

What's in a Place? Extended Uses of a Physical-World Noun in Japanese?

Author(s): Kyoko Hirose Ohara

Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Historical Issues in Sociolinguistics/Social Issues in Historical Linguistics (1995), pp. 237-251

Please see "How to cite" in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

What's in a place?
Extended uses of a physical-world noun in Japanese*

Kyoko Hirose Ohara
University of California at Berkeley

1. Introduction

1.1. Target of analysis: A closed-class grammatical noun TOKORO 'place'

This paper investigates a family of related expressions in Japanese all of which use a particular closed-class grammatical noun, TOKORO. TOKORO, usually translated into English as 'place', in most contexts requires a modifier of one of the types shown in (1a):¹

(1a) ... Modifier TOKORO ...

where:

Modifier = Demonstrative;
NP-GEN (an NP followed by the genitive case marker);
Pred_{attr} (the attributive form of a predicate);
or
Cl_{attr} (a clause containing the attributive form of a predicate)

- (1b) baakuree ni wa [nigiyakana] TOKORO] ga takusan aru
Berkeley LOC TOP lively NOM many exist
'There are many lively places in Berkeley.'

My interest in this class of expressions touches on: (i) semantic typology; (ii) characteristics of the grammar of Japanese; and (iii) lexical semantics.

1.1.1. Semantic distinction between place vs. non-place

First of all, TOKORO figures in a semantic typology between place vs. non-place. It has been observed that some languages, including Japanese, Chinese, and Korean, in contrast to languages like English, require explicit identification of places (Takubo 1984, Teramura 1968). In describing a physical movement in Japanese, for example, only place nouns are allowed as goals and sources. Thus, the literal translation of the English sentence (2a) shown in (2b) is ungrammatical, since *doa* 'door' in Japanese is a non-place noun and cannot stand alone in a goal expression:

(2a) I went to the door.

(2b) *watasi wa doa e itta
I TOP door GOAL went
Intended meaning:
'I went to the door.'

TOKORO must be attached to such non-place nouns, in order to change them into place nouns:

(2c) watasi wa [[doa no] TOKORO] e itta
GEN

Lit.

'I went to the door place.'

For a discussion of this see Takubo (1984).

1.1.2. 'Formal nouns' in Japanese

Secondly, a language-internal consideration: TOKORO is generally considered to belong to a closed class of grammatical nouns called *keishiki meishi* 'formal nouns'. They are 'grammatical' nouns in that they are accompanied by a modifier unlike 'lexical' nouns in Japanese, which can appear on their own as saturated NPs. In addition, they may appear in expressions that do not function as ordinary nominals. For example, TOKORO plus a copula can function as an auxiliary:

- (3a) Auxiliary TOKORO-*da*
kurisu ga benkyoo siteiru-TOKORO-da
Chris NOM is-studying COP
sizukani sinasai.
be-quiet
'Chris is just in the middle of studying. Be quiet.'

The sequence TOKORO-*da* occurs sentence-finally, adding the meaning 'just in the middle of' to the sentence. Note that it is structurally different from the predicative nominal use of the nominal TOKORO, as shown in (3b). Here, the sentence-final copula *da* functions to connect the subject *baakuree wa* 'Berkeley-TOP' and the predicative nominal headed by TOKORO 'the place Chris is studying'. If we were to omit the first NP *baakuree wa*, the sentence would be interpreted as an ellipted subject-predicative sentence with a contextually-understood subject as in (3c):

- (3b) Nominal TOKORO
[_{NP} baakuree wa] [_{NP} kurisu ga benkyoo siteiru TOKORO] da
Berkeley TOP
'Berkeley is the place Chris is studying.'
- (3c) Nominal TOKORO
[_{NP} kurisu ga benkyoo siteiru TOKORO] da
'(The place under discussion) is the place Chris is studying.'

In contrast to (3c), the auxiliary TOKORO-*da* sentence in (3a) is a full-fledged sentence without any ellipsis.²

TOKORO may also appear as a part of clausal conjunctions or sentential adverbials. In (4a), TOKORO connects two clauses serving as a temporal-clause conjunction, while in (4b), it attaches to an adjectival noun and forms a speech-act modifier:

- (4a) Conjunctive TOKORO
watasi ga hako o aketa-TOKORO ningyoo ga haitteita
I NOM box ACC opened doll NOM was-inside
Lit.
'When I opened the box, a doll was inside (the box).'
- (4b) Adverbial TOKORO
sottyoku na-TOKORO, kare no gendoo ni wa dare mo ga komatteiru
frank he GEN conduct DAT-TOP everyone-NOM fed-up

'To be frank, everybody is fed up with his conduct.'

