

The Evolution of *You-Ni* Purpose Clauses in Japanese¹

Naomi TSUKIDA

Keywords: purpose clauses, similitive, manner, grammaticalization, Japanese

1. Introduction

This study examines *you-ni* purpose clauses and their evolution in Japanese. The Japanese language uses several expressions to express PURPOSE. This study considers the *you-ni* clause because the morpheme *you* is used as similitive as well.

Some languages of the world use similitive morpheme to express PURPOSE. Seediq, a Formosan aboriginal language, uses *saw*, the similitive morpheme, to express PURPOSE, as in Example (1) (Tsukida, in preparation) and so does Japanese, as in Example (2).

(1) Saw 'adi mpeke-gerung ka peratu 'u, seku-un=na kulu.
SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-be_broken NOM plate GC put-FUT=3SG.GEN box
'He will put the plate in a box lest it should be broken.'

(2) Nure-nai you(-ni) oo-u.
get_wet-NEG.ADNOM SIMIL(-ADV) cover-ASSERT
'(They) cover (something) lest it should get wet.'

While modern Japanese allows affirmative and negative purpose clauses using *you*, older Japanese seems to have allowed negative purpose clauses only. This means that NEGATIVE + *you-ni* came to be used as negative purpose (= precautioning) expression first, and later, the PURPOSE usage extended to the affirmative.

This study examines how such usage has evolved using a historical Japanese

database.² Section 2 presents the SIMILATIVE-PURPOSE multifunctionality observed in languages worldwide. Section 3 introduces Japanese purpose clauses. Section 4 demonstrates how the Japanese similative morpheme is grammaticalized to express PURPOSE meaning and why it is limited to negative in some languages. Section 5 summarizes the study.

2. Similative morpheme and purpose clauses

SIMILATIVE-PURPOSE multifunctionality has been observed in many languages, including Ethiopian languages (Treis 2017), Mon (Jenny 2017), North Saami (Ylikoski 2017, 278–9), and Japanese. Formal overlaps between similative and purpose clauses were reported for Caucasian Albanian by Schulze (2017), for Lezgian languages Lezgian and Agul by Haspelmath (1993, 392–3), and for Tabasaran, another Lezgian language, by Babaliev (2013, 293f).

The following are examples from the Ethiopian languages. In Kambaata, a Highland East Cushitic language of Ethiopia, the enclitic morpheme =g ‘manner’ is used as a similative and purpose clause marker (Treis 2017, 91–2). Kambaata limits the use of similative morphemes to negative clauses. =g is used in combination with a negative relative morpheme and functions as the default marker in negative purpose clauses [=precautioning clauses], as in Example (3) (Treis 2017, 111).

(3) Kambaata (Treis 2017, 111)

Yamaz-oon-ta-ssá-a oddishsh-a-ssá bir-é wud-íin
 hip-mLOC-L-3pPOSS-ADD clothes-fGEN-3pPOSS front-fGEN side-mICP
 {hóog-ut iill-ít ba'-is-súmb-o-ssa=g-a}
 enset_juice-fNOM reach-3fPCO spoil-CAUS1-3fNREL-mOBL-3pO=G-mACC/OBL
 aab-ichch-ú qo`rr-ítee`u.
 unfrayed_leaf-SG-mACC wear.MID-3PVE

‘And on their hips they wear an unfrayed enset leaf on top (lit. in front) of their clothes {so that the enset juice does not touch (lit. reach) and spoil them}.’

Likewise, Yemsa and Xamtanga are Ethiopian languages, with similitive and negative morphemes combined to express negative PURPOSE meanings, as in Examples (4) and (5).

(4) Yemsa (Zaugg-Coretti 2017, 353)

Mīyā gir-ù-nöy-nā mātó gĩmbī kèer'-nī.
 cow enter-IRR-NEG-3 SIMIL₂ wall build-1p
 'We built a wall lest the cows enter.'

(5) Xamtanga (Darmon 2017, 382)

a kibb-s-a-y-äjä nās'älä si-t'-äk^w-in.
 cold-CAUS-IPFV-NEG-SIMIL1 scarf dress-MEDP-IPFV-1s
 'In order not to get cold, I wear a scarf.'

b giz-id bikin-z-a-y-η-äjä arč'-id
 time-DEF be_wasted-CAUS-IPFV-NEG-3p-SIMIL₁ farmer/PL-DEF
 xar-i-z fir-u-η.
 night-DEF-DAT go-PFV-3p
 'In order not to waste time, the farmers left at night.'

In some Ethiopian languages, such as Xamtanga, using the similitive morpheme for PURPOSE expression is limited to negative purpose clauses (Darmon 2017, 381). Treis (2017, 125) argued that Cushitic does not exhibit a general tendency to restrict similitive morphemes to negative purpose clauses. Kambaata contains =g-marked affirmative clauses, which is rare (Treis 2017, 125). In Seediq, a Formosan language, using similitive *saw* to express PURPOSE is limited to negative purpose clauses, as in Example (1) (Tsukida, in preparation).

