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In modern Japanese, ゲ, に and に are case markers. In independent sentences, ゲ functions as a nominative case marker and に as a genitive case marker. In relative clauses, however, ゲ and に are interchangeable. The case marker に functions as an accusative case marker in both independent sentences and relative clauses. When we look at Old Japanese, however, the case marking system is very different. ゲ and に were both genitive markers, hence the marker for the nominative case was phonologically null. The particle に appeared infrequently in Old Japanese (Old Japanese in this thesis refers to the language up to the end of the Heian Period (1192)) as an accusative case marker. Most traditional Japanese grammarians, however, consider that there was no accusative case marker. In this thesis, I will examine the changes in the case markers mentioned above, and, on the basis of my findings, make a new proposal that ゲ/に relative clauses are structurally different and no special rule is necessary to account for the appearance of に in the place of ゲ.

Chapter 1 treats the development of the nominative case marker ゲ from its origin as the genitive marker in Old Japanese. The establishment of the nominative ゲ is analyzed in relation to に which has been a genitive case marker from the time of Old Japanese through modern Japanese. The attributive form of a verb is shown here as being
the key to explaining the establishment of the nominative case marker ga.

Chapter 2 concerns the accusative case marker in Old Japanese. Most traditional Japanese grammarians consider that there was no accusative case marker. However, the research which I conducted shows this hypothesis is correct only in an independent sentence, but not in a subordinate clause. The marker did exist in subordinate clauses in which the verb is in the attributive form. This new hypothesis is developed based on two major hypotheses made by Japanese grammarians.

Chapter 3 discusses ga and no relative clauses in modern Japanese. The result of the research on Old Japanese, especially in Chapter 1, suggests that no-relative clause has no sentence structure. Based on this, I will propose that ga and no relative clauses have different structures, and no special rule such as Ga-No Conversion is necessary. Four pieces of evidence is presented to support this. The proposed hypothesis differs from those made by both grammarians and linguists.
CHAPTER 1
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NOMINATIVE CASE MARKER GA

In modern Japanese, ga functions mainly as the nominative case marker and no as the genitive case marker. However, it is well known that in relative clauses, the two particles can be interchanged without changing meaning.

(1) John ga/no yonda hon
    read book

'the book that John read'

This no in relative clause is commonly defined as an alternant of the nominative case marker ga even though no cannot mark the nominative case in an independent sentence. The appearance of no in relative clauses in modern Japanese is a remnant of Old Japanese. In Old Japanese the nominative case was not phonologically realized, i.e., the nominative case was zero (Ø). Both ga and no were genitive case markers. In this chapter I will examine the development of ga as a nominative marker from its origin as genitive case.

1.1. Ga and No in Modern Japanese

1.1.1. Ga in Modern Japanese

Ga marks the subject of the sentence (Kuno 1973:60). Kuno gives the following examples (Ibid:60).
(2) John ga kita.

came

'John came.'

(3) John ga gakusei desu.

student is

'John and only John is a student. It is John who is a student.'

According to Kuno (1973:61), "ga also marks the object of stative transitive verbals." He gives the example (Ibid:61):

(4) John wa eigo ga dekiru.

English can

'John can (speak) English.'

However, this ga is the subject marker in the traditional grammarians' view.¹ In this section, it will be enough to treat ga in the following way: the nominative case in modern Japanese is represented with ga.

Jorden (1963:350-51) gives four functions of no:²

(5) a. the nominal meaning 'one,' 'ones'

Example: akai no

red one

'red one(s)'

b. the copula: a special alternant of da

Example: syasyoo no musuko

conductor son

'my son who is a conductor'
c. the particle meaning 'of,' 'pertaining to,' 'belonging to'

Example: boku no zasshi
I magazine
'my magazine'

d. the particle which follows the subject of a sentence modifier

Example: boku no katta zasshi
I bought magazine
'the magazine I bought'

The last case of no (in d) is the one that is considered to be the alternant of ga in a relative clause.

1.1.2. Ga-No Conversion

In the structure in (5d) above, no or ga can occur. The no here is commonly viewed as a nominative marker. This phenomenon only occurs in a relative clause.

(6) Taro ga/no katta hon
bought book
'the book which Taro bought'

This phenomenon is commonly called Ga-No conversion.3 I will discuss it in Chapter 3.
1.2. Introduction to Old Japanese

Turning now to Old Japanese, I am going to examine how ga and no functioned in Old Japanese. I shall examine the use of ga and no in Manyōshū.

Manyōshū is the oldest and biggest anthology in Old Japanese, and includes about 4500 poems written by emperors, citizens, and even beggars. Compiled around the end of the eighth century, it includes poems written over a period of 450 years (Assai and Hayami 1980:8). Before going in depth concerning ga and no in Old Japanese, it is necessary to explain the verbal conjugation in Old Japanese.

1.2.1. Verbal Conjugation in Old Japanese

Verbal inflection in Old Japanese generally falls into one of six categories. These six morphologically determined categories of a verb are defined as follows: 4

i. The conclusive form (shūshikei) is placed at the end of a sentence to make simple statements.

(7) Kaze huku.
wind blow
'The wind blows.'

ii. The attributive form (rentaikei) of a verb is in an attributive relation to the following nominal.

(8) huku kaze
blowing wind
'a blowing wind'
iii. The imperfect form (mizenkei) functions to express an action or state which is imperfect. Observe the following examples.

(9) huka -zu
(wind) blow not
'(the wind) does not blow'

(10) huka -ba
(wind) blow
'if (it) blows'

(11) huka -mu
(wind) blow
'(it) will blow'

iv. The perfect form (izenkei) expresses the completion of the act or state, thus:

(12) huka -ba
blow
'since (it) blows/ it has blown'

v. The conjunctive form (renyōkei) occurs in a coordinate structure, and it implies the meaning "and."

(13) Kaze huki nami takasi.
wind blow wave high
'Wind blows and waves are high.'

iv. Imperative form (meireikei) functions as an imperative.

(14) Huke
blow
1.3. Nominative Representation Without Ga

In Old Japanese, both ga and no were genitive case markers. There was no explicit marker for the nominative case. Regarding ga, there is no question that ga as a nominative case marker did not exist in Old Japanese. Observe the following examples from Manyōshū.

(15) irihi 6 sasinure  (135)
setting sun  shine
'as the setting sun shines palishly'

(16) tori 6 tatu  (153)
bird(s)  fly
'birds fly'

(17) asahi 6 teru  (177)
morning-sun  shine
'the morning sun shines'

In the remainder of this chapter, I will explain the process by which the genitive ga in Old Japanese became the nominative ga in modern Japanese.

1.3.1. Ga and No as Genitive Case Marker in Old Japanese

I shall examine here the occurrence of ga and no between nominals in Manyōshū ([NP ga/no NP]); between nominals is the most common place where ga and no occurred in Old Japanese. In the [NP ga/no NP] construction, the first nominal acts as the modifier of the second
nominal. Either *ga* or *no* can be placed in this position; however, there was a difference in the nature of the first nominal.

1.3.1.1. Distribution of *Ga*

The first nominal of the [NP *ga* NP] construction is of a specific nature.

(18) First Person (I)

a. wa *ga* seko (9)
   I husband/lover
   'my husband/lover'

b. wa *ga* kuni (50)
   I country
   'my country'

c. wa *ga* kurokami (87)
   I beautiful hair
   'my beautiful hair'

(19) Husband/Lover

a. kimi *ga* katami (47)
   husband memento
   'the memento of (speaker's) husband/lover'

b. kimi *ga* na (93)
   husband name
   'the name of (speaker's) husband/lover
(20) Wife/Sweetheart

a. imo ga kami (123)
   wife hair
   'the beautiful hair of (speaker's) wife/sweetheart'

b. imo ga ie (91)
   love house
   'the house of my love'

In this construction **ga** works almost the same as 'of' in English, such as **kimi ga na** which means 'your name,' literally 'the name of you.' Examination of the first nominal shows that it can only refer to a few specific type of persons. They are the speaker himself, wife, husband, lover, etc. That is, the first nominal is restricted in reference to ones closely related to the speaker.

1.3.1.2. **Distribution of No**

Compared to the [NP **ga** NP] construction, a wide variety of items can be referred to by the first nominal before **no**. These include location, time, possession, belonging, equal relationship, direction, status, etc.

(21) Location

a. Uzi no miyako (7)
   capital
   'the capital in Uzi'

b. Miwa no yama (17)
   mountain
'mountains in Miwa'

(22) Time
a. koyoi no tukuyo (15)
   tonight moonlight night
   'moonlight night tonight'
b. aki no no (7)
   autumn field
   'field in autumn'

(23) Possession or Belonging
a. ko no ha (16)
   tree leaf
   'leaves of a tree'
b. kawa no mizu (79)
   river water
   'water of a river'
c. wata no sokko (83)
   sea bottom
   'bottom of the sea'

(24) Equal Relationship
a. siranami no hama (34)
   white waves beach
   'the beach with white-crested waves swelling and breaking'
b. inisie no hito(32)
   ancient times people
'men who are in ancient times'

(25) Direction

a. hingasí no no (48)
est field
'field in the east'

(26) Status

a. ookimi no miiniti (147)
emperor life
'the life span of the emperor'

b. kami no yasiro (404)
god shrine
'a shrine of god'

As to the function of  ga and no in these constructions, we can see that the first nominal modifies the second nominal in the form of the first nominal + ga or no. Ga usually only follows a word referring to a person, and in most cases the [NP ga NP] construction shows the relationship of possession or belonging. Here, the first nominal is the possessor and the second one is the possessed item/person.

On the other hand, the [NP no NP] construction shows time, location, equal relationship, direction, and status in addition to possession. In the [NP no NP] construction, when the first nominal is a person, it is usually a person socially superior to the speaker, such as gods and the emperor. That is, the referent of the first nominal is "distant" from the speaker. However, in the [NP ga NP] construction, a person in the family or those who are inferior to the speaker are seen
instead.

