

Insubordination types in Japanese —What facilitates them?—

KATO, Shigehiro
Hokkaido University

In spoken Japanese, insubordination is rather unmarked, and various forms and usages have been developed. In this paper, we discuss the relation between the syntactic properties of the language and the speakers' pragmatic preferences for insubordination. We observe that Japanese, as a right-headed language, allows speakers to change sentence structures flexibly. We propose a new type of construction, "additional insubordination," in addition to the elliptic type of insubordination defined in Evans(2007).

Keywords: Japanese, declausalization, additional insubordination, right-headed language

1. Insubordination in Japanese
2. Insubordination and declausalization
3. Insubordination of adverbial clauses
4. Insubordination of nominal or adjective clauses
5. Related problems and summary

This paper describes insubordination in Japanese, and classifies it into two subtypes. In section 1, we overview insubordination phenomena in Japanese. Insubordination looks similar to "declausalization," which I proposed in Kato(2007, 2014), and the differences between them are discussed in section 2. Section 3 deals with insubordinated adverbial clauses, and section 4 analyzes insubordinated relative or adnominal clauses. We refer to the problems related to Japanese insubordination and summarize our analyses and proposals in section 5.

1. Insubordination in Japanese

In Japanese, which has been regarded as a strictly right-headed language, subordinate clauses precede the main clause, and the modified phrase or clause follows its modifiers. This syntactic property means that a Japanese sentence properly ends only if the main clause is completed by putting the finite main verb at the rightmost position of the

sentence. The word order is generally SOV and OSV is also allowed, but Japanese is a rigid verb-final language in which sentences are never completed without a finite predicate at the right end.

In the traditional framework of Japanese linguistics, sentences were thought to be “full and perfect” only when a predicate (consisting of a verb, but sometimes of an adjective) appears in the sentence end because it is only predicates that can integrate propositional content in one sentence, give the sentence predicative power and complete the sentence form. Yamada(1908) calls this function of predicates *tōjo*, or *Apperzeption*.

According to this formal definition of a sentence, sentences with a connecting particle at the end have been long dealt with as *ii-sashi-bun*, suspended incomplete sentences. However, recent studies, based on new research developments in Japanese pragmatics, have begun to re-classify these suspended sentences, and some of them are considered almost full sentences in terms of sentence function.

1.1 Three types of Japanese suspended sentence

Shirakawa(2009) proposes two functional categories for *ii-sashi-bun*, (a) one that leaves some of the message unsaid and (b) one that conveys the whole message, even without the main clause. These categories are defined in (1).

(1) Shirakawa.2009:7 (translated by the author)

a. A sentence that is suspended in the middle, lacks a main clause, and results in leaving out part of the message.

b. A sentence consisting of just one subordinate clause or more and having no main clause, although no part of the message is left undelivered.

Then, Shirakawa(2009) divides type (b) into two subtypes: *ii-tsukushi* (saying all that the speaker intends to convey) and *kankei-dzuke* (connecting assumptions in the formal context* with the proposition expressed in the subordinate clause). As a result, he suggests three categories for Japanese insubordination (p.11).

* Formal context, or linguistic context, means the contextual information formed from all of the accumulated utterances. See Kato(2011) and Huan(2007).

Table1. Three types of insubordination in Japanese Proposed by Shirakawa(2009)

		Ellipsis of the main clause	Full conveyance of the utterance content	Obvious presence of the formal context relevant to interpretation
(a)	<i>ii-nokoshi</i> (unfinished sentence leaving some part of the content unknown)	+	-	-
(b) -1	<i>ii-tsukushi</i> (all the content needed is expressed in the subordinate clause only)	+	+	-
(b) -2	<i>kankei-dzuke</i> (incomplete sentence consisting of subordinate clause(s), which can be fully interpreted by considering the formal context)	+	+	+

Example (2) is classified as (b1) *ii-tsukushi* and example (3) as (b2) *kankei-dzuke* according to the definitions in the Table 1.

(2) *Ja, ittekuru -kara.*
DM go out P.R
 ‘So, I’ll go off.’

(3) A: *Kore, oishii.* B: *Onaka-ga suiteru -kara.*
this good stomach-NOM empty P.R
 ‘This tastes good!’ ‘(lit.) Because we are hungry.’

B’s utterance in (3) lacks a main clause, but we can understand it as “this tastes good for us because we are hungry” by utilizing the preceding context, *i.e.* A’s utterance. Shirakawa (2009) does not discuss the *ii-nokoshi* type further because it is suspended before the full sentence is produced. Likewise, we omit type (a) from our discussion of insubordination.

1.2. Two syntactic categories of subordinate clause

The classification described in Section 1.1 was proposed in terms of sentence interpretation or pragmatic function. Subordinate clauses can be sorted morphosyntactically into three subtypes: (c) adverbial clause, (d) adjective or relative clause, and (e) nominal clause. However, the nominal clause should be seen as a head

NP accompanied by a relative clause. Therefore, all we must consider in this paper is adverbial and adjective clauses.

As far as diachronic changes are concerned, Japanese lost the morphological distinction between adnominal and sentence-final forms in verbs and adjectives from the 13th to 16th century. Around the 10th century, the adnominal form (4a) differed from the sentence-end form (5a). However, in modern Japanese, forms (4b) and (5b) are the same because the latter merged into the former.

- (4) a. *sutsuru* *hito* [Old Japanese]
 throw away **person**
 b. *suteru* *hito* [Modern Japanese]
 throw away **person**
 ‘a person who deserts (something or someone)’

- (5) a. *ware-wo* *sutsu* [Old Japanese]
 1.SG -ACC **throw away**
 b. *watashi-wo* *suteru* [Modern Japanese]
 1.SG -ACC **throw away**
 ‘(that person) deserts me’

In present-day Japanese, verbs and adjectives remain unchanged between uses as a predicate of the main clause or as an adnominal modifier. This morphological merger makes it difficult to distinguish between adjective subordinate and main clauses.

