



|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Title        | The Status of Deverbal Nouns in Japanese Bilingual Dictionaries             |
| Author(s)    | Hosseini, Ayat; Jahedzadeh, Behnam  |
| Citation     | 外国語教育のフロンティア. 2018, 1, p. 83-96   |
| Version Type | VoR   |
| URL          | <a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/69781">https://doi.org/10.18910/69781</a> |
| rights       |   |
| Note         |   |

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

# The Status of Deverbal Nouns in Japanese Bilingual Dictionaries

二言語辞典における日本語の「転成名詞」の扱いについて

HOSSEINI, Ayat · JAHEDZADEH, Behnam

## Abstract

This paper deals with Japanese deverbal nouns and their status in bilingual Japanese dictionaries, and tries to establish a link between linguistic research and applied lexicography. The research question is how deverbal nouns should be treated in bilingual dictionaries. This study reviews linguistic research done on Japanese deverbal nouns in the past decades and tries to make use of them in compiling dictionaries for language learners. In this study, we investigated four Japanese bilingual dictionaries to examine how they treat deverbal nouns and to reveal problems concerning this matter. Based on these observations and linguistic evidence, the present study suggests that deverbal nouns should not be eliminated from bilingual dictionaries and decisions on the way of presenting them in dictionaries should be based on factors such as corpus-based frequency data.

Keywords: lexicography, Japanese, bilingual dictionary, deverbal noun, *renyōkei meishi*, *tensei meishi*

## 1. Introduction

In Japanese language, a deverbal noun (a noun derived from a verb) is called *tensei meishi*<sup>1)</sup> or *renyōkei meishi*<sup>2)</sup> or *renyō meishi*<sup>3)</sup>. Deverbal nouns are in fact nominalized continuative forms (*renyōkei*<sup>4)</sup>) of verbs. The continuative form is one of the inflectional forms a Japanese verb can take and has existed since ancient stages of the language (Nishio<sup>5)</sup> 1961). Although all Japanese verbs can appear in the continuative form, not all of them produce deverbal nouns. For instance, while verbs such as *hataraku* ‘to work’ or *asobu* ‘to play’ produce deverbal nouns *hataraki* ‘work’ and *asobi* ‘play’, verbs such as *utsu* ‘to hit’ or *kakureru* ‘to hide’ do not produce deverbal nouns (Shen<sup>6)</sup> 2013).

The present study raises the question whether all Japanese deverbal nouns should be independent headwords (entry-words) in bilingual dictionaries or not. The authors who are currently engaged in a lexicography project (compiling a learners’ Japanese-Persian dictionary) noticed the difficulty of this problem, and an investigation of existing Japanese bilingual dictionaries showed

inconsistency in the macrostructure of these dictionaries with respect to deverbal nouns.

On the one hand, deverbal nouns are true lexical items of the language, which gives them status as a headword in any dictionary. On the other hand, however, many deverbal nouns seem to have close semantic ties with their base verbs and this makes their meanings fairly predictable once one has the meaning of a verb. Because predictable information is in general excluded from dictionaries, many deverbal nouns are either absent in Japanese dictionaries or simply cited and explained below the entry of the related verb.

This study aims at providing suggestions for lexicographers of Japanese bilingual dictionaries on dealing with deverbal nouns. There seem to be three different possible solutions to the problem of deverbal nouns in Japanese dictionaries: 1) listing them as independent headwords (macrostructural solution), 2) presenting them below the entry of their relevant verbs as a sub-headword or in example sentences (microstructural solution) and 3) eliminating them from the dictionary and leaving their meaning to users' inference.

The macrostructural solution, being the most user-friendly solution is very space-consuming and will lead to an increase in the number of headwords and consequently to an increase in the number of pages. The microstructural solution is less user-friendly, because most users will look only in headwords to find the words they encounter when using the language. However, it will take much less space in comparison to the macrostructural solution. The third solution will use much less space in the dictionary, but will lack any information about deverbal nouns.

