

On the Grammaticalization of the Japanese Connective *Tara*

TAKANO-HAYES Sono
Carnegie Mellon University

SHINZATO Rumiko
Georgia Institute of Technology

Abstract:

The Japanese temporal/conditional connective *tara* 'if/when' has been studied most typically in synchronic comparative perspectives with other connectives, namely, *ba*, *to*, and *nara* (Kuno 1973; McGloin 1976-77). In a similar vein, the Old Japanese *tari*, the source of the Modern Japanese *tara* has been studied in comparison with the other perfect temporal auxiliaries (Fukuzawa 1997; Nomura 1994). Aside from these comparative contexts, *tara* has also started being analyzed in discursal contexts (Akatsuka 1985; Jacobsen 1992; Mayes 1996). However, *tara*'s diachronic aspects as well as emotive/subjective meanings in discursal contexts, and furthermore, the relationship between diachronic development and discursal functions have largely been neglected.

This paper aims to shed some light on these previously neglected areas through analyses of texts from Old Japanese to the present-day Japanese. Specifically, this paper delineates the developmental paths in which the Old Japanese perfect auxiliary *tari* developed discourse interactional functions as seen in the present-day Japanese *tara*. In addition, this paper discusses how such development can be viewed in the context of grammaticalization (Givón 1979; Traugott 1989, 1995; Hopper and Traugott 1993).

NOTE: An earlier and abridged version of this paper was presented at the 2nd High Desert Linguistic Student Conference on March 27, 1999 (University of New Mexico, Albuquerque).

1. Introduction

The Japanese temporal/conditional connective *tara* 'if/when' has been studied typically in synchronic comparative perspectives with other connectives, namely, *ba*, *to*, and *nara* (See Kuno 1973; McGloin 1976-77). In a similar vein, the Old Japanese *tari*, the source of the Modern Japanese *tara*, has been studied in comparison with the other perfect temporal auxiliaries (See Fukuzawa 1997; Mori 1970; Nomura 1994). Aside from these comparative contexts, *tara* has also started being analyzed in discursal contexts (See Akatsuka 1985; Jacobsen 1992; Mayes 1996). However, *tara*'s diachronic aspects as well as emotive/subjective meanings in discursal contexts, and, furthermore, the relationship between diachronic development and discursal functions have been largely neglected.

This paper attempts to shed some light on these previously neglected areas through analyses of texts from Old Japanese to the present-day Japanese. Specifically, this paper delineates the developmental paths in which the Old Japanese perfect auxiliary *tari* developed discourse interactional functions as seen in the present-day Japanese *tara*. In addition, this paper

discusses how such development can be viewed in the context of grammaticalization (Givon 1979; Traugott 1989, 1995; Hopper and Traugott 1993).

2. From the Old Japanese *tari* to the present-day Japanese *tara*

2.1. Background

Before proceeding further, basic morphological, syntactical, and semantic information about the Old Japanese *tari* is in order because *tari* expressed more than the perfect meaning, depending upon its conjugational forms. The Old Japanese *tari* had the following six conjugational forms¹:

irrealis	conjunctive	finite	adnomial	realis	imperative
tara	tari	tari	taru	tare	(tare)

The irrealis form *tara*, combined with the conditional particle *ba*, functioned as a hypothetical conditional as below:

- (1) Tsubakurame no su kuki-TARA-ba, tsuge yo.
 swallow SUB nest make-PERF-COND tell-IMP
 'Tell me when the swallows have made their nest.' (Taketori Monogatari, 9C)

The conjunctive (adjacent to another clause), finite (at the end of the sentence), and adnomial (adjacent to a nominal) forms expressed perfect aspect meaning as below²:

- (2) Kono tama no he ni fumi zo tsuke-TARI keru.
 this jewel of leaves on letter EMPH attach-PERF-EXCLAIM
 'There has been a letter attached to the leaves of jewels. (Taketori Monogatari)
- (3) Mukae ni hito ohoku mahiri-TARI.
 receive to people many come-PERF
 'Many people came to receive him.' (Taketori Monogatari)
- (4) Tennin no yosohohi shi-TARU onna, yama yori ide kite...
 celestial maiden 's dress wear-PERF lady mountain from came out
 'A lady dressed in the celestial maiden's attire came out, and...'
 (Taketori Monogatari)