- (6) a. *Taro-wa* *itsu* *kaeru?*
 Taro-TOP **when** **get back**
 b. *Taro-wa* *itsu* *kaeru-no?*
 Taro-TOP **when** **get back-P.NL**
 ‘When will Taro come home?’

(6a) is a simplex sentence. In (6b), the underlined part is originally a subordinate clause because ‘*no*’ is a noun particle or nominalizer, which is syntactically equivalent to a single NP. Apart from verbs or adjectives, the adnominal form of the copula ‘*da*’ is ‘*na*’, which is different from the predicate form. See (7a) and (7b) below.

- (7) a. *Taro-wa* *gakusei* *da.*
 Taro-TOP **student** **COP**

- b. Taro-wa gakusei na-no!
Taro-TOP **student** **COP-P.NL**
 ‘Taro is a student!’

When followed by the nominalizer ‘*no*’, the copula must be in adnominal form, and the syntagma ‘*da-no*’ is not allowed morphosyntactically.* Morphologically the underlined clauses in (6b) and (7b) are regarded as adjective clause, but recently some researchers have been dealing with ‘*no*’ as a sentence-final particle (SFP) or *shu-joshi*. If ‘*no*’ is just a SFP, the underlined parts in (6b) and (7b) are not subordinate clause.

As we have observed so far, some adjective clauses are difficult to distinguish from main clauses, because the nominalizer particle has lost its original function. In contrast, the adverbial clause is clearly distinguishable from the main clause, both morphologically and functionally. Some types of adverbial clause and adverbial phrases, however, have much in common, and it is hard to draw a clear line between them. We will discuss this problem later.

2. Insubordination and declausalization

2.1 Declausalization in Japanese

Kato(2013) proposes a new concept of declausalization in Japanese, defined in (8):

- (8) Declausalization is the structural change from a complex to simplex sentence through clause reduction, where the main clause loses its original function and begins to work as an auxiliary verb or part of an auxiliary verb. As a result, the subordinate clause is practically promoted to a main clause. (original: Japanese)

See (9) as an example of declausalization.

- (9) Taro-wa daigaku-wo sotsugyo-shi-ta to iu.
Taro-TOP **university-ACC** **graduation-do-PAST** **COMP** **say**
 ‘I hear that Taro graduated from university.’

In (9), originally, the underlined part is the main clause and the rest is the subordinate clause. However, ‘*to iu*’ has come to be interpreted as a modal auxiliary verb for indirect evidentiality, like ‘*soo-da*’ or ‘*rashii*’. Actually, (9) has almost the same meaning as a simplex sentence such as “*Taro-wa daigaku-wo sotsugyo-shi-ta rashii*”, in

* This syntagma is possible in some dialects other than Tokyo’s, but it is not allowed in standard Japanese or the Tokyo dialect. The Tohoku dialect, for example uses the syntagma ‘*da-no*’ but it has lost the morphological distinction between adnominal and predicate forms of the copula, as they have merged into ‘*da*’.

which ‘*rashii*’ is an auxiliary verb for evidential modality and ‘*sotsugyo-shi*’ functions as the main verb. If ‘*iu*’ is used as a lexical verb meaning ‘say’, it is possible to modify it with manner adverbials, such as ‘*ōgoe-de* (loudly)’ or ‘*kurikaeshi*(repeatedly)’. It is impossible to modify with manner adverbials ‘*iu*’ as a part of grammaticalized auxiliary verb, because it lost the original lexical meaning.

As the former main clause becomes an auxiliary verb, declausalization includes grammaticalization. Consider example (10).

- (10) *Taro-wa Hokkaido-ni it-ta koto-ga aru.*
Taro-TOP Hokkaido-LOC go-PAST event-NOM exist
 ‘Taro has ever been to Hokkaido.’

Example (10) is originally a complex sentence consisting of the subordinate clause ‘*Taro-wa Hokkaido-ni it-ta*’ and main clause ‘*koto-ga aru*’, which literally means that there exists a fact that Taro goes to Hokkaido. However, ‘*koto-ga aru*’ begins to serve as an auxiliary verb for telling about a past event as one’s personal experience, and then the whole sentence in (10) is regarded as a simplex whose predicate is ‘*it-ta koto-ga aru*’. In this process, the former main clause, ‘*koto-ga aru*’ ceases to be a clause and instead becomes a part of compound auxiliary verb.

Declausalization is quite a different change from insubordination, but it is sometimes relevant to the process of insubordination. We discuss this topic in Section 2.2.

2.2 Which is first?

Evans (2007:377) defines insubordination as “the conventionalized independent use of a formally subordinate clause”, and proposes that it has four stages: subordination, ellipsis of the main clause, conventionalized ellipsis, and reanalysis as the main clause structure. Declausalization is chiefly concerned with ellipsis and reanalysis.

In Japanese, the auxiliary verb for obligation is formed through declausalization, and it is originally analyzed as a syntagma consisting of a conditional clause with negation and a main clause that expresses failure of realization.

- (11) *Taro-wa benkyo-shi-nakere-ba nara-nai.*
Taro-TOP study-do-NEG-P.CD go well -NEG
 ‘(lit.) It does not work out if Taro does not study. → Taro must study.’

In example (11), the underlined part ‘*nara-nai*’ is originally the main clause, and the *-ba* clause is a subordinate. After frequent and repeated uses, ‘*-nakere-ba nara-na*’ has come to be regarded as a functional unit meaning obligation. This is one sort of

grammaticalization, including declausalization of the original main clause '*nara-nai*' and clause reduction in the whole sentence. Most Japanese speakers judge (11) as a simplex sentence because '*nakere-ba nara-nai*' seems like the equivalent of English 'must'.

