Conversation and grammar: Approaching so-called conditionals in Japanese

Tsuyoshi Ono and Kimberly Jones

Introduction[1]

For a number of years, we have been interested in what the empirical study of language use might have to offer not only linguists, but also specialists in second language acquisition and teaching. As we observed the diversity of how the Japanese language is used by speakers interacting in real-life contexts, it became clear that what we saw was frequently at odds with the sentences described in much linguistic research, with descriptions of the Japanese language found in textbooks for nonnative speakers, and with pervasive ideologies about the Japanese language that are held by many people, be they linguists, language teachers, or lay people. As the analysis of language based on naturally occurring discourse continues to progress, it seems appropriate that we reexamine our textbooks, curricula, and classroom practices to consider whether what we teach and do in our language classes reflects language practices in the real world.

As one example of a mismatch between ideology and actual practice, in her earlier work on Japanese conflict talk (1990, 1993, 1995), Jones found that despite the prevalent belief that Japanese speakers do not explicitly engage in conflict talk, it was not difficult to find examples of quite explicit talk expressing and negotiating conflicts that arose between participants in conversations. However, whether because of the ideology

of a harmonious Japan, or simply because language textbooks in general tend to portray a smoothly functioning world free of interpersonal conflict, students of Japanese are rarely taught how to engage in disagreement. The experience of encountering a relatively advanced nonnative speaker who thought that a common discourse marker of disagreement, *saa, soo deshoo ka* 'hmm, I wonder if that is the case,' conveyed an inclination to *agree* with one's interlocutor convinced Jones that students would benefit from being taught that Japanese speakers do at times explicitly discuss the inevitable conflicts that arise between them, and that there are specific forms that they typically use to do so.

Research presented in a number of the chapters in this book also looks at ideologies about language use that are commonly referred to in Japanese language pedagogy. Chapters that fall in this category include those that consider speech styles (Cook), *keigo* (Wetzel), and "gendered" language (Okada), all issues that are typically addressed by teachers and textbooks of Japanese. By taking an empirical look at how speakers in real-life contexts actually use these and other ways of speaking, as the chapters in the first half of this book do, we can develop a more informed pedagogy and avoid teaching students a stereotypical and/or inaccurate version of Japanese.

Nor is it only more global ideologies about ways of speaking and about what can or cannot be discussed that turn out to be inaccurate. In another study connecting discourse and language pedagogy, we discovered a number of ways textbook dialogues fail to accurately reflect natural speech (Ono and Jones 2001; Jones and Ono 2005). Textbook dialogues generally focus on exchanging information and are typically comprised of neat pairs of complete sentences, often with a high amount of new

information in one sentence. Information exchange, however, is only one of many possible functions of interpersonal talk, and in real conversations, only a limited amount of new information is typically introduced in each utterance (see Chafe 1987, 1994). Perhaps even more importantly, textbook dialogues typically fail to include many of the linguistic devices that Japanese speakers use frequently in order to clarify what they are saying and to confirm mutual comprehension—devices such as repetition, repair, postposing, interactional particles, backchannels, fillers, and lengthening. All these aspects of language use can be taught, so here again we can see clear applications that follow once we understand more about the nature of language as it is used in interactions.

In another study that considers the gap between textbook and classroom speech on the one hand, and naturally occurring social interactions on the other, Mori (2005) questions the way *dooshite* 'why' questions are introduced in Japanese language classes. Textbooks introduce these questions with the aim of teaching a particular question structure. However, a *dooshite* question can be interpreted as challenging something that another person has said or done. Thus, although such questions may seem acceptable in classroom language practice, they can be problematic when used in actual social interactions. As Mori points out, it is crucial that we integrate discourse and sociolinguistic perspectives with the teaching of grammar.

These are only a few of the relevant studies that have explored how studies based on empirical data can help us better understand the reality of how speakers use language, and thus help us provide a more accurate picture of language use to students. While some of our previous studies have tended to look at more global issues such as language ideologies or discourse organization, in this chapter, we want to discuss how what has

traditionally been called "grammar" (or "morphosyntax") can be studied in actual use, thus extending our previous work to a consideration of how an understanding of actual language use can inform our teaching of specific grammatical structures, and indeed, our understanding of the very nature of human language.

In order to do this, we will first discuss the theoretical assumptions underlying our approach to the study of language, which is a discourse-functional approach, and mention some typical basic assumptions about human language that such an approach might call into question. The assumptions that we question underlie much work in linguistics that does not examine spoken language. They represent an earlier and dominant tradition that has been advocated by the linguist Noam Chomsky and his followers since the late 1950s. These assumptions have permeated the field of linguistics for the past several decades without having really been tested to see whether they are a good fit for what we can observe in actual language use. In this paper, we start afresh with a set of perspectives which are often at odds with the older assumptions, perspectives that seem to us to be a better fit with what speakers do in everyday talk.

We should note that some of the alternative perspectives we discuss have already been discussed and advocated with various degrees of detail by other researchers, especially those who take an approach to linguistics often called functional linguistics, such as Givon (1979), Hopper and Thompson (1980, 1984), Langacker (1987, 1991), Chafe (1994), Ochs, Schegloff, and Thompson (1996), Tomasello (1998, 2003), Bybee and Hopper (2001), and Bybee (2006). This newer tradition came about in the 1970s as a reaction to the dominant tradition mentioned above. What will be presented here is essentially our own version of functional linguistics, more recently called usage-based

4

linguistics.[2] We feel that the insights offered by a usage-based approach to linguistics, stemming as they do from what we observe in everyday talk, have valuable implications for what a model of human language should be like.

In the second part of the paper, we will examine so-called "conditionals" in Japanese as a case study to illustrate the way in which grammar can be studied based on actual language use.[3] We hope that this case study will show the reader about how we might go about studying everyday talk in order to understand and represent human language, and why such an understanding might prove valuable not only to linguists, but also to language teachers and their students.

Theoretical underpinning

Centrality of everyday talk: Data and methodology

It is well accepted among linguists that spoken language is the fundamental form of human language. There are several reasons for this. Spoken language is shared by a great majority of people in the world. With the exception of sign languages, it is part of every natural language. Without being explicitly taught to do so, we learn to speak and participate in speech activities that are part of everyday interactions, such as greeting, chatting, joking, and telling stories. Obviously, speakers have different skill levels in these verbal activities, but the fact remains that, barring some sort of disability that inhibits language acquisition, they all learn to perform them.

Writing, another form of language, on the other hand, is much more specialized. For one thing, a great majority of world languages do not have a writing system. For languages which have a writing system, the written language has to be explicitly taught to

most people and often requires years of practice to acquire. And even in a language like Japanese, in which there is a long tradition of writing and a great majority of the speakers can write, writing still seems to be a marked form of language. That is, though Japanese speakers living in Japan are unlikely to get through a day without seeing some written materials, for most speakers, the amount of written language they actually produce on a given day is likely to be far less than the amount of spoken language they produce. For the majority of people, the spoken language constitutes the greater part of their linguistic life.