In section 2, previous works on Japanese deverbal nouns and their semantic and morphological analyses are surveyed and different classifications of these nouns proposed in the literature are explained. Section 3 briefly explains a survey by the authors on the status of deverbal nouns in four Japanese bilingual dictionaries and summarizes the results of this investigation. Section 4 refers to previous linguistic findings and proposals for deverbal nouns (introduced in section 1), and explains the consequences of these findings and proposals for lexicography and for the status of these nouns in bilingual dictionaries, and makes suggestions for creating certain standards and criteria for dealing with deverbal nouns in dictionaries.

## **2. Deverbal nouns in previous research**

Yamada<sup>7)</sup> (1936) and Nishio (1961) provide a morphological and semantic analysis for Japanese deverbal nouns. The morphological classification of deverbal nouns in Nishio (1961) has been referred to in many later studies and can be considered a reliable standard in the literature. Nishio divides Japanese deverbal verbs into the following two major groups:

- a) Pure deverbal nouns. These nouns consist of only deverbal elements, and are themselves

divided into two subgroups: simplex deverbal nouns such as *nayami* ‘trouble’ or *kanji* ‘feeling’, and compound deverbal nouns made up of two or more deverbal nouns such as *kumi-tate* ‘construction’ and *nori-ori* ‘getting on and off’.

b) Compound nouns containing a deverbal noun and another element. These compound nouns are also divided into two subgroups: those with the deverbal element on the left such as *todoke-saki* ‘receiver’s address’ or *tachi-ba* ‘standpoint’ and those with the deverbal element on the right such as *yuki-doke* ‘snow thaw’ or *kubi-maki* ‘muffler’. Nishio then divides each of the four above-mentioned subgroups into smaller groups based on their meanings and usages.

Nishio (1961) also explains that almost all verbs can be inflected in the form of continuative, a form which has both characteristics of a verb and a noun. However, a continuative form of a verb should not be mistaken for a noun. Words similar to continuative forms of verbs can be counted as a lexicalized noun only if they can potentially take an attributive modifier (*rentai shūshokugo*<sup>8)</sup>) themselves.

Kato<sup>9)</sup> (1987) briefly classifies the deverbal nouns in Japanese based on their semantic and morphological characteristics. Kato also provides a table containing around 400 deverbal nouns at the end of his paper. Kato claims that some verb / deverbal noun pairs such as *yaki* ‘cooking’ and *yaku* ‘to bake’ or *naki* ‘weeping’ and *naku* ‘to cry’ might historically have gone the opposite direction, i.e. the verbs might have been derived from the so-called deverbal noun. He has marked these nouns in the table at the end of his paper.

Okamura (1995) concentrates on types of deverbal nouns that express performing an action and calls these nouns “typical deverbal nouns<sup>10)</sup>”. He observes that most Japanese dictionaries take these deverbal nouns to be semantically identical to infinitive forms of verbs which are constructed by adding *-koto* to a verb. Okamura argues that there is an important difference between the meaning of a deverbal noun and its related *koto*-form, and they cannot be used interchangeably in most cases. For instance, in the following sentence, *hashiru-koto* ‘running’ cannot be replaced by the deverbal noun *hashiri*.

(1) *hashiru-koto-wa shintai-ni yoi*. ‘Running is good for the body.’

Okamura (1995) concludes that deverbal nouns should not be introduced in dictionaries as synonyms of *koto*-forms. Instead, their meanings can be explained by using forms such as *-sama* ‘appearing ...’, *-yōsu* ‘state of...’ or *-kata* ‘method of ...ing’.

(2) *hashiri: hashiru sama* ‘appearing running’, *hashiru yōsu* ‘the state of running’

(3) *kawaki: kawaku sama* ‘appearing drying’, *kawaki-kata* ‘the way of drying’

As was mentioned in the previous section, not all Japanese verbs can turn into deverbal nouns. An interesting survey by Kim<sup>11)</sup> (2003) reveals that only around 30% to 40% of Japanese verbs

can produce deverbal nouns. However, Nakamichi<sup>12)</sup> (2004), who carried out a brief analysis of new deverbal nouns, and new meanings of already existing deverbal nouns in Japanese, shows that some of the frequently used Japanese verbs which are considered not to produce deverbal nouns in previous studies, actually undergo nominalization, especially in the speech of young generations. For instance, she reports the following sentence uttered by a young student.

(4) *kyō-no nomi-wa rokuji-kara desu*. ‘The drinking today is from 6 o’clock.’

