# Weak deontic necessity in Japanese:
# the case of *beki*

Lars Larm

（Senior Lecturer at the Department of Languages and Literatures,
University of Gothenburg, Sweden）

# Weak deontic necessity in Japanese:
## the case of *beki*

Lars Larm*

## 1. Introduction[1]

In Japanese, the markers of weak deontic necessity are the auxiliary *beki* 'should', as in (1), and the periphrastic *hoo ga ii* 'had better', as in (2), of which the former is stronger than the latter.[2]　Strong deontic necessity is expressed by the periphrastic −*nakereba naranai* 'must', which is exemplified in (3).[3],[4]

2) The formal nouns *mono* 'thing' and *koto* 'fact' can also be used deontically (see Murata 1999 : 18-38 and 76-79, and Narrog 2009 : 84).　Makino and Tsutsui (1995 : 14) compare *beki* with *mono*, and explain that the two markers differ in that "*mono da* is used only in a generic statement to express a social norm".　As their examples below show, it is not used to refer to a "specific situation":

    Gakusei　wa　　benkyoo　suru　　　　mono　da.
    students　TOP　　study　　　do. NPAST　thing　COP. NPAST
    'Students should study.'

    Kimi　wa　　benkyoo　suru　　　　beki / *mono　da.
    you　TOP　　study　　　do. NPAST　MOBL / thing　COP. NPAST
    'You should study.'

⑴　Kimi　wa　　sugu　　　　ik-u　　　　beki　　da.
　　you　　TOP　immediately　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST
　　'You should go immediately.'

⑵　Tabe-ta　　hoo　　　ga　　　i-i.
　　eat-PAST　direction　NOM　good-NPAST
　　'(You) had better eat.'

⑶　Tabe-na-kereba　　nara-na-i.
　　eat-NEG-COND　　become-NEG-NPAST
　　'(You) must eat.'
　　'(lit.) Not eating won't do.'

The focus of this paper is *beki* 'should'. In my discussion of the properties pertaining to this marker, I shall also, where appropriate, draw on insights from research on deontic modals in English.

Let me start with a general remark on the difficulty of describing the meaning and use of a grammaticalized modal marker. Leech (1971 : 66) comments on this problem in his discussion of the modal auxiliaries in English :

> Many pages, chapters, even books, have been written about the modal auxiliary verbs in English. What makes it so difficult to account for the use of these words (which may be called 'modal auxiliaries' or 'modals' for short) is that their meaning has both a logical and a

---

3) The following abbreviations are used : ACC = accusative, ADN = adnominal, ASSUM = assumptive, COMP = complementiser, COND = conditional, CONJ = conjectural, COP = copula, DAT = dative, DED = deductive, EVID = evidential, FOC = focus particle, GEN = genitive, GER = gerund, HEAR = hearsay, INFIN = infinitive, LIT = literary, MOBL = moral obligative, NEG = negative, NML = nominaliser, NOM = nominative, NPAST = nonpast tense, PASS = passive, PAST = past tense, POL = polite, PRO = pronominal, QP = question particle, SPEC = speculative, TOP = topic.

4) −*nakereba naranai* 'must' has the variant form −*nakute wa ikenai*, which in colloquial and informal speech can be contracted to −*nakucha*.

practical（or pragmatic）element.

In the 47 years that have passed since Leech wrote this passage, the literature on modality has mushroomed immensely with publications from various theoretical perspectives and with investigations presenting cross-linguistic data.   The research literature on Japanese modality is also extensive, both within the indigenous Japanese grammatical tradition and within general theoretical frameworks（see Sawada 2006, Larm 2006, 2009, Narrog 2009 and the references therein）. However, in spite of this amount of research, Leech's remark on the 'logical' and 'practical（pragmatic）' aspects of modals is still relevant.   He goes on to say （Leech 1971 : 66-67）:

> We can talk about them［the modal auxiliary verbs］in terms of such logical notions as 'permission' and 'necessity', but this done, we still have to consider ways in which these notions become remoulded by the psychological pressures which influence everyday communication between human beings: factors such as condescension, politeness, tact, and irony.   Condescension, for example, intervenes to make the *may* of *You may go*（which in logical terms means no more than 'permission'）into something approaching a command.

As we will see during the course of this paper, *beki*, too, can be viewed from different angles.   Its meaning has been described as having to do with moral obligation or "moral expectation"（Alfonso 1980 : 820）, and it can be translated as 'ought to', 'should', or 'supposed to'.   As Johnson（2003 : 111）succinctly states, "the feeling is that a judgment is being made based on social expectations".   Furthermore, some aspects of the meaning of *beki* can be couched in terms of the well-known dichotomies of root/non-root, weakness/strength, agentivity/non-agentivity, and objectivity/subjectivity.   Although all four dichotomies will be given due attention in this paper, the issue of subjectivity is most prominent.   Scholars

differ in their positions on this point.　Kindaichi（1953）, Nomura（2003）and Larm
（2006）characterize *beki* as an objective modal marker whereas Takanashi（2005）
takes the view that it is subjective when used sentence-finally.　I this paper, I
suggest both positions may be right depending on whether subjectivity is conceived
of grammatically or pragmatically.

　　The structure of this paper is as follows.　In the next section, I briefly touch
upon the historical development of *beki*.　In section 3, I discuss its form and
distribution in present-day Japanese and also bring attention to two possible ongoing
changes.　Next, in section 4, I consider the semantic properties of *beki* both from
the perspective of other scholars' observations of weak necessity modals in English
and from a language-specific point of view.　I then discuss the issue of subjectivity,
in section 5, which is followed by some concluding remarks.


## 2．Historical development

　　Although the focus of this paper is *beki* in present-day Japanese, it is
appropriate here to include a few remarks about its origin.　In Old Japanese there
was a modal, *be-*, which is one of the markers that Frellesvig（2010 : 123）labels
"verb extensions".　He explains that they "are inflecting clitics" and that "they
follow a finite verb form to form an extended verb syntagm"（Frellesvig 2010 :
123）.　*Be-* was inflected as an adjective and had the conclusive form *beshi*, the
attributive form *beki*, and the infinitive form *beku*.

