

# On the emergence of finite structures from attributive (non-finite) constructions: Evidence from *to ihikeru* in classical Japanese

Mizuho TAMAJI

## Abstract

It is known that non-finite nominalization constructions frequently develop into stand-alone finite structures. In the classical Japanese, the *to ihikeru/to ihikeri* forms shows a clear attributive/conclusive contrast in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. However, the attributive form begun to develop into conclusive uses showing signs of blurred attributive/conclusive distinction, the conclusive form *to ihikeri* disappeared in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and ultimately to the demise of the *kakari musubi* system as a whole. This paper examines how attributive constructions in Japanese are reanalyzed as conclusive constructions through analysis of the process that attributive *to ihikeru* developed into conclusive uses. Our analysis reveals three developmental pathways that attributive form developed into conclusive structure, namely *kakari musubi* system, copular cleft constructions and converbal use. Insubordination played a crucial role on the development of finite structure and each pathway has different insubordination strategies.

It also reveals that the demise of *kakari musubi* focus system and copular use due to cleft constructions contributed to the reanalysis of attributive *to ihikeru* form as conclusive uses. Crucially, from a typological perspective, this extension provides additional insight into strategies by which relativization and nominalization constructions develop into finite clauses.

**Keywords** : attributive/conclusive distinction, *kakari musubi* system, copular cleft constructions, conclusive use

## 1. Introduction

Nominalist Hypothesis is that non-finite nominalization constructions frequently develop into stand-alone finite clauses (see Starosta, Pawley & Reid 1982, Kaufman 2009, Yap, Grunow-Harsta & Wrona 2011). In the long recorded history of Japanese language, spanning from the 8<sup>th</sup> century to the present, *-ru* has been one of the nominalization constructions. There was a clear distinction between attributive and conclusive forms in 'say' constructions such as *to ihikeru* (attributive) and *to ihikeri* (conclusive) contrast. These forms are composed of a complimentizer *to*, converbal connective form of 'say' *ihi*, and perfective auxiliary verb; *keru* is attributive form and *keri* is conclusive form of the auxiliary verb. (1) and (2) are examples of *to ihikeri* and *to ihikeru* respectively.

(1) *"Koko yai doko" to ihikereba,*  
Here FOC where COMP say.COND.PRF

*"Tosa no Tomari" to ihikeri.*  
PN GEN PN COMP say.PRF

'If (I) asked "Where is it now?", (he) said "(It is) *Tosa no Tomari*." (*Tosa Nikki*, p.38,935)

(2) *Mukashi Abe no Nakamaro to hikeru hito wa,*  
Ancient.time PN GEN PN COMP say.ATTR.PRF person TOP

*Morokoshi ni watarite kaeri ki keru tokini,*  
PN LOC across.CONV return PST ATTR.PRF time

'Once upon a time, when a person **called** *Abe no Nakamaro* went to China and returned (to Japan), .'  
(*Tosa Nikki*, p.37,935)

While classical Japanese had a clear attributive/conclusive contrast, modern Japanese does not have such contrast and *-ru* is used for both attributive and conclusive forms. It is thought that a blurring the attributive/conclusive contrast due to the demise of *kakari musubi* focus system brought disappearance of conclusive form (see Ono 1993).

*Kakari musubi* is a focus construction in classical Japanese, which involved use of focus particles such as *zo*, *mamu* and *ya* and the presence of these particles required attributive form in the sentence final position. (3) is the example of *kakaru musubi*.

(3) *hashi wo yatsu watseru niyorite*  
bridge ACC eight stretch.acrossATTR.CAUS because

*namu yatsuhashi to ihikeru.*  
FOC eight.bridges COMP say.ATTR.PRF

'Because (we) stretch eight bridges across (the river), that is why we call (the place) *Yatsuhashi* (i.e. Eight Bridges).' (*Ise Monogatari*, p.116, 10<sup>th</sup> c.)

In this example, '*Yatsuhashi to ihikeru* (that is said to be *yatsuhashi*)' is the focused element. The clause before the focus particle *namu* '*hashi o yatsu watseru niyorite* (because (we) stretch eight bridges across (the river))' is the relative clause, namely, nominalized construction that modifies the focused element.

The demise of *kakari musubi* system is considered as a trigger of the disappearance of conclusive form showing signs of blurred attributive/conclusive distinction. However, it is difficult to explain why attributive form developed into finite structure by the demise of *kakari musubi* system. This study examines how attributive constructions in Japanese are reanalysed as conclusive constructions – in other words, how noun-modifying constructions initially used in the referential domain are reinterpreted with broader scope as stand-alone finite structures that represent entire events, situations or propositions. It also examines this reanalysis of attributive constructions as conclusive constructions led to a blurring of the attributive/conclusive distinction that triggered the demise of

*kakari musubi*. The organization of this study is as follows: section 2 explains data and methodology employed in this study, section 3 analyses the process that attributive *to ihikeru* developed into conclusive structure, section 4 is conclusion.