Mon (Jenny 2017) also uses a similitive marker to express PURPOSE, but this use is not limited to negative purpose clauses. The similitive marker is *ñân* in Middle Mon and *ɲəŋ* in Modern Mon. In Middle Mon, *ñân ma s-* "as REL IRR-" is used as purposive and in Modern Mon it is *ɲəŋ kəʔ* "as get" that is so used (Jenny 2017: 311–2). In both Middle Mon and Modern Mon, it is not limited to negative. Affirmative purpose clauses with the above morphemes are used in Examples (6)

and (7).

(6) Middle Mon (Jenny 2017, 312)

ñāñ ma s-rāñ.chāy plan ʔey s-pa.
 as REL IRR-flourish again 1s IRR-do
 ‘I will act so that it may flourish again.’

(7) Modern Mon (Jenny 2017, 313)

ɲéh ɓa kòh ɲòŋ kɔʔ hnèh.màn rèn.həkɔʔ kòh
 person two MEDL as get win RECP MEDL
 həcan kɾip klɔŋ.
 try_hard run come
 ‘The two tried hard to run here, so that they would win against the other.’

Why are similative markers used to mark PURPOSE? As we find grammaticalization from SIMILATIVE to COMPLEMENTIZER and from COMPLEMENTIZER to PURPOSE in Heine and Kuteva (2002, 91, 273–4), we can imagine grammaticalization from SIMILATIVE via COMPLEMENTIZER to PURPOSE.

SIMILATIVE > COMPLEMENTIZER (Heine and Kuteva 2002, 273)

COMPLEMENTIZER > PURPOSE (Heine and Kuteva 2002, 91)

However, according to Heine and Kuteva (2002), these grammaticalizations are not yet well-established. The directionality proposed for grammaticalization from COMPLEMENTIZER to PURPOSE has not yet been established beyond a reasonable doubt, and more data are required to substantiate this hypothesis (Heine and Kuteva 2002, 91). Further research is required on the areal and genetic distribution of the grammaticalization of SIMILATIVE and COMPLEMENTATION (Heine and Kuteva 2002, 274). Jenny (2017, 311) argued that in Mon, there should be a path leading directly from SIMILATIVE to PURPOSE.

Another question is why some languages limit their use for NEGATIVE PURPOSES. These issues are discussed in Section 4.

3. Japanese purpose clause

Japanese uses a compositional strategy that contains similative to express PURPOSE.

3.1. You/Similative marker

You, which was *yau* in late Old Japanese, was a Chinese loanword. Its cognate in modern Mandarin is *yàng*. Modern Chinese *yàng* means “manner” or “appearance.” This morpheme was not observed in Old Japanese (*Zyooko Nihingo*) texts.

Yau/you in Japanese has various meanings and usages, including style, way, manner, appearance, similarity to something, situation, contents of saying or thinking, quotation markers, expectations, desires, and intentions (Oono et al. 1990, 1335). This section examines the use of *you/yau* other than PURPOSE. We turn to the PURPOSE usage in Section 3.2.

3.1.1 Similative usage

The morpheme *you* is used as a SIMILATIVE. When occurring with a referential expression, it is preceded by a genitive form, as shown in (8a), (8b), (8c), and (8d). When used predicatively, *you* is followed by *-da/-dearu*, assertive markers, as in Example (8a). When used adverbially, it is followed by *-ni*, an adverbial marker, as shown in (8b) and (8c). It can modify an adjective, as in (8b), or a verb, as in (8c). It can be used adnominally, in which case *you* is followed by *-na*, an adnominal marker, as in Example (8d).

- (8) a Sakana-no you-da.
 fish-GEN SIMIL-ASSERT
 ‘It is like a fish.’
- b Ringo-no you-ni aka-i.
 apple-GEN SIMIL-ADV red-ASSERT
 ‘It is as red as an apple.’

- c Sakana-no you-ni oyog-u.
 fish-GEN SIMIL-ADV swim-ASSERT
 ‘(They) swim like fish.’ (lit. ‘They swim in the manner of fish.’)
- d Ringo-no you-na kudamono.
 apple-GEN SIMIL-ADNOM fruit
 ‘A fruit similar to an apple.’

The original meaning of Japanese *yau* was “style, way, or manner.” *You-ni* in Example (8b) means MANNER: “It is red in the (same) way as the apple is red.” Heine and Kuteva (2002, 210) described the grammaticalization from MANNER to SIMILATIVE. This grammaticalization seems to have already occurred in late Old Japanese. This usage is observed already in late Old Japanese, as in Example (9).

