

A STUDY OF THREE EXPRESSIONS OF PURPOSE IN JAPANESE

--- TAME NI, NO NI, AND YOO NI ---

Sub-thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts (Asian Studies)
at The Australian National University

December 1984

BY

KEIKO SHIINA



DECLARATION

Except where otherwise indicated
this thesis is my own work.

KEIKO SHIINA

December 1984

GLOSSARY

KEY TO GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

ABL	ablative case marker (kara)
ALLAT	allative case marker (e)
ACC	accusative case marker (o)
CAUS	causative affix (-sase-)
COM	comitative case marker (to)
COMP	sentential complementizer (koto)
COND	conditional affix (-eba)
COP	copula (da)
DAT	dative case marker (ni)
GEN	genitive case marker (no)
HON	honorific morpheme (o-)
HOR	hortative affix (-yoo)
IMP	imperative form
INS	instrumental case marker (de)
LOC	locative case marker (ni, de)
NML	nominalizer (n(o))
NOM	nominative case marker (ga)
PASS	passive affix (-rare-)
PERF	perfect marker (-iru)
POL	politeness marker (-masu, -desu)
PROG	progressive marker (-iru)
Q	question marker (ka)
QUOT	quotative marker (to)
STEM	verb stem

TE gerund affix (-te)

TEMP temporal locative marker (ni)

TOP topic marker (wa)

*X X is ungrammatical

?X X is on the borderline between grammatical and ungrammatical

The romanized script of the Japanese text follows the Hepburn system, with the exception of proper nouns which have idiosyncratic spelling. I have chosen to spell words borrowed from English, which have undergone no significant semantic shift, as they are spelled in English, for the convenience of the reader.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to both my supervisors, Dr. Hiroko C. Quackenbush and Dr. Anna Wierzbicka, for their many helpful suggestions and great patience.

I would also like to acknowledge my great debt to Dr. Mieko Ohso and Mr. Yoshio Nitta for their valuable comments and contributions to the development of this thesis.

I am grateful to Ms Nerida Gray and Ms Elizabeth Jacques, who read the draft patiently and corrected my English. I am especially indebted to Nerida for her kindness and assistance in numerous ways throughout the two years of my study at A.N.U..

I must also mention here my indebtedness to Ms Haruko Hayakawa and Mr. Yooichiroo Higuchi. It would have been impossible to complete my thesis at such an early date without their guidance as to the use of the word processor. Many thanks also go to Mr. Edmund Skrzypczak, who checked the final draft so carefully.

Lastly, my sincere thanks to all my friends and to my family for their invaluable support and encouragement throughout the entire period of my research and thesis preparation.

ABSTRACT

Adverbs and adverbial clauses have received little attention from Japanese linguists to date. In this paper, three adverbial clauses, TAME NI, NO NI, and YOO NI, denoting 'purpose' are examined. Presented in most Japanese textbooks for beginners, these expressions are a source of considerable confusion for students, due to considerable similarity in their meaning and in the contexts in which they appear.

The paper first presents an overview of TAME NI and NO NI constructions and discusses their difference in meaning. It reveals that Purpose TAME NI focuses on the goal of the action described and Purpose NO NI on the manner or process involved. The sequential relation between the purposive and the main clause is the crucial factor of Purpose TAME NI construction.

It is suggested that, unlike the NI of Purpose TAME NI which indicates the goal, the particle NI of Purpose NO NI indicates the co-temporal relationship between the subordinate and the main clause. NI points to the occasion on which the event described in the main clause occurs.

The NI of YOO NI indicates the goal, as does the NI of TAME NI. However, the difference lies in the attitude of the subject toward the purpose. With TAME NI, the subject tries to achieve the purpose through his own effort, whereas YOO NI indicates more of a desire or wish on the part of the subject of the main clause (Kitagawa (1972), Kunihiro (1982)).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	i
GLOSSARY	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION	1
1. Purpose TAME NI and NO NI.	4
1.1 TAME NI.	4
1.2 NO NI.	6
1.2.1 Indirect Object NO NI.	7
1.2.2 Emotive Response NO NI.	8
1.2.3 Adjectival NO NI.	9
1.2.4 Purpose NO NI.	10
1.2.5 Contrary-to-Expectation NO NI.	10
1.3 Literature survey.	11
1.4 Purpose TAME NI and Purpose NO NI.	14
1.4.1 Type 1: Cases where NO NI is ungrammatical.	15
1.4.2 Type 2: Cases where TAME NI is ungrammatical.	17
1.4.3 Type 3: Cases where TAME NI and NO NI both occur, with some difference in meaning.	19
1.4.4 Type 4: Cases where both TAME NI and NO NI are possible with little or no apparent difference in meaning.	22
1.4.5 Summary.	23
1.5 Solving the problems.	24
1.5.1 Cases where the main predicate is stative.	24
1.5.2 Cases where the purposive predicate contains a negative form.	25
1.5.3 Examples of the qualitative noun HITSUYOO DA 'to be necessary' and semantically similar predicates.	26
1.5.4 Cases in which the subject of the main clause is not an animate being.	27
1.6 Summary.	31
2. PURPOSE YOO NI.	32
2.1 YOO NI.	32
2.1.1 YOO NI indicating manner.	32
2.1.2 YOO NI SURU.	32
2.1.3 YOO NI reporting a request.	33
2.1.4 Purpose YOO NI.	33
2.2 Literature survey.	34

2.3 Purpose YOO NI.	37
2.4 Purpose YOO NI and TAME NI.	41
2.5 Purpose YOO NI and the Causatives.	43
2.6 Summary.	45
3. CONCLUSION	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50

INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the difference in the meanings of three expressions of purpose in Japanese --- TAME NI, NO NI, and YOO NI. Presented in most Japanese textbooks for beginners, these expressions are a source of considerable confusion because of their similarity in meaning and in the contexts in which they appear.

To date, adverbs and adverbial clauses have received little attention from Japanese linguists. In this respect, they lag far behind the popular topics of tense, aspect and negation. This is probably due to the adverb's status as a secondary sentential element, and to the complex problems of occurrence it exhibits.

TAME NI, NO NI, and YOO NI clauses have suffered a lack of systematic investigation along with other adverbial clauses. Although some contrastive analysis has been done on Purpose TAME NI and YOO NI, the difference between Purpose TAME NI and NO NI has not yet been dealt with in any detail. Hopefully, this thesis goes towards making up for this shortfall.

The following examples display the problems dealt with in this paper.

1. Sono race ni katsu TAME NI/*NO NI kyoosooba no Achilles
 that DAT win rival horse GEN

ken o kittta.
 heel ACC cut

'They cut the Achilles' tendon of the rival horse in order to win the race.'

2. Kare wa coffee o nomu *TAME NI/NO NI ryoote de cup o
 he TOP ACC drink both hands INS ACC

mochi, sukoshi-zutsu nameru yoo ni nondar.
 hold-STEM little by little lick as if drank

'To drink the coffee, he held the cup with both hands and drank it little by little, as if lapping it up.'

3. Ressha no naka de yomu { a. TAME NI zasshi o katta.
train GEN inside LOC read b. NO NI magazine ACC bought
a. 'I bought some magazines to read in the train.'
b. 'I bought some magazines for reading in the train.'

4. Shooko o nokosanai TAME NI/YOO NI shorui wa zembu
evidence ACC not leave document TOP all
moyashita.
burned
'I burned all the documents in order/so as not to leave any
evidence.'

5. Shizukani hanashi ga dekiru *TAME NI/YOO NI aite iru hey
quietly talk NOM can do vacant room
e haitta.
ALLAT entered
'We entered a vacant room *in order/so that we could talk
quietly.'

6. Koala o miru TAME NI/*YOO NI Australia ni kita.
ACC look DAT came
'I came to Australia in order/*so as to have a look at some
Koala bears.'

7. Narubeku katayorazuni eiyoo o toru
as much as possible well balanced nutrition ACC take
TAME NI/YOO NI shokuchi ni ki o tsukau.
meals DAT mind ACC use
'I watch my meals in order/so as to get a balanced nutrition
intake.'

Notice that all examples of purposive clauses have a predicate in the non-past form. Purpose TAME NI is sometimes interchangeable with Purpose NO NI or YOO NI, and sometimes not. Although these three constructions are all said to express purpose, the precise meaning of purpose conveyed by each seems to be different.

In this paper, I will examine the semantics of each construction. In Chapter 1, after presenting an overview of Purpose TAME NI and Purpose NO NI, I will discuss the difference between the two constructions. In Chapter 2, Purpose YOO NI will be examined, followed by a comparison firstly with Purpose TAME NI and secondly with the causative construction. Finally, the reasons for the grammaticality and ungrammaticality of the examples above will be explained.

Sentences with the topic marker WA (i.e. --- TAME NI WA / --- NO NI WA) have been excluded from the data. This is because the particle WA somehow weakens the constraints on the occurrence of these expressions, and makes precise evaluation difficult. Why the inclusion of the topic particle should make sentences more easily acceptable is a problem of the particle itself, and is outside the realm of this study.
¹

Cases where NO and TAME are omitted and only the particle NI, followed by WA, is used to indicate the notion of purpose, as shown in the example below, will also be left for future study.

8. Sydney e iku NI WA Hume Highway o tooru.
 ALLAT go DAT TOP ACC pass

'To get to Sydney we go along the Hume Highway.'

¹It would be interesting to study this problem in terms of, for example, clause linkage. The fact that WA never follows Purpose YOO NI (*--- YOO NI WA) tells us that clauses are more closely linked with Purpose YOO NI than with the other two structures. N.B. Purpose YOO NI does not include YOO NI SURU, which does allow the particle WA (--- YOO NI WA SURU). See Section 2.1 below.

CHAPTER 1

PURPOSE TAME NI AND NO NI.

In this chapter the difference in meaning between Purpose TAME NI and NO NI will be discussed with particular reference to the work of Kitagawa (1972).

1.1 TAME NI.

Essentially, TAME is a noun which means 'sake' or 'account' (Alfonso, 1974: 581). In the construction S1 TAME NI S2 (where S1 is the subordinate clause and S2, the main clause), TAME, though retaining its original meaning to a certain extent, can be considered to function as a formal noun.¹ NI is a particle and in the Purpose TAME NI construction it indicates goal.

There are two basic interpretations for this pattern, viz. Purpose TAME NI and Reason TAME NI. When the subjects of S1 and S2 are different only Reason TAME NI appears, the notion of Purpose being incompatible with this kind of sentence. For example:

1. Tom wa Barry ga denwa suru TAME NI soto e deta.
 TOP NOM telephone do outside ALLAT went out

'Tom went out because Barry was going to make a phone call.'
 (Reason)

Compare:

2. Tom wa denwa soru TAME NI soto e deta.
 TOP telephone do outside ALLAT went out

'Tom went out in order to make a phone call.' (Purpose)

When the subjects of S1 and S2 are the same, the crucial factor which differentiates Purpose TAME NI and Reason TAME NI is the temporal relationship between S1 and S2 (Kunihiro, 1982: 110-111).

