UCL Working Papers in Linguistics 9 (1997)

Conceptual and procedural encoding: cause-consequence conjunctive particles in Japanese^{*}

MICHIKO TAKEUCHI

Abstract

A number of Japanese grammarians have proposed analyses of the causal connectives, KARA and NODE; however, these analyses do not appear to account in a fully adequate manner for the phenomena involved. This paper aims to clarify, using Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, their similarities and differences in meaning. It is argued that they encode both conceptual and procedural information. On the conceptual level, KARA/NODE contribute to the truth-conditional content of an utterance, while on the procedural level they indicate where presupposition and focus are to be found. I will argue that their conceptual semantics is identical, and that they differ only on the procedural level.

1 Introduction

Japanese has two conjunctive particles Kara and NODE, which are used to express the cause-consequence relationship. Examples are given in (1):¹

^{*}I am greatly indebted to Deirdre Wilson for her insightful guidance and detailed comments, and above all her constant encouragement. I am also grateful to Robyn Carston and Villy Rouchota for their useful discussions on the topic, and Seiji Uchida with whom I enjoyed discussing the Japanese data. Finally, I want to thank Kanagawa University and my colleagues in Japan for allowing my studies at UCL.

¹In what follows, the Japanese examples are followed by word-by-word gloss, literal translation and finally translation into natural English.

- (1) a. kuuki-ga kirei da KARA, kenkou-ni yoi air-NOM clean Copula health-LOC good
 'The air is clean KARA, it is good for health.'
 'It is good for one's health here, because the air is clean.'
 - b. kuuki-ga kirei-na² NODE, kenkou-ni yoi

Both particles connect two clauses: let me formalize this as P KARA/NODE, Q, where P and Q are distinct. KARA and NODE play a cohesive role, building a complex proposition in which Q is presented as a consequence of P or P as a reason for Q. How do KARA and NODE differ in meaning? What makes the speaker choose one form or the other? Since they are in many cases interchangeable, there has been considerable debate about these questions, the aim being to find a rule of thumb to distinguish the conditions in which they are used. In this paper I shall outline Japanese grammarians' treatments and show that existing analyses are far from satisfactory. Next, looking in detail at the behaviour of these particles, I shall explore the possibility of using the Relevance-based approach of Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995) to clarify their similarities and differences. I shall draw two conclusions: first, these two particles have a single conceptual semantics, and are truth-conditionally equivalent: second, the distinction emerges at the procedural level, as a difference in indications about the way the utterance is to be processed in terms of focus and presupposition. My conclusion is that the case of KARA/NODE shows that two terms may have both conceptual and procedural meaning.

2 Previous studies

2.1 Nagano's theory and the surrounding debate

At the centre of the debate has been the so-called Nagano theory, which has been adapted for use in writing dictionary entries. Nagano (1952=1972) tries to show the fundamental differences in meaning and usage between KARA and NODE, while acknowledging

²Copulative da is realized as na (or no) in an adjectival clause. The only syntactic difference between KARA and NODE is that KARA follows the bare form of Copula, e.g. da, while NODE follows a conjugated form na.

their similarities. His conclusions may be summarized as follows (See Nagano 1988; Tio 1988).³ KARA relates the first clause (P) with the second clause (Q) from the speaker's point of view. The cause-consequence relation between P and Q exists in the speaker's mind, and the hearer need not anticipate it at all before the utterance is produced. The speaker therefore has to present the cause or reason in order for the hearer to understand it or agree with it. Nagano adds that the two states are not dependent on each other in the real world and the speaker must be responsible for their being related. In other terms, he seems to claim that KARA invokes an inferential relation between P and Q.

With NODE, on the other hand, the cause-consequence relation between P and Q is presented as actual fact beyond the speaker's subjective opinion. Here, P is seen as less independent of Q than when KARA is used. As I see it, Nagano wants to claim that with NODE the relationship is not so much inferential as causal. Sweetser (1990) might say that KARA sets up a connection in the epistemic domain, and NODE in the causal domain (see 4.1).

Nagano argues that the appeal to subjectivity vs. objectivity correlates with the fact that only KARA is used when Q represents a state connected in some way with futurity, e.g. guessing, volition, request, suggestion, asking why, etc., while NODE should be used when Q represents natural phenomena or social facts, or when describing one's feelings and actions objectively. The following are some of his examples:⁴

- (2) Taro-wa kata-ga itai KARA, kyo-no pitcher-wa Jiro da roo name-TOP shoulder ache today-POS name FUT 'Taro has a shoulder ache KARA, Jiro will be the pitcher today.'
 'Since Taro has a shoulder-ache today, Jiro should be the pitcher.'
- (3) Mariko-ga kinodoku da KARA, nagusamete yar-roo name sorry comfort give-FUTURE
 'I feel sorry for Mariko KARA, I'll try to comfort her.'
 'I'll try to comfort Mariko, because I feel sorry for her.'

³There is a convenient summary of Nagano's observation in Nakada (1977).

⁴As his examples are rather archaic and sometimes taken out-of-context, the examples cited here are modified, but not to the extent that they undermine his claims.

(4) kiken da KARA, chikazuite-wa ikimasen dangerous go near don't (polite)
'It is dangerous KARA, don't go nearer.'
'Don't go nearer, because it is dangerous.'