- (9) Oni-no yau-naru mono ide ki-te ...
 demon-GEN SIMIL-ADNOM being come_out.SUSP come-SUSP
 ‘Something like a demon came out and ...’
 (Takatori Monogatari)

3.1.2 Epistemic possibility

You/yau can be preceded by the adnominal form of a verb, either a non-past adnominal form, as in (10), or a past adnominal form, as in (11). When used with the assertive morpheme *-da*, it expresses EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY in the same way as English *seem*, as in Examples (10) and (11).

- (10) Kyou kuru you-da.
 today come.ADNOM SIMIL-ASSERT
 ‘It seems that they will come today.’
- (11) Kyou ki-ta you-da.
 today come-PAST.ADNOM SIMIL-ASSERT
 ‘It seems that they came today.’

Such cases are observed cross-linguistically, such as with *seem* in English and *parecer(se)* in Spanish. Examples (12a) and (12b) are of Spanish *parecer(se)*.

(12) a Juan se parece mucho a su padre.

Juan REFL look_like much to his father

‘Juan resembles his father very much.’

b Parece que va a llover.

look_like that it_goes to rain

‘It seems like (it is) going to rain.’

(Creissels 2017, 79–80)

According to Creissels (2017, 80), sentences such as Example (12b) can be viewed as expressing similarity, the only difference being that *parecer(se)* in Example (12a) expresses similarity between two concrete entities, whereas in Example (12b), the same verb expresses similarity between the situation referred to and the propositional content of the embedded clause *va a llover*.

3.1.3 Manner

Yau-ni/you-ni (SIMIL-ADV) may express MANNER, among several meanings. The verb may be affirmative or negative and in past or non-past forms. In (13), the verbs are in the non-past form, whereas in (14), they are in the past form. In Examples (13a) and (14a), the verb preceding *you-ni* is affirmative, whereas it is negative in Examples (13b) and (14b).

(13) a Donar-u you-ni hanas-u.

yell-ADNOM SIMIL-ADV speak-ASSERT

‘(They) speak angrily.’ (Lit. ‘They said in the manner of yelling.’)

b Kobos-anai you-ni taber-u.

drop-NEG.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV eat-ASSERT

‘(They) eat without dropping.’

(14) a Mi-ta you-ni hanas-u.

see-PAST SIMIL-ADV speak-ASSERT

‘They speak as if they saw it.’

- b Sir-ana-katta you-ni huruma-u.
 know-NEG-PAST.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV behave-ASSERT
 ‘They behave as if they did not know.’

This usage was also observed in late Old Japanese texts. The examples below are from *The Tale of Genji* (11th century novel). The verb preceding *yau-ni* is affirmative in (15) and negative in (16).

- (15) tob-u yau-ni Akasi-ni tuk-itamah-inu.
 fly-ADNOM SIMIL-ADV Akasi-DAT arrive-HON-PAST.
 ‘He arrived at Akasi like flying.’

(The Tale of Genji: Akasi, late Old Japanese)

- (16) sihite misir-anu yau-ni motenas-ite,
 intentionally know-NEG.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV treat-SUSP
 ‘He intentionally treated [him] as if he does not know him,’

(The Tale of Genji: Momidiga, late Old Japanese)

3.1.4 Content of thought

A *yau-ni* clause can cooccur with verbs of thinking to express the CONTENT OF THOUGHT, as in (17a). There is another way of expressing the CONTENT OF THOUGHT by using the quotative marker *-to*, as in (17b). Compared to sentences with *-to* as the marker, the *yau-ni* clause expresses feelings more vaguely or uncertainly. According to Maeda (2006, 53), this usage is related to expressing EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY, mentioned in Section 3.1.2.

- (17) a Kyou kuru you-ni omo-u.
 today come.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV think-ASSERT
 ‘I think that they would (probably) come today.’
 b Kyou kuru-to omo-u.
 today come.ASSERT-QUOTE think-ASSERT
 ‘[I] think they will come today.’

With this usage, the verb preceding *yau-ni* may be in its past form. This was

also observed with the usage of EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY (3.1.2).

- (18) Kyou ki-ta you-ni omo-u.
 today come-PAST.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV think-ASSERT
 ‘[I] think they (probably) came today.’

This usage is also observed in late Old Japanese, as in Example (19).

- (19) wa-ga mi-mo hier-u yau-ni oboe-te, ...
 self-GEN body-also get_chilly-ADNOM SIMIL-ADV think-SUSP
 ‘He thought as if his body also got chilly,’
 (The Tale of Genji: Maborosi, late Old Japanese)

3.1.5 Content of utterance: Order, request, or prayer

The CONTENT OF THOUGHT and CONTENT OF UTTERANCE initially seem similar to each other but are, in fact, completely different.

When a *you-ni* clause cooccurs with verbs of utterance, it expresses order, request, or prayer (Maeda 2006, 53), as in Example (20a). In such cases, only non-past forms can precede *you-ni*, and *-ni* may be omitted. What is expressed by *you-ni* + verbs of utterance is not an objective proposition but the content of the subjective order or wish of the one who utters it. The quotative *-to* is used as in Example (20b) for an objective proposition.