Due to the centrality of spoken language described above, linguists have always been interested in finding out what makes spoken language possible. This is partly motivated by a goal shared by many linguists: to identify language universals, features common among all the languages in the world. The basic idea is that since spoken language is so fundamental and is shared by practically all languages, an examination of spoken language should help us identify language universals. Following this line of thought, linguists have attempted to understand the ability (often called competence or knowledge) that allows speakers to produce actual spoken language (often called performance or use). In order to do this, linguists who are native speakers of the languages they are examining have typically used constructed sentences for their data, consulting their own intuitions to decide whether those sentences are grammatical or not. The work by Chomsky and his followers represents this dominant tradition. However, our approach is instead to examine everyday talk, the fundamental form of language. More precisely, we perform close investigations of recorded talk and its transcripts.

Our basic method is inductive in that we examine that recorded talk and transcripts in order to propose hypotheses about what speakers of the language may know. It should be mentioned, however, that in practice we often begin the investigation with re-examining previously discussed and/or assumed categories, rules, or phenomena. So the basic procedure has been, for example, to start with something like the following: "Let us see what 'conditionals' are like in everyday talk. Are they really used in everyday talk? If so, how are they used?" This has been a typical procedure mainly because it is not easy to begin a study completely from scratch.[4] But this has produced results that question many of the categories and rules that have been previously assumed to exist. So by adopting this procedure, we have learned that we have to deal with traditional categories and assumptions very carefully, always testing them against what people actually do.

As the reader can see, the approach described above involves observation and description. At this stage, much of its work is still in a hypothesis-building stage, a stage that it is necessary to go through before we can engage in further theorization. However, we hope it is clear from the discussion so far that the sort of research represented by this paper is a type of theoretical morphosyntax that uses actual spoken language as its data, unlike the standard methodology of a more traditional approach to morphosyntax. It should also be pointed out that, unlike the traditional approach, much of this line of research has not been formalized. This may be an outcome of the sentiment shared by its practitioners that the amount of knowledge we have about everyday talk is still very limited and formal modeling is premature.

Having discussed the general type of data we use and how we typically approach a new study, we should also address the issue of sampling. This is an on-going challenge. There are some existing corpora, but these tend not to be suitable. The National Institute for Japanese Language has produced a spoken corpus, the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese. The majority of what is included in that corpus is interviews, lectures, and read speech, so it can be used to investigate those particular types of language use, but it is not particularly helpful for investigations of more conversational Japanese. The Linguistic Data Consortium has also produced two corpora of Japanese telephone conversations, CALLHOME (phone calls between family members) and CALLFRIEND (phone calls between friends). These are good sources of data for the study of those particular types of everyday talk, although the transcription for CALLFRIEND in particular is not always as reliable as might be desired. For children's language use, resources include CHILDES (Child Language Data Exchange System).

Simply put, the data available for the kind of work described above is still very limited. Individual researchers, including ourselves, typically base their studies on their personal collections of recordings and transcripts, so the sample size tends to be rather small. One of our goals as Japanese linguists is to contribute to an understanding of the nature of the language in general. This rather lofty goal, however, obviously requires a large enough set of data to be a good representative of what Japanese speakers do in their everyday interactions. At the time of writing this chapter, no such corpus exists.

In terms of corpora, the problem of sample size needs to be kept in mind in any study that we undertake or read. Because of this, we feel that it is most important for researchers to strive to amass and share more data at every opportunity so that we will

eventually be able to build a large corpus (or perhaps multiple smaller corpora, each representative of different types of talk) that will allow us to make general statements about the whole language with more confidence.[5]

In addition to the sample size, we also need to consider the composition of the sample. As mentioned above, different corpora contain different types of talk. Depending on what aspects of the Japanese language we hope to examine, we will need to look at different genres of talk that vary in aspects such as the purpose of talk and the formality of the talk. And if we hope to make generalizations about the Japanese language as a whole, we need to be sure that our sample represents a diverse range of speakers, such as speakers of different ages, genders, and regional dialects. This is an extremely difficult yet crucial question that we have to address at some point in our attempt to learn the nature of Japanese in general. Clearly, a large amount of collective research effort will be needed in order to address this issue.

Some standard assumptions

In this section, we would like to discuss some closely related assumptions that underlie most traditional understandings of grammar, but that we believe our data calls into question. We hope that our data will suggest new ways of understanding the nature of grammar and human language and that these new perspectives will prove fruitful to both linguistics and language pedagogy. These issues demand a much more extensive treatment than we are able to provide here. We would like to consider this brief discussion as a small step toward synthesizing these related issues with a larger goal of

coming up with a model of human language reflecting actual language use. We hope our brief treatment of these issues provides a foundation for further research.

Modularity: This is the assumption (or hypothesis) found in much linguistic research from the past several decades, that human language consists of various discreet components, such as phonology or syntax, and thus, that it can be studied one component at a time. Thus many studies, particularly in morphosyntax, have been conducted by focusing on only one area typically using information only from that area. However, a number of more recent studies have in fact questioned this long-held assumption. Linguists working from this new perspective have pointed out that many of the utterances observed in spoken language are actually more or less fixed. Thus, the lexicon and grammar might not be clearly separable as has been assumed. This suggests a different way of conceptualizing language (Langacker 1987, 1991; Erman and Warren 2000; Bybee and Hopper 2001; Bybee 2006). Based on this understanding, we will examine Japanese conditionals without limiting ourselves to looking only at grammatical evidence.

Discreet categories and (binary) features: Another common assumption in linguistics is the idea that linguistic categories are discreet. So, for instance, part of speech categories such as "noun" and "verb" have typically been assumed to be grammatically distinct from each other. These sorts of categories have also been defined using discreet (very often binary) features. However, we do not yet know whether these assumptions are warranted, so we need to examine feature-based discreet categorizations in order to see if they actually fit with how human language operates. In fact, some research in the past several decades that has considered both grammar and meaning/function has suggested a rather different type of categorization in which

categories have been shown to be defined based on prototypes and have "fuzzy edges," with given forms fitting into the categories to a greater or lesser degree, based on how closely they resemble the prototypes for those categories. (See Rosch 1978, Lakoff 1977, Hopper and Thompson 1980, 1984; Langacker 1987, 1991.) That is, categories in language may instead be non-discreet and non-feature based. Interestingly, the non-discreetness of categories seems to be related to a fundamental characteristic of human language to which we now turn our attention: change.

Synchronic grammar: Another assumption of convenience in linguistics is the idea that our goal is the description and representation of synchronic grammar—that is, of what speakers of the language know at the present moment. In reality, of course, we know that everyday talk is full of variation that defies clear categorization. In particular, it includes examples in which category boundaries are fuzzy rather than discreet, or, perhaps more precisely, in which utterances look more or less as if they belong to different categories. An example of this would be Nakayama and Ichihashi-Nakayama's (1997) work on the form *kedo* 'but', showing that *kedo*-clauses often exhibit an intermediate status between subordinate clauses (in which *kedo* functions to link a subordinate clause and a main clause or to indicate a presumed main clause that is not overtly expressed) and main clauses (in which *kedo* functions more like a final particle). Adopting a diachronic approach to grammar allows us to have a better understanding of this situation: typical examples in everyday talk exhibit various degrees of categoriality and cannot easily be fit into traditional categories, but that is a natural outcome of ongoing change in the language We need a model that can handle this essential feature of

human language, and some researchers have in fact attempted to address this issue (Hopper 1998; Langacker 1987, 1991).