As in (12), this auxiliary verb for obligation is more frequently used as '*nakere-ba*', which drops the original main clause.

- (12) *Taro-wa benkyo-shi-nakere-ba*
Taro-TOP study-do-OBL(NEG-P.CD)
 '(lit.) If Taro does not study. → Taro must study.'

Example (12) can be interpreted in two ways; one is to read it with the original meaning (subordination reading), and the other is to read it as including an ellipsis of the former main clause (insubordination reading). What we must point out is that ellipsis comes after declausalization. It is only after declausalization and grammaticalization are applied that insubordination and ellipsis are allowed. If grammaticalized form is felt too long, this judgment can prompt it to be shortened. For example, '*nakere-ba-nara-nai*' consists of 8 morae and it is regarded as too long, so this form was reduced to a 4-mora auxiliary verb*, '*nakere-ba*'.

Next, we should discuss another point of the matter; the loss of tense. (12) conveys almost the same meaning as (11) but can be used only in conversation: It is unacceptable in written text. This is because (12) expresses what the speaker is considering at the point of utterance. Therefore, (12) cannot be in the past tense, whereas (11) can be in either present or past tense.

In Section 3, we will discuss the insubordination of the adverbial clauses in Japanese, followed by the insubordination of the adjective and nominal clauses in Section 4.

3. Insubordination of adverbial clauses

As we saw in Section 2, some insubordination types involve declausalization, when the main clause is elided, leaving the adverbial subordinate clause. Adverbial clauses always accompany a connective particle (*sestuzoku joshi*) in Japanese, which always keeps the grammatical head on the right end of the phrase or clause. Adverbial clauses that can be put into use as an independent sentence are classified morphologically into five subtypes: *-ba* clauses or conditional clauses, *-shi* clauses, converbial clauses, reason clauses, and adversative clauses. Now we will observe these subtypes of insubordinated adverbial clauses respectively.

* Generally speaking, in Japanese phonology, linguistic forms containing 5 morae or more are seen as too long.

3.1 Conditional clauses

Typical examples of insubordination that are easy to find in Japanese are *-ba* clauses or conditional clauses. Contemporary Japanese has four forms for conditional clauses, as shown in Table 2. *

Table 2. Four forms for conditional clause

		Conjugative form of verb	Examples (tabe-ru ‘eat’)	Insubordination
(I) -ba form	(a) V-ba	Subjunctive form	Tabe-re-ba	Allowed
	(b) V-tara / V-tara-ba	Te-form (the form followed by ‘te’)	Tabe-tara (-ba)	Allowed
	(c) V-nara / V-nara-ba	Sentence-end form	Tabe-ru-nara (-ba)	Not allowed
(II) -to form	V-to	Sentence-end form	Tabe-ru-to	Not allowed

Although these four forms carry almost the same meaning, there are slight but obvious differences between them.

- (13) *Taro-ga* { *kure-ba* / *ki-tara(-ba)* / *kuru-nara(-ba)* / *kuru-to* },
Taro-NOM { **come-P.CD(Ia)** / **come-P.CD(Ib)** / **come-P.CD(Ic)** / **come-P.CD(II)** }
minna *yorokobu* *-darou*
all the people **be pleased** **AUX.CJ**
‘If Taro comes, everybody will be pleased.’

- (14) *Boku-ga* *hon-wo* { **yon-deire-ba* / *yon-deitara(-ba)* /
PRON.1.sg-NOM **book-acc** { **read-ASP-P.CD(Ia)** / **read-ASP-P.CD(Ib)** /
**yon-deiru-nara(-ba)* / *yon-deiru-to* }, *Taro-ga* *ki-ta*.
read-ASP-P.CD(Ic) / **read-ASP-P.CD(II)** } **Taro-NOM** **come-PAST**
‘When I was reading book, Taro came around.’

In (Ib) and (Ic), the forms without ‘-ba’ are unmarked and widely used in colloquial style speech, but ‘-ba’ does not change their syntactic or semantic properties. The four forms are all grammatical in (13), but two of the four, (Ia) and (II), are ungrammatical in (14).

*In Table 2, “V-nara” is described not to be allowed for insubordination use. Although it is possible to use “V-nara” as an independent clause, it is restricted to ad hoc elliptic use. For example, we can say ‘Taro-ga kuru-nara (If Taro comes)’ after the other conversation participant says ‘Ashita-no pāfi kuru? (Are you coming to the party tomorrow?)’. ‘Taro-ga kuru-nara’ is a seemingly insubordinated clause, but it can be reconstructed into a full sentence ‘Taro-ga kuru-nara iku-yo (If Taro comes, I will also join the party.)’ This is a kind of ad hoc ellipsis, which is different from the original definition of insubordination given by Evans(2007), in that this expression is just pragmatically elliptic and is not “the conventionalized independent use of a formally subordinate clause.” Obviously this is not conventionalized yet in the present Japanese.

Typical insubordination of the conditional clause in Japanese occurs in expressions that indicate suggestion or recommendation.

- (15) *Kono-hon*, {*yome-ba* / *yon-dara* / ^{??}*yomu-nara* / ^{??}*yomu-to*},
this-book {**read-P.CD(Ia)** / **read-P.CD(Ib)** / **read-P.CD(Ic)** / **read-P.CD(II)**}
do-desu-ka?
how-POL-IRG
 ‘How about reading this book?’

When the main clause is an interrogative sentence, as in (15), *-nara* (Ic) and *-to* (II) are unacceptable. However, if the main clause is a declarative sentence, the other three conditional forms, except for *-nara* (Ic), are grammatical and natural, as seen in (16).