- (20) a asita kuru you(-ni) it-ta.
 tomorrow come.ADNOM SIMIL(-ADV) say-PAST
 ‘They_i told [someone_{j/*i}]_i to come tomorrow.’
 b asita kuru-to it-ta.
 tomorrow come.ASSERT-QUOTE say-PAST
 ‘They_i said they_{i/j} will come tomorrow.’

3.2. Japanese purpose clauses

Purpose clauses use *you-ni* as in Example (21). In formal respect, it is very similar to the CONTENT OF UTTERANCE usage in that the verb preceding *you-ni*

cannot be in the past form and that *-ni* may be omitted. I will continue to refer to these as *you-ni* clauses even when *-ni* is omitted.

- (21) Nure-nai you(-ni) oo-u. (= (2))
 get.wet-NEG.ADNOM SIMIL(-ADV) cover-ASSERT
 ‘(They) cover (something) lest it should get wet.’

In modern Japanese, the verb preceding *you-ni* may be affirmative.

- (22) Hakkou-suru you(-ni) atatame-ru.
 ferment-do.ADNOM SIMIL(-ADV) warm-ASSERT
 ‘(They) warm (something) so that it should ferment.’

Modern Japanese differs from Seediq, Xamtanga, and Kambaata in that the Japanese *you-ni* is used in affirmative purpose clauses, as in Example (22).

The word order in Japanese is SOV; however, the word order may be reversed in colloquial Japanese. Likewise, the order of *you-ni* and preemptive clauses may be reversed in colloquial Japanese.

- (23) Oo-inasai, nure-nai you-ni³.
 cover-IMP get_wet-NEG.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV
 ‘Cover it, lest it should get wet.’

3.2.1 Argument configuration

You-ni is used when the subjects of the main and purpose clauses differ or when the predicate of the purpose clause is uncontrollable. When the subjects are the same, and the situation denoted by the predicate is controllable, a different morpheme, *tame-ni*, is used (Maeda 2006, 39).

- (24) Tomodati-ni au-tame(-ni) eki-ni it-ta.
 friend-DAT meet.ADNOM-PURPOSE(-ADV) station-DAT go-PAST
 ‘They went to the station to meet a friend.’

3.2.2 Semantics

The *you-ni* clause does not express IN-CASE meaning.

The Japanese *you-ni* are not used to express IN-CASE meanings. The in-case meaning is expressed by an entirely different construction, using *-to ikenai-kara/node*, as in (25).

- (25) Ame-ga hur-u-to ikenai-kara/node kasa-wo
 rain-NOM fall-ADNOM-if not_good-because umbrella-ACC
 mot-te ik-inasai.
 bring-SUSP go-IMP

Lit. ‘Because it is not good if it rains, bring an umbrella.’

‘Bring an umbrella lest it rains.’

Regarding apprehension or epistemics of fear, there seem to be no dedicated morphemes. One can use *-sou* in this context, as in Examples (26) and (27), but *-sou* can also be used in other contexts, as in Example (28).

- (26) Asita-ha ame-ga hur-i-sou-da.
 tomorrow-TOP rain-NOM fall-ADV-likely-ASSERT
 ‘It is likely to rain tomorrow.’

- (27) Asita-ha ame-ga hur-i-sou-de sinpai-da.
 tomorrow-TOP rain-NOM fall-ADV-likely-ASSERT.SUSP worry-ASSERT
 ‘[I] am worried as it is likely to rain tomorrow.’

- (28) Asita-ha hare-sou-de ansin-da.
 tomorrow-TOP fine.ADV-likely-SUSP be_relieved-ASSERT
 ‘I am relieved as it is likely to be fine tomorrow.’

3.3. Ambiguity and continuity

The sentences described above expressing PURPOSE, as in Examples (21) and (22), are ambiguous. Example (22) can mean, “They warm something in the way adequate for it to be fermented; that is, neither too hot nor too cold, keeping an adequate temperature.” Example (21) may mean, “They cover something in the way it will not get wet, covering it adequately.”

The ambiguity and continuity of PURPOSE and MANNER meanings in *you-ni*

clauses have been noted by Maeda (2006). Maeda (2006, 133) called the usage of the *you-ni* clause observed in such sentences as Examples (21) and (22) <Resultant Purpose> rather than simply <Purpose> and argued that <Resultant Purpose> and <Manner> are continuous. According to Maeda (2006), this parallels the continuity of <manner> and <result> in adverbs. As a Japanese adverb may be interpreted to express either <manner> or <result> according to its meaning,⁴ the *you-ni* adverbial clause may be interpreted to express either <Manner>, as in Example (13) and (14), or <Resultant purpose>, as in Examples (21) and (22). Maeda (2006) stated that one interprets the *you-ni* clause as expressing <Resultant Purpose> when the two events, the main and *you-ni* clause events, cannot be interpreted as occurring simultaneously. One interprets the event denoted by the main clause as occurring first, followed by the event denoted by the *you-ni* clause. The later event is then interpreted to express <Resultant Purpose>. When two events can be interpreted as occurring simultaneously, the <Resultant Purpose> interpretation and <Manner> interpretation are both possible (Maeda 2006, 43).

