

An LFG Account of the Compound Particle *TOIUNO* in Spontaneous Japanese

Tohru Seraku
t.seraku@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION: A growing body of work on Japanese compound particles has been conducted recently (Fujita & Yamazaki 2006). This paper focuses on the compound particle *toiuno*, as exemplified in (1).

- (1) *Tom-wa [guaba **toiuno**]-o tabeta.*
Tom-TOP [guava TOIUNO]-ACC ate
'Tom ate the one called guava.'

Literally, *toiuno* is divided into three parts: *to* (= complementiser), *iu* (= 'say'), and *no* (= nominaliser). The string (2) is a case of *no*-nominalisation; the particle *no* turns the preceding clause *bakada to iu* into a nominal that denotes the action 'to say that someone is stupid.'

- (2) *[[Bakada **to**] **iu no**]-wa hidoi.*
[[stupid COMP] say NO]-TOP mean
'It is mean to say that someone is stupid.'

There are many previous studies on *toiuno* (Fujita & Yamazaki 2006) and *no*-nominalisation (Kitagawa 2005), but their relation has not been explored extensively. In this paper, I shall aim at the following:

- To show that *toiuno* cannot be analysed as an instance of *no*-nominalisation by surveying spontaneous data extracted from CSJ (Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese) (2nd edn., NINJAL, 2011)
- To reveal the 'ambivalent' status of *toiuno* and other novel properties, and account for them in Lexical Functional Grammar, in particular by utilising the attribute DOM (Falk 2001)

2. DATA: Since *toiuno* may be marked by a range of particles, this paper focuses on *toiuno* that is marked by the topic marker *wa*, as in *toiuno-wa*. In CSJ, the compound particle *toiuno* and the *no*-nominalisation *to-iu-no* are expressed in different forms: 'と**い**うの' for *toino* and 'と**言**うの' for *to-iu-no*. CSJ contains 1,656 sentences with the string *toiuno-wa*. These CSJ data reveal a number of unique properties of *toiuno* that are not shared by *to-iu-no*. (For reasons of space, some of the core findings are presented below.)

2.1. Connotation: As mentioned in Kitagawa (2005), it is widely assumed that when the nominaliser *no* denotes a human, a derogatory connotation is found. In the case of *toiuno*, however, such connotations are absent even if a human is denoted, as illustrated in (3).

- (3) *[Saigomade yarinuita **kata** **toiuno**]-wa [[imademo jibun-no senmonno-shigoto-o*
[until.the.end complete person.POLITE TOIUNO]-TOP [[even.now self-GEN specialised-work-ACC
motte ganbatteyatteru] kata]-ga ooi.
have work.hard] person.POLITE]-NOM abundant (CSJ: S05F0463)
'As for those who have completed their work, most of them pursue their specialised works even now.'

As marked in bold ink, *kata*, a polite form to refer to a person, is felicitously used. If *toiuno* had derogative connotation, the use of *kata* would be inappropriate. The lack of connotation indicates that *toiuno* forms a compound unit, where the nominaliser *no*, a locus of expressivity, is not recognised as a separate item.

2.2. Pre-*toiuno* items: The category of what precedes the compound particle *toiuno* is much wider than the category of what precedes the *no*-nominalisation *to-iu-no*. This discrepancy lends further support to the claim that *toiuno* cannot be analysed as a case of *no*-nominalisation *to-iu-no*.

Firstly, *to* in *to-iu-no* is a declarative complementiser and it cannot select an embedded question as an argument. This restriction does not hold of the compound particle *toiuno*, as demonstrated in (4). (In what follows, there are phonological variants of *toiuno*, such as *ttsuuno* and *tteiuno*.)

- (4) *[Sore-ga jibun-nitotte kooka-ga atta nokadouka **ttsuuno**]-wa gimon nandesu.*
[that-NOM self-for effect-NOM existed whether TOIUNO]-TOP question COP
'It is questionable whether it was effective.' (CSJ: S00M0065)

Secondly, since *to* is a complementiser, it cannot follow a non-sentential item such as demonstratives. It is held that *toiuno* cannot follow a demonstrative either (Niwa 1994), but such examples are found in CSJ:

- (5) *[Sore **tteiuno**]-wa oto-o kikiwakeru kontorooru-ga dekite-nai.*
[that TOIUNO]-TOP sound-ACC listen.distinguish control-NOM possible-NEG
'As for that, it is not capable of distinguishing between sounds while listening to them.'
(CSJ: S00M0053)

Thirdly, unlike the case of *to-iu-no*, *toiuno* may even lack a preceding item if it is suffixed by the topic marker *wa*. That is, *toiuno-wa* can be used sentence-initially, meaning something like 'that is to say, ...'

- (6) ***Tteiunowa** watashi-wa syoogakkoo-jidai-ni titioya-no-tenkin-de firipin-ni sundemashita.*
TOIUNOWA I-TOP primary.school-era-in father-GEN.job.relocation-as Philippine-in lived

‘That is to say, when I was a primary school student, I lived in Philippine due to my father’s job relocation.’ (CSJ: S01F0217)

In (6), *toiuno-wa* serves as a discourse marker. Given that *toiuno-wa* never exhibits a discourse marker function when it is preceded by an item/phrase, I assume that *toiunowa* forms another compound particle.

