

**REANALYSIS AS A MEANS OF "RECYCLING"
CONVENTIONALIZED EXPRESSIONS:
A CASE STUDY FROM JAPANESE**

Kaoru Horie

Tohoku University

Abstract: This paper reports on the diachronic process in Modern Japanese whereby conventionalized expressions of a particular construction type undergo reanalysis modelled on the existing purposive construction, and are "recycled," as it were, by younger native speakers of the language.

Keywords: reanalysis, relics, direct nominalization

1. INTRODUCTION¹

From a diachronic point of view, every language, is in a state of flux at any point in history. As such, every language has both innovative and conservative features, the former features setting the stage for prospective linguistic change, while the latter features ensuing from the earlier stage of the language. According to Alice and Campbell (1995, p. 354), the latter features, which they refer to collectively as "relics," are characterized by the following two essential properties:

¹ This is a revised and substantially expanded version of the paper presented at the 16th International Congress of Linguists in Paris in July 24, 1997. I thank the audience and Debra Occhi for constructive criticism. The usual disclaimer applies. The preparation for this study is partially funded by the 1997 Grant-in-Aid from the Ministry of Education ("Syoorei kenkyuu A", Project No. 09710365), which is gratefully acknowledged. The following abbreviations are used in the gloss: Acc (Accusative), Allat (Allative), Cop (Copula), Dat (Dative), Ger (Gerundive), Imp (Imperative), Inf (Infinitive), Neg (Negative), Nom (Nominal), Noml (Nominalizer), Pol (Politeness), Pass (Passive), Q (Question), Quot (Quotative). '¹' indicates that multiple grammatical functions are fused into one form.

"(i) they are *exceptions* in an otherwise regular system; (ii) they are *archaic*."

Modern Japanese has a number of lexicalized conventional expressions, used primarily in written registers, which involve Old Japanese morpho-syntactic means of nominalization, as shown below (cf. Horie 1993, 1995, 1997abc):

(1) Sono inu-o [suteru]-ni sinobi-nai.

that-dog-Acc discard-Allat/Dat endure-Neg

"I cannot forbear to discard the dog."

Martin (1975) calls this type of nominalization "direct nominalization" whereby predicates (in this case 'suteru' "discard") directly nominalize embedded clauses without being followed by any overt nominalizer such as 'no' or 'koto,' which are obligatorily used in Modern Japanese, as shown below (in what follows, direct nominalization is marked by symbol 'ø'):

(2) [Zyon-ga ki-ta { no/koto/*ø}]-o sira-nakat-ta.

John-Nom come-Past Acc know-Neg-Past

"I didn't know that John came."

Lexicalized conventional expressions such as the one shown in (1) thus have both properties of "relics" mentioned above, and are not very productively used, especially among the younger Japanese population. However, a questionnaire conducted at two universities in Sendai, Japan, over the period of two consecutive years (1996-97) reveals an emerging pattern of reanalysis which serves to recycle a subset of these lexicalized conventional expressions. The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 presents the major findings of the questionnaire survey and presents a diachronic and functional account of the phenomenon. Section 3 summarizes the discussion.

2. REANALYSIS OF CONVENTIONAL LEXICALIZED EXPRESSIONS INVOLVING CASE PARTICLE 'NI'

Reanalysis, a "mechanism which changes the underlying structure of a syntactic pattern and which does not involve any modification of its surface manifestation" (Alice and Campbell, 1995, p.50), is illustrated by the following examples from English (underlines added):

(3) a. [it is bet for me][to sleep my self than ben defouled thus] (Chaucerian English)

"It is better for me to slay myself than to be violated thus."

b. [For me to slay myself] [would be better than to be violated thus] (Modern English)

Alice and Campbell (1995, p.62) argued that, at the stage of Chaucerian English, the sequence 'for + Noun Phrase' belonged to the main clause (cf. 3a). However, the sequence, together with 'to' Infinitive, was later reanalyzed as a constituent, and hence the whole constituent can be preposed in Modern English (cf. 3b).