He claims that to replace KARA with NODE in (2) - (4) is almost impossible, whereas in (5) - (7) the result of replacing NODE with KARA sounds unnatural:

- (5) yama-ni chikai NODE, hiruma-wa atui mountain near daytime hot
 'It is close to the mountain NODE, it is hot during the daytime.'
 'It's hot here during the daytime, because it is close to the mountain.'
- (6) sono seisaku-wa bukka-no jyoushou-o motarashi ta NODE, that policy price rise-ACC bring PAST infure-de nayamu hito-ga zoudaishi ta inflation-with suffer people increase
 'The policy brought a price rise NODE, an increasing number of people suffered from inflation.'
 'An increasing number of people suffered from inflation, because the policy resulted in a price rise.'
- (7) yo-ga ake ta NODE, hutatabi aruki-dashi ta night open PAST again begin-to-walk PAST
 'The day broke NODE, I began walking again.'
 'Because it was daylight, I began walking again.'

According to Nagano, (5) - (7) describe a causal relation between objective states of affairs: (5) describes natural phenomena, (6) social matters and (7) gives an objective description of the speaker's action.

Tio (1988) argues against Nagano's theory using (8) as an example:

(8) kakekomi jyousha-wa kiken na NODE, yamema-shoo dashing getting on train dangerous stop-let
'Dashing onto a train is dangerous NODE, don't do that.'
(Announcement): 'Do not run; please board trains in an orderly manner.'

In (8), NODE is used with an imperative form (Q), despite its connection with volition and futurity, which in Nagano's system should lead to the use of KARA. Tio is also doubtful of the objectivity of the connection between the two states of affairs, which is, according to Nagano, the main characteristic of the NODE form. He notes that NODE is not always used in this way: there are cases where it imposes a more subjective connection. His objection is chiefly to Nagano's linking of subjectivity with Q clauses expressing futurity, volition, command, prohibition, request, suggestion, asking whether, etc., as a rationale for using KARA rather than NODE.

In Tio's view, KARA is used when the speaker considers that the cause or reason will be easily understood by the hearer. By contrast, NODE is used when the speaker wants to emphasize the cause or reason to the addressee, assuming that the hearer has an insufficient understanding. He gives two concrete illustrations: first, only KARA is used when a parent gives a cause or reason to a child, in order to minimize the child's burden and facilitate his/her understanding. In such a situation the parent chooses KARA, since he considers that the cause or reason is already clear enough for the child to be convinced. Second, only NODE is used in directions or instruction manuals. Among Tio's many examples is (9):

(9)	rouden ya	kosho-no	gen'in-to	narimasu NODE,	hontai-wa
	leakage and	breakdown	cause-LOC	make PRE (Polite)	body
	zettaini	mizu-araishi	nai de	e kudasai	
	absolutely	water-washin	ng not as	k (polite)	
'An electric leakage/breakdown will be caused NODE, don't wash the applianc					
	'Washing the a	ppliance will	lead to an ele	ectric fault or breakd	own.'

According to Tio, the reason why NODE is used in directions and instruction manuals is that the consumers' understanding is supposed to be 'insufficient'.

Teramura (1981) partly agrees with both Nagano and Tio. Using the chart below, he confirms Nagano's view that NODE is unlikely to be followed by clauses expressing questions, commands or exhortations:

1	1	\mathbf{U}	
J	T	U)	

Q	P - KARA	P - NODE
Description of fact	✓	\checkmark
Conclusion	>	✓
Possibility	\	✓
Intention/Wish	\	✓
Question	X ⁵	×
Command/Suggestion	\	×
Persuasion	 ✓ 	×

Here a cross indicates that the whole sentence sounds unnatural. He concludes that the use of NODE is responsible for the sentence sounding unnatural in these cases, but gives no explanation of his own for why this is.

Kunihiro (1992) argues that NODE is a polite expression, while KARA is not. In his view, NODE sentences sound indirect, so NODE is a subjective rather than objective expression, while KARA sentences sound direct and straightforward. Consider (11a) and (11b):

(11)	a.	kaze-o	hikimasi ta KARA,	kessekishi	masu
		cold	catch	be absent	PRE (polite)
		'I've got a cold KARA, I will be absent.			
		'I can't con	ne to class, because I've got a cold.'		

b. kaze-o hikimashi ta NODE, kessekishi masu

According to Kunihiro, (11a) sounds impolite, because it indicates that catching a cold is a generally accepted reason for being absent; he concludes that students would usually use (11b) when addressing teachers (28).

⁵Followed by interrogative sentences, only KARA is used, and NODE is hardly possible. For example: I'll wash the dishes KARA (*NODE), will you dry them? For discussion, see 4.1.

and procedural encoding in Japanese

2.2 A common problem

This survey of past studies of KARA and NODE suggests that although grammarians have tried to characterize the differences in meaning between these two particles, they have not fully succeeded. As we have seen, there are objections to each argument, and counter-examples to each claim. In this section I will point out what I take to be their common problem.

First, few of the cited grammarians maintain a clear distinction between semantics and pragmatics. As seen above, their analyses and explanations tend to involve a mixture of semantic matters (mood, e.g. interrogative, imperative, etc.) and pragmatic notions (speech act, e.g. question, command, etc.). It is not always clear whether they believe that these expressions affect truth-conditional content. Only Kunihiro seems to maintain consistently that the difference in interpretation is determined pragmatically rather than semantically. In the tradition to which Kunihiro belongs, pragmatics is taken to be the study of all non-truth-conditional aspects of meaning. KARA and NODE are generally considered to have the same truth-conditional meaning, expressing the cause-consequence relationship, and to differ only non-truth-conditionally. So first we have to clarify the truth-conditional semantics of these expressions: what do KARA and NODE contribute to the proposition expressed? Then we have to explain how to capture the difference in interpretation between, say (11a) and (11b).