In Rodriguez (1604-8:503), which was written in the Muromachi Period (1338-1573), about eight hundred years after the Nara Period (710-794), we can see that the same difference still occurred in Japanese language. In his book, genitives are classified as follows. There are only two genitives. One is no which is used for second person or third person who is respected. The other is ga, which is used for first person or third person who is inferior to the speaker. Also ga is used for second person whom the speaker intends to make a fool of or make fun of.

The important point in this section is, ga and no both appeared only in the genitive case in Old Japanese. Although there was a difference in their usage based on a semantic/pragmatic dimension, they functioned virtually the same way syntactically, namely as the marker of the genitive case. In the following section, I will go into depth in analyzing ga and no in different constructions to trace their development.

1.4. Development of Ga as the Nominative Case Marker

To trace ga from the genitive case marker in Old Japanese to the nominative case marker in modern Japanese, I examined the work Tosa
nikki (Tosa Diary) written by Ki no Tsurayuki in the Heian Period (794-1192). In Tosa nikki, which was written in 935, the early Heian Period, some new constructions involving ga are seen in addition to the simple [NP ga NP] construction. Such new constructions are considered
to be intermediate stages in the development of the nominative _ga_.
Below the process of the development of _ga_ as the nominative case marker
will be discussed.

1.4.1. Appearance of Ga in Environment other than [NP ga NP]

In _Tosa Nikki_, we can see new constructions involving _ga_. First,
observe the following ("P" stands for Predicate):

(1) [NP ga P NP] Construction

(27) wa ga kogi wataru ura
       I row over bay
       'the bay where I row (a boat)'

(28) wa ga kouru hito
       I miss person (lit.)
       'the child whom I miss'

(29) wa ga susuki ni te kirukiru tendaru na
       I grass hand cut picked greens
       'the greens that I picked cutting my hand with
sukuki, the Japanese pampas grass'

This [NP ga P NP] construction appears frequently in the Heian
Period. We can in fact see such an example in _Manyōshū_ as well, though
it was not so common during the Nara Period.

(30) wa ga yuku miti
       I walk road
       'the road where I walk'

In (27) through (29), despite the English translation, _ga_ is not
clearly defined as the nominative case marker in this period. That is because the predicates are in the attributive form. As previously mentioned, the attributive form of a verb is in an attributive relation to the following nominal, namely it modifies the following nominal. The attributive form of a verb is different from its conclusive form which makes simple statements. Thus example (30) will be translated literally as 'my walking road'. Its structure is: \([\text{NP wa ga [NP yuku [NP miti]]}].\)

Here, \textit{ga} is in the structure \([\text{NP ga NP}],\) hence still a genitive marker.

Next observe the following:

(ii) \([\text{NP ga P}] \text{ Construction}\)

(31) \text{so ga iikeraku}^{13}

\text{person saying (past)}

'what the person (she) said'

This construction includes a nominalized predicate. Thus \([\text{NP ga P}]\)

is not a simple sentence but rather \([\text{NP ga NP}]\) in its interpretation.

Observe the next construction.

(iii) \([\text{P ga NP}] \text{ Construction}\)

(32) \text{kuru ga kanasisa}^{14}

\text{returning sadness}

'the sadness that I return'

(33) \text{tobu ga gotoku (ni)}^{15}

\text{flying like}

'the manner like flying in the sky'

(34) \text{miru ga kanasisa}^{16}

\text{seeing sadness}
'how pitiful it is to see; literally, the sadness that I look at ...'

This construction has a predicate before ga. However, again, when we analyze the conjugation of the predicate, we can only get a predicate in the attributive form.

It should be noticed here that the attributive form of a verb can function as a nominative in Japanese. Thus examples (32) through (34) in the [P ga NP] construction should be analyzed as still being in the [NP ga NP] construction. (I will discuss in detail the nominal nature of the attributive form in Chapter 2.) Consequently, we can say the usage of ga has broadened from the Nara Period to the Heian Period, but it is still limited by being required to occur between nominals.

1.4.2. Appearance of No in Environment other than [NP no NP]

The same development, except the last above ([P no NP]), can be seen for no constructions in Tosa nikki. Observe the following examples:

(1) [N no P N] Construction

(35) aru hito no yomeru uta
    certain person composed poem
    'a poem composed by a certain personage'

(36) hune no noboru koto
    boat get up (thing)
    'to get the boat up'
(37) oikaze no hukinuru toki
fair wind blow time
'the time when the fair wind blows'

(ii) [N no P] Construction

(38) komatsu no aru (o)
small pine tree being
'the fact that the pine tree shoots live on'

The predicates in these examples must be in the attributive form. Examples such as (38) above give further support for analyzing the attributive form as sometimes being used as a nominal.

1.4.3. Difference Between Ga and No

In the previous subsections, we saw the different constructions which can include ga or no. Although they differ in form, they essentially functioned in the same way. In other words, both ga and no are governed by the indispensable condition to which I will hereafter call the "Internominal Restriction." It requires ga and no to be between nominals. In the following subsection, I will examine how ga and no functioned differently from each other.

1.4.3.1. The Distributional Difference Between Ga and No

We have seen that ga and no can occur in the same two environments [NP ga/no NP] and [NP ga/no P NP]. However, in the [P ga NP] construction in Tosa niki, I only found ga but not no. The occurrence of a predicate in the place of the first nominal is limited to ga with
no exceptions.

Referring to this point, Tsukushima (1964) indicates that *ga* marks the genitive case, as does *no*. However, *no* never takes a predicate in the attributive form. It always takes nominals, although in later periods, there are exceptions which are special cases. On the other hand, *ga* takes predicates in the attributive form and modifies nominals or predicates in the attributive form which are noun equivalents (Tsukushima 1964:147-8).

Up to now, we can say that:

(A) *ga* can take a predicate in the attributive form which is considered to be a nominal, but *no* cannot. *No* has the rigid Internominal Restriction.

(B) When *ga* follows a nominal, it is a personal noun or a pronoun. This usage is a continuation from the previous period.

Between these two points, I believe that (A) is the crucial fact which later led to the development of *ga* as the nominative case marker. What (A) shows is that the Internominal Restriction applied rigidly to *no*, not allowing it to occur after a predicate in the attributive form. However, the restriction was somewhat loosened for *ga*, making it possible for *ga* to occur after a predicate.

1.5. **What Caused Ga to Become the Nominative Case Marker**

In Old Japanese, both *ga* and *no* were genitive markers. They, however, differ in modern Japanese, namely *ga* marks the nominative and *no* the genitive. In this section, I will analyze the cause of the
establishment of _ga_ as the nominative case marker. First, I will discuss the change in verbal conjugation which I believe contributed directly to the development of _ga_ as the nominative case marker. Second, I will explain the _kakarimusubi_ construction, which is, I believe, the primary cause for the change in verbal conjugation. Finally, I will summarize the different analyses proposed by Japanese grammarians regarding the development of _ga_ as the nominative case marker.

1.5.1. Changes in Japanese Verbal Conjugation in the Kamakura and Muromachi Periods

In the Kamakura (1192-1333) and Muromachi (1338-1573) Periods, conjugation of verbs underwent drastic change. This change comprises the beginning of modern Japanese.

The major force behind this change is the assimilation of the conclusive form by the attributive form. This change affected all verbs except irregular inflection in _n_ (na-gyō henkaku katsuyō, cf. chart below, this category only has two members, _sinu_ 'die' and _inu_ 'leave') and three other verbs mentioned below. Before the change occurred, quasi-grade inflection (yodan katsuyō), upper mono-grade inflection (kami-ichidan katsuyō) and lower mono-grade inflection (shimo-ichidan katsuyō) had the same phonological shape for both conclusive and attributive forms. The other verbs had different shapes for conclusive and attributive forms. These points are shown in Diagram 1; the verbs are shown in the various inflections before the change in conjugation.
### Diagram #1 (Before the Change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Verb</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflected Portion</td>
<td>yodan</td>
<td>ra-gyō</td>
<td>kami-ichidanichidan</td>
<td>shimo-nidan</td>
<td>kami-nidan</td>
<td>shimo-nidan</td>
<td>na-gyō</td>
<td>ka-gyō</td>
<td>sa-gyō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shūshikei (conclusive)</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-iru</td>
<td>-eru</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentaikei (attributive)</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-iru</td>
<td>-eru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram #2 (After the Change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Verb</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflected Portion</td>
<td>yodan</td>
<td>yodankami-ichidanichidan</td>
<td>shimo-nidan</td>
<td>kami-nidan</td>
<td>shimo-nidan</td>
<td>na-gyō</td>
<td>ka-gyō</td>
<td>sa-gyō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shūshikei (Conclusive)</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-iru</td>
<td>-eru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentaikei (attributive)</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-iru</td>
<td>-eru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
<td>-uru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
occurred. During the Kamakura and Muromachi Periods the assimilation of the conclusive form into the attributive form occurred for all verbs except the three types which already had the same form for conclusive and attributive (yodan katsuyō, kami-ichidan katsuyō and shimo-ichidan katsuyō) and na-gyō henkaku katsuyō. Diagram 2 illustrates the conjugation after this change. The important points are as follows:

(a) Ra-gyō henkaku katsuyō 'irregular inflection in r' was merged into yodan katsuyō due to the fact that the former lost its identifiable feature by the assimilation of the conclusive form by the attributive form, namely the change from ari to aru in its conclusive form (compare the forms in Diagram 1 and 2).

(b) The conclusive form for all verbs except na-gyō henkaku katsuyō changed into the same form as its attributive form.

The cause of this change in verbal conjugation is generally understood to be due to the existence of the kakarimusubi construction. Let us now look at this construction.

1.5.2. Kakarimusubi Construction

There is a special rule called the Kakarimusubi Rule which existed in the Japanese of Nara Period (710-794) through the Heian Period (794-1192). According to Nihon kokugo daijiten (1973:363-5), a predicate in the sentence final position must be in the attributive form instead of the expected conclusive form if the sentence includes specific particles called kakari jōshi 'kakari particle' like so, namu,
ya and ka which express emphasis or uncertainty. In Tosa nikki, for example, a diary written in the Heian Period, this rule is commonly found.