## 2. Data and methodology

Diachronic data for our analysis come from the Taikei Honbun Database, the electronic version of *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* ['The Collection of Japanese Classical Literary Texts']. The database consists of 466,574 words from 556 texts comprising poems, historical documents, fictional narratives, essays, *kyoogen* or comedy drama scripts, and novels from the 8<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century (before the Meiji period). 265 tokens of *to ihikeru* constructions were extracted and categorized according to their functions over time.

## 3. Analysis of the process that attributive *to ihikeru* developed into finite structure and the mechanisms involved in reanalysis

In Taikei Honbun Database, both *to ihikeru* and *to ihikeri* were attested as early as 10<sup>th</sup> century. While *to ihikeru* had been attested from 10<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century, *to ihikeri* had been attested from 10<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century. This implies that development of attributive *to ihikeru* into conclusive use resulted in disappearance of conclusive *to ihikeri*.

The example (4) below is the first token of attributive *to ihikeru* attested in Taikei Honbun Database, which is introduced as example (2) in the previous section. *To ihikeru* here is accompanied by a head noun (*hito*: person), which makes *to ihikeru* a headed relative clause construction. Since the head noun (*hito*) is a general noun, *to ihikeru* is reanalysed as a new nominalizer. This enables *-ru* nominalizer to be reanalysed as an attributive marker (functionally equivalent to the English relativizer *that*).

- (4) *Mukashi Abe no Nakamaro to ihikeru*  
 Ancient.time PN GEN PN COMP say.ATTR.PRF  
*hito wa, Morokoshi ni watarite kaeri ki*  
 person TOP PN LOC across.CONV return PST  
*keru tokini,*  
 ATTR. PRF time  
 'Once upon a time, when a person **called** *Abe no Nakamaro* went to China and returned (to Japan), .' (*Tosa Nikki*, p.37,935)

The example (5) is attributive *to ihikeru* without accompanied by a head noun, but it is accompanied by a topic marker *wa*. '*Soko wo yatsuhashi to ihikeru wa*' means 'that which people called there *yatsuhashi* is'. This indicates that *to ihikeru* here is a referential use in topic position and a headless relative clause structure.

- (5) *soko o yatsubashi to ihikeru wa,*  
 tthere ACC PN COMP say.ATTR.PRF TOP  
*mizu yuku kawa no kumote nareba, hashi*  
 water go river GEN spider.hand be.COND bridge  
*no kumote nareba, hashi wo yattsu wataseru*  
 GEN spider.hand be.COND bridge ACC eight stretch.across.CAUS  
*niyorite namu yatsubashi to ihikeru.*  
 because FOC PN COMP say.ATTR.PRF  
 'Because (we) stretch eight bridges across (the river), that is why we call (the place)  
*Yatsubashi* (i.e. Eight Bridges).' (*Ise Monogatari*, p.116, 10<sup>th</sup> c.)

The reanalysis of *-ru* nominalizer as an attributive marker and the emergence of headless relative structure played crucial roles on the emergence of stand-alone conclusive construction of *to ihikeru*. (6) is the example of stand-alone conclusive construction of *to ihikeru* attested in 19<sup>th</sup> century. '*Aruhito iu* (As someone said)' is introducing quotation and '*to ifu* (said that)' is marking end of the quotation, therefore *to ihikeru* locates in the sentence final position of the quotation.

- (6) *Aruhito iu Ooko wa jooge to wakarete,*  
 someone say PN TOP up.down COMP separate.CONV  
*Asakusa Tennoochoo no atari yori Senju no*  
 PN PN GEN around from PN GEN  
*hashi giwa made wo subete Sendukagoo to ihikeru to ifu.*  
 bridge edge up.to ACC all PN EVID COMP say  
 Someone said that *Ooko* was divided into uptown and downtown and (the place) from *Asakusa Tennoochoo* up to the edge of *Senju hashi* bridge is called *Sendukagoo*.  
 (*Edo Meisho Zue*, 1836, p.86)

However, such stand-alone conclusive construction did not evolve directly from attributive construction of *to ihikeru*. Our diachronic analysis reveals three developmental pathways from attributive construction to the stand-alone conclusive construction, *kakari musubi* system, copular cleft constructions (Yap, Grunow-Harsta & Wrona 2011) and converbal use. Furthermore, syntactic reanalysis is also necessary for the attributive construction in the sentence-medial position to develop into conclusive construction in the sentence-final position. The mechanism involved in such syntactic reanalysis is known as insubordination (Evans 2007). Therefore, we will discuss three developmental pathways and insubordination strategies of each pathway on the development of attributive *to ihikeru* into conclusive construction.