Reanalysis frequently leads to an increase in expressive potential of the language. In the case of Modern English illustrated above, the reanalysis in question enables the sequence 'for +NP' to occur in the sentence-initial position, as in (3b), as well as in the sentence-medial position, illustrated below, where it originally occurred in Chaucerian English:

(3c) It would be better for me to slay myself than to be violated thus. (Modern English, example by KH)

In the following subsection, we will see how reanalysis serves to recycle some a subset of lexicalized conventional expressions, or "relics," to use Alice and Campbell's terminology, in Modern Japanese.

2.1 Lexicalized conventional expressions involving case particle 'ni'

The majority of lexicalized conventional expressions in Modern Japanese, wherein the Old Japanese morpho-syntactic means of sentential nominalization is retained, have the following structural template:

(4) [S' Pred (ø)]-Particle (Particle) PREDICATE

The template in (4) represents a construction type instantiated by actual construction tokens. Stylistically, the constructions of the template (4) are used primarily in formal speech and writing, and are not commonly used in colloquial speech. '[S' Pred (ø)]' (henceforth also abbreviated as '[S']') is a nominalized clause which ends in bare sentence-final predicate form, but as noted in section 1, it is not marked by any overt nominalizer (as represented by the immediately following '(ø)'). 'Particle' in (4) is typically one of the following three case-marking particles:

(5) *ga* (nominative), *o* (accusative), *ni* (dative/allative)

As we will see below, when 'ni' occurs in 'Particle' slot, it is followed by another particle, typically focus particle 'mo' ("also") or topic particle 'wa' in some constructions, hence '(Particle)' in (4). 'PREDICATE' in (4) takes either finite, sentence-final form, such as 'itaru' ("reach"), or non-finite form, typically what Martin (1975) calls "gerundive" form (e.g. 'itatte'; reach:Ger) or

"infinitive" form (e.g. 'itari' reach:Inf), depending on whether the construction occurs in sentence-final position or in sentence-medial position. Actual instances of lexical-ized conventional expressions of the structure (4), classified according to the case-marking particle immediately following [S'], are shown below (the selection of the constructions and the English translations given to each construction are largely based on Martin 1975, 890-896):

(Constructions of the template '[S' Pred (ø)]-GA PREDICATE')

[S']-ga hayai ka ([S']-GA-fast-Q; "no sooner...than"), [S']-ga ii ([S']-GA-good; "it is better to do..."), [S']-ga gotosi ([S']-GA-like; "like...ing"), [S']-ga saigo ([S']-GA-end; "once..."), etc.

(6) Sugitaru-wa oyoba-zaru-ga gotosi. (proverb)

exceed-Top suffice-Neg GA like

"Overdoing something is just like not doing it enough" (literal translation by KH);

Too much is as bad as too little." (Martin, 1975, p.895)

(Constructions of the template '[S' Pred (ø)]- O PREDICATE')

[S' zaru]-o e-nai ([S' Neg]-O Obtain-Neg; "can't help doing..."), [S']-o mata-nai ([S']-O wait-Neg; "it needs no...ing"), etc.

(7) Kare-ga muzitu-dearu koto-wa [iu]-o mata-nai.

he-Nom innocence-Cop Nom1-Top say-O wait-Neg

"It goes without saying that he is innocent."

The next subgroup, which includes dative-allative particle 'ni' in the 'Particle' slot in (4), is by far the largest group in terms of membership and is the major concern of this paper. The constructions including particle 'ni' are divided into two groups depending on whether they occur in sentence-medial position (i.e. Group (I)) or in sentence-final position (i.e. Group (II)).

(Constructions of the template '[S' Pred (ø)]- NI (Particle) PREDICATE')

Group (I) (constructions which occur sentence-medially):

[S'] ni-sai-site ([S'] NI-occasion-do:Ger; "on the occasion when..."), [S'] ni-atat-te ([S'] NI-hit upon:Ger; "when it comes to...ing"), [S'] ni-itatte-wa ([S'] NI-reach:Ger-Top; "when it comes to..."), [S'] ni-sakidati ([S'] NI-precede:Inf; "before...ing"), [S'] ni-sitagat-te ([S'] NI-follow:Ger; "according as..."), [S'] ni-tomonatte ([S'] NI-accompany:Ger; "according as ..."), [S']-ni-turete ([S'] NI-accompany:Ger; "according as..."), [S'] ni-mo-kakawara-zu ([S'] NI-also-concern-Neg; "although..."), [S'] nikakawara-zu ([S'] NI- concern-Neg; "regardless of whether ...or not"), [S']-ni kakawari-naku (NI-concern:Inf-Neg; "regardless of whether ...or not"), [S'] ni-site-mo ([S'] NI-do:Ger-also; "even if..."), [S'] ni-seyo ([S'] NI-do:Imp; "even if..."), [S'] ni-siro (NI-do:Imp; "even if..."), etc.