(39) ...ima oitaru zo mazireru young growing mixing (attributive form)

'...the young growing ones are in confusion'

(40) ...to nan (namu) yomeru complementizer being composed (attributive form)

'...(the child) composed (the poem)'

(41) ...sirazu ya aruran unaware being (attributive form)

'...(they) will be unaware of (my bidding them farewell)'

All of the verbs above are in the sentence final position; they are in the attributive form instead of the expected conclusive form because of the presence of a kakari particle (zo, namu and ya).

There are, then, two possible reasons why a verb must be in the attributive form:

(A) Predicates in [NP ga P] and [NP no P] constructions take the attributive form by virtue of the Internominal Restriction.

(B) A predicate must be in the attributive form by the kakarimusubi rule which is triggered by the presence of a kakari particle.

The rule of kakarimusubi directly contributed to the drastic change in verbal conjugation (where the conclusive form was assimilated into
the attributive form) in the following way. As explained above, this rule was triggered by the appearance of a kakari particle (e.g., ya). However, in Late Heian, a verb in the sentence final position started to appear in the attributive form even when there was no kakari particle in the sentence. This particular use of the attributive form apparently had a special implication. Satō (1977) mentions that sometimes attributive forms are seen at the end of sentences in the absence of a kakari particle as an expression of admiration (Satō 1977:300).

In any case, this phenomenon gave an independent status to the occurrence of the attributive form in the sentence final position. This ultimately led to the replacement of the conclusive form (and its disappearance) by the attributive form.

1.5.3. Past Hypotheses Regarding Ga

There is a hypothesis widely accepted among traditional grammarians that the establishment of the nominative case marker ga from its origin as a genitive case marker is due to the change in verbal conjugation. However, there is some inconsistency in what the grammarians propose. The grammarians who embrace this hypothesis also appear to believe that ga as the nominative case marker existed even before the change in conjugation, as early as the Manyōshū. For example, concerning the construction [NP ga P NP] in the Nara Period, Hashimoto (1969:86-87) states that ga expresses the subject. Nishida (1977:208) is of the same opinion on this point. He states that this ga indicates the nominative case in a subordinate clause, a conditional clause, or in a sentence.
which ends with a verb in the attributive form. Their idea is that *ga*
was nominative when it occurred before a verb in the attributive form;
this is the case even in the Nara Period, before the change in
conjugation.

If this is correct, then *no* should be treated in the same way,
i.e., *ga* and *no* functioned as nominative case markers when they occurred
before a verb in the attributive form. According to this, the \([NP \text{*ga/no}}\ P]\) construction is interpreted as a sentence even in the Nara Period.
Hence the change in verbal conjugation would not have changed the status
of *ga* and *no* because:

(i) \(\text{Ga and no were already the nominative case markers before the change;}\)

(ii) \(\text{the structure of \([NP \text{ga/no}}\ P]\), before and after the change in}
\(\text{conjugation, should be the same, namely a sentence \([NP \text{ga/no}}\ P _{S}]\).}\)

However, in modern Japanese, we have only *ga* as the nominative case
marker. Consequently, this hypothesis has a defect. According to this
hypothesis, the status of *ga* and *no* before and after the change would
be illustrated as follows:

\[
(42) \quad [NP \text{ga/no} P ]
\]

\[
\downarrow
\]

\[
[NP \text{ga/*no}} P ]
\]

Originally, *ga* and *no* were the genitive case markers. Then they
became the nominative case markers. Later, in the same environment only
no returned to its original use as the genitive case marker. This hypothesis lacks a reasonable basis for explaining why only no changed its status in the same environment where nothing else is changed. Consequently, this hypothesis is not likely to be correct.

1.5.4. Ga as Nominative Case After Change in Inflection

We saw above that there is an inconsistency in the grammarians' statement about the establishment of ga as nominative case. The same grammarians who claim that ga became a nominative case marker after the change in verbal inflection also claim that ga as a nominative case existed before the change. The change in verbal inflection gives a straightforward reason for the transition of ga from genitive to nominative. Before the change, a predicate in the attributive form was limited to constructions such as [NP ga P NP] (and in kakarimusubi).

These constructions were clearly noun phrases; hence the attributive form was nominal in nature in these constructions, and ga may still be analyzed as a genitive marker. After the change, the attributive form "took over" the position previously occupied by the conclusive form, i.e., as a sentential predicate. Thus, the same construction, [NP ga P], can be analyzed as a sentence after the change, and, consequently, ga as nominative instead of genitive case.

I propose, then, that ga became established as the nominative case marker only after the change in verbal inflection took place after the Heian Period. Before the change, it was strictly a marker of genitive case.
Why did ga, but not no, become the nominative case marker? The Internominal Restriction gives a possible answer. We saw that, in the Heian Period, ga but not no can occur in the environment [P ga/*no NP]. In other words, the restriction applied much more strictly to no than to ga. By this Restriction, no could not become the nominative case marker because the particle had to occur between nominals, precluding the possibility of just NP no to have independent status, which would be required if no were to become a nominative case. The following illustrates the change in ga as proposed above.

\[
\text{(43) } [\text{NP } ga \ P (\text{attributive form})_{NP}] \\
\downarrow \\
\text{The Change in Verbal Conjugation (The merger of the conclusive form into the attributive form)} \\
\downarrow \\
[NP ga P (\text{attributive form= s})] \\
\text{(NOM) conclusive form)}
\]
Notes: Chapter 1

1 See Martin (1962:44) and Jorden (1962:100) for further reference.

2 Examples and translations are taken from Jorden (1963). I have furnished individual glosses.

3 See Harada (1971) and Shibatani (1978).

4 See Sansom (1946) for a more detailed explanation. I have summarized the relevant points from this work.

5 These examples are cited from Manyōshū, I, translated and edited by Takagi et al. (1957). The examples (17) to (25) are translated by the author. For the rest of the examples, the translations are from The Manyōshū by Pierson (1931). As for the examples cited from Manyōshū, they are referred to by Kokka_takun number, which appears in parentheses at the end of each example.

6 The mark Ø is inserted to show the absence of ga.

7 For other examples, see Hashimoto (1964), Nishida (1977), Ōno (1978), Aoki (1952); for examples in modern Japanese, see Ueda (1966).

8 These examples are cited from Tosa_nikki translated by Hagitani (1969). English translations are from Tosa Nikki by Porter (1912).

9 Tosa_nikki (TN) by Hagitani, 108.

10 TN 110

11 TN 96

12 Manyōshū, IV, translated and edited by Takagi et al. (1962).

13 TN 108
Tsukishima (1964) gives the following example:

(1) hana o miru no ki
    flower seeing story
    'the story about enjoying flowers'

There is another kakari particle koso, which takes predicates in the definite form (izenkei).

Yoshio Iwai (1970) has the same opinion on this point.
CHAPTER 2
ACCUSATIVE CASE MARKING IN OLD JAPANESE

In Chapter 1 we traced the development of が from genitive case in Old Japanese to nominative case in modern Japanese. In this chapter we will focus on the other case marker, お, which in modern Japanese marks the accusative case. In Old Japanese お only appeared infrequently in simple sentences; when it did appear it was usually not to represent the accusative case but was used as an emphatic marker. Three hypotheses have been put forth about the absence of any phonologically realized accusative marker (and also the nominative marker) in Old Japanese. All of the hypotheses in essence assume that お as an accusative marker did not exist. In this chapter I will argue that お did exist as an accusative marker in Old Japanese, its occurrence predictable from the grammar. I will start out by briefly illustrating the use of お in modern Japanese, then examine the three hypotheses about the absence of phonologically realized case markers in Old Japanese.

2.1. The Use of お in Modern Japanese

In modern Japanese, お shows that the preceding word is the object of the verb (Martin 1962:66). Observe the following:

(1) Taroo ga hon お katta.
    book  bought

'Taro bought a book.'
(2) Hanako ga sukiyaki o tabeta.
    ate
    'Hanako ate sukiyaki.'

(3) Taro ga hon o katta mise o sitteiru.
    book bought store know
    '(I) know the book store where Taro bought the book.'

(4) Hanako ga sukiyaki o tabeta resutoran e itta.
    ate restaurant went
    '(I) went to the restaurant where Hanako had sukiyaki.'

As seen in the above, the accusative case is marked by o in both simple sentences ((1) and (2)) and embedded sentences ((3) and (4)) in modern Japanese. Since there are different usages of o in addition to marking the accusative case, I will explain each usage in the following subsections.

2.1.1. O as the Object Marker

(1) First, observe the definition of o in modern Japanese given by Jorden (1962:42).

The particle o singles out the preceding nominals as the direct object of a following inflected expression. Note the location of the emphasis in the English equivalents.

Examples:

(5) Sore o kudasai.
    that give (me)
'Give me THAT.' (tells which one I want)

(6) Raitaa o misete kudasai.
lighter show (me)
'Please show me some LIGHTERS.' (tells what I want to see)

(7) Tabako o onegai-simasu.
cigarette give (me)
'I'd like a CIGARETTE.' (tells what I want to have)

(8) Urosiki o kimasita.
bought
'I bought a FUROSIKI.' (tells what I bought)

(ii) The traditional Japanese grammarians define o the following way. Tsukishima (1964) says that o follows nominals or nominal equivalents and indicates the targets of actions. Accusative cases are sometimes expressed without o as follows (Ibid:148-9):

(9) hana φ oru (the same meaning as hana o oru)
flower pick
'pick flowers'

(10) tuki φ miru (the same meaning as tuki o miru)
moon see
'look at the moon'

(iii) Hashimoto (1969) illustrates o from a semantic point of view. In modern Japanese, o marks the object of a predicate; this object is the patient of transitive action including mental action. He gives the following examples among others.
(11) to o akeru
door open
'open the door'

(12) seikoo o yorokobu
success be glad
'(to) be glad of success'

2.1.2. O for 'passage through'

Secondly, in addition to the function of marking an object, Hashimoto mentions that o signifies the place where the action is taking place when the predicate has the meaning of 'passage through', for example (Hashimoto 1969:109):

(13) miti o tooru
street walk
'walk along the street'

(14) kawa o wataru
river cross over
'cross over the river'

(15) sora o tobu
sky fly
'fly through the air'

2.1.3. O for 'departing point'

As the third classification, Hashimoto states that o expresses a departing point when a predicate has the meaning of separating or
leaving.