¹Matsushita (1930: 24) Formal nouns are those which have significance only as syntactic units and lack substantial meaning.

3. Nihongo o narau TAME NI nihon e itta.
 Japanese ACC learn Japan ALLAT went

'He went to Japan to study Japanese.' (Purpose)

4. Nihongo o naratta TAME NI nihon e itta.
 Japanese ACC learned Japan ALLAT went

'He went to Japan because he had studied Japanese.' (Reason)

As these examples show, when TAME NI is understood to indicate Purpose, as in Example 3, the time reference of S1 is in the future with respect to the time of S2, whereas in Example 4, where TAME NI is taken to mean Reason (at least in cases where the subject of both clauses is the same), it is the other way around, i.e. S1 is understood to take place prior to S2. This temporal sequence is the crucial factor that distinguishes Purpose TAME NI not only from Reason TAME NI but also from Purpose NO NI, discussed below.

It will thus not be necessary to propose two distinct meanings for TAME NI, in spite of the rather different English translations it yields. Rather, we could say that purpose is a "foreseen reason" for doing something. In other words, when the speaker, in Example 3 above, says someone went to Japan to study Japanese, it is basically the same as saying the person went to Japan because he planned to study Japanese there, or that the reason he went to Japan was that he intended to study Japanese.

R. T. Lakoff (1968: 198) says that 'in order to' contains 'because', as part of its meaning, claiming that of all the adverbial clauses, only purpose and causal ones can answer the question 'why?'.² Look at these examples from Lakoff (Ibid: 198).

5. Why did you rob the bank?

a. In order to make money.

b. Because the Mafia leader told me to.

²Ikegami (1981: 148) reports the same observation in personal communication with Bolinger. Bolinger points out that the answers to the following question with 'why' are Reason in the first case, and Purpose in the second.

(68) 'Why did the tree fall?' 'Because it had been cut through.'
 (69) 'Why are you hurrying?' 'To catch the train.'

- c. *When I saw that I could not pay tuition this semester.
- d. *Since all my friends are juvenile delinquents.
- e. *Although my mother brought me up to be poor but honest.

The same phenomenon can be seen in Japanese.

5'. Dooshite ginkoo o osotta no desu ka.
Why bank ACC robbed NML COP-POL Q

'Why did you rob the bank?'

a. Kane o te ni ireru TAME NI desu.
money ACC get in order to COP-POL

'In order to get some money.'

b. Mafia no oyabun ga soo shiro to itta TAME/KARA desu.
GEN leader NOM so do-IMP QUOT said because COP-POL

'Because the Mafia leader told me to do so.'

c. *Kongakki no jugyooryoo ga haraenai to shitta
this semester GEN tuition NOM cannot pay QUOT knew

TOKI desu.
when COP-POL

'When I saw that I could not pay tuition this semester.'

d. [No suitable counterpart to (5.d) in Japanese.]

e. *Haha ga mazushikute mo shoojikini sodateta
my mother NOM poor-TE even honestly raised

KEREDOMO.
although

'Although my mother brought me up to be honest, even if poor.'

1.2 NO NI.

I would like to introduce here five kinds of NO NI constructions using Kitagawa's (*Ibid.*) classification and terminology, and draw a clear distinction between Purpose NO NI expressions and all the other

types. The NO of these constructions is simply a nominalizer.³ NI is a particle, the function of which differs somewhat from one construction to another. Its function in NO NI constructions will be discussed in some detail below, and will be compared with the NI of TAME NI.

1.2.1 Indirect Object NO NI.

6. Sydney e iku NO NI kuruma de yo-jikan kakaru.
ALLAT go car INS four hours take

'It takes four hours to go to Sydney by car.'

In this construction, the dative particle NI serves to mark one of

³ Japanese linguists do not entirely agree on whether NO is a nominalizer or a formal noun. NO is commonly considered by contemporary linguists to be a nominalizer. However, Matsushita (1928), Tokieda (1950), and Sakuma (1966) class NO as a formal noun. I consider NO to be a formal noun when it replaces a nominal expression, as in:

i) Kirei na NO o kudasai.
clean one ACC give-POL-IMP

'Please give me a clean one.'

However, I consider to be a nominalizer when it nominalizes the sentence preceding it, as in:

ii) Sydney e iku NO ni yo-jikan kakaru.
ALLAT go NML DAT four hours take

'It takes four hours to go to Sydney.'

Therefore, NO in Purpose NO NI is considered to be a nominalizer.

the core arguments of the verb⁴ in the main clause, KAKARU 'to take'. This argument is nominalized by NO.

1.2.2 Emotive Response NO NI.

7. Kodomo o sodateru NO NI kuroo shita.
child ACC raise hardship did

'I had a hard time raising my children.'

Kitagawa calls the type of verb which occurs in the main clause of this construction a 'terminus verb'.⁵ ODOROKU 'to get surprised at', TSUKARERU 'to get tired', AKIRU 'to get bored with', and NAYAMU 'to worry' are all of this group and share the property of describing a mental or emotional activity or entry into a mental or emotional state. The particle NI signals the cause of these mental or emotional

⁴There are a couple of ways to test if an argument is a core argument or not. If the case relation is recoverable for the argument when it becomes a head noun, it is a core argument of the verb. Observe the following examples.

- i) Taroo ga itta daigaku.
NOM went university

'The university to which Taroo went.'

- ii) Spice o tsukau ryoori
ACC use cooking

'Cooking to/in which we add/use spices.'

The dative case is not unambiguously recoverable in Example (ii), whereas it is in Example (i). Kitagawa (Ibid: 180) considers that a noun in the dative case is a core argument of the verb TSUKAU 'to use'. However, I do not, on the basis of the result of the test above and discussion with native speakers of Japanese. So, while Kitagawa classifies TSUKAU with those verbs which take "Indirect Object NO NI", I consider it to take Purpose NO NI (see Section 1.4.4. below).

⁵Terminus verbs are non-state verbs that occur in the context of /--- HAJIMERU/ 'begin to---' but not in /---OWARU/ 'finish ---ing' nor in /---TSUTSUARU/ 'be in the process of---' (Kitagawa, Ibid: 126).

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| e.g. Tsukare-hajimeru | 'begin to get tired' |
| *Tsukare-owaru | 'finish tiring' |
| *Tsukare-tsutsuaru | 'be in the process of getting tired' |

activities or states,⁶ and NO, of course, is a nominalizer.

1.2.3 Adjectival NO NI.

8. Kono hon wa bed de yomu NO NI ii.
 this book TOP LOC read good

'This book is good to read in bed.'

The main clause of this kind of NO NI construction contains an adjective or qualitative noun⁷ which gives an evaluation, such as TEKITOO DA 'to be suitable' or FUBEN DA 'to be inconvenient'.⁸ The

⁶ It is clear that the occurrence of the particle NI in these sentences should not simply be regarded as an arbitrary rule of Japanese grammar, but can be seen to be motivated by the shared semantic features of these verbs and adjectives (see the next section) as well as by the semantic input of the particle NI. Bolinger (1984) illustrates a similar case of the interaction between semantics and syntax. He discusses two different kinds of emotion predicate in English and shows how the semantic differences are reflected in the tightness of the nexus between the clause containing the emotion verbs and the subordinate clause. For example, the difference is related to whether or not the predicate takes a 'that'-complement clause or a 'to'-infinitival complement.

⁷ Qualitative nouns in Japanese are words which have some functions that ordinary nouns have, but also some other functions peculiar to themselves when they act as modifiers (Alfonso, Ibid: 96). Observe the behavior of KIREI 'prettiness' (a qualitative noun) and BYOOKI 'sickness' (an ordinary noun) in the following sentences.

- i) a. Cathy wa kirei da.
 TOP prettiness COP

'Cathy is pretty.'

- b. Cathy wa byooki da.
 TOP sickness COP

'Cathy is sick.'

- ii) a. Kirei NA Cathy. 'pretty Cathy'

- b. Byooki NO Cathy. 'sick Cathy'

When a qualitative noun modifies another noun, it is followed by NA as can be seen in (ii-a), whereas an ordinary noun is followed by NO.

⁸ I consider that the derived verb ---SUGIRU 'to be in excess', for example, CHIISA-SUGIRU 'to be too small', belongs to this group. It is a verb in terms of its form. However, the meaning conveyed is similar to that of adjectives and it is used in this construction in the same way as adjectives.

particle NI of this Adjectival NO NI indicates the target of the evaluation.

1.2.4 Purpose NO NI.

9. Tom wa hon o yomu NO NI megane o kaketa.
 TOP book ACC read glasses ACC put on

'Tom put on his glasses to read a book.'

I would like to suggest that the particle NI in this construction specifies the co-temporal relation between the purposive and the main clause, NI being the temporal locative particle in Japanese. The subordinate clause, followed by the particle NI, tells us on what sort of occasion the action in the main clause is/was done. This semantic function of NI is one of the factors which results in the difference in meaning between Purpose NO NI and Purpose TAME NI. Recall that the particle NI indicates goal in the Purpose TAME NI construction. This difference will be discussed in detail after we have looked more thoroughly at the semantics of the purposive constructions.

1.2.5 Contrary-to-Expectation NO NI.

10. Tom wa furansugo ga dekiru NO NI hanasanai.
 TOP French NOM can do not speak

'Tom doesn't speak French even though he can.'

The ideas expressed in the subordinate clause and the main clause in this construction seem contradictory. NI is used to 'point out the fact(NO) to which the second clause stands in opposition' (Alfonso, *Ibid*: 114).

* * *

Among these five NO NI constructions, Indirect Object NO NI and Emotive Response NO NI are sometimes mistaken for Purpose NO NI. However, the distinction should be made if we are to get a clear picture of the Purpose NO NI construction. Notice that none of the NO NI constructions share the meaning of 'because' with the TAME NI construction.

1.3 Literature survey.

There are not many linguists who have tried to analyze the difference between Purpose TAME NI and Purpose NO NI. It seems that adverbial clauses, as well as adverbs, are areas which have been rather neglected in the study of Japanese linguistics. Thus, there are no standardized criteria for the classification of adverbial expressions and this class has been something of a waste basket in the study of Japanese (Yoshio Nitta: personal communication).

Kitagawa (*Ibid.*) and Ootsuka (1964) have, however, given some attention to this topic. As Ootsuka's short but useful paper was largely incorporated into Kitagawa's work, it is the latter which will be the principle source discussed here. I would like to compare the semantic conditions applying to the Purpose NO NI construction with those applying to Purpose TAME NI, as proposed by Kitagawa.