### 3.1. Pathway of *kakari musubi* system

As we have already introduced, (3) is the first example of *kakari musubi* attested in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. (7) is another example of *kakari musubi* attested in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Unlike example (3), focus particle

*zo* is located between complementizer *to* and *ihikeru*. Example (8) is an example attested in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The focus particle *zo* is in the sentence final position following *to ihikeru*. Since focus particles can occur in various syntactic position, *zo* can also appear in the sentence final position. This indicates that *zo* developed into a sentence-final particle.

- (3) *hashi wo yattsu watseru niyorite*  
 bridge ACC eight stretch.acrossATTR.CAUS because  
*namu yatsunashi to ihikeru.*  
 FOC eight.bridges COMP say.ATTR.PRF  
 'Because (we) stretch eight bridges across (the river), that is why we call (the place) *Yatsunashi* (i.e. Eight Bridges).' (Ise *Monogatari*, p.116, 10<sup>th</sup> c.)

- (7) *Hana ohokinite, akakarikereba, 'Oohana no Kuroodoegoo'*  
 nose big.CONV red.COND.PRF PN GEN PN  
*atozamani wa koto nagashi tote,*  
 later TOP quite long because  
*'Hanakuroodo' to zo ihikeru.*  
 PN COMP FOC say.ATTR.PRF  
 '(He had) a big and red nose, therefore people called him *'Oohana no Kuroodoegoo'*. Since it is quite long, people just called him *'hanakuroodo'* later on.'  
 (*Ujishuui Monogatari*, 13<sup>th</sup> c., p.315)

- (8) "*Nanji nani no yuhe o motsute ka*  
 You what GEN reason ACC have.CONV Q  
*furo ni wa hito hitori to ihikeru*  
 bath LOC TOP person one.person COMP say.ATTR.PRF  
*zo" to tohi tamaheba,*  
 SFP COMP ask HON.COND  
 'If he asked, "Why did you say that we should take a bath one by one?"  
 (*Isoho Monogatari*, 17<sup>th</sup> c., p.368)

These examples shows positional shift of focus particles. These particles shifted towards right (sentence final position in SOV language such as Japanese), which is regarded as right periphery. Such positional change also indicates change of the scope over the focused elements. If the focus particles moves towards the sentence final position, nominalized construction in referential domain is reanalyzed with broader scope as non-referential finite structure that represent entire propositions. Such shift is considered as insubordination, because focus construction involving nominalized clause is reanalyzed as a new main clause. This makes focus particles in the sentence final position optional, which consequently led to the emergence of stand-alone *to ihikeru* as seen in example (8). Thus, these suggests that insubordination strategy in *kakaru musubi* system is right periphery of focus

particles and change the focus particles into sentence final particles. These examples also shows that right dislocation of the focus particles blurred attributive/conclusive contrast and consequently led to the demise of *kakari mucubi* system.

### 3.2. Pathway of copular cleft construction

Copular cleft construction is a cleft construction supported with copular. Example (9) is the first example of such construction attested in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. It is originally considered to be a simple sentence like '*Kono hito no na wa Ochikubo no kimi*' (This person's name is Princess *Ochikubo*). However, it turned out to be a cleft construction in order to emphasize the part '*Ochikubo no kimi to wa* (the one who is said to be Princess *Ochikubo*)'. Now that '*Ochikubo no kimi to wa*' is a subordinated clause, and it is followed by a main-clause. Corresponding to nonfinalization of the subordinated clause, main-clause was also nominalized as '*kono hito no na o ihikeru nari keru*' (should be said that this person's name). Then, such attributive construction of VP *to ihikeru nari keru* (should be said that VP) is reanalysed as conclusive construction (should be that (NP) VP) in the sentence final position in the main-clause.

- (9) *Ochikubo no kimi to wa kono hito no*  
 PN GEN princess COMP TOP this person GEN  
*na o ihikeru nari keru.*  
 name ACC ay.ATTR.PERF COP COP  
 'It is said to be this person who is called Princess *Ochikubo*.'  
 (*Ochikubo Monogatari*, 10<sup>th</sup> c., p.233)

Example (10) is an example attested in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The structure of this sentence is '*Isoho mooshikeru wa VP to ihikeru nari*' (what *Isoho* said is VP)', therefore this is an example of a cleft construction.