In (4) *nomi* is used in the sense of *nomikai* ‘drinking party’, a meaning not presented in dictionaries for *nomi*.

There seems to be an interesting difference between deverbal nouns derived from vowel-final verbs and those derived from consonant-final ones. Vowel-final verbs or *ichi-dan dōshi*<sup>13)</sup> are those whose roots end in a vowel, like *tabe-ru* ‘to eat’, *mi-ru* ‘to see’ and *obi-ru* ‘to wear’, while consonant-final verbs or *go-dan dōshi*<sup>14)</sup> are verbs whose roots end in a consonant like *nom-u* ‘to drink’, *kik-u* ‘to listen’ or *tor-u* ‘to take’.

As asserted in Volpe (2005) and Yamahashi<sup>15)</sup> (2009), a close observation of deverbal nouns shows that nouns derived from vowel-final verbs have more semantic resemblances with their verbal counterparts, i.e. their meaning is more predictable from the meaning of the verb. However, nouns derived from consonant-final verbs show more semantic idiosyncrasy and have somehow different and unpredictable meanings from their verbal counterparts. Volpe (2005) points at this difference between these two groups, and argues that “the distinction between root derivations and word-based derivations is directly responsible for distinctions between non-compositional idiosyncratic semantics (special meanings) and predictable compositional interpretations”.

Volpe provides various morphological evidence in addition to the above-mentioned semantic criteria, and concludes that only nouns derived from vowel-final verbs are actual deverbal nouns and nouns that are usually considered to be derived from consonant-final verbs are not cases of nominalization at all. These nouns are in fact, directly derived from the root and not the relevant verb. Consequently, for instance, while the noun *abare* ‘a rowdy’ is derived from the verb *abare-ru* ‘to act violently’, the noun *hakari* ‘a scale’ is not derived from the verb *hakaru* ‘to measure’ and both the noun and the verb are derived from the root ‘ $\sqrt{hakar}$ ’.

The slight semantic difference between the two groups of deverbal nouns is also pointed out by Yamahashi (2009). Yamahashi does not refer to Volpe (2005), but indicates that nouns that are thought to be derived from vowel-final verbs have more compositional and predictable meanings in comparison to those that are known to be derived from consonant-final verbs. For example, *sabi* ‘rust’ and *sabi-ru* ‘to rust’ are semantically very close together, while there is an evident difference between the meaning of *hakari* and *hakaru*.

Yamashashi also observes that the accent pattern is identical in the first group of nouns and their related verbs: *hazure* ‘verge’ and *hazure-ru* ‘to be disconnected’ are both unaccented, or *shirabe* ‘investigation’ and *shirabe-ru* ‘to investigate’ both have an accent on the third syllable /be/. On the other hand, for example, *ugoki* ‘movement’ is final-accented while *ugok-u* ‘to move’ has an accent on the second syllable /go/ or *muki* ‘direction’ is initial-accented, while *muk-u* ‘to turn toward’ is unaccented.

Based on these observations, Yamashashi (2009) makes a conclusion that the first group (nouns which are known to be derived from vowel-final verbs) and the related verbs are actually identical words. In other words, the noun and the verb are the same lexical item, but the former happens to take case-marker particles such as the nominative case marker *ga* or the accusative case marker *wo*, while the later takes particles such as past/non-past tense markers (*u/ta*). As for the second group (nouns that are believed to be derived from consonant-final verbs), Yamashashi suggests that these nouns and their related verbs are two different words and should not be considered as an identical lexical item. She concludes that there is no nominalization process neither in the first group, nor the second one, and none of the so called “deverbal nouns” in Japanese are actually derived from a verb. The pairs in the first group are the same words with different grammatical endings and the ones in the second group are two different lexical items.

Tagawa<sup>16)</sup> (2013) evaluates the proposal in Volpe (2005) and rejects it based on phonological and morphological evidence. One argument Tagawa makes in his paper is that the relation between an adjective like *nemu-i* ‘sleepy’, its corresponding deadjectival verb *nemu-ru* ‘to sleep’ and the deverbal noun *nemuri* ‘a sleep’ can only be explained if we assume that the verb is derived from the adjective, and the noun is derived from the verb. Thus, a direct derivation of the noun from the root as Volpe (2005) assumes is not acceptable. Tagawa concludes that so-called deverbal nouns are actually nominalizations of their corresponding verbs.