Moreover, Maeda (2006, 61) noted the continuity of <Resultant Purpose> and <Contents of Utterance>. The CONTENT OF UTTERANCE expresses the order, request, or prayer, as discussed in Section 3.1.5. Both usages allow only non-past forms of verbs to precede *you-ni*, and the event denoted by *you-ni* clause follows the main clause event.

4. History and grammaticalization of Japanese purpose clause

As noted in Section 2, grammaticalization from SIMILATIVE to PURPOSE has not been well-established in previous studies. We examine the evolution of Japanese purpose clauses and their grammaticalization. We also examine why purpose clauses are limited to negative clauses in certain languages.

4.1. The evolution of the Japanese purpose clause

The usage of PURPOSE (also referred to as expectation, desire, and intention)

seems to have developed in the 14th century (Middle Japanese). The first examples of this usage are probably found in *Ture-dure-gusa*, a series of essays written by Yoshida Kenko in the 14th century. Oono et al. (1990, 1335) refer to this as expectation and intention. Oono et al. (1990, 1335) cited Example (29) as expressing expectation and intention (=PURPOSE).

- (29) Yo-no hito-no ue-zu samukar-anu yau-ni
 world-GEN people-GEN starve-NEG feel_cold-NEG.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV
 yo-wo-ba okonaw-amahosiki-nari.
 world-ACC-TOP govern-desirable-ASSERT
 ‘It is desirable to govern the world so that the people of the world would not feel hungry or cold.’
 (Ture-dure-gusa, Chapter 142, Middle Japanese (14th century))

However, it seems that this example can also be interpreted as expressing MANNER. This may mean, “It is desirable to govern the world in a way adequate for people of the world not to feel hungry or cold.” Examples from this era that are interpreted as meaning purposes are ambiguous in meaning.

In modern Japanese, affirmative purpose clauses, as in Example (22), and negative purpose clauses, as in Example (21), are permitted. However, the situation differed in Middle Japanese. Examples of AFFIRMATIVE + *yau-ni* with a PURPOSE meaning are not found in texts from the same era as *Ture-dure-gusa*.

The use of the AFFIRMATIVE + *yau-ni* to express PURPOSE seems to have developed in late Middle Japanese. Example (30), in which the AFFIRMATIVE + *yau-ni* clause can be interpreted as expressing PURPOSE, is found in *Toraakira-bon Kyogen*, a Japanese Kyogen playscript book compiled in 1642. This book reflects the late Middle Japanese (Kobayashi and Ichimura 2013, 323).

- (30) Yohi tuma-wo hikiahase-te kudasaru-yau-ni
 good wife-ACC make_meet-SUSP give_me.HON.ADNOM-SIMIL-ADV
 are-he mair-ahu-to zonz-uru.
 that-ALL visit_and_pray-HORT-QUOT think-ASSERT

‘I think of visiting and praying at that [shrine] so that [the god] will make me meet a good wife.’

(Toraakira-bon Kyogen: Inabado, Late Middle Japanese).

However, this sentence can also be interpreted as expressing the CONTENT OF UTTERANCE (=praying, in this case). Therefore, the example is ambiguous.

In summary, *yau-ni* clauses were used to express MANNER and some other meanings in late Old Japanese, as in *The Tale of Genji*. Middle Japanese, such as *Ture-dure-gusa*, began to use *yau-ni* clauses to express PURPOSE, as in Example (29); however, this was possible only with negative purpose clauses. In late Middle Japanese, such as *Toraakira-bon kyogen*, the AFFIRMATIVE + *yau-ni* began to express PURPOSE, as in Example (30). PURPOSE usage seems to have begun with negative predicates in Middle Japanese and expanded into affirmative predicates by the late Middle Japanese.

4.2. From manner to purpose: Reinterpretation

As shown in Section 3.3, MANNER and PURPOSE are continuous and ambiguous in Japanese. Maeda (2006) stated that it is interpreted to express MANNER when the two events denoted by the main and *yau-ni* clauses occur at the same time and to express PURPOSE when the main clause event precedes the *yau-ni* clause event.

Thus, we propose the following grammaticalization scenario. Late Old Japanese seems to have initially allowed only MANNER interpretation.⁵ That means late Old Japanese allowed the following interpretation only: the situations denoted by the main and the situation denoted by the *yau-ni* clauses to occur simultaneously and not at different times.