The imperative form, *tare*, expressed the imperative meaning as below:

- (5) Kore, shibashi mochi-tamahi-TARE.
 hey for a while hold-polite-IMP
 'Hey, hold this for a while.' (Ookagami)

In contrast to the irrealis *tara + ba*, which indicated a hypothetical conditional meaning, the realis *tare* combined with same particle *ba* conveyed a factual conditional meaning as below³:

- (6) Kakaru yoshi no kaherigoto wo mooshi-TARE ba, kiki-tamahite...
 this message of replay OBJ say-PERF-when, hear-polite
 'When they said this message in reply, he heard and...' (Takatori Monogatari)

2.2 Developmental paths of *tara + ba*

Based on the authors' data from Old Japanese texts to the present-day Japanese novels and children's books, the following developmental path of the *tara + ba* can be identified. Our data also confirm the generally held view that stage 2 took place around the early Edo era (cf. Hashimoto 1968; Yuzawa 1970a, 1970b). It should be noted that the second and the third stages co-exist in the present-day Japanese as in the sense of 'layering' (Hopper 1991).

Figure 1.

<u>Stage 1</u>	<u>Stage 2</u>	<u>Stage 3</u>
	(around 17C)	(Present-day Japanese)
<i>tara</i> 'irrealis' + <i>ba</i> (conditional/temporal) >	<i>tara</i> (conditional/temporal) >	<i>tara</i> (discourse particle)

Stage 1 examples include:

- (7) Oki tsu mo no hana saki-TARA-ba, ware ni tsuge koso⁴
 duckweed's flower bloom-COND me to tell KP
 'If the duckweed's flower has bloomed in the ocean, please let me know.'
 (Manyooshuu: 8C)
- (8) Moshi more kikoe-TARA-ba, tennka no daiji ni oyobi-maraseu-zuru
 if leak hear-COND, country GEN catastrophe to reach-polite-inference
 'If (this news) leaks out, it may cause the country's catastrophe.'
 (Heike Monogatari: 13C)
- (9) Kudarimashi-TARA-ba, sadamete obitashii hikidemono nado serare-maraseu-zu
 go-polite-COND, surely abundant gifts etc. give-polite-inference
 'If I go to (him), he will surely give me a lot of gifts.' (Heike Monogatari: 13C)

The following are stage 2 examples. Sentences (13) and (14) were taken from Yuzawa (1970b: 365):

- (10) Kano otoko ga moosu ha, 'shikiri ga mawit-TARA, koshi wa warera demo dakimasu
 that man SUB say TOP labor SUB come-COND, back TOPIC we even support
 ga...'

but (Saikaku Shokoku Banashi: 17C)
 'This man said, "if (her labor) starts, we could support her back, but..."'

- (11) Moshi mata shin-DARA, sono ato wa. Ore ga nengoro shite yaru.
 if EMPH die-DOND, afterwardsTOP I SUB take care of (you)
 'If he dies, afterwards I will take care of you.' (Chikamatsu Jooruri Shuu: 17C)
- (12) Soko wo hanashite yoosu wo kii-TARA yokaro.
 that OBJ speak circumstance OBJ ask-CONDITIONAL good
 'It will be good if you tell them that, and ask about the circumstance.'
 (Kooshoku Denju: 17C)
- (13) Hookoonin shuu sorahu-TARA, hitori zutsu niwa he mawashi-ya.
 servants gather-when one by one yard to send-IMPERATIVE
 'When the servants gather, send them to the yard one by one.' (Satsuma Uta 8: 17C)

At Stage 3, *tara* no longer has an apodosis. However, the apodosis can be filled in by the interlocutor, on the extension of the conditional meanings. For instance, in Example (14), Sayaka fills in the apodosis left unsaid by Kinuko. Likewise, the apodosis for Sentence (15) can readily be interpreted as *doo?* 'how about ~ing?' It is also natural for the interlocutor to interpret the apodosis for (16) as the speaker's covenant. In these cases, both the speaker and the interlocutor are cooperating to build a coherent discourse. It is in this sense that the functions of *tara* are considered discourse-interactional.