Shen (2013) in his corpus-based research classifies deverbal nouns in a fashion significant for the purpose of the present study. Shen divides deverbal nouns based on their independence, into the following three groups:

Type 1: nouns that appear independently and freely and have their own specific meaning like other nouns. For example, *asobi* ‘play’, *sawagi* ‘uproar’ and *kazari* ‘decoration’ are all type 1 nouns and have their own meaning everywhere.

Type 2: nouns that do appear independently and freely, but their meaning can only be inferred from the linguistic context they occur in. For example, *uke*, *sage* and *atari* are type 2 nouns and their meanings depend on their linguistic context. For instance, the noun *uke* needs to be embedded in a sentence like (5) for its meaning to be clarified.

(5) *okyakusama-no uke ga yoi*. ‘The reception of customers is good.’

Type 3: nouns that never appear independently and freely, and always need to be a part of a compound noun to occur in an utterance. For example, *soi* as in *kaiganzoi* ‘along the coast’, *sumi* as in *shiyōzumi* ‘used’ and *tsure* as in *kodomozure* ‘accompanied by children’ can all appear only as part of a compound word.

Yagi<sup>17)</sup> (2014) is a metonymic approach to the resultative usage of Japanese deverbal nouns. Resultative is a grammatical form that expresses that something has undergone a change in state as the result of the completion of an event. According to surveys conducted in this study, the resultative usage of deverbal nouns is acceptable in some cases and not acceptable in others. He proposes that the resultative usage of these nouns depend on pragmatic factors such as mutual understanding among the participants of a conversation. The significant finding of Yagi (2014) concerning the subject of the present study is the fact that the degree of lexicalization is not clear for a large number of deverbal nouns. This fact was also pointed out previously by Tamamura<sup>18)</sup> (1970) and Kunihiro<sup>19)</sup> (2002). Yagi (2014) divides the deverbal nouns whose resultative usage is acceptable into three groups: 1) those that are listed in dictionaries with their resultative usage, 2) those that are listed in dictionaries without their resultative usage being mentioned and 3) those that are not listed in dictionaries, but native speakers accept them as deverbal nouns with resultative usage. This observation also shows that dictionaries do not have constant criteria for listing deverbal nouns as their entries.

Nakao<sup>20)</sup> (2017) conducted a corpus-based semantic and syntactic analysis of deverbal nouns. Nakao points out that learners of Japanese as a foreign language have difficulty using deverbal nouns in their writings when they are at elementary or intermediate level and provides examples of errors made by learners of Japanese. Tanaka<sup>21)</sup> (1990) had previously argued that the continuative form (*renyōkei*) from which deverbal nouns are derived are also problematic for learners of Japanese.

### 3. Survey

In order to investigate the status of deverbal nouns in existing Japanese bilingual dictionaries, 120 commonly used deverbal nouns were selected and were evaluated in four different bilingual dictionaries. Since previous studies on Japanese deverbal nouns showed a significant difference between the behavior of deverbal nouns derived from vowel-final verbs (the first group) and those derived from consonant-final ones (the second group), among the selected 120 nouns, 60 nouns belonged to the first group and 60 belonged to the second one.

The deverbal nouns were all randomly chosen from the table at the end of Kato (1987). The

two groups contained both simplex and compound deverbal nouns. The first group contained nouns such as *aki* ‘vacancy’, *suwari* ‘sitting’ and *omoikomi* ‘wrong impression’ and the second group contained nouns such as *sasae* ‘support’, *shimetsuke* ‘tightening’ and *akirame* ‘resignation’.

The selected deverbal nouns were checked in the following four dictionaries:

- 1) Lighthouse Japanese-English dictionary (5th edition), Kenkyusha (around 35000 entries).
- 2) Kuroyanagi Tsuneo’s Japanese-Persian dictionary, Daigaku Shorin (around 21000 entries, 35000 words, including words in the examples).
- 3) Concise Japanese-French dictionary (3rd edition), Sanseido (around 38300 entries).
- 4) Daily Concise Japanese-Chinese dictionary (2nd edition), Sanseido (around 41000 entries).