In Middle Japanese, the interpretation that the event denoted by the *yau-ni* clause occurs after the event denoted by the main clause is allowed, initially only with negative predicates. In Example (29), one can interpret that the *yau-ni* clause situation (people not feeling hungry or cold) occurs simultaneously with the main clause event (governing the world); this is a MANNER interpretation. Subsequently,

such clauses underwent reinterpretation and were interpreted as *yau-ni* clause situation following the main clause event. As in Example (29), the *yau-ni* clause situation was interpreted to follow the main clause event (governing the world now leads to a subsequent situation where people do not feel hungry or cold), which is a PURPOSE interpretation.

Example (31) is from *Ture-dure-gusa*, Middle Japanese.

- (31) Subete otoko-wo-ba onna-ni warah-are-nu yau-ni
 all male-ACC-TOP female-DAT laugh-PASS-NEG.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV
 ohositatu-besi to-zo.
 grow-should QUOT-INTENSE
 ‘They say one should raise all boys so that/in a way they won’t be laughed at
 by women.’

(*Ture-dure-gusa*, Chapter 107, Middle Japanese)

The *yau-ni* clause in Example (31) represents a situation in which the boys are not laughed at by the women. This situation follows the main-clause event (raising boys). However, one can consider that the *yau-ni* clause situation is realized simultaneously as the main clause event (raising boys) in that the situation where small boys are laughed at by women has not yet been realized. This could explain why Middle Japanese allows such situations to be expressed by the *yau-ni* clause. As in Example (31), the interpretation that the main verb action of “raising boys,” which occurs earlier, leads to the subsequent situation, where they will not be laughed at by women, is more natural than the interpretation as a simultaneous occurrence. These examples strengthened the interpretation.

Generally speaking, a *yau-ni* clause with a negative predicate may denote a situation realized simultaneously with the main clause event in the sense that the corresponding affirmative situation has not been realized at that point (=irrealis), as in examples (29) and (31). Moreover, it is hoped that this will remain unrealized in the future. This possibility makes negative predicates more likely to occur in *yau-ni* MANNER clauses with simultaneous interpretations. Subsequently, these clauses

were reinterpreted to express PURPOSE.

Conversely, the situation expressed by an affirmative *yau-ni* clause is not realized simultaneously with the main clause event. As in Example (30), the situation denoted by the *yau-ni* clause (god making me meet a good wife) is not realized simultaneously with the main clause event (going to pray at a shrine) but follows it temporally; the situation is hoped to change. Middle Japanese did not allow this situation to be expressed using *yau-ni* clauses, whereas late Middle Japanese did. The interpretation that the *yau-ni* clause situation follows the main clause situation, which began with the negative *yau-ni* clauses, expanded to affirmative clauses by the late Middle Japanese.

To summarize, the grammaticalization was from MANNER to PURPOSE in Japanese. SIMILATIVE usage is also derived from MANNER, as mentioned in Section 3.1.1. This means that SIMILATIVE and PURPOSE are not directly related but are related in that both were grammaticalized from MANNER.

4.3. Reasons that negative more likely express purpose

Some languages, such as Seediq, Xamtanga, and some other Cushitic languages, limit the use of similative morphemes to negative purpose clauses. The irrealis nature of negative subordinate clauses may have affected this, as discussed in Section 4.2.

If PURPOSE usage developed from MANNER usage in a language, then in such a language, as stated in Section 4.2, the negative situation denoted by negative subordinate clauses is more likely to be considered simultaneous with the main clause event (expressing MANNER), as the corresponding affirmative situation is not realized (=irrealis). This situation is expected to persist. Conversely, an affirmative situation is not realized simultaneously with the main clause event but is hoped to be realized later. A semantic twist in affirmative cases is not observed in negative cases. This twist may lead to difficulty in interpreting affirmative clauses as PURPOSE expression in some languages.

In Seediq, *saw* + NEGATIVE FUTURE expresses NEGATIVE PURPOSE, as in Examples (1) and (32a), but *saw* + AFFIRMATIVE FUTURE is not interpreted to express PURPOSE but to express the situation taking place as a fact, as shown in Example (32b).

- (32) a Saw 'adi mawsa baraw ka laqi 'u,
 SIMIL NEG AV.FUT.go higher_place NOM child GC
 heci-an=na m-erehug ka rehengun.
 put-GV2=3SG.GEN AV-lock NOM door
 'S/He locked the door lest the child should go upstairs.'
- b Saw mawsa baraw ka laqi 'u,
 SIMIL AV.FUT.go higher_place NOM child GC
 heci-an=na hakaw.
 put-GV2=3SG.GEN ladder
 'S/He put a ladder, as the child will go upstairs.'

See Tsukida (in preparation) for Seediq precautioning clauses.

