

## Historical Development of Japanese Evidentials: Grammaticalization or Degrammaticalization

YANG, Wenjiang (Nankai University, China)

ywjjwy@hotmail.com

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. Historical Changes of Five Japanese Evidentials

| evidential<br>status             | <i>ge</i>       | <i>soo</i>      | <i>rashi-i</i>                        | <i>mitai</i>  | <i>ppo-i</i>           |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| S                                | CJ or earlier ~ | around 15thC ~  | MIDJ ~                                | around 1880 ~ | before middle of EMJ ~ |
| S-E <sub>1</sub>                 | early MIDJ ~    | end of MIDJ ~   | late EMJ ~                            | 1930s ~       | 1980s ~                |
| S-E <sub>1</sub> -E <sub>2</sub> | end of MIDJ ~   | middle of EMJ ~ | end of EMJ ~                          | late 20thC ~  |                        |
| S-E <sub>2</sub>                 | around 1700 ~   | around 1870s ~  | E <sub>1</sub> is disappearing in PDJ |               |                        |
| S                                | around 1800 ~   |                 |                                       |               |                        |

(S = Suffix; E<sub>1</sub> = Enclitic (INFERRED); E<sub>2</sub> = 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 > E<sub>1</sub>” 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=yo=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.

### References

- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In: Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde and Harry Perridon (eds), *Up and Down the Cline: The Nature of Grammaticalization*, 17-44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1988. From bound grammatical markers to free discourse markers: History of some Japanese connectives. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 14: 340-351.
- Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Onodera, Noriko O. 2004. *Japanese Discourse Markers: Synchronic and Diachronic Discourse Analysis*.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shinzato, Rumiko. 2007. (Inter)subjectification, Japanese syntax and syntactic scope increase. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 8(2): 171-206.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 2011. Mermaid construction: A contribution from Japanese linguistics to general linguistics. *NINJAL Research Papers* 1: 53-75.

Yang, Wenjiang. 2014. Evidentiality in Japanese [Riyu Shizheng Fanchou Yanjiu]. PhD Dissertation, Peking University.