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ABSTRACT

This dissertation attempts to shed new light on various issues concerning historical changes undergone by genitive particles in Japanese. It examines not only various historical data (e.g. Man'yōshū, ca. 759 A.D.), but also variations in modern dialects. It also considers relevant crosslinguistic data, such as O(ld)/M(iddle)/Mod(ern) English, O/M/Mod Chinese, M/Mod Korean, O/M/Mod (High) German, Latin, French, Turkish, Yaqui, Quechua, Classical/Mod Tibeto-Burman languages, and Australian languages. Based on this broader approach, this research offers specific claims about Japanese, as well as claims that have significant implications for general linguistics.

Chapter 1 provides preliminary information about Old Japanese (OJ) of the eighth century and Modern Japanese (ModJ). Chapter 2 discusses differences among three genitive particles of OJ, namely ga, no, and tu. Chapter 3 addresses their origins. Chapter 4 is devoted to subject marking by genitives in OJ and other languages. Chapter 5 discusses historical changes undergone by genitive particles, i.e. their development into the nominative ga and the conjunctive ga, the development of theme-marking particles, and the development of quasi-nominal no. Chapter 6 examines dialectal variations in ModJ and historical developments of genitive morphemes in various languages. Chapter 7 offers an overall conclusion.

Regarding the differences between GEN ga and GEN no, I claim in Chapter 2 that the so-called “pejorative/honorific distinction” in Middle Japanese (MJ) was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development based on language use at the time, and that
such distinction was not operative in OJ. GEN tu has been studied less than GEN ga and no, perhaps because it was not very productive in OJ. However, I claim that tu was actually more widely used as a general genitive in the pre-OJ period, and argue for the likelihood of the cognate relationship between OJ GEN tu and Middle Korean GEN s.

As for the origins of GEN ga, no, and tu, Chapter 3 provides thorough reviews and critiques of past studies regarding the issues, and narrows down the possible scenarios. One possible scenario seems to be that GEN no and tu came from copula verbs. Another possible scenario would be that GEN ga and tu came from demonstratives.

GEN-marking of subjects is observable in many languages. It is generally thought to be limited to subordinate clauses. In OJ, however, it is observable in almost all types of clauses, including main clauses, albeit with different frequencies. Based on the OJ data, I claim in Chapter 4 that different frequencies of GEN-marking are attributable to different degrees of clausal nouniness. In other words, each clause is “nony” (or “verby”) to a different degree, and this correlates with GEN-marking of their subjects. I also argue that the different degree of clausal nouniness is a result of what I call “category management” in the domain of the sentence, which is deducible from a more general claim that all (major) categories in a single sentence must be managed along the category squish between noun and verb.

With regard to the development of the conjunctive ga in Chapter 5, I argue against the unidirectionality hypothesis as articulated in grammaticalization theory, and claim that change from subordination towards parataxis is possible as long as two morphological and syntactic conditions are met. In Chapter 5, I also claim that a fundamental restructuring of the theme-marking system for desiderative expressions (‘want to’) occurred in Early Middle Japanese.
In Chapter 6, I argue that different genitive particles in OJ took the same
developmental path in different dialects, i.e. genitive > pronominal genitive > bound
pronominal > nominalizer > sentence particle. Crosslinguistic data show that this process is
not unusual, but simply constrained by the morphology, syntax, and lexicon of each
language. This developmental process also demonstrates that grammaticalization theory
does not - in its present formulation, at least - account for all possible changes in human
language. Based on what we observe with regard to dialectal variation, it can be claimed that
so-called “standard” languages in general do not necessarily represent what speakers must
do (or must have done) with their languages.

One recurring theme throughout this dissertation is how grammars are formulated
for competing forms, structures, and categories, and how those competitions project to
language change. In conclusion, I claim in Chapter 7 that grammar is formulated based on
speech production; there is no grammar formulated without negotiations over meanings and
structures among speakers. In other words, grammar is not autonomous. I also claim that
categories, such as “noun” and “verb”, and “subject” as well, are not given in grammar,
but rather can only be first induced from speech production.
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1.0 Introduction

This introduction covers three kinds of information about what follows. From Section 1.1 to 1.3, I provide an overall introduction to this dissertation, its purposes, organization, methodology, overviews, and implications. Section 1.4 presents preliminary information, i.e. technical issues and selected reference grammar of Old Japanese (OJ). Section 1.5 presents various uses of *ga* and *no* in standard modern Japanese (Std-ModJ), since they are the only genitive particles that have survived from OJ although not quite as such.

1.1 Purpose and Organization

This research attempts to shed new light on various issues concerning historical changes undergone by genitive particles in Japanese. These particles are generally treated as case particles in Japanese linguistics. At the beginning of this research, however, it seems appropriate to cite Martin's (1990: 499) general view on case marking particles in Japanese: "It is perhaps misleading to speak of case marking in Japanese and Korean in the way the term is usually applied to suffixes found in the Indo-European languages. The markers are postpositions much like English prepositions, and we see widespread competition, shifting,
and semantic specialization among formally disparate morphemes and larger structures, just as English locative is marked by ‘at’, ‘in’, or ‘on’; ... .”

Nonetheless, “genitives”, in crosslinguistic terms, basically connect two nouns, expressing such semantic relationships as possession (e.g. Tom’s car) or belonging (e.g. IBM’s employees), and this general definition applies to Japanese genitive particles as well. Although the particular semantic domains expressed by genitives are slightly different in every language, there is no language attested which totally lacks any genitive functions. Because of this universality, the findings and claims in this dissertation have significant implications for our understanding of human language in general.

One recurring theme throughout this dissertation is how grammars are formulated for competing forms, structures, and categories, and how those competitions project to language changes. In the course of discussion, I will examine the coexistence of (or competition among) various genitive particles, various genitive constructions, and the coexistence of GEN(initve)-marking and zero-marking of subjects. I will also consider dialectal variations that involve those competing forms, structures, and categories.

None of the competing situations mentioned above (e.g. role allocations among different genitive particles) can be accounted for by a clear-cut grammar internal only to language. Based on the observations of this research, it should be said that the grammatical status of those competing linguistic items involves historical contingency, including social factors. Also, if based on the observations about the coexistence of GEN-marking and zero-marking of subjects, it should be said that the category “subject” cannot be identified (or defined) by a discrete set of rules such as case-marking. In other words, the category “subject” is not something given in grammar. There is no a priori category “noun”,

2
subject", and such in grammar; categories can only be first induced from speech production. In fact, categorization is a major part of grammar formation.¹

The picture of grammar that emerges in this dissertation is that "grammar is not autonomous"; there is no grammar formulated without negotiations of meanings and structures among speakers. No individual has exactly the same grammar as others. What we can observe as a generalized grammar in a speech community is a result of negotiations through common communicative and psychological processes shared by the speakers (e.g. induction, deduction, abduction, and categorization).²

Also, grammar is not something passed on from generation to generation as a set of rules. What is passed on is, literally, "forms-in-use" (i.e. speech productions, while they keep changing over time), not a "grammar" (i.e. how to use forms). Grammar is constructed each time when a speaker acquires a language, based on input forms and his/her psychological processes, and is constantly being modified, based on such factors as reanalysis, different inputs, and social negotiations of meanings.

If based on this view of grammar, a conclusion about language change which we inevitably reach is that we cannot predict the outcome of language change only by studying a language. It does not mean that language change is completely random. Certainly it is constrained by speech productions and social factors in that speech community. The reason why we observe many similar historical developments in different dialects and languages is perhaps not due to the existence of "universal grammar", but rather due to the fact that communicative and psychological processes of human beings are similar.

¹ Linguistic categorization should work not only for abstract relationships among forms, which may lead to such notions as "subject" and "object", but also for concrete distinctions among things, actions, and situations (e.g. a general naku "cry, etc." for human, animals, and insects in Japanese, but cry, call, sing, warble, twitter, chirp, crow, mew, moo, etc. in English; a general rice in English, but ine "rice plant", kome "rice grain", and gohan "cooked rice" in Japanese).
² See Andersen (1973) for abductive changes.
Apparently, one objection to this view of grammar would ask where speech productions already preconstrained by grammar came from in the first place, if grammar could only be developed based on forms-in-use one encounters. Just as when positing an autonomous grammar, an answer to this question is hypothetical. It is very likely that the relationship between forms and grammar is “chicken and egg”. Just as we do not know essentially why and how ‘snow’ came to be called snow in English and yuki in Japanese, we may not be able to find out why English speakers came to practice certain linguistic behaviors, such as subject-verb agreement, and why Japanese speakers do some others, such as no subject-verb agreement. Perhaps grammar, including the shapes of lexical items, has been formulated in the long history of human beings after acquiring a certain capacity for psychological processes. Quite simply put, if we assume that relationships between forms and meanings are basically arbitrary and determined based on negotiations among speakers over a long history, why should grammar (i.e. how to use forms) be different?

I have presented a few claims above from a broader perspective, but certainly this dissertation alone may not vindicate such ambitious claims beyond doubt. I do hope, however, that this research will in some way contribute to future studies regarding these fundamental issues.

This dissertation is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction that provides preliminary information about Old Japanese (OJ) in the eighth century and standard modern Japanese (Std-ModJ), as well as some technical issues. Chapter 2 discusses differences among three genitive particles of OJ, namely ga, no, and tu. Chapter 3 addresses their origins. Chapter 4 is devoted to subject marking by genitives in OJ and other languages. Chapter 5 discusses historical changes undergone by genitive particles in
Japanese. Chapter 6 examines dialectal variations in ModJ and historical developments of genitive morphemes in various languages. Chapter 7 offers an overall conclusion.

Although all topics are related, each chapter is presented in a relatively free-standing manner. There is thus no need to read sequentially. In order to fully appreciate Chapter 7, however, it is recommended that all the preceding chapters be read beforehand, although all relevant data are briefly reintroduced in Chapter 7.

1.2 Methodology

There is no single integrated treatment in previous research of those issues mentioned above. At their best, past studies claim prescriptively that particular changes undergone by the genitives were the determinate outcomes of prior conditions, based on comparisons between OJ and Std-ModJ. There are, however, serious methodological problems in those studies. First, so-called “Std-ModJ” is based on one variety of today’s Tokyo dialects, and is not a direct descendant of the central (Nara) dialect of OJ. Thus, we cannot simply compare OJ and Std-ModJ. Second, most past studies do not consider crosslinguistic data, and their analyses do not incorporate general linguistic theories. Although Japanese is a rich source of intriguing data, it has not been extensively studied in crosslinguistic context, and past studies have not much contributed to general historical linguistics. To compensate for these shortcomings, this research examines not only various historical data in Japanese, but also dialectal variation in ModJ, as well as a wide range of crosslinguistic data. As for historical data, the earliest collection of Japanese verse, Man'yōshū (ca. 759 A.D.), is the primary source of data, since it provides the largest source of OJ language. For dialect data, I have used Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo (The National

---

3 In this study, “ModJ” generally refers to Std-ModJ, but I will specifically use “Std-ModJ” when necessary, i.e. when concerning dialectal variation.
Language Research Institute) (1989), Hirayama (1997-98), Martin (1975), and my own informants. As for crosslinguistic data, this research considers, for example, O(ld)/M(iddle)/Mod ern English, O/M/Mod Chinese, M/Mod Korean, O/M/Mod (High) German, Latin, French, Turkish, Kanakuru (an African language, belonging to the Chadic language family), Yaqui (an American Indian Language), Quechua (a Latin American Language), Classical/Mod Tibeto-Burman languages, and Australian languages (all modern varieties unless specified otherwise). For these languages, my sources have been reference grammars and research publications. Because of this broader approach, this research should have significant implications for general linguistics.

1.3 Overviews

1.3.1 Differences among Genitive Particles in OJ

There are three major genitive particles in OJ, namely ga, no, and tu.⁴ See the examples below:

(1) a. wa ga se
   [GEN lover] ‘my lover (male)’
   (MYS 1:19)

b. aki no nwo
   [autumn GEN field] ‘autumn field’
   (MYS 20:4318)

c. oki tu nami
   [offing GEN wave] ‘waves in the offing’
   (MYS 15:3583)

⁴ The particle no in ModJ is generally classified as a kaku-joshi (case particle) in Japanese grammar (e.g. Yamada 1936). Hashimoto (1969), however, classifies no as rentaji joshi (adnominal particle), since no always forms a noun-modifying phrase, even when it attaches to an adverbial phrase (e.g. tomodati to no yokusoku [friend with GEN appointment] ‘an appointment with a friend’; tii e no tegami [father to GEN letter] ‘a letter to my father’; daigaku de no koogi [university at GEN lecture] ‘a lecture at the university’). This paper calls no ‘genitive’, which is the most common terminology in crosslinguistic studies for the prototypical functions of no.
Chapter 2 discusses differences among these particles. GEN(itive) ga and no have abundant examples in OJ, while examples of GEN tu are rather limited. Partly because of this fact, past studies concern mainly GEN ga and no.

Regarding the difference between GEN ga and GEN no, the most popular view is that the use of ga expresses a pejorative sense on the noun it marks, while that of no expresses an honorific sense (e.g. Aoki 1952). However, this study claims that the pejorative/honorific distinction was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development, not a distinction essential to ga and no. The general significance of this claim is that people may develop a particular sociolinguistic differentiation in their use of forms that originally had nothing to do with such social distinctions per se. A similar distinction drawn with genitive particles is observable in Middle Korean (e.g. Martin 1992). Also, European languages have developed the well-known T/V (tu-vous) distinction, in which various uses of T/V (originally 'singular you' vs. 'plural you') have come to distinguish, in singular reference, such notions as intimacy and politeness, e.g. French (tu/vous), Russian (ty/vy), Greek (esti/esis), and once English (thou/you).

As mentioned, GEN tu has been studied less than GEN ga and no, perhaps because it was not very productive in OJ and occurs only in fossilized compounds in Std-ModJ. However, this study argues that tu was actually more widely used as a general genitive in the pre-OJ period. Given the likelihood of the cognate relationship between OJ GEN tu and Middle Korean GEN s (see Chapter 3), this claim has significant implications for the genetic relationship between Korean and Japanese, which remains unclear to date.
1.3.2 Origins and Relationships of the Various Genitive Particles

As for the origins of GEN ga, no, and tu, my research does not provide any definitive answers, mainly since the genetic affiliation of Japanese is still unclear. However, it does provide thorough reviews and critiques of past studies regarding the issues, and narrows down the possible scenarios in Chapter 3. The topic involves Japanese-internal considerations, Korean connections, and Altaic connections (e.g. Tungus, Mongol, and Manchu). One possible scenario is that GEN no and tu came from copula verbs (cf. perfective auxiliaries -nu and -tu in OJ, and the use of be in perfectives in English). Another possible scenario is that GEN ga and tu came from demonstratives (cf. proximal demonstrative ko/ka ‘this’, and mesial demonstrative to/so/si ‘that’). Regarding GEN tu particularly, this research argues that it is quite possible that OJ GEN tu and Middle Korean GEN s are cognates. Narrowing down various possibilities into a couple of plausible scenarios, based on reliable data and solid argument, is particularly important for further studies on the genetic relation of Japanese to other languages.

1.3.3 Subject Marking in OJ

Subject marking with genitives is observable in many languages, among them Turkish, Yaqui, Korean, Chinese, and English (e.g. John's being reelected surprised everyone). This phenomenon is generally thought to be limited to subordinate clauses. In OJ, however, it is observable in almost all types of clauses, including main clauses, albeit with different frequencies. This topic has not been thoroughly examined in past studies. Foley and Van Valin (1984) claim that a tighter clause linkage promotes nominalization and GEN-marking of subjects. They do not, however, explain why it leads to nominalization and GEN-marking. In Chapter 4, I argue that different frequencies of GEN-marking of
subjects are attributable to different degrees of clausal nouniness, and that the different
degree of clausal nouniness is a result of what I call “category management” in the domain
of the sentence. Setting aside the details, this claim has significant implications for our
understanding of human language. First, it supports the claim that categories such as
“verb” and “noun” are not discrete, but rather form a continuum (cf. Ross 1972; for
classical Japanese, Quinn 1987). Second, it suggests that category analysis is manifested,
or occurs, only as a component in a sentence, not as an isolated word or phrase. These two
points are especially relevant to psycholinguistics, i.e. how language works in the human
mind.

1.3.4 Historical Developments out of Genitives

There are a few well-recognized historical developments of genitive particles in OJ.
It is generally agreed that GEN *ga* developed into NOM(inative) *ga* in ModJ. Also, GEN *ga* is thought to have developed into CONJ(unctive) *ga* in ModJ. Consider the following
two examples of NOM *ga* and CONJ *ga* in Std-ModJ:

(2) a. *Ame ga hutte-iru.*
    rain NOM fall(Ger)-be
    ‘The rain is falling.’

    b. *Gakkoo ni itta ga, dare mo i-nakatta.*
    school LOG went but who even be-Neg(Perf)
    ‘Although (I) went to school, no one was there.’

The most basic approach in past studies to these changes over time has been to compare
data from different time periods, and characteristics of *ga* and *no* observable in historical
documents in each time period have been well-studied in the previous research. Chapter 5
offers an overview of these studies. There are four major topics: (i) development of GEN
*ga* into NOM *ga*; (ii) development of GEN *ga* into CONJ *ga*; (iii) development of theme-
marking particles for desiderative expressions (semantic themes: entities affected by actions or states expressed by predicates); and (iv) the so-called "juntai joshi" (quasi-nominal particle) *no*.

Hopper and Traugott (1993), as part of the so-called "grammaticalization theory" (e.g. Heine and Reh 1984; Traugott and Heine 1991a/b), claim that clause combining develops unidirectionally as follows: parataxis > hypotaxis > subordination. Section 5.3, however, demonstrates that the development of CONJ *ga* in Japanese is a case of change from subordination towards parataxis (the original idea in Ishigaki 1955). Based on the examination of a wide range of crosslinguistic data, such as Korean, Tibeto-Burman languages, and Australian languages, I propose morphological and syntactic conditions for the change from subordination towards parataxis, and claim that this direction of change is not merely an "exception" in language change, as often grammaticalizationists treat counterexamples only based on the number of cases.

Section 5.4 claims that a fundamental restructuring of the theme-marking system for desiderative expressions (i.e. 'want to') occurred in Early Middle Japanese, and that zero-marking became the default, and competed with GEN *ga/no*-marking and ACC *wo*-marking. It is generally thought that *ga*-marking (< GEN) is the standard (or even "correct one") in ModJ, but zero-marking and ACC-marking are still productive in many modern Japanese dialects. Their complex geographical distribution cannot be accounted for by dialectal spread; rather, it is a result of dialect-internal developments. Therefore, it should be concluded that *ga*-marking is not the outcome of inevitable historical changes.
1.3.5 Developmental Processes: Dialectal Variations and Crosslinguistic Data

I argue in Chapter 6 that different genitive particles of OJ took the same developmental path in different dialects, i.e. genitive > pronominal genitive (cf. English *It's John's* [John-GEN-one]) > bound pronominal (cf. *your-s* [you(GEN)-one]) > nominalizer (cp. *That prices are high is the problem*) > sentence final particle (assertion, questions, explanations, etc., but no equivalent in English). However, we will see that the choice of a particular genitive particle was not made based only on reasons internal to language. More generally, it can be claimed that so-called "standard" languages in general do not necessarily represent what speakers must do (or must have done) with their languages. This claim has significant implications for methodologies in all linguistic studies. Also, crosslinguistic data (English, Chinese, Korean, German, and French) show that the historical changes of genitive morphemes presented in this research are not unusual; rather they are simply constrained by the morphology, syntax, and lexicon of each language. This study also demonstrates that grammaticalization theory, which claims that linguistic items change unidirectionally from "more semantically concrete" to "more grammatically functional", does not account for all possible changes in human language. Chapter 6 does not require any prior knowledge of OJ, and readers who are only interested in questions pertaining to grammaticalization theory may move on to Chapter 6 directly. (Chapter 5, Section 5.3.2 also concerns grammaticalization theory.)

1.4 Preliminaries

This section provides preliminary information for this dissertation. It consists of two parts. Section 1.4.1 explains technical issues, which are necessary for all readers. It also provides some grammatical notes. Section 1.4.2 is intended to provide a
supplementary reference grammar of OJ for readers who are not familiar with OJ, at a
minimum level to follow this dissertation. For such readers, it may be better to read this
material beforehand, but it may also work to move on to actual discussions first and come
back to this section as necessary.

1.4.1 Technical Issues

1.4.1.1 Historical Division of the Japanese Language

Following the common practice in Japanese linguistics, this paper employs the
following historical divisions of the Japanese language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before 710 A.D.</td>
<td>pre-OJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Nara</td>
<td>Old Japanese (OJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794 Heian</td>
<td>Early Middle Japanese (EMJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086 Insei Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192 Kamakura</td>
<td>Middle Japanese (MJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338 Muromachi</td>
<td>MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603 Edo</td>
<td>Early Modern Japanese (EModJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 1868 Meiji</td>
<td>Modern Japanese (ModJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Historical division of the Japanese language

1.4.1.2 Central Dialect

Since the fourth century, the capital was moved around in Nara prefecture, then to
the city of Nara in the OJ period (710 A.D.), and to Kyoto in the EMJ period (794). The
term “central dialect” in this dissertation refers to the dialect(s) which was (were) spoken in
these capitals.

---

5 The late Heian period from 1086 is often referred to as “the Insei period”.
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1.4.1.3 Orthographic Conventions; Romanization

This dissertation basically adopts *kunrei-shiki* ‘official form’ romanization for ModJ, except for the use of double vowels instead of circumflex (\(^\))\(^\); e.g. *aa* for ą; *uu* for ū; *oo* for ŏ, thus *kyoo* ‘today’ instead of *kyô*. Following common practice, however, proper nouns (e.g. individual names, book titles, place names) and Japanese linguistic terms are provided in the Hepburn romanization system for the reference purpose, except that a circumflex (\(^\)) is used instead of macron, e.g. *jodôshi* ‘auxiliaries’. Even in this modified Hepburn system, the circumflex may be omitted for proper nouns or place names known to English speakers, e.g. “Tokyo” instead of “Tôkyô”.

OJ and MJ data basically follow the Japanese orthography (*kyû-kanazukai*), e.g. MJ *kiyau* ‘capital’ for ModJ *kyoo*. Given the well-accepted change sequence, [p] > [f] > [h], the phoneme /h/ in ModJ is transcribed as *p* in OJ and as *f* in MJ, e.g. OJ *pana* ‘flower’, MJ *fana*, and ModJ *hana*.

In OJ, it is generally agreed that syllables /ki, gi, pi, bi, mi, ke, ge, pe, be, me, ko, go, so, zo, to, do, no, ro/ had two distinct sounds each. One type is called *kô-rui* (A-type), and the other *otsu-rui* (B-type). Following Unger (1993 [1977]), I transliterate A-type syllables as *Ci, Cye*, and *Cwo*, and B-type syllables as *Cwi, Ce*, and *Co*. See Hashimoto (1949a/b [1917, 1931]), Unger (1993 [1977]), Martin (1987), and Lange (1973 [1968]) for details about the A/B distinction.

When Korean data are used, romanization follows Martin (1992), i.e. the Yale system. Chinese data are presented in pinyin romanization. For the representation of Chinese characters, see the following section.

---

6 Some Japanese scholars consider that the syllables /mo, yo/ had the A/B distinction, but Lange (1973) disagrees.
1.4.1.4 Chinese Characters

In this study, Chinese characters are presented with their modern Mandarin readings in pinyin with tone numbers. Note that these do not represent pronunciations of classical Chinese. A list of Chinese characters that are relevant in this study is provided in the preliminary page.

1.4.1.5 Primary Sources

When necessary, primary sources are abbreviated in data as follows:7

**QJ Materials**

Bussoku: *Bussokuseki no uta* (752)
KJ: *Kojiki* (712)
MYS: *Man'yoshū* (ca. 759)
Norito: *Norito, Shinto prayers.* Thought to be made before the Nara period.
   Twenty seven pieces are recorded in *Engishiki* (905-927), and one in *Taiki* (1136-1155).
NS: *Nihonshoki* (720)
Senmyō: *Senmyō, official edicts from emperors.* Made after Emperor Monmu’s accession (697). Sixty two pieces are recorded in *Shoku Nihonogi.*

**EMJ Materials (the Heian Period)**

EM: *Eiga monogatari* (ca. 1028)
Engishiki: *Engishiki* (905-927)
GM: *Genji monogatari* (ca. 1001-14)
Gosen: *Gosen wakashū* (951)
Ise: *Ise monogatari* (before 905)
KKS: *Kokinshū* (905)
Konjakku: *Konjakku monogatashū* (ca. 1120?)
Kohon setsuwa: *Kohon setsuwashū* (ca. 1130)
Makura: *Makura no sōshi* (ca. 1000-1017)
Myōgishō: *Ruiju myōgishō* (ca. 11c-12c)
Ochikubo: *Ochikubo monogatari* (end of 10c?)

---

7 This is not a comprehensive list of primary sources cited in this dissertation; abbreviations are not used for some primary sources, and they are not included here.
Ryōiki: *Nihon Ryōiki* (787?, or ca. 822)
SN: *Shoku nihongi* (797)
Shūi: *Shūi wakashū* (ca. 995-1011)
Taiki: *Taiki* (1136-1155), Fujiwara Yorinaga’s diary
Taketori: *Taketori monogatari* (end of 9c?)
Tosa: *Tosa niki* (ca. 935)
Wamyō: *Wamyō ruijushō* (ca. 931-938)
Yamato: *Yamato monogatari* (ca. 951)

**MJ Materials (the Kamakura period)**
- Chm or Chomonjū: *Kokon Chomonjū* (1254)
- Gukanshō: *Gukanshō* (1220)
- Heiji: *Heiji monogatari* (after 1159)
- Hōgen: *Hōgen monogatari* (after 1156)
- Tsurezure: *Tsurezuregusa* (ca. 1330-31)
- Uji-shūi: *Uji-shūi monogatari* (ca. 1212-22)

**MJ Materials (the Muromachi period and thereafter)**
- Amakusa Heike: *Amakusa-bon Heike monogatari* (1592)
- Amakusa Isoho: *Amakusa-bon Isoho monogatari* (1593)
- Kakuichi Heike: *Kakuichi-bon Heike monogatari* (ca. 1371)

**EModJ Materials (the Edo period)**
- Hizakurige: *Tōkaidōchū hizakurige* (1802-1822)
- Iruka-daijin: *Iruka-daijin misato arasoi*, a jōruri work (1743)

For major primary sources, see the detailed reference information at the end of the bibliography.

1.4.1.6 Abbreviations and Data Description

A list of abbreviations is provided in the preliminary page. For the sake of clarity, Japanese data are always presented in italics. In the body of this study, glosses are give in square brackets, and translations in single quotations, [ ], e.g. *wa ga tuma* [I GEN wife] ‘my wife’. Square brackets are also used to present a certain construction in the body, e.g. [NP GEN NP]. Translations are in most cases literal, and thus they may sound rather
awkward in English. In general, Japanese does not distinguish singular and plural as a part of noun morphology, nor does it have indefinite/definite articles; therefore, this kind of information may not be indicated in translations. English terms for Japanese technical terms (and vice versa) are provided in parentheses, not in single quotations, e.g. jo-kotoba (preface) and juntai joshi (quasi-nominal particle).

1.4.1.7 Nominative in Glosses

In Std-ModJ, *ga* is generally regarded as a nominative case particle. While it is useful for crosslinguistic discussion to some extent, characterizing *ga* as simply nominative is in fact a little problematic. Unlike inflectional nominative case-marking in Indo-European languages, *ga*-marking is not an obligatory or unmarked default among other possibilities (e.g. *wa*: topic marker; *mo*: inclusive focus marker; zero-marking; or even no overt subject). The use of *ga* in certain contexts creates a focal effect resembling the *it*-cleft construction in English. For example, *Kyoo ga nitiyoobi desu* [today NOM Sunday COP] ‘(It is) today (that) is Sunday’ is highly marked, and only possible in certain contexts, such as in answering *Itu ga nitiyoobi desu ka?* [when NOM Sunday COP Q] ‘When is Sunday?’.

Moreover, subjects are often not marked by any particles, especially in colloquial Japanese, e.g. *Ame hutteru kedo, kasa motte-kita?* [rain falling.be although umbrella holding-came] ‘Rain is falling, but did (you) bring (your) umbrella?’ . Although some may claim that subjects are always marked by *ga* at some abstract level of linguistic structure (e.g. the deep structure in the generative approach) and that it does not necessarily appear on the surface, I do not take this position because of the lack of empirical evidence. Despite these issues, *ga* is nevertheless glossed as nominative (NOM) in this research, as a cover term for all such effects, to avoid unnecessary confusion.
1.4.1.8 Japanese Verse and *Man'yoshū* Data

Most OJ data in this research are taken from Japanese verse recorded in *Man'yoshū*, *Kojiki*, and *Nihonshoki*. They are today generally called *waka* ‘Japanese songs’ in *Man'yoshū*, and *kayō* ‘songs’ in *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*. I refer to them as “songs” when necessary, although they are often referred to as poems in past studies in English. The most common format of *waka* has five lines of, respectively, 5, 7, 5, 7, and 7 moras (= syllables in OJ) each. Each line is separated by a slash in my transcriptions, e.g. *Aki no nwo no/ mi-kusa kari puki/ yadwore-ri-si/ Udi no miyakwo no/ kari-ipo si omopoyu* [autumn GEN field GEN/ Bt-miscanthus cut roof(V/RY)/ lodge(V)-Res-Evi(RT)/ Uji(place) GEN capital GEN/ temporary-hut Emph come.to.mind(SS)] ‘In the autumn field, the temporary hut in Uji, for which we cut miscanthus and roofed, and where we lodged, comes up in my mind’ (MYS 1:7). Whole songs may not always be presented as data. Translations are due to the present author, basically attempting word-by-word literal translation; they are not intended as literature! The reference indicated as “MYS 1:7” means “song no. 7 in Book I of *Man'yoshū*”. I may omit book numbers when I list more than one song. Refer to Section 1.4.1.5 for other primary sources.

*Man'yoshū* (‘A collection of myriad leaves’) is a collection of about 4,500 *waka* (Japanese songs) completed around 759 A.D. To look up examples in *Man'yoshū*, I used *Man'yoshū sō-sakuin: tango hen* ‘Complete concordance of *Man'yoshū*: word volume’ and *Man'yoshū sō-sakuin: kanji hen* ‘Complete concordance of *Man'yoshū*: Chinese character volume, compiled by Masamune (1974a/b), which are referred to together as “Sō-sakuin”.

For the interpretation and analysis of each song, I referred to *Man'yoshū*, four volumes in *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* ‘Major collection of Japanese classical literature’,
vol.4-7, annotated by Takagi, Gomi, and Ōno S. (1957), which is cited as "Taikei", and also
Man’yōshū, four volumes in Nihon koten bungaku zenshū ‘Complete collection of Japanese
classical literature’, vol.2-5, annotated and interpreted by Kojima, Kinoshita, and Satake
(1972), which is cited as “Zenshū”.

The original Man’yōshū, which was already lost by the middle ages, was written all
in Chinese characters, but as a means of representing Japanese. There were various
techniques for using Chinese characters to this end, and a direct one syllable-one character
correspondence was not always maintained. Therefore, particles had to be often recovered
from what was known of usage and written conventions of the time. For example, in one
representation, ama-no-gapa [heaven-GEN-river] ‘Milky Way’ is written with five Chinese
characters, each of which corresponds to each mora in the word. In another representation,
however, it is written with two Chinese characters, one of which means ‘heaven’, and the
other ‘river’, and the readers would have to know how to read these as ama no gapa ‘Milky
Way’. This way of representation is based on the meanings of Chinese characters, not on
sounds associated with them by Japanese. In this particular example, GEN no has to be
added in the actual reading. After the invention of the kana writing system in the Heian
period, which is based on mora-character correspondence, people repeatedly hand-copied
Man’yōshū with kana subscripts. Both Taikei and Zenshū are based on the Nishi Honganji
text of Man’yōshū, while considering other versions of relevant manuscripts which have
survived to the present day. This study basically adopts their readings.8

8 Sō-sakuia uses the Kan’ei text as its base. Readings are cross-checked with Taikei and Zenshū.
1.4.1.9 Song Numbers in Kojiki

What is Kojiki Song 3 in the Taikei’s (1957) version of Kodai kayô-shû (A collection of ancient songs) and the Shin-Zenshû’s (1997) version of Kojiki is divided into two songs in Zenshû (1983). Also, Kojiki Song 79 in Shin-Zenshû (1997) is divided into two songs in Taikei (1957). This study follows the numbering of Shin-Zenshû for all songs.

1.4.2 Selected Reference Grammar
1.4.2.1 Inflection

Japanese verbs, adjectives, and auxiliaries (jodôshi) exhibit inflection, but not for inflectional categories common to western languages such as person, gender, and number. They inflect for the type of structure in which they are embedded. This study follows traditional Japanese grammar, which identifies six inflectional categories in OJ, namely mizen (MZ: subjunctive), ren’yo (RY: infinitive), shûshi (SS: predicative), rentai (RT: attributive), izen (IZ: provisional-concessive), and meirei (MR: imperative).9 Verbs come in nine conjugations (inflectional classes) in OJ, of which the largest class, yodan (quadrigrade), exhibits the following inflectional pattern. The listed functions are only representative ones among other uses:

---

nom- ‘drink’

MZ: noma, which precedes auxiliaries of causative, passive, negative, etc.
RY: nomi, which precedes verbs, auxiliaries of aspect, etc., or functions as ‘and’.
SS: nomu, which ends main clauses.
RT: nomu, which precedes and modifies nominals, or functions as nominalization.
IZ: nome, which forms conditional or reason clauses.
MR: nomye, which forms imperative sentences.

Table 1.2: Inflection of nom- ‘drink’

Adjectives have two inflectional classes, and inflect for the same categories as verbs.
Each class has older and innovative inflectional forms, but the paradigm is deficient. Take
taka- ‘high’ as an example, which belongs to so-called the ku-inflectional class:

taka- ‘high’
MZ: takakara, which precedes auxiliaries of negative, etc.
RY: takaku, takakari, which precede verbs, auxiliaries of aspect, etc.
SS: takasi, which ends main clauses.
RT: takaki, takakaru, which precede nominals.
IZ: takakure, which forms conditional or reason clauses.
MR: takakare, which forms imperative sentences.

Table 1.3: Inflection of taka- ‘high’

Following Unger (1993 [1977]), I call base morphemes for inflection (e.g. nom- ‘drink’
and taka- ‘high’) “roots”, although many scholars call them “stems” (e.g. Martin 1987).
I regard inflectional forms (e.g. RY forms) as “stems”, to which various auxiliaries may be
attached. When I cite other scholars’ analyses, however, I keep their usage.
Inflectional forms may not always be indicated in glosses when they are not relevant to the discussion there. Refer to Martin (1987), Quinn (1987, forthcoming), and Unger (1993) for details of inflections in OJ.

1.4.2.2 Aspectual Auxiliaries

In OJ, there are six inflecting derivational auxiliaries (jodōshi) that appear to indicate some sort of aspect. Their exact functions are still controversial, and are not dealt with in this study.10 Thus, they are glossed conveniently as follows: -ri and -tari: Res(ultative); -tu and -nu: Perf(ective); and -ki and -keri: Evi(dential).11 To present representative theories about the differences among these auxiliaries, the functions of -ri and -tari are the same, namely to indicate the continuation of state or action as resultative, but they are suffixed to verbs of different inflectional classes, i.e. -ri is found with yodan (quadrigrade), sa-hen (sa-irregular), ka-hen (ka-irregular), and kami-ichidan (upper monograde); -tari, by contrast, attached to kami-nidan (upper bigrade) and shimo-nidan (lower bigrade) (e.g. ôno S. et al. 1974:1433). As for -tu and -nu, their functions are to indicate the completion of the state or action as perfective, but the former is basically used with transitive verbs, while the latter with intransitive verbs (e.g. ibid.: 1432). As for -ki and -keri, they indicate that the speaker has the information via direct experience (-ki), or via indirect experience (-keri) as evidentials (e.g. Shinzato 1991; Quinn 1983, 1987: 324-34).

---

10 See, for example, Ôno S. et al. (1974), Ogawa (1983), and Sandness (1982) for all the aspectual auxiliaries, Takeoka (1963) and Quinn (1983) for -keri, and Shinzato (1991) for -ki and -keri. See also Jacobsen (1986) for a concise historical review of the notion of evidentiality in linguistic analysis.

11 See Bybee et al. (1994) for definitions of aspectual (and tense-related) functions and common developmental relationships among them.
1.4.2.3 Particle *ni*

The particle *ni* has many functions such as dative, locative, and purposive. Locative in a broader sense seems to be the basic function of *ni*, but it may be glossed as LOC, DAT, ‘at’, ‘in’, etc., depending on context of use, e.g. *taberu toki ni* [eat(RT) time at] ‘when (I) eat’; *taberu no ni* [eat(RT) NMZ for] ‘for eating’.

1.4.2.4 *Kakari-musubi*

The term *kakari-musubi* (focus-closure) refers to an agreement rule in classical Japanese between phrases marked with *kakari* particles and following predicates in particular inflectional forms, which has been lost since late MJ. In *kakari-musubi* constructions, marking with the particle *zo, ka, ya, or namu* requires that the main predicate is inflected in its RT form, and marking with the particle *koso* agrees with the IZ form of the main predicate. The exact function of each construction is still controversial, and it is beyond the scope of this study. The *kakari* particles are glossed as KP. Many scholars (e.g. Yamada 1913; Hashimoto 1969; Ōno S. et al. 1974) include the particles *pa* [TOP] and *mo* ‘also: inclusive focus’ in *kakari* particles, but they are not glossed as KP in this study since they do not necessarily require any particular inflected form in the following main predicate.

1.4.2.5 *Rendaku* (sequential voicing) and Lyman’s Law

In compound formation, the initial voiceless consonant of the second morpheme is often replaced by its voiced counterpart, e.g. *kinu* ‘silk’ + *kasa* ‘shade; umbrella’ > *kinu-gasa* ‘silk shade’ (MYS 3:240). This phenomenon is observable throughout the history of Japanese, and is called *rendaku* (sequential voicing) in Japanese linguistics (see Martin
1952, 1987: 93; Vance 1987: 133-48; among others). It is relevant to our discussion since some scholars (e.g. Murayama 1956) attribute the voicing change to the existence of GEN *n in compounds in the pre-OJ period, i.e. N-*n-N > N-"N (with a voiced consonant).

The voicing change does not generally occur when there is /b, d, g, z/ in the second morpheme, e.g. *yama ‘mountain’ + kapi ‘in-between space’ > yama-gapi ‘between mountains’ (MYS 17:3967); but yama + kage ‘shade’ > yama-kage ‘mountain shade’ (MYS 10:1875). This constraint is generally called “Lyman’s Law” (Lyman 1894). Also, it is sometimes the case that the voicing does not occur when there is /b, d, g, z/ in the first morpheme (i.e. a strong version of Lyman’s Law), e.g. ayame ‘iris’ + kusa ‘grass’ > ayame-gusa ‘iris’ (MYS 18:4089); but kage ‘shade’ + kusa ‘grass’ > kage-kusa ‘grass in the shade’ (MYS 10:2159). However, there are many exceptions to these constraints, and rendaku does not seem to be accounted for by a solely phonological constraint; it seems to be lexically determined (e.g. Ōno K. 2000; Unger 2000b).

1.4.2.6 Ku-nominalization (Ku-gohô)

Deriving nominal constituents that end with -ku from adjectives or verbs is called ku-gohô ‘ku-method’, which I call “ku-nominalization” in this study.

Ōno S. et al. (1974: 11) posit a noun *aku ‘place, thing’ (cf. akugare (RY) < *aku-kare [place-leave] ‘leave’; akare (RY) < *aku-are [place-separate] ‘separate’), and claim that ku-nominalized forms were originally RT forms plus this noun *aku, but the vowel-vowel sequence was contracted as follows: Cu.a > Ca; Ci.a > Cye (A-type).12

---

12 Note that RT forms only exhibit u-ending or i-ending.
(3) araku ‘being, that (something) exists’ < *aru-aku [exist(RT)-aku]
tiraku ‘scattering’ < *tiru-aku [scatter(RT)-aku]
miraku ‘seeing’ < *miru-aku [see(RT)-aku]
kwopuraku ‘that (I) love’ < *kwopuru-aku [love(RT)-aku]
kwopwimaku ‘that (I) will love’ < *kwopwi-mu-aku [love(MZ)-Conjec(RT)-aku]
samukyeku ‘being cold’ < *samuki-aku [cold(RT)-aku]

For example, kwopuraku was derived from kwopuru-aku [love(RT)-place] with vowel reduction. As for the ku-nominalized form of Evidential -ki, we have to expect *syeku (< si-aku [Evi(RT)-aku]), but the attested form is siku. Óno S. et al. regard this as an exception, and hypothesize that RT si had originally contained a B type vowel, and thus would not have preceded the initial /a/ ofaku due to a combinational preference. Instead, they claim that a similar morpheme ku ‘place, thing’ (cf. ku in idu-ku ‘where’) was used, i.e. si-ku [Evi(RT)-place].

Fukuda (1972:19) argues that ku-nominalization was a remnant of the use of MZ forms for adnominal modification; ku-nominalized forms are MZ forms modifying the keishiki-meishi ‘(lit.) formal noun, i.e. nominalizer in this case’ ku, e.g. tira-ku [scatter(MZ)-ku] ‘scattering; scattering place’. As examples of MZ forms modifying nouns, he lists the following compounds, e.g. muka-pagi [facing-leg] ‘shin’; mura-yama [crowding-mountain] ‘many mountains’; ara-gaki [rough-fence] ‘rough (surfaced) fence’; maga-tama [curving-gem] ‘curved gem’; kuta-kakye [deteriorating-chicken] ‘stupid chicken (derog.)’. Also, he regards kayopa in kayopa tori [frequent(V) bird] ‘frequenting birds’ (MYS 14:3526) as the MZ form, although it is usually analyzed as an eastern dialect (azuma kotoba) of kayopu ‘frequent(V/RT)’ in the RT form. By his analysis, kwopuraku ‘that (I) love’ is also the MZ form modifying the formal noun ku (i.e. kwopura-ku [love(MZ)-ku]), but the MZ form of the relevant verb is in fact kwopwi-, so it is not clear
how his account applies in this case. In addition, his account does not provide any explanation for *ku*-nominalizations of adjectives (e.g. *samukyeku* ‘being cold’).

1.5 Modern Uses of *ga* and *no*

The rest of this dissertation concerns historical changes of genitive particles and related issues. Before moving on to diachronic issues, I will present a look at some “possible outcomes” of historical changes in this section, i.e. how those particles are used in Std-ModJ. As suggested above, these are “possible outcomes” because the uses described here carry no guarantee of any relationship holding among them; these uses could probably be unrelated. Historical developmental paths will become clear in Chapter 5 and 6.

As mentioned, there are three major genitive particles in OJ, *ga*, *no*, and *tu*. The particles *ga* and *no* are still very productive in Std-ModJ, while the particle *tu* is completely extinct as such. Thus, Section 1.5.1 provides representative uses of *ga* in Std-ModJ, and Section 1.5.2, those of *no*.

### 1.5.1 Uses of *ga* in Std-ModJ

Here I list three functions of *ga* in Std-ModJ. Perhaps the most representative function is marking a subject, commonly regarded as nominative case marking. It is generally agreed that genitive is the original function of this particle *ga*, and that the nominative use in the main clause developed in MJ (e.g. Ōno S. 1975, 1977a/b; Konoshima 1983; Sakanashi 1987). The particle *ga* can also be used for marking a semantic theme for so-called “stative predicates” (e.g. V(RY)-*tai*(Desi) ‘want to V’, e.g. *nomi-tai* [drink(RY)-Desi] ‘want to drink’; V(Root)-(*rar*)*/eru*(Pot) ‘can V’, e.g. *nom-eru* [drink(Root)-Pot] ‘can drink, is drinkable’; *suki-da* ‘be fond of’), although different scholars offer different
syntactic analyses for the NP-\text{ga}, i.e. regarding it as subject or object. The particle \text{ga} also functions as a conjunctive particle in Std-ModJ. The following are examples of these functions:

(4) \begin{align*}
\text{a. Nominative} \\
\text{Taro ga hon o yonde iru.} \\
\text{Taro NOM book ACC read(Ger) be} \\
\text{‘Taro is reading a book.’} \\
\text{b. Theme Marking (TM)} \\
\text{Mizu ga nomi-tai.} \\
\text{water TM drink(RY)-Desi} \\
\text{‘(I) want to drink water.’} \\
\text{c. Conjunctive (Antithetical)} \\
\text{Gakkoo e itta ga, tosyokan wa simatte ita.} \\
\text{school to went Conj library TOP close(Ger) be(Perf)} \\
\text{‘(I) went to school, but the library was closed.’} \\
\text{d. Conjunctive (Consequential)} \\
\text{Atarasii resutoran de tabeta ga, hyooban-doori oisikatta.} \\
\text{new restaurant at ate Conj reputation-as delicious(Perf)} \\
\text{‘(I) ate at a new restaurant, and (it was) delicious as reputed.’} \\
\end{align*}

Past studies about the development of NOM \text{ga} and TM \text{ga} will be reviewed in Chapter 5. I will also discuss these issues in Chapter 6 concerning dialectal variations.

As for conjunctive uses (e.g. (4c) and (4d)), both antithetical use and consequential use are possible, but the former is said more common than the latter in Std-ModJ. Ishigaki (1955) demonstrates that the conjunctive use of \text{ga} was derived from the subject-marking \text{ga}. If so, \text{ga} took the following developmental path: genitive > subject marker > conjunctive. I will examine this developmental path in Chapter 5.

In addition to the functions above, the use of \text{ga} as genitive can still be found in some fossilized expressions, such as \text{wa ga ya} [I GEN home] ‘my home’, but it is no longer productive in Std-ModJ.
1.5.2 Uses of *no* in Std-ModJ

The particle *no* is very versatile in Std-ModJ.\(^{13}\) It is the only productive genitive particle. Also, it can mark subjects in relative clauses. Some examples of these uses:

\[(5)\]

a. Genitive\(^{14}\)

```
watasi no kuruma  [I GEN car]   ‘my car’
Tokyo no ie        [Tokyo GEN house] ‘the house in Tokyo’
```

b. Subject Marking in Relative Clauses\(^{15}\)

```
Taro no tutomete irukaisya wa Sonii desu.
Taro GEN work(Ger) be company TOP SONY COP
‘The company where Taro is working is SONY.’

Tenki no ii hi wa kooen de ohiru o taberu.
weather GEN good day TOP park in lunch ACC eat
‘(I) eat lunch in the park on the days when the weather is good.’
```

Crosslinguistically it is not surprising at all that subjects in relative clauses should be (or may be) marked as genitive. For example, GEN-marking of subjects is observable in Turkish (Comrie 1989 [1981]) and Korean (Martin 1992). From a historical perspective,

\(^{13}\) For more information, see Yoshida (1970).

\(^{14}\) GEN *no* can be used for various semantic relationships between nouns, other than possession and location, which are seen in the examples. For example, it can also be used for time (e.g. *haru no umi* [spring GEN sea] ‘the spring sea’, topic (e.g. *syusyoku no soodan* [job.getting GEN consultation] ‘a consultation about getting a job’), number (e.g. *san-nin no kodomo* [three-Clsf GEN child] ‘three children’, and property (e.g. *sinmai no sensei* [rookie GEN teacher] ‘a rookie teacher’). See Yoshida (1970) for a detailed classification.

\(^{15}\) In this study, the term “relative clause” is used in Comrie’s (1989 [1981]) sense; constructions are identified as relative clauses from a semantic perspective, regardless of the existence of a gap or head NP. Thus, Japanese relative clauses include gapped relative clauses, gapless relative clauses, complex NPs, and head-internal relative clauses (HIRCs). Matsumoto (1988, 1997) uses the term “adnominal clauses” or “noun-modifying constructions”, but these terms are narrower because they do not include HIRCs. In relative clauses, both NOM *ga* and GEN *no* can generally be used for subject marking, known as “Ga/No conversion” in literature. Thus, *Taro ga tutomete iru kaisya wa Sonii desu* and *Tenki ga ii hi wa kooen de ohiru o taberu* have exactly the same meanings as the sentences in (5b) above. Treating this use of *no* as a subject marker is rather simplistic, but it suffices for the present discussion. To be more precise, we can also substitute *no* for *ga* in relative clauses with so-called stative predicates, in which *ga* marks semantic themes. Thus, both *ga* and *no* are possible as in (b) below:

```
   apple NOM/*GEN fond.of-COP(SS)   ‘(I) like apples.’

b. *Ringo ga*/*no* suki-na kodomo
   apple NOM/GEN fond.of-COP(RT) child  ‘the child who likes apples’
```
the basic function of GEN no has not changed since the OJ period; subjects in relative clauses were usually marked with GEN no in OJ as well. Subject marking by genitives in OJ will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Some uses of no in Std-ModJ are not entirely case-related or case-related at all. It can be used as a pronominal genitive (i.e. GEN + bound pronominal, cf. -s in It is Tom's [Tom-GEN.one]), bound pronominal (cf. one in a red one), and nominalizer (cf. that in That prices are high is the problem). See the examples below:

(6)  

a. Pronominal Genitive (GEN + bound pronominal)

\[ Taro \ no \ wa \ takakatta. \]

Taro GEN.one TOP expensive(Perf)

'Taro's was expensive.'

b. Bound Pronominal

\[ Akai \ no \ ga \ ii. \]

red one NOM good

'The/A red one is good.'

c. Nominalizer

\[ Nedan \ ga \ takai \ no \ ga \ mondai \ da. \]

price NOM high NMZ NOM problem COP

'‘That the price is high is the problem.'

The use of no for these functions is generally called “juntai joshi” (quasi-nominal particle) or “keishiki-meishi” (lit. formal noun) in traditional Japanese grammar. The particle no forms a nominal constituent with the preceding word or clause, but no itself cannot be used as an independent noun. I will review historical data about these uses in Chapter 5 (Section 5.5), and discuss their developmental path in Chapter 6.

In addition to the use as in (6c), the nominalizer no has slightly different, characteristic uses. One use can be seen in so-called “head-internal relative clauses” (HIRCs) (e.g. Kuroda 1992 [1974-77]; Mihara 1994; Hoshi 1995). Another use can be
found in so-called “referential predicates” (Quinn 1987) or “extended predicates” (Jorden with Noda 1987: 177-79). These are illustrated below:

(7)  

a. Nominalizer (HIRC)  

\[\text{Sensei wa }[\text{ Taro ga dete-iku }] \text{ no o yobi-tometa.}\]  

‘The teacher stopped Taro who was leaving.’

b. Nominalizer (Extended Predicate)  

\[\text{Kyoo wa gakkoo e ikii no/n desu.}\]  

‘Today, it is that (I) go to school.’

In (7a), the nominalizer no is placed at the head noun position of the relative clause, and is marked with ACC o. However, the actual direct object of the verb yobi-tometa ‘stop by calling’ can be analyzed as Taro, which is located inside the relative clause. Due to this feature, this construction is generally known as “head-internal relative clauses” (HIRCs).

In (7b), the whole sentence is once nominalized by no, and then predicated by the copula desu. Given this extended structure, it has been called an “extended predicate” in a number of past studies. This construction is very commonly used in ModJ, and one of its representative functions is to provide an explanation. Middle Korean had similar constructions (Martin 1992), which will be brought in to our discussions in Chapter 3 and Chapter 6.

---

16 See also Martin (1975: 851-56), although he does not use the term “extended predicates” there.

17 For example, extended predicates can also be used in questions. Compare (a) with a plain question (b):

\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Dare ga kuru n desu ka?} \quad \text{Who NOM come NMZ COP Q ‘Who is it that is coming?’} \\
b. & \text{Dare ga ki-masu ka?} \quad \text{Who NOM come-Pol Q ‘Who is coming?’}
\end{align*}

Due to the use of the extended predicate, the speaker’s assumption that someone is coming is more overt in (a) than in (b) with a plain question.
The particle _no_ can also be used as a sentence final particle (SFP). SFP _no_ indicates that the sentence is an assertion, order, question, explanation, surprise, and so forth, depending on contexts and particular intonation patterns. See some examples below:

(8) a. SFP (Assertion with the falling intonation)

_Sore wa boku ga yatta no._

that TOP I NOM did SFP

‘As for that, (it is that) I did it.’

b. SFP (Imperative with stress on _no_)

_Hora. Hayaku taberu no!_

hey quickly eat SFP

‘Hey. (The way it is is you) eat quickly!’

c. SFP (Interrogative with the rising intonation)

_Kyoo wa dare ga kuru no?_

today TOP who NOM come SFP

‘Who’s coming today?’

In these uses, actual interpretations, such as assertive, imperative, or interrogative, are derived from the combination of SFP _no_, certain intonation patterns, and contexts. In (8a), a possible situation would be, someone did a good thing, but no one notices who did it. So, the speaker asserts, “It’s me.” In (8b), perhaps a family is going out after eating lunch or something, but the child is not focused on eating. So, the mother says, “(You understand the situation, and) Eat quickly.” In (8c), the speaker knows that someone is coming, and asks the wh-question with _no_. I regard these uses of _no_ at the end of the sentence as a sentence final particle, since its particular position in the sentence plays a crucial role for determining the mood of the sentence, unlike the use of _no_ as a nominalizer. The development of SFP _no_ will be discussed in Chapter 6.
The particle *no* can also be used as an appositive particle in Std-ModJ:

(9) Appositive

a. *Kaban da no kutu da no bakari katte iru.*
   bag COP no shoe COP no only buy(Ger) be
   ‘(He/she) only buys such things as bags and shoes.’

b. *Nan no kan no to monku o yuu.*
   what no that no Comp complaint ACC say
   ‘(He/she) complains about this and that.’

As for this appositive use, Nihon Dai-jiten Kankô-kai (1976) explains that it was derived from the interjective particle *no*. I could not find any other reference to the origin of this use. Given its distribution, it does not seem to have come from GEN *no*.

In this chapter, I have presented an overall introduction to this dissertation, preliminary information, and a basic account of modern uses of *ga* and *no*. Now we are ready to move on to specific issues regarding genitive particles in Japanese.

---

18 Unlike the nominalizer *no* or SFP *no*, this appositive *no* can be used after the SS form of the copula *da*, as in *kaban da no* [bag COP(SS) no]. Thus, it is not a nominal.
CHAPTER 2

DIFFERENCES AMONG GENITIVE PARTICLES IN OJ

2.1 Introduction

There are three major genitive particles in OJ, namely *ga*, *no*, and *tu*. Examples are provided below:¹

(1) a. *imo ga ipye*
    beloved GEN house  ‘beloved’s house’

b. *opokimi no mikoto*
    lord GEN words  ‘words of the lord’

c. *ama tu kamwi*
    heaven GEN deity  ‘deities of the heaven’

This chapter discusses differences among these particles. While undergoing various historical changes, *ga* and *no* have been very productive all the way into Std-ModJ, and the differences between the two particles have inevitably attracted the interest of many scholars. The most popular view about the difference is that the use of *ga* expresses a pejorative sense on the noun it marks, while that of *no* expresses an honorific sense (e.g. Aoki 1952).

In contrast to GEN *ga* and *no*, GEN *tu* has been studied less, perhaps because it was not very productive in OJ and occurs only in fossilized compounds in ModJ, such as *oto-tu-i* (< *woto-tu-pi* [far.place-GEN-day]) ‘the day before yesterday’ and *ma-tu-ge* [eye-

¹ I will discuss other genitive particles which only have a very limited number of examples in Chapter 3, e.g. *ma-na-kwo* [eye-GEN-Dim] ‘pupil, eye’; *ke-da-mono* [hair-GEN-thing] ‘animal’.
GEN-hair] 'eyelash'. The most common practice in past studies has been to seek a specific function of *tu* by generalizing from attested examples (e.g. Ōno S. et al. 1974; Ōno T. 1978), and *tu* is regarded as a locative-genitive by many scholars (e.g. Murayama 1957; Miller 1971; Itabashi 1987).

By examining *Man'yōshū* data, dialect data, and crosslinguistic data, I claim in this chapter that the pejorative/honorific distinction was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development. In other words, it is not a part of the core functions of GEN *ga* and *no*. The general significance of this claim is that people may develop a particular sociolinguistic differentiation in their use of linguistic forms that originally had nothing to do with such social distinctions per se. As for GEN *tu*, I claim that it was actually more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ, and that we should recognize its importance for our studies of OJ, pre-OJ, and the Korean connection. I also argue that -*tu* in numeral pronominals (e.g. *pito-tu* 'one') is a bound pronominal derived from GEN *tu*.

This chapter consists of two major sections. Section 2.2 discusses differences between GEN *ga* and GEN *no*. Section 2.3 examines GEN *tu* in OJ. The detailed organization of each section is presented in the introduction to each section. Lastly, Section 2.4 presents an overall conclusion to this chapter.

2.2 GEN *ga* and GEN *no*

In this section, I discuss differences between GEN *ga* and GEN *no*. Most typically, they connect a noun with another noun. Four more examples are presented below:

(2) a. *wa ga se*  
   I GEN lover(male)  
   ‘my lover’  
   (MYS 59)

b. *imo ga na*  
   lover(female) GEN name  
   ‘(my) lover’s name’  
   (MYS 3730)
c. *umibye no yadwo*
   seaside GEN lodge
   ‘the lodge on seaside’ (MYS 3580)

d. *opokimi no mi-koto*
   lord GEN Bt-word
   ‘words of the lord’ (MYS 1785)

It is generally known that GEN *no* marks a wider variety of words while GEN *ga* marks a somewhat limited variety of words (e.g. Kobayashi 1938; Asami 1956a). More specifically, the best known view about the difference in *koten* (classical Japanese) seems to be that *ga* expresses intimacy and/or a pejorative sense on the noun it marks, while *no* expresses psychological remoteness and/or an honorific sense (e.g. dictionaries such as Jōdaigo Jiten Henshū-iinkai 1967, Matsumura 1971, Nihon Dai-jiten Kankō-kai 1976, Nakata et al. 1983, and Nakamura et al. 1994). This distinction is generally called the “pejorative/honorific distinction” (*son/pi, son*: honorific; *hi* (> *pi* in some compounds): pejorative). However, *koten* (classical Japanese) is a somewhat loosely defined term, which refers to varieties of Japanese from OJ to MJ, stretching over 900 years. Most studies in the past regarding the distinction between GEN *ga* and *no* are based on primary sources in the Insei period and thereafter (1086-), in other words, MJ data (e.g. Fujitani 1778; Tōgō 1968; Collado 1632; Doi 1938; Kobayashi 1938; Ishizaka 1934). For example, they examine *Konjaku monogatari* (late Heian), *Uji-shūi monogatari* (ca. 1212), *Amakusa-bon Heike monogatari* (1592), and *Amakusa-bon Isoho monogatari* (1593). Some of these literary works in fact contain explanations or anecdotes about people’s consciousness about the difference between *ga* and *no*.2

We cannot, however, unconditionally assume that the pejorative/honorific distinction existed in OJ. Moreover, it probably was not the essential difference between *ga* and *no*. In the following discussion, therefore, I will focus on differences between GEN *ga* and *no* in

---
2 For example, see *Kokinshū-chû* 4 by Kenshō (ca. 1130-1210) (a note on *fugi ga fana* ‘the blossoms of the bush clover’), *Konjaku* 24.56, and *Uji-shūi* 7.2.
OJ. This section consists of two subsections. Section 2.2.1 reviews past studies concerning differences between GEN ga and no, and Section 2.2.2 claims that the pejorative/honorific distinction was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development, by examining Man 'yôshû data, dialect data, and crosslinguistic data.

2.2.1 Past Studies

This subsection will first review two popular views about the distinction between GEN ga and no, one by Aoki (1952) and the other by ôno S. (1977a/b, ôno S. et al. 1974). Second, counter to these views, ôno T.'s (1978) analysis, which is based on the origins of the particles, will be reviewed. Lastly, I will review Yamada (1913) and Hashimoto (1969), which do not claim specific theories about the differences, but provide a list of characteristics of these particles.

2.2.1.1 Popular Views: Aoki (1952) and ôno S. (1977a/b; ôno S. et al. 1974)

_Aoki (1952)_

Since the previous studies are all based on primary sources from the Insei period and thereafter, Aoki (1952) examines Kojiki (712), Nihonshoki (720), Man 'yôshû (ca. 760), Senmyô (before 710?), and Norito (before 710?), and claims that the pejorative/honorific distinction between ga and no existed already in OJ.3 She argues that GEN ga and no in OJ exhibit a clear complementary distribution based on the pejorative/honorific distinction. Her examples are as follows:

3 Konoshima (1983) also advocates the pejorative/honorific interpretation, but he is not specific about time periods. He claims that the distinction emerged because ga had a feature of emphasizing a word (kyôozi suru seisitu [strong indication do feature]), and thus it was not used for words which contained some honorific sense (ibid.: 102). See Yamada (1913) in Section 2.2.1.3 for the emphasizing function of ga.
(3) a. Words that are marked by ga, but not by no
(i) Persons close to the speaker, e.g. *kimi* ‘you, lover’; *papa* ‘mother’; *imo* ‘sister, lover (female)’; *sekwo* ‘brother, lover (male)’; *tuma* ‘mate (wife, husband)’; *titi-papa* ‘parents’

(ii) Words with *-ra* or *-ro*, which are suffixes to indicate intimacy: e.g. *kwo-ra* ‘lover’; *kwo-ro* ‘lover’; *wonna-ra* ‘women’

(iii) First person pronouns, e.g. *a* ‘I’; *wa* ‘I’; *maro* ‘I’; *ono* ‘I’

b. Words that are marked by no, but not by ga
(i) Objects of respect, e.g. *opokimi* ‘lord’; *sumyerogi* ‘lord’; *kamwi* ‘god/deity’; *mikwo* ‘prince’; *mikoto* ‘honorable words, honorable person’

(ii) Neutral persons, e.g. *unemye* ‘maid’; *pito* ‘person’; *satuwo* ‘hunter’; *ama* ‘diver, fisherman’

Based on this distribution, Aoki concludes that GEN ga was used when one felt intimacy/closeness, as well as their derivative senses (e.g. disgust and a pejorative sense), while GEN no was used when one felt psychological distance or an honorific sense.

Although GEN ga and no were used for various kinds of common nouns, Aoki’s data are limited to personal (pro)nouns. Even in this limited domain, however, there are counterexamples. In *Norito* and *Senmyō*, 36 instances of *sumyera* ‘emperor’ out of 38 are in fact marked by ga, as Aoki admits herself. *Norito* are Shintō prayers, and *Senmyō* official edicts from emperors. Since there is no clear case in which *sumyera* was used as a first person pronoun by an emperor, the use of ga for *sumyera* obviously contradicts her theory. She explains that ga-marking for *sumyera* should have been possible if one had felt intimacy with the emperor. This explanation is not convincing, however. I will discuss problems of the pejorative/honorific distinction again in Section 2.2.2.

---

4 According to Ōno et al. (1974), the function of the suffix *-ro* is not so clear. The suffix *-ra* has a kind of diminutive or pejorative sense. It can also be used as a plural marker.
ôno S. (1977a/b; ôno S. et al. 1974)

From a broader perspective than the pejorative/honorific distinction, ôno S. (1977a/b; ôno S. et al. 1974) relates ga and no to uchi and soto (social inside and outside) respectively, which are a fundamental set of notions on which the language operates.\(^5\)

Unlike Aoki’s (1952) study, ôno S.’s studies include a wide range of common nouns. In addition to the personal (pro)nouns which are marked by ga in Aoki’s study, ôno S. (1977a) provides the following observations regarding the use of ga:

(4) a. The use of ga for first person pronouns (e.g. wa, a, and ono) makes up about 50% of all its tokens, and for persons close to the speaker (e.g. family members and lovers) 40%.\(^6\)

b. In relative clauses, NPs marked by ga can only be predicated by verbs (i.e. [NP ga V(RT)] NP), while NPs marked by no can be predicated by verbs and adjectives (i.e. [NP no V/Adj(RT)] NP).

c. Ga may marks animals (e.g. tadu ‘crane’, kamo ‘duck’, tori ‘bird’, aka-goma ‘red horse’) and plants (e.g. kasi ‘oak’, asi ‘reed’, ume ‘plum tree’, sasa ‘bamboo grass’).

---

\(^5\) The notions of uchi (inside) and soto (outside) are used not only in studies of the language, but also in Japanese studies in general. For various topics analyzed in light of the uchi/soto distinction, including linguistics, see Bachnik and Quinn (eds.) (1994). To demonstrate how they work in language use, let us take an example from Jorden with Noda (1987: 164). In Std-ModJ, three different forms, imasu (plain-distal), orimasu (humble-distal), and irasayaimasu (honorific-distal), must be used for the same ‘be in a place (animate)’ according to the social hierarchy and the inside/outside distinction. When one is talking with an inside person, s/he uses imasu (plain) for an inside referent at the same rank or a lower rank, and should use irasayaimasu (honorific) for an inside referent at a higher rank. When talking with an outside person, however, one should use orimasu (humble) for the same referent, regardless of the rank of the referent. When one is talking with an outside person, s/he should use irasayaimasu (honorific) for a referent in that outside at any rank. For a broader application of the uchi/soto distinction to Japanese grammar, see Quinn (1994). He regards uchi ‘inside’ and soto ‘outside’ as indexical coordinates.