Whereas the nominal TOKORO must be followed by a case particle (e.g. (1b) and (2c)) or by a copula (e.g. (3b) and (3c)), the conjunctive and adverbial TOKORO are not followed by any particle.

By appearing as an element of auxiliaries, conjunctions, and adverbials, TOKORO and other formal nouns form the basis of many constructions in Japanese, and they play an important role in the grammar. The auxiliary, conjunctive, and adverbial TOKOROs, however, have semantic and pragmatic properties distinct from the nominal TOKORO, as we will see below. Consequently, describing the constructions related to TOKORO has been problematic, especially in dictionaries and textbooks intended for learners of Japanese (Alfonso 1966 (1980), Makino and Tsutsui 1989, Martin 1975, Morita 1980, Teramura 1992).

1.1.3. Heterosemy

More importantly, TOKORO is interesting from the perspective of lexical semantics (cf. Langacker 1982, Talmy 1978). One of the findings of lexical semantic analyses of closed-class grammatical items is that grammatical morphemes are often shared by expressions that synchronically belong to different syntactic categories (e.g. Brugman 1984, 1988, Traugott 1986, 1988a). Studies of such phenomena, however, have tended to focus on English, with the exception of a recent work by Lichtenberk on Oceanic languages (1991). He specifically uses the term HETEROSEMY to refer to cases where two or more historically-related expressions share a common source element but synchronically belong to different morphosyntactic categories. He has shown that in heterosemy there need not be any property exclusively shared by all the related expressions and that the meanings of the derived expressions tend to be subjective.

Since Japanese grammarians agree that the expressions containing TOKORO are historically related, in the sense of deriving from the noun TOKORO, it is possible to regard the relations among the nominal, auxiliary, conjunctive, and adverbial TOKORO as those pertaining to heterosemy.³ Previous analyses of TOKORO, however, have not satisfactorily dealt with this issue.

1.2. Overview of the paper

The purpose of this paper is to examine the heterosemy structure of TOKORO, that is, the semantic extensions from the nominal TOKORO, by giving a synchronic account of the semantics of the auxiliary, conjunctive, and adverbial TOKOROs and by contrasting their meanings with those of the nominal TOKORO. I will be focusing on what I call temporal-marking and context-providing TOKORO constructions. I will be claiming that in these constructions, the speaker's point of view, commitment to a claim, or attitude toward a speech act is crucial and that TOKORO has undergone subjectification in meaning in the sense discussed by Traugott (1988b, 1989).⁴ Following Construction Grammar and Frame Semantics, I will assume that it is impossible to describe words in a context-free way, in other words, independently of the constructions in which they occur (Fillmore 1994, Fillmore et al. 1988, Kay and Fillmore 1994).⁵

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the temporal-marking and context-providing TOKORO constructions and contrasts them with the nominal TOKORO. Section 3 examines the temporal-marking TOKORO-*da*. Section 4 looks into the context-providing TOKORO constructions. Finally, Section 5 concludes the analysis.

2. Temporal-marking and context-providing TOKORO constructions as contrasted with nominal TOKORO

In this section, I will introduce the temporal-marking and the context-providing TOKORO constructions, which will be the main targets of analysis in the rest of the paper, and briefly contrast them with the nominal TOKORO. I will show that due to their own syntactic and semantic constraints they should be characterized as grammatical constructions, that is, form-meaning correlations, different from the nominal TOKORO.

2.1.1. Nominal TOKORO

In addition to referring to a 'place', i.e. a 'point in space', the nominal TOKORO may refer to an 'aspect of an entity' - either concrete or abstract:

'Place'

- (5a) resutoran ni iku nara, [oisij TOKORO] ga ii
 restaurant GOAL go COND delicious NOM like
Lit.

'If (we) are to go to a restaurant, I prefer a delicious place.'