Single grammar: This is perhaps not an overtly stated assumption. Nevertheless, there is a tendency to conceptualize language in terms of a single system that is responsible for various different types of linguistic skills, including both spoken and written language. So, for instance, all of the various forms that are considered conditionals in Japanese are treated together, with the implication being that they belong to the same component of the grammar. Even if researchers find mode- or genre-specific uses of these forms, such as differences between spoken and written language, for instance, they tend to maintain the assumption that there is a single grammar, simply noting the modes or genres of language in which these forms are used. However, we could instead envision treating grammar as a phenomenon that is less unified than generally assumed. For instance, mode- or genre-specific variations could be due to having two or more relatively distinct grammatical systems. Shoichi Iwasaki has recently been working on a proposal for a multiple grammar hypothesis in order to grapple with this issue.

Rules: Another common assumption about language is that utterances can be accounted for by a finite set of productive rules. Another possible scenario, however, is that utterances are often comprised of memorized expressions and variations that are newly created for the occasion, but that are nonetheless based on memorized expressions. Under this hypothesis, the role of rules might actually be much more limited than typically assumed, and (semi-)fixed phrases such as idioms, set phrases, and collocations, and variations on those fixed phrases, might account for much of the linguistic activity

that comprises everyday talk. A number of scholars have advocated this position (Pawley and Syder 1983; Erman and Warren 2000; Bybee and Hopper 2001; Bybee 2006; Wray 2005).

Simplicity/economy: An assumption that is related to the last few points is that the adequacy of a proposed grammar should be judged based on economy and simplicity. That is, the simpler the proposed grammar and more examples it can account for, the better. Here we would simply suggest that we need data that shows that human behaviors in general, and language in particular, are structured economically.

Competing forms: Finally, it is common in both linguistics and language pedagogy to treat certain sets of linguistic forms as if they are forms that are related to each other, perhaps members of the same group, and then to try to explain why one form is used in a certain situation while another form is used in another situation. In Japanese, for example, linguists, language teachers, and students alike tend to consider the so-called topic marker *wa* and the so-called subject marker *ga* together and to attempt to distinguish between the contexts that are appropriate for the use of each particle. The same could be said of other forms as well, such as active and passive verbs, epistemic/evidential forms *soo da*, *yoo da*, *mitai da*, and *rashii*, and the conditional forms that we consider in the third section of this paper. It is interesting that this attitude is observed even in some of our own research that examines discourse data, as in:

> Discourse-functional approaches to grammar have two goals. The first goal is a
> descriptive one: given the richness of the grammatical resources languages
> typically have for expressing the 'same' content, how do speakers choose among
> them? That is, what are the functions of the grammatical and lexical alternations

13

of a language? We can ask, for instance, how speakers choose between a full

noun phrase and a pronoun, or between two alternative orders for subject and verb.

(Cumming and Ono 1997: 112)

Against this commonly-held view, Pawley and Syder (1983) demonstrate that only

certain of the "competing" forms in English may be appropriate in a particular context

and/or in a certain genre. Further, as found in the quoted passage above, competing

forms are generally grouped together based on semantic (or propositional) similarities.

However, we might legitimately ask why we should necessarily start with semantics?

Why not pragmatic similarities, for instance? If our goal is to capture units that are real

to speakers of the language, it might make more sense to start with a set of forms that are

used similarly in actual speech contexts.

Conditionals

As a case study illustrating the type of approach described above, and as a way of

examining whether the assumptions we have laid out are necessarily warranted, in this

section we examine what might be considered a set of competing forms par excellence,

forms that have been called conditionals in Japanese: *tara, nara, ba,* and *to.* Linguists

have traditionally attempted to show the grammatical characteristics associated with each

of these forms, to explain how they differ from each other semantically, and to delineate

the conditions under which they can or cannot be used (e.g., Kuno 1973; Akatsuka 1985;

Hasunuma 1987). In Japanese textbooks as well, we find that these forms are often

introduced together and the characterization of each form is typically contrasted with

other conditional forms (e.g., Tohsaku 1995b, Hatasa et al. 2000). Examples (1a) through

(1e) illustrate how two or more of these forms have traditionally been examined together, suggesting that they are conceived of as a set in the grammar of Japanese.

(1a) Tomodachi ga dekire**ba**/deki**tara** gakkoo mo tanoshiku naru   deshoo

friends   S   be-made-BA/TARA school also enjoyable become TENT

    'If/when s/he makes some friends, school will probably become more

    enjoyable.' (Jacobsen 1992: 139)[6]

(1b) Asu   Tokyo ni   iku **nara**/ **it**tara**,   issho ni tsurete itte kudasai

tomorrow   to   go NARA went-TARA together taking go please

    'Please take me with you if you are going to go to Tokyo tomorrow.'

                                        (Kuno 1973: 177)

(1c) sonna kurai tokoro de hon   o   yon-**dara**/yomu **to/?**yome-**ba**

such   dark place at book O read-TARA/TO/BA

me o waruku-shimasu yo

eye O bad   do   IP

    'If (you) read a book in such a dark place, (you) are going to make your eyes

    (go) bad.'   (Hasunuma 1987: 3)

(1d) konshuu   no doyoobi isogashiku-nakat-**tara**   uchi ni kimas-en   ka

this.week of Saturday busy   -NEG-TARA house to come-NEG Q

'if you are not busy this Saturday, would you like to come to my house?'

(Hatasa et al. 2000: 214)

konshuu   no doyoobi isogashiku-nai **nara**   uchi ni kimas-en ka

this.week of Saturday busy   -NEG NARA house to come-NEG Q

'Since you're not busy this Saturday, would you like to come to my house?'

(Hatasa et al. 2000: 214)

(1e)

Conditional (…**to, ~tara, ~ba**)	ii/yokatta	+ noni

It would be good if…, I wish it would happen that…, It would have been

good if…, I wish it would have happened that…

(Tohsaku 1995b:417)

In a more recent series of work, Akatsuka, Clancy, and Strauss examine

conditionals in actual discourse data (e.g., Akatsuka 1997; Clancy et al. 1997; Akatsuka

and Strauss 2000). They explore the meanings, discourse functions, acquisition, and

history of these forms, and some of their findings are clearly compatible with what we

will discuss below. Akatsuka, Clancy, and Strauss, however, look at conditionals as the

object of their research, considering *tara, nara, ba,* and *to* to constitute a set of

conditional forms and do not detail the frequency of these forms' occurrence or explore

what they might mean in relation to the representation of Japanese grammar as a whole.

We have tried to build on their work by going on to consider the frequency with which these forms are used, the sorts of patterns we find in how they are used, and what light they shed on the nature of Japanese grammar and how we might represent it.

In our paper, we would like to change perspectives and take a corpus-based approach to *tara, nara, ba,* and *to*. Specifically, we use a small-scale corpus of everyday talk to examine aspects such as these forms' frequency and productivity in order to gain an understanding of the grammar of so-called conditionals. Our corpus consists of 28 audio-recorded spontaneous informal conversations of mostly standard Japanese (see the chapters in this volume by Okamoto and Kubota for discussion regarding "standard Japanese").[7] The conversations total about 3 hours of talk and roughly 5000 clauses. Each conversation involves between two and five participants who are family members, couples, and/or friends. The speakers range in age from approximately 15 to 65.