According to Kitagawa, the subject of both the purposive clause and the main clause in a Purpose NO NI construction must be 'a noun that denotes an animate being capable of purposeful action' (Kitagawa, *Ibid.*: 112 and 114), and neither of the two verbs can be a state predicate.⁹ Kitagawa also notes that a "terminus" verb cannot occur in the main clause of a Purpose NO NI construction. If a terminus verb does appear, he considers the sentence to involve Emotive Response NO NI (Kitagawa, *Ibid.*: 125-6), described above. Thus, Kitagawa's conditions are stated primarily in terms of verb classification. He says, further, that the well-formedness of Purpose TAME NI is identical with that of Purpose NO NI, in that the subject of the purposive clause and the main clause must be identical, and that Purpose NO NI can be replaced by Purpose TAME NI without a significant change in meaning (Kitagawa, *Ibid.*: 134).

However, I take the view that when there are two or more ways to convey the same general idea in a language, there is bound to be at

⁹ Kindaichi (1950) identified the class of 'state verbs' in Japanese as those which can indicate the state of something/someone at the moment of speech without any help from the progressive affix -IRU. ARU 'to exist' or DEKIRU 'can do' are of this class. In addition to these verbs, Kitagawa (*Ibid.*) also includes adjectives (i.e. KEIYOOSHI 'adjectives' and KEIYOO DOOSHI 'qualitative nouns') in his class of 'state verbs'. I will use the term 'state predicate' instead of 'state verb' in this paper.

least some small, but not insignificant, difference between them. That difference is the reason for their continued co-existence in the language. There seems no point in having two words or expressions which say exactly the same thing, simply cluttering up the lexicon. Therefore, even if the difference in meaning were, for example, very subtle or difficult to define, it still can and should be uncovered and rigorously explained. This view was the starting point for my investigation into semantic differences between these two purposive constructions in Japanese.

Kitagawa's work focussed mainly on a syntactic analysis of the five kinds of NO NI constructions and thus the semantic differences between Purpose TAME NI and Purpose NO NI were not dealt with in much detail. One thing I have tried to do in this paper is to state the difference in meaning between Purpose TAME NI and Purpose NO NI, which has been virtually ignored in research to date.

One problem in the syntactic conditions for Purpose TAME NI and NO NI proposed by Kitagawa is that his condition that neither the main nor the subordinate clause can have a state verb disallows examples like those below. These examples are, however, quite acceptable with TAME NI, although not with NO NI.

11. Kono yoona jiko o nido to okosanai TAME NI/*NO NI
this way accident ACC twice not cause

sassoku anzen taisaku o tatenashimasu.
immediately safety policy ACC re-organize-POL

'We are going to re-organize our safety policy immediately in order not to cause such an accident again.'

12. Ryooshin o kanashimasenai TAME NI/*NO NI uso o tsuita.
parents ACC not make sad lie ACC told

'I told a lie in order not to make my parents sad.'

Kitagawa classifies the negative forms of verbs in the class of state predicates because of the fact that negative forms conjugate in the same way as adjectives, and behave like adjectives in all other respects. Thus, according to Kitagawa, V-nai cannot co-occur with either Purpose TAME NI or NO NI. However, as sentences such as 11 and 12 above show, whilst the constraint holds for Purpose NO NI, it does not for TAME NI, i.e. the sequence V-nai + TAME NI is acceptable, whereas V-nai + NO NI is not.

Secondly, examples which have the qualitative noun HITSUYOO DA ('to be necessary') in the main clause do not meet Kitagawa's condition due to the fact that this word also belongs to his class of state predicates.

13. America e iku TAME NI/NO NI visa ga hitsuyoo da.
ALLAT go NOM necessary COP

'A visa is necessary to go to the States.'

IRU 'to need', -NAKEREBA NARANAI 'must', and HOSHII 'to want' are semantically similar to HITSUYOO DA, and they are also acceptable in the main clause of both purpose expressions.

Thirdly, Kitagawa's conditions cannot account for the following sentences, whose main clauses contain a state verb.

14. Kagaku wa konna toki ni tsukau TAME NI/*NO NI aru n
science TOP such time TEMP use exist NML
da.
COP

'Science is there for us to use at just such a time as this.'

15. Karuizawa ni wa sono hin'i o tamotsu TAME NI/*NO NI
LOC TOP that dignity ACC maintain
bar wa ikken mo nai.
TOP one even not exist

'To maintain its dignity Karuizawa doesn't have any bars.'

(i.e. Bars would not be dignified enough for a snobbish place like Karuizawa.)

Kitagawa does mention that while both of what he calls "derived state verbs", i.e. -NAI and -TE IRU, prohibit the purpose reading of NO NI constructions if they occur in the purposive clause, they do accommodate the purpose reading if they occur as the predicate of the main clause (Kitagawa, Ibid: 115). This condition can explain cases such as Example 15, where NAI is in the main clause. The acceptability of ARU in Example 14 cannot be explained by this condition, however, as it is a non-derived state verb.

These examples demonstrate that verb classification alone does not fully account for all the data. It is undoubtedly helpful to a certain extent, but not completely adequate.

Fourthly, Kitagawa's condition that the subject of both clauses in these constructions must be an animate being cannot explain cases like those below with TAME NI, where the subject of the main clause is clearly inanimate.

16. Tennooheika o o- mukae -suru TAME NI/NO NI ichi-dai
 emperor ACC HON-receive-STEM do one
 no Rolls-Royce ga shoomen genkan ni tomatta.
 GEN NOM front entrance LOC stopped
 'A Rolls-Royce stopped at the front entrance in order to receive the Emperor.'
17. Nihon no dentoo geinoo o iji suru TAME NI/?NO NI
 Japan GEN traditional arts ACC maintain do
 kokuritsu gekijoo ga dekita.
 national theatre NOM came into being
 'The national theatre came into being in order to maintain the traditional Japanese arts.'

NO NI is only grammatical when personification is involved, as in Example 16.

Finally, Kitagawa says that in the Purpose NO NI construction the subjects of the purposive clause and the main clause do not have to be identical. However, the following example from Kitagawa (*Ibid:* 134) was rejected by native speakers.

18. *Mary ga taberu NO NI bagel o katte imasu.
 NOM eat ACC buy-TE PROG-POL

Intended reading: 'He is buying bagels for Mary to eat.'

Moreover, in all the examples of natural language I collected, I could not find a single instance of a Purpose NO NI sentence which allows the interpretation of two different subjects. Although having no positive evidence, I think it is safe to assume that the subjects of the purposive clause and the main clause should be identical in Purpose NO NI, as well as in Purpose TAME NI constructions.

1.4 Purpose TAME NI and Purpose NO NI.

In this section, I am going to illustrate the difference between the Purpose TAME NI and NO NI expressions.

1.4.1 Type 1: Cases where NO NI is ungrammatical.

Observe the following examples.

19. Shiken ni ukaru TAME NI/*NO NI kanningu o suru.
exam DAT pass cheating ACC do

'They cheat in order to pass the exam.'

20. Home run o utsu TAME NI/*NO NI Oh senshu wa maiban
ACC hit (title) TOP every night

ookagami no mae de suburi o shita.
big mirror GEN front LOC practicing form ACC did

'Mr. Oh practiced his batting form in front of a big mirror
every night in order to hit a home run.'

21. Kono seinen kyooshi kara homerareru TAME NI/*NO NI shoonen
this young teacher ABL praise-PASS boyish

rashii kanjoo o kanjisaseru bamen o orikonde
emotion ACC feel-CAUS scene ACC insert-TE

oita no da.
did in preparation NML COP

'In order to be praised by the young teacher, I included in
my composition a couple of scenes which give the impression
of boyish naivety.'

22. Popeye wa tsuyoku naru TAME NI/*NO NI hoorensoo o tabeta.
TOP strong become spinach ACC ate

'Popeye ate spinach in order to become strong.'

23. Shippai shinai TAME NI/*NO NI juubun renshuu shite
failure not do enough practice do-TE

oku.
do in preparation

'I will practice thoroughly in order not to make a mistake.'

It is clear from the examples above that TAME NI is acceptable,
and NO NI is unacceptable, when the aim described in the purposive
clause is not under the full control of the agent. In Examples 19, 20,
and 21, a party other than the agent, who influences the outcome at
least as much, is also involved. In Example 20, for instance, against
Mr. Oh who is trying to hit the home run, there is the pitcher, whose
job it is not to let him do so. The control of the situation is
divided between two opposing parties. Therefore, even if Mr. Oh is in
peak condition, he will not necessarily hit a home run. As for Example

23, accident or fate may affect the outcome. However much one practices or tries to prevent any accidents happening, there are occasions when they simply cannot be avoided. Note, however, that while the agent is not in full control, he certainly can have some influence on the outcome. When something is completely outside the realm of a person's control, it is completely ungrammatical to use a purposive clause. For example, *CHICHI NI NIRU TAME NI '*in order to resemble my father' or *AME GA FURU TAME NI '*in order to rain' are as unacceptable in Japanese as they are in English.

The observation that NO NI cannot follow a predicate which is not fully controllable, whereas TAME NI can, is extremely important in the analysis of the difference between these two expressions. It seems that the function of TAME NI is to link a purposive clause and a clause which describes the means needed for realizing the intended purpose, regardless, to a certain extent, of the actual likelihood of realizing it. As I mentioned in Section 1.1, purpose can be thought of as a "foreseen reason" for performing a certain action. Purpose is basically equivalent to 'intention'. There is no guarantee that one's intentions will be achieved successfully.

It is also important to note that the majority of examples of this kind involve a specific goal, but no process leading up to that goal. SHIKEN NI UKARU 'to pass the exam', HOME RUN O UTSU 'to hit a home run', and HOMERARERU 'to be praised' are momentary predicates, and no process leading up to the terminal point is implied. Predicates of this kind fall into the category of "achievements" described by Vendler (1967).¹⁰

There are some predicates in the examples above which often do imply some kind of a process leading up to the goal, for example, TSUYOKU NARU 'to become strong' in Example 22, but even in this case, strictly speaking, what the predication itself describes is the goal,

¹⁰Achievements are momentary and telic verbs such as 'to recognize', 'to spot', 'to reach (the top)', and 'to die' in English. When we say, for example, 'we reached the hill top in two hours', that does not mean that during every minute of that two hours we were reaching the hill top. Reaching the top was realized in a moment. Thus 'X V-ed in Y hours' does not entail 'X was V-ing for Y hours'. This is only one way to test for membership of this class of verbs. For further discussion, see Vendler (1967: 97-121) and Dowty (1972: 16-37).

and not the process. That is why we can say that when Popeye eats a can of spinach, he becomes strong in an instant and there is no specific mention of a process by which he gradually gains power. Thus TSUYOKU NARU 'to become strong' is actually a momentary predicate in spite of the fact that some process is generally implied. The form TSUYOKU NATTE IRU, which is made by adding the progressive affix IRU to the -TE (gerund) form of the predicate, does not refer to the event as ongoing, but only to the result of the event. All the purposive predicates of this type except the one in Example 23, are telic and momentary, and thus have a definite goal to be achieved.