Group (II) (constructions which occur sentence-finally):

[S'] ni-atai-suru ([S'] NI-worth-do; "is worth...ing"), [S'] ni-husawasii ([S'] NI-suitable; "is suitable for...ing"), [S'] ni-kagiru ([S'] NI-limit; "is best to do..."), [S'] ni-itaru ([S'] NI-reach; "end up -ing"), [S'] ni-kawari-nai ([S'] NI-change:Inf-Neg; "is bound to do..."), [S'] ni-makaseru ([S'] NI-leave; "leave X to do..."), [S'] ni-masaru ([S'] NI-excel; "is better than to do..."), [S'] ni-tariru ([S'] NI-suffice; "is sufficient to do..."), [S']-ni-(wa) atara-nai ([S'] NI-Top apply-Neg; "there is no need to do..."), etc

The constructions in group (I) encode adverbial clauses of various grammatical meanings, typically temporal and concessive adverbial clauses, as shown below:

(8) Zikken-o hazimeru]-ni sakidati, kyoozyu-wa ippantekina tyuui-o nobe-ta.
 experiment-Acc begin NI precede:Inf professor-Top general warning-Acc
 state-Past

"Before starting the experiment, the professor stated a general caution."

(9) Ikura hosikat-ta] ni siro, manbiki-o si-ta no-wa yoku nai.
 however want-Past NI do:Imp shoplifting-Acc do-Past-Top good-Neg
 'No matter how much (he) wanted (it), it was wrong to shoplift.'

(Kawarazaki, 1995, p.137, translation by KH)

Unlike the constructions in group (I), the constructions in group (II), which are rather heterogenous, are hard to characterize in terms of the grammatical meaning encoded:

(10) Yamaiti-ga hasansi-ta koto-wa, [odoroku]-ni-wa ataranai.
 Yamaichi-Nom go bankrupt-Past-Top be surprised-NI-Top apply-Neg
 'As for Yamaichi's bankruptcy, (you) need not be surprised.'

(11) Kore-wa wazawaza [gironsuru]-ni taru mondai daroo ka.
 this-Top all the way discuss-NI suffice problem will be Q
 '(I) wonder if this is really a problem worth discussing.'

(Tomomatsu, *et al.*, 1996, p.163, English translation by KH)

The classification into the two groups above will be crucially relevant in the later discussion in section 2.3. The constructions of the structure '[S' Pred (ø)]-NI (Particle) PREDICATE' are interesting from a diachronic perspective because they still retain "direct nominalization", i.e. the Old Japanese morpho-syntactic means of sentential nominalization with zero. They are, therefore, relics. However, these constructions are not completely immune from the constant pressures of the synchronically dominant pattern of nominalization, i.e. nominalization by overt nominalizer 'no.' In fact, 'no'-nominalization has encroached upon the realm of the conservative direct

nominalization of the structural template '[S' Pred (ø)]- NI (Particle) PREDICATE' yielding the following construction:

(12) [S' Pred NQ]- NI (Particle) PREDICATE

The actual instances of the structural template (12) are given below:

(8') Zikken-o hazimeru NO- ni sakidati, kyooyu-wa ippantekina tyuui-o nobe-ta.

"Before starting the experiment, the professor stated a general caution."

(10') Yamaiti-ga hasansi-ta koto-wa, Iodoroku NO] ni-wa atara-nai.

"As for Yamaichi's bankruptcy, (you) need not be surprised."