We will start our investigation by focusing on the tokens of *tara, nara, ba, to* and related forms (e.g., *kya*) found in the corpus. Our approach is to examine how these forms are used in everyday talk in order to explore what Japanese speakers may know about these forms and how that knowledge may be organized.

Frequency of conditional forms

We found 346 tokens of *tara, nara, ba, to* and related forms in the corpus. As shown in Table 1.1, we further found that the distribution of these forms was highly skewed.[8]

Table 1.1 Conditional forms found in the corpus

tara	*to*	*ba*	*nara*	Total
166	88	84	8	346
48.0%	25.4%	24.3%	2.3%	100%

In particular, *nara* is extremely rare;[9] it seems that is not really 'competing' with the other forms in this sort of casual conversation. That is, forms that have typically been treated as a set by linguists may not actually be a set for the speakers of the language or if they are somehow members of the same set, one of those members may be a very marginal member in conversational Japanese.

Fixedness

As shown in Table 1.2, when we looked at the utterances in which these forms were used, we found that more than half of the conditional forms in our data (52.5%) are associated with various degrees of fixedness. These examples include lexicalized expressions, idioms, set phrases, and collocations that do not seem to be produced based on regular syntactic rules. We call this type "(semi-)fixed conditionals," as opposed to "rule-based conditionals," which can be understood to be based on regular syntactic rules.

Table 1.2 (Semi-)fixed and rule-based conditional

(semi-)fixed conditionals	rule-based conditionals	Total
181	164	345[10]
52.5%	47.5%	100%

The prevalence of (semi-)fixed conditionals suggests that fixed linguistic expressions play at least as important a role as syntactic rules in everyday talk, suggesting that we need to pay far more attention to this type of language in future research.[11]

The (semi-)fixed conditionals are not simply a random set of expressions that are memorized by speakers. Instead, they are associated with various types of internal structure and fixedness and involve several subtypes. In the remainder of this section, we

will go over some examples illustrating these subtypes, the frequency of which can be

seen in Table 1.3.

Table 1.3 Subtypes of conditionals

Conjunctions	Semi-fixed expressions	*-ba* positive/ *-kya* negative	Suggestions	Topic marking	Total
47	34	51	7	42	181
26.0%	18.8%	28.2%	3.9%	23.2%	100.1%[12]

Conjunctions and other (semi-)fixed expressions

Quite a few instances of conditional forms (47 out of 346 tokens, or 13.6%) are found as

part of lexicalized conjunctions, as illustrated in examples (2a) through (2d). Reduced

versions of some of these forms are also found in our corpus, and these are presented

together with the corresponding full form below. These reduced forms can be understood

as reflecting further change in the language.

(2a)   soo-shi-**tara**   soshi**tara**, hoshi**tara**, **tara**

         so -do -TARA

             'then'

(2b)   soo-suru-**to**   sosu**to**

         so -do   -TO

             'in that case/then'

(2c)   dat   -**tara**

         COP -TARA

19

'in that case/then'

(2d)   sore-**nara**   hon**nara**

        that -NARA

            'then'

Some of these examples are listed in dictionaries,[13] and their lexicalized status can be

further seen in the fact that the conditional form found in each example cannot be freely

interchanged with other supposedly competing forms. That is, replacing *tara* and *to* in

(2a) and (2b) with *ba* and *nara*, as in *soosureba* and *soosurunara*, for instance, does not

produce conjunctions.[14]

One might suggest that although examples such as (2a)-(2d) may include

conditional forms, they are not functioning as conditionals, so they should not enter into a

discussion of conditionals. But that type of thinking prevents us from asking the question

of why conditional forms commonly end up being lexicalized as conjunctions. The

prevalence of this type of lexicalization in fact demands an explanation, particularly

because it might reflect some general nature of Japanese or of human language. We need

a theory of human language that can represent this window into diachronicity in

synchronic data.

There are also 34 cases of other (semi-)fixed expressions that involve conditional

forms, as in examples (3a) through (3f).[15]

(3a)   tatoe   -**ba**

        compare-BA

'for example'

(3b)   soo-ie **-ba**

so -say-BA

    'now that you mention it'

(3c)   hyotto   shi-**tara**

by.chance do -TARA

    'maybe'

(3d)   moshika shi-**tara**

if   do -TARA

    'maybe'

(3e)   yat-**tara**   yamer-are   -nai

do -TARA stop   -potential-NEG

    'Once you (start) do(ing) it, you can't stop.'

(3f)   musashiya mo shira -nakere **-ba** uomasa mo shira -nai

Musashiya also know -NEG -BA Uomasa also know-NEG

    'If (I) also don't know Musashiya, (I) also don't know Uomasa/(I) don't know

    anything about either Musashiya or Uomasa.'

Similar to the case of the lexicalized conjunctions discussed above, some of these (semi-) fixed expressions are found in dictionaries. Further, replacing *ba* in *sooieba* in (3b) with *to, tara,* or *nara* would result in a different meaning; the expression would not mean 'now that you mention it.' Similarly, while *tara* in (3d) may be replaced with *to* as *moshika suruto*, the use of either *ba* or *nara* in the same example does not seem to work as well: *moshika sureba* and *moshika surunara* sound odd.

It should be noted that some of these expressions are not completely fixed. For instance, based on *yattara yamerarenai* 'Once you (start) do(ing) it, you can't stop' in (3e), you can rather easily say *tabetara yamerarenai* 'Once you (start) eat(ing), you can't stop', *mitara yamerarenai* 'Once you (start) look(ing), you can't stop' or even *tabedashitara yamerarenai* 'Once you start eating, you can't stop.' That is, while parts of these expressions may be fixed, they also involve open slots in which various items are inserted. Bybee (2006) calls this type of unit a "construction" and highlights its centrality in actual discourse, suggesting that it should play a major role in our theorization of human language.

~ba positive

We also found 26 examples involving *ba* in utterances expressing some sort of positive outcome, as in examples (4a) through (4c).

(4a)   jibun no shigoto dake yatte-re   **-ba** ii

self of work   only do -stative-BA good

'It's good if (I) do only (my) own work/(I) only need to do (my) own work.'

(4b)   kure -**ba** yokat-ta   noni   kumi-chan

come-BA good -past despite Kumi-chan

     'Even though it would have been good if (you) had come, Kumi-chan/(You)

     should have come, Kumi-chan.'

(4c)   maabin ni itte oke   **-ba** betsuni   mondai wa   nai

Marvin to say in.advance-BA particularly problem TOP exist.NEG

     'There won't be any particular problem, if (we) tell Marvin in advance.'

In these examples, the predicate of the main clause expresses a positive outcome (e.g., 'good' and 'no particular problem') resulting from the situation described in the conditional clause. We call these types of examples '~*ba* positive'. It is interesting that this use has been fixed to the extent that some examples are associated with a meaning that has further developed from its original meaning. So for example, (4b) actually means something more like '(you) should have…' (the second translation), which appears to have derived from its more literal meaning 'it would have been good if…' (the first translation).