　　The polysemous nature of *be-*, with both epistemic and deontic uses, and its
semantic development have been of interest for scholars of historical linguistics and
grammaticalization.[5]　Narrog（2012 : 128）explains that "*be-* gradually vanished

---

5) Narrog（2002）provides a detailed investigation into the range of meanings expressed by the
　Old Japanese *beshi*, and Narrog（2012, chapter 4）discusses its historical development.

from the spoken language of western Japan, i. e. from those dialects of Japanese on which most of the written material in Middle Japanese is based". It did, however, continued to be used in writing. Furthermore, *be-* has been preserved in the form of *bee* in many of the dialects of eastern Japan（see Narrog 2012, chapter 4）. For example, Fäldt（2006）, making reference to research by Gen Tamakake, presents examples from the Sendai City dialect illustrating hortative and conjectural uses of *bee*.

As for *beki* in present-day standard Japanese, Narrog（2012 : 128）importantly points out that it "is a recent reintroduction of the marker from written language, not a historical continuation of the Old Japanese marker." This happened at some stage during the Meiji Period（1868-1912）. The modern form *beki* is used both in adnominal and clause-final position, and it is specialized for expressing deontic meaning（although there may be an epistemic use in adnominal position, as we shall see in section 5）.

## 3. The form and distribution of *beki* in present-day Japanese

In clause-final position, *beki* is accompanied by the predicative form of the copula, whose nonpast form is *da* with the polite version *desu*. When *beki* modifies a noun the copula is covert in the nonpast tense, but in the past tense it takes the form *datta*. Before the pronominal *no* and the explanatory *noda* the copula has the adnominal form *na* in the nonpast tense and *datta* in the past tense. These patterns are illustrated below.

（4）  Ik-u        beki     da/desu.
      go. NPAST   MOBL   COP. NPAST/COP. NPAST. POL
      '（You）should go.'

⑸　kuru　　　　　beki　　Ø/dat-ta　　　　hito

　　come. NPAST　MOBL　COP/COP-PAST　person

　　'the person who is/was supposed to come'


⑹　Juushi　　　　sare-ru　　　　　beki　　na/dat-ta

　　importance　do. PASS-NPAST　MOBL　COP. ADN/COP-PAST

　　no　　ga　　anzensa　no　　takasa　　desu.

　　PRO　NOM　safety　　GEN　highness　COP. NPAST. POL

　　'A high level of safety should be given/should have been given importance.'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　（adapted and abbreviated from the internet）


⑺　Ik-u　　　　beki　　na/dat-ta　　　　　　no　　da.

　　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. ADN/COP-PAST　NML　COP. NPAST

　　'（You）should go/should have gone.'


What, then, are the forms that *beki* can follow ?　Observe first that it comes after the nonpast form of verbs, as in the above examples.　However, in the case of the light verb *suru* 'do', for historical reasons, there is also the alternative form *su beki*, as illustrated below :[6]


⑻　Gakusei　wa　　benkyoo　suru/su beki　　da.

　　students　TOP　study　　do/do　　MOBL　COP. NPAST

　　'Students should study. '


*Beki* does not occur after the past tense form.　Soga（1983 : 50-51）explains that it "requires the verb preceding it to be in the −*ru* form" and that "the event described by the verb preceding this modality marker is always regarded as

_____

　6）The *su* of *su beki* 'should do', in example ⑻, is a remnant conclusive form of the light verb *suru* 'do'（see Martin 1988 : 943-944）.

something 'uncompleted' or rather, as yet 'unrealised'". Consider the following ungrammatical example taken from Masuoka and Takubo (1992 : 123) :

⑼   *Kimi   wa    kanojo   to    wakare-ta      beki    da.
      you    TOP   she    with   split up-PAST   MOBL   COP. NPAST
    (Intended to mean) 'You should have split up with her.'

This restriction also applies to constructions with nouns or nominal adjectives going before *beki* (see also Adachi et al. 2003 : 105). Note that before nouns, nominal adjectives take the adnominal form of the copula, *na*, or the literary form of the copula *de aru*, as in *benri na doogu/benri de aru doogu* 'a convenient tool'. As for nouns in prenominal position, the copula has the allomorphs *no* and *de aru*, as in *gakusei no Hanako/gakusei de aru Hanako* 'Hanako, who is a student'. However, before *beki* only *de aru*, which provides the nonpast form, is possible :

⑽   Kyooiku   wa    kyooseiteki  *na/de ar-u              beki    da.
    education  TOP   compulsory   COP. ADN/COP. LIT-NPAST   MOBL   COP. NPAST
    'Education should be compulsory.'

⑾   Sekai   ga    heiwa  *no/de ar-u              beki    da.
    world   NOM   peace   COP. ADN/COP. LIT-NPAST   MOBL   COP. NPAST
    'There should be peace in the world.'

It should be pointed out that the two sentences above have a rather formal ring to them.

   The situation with adjectival (*i*-adjectives) constructions is unstable because there may be an ongoing change, which I will return to after having presented the textbook account. The standard description is that *beki*, which needs a preceding verb in the nonpast form as shown above, cannot follow the *i*-form of adjectives, as in :

⑿　*Jibun　ni　　kibishi-i　　　beki　　da.
　　self　　with　strict-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST
　　'One should be strict with oneself.'

In this respect, *beki* differs from clause-final modal markers such as the epistemic *hazu* 'should', *ka mo shirenai* 'may' and *ni chigai nai* 'must', and from the evidentials *yoo da* 'it appears' and *rashii* 'it seems'.　However, as pointed out by Adachi et al.（2003： 105）, instead of a construction such as that in ⑿, an adjective in the infinite form followed by *aru* 'be' can be used（*aru* in this position is characterized as a 'dummy copula' by Nishiyama 1998）.　This amendment rescues the sentence from ungrammaticality.