'Aspects of an entity'

- (5b) kurisu ni wa [okasina TOKORO] ga aru
 Chris LOC TOP funny NOM exist
 'There is something funny about Chris.'
- (5c) kurisu no iken ni wa [sansee dekinai TOKORO] ga aru
 GEN opinion LOC TOP agree-cannot NOM exist
 'There are aspects in Chris's opinion that I cannot agree with.'

The nominal TOKORO functions as a head noun of NPs. As I mentioned earlier, an NP headed by TOKORO may serve as an argument or adjunct. In that case, the NP is followed by a case particle:

[NP Modifier TOKORO]-case (Argument/adjunct of a matrix predicate)

- (6a) baakuree ni wa [nigiyakana TOKORO] ga takusan aru
 =(1b) 'There are many lively places in Berkeley.'
- (6b) [dare mo inai TOKORO] de hanasitai
 somebody even not-present LOC want-to-talk
 'I would like to talk where nobody is present.'

NPs headed by TOKORO may also be used as predicative nominals, in which case the NP is followed by a copula (cf. (3b) and (3c)):

[NP Modifier TOKORO]-COP (Predicative nominal)

- (6c) kamakura wa [sizukana TOKORO] da
 Kamakura TOP quiet COP
 'Kamakura is a quiet place.'

2.2. Temporal-marking TOKORO-da construction

What I call the temporal-marking TOKORO-da construction involves the auxiliary TOKORO-da. The sequence TOKORO-da occurs sentence-finally, and serves to locate the situation in time from the speaker's perspective.⁶ For example, in (7), attaching TOKORO-da to the end of the sentence adds the meaning that the

speaker construes the event to occur in the imminent future. This meaning is somewhat similar to the temporal sense of the English adverb *just*:

- (7a) kurisu wa bangohan o taberu
Chris TOP supper ACC eat
'Chris will have supper.'
- (7b) kurisu wa bangohan o taberu-TOKORO-da
'Chris is just about to have supper.'

We have seen in (3a) through (3c) that unlike predicative nominal TOKORO the sentence-final *da* in the auxiliary TOKORO-*da* sentences does not serve to connect two NPs in a subject-predicate relation. Moreover, in the temporal-marking TOKORO-*da* sentences, in contrast to the predicative nominal TOKORO, the sentence-final *da* cannot be negated:

- (8a) Predicative nominal TOKORO
koko wa [tabako o suu TOKORO] de wa nai
here TOP tobacco ACC smoke COP TOP NEG
'Here is not the place to smoke.'
- (8b) Temporal-marking TOKORO-*da* construction
*kurisu wa tabako o suu-TOKORO-de-wa-nai
Chris COP TOP NEG
Intended meaning:
'Chris is not about to smoke.'

Since the temporal-marking TOKORO-*da* sentences are subject to constraints which are absent in the predicative nominal TOKORO, they should be characterized as licensed by a different grammatical construction.

2.3. Context-providing TOKORO constructions

In the context-providing TOKORO constructions, the constituent to which TOKORO is attached supplies a background for the main clause.⁷ There are three types of such constructions.

The first type involves temporal clause-linking, which encodes a temporal relation between two specific past situations. The subordinate clause, S1, to which TOKORO attaches establishes a temporal setting for a subsequent situation described in the main clause S2:

Temporal clause-linking: S1 (subordinate clause)-TOKORO, S2 (main clause)

- (9) nya-gai ni deta -TOKORO, ame ga huttekitai
out-of-a-car LOC got-out rain NOM started-to-rain
'When (I) got out of the car, it started to rain.'

In the second type, S1 provides evidence for the speaker's claim made in S2:

Evidential clause-linking: S1-TOKORO-*de-wa*, S2

- (10a) sinbun de watasi ga yonda-TOKORO-*de-wa* syusyoo wa
newspaper LOC I NOM read LOC TOP Prime-Minister TOP

kaihuku ni mukatteiru yooda

recover GOAL head-PROG seem

'According to what I read in the paper, the prime minister seems to be recovering (from his illness).'