     Example (4d) further illustrates the fixed status of ~*ba* positive whereby the utterance is associated with a positive outcome even without the main clause overtly expressing it.

(4d) The speaker first says she might look for a boyfriend and then says

    ii   hito   ga ire -**ba** na

    good person S exist-BA IP

'(It would be good) if (I) had a good guy/(I wish) (I) had a guy.'

That is, such examples show that '~*ba* positive' has been established as a category in the mind of Japanese speakers to the extent that it is associated with a positive outcome even when the utterance does not explicitly state that positive outcome.

~kya *negative*

As a counterpart to '~*ba* positive', we also found 25 examples of '~*kya* negative', in that *kya* is a form of *ba* and is associated with a negative outcome, as in examples (5a) through (5d).[16] Similar examples have been extensively discussed in Akatsuka (1997), Akatsuka and Strauss (2000), and Clancy et al. (1997).

(5a)   ogora-na -**kya** ikenai deshoo

      treat -NEG-BA bad   TENT

         'It would be bad if (you) don't pay (your girlfriend's way)/(You) must treat

         (your girlfriend).'

(5b)   gyooseki age   -na-**kya** dame da   na

      results   increase-NEG-BA bad COP IP

         'It's bad if (you) don't come up with results/(You) must come up with results.'

(5c)   chanto   shi-na -**kya**   iya

      properly do-NEG-BA bad

         'It's bad if (I) don't do (it) right/(I) have to do (it) right.'

24

(5d)   mukoo   ni akuseputo sare   -nake-**rya** imi   ga nai

        over.there in accept   do.passive-NEG-BA meaning S exist.NEG

        'It's meaningless if (your work) isn't accepted in the West.'

The main clause in each of these examples expresses a negative outcome (e.g., 'bad' and 'meaningless') resulting from the situation described in the conditional clause. Similar to ~*ba* positive, ~*kya* negative has been fixed to the extent that some examples are associated with a meaning that has further developed from its original meaning. So, for example, a better translation for (5a) is '(you) must…', which appears to have derived from its more literal meaning 'it would be bad if…'.

        Also as with ~*ba* positive, with ~*kya* negative we again find examples in which the utterance indicates a negative outcome even though it lacks a main clause that overtly expresses that outcome:

(5e)   henji hayaku dasa-na -**kya**

        reply quickly send-NEG-BA

        '(I) have to send (her) a reply right away.'

As we saw earlier regarding ~*ba* positive, examples such as these are good evidence that ~*kya* negative has been (semi-)fixed and established as a category in the minds of Japanese speakers.

It seems reasonable to speculate that examples such as (4d) and (5e) derive from the frequent association between a particular form (*ba* or *kya*) with a particular meaning (positive or negative). That is, the frequent use of ~*ba* positive and ~*kya* negative may have resulted in a situation in which a particular meaning is evoked in the mind of speakers even though only the first clause is explicitly expressed.

Suggestions

We also found 7 other examples involving only the conditional clause that express a suggestion, as in (6a) through (6c):[17]

(6a) ki **-tara**

come-TARA

'Why don't you come (over)?'

(6b) hokoten itte mire-**ba**

pedestrian.paradise go try -BA

'Why don't you try going to a "pedestrian paradise" (an area where the street

has been blocked off for pedestrians)?'

(6c) higoro no koodoo o ne moo chotto jimini suru **to**

everyday of behavior O IP emphatic a.little restrained do TO

'(You should) make (your) everyday demeanor a little more restrained.'

Similar to the ~*ba* positive (4d) and ~*kya* negative (5e) examples that we saw above, the conditional clause is used alone in examples (6a) through (6c). The situation described in the clause is understood as a suggestion even though the suggestion is not made overtly, which suggests again that this type of suggestion is a (semi-)fixed expression and constitutes a category for speakers.

Topic marking

The connection between conditionals and topic marking has been noted by previous researchers as well (Haiman 1978; Akatsuka 1986; Jacobsen 1992).[18] We found 42 examples in which the conditional clause is functioning similarly to *wa* and *tte*, both of which can function as topic markers, as in:

(7a)   sore da   **to** takai   sore **wa**   takai

   that COP TO expensive   that TOP expensive

       'That's expensive.'   *'That's expensive.'* (constructed)

In this example, the conditional clause involving a copula serves a function similar to topic marking, as demonstrated by the constructed example with the topic marker *wa*, given in the right column. A more literal translation of (7a) may be 'If (it) is that, (it's) expensive'. It seems reasonable to suggest that the conditional clause 'if (it) is that' has been re-analyzed as a way to indicate a topic, as in 'That, (it's) expensive/That's expensive.'

Example (7b) is another topic-marking example of a conditional involving a copula.

(7b)   hokoten   dat **-tara**   bando mo   yatte-ru   shi

pedestrian.paradise COP-TARA band   also do   -stative and

   'As for "pedestrian paradises", bands are also playing and…'

Other predicates commonly found in topic-marking examples of conditionals are the

verbs *iu* 'say' and *naru* 'become', as in (7c) and (7d).

(7c)   nengu tte it **-tara**   okome da   yo

tax   QT say-TARA rice   COP IP

   'What you call "land tax" is rice.' (Land taxes were paid in rice.)

(7d)   kuruma toka naru   **to**   sutereo to   onaji de

car   like become TO stereo   with same and

   'When it comes to things like cars,/As for cars, like stereos,

dakara mania   tte yuu no   ga iru   deshoo

so   maniac QT say nominalizer S exist TENT

   there are those called "maniac".'

   (Cars, like stereos, have people who are really crazy about them.)

The connection between similar English verbs and topic marking may be seen in

expressions such as 'speaking of…' and 'when it comes to…' which are used for a

similar function. It should be also noted that most topic-marking uses of conditionals

involve either *tara* or *to* (39 out of 42 examples), most commonly occurring with the predicates mentioned above: a copula or the verbs *iu* 'say' or *naru* 'become'.

We have thus examined a number of (semi-)fixed expressions involving so-called conditional forms. They include several different subtypes associated with different types and degrees of fixedness. The sheer number of such examples suggests that studying conditional forms only from a grammatical-rules perspective will miss a great deal of how speakers use these forms.

Rule-based uses

As was shown in Table 1.2, close to half (47.5%) of the conditional forms used in our data can be understood based on rules, and these we will term "rule-based conditionals." (8a) and (8b) are examples of this type.

(8a)　demo Amerika ni i -chau **to** tsuyoku natte　　kuru

　　　but　America in be-end.up TO　strong　become come

　　　　　'But if (Japanese women) end up staying in America, (they) become strong.'

(8b)　chotto kii -ta　konaida　　　yoosuke to　hanashi-**tara**

　　　a.little hear-past the.other.day Yoosuke with speak　-TARA

　　　　　'(I) heard a little, when (I) spoke with Yoosuke the other day.'

Our examination of rule-based conditionals has also revealed several very interesting findings. First, it is known that, cross-linguistically, so-called conditional forms often denote a temporal meaning as in (8b), and in fact, as shown in Table 1.4, we found that

rule-based conditionals in our data were actually more frequently associated with temporal meanings, making the term 'conditional' seem somewhat of a misnomer.