⒀　Jibun　ni　　kibishi-ku　　ar-u　　　　beki　　da.
　　self　　with　strict-INFIN　be-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST
　　'One should be strict with oneself.'

Makino and Tsutsui（1995： 14）also mention that −*ku aru beki*, as in ⒀, is possible but "not commonly used".

　　Consider now negation.　From what was said above about ⑿, it follows that *beki* cannot take syntactic scope over a negated verb, which morphologically is adjectival.　Most descriptions of Japanese modality that I have come across（with a few recent exceptions, which I will return to below）state that it is not possible to say something like（example taken from Adachi et al. 2003： 105）:

⒁　*Uso　o　　tsuka-na-i　　　　beki　　da.
　　lie　　ACC　tell-NEG-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST
　　（Intended to mean）'One should not tell lies.'

On the other hand, the negated form *beki dewa nai* is perfectly grammatical, as in the following example from Moriyama (2000 : 29) (see also Sawada 2014 : 63) :

(15)  Taroo  wa     ashita     ik-u        beki     de. wa. na-i.
      Taroo  TOP    tomorrow   go-NPAST    MOBL     COP. NEG-NPAST
      'Taroo should not go tomorrow.'

Moriyama points out that the external negation in this example is superficial, and that the expressed meaning is rather [[*ikanai*] *beki*] where the modal takes semantic scope over negation.  Thus, semantically *beki* itself cannot be negated (Moriyama 2000 : 29-30).[7),8)]

As I hinted at previously, there may be a change in progress, or perhaps two different but related changes, regarding adjectives and negated verbs followed by *beki*.  Let us start with the latter, that is, sentences with the sequence −*nai beki*, as in (14) above.  This construction has been considered grammatically incorrect but may occur in actual usage.  The scholar who first brought this matter to my attention was Takashi Masuoka, who in 2014 pointed out that the construction may

---

7) See Narrog (2009 : 193) for a possible counterexample.
8) Consider also Sawada's (2014 : 63) examples below.  The negative polarity item *nani mo* is semantically associated with the negative form of the verb, not with the negation of *beki*.

  *Ashita      made    nani   mo    tabe-ru.
   tomorrow    until   what   FOC   eat-NPAST
   (Intended to mean) '(I) will not eat anything until tomorrow.'

   Ashita      made    nani   mo    tabe-na-i.
   tomorrow    until   what   FOC   eat-NEG-NPAST
   '(I) will not eat anything until tomorrow.'

   Ashita      made    nani   mo    tabe-ru       beki    de. na-i.
   tomorrow    until   what   FOC   eat-NEG-NPAST MOBL    COP. NEG-NPAST
   '(You) should not eat anything until tomorrow.'

  *Ashita      made    nani   mo    tabe-ru       beki    da.
   tomorrow    until   what   FOC   eat-NEG-NPAST MOBL    COP. NPAST
   '(You) should not eat anything until tomorrow.'

be used by young people.　Furthermore, Kato（2016）presents some examples from *The Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese*（BCCWJ）and notes that it is possible that the use will increase.　Narrog（2010 : 227）, too, points out that "examples can be found on the internet".　There are also comments on the internet on the correctness of such examples.　Particularly worth mentioning is that the linguist Takumi Tagawa reports on his blog that the issue was discussed at a research seminar held in 2017.[9]　He writes that the teaching staff seemed surprised to hear that young speakers accept −*nai beki* while the students did not consider it problematic.

As for the other possible change, that is, the use of *beki* after an adjective, information is scarce.　However, Tagawa comments that many of the speakers who accept −*nai beki* also accept sentences such as :

⒃　Kyooshi　wa　　kashikoi　beki　　da.
　　teacher　　TOP　clever　　MOBL　COP. NPAST
　　'A teacher should be clever.'

Thus, it seems that the combination of a negated verb followed by *beki* has entered the language of young speakers, and possibly this is also the case for adjectives.

## 4.　Meaning

Let us consider the meaning of *beki* from the perspective of observations on English modals.　In the literature a distinction is often drawn between 'root' and 'propositional' modality.　In sentences with root modality the modal is said to have a thematic relation with the subject while a propositional modal takes scope over a

---

9）http://dlit.hatenablog.com/entry/2017/02/14/120725 [Accessed 16 August 2018]

proposition. For example, in (17) 'must' is deontic and marks an obligation pertaining to Mary while the epistemic 'must' in (18) expresses certainty about the content 'Mary is at home'.

(17)　Mary must pay her taxes before next week.

　　　= Mary is obliged to pay her taxes before next week.

(18)　Mary must be at home (because the lights are on).

　　　= It is certain that Mary is at home (because the lights are on).

Root modals have been described as having control structure and propositional modals raising structure. I shall refrain from discussing whether the root/ propositional dichotomy is the most appropriate characterization of modal markers in general. It is, in any case, useful when describing *beki*, since, as Takubo (2009 : 154) explains, *beki* can be described as a root modal in the sense described above (although there are exceptions, which will be discussed below). Unlike English modals, Japanese modal markers are not ambiguous between epistemic and deontic readings, but the difference can be shown by comparing *beki* with *hazu* (which can be glossed, at least roughly, as epistemic 'should').[10] The following sentences, adapted from Takubo (2009 : 54), show that *beki* has a thematic relation with the

---

10) *Beki* can be viewed as a deontic expectational and *hazu* as an epistemic expectational marker. According to Narrog (2009 : 127) :

　　*Hazu* and *beki* are two modal markers that have both been traditionally defined in terms of 'matter of course' (cf. the comparison of both forms by Nakahata (1998)), and they can both frequently (but not always) be translated as 'should'. [. . .] the 'matter of course' interpretation can be adduced from the existence of a strong presupposition, or expectation on the part of the speaker. This expectation may rest on moral values or personal convictions in the case of deontic *beki*, and knowledge in the case of *hazu*. Behind these expectations, then, the realization of some state-of-affairs is conceived as a 'matter of course'.

subject, which must be animate, while no such restriction applies to *hazu*.

