tara* in spoken narrative and (*suru*) *to* in written narrative function to guide the interlocutor to anticipate an unexpected, dramatic result.

4.4.   *Difference between* tara *and* to

What, then, is the substantive difference between *tara* and *to*? In addressing this question, I suggest that we must consider the interactional environment of the storyteller who recreates a past experience in the two different communication modes: speaking and writing. The difference between *tara* and *to* seems to be directly related to the difference in the interactional environment and constraints of the storyteller in speaking and writing. When orally telling a story, the teller normally recreates a story world as if s/he experiences it for the first time. As Chafe (1994) notes that the amount of information activated by the teller is limited in part due to physical and cognitive constraints, the teller stages a past experience in linear fashion, one short segment at a time, following the footsteps that the protagonist walked through. The *tara* construction affords the teller the opportunity to effectively suspend moments that can be experienced by the interlocutor who listens to the story. The nature of oral interaction requires the teller to rely on *tara*, which suspends progression of a story and creates the feeling of suspension in the listener. The more suspended the listener feels, the more anticipation increases. In addition, the use of *tara* creates the feeling of real-life experience as it assumes completion of the verb marked by *tara*, and this sense of shared experience is only meaningful when the interlocutor is co-present with the teller.

The requirement of the speaker's first-hand experience in the use of *tara* is compatible with oral communication. In the current study's narratives, the five narrators told their experiences as the protagonist. The listener hears a story from the speaker who is also the protagonist, and there is no detachment between the one who experienced the event and the one who reports it. The listener experiences the recreated past event as if seeing it through the lens of the protagonist's eye. In other words, the listener gets on a ride with the teller. With

the recreated past experience comes the sense that the protagonist had no control over what would happen in the next moment and no knowledge about how the story would end. Kuno (1973) explains that *tara* in reference to past events denotes the speaker's lack of control of timing for the sequence between the two events. The effect is unexpectedness or surprise. The *tara* construction creates a stage building to a climax that anticipates a blank slot that is to be filled with some dramatic, unexpected event. And the innocence and uncontrollability intensifies the climax of the story. The listener is co-present with the speaker; *tara* creates a sense of shared experience of the suspended moment before the dramatic result.

In writing, as Chafe (1994) points out, the writer has more time for planning and revising. The writer has as much time as necessary to plan a story, recalling most events that happened in the story and select key events. In the process of recalling, the teller detaches him/herself from the protagonist's role to analyze and evaluate events. The teller then most typically takes an omniscient narrator's perspective. Since the teller is not under the same cognitive constraints as in speaking, s/he can lay out events in a sequence that effectively leads up to a climax and, then, a resolution. In this process, the teller integrates two events, the first one of which prompts the second climactic event, as one chunk. Kuno (1973: 194) pointed out "[. . .] S2 must represent an event that the speaker could observe objectively." The teller is no longer an innocent protagonist but, as the omniscient narrator, is aware that two seemingly unrelated events happened in succession and the second event is something unexpected or something that merits readers' attention. Rather than relying on *tara*, which presupposes the co-presence of an interlocutor, the narrator uses the *to* constructions to help the reader focus on the anticipated turn of event.

As Hasunuma (1993) associates *to* with the literary narrative genre, this objective observer's stance coincides with the writing process in which the teller detaches him/herself to rearrange recalled information. In other words, the process of writing involves first mentally recalling and processing past experience before writing it out. In this process, a succession of two events where the second event represents unexpectedness is integrated into a unit. The writer connects two events with *to*, asking the leading question to the reader, "What do you think happened?" A resolution then ensues. Instead of exploiting the on-hold function of *tara*, the teller in a written narrative calls the reader's attention to a consequence expressed in the second clause. The *to* construction in a sense functions as a guiding voice to pose the question, "Guess what happened?"