- (10b) sono sima wa mita-TOKORO-de-wa enosima gurai no ookisa desu
that island TOP saw Enoshima about GEN size COP-POLITE
'Judging from what (I) saw, that island is about the size of Enoshima.'
(Alfonso 1966 (1980))

In the third type, TOKORO attaches to a modifier denoting the speaker's sincerity. The sequence as a whole functions as a speech-act modifier describing the speaker's attitude toward the speech act in the main clause. That is, it lays the ground for a speech act:⁸

Speech-act modifier: Modifier-TOKORO, S

- (11) sottyokuna-TOKORO, kare no gendoo ni wa dare mo ga komatteiru
=(4b) 'To be frank, everybody is fed up with his conduct.'

In these sentences, TOKORO exhibits syntactic and semantic properties different from those of the nominal TOKORO. In the first and the third types, TOKORO is not accompanied by a case particle or a copula. Moreover, in all of the three types, S1 cannot be negated. Thus, they involve grammatical constructions different from the nominal TOKORO.

Having introduced the main targets of analysis in the paper, I will now discuss the semantics of each of these constructions.⁹

3. Temporal-marking TOKORO-da construction

In discussing the temporal-marking TOKORO-da construction I will show that its meanings are subjective, compared to those of the nominal TOKORO.

The sentence-final TOKORO-da serves to locate the event in time from the speaker's perspective:

(12a) kurisu wa bangohan o taberu

=(7a) 'Chris will have supper.'

(12b) kurisu wa bangohan o taberu-TOKORO-da

=(7b) 'Chris is just about to have supper.'

(13a) kurisu wa bangohan o tabeteiru

is-eating

'Chris is having supper.'

(13b) kurisu wa bangohan o tabeteiru-TOKORO-da

'Chris is just in the middle of having supper.'

(14a) kurisu wa bangohan o tabeta

ate

'Chris had supper.'

(14b) kurisu wa bangohan o tabeta-TOKORO-da

'Chris just had supper.'

I argue that in the temporal-marking TOKORO-da construction the speaker emphasizes the event's relevance to the present and the event's temporal closeness

to the present. Because of the speaker's emphasis on the two properties of the event described in the sentence, this construction is incompatible with habituais, perfect, and states, as we will see presently.

3.1. Relevance to the present

Firstly, TOKORO-*da* is incompatible with the habitual aspect:

- (15a) Prospective/Habitual
 kurisu wa puuru de oyogu
 swimming-pool LOC swim
 'Chris will swim in the pool.' (a **prospective** reading)
 or
 'Chris habitually swims in the pool.' (a **habitual** reading)
- (15b) Prospective
 kurisu wa puuru de oyogu-TOKORO-*da*
 'Chris is just about to swim in the pool.'

Although (15a) may have either a prospective (i.e. aspect which relates some future event with the present) or habitual reading, adding TOKORO-*da* results in a prospective reading only, as the translation of (15b) shows.

Comrie (1976:27-28) defines habituais as describing 'a situation which is characteristic of an extended period of time, so extended in fact that the situation referred to is viewed not as an incidental property of the moment but, precisely, as a characteristic feature of a whole period'. In other words, since habituais are by definition temporally unbounded, they cannot be relevant to the present moment, and therefore they are incompatible with the meaning of the TOKORO-*da* construction.

Secondly, TOKORO-*da* is incompatible with state verbs:

State verbs

- (16a) hanako wa eigo ga dekiru
 able
 'Hanako is able to speak English.'
- (16b) *hanako wa eigo ga dekiru-TOKORO-*da*

Lyons (1977) notes that states last or endure through time and that they are homogeneous throughout the period of their existence. That is, states are usually temporally unbounded, and thus cannot be construed as relevant to the present moment. It is worth noting that although state verbs are not licensed by the TOKORO-*da* construction, not all state predicates are disallowed. Adjectives that denote a temporary state such as 'psych' adjectives are licensed by the construction. The sentences in (17) convey the meaning of 'be right in the state of' or 'at the point of':

Temporally-bounded state predicates

- (17a) nodo ga kawaita. biiru demo hosii-TOKORO-*da*
 throat NOM dried beer something-like want
Lit.
 'I'm thirsty. I am just at the point of wanting (a bottle of) beer.'
- (17b) syusyoo no sin'i o toitadasi-tai TOKORO-*da*
 prime-minister GEN real-intention ACC question-want-to

Lit.

'I am just at the point of wanting to question the Prime Minister's real intention.'