2.3. Form of *toiuno*: CSJ does not contain any examples where *iu* in *toiuno* is negated or a subject of *iu* in *toiuno* is explicitly expressed. These results are consistent with the claim that *toiuno* on the whole forms a compound particle. An apparently problematic case is that CSJ contains the string *toittano*, where *itta* is a past tense form of *iu* (= ‘say’); this is unexpected if *iu* in *toiuno* does not function separately. A closer scrutiny, however, reveals that *toittano* does not express a past tense; even if *toittano* in these examples is replaced with *toiuno*, it does not change the tense of the clause. So, it appears that each of *toiuno/toittano* is a fixed expression on its own, and the compound status of *toiuno* is not undermined by these data.

3. ANALYSIS: The last section showed that *toiuno* formed an irreducible unit and also pointed out its unique properties. This section considers the entry of this irreducible unit within Lexical Functional Grammar.

As stated above, *toiuno* must be preceded by a phrase; *toiunowa* in (6) is a distinct item, a discourse marker. In this sense, it has a ‘bound-morpheme’ like property. On the other hand, the native speaker has a strong intuition that, though *toiuno* functions like a bound-morpheme, it also serves as a head noun; in connection with this, note that *toiuno* is always marked by the topic suffix *wa* or a case suffix (e.g. *toiuno-ga* [nominative], *toiuno-o* [accusative]). This intuition fits well with the common assumption that Japanese is a strictly head-final language. This ambivalent status of *toiuno* as being a ‘bound-morpheme’ like item and a ‘head noun’ like item is similar to the ‘construct-state genitive’ in Hebrew, as illustrated in (7).

- (7) *Ešet* *ha-politikay* [Hebrew]
 wife.CONSTR the-politician
 ‘the politician’s wife’ (Falk 2001: 83, inessential modifications)

The construct-state genitive *ešet* cannot stand on its own, requiring a possessive nominal like *ha-politikay*. On the other hand, as indicated in the free translation, it is *ešet* that serves as a head noun. Falk (2001) captures this ambivalent status of *ešet* by introducing the attribute DOM(INANT) into the entry of *ešet*. In this analysis, *ešet* is a predicate that takes a possessive argument (i.e., *ha-politikay*); this models the ‘head noun’ status. Further, the attribute DOM has a value equated with the content of the possessive argument; this models the ‘bound-morpheme’ status. Following Falk (2001), this paper argues that the (minimal) f-structure for *toiuno* has the attribute DOM, whose value is equated with the content of the preceding item. This is ensured by the existential constraint (\uparrow DOM). In the case of *toiuno*, however, there is an additional complexity: *toiuno* may be preceded not only by nouns/demonstratives (3, 5) but also clauses (4). This is modeled by the disjunction $\{(\uparrow$ OBJ) | (\uparrow COMP)}\}, where OBJ is for nouns/demonstratives and COMP is for clauses. Thus, I propose that *toiuno* has the entry (8). Given this entry, the string (1) is assigned the f-structure (9). Note that *toiuno* is a predicate; this ensures its head-noun status. On the other hand, DOM ensures the bound-morpheme status: *toiuno* is dependent on the preceding item, as represented in the equation between the value of DOM and that of OBJ (i.e., content of the preceding item *guaba*).

- (8) *toiuno*: (\uparrow DOM), (\uparrow PRED) = ‘*toiuno*<{(\uparrow OBJ) | (\uparrow COMP)}>’

- (9)

PRED	‘eat<SUBJ, OBJ>’
TENSE	PAST
SUBJ	[PRED ‘Tom’]
OBJ	[PRED ‘ <i>toiuno</i> <{(\uparrow OBJ) (\uparrow COMP)}>’]
	[OBJ [PRED ‘guava’]
DOM]]

The disjunction is satisfied by the presence of OBJ, whose value is another f-structure [PRED ‘guava’]. In other cases like (4), where *toiuno* is preceded by an embedded question, the relevant attribute is COMP. (CSJ also contains cases where *toiuno* is preceded by a declarative clause, which is also predicted by the disjunction.) This distinction is independently motivated by the verbs like *tazuneru* (= ‘ask’), which selects OBJ (*riyuu-o tazuneru* (= ‘ask a reason’)) or COMP (*Tom-ga genki ka tazuneru* (= ‘ask if Tom is fine’)).

4. CONCLUSION: This paper has shown that *toiuno* forms an irreducible unit on the basis of the CSJ data and argued that these corpus findings and the ambivalent status of *toiuno* are modelled within LFG.

REFERENCES: Falk, Y. 2001. Constituent structure and grammatical functions in the Hebrew action nominal. *Proceedings of LFG 01*. Fujita, Y. & Yamazaki, M. (eds.) 2006. *Fukugooji Kenkyuu no Genzai*. Kitagawa, C. 2005. Typological variants of head-internal relatives in Japanese. *Lingua* 115, 1243-76. Niwa, T. 1994. Syudai teiji no ‘tte’ to in’you. *Jinbun Kenkyuu* 46, 79-109.