- (14) Kinuko: Moshi, sonna koto Tanba kun no okaasan ga shit-TARA?
 if that kind of things Tanba 's mother SUB know
 'What if Tanba's mother finds out?'
 Sayaka: "Uchi no ko wo nante tokoro he tsureteku no!" tte,
 my son OBJ what kind of place to take QUOTE
 kaminari ga ochisoo de.
 thunder SUB boom-look like and
 ' "Where in the world are you taking my son to?" her mother might say
 stormingly mad...' (Pale Purple Weekend)
- (15) Kyoo wa moo yame-TARA? Okaasan ga nekon-DARA, watashi mo komaru.
 today TOP already quit-SUGGESTION mother SUB get sick-COND, I also in trouble
 'Why don't you quit? If you get sick, I will be in trouble, also.'
 (Pale Purple Weekend)
- (16) Yaru tomo. Kimi sae, ite kure-TARA
 do EMPH you only stay for me-NEGOTIATION
 'I will do it! If only you stay with me.'
 (Pale Purple Weekend)

In addition to the above primary development, there is also a secondary development in which a verb of saying is incorporated in the *tara* phrase as below:

Figure 2.

<u>Stage 1</u>	<u>Stage 2</u>	<u>Stage 3</u>
<i>to/te</i> 'quotative'+ <i>it</i> 'say'+ <i>tara+ba</i>	<i>> to/te ittara</i> (conditional)	<i>> (t)tara</i> (discourse particle)

At this point, it is difficult to pinpoint when stage 2 took place. Stage 3 is probably a fairly recent development, and four discourse interactional functions, namely, topic, attention getter, emphasis, and coercive request, evolved at this stage⁵. Some of these discourse interactional functions have been recognized in literature. However, to our knowledge, their developmental aspects, and their implications on the theory of grammaticalization have not yet been investigated vigorously. The following illustrates these four functions with examples:

Topic

- (17) Mama-TTARA, papa ga shinde yorokonde-ru.
 Mom-TOPIC Dad SUB die be happy
 'Mom is happy over Dad's death.' (*Okurete kita kyaku*)
- (18) Sore na noni, mama-TTARA, nikkori warattari shite iru.
 that in spite of Mom-TOPIC happily smile
 'In spite of that, Mom is smiling happily.' (*Okurete kita kyaku*)
- (19) Kyooko-TTARA, sonna koto mo shabetta no ka!
 Kyoko -TOP that kind of thing even exposed Exclaim
 'How could Kyoko tell them that kind of thing!' (Pale Purple Weekend)
- (20) Shiroyagi-san kara otegami tsuita. Kuroyagi-san-TARA, yomazu ni tabeta.
 White Goat Mr. from letter arrived Black Goat Mr.-TOPIC without reading ate
 'Mr. White Goat's letter arrived. Mr. Black Goat ate it without reading it.'
 (nursery song)

The development of this function conforms to Matisoff's (1991) statement that 'the development of topicalizers or conditionals from verbs meaning 'say' is documentable in many other languages of East and Southeast Asia' (Matisoff 1991:400)⁶. Compared with the regular topic marker *wa*, *(t)tara* gives a slightly negative connotation.

AttentionGetter

- (21) Hayaku hayaku. Okaasan-TTARA.
 hurry hurry Mother-TTARA
 'Hurry up, Mother!' (Daijirin)
- (22) Anata-TTARA. Henji gurai shite yo
 honey-TTARA. answer at least do-IMP SP
 'Honey! Answer me at least.' (Daijirin)

In the above examples, *tara* is added to the terms of address. This addition implies the speaker's frustration over his previous failures to get the interlocutor's attention.

Emphasis

- (23) Iya da-TTARA.
 no-TTARA
 'No! (Didn't I say so?)' (Daijirin)
- (24) Watashi ga suru-TTARA.
 I SUB do-TTARA
 'I'll do it! (Didn't I say so?)' (Daijirin)

The sentence-final *tara* emphatically restates the speaker's intention in an attempt to make the interlocutor understand.

CoerciveRequest

- (25) Osuna-TTARA! Ei, ushiro e sagare!
 push NEG-TTARA N. back to move
 'Don't push (me)! Move back!' (Iya iya-en)
- (26) Hayaku okinasai-TTARA.
 quick get up-TTARA
 'Get up quickly!' (Daijirin)

The implication here is that the speaker is irritated by the interlocutor's failure to comply with his request the first time.