These sentences show that what is incompatible with TOKORO-*da* is the temporal unboundedness. As long as a state predicate describes a temporally bounded state, the predicate is licensed by the construction, since a temporary state can be relevant to the present moment.

3.2. Temporal closeness to the present

The perfect aspect is incompatible with the construction in question:

Perfect

- (18a) kurisu wa san huransisuko ni tuiteiru
Chris TOP San Francisco LOC has-arrived
'Chris has (already) arrived in San Francisco'
(18b) *kurisu wa san huransisuko ni tuiteiru-TOKORO-*da*

The perfect is usually defined as the continuing relevance of a previous situation (Comrie 1976:56). Thus, characterizing the semantics of the construction as emphasizing the event's relevance to the present is not sufficient to account for why the perfect aspect is not licensed by the construction. There is another important meaning of the TOKORO-*da* construction: the speaker emphasizes the event's temporal closeness to the present. In fact, in contrast to (18b), perfect of recent past, or so-called 'hot news perfect', is compatible with TOKORO-*da*:

Perfect of recent past ('hot news perfect')

- (19a) kurisu wa san huransisuko ni tuita
Chris TOP San Francisco GOAL has-arrived
'Chris has arrived in San Francisco.'
(19b) kurisu wa san huransisuko ni tuita-TOKORO-*da*
'Chris has just arrived in San Francisco.'

In other words, whether or not the event is construed as temporally close to the present is crucial to the acceptability of a TOKORO-*da* sentence.

3.3 The speaker's point of view

We just saw that the function of the temporal-marking TOKORO-*da* construction is to encode the speaker's emphasis on two properties of the event described in the sentence: its relevance to the present, and its temporal closeness to the present. The meaning of the construction is thus subjective in that it pertains to the speaker's point of view toward the event.

As a matter of fact, the speaker's point of view may be playing an even larger part in this construction. It has been observed that there is a contrast in use between plain progressive sentences and those with sentence-final TOKORO-*da*, as shown below (Makino and Tsutsui 1989):

Progressive

- (20a) a kurisu ga hasitteiru
oh Chris NOM is-running
'Oh, Chris is running!'
(20b) *a kurisu ga hasitteiru-TOKORO-*da*

Intended meaning:

'Oh, Chris is just in the middle of running!'

Firstly, the TOKORO-*da* sentence in (20b) cannot be uttered as a surprise in a monologue, that is, in a situation where the speaker is by him/herself. TOKORO-*da* sentences seem to presuppose a speaker-hearer interaction.

Secondly, even when the hearer is with the speaker, the sentence (20b) cannot be used to draw the hearer's attention to the scene. Progressive TOKORO-*da* sentences are typically used when the scene is somehow inaccessible to the hearer, for example, on the phone, as (20c) shows:

Progressive TOKORO-*da* sentence

(20c) (On the phone)

kurisu wa syawaa o abiteiru-TOKORO-desu
 TOP shower ACC is-taking COP-POLITE
 ato de kakenaosu yooni iimasyoo ka
 later LOC call-back COMPL say-POLITE-PRESUM Q
 'Chris is just in the middle of taking a shower.
 Can I have her call you back?'

I would like to speculate that these two properties of progressive TOKORO-*da* sentences, namely, requiring the existence of the hearer and requiring the scene to be inaccessible to the hearer, seem to suggest that the pragmatic function of the TOKORO-*da* construction is to inform the hearer of the speaker's point of view, or his/her subjective 'location' in space and time.

4. Context-providing TOKORO constructions

The temporal clause-linking, evidential clause-linking, and speech-act modifier uses of TOKORO can be construed as context-providing TOKORO constructions. In all of them, the TOKORO-marked constituent provides a background for the main clause. I will show that the three constructions correspond to uses in the three linguistic domains discussed by Sweetser, namely, the content, epistemic, and speech-act domains, and that the speaker's perspective, commitment to a claim, or attitude is an important aspect of the meanings of these constructions.

4.1. Temporal clause-linking: Uses in the content domain

The temporal clause-linking TOKORO encodes a temporal relation between two specific past situations and thus involves what Sweetser calls the content domain (1990). In this construction, S1 describes a situation which supplies a background for a subsequent change of state or 'discovery' in the speaker's cognition described in S2:

S1 (subordinate clause)-TOKORO, S2 (main clause)

(21a) ie e kaetta-TOKORO,
 home GOAL returned
 saiho o gakkoo ni oitekita koto ni ki ga tuita
 purse ACC school LOC had-left COMP DAT realized
 'When I got home, I realized that I had left my purse at school.'