\(^6\) Sources of his data are not specified, but judging from his discussion, the numbers seem to be based on OJ data (materials from the Nara period 710-793).
d. *Ga* seems to have been more commonly used in eastern dialects (*azuma kotoba*) than in the central dialect, e.g. *pimo ga wo* [string GEN thong] ‘string’ (MYS 20:4404); *suzu ga oto* [bell GEN sound] ‘sound of bell’ (MYS 14:3438).

Ôno S. claims that characteristic (4a) above (i.e. that 90% of *ga* marked first person pronouns or persons close to the speaker) determined the later developmental path of *ga*. That is to say, GEN *ga* developed into NOM *ga* because most nouns marked by *ga* are *uchi* (inside) persons, who are active agents acting on the *soto* (outside) entities (1977a: 7-8).\

Ôno S. (1977a) also attributes characteristic (4b) (i.e. *ga* not occurring with adjectives in relative clauses) to the *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction. For example, *no* can be seen in expressions such as follows:

(5) a. *matu-kage no/* kiyoki *pamabye ni* (MYS 19:4271)  
    pine.tree-image GEN/*pure(RT) beach* LOC  
    ‘at the beach, where the image of the pine trees is pure,...’

b. *pito no kwo no/* *kanasike (< kanasiki) sida pa* (MYS 14:3533)  
    person GEN daughter GEN/*darling(RT)* TOP  
    ‘when the daughter of the person (who is out of my control) is darling,’

In these examples, the NPs marked by *no* (i.e. *matu-kage* ‘image of pine tree’ and *pito no kwo* ‘the daughter of the person’) take RT forms of adjectives (i.e. *kiyoki* ‘pure’ and *kanasike* ‘darling’). On the other hand, NPs marked by *ga* do not occur with adjective predicates in relative clauses; they only occur with verbal predicates (e.g. *kimi ga yuku miti*

---

7 I will discuss dialectal variations in Chapter 6. Some dialects have NOM *no*, instead of *ga*, which seems to present a significant obstacle for Ôno S.’s account.
[you GEN go(RT) road] ‘your going road’.

Ôno S. explains that since NPs marked by *ga* are *uchi* (inside) persons who act on the outside world, such NPs do not agree with the use of adjectives that describe static conditions of the outside world (i.e. *soto*).

With regard to characteristic (4c) (i.e. *ga* marking animals and plants), Ôno S. explains that those animals and plants were relevant to people’s daily life, and people felt intimacy with them, and thus they were marked by the *uchi* (inside) indicator *ga*.

Ôno S. (1977b) regards characteristic (4d) (i.e. high frequency of *ga* in eastern dialects) as one of the catalysts which promoted the change from GEN *ga* to NOM *ga*. According to him, in terms of simplification of grammar, eastern dialects were innovative and more advanced. He explains that the expansion of the use of *ga* disregarding the pejorative/honorific distinction and the *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction was a simplification of eastern dialects and lower class people, which allowed *ga* to become nominative during the social upheaval in the age of wars (1573-1600).

---

8 There are two inflectional classes in adjectives. One is called *ku*-adjectives, which generally describe static objective conditions (e.g. big, small, long, short, thick, thin, etc.), and the other *shiku*-adjectives, which generally describe temporary human feelings (e.g. sad, fun, happy, etc.). Despite the fact that *ga*-marked NPs do not occur with adjective predicates in relative clauses, Ôno S. (1977a: 12) observes that *ga*-marked NPs can take *sa*-nominalized *shiku*-adjectives because *shiku*-adjectives are related to human feelings, e.g. *papa ga kanasi-sa* [mother GEN dear-NMZ] ‘mother’s dearness’ (MYS 892), *imo ga kanasi-sa* [lover(female) GEN dear-NMZ] ‘my lover’s dearness’ (MYS 4391).

9 Ôno S. lists three examples for the innovative nature of eastern dialects, one from the Nara period (710-793) based on *Man'yōshū*, and the other two from the Muromachi period (1338-1573) based on documents by Christian missionaries. Already in the Nara period, the A/B (*kō/otsu*) distinction for the *e*-line (e.g. *ke* vs. *kye*, and *me* vs. *mye*) had collapsed in the *azuma-uta* (eastern songs). In the Muromachi period, /se/ was pronounced as [je] in the central dialect, but as [se] in eastern dialects, which is now the standard in ModJ. Considering [sa, su, so], the change from [je] to [se] is a simplification. Another example is a simplification of verb inflections. As early as at the end of the Muromachi period, *kami-nidan* (upper bigrade) and *shimo-nidan* (lower bigrade) inflections began to be simplified to *kami-ichidan* (upper monograde) and *shimo-ichidan* (lower monograde) respectively in eastern dialects. See Martin (1987) for verb inflections.

10 It is problematic to regard eastern dialects homogeneous, however. Some modern dialects in Shizuoka, Yamanashi, and Kanagawa prefectures have NOM *n* (< *no*).
As for the use of *no*, Ōno (1977a) provides a detailed categorization for words marked with *no* as follows:

(6) Words marked with *no*

- a. Place names, e.g. *Yosino* ‘Yoshino’; *Sumiyosi* ‘Sumiyoshi’; *Apadi* ‘Awaji’
- b. Entities in nature, or time, e.g. *yama* ‘mountain’; *kapa* ‘river’; *woka* ‘hill’; *kaze* ‘wind’; *ame* ‘rain’; *paru* ‘spring’; *natu* ‘summer’; *asa* ‘morning’; *yoru* ‘night’
- c. Plants, e.g. *pana* ‘flower’; *kusa* ‘grass’; *take* ‘bamboo’; *pagi* ‘bush clover’
- d. Creatures, e.g. *sika* ‘deer’; *pototogisu* ‘cuckoo’; *kapikwo* ‘silkworm’
- e. Parts of a house, e.g. *yadwo* ‘door’; *magaki* ‘front hedge’
- f. Personal belongings, and means, e.g. *katami* ‘memento’; *kazasi* ‘ornament hairpin’; *sube* ‘means’
- g. Properties, e.g. *kurenawi* ‘scarlet’; *ake* ‘vermilion’; *kaza-paya* ‘fast like wind’
- h. Psychologically remote persons and deities, e.g. *tawayamye* ‘delicate woman’; *pito* ‘person’; *ama* ‘diver, fisherman’; *satuwo* ‘hunter’; *kamwi* ‘deity’

It should be said that the inside/outside distinction proposed by Ōno S. is presented as rather prescriptive. He shows how applicable the *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction is to some characteristic uses of *ga* and *no*, but it is not the case that he came to his conclusion based on an examination of the full distribution of the particles. Certainly the *ga*-marked *sumyera* ‘emperor’ in *Norito* and *Senmyô*, which has been mentioned above, is problematic for his account. Also, the *uchi/soto* distinction does not explain place names which contain GEN *ga* very well, e.g. *Irago-ga-sima* [Irago-GEN-island] (MYS 1:23); *Wazami-ga-para* [Wazami-GEN-field] (MYS 2:199).
2.2.1.2 Ōno T. (1978)

Ōno T. (1978) offers an analysis different from the widely accepted views discussed above. In particular, he argues against Ōno S. et al. (1974) and Nihon Dai-jiten Kankō-kai (1976), which advocate the inside/outside distinction and the pejorative/honorific distinction. According to him, GEN ɣa came from a demonstrative pronoun ɣa (as in kano ‘that’, kare ‘he’, and kaku ‘this way’) and developed into a genitive with deictic focus (shiji kyōchō: 54), while no came from an emotive particle ɣa (kandō Joshi: 62) to indicate that the speaker is moved and developed into a regular genitive via a genitive of emotive expressions (kandō hyōgen: 62). (We will discuss the origins of ɣa and no in more detail in the next chapter.) Ōno T. (1978:62) summarizes the differences between ɣa and no as follows:11

(7) a. No can be seen in emotive expressions (kandō hyōgen) such as oso no miyabi-wo [stupid( Root) GEN elegance-man] ‘the stupid elegant man!’ (MYS 2:126), apare no tori [being, darling GEN bird] ‘darling bird!’ (MYS 18:4089), omosiro no tuki no yoru ya [refreshing(Root) GEN moon GEN night Excl] ‘(what) a refreshing moonlit night!’, ana kanasi no wakare ya [Intj sad(Stem) GEN parting Excl] ‘(lit.) Oh, the parting of sadness! > How sad the parting!’. In contrast, there are no such expressions with ɣa.

b. No can be seen in emotive expressions such as paru-same no apare [spring-rain GEN affect] ‘the touching quality of spring rain’ (Shōsōin documents of the Nara

---

11 Ōno T. does not specify sources for his examples in this list. I located some of them by using Sō-sakuin and Ōno S. et al. (1974). The A/B (kō/otsu) distinction is not made when data seem to be of EMJ.
period), \textit{kiki no kanasi mo} [listening GEN touching Excl]^{12} ‘listening (to the birds singing) is so touching’ (MYS 18:4089). In contrast, there are no such expressions with \textit{ga}.

c. \textit{No} can be seen in emotive expressions such as \textit{Ipami no ya/ Takatuno-yama no/ ko-no-ma yori} [Iwami GEN Intj/ Takatsuno-Mt. GEN/ tree-GEN-space from]^{13} ‘Oh, in the land of Iwami, from a space between the trees on Mt. Takatsuno’ (MYS 2:132), and \textit{itwokwo ya no imo no mikoto} [beloved.one Intj GEN wife GEN honorable.person] ‘(my) honorable beloved wife’ (KJ Song 4). In contrast, there are no such expressions with \textit{ga}.

d. \textit{No} can be seen in such expressions as \textit{kaku no sama} [this.way GEN situation] ‘a situation like this’ (Sennyô 27), \textit{tokiziku no kaku-no-ko-no-mwi} [timeless(RY) GEN fragrance-GEN-tree-GEN-fruit] ‘seasonless wild orange (\textit{tachibana}) fruit’ (MYS 18:4111), \textit{ojoku no fio} [many(RY) GEN people] ‘many people’,^{15} \textit{taye-mu no kokoro} [end-Vol(RT) GEN intention] ‘intention of separating’ (MYS 12:3072), \textit{wasure-zi no ykusuye} [forget(MZ)-Neg GEN destination] ‘the destination that (I) don’t forget’, \textit{nomi te no noti} [drink(RY) Conj GEN after(N)] ‘after drinking’

^{12} Zenshû analyzes this use of \textit{no} as a semantic theme marker (\textit{naishôgo-kaku}). The sentence final particle \textit{mo} is used with SS forms of adjectives in many cases. This is a single clause sentence, and \textit{no} in this example is certainly different from other GEN \textit{no}. In fact, the use of \textit{no} in this construction is not common; usually the emphasizing \textit{si} is used as in \textit{X si kanasi mo} [X Empph darling Excl], e.g. MYS 13:3342, 14:3408, 14:3479, and 15:3693.

^{13} The interjective \textit{ya} is often inserted between a noun and its preceding modifier, e.g. \textit{kasikoki ya/ kamwi no watari pa} [fearful(RT) Intj/ deity GEN straits TOP] ‘the fearful (Intj) straits of the deity’ (MYS 13:3335); \textit{ama-tobu ya/ kari wo} ... [sky-fly(RT) Intj/ wild.goose ACC] ‘a sky-flying (Intj) wild goose’ (MYS 15:3676). In the latter example, \textit{ama-tobu ya} is a \textit{makura-kotoba} (pillow word) used to introduce such words as \textit{tori ‘bird’} and \textit{kari ‘wild goose’}.

^{14} Song 134 is a variation of 132 in a different text of \textit{Man’yôshû}: \textit{Ipami naru/ Takatuno-yama no/ ko-no-ma yu no} [Iwami COP(RT)/ Takatsuno-Mt. GEN/ tree-GEN-space from Intj] ‘In the land of Iwami, from a space between the trees on Mt. Takatsuno’. In the first lines, GEN \textit{no} in Song 132 corresponds to the copula \textit{nari (<ni ari [LOC existi]) in Song 134. See Chapter 3, Section 3.3.3.2 for the copula hypothesis about the origin of GEN \textit{no}, i.e. pre-OJ *\textit{mu ‘copula’} > GEN \textit{no}.

^{15} I could not locate this example, but it is viable, even as ModJ.
(MYS 5:821, etc.), asu made no inoti [tomorrow till GEN life] ‘life till tomorrow’, 17 miyako yori no tukaft [capital from GEN messenger] ‘a messenger from the capital’. In contrast, there are no such expressions with ga.

e. No can be used in such metaphoric expressions as fana no kafo [flower GEN face] ‘flowered face’ (GM, Nowaki), tuyu no inoti [dew GEN life] ‘dew-like (transient) life’ (MYS 17:3933), while there are no such expressions with ga.

f. No can be used in such appositive expressions as Koretaka no miko [Koretaka GEN prince] ‘Prince Koretaka’ and Narifira no asomu [Narihira GEN Sir] ‘Sir Narihira’, but there are no such expressions with ga.

g. No can be seen in poetic makura-kotoba (pillow words) and jo-kotoba (prefaces) such as twoga no kwi no/ iya tugi-tugi ni [hemlock.spruce GEN tree GEN Intj succession in] ‘Hemlock spruce, Oh, in succession ...’ (MYS 6:907), and Mogami-gafa/ nobore ba kudaru/ ina-bune no/ ina ni fa ara-zu [Mogami-river/ go.up(IZ) Conj go.down(RT)/ rice-boat GEN/ nay LOC Emph COP-Neg(SS)] ‘Mogami River, the rice boat is going up and down. And it is not “nay” (ina ‘rice’ vs. ina ‘nay’) that ...’ (KKS 1092). However, ga does not occur in such examples.

h. No does not mark RT forms of predicates, while ga does.

i. When marking an NP which directly refers to a specific individual, basically ga is used, instead of no.

16 Song 821 begins with awo-yanagwi/ ume to no pana wo [blue-willow/ plum.tree together:with GEN blossom ACC] ‘a blue willow and plum blossoms’, in which to ‘together with’ is inserted in the NP ume no pana ‘plum blossoms’. It is regarded as an unusual use of to by both Taikei and Zenshû. When connecting two NPs, X and Y, the regular use of to is either [X to Y] or [X to Y to].

17 I could not locate this example, but it is viable, even as ModJ.

18 Koretaka no miko (844-897?, cf. KKS 74, 945), Ariwara no Narihira (825-880).

19 Makura-kotoba (conventionally “pillow word”, although they are usually phrases) and jo-kotoba (preface) are rhetorical techniques in Japanese verse to introduce specific words. In the first example, twoga no kwi no [hemlock.spruce GEN tree GEN] is makura-kotoba to introduce tugi-tugi ‘in succession’. In the second example, Mogami-gafa/ nobore ba kudaru/ ina-bune no [Mogami-river: go.up(IZ) Conj/ go.down(RT) rice-boat GEN] is jo-kotoba to introduce ina, which is a homonym of ‘rice’ and ‘nay’.
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j. When there are both [X no Y] and [X ga Y], the former is the regular expression, and the latter is to emphasize the possessor X (or the entity to which Y belongs).

k. Ga was originally a demonstrative, and it necessarily follows nouns or quasi-nominals (jun-taigen). In contrast, no was originally interjected as an emotive particle (i.e. kandō joshi in his terminology), and it does not necessarily follow nouns or quasi-nominals.

According to Ôno T., it is evident from (7a) to (7j) that (7k) is the essential difference between ga and no (i.e. ga deriving from a demonstrative, and no from an emotive particle).

Although Ôno T. (1978: 50) defines the degree of emotiveness (kandō-do) for emotive expressions from 1 to 5, his analysis above is predeterministic, and not always as rigorous as he purports to be. Overall, he relies on peculiar data about GEN no, which he all claims to be “emotive expressions”, and his claim about GEN no does not account for the majority of its general use, e.g. the use of GEN no in place names.

In his observation, (7g) and (7h) are in fact inaccurate. There are makura-kotoba (pillow words) such as imo ga ipye ni [beloved GEN house LOC] (MYS 17:3952) for Ikuri (place name: partial homonym of iku ‘go’), asi ga tiru [reed GEN scatter] (MYS 20:4331) for Nanipa (place name), kwo-ra ga te wo [woman-Dim GEN arm ACC] (MYS 10:1815) for Makimuku-yama ‘Mt. Makimuku’ (partial homonym of maki (RY) ‘have someone’s arm as a pillow’, and tori ga naku [bird GEN sing] (MYS 18:4131) for Aduma ‘the east’. If we put (7g) more precisely, there is no makura-kotoba (pillow word) or jo-kotoba

---

20 According to Ôno T., the degree of emotiveness of one-syllable emotive particles (e.g. ya and yo) is 1, that of one-syllable emotive interjectives and two-syllable emotive particles (e.g. kamo and paya) is 2, that of two-syllable emotive interjectives (e.g. ana and ono) is 3, that of three-syllable emotive interjectives (e.g. anani and apare) is 4, and that of four or more syllable emotive interjectives (e.g. ananiiya and ananiiyeya) is 5. For example, he lists oso no miyabi-wo [stupid(Root) GEN elegance-man] ‘the stupid elegant man!’ (MYS 2:126) as an emotive expression in (7a), but there is no apparent emotive particle in the phrase, which suggests his subjectivity.
(preface) that ends with *ga*. As for (7h), there are a few counterexamples, e.g. *taye-mu no kokoro* [cease(MZ)-Conjec(R.T) GEN heart] 'intention of ceasing (the relationship)' (MYS 12:3072) in OJ; *ware ya yuka-mu no/ isayofi ni* [I KP go(MZ)-Vol(R.T) GEN/ hesitation LOC] 'with the hesitation of (whether) I go (or you come)' (KKS 690) in EMJ.

With regard to the pejorative/honorific distinction, Ōno T. (1978: 56-7) specifically claims that it did not exist until the Insei period (1086-). He lists counter examples such as *kimi ga yo* [you GEN world] 'your world' (you = *dajōdaijin*: the highest rank in the government outside the imperial family) (KKS 16:830), *kimi ga yo* [emperor GEN reign] 'the reign of the emperor' (EM, Matsu no shidue), *tomodati no fito no kuni fe makari-keru ni yome-ru* [friend GEN person GEN country to go-Evi(R.T) on compose-Res(R.T)] '(I) composed (this song) on my friend’s going to another's' province' (KKS 372), and *tomo no aduma fe makari-keru toki ni yome-ru* [friend GEN east to go-Evi(R.T) time at compose-Res(R.T)] '(I) composed (this song) on my friend’s going to the east' (KKS 379), which cannot be accounted for by Aoki’s pejorative/honorific distinction or Ōno S.’s *uchi/soto* distinction.

Ōno T. claims that *ga* was used for individual names (as well as first and second person pronouns) simply due to its demonstrative origin. According to him, it was generally the case that lower-ranked people were called by their names, while higher-ranked
persons were referred to in indirect ways (e.g., by title or by place of residence). Based on this social custom, \textit{ga} and \textit{no} developed into the pejorative and honorific indicators respectively in the Insei period.\(^{21}\)

2.2.1.3 Yamada (1913 [1954])

Yamada (1913: 409-10) claims that the essential difference between \textit{ga} and \textit{no} is the difference in placement of focus.\(^{22}\) That is, in \([\text{NP}_1 \text{ GEN} \text{ NP}_2]\), \textit{NP}_1 is the focus when \textit{ga} is used, while \textit{NP}_2 is the focus when \textit{no} is used. This resembles Ôno T.'s point about the function of GEN \textit{ga}.

Yamada (1913: 400) summarizes the differences between GEN \textit{no} and GEN \textit{ga} as in the table below:

\(^{21}\)Ôno T. (1978: 56) explains that \textit{Ikeda no aso ga/ pana no ue wo pore} \([\text{Ikeda GEN Sir GEN/ nose GEN above ACC dig}]\) ‘Dig above Sir Ikeda’s nose’ (MYS 16:3841), \textit{Pozumi no aso ga/ waki-kusa wo kare} \([\text{Hozumi GEN Sir GEN/ armpit-smell ACC cut}]\) ‘Cut Sir Hozumi’s armpit grass (a pun with smell)’ (MYS 16:3842), and \textit{Peguri no aso ga/ pana no ue wo pore} \([\text{Heguri GEN Sir GEN/ nose GEN above ACC dig}]\) ‘Dig above Sir Heguri’s nose’ (MYS 3843) are examples of an extended use of GEN \textit{ga} to mark an individual’s name. This runs counter to Ôno S.’s (1977a: 9) account of the same songs. According to Ôno S., GEN \textit{ga} was used to make fun of the people in these songs.

\(^{22}\)I have interpreted his \textit{igi-zyoo no syuten} \([\text{meaning-on GEN main point}]\) ‘the semantic main point’ as the focus of the phrase.
1. In [X GEN NP2], indicating X as GEN for NP2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no</th>
<th>ga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1-1. X = Noun; forming names</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1-2. X = Noun; NP2 belongs to X</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1-3. X = Noun; X specifies NP2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1-4. X = Noun; X similar to NP2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2. X = Pronoun</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3. X or NP2 = Numeral/Quantity</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4. X = Adverb</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In [NP1 GEN Y], Y is not a Noun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no</th>
<th>ga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1. NP1 is a complement of Y; Y = Adverb</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES (NP1 = Pronoun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-2. NP1 is a complement of Y; Y = Predicate</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES (NP1 = Pronoun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-1. [NP1 GEN] as a modifier; Y = Noun</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-2. [NP1 GEN] as a modifier; Y = Predicate</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-3. [NP1 GEN] as a modifier; Y = Adverb</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Yamada’s classification of differences between no and ga

Examples of each category follow.23

1. In [X GEN NP2], indicating X as a genitive constituent for NP2.

1-1. X = Noun

1-1-1. Forming names (no = YES; ga = NO)

- Place Name:24 Yamato no kuni [Yamato GEN country] ‘the country of Yamato’ (MYS 1:1); Unebi no yama [Unebi GEN mountain] ‘Mt. Unebi’ (MYS 1:29)
- Person/Deities: Yatipoko-no-kamwi-no-mikoto (a name of a deity); Sa-Yamada no wodi [Pref-Yamada GEN old.man] ‘Old Man Yamada’ (MYS 17:4014)
- Things: kusa-nagi no tani [grass-cutting GEN sword] ‘Kusanagi Sword’ (KJ, Jō),

23 The translations may be awkward due to my efforts to keep his original wording.
24 GEN ga can be found in many place names (e.g. Fuji-ga-para). But Yamada does not classify them into this category, because he regards those place names with ga forming a single unit, based on his “focus account” (1913: 406).
tokiziku no kaku-no-ko-no-mwi [timeless(Ku) GEN smell-GEN-tree-GEN-nut]

'seasonless wild orange (tachibana) fruit' (KJ, Chū, Suinin)

1-1-2. NPz belongs to X (in a broad sense) (no = YES; ga = YES)

• no: Siga no Karasaki 'Karasaki in Shiga' (MYS 1:30); Ami-no-ura no ama wotomye-ra [Ami-no-ura GEN diver girl-Pl] 'diver girls in Ami-no-ura'

• ga: tati ga wo [sword GEN thong] 'sword thong' (KJ Song 2); sumyera ga mikadwo [lord GEN court] 'the lord’s court' (Senmyö 7);

1-1-3. X (= property) specifies NPz (no = YES; ga = NO)

ame no Kagu-yama [heaven GEN Kagu-Mt.] 'heavenly Mt. Kagu' (MYS 1:2);

yama-gosi no kaze [mountain-coming, over GEN wind] 'the wind coming over the mountain' (MYS 1:6)

1-1-4. Appositive (X similar to NPz) (no = YES; ga = NO)

ni-tutuzi no nipopa-mu toki no sakura-bana saki-na-mu toki ni [red-azalea GEN bloom(MZ)-Conjec(RT) time GEN cherry-blossom flourish(RY)-Perf(MZ)-Conjec(RT) time LOC] 'when red azaleas bloom, and when cherry blossoms flourish'

(YM 6:971); ti-na no i-po-na [1,000-rumor GEN 5-100-rumor] 'many rumors'

(YM 4:731); ya-tuka-po no ikasipo [eight-grip-ear.of.grain GEN vigorous ear.of.grain] 'long vigorous ear of grain' (Norito, Toshigoi no matsuri); yorodu-ti-aki no naga-aki [10,000-1,000-autumn GEN long(Root)-autumn] 'many years, eternity'

(Norito, Ōtono hokai)

25 The adjective tokizi- 'timeless; uncertain in time; out of season' has the RY form tokiziku (MYS 1:26) and RT form tokiziki (MYS 8:1627), but the use of GEN no marking the RY form tokiziku is rather strange. According to Zenshu (MYS 1:6), -zi is a suffix of negation. Thus, this tokiziku seems to be derived from toki-zí-ku [time-Neg-Ku(NMZ)], cf. toki-zi-mi [time-Neg-Mi(NM2¹) (MYS 1:6), kamo zi mono 'despite not being wild ducks' (MYS 1:50), sika zi mono 'despite not being deer' (MYS 2:199). Taikei (vol.1:334) and Ōno S. et al. (1974) regard this -zi as sharing the same origin with the adjectival ending -si.

26 We can also find a similar ti-aki no i-po-aki [1,000-autumn GEN 5-100-autumn] 'many years, eternity' (Norito, Ōnie no matsuri).
1-2. X = Pronoun (no = YES; ga = YES)

- **no**: ko no ‘this’ (MYS 854, 873, 3440, 3768, etc.); so no ‘that (mesial)’ (MYS 4000, 4054, 4113, 4122, etc.); ka no ‘that (distal)’ (MYS 3565); kore no ‘this’ (MYS 245, 1237, 4420); iedere no ‘which’ (MYS 3593, 4392, etc.); nani no ‘what’ (MYS 2969, 3912, etc.)

- **ga**: wa ga ‘my’ (MYS 812, 822, etc.); a ga ‘my’ (MYS 3767, 3751, etc.); ono ga ‘my’ (MYS 886, 3535, etc.); na ga ‘your’ (MYS 800, 3425, etc.); si ga ‘that (mesial)’ (MYS 4191, 4254); so ga ‘that (mesial)’ (KJ Song 100); ta ga ‘whose’ (MYS 3424, 4397, etc.)

1-3. X or NP2 = Numeral/Quantity (no = YES; ga = NO)

- ti-yorodu no ikusa [1,000-10,000 GEN war] ‘many wars’ (MYS 6:972); ya-swo no sima-mi [8-10 GEN island-surrounding] ‘surrounding of many islands’ (MYS 7:1399); tosi no ya-tose [year GEN eight-years] ‘many years’ (MYS 11:2832);
- kamwi no kotogoto [deity GEN all] ‘all of the emperors’ (MYS 1:29); ti-pye no pito-pye [1,000-layer GEN one-layer] ‘1/1000, a little’ (MYS 509, 963, etc.)

1-4. X = Adverb (no = YES; ga = NO)

- kaku no sama [like.this GEN situation] ‘a situation like this’ (Senmyô 59); apare no tori [affect GEN bird] ‘a touching bird’ (MYS 18:4089)

2. In [NP1 GEN Y], indicating NP1 as genitive for non-nominal Y.

2-1. NP1 being a complement

2-1-1. Complement of adverb (no = YES; ga = YES)

- **no**: kaze no muta [wind GEN together] ‘together with the wind’ (MYS 15:3661);
- opokimi no mikoto no manima [lord GEN words GEN as] ‘as the words of the lord’

---

27 Treating apare as an adverb is questionable.

28 Yamada regards muta ‘together’ and manima ‘as’ as adverbs, but syntactically they seem to be nouns. According to Ōno et al. (1974), muta corresponds to moto (in their romanization) ‘being together’ in Korean. It seems to be mawu (< mwo’two) ‘all; together’ in Martin (1992).
as the lord says’ (MYS 20:4331)

*ga (only with pronouns): na ga manima ni [you GEN as LOC] ‘as you want’ (MYS 5:800); kimi ga manima to [you GEN as Comp] ‘(thinking) that (I) follow you’ (MYS 17:3993); kimi ga muta [you GEN together] ‘together with you’ (MYS 15:3773)

2-1-2. Complement of predicate (no = YES; ga = YES)

•no: miru no goto [seaweed GEN be.like] ‘like seaweed’ (MYS 5:892); kapa-mo no gotoku [riverweed GEN be.like] ‘like riverweed’ (MYS 2:196); mi-si pi no gotoku [see-Evi day GEN be.like] ‘like the day when we saw (each other)’ (MYS 20:4473)

•ga (only with pronouns): a ga gotoku [my GEN be.like] ‘like me’ (MYS 15:3750)

2-2. [NP1 GEN] being a modifier

2-2-1. for noun (no = YES; ga = NO)

tuyu no inoti [dew GEN life] ‘dew-like (transient) life’ (MYS 17:3933); waka-kusa no tuma no mikoto [young-grass GEN wife GEN honorable.person] ‘young-grass-like (innocent) honorable wife’ (KJ Song 4)

2-2-2. for predicate (no = YES; ga = NO)

yaku sipo no omopi so yakuru [burn(Vt/RT) salt GEN heart Emph burn(Vi/RT)] ‘like burning salt, my heart burns’ (MYS 1:5); murasaki no nipopye-ru imo [purple.grass GEN be.flourishing beloved] ‘purple-grass-like flourishing beloved’ (MYS 1:21); asi-tadu no ana tadutadusi [reed-crane GEN Intj uneasy] ‘uneasy, oh, like a (lonely) crane in the reeds’ (MYS 4:575); kaze no to no topoki wagimo [wind GEN sound GEN remote my.beloved] ‘the-sound-of-wind-like remote beloved’ (MYS 14:3453);

29 Yamada regards goto and gotoku 'be like' as predicates, but goto seems to have been a noun.

30 Waka-kusa no [young-grass GEN] is a makura kotoba (pillow word) for tuma 'wife'.

50
ama-kumo no tayutapi kure ba [sky-cloud GEN sway(RY) come(IIZ) Conj] ‘since (I) came swaying like clouds in the sky’ (MYS 15:3716)31

2-2-3. for adverb (no = YES; ga = NO)

kadi no oto no tubara-tubara-ni [oar GEN sound GEN thoroughly] ‘like the sound of the oar penetrating (to the heart) (= ModJ simizimi to)’ (MYS 18:4065)32

According to Yamada (1913:403), when GEN ga and no mark pronouns, they exhibit a complementary distribution; ga marks wa ‘I’, a ‘I’, ono ‘you’, ta ‘who’, si ‘that (mesial)’, and so ‘that (mesial)’ as a possessor, in which the focus is on the ga-marked NP, while no marks ko ‘this’, so ‘that (mesial)’, ka ‘that (distal)’, kore ‘this’, idure ‘which’, and nani ‘what’ as a demonstrative modifier, in which the focus is on the following NP.33

In cases where NP2 belongs to NP1 (in a broad sense) in [NP1 GEN NP2], he claims that the tie between NP1 and NP2 is felt to be stronger when ga is used than when no is used, based on the following pairs of examples:

(8) a. tati ga wo [sword GEN thong] (KJ Song 2) vs. tama no wo [gem GEN thong] (MYS 11:2791)

b. sumyera ga mikoto [lord GEN words] (Senmyô 12) vs. opokimi no mikoto [lord GEN words] (MYS 17:3973)

c. Irago-ga-sima [Irago-GEN-island] (place name) (MYS 1:23)34 vs. Irago-no-sima [Irago-GEN-island] (MYS 1:24)

---

31 In the last two examples, kaze no to no [wind GEN sound GEN] and ama-kumo no [sky-cloud GEN] are generally analyzed as makura-kotoba (pillow words) for tayutapi ‘sway’ and toposi ‘remote’ respectively.

32 In this song, the first three lines Asa-biraki/ iire kogu nuru kadi no oto no [morning-opening/ inlet row Conj. oar GEN sound GEN] ‘The early morning departure, rowing in the inlet, the sound of the oar’ is a jo-kotoba (preface) for tubara-tubara ‘onomatopoeia for thoroughness’.

33 In fact, both si ‘that (mesial)’ and so ‘that (mesial)’ can be marked by ga as demonstrative modifiers, which contradicts Yamada’s account.

34 GEN ga in this example is questionable. Yamada seems to have used the Kan’ei text of Man’yôshû. According to Taikei and Zenshû, it is read as Irago-no-sima.
d. Pudipara ga upe [Fujiwara GEN above(N)] (MYS 1:50)  
   vs. mi-wi no upe [Bt-well(N) GEN above(N)] (MYS 2:111)

e. Pudiwi-ga-para [Fujü-GEN-field] (place name) (MYS 1:52)  
   vs. Paniyasu no ike [Haniyasu pond] (MYS 2:201)

   vs. Mano no pari-para [Mano GEN black.alder-field] (MYS 3:280)

   vs. Tapusi-no-saki [Tôshi-GEN-cape] (MYS 1:41)

h. tadu ga kowe [crane GEN voice] (MYS 15:3595)  
   vs. momo-tori no kowe [100-bird GEN voice] (MYS 5:834)

i. ume ga pana [plum GEN blossom] (MYS 5:845)  
   vs. ume no pana [plum GEN blossom] (MYS 5:820)

j. nadesikwo ga pana [pink(plant) GEN flower] (MYS 18:4114)  
   vs. nadesikwo no pana [pink GEN flower] (MYS 8:1496)

Yamada attributes the strength of connection in these compounds (or phrases) to the position of focus. He explains that the focusing effect of ga is so strong that the usual focus-final effect (due to the nature of head-final languages) is offset (i.e. NP₁ and NP₂ being of equal importance), and thus the tie between NP₁ and NP₂ is felt to be stronger as a single unit, compared with [NP₁ no NP₂], which follows the usual focus-final order.

Yamada provides a few interesting observations, but some of his grammatical analyses do not seem appropriate. Above all, his main claim that the essential difference between ga and no is the difference in placement of focus is not convincing. His judgments about the differentiated strength of genitive connections seem subjective and predetermined to fit his account.

35 According to Taikei and Zenshû, the name of the place is Nosima-no-saki. But the sidenote to the song indicates that a certain variant uses Nosima-ga-saki.

36 Yamada’s focus interpretation seems to be partly influenced by the use of ga for marking a focus in ModJ. Also, refer to Ôno T.’s (1978: 54) analysis that ga was a genitive of deictic focus (shiji kyöchō). As explained in Chapter 1 (Section 1.4.1.7), ga is not an unmarked nominative case marker in ModJ, and often involves a focus connotation, e.g. Kyoo ga nitiyoobi desu [today NOM Sunday COP] ‘It is today (that) is Sunday’. However, whether ga had a focusing function already in OJ is questionable, cf. the emphasizing particle si. See Chapter 3, Section 3.5.
2.2.1.4 Hashimoto (1969)

Hashimoto (1969) does not commit to any particular account about the distinction between \textit{ga} and \textit{no}, but speculates that \textit{ga} was more widely used before OJ, and then \textit{no} became more common later (:95). He agrees with the pejorative/honorific distinction from the Insei period and thereafter, but hesitates to accept its existence for the OJ period (:98). Hashimoto provides the following list of differences between \textit{ga} and \textit{no}, although it overlaps with Yamada’s (1913) observation in many respects:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{a. GEN \textit{no} can be used with numerals, but such examples are not attested with \textit{ga}, e.g. \textit{ti-pye no pito-pye} [1,000-layer GEN one-layer] ‘1/1000’ (MYS 2:207); \textit{ti-yorodu no ihusa} [1,000-10,000 GEN war] ‘many wars’ (MYS 6:972); \textit{tosi no ya-tose} [year GEN eight-years] ‘many years’ (MYS 16:3865).}
\item \textit{b. GEN \textit{no} can be used for repeating similar expressions in adverbial phrases, but such examples are not attested with \textit{ga}, e.g. \textit{ti-na no i-po-na ni} [1,000-rumor GEN 5-100-rumor LOC] ‘as many rumors’ (MYS 4:731); \textit{ni-tutuzi no/ nipopa-mu toki no/ sakura-bana/ saki-na-mu toki ni} [red-azalea GEN/shine.in.red-Conjec time GEN/ cherry-blossom/ bloom-Perf-Conjec time LOC] ‘when red azaleas shine in read, and when cherry blossoms bloom’ (MYS 6:971); \textit{ya-taka no ikasi po ni} [eight-grip-ear.of.grain GEN vigorous ear.of.grain] ‘like long vigorous ears of grain’ (Norito, Toshigoi no matsuri).}
\item \textit{c. \textit{No} can be used with non-nominal words, but such examples are not attested with \textit{ga}, e.g. \textit{ari te no ato} [exist(RY) Conj GEN after(N)] ‘after (it) existed (or happened)’ (source unknown); \textit{kaku no sama} [like.this GEN situation] ‘a situation like this’ (Senmyô 27).}
\end{enumerate}
d. GEN ga can mark a predicate in its RT form (i.e. nominalized form), but such examples are not attested with no:37 e.g. miru ga tomosi-sa [see(RT) GEN enviable-NMZ] ‘enviability of the seeing’ (MYS 15:3658); yuku ga kanasi-sa [go(RT) GEN sad-NMZ] ‘sadness of going’ (MYS 20:4338).

e. As for pronouns, ga is used with a ‘I’, wa ‘I’, ono ‘you’, si ‘that’, and ta ‘who’, while no is used with such words as ko ‘this’, so ‘that (mesial)’, ka ‘that (distal)’, kore ‘this thing’, and nani ‘what’.

f. Kimi ‘you, lover’, papa ‘mother’, kwo ‘child, lover’, wotomye ‘girl’, imo ‘lover (female)’, and sumyera ‘lord’ are usually marked by ga; no is rarely used. Sometimes both ga and no can be used, e.g. Irago-ga-sima or Irago-no-sima [Irago-GEN-island] ‘Irago Island’; ume ga pana or ume no pana [plum.tree GEN blossom] ‘plum blossoms’.

g. In Kojiki and Nihonshoki, ga seems to be used relatively more often than in other materials, e.g. tati ga wo [sword GEN thong] ‘sword thong’ (KJ Song 2); so ga pa [that(mesial) GEN leaf] ‘that leaf’ (KJ Song 100); pi ga kakura ba [sun GEN hide(MZ) Conj] ‘if the sun hides,...’ (KJ Song 4); tosi ga ki-pure ba [year GEN come(RY)-pass(IZ) Conj] ‘since the year came and passed,...’ (KJ Song 29).

Based on observation (9g) above, and perhaps also based on the assumption that songs in Kojiki and Nihonshoki are older than those of Man’yoshū, Hashimoto speculates that ga was more widely used before the OJ period, and then no became more common later.38 This is particularly interesting since such words as pi ‘sun’, so ‘that’, and tosi ‘year’ should have been marked by no, instead of ga, if based on the pejorative/honorific

---

37 This observation is not accurate, as pointed out for ôno T.’s observation (see Section 2.2.1.2). Also, ku-nominalized forms can be marked by GEN no, e.g. topa-maku no posiki wagimo [ask(MZ)-VoI(Ku) GEN desirable(RT) my.beloved] ‘my beloved, who (I) want to ask’ (MYS 9:1742).
38 Kojiki was compiled in 712, Nihonshoki in 720, and Man’yoshū around 759. The relative chronology among the songs contained in these works is not all clear. Some scholars regard GEN ga as an older genitive than GEN no (e.g. Kobayashi 1938; Akiba 1978).
(or inside/outside) distinction. It is difficult to maintain the distinction by saying that the author felt some intimacy with *pi* ‘sun’, *so* ‘that’ (i.e. *ma-tubaki* ‘camellia’ in the song), or *tosi* ‘year’. These examples also cast strong doubt on the existence of a pejorative/honorific distinction in the OJ period.

2.2.1.5 Summary

With regard to the differences between GEN *ga* and GEN *no* in OJ, I have briefly reviewed Aoki’s (1952) pejorative/honorific distinction, Ôno S.’s (1977a/b; Ôno et al. 1974) *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction, Ôno T.’s (1978) analysis based on his hypothesis of the origins of the particles, Yamada’s (1913) analysis based on the differential placement of focus, and Hashimoto’s (1969) observations.\(^\text{39}\)

The pejorative/honorific distinction and the *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction seem to be applicable to many instances of *ga* and *no*. However, there are also many exceptions to this distinction (e.g. place names). Above all, the pejorative/honorific distinction and the inside/outside distinction are social differentiations, and it appears that the distinction between *ga* and *no* cannot be thoroughly described in terms of a clear-cut dichotomy between “pejorative” or “inside” on the one hand, and “honorific” or “outside” on the other; these are not the essential features that determined the particles’ distributions. On the contrary, I will argue in the following section that the social sensitivity

\(^{39}\) In a more recent study, Takeuchi (1999) provides a rather different view. According to her, “… the definition of *ga* as disjunctive, and of *no* as conjunctive or similar, is at the basis of the distinction in the sense that the other characteristics can be derived from it” (ibid.: 158). She regards the ablative *kara* and the locative *ni* as possible locative cognates with GEN *ga* and *no* respectively (ibid.: 159). Her accounts appear to be based on secondary sources, and she does not provide sufficient evidence or discussion.
of language users, particularly in court society, associated the characteristic distributions of the particles with social differentiation. Also, we still have to ask how and why the distinction emerged in the first place.

Ôno T.'s (1978) judgments about the emotiveness of no and Yamada's (1913) judgments about the differential strength of genitive connections (and placement of focus) are not based on separately stated criteria. However, there seems to be some truth to these observations. Although Ôno T. relies on peculiar examples for his claim about the origin of GEN no (i.e. derived from an interjective emotive particle), these peculiar examples need an explanation. As for GEN ga, Ôno T. and Yamada share a similar view; both recognize the focusing function in the use of GEN ga. In particular, Ôno T. claims that the focusing function of GEN ga had been derived from its demonstrative origin (i.e. from ko (or ka) 'this'). I will discuss the origins of GEN ga and GEN no in the next chapter.

2.2.2 The Pejorative/Honorific Distinction Reexamined

Among the accounts for the differences between GEN ga and GEN no, the pejorative/honorific distinction is most widely accepted. Although the notions of uchi/soto (inside/outside) exhibit broader applicability in Japanese linguistics (and from which the pejorative/honorific distinction seems to have been derived), let us regarded the uchi/soto distinction as a variation of the pejorative/honorific distinction on this particular issue of GEN ga and no. Despite its well-accepted status, I claim in this section that the pejorative/honorific distinction was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development. In other words, it was not among the core semantic functions of the genitive particles. Rather, I argue that the social sensitivity of language users, particularly in court
society, associated the characteristic distributions of the particles with social differentiation, and developed the particles into markers of social deixis.

First, I will examine the Man'yōshū data. Although the first person and the second person pronouns are predominantly marked by *ga*, it turns out that *ga* and *no* exhibit overlapping distribution with many words. Therefore, the pejorative/honorific distinction does not have a strong theoretical ground in the Nara period (710-793). Crosslinguistic data also support my claim that the pejorative/honorific distinction was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development.

Second, I will examine present-day dialect data. The only dialects that observe the pejorative/honorific distinction with *ga* and *no* are several dialects in Kagoshima and Shimane prefectures. Most dialects, including Std-ModJ, despite their elaborate honorific systems, do not index social distinctions with particle use. The dialect evidence also suggests that the pejorative/honorific distinction was not due to any essential functions of the particles.

Lastly, consideration of the origins of GEN *ga* and GEN *no* also casts a strong doubt on the pejorative/honorific distinction in OJ.

2.2.2.1 Overlapping Distributions in Man'yōshū

It is well known that some nouns can be marked by both *ga* and *no*. For example, both *ume ga pana* [plum.tree GEN blossom] ‘plum blossoms’ (MYS 5:837, 845) and *ume no pana* (MYS 5:820, 822, 18:4041, 20:4497, etc.) are attested. The pejorative/honorific distinction, in a strict sense, does not provide a good explanation for these examples. Even if based on the broader *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction (Ôno S. 1977a/b), it is as if

---

40 As far as we can confirm exact readings from the use of Chinese characters as phonograms, there are only two instances of *ume ga pana*, while there are more than 30 instances of *ume no pana* in Man’yōshū.
plum blossoms were psychologically close for poets who used *ga* (i.e. an inside entity), but distant for poets who used *no* (i.e. an outside entity), at least on these occasions of use.41

There are in fact quite a few nouns with which we can observe both *ga*-marking and *no*-marking in *Man'ōshū*. They are listed below. See also Appendix A for details:

(10) a. Creatures:

   *aka-gwoma* 'red-horse'; *kamo* 'duck'; *tadu* 'crane'; *tori* 'bird'

b. Plants:

   *asi* 'reed'; *ume* 'plum tree'; *sasa* 'bamboo leaves'; *nadesikwo* 'pinks (flower)';

   *pama-matu* 'beach pine tree'; *matu* 'pine tree'; *wobana ga* [susuki(Japanese pampas grass) GEN] vs. *mi-kusa no* [water-grass GEN]

c. Nouns of personal reference:

   *imo* 'beloved'; *kimi* 'you'; *ta ga* [who GEN] vs. *tare no* [who GEN] vs. *tare si no* [who Emph GEN];

   *titi-papa ga* [father-mother GEN], cf. *titi no mwi* [chichi(plant) GEN nut] (a pun on *titi* 'father');

   *tuma* 'mate'; *tegwo/tegwo-na* 'beloved girl'; *papa* 'mother';

   *wakugwo/warapa* 'child'; *wotomye* 'girl'  

d. Others:

   *kamwi* 'god/deity/spirit'; *pimo* 'string'

Neither in these examples, nor in other NPs which contain a genitive particle, could I find any particular phonological distributions of *ga* and *no*. There is no consistent correspondence between the choice of a genitive particle and the last syllable before the

---

41 Other accounts do not provide a good explanation for this contrast between *ume ga pana* and *ume no pana* 'plum blossoms', either. Ōno T. (1978: 54) claims that while *ume no pana* is neutral, *ume ga pana* is emphatic due to the use of *ga* which contains a function of deictic focus (*shiji fyôchâ*) resulting from its demonstrative origin. Yamada (1913: 406) claims that the tie between *ume* 'plum tree' and *pana* 'blossom' is felt to be stronger in *ume ga pana* forming a single unit because *ume* is focused by the use of *ga*. Their interpretations seem predetermined, and we cannot explain all the overlapping distribution below based on this kind of focus interpretation. Also, see Note 36 for Yamada's (1913) focus interpretation.
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genitive, the last vowel before the genitive, the first syllable after the genitive, or the first consonant after the genitive. Thus, the distinction between ga and no is not phonologically conditioned.

Past studies have discussed a few such co-occurring words, such as ume ‘plum tree’, kimi ‘you’ and papa ‘mother’, but not all of the examples above together. A common explanation for these exceptions is based on the pejorative/honorific distinction, and holds that, for example, ga for kamwi ‘deity’ in kamwi ga two [deity GEN gate] ‘the deity’s straits’ (MYS 7:1216) is exceptionally motivated due to the fact that the deity in the straits is fearsome and obstructs the traffic, which leads to the animus expressed towards the deity in this song. However, kamwi in kamwi no watari [deity GEN straits] ‘the deity’s straits’ (MYS 13:3335, 3339) is marked by GEN no in the same context. As for creatures and plants, the use of ga is attributed to the speaker’s intimacy towards them, or to their relevancy to the speaker’s life (Ôno S. 1977a), but the use of no for the same creatures and plants makes this explanation seem ad hoc. In short, the pejorative/honorific distinction or the inside/outside distinction does not account for the overlapping distribution above.

In addition to the use of ga for sumyera ‘emperor’ in Norito and Senmyô, as well as the use of ga in place names (see Section 2.2.1.1 above), these overlapping distributions in Man’yôshû raise a question about the pejorative/honorific distinction in OJ. What we observe is a loosely separated complementary distribution, not a strict one. It is certainly not like gender marking in other languages, which generally operates on clear-cut categorization. Nevertheless, GEN ga exhibits a characteristic distribution; first and second person pronouns (e.g. a, wa, ono ‘I’; na ‘you’) are marked by ga without exception,42 and persons closer to the speaker (e.g. lover, wife, husband) are predominantly marked by ga.

42 The word kimi ‘you’, which can be marked by both GEN ga and no, originally meant ‘lord’. 59
Although why GEN ga exhibits such a distribution remains to be answered, it is not that the characteristic distribution is a result of the pejorative/honorific distinction. Rather, I would suggest, socially sensitive language users somehow saw a similarity between the characteristic distribution of GEN ga and social distinctions in their lives, and reinterpreted GEN ga, together with GEN no in contrast to ga, as markers of social deixis in the late Heian period and thereafter.

In fact, it is hardly peculiar to Japanese that people develop a particular sociolinguistic differentiation in language use which originally had nothing to do with social notions. In this respect, the pejorative/honorific distinction in GEN ga/no in Japanese seems to be similar to the "T/V" (tu-vous) distinction in European languages (e.g. Wardhaugh 1986): French (tu/vous), Latin (tu/vos), Russian (ty/vy), Italian (tu/Lei), German (du/Sie), Swedish (du/ni), Greek (esi/esis), and once English (thou/you). T varieties are originally 'singular you', and V 'plural you'. Although the precise social nuances are slightly different depending on the speech community, mutual T usage generally indicates "intimacy" and/or "solidarity", while mutual V is a "polite" usage. Non-reciprocal T/V usage represents a "power" relationship; giving T but receiving V means one is higher in a social power structure.

In Middle Korean (MK), GEN s, which is called sai sics (medial s) in Korean, was used to mark inanimate nouns or honorific animate nouns, whereas another GEN 'uy'/oy was used to mark ordinary animate nouns (Martin 1990, 1992). In Modern Korean (ModK), GEN s became unproductive, and GEN uy is used for all kinds of nouns; the honorific/non-honorific distinction has been lost. As Martin (1990) suggests, the distinction in MK may well have been a local and temporary development, just like the distinction between GEN ga and no in Japanese.
It is worth noting that GEN no, which is said to have been used for honorification, has become the unmarked and only productive genitive in Std-ModJ, whereas Korean GEN uy, which is said to have been used for non-honorification, has become the unmarked and only productive genitive in standard modern Korean. Therefore, crosslinguistically we cannot even predict whether the honorific variant wins out or the non-honorific variant wins out.

Since language is a social product, it is possible, even likely, that people will pick up some part of grammar, and apply it to index social distinctions, but there is little evidence that they pick what they pick on the basis of anything like a rule. Much the same seems to hold true of the disappearance of such indexical practice.

2.2.2.2 Dialect Variation

*In Genitive Use*

In most modern Japanese dialects, *ga* lost its genitive function, and *no* has become the unmarked and only genitive particle.43 However, we can observe the use of *ga* as a genitive in some dialects. According to Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo (1989), one hears *ore ga tenugui* or *ora ga tenugui* [I GEN kerchief] 'my kerchief', instead of the dominant *ore no tenugui*, in the circled areas of Map 2.1.

In these areas, we can also observe *sensei ga tenugui* [teacher GEN kerchief] and *doroboo ga tenugui* [thief GEN kerchief], but the distribution is sparser. Nevertheless, the pejorative/honorific distinction does not exist in these dialects, since both *sensei* 'teacher' and *doroboo* 'thief' are marked by GEN *ga*.

Interestingly, some dialects in Okinawa prefecture exhibit a pattern opposite to the pejorative/honorific distinction. In these dialects, *sinsii* (:: sensei 'teacher' in Std-ModJ) is

---

43 I will discuss dialectal variations of genitive derivatives in detail in Chapter 6.
marked by *ga*, while *nusuuru* (:: *dorobo* ‘thief’ in Std-ModJ, cf. *nusubito* ‘thief’) is marked by *nu*, which came from *no*.

Despite their elaborate honorific systems and the preservation of GEN *ga*, those dialects in the circled areas in Map 2.1 and Okinawa do not exhibit a lexically determined pejorative/honorific distinction in their use of genitive particles. This suggests that the pejorative/honorific distinction was not something hard-wired in grammar; it was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development.

**In Nominative Use**

As mentioned above, *ga* lost its genitive function in most modern Japanese dialects, but it has changed to a nominative(-like) particle. However, we can also observe NOM *no* in some dialects. According to Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo (1989), people use *no*, instead of *ga*, to mark *sensei* in *sensei ga korareta* [teacher NOM came] ‘The teacher came’ in the circled areas of Map 2.2.

According to Hirayama (1997-98), dialects in Kagoshima and Shimane prefectures have the pejorative/honorific distinction in subject-marking *ga* and *no*. Therefore, they have
no-marking for sensei ‘teacher’, as seen in Map 2.2, but ga-marking for ame ‘rain’ and doroboo ‘thief’ in Ame ga hutte-kita ‘The rain came to fall’ and Doroboo ga haitta ‘A thief broke in.’

However, dialects in northwestern Kyushu have all no-marking for sensei ‘teacher’, ame ‘rain’, and doroboo ‘thief’. Dialects in Shizuoka allow both ga-marking and no-marking for all the three subjects. Most dialects in Okinawa and some dialects in Kochi exhibit a pattern opposite to the pejorative/honorific distinction. They have ga-marking for sensei (or sinsii) ‘teacher’, but no-marking (nu in Okinawa) for doroboo (or nusuuru) ‘thief’.

These dialect variations are more likely to be a result of dialect-internal developments, and suggest that the pejorative/honorific distinction in MJ was not the essential feature of ga and no.

2.2.2.3 Origins and the Distinction

Although I cannot propose any definitive answers in this study, the issue of the differences between GEN ga and GEN no comes down to their origins. Might the lexical
sources of *ga* and *no* have exhibited a contrast similar to the pejorative/honorific distinction or inside/outside distinction in pre-OJ? It seems highly unlikely that such lexical items pertaining to social differentiations came to be generalized as genitive particles. Rather, a more plausible hypothesis is that GEN *ga* and *no* were derived from lexical items unrelated to such social notions. In the course of grammaticalization to a genitive particle, each item expanded its linguistic coverage, and their overall distributions were determined through competition while many sociolinguistic factors came into play.

We can take numeral expressions with GEN *no* and GEN *tu* as another example for the relationship between lexical sources and later distinctions. It is said that numeral expressions marked with a genitive are only attested with GEN *no* (e.g. Ōno S. 1977a; Hashimoto 1969). This observation is not entirely accurate since GEN *no* may mark [Numeral + Classifier] (e.g. *pito-tuki no nigoreru sake* [one-cup GEN cloudy sake] 'a cup of cloudy sake' MYS 338), whereas, as will be discussed below, GEN *tu* may mark numeral bound nominals (e.g. *ipo-tu tori* [500-GEN bird] 'many birds' MYS 4011). It is rather difficult to assume that some linguistic features of the lexical sources of *no* and *tu* led to the different uses in numeral expressions.

What seems to happen in a situation where two or more forms are in competition is that, although there may be some fluctuation at the beginning, once a certain choice has become a linguistic norm in a speech community for some reason, that choice may sweep out the other option(s).\(^{44}\) In other words, all the distributions of competing forms may not have been determined by linguistic necessities that follow from the features of the original lexical sources. It seems likely that determining processes involve historical contingency. I will return to this theme in Chapter 6.

\(^{44}\) For example, GEN *ga* in OJ has developed into NOM *ga* in many modern Japanese dialects. In Kyushu dialects, however, it is GEN *no* that has developed into NOM *no*. See Chapter 6.
Regarding the origins of *ga and *no, Ōno T.'s hypothesis has been mentioned above, but there are other hypotheses. One hypothesis is that *ga and *no originated from the same lexical item and developed into two different forms (i.e. X > *ga, *no). The other is that *ga was derived from *n-ka, of which *n is the source for GEN *no. I will discuss these hypotheses in the next chapter, but in these cases as well, it is difficult to imagine how the pejorative/honorific distinction or the inside/outside distinction could have motivated the separation.

In any case, if we consider the origins of GEN *ga and GEN *no, we have to conclude that the pejorative/honorific distinction or the inside/outside distinction must have been a result of a secondary development, and not part of the core functions of the particles.

2.2.2.4 Summary

As shown by the overlapping distribution in Man'yoshū, the pejorative/honorific distinction does not have a strong theoretical ground in the Nara period. Also, variations in the use of *ga and *no in modern Japanese dialects suggest that the pejorative/honorific distinction was not something hard-wired in these particles. From a theoretical standpoint as well, it is difficult to theorize the origination of GEN *ga and GEN *no as based on a pejorative/honorific distinction.

Nevertheless, the first person and the second person pronouns are predominantly marked by *ga in OJ, and the pejorative/honorific distinction is recognizable in literary works of MJ. It is therefore more likely that people's social sensitivity picked up on a particular distribution of *ga and *no, and then developed these particles into markers of social deixis.
2.3 GEN *tu*

As explained in the introduction to this chapter, GEN *tu* has been studied less than GEN *ga* and *no* in past studies. Those studies have sought to identify a specific function of *tu* by generalizing from attested examples, which are by nature very limited. For example, Ōno S. et al. (1974) explain that GEN *tu* in OJ was used in many cases with nouns that express location or basic positions, such as *ama-* ‘heaven’, *oki-* ‘offing’, and *kami-* ‘upper part’. Many scholars regard *tu* as a locative-genitive (e.g. Murayama 1957; Miller 1971; Itabashi 1987). According to Ōno T. (1978), the specific function of GEN *tu* was to specify a member X in a group Y in the form of [X *tu* Y] (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2.4). But the observations made in past studies are, on closer examination, not thorough.

By examining all examples of GEN *tu* in *Man’yōshū*, I claim in this section that: (i) *tu* was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ; and (ii) Bd-Pro (bound pronominal) *tu* had already developed from GEN *tu* in pre-OJ long before GEN *ga* and *no* developed into Bd-Pro in MJ (cf. Bd-Pro *no* in *akai no* [red one] ‘a/the red one’). The first claim suggests the importance of GEN *tu* in our study of OJ and pre-OJ. The second claim is based on numeral expressions in *Man’yōshū*. I will briefly explain Bd-Pro in the discussion below, but see Chapter 6 for my claim that GEN *no*, *ga*, and *tu* all took the same developmental path in various Japanese dialects, viz. GEN > pronominal GEN > bound pronominal (Bd-Pro) > nominalizer > sentence final particle.

2.3.1 Examination of GEN *tu* in *Man’yōshū*

This subsection provides a detailed examination of GEN *tu* in *Man’yōshū*. Despite the claims of past studies, the function of *tu* as a genitive in *Man’yōshū* seems to have been more general than specialized. It also exhibits overlapping distribution with GEN *no* in
many uses. Further, GEN tu was used to connect two nouns in some complex semantic relationships. Given these observations, I claim that tu was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ.

All the uses of GEN tu in Man'yōshū and relevant notes are provided in Appendix B. I will use only selected data in the following discussion. A close examination of the examples reveals the following five points, numbered I-V.

I. The use of GEN tu is spread throughout Man'yōshū, and is not limited to particular books, particular types of songs, or particular dialects.45

II. Despite the locational or positional nouns in (11a) below, the data in (11b) show that GEN tu is not a mere locative:

(11) Nouns Marked by GEN tu in Man'yōshū

a. Locations, Positions
ama ‘heaven’; ipye ‘house’; umi ‘sea’; oki ‘offing’; oku ‘inner part’; kami ‘upper part’; kuni ‘earth; state’; Kuni ‘Kuni (place name)’; saki ‘ahead’; sima ‘island’; simo ‘lower part’; toki ‘time’; two ‘outside’; naka ‘middle’; nipa ‘yard’; nwo ‘field’; pye ‘beach’; muka ‘far side’; yama ‘mountain’; wata ‘sea’; woto ‘far place’

b. Other Kinds of Nouns
ipo ‘500’; siko ‘fool (Bd)’; tanabata ‘loom’; tama ‘gem’; toko ‘eternity, eternal (root)’; topo ‘far (root)’; pana ‘flower’; po ‘jut; tip’; mi-ke ‘food’; mi-wo ‘water stream’; moto ‘root; past’; momo ‘hundred’; yu ‘august thing’

III. The examples in (12) below show that GEN tu and GEN no may mark the same nouns or bound nominal morphemes, which were not used by themselves:

45 This observation is also supported by the fact that GEN tu is used throughout Nihonshoki, e.g. oki-tume-mo [offing-GEN-seaweed] (Song 4); toyo-ata-te-pimye [Bt-Ata(place)-GEN-princess] (preface to Song 4); muka-te-wo [far-side-GEN-summit] (Song 108); pama-te-irori [beach-GEN-plover] (Song 4); pina-te-mye [countryside-GEN-woman] (Song 3); yamye-te-pimye [Yame(place)-GEN-princess] (Book VII, Keikau 18-nen); yomo-te-siko-mye [Hades-GEN-ugly-woman] (Book I Kamiyo, Jō); yomo-te-pirasaka [Hades-GEN-Hirasaka(place)] (Book I Kamiyo, Jō). (GEN tu is underlined when a Chinese character is assigned to it.)
Overlaps between GEN \textit{tu} and GEN \textit{no}.

\textit{ama no gapa} [river] ‘Milky Way’ (MYS 3658)

b. \textit{kuni tu kamwi} [earth GEN deity] ‘the deities of the earth’ (MYS 904)
\textit{kuni no kami} [state GEN head] ‘governor (of the province)’ (MYS 3098)

c. \textit{siko tu okina} [fool(Bd) GEN old.man] ‘stupid old man’ (MYS 4011)
\textit{siko no mi-tate} [Prefix-shield] ‘my humble shield’ (MYS 4373)

d. \textit{topo tu kuni} [far(Root) GEN country] ‘the other world’ (MYS 1804)
\textit{topo no kuni} ‘far country (i.e. Korea)’ (MYS 3688)

e. \textit{wata tu mi} [sea GEN spirit] ‘the spirit of the sea’ (MYS 15:3597, etc.)
\textit{wata no soko} [bottom] ‘the bottom of the sea’ (MYS 7:1223, etc.)

These data show that the differentiation between GEN \textit{tu} and \textit{no} is not a matter of phonology, and that there is no reason to regard GEN \textit{tu} as a special kind of genitive. The different genitive particles, \textit{no} and \textit{tu}, in some cases reflect differences in meaning, as seen in (12b) and (12d). Assignment of different meanings to similar structures based on similar function words in competition is crosslinguistically common, and those semantic differentiations are often linguistic norms at the time, and have less to do with differences in the function words (e.g. \textit{the House of Representatives} vs. \textit{the representatives’ house}; \textit{a thing of beauty} vs. \textit{a beautiful thing}; \textit{America’s Olympic network} vs. \textit{American Olympic network}).

IV. As partly seen in the third point above, it was common for GEN \textit{tu} to have been used with bound nominal morphemes in an adjectival function. See the examples below:46

---

46 In relation to these bound nominals, the adjectives \textit{toko-si} ‘eternal’, \textit{topo-si} ‘far’, and \textit{yuyu-si} ‘awe-inspiring’ are attested, while \textit{siko-si} ‘ugly’ and \textit{po-si} ‘superior’ are not. Bound nominals are not limited to adjective-like morphemes, e.g. \textit{muka-tu wo} [far.side-GEN ridge] ‘the ridge on the far side’ (MYS 14:3448, etc.), cf. \textit{muka-baki} [-attachment] (MYS 16:3825), \textit{muka-basu} [-lie.down] (MYS 5:800, etc.).
(13)  a. siko-tu okina [fool(Bd)-GEN old.man] (MYS 17:4011)
    b. toko-tu mikadwo [etemity(Bd)-GEN palace] (MYS 2:174)
    c. topo-tu kamu.oya [far(Root)-GEN ancestor] (MYS 18:4096, etc.)
    d. po-tu taka [jut(Bd)-GEN hawk] ‘distinguished hawk’ (MYS 17:4011)
    e. yu-tu ipamura [august(Root)-GEN rock.crowd] ‘august rocks’ (MYS 1:22)

GEN no exhibits exactly the same use with bound nominals, as shown below:

(14)  a. siko-no mi-tate [fool(Bd)-GEN Bt-shield] (MYS 20:4373)
    b. siko-no siko-kusa [fool(Bd)-GEN fool-grass] ‘damn grasses’ (MYS 12:3062)
    c. topo-no kuni [far(Root)-GEN country] ‘Korea’ (MYS 15:3688))
    d. topo-no mikadwo [far(Root)-GEN court] (MYS 15:3688, etc.)

We also find modification without a genitive, as shown below:

(15)  a. siko-ya ‘shabby hut’ (MYS 13:3270)
    b. siko-pototogisu ‘foolish cuckoo’ (MYS 8:1507)
    c. toko-pa [etemity-leaf] ‘ever-green leaves’ (MYS 14:3436, etc.)
    d. topo-duma ‘the wife in a remote place’ (MYS 7:1294, etc.)
    e. topo-to ‘remote sound’ (MYS 4:531, etc.)
    g. moto-pye ‘the root side’ (MYS 13:3222)
    h. yu-sasa ‘august bamboo grass’ (MYS 10:2336)
    i. yu-tane ‘august seed’ (MYS 7:1110)

From (13), (14), and (15), i.e. from these uses of GEN tu, GEN no, and the non-use of any genitive with bound nominals, we cannot induce any generalization from their distribution. This phenomenon seems to be another example supporting the idea that the distribution of competing forms (or structures) is determined not solely by linguistic factors, but rather involves historical contingency.