- (16) *Kono-hon*, {*yome-ba* / *yon-dara* / ^{??}*yomu-nara* / *yomu-to*},
this-book {**read-P.CD(Ia)** / **read-P.CD(Ib)** / **read-P.CD(Ic)** / **read-P.CD(II)**}
ii-desu-yo.
good-POL-SFP
 ‘It is good (recommendable) to read this book.’

Insubordination forming a sentence with a conditional subordinate clause is restricted to interrogative sentences: It is possible to omit the main clause from (15) but not from (16).

- (17) *Kono-hon*, {*yome-ba* / *yon-dara* / **yomu-nara* / **yomu-to*}?
this-book {**read-P.CD(Ia)** / **read-P.CD(Ib)** / **read-P.CD(Ic)** / **read-P.CD(II)**}
 ‘How about reading this book?’

For suggesting or recommending something, (17) must contain rising intonation and is used as a question. ‘*-Nara*’ and ‘*-to*’, which are unacceptable in (15), are completely ungrammatical under insubordination.

Another independent usage of the conditional subordinate clause is to express counterfactual desire.

- (18) *Taro-ga*, {*ire-ba* / *i-tara* / *iru-nara* / ^{??}*iru-to*} -*nā*.
Taro-NOM {**exist-P.CD(Ia)** / **exist-P.CD(Ib)** / **exist-P.CD(Ic)** / **exist-P.CD(II)**} -**SFP**
 ‘I wish Taro were with us.’

These counterfactual expressions are always affixed with ‘*na*’, which is used in monologue style. (18) results from insubordinating (19) and (19), which also is not a complete sentence, results from insubordinating (20).

- (19) *Taro-ga, {ire-ba / i-tara}, yokat-ta-noni.*
Taro-NOM {exist-P.CD(Ia)/exist-P.CD(Ib)}, good-PAST-P.AVS
 ‘If Taro were with us, it would be nice, but...’

- (20) *Taro-ga, {ire-ba / i-tara}, yokat-ta-noni,*
Taro-NOM {exist-P.CD(Ia)/exist-P.CD(Ib)}, good-PAST-P.AVS
jissaini-wa Taro-wa, i-nai.
actually-TOP Taro-TOP exist-NEG.
 ‘If Taro were with us, it would be nice, but in reality Taro is not with us.’

As we can observe the three examples above, (18) cannot be obtained without insubordination occurring twice. Strictly speaking, (19) is not a full complex sentence, meaning that the change from (19) to (18) is not insubordination under the rigid definition. However, it has much in common with insubordination in that both contain the process of ellipsis and independent use of a subordinate clause. (18) is the result from omitting the main clause twice from (20), which contains the doubled-embedded insubordinate clause. We will call this type of constructional change “double insubordination” hereafter.

3.2 -Shi and -tari clauses for parataxis

By suffixing ‘*-shi*’ at the right end of a clause, Japanese allows the sentence to continue infinitely. For example, “P-*shi*, Q-*shi*, R-*shi*, S-*shi*, T-*shi*, U-*shi*, V.” is grammatical, and it is interpreted as enumerating seven propositions, P...U and V. By adding a *-shi* clause, the speaker can lengthen the sentence as he or she likes, and one can stop enumeration and conclude the sentence by putting a full main sentence. In this way, ‘*-shi*’ functions within the sentence like the arithmetical operator “+”. This is why a sentence with *-shi* at the sentence end is seen as interrupted enumeration, much like a formula like “a+b+c+d+.” (21) is an example of a Japanese sentence with ‘*-shi*’.

- (21) *Taro-wa, atama-ga ii-shi, monoshiri-da-shi,*
Taro-TOP head-NOM good-P.PX well-informed-COP-P.PX
yasashii-shi, hansamu-da-shi, moteru-shi, doryokuka-da.
gentle-P.PX good-looking-P.PX. be popular-P.PX hardworker-COP
 ‘Taro is bright, and is well-informed, and is very gentle, and is good-looking, and is popular with girls, and is a hard-worker.’

In everyday conversation, insubordination such as seen in ‘*Taro-wa, atama-ga ii-shi*’ is frequently used. In fact, *-shi* clauses are more used in insubordination than in full complex sentences. One of the similar connecting particles is ‘*-tari*’, but there is a large difference between ‘*-shi*’ and ‘*-tari*’; clauses lose tense opposition before ‘*-tari*’, while ‘*-shi*’ clauses allow both past and present tense. See example (22), in which every clause has a past tense particle.

- (22) *Taro-wa, atama-ga yokka-ta-shi, monoshiri-dat-ta-shi,*
Taro-TOP head-NOM good-PAST-P.PX well-informed-COP-PAST-P.PX
yasashikat-ta-shi, hansamu-dat-ta-shi, mote-ta-shi,
gentle-PAST-p.px good-looking-COP-PAST-P.PX be popular-PAST-P.PX
doryokuka-dat-ta..
hardworker-COP-PAST

‘Taro was bright, and was well-informed, and was very gentle, and was good-looking, and was popular with girls, and was a hard-worker.’

Interestingly enough, different tenses can co-occur in ‘*-shi*’ clauses, as in (23). Even omitting ‘*-shi*’ from the latter clause does not affect the grammaticality of (23).

- (23) *Taro-wa, atama-ga yokka-ta-shi, ima-demo ii-shi...*
Taro-TOP head-NOM good-PAST-P.PX now-even good-P.PX
 ‘Taro was bright, and still is...’

On the other hand, tense cannot be marked in ‘*-tari*’ clauses. See (24a) and (24b).

- (24) a. *Taro-wa kawa-de sakana-wo tot-tari,*
Taro-TOP river-LOC fish-ACC catch-P.PX
mori-de mushi-wo tot-tari suru.
forest-LOC insect-ACC catch-P.PX do
 ‘Taro sometimes catches fish in the river and sometimes collects insects in the wood.’