There is very little semantic difference discernible between the pairs of examples wherein direct nominalization is used, i.e. (8) and (10), and their 'no'-nominalization counterparts (8') and (10'). The alternation between the two types of nominalization certainly deserves serious investigation. Nevertheless, very few systematic studies have been carried out to explore the exact nature of the alternation except a few descriptive and pedagogical studies which only note the alternation in passing (cf. Kawarazki, 1995). The paucity of attention given to the exact nature of the alternation prompted me to carry out a questionnaire survey at two universities in Sendai, Japan. I will discuss the design of the questionnaire in the following subsection.

2.2 *Design and results of the questionnaire survey*

In order to determine the frequency of use of direct nominalization by younger population of Japanese native speakers in the constructions of structural template '[S'] - NI (Particle) PREDICATE,' a questionnaire survey was conducted over the period of two years (1996-97) at Tohoku University and at Miyagi Gakuin Women's University, both in Sendai, Japan. The subjects were undergraduate university students in the late teens to the early twenties. The questionnaire asked the students to fill in blanks of 25 sample sentences which include lexicalized conventional expressions of varying degrees of archaism.

The questionnaire was designed to elicit a predicate form nominalized either by zero, the conservative direct nominalization, or by the innovative overt 'no'-nominalization. Such elicitation was expected to shed light on the extent to which the more conservative direct nominalization is used by the younger population of Japanese, who are not expected to use these lexicalized conventional expressions very frequently. Given below are the 25 sample sentences, which were originally given in written Japanese, although they appear in romanization here. (the

example numbering is modified; the English translations partially derived from Martin, 1975):

(13) Sono sigoto-wa () ni ataisi-nai.

that job-Top NI worth-Neg

"That job is not worth ()."

(14) Kaigi-o () ni atatte, tezyun-o kimete oki nasai.

meeting-Acc NI hit upon:Ger procedure-Acc decide on:Ger place:Inf
do:Imp

"In () a meeting, you should decide on the procedures in advance."

(15) Sore dake nara betuni () ni wa atara-nai.

that only if particularly NI-Top hit upon-Neg

"If that is the only thing (=your concern), there is no need to ()."

(16) Kono hon-wa kodomo-ga () ni-wa husawasiku-nai.

this book-Top child-Nom NI Top suitable-Neg

"This book is not suitable for kids to ()."

(17) Ikutukano hooritu-ga () ni itat-ta.

several law-Nom NI reach-Past

"Several laws resulted in ()."

(18) Tookyoo-made sinkansen-de () ni nanzikan kakari masu ka.

Tokyo-to bullet train-by NI how long take Pol-Q

"How long does it take to () to Tokyo by bullet train?"

(19) Hantai-ga () ni-mo kakawarazu sono hooan-ga kyookoosaiketu s-are-ta.

opposition-Nom NI also concern:Neg that bill-Nom voting by force do-Pass-Past

"Although the opposition (), the bill was voted on by force."

(20) Kare-ga uti-o () ni kawari-wa nai.

he-Nom home-Acc NI change:Inf-Top does not exist

"It remains to be the case that he () home."

(21) Itido sono zinzya-ni () ni kosi-ta koto-wa nai.

once that shrine-to NI surpass-Past thing-Top does not exist

"There is nothing better than to () the shrine once."

(22) Hayaku () ni sika-zu.

quickly NI be qual-Neg

"It is best to () quickly"

(23) Ano otoko-ga katteni () ni makase-ta.

that man-Nom of own will NI leave-Past

"(We) left that man to () of his own will."

(24) Sizensyoku-o () ni masaru kenkoohoo-wa nai.

natural food-Acc NI surpass health advice-Top not exist

"No health advice is more convincing than to () natural food."

(25) Ima-kara () ni-wa oyoba-nai.

now-from NI-Top extend to-Neg

"There is no need to () now."

(26) Hayameni te-o () ni siku-wa nai.

promptly hand-Acc NI equal-Top not exist

"Nothing is better than () measures promptly."

(27) Hidoi zisin-no sanzyoo-o ()-ni sinobi nakat-ta.

terrible quake-Gen aftermath-Acc NI bear Neg-Past

"(I) couldn't bear to () the terrible aftermath of the earthquake."

(28) Bunmei-ga ()-ni sitagat-te, koogai-ga hasseisi-ta.

civilization-Nom NI follow-Ger public pollution-Nom emerge-Past

"As civilization (), public pollution emerged."