V. GEN tu can be used to connect two nouns in some very complex semantic relationships, as seen in (16) below:
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(16) Advanced Uses of GEN tu

a. *pana tu duma* [flower GEN wife] ‘flower-like wife’ (MYS 3370)
   cf. *tuyu no inoti* [dew GEN life] ‘dew-like (transitory) life’ (MYS 3933);
   *waka-kusa no tuma* [young-grass GEN wife] (MYS 4331)

b. *ama tu swora nari* [heaven GEN sky COP] ‘be empty’ (MYS 2887)
   cf. *uwa no sora* ‘empty minded’ in ModJ; *ya-tuka po no ikasi po* [eight-grip ear.of.grain GEN vigorous ear.of.grain] (appositive) (Norito)

c. *mi-ke tu kuni* [Bt-food GEN country] ‘countries offering food (tribute)’ (MYS 933)

d. *tanabata-tu-myöe* [loom-GEN-woman] ‘female weaver; Orihime’ (MYS 2027)

Under (16a) are metaphorical uses. Those of (16b) are appositive. As shown in the data, these uses of GEN *tu* are also similar to some of the uses of GEN *no*. The other two, (16c) and (16d), do not express a prototypical genitive relationship, either, such as possession, belonging, or location.

If we assume that GEN *no* and *tu* were derived from content words, these complex uses suggest that the semantic meanings of these genitives were already well-bleached out in OJ. Or, even if we assume that these genitives started out from a very basic genitive function, such as possession or location, still we have to say that GEN *tu* and *no* were at an advanced stage of their development as genitives in OJ. It is less likely that these extended uses had developed separately at a stage earlier than the basic functions.

Given these observations, it can be claimed that *tu* was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ. In OJ, the use of GEN *tu* was limited, and it became unproductive in MJ. In fact, there is no possessive expression in the attested examples of *tu*. Was GEN *tu* ever used to express possession? I suspect it was, for three reasons. First, possessive is one of the most basic and productive functions of the genitive, and it is likely to precede complex uses in (16). Second, as will be discussed in Chapter 6, Fukuoka

47 *Waka-kusa no* is a makura-kotoba (pillow word) for *tuma* ‘wife’.
dialects have developed various functional morphemes out of GEN *tu*. Among them, Bd-Pro *to/tu* are observable in possessive expressions. And third, as will be seen shortly, Middle Korean has GEN *s* (so-called *sai sios*, medial *s*), which was used to express possession or belonging as one of the basic genitive functions, and it seems likely that MK GEN *s* and OJ GEN *tu* are cognates (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1).

Therefore, sometime prior to the OJ period, the three genitives, *tu*, *ga*, and *no*, came into competition, and for some reason, the possessive function of GEN *tu* was completely swept out by GEN *ga* and *no* in OJ. Or, another possible scenario would be that GEN *tu* was the primary genitive in a dialect in northern Kyushu in the pre-OJ period, and some of its uses got into the dialect in Nara, but not the possessive use, because of the preexisting GEN *ga* and *no*. GEN *tu* in OJ may appear to be a locative, simply because we do not observe its possessive use, which makes its locative use salient as a result. Also, the reason why GEN *tu* is observable in many contrasting pairs (e.g. *ama-tu-kamwi* [heaven-GEN-deity] vs. *kuni-tu-kamwi* [earth-GEN-deity]) may not be due to its grammatical functions, but rather due to the mechanism of fossilization or dialect borrowings; it is reasonable to assume that if some lexical items are often used in pairs, they are also likely to survive, or get into another dialect, as pairs.

2.3.2 GEN *tu* and Numeral Pronominals

In relation to GEN *tu*, numeral pronominals are intriguing. I claim in this subsection that *-tu* in numeral pronominals is bound pronominal (Bd-Pro) derived from GEN *tu*.

Numeral expressions in OJ are basically the same as those in ModJ. As shown in (17a) below, the numeral series with *tu*, e.g. *pito-tu* ‘one’ and *puta-tu* ‘two’, usually occur
alone as pronominals. They cannot, however, directly modify nouns as modifiers. In contrast, as in (17b), the numeral series without tu, e.g. pito- ‘one’ and puta- ‘two’, cannot occur by themselves. Instead, they always directly precede nouns as modifiers:

(17) a. Numerical Pronominals

pito-tu [one-tu] (e.g. wa ga mwi pito-tu pa [I GEN body one TOP] ‘myself (TOP)’, MYS 2691); puta-tu [two-tu] (e.g. puta-tu nasi [two lacking] ‘It is the only one,’ MYS 412); mi-tu [three-tu]; yo-tu [four-tu]; itu-tu [five-tu]; mu-tu [six-tu]; nana-tu [seven-tu]; ya-tu [eight-tu]; kokono-tu [nine-tu]

b. Bound Numerical Nouns

pito- ‘one’ (e.g. pito-pye ‘one layer’ MYS 2520; pito-tose ‘one year’ MYS 2218); puta- ‘two’ (e.g. puta-yo ‘two lives’ MYS 1410); mi- ‘three’ (e.g. mi-tose ‘three years’ MYS 1740); yo- ‘four’; i-/itu- ‘five’; mu- ‘six’; nana- ‘seven’; ya- ‘eight’; kokono- ‘nine’

What is this -tu in numerical pronominals? Ono S. et al. (1974) explain that this -tu and the -ti in fata-ti [twenty-ti] ‘twenty’ (Ise 9) and ipo-ti [500-ti] ‘five hundred > many’ (MYS 18:4101) share the same origin. According to them, the -ti in fata-ti ‘twenty’ and ipo-ti ‘five hundred’ is equivalent to the numeral classifier -ko in ModJ (e.g. i-kko [one-piece] ‘one piece’; ni-ko [two-piece] ‘two pieces’). There is no further explanation on the -tu, and their explanation is not supported by any evidence. Similarly, Martin (1987: 367) explains without any discussion that the -tu is a specialized use of GEN tu, but he is still vague. On another occasion (1990), Martin explains this use of tu as a kind of nominalization, but he does not consider it different from GEN tu, and does not explain why

48 Numerical pronominals can modify nouns with the help of genitive, as in putatu no umi [two GEN sea] ‘two seas’ (MYS 16:3849), and you no pune [four GEN ship] ‘four ships’ (MYS 4264).
49 As exceptions, when numerical pronominals directly precede nouns, they seem to form noun-noun compounds, as in pito-tu-matu [one-pine.tree] ‘a solitary pine tree’ (MYS 6:1042), and mitu-api [three-combined.thing] ‘a string twined from three strings’ (MYS 4:516).
50 The numeral series itti ‘one’, ni ‘two’, san ‘three’, ..., is a borrowing from Chinese.
a genitive morpheme was used for nominalization. Besides, bound numerals (e.g. *pi-to*-
‘one’ and *puta* - ‘two’) can be regarded as nominals, and the use of the term
“nominalization” is not entirely accurate.\(^{51}\)

To be specific, I argue that the -tu in numeral pronominals (e.g. *mi-tu* ‘three’ and
yo-tu ‘four’) is a bound pronominal (Bd-Pro) derived from GEN tu. Its equivalent in Std-
ModJ is Bd-Pro *no* in *akai no* [red one] ‘red one’ or *Taro ga motte-kita no* [Taro NOM
hold-came one] ‘the one which Taro brought’ in ModJ. Thus, *mi-tu* is literally ‘three
things’. This claim has no problem at all in terms of semantics. It is also supported by
dialect data, developmental processes of genitives, and historical evidence, as seen below.

I will examine dialectal variation in Chapter 6, but there are nearly perfect
 correspondences among *no* in Std-ModJ, *tu* in southern Fukuoka dialects (S-Fukuoka), and
*ga* in Toyama dialects across a variety of functions. Combined with historical evidence and
functional/semantic developmental processes, these correspondences show us that GEN *no*,
*ga*, and *tu* took the same developmental path in different dialects: i.e. GEN > pronominal
GEN > Bd-Pro > nominalizer > sentence final particle (see Chapter 6 for details). For
example, Bd-Pro *no* in Std-ModJ corresponds to Bd-Pro *tu* in S-Fukuoka, e.g. *akaka tu*
[red one] ‘a red one’; *Taro no motte-kita tu* [Taro NOM hold-came one] ‘the one that Taro
brought’.\(^{52}\) Thus, the morpheme *tu* is in fact observable (i.e. attested) today as Bd-Pro.

In the developmental process, pronominal GEN (Pro-GEN) is the bridging stage
between GEN and Bd-Pro. I call it Pro-GEN since it combines the function of GEN and
the meaning of a bound pronominal, e.g. *no* in *ore no* [I GEN.one] ‘mine’; *Sore wa

\(^{51}\) It was long after I wrote an earlier version of this section that I found Martin’s speculations. My claim
that the -tu in numeral pronominals is Bd-Pro originally came from the observations of dialect variations in
Chapter 6, not from Martin’s speculations.

\(^{52}\) Toyama dialects have Bd-Pro *ga*, instead of the standard *no*, as in *akai ga* [red one] ‘red one’ or *Taro ga
motte-kita ga* [Taro NOM hold-came one] ‘the one that Taro brought’.
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Tanaka-san no desu [that TOP Tanaka-Mr. GEN.one COP] ‘That is Mr. Tanaka’s.’ I claim in Chapter 6 that Pro-GEN starts out by omitting the noun after GEN when it is understood from context, e.g. ore no hon [I GEN book] ‘my book’ > ore no [I GEN.one] ‘mine’. GEN no becomes Pro-GEN [GEN.one] in such uses by gaining the function of a general pronominal, since it could substitute for various kinds of omitted nouns. Next, the genitive function was bleached out, and the particle no came to be used as Bd-Pro, e.g. akai no [red one] ‘the/a red one’. The result is the following developmental path: GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro.

Given this developmental path, it becomes more plausible that Bd-Pro  

in numeral expressions, because, as seen in (19) below, the use of genitive is observable in some numeral expressions in OJ:

(19) Numeral-GEN-

i-tu-tu [5-GEN-one] ‘five things’ (Bussoku 19)
(cf. i-po- [5-100-] in OJ; i-so- [5-10-] in EMJ, cf. ya-swo- [8-10] in OJ)
(cf. double genitive derivatives: ore ga tu [I GEN one] ‘mine’ in S-Fukuoka; your-s [you(GEN)-one]);

i-tu-tose [5-GEN-year] ‘five years’ (MYS 880);

ipo-tu tori [500-GEN bird] ‘many birds’ (MYS 4011);

ipo-tu tudwopi [500-GEN beads] ‘many beads’ (MYS 4105);

ipo-tu tuna [500-GEN rope] ‘many ropes’ (MYS 4274);

momo-tu sima [100-GEN island] ‘many island’ (MYS 3364);

momo-na pito [100-GEN person] ‘many people’ (NS, Song 11)

Perhaps the use and the non-use of genitive in numeral expressions co-existed in pre-OJ, and GEN tu developed into Bd-Pro by omitting the following noun.

An interesting example to note is a numeral pronominal itutu ‘five’, which has double tu. The bound numeral itu- directly modifies a noun, e.g. itu-tose [five-year] (MYS 33 In this example, the Chinese character dou3 ‘bean’ is used to represent the genitive. Taiket reads it as du, while Zenshū as tu.
In *Man'yōshū*, we observe *i-po~[5-100-]*, for which the combination of two Chinese characters, 'five' and 'hundred', are used. In *EMJ*, we have attested examples of *i-so~[five-ten-]*. Therefore, the morpheme *i-* meant by itself 'five', and *i-tu-tu* can be parsed as [five-GEN-one(pronominal)]. This seems to be a sort of "reverse formation". That is, once Bd-Pro *tu* was established by bleaching the genitive function of Pro-GEN, the bound numeral *i* 'five' and Bd-Pro *tu* 'one' were connected again by GEN *tu*. I call this kind of word "double genitive derivatives", and they turn out to be fairly common developments, e.g. English *your-s* [you(GEN)-one]. See Chapter 6 for more discussion.

Depending on the analysis, it is possible to regard the *-tu* in numeral pronominals as Pro-GEN, e.g. *mi-tu* [three-GEN-one]. However, given the Bd-Pro status of the second *tu* in *i-tu-tu* [five-GEN-one], and also given the fact that bound numerals up to ten do not need

---

54 In some cases, the mora *i* was often written with the combination of Chinese characters for 'five' and 'ten', e.g. *i* 'sleep' (MYS 9:1787); *ikada* 'raft' (MYS 1:50). That is, writing 'fifty' to be read as *i*. This observation suggests that the numeral *i* meant not only 'five', but also 'fifty'. According to Ôno et al. (1974), Polynesian languages have similar uses of numbers, such as one word meaning both 'four' and 'forty'.

55 Note also that *tu* in *itu-tose* (MYS 5:880) is written with the same Chinese character used for GEN *tu*, i.e. *du* 'capital'. The same character is used for both *tu* in *itu* in *Iitu* in Bussokuseki (Song 19).

56 I use the term "reverse formation" instead of "backformation" since the latter usually refers to the formation of a base form from a derived form in a paradigmatic environment.

57 Examples of double genitive derivatives are as follows: possessive pronouns in standard English, e.g. *your-s* [you(GEN)-one] and *our-s* [we(GEN)-one]; possessive pronouns in dialects of Southern England, e.g. *our-n* [we(GEN)-one] and *her-n* [she(GEN)-one] 'hers', modeling after *mine* and *thine*: a sort of triple genitive construction in English, *a friend of mine, a great country of ours*: possessive genitive expressions in colloquial German, e.g. *sein(e)-s* [he(GEN)-one], as in *Dass ist (dem) Peter sein(e)* [that is the(DAT) Peter(DAT) his one] 'That is Peter's'; *i-tu-tu* [five-GEN-one] 'five' in OJ (Bussoku 19) as well as in ModJ; *wa ga no* [I GEN one] 'mine' ('my wife' in this particular case) in *Sotanshū* (ca. 10c, EMJ); *ore n to* [I GEN one] 'mine' in Northern Fukuoka, *ore ga tu* [I GEN one] in Southern Fukuoka, and *ore ga no* [I GEN one] in eastern Fukuoka; *ore n ga* [I GEN one] in Toyama. The morpheme *non* in the Kansai area (including Kyoto, Osaka, and Nara), e.g. *ore non* 'mine', may have come from *no no* [GEN one], or possibly the lengthened *noo*. All the examples listed above are the cases in which Bd-Pro is preceded by GEN, i.e. [X GEN one], which I call "reverse formation" based on the origination of Bd-Pro (see Chapter 6, Section 6.2.4). Since Bd-Pro is a pronominal, it can also be followed by GEN, i.e. [X one GEN Y], which is not a case of reverse formation, but certainly a case of double genitive derivatives. For example, see numeral pronominals with genitive, e.g. *puta-tu no umi* [two-one GEN sea] "two seas" (MYS 16:3849) and *yo-tu no pune* [four-one GEN ship] "four ships" (MYS 4264); also a use of Bd-Pro in ModJ, e.g. *akai no no mae* [red one GEN front] 'the front of the red one' and *mote-kita no no nedan* [bring-came one GEN price] "(lit.) the price of the one which (he/she/etc.) brought".
a genitive to modify a noun (e.g. puta-yo [two-life] ‘two lives’), I regard the -tu in numeral pronouns as Bd-Pro, not Pro-GEN. In this analysis, therefore, it can be claimed that Bd-Pro tu had already developed in pre-OJ, long before ga and no developed into Bd-Pros in MJ.

Ôno S. et al. (1974) regard i-po-tu [5-100-tu] and i-po-ti [5-100-ti] as phonological variants with different functions. They explain that ipo-tu was used as a numeral modifier (e.g. ipo-tu tori [500-tu bird] ‘many birds’ MYS 17:4011), while ipo-ti was used as a numeral pronominal, e.g. apabi-tama/ipo-ti mogamo [abalone-gem/ 500-ti SFP(wish)] ‘Plenty of pearls, (I wish I had)’ (MYS 18:4101).58 Due to the limited number of examples, however, generalizations are difficult. Besides, the u/i (no A/B distinction in ti) alternation seems phonologically rare.59 Martin (1987:367) speculates that -ti in ipo-ti came from an extended *-tu-Ci. To be more specific, it seems plausible that -ti was derived from -tu-i, in which -i is to mean ‘thing, fact’, e.g. tamotu-i [keep(RT)-thing] ‘keeping’ and suturu-i [abandon(RT)-thing] ‘abandoning’ (SN, Senmyô 45). Also, the inflectional ending of RY forms of verbs seems to be this -i, e.g. omopi ‘feeling, love’ and sakyebi ‘scream’.60

Ôno S. et al. give the impression that ipo-tu and ipo-ti are the only possible numeral expressions with ipo- ‘five hundred’, and are complementary to each other, one being a

---

58 There is only one example of ipo-ti in Man’yôshû, and no example of patati ‘twenty’ and miswoti ‘thirty’. Miswoti can be seen in Bussokuseki (752 A.D.), Song 2.  
59 Possible examples are kubu-tutu and isi-tutu (KJ Song 10; NS Song 9) for kubu-tuti no tati [head-mallet GEN sword] ‘a sword with a mallet-shape grip’ (KJ, Kamiyo) and isi-tutu no tati [stone-mallet GEN sword] ‘a sword with a mallet-shape stone grip’. Song 29 of Nihonshoki contains kubu-tuti, of which the reading of mi is apparent from the use of Chinese characters. If the second tu in tutu had changed to ti, however, it cannot be a sound change since the first tu did not change to ti.  
60 We do not know much about the morpheme i in OJ. It seems to function as a case particle, in some cases as nominative and in some others as genitive, or seemingly as an interjective particles. In Korean, i is a nominative particle, and also functions as a bound nominal ‘thing, fact’. See Chapter 6 for more discussion.
modifier, and the other being a pronominal. As is the case for other numerals, however, *ipo-*
‘five hundred’ can also directly modify nouns without *-tu*, e.g. *ipo-na* ‘many names’ (MYS 4:731); *ipo-ye* ‘many branches’ (MYS 3:324, 16:3886); *ipo-tose* ‘many years’ (MYS 6:1025); and *ipo-pye* ‘many layers’ (MYS 2:205, 4:662, 8:1650).61 What we observe about the use of *ipo-* ‘five hundred’ seems to be a remnant of competition between the use and the non-use of genitive in numeral modification, also cf. *momo-na pito* [100-GEN person] ‘many person’ (NS Song 11) vs. *momo-tu sima* [100-GEN island] ‘many islands’ (MYS 3367) vs. *momo-pune* [100-boat] ‘many boats’ (MYS 1065).

2.3.3 Make-up of Numeral Nouns

This subsection discusses the make-up of numeral nouns, although it is a little stretch and highly speculative. The numeral forms up to ten seem to be very irregular, and the irregularity could be related to the use of genitive morphemes. Native Japanese nouns mostly consist of one or two mora(s), and any word longer than two moras may reasonably be suspected to be a compound (see the list of nouns in Martin (1987)).62 If there had been such a strong sensitivity to the number of moras in word formation, should the original numeral system in Japanese have varied as it does in number of moras? The initial moras in the numerals are all different, and thus even a one-mora numeral system could have been possible.

61 Another larger numeral *ya-po* [eight-hundred-] ‘eight hundred > many’ also directly modifies nouns without *-tu*, e.g. *yapo-ka* ‘800 days’ (MYS 4:596). There is no attested example of *yapo* with *-tu* modifying a noun.

62 Matisoff (e.g. 1990) refers to the Chinese area of linguistic/cultural influence in Southeast Asia as the “Sinosphere”, and observes that one of the most striking areal features of “Sinospheric” SE Asian languages is monosyllabicity and elaborate tone systems. He notes that Tai, Hmong-Mien, and Vietnamese all have Chinese-type tone systems and thoroughgoing monosyllabicity, and all share a good-sized lexical component. Given the significant influence of Chinese on Japanese since around the sixth century, it might be said that Japanese sits on the edge of the “Sinosphere”. However, its characteristic that most nouns consist of one or two moras has nothing to do with Chinese influence, since we can observe it in most native Japanese nouns in OJ; there is no evidence of Chinese influence in this regard.
Based on this hypothesis, let us examine the basic numeral nouns, namely, *pito-'
*one*, *puta- 'two', *mi- 'three', *yo- 'four', *i-tu- 'five', *mu- 'six', *nana- 'seven', *ya-
'eight', *kokono- 'nine', and *to- 'ten'. We have already examined *i-tu- 'five'. In the
remaining numerals which have more than one mora, *to in *pito- 'one', *ta in *puta- 'two', *na
in *nana- 'seven', and *ko and *no in *kokono- 'nine' could possibly be genitive derivatives.
*GEN na is attested in compounds such as *ma-na-kwo [eye-GEN-Dim] 'pupil'. *GEN no is
of course attested. Given dialect data in Fukuoka (see Chapter 6), it is plausible that *to and
*tu were both genitives, and that *ta was a fossilized phonological variant of *to: cf. *pita-sura
[one-even] 'intently' (NS Kamiyo, Jò); *pita-pye [one-layer] (MYS 14:3435). Finally, *ko
could be the source for *GEN ga (see Section 2.2.1.2 and Chapter 3). If so, then, these
numerals could originally have been *pi-to- [one-GEN-], *pu-ta- [two-GEN-], *na-na- [seven-
*GEN-], and *ko-ko-no- [nine-GEN-GEN-]. Another possibility is that *nana- and *kokono-
are results of reduplication for some unknown reason.

To summarize this hypothesis, all numeral nouns up to ten were possibly one mora
in length, i.e. *pi- 'one', *pu- 'two', *mi- 'three', *yo- 'four', *i- 'five', *mu- 'six', *na-
'seven', *ya- 'eight', *ko- 'nine', and *to- 'ten'.63 The use and the non-use of genitive in
numeral modification co-existed (e.g. *pi-to- [one-GEN-] and *mi- [three-]), and the genitives
preserved in numerals were old variants (i.e. *to, *ta, *na, and *ko). Because of the emergence
of newer genitives (i.e. *tu, *no, and *ga), and also because of the direct numeral modification
of nouns without any genitive (e.g. *mi-tose [three-year] 'three years' MYS 9:1740; *ipo-yo
[500-night] 'many nights' MYS 6:985), the older genitives (i.e. *to, *ta, *na, and *ko) came to
be reanalyzed as a part of the numeral bound nominals; people did not recognize them as
genitives any more. If this hypothesis is correct (even if only for some item(s) among *pito-

63 Even in ModJ, it is possible to hear people counting by saying *hi, hu, mi, yo. ... 'one, two, three, four,
....' But this may have been derived from the shortening of full forms; the one-mora numbers used in ModJ
may not be original.
puta-, nana-, and kokono-), their numeral pronominals turn out to be another case of what I have called double genitive derivatives, i.e. pi-to-tu *[one-GEN-thing] and pu-ta-tu *[two-GEN-thing], cf. the further layering of genitive in hitotu no kokoro [one GEN heart] in ModJ. One factor encouraging for this hypothesis is that the development of double genitive derivatives is common (see Note 57).

This is as far as we can go with this hypothesis, and it certainly calls for explanations as to why different kinds of genitive particles were used in the numeral system, why ko-ko-no- 'nine' exhibits the three-mora structure, and so forth.65

2.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed characteristics of GEN ga, no, and tu in OJ. When facing the three different genitives, it is understandable that past studies have sought to identify clear functional differences among them. The reality is, however, rather different. The distinction between GEN ga and GEN no in OJ cannot be accounted for by a clear dichotomy, such as the pejorative/honorific distinction or the uchi/soto (inside/outside) distinction. Nor was GEN tu a specialized genitive of any sort, such as a locative. The pejorative/honorific distinction (e.g. Aoki 1952) and the uchi/soto (inside/outside) distinction (e.g. ôno S. 1977a/b; ôno et al. 1974) seem to be applicable to

---

64 In this scenario, we have to assume that the older GENs to and ta were still productive when the newer GEN tu developed into Bd-Pro, as in pi-to-tu [one-GEN-thing] and pu-ta-tu [two-GEN-thing], which may be a little problematic.

65 As for comparative studies of numerals, Shimamura (1927) and Murayama (1962) claim that words for 'three', 'five', 'seven' and 'ten' in Japanese are cognates with those of the language of Koguryô (KG: Kökuri), which was once spoken in the Korean peninsula. Murayama provides the following reconstruction: OJ mi-tu 'three' < *mi-*mil :: KG mi-mil; OJ itu-tu 'five' < *itu :: KG utu < *utu; OJ nana-tu 'seven' < *nanan :: KG nanun; and OJ towo 'ten' < *tewu :: KG te-tek. Shimamura's hypothesis is as follows: the numerals up to five (i.e. pito 'one', puta 'two', mi 'three', yo 'four', and itu 'five') are independent developments; mu 'six', ya 'eight', and to 'ten' came from mi 'three', yo 'four', and itu 'five' respectively based on the doubling method; nana 'seven' is a borrowing from a Tungus nada; and kokono 'nine' was derived from kokora/kokota (perhaps he meant kokoda) 'that many'.
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many instances of ga and no. At the same time, however, there are many counterexamples in OJ, e.g. sumyera ‘emperor’ marked by ga in Norito and Senmyō, place names with ga, overlapping distribution in Man’yōshū, and dialectal variations. Similar social distinctions indexed in the use of forms which had originally nothing to do with social notions can be seen in other languages as well, such as GEN s and ‘uy in MK; the T/V distinction in European languages. Given these observations, I have claimed in Section 2.2.2 that the pejorative/honorific (or the inside/out group) distinction was a temporary and regional phenomenon. In some speech communities in the MJ period, the social sensitivity of language users associated the characteristic distributions of GEN ga and no with social distinctions, and developed them into markers of social deixis. In other words, the pejorative/honorific distinction was not a part of the essential functions that had determined their original distribution. It was the reverse; the characteristic distribution of GEN ga and no left an opening for their additional social implications. It is most likely that the original distributional differences were determined according to the properties of their lexical sources.

Ôno T. (1978) and Yamada (1913) claim that GEN ga had a focusing function, and Ôno T. attributes the focusing function of ga to its demonstrative origin (i.e. from ko/ka ‘this’). Although their arguments are predetermined, there seems to be some truth to their observation. I will discuss this point again in the next chapter.

As for GEN tu, I have claimed in Section 2.3.1 that it was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ, based on a detailed examination of the Man’yōshū data. Treating GEN tu as a locative is a simplistic generalization based only on easily noticed examples. There are in fact many words which do not express location or position but are marked with GEN tu. We also observe overlapping distribution between GEN tu
and GEN no. Further, GEN tu shares some characteristic uses with GEN no, i.e. an adjectival use with bound nominals, an appositive use, a metaphorical use, and some semantically complex uses. These observations suggest a general use of GEN tu in pre-OJ. In addition, I have also argued by examining numeral expressions in Man'yōshū that the -tu in numeral pronominals (e.g. pito-tu 'one') is a bound pronominal (Bd-Pro) derived from GEN tu (see Section 2.3.2).

GEN tu has generally been regarded as quite an old genitive in past studies (e.g. Yamada 1913; Hashimoto 1969; Ōno S. et al. 1974). I believe that this chapter has gone beyond that point, and shed new light on the importance of GEN tu in pre-OJ and OJ. I have suggested in Section 2.2.2.3 that the issue of differences between GEN ga and GEN no comes down to their origins. Given the importance of GEN tu, we have to add the origin of GEN tu to our discussion. Keeping this in mind, I will discuss the origins of various genitive particles in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

ORIGINS AND RELATIONSHIPS OF THE VARIOUS GENITIVE PARTICLES

3.1 Introduction

There is no agreement on the origins of GEN ga, no, and tu in past studies. They are not, however, the only genitive particles in OJ; there are other particles which seem to have functioned as genitives, too. Two of them are na and da:

(1)  
a. ma-na-kapi [eye-GEN-crossing.point] ‘between eyes; before one’s eyes’   
    (MYS 5:802)

b. ta-da-muki [hand-GEN-trunk] ‘arm’   
    (KJ, Song 3)

The distribution of GEN na is very limited, and that of GEN da extremely limited. There are other morphemes, such as du in nwo-du-ti [field-GEN-spirit] ‘spirit of field’ (e.g. snake) and ro in wo-ro-ti [summit-GEN-spirit] ‘huge serpent’, which also seem to be functioning as genitives in these compounds. However, past studies have not considered these morphemes together. In this chapter, therefore, I will discuss the origins of the various genitive particles and relationships among them, including of course the three major genitives, ga, no, and tu.

Obviously the origins of ga, no, and tu are difficult issues due to the limited historical data, and we cannot easily reach definitive conclusions. Thus, the general purpose of this chapter is not establishing definitive conclusions. Rather, making the most out of
currently available data, I will attempt to narrow down various hypotheses to a few plausible
scenarios. I would like to shed new light on the issue by considering the possibility of
language/dialect mixture, as well as systemic relationships among *ga*, *no*, and *tu*.

First, I will critically review various hypotheses about the origins of genitive particles
in past studies. There are two kinds of studies. One type seeks origins and
correspondences outside the Japanese language, mostly in Altaic languages (e.g. Murayama
1956, Itabashi 1987), and these are examined in Section 3.2. The other type limits its
discussion to developments internal to Japanese (e.g. Yamada 1913 [1954]; Hôjô 1970; ôno
T. 1978; Akiba 1978), which is examined in Section 3.3. None of these past studies takes
up all possible genitive particles in OJ together, and none of them is totally convincing. In
particular, GEN *tu* has not been sufficiently studied.

I have claimed in Chapter 2 that GEN *tu* was more widely used as a general genitive
in pre-OJ than in OJ, and that we should therefore recognize its importance in our study of
OJ and pre-OJ. Further, I will argue in Section 3.4.1 in this chapter that GEN *tu* in OJ and
so-called *sai sios* (medial *s*, i.e. GEN *s*) in Middle Korean (MK) are very likely to be
cognates. Section 3.4.2 offers a new hypothesis that GEN *tu* was derived from a
demonstrative *to* ‘that’. In relation to this hypothesis, Section 3.5 discusses the so-called
“emphatic particle” *sī* in OJ, which has not been studied much in past studies. Section 3.6
examines minor genitive(?) particles other than *ga*, *no*, and *tu*.

After the critical review of past studies and presenting some considerations in this
chapter, there remain a few hypotheses about the origin of each genitive particle. They can
be organized as follows:
In Section 3.7, I will discuss these hypotheses from a larger perspective, including a theoretical consideration about systemic relationships among competing forms, as well as the possibility of language/dialect mixture.

3.2 Altaic Hypotheses

There are many studies which relate Japanese to Altaic languages, although not all of them necessarily discuss functional particles/suffixes; there are more studies about lexical comparison. Murayama and Ōbayashi (1973) provide a good summary of and reference to comparative studies with Altaic languages, Austronesian languages, Korean, Ainu, and others.

Focusing on genitive particles in OJ, I will briefly review some representative Altaic hypotheses of relatively recent years in this section, namely, Murayama (1956, and others), Miller (1971), and Itabashi (1987).


Murayama (1956, 1957) identifies three genitive morphemes in OJ (i.e. ga, no, and na), and reconstructs proto-Altaic GEN *n. GEN ga and no are productive in OJ, but na can only be found in fossilized compounds such as ma-na-kwo [eye-GEN-Dim] ‘pupil’ and ta-na-suwe [hand-GEN-end] ‘finger part (< the end of the hand)’. GEN *n is not attested, but Murayama argues that it caused rendaku (sequential voicing) in compounds,
e.g. *kinu-n-kasa [silk-GEN-shade] > kinu-gasa ‘silk shade’.¹ He claims that GEN na and no were derived from proto-Altaic GEN *n, by having a vowel added. As for GEN ga, he agrees with Ramstedt’s (1952) view that it was derived from *n-ka, of which *ka is an adjective-stem forming suffix: cf. Tungus GEN *ηi < *n-ki; Manchu adjectival suffix ηga, ηge, and ηgo, e.g. aga-nga sara [rain-nga umbrella] ‘umbrella’.²,³

However, Murayama later (1974: 103, 231-237) changed his claim about the Altaic origins of na and no, since none of Altaic languages has combinations of demonstrative stems with genitive morphemes derived from proto-Altaic *n, while OJ has such expressions with GEN no, e.g. ko-no [(proximal)-GEN] ‘this’; so-no [(mesial)-GEN]

¹ Martin (1987: 26, 813, and elsewhere) claims that one source of rendaku (sequential voicing) is N-no-N when the first noun is subordinated to the second, e.g. yama-gapa (< yama-no-kapa [mountain-GEN-river]) ‘a river in the mountain’ (NS, Song 113) vs. yama-kapa [mountain-river] ‘mountains and rivers’ (MYS 1:39). Instead of positing GEN *n, he treats it as a reduction from GEN no, i.e. N-no-N > N-n-N > N-*N (" = with an initial voiced consonant). According to him, another source is N-n(i)-N when two nouns are coordinated. Also, he speculates that the obligatory voicing of the initial consonant of the verb in certain compounds was due to the subject-marking ga or no (ibid.: 96), e.g. kumo-banare (< kumo ga/no panare [cloud GEN leave(RY)]) ‘(like) the clouds go away’ (KJ Song 55, MYS 3691), a makura-kotoba (pillow word) for soki-wori [go.away(RY)-be(RY)] ‘be going away’ and toposi ‘far’; pi-deru miya (< pi ga/no teru miya [sun GEN shine(RT) palace]) ‘the palace where the sun shining’ (KJ Song 100); kamo-doku sima (< kamo-oku sima) [wild.goose GEN attach(RT) island] ‘the island wild geese come’ (KJ Song 8); pi-gakeru miya (< pi ga/no kageru miya [sun GEN shine(RT) palace]) ‘the palace where the sun is shining’ (KJ Song 99).

² Murayama speculates that the adjectival suffix *-ka may be related to the inflectional ending -ka in adjectives prevalent in Kyushu dialects, e.g. siro-ka ‘white’ in Kyushu vs. siro-i ‘white’ in Std-ModJ. Murayama provides an interesting reconstruction for ACC, which may put Kyushu dialects in the Altaic context. According to him, ACC wo came from Altaic *be (cf. Manchu ACC be; Tungus ACC we/wa). He also notes that Altaic languages have an alternation between a and e. Given these, one possible speculation is to relate Altaic ACC *be to ACC ba in Kyushu dialects, e.g. Eiga ba mīta [movie ACC watched] ‘(I) watched a movie’ in Kyushu vs. Eiga o mīta [movie ACC watched] in Std-ModJ. According to Unger (p.c.), a general account of the -ka in Kyushu adjectives is that it was derived from the innovative adjectival ending -kari, e.g. takaku an [high(RY) be(SS)] > takakari > takaka. This account seems plausible, but one drawback is that innovative forms lack SS forms (i.e. not attested). Also, negative forms of Kyushu adjectives are based on older RY forms, e.g. tako-naka < takaku-naka [high(RY)-Neg]; yasasyuu-naka < yasasiku-naka [easy(RY)-Neg]. As for ACC ba, it may have come from wo ba [ACC TOP].

³ Martin does not explore the Altaic hypotheses, but he also speculates that GEN ga came from *n-ka (Martin 1990). Unlike Murayama, however, he says that *n-ka is an emphatic use of the interrogative postadnominal ka ‘question’, attached to the noun by the adnominal marker n. Since ka is usually directly attached to nouns, his explanation is questionable.
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'that'; ka-no [(distal)-GEN] 'that'. Instead, he claims that na and no are ligatures (LG: connecting particles), which are found in Austronesian languages. For example, Tagalog has a ligature -na to follow a consonant stem (ending in a consonant or diphthong), and -ng to follow a vowel stem, e.g. ang babai ng matabå [the woman LG fat] or ang matabå ng babåe [the fat LG woman] 'the fat woman'; ang malaki ng båhay [the big LG house] or ang bahåy na malaki [the house LG big] 'the big house'.

As for GEN ga in OJ, Murayama (1973) maintains his view about its relationship with Tungus GEN -ŋi (< *-ŋgai, slightly changed from above) and Manchu adjectival suffix -ŋa, -ŋe, -ŋgo, e.g. gosin 'benevolence' > gosiga 'benevolent (person)'. In a later study, however, Murayama (1988: 26-31) does not mention genitive particles in OJ at all, although he discusses ACC wo and other suffixes and particles (e.g. ablative yo, yu, yori, and yuri). This may suggest that he was not very comfortable with his claims about genitive particles in OJ.

With regard to other particles of our concern, Murayama (1973: 160) claims tu (< *ti) in oki tu tori [offing tu bird] 'birds in the offing' (MYS 6:928) and to-ŋi (< *tu-li) in asa/yupu to-ŋi [morning/evening to-ŋi] 'in the morning/evening' (source unknown) are allomorphs of the ablative yo/yu. In his reconstruction (ibid.: 153), yo/yu in OJ came from proto-Altaic locative *du/*dü (also cf. yori/yuri < *du-li/*dö-li), which also became proto-
Mongol/Tungus locative suffixes *-du/-dii. He argues that both ma-tu-ge [eye-tu-hair] ‘eyelash’ and ma-yo/yu-(ge) [eye-yo/yu-(hair)] ‘eyebrow’ originally meant ‘hairs which exist around the eyes’.

Murayama (1974: 142) provides a hypothesis about another GEN-like morpheme -ra. According to him, the suffix -ra in aka-ra wotomye [red-ra girl] ‘a well-looking (complexion) girl’ (KJ, Song 43), aka-ra wo-pune [red-ra small-boat] ‘a small red boat’ (MYS 16:3868), and aka-ra tatibana [red-ra wild.orange] ‘reddish wild oranges’ (MYS 18:4060) is an adjective-forming suffix, which can also be found in a-ra-ka [exist(Root)-ra-place] ‘palace’ (MYS 2:167) and a-ra-pito-gamwi [exist(Root)-ra-person-deity] ‘deities appearing as human’ (MYS 6:1021). He (1973: 162-72, 1974: 144) further claims that this -ra, which forms the MZ form of some verbs, shares the same etymon with Tungus/Manchu Aorist-forming -ra, which goes back to proto-Altaic *-r.

3.2.2. Miller (1971)

Miller (1971: 22-24), who is another ardent advocate of the Altaic connection, posits proto-Altaic adjective suffix *-ki (cf. Old Tungus adjectival *-n-ki; Mongol -ki; Old Turkish -ki/qi; Bashkir -qi; Uzbek -ki/-gi; Chuvash -hi), although grammatical particles/suffixes are only briefly discussed. With regard to GEN ga and no, he generally agrees with Murayama’s (1957) hypothesis, but calls for more refinement in analysis of meanings and syntactic functions. In addition, Miller argues that ga and no are “vowel
harmony" alternants, based on *Bussokuseki* data.\(^6\) As for GEN *tu*, Miller (1971: 84) glosses it as ‘dative-locative’, corresponding to proto-Tungus *du* ‘dative suffix’ (Benzing 1955: 1031).

3.2.3. Itabashi (1987)

Itabashi (1987) replies to Miller’s call for semantic and syntactic comparisons of grammatical particles/suffixes among Altaic languages, and consolidates several past studies in making his claims (e.g. Benzing 1955; Murayama 1957; Räisänen 1957; Poppe 1977). As for genitive particles in OJ, his argument is similar to Murayama’s (1956, 1957). He claims that GEN *na* and *no* are vowel harmony alternants and came from proto-Altaic GEN *n*. As for *ga*, he agrees with Murayama (1973: 160) that its phonetic value was [ɲa] or [ɲga],\(^7\) and that it came from proto-Altaic *n-*kai (> *n-*ka > *ya*), of which *-kai* is a Proto-Altaic adjectival suffix that also resulted in the RT endings of adjectives -ki in OJ (e.g. *taka-ki* ‘high’).\(^8\) With regard to the differences between *ga* and *no* in OJ, Itabashi simply accepts Ōno S.’s *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction, which I have argued against in the previous chapter.

\(^6\) *Bussokuseki* data are very limited, and if we look at *Man’yōshū* data, it is clear that Miller’s observation is not correct; GEN *ga* and *no* are not necessarily used after *a* and *o* respectively, e.g. *imo ga swoodo* ‘beloved’s sleeve’ (MYS 15:3604); *ono ga na* ‘each one’s honor’ (MYS 18:4098); *ama no pune* ‘the diver’s boat’ (MYS 6:934); *papa no mikoto* ‘(my) honorable mother’ (MYS 19:4164).

\(^7\) Itabashi bases his argument on the phonetic values reconstructed by Karlgren (1940) for two Chinese characters, *wo3* ‘l’ and *e4* ‘hungry’, which were used to represent GEN *ga* as phonograms. The character for *wo3* was very commonly used for *ga*, but the character *e4* was very rarely used. There are more than five characters to be used for *ga*, and Itabashi’s explanation seems very selective. In any case, it is generally agreed that voiced stops were prenasalized in OJ (e.g. Hamada 1952; Asayama 1943; Martin 1987: 20-25).

\(^8\) The adjectival suffix -*ki* is also found in Manchu, Mongol, and Old Turkish, e.g. *amba-ki* [big-ki] ‘powerful’, *dursu-ki* [appearance-ki] ‘similar’ in Manchu; *degere-ki* [top-ki] ‘upper’, *ende-ki* [here-ki] ‘of this place’ in Mongol; *sō-ki* [time-ki] ‘future, former’, *ay-qī* [month-qī] ‘monthly’ in Old Turkish.

\(^9\) Itabashi claims that proto-Altaic *-kai* also resulted in the final morpheme -*ka* in some adjectival nouns, which must be used with a copula, e.g. *sidu-ka* ‘quietness’; *nodo-ka* ‘restfulness’; *yuta-ka* ‘abundance’.

---
Itabashi's reconstruction becomes rather problematic when it comes to Korean, for which he has to posit a different developmental process. He reconstructs proto-Altaic third person singular genitive pronoun *i-n [3.sg-GEN], which came down to proto-Korean *i-n, and developed into Old Korean (OK) GEN *i.10 In his reconstruction, OJ does not have a reflex for this proto-Altaic *i-n. On the Korean side, OK has neither a reflex of proto-Altaic GEN *n, nor the adjective suffix *-kai.

As for tu, Itabashi regards it as a locative based on his limited observation, just as many scholars before him have done. He presents a hypothesis that OJ du/(tu)/yu/yo came from proto-J *du (< proto-Altaic *du), and OJ da came from proto-J *da (< proto-Altaic *da).

3.2.4. Critique of the Altaic Hypotheses

The above are some of the representative Altaic-based hypotheses about the origins of Japanese GEN ga, no, and tu proposed in relatively recent years. They are based on the assumption that Japanese belongs to the Altaic language family. Regardless of their specific claims about functional particles/suffixes, however, no sort of genetic affiliation of Japanese with the Altaic languages has been proven yet. Most basically, a reliable set of cognates and sound correspondences have not been established. If Japanese is in fact genetically related to the Altaic languages despite the lack of sufficient cognate words, it should be explained why convincingly.11 It is premature to evaluate these Altaic hypotheses about GEN ga, no, and tu, and in that sense, they are not very fruitful. Besides, the correspondences among functional particles/suffixes they posit are not striking (least of

---

10 In his reconstruction, OK also has NOM *i, which came from proto-Altaic third person singular *i.
11 One of the common resorts to the issue is the hypothesis that Japanese is a hybrid language between an Austronesian language and an Altaic language. See references in Murayama and Ōbayashi (1973).
all between Korean and Japanese), and the formation of another genitive out of GEN *n suffixed with the adjective-forming *-ki (or *-kai) has not been given a sufficient explanation.

Also, Altaic hypotheses have not yet provided any sound hypothesis about *tu. Murayama's (1973) hypothesis that *tu was an allomorph of the ablative *yu/*yo is highly speculative, and is not convincing. It is based only on (a) the reconstructed consonant *d for y (i.e. *tu :: *yu/*yo < *du/*dū), and (b) the idea that *tu in OJ was a locative. Relating locative with ablative without any supporting evidence is rather bold. Moreover, as I have claimed in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3), it is less likely that *tu was a some sort of specialized genitive, e.g. locative; it is more likely that *tu had been more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ, just as GEN no was in OJ. The same kind of critique applies to Itabashi's (1987) hypothesis about *tu.

3.3 Internal Considerations

In contrast to studies that seek the origins of genitive particles outside of Japanese, there are scholars who discuss the issue within Japanese. In Section 3.3.1 below, I will review Yamada (1913 [1954]) and Hōjō (1970), who share their main claims. In Section 3.3.2, I will review Ōno S. (1977a/b; Ōno S. et al. 1974) and Ōno T. (1978), who take a traditional and very basic approach; they construct their hypotheses based on functions and distributions of genitive particles. Akiba (1978), which I will review in Section 3.3.3, takes a rather different view. It is interesting that Hashimoto (1969) hesitates to commit to any theories about the origins of genitive particles.

12 The locative-ablative syncretism is not totally implausible. LOC ni in Japanese can be used as an ablative, although such use is very limited, e.g. Hanako ni kari ru [Hanako from borrow] "(I will) borrow (it) from Hanako." In Korean and Japanese, the use of locative as allative is very common, i.e. ey in Korean and ni in Japanese. According to Genetti (1986: 388), Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman languages exhibit both locative-allative and locative-ablative syncretism.
3.3.1. Yamada (1913 [1954]) and Hōjō (1970)

Both Yamada (1913) and Hōjō (1970) claim that GEN ga and no came from GEN na. They relate ga (phonetically [ŋa]) with no through its pre-nasality, and explain the vowel qualities positing a phonological rule in compounds. Their discussions are mostly limited to phonological changes, and they do not consider the different functions of ga and no.

3.3.1.1. Yamada (1913 [1954: 417-20])

Since GEN na can only be found in fossilized compounds, Yamada (1913: 419) argues that na is the oldest genitive particle among na, ga, no, and tu. He offers two hypotheses about the development of GEN na, ga, and no as follows:\footnote{Yamada uses the phonetic description [ŋa] for ga. Kobayashi (1938) speculates that ŋa changed to na/no, but he does not provide any argument.}

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
\text{(3) a. } & (\times) \xrightarrow{\text{na}} \eta a \\
& \quad \xrightarrow{\text{nu (in OJ and Ryukyu)}} \rightarrow \text{no} \\
\text{b. } & (\times) \xrightarrow{\text{na}} \eta a \\
& \quad \xrightarrow{\text{no}} \eta u \\
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

In (3a), Yamada speculates about the existence of a GEN *nu in OJ, based on the GEN nu in modern Ryukyu dialects. In neither (3a) nor (3b), is he specific about the lexical sources of the particles, but claims that ga and no were derived from the same source based on their use with pronouns: i.e. wa ga ‘my’, na ga ‘your’, and ta ga ‘whose’ on the one hand, and ko-no ‘this’ and so-no ‘that’ on the other. He sees in this distribution the result of vowel harmony.
As for GEN tu, Yamada's view is that it is an older genitive particle, and its use was limited to words of certain types in OJ. He claims that patu ‘first’ came from upa-tu [upper.part-GEN], cf. patu-ni [upper-red.soil] ‘upper red soil’ (KJ, Song 43). Also, he regards po-tu in po-tu-ye [po-GEN-branch] ‘upper part branches’ was a variant of patu. He speculates that GEN tu is related to si in Okositari and Arusitari, which are old Korean place names recorded in Nihonshoki (720), or to sai sios (medial s), which is retained in some compounds in modern Korean.

3.3.1.2. Critique of Yamada

With regard to the GEN nu of Ryukyu dialects, which Yamada posits for OJ also in (3a), there is no evidence for GEN nu in OJ. The GEN nu of the Ryukyu dialects most likely came from GEN no due to the well-known vowel raising in those dialects (cf. Hashimoto 1969; Hôjô 1970).14

As for GEN tu, it can be said that Yamada’s observation is rather superficial; the use of GEN tu was not necessarily lexically restricted. As I have claimed in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3), it is likely that GEN tu was used more widely as a general genitive in pre-OJ, just like GEN no in OJ. His claim about patu ‘first’ (< upa-tu [upper.part-GEN]) and potu (< patu) is not convincing. There is no evidence that patu in patu-ni ‘upper red soil’ is the same as patu ‘first’. As for potu, there are other expressions which contain po, such as po tu taka [po GEN hawk] ‘distinguished hawk’ (MYS 17:4011) and po tu te [po GEN hand] ‘the best skill’ (MYS 15:3694), and po seems more likely to be the same morpheme as po in

14 Ryukyu dialects exhibit many variations, but in Shuri dialect, which used to be the central dialect in the Ryukyu kingdom, the five vowel system (i.e. /i, e, a, o, u/) in the mainland Japan changed to the present three vowel system (i.e. /i, a, u/) by the following changes: /e/ > /i/; /o/ > /u/; and further /u/ > /i/ in some environments (see Shibatani 1990: 192). According to Martin (1987: 52), the vowel raising is thought to have taken place no earlier than the thirteenth century.
ipa-po [rock-jut] ‘big tall rock’ (MYS 20:4454) and po no po [fire GEN jut] ‘flame’, meaning ‘jutting, tip’ as well as ‘an ear of grain; spearhead’ (see Ōno S. et al. 1974).

Yamada’s speculation about the relationship between GEN 𝑡𝑢 and some old Korean place names is intriguing, and I will discuss GEN 𝑡𝑢 in detail in Section 3.4 below. In sum, when discussing the origins of GEN 𝑔𝑎 and 𝑛𝒐, Yamada’s consideration is limited to phonology, and his claim is not convincing.

3.3.1.3. Hōjō (1970)

Hōjō (1970) advocates Yamada’s second scenario (i.e. (3b)) except for the existence of 𝑛𝑢. He agrees with Yamada’s claim that the change from 𝑁𝑎 to 𝑟𝑗𝑎 is phonetically natural given the nasality, and that the change from 𝑁𝑎 to 𝑛𝑜 is due to the contrast between some expressions, such as 𝑤𝑎 𝑔𝑎 [I GEN], 𝑁𝑎 𝑔𝑎 [you GEN], 𝑡𝑎 𝑔𝑎 [who GEN] on the one hand, and 𝑘𝑜𝑛𝑜 (i.e. 𝑘𝑜-𝑛𝑜 [(proximal)-GEN]) ‘this’ and 𝑠𝑜𝑛𝑜 (i.e. 𝑠𝑜-𝑛𝑜 [(mesial)-GEN]) ‘that’ on the other; the vowel change was induced by assimilation.¹⁵,¹⁶

¹⁵ The OJ demonstrative system is generally thought to have exhibited a three-way distinction, namely 𝑘𝑜-series, 𝑠𝑜-series, and 𝑘𝑎-series, just as 𝑘𝑜/𝑠𝑜/𝑎-series in ModJ. I gloss each series as “proximal” (close to the speaker), “mesial” (close to the hearer), and “distal” (far from both the speaker and the hearer) respectively, following common practice. But it may be the case that the demonstrative system in OJ did not work in the same way as that of ModJ does. See, for example, Hashimoto Shiro (1966, 1982).

¹⁶ It is rare, but still so could be marked by 𝑔𝑎, e.g. 𝑃𝑎𝐛𝑖𝑟𝑜/𝑦ु𝑡𝑢 𝑚𝑎-𝑡𝑢𝑏𝑎𝑘𝑖/𝑠𝑜 𝑔𝑎 𝑝𝑎 𝜅𝑜/𝑝𝑖𝑟𝑜𝑟𝑖 𝑖𝑚𝑎𝑠𝑢/𝑠𝑜 𝑛𝑜 𝑝𝑎𝑛𝑎 𝑛𝑜/𝑡𝑒𝑟𝑖 𝑖𝑚𝑎𝑠𝑢/𝑡𝑎𝑘𝑎-𝑝𝑖𝑘𝑎𝑟𝑢/𝑝𝑖 𝑛𝑜 𝑚𝑖𝑘𝑤𝑜 𝑛𝑖 [leaf-wide/sacred genuine-camellia/ (mesial) GEN leaf spread be/ (mesial) GEN flower GEN/ shine be/ high(Root)-shine/ sun GEN prince DAT] ‘the prince of the sun, who is comfortable like the broad leaf of that holy camellia, and who is shining like a flower of that camellia’ (KJ, Song 101). In this song, both 𝑠𝑜 [((mesial) GEN] and 𝑛𝑜 are used, and it is hard to discern any one of the distinctions between 𝑔𝑎 and 𝑛𝑜 which are claimed by Aoki (1952) (i.e. pejorative vs. honorific), Ōno S. (1977) (i.e. inside vs. outside), and Ōno T. (1978) (i.e. focus vs. emotive). Kazama (1970) claims that so was rare due to si ga ‘that (GEN)’, e.g. 𝑠𝑎𝑠𝑖𝑏𝑢 𝑛𝑜 𝑘𝑤𝑖/𝑠𝑖 𝑔𝑎 𝑠𝑖𝑡𝑎 𝑛𝑖/𝑜𝑝𝑖-𝑡𝑎𝑡𝑒𝑟𝑢/𝑝𝑎𝑏𝑖𝑟𝑜/𝑦𝑢𝑡𝑢 𝑚𝑎-𝑡𝑢𝑏𝑎𝑘𝑖/𝑠𝑖 𝑔𝑎 𝑝𝑎𝑛𝑎 𝑛𝑜/𝑡𝑒𝑟𝑖 𝑖𝑚𝑎𝑠𝑢/𝑠𝑖 𝑔𝑎 𝑝𝑎 𝜅𝑜/𝑝𝑖𝑟𝑜𝑟𝑖 𝑖𝑚𝑎𝑠𝑢 𝑃𝑎/𝑜𝑝𝑜𝑘𝑖𝑚𝑖 𝑟𝑐 𝑘𝑎𝑚𝑜 [sasibu GEN tree/ (mesial) GEN below LOC/ grow-stand/ leaf,width/sacred genuine-camellia/ (mesial) GEN flower GEN/ shine be/ (mesial) GEN leave GEN/ spread be TOP/ lord ro lat] ‘The one who is shining like a flower of that holly camellia, which grows under that sasibu tree, and who is comfortable like the broad leaf of that holy camellia, is the lord’ (KJ, Song 58).
He further extends his discussion to include GEN da/ha, GEN du/tu and GEN-like morphemes ra and ya. He lists the following examples:

(4)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>da/ha</td>
<td>ku-da-mono [tree-GEN-thing]</td>
<td>'nut'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ke-da-mono [hair-GEN-thing]</td>
<td>'animal'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ta-da-muki [hand-GEN-trunk]</td>
<td>'arm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kuni-no-sa-ta-ti-no-mikoto [country-GEN-arrow-GEN-spirit-GEN-prince]</td>
<td>'Kuni-no-satati-no-mikoto'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du/tu</td>
<td>aki-du-sima [autumn-GEN-island]</td>
<td>'Akizusima'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ika-du-ri [severe(Root)-GEN-spirit]</td>
<td>'thunder'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nwo-du-ti [field-GEN-spirit]</td>
<td>'spirit of field' (e.g. snake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mi-du-ti [water-GEN-spirit]</td>
<td>'spirit of the water' (e.g. dragon snake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nipa-tu-tori [yard-GEN-bird]</td>
<td>'chicken'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sa-nwo-tu-tori [Pref-field-GEN-bird]</td>
<td>'field bird'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra</td>
<td>sake-ra-bana [bloom(SS)-ra-blossom]</td>
<td>'cherry blossom'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medu-ra-kwo [love(SS)-ra-child]</td>
<td>'beloved child'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>makura 'pillow'</td>
<td>&lt; *maku-ra-mono [sleep(SS)-ra-thing]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kwopu-ra-ku [love(SS)-ra-NMZ]</td>
<td>'that (I) love'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sa-nu-ra-ku [Emph-sleep-ra-NMZ]</td>
<td>'that (I) sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ya</td>
<td>kagu-ya-pimye [shine(SS)-ya-princess]</td>
<td>'Princess Kaguya'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ko-no-pana-saku-ya-pimye [tree-GEN-blossom-bloom(SS)-ya-princess]</td>
<td>'Princess Blossom'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hōjō regards da and na as allomorphs, but because of the sound similarity he is unsure about which is the original form. He claims that da changed to du because of a

---

17 There are similar names, and the Zenshū version of Kojiki parses them as follows, and explains that sa-in these names is a prefix to indicate holiness: Ame-no-sa-duti-no-kamui [heaven-GEN-Pref-soil-GEN-deity]; Kuni-no-sa-duti-no-kamui [earth-GEN-Pref-soil-GEN-deity]; Ame-no-sa-gwiri-no-kamui [heaven-GEN-Pref-mist-GEN-deity]; Kuni-no-sa-gwiri-no-kamui [earth-GEN-Pref-mist-GEN-deity](KJ, Izanaki-no-mikoto to Izamami-no-mikoto, i.e. Shin-Zenshū: 39-40). Given these examples, Hōjō’s parsing of Kuni-no-satati-no-mikoto seems problematic.

18 See the account of ku-nominalization in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2.6.

19 For kagu, Hōjō assigns the Chinese character he4 ‘red: bright: shine’, which is usually read as kaku in Japanese. The verb kak- is not listed in Ōno S. et al. (1974).

20 The source for his example is unspecified, but it is written as ko-no-pana-saku-ya-bimye in Kojiki (Shin-Zenshū: 121). There is a contrasting name, ko-no-pana-tiru-pimye [tree-GEN-blossom-fall-princess] in Kojiki, (Shin-Zenshū: 73).

21 He states, “Sinkin-on ni voru sootuu de izure ga genkei ka ket terrible si-gatai” ‘It is difficult to decide which is the original form due to the similarity between the similar sounds’ (1970: 54). This statement does not make much sense because allomorphs usually share some phonetic properties.
phonological rule in compounds (i.e. *ren 'on-ketsugō-kankei* in his terminology), then *du* changed to *nu* by devoicing. As for *ra* and *ya*, he explains that they connect the SS form of verbs to the following nominals, and speculates that this *ra* was the origin of the verb inflectional endings RT-*ru* and IZ-*re*. Also, he speculates that *da*, *na*, *ra*, and *ya* were derived from the same morpheme.

3.3.1.4. Critique of Hōjō

Hōjō's claims are problematic in every respect. To support the change from GEN *na* to *ga*, he lists *tori gasu* (< *nasu*) [bird like] 'like a bird' (MYS 14:3526) in *aduma-uta* (eastern songs) as an example of the sound change from *na* to *ga*. However, this sound change is not well-attested in OJ phonology. Also, the existence of the word *gasu* (< *nasu*) is questionable because voiced obstruents in OJ generally do not occur word-initially, although *gasu* is said to be of eastern dialects. In addition, both Taikei and Zenshū parse the phrase as *tori ga su* [bird GEN nest] 'birds' nests'.

If both GEN *ga* and *no* had been derived from the same GEN *na* due to the vowel assimilation in compounds/phrases (e.g. *wa ga* [I GEN] 'my' vs. *ko-no* [(proximal)-GEN] 'this'), as Hōjō claims, the distinction between *ga* and *no* must have been purely phonological, and thus there should have been a clear-cut phonologically conditioned distribution. This is not the case, however; GEN *ga* and *no* may occur after *o* and *a* respectively, e.g. *amo ga me* [mother GEN eye] (MYS 20:4383); *imo ga ipye* [beloved GEN house] (MYS 17:3952); *ka-no kwo-ro* [that(distal)-GEN girl-Dim] (MYS 14:3565); *ama-no-gapa* [heaven-GEN-river] 'Milky Way' (MYS 15:3658); *Akina no yama* — The song in its entirety: *Numa putatu/ kayopa (= kayopu) tori ga su/ a ga kokoro/ puta yuku namo (= ramu) to/ na yo mopa-ri (= mopye-ri) so ne [swamp two/ frequent(V/RT) bird GEN nest/ I GEN heart/ two go Conjec Comp/ Proh Inj think-Res Proh Desi] 'Some birds frequent the nests in two swamps. As for my heart, please don't think that it probably goes to two places' (MYS 14:3526).

---

22 The song in its entirety: *Numa putatu/ kayopa (= kayopu) tori ga su/ a ga kokoro/ puta yuku namo (= ramu) to/ na yo mopa-ri (= mopye-ri) so ne [swamp two/ frequent(V/RT) bird GEN nest/ I GEN heart/ two go Conjec Comp/ Proh Inj think-Res Proh Desi] 'Some birds frequent the nests in two swamps. As for my heart, please don't think that it probably goes to two places' (MYS 14:3526).
[Akina(p.n.) GEN mountain] (MYS 14:3431). As shown in Chapter 2, the distinction between GEN ga and no cannot be explained by phonology alone.

As for GEN du and tu, Hōjō posits the following changes: da > du > tu. He attributes the change from da to du to a phonological rule in compounds. For this purpose, he argues that there was a phonological tendency in OJ for certain vowel combinations to be preferred in compounds, and lists the following vowel combinations (1970: 50-52): a preference for CaCu, in which “C” represents a consonant, found in such compounds as kaku (< *ko-ku [(proximal)-place]) ‘thus, this way’ and waku-kwo (< *waka-kwo [young-child])23 ‘young child’; a preference for CuCa, found in such compounds as oku-ka (< *oku-ko [interior-place]) ‘inner part, far end; future’ and yosu-ka (< *yosu-ko [get.close-place]) ‘dependable place; relative’. However, if we look at the compounds with GEN du and tu in (4), there seems to be no particular vowel combination that promoted the change from da to du. As for the change from du to tu, Hōjō (ibid.: 54) explains that it was easy for the d of du to be devoiced since u is a high vowel, which is not convincing.25 Also, given the basic syllable structure (C)V in OJ, a devoicing mechanism that would get us from du to tu does not seem plausible, since d in GEN du was always between two vowels in compounds, i.e. (C)V-du-N.

Except for Akidusima, all the attested examples of du is limited to X-du-ti [X-GEN-spirit] ‘spirit of X’. Thus, it can be claimed that GEN tu was the original, and the change

---

23 Hōjō does not seem to consider morpheme boundary for these sound preferences in compounds; the combination CaCu is found within a morpheme in waku-kwo. If we consider morpheme boundary, the change from waka to waku in wakukwo was induced by adding -kwo, and thus it should be an example of the preference for CuCwo, instead of CaCu.

24 Hōjō, of course, takes the A/B (kō/otsu) distinction into consideration.

25 In ModJ, high vowels i and u tend to be devoiced between voiceless consonants, or between a voiceless consonant and a word boundary (e.g. Martin 1975: 20; Vance 1987: 48-55). However, Hōjō is discussing a voiced consonant d, not a vowel.
from *tu to *du was a lexical matter. According to ôno S. et al. (1974), Akidu was originally a place name in the Yamato region (today's Nara, where the old capital was located), and Akidu-sima [Akizu-island] came to refer to Japan. This account seems more plausible than Hōjō's account that *aki-du-sima [autumn-GEN-island] came to mean ‘Japan’, and thus it seems less likely that *du in Akidu-sima was a genitive.

Hōjō's account of ku-nominalization (i.e. his treatment of ra in kwopuraku and sanuraku in (4)) is also questionable. If ku-nominalization had taken the form of [SS-ra-ku], there should have been an additional mora reduction rule. For example, the ku-nominalized form of *ari (SS) ‘be’ is araku. According to Hōjō's claim, however, it should have been derived from *ari-ra-ku (also cf. miru (SS) 'see': miraku vs. *miru-ra-ku: tiru (SS) ‘scatter (Vi)’: tiraku vs. *tiru-ra-ku), but this mora reduction rule is not attested in OJ.27 Also, his claim does not explain how -ku came to be used as a nominalizer, and why SS forms are used in these compounds. In contrast, ôno S. et al.'s (1974) account seems more plausible (see the explanation for tu-nominalization in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2.6, e.g. *kwopuraku-aku [love(RT)-thing] > kwopuraku ‘that (I) love’).

For the other examples with ra in (4) (i.e. *saku-ra-bana [bloom(SS)-ra-blossom] ‘cherry blossom’; *medu-ra-kwo [love(SS)-ra-child] ‘beloved child’; *maku-ra-mono [sleep-GEN-thing] > makura ‘pillow’), there may be parsing problems as well; we cannot...

---

26 Possibly a dissimilation and analogical spread: cf. *nwo ‘field’ and *tutti ‘soil’ vs. nwo-du-ti ‘spirit of field’ (e.g. snake); ame tutti ‘sky and soil’ vs. *ika-du-ti ‘thunder’. Compare these with kagu-tu-ti [sparkling.light-GEN-spirit] ‘fire spirit’, in which *tu is not voiced, perhaps because of the voiced obstruent g in the first morpheme (i.e. a strong version of Lyman's Law). For Lyman's Law, see the explanation in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2.5.

27 Even if we want to apply Whitman's (1990) /i/ reduction rule, *ari ‘be’ results in a different ku-nominalized form, i.e. *ari-ra-ku > *ari-a-ku > *areku. Also, Whitman's /i/ reduction rule is conditioned by vowel length (or related accent), and it does not seem to apply to all SS forms.
easily isolate ra as a morpheme in these examples. In *Man'yôshû, sakura no pana* [cherry.tree GEN blossom] ‘cherry blossom’ is used in 14 songs (e.g. 8:1429, 10:1887), which could have been disfavored due to the use of GEN no if the morpheme ra had preserved a genitive meaning at all in *saku-ra-bana*. Another possibility is that -ra is a diminutive/plural suffix as in *wotome-ra* ‘girl(s)’. As for *medurakwo*, there is no example in *Man'yôshû*, which only has *medu-kwo* ‘beloved child’ (MYS 16:3880). Ōno S. et al. (1974) does not have an entry for *medurakwo*, either. The source of Hôjô’s *medurakwo* is unclear, but it could be *medura-kwo* [rare(Root)-child] (cf. Adj. *medurasi* (SS) ‘rare’). As for *makura* ‘pillow’, there was a verbalized form *makuraku* (SS) in *Man'yôshû* (10:2277) (i.e. ... *itu si ka imo ga* te wo *makuraka-mu* [when Emph Q beloved GEN/ arm ACC make.it.as.a.pillow(MZ)-Conjec] ‘... when will (I) lie down having my beloved’s arm as a pillow’), and there was no trace of a genitive-like morpheme ra in *makura*.