- b. *Taro-wa kawa-de sakana-wo tot-tari,*
Taro-TOP river-LOC fish-ACC catch-P.PX
mori-de mushi-wo tot-tari shi-ta.
forest-LOC insect-ACC catch-P.PX do-PAST
 ‘Taro used to catch fish in the river and collect insects in the wood.’

Tense in ‘*-tari*’ clauses is determined by the tense of the main clause. This particle and ‘*-te*’, which is usually regarded as a converbial particle (see Section 3.3), belong to the same syntactic category in that both clause types are tenseless and depend on the tense interpretation of the main clause.

Insubordination through these parataxic particles is interpreted as the speaker attitude toward avoiding a strong assertion or leaving some assumptions unsaid.

3.3 Converbial clause or phrase?

Historically, ‘*-te*’ was originally the adverbial conjugation form of the auxiliary verb ‘*tsu*’, which meant perfection. When this auxiliary verb disappeared, ‘*te*’ lost its aspectual meaning. In modern Japanese, ‘*-te*’ is regarded as a converbial particle without a clear grammatical function, though it is used to make grammaticalized compound forms, such as ‘*te-iru*’, ‘*te-aru*’ and ‘*te-oku*’. This particle follows verbs or adjectives, but tense marking is not allowed in either position.

- (25) *Taro-ga, ki-te uta-wo utat-te, Hanako-wo nagusame-ta.*
Taro-NOM come-P.CV song-ACC sing-P.CV Hanako-ACC console-PAST
 ‘Taro came, sang songs and consoled Hanako.’

One cannot tell by the form of ‘*ki-te*’ whether it is past tense or not. In (25), the past tense marker ‘*ta*’ used in the main clause determines the tense in the preceding subordinate clauses. If the tense marker ‘*ta*’ at the sentence end is omitted, the whole sentence of (25) can be interpreted as referring to present or future events. If one hears only ‘*Taro-ga ki-te, uta-wo utat-te,*’ it is impossible to judge when the event happens or happened. Therefore, insubordination through ‘*te*’ is incomplete in Japanese in that tense in the former subordinate clause cannot be determined grammatically.*

In Japanese, verb + ‘*te*’ can be used for a request or order. This form is originally from ‘verb + ‘*te*’ + ‘*kudasai*’’, and since, after ellipsis of ‘*kudasai*’, it is conventionalized, it can be dealt with as typical insubordination.

3.4 Subordinate connectives to express reason

Shirakawa(2009) points out the independent use of subordinate clauses with *-kara* and *-node*, which are typical connective particles expressing reason, cause, or purpose, as in example (26).

* In many cases, it is possible to determine the tense pragmatically, *i.e.* by making use of contextual information.

- (26) *Kono-hon-wa, omoshiroi-kara, ureru-darou.*
this-book-TOP interesting-C.R sell well-AUX.CJ
 ‘Because this book is very interesting, it will sell well.’

This connective particle can be used even if the cause-and-effect relation is apparently illogical. (Shirakawa 2009) See example (27).

- (27) *Suiyōbi-ni* *kaesu-kara, ichi-man yen kashi-te.*
Wednesday-TMP return-C.R one-ten thousand yen lend-P.CV
 ‘(lit.) Lend me ten thousand yen, because I will pay it back to you on Wednesday.’

Strictly speaking, the underlined part is not cause or reason for the request in (27). The speaker’s promise that the money will be repaid on the designated day is only one of the factors facilitating the hearer to accept the speaker’s request. Example (28) is semantically inappropriate if ‘*to yakusoku-shita*’ is missing.

- (28) *Taro-ga suiyōbi-ni* *kaesu- (to yakusoku-shita) kara,*
Taro-NOM Wednesday-TMP return (COMP promise-do) C.R
Hanako-wa ichi-man yen kashi-ta.
Hanako-TOP one-ten thousand yen lend-PAST
 ‘Hanako lent ten thousand yen to Taro, because {he would pay it back / he promised to pay it back} to her on Wednesday.’

Because of Taro’s promise Hanako trusts him all the more, and this trust makes it easier for Hanako to decide to lend him the requested money. Thus, the cause and effect in (28) is logical to some degree. However, insufficiency of information caused by ellipsis weakens the logical relation between the given propositions.

3.5 Adversative connectives as positive politeness

Some Japanese adversative particles are now used as independent conjunctions or connective adverbs, which Norde(2009) identifies as a typical example of degrammaticalization.

- (29) *Taro-wa yūshū-na gengogakusha-da-{ga / kedo},*
Taro-TOP excellent-COP.ADN linguist-COP-ADVS
eigo-ga nigate-da.
English-NOM weak point-COP
 ‘Taro is an excellent linguist, but he is poor at English.’

- (30) *Taro-wa yūshū-na gengogakusha-da.*
Taro-TOP excellent-COP.ADN linguist-COP
 {*Ga / Kedo / Keredomo*}, *eigo-ga nigate-da.*
CONJUNCTION(ADVS) English-NOM weak point-COP
 ‘Taro is an excellent linguist. But he is poor at English.’

In (29), *ga* and *kedo** are used as connective particles for adversativeness or contrast, constituting bound morphemes called ‘*setsuzoku joshi*’. However, they work as independent adverbs in (30). They have been regarded as conjunctions in the traditional Japanese grammar, but these are not concerned with syntactic structure. Therefore, we treat them here as connective adverbs, not as syntactic conjunctions. Connective particles are necessary for marking the subordinate clause, so these particles, not connective adverbs, are the equivalent to conjunctions in the Standard Average European languages.

Regardless of whether or not a clause has *ga/kedo* at the end, it carries the same information. However, the insubordinated *ga/kedo* clause has another pragmatic function of soliciting a response from the hearer. These sometimes show that the speaker assume a friendly and respectful attitude toward the hearer. Compare (31a) and (31b) below.