(16) uti o hanareru
    home    leave
    'leave home'

The foregoing usages of o are all seen also in Old Japanese (Hashimoto 1969:110).\(^2\)

Yamada (1936) mentions that o functions to show the object which is influenced by an action. He concludes his definition of o as the marker to show the "dynamic object" (dōteki-mokuyō) (Ibid:413-5).\(^3\)

Among these uses of o, those for 'passage through' and 'departing point' are not within the scope of this paper. In the following section, the accusative case in Old Japanese will be discussed in relation to o.

2.2. The Accusative Case in Old Japanese

In Old Japanese, the accusative case, as well as the nominative case, was not represented with a case marker. Although the object marker o appears in some sentences in ancient documents dating from around eighth century, this was not ordinary use of o in Old Japanese. Observe the following examples taken from Manyōshū\(^4\) which have no markers to show the accusative case.

(17) ware wa imo sōmou\(^5\)  (133)

I    wife    think

'I think of my wife'
(18) imo ga atari Ø mimu
  wife house want to see
  '(I) want to see my wife's house'

(19) imo Ø matu to
  sweetheart wait in order to
  'in order to wait for my love'

Observe the following sentence also taken from Manyōshū, which lack both the subject marker and the object marker.

(20) Yuu Ø saraba sio Ø miti-kinamu Sumi-no-e no
  (NOM) (NOM)
  evening if comes tide will come in
  Asaka no ura ni tama-mo Ø karitena
  (ACC)
  bay fine sea-weed want to reap
  'If evening comes, the tide will come in; 0, I should
  like to reap the fine sea-weed now on the bay of Asaka
  near Sumi-no-e.'

As seen in the above, the accusative case as well as the nominative case took no particle. Hashimoto (1969) mentions that such relationships as usually described with the case marker o in modern Japanese did not require any specific particles in Old Japanese (Ibid:117).

2.2.1. Review of Past Hypotheses

As we observed above, there was no specific marker for the accusative case in Old Japanese. The accusative case (as well as the
nominative case) was zero (Ø). In this subsection, we will examine hypotheses put forth by traditional grammarians about the absence of phonologically realized case marking in Old Japanese.

Grammarians have proposed various analyses of the missing case marking. Among them Kobayashi (1970:226) gives the most straightforward reason. He argues that in Old Japanese both the accusative and nominative case took no particle since word order indicated the two cases. That is, the nominative case is designated by being at the head of sentence, and the accusative case by being next to the verb. By this "word order" hypothesis, Old Japanese is similar to present-day English, in which "cases" are reflected in the word order.

Hashimoto (1969) gives a semantic explanation for the absence of explicit case markers. He states that the relationship between a predicate and its subject is understandable naturally by the meaning of the words themselves, consequently no special marking is required to show this relationship (Ibid:93). This semantic explanation is extended to the accusative case. Hashimoto states that the relationship expressed by 0 in modern Japanese did not require 0 in Old Japanese because such a relationship was understood by the meaning of words themselves (Ibid:118).

Matsushita (1930) says that the subjects and objects in Old Japanese are in a "general" case (ippan-kaku). According to his hypothesis, Old Japanese did not distinguish between nominative and accusative cases. Rather, a word in "general" case could function as either the subject or the object (Ibid:229).
Among these three hypotheses, Matsushita’s idea of "general" case is the least likely candidate for explaining the absence of explicit case markers. According to his hypothesis, a word in the "general" case functions as either a subject or an object. But this per se fails to explain the absence of explicit case marking. Thus I will not treat his view in this paper.

Of the two remaining hypotheses, Hashimoto’s explanation that the relationship of subject and object to the predicate is understood by the meaning of words at first seems plausible. Observe the following examples from Manyōshū.

(21) asahi Ø teru
morning-sun  shine
'the morning-sun shines'

(22) tori Ø tatu
birds  fly
'birds fly'

In examples (21) and (22), the first NP is the subject of the sentence, because the predicate in both examples is intransitive. The NP next to the predicate is considered to be the subject from a semantic standpoint. There are two possibilities to consider according to his view. First, if we single out the predicate, we can then find its subject. Thus in (21) something shines and in (22) something flies. Immediately before those predicates, there is a noun which can be subject. The morning-sun can "shine," and birds can "fly." They are possible subjects given the meaning of the predicate. The second
possibility will work the opposite way. In this case, there is a noun which can be the subject (or the object) of the predicate. Thus in (21) the morning-sun does something and in (22) birds do something. What follow those nouns are intransitive verbs. In terms of the meaning of the verbs, it is quite natural to regard them as the predicate of the preceding noun.

The examples above appear to give credence to Hashimoto's semantically based explanation for the absence of explicit case marking. However, the examples we have looked at are intransitive constructions. When we consider a transitive construction, we can see that the semantic explanation alone cannot account for the phenomenon. In the construction [NP NP V], if both NP’s are semantically appropriate for being either the subject or the object, we predict by Hashimoto's hypothesis the construction is ambiguous between [SOV] and [OSV]. On the contrary, the construction is always interpreted as [SOV]. Consequently, Hashimoto’s semantically oriented hypothesis cannot be considered appropriate because of its inability to deal with this nonambiguity.

Finally, I will discuss Kobayashi’s word order hypothesis. This hypothesis says that the word order designated both the nominative and accusative cases without taking any markers in Old Japanese. For example, in the transitive construction [NP NP V], the first NP is in the nominative case (subject) and the NP next to the verb is in the accusative case (object). The NP’s do not carry explicit case marking; rather their case is given by the particular position in the sentence in
which they occur. This hypothesis has the advantage of being able to explain the nonambiguity of [NP NP V]. The hypothesis correctly predicts that the construction is to be interpreted as [SOV], not [OSV], because the word order decides the nominative case (subject) and the accusative case (object). Similarly, in the intransitive construction given in (21) and (22), the word order hypothesis predicts the first NP to be the subject; in the transitive construction given in (17)-(19), the hypothesis correctly predicts that the NP next to the verb is the object. I provisionally conclude then that the word order hypothesis is correct when the NP's are not explicitly marked for case. In the next section, I will elaborate on this hypothesis. I will also propose another way in which the accusative case was marked in Old Japanese, namely, by o.

2.3. O as the Accusative Case Marker in Old Japanese

In the preceding section, various hypothesises about the missing case marker were examined based on the grammarian's consensus that there was no specific marker to indicate the accusative case in Old Japanese. In this section, I will propose that the accusative case marker o already existed in Old Japanese. I will show that the occurrence of this accusative o had nothing to do with word order or meaning of words. I will start out by investigating the distribution of o.

2.3.1. Where O Does Not Occur

As we have already seen, in a simple sentence, the object NP
appears without any explicit case marking.

(23) {imo og matu

love wait

'wait for my love'

What is important to note here is that nothing can intervene between the object NP and the verb, not even an adverb. This is a very strong argument for Kobayashi's word order hypothesis: when there is not an explicit case marking for accusative case, it is word order that designates this case, i.e., the NP immediately preceding a transitive verb is the object (accusative case). The requirement imposed by word order is very strict; the object NP must be right next to the verb without anything coming between them. When there is no explicit accusative case marking, then the word order of the sentence is rigid, unlike the relatively free word order of present-day Japanese.

2.3.2. o as Emphatic Marker

Although it is common in Old Japanese for both the nominative and accusative cases to be indicated with no markers as shown in the foregoing examples, there are many other examples which have o as an emphatic marker. The use of o as an emphatic marker is said to be the beginning stage of the later o, the object marker.

Kobayashi (1970) states that o is the oldest exclamatory particle from which o for the accusative case developed. He gives the following examples to illustrate this use of o as an exclamation (Ibid:247).
(24) kaganabete yo ni wa kokonoyo hi ni wa tooka o
days total night nine night days ten days
'the number of days is, altogether, of nights, nine, and
of days, ten'

(25) yaegaki tukuru sono yaegaki o
many-fences build that
'I build a many-fenced palace: Ah, that many-fenced
palace' 8

Hashimoto (1969) also mentions that the origin of the case marker o
appears to be a particle expressing exclamation which followed any kind
of segment in a sentence. Such relationships as usually described with
the case marker o did not require any specific particles. Later the
sense of exclamation gradually faded away. It presumably ended up with
the new role of o, namely it came to be considered a marker of the
relationship between the segment preceding o and its predicate. Even in
the Nara Period, non-use of o was the common form. Hence o was
supposedly added when and only when it was necessary to express the word
relationship emphatically or clearly, or sometimes for the purpose of
rhythm. Later the frequency of occurrence of o gradually increased and
o came to be used primarily as an object marker (Ibid:117-18). 9

Following are some other examples of the use of o as an emphatic
marker.

(26) Imo ga se mo tugite mimasi o
sweetheart house continually want to see
Yamato naru Ōshīma no ne ni ie mo aramasi o (91)
in top in house hope to stand
'To be able to see continually the surroundings of my
love's house, oh, might my house stand on the top of
Ōshīma in Yamato'

(27) kono tosi goro o (192)
this year
'during this (mourning) year'
The next example includes o in two different places.

(28) A o matu to kimi ga nurekemu asibiki no
I wait in order to you might get wet (epithet)
yama no sizuku ni naramasimono o (108)
mountain (dew)-drop wish (I) could become oh
'O would I could become a (dew)-drop of the mountains
(the foot-dragging ones) in which you, my lord, will
have got wet waiting for me'

Note that, in (28), there are two occurrences of o. The first o
seems to be close to its use as the object marker in modern Japanese
from a semantic standpoint, whereas the second o is clearly the emphatic
marker which was common in Old Japanese.

2.3.3. Where O Must Appear as a Case Marker

We have seen that in a simple sentence, the accusative case is
designated by a strict word order. The NP next to a transitive verb is
considered as the object (accusative case). When o does appear, it is
used as an emphatic marker;  in this usage can attach to any segment of a sentence including just to an NP.