The blurring of the boundaries between semantics and pragmatics is also seen in Nakada (1977). Basically following Nagano's theory, he analyses the differences between KARA and NODE in terms of the effect each has on sentence structure. His claim is that 'P NODE, Q' is structured as a single sentence ('mono-sentential structure'), whereas in 'P KARA, Q' P and Q are two separate sentences ('bisentential structure'). On his account, P appended with NODE functions as a presupposition of the assertion in Q, whereas P appended with KARA and the following Q are two separate assertions, connected from the speaker's point of view. However, what he means by structural difference is not clear. He might mean that the clause appended with NODE is a subordinate clause, while the one appended by KARA is a coordinate clause. If so, we must accept that the two particles are of different syntactic types, but carry an identical meaning. However, the view that they differ syntactically is not immediately plausible, since KARA and NODE are not free lexical forms but bound forms which are always appended to a clause, and they are interchangeable in most cases.

I will argue later that in the Relevance-theoretic framework these two particles should

be seen as a single complex proposition, and that the role of KARA/NODE is to indicate how the proposition to which it is appended contributes to the interpretation of the utterance as a whole.

Secondly, grammarians generally describe speakers' preferences between KARA and NODE by giving contexts in which only one of the two is fully acceptable. In fact, however, both are equally acceptable in almost all contexts. Nagano (1988), in reply to Tio's counterexamples, states clearly that KARA and NODE are so similar in meaning that a clear-cut distinction is not possible, and that so there are considerable overlapping synonymous uses. He comments (1988: 68-69): 'The subjectivity/objectivity distinction is a fundamental difference and there are many cases in everyday discourse where we can't say which to choose or where NODE can be accepted, even though NODE is 'incorrect' and KARA is preferred '. This sounds like an admission of defeat.

Furthermore, Nagano himself gives an objection to his own earlier view. Consider the pair of examples in (12):

(12)	a. kiiteorimase-n KARA		wakari-kane masu
		hear (polite)-not	know-difficult
		'I haven't heard anything	KARA, I don't know (what to do).'
		'Since I haven't heard any	thing about the matter, I don't know what to do.'

b. kiiteorimase-n NODE, wakari-kane masu 'Since I haven't heard anything about the matter, (I'm afraid) I don't know what to do.'

He claims that when a polite form is used in the second clause Q, KARA must be replaced by NODE, because KARA sounds 'offensive'. Indeed, the use of NODE does make Q sound polite, as 'I'm afraid' suggests in the translation (12b). This has been seen by Kunihiro (1992) as a problem for Nagano's theory. Kunihiro claims that politeness relates to subjectivity rather than objectivity. In his view, while KARA in (11) indicates an objectively admitted reason, NODE has the effect of softening the causal/explanatory connection. Yet on Nagano's account, KARA is connected with subjectivity and NODE with objectivity. This raises the question of how the objectivity/subjectivity distinction correlates with politeness.

Tio, unlike Nagano, does not stipulate a basic relationship between KARA and subjective reasoning on the one hand, and NODE and objective reasoning on the other. As we have seen, he argues that the distinction lies in the speaker's judgement of the

degree to which the hearer has been familiarized with the existence of the connection. Nagano (1988) objects that Tio's examples are rather slanted. Consider Tio's example (13):

(13)	(to a child who has just got out of the bath):						
	o-naka-o	o dashite-i	ru to kaminari-sama	a-ni o-heso-o tor-rare ru KARA,			
	belly	expose	if lightning-Mr.	navel steal-PASS			
	o-yohfuku-o kima-shoo						
	clothes wear let's (polite)						
	'If you are in the nude, Mr. Lightning will steal tummies away KARA, you should						
	wear clothes.'						
	'Cover u	p your tun	nmy, or Mr. Lightning	g will steal it away.'			

Nagano says that he can't understand why Tio considers (13) to provide a familiar reason for the child: the claim that lightning steals the tummies of naked children would be quite unfamiliar. In Nagano's view, parents use KARA because they want to emphasize the cause-consequence relationship in order to persuade the child.

In my opinion, it is not the case that KARA in general expresses subjective reason or obviously admitted reason, nor that KARA sentences in general sound rather offensive. The point is that the speaker chooses to use one rather than the other in a particular instance. Since in most cases KARA and NODE are interchangeable, the question is what makes the speaker choose between the two? Why are there some cases where substitution is not possible? I have suggested that the speaker's decision does not affect the content of her message, but has some effect on the overall communication nonetheless. I will try to show what this effect is, and use it to clarify the differences between KARA and NODE.

Though previous studies have presented interesting linguistic data, they do not analyze them in an adequate explanatory framework, but try to always accumulate examples in the hope that generalisations will emerge. However, it is not necessarily the case that inductive observation of a great number of examples will point in the right direction. We need first an adequate semantics for these particles, Then, we need an account of how these encoded meanings interact with pragmatic factors to yield the range of possible interpretations. I will turn first to semantic question approached within the more general pragmatic framework of Relevance Theory.

3 Semantics of KARA/NODE

3.1 Explicit encoding

Both P KARA, Q and P NODE, Q express a cause-consequence relation between P and Q: P is a consequence of Q/Q is a reason for P. The cause-consequence relation can be implicitly communicated, as in P TE, Q, where P and Q are just connected by TE (translated as *and*), which is equivalent to logical '&'.⁶ There the relation is recovered inferentially using pragmatic principles and general knowledge about the way things are related in the world (see Carston 1988, 1995; Wilson & Sperber forthcoming). Let P and Q stand for:

(14) P = I drank too much yesterday. Q = I have a headache this morning.