The difference between the protagonist's viewpoint and the omniscient narrator's viewpoint is analogous to the difference between experience of a 3-D maze by actually walking through it and looking at a maze-like puzzle on a two-dimensional material such as paper. When walking in a maze, we cannot

see two turns ahead, and we have to deal with one turn/corner at a time. Not knowing what to come next helps create a heightened suspense. In spoken narrative, the teller involves the listener into the three-dimensional story world so the listener can experience real-life excitement coming from the unknown state that is experienced by the protagonist. When we look at a two-dimensional maze, we can capture a few corners in one glance. In a written narrative, the feeling of excitement is produced not through the shared experience of suspended actions because the reader is much faster than the time in which the actions occur. The writer, instead, rapidly directs the reader's focus on a dramatic and significant resolution, and, at the same time, the writer is still able to dramatize a punch line instead of merely reporting a past event. The constructions of *to* and *suru to* work as a cohesive device, directing the reader's attention to anticipate a dramatic resolution without being together with the reader.

5. Conclusion

This study shows that a storyteller may reproduce a climactic moment in a story differently depending on communicative mode, and the difference in the perspective is closely related to the linguistic choice of the two temporal connectives *tara* and *to*. In written narrative, the writer detaches him/herself from the protagonist's view and uses the omniscient narrator's voice. In the process of recalling and reorganizing past experience, the writer internalizes a prompting event and a climactic event as one unit and uses *to* as a cohesive device to prompt the reader's attention to a dramatic, unexpected result. When orally telling a story, the teller uses the *tara* construction to heighten the final stage of suspense with the expectation that something unusual will happen. The examination of the construction *to* in the spoken narratives reveals that it is used to refer to events that have been adopted into the speaker's knowledge as a recurring event or generalized lesson. This is indicative of the integration of two events into one unit that underlies the use of *to*.

The current study analyzed how the storyteller conveys climactic effect in Japanese and showed that communicative mode plays a crucial role in linguistic choice. How communicative mode (speaking and writing) affects the ways in which people process information and memories to encode messages deserves cross-linguistic analysis and analysis of various genres. The narrative data in this study were taken from five native speakers of Japanese, so the findings cannot be generalized. However, the data were elicited such that the uses of *tara* and *to* refer to the same past experiences and can be compared between the speaking and writing modes. Another significant feature of the data is the fact that in all the narratives the teller was the protagonist who experienced the events first-hand. The detachment of the teller's stance from the protagonist's

in writing has been sharply contrasted to the overlap of the two stances in the oral interaction. The microanalyses of the linguistic environments where the *tara* and *to* constructions are used have shed some light on the subtle difference between the two constructions. The analyses in this study have also provided some insight into the processes via which one's experiential memory is retrieved as a recreation of some past experience, as opposed to memory retrieval as generalized truth. This suggests that we adapt our orientation to memory, information, and knowledge according to interactional environments and goals.

Appendix A: Japanese gloss

The abbreviations for the Japanese gloss are as follows. Some of them have been adopted from Maynard (1993: 24).

BE	the copula "be"
CAU	causal connective
FL	filler (e.g., *ano*: and *eeto*)
GER	gerundive form
IP	interactional particle (e.g., *ne* and *yo*)
LK	linker (*no* and *na* linking a phrase to a nominal)
NEG	negative
NOM	nominalizer (e.g., *n*, *no*, and *wake* that nominalize a clause)
OB	object marker
ONO	onomatopoetic expression
PF	perfective
PRG	progressive form (verb + *iru*)
Q	question marker
QT	quotative marker
SUB	subject marker *ga*
TNT	tentative (*daroo* and *desyoo*)
TOP	topic marker *wa*

Appendix B: Transcription conventions

The conventions for transcription are as follows.

. .	a noticeable pause shorter than a second
:	elongated vowel sound
- between words	a compound word consisting of two or more words
- at the end of a linguistic element	a glottal stop or abrupt cutting off of sound
underlined part	indicates a point of an analysis

Notes

* I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers who provided insightful comments. I am deeply indebted to Patricia Wetzel who helped revise this paper. All errors remaining in the study are mine.

1. Syntactically *to* is a particle to link a noun phrase to another (*neko to inu* 'a cat and a dog') or to a clause (*Kodomo to itta* 'I went with a kid'), and it means 'and' or 'with'. *To* also has a conditional meaning when it is preceded by a non-past clause as in *Taberu to nemuku naru* 'If you eat, you get sleepy'. The current paper is concerned with *to* when it is preceded by a clause.