In this subsection, I will present cases in which  as accusative case marking must appear. The existence of this obligatory  has never been noted before. This  is evidence that  as accusative case marker clearly existed in Old Japanese, contrary to the belief of traditional grammarians.

Observe the following examples in which  appears as the object marker as in modern Japanese.

(29) sima  miru toki
       island see when
       'when I look on the island'

(30) Uti no Oomaetukimi Fujiwara no maetukimi, Uneme Yasumiko
       lord
       makisi toki tukuru  uta issyu
       married when composed poem a piece of
       'Poem composed when Fujiwara, the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal took the  as his wife'

These examples are subordinate clauses in the middle of which (not the end)  appears. A subordinate clause is the place where an exclamatory particle is least likely to occur. Consequently,  in these examples is not likely to be used emphatically. In addition, example (30) is the title of a poem and there is no reason to include exclamatory particle to explain a poem objectively. I examined 36 sentences (among 249 sentences) in  which include a transitive
relative clause. With four exceptions, every object NP occurs with ə. The object never appears "bare," as it does commonly in simple sentences. From this, I conclude that ə as an accusative marker had a full-fledged existence in Old Japanese. Below I will give the reason why ə must appear in relative clauses but not in simple sentences.

2.3.4. Accusative ə and Verb Inflection

From the discussion above, we can make these two points concerning accusative case in Old Japanese:

(i) In simple sentences, the accusative case is represented with no case markers. It is designated by strict word order.

(ii) In relative clauses, the accusative case is indicated by ə.

Why must the accusative case be indicated by ə in relative clauses when word order is sufficient in simple sentences? When we compare relative clauses with simple sentences, we find only one difference between them. In a relative clause, the verb placed before the head noun is in the attributive form (ren'aikei). This is different from the verb in a simple sentence, which must be in the conclusive form (shūshikei). It is this difference in verbal inflection that somehow gives rise to the different ways in which the accusative case is designated in simple sentences and in relative clauses. 13

2.3.4.1. The Nominal Nature of Attributive Form

To see why ə as accusative case marker must appear in relative clauses, then, it is necessary to examine the nature of the attributive
form of the verb. This is the form in which the verb appears in every relative clause.

The crucial point about the attributive form is that, unlike the conclusive form, it is one inflected form of a verb but it also can function as a nominal. My hypothesis is as follows. The object NP in a simple sentence, which lacks case marking, can be "assigned" accusative case by word order because it occurs next to the conclusive form, which is a "straightforward" verb. In a relative clause, however, the verb is in the attributive form, hence word order per se cannot "assign" accusative case to the object NP. Consequently, an explicit case marker in the form of _o must attach to the NP.

I have already mentioned in Chapter 1 that the attributive form of a verb has a nominal connotation by nature. A stronger argument that the attributive form may be used as a nominal is that it can function as a nominal in some instances. First observe the following examples given by Sansom (1946:71).^{14}

(31) tori _naku
    bird(s) sing
    'birds sing'

(32) tori _no _naku _o kikazu
    bird(s) singing hear-not
    'he does not hear the birds singing'

He mentions that in (31) _naku is a verb, but in (32) it is a noun. He further explains that "attributive words in Japanese have special substantial forms or substantial uses of others" (Ibid:71). Observe
another example also given by Sansom (1946:134).

(33) umaruru wa uresiku sinuru wa kanasiki koto nari
    being born joyful dying sad thing is
    'birth is a joyful, death a sad thing'

He explains this particular function of the attributive form of a verb in the following manner. In (33), the attributives themselves are equal to the English infinitive, 'to be born' and 'to die' (Ibid:134). It is clear, then, that the attributive form could function as a nominal semantically. Furthermore, this is syntactically plausible when its structural environment is taken into consideration. Given a construction, the place taken by the attributive form of a verb can be replaced with nominals. For example, in (32) naku can be substituted by a nominal, koe 'voice/birds'song'. Also in (33) umaruru and sinuru can be replaced by their nominal equivalents tanzyoo 'birth' and si 'death', respectively. We can see then that it is the nominal nature of the attributive form which causes the accusative o to appear in relative clauses. Because it is nominal in nature, an attributive form of the verb cannot "assign" the accusative case through word order. Since the accusative case must be assigned to the object NP for the sentence to be grammatical, o is attached to the NP. In a simple sentence, on the other hand, the conclusive form is a straightforward verb, hence it can "assign" the accusative case through word order. The o in a relative clause is a "pure" case marker, leading us to conclude that o as the accusative case marker had a full-fledged existence in Old Japanese.
2.3.5. Further Evidence: Kakarimusubi

I consider the peculiar nature of the verb in the attributive form responsible for the appearance of  as the accusative case marker. I have so far examined only relative clauses to support this hypothesis.

To give further evidence for this hypothesis, I also examined simple sentences which end in verbs in the attributive form. Such a sentence results from the rule of kakarimusubi. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, this rule requires a verb to be in the attributive form.

The results are as follows: Among 208 examples, there are 34 cases governed by the kakari particles, each requiring the verb to be in the attributive form. Every one of these verbs is a matrix verb, not a verb in a subordinate clause. In those 34 sentences, every object is marked by  or one of the kakari particles regardless of the word order.

There are no exceptions to the object standing by itself in a sentence which ends with a verb in the attributive form. Below are three examples from the 34 cases of kakarimusubi I examined.

(34) ...ama to  miramu tabiyuku were  (3607)

fisherman as consider traveling I

'would they consider me who go on the journey as a fisherman'

(35) ...itu to  were  iwai maturamu (3659)

when I praying to gods wait

'(my wife) thinking "When?" (will be return) probably wait for me, invoking the gods' blessing"
(36) ...kimi ga mi-hune お いと て かまたむ
you fine boat when wait
'when may we await your fine boat back?'

This gives further evidence that the accusative case marker お appears because the verb is in the attributive form which is nominal in nature. This お appears regardless of whether the object NP is in the subordinate clause or the matrix clause if its verb is in the attributive form.

2.3.6. **Accusative Case and Word Order**

The analysis in the preceding subsections leads us to the following two points concerning the accusative case marking in Old Japanese.

(i) In a simple sentence, the accusative case was indicated by word order. Here, Kobayashi's word order hypothesis is correct.

(ii) On the other hand, in a relative clause construction and in any other construction where the verb is in the attributive form, the accusative case marker お must appear to indicate this case. This shows that お as a "pure" case marker existed in Old Japanese, its occurrence completely predictable from the grammar.

We have already seen that in a simple sentence with a verb in the conclusive form, the object NP appears without any case marking, the accusative case being assigned through word order. For this assignment to occur, the NP must be adjacent to the verb, hence the word order in
such a sentence is very rigid.

Our hypothesis predicts that when the accusative case marker \( o \) appears because of the presence of the attributive form, the word order can be relatively free. This is because the object NP is not dependent on word order to receive the accusative case. Rather, the case marker itself assigns the accusative case to the NP. We predict then, that items can occur between NP \( o \) and the verb. This prediction is borne out, as illustrated below.

(37) miyoko \( o \) Nara ni utusiri no\( t \)\( 16 \)
capital to removed after

'after (the emperor) removed the capital to Nara'

(38) Hizikata no otome \( o \) Hatsuse-yama ni yakihaburu toki\( 17 \)
lady Mt. Hatsuse in cremate occasion

'the occasion to cremate Lady Hizikata in Mt. Hatsuse'

Where the object NP receives its case by word order, I found no examples in which something intervened between the object NP and the verb in the conclusive form. However, when \( o \) attaches to the NP, it is common for something to occur between the object NP and the verb in the attributive form.

2.3.7. \( o \) in Modern Japanese

As mentioned in the previous subsections, in a simple sentence in Old Japanese accusative case marking was indicated by word order. However, in a construction where the verb is in the attributive form, the accusative case must be marked by the marker \( o \). Thus the accusative
case marker _o_ existed in Old Japanese.

In modern Japanese, the accusative case is always marked by _o_ in both a matrix sentence and an embedded sentence. In other words, of the two possible ways of assigning accusative case in Old Japanese, by word order and by _o_, modern Japanese has essentially chosen only the latter assignment by the use of particle _o_. We can explain this change from Old Japanese to modern Japanese in the following way. Before the merger of the conclusive form into the attributive form, the marker _o_ had to appear on the object NP if the predicate was in the attributive form. After the change of verbal conjugation, the attributive form took over the position occupied by the conclusive form, i.e., as the main verb. Because only the conclusive form was able to "assign" accusative case by order, when it was taken over by the attributive form, _o_ came to be required even in simple sentences. This is the reason, based on our hypothesis, for the appearance of _o_ in both subordinate and matrix sentences in post-Old Japanese. It should be noted that none of the previously proposed hypotheses offers an explanation about this change in the distribution of _o_ from Old Japanese to modern Japanese.

Explanation above assumes that the appearance of _o_ in simple sentences is due to the occurrence of the attributive form, which is nominal in nature, in the sentence final position after the change in verb conjugation. The one problem with this explanation is that, in modern Japanese, a matrix verb shows no characteristic of use as a nominal, but rather, it is a "pure" verb very much like the Old Japanese conclusive form. We can only speculate on why _o_ occurs in matrix
sentence in spite of this. The verb conjugation, which is responsible for the regular appearance o in the matrix sentence, occurred over a long period of time. We can speculate that when this change was completed, the attributive form came to exist as a "pure" verb of modern Japanese. But while this change was slowly taking place, the occurrence of o in the matrix sentence was established as a part of Japanese grammar. Even after the attributive form came to be a "pure" verb, thus technically making the occurrence of o unnecessary, the part of the grammar that requires o everywhere was kept. Hence in modern Japanese, o occurs even with "pure" verbs. This can only be a speculation, and I hope to continue research to confirm this.
Notes: Chapter 2

1 Examples and translations are taken from Jorden (1963). I have furnished individual glosses.

2 In addition, Hashimoto introduces some examples which are unique in Old Japanese. See Hashimoto (1969:110-15).

3 He divides the use of お into five cases which are based on the nature of verbs used. See, for example, Yamada (1936:413-15).