⒆    Tanaka  ga      kuru        hazu/beki      da.

    Tanaka  NOM   come. NPAST  ASSUM/MOBL   COP. NPAST

    'Tanaka should come.'

⒇    Ame  ga     fur-u       hazu/??beki     da.

    rain   NOM   fall-NPAST   ASSUM/MOBL   COP. NPAST

    'It should rain.'

This holds for prototypical uses of *beki*, which express that the subject is morally obliged to carry out an action, but it is also important to consider the possibility of non-agentive uses. It is here worth drawing attention to the distinction between 'ought-to-do' and 'ought-to-be' statements in English, which has long been a topic of discussion in philosophy（see Chrisman 2012 and Schroeder 2011 and the references therein）. Note that my concern is not the epistemic use where 'ought', of course, takes scope over the proposition. The point relevant here is that deontic 'ought' can be used not only to express that someone 'ought' to do something, as in 'You ought to go home now', but also to convey that a state of affairs 'ought' to be the case. Consider the following sentences from Schroeder（2011 : 5）, which are examples of what he calls the "*evaluative* sense of 'ought'" :

�21    There ought to be world peace.

�22    World peace ought to obtain.

�23    The meeting ought to start at noon.

�24    It ought to be that the meeting starts at noon.

(25)    It ought to be that Jim jams.


Schroeder（2011 : 5）states :

> None of these sentences is plausibly understood as expressing a relation between an agent and an action, but each *is* plausibly interpreted as making a broadly normative claim, in contrast to a merely epistemic claim about what is likely to be the case.


Chrisman（2012 : 433）too, although his perspective is different from that of Schroeder, discusses 'agential and non-agential senses' of the deontic 'ought' and presents the following examples which "cannot be assigned control syntax since their syntactic subjects do not conform to thematic-role restrictions"（Chrisman 2012 : 443）:

(26)    Invitations ought to go out by post.（Wedding Advice）

(27)    Rump roast ought to cook slowly.（Cooking Advice）

(28)    Americanized spelling ought to be eliminated.（Editorial Advice）


I suggest that this line of thinking can be applied to the Japanese *beki* and propose a distinction between agentive type *beki* and non-agentive type *beki*. In（1）, here repeated as（29）, *beki* has an agentive sense. Note, however, that non-agentive uses are possible too, as in（11）, here repeated as（30）with a minor modification,（31）, and（32）, which do not require an animate subject.

(29)    Kimi  wa     sugu          ik-u          beki      da.
        you   TOP    immediately   go-NPAST   MOBL    COP. NPAST
        'You should go immediately.'

⑶⁰ Sekai　ga　　heiwa　de. ar-u　　　　　beki　　da.
world　NOM　peace　COP. LIT-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST
'There should be peace in the world.'

⑶¹ Kagaku　wa　　shinpuru　de. ar-u　　　　beki　　da.
science　TOP　simple　　COP. LIT-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST
'Science should be simple.'

⑶² Hoochoo　　wa　　tsune. ni　surudo-ku　ar-u　　　beki　　da.
kitchen knife　TOP　always　　sharp-INFIN　be-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST
'The kitchen knife should always be kept sharp.'

The last three sentences are formal, but as for ⑶², as we saw in the previous section, there may be an ongoing change in the direction towards acceptance of more colloquial forms.

　　Let me now move on to another well-known distinction, namely that between 'strong' and 'weak' deontic necessity markers. For instance, in English, 'must' and 'have to' are strong, and 'ought to' and 'should' are weak.[11] Sloman（1970 : 390‐391）remarks :

> It is worth comparing statements about what ought to happen or be done with statements about what is *obligatory*, *essential*, or what *must* happen or be done. Where the former kind of statement says（what is a necessary condition for）what is *best*, or *better* than all alternatives, the latter picks out the *only* candidate（or a necessary condition for it）. For instance 'If you want to get to London by noon, then you *ought* to go by train' picks out the best means without excluding the possibility of others, whereas 'If you want to get to London by noon

11）See Rubinstein（2012）and von Fintel and Iatridou（2008）for detailed discussions. Rubinstein（2012）provides an overview of theoretical approaches, but I shall not pursue their applicability to *beki* here.

then you *have to*（must, will be obliged to etc.）go by train' implies that no other means exists.

The difference in degree of necessity between 'ought to' and 'must' is neatly captured in the following example from von Fintel and Iatridou（2008 : 116）:

(33)　Everybody ought to wash their hands ; employees must.

They also point out that "some evidence for this relative weakness［of for example 'ought'］comes from the fact that (3)［(34) below］is not a contradiction while the examples in (4)［(35) below］are"（von Fintel and Iatridou 2008 : 116）:

(34)　You ought to do the dishes but you don't have to.

(35)　a. #You have to do the dishes but you don't have to.
　　　b. #You must do the dishes but you don't have to.

Moriyama（2000 : 45）notes that similar examples with *beki* are possible, particularly when it co-occurs with the expressions *honrai wa* 'originally' and *tatemai to shite wa*（from *tatemae* which means 'official stance'）. I have not found actual examples equivalent to the above English sentences, but (36) shows the weakness of *beki*. I owe this example to Yukinori Takubo（personal communication）:

(36)　Honrai　nara　　　chokusetsu　at-te　　　　hanas-u　　　beki　　da　　　　　　ga,
　　　 origin　COND　　 directly　　　meet-GER　talk-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST　but
　　　 jikan　ga　　　na-i　　　　　　　　node　　　meeru　suru.
　　　 time　NOM　not. exist-NPAST　because　email　do. NPAST
　　　 'We should meet up and talk face to face, but since I don't have time I'll send an email.'

Accordingly, strong modals, such as 'must' and 'have to' in English and the Japanese −*nakereba naranai* 'must', are used in, for example, rule or law-abiding situations, such as the scenario of a passport control at the airport.　In such contexts they are more felicitous than weaker modals.