This function of the temporal clause-linking TOKORO is similar to that of the clause-linking TO construction that Fujii has investigated (1991, 1993a, 1993b).¹⁰

That S1 functions to establish a temporal setting for S2 can be seen in the unacceptable sentence in (21b):

- (21b) *kooen o sanpo siteita-TOKORO, ame ga hutteita
 park ACC was-walking rain NOM was-raining
Intended meaning
 'When I was walking in the park, it was raining.'

Based on our knowledge of the world, it is difficult to imagine a case in which the subject is walking in the rain but does not realize it until a particular point in time (Fujii 1993:13). In other words, the situation described in S1 in (21b) cannot serve as a temporal setting needed for a change of state or change in speaker's cognition, and the sentence is thus unacceptable. (21c) demonstrates that what is crucial for the construction is a change in the speaker's cognition brought about by the S1 event:

- (21c) tutumi o aketa-TOKORO, ningyoo ga haitteita
 =(4a) wrapping ACC opened doll NOM was-inside
Lit.
 'When (I) opened the wrapping, a doll was inside.'

Here, S2 cannot be construed as encoding a change of state, since the doll must have been inside the box even before opening it. However, a change is brought about in the speaker's cognition by the S1 event, that is, by opening the wrapping, and thus the sentence is acceptable.¹¹ The meaning of the construction therefore crucially involves the speaker's cognition or point of view.¹²

4.2. Evidential clause-linking: Uses in the epistemic domain

In the evidential clause-linking TOKORO construction, S1 gives evidence for the content of S2, or indicates the information source that led to the speaker's assertion in S2, and thus this construction may be characterized as supplying a background for an assertion. Since evidence is concerned with the speaker's knowledge or belief, this use pertains to the epistemic domain (see Palmer 1986 for the relation between epistemic and evidential). By providing evidence, S1 qualifies the speaker's commitment to the content of the assertion made in S2, and in this sense the meaning of the construction is subjective.¹³

S1-TOKORO-de-wa, S2

- (22a) kare ga kiita-TOKORO-de -wa kaigi wa
 he NOM heard LOC TOP meeting TOP
 san-zi kara da soo desu
 three-o'clock ABL COP hearsay-POLITE
 'According to what he heard, the meeting seems to start at 3.'
 (22b) tutaerareru -TOKORO de wa, kare wa mata rikkooho suru rasii
 has-been-conveyed LOC TOP he TOP again run-for-election hearsay
 'According to what has been told, he seems to be running for election again.'

4.3. Speech-act modifier: Uses in the speech-act domain

The speech-act modifier use of TOKORO may be characterized as a context-providing construction in the speech-act domain. It provides the speaker's sincere attitude toward the speech act at the time of utterance. Note that the meaning of the

construction is subjective in that it reflects the speaker's own attitude toward the speech act.

Modifier-TOKORO, S

(23a) syoozjikina-TOKORO, watasi ni wa nani ga mondai na no ka
 honest I at TOP what NOM problem-COP-NOMINAL-Q
 wakaranai
 know-NEG

'To be honest, I do not know what is wrong (with it).'

(23b) *kare; no sottyoku na-TOKORO, kare; wa doosite ii no ka wakaranai.
 he GEN frank he TOP how-to-do NOMINAL Q does-not-know
 'To his; being frank, he; doesn't know what to do.'

It is interesting to note that the same morpheme TOKORO is used for the context-providing function in three different domains and that these domains correspond to those that are relevant for other phenomena in other languages such as polysemy of modality in English as discussed by Sweetser. The context-providing TOKORO constructions seem to support Sweetser's view that because any utterance can be viewed in terms of its content, the speaker's reasoning, and the speech situation, the content, epistemic, and speech-act domains are relevant to the analysis of many linguistic phenomena.

5. Conclusion

I have given a synchronic account of the semantics of the constructions which involve the formal noun TOKORO in Japanese. In order to examine the semantic extensions from the nominal TOKORO to other TOKORO constructions, I have focused on the meanings of the temporal-marking and context-providing constructions. To conclude, let us contrast their meanings with those of the nominal TOKORO.