- (31) [A tourist talks to a passerby in the street, who is showing a map.]
 a. *Kono-hoteru-wo sagashi-teiru-n-desu.*
this-hotel-ACC search-ASP-P.NL-POL
 b. *Kono-hoteru-wo sagashi-teiru-n-desu-ga.*
this-hotel-ACC search-ASP-P.NL-POL-P.AVS
 ‘I am looking for this hotel’

(31a) is just a declarative sentence conveying a literal meaning, but (31b) has an illocutionary force; the utterance can be an indirect speech act indicating “Could you help me?” or “What should I do?” or “I would be glad if you could show me the way to it.”

Yet *-ga / -kedo* insubordination does not always imply respectfulness.

(32) [Answering a friend’s question “Are you going to attend the linguistics conference next week?”]

- a. *De-masu.*

* ‘*Kedo*’ is the abbreviated form of ‘*keredomo*’. ‘*Keredo*’ and ‘*kedomo*’ are generally regarded as its allomorphs. Functionally these four forms make no difference but they have a different value in terms of style.

attend-POLb. *De-masu-kedo.***attend-POL-P.AVS**

Although (32a) does not give any more information than its literal meaning, (32b) implicates the speaker's demands for the hearer's next response or utterance, particularly more information about the hearer herself. For example, we could add to (32b) such as "And how about you?" or "But is that important to you?" or "Would you go with me?"

As Ohori(1995) points out, this type of insubordination usually contains some effects of (positive) politeness, but at times, it can have nuances of criticism.

We will discuss the reporting particle, '-tte' and '-to', in Section 5. These have been grammaticalized from quotative particles into reporting particles or SFPs that indicate indirect evidentiality.

4. Insubordination of nominal or adjective clauses

In terms of its grammatical history, Japanese has lost most of its original auxiliary verbs concerning modality but other auxiliaries for voice, tense, aspect and negation remained (Kato 2007). To compensate for the loss of modal aux, Japanese has made use of grammatical nouns and developed new grammatical forms. Most of the new modal auxiliaries are compound words consisting of a grammatical noun and existential verb. Grammatical nouns are called *keishiki-meishi* in the Japanese linguistics, because they formally belong to the noun category but they do not carry lexical meanings. Grammatical nouns are not independent words but bound morphemes, which are lexically empty but work as a head noun. Some serve as ordinary independent nouns, like '*mono* (thing)' and '*koto* (event)', but they are always dependent when used as grammatical nouns. Most grammatical nouns, however, are completely grammaticalized and always work as bound forms.

See examples (33) and (34) below.

- (33) *Taro-wa 11 gatsu sue-madeni ronbun-wo teisyutsu-suru*
Taro-TOP 11 month end-before paper-ACC submission-do
hazu-da
GN-COP

'It is most likely that Taro will submit a paper before the end of November.'

- (34) *Kodomo-wa oya-no iu koto-wo kiku mono-da.*
child-TOP parent-NOM say thing-ACC obey GN-COP
 ‘Children should follow what their parents say.’

‘*Hazu*’ formerly meant ‘arrow nock’ or ‘bow nock’, but it is now rarely used in this sense. Instead, it is now a grammatical noun meaning reasonability, logical naturalness or appropriateness. Furthermore, ‘*hazu*’ is now a bound morpheme and is used as an auxiliary verb in the compound form followed by the copula ‘*da*’.

‘*Mono*’ is now used either as an ordinary noun meaning ‘thing’ or ‘stuff’ or as a grammatical noun. ‘*Mono-da*’ means what one should do according to common sense or moral sensibility. Teachers use it frequently when they give guidance or instruction to children.

Grammatical nouns are dependent, bound morphemes in principle, but they sometimes drop the copula following them. These sentences lacking the sentence-end copula appear to be nominal subordinate clauses, or more correctly, adjective subordinate clauses accompanying the head noun in the sentence end.

4.1 Elliptical or additional?

Compound auxiliary verbs made up of a grammatical noun and a copula are sometimes used without the copula, particularly in colloquial style. Some of them carry the same meaning and function even if they lack a copula. Copulaless forms, which have only a grammatical noun at the end of sentence, naturally bear different stylistic values. In Japanese, which is a rigid verb-final language, making a sentence noun-final is obviously against the grammatical rules. It is widely known that Russian drops the copula in the present tense, and in the same way, Japanese uses copulaless copula sentences in the present or unmarked tense.

- (35) a. *Taro-wa daigakusei-da.*
Taro-TOP university student-COP
 b. *Taro-wa daigakusei.*
Taro-TOP university student
 ‘Taro is a university student.’
- (36) a. *Taro-wa ni-ji-goro kuru-hazu--da.*
Taro-TOP two o'clock-around come-GN-COP
 b. *Taro-wa ni-ji-goro kuru-hazu.*
Taro-TOP two o'clock-around come-GN
 ‘Taro is sure to come around two o’clock.’

(35b) and (36b) are more informal than (35a) and (36a), but there is no difference in sentence meaning. This is also true of ‘*yō-da*’, ‘*wake-da*’, and ‘*mitai-da*’. Exceptionally, the copula drop changes sentence meaning and grammatical function only in the case of ‘*mono-da*’ and ‘*koto-da*’.

- (37) a. *Soto-ni de-nai-koto-da.*
outside-LOC go out-NEG-GN(event)-COP
 ‘You had better not go outside.’
- b. *Soto-ni de-nai-koto.*
outside-LOC go out-NEG-GN(event)
 ‘Don’t go outside.’
- (38) a. *Wakai toki-wa benkyo-suru-mono-da.*
young-time-TOP study-do-GN(thing)-COP
 ‘We should study when we are young.’
- b. *Wakai toki-wa benkyo-suru-mono.*
young-time-TOP study-do-GN(thing)
 ‘Study when young. It is a matter of common knowledge.’