- (10) *Isoho mooshikeru wa, 'Ima yori nochi wa*  
 PN say.HMB.ATTR.PRF TOP now from later TOP  
*onyurushi nashi totemo, gofudai no tokoro*  
 HON.permission NEG CONCESS hereditary.Daimyoo GEN place  
*o ba yurusare moosu beshi' to ihikeru nari.*  
 ACC FOC permit.PASS say.HMB should COMP say.ATTR.PRF COP  
 (Literally: 'What *Isoho* said is that it should be all right for us to visit hereditary *Daimyoo*'s place without permission from now on.)  
 '*Isoho* said, "it should be all right for us to visit hereditary *Daimyoo*'s place without permission from now on. (*Isoho Monogatari*, 17<sup>th</sup> c., p.372)

Compared to example (9), the number of copular supporting *to ihikeru* in the sentence final position decreased in example (10). This implies the elision of copular in the cleft construction, which finally led to stand-alone sentence final *to ihikeru*. It is also considered that the elision of copular is

insubordination strategy to reanalyze attributive *to ihikeru* as conclusive structure in case of the cleft construction.

### 3.3 Pathway of converbal use

In the 13<sup>th</sup> century, attributive *to ihikeru* began to be used in converbal position as seen in following examples. Attributive *to ihikeru* is accompanied by accusative marker *wo* in example (11), whereas it is not accompanied by accusative marker in example (12). These *to ihikeru* functions as clause linker with or without particles, hence these are considered as converbal use.

- (11) *Tazune tohikeru naka ni, "Tama wo ya kafu"*  
 ask inquire.ATTR.PRF among LOC jewel ACC FOC buy  
*to ihikeru o, kikiru hito mo nakari*  
 COMP say.ATTR.PRF ACC hear.ATTR person FOC NEG.be  
*keru ni,*  
 PRF: ATTR CONCESS  
 'One of those people said, "Why don't you buy some jewels?", but nobody paid attention to him.' (*Ujishuui Monogatari*, pp.395, 13<sup>th</sup> c.)

- (12) *Narikata o meshite, "Fue esasemu*  
 PN ACC call.CONV flute get.CAUS.VOL  
*to ihikeru, hoi nari to yorokobite,*  
 COMP say.ATTR.PRF real.intention COP COMP to.be.pleased  
 '(He) called *Narikata* and said "Saying that I would let you get a flute is my real intention", and he became happy. (*Jikkinshoo*, 1215, p.116)

The clauses containing these converbal uses is subordinated clause, and there are usually main clauses following them. If the main clauses are elided due to pragmatic reasons, the former subordinated clauses are reanalyzed as new main-clauses. This triggers reanalysis of converbal use of these attributive forms as sentence final structure with pragmatic functions. This consequently enabled *to ihikeru* establish itself as stand-alone finite structure.

## 4. Conclusion

Thus, we have been discussing how attributive *to ihikeru* developed into conclusive structure using diachronic corpus. The survey reveals that there are three pathways for attributive forms to undergo before it developed into the conclusive structure, *kakari musubi* system, copular cleft construction and converbal uses. This study also reveals that indubordination of the complement clause into a new main clause contributed to reanalysis of attributive *to ihikeru* as conclusive structure. Different types of elision facilitate the insubordination of the complement clause: elision of the sentence final particles for *kakari musubi* system, elision of copular for copular cleft constructions and

elision of main-clause for converbal use. It is considered that such variety of developmental pathways and insubordination strategies is typological feature of nominalization in Japanese language.

It was considered that demise of *kakari musubi* system contributed to the reanalysis of attributive form as conclusive structure (Ono 1993). This study, however, reveals that the demise of *kakari musubi* system was affected by a chain of events in which attributive *to ihikeru* also came to be used as conclusive structures. From a typological perspective, it is worth noting that the extended use of attributive forms as conclusive ones provides additional insight into strategies by which relativization and nominalization constructions develop into finite structures (see DeLancy 2011).

### Glossing based on Leipzig Convention

ACC	accusative	HMB	humble form
ATTR	attributive	HON	honorific form
CAUSE	causative	LOC	locative
COMP	complementizer	NEG	negative
CONCESS	concessive	PASS	passive
COND	conditional	PN	person's name
CONV	converb	PRF	perfective
COP	copular	PST	past
EVID	evidentiality	SFP	sentence final particle
FOC	focus particle	TOP	topic marker
GEN	genitive	VOL	volitional

### References

- DeLancey, Scott. 2011. Finite structures from nominalization constructions in Tibeto-Burman. In *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds), pp. 343-359. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Evans, N. 2007. 'Insubordination and its uses', in Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 366-431.
- Kaufman, D. 2009. Austronesian typology and the nominalist hypothesis. In *Austronesian Historical Linguistics and Culture History: A Festschrift for Robert Blust*, Alexander Adelaar & Andrew Pawley (eds). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ono, S. 1993. *Kakari musubi no kenkyuu* (A study of Kakari musubi). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Starosta, S., A. K. Pawley, and L. A. Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Volume 2: Tracking the Travelers*, Amran Halim, Lois Carrington & S.A. Worm (eds), pp. 145-170. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Yap, F.H., K.Grunow-Harsta & J.Wrona. (eds), 2011. *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.