The conclusion we can draw from this evidence is that these constructions with TAME NI are goal oriented rather than process oriented. It will become clear as we examine other purposive constructions that this feature of 'goal orientation' is common to all those which involve TAME NI. Examples 21 and 23 will be compared with some examples of Purpose YOO NI in the next chapter.

1.4.2 Type 2: Cases where TAME NI is ungrammatical.

24. Door o shimeru *TAME NI/NO NI batan to shimeta.
ACC close with a bang closed

'I slammed the door when I shut it.' (lit: To close the door I shut it with a bang.)

25. Oyu o wakasu *TAME NI/NO NI furui yakan de
hot water ACC boil old kettle INS
wakashita.
boiled

'I boiled water in an old kettle.' (lit: To boil some water I boiled it in an old kettle.)

26. Gichoo o kimeru *TAME NI/NO NI tasuuketsu de kimeru.
chairman ACC decide majority vote INS decide

'We decide by majority vote when we elect a chairman.'
(lit: To decide on a chairman we decide by majority vote.)

Note that the same verb, telic in all cases, appears in both the purposive clause and the main clause in these examples, and the main clause contains an adverbial phrase of manner or instrument, namely, BATAN TO 'with a bang', FURUI YAKAN DE 'with an old kettle', and TASUUKEKTSU DE 'by majority vote'. Notice also that the events described in the purposive clause and the main clause are, in all cases,

co-temporal. For example, the shutting of the door was accompanied by a bang in Example 24, and the water was in the old kettle during the process of boiling in Example 25. Thus the function of the main clause in these examples is to convey the manner in which the aim, described in the purposive clause, is achieved. It seems that more interest is paid to the means or process, than to the goal, in the examples above. The focus is on the main clause which describes how the action was performed. Thus this type of sentence can be described as manner or process oriented. The crucial factor in the ungrammaticality of Purpose TAME NI in these examples is that this purpose expression is not compatible with co-temporality. Thus it cannot be used when a description of manner is involved.

Interestingly enough, the ideas expressed in the examples above could all be rephrased in a simple sentence, as follows:

24'. Door o batan to shimeta.
ACC with a bang closed

'I shut the door with a bang.'

25'. Furui yakan de oyu o wakashita.
old kettle INS hot water ACC boiled

'I boiled water in an old kettle.'

26'. Tasuuketsu de gichoo o kimeru.
majority vote INS chairman ACC decide

'We elect a chairman by majority vote.'

Now, is it appropriate to call examples like 24, 25, and 26 above purpose expressions? Strictly speaking, in the cases above the purposive clause denotes the 'occasion' on which an event or an action described in the main clause takes place. Therefore, it is predictable that the event or action described in the purposive clause and the main clause be co-temporal. This is why I say that the particle NI of Purpose NO NI indicates temporal location ('at'), rather than the goal ('to') of Purpose TAME NI. The NI of Purpose NO NI locates the event in the main clause, with reference to a certain occasion.

The particle NI has several meanings, and goal and temporal location are among them:

27. Colin wa gakkoo ni iku.

TOP school DAT go

'Colin goes to school.'

28. Colin wa ku-ji ni iku.
TOP nine o'clock TEMP go

'Colin goes at nine o'clock.'

Hence, it is not invalid to say that the particle NI serves to mark the goal ('to') in Purpose TAME NI, and the temporal location ('at') in Purpose NO NI.

1.4.3 Type 3: Cases where TAME NI and NO NI both occur, with some difference in meaning.

Consider the examples below.

29. Futari de aruku {a. TAME NI te o tsunaida.
 {b. NO NI
 together walk hand ACC took hold of

a. 'We took hold of each other's hands so that we could walk together.' (implies that we could not walk together unless we held hands, e.g. in the dark.)

b. 'We walked hand in hand.' (lit. We took hold of each other's hands when we walked together.)

a. 'I put on a kimono in order to go to the party.'

b. 'I went to the party wearing a kimono.' (lit. I put on a kimono when I went to the party.)

a. 'I asked for a glass of water in order to take the medicine.'

b. 'I took the medicine with a glass of water I'd asked for.'
(lit. When I took the medicine, I asked for a glass of water.)

In each of these examples, the event described by the purposive clause is understood to follow that of the main clause temporally. However, the interpretation is not of a simple sequence of events related by purpose, as can be clearly seen from the translations. This is because the predicate in the main clause of each of the examples above implies not simply an action but a result. They are resultative predicates.

Whether a predicate is resultative or not can be checked by affixing the progressive morpheme IRU to the -TE (gerund) form of the predicate. If the predicate turns out to refer to the result of the action or event, and not the process involved, the predicate is resultative.

For example, RADIO O KIITE IRU 'to be listening to the radio' from RADIO O KIKU 'to listen to the radio' indicates that someone is in the process of listening to the radio at the time of utterance. On the other hand, TE O TSUNAIDE IRU from TE O TSUNAGU 'to take hold of someone's hand' can only refer to the result following the action --- to be holding someone's hand --- and thus belongs to the class of resultative predicates. So do MIZU O MORAU (Example 31), KURUMA O KARIRU (Example 32), and ZASSHI O KAU (Example 33). Most of the predicates in the main clauses of this type belong to the class 'Achievements' according to Vendler's classification (*Ibid.*).

Note that KIMONO O KITE IRU from KIMONO O KIRU 'to put on a kimono' can mean either 'someone is putting on a kimono now' or 'someone has put a kimono on, and is still wearing it'. This is because

the action of getting dressed does have a clear result but, at the same time, there can be considerable interest in, and time taken over, the process involved. The same applies to semantically similar predicates like KUTSU O HAKU 'to put on shoes'.

A feature common to the predicates of Examples 29 --- 33 above is the change which occurs before the realization of the main aim. In Examples 29 and 30, the subjects enter a state of 'holding hands', and 'wearing a kimono', respectively. The change of location or (at least temporary) ownership of the objects in Examples 31 --- 33 can also be viewed as a change of state. The new state of possession of these objects remains, even if temporarily, and is necessary for the achievement of the subject's aim. As is evident from these examples, the concept of a change of state is given a broad interpretation.

The difference in meaning between an example with TAME NI and one with NO NI originates from the goal orientation of TAME NI and the manner/process oriented nature of NO NI.

In the case of TAME NI, it is clear that a sequence of events has taken place, but more importantly, the result of the first of these events is a necessary condition for the achievement of the second. This interpretation is associated with the telicity of the main predicate. Having a goal incorporated in the main predicate appears to be a necessary condition for the occurrence of TAME NI in this type of sentence. Thus in Example 29, it was necessary for the two to take hold of each other's hands to carry out their aim, to walk together, for example, in the dark.

When NO NI is used, however, there is no interest in the sequence of events at all, even if such a sequence has actually occurred. Rather, the subordinate clause describes the occasion on which the action of the main clause took place. Thus, we get the impression of co-temporality, one clause describing the occasion or circumstances of the other, even though these sentences literally describe a sequence of events. So, in Example 29, when the two people walk, they do so having taken each other's hands, that is, holding hands. In Example 32, when someone goes back to town, they go by rented car. In all the cases of NO NI construction, more attention is paid to the process than to the goal, as in the examples of Type 2 above.

1.4.4 Type 4: Cases where both TAME NI and NO NI are possible with little or no apparent difference in meaning.

34. Oyu o samasu TAME NI/NO NI fuufuu fuita.
hot water ACC cool ONOMATOPOEIA blew

'I blew on the hot water to cool it down.'

35. Watashi wa kono kaisha o sodateru TAME NI/NO NI arayuru
I TOP this company ACC extend every
doryoku o shita.
effort ACC did

'I have made every effort to build up this company.'

36. Kimochi o ochitsukeru TAME NI/NO NI heya no naka o
feeling ACC calm oneself room GEN inside ACC
ittari kitari shita.
going and coming did

'I paced around the room in order to calm down.'

37. Tooshu wa shibashiba dasha o ikaku suru TAME NI/NO NI
bowler TOP often batsman ACC intimidate
bouncer o nageru koto ga aru.
ACC throw COMP NOM exist

'A bowler sometimes bowls a bouncer to intimidate a batsman.'

38. Cheese o kiru TAME NI/NO NI sono knife o tsukatta.
ACC cut that ACC used

'I used that knife to cut the cheese.'

In these cases, the process described by both clauses overlaps temporally. The goal incorporated in the purposive clause is gradually realized as a result of the action of the main clause in Examples 34, 35, and 36. So, in Example 34, the hot water cools down more and more as the process of blowing continues. The gradual growth of the company, in Example 35, is in direct proportion to the effort made along the way. Both predicates in Examples 37 and 38 are basically momentary and do not really imply any process. In this case the purpose is achieved at the moment of, or immediately after, the action of the main clause. Therefore, in Example 37, as in the other examples of this type, the action described in both clauses overlaps temporally. The person involved will only cease his effort when his purpose has been fully achieved.

The reason that both TAME NI and NO NI are possible without much difference in meaning in this type of sentence is that the events can be viewed either as basically sequential or basically co-temporal. For example, in Example 34, the cooling down of the hot water will be realized after at least a few blows on it. Thus, the use of TAME NI is acceptable. The use of NO NI is also acceptable when one thinks of the events described in both clauses as occurring co-temporally --- the water cools down as one blows on it. In 38, we think of the cheese being cut as the knife is used in the case of the sentence with NO NI, and when TAME NI appears, we focus on the new state of the cheese, after the knife is used.

The key to explaining the difference between this type of example, and those of Type 3 above, where both TAME NI and NO NI were also acceptable, seems to lie in the fact that the main predicate is telic in the examples of Type 3, whereas it is the purposive predicate which is telic in this type. In Type 3, the goal incorporated into the main clause is interpreted as the necessary step for realizing the purpose, whereas in Type 4, the goal incorporated in the purposive clause is the goal of the whole sentence. This seems to be the reason for the differences in meaning of Types 3 and 4.

1.4.5 Summary.

The discussion in this section of Chapter One can be summarized as follows: Purpose TAME NI has a goal oriented nature, whereas Purpose NO NI has a manner/process oriented nature. It has been proposed that the particle NI of Purpose NO NI indicates the temporal location ('at') rather than the goal ('to'). Therefore, the purposive clause of Purpose NO NI is understood to express the 'occasion' when the event in the main clause takes place. More interest is paid to the manner/process described in the main clause than to the purpose per se.

Purpose NO NI is not grammatical when successful achievement of the purpose is in any doubt. On the other hand, Purpose TAME NI can accommodate such events because of its goal orientation. When the same verb occurs in both clauses and the description of manner is involved, TAME NI is not acceptable. TAME NI and NO NI are often permutable. However, a difference in meaning occurs when the main predicate is telic. Little difference can be perceived when the purposive clause contains a telic predicate.