Table 1.4 Rule-based conditionals and temporal or conditional meanings

temporal	conditional	temporal/ conditional[19]	Total
89 54.3%	68 41.5%	7 4.3%	164 100.1%

Second, our data reveals that overwhelming majority (89%) of rule-based conditionals involve either *tara* or *to*, as seen in Table 1.5.

Table 1.5 Rule-based conditionals: Frequency of *tara* and *to*

tara	to	ba	nara	Total
90 54.9%	56 34.1%	16 9.8%	2 1.2%	164 100%

As the table shows, compared to *tara* and *to*, *ba* is not common, and *nara* is extremely rare. It seems that if any of these forms should be considered as 'competing' forms in the grammar of Japanese speakers, the competition is between *tara* and *to*. We saw in Table 1.1 that *ba* is used almost as frequently as *to* in our data, at 24.3% and 25.4% of the total, respectively. However, Table 1.5 shows that the rule-based use of *ba* is not common. This demonstrates that *ba* is used mostly in the (semi-) fixed expressions that we saw in the last section.

Third, it is customary that Japanese conditionals are illustrated in the literature with examples in which the conditional clause is followed by the main clause as seen in (8a) above and in examples (9a) through (9d):

(9a) watashi ga hayashi-san dat **-tara**,   gibuson-san ni puropoozu shimasu

I   S Hayashi-san COP-TARA Gibuson-san to propose   do

'If I were Mr. Hayashi, I would propose to Ms. Gibson.' (Tohsaku 1995a:446)

(9b) anata ga kuruma de ike-**ba**, watashi mo kuruma de iku

you S car   by go-BA I   also car   by go

'If you go by car, I will, too.'   (Jorden and Noda 1990:93)

(9c) yasui (no)   **nara**   kau wa yo

cheap (nominalizer) NARA buy   IP IP

'If they're cheap, I will buy (some).'   (Hatasa et al. 2000:213)

(9d) sono kissaten   ni iku **to**, chin -san ga i -ta

that coffee.shop to go TO Chin-san S be-past

'When I went to the coffee shop, Ms. Chin was there.'   (Tohsaku 1995b:47)

Interestingly, as Table 1.6 shows, such a configuration is actually very rare in our data.

Table 1.6 Conditional + main and main + conditional

conditional + main	main + conditional	Other	Total
29	3	132	164
17.7%	1.8%	80.5%	100%

Even including examples in which the conditional clause follows the main clause, as in

(8b), examples consisting simply of two clauses actually account for less than 20% of the

rule-based conditionals in our data. Instead, more than 80% of the rule-based

conditionals occur in a string of clauses produced within speakers' currently unfolding

turns and/or embedded in a larger utterance, often as quotes, as in (10a) and (10b).

(10a)

1   A: ai -chan shitteru   tte iwa-re   -[**te**]

              Ai-chan know   QT say-passive-and

                    '"Ai, do (you) know (about it)?" (I) was told,'

2   K: [un]

                                          'mhm'

3   A: nani toka it **-tara**

              what like say-TARA

                  'when (I) said like "what?",'

4   K: un

                'mhm'

5   A: atashi wa   jitsu   wa   kinoo   kii **-te** ne

              I   TOP actually TOP yesterday hear-and IP

                  'I actually heard yesterday and'

6   sugoi bikkuri   shi-chat -ta n   da   kedo toka i **-tte**

              awfully surprised do -end.up-past nominalizer COP but like say-and

                  'was really surprised but," (she) said and'

In example (10a), the *tara* clause occurs with three clauses marked with *te*. Example

(10b) involves *to*.

(10b)

1   K: n   demo kochakocha   aru **to**

         mhm but   bits.and.pieces exist TO

              'Well but if (I) have (classes) split up at various times (throughout

              the week)'

2   moo   motto ippai shi-na **-kya** ikenai **kara**

         emphatic more   a.lot do-not-BA bad   so

              '(I) have to do a lot more so'

3   sonobun   is -shuu -kan   ni ik -kai toka da   **kara**

         that.degree one-week-period in one-time like COP so

              'instead it's like once a week so'

4   M: n   a

         mhm oh

              'mhm, oh!'

5   K: naga[i   deshoo]

         long   TENT

              '(it) is long.'

6   M: [kurasu ga is -shuu]-kan   ni ik[-kai   tte]

             class   S one-week-period in one-time QT

              '(You're saying you have) class once a week.'

7   K: [n   ] n

                                   'mhm mhm'

In this example, the *to*-clause appears with clauses marked with *kara*. As shown in (10a) and (10b), the rule-based conditional clauses with *tara* and *to* are typically found in a sequence of clauses marked with such forms as *te*, *kara*, and *kedo*. This type of sequence of multiple clauses is called 'clause chaining' and is found cross-linguistically, especially in predicate-final languages like Japanese, in which a number of different forms are used to chain clauses (Haiman and Munro 1983). Clause chaining is commonly observed in Japanese everyday talk and seems to be employed when the speaker continues talking while keeping the current turn. The prevalence of examples such as (10a) and (10b) above suggest that *tara* and *to* should be characterized primarily as part of a set of clause-chaining devices used to maintain talk in spontaneous speech (Ono and Iwasaki 2002; Iwasaki and Ono 2007).

Conclusion

We have seen that the various Japanese forms traditionally known as conditionals are highly skewed as far as how frequently they occur. In addition, they are more often used in (semi-)fixed expressions than has been recognized previously and thus are less rule-oriented than has been assumed in the past. Finally, the more rule-oriented or "grammatical" uses of conditionals are less "sentence-oriented" than previously assumed, occurring only infrequently in the two-clause (conditional clause plus main clause) sentences that have been assumed to be the canonical conditional structures.

Our findings lead us to question whether language is best understood as being modular and comprised of forms that can be divided into discrete categories, and to question the degree to which everyday talk is carried out by speakers' relying on

productive rules, forming clauses while choosing between competing forms. So-called conditional forms *tara, nara, ba,* and *to*, which might be thought of as quintessential competing forms, do not seem to form a set for speakers. The actual use of these forms can be characterized as much more lexical than has been assumed previously, and there are no clear boundaries dividing more grammatical and productive uses from semi-fixed expressions and completely lexicalized conjunctions.

We have thus seen that in order to account for the behavior of so-called conditional forms in Japanese, we may need to reconsider some of the traditional assumptions about language that we outlined earlier in this chapter with new understandings that are suggested by the behavior of actual speakers. To the extent that our findings may be surprising, they underscore the importance of examining so-called performance data in our attempts to represent speakers' knowledge. An examination of everyday talk is the first step we must take if our goal is to understand the nature of human language.

Such an examination is also crucial if our goal is to understand the details of how particular forms from specific languages are used—an understanding that is vital for language teachers who hope to impart to their students an accurate picture of how a language is used in a myriad of real-world contexts. Whether native speakers or nonnative speakers of a language, our assumptions about the language are likely to be inaccurate if not based on the observation and analysis of actual language use.