What is common in these four functions is that they are emphatically and explicitly expressing the speaker's affective stance. In this sense, *tara* is considered to have subjective/ emotive functions.

3. Development of *tara* from the perspective of grammaticalization

3.1. Subjectification

The developmental paths followed by *tara* seem to indicate two functional changes. First, as seen in Examples (14)-(16), *tara* developed discourse interactional functions by getting the interlocutor involved. We have argued that these discourse interactional functions evolved from the conditional meanings. The second change is seen in Examples (17)-(26), in which *tara* came to express the speaker's emotive stance. In this section, we would argue that such functions stemmed from the original temporal meaning of the perfect.

As defined in Comrie (1976: 52), the perfect 'expresses a relation between two time points, on the one hand the time of the state resulting from a prior situation, and on the other the time of that prior situation.' Thus, it straddles on two temporal points: past and present. We argue that the pragmatic extension of the perfect aspect marker *tara* precisely reflects this temporal duality.

When the past is highlighted, then the depicted situation (i.e., result) would be seen as the completed act. In this vein, the studies of Strauss (1994) and Yoshida (1994) on the Japanese completive aspect marker *shimau* is instructive. Strauss proposes a grammaticization model for the development of the main verb *shimau* 'put away/finish' into an affective stance marker as shown in her example below:

- (27) okashi o tabete shimaimashita
 cake OBJ eat-TE shimau-pst
 'He ate up the cake (and I am relieved, happy, upset, etc.)'

Strauss (1994: 259) claims that the semantic notion of completion and totality enables 'the morpheme *te shimau* to serve as a grammatical vehicle for expressing both objective perspectives as well as an entire range of subjective expressions from regret to pride, from guilt to happiness.

In a similar vein, the Turkish perfect marker *miş* also developed emotive/subjective meanings as discussed in Slobin and Aksu (1986). For instance, the perfect aspect marker *miş* expresses scorn, or doubt in (28), while in (29), it expresses a compliment.

- (28) Herg un kos-uyor-muş
 every day run Pres. mis
 'He reportedly jogs every day (doubting scorn).'

- (29) Kız- iniz çok iyi piyano çal-ıyor-muş
 daughter 2PL.POSS. very good piano play PRES. mis
 'Your daughter plays [-miş] the piano very well!'

Slobin and Aksu argue that what underlies these pragmatic extensions is a lack of the speaker's premonitory awareness of a described event.

Like *shimau*, and *mis*, the emotive/subjective meanings of Japanese *tara* can also be analyzed on the pragmatic extension of the completeness. A slight difference is that in the case of *tara*, the speaker's reaction is directed toward the 'expected' completion, rather than already completed actions. Thus, when it is found uncompleted, it is unlikely for the uncompleted action to evoke pleasant surprise, which would result in positive reactions. Rather, the natural reaction would be the feelings of irritation, or frustration over the uncompleted acts. For instance, 'Aren't you listening?' in the attention-getter as in Sentences (21) and (22), 'Didn't I say so?' in emphatic statements as in Sentences (23) and (24), and 'Didn't I tell you to finish it *yesterday*?' in the coercive request as in Sentences (25) and (26). It is normal that something 'contrary to the speaker's expectation' often triggers negative feelings in the speaker. We believe that the negative feelings which the topic-setting *tara* exerts can also be seen as related.

When the expected completion is projected in the future, however, such negativity no longer prevails. This is because there is still some chance to reverse the course of action in the future. Thus, the *tara* of suggestion may express neutral advice as in Example (15), or it may imply frustration as in (30):

(15) Kyoo wa moo yame-TARA? Okaasan ga nekon-DARA, watashi mo komaru.
 today TOP alreadyquit-SUGGESTION mother SUB get sick-COND I also in trouble
 'Why don't you quit? If you get sick, I will be in trouble, also.' (Pale Purple Weekend)

(30) Kyoo wa moo yame-TARA? Soo iwa-nakatta kke?
 today TOP alreadyquit-SUGGESTION so said-not SP
 'Why don't you quit? Didn't I say so?'