1.5 Solving the problems.

In this section, the problems which Kitagawa's analysis fails to explain will be discussed, and will be solved by examining firstly the temporal relation between the clauses and secondly the notion of hidden agency.

The problem areas in Kitagawa's analysis, which were introduced in Section 1.3. of this chapter, will be repeated below for the reader's convenience, and will be discussed in that order.

- a. Cases where the main predicate is stative.
- b. Cases where the purposive clause contains a negative form.
- c. Examples of the qualitative noun HITSUYOO DA 'to be necessary' and semantically similar predicates, occurring in the main clause.
- d. Cases in which the subject of the main clause is not an animate being.

1.5.1 Cases where the main predicate is stative.

Recall Kitagawa's condition that neither the purposive clause nor the main clause in constructions with NO NI and TAME NI can contain a state predicate, except for the derived state verbs, viz. -TE IRU and -NAI, which can occur in the main clause. However, examples of -NAI in the main clause of Purpose NO NI were not accepted by native speakers of Japanese. The constraint on Purpose NO NI, that is, neither the purposive clause nor the main clause can contain a state predicate except -TE IRU in the main clause, holds. Therefore, it is the cases in which the main clause of a Purpose TAME NI construction contains a state predicate which must be explained here. Recall the examples:

14. Kagaku wa konna toki ni tsukau TAME NI/*NO NI aru n
science TOP such time TEMP use exist NML

da.
COP

'Science is there for us to use at just such a time as this.'

15. Karuizawa ni wa sono hin'i o tamotsu TAME NI/*NO NI
LOC TOP that dignity ACC maintain

bar wa ikken mo nai.
TOP one even not exist

'To maintain its dignity Karuizawa does not have any bars.'

(i.e. Bars would not be dignified enough for a snobbish place like Karuizawa.)

Close examination reveals that the crucial element for all Purpose TAME NI expressions, namely that the action or event described in the purposive clause must follow the one in the main clause, holds for these examples also. In Example 14, science must first exist in order to be put to use at the right time. The dignity of Karuizawa, as a summer resort for wealthy people, has been maintained up to date. Thus, as long as the situation described in the main clause is understood to exist prior to the fulfillment of the purpose, a purposive sentence with TAME NI is grammatical. Compare Example 15 with the one below where the subordinate clause contains a state predicate. It is considered to be an example of Reason TAME NI because of the reversed temporal relation between the two clauses, viz. the state in the subordinate clause is understood to exist prior to that of the main clause.

15'. Karuizawa ni wa bar ga ikken mo nai TAME NI
LOC TOP NOM one even not exist because
hin'i ga tamotarete iru.
dignity GEN maintain-PASS-TE PERF

'The dignity of Karuizawa has been maintained because there are not any bars.'

This tells us that when a state predicate occurs in the subordinate clause, the sentence involves Reason TAME NI, and when in the main clause, Purpose TAME NI, reflecting, of course, the different temporal relations between two clauses.

1.5.2 Cases where the purposive predicate contains a negative form.

Recall that Kitagawa labelled the negative form of a verb a state predicate, and claimed that such a predicate cannot appear in either the main or the subordinate clause of a Purpose TAME NI expression. The discussion directly above gives examples of a negative form in the main clause. I will repeat some examples of negative forms appearing in the purposive clause below.

11. Kono yoona jiko o nido to okosanai TAME NI/*NO NI
this way accident ACC twice not cause

sassoku anzen taisaku o tatenaoshimasu.
immediately safety policy ACC re-organize-POL

'We are going to re-organize our safety policy immediately
in order not to cause such an accident again.'

12. Ryooshin o kanashimasenai TAME NI/*NO NI uso o tsuita.
parents ACC not make sad lie ACC told

'I told a lie in order not to make my parents sad.'

The negative form of a volitional verb like those in the examples above, expresses the agent's will or intention, and can occur in the subordinate clause of Purpose TAME NI construction. Other verbs that can occur in their negative form in the purposive clause are those which denote accidents, e.g. SHIPPAI SURU 'to fail' and MACHIGAERU 'to make a mistake', and those which describe emotions and physiological processes like NAKU 'to cry', WARAU 'to laugh', and AGARU 'to get nervous'. The degree of controllability of these verbs is rather limited as with the predicates discussed in Section 1.4.1., but note that the experiencer/actor still has some measure of control or influence on the outcome. A negative form of a completely non-volitional verb cannot occur in this environment. For example, *AME GA FURANAI TAME NI 'in order not to rain' is not in the least acceptable. Other kinds of state predicates never appear in this position.

1.5.3 Examples of the qualitative noun HITSUYOO DA 'to be necessary' and semantically similar predicates.

HITSUYOO DA 'to be necessary' can appear in the main clause of sentences with both Purpose TAME NI and NO NI, even though this word is a member of the class of state predicates, according to Kitagawa's definition. The example given in Section 1.3. was :

13. America e iku TAME NI/NO NI visa ga hitsuyoo da.
ALLAT go NOM necessary COP

'A visa is necessary to go to the States.'

As we have seen previously in Section 1.5.1., when a state

predicate occurs in the main clause of a Purpose TAME NI sentence, that state must be understood to exist prior to the fulfilment of the purpose. Example 13 with TAME NI means that people need to get a visa before they go to the United States of America. This sequential temporal relation is common to all examples of Purpose TAME NI, whether they involve state predicates or not. However, the meaning of the predicate HITSUYOO DA ('to be necessary') is also compatible with the co-temporality of Purpose NO NI. When we say, 'X is necessary for doing Y', X may be understood to accompany the performance of Y. Thus, Example 13 with NO NI means that a visa is something one is expected to carry when going to the U.S..

Amongst the state predicates defined by Kitagawa, only a few words are semantically appropriate to meet the temporal conditions required by both Purpose TAME NI and NO NI. Therefore, it seems that HITSUYOO DA and the semantically similar predicates, IRU 'to need', HOSHII 'to want', and V-NAKEREBA NARANAI 'must V' are exceptional in the analysis of the two purpose expressions under consideration.

1.5.4 Cases in which the subject of the main clause is not an animate being.

Kitagawa's constraint that, in purposive expressions, the subject of both clauses must be an animate being, cannot explain the examples below.

16. Tennooheika o o -mukae -suru TAME NI/NO NI ichi-dai
emperor ACC HON receive-STEM do one

no Rolls-Royce ga shoomen genkan ni tomatta.
GEN NOM front entrance LOC stopped

'A Rolls-Royce stopped at the front entrance to receive the Emperor.'

17. Nihon no dentoo geinoo o iji suru TAME NI/*NO NI
Japan GEN traditional arts ACC maintain do

kokuritsu gekijoo ga dekita.
national theatre NOM came into being

'The national theatre came into being in order to maintain the traditional Japanese arts.'

(Examples 16 and 17 are repeated from Section 1.3.)

39. Kootsuu juutai o nakusu TAME NI/*NO NI kondo kono
traffic congestion ACC ease this time this

dooro ga hirogaru.
road NOM extend

'This time this road will be widened (lit. extend (tr.)) in order to ease the traffic congestion.'

40. Oya ga nai kodomotachi o sukuu TAME NI/*NO NI
parent NOM not exist children ACC save

Jikei-in ga umareta.
charitable institution NOM was born

'Jikei-in was founded in order to save children who do not have any parents.'

It seems that the main predicate in all the examples above does imply the involvement of an agent even though the subject is not "an animate being capable of purposeful action" (Kitagawa). As a matter of fact, we can easily include phrases specifying intention in these sentences, for example, SEIFU NO KEIKAKU DE 'by a government plan' and HITOBITO NO ZEN'I DE 'by people's charity'. The examples will read as follows.

17'. Nihon no dentoo geinoo o iji suru TAME NI seifu no keikaku
de kokuritsu gekijoo ga dekita.

'The national theatre came into being as a result of a government plan in order to maintain traditional Japanese arts.'

39'. Kootsuu juutai o nakusu TAME NI kondo seifu no keikaku de
kono dooro ga hirogaru.

'This time this road will be widened as a result of a government plan in order to ease the traffic congestion.'

40'. Oya no nai kodomotachi o sukuu TAME NI hitobito no zen'i
de Jikei-in ga umareta.

'Jikei-in was founded by people's charity in order to save children who do not have any parents.'

The acceptability of Example 16 can be explained in a different way. The Rolls-Royce, in this example, is personified, and treated as an animate being, as if it were moving 'under its own steam'. Purpose NO NI is grammatical in this kind of example only when personification is involved.

When it is difficult to sense any implication of agency behind a predication, it cannot be used in a main clause, even with Purpose TAME NI. For example,

41. *Kusaki o sodateru TAME NI ame ga furu.
plants ACC grow rain NOM fall

'The rain falls to make things grow.'

42. *Hitobito no chuui o hiku TAME NI kabin ga wareta.
people GEN attention ACC draw vase NOM broke

'A vase broke in order to get people's attention.'

The widening of a road, building of a theatre, and founding of an orphanage are inconceivable without human involvement. These events are the result of conscious human action. So, the predicates which express these events unambiguously imply agency, even though the agent may not be overtly mentioned. On the other hand, the event referred to in the main clause of Example 41 is understood to happen by itself. The example, therefore, is not grammatical owing to the lack of implication of agency. The same holds for Example 42.

The semantic conditions on the structure of S1 TAME NI/NO NI S2 (where S1 is the purposive clause and S2 is the main clause) are, therefore:

Purpose TAME NI:

- 1.) S2 temporally precedes S1.
- 2.) S2 has an overt or non-overt agent.
- 3.) The subjects of S1 and S2 are identical except for cases in which the main clause contains a stative predicate.

Purpose NO NI:

- 1.) S2, or the state resulting from S2, is co-temporal with S1.
- 2.) Both S1 and S2 are non-state predicates and "terminus" verbs do not occur in S2.
- 3.) S1 and S2 have the same animate subject. (The subject of S2 may be inanimate, provided it is thought of as animate (i.e. personification.))

HITSUYOO DA 'to be necessary' and semantically similar predicates can appear in the main clause of both Purpose TAME NI and NO NI expressions. They are an exception to Condition (2) directly above.

We can express these conditions using Wierzbicka's theory of semantic primitives (1972).

Purpose TAME NI: someone A did Y because he wanted to cause X to happen afterwards.

Purpose NO NI: person A did Y because he wanted to do X doing Y.

In these formulae: A refers to the agent of Y;
 Y refers to the action described or implied by S2 (the main clause);
 X refers to the action described by S1 (the purposive clause).