Hôjô’s examples with ya are also insufficient for claiming the existence of a genitive-like morpheme ya (i.e. *Kagu-ya-pimye* ‘Princess Kaguya’ and *Ko-no-pana-saku-ya-pimye* ‘Princess Blossom’). There is an interjective particle ya, but it is rather difficult to identify it in compounds. Ōno S. et al. (1974) explain that ya in *Kagu-ya-pimye* is a suffix to express a condition. Shin-Zenshû (KJ: 121) offers the same explanation for ya in *Ko-no-pana-no-saku-ya-pimye*.

---

28 According to Unger (p.c.), we need to reconstruct RT *saku.ra.u > saku*. In this reconstruction, *saku.ra-* was the pre-OJ RT stem, and the -r- dropped due to the Whitman’s r-reduction rule (Whitman 1990). See also Unger (2000a).

29 Martin (1987: 517) presents a reconstruction of *sakura* ‘cherry blossoms’ as follows with a question mark: *sakura* ?< *sak(a)-u + (a)ra* ‘bloom thing’.

30 Other examples (not from OJ) include: *taka-ya-ka* ‘being high’ (GM, Kashiwagi); *sidu-ya-ka* ‘being calm’ (GM, Shii ga moto). There seems to be a variant -ra, e.g. *mare-ra* ‘being rare’ (Shūi: 1165); *marora-ka* ‘being round’ (GM, Yadorigi); *kiyo-ra* ‘being pure’ (GM, Kiritsubo); *samu-ra* ‘being cold’ (MYS 9:1800)
To summarize, Hôjô's main claim that both GEN ga and no were derived from GEN na, which is the same as Yamada's claim, is problematic. Hôjô attempts to integrate all the genitive morphemes and genitive-like morphemes, by suggesting that da(ta), na, ra, and ya were allomorphs, viz. na/da(ta) > du > tu; na > no; na > ga. But his evidence and arguments are not convincing. All we can say for sure seems to be that OJ had genitive particles tu, na, da, no, and ga, but only the latter two were very productive in OJ.31

3.3.2. ôno S. (1977a/b, ôno et al. 1974) and ôno T. (1978)

Unlike Yamada (1954 [1913]) and Hôjô (1970) discussed above, ôno S. (1977a/b; ôno S. et al. 1974) and ôno T. (1978) construct their claims based on their analyses of functional and distributional differences among genitive particles they are concerned with. To be precise, ôno S. claims nothing about origins, but focuses rather on the "basic functions" of those particles, while ôno T. offers specific claims about their origins.

3.3.2.1. Differences between GEN ga and GEN no: Summary

In order to evaluate the claims by ôno S. (1977a/b) and ôno T. (1978), differences between GEN ga and no in OJ (or MJ) are first summarized below, based on the past studies examined in Chapter 2 (i.e. Yamada 1913 [1954]; Hashimoto 1969; ôno S. 1977a; ôno S. et al. 1974; ôno T. 1978):

(5) a. First person pronouns (e.g. wa, a, and ono) and persons who are close to the speaker (e.g. lover, parents, and siblings) are usually marked with ga. The use of ga exhibits a rather peculiar distribution for these categories. Its use for first person

31 As examined in Chapter 2, GEN tu has quite a few tokens in OJ, while GEN na and da are attested only in fossilized compounds.
pronouns makes up about 50% of its whole examples, and its use for close persons 40% (Ôno S.). Perhaps this distribution led ga to connote a pejorative (or inside) sense in some uses in MJ.

b. Compared with ga, GEN no exhibits a wider distribution. Most common nouns and pronouns except for first person pronouns could be marked by no.

c. In use with pronouns and demonstratives, ga and no exhibit an almost complementary distribution (Yamada; Hashimoto): i.e. (i) ga-marking: wa, a, ono ‘I’, na ‘you’, ta ‘who’, and si ‘that (mesial)’; and (ii) no-marking: ko ‘this’, kore ‘this one’, so ‘that (mesial)’, ka ‘that (distal)’, idure ‘where’, and nani ‘what’. It is rare, but there is a case in which so ‘that’ is marked by ga: i.e. so ga pa [that(mesial) GEN leaf] ‘that leaf’ (KJ Song 101). There is no example of *na no [you GEN] in Man ‘yôshû, but there are some examples of kimi no [you GEN].

Also, ta ‘who’ is always marked by ga, but there is one example of tare si no pito [who Emph GEN person] ‘whoever’ in Man ‘yôshû (11:2628), in which the reading of no is certain by the assigned Chinese character.

d. No can form a modifying phrase with numerals, while there is no use of ga with numerals in OJ (Yamada; Hashimoto; Ôno S.), e.g. pito-tuki no sake [one-cup GEN sake] ‘one cup of sake’ (MYS 338); momo-kwi no ume [hundred-tree GEN plum] ‘many plum trees’ (MYS 3906).

---

32 Note that kimi ‘you’ originally meant ‘lord’.

33 There are two other examples in which Chinese characters are not assigned to genitive, and thus we are not sure about exact readings: i.e. tare no pito [who GEN person] ‘who’ (MYS 8:1547); tare si no pito [who Emph GEN person] ‘who’ (MYS 11:2621). The latter can also be read as idure no pito [which GEN person] ‘which person’.

34 The examples above are from Ôno S. (1977a). Hashimoto’s (1969: 82) examples are as follows, e.g. ti-yorodu no ikusa [thousand-ten-thousand GEN war] ‘many wars’ (MYS 6:972); tosi no ya-tose [year GEN eight-year] ‘for eight years > for many years’ (MYS 11:2832); ti-pye no pito-pye [thousand-layer GEN one-layer] ‘1/1000’ (MYS 2:207). The second example does not seem to be the same as others; tosi ‘year’ is not a numeral.
e. Ga can mark RT forms of predicates as nominalized forms, but such use of no is very rare (cf. Hashimoto; ôno T.), e.g. yuku ga kanasisa [go(RT) GEN sadness] ‘sadness of going’ (MYS 20:4338), but not **yuku no kanasisa.  

f. Ga may be used in relative clauses with verbal predicates (i.e. [N ga V(RT) N]), but not in relative clauses with adjectival predicates (i.e. **[N ga Adj(RT) N]). In contrast, no can be used in both types (ôno S.), e.g. [N ga V(RT) N]: kimi ga yuku/miti no nagate wo [you GEN go(RT)/ road GEN long.way ACC] ‘the long way of the road you go (ACC)’ (MYS 15:3724); [N no V(RT) N]: yuku midu no/tayuru koto naku [go(RT) water GEN/end(RT) NMZ lacking] ‘the running water does not stop’ (MYS 17:4002); [N no Adj(RT) N]: matu-kage no kiyoki pamabye [pine.tree-shade GEN/pure(RT) beach.side] ‘the pond side where the pine shade is pure’ (MYS 19:4271).

g. No can mark the roots of adjectives, while there is no such use of ga (ôno S.; ôno T.), e.g. omosiro no tuki no y o n tya [refreshing(Root) GEN moon GEN night Intj] ‘(what) a refreshing moonlit night!’; but not **omesiro ga.

---

35 Hashimoto (1969) and Ôno T.’s (1978) observation is that there is no such use of no, which is not entirely accurate. There are a few counterexamples, e.g. taye-mu no kokoro [cease(MZ)-Conjec(RT) GEN heart] ‘intention of ceasing (the relationship)’ (MYS 12:3072) in OJ; ware ya yuka-mu no/ isayofi ni [I KP go-Vol(RT) GEN/ hesitation LOC] ‘with the hesitation of (whether) I go (or you come)’ (KKS 690) in EMJ.

36 As for marking nominalized predicates, it is common that pa [TOP], mo [inclusive focus], wo [ACC], as well as zero, mark the noun koto ‘thing’ used as a nominalizer after RT forms of predicates (i.e. [Pred(RT) koto pa/mo/wo/o]), but the use of GEN no is not observable in this construction in Man'yōshū, either.

37 The co-existence of adjectives and adjective roots with genitive is observable today still in basic color expressions in ModJ, e.g. aka-i kutu [red(RT) shoe] ‘red shoe’ vs. aka no kutu [red(N) GEN shoe] (lit.) ‘shoe of red’. Basic color terms, such as aka ‘red’, awo ‘blue’, kuro ‘black’, and siro ‘white’, were all nouns in OJ, and they directly modified the following nouns, e.g. aka-gwoma [red(N)-horse] ‘chestnut horse’; awo-gumo [blue(N)-cloud] ‘blue (gray) cloud’. Adjectival RT forms for these color terms, such as akaki ‘red’ and awoki ‘blue’, were attested, but rarely used (in verse, at least) to modify nouns; they were usually used as nominalized adjectives, e.g. yama ni siroki wa [mountain LOC white(RT) TOP] ‘the white thing on the mountain’ (MYS 10:2324). Exceptions are only one case of awoki kinu-gasa [blue(RT) silk-shade] ‘blue silk shade’ (MYS 19:4204), and four cases of ka-guroki kami [Pref-black(RT)] ‘black hair’ (MYS 5:804, 7:1277, 13:3295, 15:3649).
h. *No* is often used with emotive particles such as *ya* (Ôno T.), e.g. *itwokwo ya no imo no mikoto* [sweetie Intj GEN beloved GEN honorable.person] *‘honorable beloved (addressing to the speaker’s wife)’* (KJ, Song 4). This is particularly so in EMJ when *no* marks the root of an adjective, e.g. *waro no kokoro ya* [bad(Root) GEN mind Intj] *‘Bad mind!’* (GM, Tenarai).

i. There are *makura-kotoba* (pillow words) and *jo-kotoba* (prefaces) that end with *no* to introduce particular words, while there is no *makura-kotoba* or *jo-kotoba* which end with *ga* (cf. Ôno S.; Ôno T.):38, 39 e.g. *ara-tama no* [new-gem GEN] to introduce *tosi* ‘year’, *paru* ‘spring’, *tukwi* ‘month’, etc., and *twoga no kwi no* [hemlock.spruce GEN tree GEN] to introduce *tugitugi ni* ‘in succession’.

j. *No* can be used to introduce homonyms as a rhetorical device in songs, but there are no such expressions with *ga* (Ôno S.), e.g. *asi-tadu no/ ana tadutadusi* [reed-crane GEN/ Intj clumsy] (*tadu* ‘crane’ vs. *tadutadusi* ‘clumsy’) (MYS 4:575), *puka-miru no/ mi-maku posH^e do* [deep-seaweed GEN/ see-Conjec(Ku) desirable Conj] (*miru* ‘seaweed’ vs. *mi-* ‘see’) (MYS 6:946).

k. *No* can be used for repeating similar expressions in adverbial phrases, but such examples are not attested with *ga* (Hashimoto), e.g. *ti-na no i-po-na ni* [1000-rumor GEN 5-100-rumor LOG] *‘as many rumors as’* (MYS 4:731); *ni-tutuzi no/ nippamu toki no/ sakura-bana/ saki-na-mu toki ni* [red-azalea GEN/shine.in.red-Conjec time GEN/ cherry.blossom-blossom/ bloom-Perf-Conjec time LOG] *‘when red azaleas shine in red, and when cherry blossoms bloom’* (MYS 6:971); *ya-tuka-po* 38 Ôno T.’s (1978:62) description of this point is not entirely accurate. He suggests that *ga* was not used in *makura-kotoba* or *jo-kotoba*, but there are quite a few of those, e.g. *imo ga swode* [beloved GEN sleeve] (MYS 10:2187) to introduce *maki* ‘make it a pillow’; *kimi ga kiu* [you GEN wear(RT)] (MYS 11:2675) to introduce *Mikasa no yama* [Mikasa GEN mountain]. 39 GEN *tu* can also be at the end of *jo-kotoba*. For example, *wata no soko/ oki tu* [sea GEN bottom/offing GEN] is a *jo-kotoba* to introduce the place name *Fukae* (MYS 5:813) because of the partial homonym *puka-* ‘deep’. Thus, GEN *no* is not peculiar in this regard.

---

38 Ôno T.’s (1978:62) description of this point is not entirely accurate. He suggests that *ga* was not used in *makura-kotoba* or *jo-kotoba*, but there are quite a few of those, e.g. *imo ga swode* [beloved GEN sleeve] (MYS 10:2187) to introduce *maki* ‘make it a pillow’; *kimi ga kiu* [you GEN wear(RT)] (MYS 11:2675) to introduce *Mikasa no yama* [Mikasa GEN mountain].

39 GEN *tu* can also be at the end of *jo-kotoba*. For example, *wata no soko/ oki tu* [sea GEN bottom/offing GEN] is a *jo-kotoba* to introduce the place name *Fukae* (MYS 5:813) because of the partial homonym *puka-* ‘deep’. Thus, GEN *no* is not peculiar in this regard.
no ikasi po ni [eight-grip-ear.of.grain GEN vigorous ear.of.grain LOC] ‘like long vigorous ear of grain’ (Norito, Toshigoi no matsuri).

3.3.2.2. Ōno S. (1977a) (also Ōno S. et al. 1974)

Ōno S. is very influential in the field of classical Japanese, and we may regard his views as a representative analysis in the traditional framework.

Ōno S. on GEN ga

While claiming that ga was originally a genitive particle and then developed into the nominative due to its uchi (inside) marking feature (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2 for the development of NOM ga), Ōno S. does not claim anything about the origins of GEN ga.

Concerning the use of GEN ga in OJ, Ōno S. et al. (1974: 1443) state that it is complementary to the use of GEN tu. According to them, while tu in many cases marks basic positions and locations to which something belongs (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3), ga marks place names, plants, and creatures to indicate where something belongs,40 e.g.


40 Their explanation is unclear, but they seem to be saying that both tu and ga mark where something belongs, while these particles are different in that tu follows positional or locational common nouns (e.g. ama ‘heaven’, kuni ‘earth’, oki ‘offing’, and naka ‘middle’), while ga follows place names, plants, and creatures.
ôno S. ‘s Hypothesis about GEN no

As for GEN no, ôno S. (1977a: 4-6; ôno S. et al. 1974: 1443) claims that its most basic function is to indicate “sonzai no basyo” ‘the location of an existence’. For example, Mitinoku no/Manwo no kaya-para [Michinoku(region) GEN/Mano(p.n.) GEN bush-field] (MYS 3:396) means ‘the bush field in Mano in Michinoku’. Therefore, no can be used recursively to successively specify and thus narrow down a location, e.g. Kosi no umi no tayupi no ura [Koshi(region) GEN sea GEN Tayui(p.n.) GEN bay] ‘the bay at Tayui in the sea of Koshi’ (MYS 3:367). According to him, no that marks place names consists of about 50% of the total uses of no in Man’yôshû.

Based on this basic function, ôno S. (1977a: 4-6) claims that no extended its use to form an adjective-like modifying phrase by linking a preceding NP to its head NP. He compares no with adjective-forming suffixes -y and -ly in English, e.g. snowy, cloudy, manly, and ghostly (his examples). Thus, asa-pi no wemi [moming-sun GEN smile] (KJ, Song 3) means ‘rising-sun-like smile’ (< ‘smile that exists in the condition of the rising sun’), awa-yuki no wakayaru mune [foam-snow GEN be.young breast] ‘soft-and-delicate-snow-like young breast’ (KJ, Song 3, 5), and waka-kusa no tuma [young-grass GEN wife] ‘young-grass-like wife’ (KJ, Song 4, 5). He explains some of the characteristic uses of no (i.e. (5d): numeral expressions; (5i): makura-kotoba (pillow words) and jo-kotoba.

---

41 ôno S. (1977a/b, ôno S. et al. 1974) does not explain how or why this basic function should be related to the notion of soto (outside).

42 This analysis does not seem accurate. It is rather strange that the place Tayui exists in the sea. Thus, it should be [Koshi(region) GEN sea GEN [Tayui(p.n.) GEN bay]] ‘the Tayui bay that exists in the sea that exists in Koshi’. Besides, both Taikei and Zenshû read the name of the bay as tayupi ga ura, not tayupi no ura.
(prefaces); and (5j): introducing homonyms) based on this analysis. That is, these expressions are possible with **no** because of its general function to form a modifying phrase with the preceding NP.

Ôno S.'s Observations on GEN tu

Ôno S. et al. (1974: 1442) regard **tu** as an old genitive since its use is rather limited in OJ. They observe that GEN **tu** in many cases marks positions and locations where something exists, and there are many contrasting pairs in attested examples, e.g. *ama-tu-kamwi* [heaven-GEN-deity] ‘deities in heaven’; *kuni-tu-kamwi* [earth-GEN-deity] ‘deities on earth’; *oki-tu-kai* [offing-GEN-oar] ‘the offing’s (side) oar’; *pye-tu-kai* [beach-GEN-oar] ‘the beach’s (side) oar’; *yama-tu-mi* [mountain-GEN-spirit] ‘mountain spirit’; *wata-tu-mi* [sea-GEN-spirit] ‘sea spirit’.

GEN **tu** can also be used in time expressions, e.g. *saki-tu-tosi* [ahead-GEN-year] ‘the last year’; *woto-tu-pi* [far.place-GEN-day] ‘the day before yesterday’. It can also mark adjectival bound nominals, e.g. *yu-tu ma-tubaki* [holy(Bd)-GEN genuine-camellia] ‘holy camellia’; *siko-tu okina* [fool(Bd)-GEN old.man] ‘stupid old man’.

Ôno S. on GEN na/da/etc.

Ôno S. et al. (1974: 1443) regard GEN **na** as a variant of GEN **no**, and explain that it occurs after the vowels a, u, and A-type i, e.g. *ma-na-kwo* [eye-GEN-Dim] ‘pupil’; *ma-na-kapi* [eye-GEN-crossing.point] ‘between eyes, before one’s eyes’; *ta-na-gokoro* [hand-GEN-heart] ‘palm’; *sa-na-gara* [that-GEN-nature] ‘as it is, all’; *kamu-na-gara* [deity-


3.3.2.3. Critique of ôno S.

GEN ga

Despite his explanation, it does not seem that ôno S. attempts to compare GEN ga and tu seriously. He arranged his explanations of GEN tu, ga, and no in this order, and his claim that the uses of GEN ga and GEN tu are complementary to each other seems little more than a casual comparison made in the course of his discussion. Nevertheless, I could not find counterexamples to this claim, which may have intriguing implications for the origins of ga and tu. If we examine the use of GEN ga, no, and tu, GEN ga and no exhibit overlapping distributions (Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.1, e.g. ume ga pana vs. ume no pana [plum.tree GEN blossom]), and so do GEN no and tu (Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1, e.g. topo-no kuni vs. topo-tu kuni [far(Root)-GEN country]), but GEN ga and tu do not. As we will see below, ôno T. (1978) claims that GEN ga was derived from the demonstrative ko ‘this’, and I will present a hypothesis that GEN tu was derived from a demonstrative *to ‘that (mesial)’, which also developed into the demonstrative so/si ‘that’, adverbial to ‘that way’ (e.g. to ni mo kako ni mo [that.way LOC even this.way LOC even] ‘nevertheless’), complementizer to, and the emphatic particle si. If the demonstrative system had been of a
two-way distinction, and if both demonstratives, *ko and *to, developed into the genitive particles, ga and tu, it makes sense that GEN ga and tu do not have any overlaps in their use.

**GEN no**

Ôno S.'s claim that the most basic function of no is to indicate a location of existence is so general that it does not pose any problems for most examples (cf. (5b)). For some peculiar examples, however, he has to rely on his extended explanation that NP-no forms an adjective-like modifier (i.e. for (5c), (5i), and (5j)). This does not, however, provide a good explanation for (5g). That is, why did people use no with adjective roots to form an adjective-like modifier instead of using the adjectives themselves, inflected in the RT forms (e.g. why omosiro no tuki [refreshing(Root) GEN moon] instead of omosiroki tuki [refreshing(RT) moon])? I will come back to this question later.

**GEN tu**

Ôno S.'s observations about GEN tu are not incorrect but rather limited. Since GEN tu in many cases marks positions and locations in attested examples, and also since there are many contrasting expressions (e.g. ama-tu-kamwi [heaven-GEN-deity] vs. kuni-tu-kamwi [earth-GEN-deity]), it is generally thought that the use of GEN tu was limited to particular uses (e.g. Yamada 1913; Hashimoto 1969). Some scholars even regard tu as a locative (e.g. Murayama 1957; Miller 1971; Itabashi 1987). These characteristics of GEN tu in OJ do not, however, guarantee that its use in pre-OJ was similarly limited. See my claim in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.1) that GEN tu was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ.
Unlike ôno S., I will argue in Section 3.6.1 below that GEN na is an older form of GEN no, and that GEN da is a phonological variant of na. The morphemes ya and ro will also be discussed, but no concrete hypothesis will be provided.

3.3.2.4. ôno T. (1978)

ôno T.’s (1978) approach is essentially the same as ôno S.’s (1977a/b; ôno S. et al. 1974); their arguments are based on their observations of functional and distributional differences among genitive particles. Overall, however, ôno T. argues against ôno S.

ôno T. on GEN ga: the Demonstrative Hypothesis

ôno T. (1978: 54) identifies a function of deictic emphasis (shiji kyôchô) in the use of GEN ga, and claims that ga was derived from the demonstrative pronoun ka. According to him (ibid.: 303), ko ‘this’ and ka ‘that’ came from the same source, and originally did not have any difference in demonstrative distance: cf. ko-ti-go-ti (= a-ti-ko-ti [that(distal)-place-this-place]) ‘here and there’ (KJ, Song 90); ka-ku ‘this way, like this’ (MYS 5:804). He further claims that ko and ka came to indicate different distance according to the openness of the mouth; ko with a more closed mouth for articulation came to mean ‘this’, while ka with a more open mouth came to mean ‘that’.43

To illustrate the function of deictic emphasis, he compares ume ga pana and ume no pana [plum.tree GEN blossom] ‘plum blossoms’ in Man’yôshû. While there are many examples of ume no pana, there are only two examples of ume ga pana in Man’yôshû:

43 ôno T. lists this/that in English as an example of the same iconicity (i.e. correspondence between the demonstrative distance and the openness of the mouth), but this explanation does not necessarily work well for every language, e.g. Korean i/jo ‘this’, ku/ko ‘that (mesial)’, and ce/co ‘that (distal)’. 108
\begin{enumerate}
\item \begin{quote}
\textit{To tame the Japanese nightingale singing in the spring fields, the plum blossoms in the garden of my house bloom.}' (MYS 5:837)
\end{quote}
\item \begin{quote}
'Plum blossoms which Japanese nightingales could not wait for, don’t be falling for the sake of my girl.' (MYS 5:845)
\end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

He explains that Japanese nightingales and plum blossoms are personified in these songs, and thus \textit{ume ga pana} is emphasized with \textit{ga}, which is different from other, normative \textit{ume no pana}.

According to him, it had been possible to indicate that noun $X$ possesses $Y$, or $Y$ belongs to $X$ in the form of $XY$. However, in order to indicate this genitive relationship clearly with emphasis, the demonstrative \textit{ka} was placed after $X$ as in \textit{[X-ka-Y]} (cf. so-called “resumptive pronouns” in a broad sense),\footnote{The applicability of the notion of resumptive pronouns was suggested by Charles Quin (p.c.). The use of resumptive pronouns is found in various historical changes. For example, Quinn (1997) claims that SFP \textit{zo} and \textit{ka} in OJ were derived from resumptive pronouns. Li and Thompson (1977) claim that the copula \textit{shi} in Mandarin Chinese developed from the demonstrative ‘this’ through its resumptive use. In the generative framework of Chomsky (e.g. Haegeman 1994), the term “resumptive pronoun” is used in a particular way, i.e. referring to the use of pronouns to save long-distance (or difficult) construal, generally in relative clauses in English, but more widely in relative clauses, scrambling, and topicalization in Japanese (e.g. Saitō 1985). In a crosslinguistic context, the use of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses is discussed as the pronoun-retention strategy by Comrie (1989). See also Hirata (2001) for the use of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in Japanese.} which is the same process as the demonstrative \textit{zhi} ‘this’ in Old Chinese developed into a genitive morpheme with emphasis (Ôno T. 1978: 55). He explains that the voicing from \textit{ka} to \textit{ga} was induced by sequential voicing (\textit{rendaku}).
As supporting evidence for the demonstrative origin of *ga*, he also lists the fact that only *ga* can be used for the pronouns *wa* 'I' and *na* 'you', as well as the fact that *ga* is used for individual names (e.g. *Kakinomoto no Hitomaro ga uta nari* [Kakinomoto GEN Hitomaro GEN song COP] 'This is Kakinomoto no Hitomaro's song' KKS 409).

Based on the use with *wa* 'I' and *na* 'you', ôno T. argues that *ga* is an older genitive than *no*.

ôno T. on GEN *no*: the Emotive Particle Hypothesis

As briefly mentioned in Chapter 2, ôno T. (1978) claims that GEN *no* originated from an emotive particle, then developed into a regular kind of genitive after starting out as a genitive in emotive expressions. He attributes the characteristics of *no* that he identified (i.e. (7a-h) and (7k) in Chapter 2, and (5e) in this chapter) to its origin. He (ibid.: 59) claims that a change from korochô hyôgen (emphatic expressions) to non-emphatic expressions is a general linguistic change, and that it is a particularly common change for particles (e.g. GEN *ga*, GEN *no*, and LOC/reason/instrument *de* (< *ni te*)). He also lists the merger of SS with RT in MJ as an example of this kind of change.

To support his claim, ôno T. also cites Nihon Dai-jiten Kankô-kai (1976), which argues for the existence of the interjective particle *no*, based on its use in kodai kayô (ancient songs), e.g. *Isoragasaki ni/ tai turu ama no/ tai turu ama no/ wagimokwo ga tame to/ tai turu ama no/ tai turu ama no* [Isoragasaki(p.n.) LOC/ snapper fish(V/RT) fisherman Intj/ (repeat)// my.lover GEN sake Comp/ (repeat)/ (repeat)] 'At Isoragasaki, snapper-fishing man, snapper-fishing man. For my lover's sake, snapper-fishing man, snapper-fishing man.'

Emphatic expressions can be considered as "marked" (usually indicated by morphological markedness, e.g. RT main clauses (*rentai dome*) in Chapter 4), and the change which ôno T. refers to here can be understood as a change from marked to unmarked expressions.
man' (Kagura-uta, Ko-saibari/Isora-ga-saki); Nari takasi ya, Nari takasi/Opomiya tikaku
te nari takasi/ apare no nari takasi [sound high Intj (repeat)/Ômiya(the highest shrine)
close(Adj/RY) Conj (repeat)/ affect Intj (repeat)] 'Oh, the sound is high. The sound is high.
Ômiya is close, and the sound is high. How moving! The sound is high' (Fûzoku-uta, Nari
takashi). The explanation of Nihon Dai-jiten Kankô-kai (1976: 692) is as follows: “There
are some claims that the interjective particle no originated from the interjective particle na,
which developed into nau/naa in MI, then into no/nou. However, there are examples of the
interjective particle no already in the ancient songs, and the function of no is rather different
from that of na. Thus, we should conclude that there was an interjective particle no, separate
from na.”

Ôno T. on GEN tu

Ôno T. (1978: 52) regards tu as a different kind of genitive from no and ga, and
claims that the function of tu was to single out a member (or part) X from a group (or
whole) Y in [X tu Y]. This is rather different from the common semantic relationships
between X and Y in [X ga/no Y], i.e. X being a possessor and Y being a possessed, or X
being a location and Y belonging to X. His claim is based on the fact that most examples of
tu are observable in contrasting pairs of compounds (or phrases). Thus, ama-tu-kamwi
[heaven-GEN-deity] is not ‘the deities who belong to the heaven’ but ‘the deities of heaven
among many deities’, contrasting with kuni-tu-kamwi [earth-GEN-deity]. Kami-tu-se
[upper.part-GEN-shallow], naka-tu-se [middle-GEN-shallow], and simo-tu-se [lower.part-
GEN-shallow] are not identifying three parts of one shallow, but there are many shallows in
one river, and each one is specified by kami-, naka-, and simo-. Ma-tu-ge [eye-GEN-hair]
is not ‘hair that belongs to the eye’, but ‘eyelash among various kinds of hair’. Other
examples include: yama-tu-mi [mountain-GEN-spirit] vs. wata-tu-mi [sea-GEN-spirit]; kami-tu-Ke'nwo [upper.part-GEN-Keno(p.n.)] vs. simo-tu-Ke'nwo [lower.part-GEN-Keno]; tika-tu-Apumi [close(Adj/Root)-GEN-ômi(p.n.)] vs. topo-tu-Apumi [far(Root)-GEN-ômi]; oki-tu-kai [offing-GEN-oar] vs. pye-tu-kai [beach-GEN-oar]. He hypothesizes that GEN tu and the demonstrative to, as seen in to-ni-kaku-ni [that-LOC-like.this-LOC] 'in various ways', share the same origin since [X-fu-] has a function to clearly specify X.46

Ôno T. on GEN na

Ôno T. (1978: 62) mentions GEN na, which he claims is an alternative form of GEN no, as a piece of evidence for the origin of GEN no. He claims that GEN no, GEN na, and the emotive particle na in OJ came from the same emotive particle.

3.3.2.5. Critique of Ôno T. (1978)

GEN ga

Ôno T. specifically claims that the demonstrative ka, not ko, developed into GEN ga. According to him, originally ko and ka did not have any difference in distance. If so, however, what had been the difference between ko and ka? He does not provide any explanation for this point. Nevertheless, if we consider the use of GEN ga with first person pronouns (e.g. wa, a, ono), it seems unlikely that the development into genitive occurred after ka became a demonstrative for the distal 'that'.

46 The complementizer to in Japanese appears to have been derived from this demonstrative to (e.g. Ôno S. et al. 1974: 1447). Cf. also English that as a demonstrative and a complementizer (see Hopper and Traugott 1993: 185-89).
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Although it is not definitive in any sense, I find Ōno T.'s claim intriguing, since it seems possible to entertain the possibility that GEN tu could also have been derived from a demonstrative, in this case, from the demonstrative *to 'that'. I will discuss this hypothesis in Section 3.4.2 below. One possible strength of the demonstrative hypothesis is that demonstratives in general do not take GEN ga: i.e. ko-no [this-GEN] 'this', so-no [that(mesial)-GEN] 'that', ka-no [that(distal)-GEN] 'that', but **ko-ga, **ka-ga. Among the few exceptions are so-ga ‘that’ (KJ, Song 100) and si-ga ‘that’ (MYS 904, 4094, 4191, 4254, and a few others in other materials), and these uses may constitute counterexamples to the demonstrative hypothesis. Since these examples are so rare, however, they may be a result of fluctuation after the demonstrative meaning of ga was completely bleached out.

The two demonstrative hypotheses (i.e. GEN ga < ko/ka ‘this’; GEN tu < *to ‘that’) also agree with positing a two-way demonstrative system with ko ‘this’ and so (or possibly *to) ‘that’, instead of the three-way system (see Section 3.4.2.4). In this scenario, both demonstratives, ‘this’ and ‘that’, developed into genitive particles. The demonstrative ka could possibly be a phonological variant of ko ‘this’, since so ‘that (mesial)’ had a phonological variant sa, and ko/ka ‘this’ would have changed to GEN ga before ka changed to ‘that’.

It is difficult to provide an objective measure for the degree of emphasis (or focus), but one notion which often comes up in the study of ga is “focus” and/or “emphasis”. For example, as we have seen in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2.1.3), Yamada (1913 [1954]) also identifies an emphasizing function in OJ GEN ga. It also agrees with the use of ga for focus constructions (in the sense of identifying an entity) in ModJ, in which ga is used more often than omitted. See the examples below:

47 The demonstrative sa was often used in Heian literature (i.e. EMJ), but I could not find examples in OJ.
48 See also “nominative in glosses” in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1.7.
The notion of “closeness” also seems to have something to do with ga. In Chapter 2, I have discussed the pejorative/honorific (or inside/outside) distinction, according to which ga indicates psychological closeness to the speaker. Also, NOM ga in ModJ can only (and only once) indicate a subject for the closest predicate, which contrasts with the function of TOP wa, as shown below:

Thus, these notions (i.e. focus, emphasis, and closeness) seem to agree with the use of ga, if ga had come from the proximal demonstrative ‘this’.

As Ōno T. mentioned, it is generally thought that GEN zhi l in Old Chinese (OC) was derived from the demonstrative zhi l ‘this’, e.g. fù zhi l daò [father GEN road] (Lunyu (Rongo) ca. B.C. 5c?). Are Chinese GEN zhi l and Japanese GEN ga related in any way? There are three possibilities: (i) OJ GEN ga came from OC GEN zhi l (i.e. lexical borrowing and sound change), (ii) pre-OJ adapted its demonstrative *ga to a genitive use, in analogy with the homonymic zhi l ‘this’ and zhi l ‘of’ in Chinese; or (iii) they are
unrelated. Chinese and Japanese are genetically unrelated, and the development of GEN *ga* seems to have occurred prior to the massive import of Chinese vocabulary with Chinese characters that took place from around the sixth century. If we compare their forms, it is highly unlikely that OJ GEN *ga* came from lexical borrowing of OC GEN *zhil*. Also, it seems unlikely that pre-OJ copied the homonymic status of OC *zhil* ‘this’ and *zhil* ‘of’. In order for this to be possible, a great number of bilingual immigrants (and perhaps their higher social status) seems necessary. However, there is no sufficient linguistic evidence to support a significant influence of Chinese on pre-OJ grammar (particularly on spoken language), or social evidence for many Chinese/Japanese bilinguals. Therefore, even if we assume that GEN *ga* was derived from a demonstrative ‘this’, it is more likely that the development of GEN *ga* in pre-OJ was independent from that of Chinese GEN *zhil*.

Another thing to note is that there are eleven examples of *wa go opokimi* [I GEN lord] ‘my lord’ in *Man’yōshū* while there are only two cases of *wa ga opokimi*. Taikei (vol.1: 324) explains that *wa ga opokimi* seems to be the original since that is the form we observe in *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*, and claims that *wa go opokimi* was a poetic word (*ka-go*) in the Man’yō era, having the vowel in the genitive assimilated to the following *o*, i.e. *wa ga opokimi* > *wa go opokimi*. However, many songs in *Man’yōshū* were composed before *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki* were compiled, and thus we cannot say for sure that the songs in

---

49 It is thought that Buddhism was introduced in 538 A.D. The introduction of Chinese characters is earlier than that.

50 For theories about language contact in general, see Thomason and Kaufman (1988).

51 Apparently, Chinese culture had been coming into Japan for a long time, but the official delegation from Japan was first sent to the Sui dynasty in 607 A.D.

52 There are many other instances of *wa ga/go opokimi*, but the readings for those examples are not certain because of the lack of a Chinese character assigned to the genitive.
Kojiki and Nihonshoki are generally older.\(^5\) Also, the assumed change from GEN ga to go cannot be a phonetically conditioned sound change proper induced by the following o, since there are other examples in which GEN ga remains unchanged despite the following okutuki ‘grave’ (MYS 1801), omopa-naku ni [think-Neg(Ku) LOC] ‘(I) do not think’ (MYS 3392), osoki ‘clothes’ (MYS 3509), oto ‘sound’ (MYS 3438), omo ‘face’ (MYS 3515),oku-duma [depth-wife] ‘wife’ (MYS 3978), and opoguro (name of a hawk) (MYS 4011).

It would be interesting if we could entertain the possibility that wa go opokimi ‘my lord’ was older than wa ga opokimi for the sake of the demonstrative hypothesis (i.e. GEN ga < ko/ka ‘this’). However, it does not seem very promising since there is no GEN go attested in other examples. The phrase wa go opokimi [I GEN lord] ‘my lord’ seems rather unusual (i.e. too ritualistic) to be the only attested fossilized expression.\(^3\) Nonetheless, the co-existence of wa ga opokimi and wa go opokimi is still a little puzzling.

Ôno T. explains that the voicing change from ka to ga was due to sequential voicing (rendaku). This account does not agree with Murayama (1956) and others’ (e.g. Martin 1987) claim that sequential voicing was originally induced by the existence of GEN *n (or simply GEN no or LOC ni, according to Martin). Nonetheless, how sequential voicing started out is unsolved, and also there are other cases in which the voicing of genitive particles seems to have occurred, e.g. ku-da-mono [tree-GEN-thing] ‘nut’; ke-da-mono [hair-GEN-thing] ‘animal’; ika-du-ti [severe(Root)-GEN-spirit] ‘thunder’; nwo-du-ti [field-GEN-spirit] ‘spirit of field’ (e.g. snake); mi-du-ti [water-GEN-spirit] ‘spirit of the

\(^5\) For example, Song 52 in Man’yoshû, which contains wa go opokimi ‘my lord’, was composed around the time when the capital was moved to Fujiwara in 694. Kojiki was compiled in 712, although it also contains older songs.

\(^3\) There are some examples in which GEN ga (or go?) underwent contraction, e.g. wagimo(kwo) ‘my beloved’ < wa ga imo-(kwo) [I GEN beloved-(Dim)]; wagipye ‘my house’ < wa ga ipye [I GEN house]. See Unger (2000a) for these sound changes. Unlike wagimo(kwo) and wagipye, contraction did not occur in wa ga/go opokimi ‘my lord’ perhaps because the phrase is too formal.
water’ (e.g. dragon snake). In addition, the voicing of particles does occur without the existence of a genitive, e.g. so/zo, woba (< wo pa [ACC TOP]) (see Martin 1987: 104-13). Therefore, ôno T.’s account is not ruled out.

**GEN no**

Ôno T.’s emotive particle hypothesis about no is not totally convincing.55 First of all, there is a serious problem in his approach. He only looks at peculiar, rather limited examples, i.e. kando hyōgen (emotive expressions), most representatively the use of no with adjective stems in his argument. The use of GEN no is so general in OJ (see (5b)) that the majority of its examples do not support his claim. For the process in which the use of no was generalized, he appeals to the loss of markedness, which he considers a common linguistic change, to the change from emphatic expressions to regular expressions. However, the corpus of GEN no in which we cannot find any trace of its purported original sense seems too large (see (5b) again).

---

55 Ôno T. also claims that DAT/LOC ni has the same origin as the emotive particle na and GEN no (1978: 62, 71-84). Thus, the degree of emotiveness of ni is high in such examples as aya ni ‘ah’, ana ni ‘ah’, ... nasi ni [... lacking Intj] ‘... lacking!’; e.g. Kaze nasi no/ pama no sira-nami itadura-ni/ koko ni yosekuru/ miru pito nasi ni [wind lacking GEN/ beach GEN white-wave/ for.nothing/ here LOC get.close/ see person lacking Intj] ‘There is no wind on the beach, and the white waves come close for nothing, without anyone seeing them’ (MYS 9:1673). Also, see X mo Y ni [X even Y Intj], e.g. asi mo agaka ni [foot even scratching Intj] ‘even a foot scratching! > irritatedly’; and kokoro mo sino ni [heart even wet Intj] ‘even a heart wet’. However, it is also possible to analyze that various uses of ni is derived from locative (e.g. Jorden with Noda 1987; Quinn 1994; also see a list of functions in Martin 1975: 40-42), and the emotions in those expressions above is expressed in relation to a certain situation or condition (i.e. location). The reverse path seems rather difficult (i.e. from a particle of emotion to that of location). Akiba (1978) claims that GEN no, DAT/LOC ni, inflecting derivational suffix (jodōshi) nu, and the copula nari were all derived from some sort of be-verb ‘exist’. This hypothesis seems more plausible than Ôno T.’s claim. See Section 3.3.3 for Akiba (1978).
Second, exact time periods of the examples of the emotive particle *no* in the ancient songs are not clear, and the existence of the emotive particle *no* in OJ is still uncertain.\(^{56}\) One possibility is that some ancient songs preserved the emotive particle *no*, which was no longer productive in OJ. As ôno T. explains, however, we do not have many examples of this kind of *no* in ancient songs.

Third, although ôno T. attributes the use of GEN *no* with adjective roots to the emotive sense of GEN *no* (see (7a) in Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1.2), such a use of genitive is not limited to *no*: GEN *tu* has the same use, as examined in Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1, e.g. *toko-tu mikadwo* [eternal(Root)-GEN palace] (MYS 2:174); *topo-tu kamu.yoa* [far(Root)-GEN ancestor] (MYS 18:4096). While the use of *no* in *Kagura-uta* and *Fûzoku-uta* suggests the existence of the emotive particle *no*, there is no evidence for an emotive sense in *tu*. Therefore, we have to conclude that the use of the genitive with bound morphemes to execute an adjective function is not motivated by emotive senses. Rather, this use of genitives seems to be a reflection of the late development of adjective inflection (cf. Martin 1987).\(^ {57}\) Such use survived into EMJ, perhaps as a marked expression, which may be the reason of the co-occurrence with emotive particles, as observed by ôno T., e.g. *omosiro no tuki no yoruya* [refreshing(Root) GEN moon GEN night Excl] ‘(what) a refreshing moonlit night!’.

---

\(^{56}\) In general, *Kagura-uta* and *Fûzoku-uta* are treated as a part of Heian literature, i.e. after 794 A.D., not the materials in the OJ period. There is no agreement on when they were compiled, but the earliest possible date seems to be around 860 for *Kagura-uta*. The songs recorded there are thought to have come from folk songs, and possibly older than the traceable date.

\(^{57}\) In OJ, we can observe four patterns of noun modification (except for modification by verbs): i.e. [N-N] (mwo-bwi [field-fire] ‘field fire’ MYS 230); [Bd.N(Adj.Root)-N] (toko-pa [eternal(Root)-leaf] ‘ever-green leaves’ MYS 3436); [Bd.N-GEN-N] (toko-tu mikadwo [eternal(Root)-GEN palace] ‘eternal palace’ MYS 174); and [Adj N] (kiyôki nagisa [pure beach] ‘pure beach’ MYS 3706). This is a stipulation, but the developmental sequence could possibly be: [N-N] > [Bd.N(Adj.Root)-N] > [Bd.N-GEN-N] / [Adj N].
Fourth and last, the change from an emotive interjective morpheme to a grammatical morpheme is not well attested crosslinguistically. Certainly, so-called "grammaticalization" is not the only possible kind of grammatical changes in human language, but most cases reported in crosslinguistic studies are changes from a content word (e.g. verb) to a functional morpheme (e.g. Heine and Reh 1984; Traugott and Heine (eds.) 1991a/b; Hopper and Traugott 1993). On the other hand, in traditional analyses, many functional particles in OJ are thought to have been derived from emotive (interjective) particles. For example, many scholars claim that ACC wo was derived from the emotive particle wo (e.g. Hashimoto 1969; Murayama 1973; ôno S. et al. 1974; ôno T. 1978; among others).58 Also, the sentence final particles yo and yo, as well as the kakari particle ya, are generally regarded as having been derived from emotive interjective particles. If based on these claims, the tendency in grammaticalization does not necessarily refute ôno T.'s emotive hypothesis about GEN no. However, we certainly have to be cautious since those particles that are thought to have come from emotive interjective particles actually have many attested examples of the same forms used as emotive particles, while we only have few examples of the emotive no in the ancient songs.

**GEN tu**

Ôno T.'s (1978) approach to GEN tu is also problematic. Again, he pays attention only to a subset of examples, i.e. noticeable examples which make up contrasting pairs. Therefore, his claim about the semantic relationship between X and Y in [X tu Y] is

---

58 Even in an Altaic hypothesis, Murayama (1957, 1973) claims that accusative particles in OJ and Tungus were derived from emotive/emphatic particles. He reconstructs those particles as *ba (> ACC wo) in proto-J and *ba/bd (> ACC ba/bd) in proto-Tungus. He explains that ba/bd in Tungus languages have emotive/emphasizing functions, and the emphatic particle ba in Mongol shares the same origin.
questionable as a generalization. Many examples do not have clear contrasting counterparts, and X in [X tu Y] cannot always be interpreted as a specification of a certain member of the group Y.

For example, ama-tu-sirusi [heaven-GEN-mark] (MYS 10:2007) was used to refer to the Milky Way, which was held to separate Princess Orihime (Vega in the Lyra) from her lover, Kengyû (Altair in the Aquila). In this usage, it is difficult to assume that sirusi refers to a certain set of marks, and that ama-tu ‘of heaven’ is a specification of one subset among them. Also, in the sequence wata no soko/oki tu Fukaye no/una-kami no [sea bottom/ offing GEN Fukae GEN/ sea-above GEN] (MYS 5:813), wata no soko oki tu is a jo-kotoba (preface) for the place name Fukae, which evidently cannot constitute a group. Another counterexample would be oki tu ma-kamo [offing GEN genuine-wild.duck] (MYS 14:3524). The word ma-kamo refers to wild ducks, and it is most reasonable to interpret oki tu ma-kamo as ‘the ducks in the offing’; oki tu [offing GEN] is not a specification among different kinds of wild ducks: cf. also oki tu kwo-sima [offing GEN small-island] (MYS 7:1401).

To list some other examples, there is no contrasting counterpart attested with ma-tuge [eye-GEN-hair] ‘eyelash’ in a set of ke ‘hair’ in the human body. Also, we do not find a reasonable counterpart to tanabata-tu-mye [loom-GEN-woman] ‘female weaver; Orihime’ (MYS 10:2027). Likewise, woto-tu-pi [far.place-GEN-day] ‘the day before yesterday’ does not have a counterpart expression with regard to a certain set of days.

59 In a Chinese legend, Princess Orihime and Kengyû can meet only once a year on July 7th.
60 One thing to note is that there is no Chinese character (man ‘yô-gana) assigned to tu in ama-tu-sirusi in the original orthography. But both Taikei and Zenshû read the phrase as ama-tu-sirusi. The noun ama-‘heaven’ usually takes GEN tu, which can be confirmed with Chinese characters, e.g. ama-tu-kwiri [heaven-GEN-mist] (MYS 7:1079); ama-tu-swora [heaven-GEN-sky] (MYS 12:2887). It is certain that the phrase was read as ama-tu-sirusi when Man yôshû was copied with Japanese kana (syllabic alphabets) in the MJ period.
Therefore, it should be said that Ôno T.'s (1978) claim about GEN *tu* is not convincing.

See my claim in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.1) that GEN *tu* was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ.

**GEN na**

Ôno T. (1978) claims that GEN *na*, GEN *no*, and the emotive particle *na* were derived from the same emotive particle. If his account is correct, and if we consider the functional changes and phonological shapes, it seems most reasonable to assume that the emotive particle *na* is closest to the common origin, GEN *na* the second closest, and GEN *no* the most further developed. However, attested examples of GEN *na*, such as *ma-na-kwo* [eye-GEN-(Dim)] ‘pupil, eye’, *ta-na-gokoro* [hand-GEN-heart] ‘palm’, *mi-na-two* [water-GEN-gate] ‘harbor, port’, and *mi-na-kami* [water-GEN-upper.part] ‘upstream’, do not exhibit any emotive sense. Therefore, extant examples of GEN *na* do not support his claim.

3.3.3 Akiba (1978)

Akiba (1978) calls the Japanese language of the early Heian period (i.e. 794-) “Old Japanese”, which I refer to as “Early Middle Japanese”, and studies prose literature, such as *Taketori monogatari* (late 9c?), *Ise Monogatari* (before 905), *Genji monogatari* (ca. 1000-1014), and *Tsutsumi-chûnagon monogatari* (late Heian). She treats the language of this period as if it were the oldest variety that we can study, and sometimes discusses the origins of case particles. This approach is obviously inappropriate. Nonetheless, she provides an intriguing hypothesis about the origin of GEN *no* (of which she is not necessarily the originator, however), and I will review her claims below. When considering
the function of connecting two nouns, Akiba compares GEN ga, GEN no, and zero-marking. GEN tu, na, and other forms do not come up in her discussion.

3.3.3.1. Akiba on GEN ga

Although she is not specific about the origin of GEN ga, Akiba (1978: 114-17) claims that zero-marking and GEN ga exhibit a complementary distribution, and that they belong to an older grammatical layer than GEN no. According to her observation about connecting two nouns, GEN ga is used to mark personal pronouns or true possessors, while zero-marking is used otherwise.

3.3.3.2. Akiba on GEN no

Concerning the origins of GEN no, Akiba (1978: 243-58) argues that GEN no, LOC ni, COP ni, and the perfective auxiliary (jodôshi) -nu were all derived from a locative be-verb *nu ‘be at’. By “locative be-verb”, she means a verb which takes an zero-marked locative nominal as one of its arguments, e.g. sukuu wc Kumase [school be.at Kumase] ‘The school is at Kumase’ in Twi (Ellis and Boadi 1969). As she notes herself (ibid.: 265), this idea is not totally new, and her discussion seems to be a refinement of Sansom (1928), who conjectures that the particle ni, GEN no, and the perfective nu are all reflexes of an extinct copulative verb *nu.

Akiba (1978: 256-57) further claims that genitive constructions were derived from relative clause constructions, e.g. *Kaguya-pimye nu ipye [Kaguya-princess be.at house] ‘the house which is at/with Princess Kaguya (> Kaguya’s possession)’. She offers an example from Hebrew, in which genitive constructions were derived from relative clause

---

61 Citing Clark (1978), she mentions other languages which have locative be-verbs, such as Syrian Arabic, Eskimo, and Kurukh. She also mentions zaï in Mandarin Chinese and se in Siswate.
constructions involving a locative verb (ibid.: 259): i.e. ha-bayit she-l-i [the-house that-to-me] ‘my house’, in which the preposition l was derived from a locative verb *ʔal ‘to mount (somewhere)’ or ‘to go up (somewhere)’.62

Akiba (1978: 257-59) experiences a difficulty in explaining how the RT form *nu (RT) ‘be at’ phonologically changed to GEN no. One hypothesis she presents is that *no had been the root of the reconstructed *nu and various inflectional forms had developed by adding stem-forming suffixes (e.g. *no-a > *na (MZ); *no-i > *ni (RY)), and that the root form *no had been used for the adnominal function. According to her, this root *no had developed into GEN no before other inflectional forms developed.63

3.3.3.3 Critique of Akiba

GEN ga

Akiba’s account of ga is too simplistic. She deliberately excludes place names in which GEN ga is used from her discussion, since she considers those uses of ga synchronically unproductive in the early Heian period. For one thing, there is no evidence that GEN ga was no longer used in new place names in the Heian period and thereafter. For another, even if the use of GEN ga in place names had been no longer productive, if she neglects such older uses, she cannot make valid claims about an older stage. Thus, her observation that zero-marking and ga-marking exhibit a complementary distribution is

62 Akiba credits this example to Talmy Givón, in personal communication.
63 Akiba is not comfortable with this hypothesis herself, but boldly states (1978: 259): “Whatever may be the reason for it, the fact that the no does not exactly match the tentatively reconstructed nominal form [‘RT form’ in this study - Y.H.] *nu does not prevent us from believing that the Old Japanese associative [‘genitive’ in this study - Y.H.] particle no was derived from the pre-Japanese locative BE.”
severely undercut. Furthermore, the use of GEN no is also observable in place names, and thus her claim that zero-marking and GEN ga belong to an older grammatical layer than GEN no is not a sound argument.

The observation that zero-marking and GEN ga exhibit complementary distribution is wrong. In place names (including mountains, rivers, etc.), we can observe all varieties, i.e. zero-marking, ga-marking, no-marking, as well as tu-marking, which is not included in her discussion, e.g. Tayupi-gata [Tayui-beach-at.ebb.tide] ‘Tayui beach’ (MYS 14:3549); Tayupi-ga-ura [Tayui-GEN-bay] ‘Tayui bay’ (MYS 3:366); Wazami-no [Wazami-field] ‘Wazamino’ (MYS 11:2722); Wazami-ga-para [Wazami-GEN-field] ‘Wazamigahara’ (MYS 2:199); Idumi-gapa [Izumi-river] ‘Izumi River’ (MYS 6:1054); Idumi-no-kapa [Izumi-GEN-river] ‘Izumi River’ (MYS 1:50); Kami-tu-Ke’no [upper-GEN-Keno] ‘Kamitsukeno’ (MYS 14:3417); Tama-tu-sima [gem-GEN-island] (MYS 7:1215).64 Also, despite her claim, there are many expressions with GEN ga in OJ which do not have a possessor-possessed or whole-part relationship in an obvious sense, e.g. imo ga tame [beloved GEN sake] ‘for the sake of (my) beloved’ (MYS 3993); nuru ga pe ni [sleep(RT) GEN addition for] ‘in addition to sleeping’ (MYS 3465); asi ga naka [reed GEN inside] ‘amongst the reeds’ (MYS 14:1445); wobana ga sita [susuki(Japanese pampas grass) GEN below] ‘under the susuki’ (MYS 10:2270). Moreover, personal pronouns can be directly attached to the following noun, although such expressions are not that common, e.g. wa-dori [I-bird] ‘my bird’ (KJ, Song 3); na-dori [you-bird] ‘your bird’ (KJ, Song 3);

---

64 As can be seen, the examples with GEN tu are slightly different from the others; they do not consist of [Place-GEN-Geographic.entity(Mt/River/Field/etc.)]. According to Zenshû (vol.2: 514), Tama-tu-sima possibly came from Tama-idu-sima [gem-come.out-isIand], and thus tu may not be a genitive in this example. A closer example to the others would be Yomo-tu-pirasaka [Hades-GEN-flatslope] (NS, Kamiyo Jō, i.e. Shin-Zenshû, vol.1: 46). Nonetheless, GEN tu can be seen in place names.
*a-gwo* [I-child] 'my son' (MYS 13:3295); *a-gwo* [I-boy] 'my boy (toward a nephew)' (MYS 19:4240); *ono-duma* [I-wife/husband] 'my wife/husband' (MYS 546, 1198, 1738, 3314, 3571).65

**GEN no**

Akiba's claim that GEN no was derived from a locative be-verb *nu* (or a similar form) seems semantically and syntactically plausible. Her claim is more concrete, but it is similar to Ōno S.'s (1977a) claim that the most basic function of GEN no is to indicate a location of existence. Although she somehow discounts the importance of formal discrepancy, it is necessary to explain the change in shape from *nu(?)* to no, which may well be phonological and/or morphological.

---

65 The distribution of direct connection (N-N) and the use of genitive (N-GEN-N) is beyond the scope of this study, but it seems that direct connection is the most basic method in any language and is always a possibility, which often makes a semantic differentiation from the use of genitive, e.g. *ei-kaiwa gakkoo* [English-conversation school] = *ei-kaiwa no gakkoo* [English-conversation GEN school] 'English conversation school'; *kabusiki-gaisya* [stock-company] 'joint-stock company' vs. *kabusiki no kaisya* [stock GEN company] 'a company dealing with stocks'; *art museum* vs. *museum of art; movie theater* vs. *theater of movie; Ohio State* vs. *State of Ohio*.
From a broader perspective, Frellesvig (1999) reconstructs proto-Korean/Japanese (pKJ) copula *t- and *n-. On the Japanese side, he presents the following paradigm:

(9) pJ copula root finite (SS) root + -i- (RY) *to *to *tu *te *no *no (~ na) (*no) *ni

Apparently, adnominal forms (RT) are the same as finite forms (SS) in his reconstruction. However, the formal peculiarity of adnominal no, as well as the relationship between no and na, still remain unexplained.

Frellesvig’s claim is intriguing since it means both GEN tu and GEN no were derived from copula verbs. In fact, as examined in Chapter 2, GEN tu and GEN no share characteristic uses which have not been recognized in past studies, i.e. overlapping

---

66 A thorough comparative study between Korean and Japanese is beyond the scope of this study, but Frellesvig provides the following summary for the reflexes of pKJ copula *t- ~ *n- (pK: proto-Korean; MK: Middle Korean; pJ: proto-Japanese):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pKJ *t-</th>
<th>pK *t-</th>
<th>MK t</th>
<th>pJ *t-</th>
<th>OJ t-</th>
<th>pKJ *n-</th>
<th>pK *n-</th>
<th>MK n-</th>
<th>pJ *n-</th>
<th>OJ n-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>toWoy- ‘become’</td>
<td>-'te'/-'ta' ‘retrospective’</td>
<td>toWoy- ‘become’</td>
<td>-'te'/-'ta' ‘retrospective’</td>
<td>to 'non-finite copula; particle’</td>
<td>tu ‘adnominal’</td>
<td>tu ‘adnominal’</td>
<td>-'te' ‘gerund’</td>
<td>-'tel-tu ‘perfective’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'taw'/-'taw' ‘be (like)’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td>-'u' ‘copula’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘topic’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘processive aspect’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td>-(n)un ‘modifier (adnominal)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td>no ‘adverbalizer’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distributions, an adjectival use with bound nominals, an appositive use, metaphorical and other semantically complex uses (see Section 2.3.1). While this observation is encouraging for the copula-verb hypothesis, it also raises new questions. Why were there two copulas, and what were their differences? Also, it is critical to solve the verb inflectional systems for this hypothesis to be more convincing.

3.3.4 Summary

Up to this point, I have examined various hypotheses about the origins of genitive particles and relationships among them in past studies. As stated in the introduction to this chapter, none of them concerns all possible genitive particles in OJ together, and none of them is totally convincing. However, there remain a few hypotheses that seem to be more plausible than the others, namely the demonstrative hypothesis about GEN ga (Ôno T. 1978), the copula hypothesis about GEN no (Akiba 1978, among others), and the copula hypothesis about GEN tu (Frellesvig 1999).

In those past studies, GEN tu has not been studied sufficiently. I have claimed in Chapter 2 that GEN tu was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ, and thus the study of GEN tu becomes more important than previously recognized. In the following Section 3.4, therefore, I will discuss the origins of GEN tu. As a related issue, I

---

67 With regard to the differences, there are some suggestive analyses in past studies that are concerned with the two copulas nari (< ni ari [at be], since OJ) and tari (< to ari [with be], since EMJ). Yamada (1922: 115) explains that the former is used with internal (naimenteki) quality, whereas the latter is used with externally apparent (gaibóteki) quality. Martin (1975: 754; 1987: 801) calls nari and tari (or ni and to as essives) “objective copula” (or essive) and “subjective copula” (or essive), respectively. Quinn (1994) characterizes nari as “unmarked, essential, and internal (i.e. uchi-related)”, and tari as “marked, contingent, and external (i.e. soto-related)” (see also Quinn 1987: 186). These accounts, however, lead us to a further question, i.e. how did such differences come about? If the reconstructed copulas *nu (or such) and *tu had such differences, it is reasonable to assume that such distinctions were due to the properties of their lexical sources, and it seems that we have to further seek the origins of *nu and *tu.
will also discuss the emphatic particle *si* in Section 3.5. Section 3.6 deals with a couple of small issues, and lastly, in Section 3.7, I will consolidate the hypotheses which still seem plausible from a broader perspective.

3.4 GEN *tu*

In this section, I would like to offer some new insights into the origins of GEN *tu*. Section 3.4.1 argues that it is likely that GEN *tu* in OJ and so-called *sai sios* (medial *s*, i.e. GEN *s*) in Middle Korean (MK) are cognates. Section 3.4.2 provides a new hypothesis about the origin of GEN *tu*.

3.4.1 GEN *tu* in OJ and GEN *s* in MK

As discussed in Chapter 2, MK had two kinds of genitive particles, *s* and 'uy'/"oy. GEN *s*, which is called *sai sios* (medial *s*) in Korean, was used for inanimate nouns or honorific animate nouns, whereas another GEN 'uy'/"oy was used for ordinary animate nouns (Martin 1990, 1992). In this subsection, I argue for a strong possibility that GEN *tu* in Japanese and GEN *s* in MK are cognates. Although this view is not totally new (e.g. Yamada 1913; Hashimoto 1969; Martin 1990), the observations below, when combined, strengthen the hypothesis.

---

68 Unger (p.c.) has pointed out to me that *sai sios* is also traditionally used to indicate tensing of obstruents in native Korean compounds when the first morpheme ends in a vowel, e.g. *patakka* 'seaside' < *pata.s.ka*. See details of the "reinforcement" phenomenon and its writing conventions explained in Martin (1992: 12-13, 13 for the use of *sai sios*). In MK, the use of *sai sios* that is relevant to our discussion here is generally identified as a separate morpheme, functioning as GEN *s*.
First, some examples of GEN s in MK:

(10) MK GEN s/t (Martin 1992)

a. *pwuthye s'na.h* [Buddha GEN age] ‘Buddha’s age’ (Sakpo sangcel 1447 A.D.)
b. *holo s a’cho.m* [one.day GEN morning] ‘one morning’ (Twusi enhay 1481)
c. *LYEN-HWA s HYANG* [lotus.blossom GEN fragrance]° the fragrance of the lotus blossom’ (Wel.in sekpo 1459)

In regard to the claim that GEN tu in OJ and GEN s in MK are cognates, it is worth noting that GEN s had an allomorph t before s or c (Martin 1992: 787), e.g. *nwun t co’zo* ‘the pupil of the eye’ (Sekpo sangcel 1447) = *nwun s co’zo* (Wel.in sekpo 1459); *SYEY-THYEN t ”CWO-SO* ‘ancestral master of India’ (Sekpo sangcel 1447); *KWUN t ’CCO* ‘the characterKWUN’ (Hwunmin cengun enhay 1451).

In *Nihonshoki* (720 A.D.), quite a few old Korean place names are recorded. Among them, the following and other related place names are relevant to our discussion:

(11) Korean Place Names recorded in *Nihonshoki* (720 A.D.) (Yamada 1913; Hashimoto 1969)

b. *Arusi-tari* ‘lower Tari’° (cf. *Shimo-tu-Ke ’nwo* ‘lower Keno’)
c. *Arusi-kara* ‘lower Kara’°°

Yamada (1913: 418), without much discussion, speculates that *si* in these place names, *sai sios* (medial *s*) in ModK, and GEN *tu* in OJ share the same etymon. Hashimoto (1969: 108) refers to such an idea, but does not take a position. *Okosi-tari* and *Arusi-tari* are names of two prefectures belonging to Mimana (Imma in Korean), where Japan had a satellite government from 4c to 562 (on the southeast coast of the Korean peninsula).

°° In Martin’s citation, Chinese characters used in MK texts are presented in capital letters.
°°° *Okosi-tari* and *Arusi-tari* are found in *Nihonshoki*, Book 17 (Keitai 6-nen), and Book 19 (Kinmei gan-nen), i.e. Shin-Zenshû (1996), NS, vol.2: 297, 363.
Arusi-kara refers to the eastern part of Mimana. These readings are supposed to represent the approximation of Old Korean (OK) sounds to OJ phonology, and written with Chinese characters as shang3-che3-li4 [above-large.mouth-voice], xia4-che3-li4 [below-large.mouth-voice], xia4-han2 [below-Korea], respectively (see the list of Chinese characters in the preliminary page). There was a region called “Tari” on the southwest coast of the Korean peninsula, and thus Okosi-tari and Arusi-tari means ‘upper Tari’ and ‘lower Tari’. Since there is no specific character assigned to -si-, it must have come from readings in the Heian period. The identification of the morpheme -si- (in Japanese phonology) is an issue, but given the existence of GEN s in MK, it seems analyzable as a genitive morpheme. Thus, GEN s in Korean seems to date back at least to the eighth century, cf. Japanese place names Kami-tu-Ke’nwo [upper-GEN-Keno] and Simo-tu-Ke’nwo [lower-GEN-Keno] in OJ. The morpheme oko- in Oko-si-tari seems to be a cognate with the verb root okos- ‘raise’ and okor- ‘arise’ in OJ. The morpheme aru- in Aru-si-tari seems to be the etymon of ModK alay ‘below’.

There are other morphemes related to GEN s in MK. First, MK used the morpheme s/t as a nominalizer (NMZ):

72 With regard to the related form Aripisi-no-kara (NS Book 9 Zingû 49-nen, i.e. Shin-Zenshû 1994, NS, vol.1: 457), which is written as nan2-jia1-luo2 [south-add-net] (or nan2-han2 [south-Korea] in other occasions), Shin-Zenshû (1994) explains that aripisi is the OK word for ‘south’. Shiratori (1937) provides a little different account. He associates aripî- with ModK aphi ‘the front; the south’, and regards the -si- as related to GEN tu in OJ. With regard to Arusitakori-no-koori (NS Book 14 Yûryaku 21-nen, i.e. Shin-Zenshû ibid.: 206), which is written as xia4-che3-hui4-li4-xian4 [below-many.voice-call-benefit-prefecture], Shin-Zenshû explains that aru means ‘below’ in OK, and si is a genitive.

73 Also, what about sore-ga-si [that-GEN-si] ‘that person’? Ôno S. et al. (1974) explains that the si in this word is a morpheme to indicate direction, cf. higasi (< pi-muka-si [sun-face(V)-direction]) ‘east’; nisi (< ini-si [being.gone-direction]) ‘west’. However, it is more straightforward to regard it as a bound pronominal (Bd-Pro) for ‘person’ derived from a genitive, cf. MK GEN s; MK/ModK Bd-Pro t ‘person’.

74 In ModK, the word for ‘above’ is wi. Ôno S. et al. (1974) regard oko- as a variant of iki- ‘breath’, which seems less plausible.