A pragmatic theory should explain why we can interpret (15) along the lines of (16), relying on general knowledge such as (17):

- (15) I drank too much yesterday TE, I have a headache this morning.
- (16) I drank too much yesterday and [as a consequence/because of that] I have a headache this morning.
- (17) Too much drinking may lead to a headache the following day.

One reason for claiming that the cause/consequence relation is not part of the encoded meaning of TE is that there are utterances with TE which do not communicate a cause-consequence relation. Consider the following:

⁶TE is a contracted form of a verb stem + sosite 'and', followed by a sentence. For example:

(i)	boku-ga	shokuji-o tsuku ru.	sosite	kimi-ga tabe ru	
	I (male)	meal make	and	you	eat
	'I will make				

(ii) boku-ga shokuji-o tsuku TE kimi-ga tabe ru 'I will make a meal and you will eat it.'

- (18) I finished the work with which I had been concerned for months TE, made a report of the mission.
- (19) It is close to the sea here TE, it's good for one's health.

In (18) a cause-consequence interpretation is not necessarily recovered. In (19) the relation understood to hold is more or less indeterminate: closeness to the sea may be interpreted as a possible cause of good health, or the two clauses may simply be interpreted as describing two characteristics of the place. This is the standard mark of a relation that is inferred rather than encoded.

Inferring a causal relation needs some effort, but it also yields more contextual effects than other types of relation, e.g. temporal or spatial relations. Because inference involves some effort and risk of misunderstanding, the speaker may encode the causal relation explicitly by using KARA or NODE. Compare (20a) and (20b) with (19):

- (20) a. It's close to the sea here KARA, it's good for one's health.
 - b. It's close to the sea here NODE, it's good for one's health.

The examples in (20) explicitly encode the information that good health is a consequence of closeness to the sea. The hearer has no option of supplying some weaker relation, as he does with TE.

So far, I have demonstrated that KARA and NODE explicitly encode a causeconsequence relation. The next question to be examined is whether this relation is truthconditional or not. I will argue that in the case of both KARA and NODE, it is truthconditional.

3.2 Truth-conditional or non-truth-conditional?

Within the framework of Relevance Theory, Blakemore (1987) drew a distinction between conceptual and procedural meaning. For her, conceptual meaning was truth-conditional and procedural meaning was non-truth-conditional. In analysing the meaning of KARA/NODE, our first step must therefore be to establish to what extent, if any, their meaning is truth-conditional.

There is a standard test to distinguish truth-conditional from non-truth-conditional meaning. It involves embedding into a conditional a sentence which includes the

expression to be tested, and seeing if this expression falls within the scope of the *if* (Carston 1988; Ifantidou 1993). Let me illustrate this by looking at KEDO '*but*', which is generally claimed to have a contrastive and non-truth-conditional meaning. Consider the conditional in (21):

(21) If fish are plentiful KEDO, it's cold in winter, then we won't live here when we get old.

The question is under what conditions the speaker of (21) is claiming that we won't live here when we get old: Is she saying that if (a) and (b) in (22) are true we won't live here when we get old, or that if (a), (b) and (c) are true we won't live here when we get old? If the former, KEDO is non-truth-conditional, and if the latter, KEDO is truthconditional:

- (22) a. Fish are plentiful here.
 - b. It's cold in winter.
 - c. There is a contrast between the fact that fish are plentiful here and the fact that it's cold in winter.

Here it seems clear that the connotation of contrast in (22c) does not contribute to the truth-conditions of (21), and the contrastive meaning of KEDO is therefore non-truth-conditional.

Now we can see how sentences with KARA/NODE behave in similar condition. The question is whether the speaker of (23) is claiming that if (a) and (b) in (24) are true we want to live here when we get old, or that if (a), (b) and (c) are true we want to live here when we get old. In other words, does (24c) contribute to the truth conditions of (23), or does it remain outside the scope of '*if* '?

- (23) If it's close to the sea KARA/NODE, the climate is mild all year round, then we want to live here when we get old.'If the climate is mild all year round, because it's close to the sea, then we would want to live here when we get old.'
- (24) a. It's close to the sea.
 - b. The climate is mild all year round.
 - c. The fact that it's close to the sea makes the climate mild all year round.

Concepted

Here, the result are different from those with KEDO. (24) clearly falls within the scope of 'if' in (23).' Thus the intuition that KARA/NODE are truth-conditional is confirmed.

The fact that KARA/NODE are truth-conditional suggests that they should be seen as encoding conceptual rather than procedural meaning. Understanding the sentences in (20) involves recovering three propositions: (i) the place is close to the sea (P), (ii) it is good for one's health(Q) and (iii) Q is a consequence of P. Contributing to the truth conditions of the utterance, they are therefore best treated as involving conceptual encoding.