Each deverbal noun was checked in the above-mentioned four bilingual dictionaries to see which approach has been taken toward them. The aim was to see whether they form an independent entry in the dictionary, they are given below the entry of their relevant verb, or they are not mentioned in the dictionary at all. For all the selected deverbal nouns, the relevant verb existed in the dictionary as an independent headword. Table 1 summarizes this survey, presenting the number and the percentage of the three possible approaches for the two groups of deverbal nouns.

**Table 1: The status of 120 selected deverbal nouns in four Japanese bilingual dictionaries**

| Dictionaries<br>Status                         | Lighthouse<br>(English) |               | Kuroyanagi<br>(Persian) |               | Concise<br>(French) |             | Daily-Concise<br>(Chinese) |               |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------|
|  | V-final                 | C-final       | V-final                 | C-final       | V-final             | C-final     | V-final                    | C-final       |
| <b>Independent entry<br/>(macrostructural)</b> | 34<br>(56.6%)           | 56<br>(93.3%) | 32<br>(53.3%)           | 44<br>(73.3%) | 47<br>(78.3%)       | 54<br>(90%) | 35<br>(58.3%)              | 50<br>(83.3%) |
| <b>Below an entry<br/>(microstructural)</b>    | 2<br>(3.3%)             | 0<br>(0.0%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)             | 4<br>(6.6%)   | 0<br>(0.0%)         | 0<br>(0.0%) | 0<br>(0.0%)                | 0<br>(0.0%)   |
| <b>Not mentioned in<br/>the dictionary</b>     | 24<br>(40%)             | 4<br>(6.6%)   | 28<br>(46.6%)           | 12<br>(20%)   | 13<br>(21.6%)       | 6<br>(10%)  | 25<br>(41.6%)              | 10<br>(16.6%) |

Table 1 reflects many interesting facts. First of all, the average number of deverbal nouns that form an independent entry is 44 (N=60). This means that 73.3% of the investigated deverbal nouns form independent entries in these four dictionaries. However, a closer investigation of the two noun groups shows that the average number of the first group of deverbal nouns (V-final) which form independent entries is 37 out of 60 (61.6%), and that of the second group of deverbal nouns (C-final) is 51 (85%).

This means that in these dictionaries, the tendency to present deverbal nouns derived from consonant-final verbs as independent entries is much stronger than the tendency to present deverbal nouns derived from vowel-final verbs as independent entries. This is consistent with the findings in



Volpe (2005) and Yamahashi (2009), because they reveal that first group deverbal nouns generally have more predictable meanings than the second group, and this makes the nouns in the second group more rightful candidates to be listed as headwords and to form independent entries.

Another fact revealed by table 1 is that these dictionaries rarely present deverbal nouns below the entries of their relevant verbs and instead, tend to present them as headwords or eliminate them completely. Less than 1% of the investigated deverbal nouns were presented in the entry of their original verbs as sub-headwords of examples.

A closer observation of selected words also reveals that the four bilingual dictionaries seem to have different approaches towards deverbal nouns. Although these dictionaries have almost the same size and the numbers of their entries are comparatively similar to each other, they don't seem to follow the same logic with respect to presenting deverbal nouns. Among the 120 randomly selected deverbal nouns, only 58 nouns (48.3%) were recorded as independent entries in all four dictionaries. On the other hand, 11 nouns (9.1%) were not found in any of the dictionaries. Therefore, for 51 nouns (42.5%), the four dictionaries had different approaches.

For instance, deverbal nouns such as *omoikomi* 'wrong impression' and *nobose* 'hot flash' were found only in Daily Concise Japanese-Chinese dictionary, *kizami* 'notch', *domori* 'stutter' and *haori* 'Japanese formal coat' were found only in Lighthouse Japanese-English dictionary and *suberi* 'sliding', *akirame* 'resignation', *kusare* 'rotting', were found only in Concise Japanese-French dictionary.

#### 4. Discussions and suggestions

As we observed in the previous section, of 120 selected deverbal nouns, 51 were absent in at least one dictionary. We also saw that the tendency to eliminate a deverbal noun from a dictionary is much stronger for nouns derived from vowel-final verbs in comparison to nouns derived from consonant-final verbs. Since previous research on Japanese deverbal nouns suggest that nouns derived from vowel-final verbs have stronger semantic links with their verbs, which makes their meaning more regular and predictable, this can be considered as consistency between lexicography and linguistic theories.

