bls Berkeley Linguistics Society

From Bound Grammatical Markers to Free Discourse Markers: History of Some Japanese Connectives
Author(s): Yo Matsumoto
Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1988), pp. 340-351

From Bound Grammatical Markers to Free Discourse Markers: History of Some Japanese Connectives

Yo Matsumoto
Stanford University

0. Introduction

In this paper I will discuss the formal and functional aspects of historical change in certain Japanese connective expressions as they relate to theories of diachronic grammaticalization and language change in general.[1] First, I will point out that the historical change that many Japanese connectives have undergone poses a counterexample to the general direction of the formal change assumed in certain theories of grammaticalization (Givon 1979, Lehmann 1985). Second, I will show that they have undergone a pragmaticalization of meaning, and that this supports the view that pragmaticalization is a typical direction of semantic change (Traugott 1987, cf: Traugott 1982).

1. Formal changes in some Japanese connectives

In the literature of diachronic grammaticalization, it has been claimed that when a morpheme moves from one level to another, the direction of change is toward an increasing dependence of a morpheme on other words, or from word to clitic to affix, and finally, to zero. Givon (1971), for example, states this intuition in his slogan "Today's morphology is yesterday's syntax."[2] He has shown that this change is seen in the development of agreement markers, case markers and other grammatical markers in many languages (see Givon 1979 for a summary). Christian Lehmann (1985) also assumes that an increasing degree of boundness of a morpheme in the process of grammaticalization is the general direction of change.

This view of unidirectionality of change toward increasing boundness has been supported by data from many languages (e.g. Heine & Reh 1984). However, this view has not been unchallenged. Jeffers and Zwicky (1980), for example, have pointed out that clitic particles in Proto-Indo-European developed into the roots of relative/indefinite/interrogative words in descendant languages. That is, they claim that the opposite process, a change toward increasing freeness of morphemes, does occur in language change (see also Nevis 1986).[3]

It is one claim of this paper that Japanese connectives provide another instance of the change toward increasing independence of morphemes. The term *connective* is used here to refer to a variety of free forms that are used to connect two or more constituents. In Japanese they are not the only device that is used to connect two elements. The other option is relatively bound morphemes called *connective particles,* which are often referred to as enclitics (e.g. McCawley 1968) or enclitic particles (e.g. Martin 1987). Most of the connective particles are used to relate two clauses in a sentence (coordination or subordination), and occur at the clause-final position of the first clause.

One kind of connective that I want to look at in this paper is one which has the same form as a connective particle. An example is given in (1).

(1-a) *Taro-wa   wakai(*-yo)-ga,   yoku yar-u(-yo).*
       Taro-TOP   young(-PART)-but   well do-PRES(-PART)
       "Taro is young, but he does a good job."

  b) *Taro-wa   wakai(-yo).   Ga,   yoku yar-u(-yo).*
       Taro-TOP   young(-PART).   But   well do-PRES(-PART)
       "Taro is young. But he does a good job."

In (1-a), the morpheme *-ga* is used as a connective particle, which is attached to the predicate of the first clause. In (1-b), on the other hand, *ga* is used as a connective. In this sentence what is one sentence in (1-a) is expressed in two sentences, and *ga* is used in the sentence-initial position of the second sentence. Several connectives of this type are listed in (2).

(2) Connectives / connective particles

ga	'but'	/ *-ga*	'but'
ke(re)do(mo)	'but'	/ *-keredomo*	'even though' (< *-kere*
though')			inflectional ending? + *-domo* 'even
tokorode	'by the way'	/ *-tokorode*	'when''since'
		(< *tokoro* 'place' + *-de* LOC)	
tokoroga	'but'	/ *-tokoroga*	'even though'
		(< *tokoro* 'place' + *ga* NOM)	
to	'just then'	/ *-to*	'when''as soon as' (<*-to* 'and')

The difference between (1-a) and (1-b) or connective particles and corresponding connectives in general may call for comment. The differences are summarized as follows. The connective particles are not used alone and therefore are bound morphemes in Bloomfield's (1933) definition. They are attached directly to a tensed form of a verb, an adjective or an auxiliary, and usually form one accentual unit with it, pronounced with one accent in that unit.[4] The connectives, on the other hand, are used by themselves and therefore are free morphemes. They always form one accentual unit by themselves. They are separated from the preceding word (in the preceding sentence) by a long pause. Furthermore, a sentence-final particle like *-yo*, which occurs sentence-finally, but not clause-finally, can occur at the end of the preceding sentence, showing that there is a sentence boundary before the connective (cf: 1-a and b). Also, some of the connectives can be used to start a new turn in a discourse, with no related preceding utterance (see section 2).[5] These facts show that the connective particles are bound to the preceding word, while the connectives are clearly independent of it.