Now compare the sentences in (25):

- (25) a. kinoo nomi-sugi TE ne-busoku TE, atama-ga itai yesterday drink sleep-lack headache 'I drank too much yesterday and had a lack of sleep, and I have a headache.'
 - b. kinoo nomi-sugi TE ne-busoku da KARA/NODE, atama-ga itai
 - c. kinoh nomi-sugi ta KARA/NODE ne-busoku na NODE/ da KARA, atamaga itai

(25a), with two occurrences of TE, provides the hearer with an immediately accessible context for interpretation but may not be clear where a causal relation is being proposed. In conversation, the speaker might make her intention clearer by the use of KARA/NODE: in (b) she presents both drinking too much and a lack of sleep as causes of her headache, while in (c) the main clause can only be a lack of sleep. These differences in interpretation confirm the views that KARA/NODE affect the truth-conditions of utterances, and therefore encode conceptual meaning.

A further reason for treating that KARA/NODE encode conceptual meaning is given by Wilson & Sperber (1993) and Ifantidou (1993). Conceptual representations have logical properties: they may be true or false, entail or contradict each other. It follows that if KARA/NODE encode concepts, then the speaker who uses them may be open to charges of untruthfulness in their use. This turns out to be the case. Consider the following exchange:

(26) Husband: I had a lack of sleep yesterday KARA/NODE, I have a headache.Wife: That's not true. It's not that you had a lack of sleep KARA /NODE, but you drank too much KARA/NODE, you have a headache.

Here, the wife is not necessarily denying that her husband had a lack of sleep, but she is denying that it was the cause of his headache. Parallel examples with non-truth-conditional KEDO are hard to construct. Thus, KARA/NODE are both truth-conditional and conceptual.

4 Differences between KARA and NODE

4.1 What is asserted?

I have argued that KARA/NODE have a common truth-conditional semantics. Now it remains to explain the differences between the two cause-consequence particles. My hypothesis is that the resulting utterances differ in their information structure, i.e. in what clause is indicated as pragmatically most important, and that the semantic difference between KARA and NODE are linked to these differences in information structure.

Sweetser (1990) argues that conjunctives such as *because* have differing interpretations in three domains of usage. I will compare KARA/NODE with her analysis of *because*, to bring out their similarities and differences. Sweetser argues (p77) that P *because* Q can link (a) states of affairs, (b) the speaker's thoughts and (c) speech acts, as seen in the sentences below:

- (27) a. John came back because he loves her.
 - b. John loved her, because he came back.
 - c. What are you doing tonight, because there's good movie on.

Sweetser calls (27a) a content-conjunction, (27b) an epistemic-conjunction and (27c) a speech-act conjunction. She argues that in (27a), the speaker asserts a real-world causal connection between P and Q. Example (27b) would normally be understood as conveying that the speaker's knowledge of John's return causes her to draw the conclusion that John loved her. Utterances of this type may be ambiguous as in:

(28) She went, because she left her book in the movie theatre last night.

Here, it would be possible to read the *because*-clause either as a real-world cause of the departure or as a conclusion drawn from the speaker's knowledge of the person's departure. The *because*-clause in (27c) gives the cause of the speech-act expressed by P: the reading is something like 'I ask you what you are doing tonight because I want to

suggest that we go see this good movie.' Thus, *because* may be interpreted as relating to three different domains, and the correct interpretation depends on 'pragmatically motivated choice between viewing the conjoined clauses as representing content units, logical entities, or speech acts (78).'

It is interesting to note that only KARA is used in conversation in Sweetser's speech-act domain.⁷ Consider the following examples:

- (29)yoku sittei ru omae-wa nan-demo KARA tazune ru ga, well know PRESENT everything (I) ask you taikansiki-wa nan-nen dat-ta? Elizabeth jyoou-no Oueen coronation what year 'Since you know anything very well KARA I ask, when did Queen Elizabeth II's coronation take place? 'Since you seem to know the answer to everything, can you tell me when Queen Elizabeth's coronation was?'
- (30) mituke-rare nai you da KARA oshiete-age ru ga, kotae-wa find out-can not seem tell answer tugino page-ni aru yo next page
 'Since you can't find out the answer KARA I tell you, it is on the next page.'
 'Since you don't seem to be able to find the answer, you'd better look on the next page.'
- (31) kisoku-wa kisoku da KARA (ii masu ga), ikemase-n rules say (polite) don't
 'The rules are rules KARA (I say), 'no'/'you don't.'
 'Rules are rules, so don't do it.'

⁷The apparent counter examples are discussed below.

(32) sekkaku London-ni i-ru KARA, Paris-no gakkai-ni iku-beki da to omoimasu fortunately stay conference go-should COMP think 'Fortunately, you are in London KARA, I think you should go to the conference in Paris.'
'Since it's a good thing you're in London, I think you ought to go to the conference in Paris.'

It is characteristic of Japanese that speech-act verbs are usually explicitly encoded: *tazune-ru* 'I ask' in (29), *oshie-ru* 'I tell/teach' in (30), *omow-ru* 'I think' in (32). Sometimes, as shown in (31)(*iw-ru* 'I say'), the speech-act verbs are optional as in English. Compare (31) with (33):

(33) watashi-ga shokki-o arau KARA, anata-wa hukin-de huite choudai⁸
I china wash you dishcloth-with wipe IMP
'I wash the dishes KARA, I ask you to wipe them with the cloth.'
'If I wash the dishes will you dry?'

In (33) the speech-act verb is implicitly understood with the imperative ending of the second conjunct.

In examples (29) - (32), Sweetser's content-conjunction reading is impossible. Instead the causal conjunctions are used to justify the speech act whose content is given in the following clause. Intuitively the hearer interprets the KARA-appended clauses as modifying higher-level explicatures, which sometimes are not encoded but only inferred. In (29), where the main clause is not a statement, the KARA-appended clause justifies the question about when the coronation took place. Similarly, in (30) - (32) the KARA clauses motivate the speaker's assertion or suggestion. It is clear that while the KARA clauses concern the speaker's attitudes to her asserting, telling, asking or suggesting, the main point of each utterance is understood to be in the propositional content of the main clause, to which the KARA clause gives secondary support.