4 These examples are cited from Manyoshu, I, translated and edited by Takagi et al. (1957). The English translations are from The Manyoshu by Pierson (1931). I examined volume 2 which was written in the early eighth century. The number in parentheses refers to Kokka taikan number.

5 In this thesis modern romanization is used to transcribe Old Japanese, namely onou for omohu.

6 Ge in (39) is the genitive case marker, i.e., 'of' in English.

7 Imo is a pronoun referring to one's wife, sweetheart or sister.

8 Translation of (24) and (25) are cited from Kojiki (Philippi 1968).

9 Hashimoto (1969) also briefly mentions the phonological change of お. お was formerly お which came to be pronounced お in the middle of the Heian Period (Ibid:116). Ono (1977) speculates on the development of お as an object marker in the following way. When Chinese writing (kanbun) was read in the native Japanese way, お was always attached to mark
objects. This would greatly contribute to the frequent use of accusative お (Ibid:19).

10 This example is the title of the poem of Kokka tairan number 95.


12 These four exceptions which I found are as follows:

(i) Katusaka no Mama no irie ni utinabiku
in bay in bending and yielding

tamamo karikenu Tekona si omooyu (433)
fine seaweed will have cut recollect

'To my memory comes spontaneously the beautiful girl Tekona who will have cut and reap the fine seaweed bending and yielding (with the waves) in the bay of Mama in Katsushika.'

(ii) Aratae no Huzie no ura ni suzuki turu ama (epithet)
(bay in perch fish fisherman

to ka mizamu tabiyuku ware o (252)
consider traveling I

'Would they consider me as a fisherman angling perch in the bay of Fujie minding of coarse hempen cloth? I who am travelling'

(iii) Omiya no uti made kikoyu abiki-su

Imperial Palace inside as far as reach one's ear draw a net
to ago totonouru ama no yōbīgoe (238)
fisherboys arrange fisherman cry

'Oh! The fishermen's cries calling together and arranging in order the fisherboys and girls saying: "We are going out to
draw the nets!' they resound unto the inner part of the Imperial Palace.'

(iv) Ana miniku sakasira o su to sake nomanu hito o
      ugly   try to be smart   drink(not) person
      yoku  mireba saru ni kamo niru    (344)

'If one observes carefully such people who do not drink sake thinking: "I will play the sake!" How ugly it is; surely they will resemble monkeys.'

The example in (i), tamamo karu 'reaping fine seaweed,' is an idiom. Hence tamamo karu is a fixed transitive expression without o. The other three are not clearly established as idiomatic expressions. However, their usage without o was common. For example, suzuki turu 'fishing perch' lacks o in a relative clause' but it is common for the word turu 'fish (something)' to take no object marker.

13 S. miyagawa suggested that this may be due to the occurrence of the attributive form of a verb in relative clauses. Dr. miyagawa, in personal communication, suggested that I also look at the possibility that o as an accusative marker existed in the kakarimusubi construction, in which the verb is also in the attributive form.

14 Examples and translations are cited from Sansom (1946). I have furnished the glosses.

15 Examples are taken from Takagi et al., trans. and eds., Manyōshū, IV (1962). Translations are from Pierson (1963). I have furnished the glosses.

16 Examples are taken from Takagi et al., Manyōshū, I (1957). This
is the explanation of the poem No.260 which I translated.

17 This is the title of the poem No.428.
CHAPTER 3
GA/NO RELATIVE CLAUSE

In modern Japanese, ga and no can be interchanged in a relative clause. In an independent sentence, ga mainly functions as a nominative case marker, and no is the genitive case marker. Traditional grammarians and linguists give different explanations for this phenomenon. All of the explanations have in common the assumption that ga and no occur in the same structure, i.e., a sentence ([ S NP ga/no V ] N ]).

The research in Old Japanese, which I presented in the previous chapters, show that ga-relative clauses and no-relative clauses are in different structures. I will propose that the modern Japanese ga and no relative clauses are remnants of these Old Japanese structures, and hence have different structures. I will first explain the traditional grammarian's view, then I will review a transformational approach, the Ga-No Conversion. Finally, I will give evidence for structural difference between the two types of relative clauses.

3.1. Review of Past Hypotheses

3.1.1. Grammarian's View

Grammarians believe that there is no structural difference between a relative clause with ga or one with no; in both the attributive phrase which precedes its head noun is always analyzed as a sentence. Thus ga and no have the same function, and can be used interchangeably without changing the meaning of the relative clause. For example, Yamada
(1936:410) explains that underlined in (1) shows the nominative case within the attributive clause.¹

(1)  uguisu  no kite naku ume  no ki

Japanese nightingale come sing plum tree

'the plum-tree that Japanese nightingales come and sing'

According to this, example (1) is considered to be a free alternant of a clause that has ga in the place of no, as illustrated in (2).

(2)  uguisu  ga/no  kite naku ume  no ki

\[
\text{[[ NP \ ga/no \ P \ S ] N \ NP]}
\]

3.1.2. Ga-No Conversion

Modern linguists treat the interchangeability of ga and no with the so-called Ga-No Conversion. The most crucial point here is that they also believe that ga-relative clause and no-relative clause have the same structure, namely the sentence precedes the head noun.

3.1.2.1. Review of Harada

According to Harada (1971), the particle ga is optionally converted into the particle no typically in relative clauses without changing structure. Basically his formulation of the "Ga-NO Conversion" rule can be illustrated in the following manner.

(3) \[
\text{[[ NP \ ga \ P \ S ] N \ NP]} \implies \text{[[ NP \ no \ P \ S ] N \ NP]}
\]

Harada further argues that there are two groups of speakers that
differ in their judgement of the outputs of Ga-No Conversion. He states that this difference is simply a matter of idiolectal variation. Observe the following given by Harada (the parenthesized asterisk indicates that the sentence was judged as acceptable by one group of speakers but as unacceptable by the other group.)

(4) a. Watakusi wa Nixon ga uso o tuite iru koto o lie telling be satotta.
realized
'I realized that Nixon was telling a lie.'

b. (*)Watakusi wa Nixon no uso o tuite iru koto o
satotta.

The sentence (b) is judged as acceptable by one group of speakers but as unacceptable by the other group. He calls the former "speakers of Dialect A" and the latter "speakers of Dialect B." He explains that this disagreement about the acceptability of the output of Ga-No Conversion is due to the existence of an intervening element between the no phrase and the verb. Speakers of Dialect A allow such an element, while Dialect B speakers do not. Unlike (4b), (5b) below, derived by Ga-No Conversion from (5a), is accepted by both groups of speakers.

(5) a. Taroo ga yonda hon
read book
'the book which Taro read'

b. Taroc no yonda hon

The difference between (4b) and (5b) is that the latter has no
intermediate element between the no-phrase and its verb. On the other hand, in (4b), the ga-phrase, Nicon ga, is separated from the main verb tutti iru by the object NP, waco. Thus the difference between (4b) and (5b) is the presence or absence of elements between the no-phrase and the main verb. According to Harada, Ga-No Conversion for speakers of Dialect A is as follows:

(6) Ga-No Conversion for speakers of Dialect A

\[ X-1Y-NP-ga-(A)-PRED S^1 N_{NP} \text{-} W \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
1 & 2 & 3 & \text{no} & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

On the other hand, for the speakers of Dialect B, the following rule is applied:

(7) \[ X-1Y-NP-ga-PRED S N_{NP} \text{-} W \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
1 & 2 & 3 & \text{no} & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array}
\]

Harada states that "if more than one element [intervene] between the ga-phrase and the main verb, Ga-No Conversion cannot be applied even for the speakers of Dialect A" (Harada 1971:28-33).

3.1.2.2. Review of Shibatani

Shibatani (1975) proposes a different version of Ga-No Conversion. In addition to the rule in (3), he introduces an output condition to account for the acceptability of the b-type (no) sentence in (4). He gives the following:
(8) **Output Condition on NP no NP**

If the sequence of *NP no NP* could be a well-formed NP with respect to the context of the sentence, then it must be such an NP in the surface structure under consideration (Ibid:475).

With the above condition he analyzes the acceptability of the following sentences, the same type of sentence pair as (4) (Ibid:473-74).

(9) a. 

friend with

'the book Taro bought with a friend'

b. *Taro no tomodati to kat-ta hon

(10) a. Daremo Taro ga Amerika e kita koto o sir-ana-i.

no one come-pastComp. know-Neg-Pres.

'No one knows that Taro came to America.'

b. Daremo Taro no Amerika e kita koto o sir-ana-i.

The output condition in (8) explains the unacceptability of (b) sentence in (9) and the acceptability of (b) in (10) in the following manner. "Taro no Amerika is least likely to be a well-formed NP due to semantic reasons," but "Taro no tomodati 'Taro's friend' could be a well-formed NP." To avoid such *NP no NP* output, he argues for the following perceptual rule that isolates the genitive construction (Ibid:474-75). This rule will be applied to a given structure to single out a well-formed NP as mentioned in (8).
(11) X NP no NP Y \rightarrow X [ NP no NP ] Y

Shibatani concludes that "what the blocking of Ga-No Conversion Rule in the environment in question entails is systematic avoidance of the NP no NP sequence resulting from the NP ga NP sequence" (Ibid:474).

The weakness of the rule is that it cannot apply to every NP no NP sequence. Some might accept even the example (9b) which should be unacceptable according to his rule. That is because the basis of his rule is semantic/pragmatic. Speakers differ widely on what are semantically/pragmatically acceptable [NP no NP] constructions.

To summarize, traditional grammarians treat the interchangeability of ga and no in relative clauses as an arbitrary choice. For them ga and no have essentially the same function. They consider ga-relative clause and no-relative clause as being the same structure, namely, [NP ga/no V] is a sentence which precedes its head noun in a relative clause. The so-called Ga-No Conversion is based on the same idea: the rule assumes that [NP ga/no V] is a sentence.