How does the presentness of the perfect aspect contribute to the development of the emotive/subjective meanings of *tara*? Li, Thompson and Thompson (1982) assert that the discourse function of the perfect aspect is to relate some state of affairs to the 'current speech time'. We believe that the relevance to the current speech situation enabled *tara* to bring the proposition into the speech context, thereby strengthening the discourse interactional character of *tara*. This is especially evident if we compare *tara* with *nara*. As shown in Figure 3, up to stage 2, the copula *nara* follows the same developmental path as *tara* (cf. Figure 1). However, *nara* has not yet developed into a discourse interactional particle. We would argue that this is due to the fact that *nara* lacks a mechanism to connect to the current speech context.

Figure 3

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
<i>nara</i> 'irrealis of copula' + <i>ba</i>	> <i>nara</i> (conditional)	

To recapitulate, we have demonstrated that the developmental paths followed by *tara* led in the direction of increasing discourse interactionality and subjectivity. Furthermore, we argued that the emotive/subjective functions of *tara* are rooted in the aspectual meaning of perfect. These diachronic changes in *tara*'s functions corroborate Traugott's claim of the unidirectionality of change, namely, what she calls 'subjectification in grammaticalization'. Traugott (1995) states:

'Subjectification in grammaticalization' is, broadly speaking, the development of a grammatically identifiable expression of speaker belief or speaker attitude to what is said. It is a gradient phenomenon, whereby forms and constructions that at first express primarily concrete, lexical, and objective meanings come through repeated use in local syntactic contexts to serve increasingly abstract, pragmatic, interpersonal, and speaker-based functions.

3.2. Clause combining

Another unidirectionality in grammaticalization has been discussed from the viewpoint of clause combining. It is generally construed that when two clauses are combined, the level of their integration would change in the direction of increasing bondedness. Givon (1979) proposes the following path of grammaticalization:

discourse > syntax > morphology > morphophonemics > zero

Indeed, the developmental paths illustrated by Figures 1 & 2 seem to support Givon's formalization. This is because in each case, multiple morphemes fused together and eventually simplified to become one clitic. However, if the functions of *tara* are considered in relation to the entire sentence, it becomes clear that Givon's formalization can only partially be validated. At stage 3, *tara* acquired freeness to position itself both sentence medially and finally. In addition, its subjective/emotive meanings are often triggered by the preceding discourse. Considering these two points, the reverse to Givon's proposed path seems more accurate.

This is reminiscent of the grammaticization of the main clause *I think* as in (31) into an epistemic parenthetical *I think* without *that* as in (32) as discussed in Thompson and Mulac's (1991):

(31) I think *that* we're definitely moving towards being technological. (10.16)
 (Thompson and Mulac 1991:314)

(32) It's just your point of view you know what you like to do in your spare time *I think*.
 (Thompson and Mulac 1991:314)

According to Thompson and Mulac (1991:326), the epistemic parentheticals occur freely in various positions in the clauses like an epistemic adverb, *maybe*, and 'provide testimony' to the clause it is associated with. The relative freeness of position acquired by the epistemic parenthetical, *I think* seems to be at least partially at odds with Givón's proposal.

4. Conclusion

This paper has first delineated the diachronic change of the Japanese connective *tara* which started as a temporal/conditional connective and developed into a discourse interactional particle. The paper asserted that seemingly diverse functions of *tara* as the discourse particle actually stemmed from the original conditional meaning, or aspectual characteristics of perfect. Following the discussion, this paper also examined how this change can be viewed in the theories of grammaticalization. It was demonstrated that at the functional level, the change is consistent with Traugott's claim of the unidirectionality of the grammaticalization. However, it was argued that Givón's unidirectionality theory in terms of a cline of clause combining does not reflect the entire picture.

Although more extensive data analyses of the 16th-17th century documents are desired, nonetheless it is hoped that this paper makes a useful contribution to the growing field of grammaticalization.

Notes

¹ Very often the imperative form is either omitted, or placed in parentheses as below because its occurrence in the Heian texts is without controversy.

² Of these three, the conjunctive *tariis* still preserved in the present-day Japanese, however, the finite *tari* was eventually supplanted by the adnominal *taru*, which also was phonologically simplified to *ta* in the present-day Japanese.

³ A generally held theory states that the realis *tare + ba* eventually acquired a hypothetical meaning at the same time it was phonologically simplified as below (see Hashimoto 1968; Yuzawa 1970b; and Yoshida 1971):

tare + ba > *tarya* > *tara*

This paper adopts Sakakura's (1993) theory and regards the present-day *tarato* to be the development from the Old Japanese *tara ba*

⁴ *Tara + ba* should be glossed as PERF-COND as in example (1). However, for the sake of simplicity, it is only glossed as COND.