75 Unger (2001) compares ModK alay ‘below’ with pl *oro- ‘descend’ (cf. ModJ orosu ‘put something down’ and oriru ‘descend’).
MK Nominalizer s (after imperfect -lq only) or t (after -lq or -n) ‘the fact that ...
(Martin 1992: 264)

a. -lq 's oy [V-ending NMZ LOC] ‘because, since’
   (cf. no ni [NMZ LOC] ‘although’, no de [NMZ LOC] ‘because’ in ModJ)

b. -lq 's ol [NMZ ACC] (cf. ... no o [NMZ ACC] in ModJ)

c. -'uon 't ol [V-ending NMZ ACC] ‘that it/one did (or is)’ or
   ‘despite the fact that ...’

(d. ...-lq 's i ... ; ...-n 't i ... [V-ending NMZ COP] ‘It is that ...’
   (extended predicates: cf. ... no da [NMZ COP] ‘it is that ...’ in ModJ)

Martin (1990) speculates that NMZ s is etymologically identical with GEN s, but he does not provide any explanation. I will argue in Chapter 6 that GEN ga, no, and tu in OJ took the same developmental path in different dialects, i.e. GEN > pronominal GEN > bound pronominal > NMZ > sentence final particle (SFP), and that these changes are not rare changes in human language. In the course of discussion, I will also examine historical developments of GEN s in Korean and GEN de in Mandarin Chinese. To state a conclusion, these genitive particles in Korean and Mandarin seem to have taken essentially the same developmental path as those in Japanese; thus, NMZ s in MK was derived from GEN s.

It is intriguing to note that Fukuoka, where GEN tu developed into various functional particles, is the closest prefecture to Korea. For nominalization, southern Fukuoka dialects use NMZ tu, e.g. Itta tu no bareta [went NMZ NOM came.out] “That (I) went (there) got out (became revealed)”; Nedan no takaka tu wa komaru ne [price NOM high NMZ TOP be.troublesome SFP] “That the price is high is troublesome.”76

---

76 NMZ tu can only be used when the preceding verb is in perfective with the suffix -ta or the preceding adjective is of the bu-type (e.g. akaka ‘red’). Instead of tu, northern Fukuoka dialects use NMZ to. See Chapter 6 for details.
Another possibly related morphemes in MK are what Martin (1992: 263) calls "emotives". According to him, the emotive bound stems express a subjective statement, often poetic or exclamatory. See examples of their predication structures below:

(13) MK Emotive -s(o)-, -l(o)- or modulated -swo-, -two-
   a. -two-ta, e.g. 'i 'za mozo.m ay hwen hi 'cul'keptwo' ta (Sekpo sangcel 1447)
      ‘This very thing is a great delight to my heart.’ (Martin: 843)77
   b. (i)la-s-ta
   c. -ta-s-ta
   d. -'no-s-on 'ta (processive emotive):78 ne-huy 'tol.h i mu'su'k ul 'pwo'noson 'ta
      ‘What do you people see?’ (Wel.in sekpo 1459; Martin: 721)79
      (cf. SFP no/ga/tu in ModJ dialects in Chapter 6)

The origins of Korean emotives are not certain, but Yu (1973: 349) associates Emotive s with NMZ s. From a crosslinguistic perspective, NMZ ga, no, and tu in different ModJ dialects have independently developed into sentence final particles, which express various connotations such as assertion, questions, explanations, and surprise, working together with particular intonation patterns and contexts, e.g. Densya ga okureta no [train NOM was.late SFP] ‘(It is that/the reason is that) the train was late.’ In Mandarin Chinese, GEN de has developed into an SFP, which expresses the mood (yûqî) of explanation (e.g. Wang 1943 [1985: 232]), e.g. tâ bu huî dâ nî de [s/he Neg can hit you de] ‘(It is that/it is because) s/he can’t hit you.’ Given these observations, it seems plausible that Emotive s in MK was derived from NMZ s. (See Chapter 6 for details.)

77 Martin does not provide glosses, but as a reference: 'i 'za mozo.m ay hwen-hi 'cul'keptwo' ta [this Intj heart to very-Adv.forming delight-Emotive].
78 "Processive" is a verb category used in Martin (1992: 216), which lacks a plain indicative assertive with -ta, basically replacing it by the processive indicative -nunta/-nta in ModK. All transitive verbs are processive.
79 ne-huy 'tol.h i mu'su'k ul 'pwo'noson 'ta [you-Pl PI(group.of) NOM what ACC see-Emotive Q].
Lastly, some Korean numerals exhibit a similarity to Japanese numerals in terms of the use of bound pronouns (Bd-Pros). See examples below (Martin 1990):

(14) Korean Numerals (not all numbers)
   a. Pronominal: sey-s ‘three’; nay-s ‘four’ (cf. puta-tu ‘two’ in OJ)
   b. Bound Nominal: sey- ‘three’; nay- ‘four’ (cf. puta- ‘two’ in OJ)

In Korean, sey- ‘three’ and nay- ‘four’ directly modify nouns, but occur as sey-s and nay-s as numeral pronouns. I have argued in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.2) that the -tu in numeral pronouns in OJ (e.g. pito-tu ‘one’) are bound pronouns (Bd-Pros), derived from GEN tu. Given the parallelism, it seems likely that the -s in sey-s and nay-s in Korean is also a Bd-Pro derived from GEN s.

From (10) through (14), I have examined GEN s in MK and related morphemes. The Korean/Japanese relationship needs further study, but given the observations above, it is very likely that GEN tu in OJ and GEN s in MK are not only cognates, but also took similar developmental paths.

The following discussion is a little off the track, but nonetheless related. Some compounds in Japanese contain -s- which is not in the original morphemes, e.g. paru ‘spring’ and ame ‘rain’, but parusame ‘spring rain’ (MYS 17:3969); mura ‘being crowded’ and ame ‘rain’, but murasame ‘shower’ (MYS 10:2160). Hōjō (1970) regards this phenomenon as an insertion of -s- due to some phonetic reason, e.g. ara-wo [wild-man] > ma-ara-wo [genuine-] > masarawo > masurawo ‘grown-up man’. This developmental process has little evidence, however. Miller (1967: 194) argues that

---

80 Things are more complicated in MK than in OJ. According to Martin (1990), taser (< tusos) ‘five’ and yeses (< yosos) ‘six’ do not lose the final s when modifying nouns. Also, other numbers have final -h, -k, and other formatives.
81 Ōno S. et al. (1974) analyze masura as masu-ra [increase-Suffix].
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/parusame/ was originally */paru tu ame/, based on the phonetic value of /tu/ in OJ as [ʦu], following Arisaka (1957). However, Martin (1987: 17-18) shows that the change from [ʦu] to [ʦu] occurred in the sixteenth century. Also, one clear example in which GEN ʦu had been reduced in a compound suggests that the change above is less likely, i.e. kage-tomo (< kage-tu-omo [light-GEN-side]) 'daylight side, south' (MYS 1:52).

Martin (1987: 36) regards this genitive hypothesis only as a remote possibility. Instead, considering the alternation of ʦ with zero (e.g. ine ‘rice’ and -sine as in uru-sine (= uruti) ‘nonglutinous rice’; ara- ‘new’ and sara ‘again’; uwe- ‘plant’ and suwe- ‘place(V)’; in- ‘go away’ and sin- ‘die’; see more examples in Martin 1987: 35-36), he reconstructs a word-initial *z- (> ə) (cf. *b- > w-, *d- > y-, *g- > k/ə in his reconstruction).

Likewise, Unger (1993: 25-26) views the genitive hypothesis as “tempting”, but he suspects that those alternations give evidence for a proto-phoneme lost in OJ, and posits a word-initial *s- (> ə) (ibid.: 39-40). Those “disappearing” initials are not limited to ʦ, and he discusses the issue as one admitting to the possibility of dialect mixture.82

Given the strong possibility that GEN ʦu in OJ and GEN s in MK (or OK) are cognates, however, it seems too early to abandon the hypothesis that the -s- in parusame is related to a genitive morpheme. It is unlikely that GEN ʦu was reduced to s in these compounds, but the -s- might be a fossilized genitive of pKJ (or a result of language mixture with some variety of OK).

As for the alternations of ʦ with zero, it may be the case that there is more than one reason for the phenomenon. The prefix sa-, the meaning of which is unclear, seems to provide an account for some of those alternations. For example, ao ‘blue’ in ModJ gains the s in ma-ssao [genuine-blue] ‘pale’, but sawo is attested as a free form in OJ (MYS

82 See also Yamaguchi (1974) for other “disappearing” initials.
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16:3889). Also, *amanesi* 'thorough' (MYS 8:1553) and *samanesi* 'full' (MYS 1:82) are both free forms in OJ, but *manesi* 'frequent' (MYS 207) is also attested. Ōno S. et al (1974) speculate that *manesi* in OJ and *manh* ‘many’ (*mânh.i* in Martin 1992) in Korean may share the same etymon.

3.4.2 Origin of GEN *tu*: the Demonstrative Hypothesis

As discussed in Section 3.3.2.4, Ōno T. (1978) claims that GEN *ga* was derived from the demonstrative *ka* ‘this’. He speculates, without discussion, that GEN *tu* and the mesial demonstrative adverbial *to* ‘that way’ share the same origin. Expanding this hypothesis, I would like to examine in this subsection the possibility that a demonstrative *to* ‘that’ had developed into several different particles, namely the mesial demonstrative *so/si* ‘that’, so-called emphatic particle *si*, mesial demonstrative adverbial *to* ‘that way’, complementizer *to*, appositive *to*, and GEN *tu*. A hypothetical developmental process is presented below:

(15) Demo *to(?)

- Demo so/si
- Emphatic si
- Demo Adv. to
- Comp to
- Appositive to
- GEN tu

---

83 This is just to show that all the functions on the right were derived from the demonstrative *to* ‘that’; their developmental sequence and subgrouping require further consideration.
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The demonstrative adverbial *to* is not clearly attested in OJ, but it can be seen in fixed expressions such as *to ni kaku ni* [that LOC this LOC] ‘like that (or) like this, in various ways; nevertheless’ and *to mo kaku mo* [that even this even] ‘anyway, nevertheless’ in EMJ.

Some hypotheses have been proposed about these particles in past studies. It has been claimed by some scholars that the demonstrative adverbial *to* and the complementizer *to* share the same etymon (e.g. Aston 1904: 139; ôno S. et al. 1974). ôno T. (1978) speculates that the demonstrative *so/si* ‘that’ and the emphatic *si* share the same origin. Given the *t/s* sound correspondence in OJ (see the following Section 3.4.2.1), Hashimoto (1969: 139) speculates that there had been a demonstrative *to* (: *so* ‘that’) before the OJ period.

In historical linguistics it is rather rare, if not impossible, to observe the kind of multi-derivative development seen in (15). However, these functions appear to be reasonably related to each other, except perhaps for the appositive *to* and GEN *ni*, which at first glance may seem to bear little semantic similarity to the others. It seems very plausible that the demonstrative *so/si* ‘that’ and the emphatic *si* are related, given the resumptive

---

84 In *Man'yôshû*, there are *ka ni kaku ni* ‘in any way; nevertheless’ (800, 897, etc.) and *ka ni mo kaku ni mo* ‘in any way; nevertheless’ (412, 628, etc.).

85 Note also the use of the demonstrative *that* as a complementizer in English (see Hopper and Traugott 1993: 185-89).

86 The particle *to* can also form adverbial phrases for manner, e.g. *opi-soya no soyo to naru made* [carrying-arrow GEN soyo(Onoma) to make.sound as.if] ‘as if the carrying arrow makes the soyo sound’ (MYS 20:4398); *todo to si (< asi) te* [todo(Onoma) to push Conj] ‘knocking loudly (at the door)’ (MYS 14:3467). The particle *ni* exhibits a similar use, e.g. *makura mo soyo ni* [pillow even soyo(Onoma) ni] ‘as if the pillow weeps’ (MYS 12:2885); *ipa mo todoro ni oturu midu* [rock even todoro(Onoma) ni fall(RT) water] ‘the water that falls as if shaking the rocks’ (MYS 14:3392). It is not certain that all uses of *to* came from the same source. See, for example, Yamada (1913) and Quinn (1987, 1994) for similarities and differences between *to* and *ni*. See also Frellesvig’s (1999) reconstruction of pKJ copula *t*- and *n*-, which has been discussed in Section 3.3.3.3 above.

87 Hashimoto (1969: 140) explains the development of the complementizer *to* from the demonstrative adverbial *to* in a change from parataxis (independent sentences) to subordination, e.g. ‘[(direct quote)] + *To ipu* [that.way say]]’ ‘(direct quote). (Subject) say so’ > { (quote) to *ipu* } ‘(Subject) say that (quote)’.
emphatic use of demonstratives. Also, the demonstrative adverbial *to and the complementizer *to are likely to have come from the same source (cf. the complementizer *that in English). It also seems that the development of the appositive *to and GEN *tu from the demonstrative *to can be accounted for based on the notion of emphasis.

In the following five subsections, I will examine the hypothesis that GEN *tu was derived from a demonstrative *to ‘that’ from various viewpoints, i.e. phonology, syntax, semantics, demonstrative system, and crosslinguistic data (Korean, Chinese, and Chadic languages in Africa).

3.4.2.1 Phonological Considerations

In order to examine the phonological feasibility of the hypothetical development in (15), I will discuss correspondences between *t and *s, *to and *tu, *so and *si, and among *to, *tu, and *ti.

Hashimoto (1969:139) lists the following *t/*s doublets, e.g. *Kuni-no-tokotati-no-mikoto (name of a deity) and *Kuni-no-sokotati-no-mikoto (NS Kamiyo, Jô);^{88} *to ‘ten’ and *swo ‘ten’ (only found in compounds); *matak- (KJ Song 31) and *masok- ‘complete’ (NS Song 23); *ket- and *kes- ‘extinguish’; *panat- and *panas- ‘release’ (eastern dialects); *putag- and *pusag- ‘cover’. Also in eastern dialects, *titi ‘father’ appeared as *sisi (e.g. *amo-sisi [mother-father] MYS 20:4376), *tati (RY) ‘stand’ as *tasi (MYS 20:4423), and the particle *so as *to (MYS 14:3409, 20:4430). As we will see in Chapter 6, the same *t/*s correspondence can also be found in ModJ dialects. The direction of change is unclear in many cases, but *putagu ‘cover (V)’ seems to be the original for *pusagu if we assume the noun *puta ‘cover (N)’ was at least as old as the corresponding verb. From a phonological standpoint,

---

^{88} The latter is listed as another name of the same deity. In Kojiki, there is only *Kuni-no-tokotati-no-kamwi.
therefore, it seems plausible that there was a demonstrative *to ‘that’, corresponding to (and older than) the demonstrative so ‘that’.

With regard to to/tu variation, there are few good examples in OJ. I have argued in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.3) that the numeral pronominal *pi-to-tu ‘one’ could possibly have been derived from *pi-to-tu [1-GEN-thing]. In this analysis, to would be an older variant of GEN tu. There are also doublets woto-tu-pi [far.place-GEN-day] ‘the day before yesterday’ and woto-to-pi. They do not, however, necessarily indicate that the direction of change was from to to tu, since the former is attested in OJ (MYS 17:3924, etc.), while the latter is not.

Other possible correspondences between to and tu in Man’yōshū are as follows:

twoga no kwi [hemlock.spruce GEN tree] ‘hemlock spruce’ (6:907) vs. tuga no kwi (1:29);
tadwoki/tadoki ‘clue, method, circumstances’ (10:2092, etc.) vs. taduki (20:4410, etc.);89
Takamatwo (place name) (20:4295, etc.) vs. Takamatu (10:2191, etc.); itwoma ‘leisure’ (15:3673, etc.) vs. ituma (20:4327) (eastern dialects). These are all correspondences between A-type two and tu. Again, the question of which, if either, “came first” is unclear in many cases, although one case seems to be a change from du to dwo (i.e. ta-duki > ta-dwoki). One ambiguous example is Isi-kori-dwo-mye-no-mikoto [stone-cut-dwo-woman-GEN-honorable.person] ‘Ishikoridome-no-mikoto’ (name of a person) in Kojiki. Shin-Zenshū (1997) explains that dwo is a variant of GEN tu: cf. tanabata-tu-mye [loom-GEN-woman] ‘female weaver; Orihime’ (MYS 10:2027).90 In Nihonshoki, however, the Chinese character mu3 ‘old woman’ is used for dwomye, and Isi-kori-dwomye is generally parsed

89 This word seems to be a compound of ta- ‘hand’ with tuki ‘attachment’.
90 Also, Hashimoto (1969) suspects that dwo is a genitive. On the other hand, Zenshū (1973) parses the name as isi-kori-dwomye-no-mikoto, regarding dwomye as ‘old woman’.
as [stone-cut-old.woman]. 91 Other possible examples are: *toh- ‘fly’ vs. *tubasa ‘wing’; *tutu ‘wagtail’ (KJ Song 17) vs. *sitoto ‘Japanese bunting’ (KJ Song 17) (both related to *tori ‘bird’?). 92 These data do not strongly support the change from *to to *tu, but they certainly do not disconfirm it. In Ryukyu dialects, o was raised to u, e.g. *tuu (< *too) ‘ten’; *tuin (< *toru) ‘get’ (cf. Hirayama 1977c). 93 As we will see in Chapter 6, Kyushu dialects exhibit the *to/*tu variations in genitive derivatives, although the direction of change is uncertain, e.g. akai *to vs. akaka *tu [red one] ‘the/a red one’; ore *n to vs. ore ga *tu [I GEN one] ‘mine’. Thus, it seems phonologically possible that the demonstrative *to might have changed to *tu (GEN). In those Kyushu dialects, however, the *to/*tu correspondence is not observable except for genitive derivatives. Also, it is difficult to posit a regular sound change from pre-OJ *to to OJ *tu. Thus, it is more likely that the change from pre-OJ *to to OJ *tu was a lexically conditioned phonological change, cf. a structurally conditioned, very recent development of an affirmative expression in Std-ModJ: ... *da *tuu no! < ... *da *to *iu no! [COP Comp say SFP] ‘(It is) that ... ’

The demonstrative *so (B-type) has a variant *si, a syllable for which there is no A/B distinction. The o/i correspondence is not uncommon if we include B-type i, e.g. *ko- vs. *kwi (B-type) ‘tree’; *po- vs. *pwi ‘fire’. As for the i/u correspondence, *ti ‘blood’ is found as *tu in *tu.nu no agata [blood.swamp GEN government.land] ‘Tunu (p.n.)’ (Ryôiki, Chû 2). If we include B-type i, *mwi ‘body’ has an old variant *mu- in compounds (e.g. *mu-kapari [body-substitute] ‘scapegoat’ NS, Jomei 3-nen), which seems to be cognate with *mom ‘body’ in Korean. Also, *kamwi ‘deity’ has a variant *kamu-, and *tukwi ‘moon’ has *tuku-

91 This parsing is also questionable since there is no *dwomye attested in OJ meaning ‘old woman’. In another example in *Nihonskold, the same person is written as *isi-kori-*twobye.
92 The word *tutu may well be an onomatopoeia.
93 According to Martin (1987: 52), the vowel raising is thought to have taken place no earlier than the thirteenth century.
e.g. *kamu-sabi [deity-behave] ‘behave like a deity, be holy’ (MYS 5:813); *tuku-yo [moon-night] ‘moon’ (MYS 18:4054). Thus, correspondence among *su, so, and si (*swi?) seems feasible. With regard to to/ti variations, the morpheme woto- ‘far place’ in woto-tu-pi [far.place-GEN-day] ‘the day before yesterday’ has a variant woti ‘far place; past; later’.94 Thus, the to/tu/ti correspondence also seems plausible. Whitman (1985: 27, 34, 163) claims that pre-OJ *t changed to OJ s before i or y, i.e. t > s/ _i, y. According to this claim, it might have been the case that pre-OJ demonstrative *to had a variant *ti (cf. OJ so/si ‘that ’), which changed to si, which in turn motivated an analogical sound change from *to to so.

To conclude about the phonological developments in (15), while there is not strong supporting evidence, neither do they seem to be unlikely developments.

3.4.2.2 Syntactic Considerations

As will be discussed in Section 3.5, the so-called emphatic particle si exhibits a syntactically very wide distribution in OJ. Based on its phonological shape, one possibility is that the emphatic si and the demonstrative so/si ‘that’ came from the same source (e.g. Ôno T. 1978). If so, it supports the possibility that a demonstrative might have developed into functional particles in various syntactic positions, just as si did.

The appositive to was used to list two entities, e.g. *kagu-yama to mimisis-yama to api-si toki [Kagu-mountain to Miminashi-mountain to fight-Evi(RT) time] ‘when Mt. Kagu and Mt. Miminashi fought’ (MYS 1:14); *paru no yanagwi to (...) ume no puna to wo [spring GEN willow to (...) plum GEN blossom to ACC] ‘spring willow and plum

94 The numeral expression ipo-tu- [500-GEN-] seems to be related to ipo-ti [500-ti], but Martin (1987: 367) speculates that -ti came from -tu-Ci, and I have suggested in Chapter 2 that it came from -tu-i [-GEN-thing]; ipo-tu- and ipo-ti- are not phonological variants.
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blossoms (ACC)' (MYS 5:826). Unlike ModJ, in which to is basically used only once between two nouns (i.e. [X to Y] ‘X and Y’), to in OJ was used in many cases to mark both nouns (i.e. [X to Y to] ‘A and B’). Given this appositive use, it seems syntactically possible that to came to connect two nouns.

There are rare cases in which only the second noun is marked by to (i.e. [X Y to]), e.g. *awo-yanagwi ume to no pana wo ori-kazasi* [blue-willow plum to GEN blossom ACC break-ornament.hair(RY)] ‘breaking the blossoms of young willow and plum tree, and ornamenting the hair with them’ (MYS 5:821); *tidori kapazu to* [plover frog to] ‘the plovers and the frogs’ (MYS 7:1123). Another irregular use is after the accusative (i.e. [X ACC to Y ACC]), e.g. *na wo to wa wo/ pito so saku-naru* [you ACC to I ACC/ people Emph separate(SS)-Conj] ‘Others seem to separate you and me’ (MYS 4:660). This kind of syntactic irregularity/flexibility resembles that of the emphatic *si* (see Section 3.5 below). If the distributional flexibility of *si* and to is due to their demonstrative origins and their emphasizing functions, it seems syntactically possible that to came to occur between nouns.

3.4.2.3 Semantic Considerations

“Emphasis” (> focus with *ga*) seems to be the common observation when explaining GEN *ga* (e.g. Yamada 1913; ôno T. 1978), various functions of *to* (e.g. Hashimoto 1969), and the emphatic *si* (e.g. Hashimoto 1969; ôno T. 1978). Under the demonstrative hypothesis, these functional particles were all derived from demonstratives. I

---

95 The particle *to* can also be used as a comitative, e.g. *miminasi to api-arasopi-ki* [Miminashi(Mt.) with meet-fight-Evi] ‘(Mt. Kagu) fought Mt. Miminashi’ (MYS 1:13); *kimi to tokidoki ide-masi te* [husband with sometimes go.out-Hon(RT) Conj] ‘(She) sometimes went out with his husband, and’ (MYS 2:196). Hashimoto (1969: 137-40) claims that most functions of *to* in OJ came from a demonstrative *to* and its use for emphasis. He suspects that the comitative *to* may not share the same origin with the other uses of *to* (e.g. complementizer), but also suggests the possibility that the comitative *to* came from the appositive *to*. ôno S. et al. (1974) do not distinguish the comitative *to* from the appositive *to*, and suspect that they do not share the same origin with the other uses of *to*. 
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have not found any supporting crosslinguistic data which show that demonstratives developed into a focus/emphatic morpheme, but theoretically it does not seem unreasonable for demonstratives to come to be associated with the notion of focus/emphasis: cf. *yutu ma-tubaki/ so ga pa* [sacred genuine-camellia/ (mesial) GEN leaf] ‘the holy camellia, the leaf of that’ (KJ, Song 100); *Beer, this is my friend.* Japanese internally, Quinn (1997) claims that the sentence final particles (also *kakari* particles) *ka* and *zo* were derived from demonstratives based on their resumptive emphatic uses.

Ôno T. (1978) explains the development of GEN *ga* as follows. Connecting two nouns directly (i.e. X-Y) was the most basic genitive structure, and the proximal demonstrative *ka* was inserted between X and Y to emphasize the possessive relationship (i.e. X *ka* Y), and the initial *k* was voiced by *rendaku* (sequential voicing), i.e. *ka* > *ga*.96

With regard to the double marking of the appositive *to* (i.e. [X to Y to]), Hashimoto (1969: 139-40) explains that no particle is theoretically necessary to list things, but *to* was attached to each entity here for emphasis. Also, the appositive *to* is observable in repetition for emphasis, e.g. *kamwi to mo kamwi to/ kikoye-kuru/ toko-yo no kamwi wo* [deity to also deity Comp/ be.heard-come(RT)/ eternity-world GEN deity ACC] ‘the deity of the eternal world (ACC), who is said to be the deity of deities’ (NS, Kôgyoku 3-nen 7-gatsu, Song 112, i.e. Shin-Zenshû, vol.3: 95); *ono to mo ono ya* [ono(Onoma) to also ono Intj] ‘surprisingly’ (MYS 18:4129). Hashimoto (1969: 140) attributes this emphatic use of *to* to its demonstrative origins.

As for the emphatic *si*, it was very often written with the same Chinese character for GEN *ga* and *no*, despite the fact that it often occurred in syntactically the same

---

96 The original motivation for *rendaku* is uncertain.
environments where ga and no occurred. The focus function of si seems to have allowed such writing, while succeeding in distinguishing si from GEN ga and no. See Section 3.5 below for details.

In addition to these particles discussed above, i.e. appositive to and emphatic si, genitives might also have been derived from demonstratives based on the notion of emphasis. Let us consider how “emphasis” works for a genitive relationship. The following is only one possible scenario. In Section 3.3.3.3, I have presented examples in which personal pronouns directly precede common nouns, e.g. wa-dori [I-bird] ‘my bird’ (KJ, Song 3); na-dori [you-bird] ‘your bird’ (KJ, Song 3); a-gwo [I-child] ‘my son’ (MYS 13:3295); a-gwo [I-boy] ‘my boy (toward a nephew)’ (MYS 19:4240); ono-duma [I-wife/husband] ‘my wife/husband’ (MYS 546, 1198, 1738, 3314, 3571). This kind of expression is much rarer than directly juxtaposing two common nouns. This may be because “possession” is a marked relationship which should be emphasized among various N-N relationships; personal pronouns generally required the use of genitive to emphasize the possessive relationship while common nouns could still be directly connected to each other. In order to express the relationship clearly, demonstratives may have been attached to the possessor in N-N.

The above explanation provides an account for the development of GEN ga. It does not, however, fit GEN tu very well, since possessive expressions are not attested with GEN tu. On this point, therefore, my claim in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.1) that GEN tu was more widely used in pre-OJ and very likely to have had a possessive function becomes more significant. Nonetheless, “possession” is not the only relationship that can be associated with emphasis, and the use of demonstratives for emphasis may have started out in different ways.
Let us discuss the demonstrative system in OJ. It is generally thought to be a three-way system with *ko- ‘this’, *so- ‘that (mesial)’ and *ka- ‘that (distal)’, just like the one in ModJ. At some earlier time, however, there might have been a two-way system. This is rather a casual observation, but the three-way distinction (i.e. ko- vs. so- vs. ka-) exhibits asymmetries from a phonological standpoint; the distinction is not solely based on consonants (i.e. *k vs. *s) or vowels (i.e. o vs. a). Thus, it might be an altered system. If we assume the existence of an older *to ‘that’, which developed into so ‘that’, it may be the case that a two-way system with ko and *to was original, and that ka ‘that (distal)’ was derived from ko ‘this’ (cf. ka-ku ‘like this way’).

Yamada (1913 [1954: 77-81]) also argues that ka ‘that’ was a newer form for three reasons. First, there are only two examples of the distal demonstrative ka in Man’yōshū, i.e. ka-no kwo-ro to [that(distal)-GEN girl-Dim with] ‘with that girl’ (MYS 14:3565); kimi ga mi-pune kamo ka-re [you GEN Bt-boat Q that] ‘Is that your boat? (right-dislocated ka-re)’ (MYS 18:4045). Second, the Chinese character bi3 ‘that; (ModJ kare ‘he’)’ was used for kano and kare in EMJ and thereafter, but it was meant to be read as sore or sono in OJ documents, cf. Sonoki (county name in Hizen country), which was written with the Chinese characters bi3 ‘that’ and chu3 ‘pestle’. Third and lastly, while ko- ‘this’ and so- ‘that (mesial)’ have the locative demonstratives ko-ko ‘here’ and so-ko ‘there (mesial)’ (both commonly used in Man’yōshū), ka has a morphologically different ka-siko ‘there (distal)’ (not used in Man’yōshū), which seems to be a compound of ka with *siko ‘there (mesial)’.
This development seems to parallel the process whereby a-soko [that(distal)-there(mesial)]
developed in MJ by using a ‘that (distal)’.97, 98

Yamada’s first observation may not be entirely accurate; there seem to be at least a
few more examples of ka ‘that (distal)’ in Man’yōshū, e.g. ka-ni mo [that-LOC even] ‘in
any ways’ (MYS 18:4132); ka pa tare toki [that TOP who time] ‘the dim time, right before
dawn’ (MYS 20:4384).99 Of course, Yamada recognizes the adverbial use of ka ‘that way’,
e.g. ka ni kaku ni [that.way LOC this.way LOC] (MYS 5:800, 5:897); ka ni mo kaku ni mo
[that.way LOC even this.way LOC even] (MYS 4:628); ka mo kaku mo (MYS 14:3377,
17:3993); ka yuki kaku yuki [that.way go(RY) this.way go(RY)] (MYS 17:3991). Solely
based on the number of examples of the distal demonstrative (proper) ka ‘that’ and
the number of examples of the adverbial ka ‘that way’, Yamada claims that the former was
derived from the latter. That is, the distal demonstrative (proper) ka ‘that’ was a later
development, and he argues for a two-way demonstrative system with ko/kore ‘this’ and
so/sore ‘that’ in the pre-OJ period (Yamada 1913 [1954:78]), while accepting the existence
of the adverbial ka ‘that way’. Although this particular argument is questionable, Yamada
presents intriguing observations. It is generally agreed that the use of ka- ‘that (distal)’ in

97 The semantic change from ko- ‘this’ to ka- ‘that’ seems peculiar, but projective reinterpretation is not
rare in personal pronouns. According to ôno et al. (1974), na ‘you’ in OJ originally meant the first person,
e.g. na ga kokoro [self GEN heart] ‘self’s heart’ (MYS 9:1741). Also, onore ‘I’ could be used for the
second person, e.g. onore yuwe [you reason] ‘because of you’ (MYS 12:3098). In modern Kansai dialects,
zibun ‘self’ and ware ‘I’ can be used for ‘you’. Besides, the earlier demonstrative system in pre-OJ may not
have been solely based on physical distance. See, for example, Hashimoto Shirō (1965, 1982).

98 It is generally thought that a- ‘that’ in Late OJ (and thereafter) was derived from ka-, but ôno T. (1978)
claims that it was derived from wa/wo ‘that’: cf. wo-ti ko-ti [(distal)-(morpheme for place) (proximal)-ti]
‘here and there’, and wo-ti-kata [(distal)-ti-direction] ‘far place’. A distal demonstrative *wa is not attested
in OJ, however.

99 The reading of ka is confirmable in these examples, as well as in Yamada’s examples, by the use of
Chinese characters. In addition, there is another example: i.e. ka-ni mo [that-LOC even] ‘in any ways’
(MYS 18:4132). There are two other cases of ‘who is that person’ for which both Taikei and Zenshū read
ta so ka-re to [who Empth that.person Comp] (MYS 10/2240, 11/2545). But the Chinese character bi3
‘that’ is used for kare in both cases, and the reading may not be correct because of the very reason discussed
next in the body.
OJ is significantly rarer than the use of ko- ‘this’ and so- ‘that (mesial)’. Also, Yamada’s second and third observations above (i.e. concerning the reading of the Chinese character bi3 ‘that’ and the development of the locative demonstrative ka-siko ‘there’) show the peculiarity of ka ‘that (distal)’.

Hashimoto Shirô (1966, 1982) provides a thorough study of demonstratives, and argues that the demonstrative system in OJ was basically a two-way system with ko “perceivable reference” (kankaku-teki shijî) and so “conceptual reference” (kannen-teki shijî). According to Hashimoto, ko was used when the referent was perceivable by the speaker at the time of utterance, regardless of the physical distance to the referent or his/her familiarity with it (1982:235). In contrast, Hashimoto’s observations concerning so are:

(i) there is no clear case in which the referent of so was present at the scene of utterance; (ii) so was mostly used for referring back to an entity previously introduced in the context; (iii) there are some cases in which the referent is not found in the previous context, but even so those uses are still not the mesial use; and (iv) there are some examples of soko ‘there’ to

---

100 There are some other past studies which are concerned with the demonstrative system in OJ. An idea similar to Hashimoto Shirô’s is also seen in Ōno T. (1978), although he does not specifically argue for a two-way demonstrative system. He calls ko/ka “external demonstratives” (gai-teki shijigo), which were originally accompanied by the physical action of pointing to the referent, and so/sa/si/to “internal demonstratives” (nai-teki shijigo), through which the referent is understood by context without a physical action. Hamada (1966) studies the use of demonstratives in so-called “Korean materials” (Chôsen shiryo) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which are written in both Korean and Japanese. He observes differences between Japanese mesial/distal and Korean mesial/distal, and speculates that the demonstrative system in Japanese (not specified) is better understood as a double two-way system, i.e. ko ‘this’ vs. ka/a ‘that’, and ko ‘this’ vs. so ‘that’. However, it is quite common that similar notions operate in slightly different domains in different languages (e.g. English and German definite and indefinite articles), and Hamada’s argument does not seem to be supported by sufficient evidence. Gotô (1967) argues that the ko-series was the original, and both so ‘that (mesial)’ and ka ‘that (distal)’ were derived from ko. He first develops his argument based on the observation about demonstrative systems of four Ryukyu dialects, but the overall discussion is hard to follow, and is not supported by sufficient evidence.

101 Gotô (1967:32) offers the following example as an example in which ko is used to refer to a distant entity:

Kore ya kono/... / na ni opu Se-no-yama [this Intj that/ ... / name LOC carry(RT) Se-GEN-Mt] ‘This is that ... famous Mt. Se’ (MYS 1:35). The set phrase kore ya kono ‘this is that ...’ was used when encountering something the speaker had heard of before; it can be paraphrased as kore ga ano [this NOM that] in ModJ. See also (MYS 15:3638).
refer to the hearer’s place (i.e. mesial, e.g. MYS 19:4189), but still it is a place which the
speaker cannot perceive (1966: 335-36). Based on these observations, Hashimoto
hypothesizes that so was used for “conceptual reference” (kannen-teki shiji).

As for ka ‘that’, Hashimoto identifies only three examples in Man’yōshū as clear
cases of ka, i.e. ka-no kwo-ro to [that-GEN girl-Dim with] ‘with that girl’ (MYS 14:3565);
kimi ga mi-pune kamo ka-re [you GEN Bt-boat Q that] ‘Is that your boat? (right-dislocated
ka-re)’ (MYS 18:4045); ka pa tare toki [that TOP who time] ‘the dim time, right before
dawn’ (MYS 20:4384).

By analyzing these examples, he claims that ka was used when the speaker had the referent’s image (including in his/her mind), but specifically when the image was not clear. According to him, ko and ka are allomorphs, and work in the same
domain, i.e. the domain of perception: ko was used when the referent was clearly
perceivable, while ka was used when it was not clear.

Hashimoto offers intriguing analyses about the duplication of demonstratives. He
attributes the expression koti-goti [this.place-this.place] ‘here and there’ (MYS 210, 213,
319, 1749), which is a duplication of ‘this’ unique to OJ, to ko’s characteristic of being
used when the referent was perceivable regardless of the physical distance to the referent
voicing) because the two referent locations are not in contrast but perceived in the same
domain, whereas similar expressions such as koko kasiko [here there], anata konata [there
here], and kore Kare [this that], which developed in EMJ and thereafter, do not exhibit
sequential voicing because the two locations are clearly in contrast, i.e. proximal vs.

---

102 Regarding these examples, he notes that the first one is an azuma uta (eastern song), the second one a sakimori no uta (border guard’s song), and the last one belongs to the repaired portion of Book 18, and that these facts are disadvantageous to the general existence of ka ‘that (distal)’.

103 According to Ōno S. et al. (1974), koti-goti is said to have started as ‘this side and this side’ referring to both the right-hand side and the left-hand side of the speaker, and have developed in OJ because OJ did not have such expressions as *soti and *(k)ati ‘there’.
In OJ, when indicating two locations with the notion of distance, i.e. as ‘here’ and ‘there’, a non-demonstrative woti ‘far place’ was used, e.g. woti koti [far.place here] (MYS 3962); wotemo konomo (< woti omo kono omo [far.place side this side]) (MYS 14:3393); woti kata ... kono kata [far.place direction ... this direction] (MYS 13:3299). The expression woti koti [far.place here] does not exhibit sequential voicing, unlike koti-goti [this.place-this.place], because with woti koti there is a clear contrast between distal and proximal in the referents.

It is generally thought that in expressions such as ka mo ka mo [ka even ka even] (MYS 6:965, 7:1343), ka ni kaku ni [ka LOC kaku LOC] (e.g. MYS 737, 800, 897, 1749), and ka yuki kaku yuku [ka go(RY) kaku go(RY)] (MYS 17:3991) the former use of ka corresponds to ‘that (distal)’ and the latter to ‘this (proximal)’. Hashimoto (1982:231), however, regards these expressions as the duplication of ka as ‘this (proximal)’, given koti-goti [this.place-this.place] ‘here and there’. The use of ka ‘that (distal)’ with another demonstrative developed in EMJ and thereafter, and those expressions all exhibit the order of [this that], e.g. konata kanata [this.side over.there] (KKS 379) (GM, Azumaya); kono mo kano mo [this also that also] (KKS 1095); kore kare [this that] (Tosa Jan. 27th) (GM, Asagao), except that kore kare [this that] has a counterpart kare kore. When the distal a ‘that’ came to replace the distal ka ‘that’, the combinational sequence with proximal demonstratives changed to [that this], e.g. anata konata [over.there this.side] (GM, Wakana, Ge).

I have reviewed above Yamada’s (1913 [1954]) and Hashimoto Shirô’s (1966, 1982) arguments for two-way demonstrative systems in pre-OJ (Yamada) and OJ.

104 Koti-goti ‘here and there’ is another example which shows that the origination of rendaku (sequential voicing) is not necessarily due to the existence of GEN no (or *n) between the two morphemes.

105 It has less to do with the discussion in this study, but Hashimoto Shirô (1982: 243) claims that the domain of the distal a-series was first established with anata ‘over there, the other side’.
(Hashimoto). If the two-way demonstrative system with \textit{ko} and \textit{so} did indeed predate the three-way system currently familiar to us, this could be viewed as supportive of the demonstrative hypotheses of GEN \textit{ga} and \textit{tu}. That is, in this two-way system, both demonstratives developed into genitive particles, i.e. \textit{ko/ka} ‘this’ \textgreater{} GEN \textit{ga}; \textit{*to} ‘that’ \textgreater{} GEN \textit{tu}.

3.4.2.5 Crosslinguistic Considerations; Korean, Chinese, and Chadic languages (Africa)

First, let us look at Korean. According to Martin (1975:1066; 1992:134), modern Korean (ModK) also marks three degrees of distance, but only two of the forms are likely cognates with Japanese, and each of these is askew by one degree:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{‘this’ (proximal)} & \text{ModJ} & \text{ModK} \\
\text{ko-} & i/y/o \\
\text{‘that’ (mesial)} & \text{so-} & \text{ku/ko} \\
\text{‘that’ (distal)} & \text{a-} & \text{ce/co}\end{array}
\]

Although the reconstruction of pKJ demonstratives is not straightforward, the fact that there are two likely cognates is encouraging for the two-way demonstrative hypothesis. Moreover, the exact items of those two likely cognates (i.e. ModJ \textit{ko} and \textit{so}, and ModK \textit{ku/ko} and \textit{ce/co}) agree with the hypothesis about GEN \textit{ga} and GEN \textit{tu} in OJ, i.e. \textit{ko/ka} \textgreater{} GEN \textit{ga}, and \textit{*to} \textgreater{} GEN \textit{tu} (while \textit{*to} \textgreater{} \textit{so}).

106 Quinn (p.c.) suggests that the OJ prefix \textit{ka-} was derived from the demonstrative \textit{ka} as ‘like that’, e.g. ka-awoku [Pref-blue(RY)] (MYS 2:131); ka-guroki kami [Pref-black(RT) hair] (MYS 15:3649); ka-yasuki [Pref-easy(RT)] (MYS 17:4011).

107 The correspondences are basically the same in MJ and Middle Korean (MK). See Hamada (1966) for some differences between MJ mesial/distal and MK mesial/distal.

108 Ōno S. et al. (1974) claim that \textit{so} ‘that [mesial]’ in Japanese and \textit{t/ð} in Korean share the same origin. The vowel is actually schwa, i.e. \textit{t/ð}, according to Unger (p.c.).
Although *ce/co* ‘that (distal)’ in ModK (*'ye* in Middle Korean: MK) may share the same origin with GEN s in MK, a rather discouraging fact is that there is no genitive particle attested in Korean which appears to share the same origin with *ku/ko* ‘that (mesial)’. In ModK, the productive genitive particle is *uy*, e.g. *tangsin uy kwutwu* [you(impersonal) GEN shoe] ‘your shoes’; *na uy (= nay) enni* [I GEN older.brother] ‘my older brother’; *Nam-puk uy thôngil* [south-north GEN unification] ‘the unification of North and South’; *Tong.lay uy onchen* [Tong.lay GEN hot.spring] ‘the hot spring at Tong.lay’; *hanul uy kwulum* [sky GEN cloud] ‘a cloud in the sky’ (Martin 1992:920-21). MK had two different genitive particles, *s/t* and *'uy'/oy* (Martin 1992: 923). The origins of *'uy'/oy* are uncertain.

In Old Chinese (OC), it seems widely accepted that demonstratives developed into genitive particles. As mentioned in Section 3.3.2.4, it is generally thought that GEN *zhil* in OC came from the demonstrative *zhil* ‘this’ (Wang 1958 [1988:438]; Ôno T. 1978), e.g. *fū zhī daò* [father GEN road] (Lunyu (Rongo) ca. 5c?). Moreover, according to Ôno T. (1968: 172-73), another demonstrative *qi2* ‘that’ also developed into a genitive particle, e.g. *zhèn qi dī* [I GEN younger.brother] (Shujing (Shokyô) ca. B.C. 8c?). He notes that *qi2* ‘that’ was used as genitive often, while *zhil* ‘this’ was used less often. It is also observed that *qi2* was used as a third person genitive (no gender, no number, i.e. ‘his/her/its/their’) (Wang 1958 [1988: 345]), e.g. *qí wénrén yě hào shàn* [his personality

---

109 Allative ‘to’ in MK is also *'uy*, e.g. *YA-SYWU s KWUNG 'uy 'ka-pwo'n i* ‘went to the palace of Yasodhara (Buddha's wife)’ (Martin 1992: 923), [Yasodhara GEN palace to went NMZ] ‘the fact of having gone to Yasodhara’s palace’.

110 Itabashi (1987) transliterates these allomorphs as *ii* and *ai*. He attributes their different initial vowels to the vowel harmony in Altaic languages, and reconstructs Old Korean GEN *zi*.

111 Ôno T.’s study is mostly based on materials from the eighth century B.C. to the third century B.C.
also like(V) goodness] ‘His personality is fond of being good’ (Mengzi (Môshi) ca. B.C. 4c?). Based on these OC data, it seems possible that demonstratives develop into genitives.¹¹²

In Chadic languages, a language family in Africa, it is reported by Schuh (1982) that genitive morphemes have been derived from demonstratives, although the word-order in genitive NPs is different from that of Japanese (i.e. [Y of X] in Chadic, while [X GEN Y] in Japanese). Here are some examples from Kanakuru, a Chadic language:¹¹³

(17) a. ɓil-i ma lowo-i  
    horn-the of boy-the ‘the boy’s horn’ (alienable)  
    (cf. gàm ‘ram’, and gàm-iì mè ‘this ram’)

b. tiŋa ra lowo-i  
    ewe of boy-the ‘the boy’s ewe’ (alienable)  
    (cf. tiŋd ‘ewe’, and tiŋd-i shé ‘that ewe’)

According to Schuh (1982: 118), the “linker” in the alienable construction can virtually always be related, directly or historically, to an element of the determiner system; thus, the linker ma in (17a) is apparently related to the masculine demonstrative me ‘this’, and ra in (17b) to the feminine demonstrative she ‘that’, given well-documented sound laws.

Schuh explains the development of genitive morphemes in Chadic languages as follows. While genitive morphemes are used for alienable items, as seen in (17) (i.e. [Y of X]), the possessed noun and the possessor noun are directly connected for inalienable items (i.e. [Y-X], e.g. ɓil kimne [horn buffalo] ‘buffalo’s horn’). This “alienable/inalienable” distinction is widespread in Chadic languages. Possessed alienables are typically definite

¹¹² The opposite development (i.e. genitive > demonstrative) seems unlikely. In Chapter 6, I will discuss a process in which genitives develop into pronominal genitives, but this process does not involve development of deictic functions.

across discourse, and thus they were frequently marked by definite determiners. Such use of demonstratives has been reinterpreted as genitive linkers. On the other hand, inalienable possessions have no demonstrative-derived linker because they are inherently determined.

Because of the different syntax and semantic processes, we cannot take the Chadic case as a straightforward supporting evidence for the demonstrative hypotheses about GEN ga and tu in OJ. However, this shows that it is possible that demonstratives could develop into genitives, given certain linguistic conditions (e.g. syntactic and semantic conditions).

3.4.2.6 Summary

I have discussed the demonstrative hypothesis about the origin of GEN tu from the viewpoints of phonology, syntax, semantics, demonstrative system, and crosslinguistic data. Overall it should be said that the demonstrative hypothesis is still not totally convincing. Although a change from a demonstrative to a genitive seems plausible, considerations internal to Japanese alone do not make arguments necessarily definitive, and the hypothesis becomes more convincing if we can find more genitive morphemes in crosslinguistic data that have possibly been derived from demonstratives under linguistic conditions similar to those of OJ. With regard to the developments of various particles in (15) (i.e. demonstrative so/si ‘that (mesial)’, emphatic si, demonstrative adverbial to, complementizer to, appositive to, and GEN tu), it seems also possible that some of them came from a copula *tu (possibly, appositive to and GEN tu).

3.5 Particle si and the Use of Chinese Characters

Another issue probably related to GEN ga, no, and tu is the particle si in OJ, which has not been discussed much in past studies perhaps because it appears to be completely
Although its functions in OJ are not entirely clear, it is generally regarded as a particle for emphasis. About a half of its uses in Man'yōshū are written with the Chinese character zhil 'this', read as *si* in Japanese. Interestingly, the character zhil was often used to represent GEN *ga* and *no*, based on the functional association with Chinese GEN *zhil*. These three particles could occur in the same environments, although the emphatic *si* exhibited wider syntactic distribution than GEN *ga* and *no*.

There are not many cases in which the same Chinese character is used for different readings in the same song (Ôno T. 1977: 270-75). Even in such cases, people generally avoided mixing phonogramic readings (so-called *on-yomi* [sound-reading] based on approximated Chinese sounds) with logogramic readings (so-called *kun-yomi* [interpretation-reading] based on the semantic association of Chinese characters with Japanese morphemes). In addition, which reading was meant was usually obvious in the surrounding environment, e.g. the character er4 'two' being read as *ni* (phonogramic reading: *on-yomi*) as in *asa-nagwi ni* [morning-calm LOC] 'in the morning clam', and read as *putatu* (logogramic reading: *kun-yomi*) as in *putatu ta-basami* [two hand-pinch(RY)] 'grab(ed) two' (MYS 13:3302); cf. the *gh* in English *enough* and *night*.

However, when the character *zhil* is used as a particle, there seem to be few clues to getting the correct reading, except for differences among *si*, *ga*, and *no*. For example, *zhil* can be used for all the three readings in one song, e.g. (underlined particles) *Kamo-yama

114 The use of *si* is observable as a conjunctive in ModJ, meaning 'and (also/moreover)', e.g. *Tukare-ta si, nemui si, ...* [get.tired-Perf Conj sleepy Conj] '(I am) tired, and sleepy, ...'. According to Martin (1975: 977), this use of *si* first appeared in the seventeenth century. Since the particle *si* which is discussed in this section is already obsolete in EMJ, *si* in OJ and *si* in ModJ seem unrelated.

115 According to Ôno T. (1962: 161), the oldest attested use of *zhil* as *si* dates back to 658 A.D., which does not seem to be quite old. There is no use in *Kojiki* and in the body of Nihonshoki.

116 However, the character *zhil* was never read as the other GEN *tu*, perhaps because *tu* was not that productive in OJ.
mountain GEN/ rock-root Emph make.it.a.pillow-Res(RT)/ I ACC Excl/ know-Neg with 
beloved GEN/ wait Ptcl(repeated action) exist-Conj[e] 'I'm lying down with a rock for a 
pillow on Mt. Kamo. Is my wife waiting for me without knowing my situation?' (MYS 2:223).

Ôno T. (1977: 273) explains that the use of the character zhi as si tends to be 
limited to phonogramic reading environments (not an absolute constraint), while its use as 
GEN ga or no always comes after characters with logogramic readings. However, this 
observeration does not seem accurate. A count in Sô-sakuin suggests that about 45% of its 
uses as si occur after characters with phonogramic readings, and 55% after characters with 
logogramic readings. Moreover, its uses as si after phonogramic readings are concentrated 
in particular books (e.g. Book 14, 15, 17, 18). Therefore, the distinction which Ôno 
T. suggests does not help much; there are many cases in which the character zhi 'this' is 
read as si, ga, or no in logogramic reading environments.

How to read the character zhi 'this' as a particle, then, comes down to differences 
among si, ga, and no. Let us examine some examples of si. Yamada (1913 [1954: 524-26]) 
regards si as an interjective particle (kantô joshi) due to its wide distribution. Examples are 
provided below following his categorization:

117 The three readings can also be found together in Song 1514. However, si is not a particle in this song
but a part of the inflecting suffix (jodôshi) rasi.
118 In general, phonogramic readings (on-yomi) are predominant in Book 5, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20 (see
119 In contrast, the character zhi 'this' is never read as ga in Book 5, 14, 18, and 20, and only once in
Book 15 and twice in Book 17. Also, it is never read as no in Book 14, 15, and 18, and only once in Book
17 and 20. I found six examples of no in Book 5, but they are all in Song 904. I checked Sô-sakuin first,
and double-checked with Zenshû, but there may be some discrepancies with Taikei.
(18) a. marking a subject
pi te si kanasi mo [person si piteous Excl] ‘the people is piteous!’ (MYS 15:3693)

b. substituting for a case particle (ACC)
ipa-ne si maki te [rook-root si make.it.a.pillow Conj(and)]
‘taking a rock as a pillow’ (MYS 2:86)

c. after a case particle (LOC)
tabi ni si are ba [trip LOC si be(IZ) Conj] ‘because (I’m) on trip’ (MYS 1:5)

d. after an adverbial particle (fuku-joshi)
ne nomi si naka-yu [voice only si cry-Spn] ‘(I) start to cry’ (MYS 5:897)

e. before kakari particle
sika si mo ara-mu to [so si KP be-Conjec Comp] ‘perhaps it will be so’
(MYS 2:199)

f. after a kakari particle
miti pa si topoku [road KP si far] ‘the road is far’ (MYS 17:3978)

g. after a conjunctive particle
kuni mire ba si mo [country see(IZ) Conj si KP] ‘when (I) see the country’
(MYS 13:3234)

h. after an adverbial phrase
ananapi tasuke-matura-mu koto ni yori te si
[help(RY) help(RY)-Humb(MZ)-Vol(RT) thing LOC base(RY) Conj si]
‘by helping out’

i. after an interjective particle
pasiki ya si [sweet Intj si] ‘sweet, darling’ (MYS 7:1358)

In addition to Yamada’s observations, the following are worth adding:

(19) a. in a compound predicate
wakare si kure ba [separate(RY) si come(IZ) Conj]
‘since (I) came parting (from her)’ (MYS 2:135, 13:3276, etc.)

katari si tuge ba [talk(RY) si succeed(IZ) Conj]
‘since (we) transmit stories (from one generation to another)’ (MYS 3:313)

120 Since Yamada regards pa and mo as kakari particles, they are glossed as KP here. They are glossed as TOP and ‘even’ respectively in the other part of this dissertation.

121 According to Taikei and Zenshû, it is said that there may be a hand-copy error (omission or addition) in this part. Taikei notes that there is no other case which contains the sequence ...ba si mo.

122 There are variants, pasiki yo si (MYS 17:3964) and pasikye ya si (KJ Song 32).
b. after adverbs, or RY forms of adjectives

\[ \text{kaku si kikosa ba [this\text{-}way si say(Hon/MZ) Conj] 'if (you) say so'} \]

(MYS 20:4499)

\[ \text{pito-goto no/ sigeku si ara ba [others\text{-}word GEN/ crowded(RY) si be(MZ) Conj] 'when rumors become many'} \]

(MYS 12:3110)

c. after ku-nominalized form

\[ \text{miraku si yosi mo [seeing(Ku) si good Excl] 'the seeing (of it) is good'} \]

(MYS 6:983)

Ôno T. (1978: 113-23) claims that si is an emotive-emphatic \( (kando-kyochô) \) particle, which shares the same etymon with the demonstrative so/si ‘that (mesial)’. Here again he utilizes an analysis based on “emotiveness”, but it is not easy to follow.

Ôno S. et al. (1974) claim that si is a particle which indicates the speaker’s uncertainty, based on their observation that about a half of its uses in OJ and most examples in EMJ are in consequential/conditional IZ clauses (i.e. ... \( si ... \) Pred(IZ) ba, ... ), otherwise it usually occur with conjectural auxiliaries mu, ramu, rasi, masi, kyemu, kyerasi, and besi. They speculate that the particle si came from the noun si ‘wind’, which also indicated direction: cf. \( pi-muka-si \) [sun\text{-}face(Root)-(direction)] ‘east’, \( ni-si \) (< \( ini-si \) [leave(RY)-(direction)]) ‘west’. They attempt to generalize on the function of si only based on a subset of examples, just as he did with GEN \( tu \). As can be seen in the examples in (18) and (19), many uses have nothing to do with the speaker’s uncertainty. In short, the shared function of si observable in widely distributed examples seems to be “emphasis”, as has been generally thought.

A peculiar thing about the emphatic si, GEN ga, and GEN no is that these three particles can be written with the same Chinese character \( zhili \), despite the fact that they may occur in exactly the same environments (e.g. marking a subject in consequential/conditional
IZ clauses). Apparently, the use of *zhil* was sometimes confusing for people in later days, and has caused reading variations. For example, Sô-sakuin (based on the Kan’ei text of the *Man’yôshû*) reads the character *zhil* as GEN *no* in *pito no kanasi no* [person GEN piteous Excl] ‘the people is piteous!’ (MYS 15:3693), *tiru pana no* [fall blossom GEN] ‘falling blossoms’ (MYS 17:3906), and in *itakye ku no* [painful(Ku) GEN] ‘being painful’ (MYS 17:3962), and read it as GEN *ga* in *wa ga sekwo ga* [I GEN husband GEN] ‘my husband’ (MYS 15:3725). Zenshû (based on the Nishi Honganji text) reads all of these as *si*, and Taikei (the Nishi Honganji text) reads all but Song 3906 as *si*.124, 125

If we examine the phonogramic use of the character *zhil* to represent the particle *si*, and then if we exclude cases in which *ga-* or *no-*reading is less likely or impossible (e.g. *X si omopoyu* [X *si* come.to.one’s.mind], *X si sinoba-yu* [X *si* think.of-Spn], *X oki te si kure ba* [X put Conj *si* come(IZ) Conj]), there remain 24 cases in which *ga-* or *no-*reading seems also possible.126 In this examination, one feature stood out, i.e. the particle *si* does seem to have an emphatic (or focus) function which GEN *ga* and *no* do not have. This can be induced from the following three observations.

123 As mentioned above, the overall distribution of *si* is wider than that of GEN *ga* and *no*.
124 Given the predominant use of phonogramic readings in Book 15 and 17, as well as the use of *si* in conjectural or hypothetical clauses, the Zenshû readings seem to be more appropriate in these cases.
125 In other cases, there are character variations while their readings are the same. For example, Sô-sakuin uses the character *zhil* ‘this’ for GEN *no* in *puka-miru no* [deep-seaweed GEN] ‘deep seaweeds’ (MYS 6:946) and in *oka no saki* [hill GEN top] ‘the top of the hill’ (MYS 20:4408), while Zenshû uses the character *nai* ‘namely’.
126 They are: MYS 210, 213, 288, 472, 506, 1018, 1312, 1543, 1747, 1770, 2568, 2665, 2909, 2982, 3400, 3630, 3806, 3981, 4113, 4115, 4158, 4166, 4331, and 4499.
First, a half of the 24 examples (12 cases) are hypothetical conditional clauses with MZ forms (e.g. (20a), (20b), and (20c) below), 7 cases consequential clauses with IZ forms (e.g. (20d)), 4 cases other kind of hypothetical clauses (e.g. (20e) and (20f)), and one complement to-clause:

(20) a. **koto si ara ba** (MYS 4:506, 16:3806)  
incident si exist(MZ) Conj 'if something happens'

b. **oporoka ni/ ware si omopa ba** (MYS 7:1312)  
casualness LOC/ I si think(MZ) Conj 'if I think (of you) casually'

c. **kimi si pumi-te ba** (MYS 14:3400)  
you si step.on(RY)-Perf(MZ) Conj 'if you step on (it)'

d. **kaze si yama-ne ba** (MYS 9:1747)  
wind si stop-Neg(IZ) Conj 'since the wind does not stop, ...'

e. **mi-wo si taye-zu pa** (MYS 9:1770)  
water-string si cease-Neg(RY) TOP  
‘if the stream does not cease running > as long as the stream keeps running’

f. **kokoro si naku pa** (MYS 18:4113, 18:4115)  
heart si lacking(RY) TOP 'if there is no heart'

Second, eight of these tokens concern the existence or non-existence of something, e.g. **tukwi si are ba** [moon si exist(IZ) Conj] 'since the moon exists (is out there)' (MYS 11:2665); **imo si nakyere ba** [beloved si lacking(IZ) Conj] ‘since (my) beloved is not here’ (MYS 12:2982). Surprisingly, it is not very common for GEN ga or no to be used in consequential or conditional clauses concerning existence. With regard to the use of ar- ‘exist’, there is no clear-cut case in which the subject of the consequential/conditional clause is marked by ga or no. As for the use of na- ‘lacking’, subject marking by GEN ga or

---

127 When **si** is written with phonogramic Chinese characters which cannot be used to represent GEN ga or no (e.g. *sil* 'think', *shi* 'ambition'), the use of **si** in consequential clauses with IZ forms is very common (e.g. MYS 150, 457, 886, 897, 1769, 3305).

128 One possible case is **sa-ne-ti yo no/ ikuda mo ara-ne ba** [Pref-sleep(RY)-Evi(RT) night GEN/ how.many even exist(MZ)-Neg(IZ) Conj] ‘although there are not many nights when (I) slept’ (MYS 5:804), but this example concerns quantity, i.e. there are such nights, but not many. Another case is **topo-duma no koko ni ara-ne ba** [far(Root)-wife GEN/ here LOC exist(MZ)-Neg(IZ) Conj] 'since (my) far-off wife is not here' (MYS 4:534), but there is no character assigned to GEN no. The other cases all concern features, not existence, e.g. **midu no kiyoku are ba** [water GEN pure be(IZ) Conj] 'since the water is pure' (MYS 7:1127).
no is limited to a particular expression: i.e. yosi no nakyere ba [reason GEN lacking(IZ) Conj] ‘since there is no reason’ (MYS 546, 935, 3255, 4011).

Third, si may be inserted causing a ji-amari (prosodically overlong) line even when it is not syntactically necessary, e.g. wa ga inoti si/ masakiku ara ba [I GEN life si/ safely be(MZ) Conj] ‘if my life is safe’ (MYS 3:288); koto si ara ba [incident si exist(MZ) Conj] ‘if something happens’ (MYS 4:506); tukwi si are ba [moon si exist(MZ) Conj] ‘since the moon is there’ (MYS 11:2665).

The first and second observations above are particularly interesting in relation to ga in Std-ModJ. In those hypothetical clauses or clauses which concern the existence of something, as in if X were to ... , if I had X, if there were X, since X is not here, X is the main concern of the clauses, in other words, the focus. In ModJ, si is obsolete, and the particle ga takes this kind of focus function, e.g. (mosi) X ga ...-tara [supposing X NOM Pred-Cond] ‘if X were to ... ’; (mosi) X ga at-tara ‘if there were X’ or ‘if (I) have X’; (mosi) X ga nakat-tara ‘if there were not X’ or ‘if (I) don’t have X’. As far as the data in Man’yōshū are concerned, it seems that si took the focus function in OJ, for which ga was not used.

This is rather off the track, but given these observations, some corrections seem necessary in how to read the character zhil ‘this’. As for Song 472 (MYS 3:472), Sōsakuin and Zenshū read zhil as si in yo no naka si/ tune kaku nomi to [society GEN inside si/ eternity like this only Comp] ‘society is always like this’. Since it is not a hypothetical clause or an existential clause, and also since many first lines of Japanese songs (waka) are ended with GEN no at the end, it seems better to read the line as yo no naka no [society GEN inside GEN]. Interestingly, Taikei reads the character as pa, following the case in yoru pa [night TOP] (MYS 3:370), which seems too radical (see the note for MYS 370 in
Taikei, vol.1). As for Song 1000 (MYS 6:1000), Sô-sakuin and Taikei read the character as ga in kwo-ra ga ara ba [girl-Dim GEN exist(MZ) Conj] ‘if she were here’, while Zenshû reads it as si. Given its use in a hypothetical clause, Zenshû’s si reading seems preferable. As for Song 4166 (MYS 19:4166), Sô-sakuin, Taikei, and Zenshû all read the character as si in u-dukwi si tate ba [April si begin(IZ) Conj] ‘when April comes’. In this song, there are other instances of zhîl read as si, but all of them are in phonogramic reading environments. In contrast, u-dukwi ‘April’ and tat- ‘begin’ are written with characters of logogramic readings. Given also its use in the consequential clause, the reading u-dukwi no tate ba seems very likely.

To summarize, based on its overall distribution, it should be said that the particle si is syntactically different from GEN ga and no. Interestingly, however, these three particles were sometimes written with the same Chinese character zhîl ‘this’, despite the fact that they can occur in the same environments. The key distinction here seems to be the focus function of si, which is now expressed with ga in Std-ModJ.

Based on its form, it seems likely that the particle si and the demonstrative so/si ‘that’ share the same etymon. Also, it seems semantically and pragmatically plausible that a demonstrative came to be used as an emphatic particle (see Section 3.4.2.3). Perhaps the syntactically broad distribution of si was a reflection of the applicability of the notion of emphasis (or focus) to any constituent of an utterance. As discussed in Section 3.4.2, all these observations (and hypotheses) about the emphatic si are encouraging for the hypothesis that the demonstrative *to developed into the emphatic si, demonstrative so/si ‘that’, and GEN tu, as well as other particles, such as the complementizer to and the appositive to.
3.6 Remaining Issues

In this section, I will discuss two remaining issues. One is the relationship among GEN da, na, and no, and the other is other genitive-like morphemes.