There are also connectives that have the same forms as the sequences of a copula (*-da* or its variant) and a connective particle. (*-Da* is also a relatively bound morpheme or an enclitic, attached directly to a noun with or without a case marker.) One example is given in (3).

(3-a) *Taro-wa   mada   kodomo-da-kara   sore-wa   muri-da.*
Taro-TOP still   child-COP-because   that-TOP   unreasonable-request-COP
"Since Taro is still a child, he is not equal to that task."

b) *Taro-wa   mada   kodomo-da. Da-kara sore-wa muri-da.*
Taro-TOP still   child-COP   therefore that-TOP unreasonable-request-COP
"Taro is still a child. Therefore, he is not equal to that task."

In (3-a), the form *-dakara,* which is composed of a copula *-da* and a connective particle *-kara* 'because', is attached to the predicate nominal in the first clause of the sentence. In (3-b), on the other hand, the form *dakara* is used as a connective. Since *dakara* is here a connective, there is nothing strange about the first sentence

ending in the copula *-da*. The first sentence can also end in a verb, rather than a copula. Several such connectives are listed in (4).

(4) Connectives / copula + connective particles

daga[6]	'but'	/ -*da* COP + -*ga* 'but'
dakedo(mo)	'but'	/ -*da* COP + -*keredomo* 'although'
datte	see below	/ -*da* COP + -*tote* 'even if'
dakara	'therefore'	/ -*da* COP + -*kara* 'because'
dattara	'if so'	/ -*da* COP + -*tara* 'if'
nanoni	'in spite of it'	/ -*na* COP + -*noni* 'even though'

The other kind of connective that is discussed is that which has the same form as the gerund (participial) form of a copula *-de*, by itself or with a so-called "focusing" particle. This gerund form of the copula is used to form an adverbial subordinate clause or the first conjoined clause in a sentence. One example of the use of *-de* and a focusing particle is given in (5). In (5-a), the sequence of a copula *-de* and a highlighting particle *-mo* is attached to an anaphoric term *sore* 'that', forming a subordinate adverbial clause. In (5-b), on the other hand, *demo* is used as a connective. Such connectives are listed in (6).

(5-a) *Taro-wa   shippaishi-ta. Sore-de-mo   kare-wa   kujike-nakat-ta.*
　　　Taro-TOP fail-PAST   that-COP-even he-TOP   be-discouraged-NEG-PAST
　　　"Taro failed. Even though that was the case, he was not discouraged."

　b) *Taro-wa   shippaishi-ta. **Demo**   kare-wa   kujike-nakat-ta.*
　　　Taro-TOP fail-PAST   All the same he-TOP   be-discouraged-NEG-PAST
　　　"Taro failed. All the same, he was not discouraged."

(6) Connectives / gerund form of copula *-de* (+ a focusing particle)

de	'and' 'and then'	/ -*de* COP (gerund)
demo	'but'	/ -*de* COP (gerund) + -*mo* 'even'
dewa (jaa)	'then''now'	/ -*de* COP (gerund) + -*wa* TOPIC

Incidentally, the complex forms like *soredemo* in (5-a) can often be regarded as complex connectives. For the purpose of this paper, I will call all cases of these complex forms *anaphoric connectives*.

How did these connective expressions develop in history? Given the general claim about the direction of language change, one might expect, for example, that the connective particles, which are relatively bound morphemes (clitics), developed from corresponding connectives, which are free, independent morphemes. However, according to the established view in Japanese linguistics this is not the case.

It has been claimed that the connectives in (2), (4) and (6) developed from corresponding particles or sequences of a copula and a particle (Doi 1969a,b, Kyogoku 1977, Kyogoku & Matsui 1973, Yuzawa 1936, *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (NKD), etc.). There are two different patterns of development. First, connectives like *ga* in (1-b) developed from connective particles like -*ga* in (1-a) by being separated or detached from the preceding word in the preceding clause (Kyogoku 1977, Kyogoku & Matsui 1973).[7] This process may have been a reflection of the strategy of making a sentence sound as if it is the continuation of the preceding

sentence, which the speaker (or some other speaker) has actually finished, a phenomenon that can be found in other expressions in Japanese.[8] Connectives in (2) and probably many in (4) fall into this category. I will call connectives formed through this process *detached connectives* for the lack of a better term.

