

**On the emergence of finite structures from non-finite constructions:
Evidence from 'say' constructions in Japanese**

Abstract category (oral/poster)

Theme session (N/A)

In this paper, we will examine how some 'say' constructions in Japanese develop finite structures from non-finite ones. Diachronic data for our analysis come from the Taikei Honbun Database based on texts from the 8th to 19th century. We will focus on the perfective *ihe-* and imperfective *ihi-* counterparts of the 'say' verb *ifu*. Our analysis reveals that the rise and fall of the *kakari musubi* system (see Ono 1993), which makes a distinction between attributive and conclusive forms, triggered a chain of events in which attributive (non-finite) quotative and evidential 'say' forms came to be used as conclusive (finite) structures as well. This extension contributed to the demise of the *kakari musubi* system. Crucially, from a typological perspective, this extension provides additional insight into strategies by which relativization and nominalization constructions develop into finite clauses (see DeLancey 2011).

Our findings show that between the 8th to 19th centuries there were three major waves of attributive/conclusive contrastive forms within the 'say' constructions in Japanese. The *to ihe-ru/to ihe-ri* forms, which emerged within the perfective *to ihe*-series, showed a clear attributive/conclusive contrast in the 8th century, but the attributive form soon extended via concessive uses, attested in the 10th century, to conclusive contexts by the 13th century. This gradual blurring of the attributive/conclusive distinction contributed to the disappearance of *to ihe-ru/to ihe-ri* forms in the 18th century, and ultimately to the demise of the *kakari musubi* system as a whole.

The other two attributive/conclusive contrastive forms emerged within the imperfective *to ihi*-series. Tokens of the *to ihi-keru/to ihi-keri* distinction were first attested in the early 10th century but the attributive *to ihi-keru* form had already developed conclusive uses as well, thus showing signs of an already blurred attributive/conclusive distinction, with the *to ihi-keru* form disappearing in the 17th century while the *to ihi-keri* form lingered on into the 18th century. A similar fate befell the *to ihi-taru/to ihi-tari* distinction first attested in the 10th century, with the *to ihi-taru* form disappearing in the 16th century and the *to ihi-tari* form surviving longer into the 18th century.

In this paper, we will also examine evidence from the early 10th century showing attributive *to ihi-taru* forms accompanied by particles frequently associated with nominal constructions. As illustrated in (1) with *ni*, these particles that typically mark nominal expressions were also being used as markers of subordinate clauses. The presence of these particles provides evidence of a link between the attributive and nominalization and relativization constructions, as well as subordinated clauses, and the drift from attributive-to-conclusive uses seen in Japanese provide additional support for the Nominalist Hypothesis that non-finite nominalization constructions frequently develop into stand-alone finite clauses (see Starosta, Pawley & Reid 1982; Kaufman 2009; Yap, Grunow-Harsta & Wrona 2011).

- (1) “*Kore wa ikaga*” *to ihi-taru ni*,
this NOM okay QT.ATTR PRT
‘When (X) said “How is this?”’,

tada, “*Hayaku ochi ni keri.*” *to irahe tareba*
just early fall PRT PERF” COMP reply PERF.COND
(Y) simply replied “The flower had fallen early.”

(*Makura no Sooshi*, 996 AD, pp.165)

(452 words excluding examples; 500 with examples)

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.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 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, Susumu. 1993. *Kakari musubi no kenkyuu* (A study of Kakari musubi). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley, and Lawrence 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, Foong Ha, & Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona. (2011). Nominalization strategies in Asian languages. In *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, F.H. Yap, K. Grunow-Hårsta & J. Wrona (eds), pp. 1-57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.