The main reason for eliminating certain lexical items from a dictionary is space limitation. In paper dictionaries, the number of entries and the number of pages is limited and only the most "necessary" lexical items have the right to form an entry. It is worth noting that there are no such constraints for electronic dictionaries, because in most cases, there are basically no space limitations in electronic versions. The question is, what are the criteria for a lexicographer to eliminate certain words from a paper dictionary? Two possible answers to this question can be "low frequency" and

“predictability”. In the following, we will discuss how relying on low frequency and predictability in eliminating lexical items from dictionaries can be problematic.

The importance of word frequencies in organizing the entries of a dictionary has been discussed frequently in lexicography literature. As Kilgarriff (2013: 79) summarizes, “*Ceteris paribus*, if a dictionary is to have N words in it, they should be the N words from the top of the frequency list”. Adopting this criterion will lead the lexicographer to eliminate most infrequent items from a dictionary.

The second criterion for eliminating lexical items from a dictionary is the predictability of the meaning of that item. According to this criterion, inflected forms of words and also some derived forms which are semantically transparent need not be presented in a dictionary. Adopting this criterion will lead to the elimination of predictable derivational forms from dictionaries regardless of their frequencies.

As for low frequency criterion, as Kilgarriff (ibid) points out, lexicographers should not depend solely on corpora and use their most frequent items as headwords, because every corpus shows ‘noise’ and bias. In addition, professional users of dictionaries such as translators seem to look for less frequent words more than frequent ones. Bogaards (1998) actually finds that infrequent words are looked up much more often by dictionary users.

As for predictability criterion, first of all, it should be noted that the degree of predictability should not be considered the same for native speakers and language learners. In case of a monolingual dictionary compiled for native speakers, most users share the linguistic competence of a native speaker, while in case of most bilingual dictionaries, users are learners or L2 speakers of the language and the semantic relations between base forms and derived forms may not be as clear to them as they are for native speakers of the language.

Moreover, derivation by its nature is a process that produces new lexical items. Derivation differs from inflection in that it is less productive, less regular and it changes the meaning and part of speech (Stump 1998: 13-16). Therefore, derived forms are considered as independent words regardless of predictability of their meanings in some cases, and they should be listed in dictionaries.

Most research on lexicography makes a distinction between inflection and derivation, and does not recommend eliminating derived forms from dictionaries. For instance, Atkins and Rundell (2008: 180) conclude that for derived forms, the lexicographer has to decide if they should all be headwords (which is very space-consuming) or be included within the entry of the root word (which makes them more difficult for users to find).

De Caluwe and Tældeman (2003) make a similar proposal and suggest that listing derived

forms as headwords or presenting them below another headword should be decided based on the frequencies of these words. In their opinion, restrictions on the inclusion of derivations that are regular / predictable in their form-content systems are most clearly visible in paper-based dictionaries. They suggest that in order to keep the volume of a dictionary within reasonable limits, lexicographers have to use frequency criteria when selecting items for the macrostructure. Words of high frequency that are, nonetheless, predictable in meaning need to be included as headwords, as this would allow users to quickly find them. Words of low frequency on the other hand, can be used in examples (without further explanation) when treating a certain headword or affix.

Deverbalization in Japanese is an example of derivation. It changes the part of speech of a word from verb to noun; it changes the meaning of a word slightly in some cases and dramatically in others and does not follow a regular pattern (Volpe 2005, Yamahashi 2009, Tagawa 2013, Shen 2013). In addition, the degree of lexicalization is not the same for all deverbalized nouns (Tamamura 1970, Kunihiro 2002, Yagi 2014). Deverbalization changes the accent pattern of a word in some cases (Yamahashi 2009) and it is not productive and does not apply to all verbs (Kim 2003). This makes them distinct from inflectional forms and gives them privilege to be present in dictionaries.

We also discussed that the meaning of deverbal nouns may not be predictable for language learners and L2 speakers of Japanese as they are for native speakers of the language. Tanaka (1990) and Nakao (2017) actually show that deverbal nouns and continuative forms of verbs from which deverbal nouns are derived are indeed difficult for learners of Japanese. This shows that deverbal nouns are important and necessary for bilingual dictionaries that are mostly used by language learners and L2 speakers. In addition, as Nakamichi (2004) reports, the younger generation in Japan especially tend to use new deverbal nouns, which do not exist in the speech of older generations, and also use the existing deverbal nouns in new meanings and senses.