What then are the implications of our study for second language researchers and teachers? As far as the Japanese conditional forms in particular are concerned, we would argue that for many types of use, teachers should not take a rule-based perspective, but

rather, should introduce specific fixed uses or common patterns without referring to other conditional forms that a traditional perspective might view as possible in the same context. Considering the frequency of the various (semi-)fixed uses, as shown in Table 1.3, will give us an idea of which are the most important to introduce for teaching informal spoken Japanese. Work based on a larger corpus is needed to verify these frequencies, of course, and there is also a need for similar work based on corpora of more formal spoken Japanese and of written Japanese. This study, at any rate, suggests that if we want to enhance our students' ability to engage in everyday conversation, we should introduce them to, and have them practice using, the most common conjunctions, the conditional phrases most often used for the topic-marking function, and the –*ba* positive and –*kya* negative patterns. We should also take a look at the category of other semi-fixed expressions to see what uses are common and consider teaching those as well. Teaching these few uses would insure that our students could produce examples similar to the overwhelming majority of the (semi-)fixed uses of conditional forms found in our data.

We should note that there are cases in which we might want to introduce patterns that are not so frequent in actual interaction. For example, suggestions were not very common among the (semi-)fixed expressions in our data. This may be because making suggestions to others is potentially problematic in social interactions. That is not to say that we should not teach our students these ways of making suggestions, however. For one thing, as relative novices in the target culture, they may be likely to be the target of well-meaning suggestions about how they should behave, and so it is important for them to recognize that conditional forms can function in this way. When we do teach this use

of conditionals, though, we should caution students about the potential social pitfalls of making suggestions to others.

In teaching more rule-governed uses of conditionals, which comprised 47.5% of the occurrences in our study, we might introduce *tara, to,* and *ba,* but then focus classroom language practice on the use of *–tara* and *to*, since they make up all but a small percentage of such conditionals. Given a limited amount of instructional time, it is probably less important to focus on the production of rule-governed *–ba* conditional phrases, which are rare in everyday talk.

Other less common uses of conditional forms, whether rule-governed or (semi-) fixed, can be taught as they occur. For example, the meaning of *nara* can be taught whenever it is naturally encountered, whether that be in spoken or written Japanese. In most cases, there is probably no reason to have students practice producing it. If they need to produce more formal or spoken Japanese or written Japanese, and if indeed an examination of corpora of those sorts of language shows that *nara* is commonly used in those contexts, students could then be encouraged to use the form as appropriate.

Finally, in addition to using frequency of occurrence in everyday talk to guide our choice of forms to present to our students and have them practice, we should also consider the structures in which those forms typically occur. This study suggests that the traditional view of conditional forms as occurring primarily in two-clause sentences does not reflect actual use. Students will benefit from being exposed to examples of typical Japanese talk so that they can learn how these forms typically function as clause-chaining devices in naturally occurring talk.

This study of Japanese conditional forms is merely one example of how a discourse functional approach can be helpful to applied linguistics, but the implications are far-reaching. For every form or "set" of forms that we look at from this perspective, we are sure to find ways to improve both our overall understanding of language and specific aspects of language pedagogy. Similar areas in which we see potential applications for this approach to the Japanese language include (but are definitely not limited to!) the use of various particles, such as *wa* and *ga*; active versus passive voice of verbs; different types of nominal reference, such as full noun phrase, pronoun, or no explicit reference at all; different word order types; the nominalizers *koto*, *mono*, and *no*;[20] and the epistemic/evidential forms *soo da*, *yoo da*, *mitai da*, and *rashii*. Observing how these are used in actual interactions and then applying those observations has the potential to make our language teaching both more accurate and more efficient.

At every level of language, from more global beliefs about what is appropriate to say and how to say it, to our assumptions about how sentences and discourses are typically structured, to traditional beliefs about grammar and vocabulary, ideologies about language have the potential to blind us to its real nature. Looking at actual language use with an open mind can help us overcome some of those blind spots.

References

Akatsuka, N. (1985) Conditionals and epistemic scale. *Language* 61, 625-639.

Akatsuka, N. (1986) Conditionals are discourse-bound. In E. C. Traugott, A. ter Meulen, J. S. Reilly and C. A. Ferguson (eds), *On Conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 333-351.

Akatsuka, N. (1997) Negative conditionality, subjectification, and conditional reasoning. In A. Athanasiadou and R. Dirven (eds), *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 323-354.

Akatsuka, N. M. and Strauss, S. (2000) Counterfactual reasoning and desirability. In E. Couper-Kuhlen and B. Kortmann (eds), *Cause-condition-concession-contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton, pp. 205-234.

Bybee, J. (2006) From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82(4), 711-733.

Bybee, J. and Hopper, P. (2001) *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chafe, W. (1987) Cognitive constraints on information flow. In R. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 21- 51.

Chafe, W. (1994) *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clancy, P. M., Akatsuka, N. and Strauss, S. (1997) Deontic modality and conditionality in discourse: A cross-linguistic study of adult speech to young children. In A.

Kamio (ed.), *Directions in Functional Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 19-57.

Cumming, S. and Ono, T. (1997) Discourse and grammar. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Structure and Process.* London: Sage, pp. 112-137.

Erman, Br. and Warren, B. (2000) The idiom principle and the open choice principle. *Text* 20, 29-62.

Givon, T. (1979) *On Understanding Grammar.* New York: Academic Press.

Haiman, J. (1978) Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54, 564-589.

Haiman, J. and Munro, P. (eds) (1983) *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hasunuma, A. (1987) Jookenbun ni okeru nichijooteki suiron: 'tewa' to 'ba' no sentaku yooin o megutte. [Common inferences in conditional clause: On the factors behind the choice between 'tewa' and 'ba']. *Kokugogaku* 150,1-14.

Hatasa, Y. A., Hatasa, K. and Makino, S. (2000) *Nakama 2: Japanese Communication, Culture, Context.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hayes, S. T. and Shinzato, R. (2001) Jooken no setsuzokujoshi kara danwa/taijinkinoo no joshi e: tara, ttara no bunpooka [From conditional conjunctive particles to discourse/interactional particles: The grammaticization of tara/ttara]. In M. Minami and Y. S. Alam (eds), *Gengogaku to Nihongokyooiku II: New Directions in Applied Linguistics of Japanese.* [Linguistics and Japanese Language Education II]. Tokyo: Kuroshio, pp. 127-142.

Hopper, P. J. and Thompson, S. A. (1980) Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2), 251-299.

Hopper, P. J. and Thompson, S. A. (1984) The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60(4), 703-752.

Hopper, P. J. (1998) Emergent grammar. In M. Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 155-175.

Iwasaki, S. and Ono, T. (2007) 'Sokujibun' to 'hisokujibun': Gengogaku no hoohooron to kiseigainen ['Spontaneous sentence' and 'processed sentence': Methodology and categories in linguistics]. In S. Kushida, T. Sadanobu and Y. Den (eds), *Bun to Hatsuwa* [Sentence and Utterance]. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo, pp. 135-157.

Jacobsen, W. M. (1992). Are conditionals topics? The Japanese case. In D. Brentari, G.N. Larson, and L.A. Macleod (eds), *The Joy of Grammar: A Festschrift in Honor of James D. McCawley.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 131-160.

Jones, K. and Ono, T. (2005) Discourse-centered approaches to Japanese language pedagogy. *Japanese Language and Literature* 39, 237-254.

Jones, K. (1990) Conflict in Japanese Conversation. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan.

