

How “things” inhibit control: *Mono*- clausal connective constructions in Japanese  
Nina Azumi Yoshida

In Modern Japanese, there exist a number of clausal connective constructions that involve the morphosyntactic element *mono*: namely, *mononara*, *monodakara*, *monode*, and *monono*. Such *mono*- clausal connective constructions (hereafter, *mono* CCC) grammatically function to embed the *mono* CCC-marked clause as an adverbial and subordinate it within a main clause, while semantically signaling the existence of an antecedent–consequent relationship that is either conditional (*mononara*), causal (*monodakara/monode*), or concessive (*monono*) between (the propositional contents of) the two clauses they combine. (See examples 1-4):

Past studies (e.g., Noda 1995, Itami 2000, Ogata 2001) have pointed out the availability in Japanese of other connective forms for expressing these three clausal relationships. Moreover, in the cases of *mononara* and *monodakara/monode*, it has been noted that the absence of *mono* in these constructions still results in a well-formed sentence expressing the same conditional and causal clausal relationships, respectively (See examples 1a -3a). However, a crucial omission in the literature has been what precise role *mono* is playing in constructions that do include this element, and what motivates speaker use of *mono*- CCCs in discourse?

This study seeks to address such issues by proposing an alternative, unitary analysis of *mono*- CCCs in Japanese discourse. The analysis is “unitary” in suggesting that a continuity exists in the semantics born by *mono* in *mono*- CCCs, and these represent inferable extensions of *mono*’s primary meaning arising via reanalysis (Hopper and Traugott 1993) from its occurrence in such grammaticalized constructions. It is “alternative” in proposing an underlying semantics for *mono* variant from those claimed in past studies (e.g., Fujii 2000). Structurally, *mono*- CCCs are viewed as instances of a clause in the *rentaikei* (‘attributive form’) modifying the *keesiki meesi* (‘formal noun’) *mono* as a head noun, and followed by the clausal linkers *nara* or *(da)kara*, or the connective particles *de* or *no*, which in turn occupies the position of antecedent clause and is adverbially subordinated to its consequent, main clause (as diagrammed below):

[Adverbial Subordinate Clause ] [Main Clause]  
[(Antecedent) CLAUSE<sub>1</sub><sup>attributive</sup> *mono*+*nara/dakara/de/no*], [(Consequent) CLAUSE<sub>2</sub>]

Based on *mono*’s uses as a bare noun equivalent to ‘thing(s)’, as well as its wide range of grammatical and interactional usages as a discourse modal in Modern Japanese, it is hypothesized that *mono*’s semantics primarily signals a “physically perceived / unrationalized” existence when it takes on a referential reading. When *mono* occurs in the *mono*- CCC, however, where it takes on a non-referential (modal) reading, its meaning is metaphorically (e.g., SPACE > TIME) and metonymically (e.g., existence = truth/obligation, unrationalized = unindividuated/uncontrollable) extended so as to signal that the event/situation named by the *mono*- CCC-marked clause is one lacking in individual (human) agency, and that the diffusion of speaker agency—and thus, of control and responsibility—underlie the discourse intents of *mono*- CCC employment.

In further support of these claims, a contextualized analysis of *mono*- CCC tokens collected from authentic Japanese spoken and written data is presented to illustrate how the semantic and pragmatic effects conveyed by these constructions are born out in actual discourse.

Examples (adapted from Nagara et al. (1987: 111-2))

- (1) *Pari e ikeru mononara, itte-mitai desu.*  
Paris ALL can go:NPST MONO CCC go:TE-see:DES COP:POL  
'If (only) I could go to Paris, I would like to go and see (how it is).'
- (2) *Mada tiisakatta monodakara, yoku oboete-imasen.*  
still small:PST MONO CCC well remember:TE-ASP:NEG:POL  
'Because (I) was still young, (I) don't remember (it) well.'
- (3) *Senzitu wa isoideita monode, go-aisatu mo sezu situree simasita.*  
other.day TOP hurry:TE-ASP:PST MONO CCC PFX-greeting even do:NEG be rude:PST:POL  
'Because (I) was in a hurry the other day, (I) was rude to not have even greeted (you).'
- (4) *Kyoto made itta monono, Kinkakuji wa mimasendesita.*  
Kyoto until go:PST MONO CCC Kinkaku Temple TOP see:POL:NEG:PST  
'Although I went up to Kyoto, (I) didn't see the Kinkakuji Temple.'
- (1a) *Pari e ikeru nara, itte-mitai desu.*  
'If I can go to Paris, I want to go and see (how it is).'
- (2a) *Mada tiisakatta kara, yoku oboete-imasen.*  
'Because (I) was still young, (I) don't remember (it) well.'
- (3a) *Senzitu wa isoideite, go-aisatu mo sezu situree simasita.*  
'(I) was in a hurry the other day, and (so) (I) was rude to not have even greeted (you).'

**Abbreviations:** ALL=Allative; ASP =Aspect; COP=Copula; DES=Desiderative; MONO CCC= *Mono Clausal Connective Construction*; NEG=Negative; NOM=Nominative; NPST=Non Past; POL=Polite; PFX=Prefix; PST=Past; TE= *Te* Connective; TOP=Topic

## References (cited in abstract)

- Itami, C. 2000. Monono no imi to yoohoo ni tuite ('On the Meaning and Usage of "Mono-no"') *Tookyo Gaigo Daigaku Ryuugakusee Nihongo Kyooiku Sentaa Ronsyuu.*, Vol. 26:3 pp. 231-240.
- Fujii, S. 2000. Incipient Decategorizaion of MONO in Japanese Discourse. In G. Andersen and T. Freitheim (eds.) *Pragmatic Markers and Propositional Attitude.* 83-118. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hopper, P. and E. C. Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagara S., Hirota, N. and Nakanishi, Y. 1987. *Japanese for Foreigners: Innovative Workbook in Japanese: Volume 2.* Tokyo: Aratake.
- Noda, H. 1995. *Noda no kinoo* ('The Functions of NODA'). Kurosio Syuppan.
- Ogata, R. 2001. Monono no imi to yoohoo ('The Meaning and Usage of "Mono-no"') *Tookyo Gaigo Daigaku Ryuugakusee Nihongo Kyooiku Sentaa Ronsyuu.*, Vol. 27: 3 pp. 1-15.