Connectives listed in (6) and perhaps some in (4) have a different story. They are said to have arisen with the loss of an anaphoric term from anaphoric connectives like *soredemo* in (5-a) (NKD, cf: Martin 1975: 818-9). In (5-a), the sequence of a copula and a focusing particle *-demo* is used as a part of an anaphoric connective *soredemo*. In (5-b), *demo* occurs without *sore*, and is used as a connective. In this paper, I will call this type of connectives *anaphorless connectives*.[9] The process of the loss of anaphoric terms in the formation of connective expressions is not unique to Japanese. In English, for example, (phrasal) connectives like *instead* and *as a result* developed from phrases with an anaphor, such as *instead of that* and *as a result of that* (Halliday and Hasan 1976:230). In the case of Japanese this loss of an anaphor has resulted in the use of the sequence of relatively bound morphemes (a copula and a focusing particle) as a connective.

The historical change that produced the detached connectives may require some elucidation. Historical data show that these connectives appeared in history quite recently. All of the connectives began to be used in the 17th century or afterward in texts that reflect the colloquial speech of that period, in some cases in *shoomono* (commentaries on classical writings), but in most cases in *kyoogen* and *kabuki* (popular play scripts), and so-called vulgar style Edo literature such as *kokkeibon* (Aoki 1973, Kyogoku & Matsui 1973, Yuzawa 1929, 1936, 1954).

The corresponding particles, on the other hand, had been used before that time. Some date back to Old Japanese. These particles had the same phonological/morphological properties as today before and around the time connective forms appeared. The accentual marks annotated in *Heikyoku,* which seem to reflect the accent of the 15-18th century Kyoto dialect, show that particles (including the connective particle *-ga*) and a copula almost always formed one accentual unit with the preceding word (Okumura 1981). This accentual pattern is also dominant in the accentual marks annotated in *Shizakooshiki*, which reflect the accent of Kyoto dialect around the 13th century (Kindaichi 1964).[10]

Take the example of *(-)ga*. It started as a genitive marker and a subject (nominative) marker in certain kinds of subordinate clauses in Old Japanese. *-Ga* developed into a connective particle from its use as a subject marker around the late 11th century (Ishigaki 1944, NKD).[11] *Ga* as a connective, on the other hand, appeared in the 17th century (Yuzawa 1936; see also Kyogoku 1977).[12] The appearance of *ga* as a connective is clearly indicated by the examples where the preceding sentence ends in a form to which a connective particle cannot be attached. In the following example, taken from a (kokanbon) kyoogen entitled *Asaina* (1792), the preceding sentence ends in a particle *-monoo*, which is a connective particle, but here is used as a sentence-final particle that marks the speaker's regret.

(7) *Asaina-to*   *kii-ta-naraba*   *semu-mai-monoo.*
    Asaina-COMP   hear-PAST-COND   attack-NEG(FUT)-PART

    Ga, Asaina-to   *kiite*   *seme-ne-ba*   *jigoku-no*   *naore-ja.*
    but Asaina-COMP   hear (gerund)   attack-NEG-COND hell-GEN   disgrace-COP

"If I had known that you were Asaina, I would not have attacked you! But if I stop attacking you after I know that you are Asaina, it is a disgrace to the world of hell."

Another connective of this type, *ke(re)do(mo)* can be traced back to two bound morphemes *-kere* and *-domo*. *-Kere* is supposed to have been an inflectional ending or an auxiliary,[13] and *-domo* was a connective particle. The combination of *-kere* and *-domo* formed a connective particle *-keredomo* in the 15th century.[14] *Keredomo* as a connective appeared later, in the 17th century (Yuzawa 1936, NKD).[15] Phonologically reduced forms like *(-)kedo(mo)* appeared in the 17-19th century (Yuzawa 1936,1954; NKD). Another connective, *tokorode,* ultimately goes back to a noun *tokoro* 'place', which was grammaticalized into a connective particle around the 11th century (Doi 1969b, NKD). The connective particle *-tokorode,* which comes from the combination of a noun *tokoro* and a locative marker *-de,* appeared in the 16th century,[16] and the connective *tokorode* appeared in the 17th century in the meaning of 'since' (Yuzawa 1929, Doi 1969b, NKD),[17] and in the present-day meaning of 'by the way' in the 19th century (NKD).[18] The direct source of the connective *tokorode* is not the noun, since the meaning of the noun *tokoro* 'place' is not related to any meanings of the connective *tokorode* in its history. Connectives with the copula *-da,* such as *daga, dakeredo* and *datte,* appeared in the 18-19th century.[19]

Anaphorless connectives like *de, demo* and *dewa* also appeared in the 18th century or afterward, after their corresponding anaphoric connectives appeared.[20] Their component morphemes date back to a much older time. The gerund form of a copula *-de* dates back to the late 11th century, and *-wa* and *-mo* to Old Japanese (Matsumura 1969, NKD).