3.6.1 Relationships among GEN da, na, and no

Let us now consider the relationship among GEN da, na. Neither GEN da nor na was any longer productive in OJ, and the examples of da are more limited than those of na. Hōjō (1970) and Ôno S. et al. (1974) regard da and na as allomorphs, which seems plausible due to their similarity in sound and function. While Hōjō was uncertain about which is the original (or the base form), Ôno S. et al. state that da is a variant of na, but offer no further explanation. One general possibility is that when a rarer variant occurs in compounds, it is often the older form. If based on this logic, GEN da would be an older form of na. In this case, however, the change from da to na does not seem well motivated in attested examples (e.g. *ta-da-suwe (?) > ta-na-suwe ‘finger part’). On the contrary, if we assume the change from na to da in compounds, we can provide a reasonable phonetic explanation, as far as the available data are concerned. The attested examples of GEN da (i.e. ku-da-mono [tree-GEN-thing] ‘nut’, ke-da-mono [hair-GEN-thing] ‘animal’, and ta-da-muki [hand-GEN-trunk] ‘arm’) suggest that the change from na to da in these

---

129 Voiced stops in OJ are highly likely to be prenasalized (e.g. Martin 1987: 20-25), so it does not seem totally implausible to posit a change from [d] to [n]. However, in contrast to doublets with b/m, which have quite a few examples (ibid.: 31), there are not clear examples of alternations of d/n. Martin (ibid.: 32) notes that sonape- ‘equip’ is written as sodape- in Bussokuseki, but it seems to be so-dare-ru (< sonapitarve-ru [equip(RY)-satisfy-Res(RT)] ‘fully equipped’ (see Taikei, Bussokuseki, Song 2). He also lists ide- ‘leave’ and in- ‘go away’, but as he notes, the latter may well be related to sin- ‘die’. There are also a few examples of initial d/n alternations in ModJ, but OJ did not have initial voiced stops, e.g. damaru/domoru ‘hush/stammer’ vs. namaru ‘speak in dialect’; dokeru = nokeru ‘remove’; doku = noku ‘step aside’.
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compounds was a dissimilation from the following nasal sound.\textsuperscript{130} Also, given the fact that the surviving examples of \textit{da} are very limited, it is more likely that \textit{da} was a variant of \textit{na} in a limited number of environments. Therefore, it seems more plausible that \textit{na} is the original, and \textit{da} is an old phonological variant that survived in compounds.\textsuperscript{131}

As for GEN \textit{na} and \textit{no}, there are also two possibilities. One is that \textit{no} is the original, and \textit{na} is its allomorph (i.e. \textit{no} > \textit{na} in certain compounds), which I will call Scenario 1. The other is that \textit{na} is the original, and the newer form \textit{no} replaced it except for in some compounds, which is Scenario 2. ôno S. et al. (1974) take Scenario 1, and Hôjô (1970) Scenario 2. Examples of GEN \textit{na} are as follows:\textsuperscript{132}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{u-na-kami} [sea-GEN-upper] ‘beach?, place name?’ (MYS 5:813)
  \item \textit{u-na-para} [sea-GEN-plain] ‘the wide expanse of waters’ (MYS 20:4335)
  \item \textit{u-na-saka} [sea-GEN-border] ‘the end of the sea’ (MYS 9:1740)\textsuperscript{133}
  \item \textit{kamu-na-gara} [deity-GEN-nature] ‘as being a deity’ (MYS 2:1999)
  \item \textit{kamu-na-dukiwi} [deity-GEN-month] ‘October (lunar)’ (MYS 8:1590)
  \item \textit{kamu-na-bwi} [deity-GEN-fire] ‘the places where deities descend, i.e. shrine places’ (MYS 8:1466)
  \item \textit{ta-na-ura} [hand-GEN-back.side] ‘palm’ (NS Kôgyoku 3-nen)
  \item \textit{ta-na-gokoro} [hand-GEN-heart] ‘palm’ (Chm 46)
  \item \textit{ta-na-suwe} [hand-GEN-end] ‘the end of the hand (finger part)’ (KJ Kamiyo, Jô)
  \item \textit{ta-na-soko} [hand-GEN-bottom] ‘palm’ (NS, Kenzô sokui mae)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{130} As Hock (1991: 35, 111) notes, dissimilation is generally known to be irregular or sporadic, which may explain why there are few alternations of \textit{d/n}.

\textsuperscript{131} A long after writing this part, I found that Murayama (1988: 215-32) presents the same idea about the \textit{na/da} alternation in \textit{kedamono} ‘animal’ and \textit{kudamono} ‘nut’, although he does not specify the change as dissimilation. He offers possible dialect data from various sources, e.g. \textit{asu no ban doma} < \textit{asu no ban *no ma} [tomorrow GEN evening GEN space] ‘at least tomorrow evening’ (Kagoshima dialect); \textit{keo no ake doma ni} < \textit{keo no ake *no ma ni} [today GEN dawn GEN space LOC] ‘in today’s dawn’ (Ryukyu dialect); \textit{nama do} < \textit{nama no} [raw GEN] (a dialect in the Shimokita peninsula). This analysis of \textit{ban doma} in Kagoshima does not accommodate the meaning of ‘at least’, however. It could have been derived from \textit{domo fa} [Pl/Humb TOP].

\textsuperscript{132} These examples are taken from ôno S. et al. (1974) and other materials; the list is by no means exhaustive for GEN \textit{na}.

\textsuperscript{133} Unger (2001) regards \textit{una-} in these words as a single morpheme found in \textit{une} ‘ridges in a rice paddy’, \textit{una.zi} ‘nape of the neck’, etc., used in the sense of ‘wave(s)’.
V(RY)-na-gara (?< na-kara [GEN-body]) ‘while ...ing’
ma-na-kapi [eye-GEN-crossing.point] ‘before one’s eyes’ (MYS 5:802)
ma-na-kwo [eye-GEN-Dim] ‘pupil, eye’ (Tosa Feb. 5th)
ma-na-siri [eye-GEN-hip] ‘the tail of the eye’ (Wamyô)
mi-na-ura [water-GEN-fortune-telling] ‘fortune-telling by reading water’
  (MYS 17:4028)
mi-na-kamwi [water-GEN-deity] ‘water deity’ (Gosen 586)
mi-na-kami [water-GEN-upper.part] ‘upstream’ (KKS 511)
mi-na-kipa [water-GEN-edge] ‘waterside’ (MYS 20:4462)
mi-na-simo [water-GEN-lower.part] ‘the lower reaches of a river’ (Shûi 574)
mi-na-soko [water-GEN-bottom] ‘the bottom of the water’ (MYS 20:4491)
mi-na-two [water-GEN-gate] ‘port, harbor’ (MYS 7:1288)\(^\text{135}\)
mikwo-na-gara [prince-GEN-nature] ‘as being a prince’ (MYS 2:199)
momo-na-pito [hundred-GEN-person] ‘many people’ (NS Song 11)

Scenario 1 (i.e. no > na) seems problematic for two reasons. First and foremost, we cannot induce reasonable phonetic conditions which originally motivated the change from no to na. Ôno S. et al. (1974: 1443) claim that no changed to na when the preceding sound was either a, u, or A-type (kô-rui) i. However, they list a, u, and o (A-type, in their description) as conditioning sounds on a different occasion (ibid.: 938), and mention i as a rare case. These conditions are easily inducible from the examples in (21), but they do not constitute a well-constrained phonological environment, even if we follow the eight-vowel hypothesis by Ôno S. et al. (i.e. a, i, u, e, ō, and ō).\(^{136}\) Consider kedamono ‘animal’ (< *ke-na-mono [hair-GEN-thing]), which requires B-type ō to be added to the condition.

\(^{134}\) Both Ôno S. et al. (1974) and Ôno T. (1978) agree that the conjunctive particle nagara came from na-kara, although they disagree on the etymology of kara. Ôno S. et al. claim that kara originally meant ‘tribe’ or ‘birth’, which is related to kala and xala in Manchu and Mongol: cf. OJ kara-kara [belly-tribe] ‘sibling’; ya-kara [house-tribe] ‘tribe’. Ôno T. claims that kara shares the same etymology with karada meaning ‘body, core function’. Nonetheless, if nagara came from na-kara, this is a clear case in which sequential voicing (rendaku) was not induced by the assumed GEN na. Of course, GEN na did not always induce the voicing, e.g. ma-na-kwo ‘pupil’.

\(^{135}\) According to Unger (p.c.), mina- in these words is possibly a single morpheme, given the correspondence between MK \(\text{l}\) and OJ na, i.e. MK ‘mul ‘water’ : OJ mina- ‘water’ (cf. MK ‘twolh ‘stone’: OJ suna ‘sand’).

\(^{136}\) In fact, the eight-vowel hypothesis has been refuted by such scholars as Lange (1973), Unger (1993), Whitman (1985), and Martin (1987).
Also, *momo-na-pito* [hundred-GEN-person] ‘many people’ requires o in *momo* to be added. It is generally thought that the syllable *mo* did not have A/B distinction at the time, and that its phonetic value is of B-type, i.e. [mɔ] instead of [mwo]. Thus, we have a, A-type i, u, B-type ë, A-type o, and perhaps B-type ō as the phonological condition which supposedly induced *no* to change into *na*. Looking at this condition, however, we cannot discern any phonetic motivation for *no* to change into *na*; this six-vowel condition does not seem to be a preferably constrained environment to support the sound change in compounds. Note also that the sounds following *na* in the examples in (21) do not constitute constrained environments, either.

Second, Scenario 1 is rather problematic for explaining GEN *da*. I have claimed above that *da* was an old phonological variant of *na* (i.e. *na* > *da*), which is also the position Ōno S. et al. take. Let us assume this was the case. With regard to *na* and *no*, then, if *no* had been the original (i.e. *no* > *na*), as Ōno S. et al. claim, the compounds that contain *da* should have gone through the change from *no* to *na* and then onto *da* (e.g. *ke-no-mono* [hair-GEN-thing] (?) > *ke-na-mono* > *ke-da-mono* ‘animal’), which makes phonetic explanations even more difficult. Given these two reasons, Scenario 1 seems less likely and less preferable.

Hōjō (1970) takes Scenario 2 (i.e. *na* > *no*), but he has his own claim to make. Comparing the vowel alternations in *ma/me* ‘eye’ and *ta/te* ‘hand’, he argues that *me* ‘eye’ and *te* ‘hand’ are the originals, and *ma* ‘eye’ and *ta* ‘hand’ in compounds (e.g. *ma-na-kwo* [eye-GEN-Dim] ‘pupil, eye’; *ta-na-ura* [hand-GEN-back.side] ‘palm’) are

---

137 The numerical noun *momo* ‘hundred’ usually modifies nouns directly, e.g. *momo-tori* [hundred bird] ‘many (kinds of) birds’ (MYS 18:4089); *momo-tose* [hundred year] ‘many years’ (MYS 4:764). A few exceptions are *momo-na-pito* [hundred-GEN-person] ‘many people’ (NS Song 11) and *momo-tu-sima* [hundred-GEN-island] ‘many islands’ (MYS 14:3367), of which the latter is a makura-kotoba (pillow word).
phonological variants induced by the following GEN na (e.g. *me-na-kwo (?) > ma-na-kwo). This is completely opposite to the well-accepted hypothesis that ma and ta are older forms of me ‘eye’ and te ‘hand’ respectively. If we consider examples such as ma-buta [eye-lid] ‘eyelid’, ma-tu-ge [eye-GEN-hair] ‘eyelash’, ta-dikara [hand-power] ‘hand power’, ta-tuka [hand-grip] ‘grip’, and ta-moto [arm-root] ‘the upper arm; sleeve’, which do not contain GEN na, Hôjô’s claim about what motivated a in ma and ta loses its ground. Since ma and ta in compounds are not retained in phonologically conditioned environments, they do not seem to be phonological variants of me ‘eye’ and te ‘hand’, but rather, they seem to be older forms of me and te. We can account for ma-na- [eye-GEN-] (e.g. ma-na-kwo [eye-GEN-Dim] ‘pupil, eye’) and ta-na- [hand-GEN-] (e.g. ta-na-ura [hand-GEN-back.side] ‘palm’) as combinations of older forms, ma, ta, and na, without resorting to a phonological change in compounds.

Hôjô’s other claim that the change from na to no started out as a phonological change in compounds (or a sequence of words) seems possible (e.g. *ko-na-ma > ko-no-ma [tree-GEN-inbetween.space] ‘the space between trees’; ko-no-ne [tree-GEN-root] ‘tree root’; ko-no-kure [tree-GEN-shadow] ‘shadow under trees’; ko-no-pa [tree-GEN-leaf] ‘tree leaf’; po-no-po [fire-GEN-ear.of.grain] ‘flame’). As seen in the examples above, phonological environments are not very limited for GEN na. In addition, given the existence of very limited old GEN da, which has been claimed to be a phonological variant of na (i.e. na > da), Scenario 2 (i.e. na > no) seems more plausible than Scenario 1 (i.e. no > na).

138 Note that ko and po are said to be older forms of kwi ‘tree’ and pwi ‘fire’. In addition to Hôjô’s examples, there are examples such as two-no-pye [outside-GEN-layer] ‘an outer wall of palace’ (MYS 3:443), po-no-ke [fire-GEN-sign] ‘smoke’ (Kagura-uta 75), ko-no-mwi [tree-GEN-nut] ‘nut’ (MYS 18:4111), yo-no-naka [society-GEN-inside] ‘society, world’ (MYS 5:804), and ko-no-yo [(proximal)-GEN-society] ‘this society’ (MYS 4:541).
To summarize the issue about GEN *na*, *no*, and *da*, it seems most plausible that *na* was an older form of GEN *no*, and *na* changed to *da* by dissimilation in some limited compounds. I have mentioned the possibility that *na* had been the MZ form of the extinct copula *nu* in Section 3.3.3.3 above.

### 3.6.2 Other Genitive-like Morphemes

So far, I have discussed GEN *tu, ga, no, na, da*, and an emphatic particle *si* in this chapter. There are some other suspicious morphemes, namely, *du, ro*, and *ra* (see also Section 3.3.1.3 above for *ya*), which I will examine in this subsection.

The morpheme *du* seems to be functioning as genitive in the following examples:

$$(22) \quad \text{i=k-a-du-ti [severe(Root)-GEN-spirit] 'thunder' (NS Kamiyo, Jô)}^{139}$$
$$\text{n=w-o-du-ti [field-GEN-spirit] 'spirit of field' (e.g. miscanthus) (NS Kamiyo, Jô)}$$
$$\text{m=i-tu(du?)-'ti [water-GEN-spirit] 'spirit of the water' (MYS 16:3833)}^{140}$$
$$\text{a=s-i-na-du-ti [foot-Dim-GEN-spirit] 'Ashinazuchi (a deity's name)' (KJ, Jô)}$$
$$\text{t=e-na-du-ti [hand-Dim-GEN-spirit] 'Tenazuchi (a deity's name)' (KJ, Jô)}^{141}$$

*cf. kagu-tu-ti [sparkling.light-GEN-spirit] ‘fire deity’ (NS Kamiyo, Jô)*

*cf. yama-tu-mi [mountain-GEN-spirit] ‘mountain spirit’ (MYS 1:38)*

*cf. wata-tu-mi [sea-GEN-spirit] ‘sea spirit’ (MYS 1:15)*

In fact, the voicing of the genitive in these examples is uncertain in the OJ documents; it might be the case that *tu* became *du* in EMJ. The list above may not be exhaustive, but

---

139 Ōno T. (1978: 49) analyzes this word as i=k-a-duti (< i=k-a-tuti [severe(Root)-mallet]), which semantically fits ‘thunder’, but it does not explain other words with -tu/du-ti.

140 Taikei reads it as mi-du-ti, but Myôgishô (ca. 11c-12c) provides mi-tu-ti in the entry.

141 Shin-Zenshû (1997: 69) regards these deities’ names as a=s-i-na-du-ti [foot-rub-spirit] and t=e-na-du-ti [hand-rub-spirit]. However, *nadu* is the SS form of the verb nade- ‘rub’, and this parsing is not morphologically sound. In contrast, the diminutive suffix -na, which is a variant of -ra, is not rare in Man’yôshû, e.g. kwo-na ‘girl’; se-na ‘husband’; te-gwo-na [hand-child-Dim] ‘girl’.
given the fact that examples of GEN du are very limited, it seems better to regard it as a voiced allomorph of GEN tu in specific compounds. 142

The examples of ro are also limited. I found only three possible examples.

(23) wa-ro-tabi [I-ro-trip] 'my trip' (MYS 20:4343) 143
wo-ro-ti [summit-ro-spirit] 'towering serpent' (KJ J6)
wo-ro-ta [summit-ro-rice.field] 'rice field on a mountain' (MYS 14:3501)

Readings are certain in these examples, and the morpheme ro seems to be functioning as a genitive.

However, there is a suffix -ro, which is generally a diminutive but can also be used with wo 'summit' and similar natural objects, e.g. ipapo-ro no [rock-Dim(?) GEN] 'of the rock' (MYS 14:3495); awo-ne-ro ni [blue-mountain-Dim(?) LOC] 'at the blue mountain' (MYS 14:3511); pito-ne-ro ni [one-mountain-Dim(?) LOC] 'at one mountain' (MYS 14:3512); 144 opo-nwo-ro ni [big-field-Dim(?) LOC] 'at wide hills' (MYS 14:3520). 145 It seems possible to regard ro in wo-ro-ta 'rice field in a mountain' as a diminutive suffix, since the song begins with the first line, Apa wo-ro no [Awa(p.n.) summit-Dim(?) GEN]

‘In the mountains of Awa’, which leads to the second line, wo-ro-ta ni ... 'in the mountain rice fields ...' (MYS 14:3501). One problem of this analysis is that there is no other case in which the diminutive -ro is directly followed by another noun to express a genitive

---

142 (Note 26 is repeated here.) Possibly a dissimilation and analogical spread: cf. nwo 'field' and nuri 'soil' vs. nwo-du-ti 'spirit of field' (e.g. snake); ame turi 'sky and soil' vs. ika-du-ti 'thunder'. Compare these with kagu-tu-ti [sparkling.light-GEN-spirit] 'fire spirit', in which tu is not voiced, perhaps because of the voiced obstruent g. See the strong version of Lyman's law in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2.5.

143 Taikei explains that this is dialectal ware tabi [I trip] (> waro tabi), but there is no attested example in which ware is directly attached to another noun in a genitive relationship in Man'yōshū.

144 The phrase pito-ne-ro [one-mountain-Dim(?)] is a pun with pito nero [others sleep(MR)] in the song.

145 It is generally thought that the suffix ro is of eastern dialects (azuma kotoba), and the examples above are concentrated in a particular section of Book 14.
relationship. Also, the use of the diminutive does not agree with wa ‘I’ in wa-ro-tabi ‘my trip’ and wo ‘summit’ in wo-ro-ti ‘huge serpent’, and further, wo-ro-ti is not of eastern dialects. 146

Nevertheless, attested examples of ro are very limited, and it does not seem to be a variant of other genitive morphemes in those compounds. It is still curious, but it is of less importance in our discussion of genitive particles in OJ.

Another suspicious morpheme (?) brought up in past studies is -ra. Murayama (1974: 142) lists the following examples:

(24) aka-ra wotome [red-ra girl] ‘a well-looking (complexion) girl’ (KJ, Song 43)
aka-ra wo-pune [red-ra small-boat] ‘a small red boat’ (MYS 16:3868)
aka-ra tatibana [red-ra wild.orange] ‘reddish wild oranges’ (MYS 18:4060)
ara-ka [exist(Root)-ra-place] ‘palace’ (MYS 2:167)
ara-pito-gamwi [exist(Root)-ra-person-deity] ‘deities appearing as human’ (MYS 6:1021)

However, there seems to be a parsing problem in these examples. There are no color nouns which can be suffixed by -ra, except for aka ‘red’. The color noun aka ‘red’ has a related verb, akar- ‘become bright; become red; ripen’, while other color nouns do not. Thus, akara- seems to be the MZ form, and so is ara- in ara-ka ‘palace’. The morpheme ara- in the last example seems to be related to arapa ‘being obvious; this world’, arapas- ‘make manifest, realize; make public’, and arapare- ‘appear’, not with ar- ‘exist’, although they may be essentially related.

Fukuda (1972: 19) observes that a-ending inflectional forms (i.e. MZ forms) in OJ could take the attributive function, and lists the following examples, e.g. muka-momo [face(MZ)-thigh] ‘the facing thigh’; muka-pagi [-leg] ‘shin’; mura-yama [being.crowded-

146 The famous story about ya-mata no wo-ro-ti ‘a huge serpent with eight heads and tails’ takes place in Izumo (in Tottori prefecture).

This analysis is not, however, entirely accurate; they are not inflectional forms of known verbs, except for muka-. The morpheme muka- in muka-pagi ‘shin’ can be regarded as the MZ form of a yodan (quadrigrade) verb muk- ‘face’. But mura- is not an MZ form of any attested verbs; a related verb is mure- (MZ) ‘crowd’. Also, ara- in ara-yama ‘rough mountain’ is related to arakara- (MZ) ‘rough (Adj)’, arasa- (MZ) ‘leave disorganized’, and are- (MZ) ‘become rough’, but not an MZ form of an extant verb. Likewise, maga- in maga-tama ‘curved gem’ is related to maga-magasi ‘portentous’, magara- (MZ) ‘curve (Vi)’, and mage- (MZ) ‘curve (Vt)’, and kuta- to kutas- ‘deteriorate (Vt)’, kutat- ‘deteriorate (Vi)’. Therefore, it seems more accurate to state that a-ending forms often became bound nominals, regardless of the status of that form in an inflectional paradigm.

The discussion above suggests that there was not a genitive-like morpheme -ra in OJ. However, the idea that MZ forms took the attributive function is intriguing when considering GEN na and no. I have claimed above that na is an older form of GEN no, and discussed the possibility that GEN no came from a copula verb. One way of looking at GEN na would be, then, the MZ na of the extinct copula *nu had been taking the attributive function.

147 Quinn (1987, 1990) considers MZ forms non-finite, thus nominal. Óno S. (1960) and Unger (1993: 67; 2000a) claim that [MZ-X] is in fact [(Root)-aX], and thus there is no need to posit MZ allomorphs. If this is the case, the a-ending bound nominals seem to have been analogical to MZ forms which gained some substance after the reanalysis (i.e. [(Root)-aX] > [MZ-X]).
3.7 Conclusion

3.7.1 Summary of Findings and Claims

In this chapter, I have discussed GEN *ga, no, tu, na, da, du,* and other morphemes, *ro, ra, ya,* and *si,* in terms of their origins and the relationships that hold among them. The first three, *ga, no,* and *tu,* can be regarded as the three major genitive particles in OJ. As reviewed in Section 3.2 and 3.3, there are quite a few studies about the origins of GEN *ga* and *no.* In contrast, GEN *tu* has been studied less, although many scholars agree that it is an older genitive. In Chapter 2 (Section 2.3), I have claimed that *tu* was more widely used as a general genitive in pre-OJ than in OJ. In addition, I have suggested in this chapter the distinct possibility that GEN *tu* in OJ and GEN *s* in MK are cognates (Section 3.4.1). These claims about GEN *tu* suggest that we should regard *ga, no,* and *tu* as equally important when considering their origins. Regarding the origins of GEN *tu,* I have presented and examined the new hypothesis that it was derived from a demonstrative *to* ‘that’ in Section 3.4.2.

Another new consideration I have added to the issue is the emphatic particle *si,* which seems to share the same origin with the demonstrative *so/si* ‘that (mesial),’ and possibly with GEN *tu.* The particle *si* exhibits a syntactically wider distribution than GEN *ga* and *no,* but they may occur in similar environments. When marking a subject in consequential/conditional clauses, it seems that *si* tends to be used in more hypothetical clauses in which the subject is in focus, while *ga* or *no* is used in factual consequential clauses.148 This use of *si* is extinct in ModJ, and *ga* has taken over the focus function in those subordinate clauses.

Obviously, the origins of *ga, no,* and *tu* are difficult issues, due to limitations in historical data, and we cannot easily reach definitive conclusions. Making the most out of

148 The distribution is not entirely complementary; *si* can be used in consequential clauses as well.
currently available data, the critique and additional considerations in this chapter have narrowed down various hypotheses to a few likely scenarios. The remaining hypotheses can be organized into two groups as follows:

(25)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Set A</th>
<th>Hypothesis Set B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN ga &lt; Demo. ko/ka ‘this’</td>
<td>Demo. ko/ka ‘this’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN no &lt; Copula *nu</td>
<td>Copula *nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN tu &lt; Copula *nu</td>
<td>Demo. *to ‘that’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following, I would like to discuss these from a broader perspective.

3.7.2 Consolidation of Hypotheses

3.7.2.1 Grammaticalization

First, let us step back to a basic theoretical discussion. Language changes are of course very complex phenomena, and difficult to account for with an integrated theory, if that is possible at all. One such attempt at dealing with changes in morphology, syntax, and semantics is the so-called “grammaticalization theory” (e.g. Heine and Reh 1984; Traugott and Heine (eds.) 1991a/b; Hopper and Traugott 1993). I do not agree with the popular idea that all historical changes can be accounted for by grammaticalization theory, or the idea that every historical change is an instance of grammaticalization, but I would like to discuss the origins of GEN ga, no, and tu in light of some of its general observations, which are valid regardless of one’s theoretical frameworks.149

There are two fundamental assumptions (hypotheses, or claims) in grammaticalization theory. One is that grammatical items cannot develop without a prior lexical history, which I will call the “origination hypothesis”. The other is that the direction

---

149 Most recently, the validity of grammaticalization theory has been seriously challenged by Joseph (2001), Janda (2001), and other scholars in the same issue of Language Sciences.
of historical change is always from “more lexical” to “more grammatical” (i.e. the so-called “unidirectionality hypothesis”). In Chapter 6, I will argue against the unidirectionality hypothesis.\textsuperscript{150} I am personally convinced that the unidirectionality hypothesis is predeterministic and does not hold. As for the origination hypothesis, however, “To date there is no evidence that grammatical items arise full-fledged, that is, can be innovated without a prior lexical history in a remote (or less remote) past” (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 128-9).\textsuperscript{151} \textsuperscript{152} Although there are quite a few grammatical items of which origins are unknown in any language, we also know that many grammatical items have developed from lexical items. Thus, it is worth developing a discussion treating the origination hypothesis as a working assumption. However, it is still a hypothesis, and if the reconstruction of unattested lexical sources is too arbitrary, i.e. without reasonable supporting evidence, discussions become unproductive (e.g. Altaic hypotheses for Japanese, given the current state of studies).

With regard to the remaining hypotheses about the origins of GEN \textit{ga}, \textit{no}, and \textit{tu}, each candidate for the lexical source has reasonable (or very probable) reflexes in OJ data, and thus they provide data to support valid discussions. I repeat the remaining hypotheses in (25) below:

\textsuperscript{150} Chapter 5, Section 5.3 also argues against the unidirectionality hypothesis, in terms of the change from parataxis to subordination.

\textsuperscript{151} Logically speaking, the origination hypothesis has an unfair advantage. Historical records are always imperfect, and we cannot in fact prove that a certain linguistic item never existed. So, it is always possible to resort to unattested hypothetical forms.

\textsuperscript{152} However, Joseph (2001) demonstrates that weak subject pronouns \textit{tos} (etc.) in Modern Greek did not arise as a reduction of a full form (whether phonologically or via morphological resegmentation) but as the result of an analogical extension of an already-existing pattern, i.e. there is no prior lexical history. He also discusses the Modern Greek future marker \textit{th}, and claims that “[the developmental steps - Y.H.] are not guided by some “higher force” driving them on since, \textit{ex hypothesi}, there is no process of grammaticalization; rather they are just ordinary instances of phonetic change and analogy, ...”
The demonstrative *ko ‘this’ is productive in OJ, and its allomorph *ka ‘this’ is observable in some expressions, e.g. *ka-ku ‘like this’. For reflexes of the copulas *nu and *tu, see Section 3.3.3.3. For reflexes of the demonstrative *to, see Section 3.4.2.

In both Set A and Set B in (26), two of the three genitives share similar origins. Perhaps this is more likely than the case in which all the three genitives were derived from completely different lexical items, although it is not impossible. Changes from lexical items to grammatical items are not random, and the kinds of lexical items which tend to develop into a certain grammatical item in a single language are limited. For example, ‘be’ verbs, ‘have’ verbs, ‘finish/complete’ verbs, and ‘come’ verbs tend to develop into markers of resultative, perfective, and related senses in various languages (Bybee et al. 1994: 51-105). In a single language, however, not all of them change to perfectives, e.g. be and have for perfectives in English, but not finish or complete. Given this kind of constraint, both Set A and Set B, which limit the number of kinds of lexical sources to two instead of three, seems reasonable. Also note that we have arrived at Set A and Set B without intentionally making two out of the three sources similar.

Another reason for the preference of Set A and Set B is due to the possibility of language/dialect mixture. Why there were three genitives in OJ is an interesting question to begin with, and the language/dialect mixture seems to be one of the possible causes which brought the complex genitive situation. It is common that similar but different items take

---

153 For genitive/possessive case markers, Heine and Reh (1984: 279) list the following as possible sources: ablative (SOURCE) case maker, ablative (SOURCE) adposition, determinant, noun (‘thing’, ‘place’, etc.), and third person pronouns. They state that the list is mostly based on African languages, plus some other languages. But those languages are not specified.
the same developmental path in different dialects. As we will see in Chapter 6, for example, GEN ga developed into a bound pronominal, nominalizer, and a sentence final particle in Toyama dialects. Likewise, GEN no developed into those particles in Std-ModJ, and so did GEN tu in Fukuoka dialects. In Middle English, the current possessive pronouns (e.g. her-s, our-s) developed in the north by analogy with possessive pronominal expressions of proper nouns (e.g. Tom's [Tom-GEN.one]), while different possessive pronouns (e.g. her-n, our-n) developed by analogy with mine and thine in the south. Therefore, if the three-genitive situation in OJ had been a result of language/dialect mixture, it seems plausible that two out of the three might come from similar items in different languages/dialects, as indicated in Set A and Set B. I will discuss the possibility of language/dialect mixture again in Section 3.7.2.3.

3.7.2.2 Distribution

Let us now consider the distributions of GEN ga, no, and tu. Even after some grammaticalization, grammatical items may keep the semantics of their original lexical sources to some degree (cf. Bybee et al. 1994: 17). In fact, to some extent, they may retain not only the semantics, but also morphology and syntax of their sources. Therefore, in a situation where more than two grammatical forms are competing, each is expected to exhibit a high concentration of its use in the environment(s) where it originated, especially while it is still developing (but not necessarily so at a later stage). As for ga, no, and tu, the use of ga, in the extant historical materials at least, is concentrated on first and second person pronouns. In contrast, the uses of no and tu exhibit more variety and share some similarities with each other, i.e. the adjectival use with bound nominals, the appositive use, the metaphorical use, and some other semantically complex uses (see Chapter 2, Section
2.3. If based on this observation, Hypothesis Set A (i.e. GEN no < copula *nu, GEN tu < copula *nu) appears to have a slight advantage over Set B. This is perhaps the most straightforward interpretation, but Set B is not necessarily ruled out. It still seems possible that GEN tu was used as a general genitive (similar to GEN no) in some dialects, not because of origins similar to no's, but because of the role allocation that resulted from the competition with ga.

As for other environments to which newly developed grammatical items have expanded, not all distributions need have been determined by linguistic necessities resulting from features of the original lexical sources or newly developed grammatical functions, since the processes in which such distributions are determined are open to historical contingency. For example, in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2.2.1), I have discussed overlapping distributions between GEN ga and no in Man'yoshū. It may well be the case that comparing such pairs as ume ga pana [cherry.tree GEN blossom] 'cherry blossoms' and ume no pana does not tell us anything about the difference between ga and no, cf. Britain's athletes vs. British athletes vs. the athletes of Britain.

When generalization towards a certain grammatical function has advanced in each grammatical item in competition, while its lexical meanings are progressively bleached out, one form may win out, and the other forms may be abandoned, remaining only in fossilized expressions. For example, GEN tu became unproductive in EMJ, but remains in archaic phrases like toki tu kaze [time GEN wind] 'seasonal wind' and wata tu mi [sea GEN spirit] 'the sea deity'. Or, another possibility is that the forms in competition may develop a new semantic or syntactic differentiation among them based on their characteristic distributions in that particular speech community. An example of this may be the pejorative/honorific

154 See the similarity to the situation of ‘one form - one meaning' in paradigmatic leveling (Anttila 1972).
distinction that became observable between GEN ga and no in MJ. Also, GEN ga has
developed into NOM ga in Std-ModJ, while GEN no has gained the status of the only
productive genitive.

To summarize, it is imperative to pay attention to how overall distributions of
competing forms come about, and not to develop a hypothesis only based on peculiar uses
or easily noticed but partial characteristics, as has often been done in past studies.

3.7.2.3 Language/Dialect Mixture

I have defined “OJ” as a central dialect around the capital Nara at the time, but there
is no reason to believe that Japan was linguistically homogeneous in the OJ period or in the
pre-OJ period. As for pre-OJ, it is still uncertain where the political center was located
(possibly more than one?), and thus the central dialect is unspecifiable. Archaeologically
speaking, northern Kyushu (including Fukuoka prefecture) is a strong possibility, just as
Nara is. As we will see in Chapter 6, dialects in Fukuoka have developed various functional
particles out of GEN tu (i.e. bound pronominal, nominalizer, and sentence final particle),
which correspond to various uses of no in Std-ModJ. This evidence suggests that the use
of GEN tu was very common sometime in the history of Fukuoka dialects. Thus, one
possibility is that GEN tu was more of a general genitive in non-central dialects, and some
of its uses were borrowed into the central dialect in Nara, i.e. OJ. This hypothesis agrees
with the fact that examples of GEN tu are rather limited in OJ data, while there are abundant
examples of GEN ga and no. It is also encouraging to this hypothesis that Fukuoka is the
closest prefecture to Korea, and that GEN tu in OJ and GEN s in MK are likely to be
cognates (see Section 3.4.1). The possibility that all the three genitives may not have been
originated in a single dialect increases the complexity of the problem. However, the recognition of this possibility may direct us to better understandings in future studies.

In Section 3.7.2.2, I have suggested that Hypothesis Set A may have a slight advantage over Set B if we focus on the observable distributions of GEN ga, no, and tu. From a dialectal/crosslinguistic standpoint, however, Set B seems to have an advantage. First of all, the copula hypothesis in Set A (i.e. copula *tu, *nu > GEN tu, no in OJ) does not provide an account for GEN s in MK. As mentioned, it is likely that GEN tu in OJ and GEN s in MK are cognates, and that the former in Fukuoka dialects and the latter in MK took similar developmental paths (see Section 3.4.1). Also, a two-way demonstrative system can be reconstructed in pKJ, and it seems possible that the demonstrative so/si (and probably to) shares the same origin with GEN tu on the Japanese side, and so does the demonstrative ce/co with GEN s on the Korean side. It is rather problematic, however, that GEN ga in OJ does not have a likely cognate in MK that could have shared its origins with the demonstrative ko/ku.

Any hypothesis should finally be confirmed by comparative data, but correspondences with Korean are still obscure in many words. What we may call OK or pre-OK is by no means homogeneous, either. Perhaps we should put more emphasis on language diversity on the Korean side, more so than in the OJ situation, since multiple kingdoms (i.e. Koguryō, Silla, and Paekche) had split the Korean peninsula until it was unified by Silla in the seventh century (676 A.D.). Although available written documents are very limited, we may expect more from dialect studies in Korean.

Lastly, Hypothesis Set A and Set B may turn out to be incorrect or only partially correct in future studies, but I believe and hope that the approaches to the problem demonstrated in this chapter will contribute to those studies.
4.1 Introduction

It has long been noted of OJ that subjects in RT clauses (e.g. relative clauses), MZ clauses (e.g. hypothetical clauses), and IZ clauses (e.g. reason clauses) are generally marked by *ga* or *no*, while they are zero-marked in main clauses. Because of this constraint, it is more appropriate to regard these tokens of *ga* and *no* as genitives, rather than nominatives. This GEN-marking phenomenon has not been thoroughly studied in the previous literature on OJ.

A common view about subject marking in OJ is that the subject in the subordinate clause is marked by genitive in order to avoid confusion with the subject in the main clause (e.g. Akiba 1978: 118-21; Sakanashi 1987). For example, Akiba (ibid.: 120) claims that there was a need to differentiate the subordinate clause subject from the main clause subject, and that marking by GEN *ga* or *no* was the best available solution. Her claim is based on the a priori belief that the subject NPs in the main clause and the subordinate clause would occur next to each other since they are the first elements in the clauses (ibid.: 118), i.e. [NP1 [NP2 Pred2] Pred1]. In fact, such constructions are rarely seen in OJ since subject NPs are very often not overtly expressed. Further, it applies at best only to relative clauses, and not to other types of subordinate clauses, such as MZ (e.g. hypothetical) clauses and IZ (e.g.
reason) clauses, i.e. [[NP1 Pred1], [NP2 Pred2]]. Also, there are other ways to clarify which subject goes with which predicate (e.g. honorification, scrambling), and GEN-marking was not the only (or “best”) solution. Therefore, “the differentiation theory” is not sound for the subject marking in OJ. It does not agree with crosslinguistic data, either.

GEN-marking of subjects is observable in many languages, among them Turkish, Yaqui, Korean, Chinese, and English (e.g. *John’s being reelected surprised everyone*). It is generally thought to be limited to subordinate clauses (e.g. Givón 1979: 149). Except for a few studies, this topic has not been discussed very much in the previous literature. Foley and Van Valin (1984), following Silverstein (1976), claim that a tighter clause-linkage promotes nominalization and GEN-marking of subjects. They do not, however, explain why it leads to nominalization and GEN-marking.

This chapter examines GEN-marking of subjects in OJ and other languages. The most significant finding from *Man’yōshū* data (ca. 759) is that this GEN-marking phenomenon is observable in almost all types of clauses in OJ, including main clauses, albeit with different frequencies. Based on the OJ data, I present two major claims in this chapter which have significant implications for linguistics in general: (i) different frequencies of GEN-marking of subjects are attributable to different degrees of clausal nouniness; and (ii) the different degree of clausal nouniness is a result of what I call “category management” in the domain of the sentence.

To elaborate on these two claims, the first claim (i) means that each clause is “nouny” (or “verby”) to a different degree. The GEN-marking is reasonable in that the notion of subject projects to a possessor of action or state when verbs are nominalized to a certain degree. This claim agrees with the view that categories such as “verb” and “noun” are not discrete, but rather form a continuum, what Ross (1972) calls a “category squish”.
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In the OJ data, it is apparent that GEN-marking of subjects is a scalar matter (i.e. of frequency, degree). It is not something invariably found or not found in a certain type of clause, and in fact both GEN-marking and zero-marking are observable in all types of clauses. The second claim (ii) is deducible from a more general claim that all (major) categories in a single sentence must be managed along the category squish between noun and verb. In principle, there should be only one most verb-like verb in a single sentence. Thus, the main-clause verb must be most verbly (or least nouny), and the other clauses in the same domain should be treated accordingly. The more subordinate a certain clause becomes, the more nouny it should be.

The observation in this chapter is also suggestive for the larger theme of this dissertation, i.e. a view of grammar formation based on speech production. In relation to claim (ii), the category assignment to each form seems to occur only as a component in a sentence, not as an isolated word or phrase. This implies that there is no a priori prototypical category “noun”, “verb”, or such in grammar; categories can only be first induced from speech production. The co-existence of GEN-marking and zero-marking of subjects in all types of clauses also suggest that the category “subject” may not be identified (or defined) by a discrete set of rules (e.g. case-marking). In other words, “subject” is not something given in grammar.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. Section 4.2 and 4.3 provide preliminary discussions about the notion of subject in OJ. Section 4.4 examines constraints on GEN-marking of subjects, and Section 4.5 provides a conclusion to this chapter. The former two sections, 4.2 and 4.3, are included for this chapter to be as thorough as possible,
but nonetheless they may not be necessary to follow the main discussions in Section 4.4; readers might want to go directly to Section 4.4, after reading the overviews of the two sections below.

Section 4.2 discusses confusion about the use of “shukaku” as a translation of nominative in Japanese linguistics, and clarifies at what stage we should regard the use of ga as nominative in the history of Japanese. Section 4.3 provides an assumption about the notion of subject in this study, which at the end agrees with the observations about GEN-marked subjects.

4.2 Genitive or Nominative?

There seems to be some confusion in Japanese linguistics regarding subject-marking and the nominative case. In Japanese, the term “shukaku” is used as a translation of nominative, and “marking a subject” is regarded as “being shukaku (NOM)”; they are not clearly distinguished. Due to this confusion, some scholars (e.g. Ishigaki 1955; Asami 1956b; Kazama 1970; Sakanashi 1987) claim that ga and no were used as shukaku already in the Nara period, based on the fact that subjects were marked by ga or no.

---

1 Ishigaki’s study is about the development of ga as a conjunctive particle. He claims that ga came to be used as a conjunctive particle in the Insei period (i.e. late Heian period from 1086). According to his argument, the emergence of NOM ga is a prerequisite for the emergence of CONJ ga, which means that NOM ga emerged before the late Heian period. He uses the term shukaku no ga ‘NOM ga’ throughout the history of the development of ga.

2 Asami (1956b: 8) states: “Kaku site, rentaikaku zyosi “no” wa, rentaitku no naka ni oite wa, syukaku zyosi ni kanzen ni tensei sita to ihi eru ni itaru” ‘Therefore, we can conclude that GEN no completely developed into NOM in adnominal clauses.’

3 Kazama (1970: 57) states: “... kono rentaikaku ga ryooteki ni wa ga, no no yookoo no tuusin o nasu ga, zyoodai ni wa mata syukaku yookoo ga aru. Syukaku yookoo wa, ga, no no ukeru taiyen ga sita no yogen ni kakawaru koozoo ni hoka-nara ni "... this genitive use was most common, but in Zyoodai (i.e. the Nara period and before), there also existed a nominative use. The nominative use is nothing but the structure in which the nominal marked by ga or no relates to the following predicate.’

4 Sakanashi (1987: 60) states: “Sikasi migi ni mita yoo ni, syukaku-zyosi to site no yookoo wa. Nara zidai ni wa sude ni okonawarete ita to miru koto ga dekira no de aru” ‘However, as seen above, it is possible to see the nominative use as existing already in the Nara period.’ He cites Hashimoto (1969), but in fact Hashimoto does not use the term shukaku ‘nominative’.
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in relative clauses, IZ clauses, or other limited environments. For more accurate analysis, however, we must distinguish various functions of case markers (e.g. marking a subject) from their names (e.g. NOM) since cases are merely named after a prototypical function. Subjects can be marked by a case marker other than nominative in many languages. As long as ga and no were used to mark subjects in limited environments and did not occur in a single clause plain affirmative sentence, it is more accurate to regard them as genitive particles (i.e. "zokukaku" in Japanese). This study regards ga as a nominative(-like) particle when it came to be commonly used to mark subjects in single clause plain affirmative sentences (approximately in the late MJ period).

4.3 Notion of Subject

My view of the notion of subject is similar to that of Keenan’s (1976) and others’ (e.g. Cole et al. 1980; Comrie 1989 [1981]; Givón 1995), i.e. subjecthood consists of various behavioral and coding properties, which may be distributed to different constituents in a sentence. Further, I would claim that subject is not a given syntactic category, but rather a category which develops in each language to a different degree or relevance (in a different construction) as a result of linguistic changes. This view in fact agrees with the observations which I will present in Section 4.4. In this regard, Cole et al. (1980) discuss acquisition processes of subjecthood in various languages. Li and Thompson (1976) argue that the syntactic category “subject” has a very low functional load in Lisu (a Lolo-Burmese language) and other Sino-Tibetan languages (e.g. Mandarin), which are “topic” oriented languages. So-called “ergative languages” may also display the irrelevancy of the

---

5 This view is conservative, but nothing new. As mentioned, Hashimoto (1969) does not use the term shukaku, either.

6 This claim is critically different from Keenan’s (1976) view of subject, since he attempts to treat the notion of subject as a primitive in Universal Grammar. See also Chapter 7 for further discussion.
notion of subject in some constructions, although the number of such “deep” ergative languages is very limited (e.g. Dyirbal, Eskimo, Karaoj). In another case, Schachter (1976, 1977) discusses subject properties split between agent and topic in Philippine languages.

As for Japanese, there are some scholars (e.g. Mikami 1963a, 1963b) who claim that the notion of subject is irrelevant to Japanese grammar. The most basic approach in confirming its validity is to examine various features related to subjecthood, i.e. coding properties, such as morphological marking, as well as behavior-and-control properties, such as passivization, reflexivization, and equi-NP deletion (e.g. She wanted 0 to leave). It is interesting to note that Cole et al. (1980) claim that behavioral subject properties are acquired historically prior to coding properties. This seems to be the case in the history of Japanese as well, given the fact that NOM ga emerged as such in the late MJ. A thorough examination of subjecthood in Japanese (or even just in OJ and MJ, for our concerns) is, however, beyond the scope of this study. In traditional analyses, there has been little debate on subjecthood in OJ, and I regard what is generally treated as subject there as subject.

---

7 Anderson (1976) demonstrates that major behavior-and-control properties in most ergative languages are controlled by the notion of subject. Also, Givón (1995: 256-67) argues that even in “deep” ergative languages, the deviations from the nominative control are partial.

8 Behavioral properties are already observable in OJ. For example, reflexivization exhibits a predominant orientation to subject in Man'yōshū. Out of 26 instances of the reflexive expressions, ono ‘self’, onono-duma ‘self’s wife/husband’, and onore ‘self; you’, eleven reflexives refer to overt subjects other than the first person ‘I’, eight refer to the composers of the songs as covert subject, four refer to the first person ware ‘I’ (two cases of ware pa [I TOP], one ware mo [I too] as subject, and one ware ni [I DAT]), and one case refers to the covert second person subject in imperative. In the remaining two cases, onogata tuma ‘my wife’ itself is the subject of the song, and onore is used as the second person ‘you’.
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4.4 Constraints on GEN-marked Subjects

There are constraints on GEN-marked subjects in OJ. Most typically, *ga* and *no* are used to mark subjects in subordinate clauses, while subjects in main clauses are usually zero-marked. First, let us examine the cases in which subjects do not need to be morphologically marked.

4.4.1 Zero-marked Subjects in Main Clauses

In many instances, main clauses end with RT forms when they are emotively marked (for some extra emotion such as sorrow and exclamation) or syntactically marked by the *kakari-musubi* (focus-closure) constructions. They may also end with IZ forms to agree with a *kakari* particle *koso*. In general, however, unmarked main clauses end with SS forms (to conclude a sentence). Also, clauses ending with RY forms (for paratactic conjunction 'and') can be regarded as quasi-main clauses. In these environments, subjects do not need to be morphologically marked in OJ, although they may be marked by other particles such as *pa* [topic] and *mo* 'even; too [inclusive focus]'. Examples of clauses ending with an SS form and RY form are provided below:

(1) a. SS form

*panatidori*/*pito-me ni kwopwi te/ ike ni kaduka-zu.* (MYS 2:170)
released-bird/ person-eye LOC love Conj/ pond LOC dive-Neg(SS)
‘Longing for attention, the released bird does not dive in the pond.’

b. RY form

*yoru no simo puri/*
night GEN frost fall(RY)
‘the night frost falls, (and ...)’
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In (1a), the sentence ends with the SS form -zu [Neg], while in (1b), the clause ends with the RY form puri ‘fall’. In both cases, the subjects panati-dori ‘the released bird’ and yoru no simo ‘the night frost’ are not marked by any particles.

However, it is not that subjects in SS clauses and RY clauses must not be marked by GEN ga or no as if a prescribed syntactic rule dictates without any exceptions. It was possible that subjects in SS clauses and RY clauses were marked by GEN ga or no, and I will provide those examples later.

4.4.2 Subjects Marked by GEN ga or no

The following table presents numbers of occurrences of ga- or no-marked subjects (or subject-like NPs) in various environments in Man’yōshū:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>gen+no (total)</th>
<th>subject-gen</th>
<th>subject-no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Relative Clauses</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>169 (a)</td>
<td>427 (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 RT main clauses</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>80 (b)</td>
<td>69 (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 IZ clauses</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>21 (c)</td>
<td>111 (h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Headless RT-nominals</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ku-nominalized clauses</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MZ clauses</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29 (d)</td>
<td>33 (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 RY clauses</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6 (e)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sa-nominalized clauses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 To [Comp] clauses</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Goto/gotosi/gotoku</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SS clauses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Tutu [while] clauses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Gani clauses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mi-nominalized clauses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Unclear, GEN-rel., non-SUBJ</td>
<td>44+</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Notes]: (a) ~ made 5, ~ tame 2, ~ noti 1; (b) Kakari particle not involved 14; (c) ba 17, koso 1, ka 1, so 1, koso ba 1; (d) MZ-ba 28, MZ-pa 1; (e) RY 2, RY-te 4; (f) ~ made 23, ~ kipami 7, ~ toki 8, ~ mono 3, ~ koto 1; (g) Kakari particle not involved 12; (h) ba 104, do 3, koso 2, ka 1, IZ-a 1; (i) All MZ-ba

Table 4.1: Subject NPs marked by GEN ga or no
The table above is compiled based on Sô-sakuin data, which identify the use of GEN ga and no in marking subjects. Readings and interpretations have also been checked with Taikei and Zenshû. The numbers of occurrences may slightly differ depending on different readings, interpretations, and possibly my mistakes. Note also that in some cases ga and no are supplied in readings even when there is no Chinese character assigned to the genitive particle. Sô-sakuin does not provide information about those instances under the entries for GEN ga and no, and thus they are not included in the above table. As indicated in the notes for relative clauses above, I treated the words such as made ‘until; to that extent’, tame ‘sake’, toki ‘time’, which may be analyzed to form adverbial clauses, as head NPs in relative clauses. If both Taikei and Zenshû read assigned Chinese characters as si, instead of ga or no as suggested in Sô-sakuin, I included those examples in “unclear cases”. Also, I interpreted the use of ga or no in some examples as not marking a subject (e.g. connecting two nouns), which were also put into the last row, “GEN relation” or “non-SUBJ”.

Another thing to note is that Japanese songs (waka) basically follow a particular syllable structure for each line, most typically five lines of 5-7-5-7-7 syllables, which may have some effect on the use of particles. However, such effects can be considered negligible for the purposes of this study because there are a variety of ways used to adjust the number of syllables in a given line (e.g. word choice, structural manipulation, etc.).

A couple of initial observations about the table are: (i) both GEN ga and no may be used for subject marking in the same clausal environments, and do not exhibit peculiar distribution; and (ii) GEN-marking occurs, although not necessarily, in all kinds of subordinate clauses.

---

9 As will be mentioned at the end of Section 4.4.3.3, exact frequencies (i.e. ratios) are not obtainable. Just to provide some reference numbers without considering details (e.g. the existence of subjects), there are 47 instances of sa-nominalized clauses (at least), 420 tatu clauses, and 9 gani clauses. The ratio of GEN-marking in sa-nominalized clauses is 100 percent, if we count in the use of ga and no which is not indicated by Chinese characters.
I will provide examples below, following the clause types in the table. Most past studies of GEN *ga* and *no* in OJ provide their observations on subject marking, and some of the following examples are also mentioned in Yamada (1913), Saeki (1928), and Hashimoto (1969). Consult these studies for more examples besides the following. Or, see Appendix C, which provides all the song numbers counted in the table.

4.4.2.1 Relative Clauses

As shown in Table 4.1, relative clauses are the most common environment where we find *ga*- or *no*-marked subjects. Consider the examples below:

(2) a. NP-*ga* in a relative clause

\[ wa \, ga \, puru \, \text{s}\text{wode} \, wo \]  
I GEN wave(RT) sleeve ACC

‘the sleeve that I wave’

b. NP-*no* in a relative clause\(^{10}\)

\[ sira-tuyu \, no/ \, \text{s}\text{i}ku \, \text{nipa} \, ni \]  
white-dew GEN/ settle(RT) this garden LOC

‘in this garden, where white dews settle’

In (2a) and (2b), the subjects in the relative clauses, *wa* ‘I’ and *sira-tuyu* ‘white dews’, are marked by GEN *ga* and *no* respectively.

However, it is not that subjects in relative clauses must be marked by GEN *ga* or *no*.

Consider the example below:

(3) *Nanipa-pito*\(/

\[ \text{naniwa-person/ reed-fire burn(RT) house GEN} \]  
\[ \text{taku} \, \text{ya} \, no \]  
burn reeds’

the houses where Naniwa people burn reeds’

In (3), the subject in the relative clause, *Nanipa-pito* ‘Naniwa people’, is not morphologically marked; zero-marked subjects in relative clauses are grammatical.

---

\(^{10}\) GEN *no* can still be used to mark subjects in relative clauses in ModJ (see Chapter 1, Section 1.5.2).
4.4.2.2 RT Main Clauses (*rentai-dome*)

Main clauses may end with RT forms or IZ forms when they are in *kakari-musubi* (focus-closure) constructions (see Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2.4 for *kakari-musubi*). Also, main clauses may end with RT forms without any *kakari* particles. In this case, the RT endings are generally associated with an extra emotion (e.g. sorrow and exclamation) in their interpretation. I call these constructions "RT main clauses", including one case which exhibits the construction of [koso Pred(IZ)] (i.e. MYS 2:118). Subjects in RT main clauses are usually marked by GEN *ga* or *no*, and Table 4.1 shows that this clause type ranks second in terms of the number of occurrences.

Below are examples of RT main clauses without *kakari* particles:

(4) a. NP-*ga* in an RT main clause without a *kakari* particle

```
 pito-duma kwo-ro wo/i ki ni wa ga suru. (MYS 14:3539)
 person-wife girl-Dim ACC/breath to I GEN do(RT)
 (lit.) 'I make another's wife my breath (= life)' > 'I desperately love his wife.'
```

b. NP-*no* in an RT main clause without a *kakari* particle

```
koyopi yu kwopwi no/i ya masari-na-mu. (MYS 12:3135)
 tonight from love(N) GEN/more increase-Perf-Conjec(RT)
 '(My) longing will increase from tonight.'
```

c. NP-*no* in an RT main clause without a *kakari* particle

```
pito no tune naki. (MYS 7:1270)
 person GEN eternity lacking(RT)
 'Human beings are transitory.'
```

In (4a), (4b), and (4c), the subjects *wa* ‘I’, *kwopwi* ‘love’, and *pito* ‘person’ are marked by genitives. As for (4b), the RT form and the SS form of -mu [conjecture] are the same, but it is generally regarded as RT in this case because of the use of *no* for subject marking. In contrast, it is clear in (4a) and (4c) that the predicates take the RT forms; the SS form of ‘do’ is *su*, and that of ‘lacking’ is *nasi*.$^{11}$

$^{11}$ It is possible to regard *tune* ‘eternity’ as the subject of *naki* ‘lacking’ in (4c), but I treated *tune naki* ‘transitory’ as a complex predicate.
It is more common for a kakari particle (KP) to occur before the subject NP marked by *ga* or *no* than after the subject NP. A couple of examples are provided below:

(5) a. KP_NP-ga_RT  
   *kagiri to ya/ kimi ga ki-masa-nu.*  
   (MYS 14:3495)  
   ‘(as if this is) the end, you don’t come.’

   b. KP_NP-no_RT  
   *kwopure ba ka/ imo ga sugata no/ ime ni si miyuru.*  
   (MYS 12:2937)  
   ‘Is it because (she) longs for (me)? She appears in (my) dream.’

In (5a) and (5b), the subjects *kimi ‘you’* and *imo ga sugata ‘beloved’s image’* are marked by GEN *ga* and *no* respectively.

It is also possible for a kakari particle (KP) to occur after the subject NP (e.g. MYS 197, 1478[?topic-like], 3521, 4359). Below is one of the examples:

(6) *nagaruru midu no/ yodo ni ka ara-masi.*  
    (MYS 2:197)  
    ‘Would the flowing water stagnate?’

In (6), the subject *midu ‘water’* is marked by GEN *no*, and occurs before the kakari particle *ka* [question].

An interesting observation by Saeki (1928) is that even when there is an interrogative wh-word, the subject NP is not marked by GEN *ga* or *no* if there is no kakari particle. Compare:

(7) a. without KP  
    *idure no pi made/ are kwopwi-wora-mu.*  
    (MYS 15:3742)  
    ‘Until when will I be longing (for you)?’
b. with KP

\begin{quote}
\textit{itu made ka/ a ga kwopwi-wora-mu.}
when till KP/ I GEN love-be-Conjec(RT)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{‘Until when will I be longing (for you)?’}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(MYS 15:3749)\footnote{This song continues to the last line, \textit{toki no sira-naku} \textit{[time GEN know-Neg(Ku)]} ‘(I) don’t know the time’.}
\end{quote}

\textbf{c. without KP}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ika-ni ware se-mu.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{how I do-Vol(SS)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{‘How shall I cope?’}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(MYS 18:4046)
\end{quote}

\textbf{d. with KP}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ika-ni ka a ga se-mu.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{how KP I GEN do-Vol(RT)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{‘How is it I shall cope?’}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(MYS 5:795)
\end{quote}

In (7a) and (7c), there is no \textit{kakari} particle, and the subjects are ‘I’ and \textit{ware} ‘I’ are zero-marked. In contrast, (7b) and (7d) contain \textit{kakari} particles, and thus the clauses end with RT forms, and the subjects, a ‘I’ in both examples, are marked by GEN \textit{ga}.

Wh-words do not necessarily require agreement with RT forms or IZ forms of predicates, whereas \textit{kakari} particles do.\footnote{In general, it is difficult to find clear cases in which sentences contain wh-words while ending with SS forms for two reasons: (i) wh-words are very often used with a \textit{kakari} particle, which requires the RT or IZ ending; and (ii) wh-words are very often used with a conjectural auxiliary (e.g. -\textit{mu}, -\textit{ramu}, -\textit{kemu}) which does not distinguish its SS form from its RT form. However, Saeki (1928: 7) takes the position that wh-words do not have any effect on sentence endings. According to Zenshû (the headnote for MYS S/869), if the \textit{kakari} particle \textit{ka} [question] is not used, sentences end with SS forms, even when they contain wh-words such as \textit{tare} ‘who’, \textit{idure} ‘where’, and \textit{nani} ‘what’. Some examples include: \textit{isi wo tare mi-ki} \textit{[stone ACC who see-Evi(SS)]} ‘who saw the stone?’ (cf. \textit{-si} \textit{[Evi(RT)]}) (MYS 5/869); \textit{tare kiki-tu} \textit{[who hear-PerffSS]} ‘who heard (it)?’ (cf. \textit{-turu} \textit{[PerffRT]})) (MYS 8/1562); \textit{Umone pana/ itu pa ora-zî to/ itopa-ne do/ saki no sakari pa/ wosiki mono nari} \textit{[plum GEN blossom/ when TOP break(MZ)-Neg(SS) Comp/hate(MZ)-Neg(IZ) Conj/ blooming GEN peak TOP/ regrettable(RT) thing COP(SS)]} ‘Plum blossoms, although (I) don’t (necessarily) decide when not to break (their branches), the peak of bloom is a regrettable thing (if I break them)’ (MYS 17/3904); \textit{koto no fa/ no/ fukaki pa ika ni/ afare nari-keri} \textit{[word GEN leaf GEN/ deep(RT) TOP how LOC/ affect COP(RY)-Evi(SS)]} ‘How moving (it) is that the words (of love) are deep!’ (Gosen 600, 951 A.D.).} The observation above can be regarded as one piece of evidence that GEN-marked subjects are attributable to particular states of clauses, namely, in this case, RT forms.
However, again, it is not that zero-marked subjects in *kakari-musubi* (focus-closure) constructions result in ungrammatical sentences. There are some cases in which subjects are zero-marked in these constructions (e.g. MYS 231, 290, 1491, 4489):

(8) *paru wo tikami ka.../ koyopi no tuku-yo kasumi-taru-ramu.*

spring ACC close(Mi) KP.../ tonight GEN moon-night grow.hazy-Res-Conj(RT)

'is it because spring is close, that the moon tonight is hazy?'  (MYS 20:4489)

In (8), the subject *tuku-yo* ('moon' itself in this case, instead of 'the moon night') is not marked by any particle.

4.4.2.3 IZ Clauses

IZ clauses may be followed by various particles or even zero. Regardless of those particle uses, subjects in IZ clauses are generally marked by GEN *ga* or *no*. In Table 4.1, IZ clauses rank third.

The conjunctive particle *ba* is perhaps most commonly used after IZ clauses, and [IZ *ba*] means 'because ...' or 'when ...'. Consider the examples below:

(9) a. NP-*ga_IZ ba*

*wa ga kogi-yuke ba*  
'I GEN row-go(IZ) Conj

'when I row and go, ...'

b. NP-*no_IZ ba*

*yuki no pure-re ba*  
'snow GEN fall-Res(IZ) Conj

'since the snow has fallen, ...'

In both (9a) and (9b), the subjects *wa* 'I' and *yuki* 'snow' are marked by genitives.
IZ clauses may also be followed by other particles, such as do [antithetical], koso [KP], so [KP], and ka [question], or even zero, although these examples are rather few (see Appendix C):

(10)  a. NP-ga_IZ koso

wa ga sekwo ga/ kaku kwopure koso  (MYS 4:639)
   I  GEN lover  GEN/ like.this love(IZ) KP
   ‘since my lover thinks of (me) this much, ...’

b. NP-ga_IZ ka

wagimokwo ga/ ika-ni omope ka  (MYS 15:3647)
   my.lover  GEN/ how think.of KP
   ‘It is because of how my lover thinks of (me), (I wonder) that ...?’

c. NP-no_IZ ø

pi-tukwi no/ maneku nari-nure  (MYS 2:167)
   day-month GEN/ many become-Perf(IZ)
   ‘since many days and months passed, ...’

In (10a), the subject wa ga sekwo ‘my lover’ is marked by GEN ga. Similarly, wagimokwo ‘my lover’ in (10b) and pi-tukwi ‘days and months’ in (10c) are marked by GEN ga and no respectively.

Again, we can also observe zero-marked subjects in IZ clauses; it is not that they must be marked by GEN ga or no (e.g. MYS 135, 1009, 1263, 2308, 3673):

(11)  a. ame pure ba  (MYS 10:2308)
   rain fall(IZ) Conj
   ‘when the rain falls, ...’

b. yo-garasu nake do  (MYS 7:1263)
   night-crow caw(IZ) Conj
   ‘although the night crow is cawing, ...’

c. iri-pi sasi-nure  (MYS 2:135)
   enter-sun shine.in-Perf(IZ)
   ‘since the setting sun shone in, ...’

In the examples above, none of the subjects is marked by any particle.
4.4.2.4 Headless RT-nominals

In OJ (as well as in MJ), RT forms can be used as nominal constituents without a following head NP. In these nominalized clauses, subjects are usually marked by GEN ga or no. This clause type ranks fourth in Table 4.1. Consider the examples below:

(12) a. NP-ga in Headless RT-nominal
kimiga katiyori/nadumi-yuku mire ba, (MYS 13:3316)
you GEN walking by/ trouble(Vi)-go(RT) see(IZ) Conj
‘when (I) see you are troubled to go on foot, ...’

b. NP-no in Headless RT-nominal
yo no pito no/kwopwi ni sina-mu wo/
world GEN person GEN/ love LOC die-Conjec(RT) ACC/
ika-ni seyo to so
how do(MR) Comp KP
‘What (do you say) I (= a person in this world) should do, dying because of love?’

In both examples, the nominalized clauses *kimiga katiyori/nadumi-yuku* ‘(the situation) that you are troubled to go on foot’ and *yo no pito no/kwopwi ni sina-mu* ‘(the situation) that I (= a person in this world) am dying because of love’ function as direct objects of the verbs *mi-* ‘see’ and *s-* ‘do’. In these clauses, the subjects *kimi* ‘you’ and *yo no pito* ‘a person in this world (= I)’ are marked by GEN ga and no respectively.

These are often called “head-internal relative clauses” (HIRCs) or “internally headed relative clauses”, because, as indicated in English translations, what is seen or taken action on is considered to be *kimi* ‘you’ and *yo no pito* ‘a person in this world (= I)’, which are located inside the RT clauses. In other words, the subject NPs in the RT clauses *kimi* and *yo no pito* are thought to function as the semantic heads in these relative clauses.  

14 It is not always the case that the subject NP is the semantic head of HIRCs; the object NP can also be the semantic head. See Kuroda (1992 [1974-77]), who uses the term “pivot-independent relative clauses”, for HIRCs in Japanese. HIRCs in Japanese seem to be most widely discussed in the Chomskyan framework (e.g. Hoshi 1995). For HIRCs in classical Japanese, see Kaiser (1991). Also, see Comrie (1989: 145-46), for example, for languages which have HIRCs.
However, we cannot regard all headless RT-nominals as internally headed relative clauses. For example, they are very often followed by LOC ni, which leads to various interpretations, such as 'when ...' and 'because ...':

(13) a. NP-ga_RT-ni
   omopu kwo ga/ koromo sura-mu ni
   think.of girl GEN/ clothes dye-Vol(RT) LOC
   'because (my) loving girl wants to dye clothes, ...'

b. NP-ga_RT-ni
   wa ga piraka-mu ni
   I GEN open-Vol(RT) LOC
   'when I open (the door), ...'

c. NP-no_RT-ni
   paru-same no/ sikutaku puru ni
   spring-rain GEN/ continuously fall(RT) LOC
   '(now,) when spring rain continuously falls, ...'

In these cases as well, the subjects are marked by the genitive particles, i.e. omopu kwo ga [love girl GEN], wa ga [I GEN], and paru-same no [spring-rain GEN].

In some examples, the particle nape follows the RT forms in the headless RT-nominals (see Appendix C). This could be a very intriguing use. The sequence [RT nape] entails time-related notions, such as continuity and simultaneousness, meaning 'while ...', 'as ...', or 'as soon as ...':

(14) a. NP-ga_RT nape
   wa ga sekwo ga/ koto torn nape ni
   I GEN buddy GEN/ koto grab nape LOC
   'as soon as my buddy grabs the koto (Japanese harp), ...'

b. NP-no_RT nape
   tadu ga ne no/ kyesa naku nape ni
   crane GEN gaggling GEN/ this.morning gaggle(RT) nape LOC
   'while cranes gaggled this morning, ...'