2. The Romanization system in this study has been adopted from Jorden and Noda (1987) and is similar to *kunrei-siki*.

3. According to Chafe (1982, 1994), the major differences between speaking and writing can be summarized as follows. Spoken discourse happens spontaneously with the interlocutor co-present in the situation where communication takes place. And spoken discourse tends to be fragmented in small units of language. Writing often takes place where readers are not present at the time of writing, and there is much time to integrate ideas into a single sentence.

4. It is not clear how the stories were produced as Fujii (1993: 12) states, "Story data were elicited by a picture story-book [. . . .]" On the basis of the distal style and the lack of interlocutor's backchannels in the examples, I assume that the data are written stories, rather than orally retold.

5. Similarly, Toyoda (1979) discusses semantic constraints in the use of *to* as *hakken* 'discovery', where S1 indicates a state or a situation in which the discovery takes place and S2 a condition or a thing that is/was discovered. A condition or a thing to be discovered requires the discoverer to either see or physically move to a place where the condition or thing exists. Hayase (2009) finds a parallel between dangling participles in English and *to* in Japanese. She states that S1 prior to *to* and the dangling participle express a process in which a speaker perceives a change in a state, and the change is represented by the main clause S2.

6. The original purpose of collecting the narratives was to compare a degree of difference between spoken and written narratives produced by Japanese native speakers and learners of Japanese. Thus, only five native speakers were involved.

7. Among the five participants, one person chose to type her narrative on a computer, and the other four hand-wrote their narratives.

References

Chafe, Wallace. 1982. Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In Deborah Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and written language*, 35–53. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fujii, Seiko. 1993. On the clause-linking *to* construction in Japanese. In Patricia Clancy (ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics, vol. 2*, 3–19. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hasunuma, Akiko. 1993. "Tara" to "to" no zizituteki yoohoo o megutte [On the factual use of "tara" and "to"]. In Takashi Masuoka (ed.), *Nihongo no zyooken hyoogen* [Conditional expressions in Japanese], 73–97. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Hayase, Naoko. 2009. Kensui-bunsi koobun o dooki-zukeru "uti" no siten [Internal perspective that motivates dangling participle]. In Atsuro Tsubomoto, Naoko Hayase & Naoaki Wada (eds.),

"Uti" to "Soto" no Gengogaku [Linguistics from the perspective of internal and external sub-jectivity], 55–97. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Iwasaki, Shoichi. 1993. *Subjectivity in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jorden, Eleanor H. & Mari Noda. 1987. *Japanese: The spoken language, part 1*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Jorden, Eleanor H. & Mari Noda. 1990. *Japanese: The spoken language, part 3*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Maeda, Naoko. 2009. *Nihonno no Hukubun* [Complex sentences in Japanese]. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Masuoka, Takashi. 1993. *Nihongo no Zyooken Hyoogen* [Conditional expressions in Japanese]. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Maynard, Senko K. 1993. *Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nattinger, James R. & Jeanette DeCarrico. 1992. *Lexical phrases and language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nihongo Kizyutu Bunpo Kenkyukai. 2008. *Gendai Nihongo Bunpo* [Modern Japanese grammar]. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Ono, Tsuyoshi & Kimberly Jones. 2009. Conversation and grammar: Approaching so-called con-ditionals in Japanese. In Junko Mori & Amy S. Ohta (eds.), *Japanese applied linguistics*, 21–51. New York: Continuum.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, Deborah (ed.). 1982. *Spoken and written language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Toyoda, Toyoko. 1979. Hakken no "to" ["To" of discovery]. *Nihongo Kyoiku* [Japanese language education] 36. 91–105.

Uehara, Satoshi. 1998. Pronoun drop and perspective in Japanese. In Noriko Akatsuka, Hajime Hoji, Shoichi Iwasaki, Sung-Ock Sohn & Susan Strauss (eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics, vol. 7*, 275–289. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Suwako Watanabe received her Ph.D. in linguistics from Georgetown University and is currently Professor of Japanese. Her research interests include discourse analysis, pragmatics, and language pedagogy/assessment. She authored "Cultural differences in framing: American and Japanese group discussions," in *Framing in Discourse* (Tannen, 1993) and co-authored "The acquisition of Japanese modality during study abroad," in *Japanese Modality* (Pizziconi and Kizu, 2009). Ad-dress for correspondence: Department of World Languages and Literatures, Portland State Univer-sity, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751, USA ⟨suwako@pdx.edu⟩.