In all of these cases, connective forms appeared later than the corresponding clitic forms. One might think that both a connective and a connective particle originate in some common independent word of some other category. However, the history of *(-)ga,* for example, shows that this morpheme was not an independent word before it appeared as a connective. This shows that the change that took place was one from clitics to independent words. This means that the direction of change toward an increasing degree of boundness seen in the literature on grammaticalization is not exceptionless.

Then under what conditions is this exceptional change toward increasing freeness of morphemes likely to occur? What is striking in this regard is that no similar change toward increasing freeness has been reported in recent studies on the origins of connectives by Traugott (1985, 1986), Konig (1986) and others.[21] Also, no similar phenomena can be found in the history of other grammatical markers in Japanese (cf: Matsumura 1969, Akiba 1978).[22] Then what makes Japanese connectives unique in this respect? Although I cannot state clear conditions for the occurrence of this unusual change, I can point to two factors that have presumably made the detaching process possible. One of them is the fact that Japanese has connective particles as relatively bound (clitic) morphemes. The other factor is the clause-final position of those particles. Given this situation, detaching clitics from the preceding sentence is a natural measure to resort to, in order to have free sentence connectives in the sentence-initial position. These two factors are related to two typological characteristics of Japanese. The presence of connective particles can be ascribed to the agglutinating nature of Japanese. The clause-final position of connective morphemes is typical of OV (verb-final)/postpositional languages.[23] A

close study of connectives in languages typologically similar to Japanese might lead to the discovery of similar phenomena.24

2 Functional change in some Japanese connectives

The second problem to be discussed is the functional (semantic) change of these connectives. Although the change that I have described produced free morphemes from relatively bound morphemes, they have not acquired the rich lexical semantic content typical of free morphemes. On the contrary, the functional (semantic) change that these connective expressions have undergone is one toward discourse/pragmatics-oriented meanings.

First, let us consider the functional change in terms of the scope of the connective morphemes, or the type of constituents that the morphemes combine. As I have described before, a connective particle combines two clauses in a sentence, while a connective combines two matrix sentences. This means that when the detaching occurred the relationship that the morpheme indicates has changed from intrasentential relationship to intersentential relationship. That is, the function of those morphemes changed from the domain of syntax to that of discourse.25

The same is true of anaphorless connectives. In the original form of a complex anaphoric connective *soredemo,* for example, the form *-demo* marks the relationship between the proposition expressed in *sore* and the rest of the clause. When *demo* stands alone as a connective, it indicates directly the relationship between the preceding sentence and the sentence in which the connective occurs. Again, the function has shifted from the domain of syntax to discourse. I will point out later that many connectives including *demo* have come to relate still larger units like conversational turns.

This change of the scope of an item is also the opposite of a putatively unidirectional process of grammaticalization. Lehmann (1985) claims that grammaticalization involves the shrinkage of the scope of an item. That is, the constituents that a morpheme relates to are claimed to become smaller. In the process that I am describing, however, the constituents connected after the change are larger units.

There are more to the functional change than just this. Many of the detached and anaphorless connectives have now acquired new discourse functions. Most of these uses manifest themselves when the connectives are used in the turn-initial position, where they mark some features of the discourse units (e.g. turns) that they introduce. In many such cases, the logical relationship that original connective expressions mark has been lost.

This can be illustrated with a detached connective *dakara*. The original meaning of *dakara* 'therefore' retains the meaning of the connective particle *-kara* 'because' (see examples 3-a and -b above). When this connective is used in a turn-initial position, the "reason" that *dakara* marks can be found in the non-linguistic situation shared by the speaker and hearer. (8) is an example of this.

(8) After seeing a child drop a glass,
  Dakara *chuuishi-nasai-tte* *it-ta-n-da.*
  therefore take-care-IMP-QUOT say-PAST-Nominalizer-COP
  'That's why I told you to be careful."

In some cases the notion of causality is lost. One example is given in (9). In this case, *dakara* is used to introduce an utterance in which the speaker insists on his/her opinion, in the face of a failure to understand on the part of the hearer. In

this use, a pause is often put after *dakara,* and an "interjection" particle (e.g. *-ne*) is often suffixed to it.

(9) seeing that the conversational partner talks as if (s)he has not been convinced of the speaker's point made earlier that Ken is a liar.
　　　Dakara(-ne),　　　*Ken-wa*　　　*usotsuki-na-n-da-yo.*
　　　　　(-PART)　　　Ken-TOP　　　liar-COP-Nominalizer-COP-PART
　　　'I'm telling you that Ken is a liar!'