(29) Kare-no hanasi-wa ()-ni tae-nai.

he-Gen story-Top NI bear-Neg

"(I) can't stand () what he says."

(30) Ano otoko-wa wazawaza aite-o ()-ni tari-nai.

that man-Top all the way partner-Acc NI suffice-Neg

"That man is not worth () as your equal."

(31) Kono hako-wa hooseki-o ()-ni tekisite iru.

this box-Top jewelry-Acc NI suitable:Ger exist

"This box is suitable to () jewelry."

(32) Tanni kiboo-o ()-ni todomat-ta.

simply wish-Acc NI limit-Past

"(I) limited myself to simply () my wish."

(33) Zikan-ga ()-ni turete, hitobito-wa iradati hazime-ta.

time-Nom NI follow:Ger people-Top get irritated:Inf begin-Past

"People started to get irritated as time ()."

(34) Sono syooko-wa ano otoko-o ()-ni zyuubunda.

that evidence-Top that guy-Acc NI sufficient

"That evidence is sufficient to () the guy."

(35) Ano hito-wa sono sigoto-o () ni uttetukeda.

that person-Top that job-Acc NI most ideal

"That person is most ideal to () the job."

(36) Mensetu-o ()-ni site mo, ukaru mikomi-wa hotondo nai.

interview-Acc NI do:Ger also pass chance-Top almost not exist

"Even though (), there is hardly any chance of you being screened in."

(37) Ikura tukarete i-ta to wa ie, () ni mo hodo-ga aru.

however tired be-Past Quot Top say:Imp NI also limit-Nom exist

"No matter how tired (he) was, (he) should have known better than ()."

The following table illustrates the results of the questionnaire survey:²

² There were "other" responses, varying in number in each construction, wherein neither type of nominalization was used. Hence the total number of responses to be shown below varies for each construction. This was inevitably caused by the lack of explicit instruction to use either type of nominalization, which would have biased the results.

Table 1. Frequency of direct nominalization and 'no'-nominalization in the questionnaire survey (rounded off to one decimal place)

Example	direct nominalization	'no'-nominalization
(13) [S']-ni atai sinai	485 (95.3%)	24 (4.7%)
(14) [S']-ni atatte	<u>492 (99.6%)</u>	2 (0.04%)
(15) [S']-ni wa ataranai	209 (97.2%)	6 (2.8%)
(16) [S']-ni wa husawasikunai	467 (91.4%)	44 (8.6%)
(17) [S']-ni itaru	294 (98.3%)	5 (1.7%)
(18) [S']-ni	64 (14.1%)	<u>389 (85.9%)</u>
(19) [S']-ni mo kakawarazu	<u>397 (90.2%)</u>	43 (9.8%)
(20) [S']-ni kawari wa nai	212 (59.6%)	144 (40.4%)
(21) [S']-ni kosita koto wa nai	429 (93.7%)	29 (6.3%)
(22) [S']-ni sikazu	379 (98.7%)	5 (1.3%)
(23) [S']-ni makaseru	106 (57%)	80 (43%)
(24) [S']-ni masaru	331 (77.5%)	96 (22.5%)
(25) [S']-ni wa oyobanai	417 (95.4%)	20 (4.6%)
(26) [S']-ni siku wa nai	436 (94.8%)	24 (5.2%)
(27) [S']-ni sinobi nai	460 (93.3%)	33 (6.7%)
(28) [S']-ni sitagatte	473 (96.1%)	19 (3.9%)
(29) [S']-ni tae nai	456 (99.6%)	2 (0.4%)
(30) [S']-ni tari nai	407 (94.9%)	22 (5.1%)
(31) [S']-ni tekisite iru	138 (26.8%)	<u>376 (73.2%)</u>
(32) [S']-ni todomaru	437 (94.4%)	26 (5.6%)
(33) [S']-ni turete	<u>513 (100%)</u>	0 (0%)
(34) [S']-ni zyuubunda	213 (42.9%)	<u>284 (57.1%)</u>
(35) [S']-ni uttetukeda	179 (35.4%)	<u>326 (64.6%)</u>
(36) [S']-ni site mo	<u>418 (100%)</u>	0 (0%)
(37) [S']-ni mo hodo ga aru	339 (95%)	18 (5%)

In the following subsection, I will present and analyze three major findings of the questionnaire survey.