⑶⑺　You must/have to show your passport.

⑶⑻　?You should/ought to show your passport.

⑶⑼　Pasupooto　o　　　mise-na-kereba　　　nara-na-i.

　　　passport　　ACC　show-NEG-COND　become-NEG-NPAST

　　　'(You) must show show (your) passport.'

⑷⑽　?Pasupooto　o　　　mise-ru　　　beki　　da.

　　　 passport　　ACC　show-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST

　　　'(You) should show (your) passport.'

Referring to Adachi et al. (2003 : 107), Narrog (2009 : 83) notes that, "*beki* can only be used when the modal target has a choice of action, while- (a) *nakereba naranai* can be used both in cases when there is and is not a choice".

## 5．Subjectivity

　　　In this section, I turn my attention to the extensively discussed distinction between subjective and objective modality, which is one aspect of the near descriptive ineffability of modals.　Recall Leech's statements on the 'logical' and 'practical (pragmatic)' aspect of modals that I cited in the introductory section, which have bearing on this topic.　That is, the deontic *may* in Leech's example *You may go* is not subjective in logical terms, but from a practical or pragmatic

point of view we may say that it can be used to express the attitude of the speaker. Lyons (1977) is well known for having pointed out that even epistemic modals can, depending on the context, be taken objectively or subjectively. However, this does not mean that subjectivity is always pragmatic. It must be emphasized that there are modals with encoded subjectivity, where the 'I－here－now' perspective is part of the semantics of the form.

　　Let us see how this relates to *beki*. Narrog (2009 : 127) states, about *hazu* 'should' (epistemic) and *beki* 'should' (deontic), that "[...] the association of these markers with speaker expectations, based on knowledge or moral values, make *hazu* and *beki* the most 'subjective' among the set of deontic and epistemic markers". A similar position is taken by Takanashi (2005) who takes the view that *beki* is subjective when used sentence-finally. On the other hand, Kindaichi (1953), Nomura (2003), and Larm (2006) characterize *beki* as an objective modal marker. Although Kindaichi does not focus on *beki* in his 1953 paper, the following citation shows that he considers the imperative －*e* (*ro*) as the subjective version of objective deontic modal expressions such as *beki* and －*nakereba naranai* (Kindaichi 1953 : 224, my translation):

> A command expressed by the imperative form is truly subjective. It is the command of the speaker, and moreover, it can only express a present command. If one wants to express a command-like meaning objectively, one would probably have to say *shinakereba naranai* [must do] or *su beki da* [should do].

What underlie the two perspectives mentioned above are different conceptions of subjectivity, which Kaufmann and Tamura (forthcoming : 22) label the 'pragmatic versus lexico-grammatical conception' of subjectivity. They state (boldface in original):

Authors disagree specifically on whether the distinction is to be drawn between linguistic expressions（**strict lexico-grammatical conception**, e. g. Kindaichi 1953, Larm 2009, Langacker 1985, 2002）or between occurrences of linguistic expressions（**pragmatic conception**, Traugott and Dasher 2002, Lyons 1977），−a crucial point for semantic theory building.

The issue is quite complicated and I shall not go into all details here.[12]　　At the risk of oversimplifying, my standpoint, which I touched upon at the beginning of this section, can be illustrated with the following examples of epistemic modality.

⑷1　Hanako　ga　　kuru　　　　kanoosei　ga　　taka-i.
　　　Hanako　NOM　come. NPAST　possibility　NOM　high-NPAST
　　　'There is a high possibility that Hanako will come.'

⑷2　Hanako　ga　　kuru　　　　　daroo.
　　　Hanako　NOM　come. NPAST　CONJ
　　　'Hanako will probably come.'

In ⑷1 the noun *kanoosei* 'possibility' can but does not *have to* be used subjectively to express the speaker's attitude, which means that the subjectivity is not inherent in the form.　If a listener says 'No, that's wrong' she or he disagrees with the propositional content of the utterance, in which *kanoosei* 'possibility' is included, as in 'I do not agree that there is a high possibility that Hanako will come'.　On the other hand, *daroo* is inherently subjective, and performative, which means that saying 'No, that's wrong' would be to disagree with the content 'Hanako will come', not with the modal attitude.　This performative, non-truth-functional nature

---

12）See Verstraete（2001）, De Smet and Verstraete（2006）, Kaufmann and Tamura（forthcoming）, and Narrog（2012 : chapter 2）for detailed discussions, and, for my own view, see Larm（2009 and 2014）.

of *daroo* is reflected in that it resists embedding (see Larm 2009 for examples). Embedding and other criteria used for testing whether a given marker is subjective or objective have been well known for a long time, at least since the publication of Kindaichi (1953). Thus, although matters are more complex in actual usage, I think a distinction between pragmatically expressed and linguistically encoded subjectivity is warranted.

My point here is that regarding whether *beki* is subjective or objective, both positions may be right depending on whether subjectivity is conceived of pragmatically or grammatically. In actual usage, an utterance such as *Iku beki da* 'You should go' would most likely be used in situations where the speaker gives advice or perhaps, in some contexts, even issues an order. In this sense, it is correct to label it 'subjective'. However, distributional facts show that *beki* can be propositionalized (although it is not entirely consistent throughout the tests I will use below) and in this sense it is objective.

Let us first consider two aspects of *beki*'s syntactic behaviour that do *not* support my claim that it is objective, not even from a grammatical point of view. These are scopal relations with negation and past tense. As we saw in (15) above, negation can follow *beki*, but as was noted, the embedding is syntactic rather than semantic. The same can be said about past tense, which only syntactically, but not semantically, can take scope over the modality. Adachi et al. (2003 : 106) state that *beki datta* conveys the feeling of 'regret' or 'dissatisfaction'. If my supposition is correct, 'regret' is expressed when the subject is first person and 'dissatisfaction' when it is non-first person, as exemplified below :

(43) Boku wa ik-u beki dat-ta.
     I    TOP  go-NPAST  MOBL  COP-PAST
     'I should have gone.'