I have argued that the meanings of both temporal-marking and context-providing constructions can be characterized as subjective. The temporal-marking construction involves the speaker's subjective judgment toward the event, since it emphasizes the event's relevance and temporal closeness to the present. Likewise, the context-providing constructions pertain to either the speaker's point of view, commitment to the claim, or attitude toward the speech act. In contrast, the nominal TOKORO refers to objects in the real world, either a 'place' or an 'aspect of an entity'. It is thus possible to characterize the semantic extensions from the nominal TOKORO to the temporal-marking and context-providing constructions as a semantic-pragmatic change from less to more subjective. This pattern of semantic extension is in accord with Traugott's generalization of semantic change.

It is hoped that this study not only contributes to a better understanding of extended uses of other formal nouns in Japanese, but also may shed light on the nature of semantic extensions in general.

NOTES

* My deepest thanks go to Julia Elliott, Charles J. Fillmore, Katsuya Kinjo, and Eve Sweetser for reading earlier versions of the paper. I would also like to thank Yoko Hasegawa, George Lakoff, Kojiro Nabeshima, and participants of the Japanese Linguistics seminar at the University of California, Berkeley, for helpful

comments. I have also benefited from discussions with Shoichi Iwasaki, Yoshiko Matsumoto, and Shigeo Okamoto.

¹ Except in idiomatic expressions such as:

- (i.a) TOKORO kawareba sina kawaru
change-COND custom change
'Different places, different customs.'
- (i.b) kare wa TOKORO kamawazu nekorogaru
he TOP mind-NEG sprawl
'He sprawls no matter where he is.'

When it refers to (the addressee's) address, it is preceded by an honorific prefix *o*:

- (i.c) o-namae to o-TOKORO o kaite kudasai
HON-name AND HON- ACC write please
'Please write your name and address.'

² There is a syntactic test to distinguish the auxiliary TOKORO-*da* from the predicative nominal TOKORO: In general, when a subordinate clause is headed by the following noun, the case marking on the subject NP in the lower clause alternates between *ga* 'nominative' and *no* 'genitive'. The predicative nominative TOKORO sentences exhibit this alternation, but the auxiliary TOKORO-*da* sentences do not:

- (i.a) Predicative nominal TOKORO
baakuree wa [kurisu ga/no benkyoo siteiru TOKORO] da.
Berkeley TOP Chris NOM/GEN is-studying COP
'Berkeley is the place Chris is studying.'
- (i.b) Auxiliary TOKORO-*da*
kurisu ga/*no benkyoo siteiru-TOKORO-*da*. sizukani sinasai.
be-quiet
'Chris is just in the middle of studying. Be quiet.'

³ According to *Shogakukan Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (The Japanese Language Dictionary), the nominal TOKORO already existed in the 8th century. The conjunctive TOKORO is attested in the early 11th century. It appears that the auxiliary TOKORO-*da* and the adverbial TOKORO did not appear until the early 20th century.

⁴ See also Okamoto 1992 for a synchronic account of semantics and pragmatics of sentence-final particles in Japanese including NO and KOTO, which have traditionally been classified as 'formal nouns' along with TOKORO.

⁵ This assumption is, by and large, compatible with that of Teramura (1978a:300, 1978b:323).

⁶ I will not be discussing the counterfactual marker use of TOKORO-*da*::

- (i) Counterfactual Marker
kare ga kiteireba, komatta koto ni natteita-TOKORO-da
he NOM come-ASPECT-COND come-to-be-in-trouble-ASP

¹² When the agent of S1 is distinct from the speaker, sentences such as (21c) are felicitous only when S2 describes the speaker's point of view and NOT that of the agent of S1.

¹³ Eve Sweetser has pointed out that *where* in English has a use parallel to this use of TOKORO:

(i.a) I read (in the paper) where he is going to resign.

(i.b) I heard where it's supposed to flood again.

In these sentences, *where* is syntactically a complementizer comparable to *that*, but semantically it is used as a mental-space builder denoting a mental-state location.