2.3 *Analysis of the major findings*

The results of the questionnaire survey given in Table 1 show the differing frequency of two types of nominalization used in each construction. In what follows, I will discuss and analyze three major findings of the questionnaire survey.

Degree of retention of direct nominalization in lexicalized conventional expressions. Contrary to my expectation, the majority of the students used the older direct nominalization in 21 out of 25 lexicalized conventional expressions, barring the four constructions (examples 18, 31, 34 and 35) indicated by double underlines in Table 1. This suggests that direct nominalization, though clearly the conservative, often archaic-sounding form, is still very much alive even among the younger native speakers of Japanese.

Correlation between the position of the construction and the frequency of direct nominalization. In section 2.1, I proposed classifying the constructions into two groups, i.e. (I) constructions which occur in sentence-medial position, and (II) constructions which occur in sentence-final position. There was observed a remarkable difference between the two groups in terms of the frequency of direct nominalization. The frequency of direct nominalization in group (II) (sentence-final group) varies considerably within the approximate range of 27 (example (31) '[S']-ni tekisite iru') to 99 percent (example (22) '[S']-ni sikazu'), averaging 76.3% (rounded off to one decimal place). In contrast, the frequency of direct nominalization is constantly very high in group (I) (sentence-medial group) within the approximate range of 90 to 100 percent, averaging 97.5% (rounded off to one decimal place). The constructions in group (I), which are marked by single underlines in Table 1, are '[S']-ni atatte' (example 14), '[S']-ni turete' (example 33), '[S']-ni mo kakawarazu' (example 19), and '[S']-ni site mo' (example 36).

The former two constructions encode temporal meaning, while the latter two constructions encode concessive meaning, two major grammatical meanings encoded by the constructions of this groups as noted in section 2.1.

Though a more thorough investigation is indispensable, I conjecture that the differing frequencies of direct nominalization between the two groups suggest a possible correlation between the position of the construction within a sentence (in this case, sentence-medial vs. sentence-final)

and the rate at which a syntactic change affects the position (in this case, occurrence of the innovative 'no'-nominalization). Specifically, the innovative 'no'-nominalization appears to occur in the position immediately preceding 'ni' (marked by '()' in Figure 1 below) more readily when the entire conventional construction occurs sentence-finally, as in (a), than when the construction occurs sentence-medially, as in (b):

(a) [S' ()]-NI PREDICATE.
 (b) [S' ()]-NI PREDICATE,...[S].

Figure 1. Structural templates of the sentence-final and sentence-medial constructions

This tendency is indeed very natural in light of the obligatory overt marking of nominalized clause in argument position of sentence-final non-lexicalized predicates in Modern Japanese noted in section 1, as shown by example (2) (repeated here):

(2) [Zyon-ga ki-ta { no/koto/*(ø) }]-o sira-nakat-ta.
 John-Nom come-Past Acc know-Neg-Past
 "I didn't know that John came."

This tendency, if confirmed, points to a potentially intriguing line of research project which explores the correlation between the position of a construction and the degree of susceptibility to syntactic change.

Emerging use of no-nominalization in lexicalized conventional expressions. Finally, I'd like to note that there were four constructions, i.e. '[S']-ni' (example 18), '[S']-ni tekisite iru' (example 31), '[S']-ni zyuubunda' (example 34), and '[S']-ni uttetukeda' (example 35), wherein the frequency of the two types of nominalization is reversed. Among the four constructions in question, dominant use of 'no'-nominalization in construction '[S']-ni' in (18) was anticipated since purposive construction 'no ni' ("in order to") is fully grammaticalized and recognized as one conjunctive particle in Modern Japanese.³ In this sense, 'no ni' is similar to another purposive construction 'tame ni' ("in order to"), and 'no' is not normally ommissible, as shown below:

(38) Kore-wa gokiburi-o korosu {no ni, tame ni, *ni} itiban kookatekina hoohoo desu.
this-Top cockroach-Acc kill first effective method Cop

"This is the most effective way (in order) to kill cockroaches."