Jones, K. (1993) Nihongo no konfurikuto-ji no hanashiai [Negotiating conflicts in Japanese]. *Nihongogaku* 12(4), 68-74.

Jones, K. (1995) Masked negotiation in a Japanese work setting. In A. Firth (ed.), *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace.* Oxford: Pergamon

Press, pp. 141-158.

Jorden, E. H. with Noda, M. (1990) *Japanese: The Spoken Language, Part 3*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Lakoff, G. (1977) Linguistic gestalts. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 13, 236-87.

Langacker, R.W. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. II: Descriptive Applications*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Maynard, S. K. (1997) Shifting contexts: The sociolinguistic significance of nominalization in Japanese television news. *Language in Society* 26, 381-399.

Mori, J. (2005) Why not why? The teaching of grammar, discourse, and sociolinguistic and cross-cultural perspectives. *Japanese Language and Literature* 39, 255-289.

Nakayama, T. and Ichihashi-Nakayama, K. (1997) Japanese *kedo*: Discourse genre and grammaticization. In H. Sohn and J. Haig (eds), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 6*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp. 607-618.

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E. A., and Thompson, S. A. (eds) (1996) *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ono, T. and Iwasaki, S. (2002) Toward an understanding of 'sentence' in spoken

   Japanese discourse: Clause-combining and online mechanisms. In K. Kataoka and

   S. Ide (eds), *Bunka, Intaa-akushon, Gengo* [Culture, Interaction, and Language].

   Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo, pp. 103-131.

Ono, T. and Jones, K. (2001) Kaiwa ni okeru ninchiteki sokumen to washakan no

   soogo sayoo: Nihongo kyooiku e no teian [The cognitively based and

   interactionally situated nature of talk: Suggestions to Japanese language

   pedagogy]. In M. Minami and Y. S. Alam (eds), *Gengogaku to Nihongo*

   Kyooiku II: New Directions in Applied Linguistics of Japanese [Linguistics and

   Japanese Language Education II]. Tokyo: Kuroshio, pp. 181-196.

Ono, T. and Jones, K. (2005) Bunpoo kisoku no shiyoo to keishiki no sentaku no

   jissai: Kaiwa ni okeru "jookenbun" kansatsu kara [Grammatical rules and

   competing forms: conditionals in Japanese conversation.] In M. Minami (ed.),

   Gengogaku to Nihongo Kyooiku IV [Linguistics and Japanese Language

   Education IV]. Tokyo: Kuroshio, pp. 73-85.

Pawley, A. and Syder, F. H. (1983) Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike

   selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (eds),

   Language and Communication. London: Longman, pp. 189-226.

Rosch, E. (1978) Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch and B. B. Lloyd (eds),

   Cognition and Categorization. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, pp. 27-47.

Shibatani, M. (1990) *The Languages of Japan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tohsaku, Y. (1995a) *Yookoso! An Invitation to Contemporary Japanese.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tohsaku, Y. (1995b) *Yookoso! Continuing with Contemporary Japanese.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tomasello, M. (ed.) (1998) *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure Volume 1.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tomasello, M. (ed.) (2003) *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure Volume 2.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wray, A. (2005) *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Notes

[1] We would like to thank the editors of this volume, Junko Mori and Amy Snyder Ohta, for their patience and help at each stage of writing and revising this chapter. Although we alone are responsible for any remaining shortcomings in the paper, their editorial suggestions were invaluable in helping us frame the paper for readers from the field of applied linguistics. The first author would also like to thank Shoichi Iwasaki, Ritva Laury, and Sandy Thompson for discussing with him some of the issues addressed in the paper and inspiring him to take on the current project.

[2] Please note that the literature on Japanese inspired by this newer tradition is found starting in Kuno (1973) and Shibatani (1990), and more recently, for instance, in many of the papers published in the Japanese/Korean lingusitics volumes published by CSLI.

[3] We originally presented an analysis of this data at the Third International Conference on Practical Linguistics of Japanese (ICPLJ3), held at San Francisco State University in March, 2002, and at the 1st Second Language Acquisition and Teaching Interdisciplinary Roundtable, held at the University of Arizona in April, 2002. We then published a Japanese version of the analysis in a volume of papers from the ICPLJ conference, Linguistics and Language Education IV (Ono and Jones 2005). We wish to thank participants at both of those conferences, the anonymous reviewers of the paper, and the editor of Linguistics and Language Education IV, Masaahiko Minami, for their helpful comments on that paper.

[4] Fresh examinations of data made without taking traditional categories and earlier findings into consideration (unless those findings are based on data from spoken language), and made without taking *a priori* theoretical orientations, might actually be just what is needed for the approach which we are advocating here.

[5] As an effort to address the sample size problem, Ono and several collaborators are currently working to develop a large-scale corpus of audio- and video-recordings and transcriptions of everyday Japanese interactions.

[6] Proposed rewording: Throughout the chapter, we use the Hepburn system of romanization. Examples cited from published work that uses the Kunrei system have been altered to correspond to Hepburn romanization. See the appendix for abbreviations used in glosses. We modified some of the abbreviations used in the examples cited from previously published work for the sake of consistency.

[7] There were occasional uses of non-standard Japanese in the corpus.

[8] Variant forms (e.g., *kya* in *chanto shina**kya** iya* 'It's bad if (I) don't do (it) right.') are grouped together with their base form (*ba*) in this table.

[9] A similar skewed distribution is reported in Clancy et al. (1997: 26).

[10] One of the original 346 conditionals could not be coded, as the surrounding material was inaudible.

[11] Hayes and Shinzato's (2001) study, which discusses the grammaticized use of *tara,* is a good example of this sort of work.

[12] Total not equal to 100% due to rounding.

[13] Determination of fixedness is difficult partly because we are dealing with the degree of fixedness mirroring on-going change. Further, most dictionaries only list lexicalized forms used in written language, tending not to deal with forms found only in spoken language. We chose to be conservative in our determination of fixedness by selecting only relatively clear cases. Further investigation of this topic is needed.

[14] *Soosureba* might sound good to some speakers. We think that it is because of its frequent use in another (semi-)fixed expression discussed later in this section (i.e., *~ba* positive). In any case, the point here is that, unlike the lexicalized conjunctions *sooshitara* and *soosuruto*, *soosureba* and *soosurunara* do not function as conjuctions.

[15] Other examples of this type include: *dotchikatte iuto, kyokutanni iuto, ikinari iwareruto, soo iwaruto, soo iwarereba, soo iwarete mireba, dekirunara, moshi yokattara, nainara naitte iyaa ii jan*.

[16] *kya* is said to have been derived by going through the following steps. All of these forms are still used in present-day Japanese:

nakere-ba -> nakerya -> nakya

NEG   -BA

[17] Similar examples are discussed in Hayes and Shinzato (2001).

[18] Using constructed data, however, Jacobsen (1992) argues that there is no connection between conditionals and topic marking.

[19] It was not possible tell whether a temporal or a conditional meaning was intended in these examples.

[20] For example, Maynard's (1997) study of *koto* and *no* would be helpful to Japanese language teachers who are trying to help their students learn to use these forms. In addition, the *Gengogaku to Nihongo Kyooiku* [Linguistics and Japanese Language Education] series published by Kuroshio contains many relevant articles.