In analyzing Japanese conjunctions, there are two types of approaches: “grammaticalization approach” (Hopper & Traugott 1993, Koda 2001) versus “compositional approach” (Takubo 1992). The former regards conjunctions as grammaticalized functional units, and the latter as functional complexes composed of anaphoric elements and conjunctive particles (which make subordinate clauses).

This paper shows that there are both compositional and grammaticalized (non-compositional) conjunctions, by observing the interpretation of inferential modal auxiliary (=MA). I assume that the compositional conjunctions are equivalent to “anaphor + conjunctive particles” in interpretation. Let us use the phrases “focus of MA” to denote “new information gained by inference”, and “scope of MA” to denote “part of language expressions where the focus of MA are situated”.

Notice restriction (A). With sorede/dakara, (2) is natural though it appears to violate (A). This is because the focus of MA is causality between “eating cake” and “having a stomachache” (same as (3)). Since causality is a binary relation between cause and effect, the scope of MA should contain not only the second sentence, but also the first sentence, as schematized in (4). Regarding sosite, (5) is unnatural (although the speaker’s direct experience is in the first sentence, not in the second sentence). This suggests that the first sentence in (5) is in the scope of MA.

Assuming that MA’s scope is decided by syntactic relations (for example, c-command), we need to explain how it extends to the structurally independent first sentence. One may object that non-structural analyses such as (Bi-iii) are possible, but none of them seems to be correct. If (Bi) were correct, (7) should have the same interpretation as (2) (focusing on causality), but actually it does not. With (Bii, iii), semantic representations should be something like (8), not (4). Given that the conjunctions are compositional, they get into the scope of MA as subordinate clauses, and by having anaphoric relations with the first sentences, they semantically bring the first sentences into MAs’ scope ((9)).

There are non-compositional conjunctions, too. (10a,b), in contrast to (2), (5) respectively, suggest that MAs’ scopes do not extend to the first sentences. Assuming that simple conjunctions sosite/sorede do not have anaphoric relations with the first sentences, we can explain (10a,b). Functional differences between sosite/sorede and conjunctive particles -tel/-node also support the existence of non-compositional conjunctions. Suppose conjunctions are always compositional, then we predict that a. and b. are equivalent in (11), (12). However, this prediction is not correct. (11a) and (12a) mean that the speaker infers ‘that Yamada has returned home’ from the knowledge ‘that lights are turned off’. However, neither (11b) nor (12b) mean that. I hence conclude that sosite/sorede are not compositional. Based on (11), (12), and the assumption that non-compositional sosite/sorede lack anaphoric relation, we can further construct generalization (C). (C) does not apply to dakara ((13)).

The polysemy of conjunctions is usually explained by cognitive or historical reasons (Sweetser 1990). This paper suggests the necessity for taking syntactic/semantic factors, such as (C), into consideration.
(A) If the focus of MA is the speaker’s direct experience, the sentence becomes semantically unnatural (see (1)).

(1) [[[ watasi/ok ane]-wa onaka-ga itaku-natta ] {nodaroolyooodarasi}. ([ ] shows the scope of MA)
   \{/ elder.sister-TOP stomach-NOM ache-became \} (inferential MA)

(2) watasi-wa syoomikigengire-no keeki-o tabeta. \{sorede/dakara\}, onaka-ga itakunatta
   \{/TOP past.expiration.date-GEN cake-ACC ate \} \{SOREDE/DAKARA\} stomach-NOM ache-became
   \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.

(3) watasi-wa syoomikigengire-no keeki-o tabeta \{node/kara\}, onaka-ga itakunatta \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.

(4) \{ S conj S \} MA.

(5) [[[ watasi/ok kokyaku]-ga puroguramu-no bagu-wo sitekisita. sosite, syain-no Yamada-ga
   \{/client-NOM program-GEN bug-ACC pointed.out \} SOSITE stuff.member-gEN Yamada-NOM
   syuuseisagyoo-wo okonatta \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}

did

(6) [[[ watasi/ok kokyaku]-ga puroguramu-no bagu-wo sitekisi-te, syain-no Yamada-ga syuuseisagyoo-wo
   okonatta \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.

(B) i.  We can freely extend MA’s scope to the first sentence (even without conjunctions).
   ii.  We can freely copy MA from the second sentence to the first sentence.
   iii. There is a MA in the first sentence, but it is superficially omitted.

(7) [[[ watasi-wa syoomikigengire-no keeki-o tabeta. (watasi-wa) onaka-ga itakunatta \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.

(8) \{ S \} MA. conj \{ S \} MA.

(9) S, \{ (anaphor, + conj) S \} MA.

(10) a.  [[ ane-wa tiizukeeki-o tabeta. sorede, watasi-wa aisukuriimu-o tabeta
   \{/TOP cheese.cake-ACC ate \} \{SOREDE\} \{/TOP ice.cream-ACC ate \}
   \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}. simple coordination
       b.  watasi-wa aisukuriimu-o tabeta. sosite, ane-wa tiizukeki-o tabeta \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.

(11) a.  zimusyo-no denki-ga kieteiru node, [Yamada-wa moo kaetta] \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.
    \{office-NOM light-NOM be.turned.off \} NODE Yamada-TOP already went.home
    b.  # zimusyo-no denki-ga kieteiro. sorede, [Yamada-wa moo kaetta ] \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.

(12) a.  [ Yamada-wa moo kaetta ] \{rasiku-tyoo-de\}, zimusyo-no denki-ga kieteiro.
    \{RASII-TE/YOODA-TE\}
    b.  # [ Yamada-wa moo kaetta ] \{rasiityooda\}. sosite, zimusyo-no denki-ga kieteiro.

(13) zimusyo-no denki-ga \{kieteiro kara/kieteiro. dakara\}, Yamada-wa moo kaetta \{nodaroolyooodarasi\}.

(C) Sostielsorede cannot have anaphoric relation with the first sentence when each of the two sentences is in
   different MA’s scope.

References


   Tokyo: Kazama Shobo.

   sono teigen to kensetu. Tokyo: Sanseido.