Let us have a brief look at how these formulae work. Firstly, it is important to note that these formulae refer to meaning, and not to surface form. Therefore, sentences which include a stative predicate in the main clause are compatible with these formulae, even though the words "person A did Y" are used in both cases. For example, in Example 13, repeated below for your convenience, even though the main predicate is stative, it clearly refers to a human action --- "A visa is necessary" implies that one must obtain a visa. In the same way, in Example 14, "Science is there for us to use at a time like this" implies that man has developed science to be used for the advancement of the human race. Similarly, these formulae are also compatible with the condition that Purpose TAME NI implies human involvement, whether or not this is overtly mentioned in the main clause (see Example 17). The words "someone A", rather than the more specific "person A" are used in the formula for TAME NI to cater for this kind of sentence, where the agent is not mentioned.

13. America e iku TAME NI/NO NI visa ga hitsuyoo da.
 ALLAT go NOM necessary COP

'A visa is necessary to go to the States.'

14. Kagaku wa konna toki ni tsukau TAME NI/*NO NI aru n
 science TOP such time TEMP use exist NML
 da.
 COP

'Science is there for us to use at just such a time as this.'

17. Nihon no dentoo geinoo o iji suru TAME NI/*NO NI
 Japan GEN traditional arts ACC maintain do
 kokuritsu gekijoo ga dekita.

national theatre NOM came into being

'The national theatre came into being in order to maintain the traditional Japanese arts.'

The inclusion of the words "afterwards" in the semantic formula proposed for Purpose TAME NI excludes examples in which the events described in the purposive and the main clauses are co-temporal. An example of the ungrammaticality of this kind of sentence, repeated from Section 1.4.2 is:

24. Door o shimeru *TAME NI/NO NI batan to shimeta.
ACC close with a bang closed

'I slammed the door when I shut it.' (lit. To close the door I shut it with a bang.)

1.6 Summary.

In this chapter, firstly, two kinds of TAME NI construction and five kinds of NO NI construction were presented to draw a clear line between the purpose constructions and all other kinds. Secondly, the major work on this topic by Kitagawa was reviewed and its shortfalls revealed. In the third section, the difference in meaning between Purpose TAME NI and Purpose NO NI was discussed. Finally, the semantic properties of both constructions were summarized, after having solved the problems which Kitagawa failed to explain.

CHAPTER 2

PURPOSE YOO NI.

In this chapter, Purpose YOO NI is discussed, and it is compared with Purpose TAME NI and the causative construction.

2.1 YOO NI.

At the outset, four types of YOO NI construction, which function as adverbial clause, are presented here in order to determine the precise nature of the Purpose YOO NI expression.

2.1.1 YOO NI indicating manner.

1. Te o toru YOO NI oshiete kuremashita.
hand ACC hold teach-TE gave- POL

'He taught me as if leading me by the hand.'

2. Sono shinamono wa tobu YOO NI uremashita.
those goods TOP fly sold-POL

'Those goods sold like hot cakes.' (lit. Those goods sold as if flying away.'

This kind of YOO NI clause indicates, by means of a metaphor, the manner in which the action described in the main clause is performed, and is equivalent to 'as if' in English.¹

2.1.2 YOO NI SURU.

3. Kore kara wa ano hito ni awanai YOO NI shimasu.
this ABL TOP that person DAT not meet do-POL

'I will try not to see that person from now on.'

4. Dekirudake ichi-ji made ni kuru YOO NI shite
as much as possible one o'clock by come do-TE

¹ Examples 1 to 8 are from Alfonso (Ibid.).

kudasai.
give-POL-IMP

'Please try as hard as you can to come by one o'clock.'

Alfonso (Ibid: 1060) claims that this YOO NI SURU pattern is no different from the YOO NI used to express purpose (see below). YOO NI SURU is a set phrase, meaning 'try to', or 'make sure that'. In this paper, it is considered a variation of the basic Purpose YOO NI pattern, and is not dealt with in detail.

2.1.3 YOO NI reporting a request.

5. Chotto kyakuma de matsu YOO NI tanomimashita.
a moment parlor LOC wait asked-POL

'I asked (him) to wait in the parlor for a while.'

6. Koko de tabako o suwanai YOO NI chuuui shite
here LOC cigarette ACC not smoke warning do-TE

kudasai.
give-POL-IMP

'Please warn him not to smoke here.'

These are reported forms of direct requests. The corresponding requests are as follows:

5'. Chotto kyakuma de matte kudasai.
a moment parlor LOC wait-TE give-POL-IMP

'Please wait in the parlor for a while.'

6'. Koko de tabako o suwanaide kudasai.
here LOC cigarette ACC not smoke-TE give-POL-IMP

'Please do not smoke here.'

Speech act verbs, such as IU 'to say', CHUUI SURU 'to warn', and TANOMU 'to ask', appear in the main clause of sentences such as 5 and 6 above, in each case preceded by YOO NI.

2.1.4 Purpose YOO NI.

7. Itsu demo dekakerareru YOO NI kuruma o dashite
any time can go out car ACC get out-TE

okimasu.
do in preparation-POL

'I will get the car out so that we can leave any time.'

8. Tori ga tobenai YOO NI hane o kitte
bird NOM cannot fly wing ACC cut-TE

okimashoo.
do in preparation-HOR-POL

'Let's trim the bird's wing so that it won't be able to fly away.'

The English equivalent of YOO NI in Examples 7 and 8 above is 'so that'. The particle NI in sentences such as these indicates the goal, and YOO retains its original meaning to a certain extent, namely 'the way things look' (Alfonso, *Ibid*: 1047).

2.2 Literature survey.

Observe the following examples.

9. Kyooyoo o takameru TAME NI/*YOO NI hon o yomu.
culture ACC enhance book ACC read

'I read books in order/*so as to improve myself.'

10. Kyooyoo ga takamaru *TAME NI/YOO NI hon o yomu.
culture NOM be enhanced book ACC read

'I read books *in order/so as to become more cultured.'

11. Kippu o kau TAME NI/*YOO NI retsu ni naranda.
ticket ACC buy queue LOC lined up

'I stood in a queue in order/*so as to buy a ticket.'

12. Yoku mieru *TAME NI/YOO NI takai tokoro ni hatta.
well can see high place LOC pasted

'I pasted it high up *in order/so that people could see it well.'

13. Kaze ga fukikomanai *TAME NI/YOO NI mado o shimeta.
wind NOM not blow in window ACC closed

'I closed the window *in order/so that wind would not blow in.'

These examples are all taken from Kunihiro (1982: 105-6), and suggest that purposive clauses with TAME NI contain predicates which describe an action which is within the control of the agent. Those with YOO NI, however, contain predicates which describe an event or state which is outside the control of the subject in the main clause

(Kunihiro, Ibid: 105). Therefore with volitional verbs, such as TAKAMERU 'to enhance' and KAU 'to buy', the use of TAME NI is grammatical, whereas YOO NI is not. However, this is not the case if the subjects in the purposive and main clauses are not identical (Kunihiro, Ibid: 106). In this case the action in the purposive clause is outside the control of the subject of the main clause. Thus the use of YOO NI is grammatical. Compare Example 14 below with Example 9.

14. Gakusei ga kyooyoo o takameru *TAME NI/YOO NI daigaku
student NOM culture ACC enhance university

wa toshokan o juujitsu saseru.
TOP library ACC completeness do-CAUS

'The university upgrades its library *in order/so that the students will improve themselves.'

In Example 14, YOO NI is grammatical in spite of the fact that both verbs, i.e. TAKAMERU and JUUJITSU SASERU are volitional. This is because the subject in each clause is not identical, and the act of students' enhancing themselves culturally is beyond the control of the university. TAME NI is not acceptable when the subjects of the clauses are not identical.

Kunihiro (Ibid: 108) summarizes the semantics of Purpose YOO NI as follows:

YOO {B no doosashu no ishi de seigyo dekinai han'i nai no
kotogara o shimesu.}

"[The purposive clause with YOO NI] indicates something that is not under the control of the subject B."
(B is the main clause.)²

Kitagawa (Ibid: 139) also says:

(105) a. Underlying the purpose YOO NI is a sense of 'wish'
embraced by the subject of S2; and

b. There is a semantic principle that stipulates that when one WISHES that something might turn out to be the case, it must be assumed that that something is beyond the power of one's control.

I agree with these proposals that the clause marked by YOO NI

²Translation mine.

expresses a 'wish', i.e. something which is desired by the subject but not under his control.

The syntactic and semantic conditions applying to Purpose YOO NI are summed up by Kitagawa (*Ibid*: 143) in the following way:

- (a) The subject of S2 is a noun that represents a being capable of 'wishful thinking';
- (b) V2 is a non-state and non-terminus verb; and
- (c) The subjects of S1 and S2 are not identical; or
- (d) In the event that the subjects of S1 and S2 are identical,
V1 is a state verb.³

These conditions appear to cover most cases of Purpose YOO NI. However, there are some counterexamples, which have been overlooked by Kitagawa.

15. Mame ni jisho o hiku YOO NI temoto ni
with ease dictionary ACC look up at hand LOC

oite oku.
put-TE do in preparation

'I put the dictionary within reach so that I can look it up with ease.'

16. Kyooshitsu de wa narubeku shizenna nihongo o
classroom LOC TOP as much as possible natural Japanese ACC

hanasu YOO NI kokorogakete iru.
speak keep in mind

'In the classroom, I try to speak as close to natural Japanese as I can.'

17. Dekirudake iroirona hito to sessuru YOO NI
as much as possible various kinds people COM contact

atsumari ga areba kanarazu shusseki suru
meeting NOM exist-COND without fail attendance do

koto ni shite iru.
make it a rule

'I make it a rule to attend get-togethers, if there are any,

so that I can meet as many different kinds of people as possible.'

Examples 15, 16, and 17 above are completely grammatical, even though the subjects of both clauses are identical, and the verb in the purposive clause is non-state. These counterexamples share certain characteristics. The purposive clause tends to contain an adverbial phrase such as NARUBEKU and DEKIRUDAKE, both meaning 'as much as possible'. Verbs such as DORYOKU SURU 'to make an effort', and KOKOROGAKERU 'to keep in mind', or 'to try' are common in the main clause. The wish expressed in the purposive clause is not a desire concerning one's ability, but rather a matter of success or non-success.⁴ These counterexamples will be explained in more detail in the following section.

2.3 Purpose YOO NI.

Let us examine, again, some sentences containing Purpose YOO NI in which the subjects of both clauses are the same. In these examples, the purposive predicate is a state verb, thus fulfilling Kitagawa's conditions.

18. Wasurenai YOO NI nooto ni kaite oku.
not forget notebook LOC write-TE do in preparation

'I'll write it down in my notebook so that I won't forget.'

19. Shippai shinai YOO NI yoku renshuu shite oku.
failure not do well practice do-TE do in preparation

'I will practice enough so that I won't make a mistake.'

20. Nesugosanai YOO NI mezamashi-dokei o kaketa.
not oversleep alarm clock ACC set

'I set an alarm clock so that I wouldn't oversleep.'