4.4. Grammaticalization from complementizer to purpose

Heine and Kuteva (2002, 91) mentioned grammaticalization from COMPLEMENTIZER to PURPOSE. In modern Japanese, *you-ni* has two complementizer usages. One introduces the CONTENT OF THOUGHT, and the other introduces the CONTENT OF UTTERANCE, as shown in Section 3.1.4 and 3.1.5, respectively. We must conclude that the development from neither of these usages to PURPOSE usage was likely in Japanese.

Regarding the CONTENT OF UTTERANCE usage, Maeda (2006) demonstrated that this usage is continuous with PURPOSE usage. The CONTENT OF UTTERANCE and PURPOSE are ambiguous and continuous, as in Example (30). However, it seems that the CONTENT OF UTTERANCE usage develops in late Middle Japanese. Therefore, the CONTENT OF UTTERANCE and PURPOSE usage developed in Japanese at approximately the same time. The development from this usage to PURPOSE usage

is unlikely.

The CONTENT OF THOUGHT usage is different from PURPOSE usage. The former usage allows perfective morphemes and affirmative forms to precede *yau-ni*, as shown in Example (33) from *The Tale of Genji* in late Old Japanese. However, these characteristics are not shared by PURPOSE usage.

- (33) Kokoro-gawari s-i-tamah-eru yau-ni
 mind-change do-ADV-HON-PFV.ADNOM SIMIL-ADV
 hito-no ih-i tutah-u beki korohohi-wo-dani
 people-GEN say-ADV transmit-ADNOM should.ADNOM time-ACC-only
 omoh-i nodom-ete-koso-ha.
 think-ADV calm_down-SUSP-EMPH-TOP
 ‘One should keep calm at least during the time for people to rumor that my character may have changed.’
 (The Tale of Genji: Maborosi).

Therefore, PURPOSE usage was unlikely to be directly related to this usage. The development from this usage to PURPOSE usage is unlikely, either.

4.5. From epistemic possibility to purpose

Seediq and Japanese use similative morpheme to express EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY (see 3.1.2 for Japanese). Example (34) is a Seediq example.

- (34) Saw mpe-takur ka laqi.
 SIMILAV.FUT-stumble NOM child
 ‘It seems that the child will stumble.’

EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY and PURPOSE seem to be semantically related. EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY involves the assertion of logical possibility. Alethic (or subjunctive) possibility is also concerned with necessary and possible truth; however, epistemic modality differs from alethic modality in that it is speaker-oriented or subjective (Watts 1984, 130). What is denoted by a purpose clause is not actual at the point of a main clause event but a desired or undesired possibility, with

desire being subjective. Therefore, the EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY has an affinity with PURPOSE.

However, this does not automatically guarantee that EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY clauses are interpreted as PURPOSE when used subordinately. For instance, *seem* in English, *parecer(se)* in Spanish, and *saw* + AFFIRMATIVE FUTURE in Seediq are not used as purpose clause markers. The Japanese *you-ni* clause used subordinately may mean MANNER or CONTENT OF THOUGHT as well as PURPOSE.

Historically, *yau* expression (*yau-nari*) seems to have developed to express EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY in Middle Japanese, that is about the same time as the negative *you-ni* clause began to express PURPOSE (see 4.1). Therefore, the evolution from EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY to PURPOSE is unlikely.

In addition, a discontinuity exists between these two usages in Japanese. The *you* clause, which expresses EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY, allows the past form of the verb to precede it (see Section 3.1.2), but the *you-ni* PURPOSE clause does not.

Therefore, the path from EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY to PURPOSE is not evident.

5. Summary

Some languages, including Seediq and Japanese, use similative morpheme to express PURPOSE. This study examines the evolution of Japanese purpose clauses.

The Japanese purpose clause uses a similative morpheme (*you/yau*), as described in Section 3. Initially, *yau* meant MANNER. SIMILATIVE usage seems to be derived from MANNER. Some examples are ambiguous regarding MANNER and PURPOSE.

Section 4 discusses the relationship between MANNER and PURPOSE. In Japanese, the grammaticalization from MANNER to PURPOSE was observed. The historical Japanese database revealed that PURPOSE usage began with negative predicates and expanded into affirmative. In earlier Japanese, *yau-ni* clauses were limited to expressing a situation simultaneous with the main clause event. Such a clause was interpreted as expressing MANNER. The situation expressed by a negative

predicate was interpreted as simultaneous, as it was irrealis; thus, negative predicates were allowed to occur in *yau-ni* clauses. Subsequently, it underwent semantic reinterpretation and began to express PURPOSE. This irrealis nature of negative clauses seems to be why some languages, including Seediq and Middle Japanese, limit the use of similative morphemes for expressing PURPOSE meaning to negative. This interpretation expanded to affirmative clauses in late Middle Japanese.