The sentences ending with a copula, (37a) and (38a), are declarative sentences for advice or warning. The copulaless sentences, (37b) and (38b), have more illocutionary force and are equivalent to the imperative mood. (37a) is originally a complex sentence, whose main clause is ‘*koto-da*’, but ‘*koto-da*’ has been grammaticalized, lost morphosyntactic independence, and begun to be regarded as an auxiliary verb. In the same way, (38a) has changed from a complex to simplex sentence. This is what we introduced as declausalization in Section 2.1.

Evans(2007) suggests ellipsis of the main clause as the second stage of insubordination. If (37a) and (38a) change into (37b) and (38b), respectively, it is because of the ellipsis of the copulas, not ellipsis of/in the main clause. We cannot think of this as a kind of insubordination, at least, it obviously differs from the general patterns of insubordination known so far.

Clearly, (37b) and (38b) are, morphologically, nominal subordinate clauses whose heads are grammatical nouns ‘*koto*’ and ‘*mono*’, respectively. This type of nominal clause, or head NP with a relative clause, can be analyzed in two ways. One is that the nominal clause is produced through two phases: declausalization and ellipsis. The other is that it is produced only by adding a grammatical form, ‘*koto*’ or ‘*mono*’. We adopt the latter analysis in this paper because lacking a copula, which has no lexical meaning, causes the sentence to have a different function and meaning. It is irrational to think that

this phenomenon is merely the conventionalization of ellipsis. Therefore, we propose a new type of insubordination: additional insubordination, which makes a clause subordinate by adding a pseudo head NP but then begins to behave as a main clause. In this process, the additional NP functions like a bound morpheme. Evans'(2007) concept of insubordination includes the process of ellipsis; we call this "elliptic insubordination" if we must distinguish it from "additional insubordination."

4.2 Grammatical nouns changes into SFPs

There is another ground for believing that '*mono*' and '*koto*' are added and not produced by ellipsis. In (37) and (38), both '*mono*' and '*koto*' retain the properties of a noun, and the preceding clauses do not lose the properties of an adnominal clause. As pointed out in Section 2.2, present-day Japanese has lost the morphological distinction between the sentence-end and adnominal forms of verb and adjective. The exception is the copula suffixed to adjectival nouns.

- (39) a. *Taro-wa* *tsuneni* *reisei-da.*
Taro-TOP **always** **coolheaded-COP**
 'Taro is always calm-headed.'
- b. *Taro-wa* *tsuneni* *reisei-na* *otoko-da.*
Taro-TOP **always** **coolheaded-COP** **man-COP**
 'Taro is always calm-headed.'

When the copula '*da*' is used as part of the main predicate at the end of sentence, it remains '*da*', as in (39a). In contrast, when it modifies the following noun, it takes the form '*na*'. Thus, in (39), '*da*' at the sentence end is attached to the NP '*reisei-na otoko* ('coolheaded man')' as _{Pred} [_{NP} [*reisei-na otoko*] -*da*].

This morphological opposition helps to distinguish the syntactic property of the preceding clause, that is for '*-na+X*', X is regarded as a noun, but in '*-da+X*', X does not belong to the category of noun. '*Mono*' and '*koto*' have two usages, but by using this test, we can easily judge whether they are nouns or not.

- (40) a. *Rippa-na* *mono-da.*
great-COP **thing-COP**
 '(It is) a great thing.'
- b. *Rippa-da* *mono.*
great-COP **SFP**
 '(It is) great.'
- (41) a. *Rippa-na* *koto-da.*

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| great-COP | event-COP |
| ‘(It is) a great event.’ | |
| b. <i>Rippa-da</i> | <i>koto.</i> |
| great-COP | SFP |
| ‘(It is) great.’ | |

As we can see from (40b) and (41b), ‘*mono*’ and ‘*koto*’ have been further grammaticalized into sentence-final particles. By suffixing them to the end of sentence, he can express amazement, shock, delight or some other emotional emphasis. The grammatical noun ‘*mono*’ and SFP ‘*mono*’ are functionally different words, allowing sentences such as ‘*Rippa-na mono-da mono*’.

5. Related problems and summary

Japanese, a rigid right-headed languages (RHL, hereafter), marks the syntactic property of the clause at the end of the clause, while left-headed languages (also LHLs), such as English and German, mark it at the beginning of the clause.

- (42) a. *Ob wir richtig sind.*
whether 1.PL. right COP(1.PL)
 ‘(I wonder) whether we are right.’
- b. *Wareware-ga tadashii -ka-dō-ka.*
1.PL-NOM right whether(1RG-how-1RG)
 ‘(I don't know) whether we are right.’
- c. *Wareware-ga tadashii -ka-dō-ka wakara-nai.*
1.PL-NOM right whether(1RG-how-1RG) understand-NEG
 ‘It is incomprehensible whether we are right.’

In German, when we hear or see the first word ‘*ob*’ in (42a), we can recognize that the speaker will make use of insubordination (Evans 2007). However, in Japanese, we can understand the possibility of insubordination only when we catch ‘*ka-dō-ka*’ at the end of the clause. There is a more important difference between these two types of language. In LHLs, the hearer can determine at the beginning of the clause how it will be constructed, and the speaker can rarely choose another construction in the middle of a clause. Therefore, in most LHLs, speakers need to close the structure early, and it is difficult to change structures halfway through the utterance.

RHLs, on the other hand, allow the speaker to change the sentence structure before reaching the sentence end. Japanese speakers can decide whether they use

insubordination or not at the clause end of (42b): By adding the underlined part of (42c), they can instantly create full complex sentence. This means that RHLs are linearly, or in the course of time, flexible in deciding the structure, but the hearer must pay attention for longer to determine the sentence structure completely. LHLs have the opposite property, so LHL hearers have a smaller burden in deciding the sentence structure.