⑷　Kimi　wa　ik-u　　　　beki　　dat-ta.
　　you　　TOP　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP-PAST
　　'You should have gone.'

Consider also the following example with the auxiliary verb *oku* :

⑤　Kippu　o　　kat-te　　ok-u　　　　　　　beki　　dat-ta.
　　ticket　ACC　buy-GER　do. in. advance-NPAST　MOBL　COP-PAST
　　'I should have bought it（when I had the chance）.'

Narrog（2010 : 228）remarks, about a similar example, that "［...］ no actual obligation in the past is reported.　Instead, *beki* expresses the judgment of the speaker at time of speech that some event in the past ［...］ should have been realized."　Furthermore, in Narrog（2009 : 205）, he explains that most examples with the past tense form *beki datta* carry an implication of "non-realization of the state-of-affairs".　He illustrates this with the following example（Narrog 2009 : 205）:

⑹　??Kinoo　　wa,　shigoto　o　　　suru　　beki　　dat-ta.
　　yesterday　TOP　work　　ACC　do. NPAST　MOBL　COP-PAST
　　Dakara,　　shigotoba　e　　it-ta.
　　therefore　work-place　to　go-PAST
　　'I should have worked yesterday.　Therefore, I went to my workplace.'

Adachi et al.（2003 : 106）also note the past negative form *de wa nakatta* and that the expressed meanings in such examples, too, are 'regret' and 'dissatisfaction'. It seems that person is relevant as well, as we saw in examples ⑷ and ⑷ above. Observe the sentences below :

(47)　Boku　wa　　ik-u　　　　beki　　　de. wa. nakat-ta.

　　　I　　　TOP　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NEG-PAST

　　　'I shouldn't have gone.'

(48)　Kimi　wa　　ik-u　　　　beki　　　de. wa. nakat-ta.

　　　you　　TOP　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NEG-PAST

　　　'You shouldn't have gone.'

However, other grammatical tests show that the modal source is not necessarily the speaker. First, there is the issue of interrogation, and, again, we may draw a parallel with the English *may*. In interrogative sentences, as Lehmann (forthcoming : 1) puts it, "it is often systematically the hearer who is credited with the modal attitude." He exemplifies by saying that "*Linda may go* is commonly interpreted as 'I allow Linda to go'. However, the interrogative version *May Linda go ?* usually means 'Do you allow Linda to go ?' rather than 'Do I allow Linda to go ?'". This can be applied to *beki*, which can be questioned, as in the following example where the speaker, to borrow the wording of Lehmann (forthcoming : 1), "cedes the decision on the pragmatic focus to the hearer" :

(49)　Kare　mo　sanka　　　suru　　　beki　　　desu　　　　　ka.

　　　he　　too　attendance　do. NPAST　MOBL　COP. POL. NPAST　QP

　　　'Is it his duty to attend as well ?'

Second, let us consider another subjectivity test, which is often used in the Japanese literature on modality, namely, embedding in relative clauses. A modal with encoded subjectivity, for instance the epistemic *daroo*, resists occurring in such embedded environments (see Larm 2009 for more details and examples). But *beki* can be placed in adnominal position, as in (50) and (51) :

⑸0)　kuru　　　　　beki　　Ø　　　hito
　　　come. NPAST　MOBL　COP　person
　　　'the person who is supposed to come'

⑸1)　Juushi　　　　sare-ru　　　　　beki　　　na
　　　importance　do. PASS-NPAST　MOBL　COP. ADN
　　　no　　ga　　anzensa　no　　takasa　　desu.
　　　PRO　NOM　safety　　GEN　highness　COP. NPAST. POL
　　　'A high level of safety should be given importance.'

As noted previously, Takanashi（2005）takes the view that *beki* is subjective when used sentence-finally, but he also comments on and exemplifies adnominalisation. He makes the valuable observation that *beki* in this position, in addition to deontic readings, can also be used to express logical necessity as in the following example where the meaning is similar to that of epistemic *hazu* 'should' :

⑸2)　Moo　　tsui-te　　　i-ru　　　hazu　　　no/　　　beki　　Ø
　　　already　arrive-GER　be-NPAST　ASSUM　COP. ADN　MOBL　COP
　　　kare　ga　　mada　araware-na-i.
　　　he　　NOM　still　　appear-NEG-NPAST
　　　'He, who is supposed to have arrived by now, is yet to turn up.'（Takanashi 2005 : 9）

Takanashi（2005 : 9-10）states that *beki* may have inherited this use from its predecessor *be-*, which, as I mentioned in section 2, was polysemous and had the adnominal form *beki*.　This point is also noted by Moriya and Horie（2009 : 110）who comment that *beki* "preserves its ambiguity in some contexts.　For example, *kuru beki hito* either means 'a person who（morally）should come' or 'a person who is（epistemically）supposed to come'."　However, it is nevertheless plausible that adnominalisation can be used as a subjectivity test, since also the present-day

deontic *beki* can be embedded.

The third point demonstrating the objective character of *beki* concerns combinations with other modal expressions.  Nitta (2000 : 87) reports that *beki* can be followed by the conjectural *daroo* and the speculative *ka mo shirenai*.  This is confirmed by corpus data presented by Narrog (2009) (Narrog also adds *hazu* to the list of epistemic modals that may come after *beki*).  The data thus reflect the cross-linguistic pattern that epistemic modality belongs to a higher layer taking scope over deontic modality.  Consider the following examples with the conjectural *daroo* and the speculative *ka mo shirenai* :

(53)  Ken   ga     ik-u          beki       Ø               daroo.
      Ken   NOM   go-NPAST   MOBL   COP. NPAST   CONJ
      'I think that Ken should go.'

(54)  Ken   ga     ik-u          beki       Ø               ka. mo. shirenai.
      Ken   NOM   go-NPAST   MOBL   COP. NPAST   SPEC
      'Maybe Ken should go.'