3.2. Similarities of Relative Clause in Modern Japanese and Old Japanese

Taking the above analyses into consideration, I am going to examine the phenomenon in a different way. The research on Old Japanese which I presented in the previous chapters suggests that in a relative clause, the embedded sentence within a noun phrase might not be a "pure" sentence. As previously mentioned, the subject marker ga in modern Japanese developed as a result of the change in verbal conjugation. Before the change took place, syntactically ga functioned in the same
way as _no_ did, i.e., it appeared as a genitive marker in noun phrases and embedded sentences, but not in a "pure" sentence. In Old Japanese, there was a clear distinction between the attributive form and the conclusive form in a verb. At that time, both _ga_ and _no_ were not subject markers, rather they functioned to link two noun phrases. Schematically, such occurrence of _ga_ and _no_ in Old Japanese is analyzed as follows:

\[(12) \quad [[\text{NP}] \quad _ga/_no \quad [\text{V} \text{NP}] \text{NP}]\]

Observe the following examples.

\[(13) \text{ wa } _ga \quad yuku \quad miti\]

I going road

'the road where I walk. Lit. my going road'

\[(14) \text{ hito } _no \quad uuru \quad ta\]

people cultivating rice field

'the rice field which people cultivate. Lit. people's cultivating rice field'

Those predicates in relative clauses above are in the attributive form and are said to be in the attributive relation with the following noun.

Turning to modern Japanese, when we consider the structure of a relative clause, we find a similarity with that of Old Japanese. For example, almost the same relative clause as those mentioned in examples (13) and (14) do exist in modern Japanese. One thing that we have to notice here, however, is a difference in the form of predicates in a relative clause. In Old Japanese, they are in the attributive form which is differentiated in form from the conclusive form. In contrast,
in modern Japanese this distinction has been lost due to the merger of the conclusive form into the attributive form. The following are the modern Japanese counterpart of the Old Japanese relative clauses in (13) and (14) (some lexical changes have occurred).

(15) wa ga yuku miti (formal written style)

I going road
'the road where I walk/my going road'

(16) hito no ueru ta
people cultivating rice field
'the rice field that people cultivate/people's cultivating rice field'

The fact that there is no difference between the attributive form and the conclusive form in modern Japanese may be the reason why traditional Japanese grammarians consider both ga and no relative clauses to have the same sentence structure, and also why linguists analyzed those structures with Ga-No Conversion within the same structure, namely a sentence. In the next section, a new analysis will be attempted.

3.3. Structures of Ga and No Relative Clauses

In this section, I am going to examine the ga-relative clause and no-relative clause based on the hypothesis that they are different from each other in their structures. Provisional structural configurations for the two relative clauses are illustrated as follows: ²
(17) No-Relative clause

[ NP no [ V N NP ] NP ]

(18) Ga-Relative Clause

[[ NP ga V S ] N NP ]

As shown in (17), in no-relative clause, there is no sentence structure. [V N] is a noun phrase. Thus we find the [ NP no NP ] structure in no-relative clause, which is the structure where no appears since the time of Old Japanese. Although ga has changed from being a genitive marker in Old Japanese to a nominative marker in modern Japanese, no has kept its status of being a genitive marker. As we saw in Chapter 1, no has the rigid Internominal Restriction which requires no to be between nominals. As a proof of it, no can never appear in the place of ga as the nominative case marker in an independent sentence. This suggests that it is not appropriate to consider no in a no-relative clause in terms of the conversion from ga to no in an S. My proposal simply states that no always appears between nominals in both relative clauses and in independent sentences.

3.4. Structural Difference Between Ga and No Relative Clauses

In this section, I will elaborate on my hypothesis by presenting several arguments to support it. My hypothesis briefly mentioned in the previous section is made up of the following two points.

(i) Ga-relative clause and no-relative clause are structurally different. No-relative clause has no sentence structure.
(ii) By analyzing the structure of no-relative clause as in (i), my proposal requires no special rule for the occurrence of no.

Regarding the structural difference in (i), those two relative clauses illustrated are as follows:

\[(A) \quad [[\text{NP} \, \text{ga} \, \text{V} \, \text{S}] \, \text{N} \, \text{NP}]\]

\[(B) \quad [\text{NP} \, \text{no} \, \text{V} \, \text{N} \, \text{NP}] \, \text{NP}\]

This structure of no-relative clause in (B) is based on the research of Old Japanese presented in the previous chapters. In Old Japanese, ga and no were genitive markers. At that time, there was a clear distinction between the attributive form and the conclusive form of a verb. Ga and no appeared in the same structure as that in (B). When the merger of the conclusive form into the attributive form occurred, ga as the nominative marker was established. However, no, which has the rigid Internominal Restriction, has kept its status of being a genitive marker in modern Japanese. Thus we find the [NP no NP] structure in no-relative clause, which is the structure where no appears in Japanese since the time of Old Japanese. No never appears in the place of the nominative ga in an independent sentence.

As for (ii), my proposal can account for the appearance of no in Japanese grammar. The proposed structure of no requires no special rule such as Ga-No Conversion. No in a given no-relative clause is accounted for by a general rule.
3.4.1. MOD Insertion Rule of Kitagawa and Ross

The rule proposed by Kitagawa and Ross (1982) explains that Japanese no is inserted before a noun phrase. Their MOD Insertion Rule (MOD in Japanese is no) is presented in the following manner (X stands for any category functioning as a modifier) (Ibid:39).

(19) [ X NP NP] -----→ [ X MOD NP NP]

Thus my proposal of analyzing no-relative clause as [NP no [V N NP] NP] itself explains the appearance of no without any additional rule. The same rule responsible for insertion of no in simple [ NP no NP ] construction (Taro no hon 'Taro's book') will insert no in no-relative clause.

In the following subsections, I will give four pieces of evidence to support the hypothesis that ga and no relative clauses have different structures. None of the points I will raise have been previously noted in the analysis of ga and no relative clauses.

3.4.2. The Difference in Accentuation Between Ga and No relative Clauses

Tashiro (1953:38) mentions that when two or more than two words are closely connected, the accent of a word tends to dominate others. Terakawa (1951:553) gives the following as one example in the accent of Tokyo Japanese.
(20) atáma ga + itái ———→ atámagaïatai

head    painful    'I have a headache'

He explains that when the accented word is connected with another accented word, only the accent of the first word remains. This loss of accent is also seen in the following examples:

(21) a. hurúi + hón ———→ [ húrui hon ]

old    book    'an old book'

b. samúi + yóru ———→ [ sámui yoru ]

cold    night    'cold night'

In (21), the loss of accent occurs due to the fact that two accented words are combined into one noun phrase. Consequently, when and only when the accented word follows another accented word in the same phrase, the loss of accent occurs in the second accented word.

Observe now the following examples in terms of the loss of accent in no-relative clause in comparison with ga-relative clause.

(22) a. yuki ga húru yóru

b. yuki no húru yoru

(23) a. Taro ga yónda hón

b. Taro no yónda hon

(24) a. minna ga míta kázan

b. minna no míta kazen

As we saw in the above, the loss of accent in the second accented word after ga or no occurs in no-relative clauses, but not in ga-relative clauses. According to this, the VN sequence after no can be considered a new constituent.
If [ V N ] is a constituent, as evidenced by accentuation, what type of phrase is it? Since Japanese is a head-final language, the constituent, [ V N ], is considered a noun phrase. As seen in (19), it explains the appearance of _no_ before an NP in an NP construction. By looking at _ga_ and _no_ relative clauses in terms of accentuation, we see the structural difference between them and also the evidence of analyzing _no_-relative clause as [ NP _no_ [ V N ] NP ].

3.4.3. **Intervening Elements Between Ga/No Phrase and Verb**

When there is an intervening element between a _ga/no_ phrase and a verb, _ga_-relative clauses and _no_-relative clauses differ in terms of acceptability. Martin (1962) mentions that "if the modifying clause is quite long and object is separated from the verb by a number of words, the emphatic _ga_ is usually used" (Ibid:130). He gives the following examples among others (Ibid:131).

(25) Taroo _no_ matte iru tokoro wa ekimae desu.

> waiting is place station square is

>'the place where Taro is waiting is the (square) in front of the station.'

(26) Taroo _ga_ Ootake-san o matte iru tokoro wa ekimae desu.

> waiting is place

station square is

>'the place where Taro is waiting for Miss Otake is the station square.'
Harada (1971) argues that if there is more than one intervening element, the no-relative clause is not acceptable. Thus it is clear that ga-relative clause can have intervening elements between the ga-phrase and the verb, but in case of no-relative clauses, even only one element causes opposing opinions about the acceptability (cf. Harada’s Dialects A and B). This supports our hypothesis. [NP ga V] is a sentence, but NP no sequence is not in the same phrase with V. V is in [ V N ] which is proposed here as an NP. The unacceptability of intervening elements in a no-relative clause suggests that the no-phrase (NP no) and V are not in the same constituent.

3.4.4. Further Evidence to Distinguish Ga/No Relative Clauses

I will consider here a hypothesis made by Bedell (1972). He analyzes no-relative clauses based on the analysis by the Japanese grammarian, Matsushita (1930).

(27) tuki no deru koro

moon emerge time

‘the time the moon rises’

His proposal is the one closest to mine in terms of analyzing the structure of no-relative clause as [ NP no NP NP]. However, there is a crucial difference: he explains the change from ga to no in terms of
restructuring. Thus the above structure is from the following structure.

(28)  

Thus his hypothesis is different from previous hypotheses and the one proposed in this chapter. I will show below that this hypothesis, thought similar to the present one, cannot deal with some facts about no-relative clauses.

3.4.5. Coordinate Relative Structure

Observe the following examples which distinguish those two relative clauses.

(29) a. Hanako _ga_ katte Ziroo _ga_ yonda hon  
   buy read book  
   the book that Hanako bought and Jiro read

   b. Hanako _no_ katte Ziroo _no_ yonda hon

   c. Hanako _ga_ katte Ziroo _no_ yonda hon

   d. Hanako _no_ katte Ziroo _ga_ yonda hon

These examples are coordinate relative clauses that share the same head noun. The acceptability/unacceptability of _no_ in these examples is a strong argument for the proposal made in this chapter. The structure of (b) is [[NP no V] [NP no [V N NP] NP] NP] based on the present hypothesis. This structure explains the unacceptability of the first _no_
and the acceptability of the second no in (b). The first no is not acceptable because it is not between two NPs. However, the second no in the same example is acceptable by its occurrence in an internominal position.