However, preference for 'no'-nominalization in sentences (31), (34), and (35), which was not anticipated, definitely calls for an explanation. I'll present a possible diachronic explanation in the following subsection.

³ It must be noted, though, that 'no ni' also takes on a concessive meaning, especially when the immediately preceding predicate is past tense.

2.4 A diachronic and functional explanation of 'no'-nominalization in a subset of lexicalized conventional expressions

The suggestive source for explanation comes from a paper by Dwight Bolinger. Bolinger (1960) cites numerous English constructions of the following structural template:

(39) X- is -(too)-Adjective to-INFINITIVE

The structural template (39) is instantiated by example (40):

(40) It's too humid to play.

In particular, Bolinger (1960) notes the following type of conversion:

(41) He is hard to convince. <==> To convince him is hard.

(42) A million dollars is sufficient to purchase this property. <==> To purchase this property a million dollars is sufficient.

This type of conversion, which is very common in English, is observed not only when 'to'-infinitive is the argument of 'Adjective,' as in (41), but also when it is purposive adjunct of 'Adjective.'

The functional duality of the 'to'-infinitive in English, which functions as both argument of predicate and purposive adjunct, closely resembles that of Japanese dative-allative particle 'ni,' which occurs in the following templates:

(a) [S' ()]-NI PREDICATE.

(b) [S' (NQ)]-NI

Figure 2. Structural templates of two types of 'ni'-marked embedded clauses

In (a), the 'ni'-marked embedded clause functions as argument of a matrix predicate, while in (b), the embedded clause functions as purposive adjunct clause. Crucially, use of 'no'-nominalization to mark the purposive embedded clause is firmly established as shown in (b). The purposive meaning of the construction 'no ni' obviously derives from the "allative" meaning of particle 'ni,' as shown in the following example (cf. English 'to'-infinitive, which also derives from allative preposition 'to'):⁴

(43) Tookyoo-ni asu iku yotei desu.

Tokyo-to tomorrow go plan Cop:Pol

"(I) plan to go to Tokyo tomorrow."

⁴ Cf. Haspelmath (1989) for a functional/cognitive account of the cross-linguistically common development of purposive constructions from allative case-markers.

I argue that the fully grammaticalized purposive construction 'no ni' ("in order to") permeates a subset of lexicalized conventional expressions which originally employed the conservative direct nominalization, and thereby facilitates the following diachronic process of reanalysis:

[S' Pred (\emptyset)]- NI Predicate ---> [S' Pred (\emptyset /NO) NI Predicate ---> [S' (\emptyset /NO)]- NI Predicate
 [S' Pred]-NO NI Predicate

[S' Pred]-NO NI
 (purposive)

[S' Pred]-NO NI
 (purposive)

Stage I

Stage II

Stage III

Figure 3. Reanalysis of a subset of conventionalized nominalized constructions in Modern Japanese

Stage I indicates the original stage in which direct nominalization was the norm. Stage II represents the next stage where the alternation between two types of nominalization started. At this stage, purposive adjunct construction 'no ni' was grammaticalized. Stage III indicates the current state of Japanese wherein the alternation continues to be seen to varying degrees among lexicalized conventional expressions (cf. Table 1).

However, a subset of these expressions, repeated below, show overwhelming preference for 'no'-nominalization (cf. Table 1):

(31) Kono hako-wa hooseki-o ()-ni tekisite iru.

this box-Top jewelry-Acc NI suitable:Ger exist
 "This box is suitable to () jewelry."

(34) Sono syooke-wa ano otoko-o ()-ni zyuubunda.

that evidence-Top that guy-Acc NI sufficient
 "That evidence is sufficient to () the guy."

(35) Ano hito-wa sono sigoto-o () ni uttetukeda.

that person-Top that job-Acc NI most ideal
 "That person is most ideal to () the job."