We can point out that this flexibility in deciding the sentence structure enables Japanese speakers to use insubordination more often, and indeed they have developed a strong preference for it.

In addition, Japanese is very sensitive to the directness of information or the source of knowledge. If the speaker has obtained information from another person, he must use a reporting auxiliary verb or a quotative particle.

- (43) a. *Taro-ga tenkō-suru -tte.*
Taro-NOM changing of school-do COMP
 ‘I hear Taro’s going to move to a new school.’
- b. *Taro-ga tenkō-suru -tte it-teru.*
Taro-NOM changing of school-do COMP say-ASP
 ‘They say Taro’s going to move to a new school.’

Originally, ‘-tte’ was a particle marking quotation, but now it has been grammaticalized as the marker for indirect evidentiality. (43b) is a full complex sentence, and if its main verb ‘it-teru’ is omitted, we can form (43a). However, there are some grammatical and semantic differences between (43a) and (43b). Grammatically, (43a) is the insubordinate structure and (43b) is not. Semantically, (43b) expresses someone’s statement, and (43a) carries the speaker’s indirect world knowledge. So (43b) is a sentence for a factive event, while the main proposition is more vague with a modal particle. Therefore, it is more reasonable, or more pragmatically rational, to regard (43a) as additional insubordination rather than elliptic insubordination. Additional insubordination accounts for the structure of (43a) as the combination of a proposition and the marker for its metapragmatic value. On the other hand, applying elliptic insubordination to (43a) needs more complicated procedures, such as morphological compounding, grammaticalization of the compound, semantic projection, insubordination by ellipsis and so forth. Additional insubordination is more economical in description, and there is no need to use Ockham’s razor. This particle of ‘-tte’ is also one of the hypotonic particles and quite different from converbial ‘te’, which is classified as chiefly parataxic.

In Sections 3 and 4, we examined the adverbial adjectival clauses. Table 3 lists the auxiliary verbs and particles for insubordination.

Table 3. Auxiliary verbs and particles for insubordination

	Original meaning	Forms	Insubordination usage	Elided part	Tense	Clause type
hypotaxic	conditional	<i>shinakereba</i>	obligation	<i>naranai</i>	tenseless	Adverbial
		<i>sureba</i>	suggestion / counterfactual	<i>dō-da?</i>		
		<i>shitara</i>	illocutionary	main clause		
	reason	<i>kara</i>				
		<i>no-de</i>				
	adversative	<i>kedo</i>				
		<i>ga</i>	copula	Adjective		
event / fact	<i>koto</i>					
thing	<i>mono</i>	indirect evidentiality	main clause	Adverbial		
quotation	<i>-tte</i>					
parataxic	additional	<i>-shi</i>		main clause	tenseless	Adverbial
		<i>-tari</i>				
	coverbial	<i>-te</i>	coverbial / imperative			

Pragmatically, the end of the clause is also a turn-relevant point (generally known as TRP). Japanese speakers are well-known for their frequent use of back-channeling expressions, which are interjected between clauses, that is, at the end of a clause. The late closing structure of Japanese and the pragmatic function of clause-end allow additional types of insubordination.

Abbreviations

- ACC: accusative case
 ASP: progressive or incomplete aspect
 AUX.CJ: auxiliary verb for conjecture
 COMP: complimentizer / quotation particle
 COP: copula
 C.R: connective particle for cause or reason
 DM: discourse marker
 IRG: interrogative particle
 LOC: locative case
 NEG: negation
 NOM: nominative case
 OBL: auxiliary verb for obligation
 PAST: past tense marker
 P.AVS: connective particle for adversativeness or contrast

P.CD:	connective particle for conditional
P.CV:	connective particle for converb
P.NL:	particle for nominalization / nominalizer
P.PX:	connective particle for parataxis
POL:	polite style
SFP:	sentence-final particle
TMP:	temporal case
TOP:	topic marker

References

- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. "Insubordination and its uses", In Nikolaeva, Irina(ed) *Finiteness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.366-431.
- Huan, Yan. 2007. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kato, Shigehiro. 2007. "Nihongo-no Hinshi-taiki-no Tsūgengogaku kadai (Dialinguistic problems in the study of Japanese parts-of-speech system)". *AALL* 3, Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. pp.5-28.
- Kato, Shigehiro. 2011. "Sekai Chishiki to Kaishaku-teki Bun'myaku-no Riron (Psychopragmatic Theory based upon World Knowledge Discourse and Dynamic Contexts)". *The Annual Report on Cultural Science* 134, graduate school of letters, Hokkaido University. pp.69-96.
- Kato, Shigehiro. 2013. *Nihongo tōgo tokuseiron (Translinguistic study of the Japanese syntactic properties)*. Sapporo: Hokkaido University Press.
- Kato, Shigehiro. 2014. "Fukubun-no Tanbunka-to (Datsu-)Bun'pōka (Simplexication of complex sentence and (De-)Grammaticalization)" In Masuoka, T et al.(eds) *Nihongo Fukubun Kobun-no Kenkyu (Form and Meaning in Japanese Complex Sentence Construction)*, Tokyo: Hituzi Publisher. pp.495-520.
- Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ohuri, Toshio. 1995. "Remarks on suspended clauses: a contribution to Japanese phraseology". In: Shibatani and Thompson (eds) *Essays in Semantics and Pragmatics: In Honor of Charles J. Fillmore*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp.201-218.
- Shirakawa, Hiroyuki. 2009. *Iisashibun no kenkyū (Studies on suspended sentences in Japanese)*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- Yamada, Yoshio. 1908. *Nihon bunpōron (Japanese Grammar Study)*, Tokyo: Hozōkan.