論文の英文要旨	
論文題目	The Establishment of the Category of Compound Adverbial
	Particles Indicating Paradigmatic Relationships: A Study Focusing on Function Words such as 'nikagirazu',
	'dakede(wa)naku', and 'kawari(ni)'
氏名	Gui Xiang

The aim of this study is to propose a category of particle-like function words in Modern Japanese, including 'nikagirazu', 'dakede(wa)nakun', and 'kawari(ni)', which display the same syntactic functions.

These function words possess three fundamental characteristics: (a) the inability to occur independently, (b) the loss of lexical meaning, and (c) the function of arranging in a syntagmatic relationship linguistic units which exist in a paradigmatic relationship. Although they have previously been analyzed as a type of particle-like function word based on feature (c) above, there is no consensus on their syntactic features, and the distinction between these and other types of particles remains unclear. To address these issues, this study re-examined the syntactic properties of these forms by addressing the following research questions:

- 1. What linguistic units do they arrange, and how?
- 2. Can each be considered a single form?
- 3. What sentence elements can they form?

The findings of this study are as follows:

- These forms attach to an element A and arrange to its right another element B, which stands in a paradigmatic relationship with A.
- Their constituents have become morphologically fixed, and each form must be regarded as a single word.
- These forms exist outside of a clause and create an element that explicates the paradigmatic relationship with (part of) the subsequent clause.

The fact that these forms are outside the clause to which they are semantically equal is consistent with the viewpoint of previous studies that they should be classified as conjunctive particles. However, the linguistic units preceding them are not always clauses, making such a categorization problematic. Therefore, considering the syntactic properties of these forms, it is only possible to say that they create a component that appears outside a subsequent clause and expresses a paradigmatic relationship with (part of) that subsequent clause. Consequently, this study designates them as 'compound adverbial particles indicating paradigmatic relationships'.

The study consists of three parts, Introduction (Part I), Main Discussion (Part II), and Conclusion (Part III). Part I consists of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, Part II consists of Chapters 3 to 7, and Part III corresponds to Chapter 8. Below, an overview of the Main Discussion (Chapters 3 to 7) is provided.

Chapter 3 discusses the first research question. First, this type of function word always places in a syntagmatic relationship two or more items which exist in a paradigmatic relationship. In this sense, it is a means of expression that makes the paradigmatic relationship explicit rather than implied. Next, regarding how paradigmatic relationships are recognized between linguistic units arranged by this type of function word, there are two subcategories: [a] typical paradigmatic relationships between elements of the same type, and [b] relationships that can be interpreted as paradigmatic. Furthermore, considering the arrangement of units, the following characteristics can be observed: a) multiple units must always appear and b) units do not necessarily have to be adjacent to each other. These characteristics indicate that forms including 'nikagirazu', 'dakede(wa)naku', and 'kawari(ni)' are distinct from coordinating particles, occupying a unique position in the explicit expression of paradigmatic relationships.

Chapter 4 investigates the second research question by analyzing whether the constituent elements of various forms have undergone grammatical changes. This examination leads to the conclusion that these forms have undergone grammaticalization. Particular attention should be paid to forms containing verbal elements that exhibit a) the loss of their original case-governing ability, b) the inability to be modified by manner adverbs or quantifiers, and c) the inability to co-

occur with mood adverbs. These phenomena collectively support the conclusion that these forms have undergone grammaticalization.

Chapter 5 explores the third research question proposed in this study. Previous research analyzed the underlined portion of 'Taro nikagirazu Jiro ya Saburo mo kita." "Not only Taro came, but Jiro and Saburo too." as a whole nominal phrase, with 'Taro nikagirazu' subordinated to the head 'Jiro ya Saburo'. This chapter identifies two issues with this conclusion: (a) the following noun can appear within the scope of particle 'mo', but the preceding noun cannot, and (b) semantically, the preceding noun does not participate in the content of the situation expressed by the clause in which the succeeding noun appears. Furthermore, based on the word order feature that the "preceding noun + α " clause always appears to the left of the following noun, it is possible to analyze the "preceding noun + α " clause as having no relation to the following noun but as constituting a semantically equal component from outside the following clause in which the following noun appears. Therefore, this study concludes that functional words such as 'nikagirazu', 'dakede(wa)naku', and 'kawari(ni) ' should be analyzed as always being outside of the following clause, regardless of the type of linguistic unit actually arranged, creating a component which explicates the paradigmatic relationship with (part of) the following clause.

Chapters 6 and 7 serve as case studies to validate the findings of the preceding chapters. Chapter 6 examines the grammaticalization of 'nikuwae(te)' and explains how phrase 'N + nikuwae(te)' is distinct from adverbial phrases within the clause through a comparison with synonyms such as 'N + nikuwawatte', 'N + nisoe(te)', and 'N + nitsukekuwae(te)'. Chapter 7 examines the distribution of 'N + nokawari(ni)' phrase and shows how apparent differences in word order reflect distinct syntactic structures. 'N + nokawari(ni)' phrase has two uses: as an adverbial modifier within the clause and as an outside component which explicates the paradigmatic relationship with (part of) the following clause. The findings presented in these two chapters corroborate the assertions in Chapter 5.