The following diachronic process of reanalysis, modelled on the existing 'no ni' construction, is responsible for the strong bond of 'no ni' in these three constructions:

(44) [S' Pred NO]-NI ==> [S' Pred] NO NI

Crucial in this reanalysis process are the "allative" meaning of particle 'ni,' noted previously, and the semantics of the predicate immediately following particle 'ni.' The predicates immediately following particle 'ni' in examples (31), (34) and (35) share the lexical meaning of the following kind:

(15) "appropriate by a certain standard"

This holds true for predicates 'tekisite iru' ("suitable") in (31), 'uttetuke da' ("most ideal") in (34), and 'zyuubun da' ("sufficient") in (35). Crucially, the three predicates in question are all affirmative in polarity, which accords with purposive/fulfillment meaning of 'no ni' construction. In connection with this, please note example (30), repeated below, wherein negative form of 'tariru' ("suffice") is used.

(30) Ano otoko-wa wazawaza aite-o ()-ni tari-nai.

that man-Top all the way partner-Acc NI suffice-Neg

"That man is not worth () as your equal."

As shown in Table 1, this construction overwhelmingly favors direct nominalization.

The following examples illustrate the reanalysis process indicated in Figure 2:

(45) a. (Stage I) Ano-hito-wa [sono-sigoto-o tanomu (ø)]-NI uttetuke da.

that-person-TOP that-job-ACC ask ideal

"That person is ideal to trust the job with."

b. (Stage II) Ano-hito-wa [sono-sigoto-o tanomu NO]-NI uttetuke da.

"same meaning as (45a)"

c. (Stage III) (Reanalysis) Ano-hito-wa, [sono-sigoto-o tanomu] NO NI, uttetuke da.

"In order to trust with the job, that person is ideal."

3. CONCLUSION

In this paper, I noted a subset of conventionalized expressions of Japanese which strongly favor the innovative 'no'-nominalization strategy, and argued that they have undergone a diachronic process of reanalysis modeled on the already grammaticalized purposive clause construction. The reanalysis doesn't take place randomly and is crucially aided by both the particular lexical meaning shared by the predicates and the allative meaning of the particle 'ni', which facilitate purposive interpretation of the conventionalized expressions. Future research projects are indicated wherein the complex interplay of various factors affecting the alternation between direct nominalization and 'no'-nominalization (e.g. position of the construction, polarity of the predicate in the construction) will be fully explored.

REFERENCES

Bolinger, Dwight. (1960). Syntactic blends and other matters. *Language* **36**, 207-221.

Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell. (1995). *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Haspelmath, Martin (1989). From purposive to infinitive - a universal path of grammaticalization. *Folia Linguistica Historica* **10.1-2**, 287-310.

Horie, Kaoru. (1993). From zero to overt nominalizer *no*: a syntactic change in Japanese. In: *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 3* (S. Choi, (Ed.)), 305-321. CSLI, Stanford. [distributed by Cambridge University Press]

Horie, Kaoru. (1995). What the choice of overt nominalizer *no* did to Modern Japanese syntax and semantics. In: *Historical Linguistics 93*, (H. Andersen, (Ed.)), 191-203. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Horie, Kaoru. (1997a). Koobun kara mita nihongo rasisa.(Characteristics of Japanese observed in sentential structure) *Nihongogaku*. **16.7**, 14-22.

Horie, Kaoru. (1997b). Three types of nominalization in Modern Japanese: *no*, *koto*, and zero. *Linguistics* **35.5**. 879-894.

Horie, Kaoru. (1997c). From core to periphery: a study on the directionality of syntactic change in Modern Japanese. Paper presented at the third Conference on Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language. University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, USA. May 24-26, 1997.

Kawarazaki, Mikio. (Ed.) (1995) ed. *Zisyo de hikenai nihongo buntyuu hyoogen*. (Sentence -medial expressions in Japanese not listed in dictionaries) Hokuseido, Tokyo.

Martin, Samuel E. (1975). *A reference grammar of Japanese*. Yale University Press, New Haven .

Saji, Keizo. (1984). Ruigi hyoogen bunseki no itihoohoo. (A method of analyzing synonymous expressions") In: *Kindaiti haruhiko hakusi kokin ronbunshuu* vol. 2. *Gengogaku hen*, 9-21. Sanseido, Tokyo.

Tomomatsu, Etsuko, Jun Miyamoto, and Masako Izumi. (1996). *Donna toki doo tukau nihongo hyoogen bunkei 500*. (500 essential Japanese expressions: a guide to correct usage of key sentence patterns) ALC, Tokyo.