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Evidentials in Modern Japanese include yoo, ge, soo, rashi-i, mitai and ppo-i. Yoo grammaticalized from CJ noun yau, and “VP yoo=da” is a typical case of mermaid constructions (Cf. Tsunoda 2011). On the other hand, although ge and soo also originated in nouns, their evidential usages came directly from adjectival suffixes, which is also the case of rashi-i and ppo-i. Mitai developed from “(o) mi-ta=yoo” in EMJ. Interestingly ge lost its enclitic form and retreated to its original status of suffix, which is similar to what Haspelmath (2004) called “retraction”. If we distinguish the two evidential functions of INFERRED and REPORTED, the historical changes of the five evidentials can be represented as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical status</th>
<th>ge</th>
<th>soo</th>
<th>rashi-i</th>
<th>mitai</th>
<th>ppo-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>CJ or earlier</td>
<td>around 1560</td>
<td>MIDJ</td>
<td>around 1880</td>
<td>before middle of EMJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-E1</td>
<td>early MIDJ</td>
<td>end of MIDJ</td>
<td>late EMJ</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-E1 E2</td>
<td>end of MIDJ</td>
<td>middle of EMJ</td>
<td>end of EMJ</td>
<td>late 20thC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-E2</td>
<td>around 1700</td>
<td>around 1870s</td>
<td>Ei is disappearing in PDJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>around 1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S = Suffix; E1 = Enclitic (INFERRED); E2 = Enclitic (REPORTED); CJ = Classical Japanese; MIDJ = Middle Japanese; EMJ = Early Modern Japanese; PDJ = Present-Day Japanese)

Yang (2014) makes the point that the development “S > Ei” may be seen as an instance of degrammaticalization in that it is the reverse of the well-known grammaticalization cline “clitic > affix”. In PDJ, soo, rashi-i, mitai and ppo-i have further degrammaticalized so that they can be used independently as mitai in the following example.

“Are, onna=des.u=yoo=ne.” “Mitai=da=na.”
IP, woman=COP=ILL=ILL  mitai=COP=ILL

“Oh, it’s a woman, isn’t it?” “Seems like.” (OUT, 2002)

The above two stages of “degrammaticalization” both exhibit syntactic scope expansion, but as Shinzato (2007) claims, syntactic scope reduction may not be the defining criterion of grammaticalization, and the widening of syntactic scope is observed in many cases of Japanese grammatical changes. Also considering the development of discourse makers described by Matsumoto (1988) and Onodera (2004), it may be safe to say that syntactic scope expansion is a recurrent phenomenon of Japanese grammar.

If syntactic scope expansion is not a criterion of degrammaticalization, should we treat the historical development of five Japanese evidentials as grammaticalization or degrammaticalization? Is this case a real counterexample to the unidirectionality hypothesis? In this paper, I will approach these issues from the perspective of constructionalization suggested by Traugott & Trousdale (2013), which may reconcile the two current models of grammaticalization, namely grammaticalization as reduction and grammaticalization as expansion.
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