　　　This semantic change of *dakara* illustrates the process of the loss of the original logical relationship that the morpheme originally marks, and also the process of pragmaticalization of meaning. As illustrated by the last example, the morpheme has come to be used as a discourse marker, a morpheme that functions to mark some feature of discourse in the interaction between speaker and hearer.
　　　Other discourse functions[26] seen in detached connectives include the use of *tokorode.* This connective comes from a particle meaning 'when' or 'since' and is now used solely to change a topic of conversation to an entirely new one with some abruptness. Another connective *datte,* which comes from the copula *-da* and a particle *-tote* 'even', is used to introduce an utterance in which the speaker justifies his or her behavior or opinion.[27] Furthermore, *dakedo, ke(re)do(mo)* and *daga,* which have been used as adversative connectives, are now also used to introduce with some abruptness an utterance in which the speaker is reflecting on something.
　　　In the case of anaphorless connectives, the acquisition of new discourse functions is sometimes paralleled by the acquisition of these functions by related anaphoric connectives. One example of this is *dewa,* which comes from *soredewa* (<*sore* 'that' + *-de* COP + *-wa* TOP). The original meaning of *soredewa* and also *dewa* is something like 'Given that is true,...'. When used in the turn-initial position, they indicate that, given the (conversational) situation, the speaker takes it as natural to move to a new stage of a conversation (cf: "*Well, then...*"). One typical case of this is the opening up of a closing of conversation. This seems to have led to the use of *soredewa* and *dewa* as words to say "good bye." For this purpose, phonologically reduced forms like *sorejaa, jaa,* and *ja* are also used, often with an "interjection" particle, as in *jaane* and *jaana.* Another typical case is to start a discourse (e.g. a meeting). This seems to have led to the use of the reduced form *jaa* as some sort of interjection, which informs or reminds the hearer that the speaker is beginning a new action. An example is given in (10). *Soredewa* cannot be used here.

(10) *Jaa*　　　*ik-oo.*
　　　　　　　　go-HORTATIVE
　　　" Let's go."

　　　Another instance of the parallel change between anaphoric and anaphorless connectives toward discourse function is the use of *de* and *sorede* 'then (temporal and causal)'(< *sore* 'that' + *-de* COP). They are used by the hearer as a prompt for the speaker, in order to tell the speaker to go on. When pronounced in certain ways, such as *nde,* they convey the feeling that the hearer does not see the importance of the speaker's speech (cf: "*Then what?*").
　　　In contrast, *demo* has acquired novel functions that have not been seen in its original form *soredemo* 'even so'(< *sore* 'that' + *-de* COP + *-mo* 'even'). There are three main novel uses in *demo.* First, it can be used as an adversative con-

nective, without any concessive meaning. When it is used in the turn-initial position, it often introduces a discourse in which the speaker tries to refute what the conversational partner has said in the preceding turn. It can also be used to introduce an utterance in which the speaker is reflecting on something (cf: *daga* and *dakeredo* above). In this case, no necessary concessive or adversative relationship is found between the preceding and following discourse.[28]

This kind of pragmaticalization of meaning is not a process uniquely associated with the formal change that I have reported. I have already pointed out in relation to some uses of *dewa,* that in some cases anaphoric connectives have undergone the same semantic change as anaphorless connectives. Moreover, Urdaneta (1980) shows that a Spanish connective *pues* has acquired similar pragmatic uses in its history. Studies by van Dijk (1979) and Schiffrin (1987) have also revealed that special discourse uses have been acquired by English connectives like *and* and *but.* Therefore the acquisition of discourse use by connectives is a general phenomenon of the semantic change in these items, not specific to the change that I have described.

In fact, the pragmaticalization of meaning seems to be an even more general phenomenon of semantic change. Traugott (1982) suggested that in the course of grammaticalization, the accompanying meaning change is more likely to be one from propositional meanings to textual and expressive meanings, the kind of change that we have seen in Japanese connectives. Recently, she has suggested that this kind of pragmaticalization of meaning is a general trend of semantic change, not only in grammaticalization but also in other kinds of diachronic semantic change (Traugott 1987). The case of Japanese connectives reported here supports her recent view, since they show that the pragmaticalization of meaning also occurs in a change quite different from the grammaticalization process.

Notes

[1] In writing this paper I am indebted to the following persons: Fumiko Arao, Joan Bybee, Charles Fillmore, Joseph Greenberg, Yoko Hasegawa, Ki-sun Hong, Michael Inman, Suzanne Kemmer, Stephen Levinson, Kenjiro Matsuda, Tara Mohanan, Toshio Ohori, William Poser, John Stonham, Nancy Wiegand, Seiko Yamaguchi, Arnold Zwicky, and, above all, Keith Denning and Elizabeth Traugott. Of course, they are not responsible for any faults found in this paper.