Since grammaticalization occurred from MANNER to PURPOSE and SIMILATIVE usage is derived from MANNER, we can say there was no direct grammaticalization from SIMILATIVE to PURPOSE. SIMILATIVE and PURPOSE are related because both usages were derived from MANNER. The grammaticalization from COMPLEMENTIZER to PURPOSE and that from SIMILATIVE via EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY to PURPOSE are examined in Section 4.4 and Section 4.5, respectively. Both are unlikely in Japanese.

Notes

- 1 I would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.
- 2 The corpus of historical Japanese provided by Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo (National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics) (2021) was consulted. Nihongo Rekishi Corpus [Historical Japanese Corpus] (ver. 2021.3) <https://ccd.ninjal.ac.jp/chj/>
- 3 Adverbial *-ni* is usually not omitted when the clause order is reversed.
- 4 Maeda (2006) provided the following examples. In (i), the adverb *gachan-to* expresses <manner>, and in (ii), the adverb *konagona-ni* expresses <result>.
 - (i) Kabin-ga gachan-to ware-ta. (manner)
vase-NOM clash-QUOT break-PAST
The vase crashed.
 - (ii) Kabin-ga konagona-ni ware-ta. (result)
vase-NOM into_pieces-ADV break-PAST
The vase broke into pieces.
- 5 Other usages such as CONTENTS OF THOUGHT are not considered here.

References

- Babalieva, Ayten. 2013. Étude sur la morphosyntaxe du tabasaran littéraire. PhD dissertation, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris.
- Creissels, Denis. 2017. Similarity, suitability, and non-epistemic modalities (volitionality, ability and obligation). In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 79–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Darmon, Chloé. 2017. The morpheme *-(ä)ŋä* in Xamtanga: Functions and grammaticalization targets. In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 359–385. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. *A grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenny, Mathias. 2017. Comparative, similative, and equative constructions in Mon Form, function and development. In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 291–319. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kobayashi, Masayuki and Taro Ichimura. 2013. Structuring the corpus of Toraakira-bon Kyogen. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop of Corpus Japanese linguistics*, 323–332. Tokyo: Center for Corpus Development, National Institute of Japanese Language and Linguistics.
- Maeda, Naoko. 2006. Meaning and usage of the ‘youni’ clause in Japanese. Tokyo: Kasama-shoin.
- Oono, Susumu, Satake Akihiro, and Maeda Kingorou. 1990. *Iwanami Kogo Jiten Hotei-ban* [Iwanami Dictionary of Classic Japanese, revised version]. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.
- Schulze, Wolfgang. 2017. Toward a cognitive typology of like-expressions. In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 33–77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Treis, Yvonne. 2017. Similative morphemes as purpose clause markers in Ethiopia and beyond. In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 91–142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tsukida, Naomi. In preparation. Precautioning clauses in Seediq. *The Journal of the School of Foreign Studies Aichi Prefectural University (Language and Literature)*. No. 56.
- Watts, Richard J. 1984. An analysis of epistemic possibility and probability. *English Studies*

65 (2): 129–140.

- Ylikoski, Jussi. 2017. Similarity, equality and the like in North Saami. In Treis and Vanhove (eds.), *Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 259–290. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zaugg-Coretti, Silvia. 2017. Similative morphemes and their grammaticalization in Yemsa. In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 341–357. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Texts

- Taketori Monogatari (Late Old Japanese): Unknown. Unknown.
- The Tale of Genji (Late Old Japanese): Murasaki Sikibu. 11th Century.
- Toraakira-bon Kyogen (Late Middle Japanese): Ookura Yaemon Toraakira. 1642.
- Ture-dure-gusa (Middle Japanese). Yosida Kenko. 14th Century.

日本語の「よう-に」目的節の発達

月 田 尚 美

要 旨

日本語の類似格形態素（ヨウ）の文法化について、国立国語研究所が開発したコーパス検索アプリケーション「中納言」の日本語歴史コーパスを利用して研究した。中古日本語（平安期）には、「ヤウ-ニ」（「ヨウ-ニ」の古い形）が「様態」を表す例はあった。主節の表す事態と従属節の表す事態は同時だった。否定述語は、それが表す「実現されていない」という状況は主節の表す事態と同時にありと解釈できるため、この従属節に現れることが許された。そのような否定の従属節が中世日本語（鎌倉期）では「目的」（「～しないように」）を表すと解釈されるようになった。そして後期中世日本語（室町期）ではこの用法が肯定述語にも広がっていった。現代日本語でも、「ヨウ-ニ」の例の多くで「様態」を表すとも「目的」を表すとも解釈できる。日本語では、文法化の方向は「様態」→「目的」、「様態」→「類似」であり、「類似」と「目的」の間に直接的な文法化があったわけではないことが分かった。鎌倉期の、「ヨウ-ニ」が目的にかんしては否定目的しか表せないという状況は、台湾のセデック語やエチオピアのクシ系言語の類似格形態素が否定目的しか表せないという状況に似ており、否定が「実現されていない」を表すという点がこのような制限に関与しているのではないかと考察した。