In Examples 18, 19, and 20 above, it appears that there is a discrepancy between what the subject should do and what he actually might do. For example, in Example 18, the subject does not want to

⁴Kaneko (1975) talks about five meanings of potentials. The potential concerning success or non-success is, 'whether or not an agent of an action will/will not carry out [or] carried out/did not carry out something by overcoming some barrier in his way' (p. 175).

Before going any further, I would like to mention Starosta's (1978) comments in his article "One Per Sent Solution", which are instructive in this context.

... human beings are typically regarded by case grammars as dualistic composites of a mentalistic phase, which is typically encoded as an Agent or Correspondent, and a physical phase, which is more typically encoded as an Instrument or a Patient. (p. 482)

Starosta's discussion deals mainly with simple sentences, in which a body part is interpreted as separate from the main body, functioning as an instrument in the case of Example (20) below.

e.g.

- (20) Sylvie (accidentally) broke the pane with her voice. (p. 480)
 /+AGT/ /+PAT/ /+INS/

Starosta defines the agent and the patient as follows:

An Agent is 'the non-immediate perceived causer of the action of the verb.' (Ibid: 478)

A Patient is:

- (a) the entity which is viewed as affected by the verb,
- (b) the entity which is viewed as moving or as being located in (abstract or concrete) space,
- (c) the entity which is viewed as existing in a state, or whose state is changing. (Ibid: 472)

According to his definitions, therefore, in a case involving an embedded sentence, as in Example 21, Anthony is the agent and Ingrid is the patient.

21. Anthony told Ingrid to take out the garbage.

I will now apply this concept of the 'dualistic bias in language' to the problem at hand. I will consider the subject of the main clause of Purpose YOO NI as the agent --- the non-immediate causer of the action, and that of the purposive clause as the patient --- an entity affected by the agent's action.

The agent in all YOO NI sentences, the subject of the main clause, brings about a situation from which the desired action will follow as a natural consequence. The agent thus behaves as a non-immediate causer.

On the other hand, the patient, the subject of the purposive clause, is to perform the action as desired by the agent, as a result of the situation brought about by the agent. The patient is in this way affected by the agent.

Now in sentences in which the subject is the same in both clauses, a single human entity is viewed as being both the agent and the patient. This factor explains why there exists a discrepancy between what the subject should do and what he actually might do, in all sentences of this kind. The relevant condition for grammaticality in these sentences is not whether the verb of the purposive clause is stative or not, but whether the subject can be simultaneously regarded as both agent and patient. It is certainly true that sentences with a stative predicate in the purposive clause are the most obvious candidates to meet this condition, but the condition is also fulfilled by sentences like 15, 16, and 17 above, where the subject recognizes his own reluctance or repeated failure to do what he knows he should, and takes steps to overcome it.

Thus, the semantic conditions on the use of YOO NI are:

- (1) the main predicate is neither a state nor a terminus verb.
- (2) the subject of the main and purposive clauses are not identical, or
- (3) if they are identical, the subject, which exists as a single entity in the real world, can be viewed as comprising two components viz. agent and patient, with respect to its semantic roles.

The semantic properties of Purpose YOO NI, in a similar fashion to those of Purpose TAME NI and NO NI (above), using Wierzbicka's theory of semantic primitives:

person A did Y because A wanted X to happen. A thought that X might happen because of that. A couldn't assume that X would happen because of that.

In this formula:

A refers to the agent of Y;

Y refers to the action described by S2 (the main clause);

X refers to the action described by S1 (the purposive clause).

Now let us check how this formula explains the grammaticality or ungrammaticality of YOO NI in some examples, repeated here for the reader's convenience.

11. Kippu o kau TAME NI/*YOO NI retsu ni naranda.
 ticket ACC buy queue LOC lined up

'I stood in a queue in order/*so as to buy a ticket.'

12. Yoku mieru *TAME NI/YOO NI takai tokoro ni hatta.
 well can see high place LOC pasted

'I pasted it high up *in order/so that people could see it well.'

17. Dekirudake iroirona hito to sessuru YOO NI
 as much as possible various kinds people COM contact

atsumari ga areba kanarazu shusseki suru
 meeting NOM exist-CON without fail attendance do

koto ni shite iru.
 make it a rule

'I make it a rule to attend get-togethers, if there are any, so that I can meet as many different kinds of people as possible.'

Example 11 with YOO NI is ungrammatical because KIPPU O KAU 'to buy a ticket' is not something that 'happens' but, rather, refers to someone's action. Example 12, on the other hand, is grammatical with YOO NI, because YOKU MIERU 'can see well' is stative, and so is something that can be described as 'happening' to someone, rather than as something they 'do'. Thus, the first sentence of the formula, especially the word 'happen', effectively excludes examples which contain the notion of volitional action in the purposive predicate. As for Example 17, it is certainly true that IROIRONA HITO TO SESSURU 'to meet various kinds of people' is not a state predicate. However, as the semantic formula refers to the meaning of the sentence, not to the form of the surface structure, provided the event described in the purposive clause is semantically stative, the sentence is acceptable. Because the agent finds meeting new people so difficult, he creates a situation in which it almost 'happens', rather than requiring any real action on his part.

2.4 Purpose YOO NI and TAME NI.

There are some syntactic environments in which either Purpose YOO NI or TAME NI are acceptable. These are: after negative forms of verbs and passives. The following examples, repeated from Chapter 1, are grammatical with either TAME NI or YOO NI.

22. Kono seinen kyooshi kara homerareru TAME NI/YOO NI shoonen
 this young teacher ABL praise-PASS boyish

rashii kanjoo o kanjisaseru bamen o orikonde
 emotion ACC feel-CAUS scene ACC insert-TE
 oita no da.
 did in preparation NML COP

'In order/So as to be praised by the young teacher, I have included in my composition a couple of scenes which give the impression of boyish naivety.'

23. Shippai shinai TAME NI/YOO NI juubun renshuu shite
 failure not do enough practice do-TE

oku.
 do in preparation

'I will practice thoroughly in order/so as not to make a mistake.'

The difference in meaning between the examples with TAME NI and YOO NI seems to be due to the attitude of the agent (the subject of the main clause) towards the accomplishment of his purpose. When YOO NI is used in Example 22, we understand that he writes his composition in this way simply in the hope that it will earn praise. He has no real assurance that this will indeed please the teacher. TAME NI, on the other hand, expresses the agent's positive attitude toward the aim. The student knows his young and inexperienced teacher's taste and writes his composition in just the way the teacher likes so that he will get a good mark for it. He is almost sure that the teacher will praise his composition. While YOO NI indicates a 'wish', TAME NI describes a 'goal'.

Remember that verbs whose negative form can appear in a purposive clause with TAME NI, as in Example 23 above, are those which denote accidents, such as SHIPPAI SURU 'to fail' and MACHIGAERU 'to make a mistake', and those which describe emotions and physiological processes, like NAKU 'to cry', WARAU 'to laugh', and AGARU 'to get nervous'. The negative form of any verb can appear in a purposive YOO NI clause, with no restriction.

2.5 Purpose YOO NI and the Causatives.

It is interesting to note that Purpose YOO NI shares a significant feature with causative constructions, namely of 'undergoer control'. Consider the following example.

24. Peter wa Patrick o suwaraseta.
TOP ACC sat down-CAUS

'Peter made Patrick sit down.'

In the causative Example 24 above, Patrick, the 'undergoer'⁵, did the "caused event", and Peter, the 'actor'⁶, was responsible for the "causing event". It is the undergoer, not the actor, who is the direct doer of the event referred to by the predicate. This is what Foley and Van Valin refer to as 'undergoer control' (Chapter VI. P. 70).

There is another kind of causative construction in Japanese, in which the undergoer is marked by the dative particle NI instead of the accusative O.

25. Peter wa Patrick ni suwaraseta.
TOP DAT sat down-CAUS

'Peter let Patrick sit down.'

As can be seen from the translations, Examples 24 and 25 differ in the degree of the actor's influence on the undergoer. Example 24 could be taken to mean that Peter forced Patrick to sit down, whereas Example 25 can be understood to mean that Peter permitted Patrick to sit down. Causatives like Example 24 are called "O-causatives" and those like Example 25 "NI-causatives". The feature of undergoer control is clearly stronger in the "NI-causative" construction.

In the case of Purpose YOO NI sentences, the subject of the purposive clause is Foley and Van Valin's 'undergoer' (Starosta's 'Patient'), and has control over the intended event, in that he is the

⁵"Undergoer" is 'the argument which expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate or control any situation, but rather is affected by it in some way' Foley and Van Valin (forthcoming: Chapter II. p. 3).

⁶"Actor" is 'the argument of a predicate which effects, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate' Foley and Van Valin (Ibid: Chapter II. p.3).

actual performer of the intended event. The subject of the main clause is only a remote causer who does the causing event. Thus Purpose YOO NI construction also features the phenomenon of undergoer control.

Foley and Van Valin also discuss the 'verbal causative', in which the speaker/actor tries to get the addressee/undergoer to perform some action by means of an utterance (i.e. directive) (Ibid: Chapter VI. p. 71). The examples given are as follows:

- (6. 108) a. Max invited Fred to sit down.
- b. Max ordered Fred to sit down.
- c. Max told Fred to sit down.

These examples also feature 'undergoer control'. Fred, the undergoer, does the action expressed in the infinitive clause. Interestingly, these sentences are expressed in Japanese using YOO NI plus verbs of saying as shown below:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 26. Max wa Fred ni suwaru YOO NI | a. susumeta. |
| TOP DAT sit down | invited |
| | b. meirei shita. |
| | order did |
| | c. itta. |
| | said |

As Foley and Van Valin explain;

'these verbs differ primarily from the causative verbs in that with these the causing event is always verbal, whereas with the others it is not. There is thus a strong common semantic thread linking causative and directive verbs, all of which have undergoer control' (Ibid: Chapter VI. p. 71).

We can see a continuum exists between the two kinds of causatives (O-causative and NI-causative), the verbal causative (introduced in Section 2.1. as YOO NI 'Reporting a request'), and Purpose YOO NI in Japanese. Sequences formed by these constructions all feature 'undergoer control'. The degree of the actor's influence on the undergoer is greatest in the O-causative, where the actor could apply force to cause the intended event. With Purpose YOO NI, which is at the other end of the continuum, the actor can only attempt to bring it about, by creating the situation in which it is most likely to happen.

2.6 Summary.

In this chapter, the semantics of Purpose YOO NI were discussed. Purpose YOO NI expresses a desire or wish on the part of the subject of the main clause. The wish is either projected on to someone else, or onto the subject of the main clause himself. In the latter case, a single person takes two different roles, that of both actor and undergoer. 'Undergoer control' was introduced as a feature common to O- and NI-causatives, the verbal causative, and Purpose YOO NI. 'Undergoer control' is the idea that the undergoer (causee) has actual control over the event caused by the actor (causer). In consequence, the control of the causer of the event over the causee is not complete. The subject of the main clause works upon the subject of the subordinate clause indirectly in order to achieve the anticipated result as a natural necessary consequence.