[2] In his slogan he also claims that the morpheme order is a reflection of previous word order. I will not discuss this claim here.

[3] Traugott (1982: footnote 2) also gives some sporadic examples of this type of change.

[4] In Japanese enclitic particles in general (and also some auxiliaries like *-da*) are attached to free morphemes, and usually form one accentual unit with them (i.e. have only one High-pitch mora after which the pitch is Low). These morphemes have often been called *huzokugo* in Japanese linguistics, and regarded as less bound than those which are affixed to non-free morphemes. This relative freeness of particles and some auxiliaries has led some to prefer writing them separately from the free morphemes to which they are attached when they are romanized. In this paper, I will separate them with a hyphen.

[5] In many cases there is a semantic difference, too. It has been pointed out to me that *ga* as a connective can only be used in an adversative meaning, whereas *-ga* as

a connective particle can often be used in a non-adversative meaning, which is the original meaning of this particle. See section 2 below for more examples.

6 Polite forms like *desu-ga* (<-*desu* COP (polite) + -*ga* 'but') and *de-gozaimasu-ga* (< -*de* COP (gerund) + -*gozaimasu* POLITE + -*ga* 'but') are also found.

7 Alternatively, the development of the connective *ga* from a particle -*ga* might have been mediated by (now obsolete) detached or anaphorless connectives such as *shitaga* 'but' (< *shi* 'do' + -*ta* PAST + -*ga* 'but') and *jaga* 'but' (< -*ja* COP (an older form) + -*ga* 'but').

8 There are some cases where the copula with some other elements is used as a non-connective free morpheme. One case is the use of *dasoodesu* (<-*da* COP + *soodesu* an auxiliary marking hear-say) and *datte* (<-*da* COP + -*tte*, a quotation marker) (and perhaps even *tte* (<-*tte* QUOT)). Originally, these expressions are used to report or quote someone's speech, and are usually attached to the nominalized form of a verb, an adjective or an auxiliary. They can also be used by themselves after somebody else has finished a turn, so that the speaker can pretend as if the whole preceding turn were what (s)he reports or quotes as a part of his/her sentence. This kind of pretension is also found in the use of a complementizer, together with some other elements. For example, after a long talk by a person, another person can start his/her turn by *toyuu-koto-wa* (<-*toyuu* COMP + *koto* thing + -*wa* TOP) "That means....". Here the complementizer takes the whole preceding discourse as the complement, so to speak. I owe Charles Fillmore for insisting on this point to me.

9 After the 16th century, some other kinds of Japanese connectives were also formed through the loss of anaphoric expressions. They include *suruto* 'if so' 'and then' (< *soo* 'so' + *suru* 'do''assume' + -*to* 'when''as soon as'), and *shite* 'and then' (< *soo* 'so' + *shite* 'do' (gerund)), which is now obsolete (Yuzawa 1954). I have not included these in the discussion because they are not cases of a change toward increasing freeness.

10 It has been claimed that enclitic particles in Japanese did not form one accentual unit with the preceding word in Old Japanese, and therefore had more independence than they do today. For the discussion of the transition to the present-day pattern, see Sakurai (1975, 1984) and also Martin (1987: 169-172).

11 The following is a somewhat simplified description of the change from -*ga* as a subject marker to -*ga* as a connective particle. In (a), a headless relative clause, in which the subject (or the object) in the relative clause functions as the semantic head, is the matrix subject, marked with -*ga* as a subject marker. (a) was reanalyzed as (b), in which the relative clause is regarded as the first conjoined clause of a coordinate sentence, with -*ga* as a connective particle, and the remainder of (a) is regarded as one independent clause (the second conjoined clause) with an empty subject.

(a) [[S   O   V]$_{rel-cl}$-*ga*   O   V]$_s$
(b) [[S   O   V]$_{conj-cl}$-*ga*   [$\emptyset$ O   V]$_{conj-cl}$]$_s$

This is a rare case of the type of reanalysis called *boundary addition* by Langacker (1977). Also, this is a case of change from subordination to coordination.

12 Yuzawa (1936) cites an example from *Kooshoku Denju* (1693).

[13] It has been suggested that it was either the so-called "literary concessive" ending of either adjectives or the auxiliary *-maji* , or the "literary concessive" form of the auxiliary *-keri* (see Doi 1969a).

[14] Doi (1969) cites an example from *Shikishoo* (1477).

[15] NKD cites an example from *Rooshikeishoo* (1652).