REFERENCES

- Alfonso, Anthony. 1966 (1980). Japanese language patterns: a structural approach. vol. 2. Tokyo: Sophia University.
- Brugman, Claudia. 1984. The *Very* Idea: A Case Study in Polysemy and Cross-Lexical Generalizations. CLS Parasession on Lexical Semantics. 21-38.
- Brugman, Claudia. 1988. The Story of *Over*: Polysemy, Semantics, and the Structure of the Lexicon. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1994. The Hard Road from Verbs to Nouns. University of California, Berkeley, ms.
- Fillmore, Charles J.; Paul Kay; and Mary Catherine O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and Idiomatity in Grammatical Constructions: The case of *Let Alone*. Language 64.501-538.
- Fujii, Seiko Yamaguchi. 1991. Frame-setting Constructions in Japanese: When Conditionals Interact with Temporals. University of California at Berkeley, Paper presented at the Second International Cognitive Linguistics Conference (ICLA) at Santa Cruz, California.
- Fujii, Seiko Yamaguchi. 1993a. On the Clause-Linking *to* Construction in Japanese. Japanese/Korean Linguistics. ed. by Patricia M. Clancy, 3-19. Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Association.
- Fujii, Seiko Yamaguchi. 1993b. The use and learning of temporal clause-linkage in Japanese and English. Current Issues in European Second Language Acquisition Research. ed. by Bernhard Ketterman and Wilfred Wieden, 279-291. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Kay, Paul, and Charles J. Fillmore. 1994. Grammatical Constructions and Linguistic Generalizations: the *What's X doing Y?* Construction. University of California, Berkeley, ms.
- Lakoff, George. 1992. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. Metaphor and Thought. 2nd edition, ed. by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1982. Remarks on English aspect. Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics. ed. by Paul J. Hopper, 265-304. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1991. Semantic Change and Heterosemy in Grammaticalization. Language 67.3.475-509.

- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Makino, Seiichi, and Michio Tsutsui. 1989. *A Dictionary of basic Japanese grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times, Ltd.
- Martin, Samuel. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Morita, Yoshiyuki. 1980. *Kiso Nihongo (Basic Japanese)*. vol. 2. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.
- Ohuri, Toshio. To Appear. *Transitivity in grammar and rhetoric: A Case from English and Japanese*. The *Locus of Meaning*, ed. by Keiichi Yamanaka. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Okamoto, Shigeko. 1992. *Pragmaticization of Meaning in Some Sentence-Final Particles in Japanese*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia.
- Palmer, F.R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. vol. 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Takubo, Yukinori. 1984. *Gendai Nihongo no Basho o arawasu Meishi rui ni tsuite (On Place Nouns in Modern Japanese)*. *Nihongo, nihon bunka (Japanese Language and Culture)* 12.89-117.
- Takubo, Yukinori. 1994. *Cognitive Mapping and Japanese Counterfactuals*. Kyushu University, Talk given at University of California, Berkeley.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1978. *The Relation of Grammar to Cognition - a Synopsis*. *Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing (TINLAP)* 2. 14-24.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1968. Reprinted in Teramura 1992. *Nihongo Meishi no kai-bunrui (Subcategorization of nouns in Japanese)*. *Nihongo Kyôiku* 12.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1978a. Reprinted in Teramura 1992. *Rentai shûshoku noshintakusu to imi 4 (Syntax and semantics of adnominal clauses)*. Osaka University of Foreign Language.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1978b. Reprinted in Teramura 1992. *'tokoro' no imi to kino (Semantics and Functions of tokoro)*. University of Osaka.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1984. *Nihongo noshintakusu to imi (Syntax and Semantics of Japanese)*. vol. II. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1992. *Teramura Hideo Ronbun Shu Nihongo Bunpo Hen: Selected Papers - Grammar of Japanese*. vol. I. Tokyo Japan: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1986. *From polysemy to internal semantic reconstruction*. *BLS* 12. 539-550.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1988a. *Is Internal Semantic-Pragmatic Reconstruction Possible? On Language: rhetorica, phonologica, syntactica: a festschrift for Robert P. Stockwell from his friends and colleagues*. ed. by Caroline Duncan-Rose and Theo Vennemann, 128-144. London and New York: Routledge.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1988b. *Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization*. *BLS* 14. 406-416.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. *On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: an example of subjectification in semantic change*. *Language* 65.1.31-55.