The sense of these sentences is that Ken is seen as the most suitable or appropriate person to go.  Note, however, that a different situation obtains with the epistemic *ni chigai nai* 'must'.  Nitta (2000 : 87) states that he has not found any examples where this marker follows *beki*, and that these two probably cannot be combined. The same observation is made by Sugimura (2003 : 264).  Thus, the following sentence would be regarded as unacceptable : [13]

---

13) However, Harumi Sawada (personal communication) points out that it might be possible to say, when driving on a highway :

      Ichijikan. goto. ni   kyuukei   su   beki       ni. chigai. na-i.
      every. hour            break    do   MOBL   DED-NPAST
      'Certainly one should take a break every hour.'

(55)　*Ken　ga　　ik-u　　　　beki　　Ø　　　　　　　ni. chigai. na-i.
　　　Ken　NOM　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST　DED-NPAST
　　　(Intended to mean)'Ken must be the one who should go.'

The data are less conclusive regarding evidential markers.　Narrog (2009 : 188)
states that *beki* "resists embedding in evidentials".　However, in certain contexts it
may be possible to place the hearsay *soo da* or evidential *rashii* after *beki*, as in :

(56)　Kimi　ga　　ik-u　　beki　　da　　　　soo　　da.
　　　you　　NOM　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST　HEAR　COP. NPAST
　　　'I hear that you should go.'

(57)　Kono　kusuri　o　　　mainichi　nom-u　　　beki　　Ø　　　　　　　rashii.[14]
　　　this　medicine　ACC　every day　drink-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST　EVID
　　　'It seems (you) should take this medicine every day.'

Observe also the following sentences from the internet, in which the evidential *yoo
da* follows *beki*.

(58)　Kaminari　ni　　　chuui　　su　beki　　Ø　　　　　　　yoo　　desu.
　　　thunder　　DAT　caution　do　MOBL　COP. NPAST　EVID　COP. NPAST. POL
　　　'It seems that (we) should be careful of the thunder.'

(59)　Moo　sukoshi　hayaku　tanemaki　o　　　suru
　　　more　a little　early　　sowing　　ACC　do. NPAST
　　　beki　　dat-ta　　　yoo　　desu.
　　　MOBL　COP-PAST　EVID　COP. NPAST. POL
　　　'It seems that (I) should have planted the seeds a little earlier.'

---

　　　　Fourth, I shall briefly remark upon the propositional attitude verb *omou* 'think'. Narrog (2009 : 84), making reference to Natsu Ozaki, explains that *beki* followed by *to omou* 'I think' is a harmonic construction. That is, the propositional attitude verb and *beki* co-express subjectivity.　However, Susumu Kubo (personal communication) points out that *beki* can also be followed by the stative version *omotte iru* 'think', which is an objective marker (see Nakau 1979), and, in Susumu Kubo's wording, expresses 'an intentional state'.　Consider the difference between the sentences below.　In (61) the modal attitude holder is Taroo, not the speaker.

(60)　Ken　ga　ik-u　　beki　da　to　omo-u.

　　　Ken　NOM　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST　COMP　think-NPAST

　　　'I think that Ken should go.'

(61)　Taroo　wa　Ken　ga　　ik-u　　　beki　da　　　　　to　　　omot-te　i-ru.

　　　Taroo　TOP　Ken　NOM　go-NPAST　MOBL　COP. NPAST　COMP　think-GER　be-NPAST

　　　'Taroo thinks that Ken should go.'

Thus, the data indicate that *beki* can become part of the propositional content, and it is, from a strictly grammatical perspective, objective.

# 6. Concluding remarks

　　　　I shall conclude this paper by suggesting avenues of further investigation. In section 3, on the morphological and distributional behaviour of *beki*, I drew attention to two changes that may be occurring. It would be valuable to systematically test these constructions against native speakers of different age groups. Further, when discussing the semantic properties of *beki*, in section 4, I restricted my focus to aspects that are amenable to investigation from the perspective of

the well-known dichotomies of root/non-root, weakness/strength, and agentivity/ non-agentivity. And, my treatment of subjectivity, in section 5, was limited to distributional tests aimed at determining whether or not *beki*, from a grammatical point of view, is subjective. However, *beki* also displays interesting language-specific characteristics in terms of its pragmatic and sociolinguistic properties. The functional and stylistic aspects of *beki*, and its use in different registers, merit further attention.

### References

Adachi, T. et al.（Nihongo Kijutsu Bunpoo Kenkyuukai［The Society of Descriptive Japanese Grammar]）（eds）.（2003）. *Gendai Nihongo Bunpoo 4 : Dai 8 Bu Modariti*［Modern Japanese Grammar 4 : Part 8 Modality]. Tokyo : Kuroshio.

Alfonso, A.（1980）. *Japanese language patterns : a structural approach*（vol. 1 and 2）. Tokyo : Sophia University L. L. Center of Applied Linguistics.

Chrisman, M.（2012）. 'Ought' and control. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*. 90（3）: 433-451.

De Smet, H. and Verstraete, J-C.（2006）. Coming to terms with subjectivity. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17（3）: 365-392.

von Fintel K. and Iatridou S.（2008）. How to say *ought* in foreign : The composition of weak necessity modals. In : Guéron J. and Lecarme J.（eds）*Time and modality. Studies in natural language and linguistic theory*, vol 75. Dordrecht : Springer. 115-141.

Frellesvig, B.（2010）. *A history of the Japanese language*. Cambridge University Press.

Fäldt, K.（2006）. *The conjectural and hortative bee : From dialectal particle to stereotypic marker*. Bachelor's thesis. Lund University.

Johnson, Y.（2003）. *Modality and the Japanese language*（Michigan Monograph Series in Japanese Studies 44）. Ann Arbor : Center for Japanese Studies, The University of Michigan.

Kato, E.（2016）. Koopasu ni motozuku 'beki da' no bunseki［A corpus-based analysis of *beki da*]. *The Bulletin of the Center for International Students at Asahi University*. 13（13）: 15-24.