In connection with speech-act verbs and KARA, I note that when the main clauses are marked by sentence-final particles, KARA sounds much better than NODE. Compare (34a) and (34b):

⁸*Kure*, *kudasai* (polite) and *choudai* (informal) are imperative forms of *give*, which can be paraphrased, followed by a (real) verb, something like 'make the action/the thing come to me'.

- (34) a. koko-wa umi-ni chikai KARA/NODE, kenkou-ni ii here sea close health good 'It is close to the sea here KARA, it is good for one's health
 - b. kokowa umi-ni chikai KARA (?NODE), kenkou-ni ii yo

In face-to-face conversation in Japanese, it is usual for the sentence to be marked by such sentence-final particles as *ka*, *ne*,*sa*, *yo* etc.⁹ They are assumed not to contribute to propositional content. *Yo* is considered emphatic: it forces the hearer to interpret the information given as a claim, advice, warning or the like (Uyeno 1971). Thus, in (34b) the KARA clause serves to motivate the speaker's emphatic assertion that the place is good for one's health.

Nakada (1977) makes a similar point, discussing the paired sentences in (35):

- (35) a. atama-ga itai NODE (?KARA), iinkai-wa kesseki simasu head ache meeting absent be (polite)
 'I have a headache KARA, I will be absent from the meeting.'
 'Because I have a headache, I will not attend the committee meeting.'
 - b. atama-ga itai KARA (?NODE), iinkai-wa kesseki simasu yo

(35a), with KARA and without *yo*, has 'a lower degree of acceptability', because a 'declarative sentence without some particle at the end is less compatible with KARA' (257). To quote Nakada further: [the particle] 'involves the mental operation of S2 [in S1 KARA S2 construction]..., and it is a device resorted to only when the speaker has strong motivation to create some impact (a command, advice, invitation, etc.) upon the hearer' (257). Nakada's claim is that the speaker of (35b) strongly asserts a reason, while in contrast, sentences using NODE ((35a)) presuppose the reason and assert the main clause. My claim is the opposite: (35a) with NODE is equivalent to: I will not attend the committee meeting, because I have a headache, and (35b) with KARA is equivalent to: since I have a headache, I will not attend the committee meeting. That is to say, the fact that *yo* can be appended only to the clause following the KARA clause shows that the main clause is highlighted.

⁹Uyeno (1971) is, to the best of my knowledge, the first systematic study of the sentence-final particles; Itani (1995) analyses them in the Relevance-theoretic framework.

Recall that KARA and NODE are in most cases interchangeable but sometimes KARA makes the sentence sound unnatural. So in (7) (repeated as (36) below), NODE is preferable:

(36) yo-ga ake ta NODE/KARA, hutatabi aruki-dashi ta 'Since it was daylight, I began walking again.'

In Sweetser's terms, here P and Q are connected by real-world causality: the day's breaking was the cause of my walking again. The NODE-appended clause forces the reading which asserts the causal relation between p and Q and also the truth of the main clause. Thus, (36), with NODE, is interpreted as asserting that I began walking again, and that this action is caused by the daylight. On the other hand, with KARA my resumption walking as asserted, presupposing that it was daylight. In (34a), with NODE the closeness to the sea is asserted and the cause is asserted, too., while with KARA it is asserted that the place is good for one's health and presupposed that the place is close to the sea. My point is that the use of NODE presents a clause as an independent assertion, hence the main clause tends to remain in the background. What is focused/highlighted in (34), (35) as well as (36) with KARA and NODE lies in relative importance of P and Q.

If we accept the claim that the KARA clauses present a presupposition and with NODE clauses a causal relation is more asserted, this offers an explanation for the fact that KARA is connected with the expression of subjectivity (with opinion, volition, persuasion, command, request, suggestion, question, etc.; see 2.1, and that in these contexts NODE is strange. Consider the following:

- (37) yooji-ga aru KARA, hayaku kaeritai
 business be early come home (I) wish
 'I have some business KARA, I want to come home soon.'
 'Since I've got something to do, I want to come home soon.'
- (38) kuraku natte-ki ta KARA, akari-o tsukete kure dark becoming light put on IMP 'It's getting dark KARA, put on the light.'
 'Put on the light: it's getting dark.'

The assumptions expressed in the KARA clauses are presupposed; and the speaker uses

them to justify her wish (as in (37)) or her suggestion, to persuade the hearer of her opinion or to obey her directions (as in (38)).

Recall Tio's (1988) claim that NODE is used with an imperative form, when the speaker wants to emphasize the cause or reason to the addressee. Let me cite again his examples (8) and (9), as (39) and (40) respectively:

- (39) kakekomi jyousha-wa kiken na NODE, yamema-shoo 'Dashing onto a train is dangerous NODE, don't do that.'
- (40) rouden ya koshou-no gen'in-to nari masu NODE, hontai-wa zettaini mizu-arai-shi nai de kudasai
 'An electric leakage or breakdown will be caused NODE, don't wash the appliance.'

Note that (39) and (40) are examples of directions and instructions. In such contexts the speaker wants to assert the imperative cause as well as to persuade the hearer to carry out the instruction. The use of NODE marks the presence of two assertions rather than making the imperative clause a presupposition.