These observations help us draw the conclusion that deverbal nouns should not be eliminated from bilingual dictionaries and must be presented in some form in these dictionaries. The important question then is, which deverbal nouns should be headwords and which can be presented below the entry of their root verbs? As de Caluwe and Taldeman (2003) suggest, frequency might provide a reliable criterion to decide on the way of presenting deverbal nouns in dictionaries. According to this criterion, most common deverbal nouns should be independent entries, and less common ones can appear below other entries to save space.

The survey presented in section 3 shows that frequency criterion is not considered significant in deciding on the way of presenting deverbal nouns in the four consulted dictionaries. Let us take two deverbal nouns *omoikomi* ‘wrong impression’ and *oyogi* ‘swim’ as examples. With the exception of Kuroyonagi’s Japanese-Persian dictionary, the noun *oyogi* exists in all the evaluated dictionaries

as an independent headword, however, the noun *omiokomi* exists only in Daily Concise Japanese-Chinese dictionary as a headword and is absent in the three others.

To compare the frequencies of these two nouns, we consulted Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese (BCCWJ), a corpus compiled by The National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL), which is comprised of 104.3 million words. The search for *oyogi* found 794 tokens of the word in the corpus among which 199 tokens were tagged as nouns, and some of these tokens were actually part of a compound noun. The search for *omoikomi* on the other hand, found 747 tokens of the word among which 376 tokens were tagged as nouns. This suggests that *omoikomi* as a noun is about two times as frequent as *oyogi* as a noun in this balanced corpus.

Although consulted dictionaries lack inclusive meta-lexicographical information, this observation suggests that existing bilingual dictionaries do not use corpus-based frequency data in determining their entry words. Based on the above discussion, we suggest that deverbal nouns not be omitted from Japanese bilingual dictionaries and that lexicographers refer to the frequency of deverbal nouns to decide whether to record them as independent entries or to present them below the entry of their root verbs. More frequently used deverbal nouns can be treated in the first way, and less frequent ones in the second way.

One remaining question concerns the way the meanings of deverbal nouns in the relevant entries at the microstructural level are presented. In other words, we must find a solution to the problem of introducing the meanings of deverbal nouns in bilingual dictionaries. One suggestion comes from Okamura (1995) according to which the meaning of deverbal nouns differs from that of infinitive (*koto*-forms), and these two forms cannot be used interchangeably in most contexts. Introducing deverbal nouns as synonyms of *koto*-forms or any infinitive equivalent in other languages may be misleading for language learners. Instead, as Okamura (1995) suggests, deverbal nouns can be introduced using expressions such as ...-*sama* ‘appearing ...’, ...-*yōsu* ‘state of...’ or ...-*kata* ‘method of ...ing’, or in case of bilingual dictionaries, the equivalent of these forms in other languages.

The second suggestion comes from the corpus-based study by Shen (2013) in which he divides Japanese deverbal nouns into three groups based on their degree of independence. We suggest that type 2 nouns in his study, whose meaning can only be inferred from the linguistic context they occur in, must necessarily be introduced using example sentences. Although these nouns appear in isolation, as Shen (2013) argues, their meaning thoroughly depends on the linguistic context in which they appear, and thus, providing any equivalent and synonym for them in the dictionary can be misleading.

## 5. Conclusions

In this study, we reviewed the previous linguistic research on Japanese deverbal nouns and tried to make use of it in applied bilingual lexicography. We investigated the status of 120 deverbal nouns in four existing bilingual dictionaries and found that they do not follow the same standards with regard to deverbal nouns. We observed that many examined deverbal nouns are either presented as headwords or omitted completely in the consulted dictionaries. We also observed that presenting the deverbal noun as a sub-headword of the root verb was very rare.

Based on linguistic evidence and lexicographical considerations, we suggested that Japanese deverbal nouns are products of derivational processes, which produce new lexical items whose meaning might not be clear for language learners, thus they should not be eliminated from bilingual dictionaries. However, to save space in paper dictionaries, we suggested that more common deverbal nouns be presented as independent headwords and less common ones be given below the entry of the verbs from which they have been derived.