15 It is also possible that RT-ni clauses are HIRCs, e.g. kimi ga aruku ni/ niru pito mo ape ya [lord GEN commute(RT) LOC/ resemble person even see(IZ) SFP] '(I) cannot even see a person who looks like (my lord) who were commuting (to her place) (MYS 3:425).
According to Ōno S. et al. (1974), *nape* was derived from *na upe* [GEN above]. Thus, the time-related notions came from the spatial notion 'on top of...'. This seems to be phonologically and semantically plausible. In Chapter 2, I have argued that GEN *na* is an older form of GEN *no*. If these analyses are correct, [RT *nape*] means that RT forms could be marked by GEN *na* (> *no*), despite the common belief that only GEN *ga* could mark RT forms. This could be another piece of evidence that the determining process of the distribution of GEN *ga* and *no* involved a competition in language use. In other words, it was not solely determined by linguistic features of the particles.

Also, zero-marked subjects in headless RT-nominals do not make sentences ungrammatical. Consider the examples below:

(15) a. **toki tu kaze/ kumo-wi ni puku ni** (MYS 2:220)
    time GEN wind/ cloud-place.of.being LOC blow(RT) LOC
    'since a gust of wind blows in the sky, ...'

    b. **ume no pana/ saka-nu ga siro ni** (MYS 8:1642)
    plum GEN blossom/bloom-Neg(RT) GEN substitute LOC
    'as a substitute for (the fact that) plum blossoms do not bloom, ...'

In (15a) and (15b), *toki tu kaze* 'a gust of wind' and *ume no pana* 'plum blossoms' are the subjects, and they are not marked by any particles.

4.4.2.5 *Ku*-nominalized Clauses

Subjects are also generally marked by GEN *ga* or *no* in *ku*-nominalized clauses, which ranks fifth in Table 4.1.

(16) a. NP-*ga_Ku*

    **kyesiki kokoro wo/ a ga mopa-naku ni** (MYS 14:3482)
    unfaithful mind ACC/ I GEN think-Neg(Ku) LOC
    (lit.) 'although I don’t think (about) unfaithful mind.' > 'although I don’t have unfaithful mind.'
In (16a), a ‘I’, which is marked by GEN ga, is the subject of the ku-nominalized predicate mopa-naku [think-Neg(Ku)]. In (16b), iswo no kusa-ne ‘the grass on the beach’, which is marked by GEN no, is the subject of the ku-nominalized predicate kare-maku [wither-Conjec(Ku)].

Similarly to the other environments, subjects in ku-nominalized clauses do not need to be marked by GEN ga or no (e.g. MYS 824, 1761, 1870, 2121):

(17)  a. ume no pana/ tira-maku wosimi  (MYS 5:824)
   plum GEN blossom/ fall-Conjec(Ku) feel.sorry(Vt/RY)
   ‘Feeling sorry that plum blossoms fall, ...’
   b. asa-duku-yo/ ake-maku wosimi  (MYS 9:1761)
   morning-moon-night/ break-Conjec(Ku) feel.sorry(Vt/RY)
   ‘Feeling sorry that dawn with the moon breaks, ...’

In (17a) and (17b), the subjects ume no pana ‘plum blossoms’ and asa-duku-yo ‘dawn with the moon’ are zero-marked.

4.4.2.6 MZ Clauses

MZ clauses are generally followed by the particle ba, and form hypothetical or conditional clauses about future events. In this environment as well, subjects are generally marked by GEN ga or no:

(18)  a. NP-ga_MZ
   kimi ga kaye-ina ba  (MYS 9:1778)
   you GEN go.over-disappear(MZ) Conj
   ‘if you leave (going over the mountain), ...’
In (18a) and (18b), the subjects *kimi* ‘you’ and *kwopwi* ‘love’ are marked by GEN *ga* and *no* respectively.

Again, GEN-marking of subjects in MZ clauses is not a strict syntactic rule; there are some examples in which subjects are zero-marked:

(19) a. *paru sara ba*  
    spring come(MZ) Conj  
    ‘when spring comes, ...’

b. *toki sugi-yuka ba*  
    time pass-go(MZ) Conj  
    ‘when the time passes by, ...’

In the MZ clauses in (19a) and (19b), the subjects *paru* ‘spring’ and *toki* ‘time’ are not marked by any particles.

4.4.2.7 RY Clauses

As explained in Chapter 1 (Section 1.4.2.1), RY forms are used before other verbs or aspectual suffixes, or before another clause, functioning as paratactic ‘and’ with or without the conjunctive particle *te*. I categorize clauses in this paratactic use as RY clauses. As explained in Section 4.4.1, paratactic RY clauses can be regarded as quasi-main clauses, and their subjects generally do not exhibit GEN-marking. If we consider the frequency

---

16 In fact, calling the inflectional form *ren yōkei* “infinitive” (e.g. Martin 1987) is rather problematic, since aspectual suffixes also have “infinitive” forms. That is, RY clauses can be aspectually marked (i.e. aspectually not subordinate to other clauses), as in *nadusapi-ki-ni te* [float(RY)-come(RY)-Perf(RY) Conj] ‘(I) have come floating (on the water), and ...’ (MYS 3691). Because of this problem, I prefer using “RY forms” instead of “infinitive forms”.
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of RY clauses, 47 occurrences of GEN-marked subjects are rather few. Nonetheless, we can find GEN-marked subjects in RY clauses:

(20) a. NP-ga_RY

\[ \text{kimi ga omopoe te/ nageki pa yama-zu.} \]  
\[ \text{you GEN come.to.mind(RY) Conj/ grief TOP stop-Neg(SS)} \]  
\[ \text{‘You come up in my mind, and (my) grief does not stop.’} \]

b. NP-no_RY

\[ \text{awa-yuki no/ nipa ni puri-siki/.../} \]  
foam-snow GEN/ garden LOC fall-spread(RY)/.../  
\[ \text{pitori ka mo ne-mu.} \]  
alone KP even sleep-Conjec(RT)  
\[ \text{‘The foamy (= transitory) snow falls and spreads on the garden, and perhaps I sleep alone.’} \]

In (20a) and (20b), the subjects are marked by genitives, as in \text{kimi ga} [you GEN] and \text{awa-yuki no} [foam-snow GEN], and the clauses end with RY forms, i.e. \text{omopoe te} [come.to.mind(RY) Conj] and \text{puri-siki} [fall-spread(RY)]. If we consider semantic relationships, the first clause in (20a), \text{kimi ga omopoe te ‘You come up in my mind,’} can be regarded as a cause of the second clause, \text{nageki pa yama-zu ‘(my) grief does not stop.’} In (20b), the two events, snow covering the garden and the author sleeping alone, make a contrast. As suggested in English translations, however, it is generally thought that RY forms function as neutral conjunction ‘and’, and that they do not indicate a subordinate relationship. To a large degree, this analysis seems appropriate. But to the extent that the conjunctive function is a part of the verb morphology in RY clauses (i.e. \text{[X(RY), Y]}, in which X and Y are coordinated clauses), the dependency of RY clauses on another clause (i.e. subordination) seems higher than the case of \text{and}-coordination in English (i.e. \text{[X, and Y]}, in which X is free from the conjunctive morphology).
In past studies, RY clauses have not been regarded as a typical environment where we find \textit{ga-} or \textit{no-} marked subjects, and it is easier to find zero-marked subjects in this environment:

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{yama no ma ni/ ugupisu naki te} mountain GEN space LOC/ Japanese.nightingale warble(RY) Conj
  ‘In the mountains, a Japanese nightingale warbles, and ...’ (MYS 10:1837)
\item b. \textit{yama-bwi ni pa/ sakura-bana tiri} mountain-surrounding LOC TOP/ cherry-blossom fall(RY)
  ‘Around the mountains, cherry blossoms fall, and ...’ (MYS 17:3973)
\end{enumerate}

In (21a) and (21b), the subjects \textit{ugupisu} ‘Japanese nightingale’ and \textit{sakura-bana} ‘cherry blossoms’ are not marked by any particles in RY clauses.

4.4.2.8 \textit{Sa}-nominalized Clauses

The suffix -\textit{sa} nominalizes adjectives, and they are always preceded by NP-\textit{ga/no} in \textit{Man'yōshū}, i.e. [NP-\textit{ga/no} Adj(Stem)-\textit{sa}]. Yamada (1936) regards this construction as one of \textit{kantai-ku} (exclamatory nominal clauses), which express a strong emotion (e.g. exclamation or sorrow). Below are a couple of examples:

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. NP-\textit{ga Adj-sa}
  \textit{yuku ga kanasi-sa} (MYS 20:4338)
  go(RT) GEN sad(Stem)-NMZ
  ‘The sorrow of going!’ > ‘How sad it is to go!’
\item b. NP-\textit{no Adj-sa}
  \textit{oto no paruke-sa} (MYS 10:1952)
  sound GEN remote(Root)-NMZ
  ‘The remoteness of the sound!’ > ‘How far off the sound is!’
\end{enumerate}

In (22a), \textit{yuku ga kanasi-sa} is literally ‘The sorrow of going!’; but if we interpret \textit{yuku ga [go(RT) GEN]} as a subject, it is equivalent to ‘How sad going is!’ in English, cf. also
The sadness of it! Similarly, oto no [sound GEN] in (22b) can be regarded as a subject as in ‘How far off the sound is!’.

The treatment of NP-ga/no in this construction varies depending on scholars. Yamada (1913) seems undetermined on this point; in his relevant discussion, he uses two terms, shugo (subject) and shutai (main entity), but he never calls it shugo (subject). Kazama (1970) regards ga/no in this construction as formally (keishiki-teki ni wa) genitive but semantically (imi-teki ni wa) nominative, although there is some confusion in his terminology, as explained in Section 4.2. While recognizing that the sa-nominalized construction is one of the structures which promoted ga to become a nominative particle, Ōno S. (1977a) and Sakanashi (1987) do not regard these NP-ga/no as subjects at this stage. In contrast, Hashimoto (1969) regard them as subjects.

Regardless of their claims, these past studies do no include a discussion about the distribution of sa-nominals. As far as 12 types of sa-nominals which I found in Man'yōshū are concerned, namely, kanasi-sa ‘sorrow’ (10 examples), paruke-sa ‘remoteness’ (3 examples), sabusi-sa ‘loneliness’ (3 examples), kurusi-sa ‘anguish(N)’ (4 examples), tomosi-sa ‘envy(N)’ (6 examples), sube-nasa (or sube no nasa) ‘helplessness’ (4 examples), sayake-sa ‘clearness’ (9 examples), yo-sa ‘goodness’ (2 examples), taputwo-sa ‘preciousness’ (3 examples), yorosi-sa ‘goodness’ (1 example), tanosi-sa ‘delight’ (1 example), and kupasi-sa ‘delicate beauty’ (1 example), they are all used in a construction of [NP GEN Adj(Root)-sa], which serves as a complete sentence. Although this observation is limited to verse, sa-nominals are not found in any other environments where common nouns can occur (e.g. subject, object, topic, or any postpositional phrase).\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{17}\)Unlike in OJ, those sa-nominals can be used as common nouns in ModJ; they can be, for example, a subject or an object in a sentence.
In this sense, it can be argued that sa-nominals are used only for predicating the preceding NP-\textit{ga} or NP-\textit{no} as a subject in OJ.

4.4.2.9 \textit{To [Comp]} Clauses

We can also find subject NPs marked by GEN \textit{ga} or \textit{no} in complement clauses headed by \textit{to [Comp]}, although there are only 29 examples of such cases in \textit{Man’yōshū}. See examples below:

(23) a. NP-\textit{ga_to [Comp]}

\begin{verbatim}
na ga ku to omope ba
you GEN come Comp think(IZ) Conj
’since (I) think that you (will) come, …’
\end{verbatim}

b. NP-\textit{no_to [Comp]}

\begin{verbatim}
itu si ka mo/ kono yo no ake-mu to/ samorapu ni
when Emph KP even/ this night GEN break-Conj Comp/ wait(RT) LOC
’while waiting (thinking that) when this night breaks, …’
\end{verbatim}

In (23a), the subject \textit{na} ‘you’ is marked by GEN \textit{ga} in the \textit{to}-complement clause.

Likewise, \textit{kono yo} ‘this night’ in (23b) is marked by GEN \textit{no}, which serves as the subject for \textit{ake-mu} [break-Conj] in the \textit{to}-complement clause.

Similarly to the other environments, subjects in \textit{to}-complement clauses may not be marked by GEN \textit{ga} or \textit{no}. See examples below:

(24) a. \textit{kuni sakaye-mu to/ tukwi pa teru-rasi}

\begin{verbatim}
country prosper-Conj Comp/ moon TOP shine-Conj
’suggesting) that the country will prosper, perhaps, the moon shines.’
\end{verbatim}

b. \textit{ume no pana/ saki te tiri-nu to/ pito pa ipe do}

\begin{verbatim}
plum GEN blossom/ bloom Conj fall-Perf Comp/ person TOP say(IZ) Conj
’although people say that the plum blossoms bloomed and fell, …’
\end{verbatim}
In (24a) and (24b), the subjects *kuni* ‘country’ and *ume no pana* ‘plum blossoms’ are zero-marked in the to-clauses.

4.4.2.10 *Goto/gotosi/gotoku*

The use of genitive in [NP GEN *goto*] (e.g. *pana no goto* [flower GEN like] ‘like flowers’ MYS 9:1807) is regarded as connecting two nominals, and of course it is not counted in for subject marking. What is counted in this clause type is a possible subject-marking genitive in [NP GEN Pred(RT) (ga) *goto*]. As seen in this structure, it is essentially a headless RT-nominal followed by (ga) *goto* [(GEN) like], but I have set up a separate category since they are noticeable and often mentioned in past studies. It does not affect the overall ranking for the clause type of headless RT-nominals in Table 4.1. Below are a pair of examples:

(25)  

a. NP-ga_RT *gotosi*  

*sika ipu kimi ga/ pigu naki gotosi.*  

so say you GEN/ beard lacking(RT) like  

‘(It is) just like you, who say so, do not have a beard.’

b. NP-no_RT-ga *goto*  

*wataru pi no/ kure-nuru ga goto*  

cross sun GEN/ set-Perf(RT) GEN like  

‘like the crossing sun is setting,...’

In the data for this clause type, (25a) is the only example which contains NP-ga, but the subjecheidt in this example is not straightforward. Syntactically speaking, the subject of *naki* ‘lacking’ is *pipe* ‘beard’, which is zero-marked. The *ga*-marked NP, *kimi* ‘you’, is an

---

18 Hashimoto (1969: 85) argues that an adverb-forming morpheme *goto* ‘like; similarly to’, which can also be used as an adjective root, was derived from a nominal *koto* ‘being the same’. Ōno S. et al. (1974) takes the same view, cf. *koto sake ba* [same separate(MZ) Conj] ‘if being separated anyway (< the same),...’ (MYS 7:1402); *koto pura ba* [same fall(MZ) Conj] ‘if it snows anyway,...’ (MYS 10:2317).
entity to which the beard belongs; it is a possessor. Thus, some subjecthood is shared by

kimi. In (25b), the subject, wataru pi ‘the crossing sun’, is marked by GEN no.

For zero-marked subjects in headless RT-nominals, see (15a) and (15b) above.

4.4.2.11 SS Clauses

As explained in Section 4.4.1, unmarked main clauses end with SS forms, and

subjects need not be marked by any particles. In past studies, main clauses ending with SS
forms are generally regarded as an environment where we do not expect ga- or no-marked
subjects. I found 12 such cases at most in Man'yôshû, which include some ambiguous or
suspicious cases (see Appendix C). Most of the 12 examples do not end with SS forms
alone, but are accompanied by a sentence final particle (SFP), either mo [exclamation] or ya
[question]. Consider the examples below:

(26)  a. NP-ga_SS

kimi ga  topa-su mo
you GEN ask-Hon Excl
‘You ask!’

b. NP-no_SS

kumo no/ kakusa-pu-besi ya
cloud GEN/ hide-Repetition-should(SS) Q
‘Should the clouds hide (the mountain)?’

In these examples, the subjects kimi ‘you’ and kumo ‘cloud’ are marked by GEN ga and

no respectively. Because of the addition of SFPs to SS clauses, these sentences can be

regarded as more marked than simple SS-ending sentences.20

19 The suffix -pu, inflecting in yodan (quadrigrade), makes verbs repetitive or continuative. According to
Ôno S. et al. (1974), it came from the verb ap- ‘coincide’, which was attached to RY forms of verbs. Thus,
kakusa-pu [hide-REPEAT] was in fact derived from kakusi-apu.

20 Givon (1979: 45-90) argues for the privileged status of the main, declarative, affirmative, active sentence
as the “basic”, “neutral” pattern, from the viewpoint of discourse presupposition. Due to the use of SFP
mo (exclamatory mood) and ya (interrogative mood), (26a) and (26b) are different from simple declarative
sentences.
Except for ambiguous cases, there is only one example which contains a GEN-marked subject and ends with an SS form alone. See the example below:

(27) sena no (kimi/mikoto) ga swode mo/ saya-ni pura-si-tu. (MYS 14:3402)  
husband Pro-GEN GEN sleeve even/ clearly wave-Hon-Perf(SS)  
'My husband clearly waved a sleeve.'

In this example, the subject sena no seems to have been reduced from sena no kimi [husband GEN lord] or sena no mikoto [husband GEN honorable.person]. Thus, no in sena no can be regarded as Pro-GEN (pronominal genitive), which combines the function of genitive and a pronominal for the omitted noun, cf. watasi no kuruma [I GEN car] 'my car' vs. watasi no [I Pro-GEN] 'mine'. The second genitive, ga, marks sena no 'my husband', and the sentence ends with the SS form of the perfective -tu.

SFP mo [exclamation] and ya [question] do not necessarily require GEN-marking of subjects. See examples below:

(28) a. ipye kwopu-rasi mo. (MYS 3:364)  
house think.of-Conjec(SS) Excl  
'My family seems to be thinking of (me).'

b. tadu naku-besi ya. (MYS 1:71)  
crane cry-Should(SS) Q  
'Should cranes cry?'

These sentences end with [SS mo/ya], but the subjects ipye 'house > family' and tadu 'crane' are not marked by any particles.

4.4.2.12 Tutu [while] Clauses

We can also find ga- or no-marked subjects in tutu clauses (see Appendix C for details), although examples of such cases are rather limited in the OJ data. The conjunctive particle tutu follows the RY forms of verbs, and generally forms adverbial clauses, which
most typically function as 'while repeatedly ...' (e.g. MYS 3978) and 'while simultaneously ...
(e.g. MYS 4150). In some cases, tutu clauses may function as quasi-main clauses, meaning 'repeatedly ...' or 'continuously ...' with some emotive sense (e.g. exclamation or sorrow). According to Taikei (see the note for MYS 1446), subjects are generally marked
by pa [topic] when clauses end with tutu alone, whereas they are marked by GEN no when clauses end with tutu motona [Conj thoughtlessly]. Both the adverbial use and the main-clause use with GEN-marked subjects are illustrated in (29) below:

(29) a. NP-ga_RY tutu

aka-gwoma ga/ kadwode wo si tutu                     (MYS 14:3534)21
red-horse GEN/ leaving ACC do(RY) while
'through the chestnut horse is leaving, ...

b. NP-no_RY tutu

pura namu yuki no/ swora ni ke-ni tutu.       (MYS 10:2317)22
fall SFP(wish) snow GEN/ sky LOC fade-Perf(RY) repeatedly
'The snow, which (I) want to fall, is fading in the sky.'

In (29a) and (29b), the subjects aka-gwoma 'chestnut (horse)' and yuki 'snow' are marked
by GEN ga and no in the tutu clauses.

Subjects are very often not overtly expressed in tutu clauses, but we can observe
zero-marked subjects in some cases. See examples below:

(30) a. momiti tiri tutu
red.leaves fall(RY) Conj
'Red leaves are falling, and ...'

---

21 This example is rather ambiguous. The whole song goes as follows: Aka-gwoma ga/ kadwode wo si tutu/ ide-kate-ni/-se-si wo mi-tate-si/ ipye no kwo-ro pa mo [red-horse GEN/ leaving ACC do(RY) while/ leave-can-Neg(RY)/ -do-Evi(RT) ACC see.of-Evi(RT)/ home GEN lover-Dim SFP SFP] (MYS 14:3534). Taikei interprets aka-gwoma ga kadwode as an NP 'the leaving on the chestnut'. Zenshû analyzes that aka-gwoma ga is not the subject for si tutu [do while] in the second line, but the subject for ide-kate-ni-se-si [leave-can-Neg-do-Evi]. Projecting the author's act of leaving to his horse's, it seems possible to regard aka-gwoma ga as the subject for si tutu, which, I think, is the most straightforward interpretation.

22 The particle namu is usually regarded as a sentence-final particle to express a wish. According to Zenshû, the predication is once ended with namu in this song, but namu is also treated as a sort of adnominal form.
b. *kimi ki-masi* *tutu* *kazasi-tari-kyeri.* (MYS 20:4302)
   *you* *come-Hon(RY) Conj* *wear.a.hairpin-Res-Evi(SS)*
   ‘You often come, and wear (it: *yamabuki*) as a hairpin.’

In (30a) and (30b), the subjects *momiti* ‘red leaves’ and *kimi* ‘you’ are not marked by any particles; neither GEN-marking by *ga* or *no*, nor TOP-marking by *pa* is required for a *tutu* clause to be grammatical.

4.4.2.13 Gani Clauses

The particle *gani* follows SS forms of verbs, and forms adverbial clauses, meaning ‘to the extent that ...’ or ‘almost as if ...’. To my knowledge, this construction has not been discussed in past studies, but *no*-marked subjects are observable in this environment. There is no *ga*-marked subjects in *gani* clauses in *Man’yōshū*. See an example below:

(31) ... *pototogisu*/*ima koso ba/ kowe no karu gani/ Japanese.nightingale/now KP Emph/voice GEN get.hoarse gani/
    *ki naki toyome-me.* (MYS 10:1951)
    come warble sound(Vt/MZ)-Conjec(IZ)
    ‘Now, (I wish) a Japanese nightingale comes, sings, and makes it resound, as much as (its) voice gets hoarse.’

The subject of the main clause is *pototogisu* ‘a Japanese nightingale’, which is zero-marked despite the IZ-ending *toyome-me* [sound(Vt/MZ)-Conjec(IZ)], whereas the subject of the adverbial clause is *kowe* ‘voice’, which is marked by GEN *no*. In the adverbial clause, the verb *karu* ‘get hoarse’ takes its SS form. Therefore, it is not that SS forms should agree with zero-marking of subjects as usually observed (see Section 4.4.2.11).
There are only nine examples of *gani* clauses in *Man'yōshū*, and there is no instance in which a subject is overt and zero-marked.23

4.4.2.14 *Mi*-nominalized Clauses

The suffix *-mi* is attached to an adjective root, and generally forms a nominal, referring to a place associated with the property described by the adjective, e.g. *sige-mi* [thick(Root)-mi] ‘thicket’ (MYS 17:3969). In another usage, however, *mi*-nominalized adjectives still exhibit predication, plus a conjunctive function. In most cases, it is used in a reason or causal conjunction, e.g. *miyakwo wo topo-mi* [capital ACC far(Root)-mi] ‘since the capital is far’ (MYS 1:51). In some cases, however, it appears that it may be used in a neutral conjunction, e.g. *yama taka-mi/kapa toposirosi/ nwo wo piro-mi* [mountain high(Root)-mi/ river magnificent/ field ACC wide(Root)-mi] ‘the mountain is high, the river is magnificent, the field is spacious, and ...’ (MYS 17:4011).

As seen in MYS 51 and 4011 above, it is interesting to note that subject-like NPs in *mi*-clauses are very often marked by ACC wo (e.g. MYS 44, 321, 767, 980, 981, 1058). Also, those NPs are very often zero-marked. There are only two examples which seem to contain *ga-* or *no-*marked subjects (or subject-like NPs) in *mi*-clauses in *Man'yōshū*. See examples below:

(32) a. NP-*ga_mii*  
*pane-kadura/* imaa suru imo ga/ urawaka-mi  (MYS 11:2627)  
feather-hair.ornament/ now do beloved GEN/ innocent(Root)-mi  
‘since (my) beloved, who now wears a feather hair ornament, is innocent, ...’

---

23 There is another particle *gane*, which is regarded as a morpheme different from *gani* (Ôno et al. 1974). It follows RT forms of verbs, and expresses conjecture or forms a purpose clause, meaning ‘in order to ...’. The particle *gane* takes the form of *gani* in eastern dialects, but they are not counted as *gani* clauses. In *Man'yōshū*, there is no example in which a genitive particle indicated by a Chinese character marks a subject in *gane* clauses.
b. NP-no_mi

Yosino-gapa/ yuku se no paya-mi  
Yoshino-river/ go(RT) shallow GEN fast(Root)-mi
‘Yoshino River, the running shallows are fast, so...’

In (32a) and (32b), the subjects imo ‘beloved’ and se ‘shallow’ are marked by GEN ga and no respectively.

As mentioned above, subjects in mi-clauses are very often zero-marked (e.g. MYS 861, 1005, 1342, 1722, 2616, 3646). See examples below:

(33) a. Matura-gapa/ kapa no se paya-mi  
Matsura-river/ river GEN shallow fast(Root)-mi
‘Matsura River, since its shallows are rapid, ...’

b. Yosino no miya pa/ yama taka-mi  
Yoshino GEN palace TOP/ mountain high(Root)-mi
‘As for the Yoshino palace, since the mountain is high, ...’

In (33a) and (33b), the subjects se ‘shallow’ and yama ‘mountain’ are zero-marked.

4.4.3 Syntactic Rule or Tendency?

4.4.3.1 Findings

I have presented above a comprehensive list of environments where we can observe GEN-marked subjects in Man'yôshû. When facing zero-marked subjects and GEN-marked subjects, it is natural to ask what motivates GEN-marking of subjects. One general explanation in past studies has been that the GEN-marking is to distinguish subjects in subordinate clauses from those in main clauses (e.g. Akiba 1978: 118; Sakanashi 1987: 37, 58). Apparently, this claim came from the fact that relative clauses are the most noticeable

24 Both Taikei and Zenshû treat paya-mi [fast(Root)-mi] in this song as a noun ‘rapids’, but it is used in most cases as mi-clauses (i.e. adjective predication plus conjunctive) in Man’yôshû. This interpretation seems plausible for this song as well, i.e. Yosino-gapa/ yuku se no paya-mi/ simasiku mo/ yodomu koto naku/ ari-kose nukamo [Yoshino-river/ go(RT) shallow GEN fast(Root)-mi/ little even/ stagnate(RT) fact lacking(RY)/ be-give(MZ) SFP(wish < nu ka mo [Neg Q Excl]) ‘Yoshino River, its shallows are rapid, and (just like that) even for a little, (I) wish (our relationship) is without a stagnation’ (MYS 2:119).
environment where we find GEN-marked subjects. However, it should be said that this account is too simplistic and prescriptive, since it fails to consider the actual overall distribution of GEN-marked subjects.

There are several findings from the data in the previous section, i.e. two major findings which seem crosslinguistically significant, and two more findings that are specifically relevant to OJ.

First, GEN-marking of subjects is observable in all types of clauses in *Man'yoshū*, except for imperative clauses. As mentioned, it has generally been thought that GEN-marking of subjects is limited to subordinate clauses, but the data suggest that we cannot attribute the GEN-marking to a distinction between main clauses and subordinate clauses. Among the environments where we find GEN-marked subjects, RT main clauses (*rentai dome*) and *sa*-nominalized clauses are always main clauses. Also, *tutu* clauses can be main clauses. Even in SS clauses, we find GEN-marked subjects. As seen in Table 4.1, there are not many examples of GEN-marking in *tutu* clauses and SS clauses, but RT main clauses are ranked second, and we find more examples of GEN-marked subjects in RT main clauses than in IZ clauses or headless RT-nominals. Overall, less than 16 percent of GEN-marked subjects occur in main clauses, but we cannot simply conclude that subordination makes genitives mark subjects.

Second, we cannot regard any environments as purely structural constraints, which always induce GEN-marking of subjects. As shown in the previous section, zero-marked

---

25 *Japanese employs head-final relative clauses without any relative pronouns, and the subject NP in the main clause and that of a relative clause may occur next to each other, e.g. [SUBJ [SUBJ V] NP V]. In practice, however, argument NPs need not be overt in Japanese, and subject NPs should very often be understood by the honorific system and/or contexts; two subject NPs do not commonly occur next to each other. Also, if we want to avoid the confusion between two subject NPs, the word-order of [[SUBJ V] NP SUBJ V] is possible.

26 As seen in the previous section, SS clauses do not include *gani* clauses, which take the form of [SS *gani*] but make subordinate clauses.
subjects may occur in all of those environments. Therefore, it seems more appropriate to regard GEN-marking of subjects as a tendency and scalar matter (i.e. frequency, degree) than as a clear-cut syntactic rule, such as the *kakari-musubi* (focus-closure) agreement.

Third, *ga-*marked subjects and *no-*marked subjects are observable in the same environments except for *gani* clauses, which are very limited in number and thus we cannot regard them as a legitimate constraint. In other words, GEN *ga* and *no* for subject marking do not exhibit peculiar (complementary kind of) distribution in terms of various clause types.

Fourth, we cannot attribute GEN-marking of subjects to particular inflectional forms of predicates. RT forms are the dominant single category; about 64% of GEN-marked subjects occur in clauses ending with RT forms (i.e. relative clauses, RT main clauses, headless RT-nominals, and *goto* clauses). However, we also find GEN-marked subjects in clauses ending with MZ (about 4.7%), RY (about 4.2%: RY clauses and *tutu* clauses), SS (about 1.2%: SS clauses and *gani* clauses), and IZ forms (about 10%).

4.4.3.2 GEN-marking and Crosslinguistic Data

Still the remaining question is, under what principle does the GEN-marking tendency operate? Crosslinguistic studies are suggestive on this point. GEN-marked subjects are not peculiar to OJ. For example, Turkish, Yaqui (an Indian language observable for example in Arizona and Sonora, Mexico), and Korean exhibit GEN-marking of subjects in relative clauses. The most significant characteristic of these constructions is, according to Givón (1979: 149), the verb in the relative clause usually appears in a

---

27 The only remaining inflectional form is MR forms, which are used for imperative sentences. I did not find any examples of GEN-marked subjects in imperative sentences in *Man'yōshū*. 210
nominalized, non-finite form, and at least one of the arguments is marked as genitive.28

Chinese provides another intriguing case. In Modern Mandarin Chinese, relative clauses seem to be treated as nominal, although subjects are zero-marked. In Old Chinese (OC), we observe GEN-marking of subjects in nominal clauses, equivalent to *that*-clauses in English.

Let us examine relative clauses in those languages, as well as nominal clauses in OC. A Turkish example below is taken from Comrie (1989 [1981]: 142):

(34) [Hasan-in Sinan-a ver-diğ-i] patates-i yedim.
   Hasan-of Sinan-to give-diğ-his potato-ACC I-ate
   ‘I ate the potato that Hasan gave to Sinan.’

The verb form ver-diğ is a non-finite form of the verb ver ‘give’ with the nominalizing suffix -diğ. In a nominalized clause, the subject must be in genitive, as in Hasan-in [Hasan-of] in (34), and an appropriate possessive suffix must be attached to the verb, as in ver-diğ-i [give-diğ-his]. A literal translation of the relative clause would be ‘the potato of Hasan’s giving to Sinan’.

The Yaqui examples below are taken from Lindenfeld (1973: 65-66):

   you this-Dep house-Dep your buy-Realized-Rel like
   ‘You like fire house you bought.’

   b. hu kari in ačai-ta hinu-k-a?u weče-k.
   this house my father-Dep buy-Realized-Rel fall-Realized
   ‘The house which my father bought fell down.’

28 Despite his claim, Givón (1979) does not provide a clear example in which more than one argument is marked as genitive. As we will see, he glosses the suffix -ta or -ka in Yaqui as genitive, which may be the basis of his claim. But in fact it is not accurate. His data is based on Lindenfeld (1973), who glosses them as “Dependency marker”. See below for more details.
As shown in (35a), if the subject in the relative clause is a personal pronoun, it appears in its possessive form, e.g. em 'your'. If it is a common noun, it is marked for "dependency" (Lindenfeld 1973: 65), as shown in (35b). Givón (1979: 150) glosses the suffix -ka (or -ta) as genitive, but it is not quite accurate. According to Lindenfeld (ibid.: 53), nouns are marked for dependency if they are direct objects, postpositional objects, or genitives.29 Demonstratives are also marked by the dependency marker if they or the head NPs which they modify are in the above conditions. Note that hu 'this' in (35a) is marked by -ka, but it is not in (35b). Another thing is that only singular nouns may be marked for dependency. Therefore, it is not that simple, and only by comparing (35a) and (35b), we may be able to claim that the subject in the relative clause in (35b), ačai 'father', is in the genitive case.

In Modern Korean (ModK), the nominative particle is / after a consonant, or ka after a vowel. The genitive particle is uy. In relative clauses, subjects can be marked by either GEN uy or NOM i/ka. The following example is from Martin (1992: 922):

(36) Na uy (= Nay ka) wēnhanun kes i kes ita.30
I GEN (I NOM) want one NOM this one COP
'The one (that) I want is this one.'

Middle Korean (MK) also exhibits GEN-marking of subjects in relative clauses. MK had two kinds of genitive particles. One is s (or, t before s- or c-), which was generally used to mark inanimate or honorific animate nouns, and the other is 'uy (or, oy depending

---

29 Consider the examples below:
   a. itepo em kari-ta tu?ure.
     we your house-Dep like
     'We like your house.'
   b. aapo piino-ta betuk kate-k
     she tree-Dep under be-Realized
     'She was under a tree.'
   c. itom pare-ta kari si mweela
     our priest-Dep house very old
     'Our priest's house is very old.'

30 In Martin (1992: 922), wēnhanun 'to want' is written as wēn hanun, but according to a Korean colleague, it is better regarded as a word.
partly on the vowel of the preceding syllable), which was generally used to mark non-
 honorable animate nouns (Martin 1992: 764). The nominative particle in MK was 'i, but
 GEN s/t and GEN 'uy/oy were also used to mark subjects in relative clauses. See examples
 from Martin (1992: 766):

(37) a. 'na 'non pwuthye s solang-'hosi'ñwon az'G  i'la.
    I TOP Buddha GEN love-do(Polite) younger.brother COP
    'I am the younger brother whom the Buddha loves.'

    b. hon 'nwun s 'PPYENG-hon "salo'm
    one eye GEN ailing person
    'a person with one ailing eye'

Chinese does not morphologically distinguish verbs from nouns. In Modern
Mandarin Chinese (ModM), however, relative clauses appear to be treated as nominals,
since they and their head NPs should be connected by GEN de. Unlike the other languages
above, subjects in relative clauses are zero-marked. See an example below:

(38) wō zuótiān māi de shū hēn hāo.
    I yesterday buy GEN book very good
    'The book I bought yesterday is very good.'

In Old Chinese (OC), we can observe GEN-marking of subjects in subordinate
clauses other than relative clauses. Shibata and Torii (1985: 173) consider them
equivalent to that-clauses in English, while Ōno T. (1968) calls them nominal clauses, and
[1990: 319-31]) refer to them as subordinate clauses. These clauses may function as
subjects (or topics) or complements of verbs. According to Ōno T. (1968: 174), subjects in
nominal clauses in OC are either zero-marked or marked by GEN zhīl (for common

31 OC does not have relative clause constructions equivalent to those of ModM.
nouns) or GEN qi2 (for pronouns). Wang (1983 [1990: 319-31]) also notes that subjects in subordinate clauses in OC are marked by zhil, although he does not specify it as genitive. See examples from Wang (ibid.):

32 Ōno T.’s (1968) main claim is about the recognition of a separate case for subjects in nominal clauses in OC, which he calls zoku-shukaku (genitive-nominative).

33 The morpheme zhil also function as a demonstrative pronoun ‘this’, and qi2 as ‘that’. Also, they both function as third person pronouns. See Wang (1983 [1990]).
Wang's explanations are a little inconsistent. In one study (Wang 1983 [1990: 320]), he in fact notes that ModM does not have any constructions equivalent to the complement clauses in OC in which subjects are marked by GEN zhî. In another study (Wang 1958 [1988: 521]), however, he attributes such constructions to the influence of foreign language translations after 1919; ModM introduced the use of GEN de to mark NPs as agents of action nouns, i.e. [Agent GEN Action.N], which came to be recognized as an embedded clause.34

4.4.3.3 Clausal Nouniness and GEN-marking

As seen in OJ and OC, GEN-marking of subjects is not limited to relative causes. Comrie (1989: 143) notes that in Turkish, subordination is in general by means of non-finite constructions, although he does not discuss subject marking. As for OJ, Quinn (1987, 1990) claims that MZ, RY, and IZ forms are non-finite.35 According to Foley and Van Valin (1984: 275), citing Cole and Hermon (1981), Imbabura Quechua also employs nominalization for various complement clauses, which they call “linkage at the core level”, although subjects are not marked as genitive.

34 Wang (1958 [1988: 521]) also notes that we can observe a sort of direct substitution of de in ModM for the subject-marking zhî in OC in Luxun's (1881-1936) works. Nonetheless, the attribution of the use of de for marking a subject of a nominal clause to the influence from foreign languages seems questionable.  
35 Regarding SS and RT forms, Quinn (1987, 1990) claims that they are finite forms. However, we find more GEN-marked subjects in RT, IZ, and MZ clauses than in SS and RY clauses. Thus, the distinction between finite and non-finite does not seem suitable to explain GEN-marking of subjects in OJ. See also Chapter 5, Section 5.3.3 for the general applicability of the finite/non-finite distinction to verb morphology.
There seems to be some universality in these crosslinguistic phenomena. Silverstein (1976) proposes the following hierarchy of logical relations between clauses with co-referent NPs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical-relations of clauses (Silverstein 1976: 163)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habitual actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habitual agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative clause (making definite reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purposive complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect discourse complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal adverbial clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if - then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause sequence (sequitur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause sequence (non-sequitur)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He does not provide a definition of each category, but most of them are understandable. Still some of the categories may need explanations. The second item, “habitual actor”, appears to refer to NPs which contain an intransitive subject as the possessor of a derivational action noun (Silverstein 1976: 143). Similarly, “habitual agent” refers to NPs which contain a transitive subject as the possessor. The seventh item, “indirect discourse complement”, refers to complements of cognition and propositional attitude verbs (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 269). As for the two item on the bottom, “clause sequence (sequitur)” and “clause sequence (non-sequitur)”, neither of them has any syntactic connection between clauses, but the former involves some semantic relationship, whereas the latter does not.

36 The underlines for “relative clause” and “conjunction” are not in the original.
As Foley and Van Valin (1984) suggest, this hierarchy may be divided into three sections. The first section on top covers “possessive” to “relative clause”, which are in fact NPs. The second section in the middle covers “purposive complement” to “conjunction”, in which two clauses are syntactically connected in some way. In contrast, the third section on the bottom, “clause sequence (sequitur)” and “clause sequence (non-sequitur)”, do not have any syntactic linkage.

Along the hierarchy towards “possessive”, Silverstein claims that the probability of nominalization, the degree of formal distinctness, and the markedness of connection increase. He also claims that if a language uses a special form for co-reference relations over a logical connection at a certain point in the hierarchy, it will use at least that mechanism for everything above, and possibly even more elaborate formal distinctions.

Foley and Van Valin (1984: 268-78) agree with Silverstein (1976, 1980), and elaborate the second section of the hierarchy from the viewpoint of the relationship between semantics and syntax. They claim that the more tightly linked the dependent clause is to an adjacent clause, the more likely that nominalization results, and at the same time, the more the case-marking possibilities in it are reduced, ultimately only to genitive (or if there is no genitive, then dative).37 In English nominalizations, for example, a gerund allows genitive, accusative, and dative case marking, e.g. the man’s giving the book to her, an action nominal only genitive and dative, e.g. his gift of the book to Mary, and finally an agent noun only genitive, e.g. the book’s buyer (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 278).

Generally speaking, I agree with the idea that there is a strong tendency in human perception, which interacts with linguistic activities and results in various linguistic

37 The primary focus of Silverstein (1976, 1980) is the explanation of split case marking in ergative languages, and further an understanding of the various factors which affect case marking in human languages. Foley and Van Valin’s (1984: 268-78) main concern is clause linkage, and thus relative clauses are not included.
hierarchies as tendencies. I should, however, raise a strong doubt on the absolute universality of those hierarchies, such as Keenan and Comrie's (1977) accessibility hierarchy for relativization. I do not take the position that linguistic categories, such as "subject" and "object" for Keenan and Comrie, and "conditionals" for Foley and Van Valin, are absolute universals.38

Unfortunately, neither Silverstein (1976) nor Foley and Van Valin (1984) explains how the hierarchical order in (42) came about, or why a tighter linkage leads to nominalization and GEN-marking. Nor do their claims provide proper accounts for the two major findings about OJ presented in Section 4.4.3.1. First, GEN-marking occurs not only in subordinate clauses, but also in main clauses, i.e. RT main clauses, sa-nominalized clauses, unmarked main clauses, and some tutu clauses. Silverstein (1976) and Foley and Van Valin (1984) only concern relationships between clauses (except for possessive NPs in Silverstein), and their claims do not account for the GEN-marking in main clauses in OJ.

Second, subjects are not always marked by genitive even in the environments where we usually expect GEN-marking, such as in relative clauses. Silverstein (1976) and Foley and Van Valin (1984) do not mention whether or not all clauses in a single category (e.g. temporal adverbial clauses) behave the same way. They appear to regard nominalization as a process with two absolute values, either nominalized or not nominalized at all, which is the most common assumption among past studies. In the OJ data, however, it is apparent that GEN-marking of subjects is a scalar matter (i.e. frequency, degree). It is not something invariably found or not found in a certain type of clause.

Considering the shortcomings of past studies, I would like to apply the notion of category squish proposed by Ross (1972) to the OJ data. He demonstrates that categories such as verb, adjective, and noun are not discrete but rather form a continuum, which he calls...
a "category squish". Its most universal representation can be summarized in the following formula: [verb > adjective > noun]. In my analysis, it can be claimed that different frequencies of GEN-marking reflect different degrees of clausal nouniness. In other words, each clause is "nouny" (or "verby") to a different degree. Foley and Van Valin do not explain why subjects come to be marked by genitive in nominalized clauses, but it makes sense that the entity which is predicated is expressed as a possessor of the action noun or status noun, when the predicate is nominalized. Another inducible claim is that languages may not form linguistic constructions, such as conditionals or temporal adverbial clauses, as categorical domains which either accept or reject a certain linguistic phenomenon, such as GEN-marking of subjects.

OJ may possibly be one of the best cases in which we can compare the nouniness of each clause type by a single indicator, i.e. GEN-marking. Nevertheless, I have only presented the numbers of occurrences of GEN-marked subjects in this research. If we want to obtain probabilities of GEN-marking, all clauses in Man'yōshū songs should be investigated, which is well beyond the capacity of this study. There are a few problems, however: (i) some of the clause types may not have a sizable number of occurrences for fair comparison; (ii) argument NPs (e.g. subjects) need not be overtly expressed in Japanese;

39 For English, he specifically argues for the following hierarchy: verb > present participle > perfect participle > passive participle > adjective > preposition (?) > "adjectival noun" (e.g. fun, snap) > noun. For example, by examining various linguistic operations, such as preposition deletion and PP postposing, he argues for a squish [proud > opposite > near > like > in], in which proud is most adjective-like among all, and in is the least adjective-like but most preposition-like item.

40 It is well-know that genitive may express not only the subject relationship, but also the object relationship, e.g. the army's invasion; the capital's invasion. In Man'yōshū, there are some examples in which objects seem to be marked by GEN ga or no, e.g. wa ga pimo no wo no/ yupu te tayuki mo [I GEN string GEN string GEN/ tie(RT) hand dull Excl] '(lit) (my) hands (with which) I tie the string are dull', in which the object, pimo no wo 'the string (appositive)', is marked by GEN no in the relative clause. See Appendix C.
and (iii) subjects may be marked by other particles (e.g. pa [topic] or mo [inclusive focus ‘even; too’]) depending on contexts. Because of these difficulties, exact frequencies (i.e. ratios) of GEN-marking are not obtainable.

4.4.3.4 Category Management and Nominalization

Silverstein (1976) and Foley and Van Valin (1984) provide observations about nominalization, but they do not explain why a tighter linkage between clauses or a higher position in the hierarchy results in the more likelihood of nominalization. What induces nominalization? I would claim that nominalization is a natural consequence of what I call “category management” in the domain of the sentence. In the observation by Ross, each word stands at a certain point in the squish (i.e. continuum). In other words, this is a static analysis; the position of each word in the squish is static information about the word.

In contrast, I argue for a more dynamic view of the phenomenon. That is, a word’s position in the squish is determined in relation to other components in its sentence, not its nature as an isolated word, although a prototypical feature of each word is generalized and stored in the lexicon. For example, in I will go to the early class, the word go is recognized as more verb-like than the others, early more adjective-like, and I and class more noun-like. We recognize these words as a verb, adjective, or a noun based on these actual uses. The category for each word is not fixed, and we analyze it every time we attempt to produce or understand an utterance. By this dynamic view, we can understand why a word can move from one category to another, e.g. He was blind-sided; Please e-mail me.

That is what a consideration of the problem tells us from a viewpoint of category analysis. The other side of the issue is category management. For example, in the syntax
of I will read that book, the word read must be a verb, and that book an NP. The analytic side and the management side are inseparable, and both work in the domain of sentence.

In this dynamic view, it can be claimed that all (major) categories in a single sentence must be managed along the category squish (i.e. continuum) between noun and verb. Sentences may consist of verbs, adjectives, nouns, and others, depending on each language, but in principle, there should be only one most verb-like verb in a single sentence. Thus, the main-clause verb must be most verby (or least nouny), and the other clauses in the same domain should be treated accordingly. That is, to avoid two verb-like constituents in the same domain, "sentence" so to speak, subordinate clauses should be less verbal and more nominal.

For example, when a relative clause is added to a sentence, one way of managing its categorical status is to nominalize (i.e. de-verbalize) it or treat it as a nominal. As seen above, Turkish uses the nominalizing suffix -diğ. OJ employs special inflectional terms, i.e. RT forms, which can also be used as nominalized clauses. Modern Mandarin Chinese does not have a complex verb morphology, but connects relative clauses and head NPs by GEN de, which suggests the nominal status of those relative clauses. As discussed above, Turkish subordination is in general by means of non-finite constructions. Imbabura Quechua also employs nominalization for various complement clauses. Old Chinese exhibits GEN-marking of subjects in various nominal complement clauses.

Foley and Van Valin's claim about clause linkage can be understood in light of category management. A tighter clause linkage means that the subordinate clause is

---

41 This is how "in principle" nominalization works in category management. As I will note shortly, however, category management is not the only factor which promotes nominalization. As seen above, the nouniness of RT main clauses seems high, but they can take subordinate clauses. In this case, category management is still at work, but it does not necessarily make subordinate clauses more nouny than main clauses.
recognized more as one of the components of the main clause, rather than a non-component in a different domain (i.e. in a different sentence). Categories of all constituents in the domain of the sentence must be managed, and thus a tighter clause linkage results in a greater effect of category management on the subordinate clause. That is, to avoid another verb-like constituent other than the main predicate, the nouniness of the subordinate clause should increase, when a clause linkage becomes tighter.

Based on the discussion above, the category analysis/management principle can be stated as follows:42

(43) The Category Analysis/Management Principle:

All constituents (including subordinate clauses) in the domain of sentence are subject to category analysis, and their categories are controlled in relation to the categories of the other constituents in the sentence.

As discussed above, we can attribute the nominalization of subordinate clauses, which is widely observable in many languages, to this principle. However, its actual manifestation in clause linkage and correlation with GEN-marking of subjects vary from language to language. For example, nominalization is generally realized by verb morphology in Turkish, Imbabura Quechua, and OJ. While Imbabura Quechua does not exhibit GEN-marking of subjects in complement clauses for ‘know’ (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 275-76), OJ exhibits it in complement clauses with to [Comp] to some extent. In contrast to

42 Hopper and Thompson (1984: 747) argue that “Categoriality - the realization of a form as either as a N or a V - is imposed on the form by discourse.” In addition to the fact that their claim is concerned with discourse-level effects on categories while the category analysis/management principle in (43) is concerned with sentence-level effects, Hopper and Thompson’s view on categories seems essentially different from the present author’s, in that they do not seem to regard the categories “noun” and “verb” as forming a single continuum, although they identify a continuum within each category. Also, they appear to regard nominalization as a process with two absolute values, either nominalized or not nominalized at all, as is the case for Silverstein (1976) and Foley and Van Valin (1984). However, it can also be said that Hopper and Thompson’s view is in essence the same as the present author’s, in that we all regard categorical statuses not as something given and fixed in grammar.
these languages, Modern Mandarin Chinese (ModM) does not indicate nominalization by verb morphology. In case of relative clauses, their nominal status is noticeable by the use of GEN de to connect with head NPs. In case of complement clauses, it is indicated by GEN-marked subjects. In English, a clear nominalization is limited to the use of gerunds, with which GEN-marked subjects are also observable, e.g. *Everyone is concerned about John's being always late. In addition, that-clauses occur in the positions where nouns usually occur, and their formation can be regarded as nominalization, although it is not by verb morphology, e.g. *That John won the race surprised everyone; She knows that John came back. In that-clauses, English maintains the full tense inflection, and subjects are not marked by genitive.

The sensitivity to clausal nouniness also changes over time. In ModJ, the verb morphology is significantly simplified. Most significantly, SS forms have merged into RT forms, and predicates take the same forms in relative clauses and main clauses (except for adjectival nouns with copula). Thus, the verb morphology no longer indicates that relative clauses are more nouny than main predicates. It is only inducible by the fact that subjects can still be marked by GEN no in relative clauses. Speaking of GEN-marked subjects in Std-ModJ (i.e. NP-no), their distribution has also been narrowed, basically only to relative clauses; in Std-ModJ we do not observe no-marked subjects in other types of subordinate clauses, such as conditional clauses.

What constitutes a sentence also differs from language to language. For example, English generally does not accept a nominalized clause as a complete sentence, e.g. *that I went to the movie; *having been to the movie. In contrast, RT main clauses (rentai dome) and sa-nominalized clauses in OJ are good examples for the fact that nominalized clauses

43 Adjectival nouns with copula exhibit different SS forms and RT forms, e.g. Kono basu wa sugoku benri-desu [this bus TOP very convenience-COP] *This bus is very convenient*; benri-na basu [convenience-COP(RT) bus] *a convenient bus*.
can be complete sentences in Japanese. It is in fact a difficult task to define a universal notion of "sentence". Apart from theoretical definitions, if we follow the line of argument in this chapter, "sentence" does not seem to be a category given in grammar, but rather a category induced from speech production.

In the cases of RT main clauses (*rentai dome*) and *sa*-nominalized clauses in OJ, nominalization occurs in single-clause sentences, and thus is not necessarily due to category management, relative to another predicate. In interpretation, these nominal sentences, either ending with RT forms or *sa*-nominals, are generally associated with some emotive sense, such as exclamation and sorrow. This can be attributed to the fact that nouns are referential to certain entities, and that this use of nominalization makes sentences refer to certain situations; RT main clauses refer to a discourse context, and *sa*-nominals to the degree of a condition or attribute described by the adjective stem (cf. *The sadness of it! or The waste of it all!*). Therefore, it should be said that category management is not the only factor that promotes nominalization. Nevertheless, GEN-marking of subjects is induced by nominalization, regardless of its causes.

I have attributed clausal nouniness to the category analysis/management principle in (43). It is also consistent with the notion of iconicity. The information in subordinate clauses such as relative clauses, conditional clauses, and temporal clauses is presuppositional, in relation to the information in main clauses. In other words, the former is more static and given, while the latter is more dynamic and unstable. Based on iconicity, therefore, it is reasonable that the forms used for subordinate clauses are nounier, while

---

44 The similarity of these English expressions to *sa*-nominalized clauses was pointed out by Charles Quinn (p.c.).

45 Ōno S. (1993; Ōno S. et al. 1974) claims that RT endings in *kakari-musubi* constructions came from reverse dislocation (*tōchi*), e.g. *kuyasiki ima so* [regrettable(RT) now(N) Excl] ‘(lit.) What a regrettable now!’ > *ima so kuyasiki* [now KP regrettable(RT)] (MYS 12:3001). In this case, then, the use of RT endings is due to a historical reason.
those used for main clauses are verbier. As examined in Section 4.4.2, relative clauses take
RT forms, when/because/although clauses IZ forms, and if clauses MZ forms. Subjects in
these types of clauses are generally marked by GEN ga or no. In contrast, paratactic and
clauses take RY forms, and the GEN-marking of subjects is rare in this environment.

4.4.3.5 Where Do Categories Come About?

In contrast to the static view about the category squish (i.e. continuum), I have
presented its dynamic view; categories such as verb, adjective, and noun are analyzed and
managed in relation to other components in a sentence, not as isolated words. This view is
also supported by the observation about RT forms and RY forms. RT forms basically
function to modify nouns in relative clauses (see (2)). RT forms also function as nominal
constituents without a following head NP (see (12)). In these environments, subjects are
usually marked by GEN ga or no, which suggests a higher degree of nouniness of RT
clauses. In contrast, GEN-marked subjects are not very common in RY clauses; the
nouniness of RY clauses is low. Contrary to the nouniness as clauses, RT forms do not
have deverbal nouns, whereas RY forms are generally regarded as infinitives (e.g. Quinn
1987, 1990; Martin 1975, 1987), and many RY forms can be used as common nouns (e.g.
kapyeri (RY) ‘return’, omopi (RY) ‘thought; feeling; wish’). In other words, nouniness is
not determined by their forms, but by their functions in a sentence; categories are analyzed
in a sentence, not as isolated words.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued for a correlation between the degree of clausal
nouniness and the frequency of GEN-marking of subjects, and claimed that nominalization
is due to category management in the domain of the sentence. Languages can be morphologically and syntactically quite different, and the correlation between clausal nouniness and GEN-marking of subjects is not always fully observable (e.g. that-clauses in English). Japanese has also undergone a number of syntactic changes and significant simplification of verb inflection (e.g. GEN ga in OJ becoming a nominative-like particle; SS forms having merged into RT forms), and ModJ no longer provides an elaborate squish (i.e. continuum) in this regard; the GEN-marking is basically limited to relative clauses in ModJ (as so-called “Ga-No conversion”). OJ seems to be one of the rare cases, if not the only one, in which we can observe something close to the full range of the phenomenon.
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CHAPTER 5

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS OUT OF GENITIVES

5.1 Introduction

There are a few well-recognized historical changes undergone by the genitive particles of OJ. It is generally agreed that GEN ga of OJ developed into NOM (inative) ga of ModJ. Also, GEN ga is thought to have developed into CONJ (unctive) ga, as well as the semantic theme-marking (TM) ga. The most basic approach to these changes taken by past studies has been to compare data from different time periods. So, characteristics of ga and no observable in historical materials from each time period have been well studied. While examining those studies, this chapter attempts to provide data relevant to those changes in an organized way. In contrast to GEN ga and no, GEN tu became almost completely unproductive in EMJ, and thus is not discussed in this chapter. There are four topics: Section 5.2 reviews studies of the development of GEN ga into NOM ga; Section 5.3 concerns the development of GEN ga into CONJ ga; Section 5.4 examines changes of theme-marking particles; and Section 5.5 discusses so-called juntai-joshi (quasi-nominal particle) or keishiki meishi (lit. formal noun) no. Unlike NOM/CONJ/TM ga, the origins

1 By "semantic themes" in this study, I refer to entities affected by events or states expressed by so-called "stative predicates", e.g. Mizu ga nomi-tai [water TM drink-Desi] '(I) want to drink water.' The reason of employing the term "theme", instead of calling the constituents syntactic subjects (e.g. Martin 1975) or syntactic objects (e.g. Kuno 1973) is because I take the position that subject properties may be distributed to different constituents (i.e. experiencers and themes) in these constructions (cf. Keenan 1976).
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of the quasi-nominal no have not been clarified in past studies (e.g. Martin 1975, 1990; Horie 1995, 1997), and will become clear in Chapter 6.

A good deal of space is devoted to describing the changes with data, but there are two major claims, in addition to some minor arguments and critiques of past studies. The first major claim is presented in Section 5.3, where I argue against the unidirectionality hypothesis of grammaticalization theory with regard to clause combining. Hopper and Traugott (1993) claim that clause combining develops unidirectionally as follows: parataxis > hypotaxis > subordination. Section 5.3, however, demonstrates that the development of CONJ ga in Japanese is a case of change from subordination towards parataxis (based on the original idea developed in Ishigaki 1955). Based on the examination of a wide range of crosslinguistic data, such as Korean, Tibeto-Burman languages, and Australian languages, Section 5.3 proposes morphological and syntactic conditions for the change from subordination towards parataxis, and claims that it is not merely an “exception” in language change, as counterexamples are often treated by advocates of grammaticalization theory only based on the number of those counterexamples.

The second major claim is offered in Section 5.4, where I claim that a fundamental restructuring of the desiderative ('want to') theme-marking system occurred in EMJ. In OJ, GEN ga/no-marking was most common for semantic themes of V-maku posi [V-Conjec(Ku) desirable] 'want to V' due to the ku-nominalization, whereas for themes of V-maku poru [V-Conjec(Ku) want], ACC wo-marking was usually used due to the transitivity of poru 'want'. In EMJ, -maku posi developed into -mafosi, while -maku poru became obsolete. I claim that due to these changes, zero-marking became the default marking of themes for desiderative expressions in EMJ, and that GEN-marking and ACC-marking were used depending on the clausal nouniness (see Chapter 4) and transitivity of predicates.
respectively. It is generally thought that ga-marking (< GEN) is the standard (or even "correct one") in ModJ. However, zero-marking and ACC-marking are also productive in modern Japanese dialects. Their complex geographical distribution cannot be accounted for by dialectal spread. Rather, it seems to be the result of dialect-internal developments. Thus, it can be claimed that ga-marking in Std-ModJ was not a predetermined outcome from the competition among GEN ga/no, ACC wo, and zero. This is another example which shows that approaches that seek linguistic necessity in language change are inappropriate (see also Chapter 6).

5.2 From GEN ga to NOM ga

In this section, I will briefly review past studies about the development of GEN ga into NOM ga. Section 5.2.1 explains an underlying assumption common in past studies. Section 5.2.2 examines four key constructions in OJ, which are thought to have promoted the process in which genitive particles came to mark subjects. Section 5.2.3 moves on to EMJ and MJ data, and examines past claims about the emergence of NOM ga.

5.2.1 A Common Assumption in Past Studies

It is generally agreed that GEN ga in OJ developed into NOM ga in Std-ModJ and lost its genitive function. NOM ga in Std-ModJ is illustrated here:

(1)  
Tanaka-san ga haitte-kita.  
Tanaka-Mr./s. NOM enter(Ger)-came  
'Mr./s. Tanaka came in.'

Despite the confusion about the use of the term "shukaku" (NOM) in the previous literature, which has been discussed in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2), most scholars agree that NOM ga emerged in MJ; it came to be commonly used to mark subjects in main clauses or
mono-clausal sentences in MJ (i.e. the Kamakura period from 1192 and the Muromachi period from 1338) (e.g. Kazama 1970; ôno S. 1975, 1977a/b; ôno T. 1978; Sakanashi 1987; and Nomura 1993).^2

Facing the development of GEN ga to NOM ga in Japanese, it is reasonable to ask why GEN ga, and not GEN no, became the nominative(-like) particle in Std-ModJ. Past studies have attempted to seek answers in linguistic differences between ga and no. The basic assumption informing these studies is that there must have been some essential linguistic differences between GEN ga and GEN no such that it had to be ga, and not no, that became the nominative. In other words, past studies assume prescriptively that particular changes undergone by the genitives were the determinate outcomes of prior linguistic conditions.

For example, ôno S. (1977a/b) claims that the choice of ga over no as nominative was due to the uchi/soto (inside/outside) distinction.^3 Since agentive subjects are prototypical, GEN ga, which marked uchi (inside) entities, mostly first person pronouns and persons closer to the speaker, developed into the nominative.^4 In his explanation, uchi (inside) entities are the agents that act on soto (outside) entities.

Similarly, Akiba (1978: 121-23) attributes the choice of ga over no to the referentiality and definiteness of NPs marked by ga. By examining EMJ materials, she claims that GEN ga could only be used when there was a possessor-possessed or whole-
part relationship between two nominals, and that NPs marked by ga were referential and definite. According to her, it was quite natural that ga, rather than no, became the nominative because of the referentiality and definiteness of NP-ga, since subjecthood includes these properties (Keenan 1976).

Ôno T. (1978: 59) regards the merger of SS forms into RT forms in MJ as the main cause of the emergence of NOM ga. In his argument, GEN-marking of subjects in RT clauses in OJ was the prerequisite for the emergence of NOM ga. He claims that the function of ga in OJ was to “clarify and emphasize” (meiji kyōchō) the genitive relationship, and that it was a natural extension for ga to be used for clarifying and emphasizing subjects in subordinate clauses (ibid.: 58). Obviously this account does not explain why GEN no was also used to mark subjects in subordinate clauses. Nonetheless, he attributes the development of the subject-marking function of GEN ga to a specific linguistic feature it possessed.

In Chapter 6, I will explore the problem of comparing OJ with Std-ModJ without much caution (e.g. GEN ga in OJ with NOM ga in Std-ModJ), and demonstrate that the

---

3 Akiba’s study involves a fundamental methodological problem; she only examines EMJ materials (see also Chapter 3, Section 3.3.3). In addition, her inquiry does not pursue its questions far enough. For example, she ignores the fact that GEN ga could mark RT (adnominal) forms of predicates. There are many expressions with GEN ga in OJ which do not have a possessor-possessed or whole-part relationship, e.g. ino ga tame [beloved GEN sake] ‘for the sake of (my) beloved’ (MYS 3993); nuru ga pe ni [sleeping GEN addition for] ‘in addition to sleeping’ (MYS 3465). Also, NPs marked by ga are not necessarily referential and definite. For example, ta ‘who’, which is not definite by nature, was always marked by ga when it was in the genitive case. Further, GEN no could also mark nominals which were referential and definite, e.g. wa ga opokimi ‘my lord’ in wa ga opokimi no mi-na [I GEN lord GEN Bt-name] ‘my lord’s name’ (MYS 2:198).

4 Akiba’s application of Keenan’s claim is very prescriptive. According to Keenan, subjecthood consists of a cluster of properties, and referentiality and definiteness are only part of them. Akiba’s argument does not explain why the other properties were irrelevant.

5 See Section 5.2.3 for details.

6 See Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1.2 for his claim about the differences between GEN ga and GEN no in OJ.

9 Similarly, Konoshima (1983: 103) attributes the emergence of NOM ga to its emphasizing function.
studies that are based on prescriptive assumption that particular changes were the
determinate outcomes of prior linguistic conditions do not bring us proper understandings
about language change. Unfortunately, most studies in the past are of this kind.

5.2.2 Key Constructions in OJ

As examined in Chapter 4, subjects could be marked by GEN ga or GEN no in OJ, although the GEN-marking was generally concentrated in subordinate clauses. In past studies, some of those constructions are thought to be the key constructions which promoted the process in which genitive particles came to mark subjects. There are four constructions that are often brought up in discussion, i.e. relative clauses, sa-nominalized clauses, goto clauses, and MZ/IZ clauses (e.g. hypothetical and reason clauses), and I will examine these constructions in the following subsections. One thing to note, however, is that these constructions are not peculiar to ga; GEN no can also be found in these constructions to mark subjects.

5.2.2.1 Relative Clauses: [[NP1 GEN Pred(RT)] (NP2)]

As seen in Chapter 4, subjects in relative clauses are usually marked by GEN ga or no in OJ. See examples below:

(2) Relative Clauses with Subject-ga

a. wa ga suru toki ni
   I GEN do(RT) time LOC
   (lit.) 'at my doing time' > 'when I do (it), ...'

b. kimi ga yuku/ miti no nagate wo
   you GEN go(RT)/ road GEN long.distance ACC
   (lit.) 'your going a long way of the road' > 'the long way of the road you travel'

Despite the fact that the types of subordinate clauses that are discussed in past studies are limited, GEN-marked subjects are in fact observable in almost all types of clauses, including main clauses. See Chapter 4 for details.

For differences between GEN ga and GEN no, see Chapter 2.
One topic often discussed in past studies is how genitive particles came to mark subjects in relative clauses. With regard to the relative clause construction as in \([\text{NP}_1 \text{ GEN Pred(RT)}] \text{ NP}_2\), a common view is that a genitive is used to mark \(\text{NP}_1\) because of the noun-noun relationship between \(\text{NP}_1\) and the head noun \(\text{NP}_2\) (e.g. Hashimoto 1969; Asami 1956b; Ōno S. 1975; Sakanashi 1987).

Following the analyses of Asami (1956b: 8), Ōno S. (1975: 8), and Sakanashi (1987: 56), let us look at \(\text{kimi ga yuku miti}\) [you GEN go(RT) road] ‘your going road > the road you go’, which is simplified from (2b) above. According to their analysis, both \(\text{kimi ga}\) [you GEN] and \(\text{yuku}\) [go(RT)] modify \(\text{miti}\) ‘road’, i.e. \(\text{kimi ga miti}\) [you GEN road] ‘your road’ and \(\text{yuku miti}\) [go(RT) road] ‘going road’. They claim that a direct syntactic relationship was lacking between \(\text{NP}_1\)-\(\text{ga/no}\) and the predicate in the relative clause at this stage, but that the semantic relationship between them was so obvious that \(\text{NP}_1\)-\(\text{ga/no}\) came to be reanalyzed as the subject of the predicate that modifies \(\text{NP}_2\), i.e. \([[\text{kimi ga yuku}] \text{ miti}\]]. Thus, relative clauses in the structure \([[\text{NP}_1 \text{ GEN Pred(RT)}]\] \text{NP}_2\) facilitated the reanalysis of the genitive as a subject marker.