Finally I would like to touch on Kunihiro's (1992) claim that KARA sentences sometimes make the utterance sound impolite. Look at his examples in (11), repeated below as (41):

- (41) a. kaze-o hikimasi ta KARA, kessekishi masu
 - b. kaze-o hikimasi ta NODE, kessekishi masu 'I can't come to class, because I've got a cold.'

Suppose that a student addresses a teacher before class. Being absent from class is an impolite action, and should not be highlighted and what matters is the excuse. Using (41b), even if two assertions are made, the main clause is presented as relatively less highlighted. With (41a), by contrast, it is the main clause that is highlighted, which makes it sound impolite. Thus, by using NODE the speaker can soften the impoliteness and so she can protect herself from damaging her relationship with the hearer. Being polite, however, is not explicitly conveyed to the hearer but only implicitly conveyed: with the use of NODE that the speaker is polite is supposed to be recovered as one of implications. The point of utterance does not lie with this. My claim is that politeness is

not a deciding factor when choosing which utterance to use, but it is derived from the interaction of contextual information with the utterance.

4.2 KARA and NODE as procedural

What type of information is encoded by KARA and NODE? I want to claim that they encode procedural constraints on 'information structure' i.e. the foregrounding and backgrounding of propositions. In this section I propose that these particles, besides contributing to the truth-conditional content of utterances, also encode constraints on focus or presupposition. That is to say, they encode both procedural and conceptual meaning. I will also argue that where the speaker has a choice between the two conjunctive particles, the form she chooses will follow from considerations of Optimal Relevance.

Sperber & Wilson's Relevance theory, on which this analysis is based, claims that the interpretation of any utterance is guided by an expectation of Optimal Relevance. This entitles the hearer to assume that the utterance will yield adequate cognitive effects and require no gratuitous processing effort, or at least that the speaker expected it to do so.

It is often the case that two utterances with the same linguistically determined truth conditions differ in both contextual effects and processing effort. Consider the following pairs of examples:

- (42) a. He is unhappy because he is rich.
 - b. Since he is rich, he's unhappy.
 - c. It's because he is rich that he is unhappy.

In (42a) 'he is unhappy' is treated as given or uncontroversial information, while the *because*- clause is presented as focal (new) information. In (42b), the fact that he is rich is taken for granted, and the fact that he is unhappy is focal. While (42a) is interpreted as an answer to the question 'Why is he unhappy?', (42b) might be a response to someone who has just said 'He is rich.' (42c) is a variant of (42a).

I believe that the similar arguments apply to the KARA/NODE distinction. Consider again the examples below:

(43) a. I drank too much yesterday KARA, I have a headache this morning.b. I drank too much yesterday NODE, I have a headache this morning.

The speaker who chooses NODE intends to highlight the preceding clause and encourages the hearer to interpret this as her main assertion. The resulting structure is something like (42a) or (42c). By contrast, the speaker who chooses KARA puts the preceding clause in the background and intends to emphasize the following clause. The resulting structure is something like (42b). Thus, the difference in the choice of linguistic forms creates a difference in pragmatic interpretation.

In either utterance in (43), the proposition expressed by P is a part of the context for interpreting the proposition expressed by Q. In (43a) KARA indicates that the preceding clause expresses a presupposition for Q. In (43b), by contrast, NODE indicates that the preceding clause is an assertion — typically presenting what the speaker has inferred is the best explanation for Q. The speaker uses the linguistic form to guide the interpretation process by indicating which information is in focus and which is 'presupposed.'

Blakemore (1987, 1992) suggests that within the framework of Relevance theory, a language may be expected to develop certain linguistic forms whose function is to guide the interpretation process by indicating how the inferential phase of comprehension is expected to go. These linguistic expressions are claimed to encode procedures rather than concepts. For instance, to take examples from Blakemore (1996):

- (44) a. Tom can open Bill's safe.
 - b. So he knows the combination.
- (45) a. Tom can open Bill's safe.
 - b. After all, he knows the combination.

The role of *so* or *after all* in (44b) and (45b) is not to contribute to the proposition expressed by the utterance it prefaces, but to instruct the hearer to interpret that proposition as a contextual implication of (44a) and a premise for (45a) respectively. She suggests that expressions such as *so* and *after all* impose constraints on the inferential computations that the following proposition enters into. That is to say, linguistic meaning may amount to a procedure for manipulating propositional representations in inferential computations.

My hypothesis is that the differences in meaning between KARA and NODE are differences in procedural meaning. In the course of comprehension, an utterance with KARA/NODE is assigned a conceptual representation and completed into a fully propositional form by a combination of decoding and inference. At the same time, these

expressions function as indicators of the relative importance of the clause P in which they occur and the main clause Q: the KARA clause provides background for an inference presented in Q, while the NODE clause is asserted based on evidence provided by Q. Both contribute to relevance by guiding the hearer towards the intended contextual effects and hence reducing the overall effort required for processing.

Blakemore treated *so* and *after all* as encoding semantic constraints on implicature, which contribute purely to non-truth conditional meaning (also Blass 1990). Later, other analysts (Wilson & Sperber 1993; Ifantidou 1994; Ifantidou-Trouki 1993; Rouchouta 1996), argued for various types of expression encoding procedural constraints on explicature. The general idea behind the conceptual-procedural distinction is that linguistic decoding yields two types of information: information which is part of a conceptual representation and information governing the manipulation of conceptual representations. Most words encode concepts which are part of conceptual representations. What I am proposing here is that there might be certain expressions which encode both conceptual and procedural information. On the one hand, KARA and NODE encode concepts which are constituents of the proposition expressed, and on the other, they impose constraints on the processing of the proposition expressed, guiding the hearer towards the intended context and contextual effects.

