This study enlarges the scope of historical studies of Japonic nominalizers by exploring relevant structural changes, and including comparative typological analyses with the Western-periphery dialects. Starting with grammaticalization of the pre-Okinawan (Okn) pronominal (*sô>*su>*si>*shi) as a nominalizer, it brings into the picture the Okn cognate of the Old Japanese (OJ) kōsō kakari particle (*sô>*sô>*syô>*su>*syu>*si>*syu>*si>*Ø), because of its claimed relation to the *sô nominalizer (Serafim and Shinzato 2005). It then analyzes these in comparative perspective with the Northern-Kyushu/Yamaguchi nominalizers shi/si/su/so/ho (all <*sô), and connects those s-initial nominalizers with other t-initial Kyushu nominalizers, to/tu/Q.

First, it relates three events: (a) the rise of Okn *sô as a nominalizer at about the same time as (b) the demise of *sô-type kakari musubi (KM), and (c) re-creation of the rentai ‘adnominal’ and shūshi ‘finite’ distinction (Hattori 1959, Mamiya 1983, Uchima 1994), which spread back into the non-progressive parts of the paradigm after the rise of a new stative-extension-based verbal paradigm. Okn, just as Japanese, nearly obliterated the original shūshi and rentai distinction (excepting existence verbs), thus triggering events leading to the creation of a nominalizer (*sô ‘one’ > ‘to DO, DOing’). Unlike Japanese, the new shūshi and rentai distinction helped preserve du-type KM (counterpart of OJ zo-type KM), which otherwise probably would have followed a similar path to extinction. Contrasting, the new paradigm did nothing to maintain the izen ‘realis’ and meirei ‘imperative’ distinction, already blurred due to the near-merger of yodan with nidan verbs. Thus *sô-type KM, dependent upon that distinction, gained no ground for renewal; additionally, due to internal functional changes, *sô-type KM fossilized, leaving behind only pronominal *sô, which required preceding rentai-ending predicates, thus affording pronominal>nominalizer grammaticalization.

Second, neither of the Okn cognates ga, nu of the OJ genitive markers ga, no was recruited as a nominalizer because of possible parsing difficulties they would have created. Both ga and nu functioned as main-clause nominative case-markers. If one of them were to have taken on a nominalizer function, a ga/nu-marked phrase could be any of: genitive/ nominative/ accusative/ nominalized clause, since Colloquial Okn has no accusative marker, thus militating against nominalizer grammaticalization. In this context, Okn pronominal (*sô>*su ‘one’ (i.e., ‘person’ or ‘thing’ [Hokama 1995]) served as a ready candidate, just as the Kyushu dialects had t- or s/h-initial pronominals with which to work, while the Central-Japanese lineage did not.

Third, Kyushu/Yamaguchi nominalizers participate in forming sentence-level focusing constructions (similar to no da in Standard Japanese [Serafim 2003]). However, Colloquial Okn (*sô>*su) shi does not, because Okn still preserves du-type KM, which carries a stance-marking function similar to no da (Shinzato 1998).

Fourth, Serafim (2003) has suggested a cognation between the t-initial and s-initial pronominals. Even if they are related, the genitive-locative function (Vovin [2005:152]) seen in OJ tu, a potential cognate as well, is absent from them, and thus, at least in attested forms, they form a distinct pathway into pronominal and nominalizer function, perhaps never going through the stage of nominative markers.
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