## 注

- 1) 転成名詞
- 2) 連用形名詞
- 3) 連用名詞
- 4) 連用形
- 5) 西尾寅弥
- 6) 沈晨 (Shen Chen)
- 7) 山田孝雄
- 8) 連体修飾語
- 9) 加藤弘
- 10) 典型的な動詞連用形名詞
- 11) 金姜淑
- 12) 中道知子
- 13) 一段動詞
- 14) 語段動詞
- 15) 山橋幸子
- 16) 田川拓海
- 17) 八木健太郎
- 18) 玉村文郎
- 19) 国広哲弥
- 20) 中尾桂子
- 21) 田中寛

## References

Atkins, Sue and Michael Rundell

- 2008 *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*, New York : Oxford University Press.

BCCWJ

- 2011 *Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese*, NINJAL, Tokyo.

Bogaards, Paul

- 1998 “What type of words do language learners look up?”, In S. Atkins (Ed.), *Using Dictionaries. Studies of Dictionary Use by Language Learners and Translators*, Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 151-157.

de Caluwe, Johan and Johan Tældeman

- 2003 “Morphology in dictionaries”, In Sterkenburg, P. van (Ed.), *A Practical Guide to Lexicography*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 114-126.

Kilgarriff, Adam

- 2013 “Using corpora as data source for dictionaries”, In H. Jackson (Ed.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Lexicography*, Bloomsbury, London, 77-96.

Stump, Gregory

- 1998 “Inflection”. In A. Spencer and A. Zwicky (Eds.), *The handbook of morphology*, Blackwell, Oxford, 13-43.

Volpe, Mark

- 2005 *Japanese Morphology and its Theoretical Consequences: Derivational Morphology in Distributed Morphology*, Ph.D. dissertation, Stony Brook University.

NHK 放送文化研究所

- 1998 『NHK 日本語発音アクセント辞典 新版』 日本放送出版協会。

岡村 正章

- 1995 「典型的な動詞連用形名詞に関する一考察」『上智大学国文学論集』 28、73-89。

加藤 弘

- 1987 「転成名詞について」『東京外国語大学外国語学部附属日本語学校』 14、49-67。

金 姜淑

- 2003 「連用形名詞」『日本語論究』 7、299-320。

国広 哲弥

- 2002 「連用形転成名詞の新用法は異常か」『言語』 31 (9)、74-77。

黒柳 恒男

- 1998 『ペ日・日ペ現代ペルシア語辞典 (合本)』 大学書林。

小島 義郎ほか

- 2008 『ライトハウス和英辞典 (第5版)』 研究社。

沈 晨

- 2013 「日本語連用形名詞の自立性の段階について」『第4回コーパス日本語学ワークショップ 予稿』 151-158。

重信 常喜ほか

- 2003 『コンサイス和仏辞典 (第3版)』三省堂。
- 杉本 達夫ほか
- 2013 『デイリーコンサイス日中辞典 (第2版)』三省堂。
- 田川 拓海
- 2013 「動詞派生かRoot派生か：分散形態論による連用形名詞の分析」『文藝言語研究・言語篇』64、59-74。
- 田中 寛
- 1990 「動詞連用形の構文・語彙的な機能：日本語教育の立場から」『言語と文化』3、35-80。
- 玉村 文郎
- 1970 「現代語における居体言」『花園大学研究紀要』1、121-144。
- 中道 知子
- 2004 「連用形転成名詞の新用法について」『語学教育研究論叢』21、223-231。
- 西尾 寅弥
- 1961 「動詞連用形の名詞化に関する一考察」『国語学』43、60-81。
- 八木 健太郎
- 2014 「連用形名刺の「結果状態解釈」に対する換喩分析」『中央学院大学人間・自然論叢』38、95-115。
- 山田 孝雄
- 1936 『日本文法学概論』宝文館。
- 山橋 幸子
- 2009 「転成名詞の別の見方」『The Sapporo University journal』27、97-110。
- 山本 清隆
- 1983 「転成名詞の語彙的展開」『ソフトウェア文書のための日本語処理の研究』（情報処理振興事業協会）12。