In the same way, example (d) will be analyzed [[[NP no V ] [[[NP ga V g ] N NF]NF]] which shows the unacceptability of no. As for (c), it is grammatical, but it sounds somewhat unnatural. I speculate that this unnaturalness stems from a preference of using the same particle ga in a coordinate structure as seen in (a). Thus, of the three possible alternants of (a), only (c) is grammatical.

To the above, when we apply Ga-No Conversion and also Bedell's Restructuring, we find that they cannot avoid deriving ungrammatical clauses.

Let us first consider Ga-No Conversion. This optional rule will apply to (29a), and derive all of the remaining three examples in (29). In other words, the rule wrongly predicts that (b)-(d) are all grammatical, though, in reality, only (c) is acceptable.

When Bedell's Restructuring is applied to (28a), it derives only ungrammatical (d); it is unable to derive (b) and (c) even though (c) is the only grammatical sequence. If Bedell's Restructuring is applied to both ga in (a), the result is worse than (b): it derives a totally awkward sequence, i.e., *Hansko no Zirco no katte yonda hon, as shown below.
When it applies to only the second ga in (a), it will give the following ungrammatical sequence, which is even worse than (c): *Ziroo no Hanako ga katte yonda hon.

It can only derive ungrammatical (d) by applying it to the first ga in (a) as shown below.

Thus Bedell's Restructuring derives one of the two ungrammatical sentence, but it cannot derive the acceptable (c).
3.4.6. Passive Structure

Observe the next examples.

(33) a. *sono kodomo ga sikararetara heya
   child be scolded room
   'the room where the child was scolded'

   b. *sono kodomo no sikararetara heya

(34) a. *sono kodomo ga sikararetara haako ya
   child be scolded mother
   'the mother whose child was scolded'

   b. *sono kodomo no sikararetara haako ya

   (i) 'the mother whose child was scolded'

   (ii) 'the child's scolded mother'

In (a), the structure is \[[ NP ga V S ] N_\text{NP} \], but in (b) it is

\[[ NP no [ V N_\text{NP} ] \text{NP} \]. Note that the no-relative clause in (33b) is unambiguous, meaning the same as (33a), but the no-relative clause in (34b) is ambiguous. The ambiguity in (34b) can be analyzed with the proposed hypothesis by considering the structure of those ga and no relative clauses which contain a passive structure. The ambiguity arises from the conflict between the nature of the verb sikararetara 'be scolded' and the structure of the no-relative clause in which \[ V N \] is a noun phrase. In (34b), but not in (33b), the head noun happens to be able to be the object of V semantically, i.e., \[ *sikararetara heya 'scolded room, sikararetara haako ya 'the scolded mother. \] This causes the ambiguity in (34b), though in (33b) there is no such ambiguity. The
following illustrates the two possible interpretations of (34b).

(35) (a)  
\[
[\text{sono kodomo}_\text{NP}] \text{no} [\text{sikareseta}_\text{NP}]_\text{NP} \\
(\text{obj}) \quad (\text{V}) 
\]
'the mother whose child was scolded'

(b)  
\[
[\text{sono kodomo}_\text{NP}]_\text{MOD} \text{no} [\text{sikareseta}_\text{NP}]_\text{NP} \\
(\text{V}) \quad (\text{obj})_\text{NP} 
\]
'the child's scolded mother'

Thus the ambiguity in (34b) can be explained by the proposed hypothesis, whereas Ga-No Conversion and Bedell's hypothesis cannot distinguish between (33b) and (34b). Both predict that (34b) as well as (33b) is unambiguous. The Ga-No Conversion converts ga into no in both examples without changing their structure \[[\text{NP} \text{ga/no}_\text{V} \text{S}]_\text{N}_{\text{PE}}\]. Thus it fails to explain why only (34b) is ambiguous in the same sentence structure. Bedell's Restructuring also derives (33b) and (34b). His no-relative clause, however, retains a sentence structure as seen in (27). Therefore his hypothesis cannot predict the occurrence of the meaning 'the child's scolded mother' which causes the ambiguity in (34b). As we have seen, it is clear that ga-relative clauses and no-relative clauses are structurally different, contrary to the consensus among Japanese traditional grammarians and linguists.

3.5. **Summary**

The structural difference between ga-relative clauses and no-relative clauses has been made clear. It was found that the traditional grammarians' "random choice" hypothesis between ga and no in a relative clause and linguists' Ga-No Conversion cannot account for the
appearance of no in a relative clause in a general way. By analyzing a relative clause with no as \[ NP \text{no} [ V N_{NP} ]_{NP} \], the insertion of no can be done with a general rule that is needed anyway for Japanese as we saw in the MOD Insertion Rule in Kitagawa and Ross. Thus no special rule such as Ga-No Conversion is necessary to analyze ga and no relative clauses. They are different structurally, and it is not appropriate to treat them within the same structural frame. In addition, it is not necessary to explain ga and no relative clauses through a restructuring process converting ga into no. The occurrence of ga or no in a relative clause is closely connected with the same form but different function of V, namely the attributive form and the conclusive form. The existence of the attributive form of a verb is again the clue to analyzing a structure in Japanese. Although my proposal has much evidence to support it, it is hoped that further research will be done on following questions.

(1) How to explain the occurrence of the object marker o in a noun phrase, for example, Taro no uso o tuita koto, which usually appears in a sentence. This occurrence of uso o is not predictable from the proposed structure of no-relative clause (\[ NP \text{no} [ V N_{NP} ]_{NP} \]) because of its appearance without no between NPs (cf. Taro no zuygyou no kengaku 'the observation of Taro's teaching'. However, it should be noticed here that only some native Japanese speakers accept this sentence.

(ii) How to avoid such an occurrence of Amerika e no in *Ziuro no
Amerika e no itta koto. This is wrongly predicted from, for example, Ziroo no Amerika e no tabi which has the same [ NP no NP no NP NP ] structure as would be proposed for *[ [ Ziroo ] no [ Amerika e ] no [ itta koto ]]].

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this thesis, I have attempted to analyze the development of the nominative case marker _ga_ and the accusative case marker _o_ and the structural difference between _ga_-relative clauses and _no_-relative clauses in relation to the attributive form of a verb. For each topic, the attributive form of a verb was the key to analysis.

The attributive form played a significant role in the development of _ga_ and _o_ as case markers. The nominative case marker _ga_ was established when the merger of the conclusive form into the attributive form occurred. Before the change, _ga_ as well as _no_ was a genitive case marker, which appeared between nominals. Unlike _no_ which had the rigid Internominal Restriction, _ga_ appeared somewhat freely within the frame of a noun phrase. For example, it appeared in [ P ga NP NP ] and [ NP ga P NP ] constructions, in both of which predicates were in the attributive form. The attributive form of a verb can function as a nominal. Thus the construction above are both NPs. Hence in Old Japanese, _ga_ is still considered to be a genitive marker even though it appeared before or after a verb. After the merger, this attributive form in the [ NP ga P ] construction functioned as the conclusive form.
This is the time when the nominative marker *ga* was established.

In the case of *o*, most traditional Japanese grammarians consider that there was no accusative case marker in Old Japanese. Regarding the absence of markers, two major explanations have been made by grammarians: (i) word order indicated the case; (ii) the meaning of words and the relation among them naturally expressed the case. Of those two, (ii) was shown to be not correct. As for (i), it was judged to be correct only in an independent sentence. The idea that the accusative case marker *o* did not exist in Old Japanese was found to be incomplete: the marker *o* already existed in Old Japanese, and its occurrence was predictable from the grammar. It almost always appeared when the predicate was in the attributive form. This occurrence of *o* was explained in relation to the attributive form of a verb in the following manner. In an independent sentence, the accusative case marker *o* was not phonologically realized and word order indicated the case. However, in attributive clauses, such as relative clauses, the marker *o* did exist when those clause had objects to mark. Since the attributive form of a verb has an additional feature in that it can function as a nominal, the verb could not assign the case as it did in an independent sentence where it was in the conclusive form, a "pure" verb. Consequently, the marker *o* must be inserted after the object. This phenomenon was also observed even in an independent sentence whose verb was in the attributive form, in the *kakarimusubi* construction. These analyses relating to the attributive form of a verb led to the assumption that the attributive phrase in the *no*-relative clause is not
a sentence. The place where no appears has been in an internominal position since the time of Old Japanese.

Based on the analyses in Old Japanese, my proposal was presented. It is that ga and no relative clauses in modern Japanese have different structures and no special rule, such as Ga-No Conversion or Restructuring is necessary to analyze the no-relative clause. By analyzing no-relative clause as [ NP no [ V N NP ] NP ], which has never been proposed before, the occurrence of no is predictable from the grammar.

Thus each chapter concerns the attributive form of a verb, which played a key role in analyzing the structure discussed, especially my proposal regarding no-relative clause which can be seen to have a predecessor in Old Japanese structure. The different usages of the attributive form of a verb was the key: it is one inflected form of a verb and is in an attributive relation to the following nominal. In addition, it has another use which is common in Old Japanese, namely it can function as a nominal. This peculiar nature of the attributive form is the basis for the analysis of each topic. Although the proposal has much evidence to support it, it is hoped that further research will be attempted on questions previously mentioned. It is also hoped that the proposal will provide a different approach in the linguistic analyses on Japanese by looking at its historical development.
Notes: Chapter 3

1 See, for further examples, Hashimoto (1969), Tsukishima (1964) and Yuzawa (1977).

2 In this thesis, I only treat relative clauses which have phonologically full lexical head nouns.

3 This is a particular phenomenon in Tokyo-Japanese which is considered to be the standard Japanese. He mentions that this rule does not apply to Ise-Dialect (Terakawa 1951:553).

4 This example is taken from Kunihiro (1967), P. 221. He explains that the relation between words are different in those two examples, (a) and (b): yuki ga only connects with huru, but yuki no relates to huru yoru. This difference is seen in the pronunciation.

5 Translations are from Martin (1962). I have furnished the glosses.

6 I am indebted to Dr. S. Miyagawa for these examples.
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