Kaufmann, M. and Tamura, S.（Forthcoming）. Japanese modality－Possibility and necessity : Prioritizing, epistemic, and dynamic. Preliminary draft of chapter 13 to appear in Jacobsen, W. and Takubo, Y.（eds）. *The Handbook of Japanese Semantics and Pragmatics*. Moulton de Gruyter. Version : January 30, 2017.

Kindaichi, H. (1953). Fuhenka jodooshi no honshitsu－shukanteki hyoogen to kyakkanteki hyoogen no betsu nitsuite [The nature of non-inflectional auxiliaries : on the distinction between subjective and objective expressions]. *Kokugo Kokubun* [National Language and Linguistics] 22 (2-3). Reprinted in : Hattori, S. et al. (eds), *Nihon no Gengogaku* [Linguistics in Japan], (vol. 3). Tokyo : Taishuukan. 207-49.

Larm, L. (2006). *Modality in Japanese*. DPhil thesis. University of Oxford.

Larm, L. (2009). West meets East : A Kindaichian approach to subjective modality. In Pizziconi, B. and Kizu, M. (eds), *Japanese modality : exploring its scope and interpretation*. Palgrave Macmillan. 56-86.

Larm, L. (2014). Modality packaging in Japanese : The encoding of modal meanings and subjectivity. *Studies in Pragmatics* 16 : 20-46.

Leech, G. N. (1971). *Meaning and the English verb*. Burnt Mill, Harlow, Essex : Longman Group Limited.

Lehmann, C. (Forthcoming). Speech-act participants in modality. Downloadable at https://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/lehmann_modality.pdf
Accessed on August 12, 2018.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (vol. 2). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Makino, S. and Tsutsui, M. (1995). *A dictionary of intermediate Japanese grammar*. Tokyo : The Japan Times.

Martin, S. E. (1988). *A reference grammar of Japanese*. Rutland : Charles E. Tuttle Company.

Masuoka, T. and Takubo, Y. (1992). *Kiso Nihongo Bunpoo* [Basic Japanese Grammar] (Rev. ed.). Tokyo : Kuroshio.

Moriya, T. & Horie, K. (2009). What is and is not language-specific about the Japanese modal system ? A comparative and historical perspective. In Pizziconi, B. and Kizu, M. (eds), *Japanese modality : exploring its scope and interpretation*. Palgrave Macmillan. 87-114.

Moriyama, T. (2000). Kihon johoo to sentaku kankei to shite no modariti [Modality as basic moods and selectional relations]. In Moriyama, T., Nitta, Y., and Kudo, H. *Modariti* (Nihongo no bunpoo 3) [Modality (Japanese Grammar 3)]. Tokyo : Iwanami Shoten. 1-78.

Murata, M. (1999). *Syntax and semantics of the nominals 'mono' and 'koto' in Japanese*. Master's thesis. Massey University.

Nakau, M. (1979). Modariti to meidai [Modality and proposition]. In Hayashi Eiichi Kyooju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshuu Kankoo Iinkai (eds). *Eigo to Nihongo to : Hayashi Eiichi Kyooju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshuu Kankoo* [English and Japanese : A Publication of Collected Papers for the 60th Birthday of Professor Eiichi Hayashi]. Tokyo : Kuroshio. 223-250.

Narrog, H. (2002). Polysemy and indeterminacy in modal markers－the case of Japanese *beshi*. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 11 : 123-167.

Narrog, H.（2009）. *Modality in Japanese : The layered structure of the clause and hierarchies of functional categories*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Narrog, H.（2010）. The order of meaningful elements in the Japanese verbal complex. *Morphology* 20 : 205-237.

Narrog, H.（2012）. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change : A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Nishiyama, K.（1998）. *The morphosyntax and morphophonology of Japanese predicates*. Doctoral dissertation. Cornell University.

Nitta, Y.（2000）. Ninshiki no modariti to sono shuuhen［Epistemic modality and its surroundings］. In Moriyama, T., Nitta, Y., and Kudo, H. *Modariti*（Nihongo no bunpoo 3）［Modality（Japanese Grammar 3）］. Tokyo : Iwanami Shoten. 79-159.

Nomura, T.（2003）. Modariti keishiki no bunrui［On the classification of Japanese modal forms］. *Kokugogaku*［National Language Studies］54（1）: 17-31.

Rubinstein, A.（2012）. *Roots of modality*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Sawada, H.（2006）. *Modariti*［Modality］. Tokyo : Kaitakusha.

Sawada, H.（2014）. Ninshikiteki modariti to shookoteki modariti no aida［Between epistemic and evidential modality］. *Proceedings of the International Modality Workshop［funded］via Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research* 6 : 45-77.

Schroeder, M.（2011）. *Ought*, agents, and actions. *Philosophical Review*. Vol. 120（1）: 1-41.

Sloman, A.（1970）. 'Ought' and 'better'. *Mind*. 79（315）: 385-394.

Soga, M.（1983）. *Tense and aspect in modern colloquial Japanese*. Vancouver : University of British Colombia Press.

Sugimura, Y.（2003）. Tsuzuki : kamoshirenai to nichigainai no ishitsusei : koopasu no kekka kara ［Sequel : the heterogeneous character of *ni chigainai* and *kamoshirenai* : from the results of the corpus］. *Kotoba to Bunka*［Language and Culture］4 : 261-276.

Takanashi, S.（2005）. Hyooka no modariti o arawasu jodooshi *beki da*［*Beki da* : a modal expressing evaluation］. *The Bulletin of the International Student Center*, Kobe University. Vol. 11 : 1-15.

Takubo, Y.（2009）. Conditional modality : Two types of modal auxiliaries in Japanese. In Pizziconi, B. and Kizu, M.（eds）, *Japanese modality : exploring its scope and interpretation*. Palgrave Macmillan. 150-182.

Verstraete, J-C.（2001）. Subjective and objective modality : Interpersonal and ideational functions in the English modal auxiliary system. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 : 1505-1528.