The comparison of Purpose YOO NI with Purpose TAME NI showed that they differ with regard to the agent's attitude towards the aim. The agent of Purpose TAME NI is confident of achieving his aim by the means he has chosen. Therefore, Purpose TAME NI conveys the idea of aim clearly, unlike Purpose YOO NI, which indicates a wish.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSION

It is not easy for native speakers of any language to explain clearly the usage of any particular expression in it. They speak their language intuitively, without knowing why or how. Given the need among language teachers to have a clear and concrete picture of grammar, linguistic studies should be of practical value at the same time as being theoretically sound.

In this thesis, three Japanese adverbial clauses denoting 'purpose', TAME NI, NO NI, and YOO NI, were examined. In spite of their high degree of similarity, certain differences are apparent. Let me summarize these differences by returning to my original examples.

1. Sono race ni katsu TAME NI/*NO NI kyoosooba no Achilles

that DAT win rival horse GEN

ken o kitta.
heel ACC cut

'They cut the Achilles' tendon of the rival horse in order to win the race.'

2. Kare wa coffee o nomu *TAME NI/NO NI ryoote de cup o

he TOP ACC drink both hands INS ACC

mochi, sukoshi-zutsu nameru yoo ni nondar.
hold-STEM little by little lick as if drank

'To drink the coffee, he held the cup with both hands and drank it little by little, as if lapping it up.'

3. Ressha no naka de yomu {a. TAME NI zasshi o katta.

train GEN inside LOC read magazine ACC bought

a. 'I bought some magazines to read in the train.'

b. 'I bought some magazines for reading in the train.'

4. Shooko o nokosanai TAME NI/YOO NI shorui wa zembu
evidence ACC not leave document TOP all

moyashita.
burned

'I burned all the documents in order/so as not to leave any evidence.'

5. Shizukani hanashi ga dekiru *TAME NI/YOO NI aite iru heya
quietly talk NOM can do vacant room

e haitta.
ALLAT entered

'We entered a vacant room *in order/so that we could talk quietly.'

6. Koala o miru TAME NI/*YOO NI Australia ni kita.
ACC look DAT came

'I came to Australia in order/*so as to have a look at some Koala bears.'

7. Narubeku katayorazuni eiyoo o toru
as much as possible well balanced nutrition ACC take

TAME NI/YOO NI shokujii ni ki o tsukau.
meals DAT mind ACC use

'I watch my meals in order/so as to get a balanced nutritional intake.'

The fact that TAME NI is grammatical in Example 1 whereas NO NI is not, is due to the different semantic orientation of each expression. TAME NI gives focus to the goal, whereas NO NI focuses on the manner or process involved.

It was suggested that the particle NI of NO NI indicates the temporal relationship between the subordinate and main clauses. NI points to the occasion upon which the event described in the main clause occurs. Thus, it implies co-temporality of the two clauses. This contrasts with the temporally sequential nature of clauses linked by TAME NI. It is not surprising, then, that when the main clause describes that manner of the event detailed in the subordinate clause, as in Example 2, NO NI is acceptable, whereas TAME NI is not.

The grammaticality of both NO NI and TAME NI in Example 3 is due to the telic nature of the subordinate clause. Telicity is compatible with the orientation of both expressions. The difference in orientation

of the two sentences is, however, still transparent. With TAME NI, focus is on the goal and the idea of purpose is conveyed clearly. With NO NI, although the events described by the main and subordinate clauses occur sequentially in the real world, the result of the action described in the main clause remains at the time of occurrence of the event described in the subordinate clause, and thus gives the impression of co-temporality. The subordinate clause, therefore, functions to indicate the occasion on which the event of the main clause takes place.

YOO NI expresses a desire or wish on the part of the subject of the main clause. The conditions for correct use of YOO NI proposed by Kitagawa and Kunihiro can be used to explain Examples 4, 5, and 6.

The state verb contained in Examples 4 and 5 satisfies the condition that the event described in the purposive clause must be outside of the control of the main clause subject, whether the subjects of the main and subordinate clauses are identical or not.

This compares with Example 6, in which the event described in the purposive clause is within the control of the subject of the main clause. Thus, YOO NI is ungrammatical. In a sentence such as this, it is usually the case, as it is here, that the two subjects are identical and the verb is volitional.

When the two subjects are identical and the predicate in the subordinate clause is not stative, as in Example 7 (thus not satisfying the aforementioned conditions), the grammaticality of YOO NI can be explained in the following way: The "dualistic bias of language" permits the subject, a single person in the real world, to be thought of as fulfilling two roles --- that of an agent and the patient. This division can explain the agent's incomplete control over the patient. It is the patient, not the agent, who has control over the intended event. This is the same as the phenomenon of "undergoer control" which is a feature of causatives.

In this paper, an attempt has been made to rigorously explain the difference in the meanings of three purposive expressions in Japanese. Although quite similar, it seems that these expressions are not simply cluttering up the lexicon after all, but rather each has its own meaning to convey. It is confusing when one learns a foreign language to encounter cases where there is more than one way to express one

general idea, or cases where the range covered by a certain expression or structure does not correspond exactly with an expression or structure in one's own tongue. It is hoped that this small paper will be a help for both those who learn and those who teach Japanese as a foreign language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alfonso, Anthony. 1974. Japanese Language Patterns. Tokyo: Sophia University. L.L. Centre of Applied Linguistics.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1984. 'Surprise' in L. J. Raphael, C. B. Raphael, and M. M. R. Valdovinos, Language and Cognition: Essays in Honor of Arthur Bronstein. New York and London: Plenum Press.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. 'Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of view' in C. N. Li (ed.) Subject and Topic. New York: Academic Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dowty, David. R. 1972. 'Studies in the logic of verb and time reference in English' in Studies in Linguistics I. Austin: University of Texas.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. Word Meaning and Montague Grammar. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1968. 'The case for case' in E. Bach and R. T. Harms (eds.) Universals in Linguistic Theory. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Foley, William A. and Van Valin R. D. Jr. Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar. Memeograph. (Forthcoming.)
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse' in Language, vol. 56.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1981. "Suru" to "naru" no gengogaku. Tokyo: Taishukan-shoten.
- Jakendoff, Ray S. 1972. Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jacobsen, Wesley. 1982. Transitivity in the Japanese Verbal System. Indiana: Indiana University Linguistic Club.
- Kaneko, Hisakazu. 1975. Descriptive research into some problems of Japanese potential expressions. M. A. Thesis, The Australian National University.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1971. 'Two kinds of Presupposition in Natural Language' in C. J. Fillmore and D. T. Langendoen (eds.) Studies in Linguistic Semantics. New York: Holt, Reinehart and Winston.

- Kindaichi, Haruhiko. 1950. 'Kokugo dooshi no ichibunrui' Reprinted in H. Kindaichi (ed.) Nihongo dooshi noasupekuto. (1976) Tokyo: Mugi-shoboo.
1955. 'Nihongo dooshi noasupekuto' Reprinted in H. Kindaichi (ed.) Nihongo dooshi noasupekuto. (1976) Tokyo: Mugi-shoboo.
- Kitagawa, Chisato. 1972. Expressions of Purpose, Emotive Response, and Contrariness to Expectation --- A Study of Japanese NO NI constructions. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan.
- Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo. 1972. Dooshi no imiyooahoo no kijutsuteki kenkyuu. Tokyo: Shuuei-shuppan.
- Kunihiro, Tetsuya. 1979. Koozooteki imiron. Tokyo: Sanseidoo.
- Kunihiro, Tetsuya., Takeshi Shibata, Nagashima Yoshiroo, Yamada Susumu, and Asano Yuriko. 1982. 'Tame ni---Yoo ni' in Kotoba no Imi. 3. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. Nihon bumpoo kenkyuu. Tokyo: Taishukan-shoten.
1980. Danwa no bumpoo. Tokyo: Taishukan-shoten.
- Lyons, John. 1977. Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1975. A Reference Grammar of Japanese. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Matsushita, Daizaburoo. 1928. Senkai hyoojun nihon bumpoo. Tokyo: Kigensha.
1961. Hyoojun nihonkoogohoo. Tokyo: Hakuteisha.
- Mikami, Akira. 1976. Gendai gohoo shinsetsu. Tokyo: Kuroshio-shuppan.
1980. Gendai gohoo josetsu. Tokyo: Kuroshio-shuppan.
- Minami, Fujio. 1977. Gendai nihongo no koozoo. Tokyo: Taishukan-shoten.
- Morita, Yoshiyuki. 1977. Kiso nihongo. Tokyo: Kadokawa-shoten.
- Murata, Yasumi. 1983. A Study of Corresponding Transitive and Intransitive Verbs in Japanese. M.A. Thesis, The Australian National University.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1982. Dooshi no imi to koobun - tensu to asupekuto o megutte. in Nihongogaku. vol.1, no. 1. Tokyo: Meiji-shoin.
1983. 'Kekkadooshi to sono shuuhen' in M. Watanabe (ed.) Fukuyoogo no kenkyuu. Tokyo: Meiji-shoin.
- Ooe, Saburoo. 1979. Nichieigo no hikakukenkyuu -- shukansei o megutte. Tokyo: Nan'undoo.
- Ootsuka, Kiyoko. 1964. 'No ni to tame ni' in M. Tokieda and Y. Endoo (eds.) Yureteiru bumpoo. Kokugo bumpoo kooza. 3. Tokyo: Meiji-shoin.

- Sakuma, Kanae. 1966. *Gendai nihongo no hyoogen to gohoo -- zoohoban.* Tokyo: Kooseisha kooseikaku.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1978. 'The One Per Sent Solution' in W. Abraham (ed.) *Valence, Semantic Case, and Grammatical Relations.* SLCS. vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1980. 1982. *Nihongo no bumpoo.* Joo. Ge. Tokyo: Kokuritsu kokugo kenkyuujo.
1982. *Nihongo no shintakkusu to imi.* vol.1. Tokyo: Kuroshio-shuppan.
1982. 'Nihongo ni okeru tambun fukubun nintei no mondai' in K. Morioka and el. (eds.) *Kooza nihongogaku.* vol.11. Tokyo: Meiji-shoin.
1983. 'Jikantekigentei no imi to bumpooteiki-kinoo' in M. Watanabe (ed.) *Fukuyoogo no kenkyuu.* Tokyo: Meiji-shoin.
1983. 'Futai jookyoo hyoogen no seiritsu no jooken' in *Nihongogaku.* vol.10. Tokyo: Meiji-shoin.
- Tokieda, Motoki. 1950. *Nihon bumpoo koogohen.* Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.
- Watanabe, Minoru. 1981. *Kokugo koobunron.* Tokyo: Haniwa-shoboo.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. 'Verbs and Times' in Z. Vendler (ed.) *Linguistics in Philosophy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1972. *Semantic Primitives.* Frankfurt: Athenaum Verlag.