⁵ Another possible development from the temporal/conditional *tara* is the suffix *-tarashii* as in *nagattarashii* 'unpleasantly long', *iyamittarashii* 'disgustingly cynical', etc. One

extensive study which focuses on this topic is Shimada (1995), though she takes a different account from our speculation.

⁶ Jacobsen (1992) argues against Haiman's (1978) claim that conditionals are topics. The authors also agree with Jacobsen. However, some of his very examples of *ba* and *tara* which are paraphrasable as a topic contain the verb *iu*, 'saying'. This also supports Matisoff's generalization.

References

- Akatsuka, Noriko. 1985. Conditionals and epistemic scales. *Language* 61: 625-39.
- Aksu-Koc, Ayhan A. And Dan I. Slobin. 1986. A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish. *Evidentiality: The Linguistic coding of epistemology*, eds. by Chafe, Wallace and Johnna Nichols. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fukuzawa, Masaki. 1997. *Tari, ri to dooshi no asupekuchuaritii*. *Kokugogaku*, 191: 28-41. Tokyo: Musashino shoin.
- Givon, T. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar* New York: Academic Press.
- Hashimoto, Shinkichi. 1968. *Joshi, Jodooshi no Kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Haiman, John. 1978. Conditionals are topics. *language* 54: 564-589.
- Hopper, Paul and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. *Approaches to Grammaticalization Volume II*, eds. by Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Heine Bernd. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company.
- Jacobsen, Wesley. 1992. Are conditionals topics? *The Joy of Grammar*, eds. by Brentari, Diane, Gary N. Larson and Lynn A. MacLeod, pp. 131-160. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language* Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Li, Charles N., Sandra A. Thompson and R. McMillan Thompson. 1982. *The discourse motivation for the perfect aspect. Tense-Aspect: between Semantics and Pragmatics*, ed. by Paul Hopper, pp. 19-44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu. *Approaches to Grammaticalization Volume II*, eds. by Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Bernd Heine, pp. 383-453. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company.
- Mayes, Patricia. 1996. The complementary functions of *tara* and *to*: Evidence from procedural/instructional discourse. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 5*, eds. by Akatsuka, Noriko, Iwasaki, Shoichi and Strauss, Susan, pp. 101-113. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- McGloin, Naomi Hanaoka. 1976-77. The speaker's attitude and the conditionals *to*, *tara* and *ba*. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 5: 181-191.
- Mori, Shoichi. 1970. *Tari to ri ni tsuite. Gekkan Bunpo: Tokusyu tsu, nu, tari, ri no tetteiteki kenkyu*, 3: 33-40. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Nomura, Tuyoshi. 1994. *Jyodai go no ri • tari ni tsuite. Kokugo Kokubun*, 63-1.
- Sakakura, Atsuyoshi. 1993. *Nihongo Hyoogen no Nagare* Iwanami Seminaa Bukkusu 45. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Shimada, Yasuko. 1995. *Setsubiji tarashitino seiritsu. Kokugogaku* 180: 33-46. Tokyo: Musashino Shoin.
- Strauss, Susan. 1994. A cross-linguistic analysis of Japanese, Korean and Spanish: -te shimau, -a/e pelita, and the 'Romance reflexive' se. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4, ed. by Noriko Akatsuka, pp. 183-199. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Thompson, Sandra A. And Anthony Mulac. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. *Approaches to Grammaticalization Volume II*, eds. by Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Heine Bernd, pp. 313-329. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: an example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31-55.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. Subjectification in grammaticalization. *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*, eds. by Stein, Dieter and Susan Wright, pp. 31-54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yoshida, Eri. 1994. Speaker's subjectivity and the use of shimau in Japanese spoken narrative. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 4*, ed. by Noriko Akatsuka, pp. 257-273. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Yoshida, Kanehiko. 1971. *Gendaigo Jodooshi no Shiteki Kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Yuzawa, Kokichiro. 1970a. *Muromachi Jidai Gengo no Kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Kazama Shoin.
- Yuzawa, Kokichiro. 1970b. *Tokugawa Jidai Gengo no Kenkyuu*. Tokyo: Kazama Shoin.