[16] An example is found in *Kobunshinhooshoo* (1525) cited in Yuzawa (1929).

[17] NKD and Yuzawa cite an example from *Mookyuushoo* (1633). A Catholic missionary, Rodriguez, also noted this use in *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* (1604-1608).

[18] The first citation in NKD is from the kokkeibon *Aguranabe* (1871).

[19] NKD cites an example of *daga* from *Yanagidaru* (1765). Yuzawa (1954) and NKD cite an example of *dakedomo* from *Shichihenjin* (1857).The copula *-da* developed from the combination of the gerund form of an older copula *nite* and a verb *ari,* through intermediate forms like *niari, dearu* and *ja.* The first citation of *-da* in NKD is from *Hekigandaikuushoo* (1501).

[20] Here are the earliest uses known to me; *de: Osanagono katakiuchi* (1753) (NKD), *demo: Kanokomochi* (1772) (NKD), *dewa: Ukigumo* (1887-9) (NKD), *sorede:* a Genroku kabuki script (1689-90) (Yuzawa 1936), *soredewa:* a Genroku kabuki script (1694) (Yuzawa 1936), *soredemo:* a Chikamatsu kabuki script (1702) (Yuzawa 1936).

[21] The origins of some other Japanese connectives are more similar to those found in other languages. They include 1) verbs (e.g. *tsumari* 'in short' (< *tsumaru* 'be stopped' 'come to an end'), 2) adverbs (e.g. *nao* 'incidentally' (< *nao* 'still'), 3) a combination of an anaphoric expression and some other words (e.g. *soshite* 'and then' (< *soo* 'so' + *shite* 'do' (gerund form)), *sorekara* 'after that"and' (< *sore* 'that' +-*kara* 'from'), *soreyue* 'for that reason' (< *sore* 'that' + *yue* 'reason' (archaic)).

[22] The history of Japanese has shown many regular processes of grammaticalization. Examples include the development of many restrictive particles (e.g. *-bakari, -nomi, -dake, -kurai, -kiri, -hodo*) and case markers (e.g. *-e, -kara*) from nouns, auxiliaries (e.g. *-nu, -tari*) from verbs, aspectual auxiliary verbs (e.g. *-kuru, -oku*) from motion verbs, and honorific auxiliary verbs (e.g. *-tamau, -mesu*) from action verbs.

[23] Givon (1984: 71) notes that in many verb-final languages, conjoining and subordinating morphemes appear as suffixes on the main verbs in conjoined or subordinate clauses. Interestingly, the position of sentence connectives (e.g. *therefore, then*) does not respect this parameter in Japanese and other languages. They are in many cases free morphemes, too.

[24] Malayalam (a Dravidian verb-final language) has a similar pair of connective particle and connective, *(-)engilum* 'even though' or 'if so'.

[25] The English connective *though* has also undergone a similar functional change.

[26] I owe much to Morita (1980) for my thinking about the discourse use of connectives. However, I do not follow his analyses in many cases.

[27] Note that the meaning of *datte* is not defined in terms of the linguistic context (i.e. the relation between the preceding sentence and the sentence in which *datte* occurs). In fact, *datte* can be preceded by many different kinds of utterances, depending on the way in which the speaker has come to justify his/her behavior or opinion, or how or whether this behavior or opinion is linguistically expressed. Take the utterance (c), used by a child to justify the neglect of homework.

(c)   *Datte*   *atama-ga*   *itai-n-da-mon*
        COP-'even'   head-NOM   aching-Nominalizer-COP-PART
        "I have a headache, you know."

This sentence can be preceded by (1) speaker's own utterance that expresses his/her opinion or behavior which requires a justification (e.g. "I won't study today."), or the conversational partner's (2) question (e.g. "Why do you not study today?"), (3) command (e.g. "Study!"), (4) suggestion (e.g. "Why not study?"), etc. (see Morita 1980). It can even be preceded by non-linguistic reproach (e.g. staring at the speaker). In my view, these are just different patterns of linguistic manifestations of how a questioned behavior or opinion is expressed and how the speaker has come to justify it. These five cases can be boiled down to one meaning of *datte*.

[28] In addition, while *soredemo* is used both as a concessive and concessive conditional connective (cf: König 1986), *demo* can only be used as a concessive connective (see Morita 1980).

Bibliography

Aoki, R. 1973. "Setsuzokushi oyobi setsuzokushitekigoi ichiran" [A list of connectives and connective-like vocabulary]. In *Setsuzokushi Kandooshi, Hinshibetsu Nihonbunpookooza*, Vol. 6 [Connectives and interjections, Japanese Grammar Series according to Parts of Speech]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Akiba, K. 1978. *A Historical Study of Old Japanese Syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation (UCLA). Published from University Microfilms International.

Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Doi, Y. 1969a. "-*keredomo*." In A. Matsumura (ed.), 1969.

_____ 1969b. "-*tokorode*." In A. Matsumura (ed.), 1969.

Givon, T. 1971. "Historical syntax and historical morphology: an archaeologist's field trip." *CLS* 7, 394-415.

_____1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

_____1984. *Syntax*, Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M.A.K. & R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Heine, B. & M. Reh. 1983. *Grammaticalization and Reanalysis in African Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Ishigaki, K. 1944. "Shukaku *ga* joshi yori setsuzoku *ga* joshi e" [From the nominative marker -*ga* to the connective particle -*ga*]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 21, 3-4.

Jeffers, R. & A. Zwicky. 1980. "Evolution of clitics." In E. C. Traugott et al. (eds.) *Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kindaichi, H. 1964. *Shizakooshiki no Kenkyuu* [Studies on *Shizakooshiki*]. Tokyo: Sanseido.

König, E. 1986. "Concessive relations and concessive connectives: some cross-linguistic observations." (ms)

Kyogoku, K. 1977. "Setsuzokushi *ga:* sono hattatsu to yoohoo o megutte" [The connective *ga:* its development and use]. In Matsumura Akira Kyooju Kanreki Kinenkai (ed.) *Kokugogaku to Kokugoshi.* Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Kyogoku, K & E. Matsui. 1973. "Setsuzokushi no hensen" [Historical changes in connectives]. In *Setsuzokushi Kandooshi* [Connectives and Interjections]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Langacker, R. W. 1977. "Syntactic reanalysis." In C. N. Li (ed.) *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change.* Austin: Texas UP.

Lehmann, Ch. 1985. "Grammaticalization: Synchronic variation and diachronic change." *Lingua e Stile* 20, 3.

Martin, S. E. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese.* New Haven: Yale UP.

_____1987. *The Japanese Language through Time.* New Haven: Yale UP.

Matsumura, A. (ed.) 1969. *Joshi Jodooshi Yoosetsu* [Detailed Descriptions of Particles and Auxiliaries]. Tokyo: Gakutosha.

McCawley, J. D. 1968. *The Phonological Component of a Grammar of Japanese.* The Hague: Mouton.

Morita, Y. 1980. *Kiso Nihongo 2* [Basic Japanese 2]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.

Nevis, J.A. 1986. "Decliticization and deaffixation in Saame: abessive *taga.*" *OSU WPL* 34, 1-9.

Nihon Kokugo Daijiten (NKD) [Unabridged Japanese Dictionary]. 1972-1976. Tokyo: Shogakkan.

Okumura, M. 1981. *Heikyokuhuhon no Kenkyuu* [Studies on *Heikyokuhuhon*]. Tokyo: Ohusha.

Sakurai, S. 1975. "Joshi akusento no shiteki koosatsu" [A historical study of particle accent]. In S. Sakurai *Kodai Kokugo Akesentoshi Ronkoo* [Studies in the Accentual Change in Old Japanese]. Tokyo: Ohusha.

_____1984. *Chuusei Kyooto Akusento no Shiteki Kenkyuu* [A Historical Study of the Accent of Middle Kyoto Dialect]. Tokyo: Ohusha.

Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers.* London: Cambridge UP.

Traugott, E.C.1982. "From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization." In W.P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (eds.) *Perspectives in Historical Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

_____1985. "Conditional markers." In J. Haiman (ed.) *Iconicity in Syntax.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

_____1986. "On the origins of 'and' and 'but' connectives in English." *Studies in Language* 10-1. 137-150.

_____1987. "From less to more situated in language: the unidirectionality of semantic change." Paper presented at ICEHL V (Cambridge, April).

Urdaneta, I. P. 1980. "Conversational *'pues'* in Spanish: A process of degrammaticalization?" In A. Ahlqvist (ed.) *Papers from the 5th International Conference of Historical Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Banjamins.

van Dijk, T. A. 1979. "Pragmatic connectives." *Journal of Pragmatics,* 3: 447-56.

Yuzawa, K. 1929 (=1958). *Muromachijidai Gengo no Kenkyuu* [A Study on the Language in the Muromachi Era]. Tokyo: Kazama Shobo.

_____1936. *Tokugawajidai Gengo no Kenkyuu* [A Study on the Language in the Tokugawa Era]. Tokyo: Tooe Shobo.

_____1954. *Edokotoba no Kenkyuu* [A Study on the Edo Language]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.