5 Conclusion

My major concern in this study has been the relation between linguistic form and pragmatic interpretation: how speakers use particular forms to achieve pragmatic effects. I have tried to look at the data involving KARA and NODE with two questions in mind: what do they have in common, and how can their differences be explained? The first question has not been answered explicitly by traditional Japanese grammarians, and the second has not been fully dealt with in any adequate theoretical framework.

I have argued that these conjunctive particles are linguistic devices whose function is to relate two propositions, P and Q, in such a way that Q is a consequence of P. Thus, they have truth-conditional content which contributes to the construction of a single proposition, and they may be seen as encoding concepts. However, on the procedural level they also function as guides to the interpretation process by indicating where the presupposition/focus of an utterance is to be found. My claim is then that KARA and NODE, in addition to their truth-conditional meaning, carry semantic constraints on relevance, indicating how the associated utterance is to be processed in a context.

In the framework of Relevance Theory, utterance interpretation is not just a matter of

identifying the propositional content of an utterance: the hearer is also expected to perform computations on it. In section 3 we saw how the use of KARA/NODE enables the speaker to help the hearer identify the proposition expressed and in section 4 we saw how the form itself simultaneously constrains the hearer in processing that proposition. This shows that, in analysing word meaning, the issue is not whether a form is specified for either conceptual or procedural meaning. Rather, I have argued that certain forms encode both types of information: they are both conceptual and procedural.

In embarking on this study, I had two main aims. On the one hand, I wanted to provide a semantic and pragmatic analysis of one of the most controversial pairs of expressions in Japanese. On the other, I hoped that my analysis might make some explanatory contribution to Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory. In particular, though there may be great variation in languages, the principles which the speaker and the hearer use in producing and interpreting utterances are supposed to be universal. In focusing on the specific area of Japanese KARA and NODE, I hope I have gone some way towards achieving these two aims.

References

Blakemore, D. (1987). Semantic constraints on relevance. Blackwell: Oxford.

Blakemore, D. (1992). Understanding utterances: An introduction to pragmatics. Blackwell: Oxford.

Blakemore, D. (1996). Are apposition markers discourse markers? Journal of Linguistics 32. 325-347.

- Blass, R. (1990). *Relevance relations in discourse: A study with special reference to Sissala*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Carston, R. (1988). Implicature, explicature, and truth-theoretic semantics. In Kempson, R. (ed.), *Mental representations: The interface between language and reality*. 155-181. CUP: Cambridge.
- Carston, R. (1995). Postscript to implicature, explicature, and truth-theoretic semantics. Ms. University College London.
- Ifantidou-Trouki, E. (1993). 'Sentential adverbs and relevance.' Lingua 90. 69-90.
- Ifantidou, E. (1994). Parentheticals and relevance. Ph. D. dissertation, University College London.

Itani, R. (1995). Semantics and pragmatics of hedges in English and Japanese. Hitsuji Shobo: Tokyo.

- Kunihiro, T. (1992). 'Noda' kara 'noni', 'node' e : 'No' no kyoutsuusei (From *noda* to *noni*, *node*: Some common characteristics of *no*). In Quadenbush, H. *et al.* (eds.), *Nippongo kenkyuu to nippongo kyouiku (Studies on Japanese and Japanese education)*. 17-34. Nagoya University Press.
- Nagano, M. (1951). 'Kara' to 'node' wa doo chigau ka (How are KARA and NODE different). In Kokugo to kokubungaku (Japanese Language and Japanese Literature). 29.2. University of Tokyo, 30-41. Reprinted in Hattori, S. *et al.* (eds.), 1972. *Nippon no Gengogaku* (Linguistics in Japan), vol. 4: *Bunpoo* (Grammar) II, Taishuukan, Tokyo, 467-488.

- Nagano, M. (1988). Saisetsu: 'kara' to 'node' wa doo chigauka Tio Sanbun-eno hihan-o humaete (How are KARA and NODE different, revisited: In reply to Tio Sanbun (1988)). In Nippongo gaku (Journal of Japanese Linguistics), December, 67-83.
- Nakada, S. (1977). Kara and node revisited. In *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 12. 249-279.
- Rouchota, V. (1996). Procedural meaning and parenthetical discourse markers. To appear in A. Jucker & Y. Ziv (eds.) *Discourse markers*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Sperber, D. & D. Wilson (1986), *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Blackwell: Oxford. Revised 1995.
- Sweetser, E. (1990). From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Teramura, H. (1981). *Nippongo no bunpoo* (The grammar of Japanese) II. National Language Research Institute.
- Tio, S. (1988). 'Kara' to 'node' Nagano setsu o kaishakusu (KARA and NODE Interpreting the Nagano's theory). In *Nippongo gaku* (Journal of the Japanese Linguistics), July, 63-77.
- Uyeno, T. (1972). A study of Japanese modality A performative analysis of sentence particles. PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Wilson, D. and D. Sperber. (1993). Relevance and time. UCL Working Papers in Linguistics 5. 277-298. To appear in Carston, R., S. Uchida, and N. S. Song, (eds). Proceedings of the Osaka workshop on relevance theory. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Wilson, D. and D. Sperber. (1993). Linguistic form and relevance. Lingua 90. 1-25.