Hashimoto’s (1969) analysis is slightly different from Asami’s (1956b), Ōno S.’s (1975), and Sakanashi’s (1987). According to his analysis, the relative clause \(\text{kimi ga yuku miti}\) ‘the road you go’ should be analyzed as \([\text{kimi ga}\ [\text{yuku miti}]\] [you GEN [go(RT)]]
Hashimoto regards it as an extension of a simpler *kimi ga miti* [you GEN road] ‘your road’, i.e. [NP1 GEN NP2]. He claims that NP1 (e.g. *kimi*) had first no direct syntactic relation to the following predicate (e.g. *yuku*), but then it came to be recognized as a subject in relative clauses because of the obvious semantic relationship between NP1 and the predicate.

5.2.2.2 *Sa-*nominalized Clauses: [NP GEN Adj(Root)-sa]

We can observe the construction [NP GEN Adj(Root)-sa] in OJ, and I call it *sa-*nominalized clauses, since the adjective is nominalized with -*sa* and the whole phrase is attested as a sort of statement. Yamada (1936: 936-63) regards it as one of *kantai-ku* (exclamatory nominal clauses), which express a strong emotion (e.g. exclamation or sorrow). Consider the examples below:

(4) a. *imo ga kanasi-sa* (MYS 15:3727)
   
   beloved GEN darling(Stem)-NMZ
   
   ‘the darlingness of (my) beloved’ > ‘How darling (my) beloved!’

b. *miru ga tomosi-sa* (MYS 15:3658)
   
   see(RT) GEN enviable(Stem)-NMZ
   
   ‘the enviableness of the seeing’ > ‘How enviable to see (it)!’

c. *kyepu no taputwo-sa* (MYS 19:4255)
   
   today GEN precious(Root)-NMZ
   
   ‘the preciousness of today’ > ‘How precious today (is)!’

d. *omopaku no yo-sa* (MYS 10:2073)
   
   think(Ku) GEN joyful(Root)-NMZ
   
   ‘the joyfulness of thinking (that way)’ >
   
   ‘how joyful to think (that way)!’

As seen in (4a) and (4c), *sa-*nominalized clauses basically follow the syntax of genitive phrases, i.e. [NP1 GEN NP2]. As in (4b), however, GEN *ga* may mark RT forms of verbs as NP1. While GEN *no* does not usually follow RT forms, it may mark a *ku-*nominalized verb, as in (4d), although this is the only example observable in *Man ‘yōshū*. 
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In addition to relative clauses (Section 5.2.2.1), past studies consider sa-nominalized clauses one of the constructions which facilitated the reanalysis of genitives as subject markers (e.g. Yamada 1936: 940; Hashimoto 1969: 93; Asami 1956b; Kazama 1970: 58; ōno S. 1977a: 12-14; Sakanashi 1987: 48). A common analysis is that while maintaining genitive syntax (i.e. [NP1 GEN NP2]), NP1 is semantically predicated by NP2, which is an adjective nominalized with -sa. Thus, NP1 is easily reinterpreted as subject, and thus the genitive is marking the subject.

5.2.2.3 Goto Clauses: [NP GEN Pred(RT) goto/gotoku/gotosi]

In OJ, goto clauses function to express ‘like ...’ or ‘as if ...’ relations. Just like relative clauses and sa-nominalized clauses, they also contain GEN-marked subjects, and are regarded by some scholars (e.g. Hashimoto 1969: 85-86, 93; Asami 1956b; Sakanashi 1987: 54-55) as one of the constructions which facilitated the reanalysis of genitives as subject markers. Consider the examples of goto clauses below:

(5) Goto Clauses with Subject-ga
   a.  a ga kwopuru goto
       I GEN long.for(RT) like
       ‘just as I long for (it), ...’
   b.  sikaipu kimiga/ piged naki gotosi.
       (MYS 16:3835)13
       so say you GEN/ b e ^ lacking(RT) like(SS)
       ‘(It is) just like you, who say so, not having a beard.’

(6) Goto Clauses with Subject-no
   a.  teru tukwi no/ kumo-gakuru goto
       shine moon GEN/ cloud-hide(RT) like
       ‘just as the shining moon hides behind the clouds, ...’

---

12 Goto can also be used without any predicates involved, e.g. ime no goto [dream GEN like] ‘like a dream’ (MYS 15:3694). For obvious reasons, I do not regard this use of goto as goto clauses, and it has less to do with the development of NOM ga.

13 As noted in Chapter 4, the subject status of kimi ‘you’ in this example is not straightforward, since naki ‘be lacking’ directly predicates piged ‘beard’.
b. **saku pana no/ nipopu ga gotoku** (MYS 3:328)
   bloom flower GEN/ full-bloom(RT) GEN like(RY)
   'just as the flowers that bloom are in full bloom, ...'

c. **natu-kusa no/ kari-parape do mo/ opwi-siku gotosi.**
   summer-grass GEN/ cut-blush.off Conj even/ grow-layer(RT) like(SS)
   '(It is) like the summer grasses grow one after another, in spite of cutting (them) out.'
   (MYS 10:1984)

As seen above, goto exhibits an adjectival inflectional pattern (i.e. gotoku (RY) and gotosi (SS)), and this is thought to be the key to its role in the reanalysis of genitives as subject markers.

It is generally thought that the adverbial-forming morpheme goto 'like, as if' was derived from a nominal koto 'being the same' (e.g. Hashimoto 1969: 85; ôno S. et al. 1974), cf. **koto sake ba** [same separate(MZ) Conj] 'if being separated anyway (< the same)' (MYS 7:1402); **koto pura ba** [same fall(MZ) Conj] 'if it snows anyway' (MYS 10:2317). Thus, the structure [NP GEN Pred(RT) goto] originally came from relative clauses, with goto being the head noun. Meanwhile, goto was taken up as an adjectival root, and a partial paradigm developed, i.e. only gotoku (RY) and gotosi (SS) are attested. Due to the emergence of the construction [NP GEN Pred(RT) gotoku(RY)/gotosi(SS)], the genitive came to be reanalyzed as marking subjects in RY or SS clauses (e.g. Hashimoto 1969: 93; Sakanashi 1987: 54-55).15

---

14 Cf. similar expressions in ModJ, e.g. **onazi huru nara** [same fall COP(Provisional)] 'if it falls (= rains, snows, etc.) anyway'. Some scholars analyze nara in ModJ as the provisional form of the copula da (e.g. Martin 1975, 1987; Jorden w i6 Noda 1990).

15 With regard to goto clauses, the main concern in past studies is how genitives came to be used in ren 'yo-seisu (adverbial clauses), although the recognition of the subject status of NP-ga/no in goto clauses varies among scholars.
5.2.2.4 MZ/IZ Clauses: [NP GEN Pred(MZ/IZ), ...]

As in relative clauses, sa-nominalized clauses, and goto clauses, subjects in MZ clauses and IZ clauses are usually marked by GEN ga or GEN no. MZ clauses are generally followed by the conjunctive particle ba, and form hypothetical or conditional clauses about future events. Examples follow:

(7) a. MZ clause with Subject-ga

\[ Puzi no yama-bwi ni/ wa ga ki-na ba, \]
Fuji GEN mountain-surrounding LOC/ I GEN come-Perf(MZ) Conj
‘when I arrive at the surrounding of Mt. Fuji, ...’

(MYS 14:3357)

b. MZ clause with Subject-no

\[ wa ga pi no mikwono imasi-se ba, \]
I GEN sun GEN prince GEN be(Hon)-Evi(MZ) Conj
‘if my Sun Prince were alive, ...’

(MYS 2:173)

IZ clauses may be followed by various particles or even zero, but the conjunctive ba is most common. IZ clauses typically function as ‘since ...’ or ‘when ...’. See examples:

(8) a. IZ clause with Subject-ga

\[ wa ga tati-kike ba, \]
I GEN stand-listen(IZ) Conj
‘when I stand still and listen to (it),’

(MYS 2:207)

b. IZ clause with Subject-no

\[ tukapi no ipe ba, \]
messenger GEN say(IZ) Conj
‘since the messenger say (so),’

(MYS 2:207)

Although it is well known that subjects in MZ/IZ clauses are very often marked by GEN ga or no, these constructions have attracted less attention in past studies than relative clauses, sa-nominalized clauses, and goto clauses when discussing how ga and no came to mark subjects (e.g. Yamada 1913; Hashimoto 1969; Asami 1956b; Kazama 1970; Ōno S. 237)
1977a/b; Ôno T. 1977; Akiba 1978; Konoshima 1983; Sakanashi 1987; Nomura 1993),
perhaps simply because it is difficult to provide an account for the genitive construction
without two obvious nominal constituents in [NP GEN Pred(MZ/IZ)].

Among the past studies which I referred to in this research, Sakanashi (1987) is the
only one who attempts to explain how genitives came to mark subjects in MZ/IZ clauses.
He (ibid.: 56) speculates that it was an extension from relative clauses; once the syntactic
relationship between NP1 and the predicate was established in a relative clause [NP1 GEN
Pred(RT) NP2], it became acceptable to use the structure of [NP GEN Pred] with the
predicate in MZ/IZ forms.

5.2.2.5 Summary

In Section 5.2.2, I have reviewed relative clauses, sa-nominalized clauses, goto
clauses, and MZ/IZ clauses in OJ. Past studies regard these as the major constructions
which facilitated the reanalysis of genitives as subject markers. They do not, however,
provide an integrated account for subject marking in OJ; their analyses are limited and work
when there are two obvious nominals in the construction they are concerned with, but GEN-
marked subjects are observable in almost all types of clauses in OJ, which may not involve
an obviously nominalized predicate (e.g. SS, MZ, and IZ clauses), as examined in Chapter
4. On this topic, see Chapter 4 for my claim that different frequencies of GEN-marking of
subjects is a reflection of different degrees of clausal nouniness.

In any case, it is a fact in OJ that under certain conditions, subjects could be marked
by ga or no, and it appears that the constraints became looser as we move on to EMJ and
MJ.

Nomura (1993) disagrees with the view that the subject marking function of ga and no was derived from
genitive uses. However, he does not provide any alternative claims.
5.2.3 Expansion of Subject Marking in EMJ and MJ

As mentioned in Section 5.2.1, most scholars agree that NOM ga emerged as such in MJ (i.e. the Kamakura period from 1192 and the Muromachi period from 1338) (e.g. Kazama 1970; ôno S. 1975, 1977a/b; ôno T. 1978; Sakanashi 1987; and Nomura 1993). Past studies have arrived at several reasons for the emergence of NOM ga in MJ. I will review those reasons in Section 5.2.3.1, and provide key observations and data in past studies in Section 5.2.3.2.

5.2.3.1 Causes for the Emergence of NOM ga

In past studies, there has not been a single definitive account for the emergence of NOM ga in MJ. Major causes for the emergence of NOM ga discussed in the past can be summarized into the following four (cf. Nomura 1993):17

(9) a. Spread of RT endings in place of SS endings (most scholars)
    b. Expansion of NPs possibly marked by ga (e.g. ôno S. 1977a/b; Sakanashi 1987)
    c. Necessity for subject marking (e.g. ôno S. 1977b; Nomura 1993)
    d. Emphasizing function of ga (e.g. ôno T. 1978; Konoshima 1983)

As for (9a), the merger of RT forms with SS forms occurred in MJ. In that merger, RT (adnominal) forms took over the function of SS (conclusive) forms, and thus became the unmarked way of ending sentences. Since subjects in RT clauses were usually marked by genitives already in OJ, it is generally thought that this inflectional merger is one of the major factors that motivated ga to become a subject marker, i.e. a nominative, in main clauses or mono-clausal sentences. In theory, however, the merger of RT forms with SS

---

17 Akiba’s (1978) claim is rather different from others’, and thus it is not included here. See Section 5.2.1 for her claim.
forms does not work in favor of one genitive form over the other (e.g. *ga* over *no*); it simply promotes the reanalysis of genitive as nominative.18

As for (9b) (i.e. expansion of NP-*ga*), the underlying logic is that the use of GEN *ga* was restricted in OJ, but the restriction became looser as time went by, which enabled *ga* to be used rather freely to mark subjects as nominative. Ôno S. (1977a/b) can be regarded as a proponent of this view. His argument is as follows. In OJ, GEN *ga* was originally used to mark *uchi* (inside) entities, which were related to agentivity (Ôno S. 1977a). In EMJ (i.e. the Heian period from 794), however, social *uchi* (inside) domains expanded (Ôno S. 1977b: 102-6).19 In MJ (i.e. the Kamakura period from 1192 and the Muromachi period from 1338), the *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction changed to the pejorative/honorific distinction (ibid.: 107-9), and *ga* eventually lost its social markedness, i.e. becoming *mu-sonkei* (non-honorific) instead of *hi-sonkei* (disrespect), in his explanation (ibid.: 112). The original *uchi*-marking function (as a motivation of agent marking) and the ever-wider distribution helped *ga*, not *no*, to become nominative.20

Theoretically, (9b) can be regarded as a necessary condition for GEN *ga* to become NOM *ga*, but not as a determining factor, since GEN *no* exhibits wider distribution in OJ as well as in MJ (see Chapter 2 for distributions of *ga* and *no*). Ôno S. (1977a/b) compensates for this shortcoming by attributing the choice of *ga* to its original *uchi-*

---

18 In fact, as we will see in Chapter 6, most modern Kyushu dialects, including Fukuoka dialects, use NOM *no*, instead of the standard NOM *ga*.

19 Ôno S. offers observations about the use of *ga* in *Genji monogatari* (ca. 1001-14) in EMJ and *Kakuichi-bon Heike monogatari* (ca. 1371) in MJ.

20 Ôno S. (1977b) also observes that *ga* was more widely used in eastern dialects (*Azuma-kotoba*) than in the central dialect. He regards the spread of the lower class language in eastern dialects to the higher class language under the social upheaval during the Kamakura and Muromachi periods as one of the main reasons for the emergence of NOM *ga*. Dialect mixture is always possible, but Ôno S. does not provide any supporting evidence for the dialectal spread of *ga*.  
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marking function. However, this is rather contradictory since, according to his explanation, 
*ga* had lost its social markedness derived from the *uchi*-marking function in return for 
gaining a wider distribution, when *ga* became a nominative particle.

The third point, (9c) (i.e. a felt necessity for subject marking), is the product of 
casual reasoning, but Ōno S. (1977b: 112), for example, speculates that people must have 
for a long time felt a *sensai-teki* ‘underlying’ necessity for clearly distinguishing subject 
NPs from object NPs. Behind this kind of view, there seems to lie an assumption that 
subjects and objects are always marked by NOM *ga* and ACC *o* respectively in ModJ, and 
that the change from non-marking in OJ to the overt marking of ModJ is a logical evolution 
of the language. The present author disagrees with such a view that language always 
changes unidirectionally towards a simpler (or economical) and/or more logical (or rational) 
variety. For one thing, we cannot say for sure on behalf of the speakers of OJ that the 
subject/object distinction was ambiguous for them. Also, subjects and objects are not 
always marked by *ga* and *o* in ModJ, and it is not always structurally or semantically 
necessary to express subjects and objects overtly, either. In any case, (9c) tells us nothing 
about the choice of *ga* over *no* as a nominative marker.

As for (9d) (i.e. the emphasizing function), the notion of emphasis (or focus) has 
often been used to explain the characteristics of GEN *ga* (e.g. Yamada 1913; Ōno T. 1978), 
and some scholars attribute the development of NOM *ga* to its emphasizing function (e.g. 

21 I am aware of the Chomskyan framework and their treatment of these phenomena in the deep structure. 
As stated in Chapter 1, I do not agree with the view that grammar, including syntax, is autonomous. 
Developing a model or a descriptive tool is one thing, but is it reasonable to assume that linguistic 
processes in the human brain can be fully described two-dimensionally, in the case with tree diagrams?
5.2.3.2 Distributional Comparisons in Literary Texts

Many scholars provide their observations about the expansion of the use of ga in terms of numbers as well as types of its uses. This subsection presents the statistical observations of Ishigaki (1955), Ōno S. (1977b), Nomura (1993), and Sakanashi (1987).

Among the past studies I have consulted, Ishigaki’s (1955) data are most comprehensive, although there is a problem in his treatment of the notion of shukaku (nominative) (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2). He regards all instances of subject-marking ga as shukaku joshi (nominative particle), and thus in his analysis, NOM ga already existed in OJ. As mentioned above, most scholars take the position that ga was established as a nominative case marker when it came to mark subjects in simple declarative sentences (or more broadly in main clauses) in MJ, which is the position I take. To avoid confusion with the treatment of nominative in other studies, his tokens of shukaku joshi (nominative particle) are simply presented as cases of “subject-marking” in the table below. Ishigaki’s (1955: 53) original table presents numbers of occurrences for GEN ga, four types of subject-marking (S-Mkg) ga, and seven types of CONJ(unctive) ga, but the following table is summarized into simple ratios of GEN ga, S-Mkg ga, and CONJ ga (see Section 5.3.1 for his original table): 22

---

22 Ishigaki used the following versions of primary sources: editions of Iwanami bunko: Shoku Nihongi Senmyô, Engishiki Norito, and Taketori monogatari; the Den-Teika-hitsu-bon of Ise monogatari; the Teika-jihitsu-bon of Tosa niki; editions of Nihon koten zenshû: Yamato monogatari and Genji monogatari; editions of Shinteï zôho kokushi taikei: Konjaku monogatari, Uji-shûi monogatari, Gukanshô, and Kokon Chomonjû; editions of Kokumin bunko: Hôgen monogatari and Heiji monogatari; the Kamei Takanori honji-bon of Amakusa-bon Heike monogatari; the Shinmura Izuru honji-bon of Amakusa-bon Isoho monogatari.
Table 5.1: Ratios of GEN, Subject-Marking, and CONJ ga (based on Ishigaki 1955: 53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>Subject-Marking</th>
<th>CONJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nara: OJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senmyō</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norito</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Heian: EMJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosa nikki</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taketori</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ise</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamato</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Late Heian, Insei Period: EMJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konjaku (- B.20)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konjaku (B.22-)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kamakura: MJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uji-shūi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gukanshō</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chomonjū</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hōgen</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiji</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(After Muromachi: Late MJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amakusa Isoho</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amakusa Heike</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These works belong to different genres, such as the memoir diary (nikki), romance, discursive essay, and folk tales. Also, there are several works for which authors are unknown. Although Kyoto was the cultural center when most of the works (except for the OJ Senmyō and Norito) were written, it is very likely that there occurred some dialect mixture between west (i.e. Kyoto) and east (i.e. Kamakura), as well as class-language mixture among court people, samurai (soldier) class, and ordinary people, especially since

---

23 Ishigaki separates Konjaku monogatari up to Book 20 from that of Book 22 and thereafter, since the former is in more of a written style (e.g. strong influence of Chinese) while the latter is more colloquial and suspected of containing later additions (ibid.: 43-44).
the Kamakura period (1192-). The last two, *Amakusa-bon Isoho* and *Heike*, were published by Christian missionaries after the Muromachi period (1338-1573) as reference materials for use at the time in studying spoken Japanese. Thus, there are some concerns when simply comparing these data.

Nonetheless, if based on Ishigaki's observation in Table 5.1, it can be said that the ratio of *ga* as a genitive proper (i.e. connecting two NPs) decreased from OJ to MJ, that of S-Mkg *ga* increased, and CONJ *ga* emerged from the late Heian period. Unfortunately, Ishigaki does not provide the data for S-Mkg *ga* by clause types (e.g. by MZ/RY/SS/RT/IZ clauses, or by main/subordinate clauses), and we cannot tell from his data when *ga* came to be commonly used in simple declarative sentences.24

Unlike Ishigaki (1955), which only studies the use of *ga*, ôno S. (1977a/b) compares *ga* with *no*. He offers simple ratios of *ga* to *no* in terms of number of tokens in classical literature over time:

---

24 This is because, as mentioned, Ishigaki regards all instances of S-Mkg *ga* as nominative even in OJ and does not pay much attention to the clause types in which *ga* was used for subject marking. Instead, he distinguishes types of subjects marked by *ga* (see Section 5.3.1 for details).
Table 5.2: Ratios of ga to no (based on Ôno S. 1977b: 102, 105, 109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>ga : no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Heian: EMJ)</td>
<td>Taketori (late 9c?)</td>
<td>1 : 14 ~ 20 (unspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tosa (ca. 935)</td>
<td>1 : 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makura (ca. 1000-17)</td>
<td>1 : 14 ~ 20 (unspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genji (ca. 1001-14)</td>
<td>1 : 20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kohon setsuwa (ca. 1130)</td>
<td>1 : about 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kamakura: MJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uji-shûi (ca. 1212-22)</td>
<td>1 : 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsurezuregusa (ca. 1330-31)</td>
<td>1 : 14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kakuichi Heike (ca. 1371)</td>
<td>1 : 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(After Muromachi: Late MJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amakusa Heike (1592)</td>
<td>1 : 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amakusa Isoho (1593)</td>
<td>1 : 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant increase of the use of ga relative to that of no is apparent in the data. According to Ôno S. (1977b), there are two reasons for this increase. One is the emergence of CONJ ga, which will be discussed in Section 5.3 below, and the other is the loss of the social markedness of ga.25 He induces the loss of social markedness of ga from the expansion of the kinds of NPs that could be marked by ga (see the discussion about (9b) in Section 5.2.3.1 above).

25 Ôno S. (1977b: 110) states that CONJ ga takes up about 20 percent of the total uses of ga in Amakusa-bon Heike, but it is about 6.5 percent according to Ishigaki’s (1955) data in Table 5.1. This discrepancy shows that it is often difficult to distinguish S-Mkg ga from CONJ ga. Since Ishigaki is more concerned with the development of CONJ ga, he seems more conservative in identifying CONJ ga than Ôno S. does. Ishigaki (1955: 32) provides his criteria for identifying CONJ ga (see Section 5.3.1), and states that he would regard ga as CONJ ga when it is the only possible analysis, otherwise regard it as NOM ga. Ôno S. does not provide his criteria.
While losing its social markedness, according to Ōno S. (1977b), *ga* increased its uses with verbal and adjectival predicates (i.e. *yógen*): the ratio of \([\text{NP } ga \ V/Adj]\) increased in comparison to \([\text{NP } ga \ NP]\). He (ibid.: 110) provides the following observations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>([\text{NP } ga \ V/Adj])</th>
<th>([\text{NP } ga \ NP])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Heian: EMJ)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohon setsuwa (ca. 1130)</td>
<td>27 %</td>
<td>73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Kamakura: MJ)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujishûi (ca. 1212-22)</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsurezuregusa (ca. 1330-31)</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakuichi Heike (ca. 1371)</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Otogi-zôshi, 14c to 17c)</strong></td>
<td>15 %</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(After Muromachi: Late MJ)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amakusa Heike (1592)</td>
<td>70 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Ratios between \([\text{NP } ga \ V/Adj]\) and \([\text{NP } ga \ NP]\)

One thing to note is that verbs and adjectives in \([\text{NP } ga \ V/Adj]\) do not distinguish inflectional forms; they include such forms as RT, RY, MZ, and IZ, as well as SS forms. As seen in Section 5.2.2 (also see Chapter 4), the structure of \([\text{NP } ga \ V(RT/MZ/IZ)]\) (e.g. relative clauses and hypothetical clauses) are very common even in OJ, in which *ga* should be analyzed as a genitive. Thus, we cannot directly relate the increase of the ratio of \([\text{NP } ga \ V/Adj]\) in Table 5.3 to the emergence or increase of NOM *ga*.

Unlike the simple *ga/no* ratios in Table 5.2, the percentages of \([\text{NP } ga \ V/Adj]\) in Table 5.3 do not exhibit a gradual increase; the works in the Heian and Kamakura periods

---

26 "Otogi-zôshi" is not a work title, but a name of genre for popular short novels with illustrations. Some representative works include *Issun-bôshi*, *Shuten-dôzi*, *Benkei monogatari*, and *Fukutomi-zôshi*. Ōno S. presents the data in parenthesis, and he does not specify which work(s) he examined. Apparently, the *Otogi-zôshi* data disagree with the trend he claims.
show about the same percentages (except for *Oto-gi-zōshi*), and there is a sudden increase in *Amakusa-bon Heike*. This may cast some doubt on the validity of this comparison.

Nonetheless, as far as the data in Table 5.3 are concerned, the shift of weight from [NP *ga* NP] to [NP *ga* V/Adj] is noticeable, which may well be a reflection of the emergence of NOM *ga*. For a better understanding, however, we need an analysis by each inflectional form (and perhaps more materials to demonstrate a gradual change).

Nomura (1993) provides another observation. He (ibid.: 28) observes that subject marking by *ga* or *no* in EMJ (*chūko chūki* ‘mid-Heian’ period, in Nomura’s description) basically follows the same constraints as in OJ. In *Amakusa-bon Heike* (i.e. late MJ), however, S-Mkg *ga* is used twice as often as S-Mkg *no*. As for S-Mkg *ga*, about a half of its uses occur in conclusive or antithetical clauses, and the other half in adnominal or consequential clauses. As for S-Mkg *no*, the uses are concentrated in quasi-nominal clauses (i.e. *juntai-ku*), adnominal clauses, and consequential clauses. Nomura interprets the spread of *ga* in conclusive and antithetical clauses as the emergence of NOM *ga*, and the use of S-Mkg *no* in the three types of clauses above as its leaning towards an adnominal particle (*rentai-joshi*, i.e. genitive).

Nomura’s interpretation of his data is problematic for two reasons: (i) both *ga* and *no* could be used to mark subjects in antithetical clauses, even in OJ, and (ii) it is not the case that GEN *no* was derived from S-Mkg *no*. Nevertheless, it seems significant for the emergence of NOM *ga* that S-Mkg *ga* was used twice as often as S-Mkg *no*, although

---

27 This is obviously an immense task, and the validity of comparison, due to such factors as different genres and different dialects, can still be questioned, so the present study does not take up the challenge.

28 Both antithetical and consequential clauses take IZ forms, and different interpretations are due to the following conjunctive particles, i.e. *do* for antithetical and *ba* for consequential. Thus, Nomura’s treatment of these clauses as belonging to different types is questionable.
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Nomura's data are limited to *Amakusa-bon Heike*. It is still more significant that S-Mkg *ga* came to be used often in conclusive clauses.

Ishigaki (1955), Ōno S. (1977b) and Nomura (1993) provide some intriguing observations. However, Ishigaki's identification of NOM *ga* tokens seems inadequate, and both Ōno S. and Nomura use *Amakusa-bon Heike* (1592) as a key data source. We should be careful about its status because of its peculiarity, i.e. a book published by Christian missionaries in romanized transcription, although it is often compared with *Kakuichi-bon Heike* (ca. 1371) to study language changes in texts based on "the same story" (e.g. Kazama 1960; Ōno S. 1977b).

Moving further down to the Edo period (1603-1868, EModJ), Sakanashi (1987:68-69) provides data from three plays by Chikamatsu (1653-1724). He compares the number of tokens for subject marking (*shukaku* in his terms) with those for the adnominal function (*rentaikaku* in his terms, i.e. the genitive proper as in [N GEN N]). His numbers are simple occurrences, not ratios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>ga</em></th>
<th><em>no</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sonezaki shinjū</em> (1703) SUBJ-marking</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnominal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Horikawa nami no tsuzumi</em> (1707) SUBJ-marking</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnominal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Meido no hikyaku</em> (1711) SUBJ-marking</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnominal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Numbers of *ga* and *no* in selected plays by Chikamatsu (Sakanashi 1987)

---

29 Chikamatsu Monzaemon was born in Echizen (today's Fukui prefecture except for the Wakasa area), and moved to Kyoto in his childhood, where he learned classical literature. Thus, he can be regarded as belonging to the literary tradition rooted in Kyoto (i.e. EMJ and most MJ). He was a *kabuki/föruri/kyōgen* writer, and his home ground as a professional writer was Osaka.
It appears that there are some chronological trends in subject marking and adnominal uses in these three works, but these trends may not be reliable since the works were written by a single author within a span of eight years; these particular texts could have been chosen to agree with prescribed trends. Nonetheless, it is apparent in all three works that ɡa is used as a subject marker four to five times as often as ɡo, and that ɡo is used as a genitive proper (i.e. [N GEN N]) ten to twenty times as often as ɡa. Also, the particle ɡa is used more often as a subject marker than as a genitive proper (from about two to four times).

Unfortunately, Sakanashi (1987) does not provide detailed information about clause types, e.g. inflectional forms and the main/subordinate distinction. In any case, it is generally agreed that NOM ɡa emerged as such in MJ, and the three plays he considers do belong to EModJ, i.e. were written after NOM ɡa emerged.

5.2.3.3 Key Constructions in EMJ and MJ

Before examining new data in EMJ and MJ, let me first mention what happened to the four key constructions in OJ that are thought to have motivated the reanalysis of genitives as subject markers (see Section 5.2.2): relative clauses, sa-nominalized clauses, goto clauses, and MZ/IZ clauses. Of these, relative clauses and MZ/IZ clauses are still very productive in EMJ and MJ (in fact, all the way into ModJ with some morphological changes), but they have not been discussed any further in past studies since there were no changes in terms of subject marking. The other two, sa-nominalized clauses and goto clauses, are prominent in OJ because waka (or uta ‘songs’, the dominant classical verse form) is the main source of OJ data; sa-nominalized main clauses express some extra emotion (e.g. exclamation or sorrow), while goto clauses are all similes, used to fit the genre of waka. Although waka is still an integral part of EMJ/MJ literature, its weight as a source
of data decreased significantly in EMJ and MJ due to the emergence of prose literature, and 
*sa*-nominalized clauses and *goto* clauses in these later works have attracted little attention in past studies.

The constructions that are most often brought up in discussing subject marking in EMJ and MJ can be grouped into three types. One is SS clauses (i.e. unmarked main clauses ending with SS forms), the subject marking of which directly leads to the reanalysis of genitive as nominative. I call the other two types “RT-COP constructions” and “no-*ga*-appositive constructions”. The RT-COP construction ends with [X(RT) COP(SS)] (X being a verb or an auxiliary), e.g. ... *fazime-taru nari* [... start(RY)-Res(RT) COP(SS)] ‘(it is) that ... started’ (GM, Tenarai). The no-*ga*-appositive construction takes the structure of [X no Y(RT) ga ...] with Y being an appositive elaboration of X, e.g. *mi mo sira-nu fana no iro imiziki ga sakt-midare-tari* [see(RY) even know-Neg(RT) flower GEN color splendid(RT) ga bloom-go.out.of.control-Res(SS)] ‘some unknown flowers, the color of which is splendid, are in full bloom everywhere’ (Uji-shûi 13.11).

No study has succeeded in clearly illustrating the developmental process of NOM *ga* by presenting actual examples. As mentioned in Section 5.2.1, this study disagrees with the prescriptive assumption that there must have been essential linguistic differences between GEN *ga* and GEN *no* which determined that *ga*, not *no*, would become the nominative in Std-ModJ. Therefore, it is not my intention to induce any linguistic necessity for the emergence of NOM *ga* in the following data presentation. To be precise, the very status of *ga* as a nominative case marker in Std-ModJ is questionable (see Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1.7). The data presented below are inevitably sketchy, and merely suggest the

---

30 Cf. so-called “extended predicates” in ModJ, which take the form of [.. Pred NMZ COP], e.g. *Terebi mite-ru n desu* [TV watching-be NMZ COP] ‘(It is that I am watching TV.’
fact that GEN ga has developed the capacity (but not the necessity) to mark subjects in simple declarative sentences in some varieties of ModJ.

**SS Clauses**

In OJ and EMJ, simple declarative sentences most typically end with predicates in SS forms, and their subjects are usually zero-marked. A general consensus among scholars is that the time when ga-marked subjects became common in simple declarative sentences in MJ is the time when NOM ga emerged as such. Thus, subject marking in SS clauses is considered most relevant to the emergence of NOM ga.

Even in OJ, subjects in SS clauses can be marked by GEN ga or no (see the examples in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2.11), although such cases are very rare. They are still rare in EMJ, but below are some examples of ga/no-marked subjects in SS clauses. S-Mkg ga and no are glossed simply as ga and no in order to distinguish them from other prototypical genitive uses:

(10) a. *Ise monogatari* (before 905 A.D.) (Ise 102)

\[ \text{Ate-naru wonna no, ama ni nari te, yo no naka wo} \]
\[ \text{omofi-unzi te, Kyoo ni mo ara-zu, think.of-get.tired(RY) Conj Capital at even be-Neg(RY)} \]
\[ \text{faruka-naru yama-zato ni sumi-ni-keri,} \]
\[ \text{far(N)-COP mountain-village at live-Perf-Evi(SS)} \]

'A noble woman, becoming a nun, getting tired of society, not even being in the capital, and was living in a distant mountain village.'

b. *Kokinshū* (905 A.D.) (KKS 854)

\[ \text{namida no/ tagi.masari-keri.} \]
\[ \text{tear no/ waterfall.increase/surpass(RY)-Evi(SS)} \]

'Tears surpass a waterfall!'

---

31 This use of *keri* is generally called *etan no keri* ‘keri of exclamation’. It has less to do with past tense, but rather it expresses some extra emotion, such as exclamation and sorrow, induced by a newly noticed event. See Shinzato (1991), for example, for an analysis of *-ki* and *-keri* from the viewpoint of evidentiality.
c. *Konjaku monogatari* (ca. 1120?) (*Konjaku* 2.8)

Tigo yauyaku tiyau-dai-si te mi no zai firoku
boy gradually long-big-do Conj body GEN intelligence wide
kokoro no itare-ri.
heart no reach-Res(SS)

'The child gradually grew up, (he is) very intelligent, and his heart reaches outwards (i.e. he is considerate).'

d. *Kohon setzuwashi* (ca. 1130) (*Kohon* setzuwa SB)

Wara-sudi fito-sudi ga kauzi mitu ni nari-tari-tu.
straw-string one-string ga tangerine three to become(RY)-Res(OY)-Perf(SS)

'A string of straw changed to (was exchanged for) three tangerines.'

Kauzi mitu ga nuno mi-mura ni nari-tari.
tangerine three ga cloth three-Clsf to become-Res(SS)

'The three tangerines changed to three roles of cloth.'

All the examples in (10) end with SS forms. Note that in (10a), (10b), and (10c), *no*, instead of *ga*, is used to mark the subjects *wonna* ‘woman’, *namida* ‘tear’, and *kokoro* ‘heart’. In (10a), the intermediate clauses take RY forms (or [V(RY) Conj]) for a neutral conjunction. We cannot attribute the *ga-* or *no-*marking of subjects to RY forms, since RY clauses function as paratactic ‘and’ clauses (i.e. the degree of subordination is low), and accordingly, GEN-marking of subjects is rare in RY clauses, just as in SS clauses (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4).

Moving down to MJ, below are some examples from *Uji-shūi monogatari* (ca. 1212-22). According to Nomura (1993: 31), there are more than 20 examples in which *ga* or *no* marks subject NPs (which are not RT forms of verbs or adjectives) in SS clauses:32

---

32 Nomura (1993: 31) provides only the second sentence in the following example, and regards *mazusikari-keru* [poor-Evi(RT)] as a subject marked by *ga*. But it seems more accurate to regard this use of *ga* as conjunctive due to the context set up by the first sentence:

a. *Fiei-zan ni sou ari-keri.*
Hiei-Mt. in monk exist-Evi(SS)
'There was a monk in Mt. Hiei (= Enryaku Temple).'

*Ito mazusikari-keru ga Kurama ni nanuka mawiri-keri.*
(Uji-shūi 6.6)
very poor-Evi(RT) ga Kurama to 7.days come-Evi(SS)

'Although (he was) very poor, (he) went to Kurama (temple) for seven days.'
(11) a. *Sono fito no moto ni tosigoro ari-keru saburafu no tuma ni gusi te inaka fe ini-keri.* (Uji-shûi 5.8)

A samurai, who served for that person for many years, left for the countryside, accompanied by his wife.

b. *Wara fito-sudi ga kauzi mitu ni nari-nu.* (Uji-shûi 7.5)

One string of straw became (was exchanged for) three tangerines.

c. *San-zyaku bakari naru namazu no, futafuta to si te nifa ni fafi-ide-tari.* (Uji-shûi 13.8)

An about three-foot long catfish crawled and went pitapat out to the garden.

Note again that *no,* not *ga,* is used to mark subjects in SS clauses in (11a) and (11c).

Below are some more examples from other materials in MJ:

(12) a. *Yakumo-mishô* (early 13c) (Yakumo-mishô 4)

Gushing feelings. (It’s that) feelings gush, (and they) spring out like water and such.

b. *Kokon chomonjû* (1254) (Chomonjû 11)

My little son wrote (it).

c. *Engyô-bon Heike* (ca. 1309-10) (Engyô Heike 5)

At the beginning of the month, the east (side) becomes shallows.

At the bottom of the month, the west (side) becomes shallows.

---

33 *Yakumo-mishô* is a handbook for *waka* (lit. Japanese songs, i.e. poetry) compiled by Emperor Juntoku (1197-1242).
According to ôno S. (1977b: 112), Amakusa-bon Heike (1592) contains many examples of simple declarative sentences in which subjects are marked by *ga*, as seen in (13a-c) below. But *no*-marking is still observable, as in (13d):

(13) a. *Kafi-nai namida ga kobore-ta.*
    use-lacking(RT) tear ga drop-Res(SS)
    ‘Useless tears dropped.’

b. *Yo ga ake-ta.*
    night ga come.to.a.new.term-Res(SS)
    ‘Dawn broke.’

c. *Tukafi ga ki-ta.*
    messenger ga come-Res(SS)
    ‘A messenger came.’

d. *Sore ni yotute (< yori te) moro-fito no me wo sumai (< sumasi) te kore wo mi-marasi-ta.* (Amakusa Heike I)
    that on depend Conj various-person no eye ACC concentrate Conj this ACC see-Pol-Res(SS)
    ‘Because of that, many people saw it, focusing (their) eyes.’

Note that in all the examples in (13), the resultative -tari (SS) of OJ is reduced to -ta; and there is no formal distinction between its SS form and RT form any longer.

As seen in the previous subsection, the statistical data in Table 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 do not directly address the increase of *ga*-marked subjects in SS clauses, but it is generally agreed that such use of *ga* for marking subjects in simple declarative sentences became very common in late MJ (e.g. Hashimoto 1969: 97 [1928-35]; Kazama 1960: 60; ôno S. 1977b: 112-13; Nomura 1993: 28). Hashimoto (1969: 97 [1928-35]), however, notes that *no* was also often used to mark subjects in SS clauses in the Muromachi period (i.e. the latter half of MJ).
**RT-COP Construction**

As mentioned above, the RT-COP construction ends with an extended predicate in the form of \([X(RT)\ COP(SS)]\) (\(X\) being a verb or an auxiliary). Some scholars do not distinguish it from the SS clauses discussed above, since both end with SS forms. In the RT-COP construction, however, the ga- or no-marking of subjects seems attributable to the RT form preceding the copula *nari*. In that sense, subjects are more likely to be marked by GEN ga or no in the RT-COP construction than in simple SS clauses.\(^{34}\)

It is interesting to note that the RT-COP construction is not observable in *Man'yôshû* of OJ; according to Sô-sakuin, there are 26 examples of *nari* (SS) used after verbs,\(^{35}\) but all the verbs take SS forms, not RT forms, i.e. \([V(SS)\ nari(SS)]\). This use of *nari* after SS forms is generally thought to express *denbun suitei* (hearsay, conjecture), and distinguished from the copula *nari*, which comes after nouns or RT forms of verbs.\(^{36}\)

In the following EMJ/MJ examples, however, *nari* is apparently a copula after RT forms (cf. *samu* (SS) ‘awake’ vs. *samuru* (RT); *nari* (SS) [COP] vs. *naru* (RT)):

\(^{34}\) See the case made in Chapter 4 that GEN-marking of subjects is a reflection of clausal nouniness.

\(^{35}\) These examples do not include COP *naru* (RT) or the full verb *naru* ‘be born, become’.

\(^{36}\) However, Quinn (1987) attributes the difference to the different inflected forms.
In these examples, two kinds of analyses seem possible, one illustrated in the first set of the translations, and the other in the second set of the translations. The first analysis does not regard (14a) and (14b) as RT-COP constructions; they are not single clause sentences with extended predicates, but rather consist of main clauses and embedded clauses. The main-clause subjects are wosiku aru mono ‘things that are hard to lose’ marked by fa [TOP] in (14a) and kore ‘this’ marked by mo ‘too’ in (14b), and their predicates are nari-keri [COP(RY)-Evi(SS)] and nari [COP(SS)] respectively. The subjects yume ‘dream’ marked by no in (14a) and kokoro ‘heart’ marked by ga in (14b) are in the embedded clauses ending with samuru ‘awake (RT)’ and naru [COP(RT)] respectively. In this analysis, samuru nari-keri [awake(RT) COP(RY)-Evi(SS)] in (14a) and koto naru nari [thing COP(RT) COP(SS)] in (14b) do not form extended predicates, and thus (14a) and (14b) are not treated as RT-COP constructions. In fact, the embedded clauses are a headless RT-nominal clause in (14a) and a relative clause with the head NP koto ‘thing’ in (14b), and GEN-marking of subjects in constructions like these is common even in OJ (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2).

In another analysis, however, it seems possible to regard the phrases marked by fa and mo (i.e. wosiku aru mono fa in (14a) and kore mo in (14b)) as topics, and to regard the remaining portions as the main clauses, as shown in the second set of the translations. In this interpretation, ... samuru nari-keri [awake(RT) COP(RY)-Evi(SS)] in (14a) and ... koto naru nari [thing COP(RT) COP(SS)] in (14b) do form extended predicates (i.e. RT-COP constructions), and the subjects marked by ga and no (i.e. yume no in (14a) and kokoro ga in (14b)) are in the main clauses ending with SS forms, although the extended predicates still contain RT forms.37

37 Note that RT forms generally induce GEN-marking of subjects.
In the following examples, the subjects marked by *ga* are clearly of the main clauses with extended predicates, in which *nari* comes after *faberi* in its RT form (cf. *faberi* (SS) vs. *faberu* (RT)). Thus, these are RT-COP constructions. The word *faberi* originally meant 'to be humbly serving', but came also to be used as a polite humble copula or just as a polite marker:

(15) a. *Taketori* (ca. originally late 9c - early 10c ??)

..., *fodo naku makari-nu-beki-nameri to omofu ga*  
*time lacking leave-Perf-should-Conjec Comp think(RT) ga*

*kanasiku-faberu nari.*  
*sad-Pol(RT) COP(SS)*

(lit.) 'Thinking that perhaps (I) have to be gone before long is sad.'

b. *Gukanshô* (1220) (Gukanshô 3)

*Kore ga makoto no doorini te fa faberi nari.*  
*this ga genuineness GEN truth at Conj TOP COP(Pol/RT) COP(SS)*

'This is, at least, the genuine truth.'

Again, *ga*-marking of subjects in these examples is still attributable to the RT forms in the extended predicate (i.e. *faberu*), but the overall sentences end with SS forms of the copula *nari*. This two-sided nature of the RT-COP construction may have been one of the promoting factors for the movement towards the use of *ga* (or *no*) in simple declarative sentences, i.e. the emergence of NOM *ga* (or *no* in some dialects).

**no-ga Appositive Construction**

The *no-ga* appositive construction takes the structure of [X *no Y(RT) ga ...*] with Y being an appositive elaboration of X. This construction is very common in EMJ literature, and may be illustrated with an example from *Ise monogatari* (before 905):

---

38 Sakanashi (1987) and Nomura (1993) cite this example, but *ga* is not used in the Shin-zenshû version of *Taketori*, as in *omofu [think(RY)] ‘thinking ...’* instead of *omofu ga [think(RT) ga]*.

39 The topic marker *fa* is translated as 'at least' in this example.
(16) 

wonna no mada yo fe-zu to oboye-taru ga woman GEN yet relationship pass-Neg Comp seem-Res(RT) ga fito no omoto ni sinobi te mono kikoye te... (Ise 120) 

person GEN place at hide(RY) Conj thing tell(RY) Conj

‘A woman, one seemed not to have experienced a relationship yet, hiding at a certain person’s place, told (a love with him), ...’

As shown in the translation, the phrase up to ga in [X no Y(RT) ga ...] forms a complex NP subject; X is a simple NP, for which Y functions as a clausal elaboration ending in its RT form, and X and Y are connected by GEN no. I call this type of subject “appositive subjects”. For these appositive subjects, GEN ga seems to function as a subject marker.

S-Mkg ga in [X no Y(RT) ga ...] is not necessarily required, especially when the overall sentence ends in SS form. See examples below:

(17)

a. Ise monogatari (before 905) (Ise 9)

Siroki tori no kutibasito asi to akaki o, ...

white bird GEN bill and leg and red(RT)

midu no ufe ni asobi tutu sakana wo kufu.

water GEN upper on play(RY) while fish ACC eat(SS)

‘A white bird, one whose bill and legs are red,..., eats fish while swimming around on the water.’

b. Genji monogatari (ca. 1001-14) (GM, Yûgao)

Warafano wokasige naru o ide-ki te uti-maneku.

child GEN pretty COP(RT) get.out-come(RY) Conj Pref-beckon(SS)

‘A child (girl), one who is pretty, comes out and beckons.’

c. Uji-shûi monogatari (ca. 1212-22) (Uji-shûi 11.7)

Tayori-nakari-keru wonna no Kiyomidu ni dependence-lacking(RY)-Evi(RT) woman GEN Kiyomizu to anagati-ni mawiru o ari-keri.

intently visit(RT) exist(RY)-Evi(SS)

‘A woman with no one to depend on, one who intently went to worship to the Kiyomizu temple, existed.’

As indicated by the ø, the appositive subjects in these examples end with RT forms and have no subject marker, while the overall sentences end with SS forms.
The appositive construction is commonly used in *Genji monogatari* (ca. 1001-14) in various ways. See the examples below:

(18) a. Zuryau no ko-domo no sukizukisiki ga ... yagate wi te governor GEN child-Pl GEN lewd(RT) ga ... soon after lead(RY) Conj kudari-keru ni ya to zo omoši-yori-keru. (GM, Yûgao) descend(RY)-Evi(RT) at KP Comp Emph think-get.close-Evi(RT)

‘(She) wonders if it might be that the governor’s children, a playboy, ..., took (her) down (to the country side).’


‘(He) regards the thinly stretched clouds, those that are gray, as deeply sad.’

c. Musume no ama-gimi fa, kandatime no kita-no-kata ni te daughter GEN nun-Title TOP court.noble GEN wife.of.a.nobleman COP Conj ari-keru ga, ...., sumi-fazime-taru nari. (GM, Tenarai) COP(RY)-Evi(RT) ga live-start-Res(RT) COP(SS)

‘(His) daughter, m’lady the nun, who is the wife of a nobleman, ..., has started to live (there).’

d. Ofo-ama-gimi no mago no Ki-no-kami grand-nun-Title GEN grand.child GEN Ki-GEN-head.person nari-keru ga, kono koro nobori te ki-tari.40 COP(RY)-Evi(RT) ga this time ascend(RY) Conj come(RY)-Res(SS)

‘The Grand Nun’s grandchild, who is the governor of Ki, came up (to Kyoto) around this time.’ (GM, Tenarai)

All the examples above have appositive subjects marked by *ga*. In (18a), the subject [X no Y(RT) ga] appears to agree with the RT form kudari-keru [descend(RY)-Evi(RT)] before the complementation with *to*. In fact, this example also contain an RT-COP construction, but the final copula is omitted before the complementizer *to*, i.e. kudari-keru ni ya (ara-mu) [descend(RY)-Evi(RT) at KP COP-Conj(RT)].41 In (18b) as well, the *ga*-marked subject seems to agree with the RT form of the predicate nibi-iro naru [gray-color COP(RT)]. The

40 According to Sakanashi (1987: 63), some texts of *Genji monogatari* do not have *ga* in this sentence, and it seems possible that this use of *ga* was added later in the process of hand-copying.

41 The copula predicate ara-mu [COP-Conj(RT)] takes its RT form due to the preceding KP *ya*. It is also possible to analyze the predicate ni ya ara-mu [COP KP COP-Conj(RT)] as a clefted-copula, cf. COP nari < ni ari [LOC COP].
next example, (18c), is slightly different from other appositive constructions since the topic marker fa, instead of GEN no, is used after ama-gimi ‘Ms. Nun’. It seems possible to regard ga in (18c) as a conjunctive, but it is generally agreed that the conjunctive use of ga was not established until the Insei period (1086-). If we follow this analysis, [X fa Y(RT) ga] in (18c) is an appositive subject (X being a topic, and Y being X’s elaboration), which is in the end predicated with fazime-taru nari [start(RY)-Res(RT) COP(SS)], i.e. an RT-COP construction. The last example, (18d), contains a typical appositive subject in the forms of [X no Y(RT) ga], but the difference from others is that the sentence ends with the SS form ki-tari [come(RY)-Res(SS)], which does not contain any RT forms.

In later years, it seems to have become more common for appositive subjects to be predicated with predicates in the SS form. Consider these examples from Konjaku monogatari (ca. 1120?):

(19) a. take fa si-syaku bakari aru wi no kiba wo kufi-ide-taru ga height TOP four-foot about be boar GEN fang ACC eat-put.out-Perf(RT) ga ifa wo farafara to kufe ba, fi firafira to ide te, rock ACC Onoma Comp eat(IZ) Conj fire Onoma Comp put.out(RY) Conj ke wo ikarakasi te fasiri-kakari te kufu. (Konjaku 20.10) hair ACC bristle(RY) Conj run.into(RY) Conj eat(SS)

‘A wild boar of about four feet in height, one with fangs bared, crushing rocks, emitting sparks, and bristling its hairs, jumps on (him) and bites.’

b. Tosi gozifu bakari naru wotokono osorosi-ge naru ga, age fifty about COP(RT) man GEN scary-look(N) COP(RT) ga suikan siyauzoku-si te utide-no-tati obi-tari. (Konjaku 26.18)

‘An about-50-year-old man, who looked scary, was wearing suikan, and carrying a long sword.’

42 “Suikan” is a kind of casual wear.
These sentences have appositive subjects, and end with SS forms. There are intermediate RY clauses ending with [V(RY) Conj]. These are not subordinate to the final SS clauses; they function, rather, as stacked independent clauses conjoined in a neutral ‘and’ relationship. Note that GEN-marked subjects are rare but attested in SS clauses and RY clauses in OJ (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2).

Consider another set of examples from Uji-shûi monogatari (ca. 1212-22):

(20) a. Fira-dura naru housi no futori-taru ga
   flat-face COP(RT) monk GEN fat-Res(RT) ga
   rokuzyuu bakari ni te ari.  (Uji-shûi 9.5)
   sixty about LOC Conj COP(SS)
   ‘(He is) about sixty years old, a monk with a flat face, who is fat.’

b. Take takaki sou no oni no gotoku naru ga,
   height high(RT) monk GEN ogre GEN like COP(RT) ga
   Shinano-nuno wo koromo ni ki, sugi no fira-asida wo
   Shinano-cloth ACC clothes for wear(RY) ceder GEN flat-clog ACC
   faki te, dai-mokugenzi no nenzu wo mote-ri.  (Uji-shûi 15.8)
   wear(RY) Conj large-mokugenzi GEN rosary ACC hold-Res(SS)
   ‘A tall monk, who was like an ogre, was wearing Shinano cloth for a robe, ceder clogs, and holding a large mokugenji (Chinese bladdernut wood) rosary.’

c. Siyaufou-souziyau no wakaki sou ni te ofasi-keru ga ...
   Shôhô-bishop GEN young monk COP Conj COP(Hon/RY)-Evi(RT) ga
   waza-to aragafi wo se-rare-keri.  (Uji-shûi 12.8)
   intentionally dispute ACC do(MZ)-Hon(RY)-Evi(SS)
   ‘Bishop Shôhô, who was a young monk, intentionally had a dispute.’

d. mi mo sira-nu fana no iro imiziki ga
   see(RY) even know-Neg(RT) flower GEN color splendid(RT) ga
   saki-midare-tari.  (Uji-shûi 13.11)
   bloom(RY)-go.out.of.control(RY)-Res(SS)
   ‘Some unknown flowers, the color of which is splendid, are in full bloom everywhere.’

43 The IZ clause ifa wo farafara to kufe ba [rock ACC Onoma Comp eat(IZ) Conj] in (19a) is subordinate to the following RY clause fi, firafira to ide te [fire Onoma Comp put.out(RY) Conj]. Thus, the boar appears to be putting out sparks while crushing the rock with its teeth.
In (20a-d), the sentences end with SS forms. In (20e), the GEN-marking of the subject still complies with the original tendency to be used in RT clauses; the appositive subject marked by *ga* is in the RT clause, predicated by *wi-tari-keru* [be(.doing)-Res(RY)-Evi(RT)].

It seems that while *no-ga* appositive subjects were common, the restrictions for *ga*-marking of subjects (i.e. most typically in RT clauses) had become less strict, and we find more examples of RY forms and SS forms predicating appositive subjects. Thus, the trend towards the use of *ga* in simple declarative sentences appears to be observable with *no-ga* appositive construction as well.

5.2.4 Summary

In Section 5.2, I have discussed several key constructions through which GEN *ga* in OJ may have come to mark subjects in simple declarative sentences in Japanese. These processes are generally regarded as the development of NOM *ga* in past studies. As shown in Section 5.2.2, GEN *ga* and GEN *no* were used to mark subjects even in OJ, albeit usually in limited environments due to clausal nouniness, e.g. relative clauses, *sa*-nominalized clauses, *goto* clauses, and MZ/IZ clauses. Then, moving down to EMJ and MJ, the constraints seem to have loosened, as shown in Section 5.2.3. Although it is rather sketchy, this review of past studies has provided the following observations: (i) the use of *ga* generally increased from OJ to MJ; (ii) the use of *ga* for subject marking increased; and (iii) the use of *ga* for subject marking in simple declarative sentences increased. The last
observation, (iii), directly leads to the emergence of NOM ga. Some studies have sought to identify reason(s) why GEN ga, instead of GEN no, has become the nominative particle. The underlying assumption in these studies is, as seen in Section 5.2.1, that there must have been some linguistic necessity which motivated GEN ga, rather than no, to become the nominative particle.

I disagree with this sort of prescriptive assumption, and will present a counter-argument in Chapter 6. It is a fact that the particles ga and no were genitives in OJ, and that ga in Std-ModJ is often used as a subject marker in simple declarative sentences (or, more broadly, in main clauses). However, it is also a fact that some modern dialects use no as a subject marker (e.g. Kyushu dialects) in place of the standard ga. Furthermore, as far as dialects are concerned, Std-ModJ is not a direct descendant of OJ, and ga is not an unmarked mandatory subject marker even in Std-ModJ. Unfortunately this dissertation does not provide an answer to every issue of subject marking in Japanese, but it is misleading for us to assume a priori that GEN ga has inevitably changed to NOM ga.

5.3 From GEN ga to CONJ ga

In addition to the change from GEN ga to NOM ga, it is generally agreed that GEN ga also developed into CONJ(unctive) ga (e.g. Saeki 1953; Ishigaki 1955; Kazama 1960; Ōno 1977b; Konoshima 1983; Sakanashi 1987; Nomura 1993). Ishigaki’s (1955) study is regarded as the most authoritative research on the issue, although there is a problem in his treatment of the notion of shukaku (nominative case). Section 5.3.1 is devoted to reviewing his study.

This section also puts the issue into a broader perspective in Section 5.3.2. In grammaticalization theory, Hopper and Traugott (1993) claim that clause linkage in human
language develops unidirectionally from "more independent" to "more dependent", forming a cline between parataxis and subordination, and this is discussed in Section 5.3.2.1. However, CONJ ga in Japanese seems to provide a clear counterexample to this unidirectionality hypothesis; CONJ ga developed through the opposite process, i.e. a weakening of clause linkage, from subordination towards parataxis. Section 5.3.2.2 reviews a syntax-based approach by Harris and Campbell (1995). Unlike the unidirectionality hypothesis of grammaticalization theory, they attempt to account for the development of subordination not from paratactic constructions, but based on the duality of non-finite verb forms in the syntax of a single sentence. However, their argument has its problems, and is a priori syntactocentric. Their claim does not account for the development of CONJ ga in Japanese, either.

Section 5.3.2.3 examines a wide range of crosslinguistic data, such as Korean, Tibeto-Burman languages, and Australian languages, and proposes morphological and syntactic conditions for the change from subordination towards parataxis, and claims that this type of change is by no means an "exception" in human language. I argue against the easy resort to calling counterexamples merely "exceptions" based only on the number of tokens, as is often done by proponents of grammaticalization theory.44

5.3.1 Ishigaki (1955)

Let us first visualize the evolution of ga illustrated by Ishigaki (1955). His concluding summary table is presented below. As mentioned in Section 5.2.3.2 above (also

44 As we will see, Hopper and Traugott themselves admit the existence of counterexamples. As Janda (2001: 291) states, "it is striking that current research on grammaticalization contains little discussion of proposed counterexamples to unidirectionality/irreversibility, since the latter are actually quite numerous." According to him (ibid.: 292), there are 84 counterexamples (or at least questionable cases) to unidirectionality/irreversibility in the past studies he cited, 29 studies mostly from before 1990 and 40 more articles or books (some by grammaticalizationists) in the 1990s alone (see his references).
see Chapter 4, Section 4.2), Ishigaki regards all instances of subject-marking *ga* as *shukaku joshi* (nominative case particle), and as handled in Table 5.1, his examples of *shukaku joshi* are simply presented as tokens of "subject-marking", in order to avoid confusion with the treatment of nominative case marking in other studies.45

As seen above, Ishigaki identifies four types of uses for subject-marking *ga* (hereafter "S-Mkg ga") and seven types for CONJ *ga*. His basic argument is that CONJ *ga* was derived

45 For Ishigaki's primary sources, see Note 22.
from S-Mkg ga due to the weakening of clause linkage, and that a weaker clause linkage in the relevant construction is observable towards the right end of the table (i.e. in newer types of uses). For example, the clause linkage for Type I of S-Mkg ga is weaker than that of Type 0. Likewise, the clause linkage for Type 3 of CONJ ga is weaker than that of Type 2. Clause linkage indicated with ga became weaker and weaker as time went by, and thus we observe more examples in newer uses on the right moving down the table.

Ishigaki's definitions of GEN ga and S-Mkg ga (shukaku joshi 'nominative case particle' in his terminology), and his criteria for identifying CONJ ga are as follows. GEN ga is a particle that connects two NPs (ibid.: 17). S-Mkg ga is the ga used in the structure of [X ga V/Adj], i.e. when X-ga is predicated by a verb or adjective (yôgen) (ibid.: 17). CONJ ga is identified based on three criteria (ibid.: 32): (i) interpretation of the sentence; (ii) in [X ga Y], if there is a subject in Y, this ga is CONJ ga; and (iii) in [V(RT) ga V], if both verbs end with -u in their SS forms, this ga is CONJ ga. Ishigaki (ibid.: 32) also notes that in order to make his claim about the development of CONJ ga reliable, he regards ga as CONJ ga only when it is clearly so; when both analysis as S-Mkg ga and as CONJ ga are possible, he categorizes it as S-Mkg ga. Thus, there are ambiguous cases in Genji monogatari (ibid.: 33-38), but those are classified as S-Mkg ga in Table 5.5, and Konjaku monogatari is the first material in which CONJ ga appears in Ishigaki's data.

Let us now look at Ishigaki's classification for the four types of S-Mkg ga and the seven types of CONJ ga. In [X ga Y], Type 0, I, and II of S-Mkg ga is defined by a feature of X, while Type III concerns both X and Y. Most types of CONJ ga are defined by the

---

46 He categorizes goto 'like', yuwe 'reason', and tame 'sake' as keishiki-go (quasi-word), and does not regard them as nouns.
47 All verbs except for so-called ra-hen (ra-regular) verbs end with -u in their SS forms.
relationship between the relevant constituents (e.g. subject and object) inside X and Y, which, in Ishigaki’s analysis, reflects the relative strength of cross-clause linkage.

First, Type 0 of S-Mkg ga is quite simple. When ga marks a subject noun (i.e. not an RT-nominalized clause), this use of ga is Type 0 (ibid.: 53).

Next, the use of S-Mkg ga is categorized as Type I when ga marks RT clauses as NPs which refer to certain situations or events, equivalent to relative clauses with the overt head NP koto ‘matter/thing/fact/event’, i.e. \([X(RT) ga Y] = [X(RT) koto ga Y]\) (ibid.: 27). Note that RT clauses can be used as nominalized clauses in OJ and MJ. Here is an example of S-Mkg ga Type I:

(21) ..., fodo naku makari-nu-beki-nameri to omofii ga
    kanasiku-faberu nari.
    (Taketori)

(lit.) ‘It's that thinking that it looks as if (I) have to be gone before long is sad.’

In (21), ga marks ... omofii [... think(RT)] ‘thinking that ...’, which is equivalent (in Ishigaki’s analysis) to ... omofii koto, and the whole phrase marked by ga is predicated by kanasiku-faberu ‘is sad’. Thus, this use of ga is of Type I.

Type II of S-Mkg ga takes the same structure as Type I, i.e. \([X(RT) ga Y]\). The only difference is that RT clauses marked by ga of Type II refer to certain substantial entities (ibid.: 27). This use of RT clauses can be regarded as head-internal relative clauses (HIRCs), which are, in Ishigaki’s analysis, equivalent (in Ishigaki’s analysis) to relative clauses with the overt head NP mono ‘thing/person’. Thus, the following equation stands.

---

48 Ishigaki calls this type of noun phrase sayō-sei meishi-ku (eventive noun phrase), in contrast to keijō-sei meishi-ku (substantive noun phrase). (The translations of these terms are the present author’s approximation, not direct translations.)
49 As seen in (15), this example takes the RT-COP construction, ending with -fabeni nari [Pol(RT) COP(SS)].
50 Ishigaki calls this type of noun phrase keijō-sei meishi-ku (substantive noun phrase).
for Type II: \([X(RT) \text{ ga } Y] = [X(RT) \text{ mono ga } Y]\). In Type II, the referent of the RT clause (i.e. the semantic head of the HIRC) is the subject in the clause. An example of Type II:

(22) \(\text{wonna no madoyo } \text{ fe-zu to oboyetaru ga}\)
\(\text{woman GEN yet relationship pass-Neg Comp seem-Res(RT) ga}\)
\(\text{fito no omoto ni sinobi te mono kikoye te...} \) (Ise 120)
\(\text{person GEN place at hide(RY) Conj thing tell(RY) Conj}\)

‘A woman, one seemed not to have experienced a relationship yet, hiding at a certain person’s place, told (a love with him), …’

According to Ishigaki, the RT clause marked by \(\text{ga}\) in (22) \(\text{okeyetaru [... seem-Res(RT)]}\) can be paraphrased as \(\text{okeyetaru mono [... seem-Res(RT) person]}, which in fact refers to \(\text{wonna ‘woman’}. The semantic head of the RT clause (i.e. \(\text{wonna ‘woman’}) functions as the subject for the verb \(\text{sinobi ‘hide’}. Thus, this example is of Type II.\(^{51}\)

The last type of S-Mkg \(\text{ga}\), Type III, is similar to Type II, in that \(\text{ga}\) marks RT clauses which refer to certain substantial entities. The difference is that the semantic head of the RT clause (i.e. the referent of the RT clause as an HIRC) in Type III is the direct object of the clause (ibid.: 29). An example of Type III:

(23) \(\text{Onaiz Tyuunagon, kano to no sinden no mae ni}\)
\(\text{same Chûnagon(Title) that palace GEN main.building GEN front at}\)
\(\text{sukosi tofoku tate-ri-keru sakura wo tikaku}\)
\(\text{a.little far stand-Res-Evi(RT) cherry.tree ACC closely}\)
\(\text{fori-uwe-tamafi-keru ga, kare-zama ni miye-kere ba, ...}\)
\(\text{dig-plant-Hon-Evi(RT) ga withered-appearance at appear-Evi(IZ) Conj}\)

‘Speaking of the same Chûnagon, since the cherry tree that used to be standing a little far from the front of the main building of the palace, the one (he) dug and planted closer, appeared to be withered, …’ (Yamato 74, Yado no sakura)

In (23), the RT clause \(\text{... fori-uwe-tamafi-keru [... dig-plant-Hon-Evi(RT)]}\) marked by \(\text{ga},\) functions as an HIRC, and its semantic head is \(\text{sakura ‘the cherry tree (specified by its}\)

\(^{51}\) As seen in (16), this example can also be analyzed as a \(\text{no-ga appositive construction, i.e. [X no Y(RT) ga] with Y being a clausal elaboration of X.}\)
modifying clause'), which is the subject for *kare-zama ni miye-kere* 'appeared to be withered'. The semantic head *sakura* 'the cherry tree' is inside the RT clause, and is the direct object for *fori-uwe-tamafi-keru* 'dug and planted'.

Up to this point, we have reviewed Ishigaki’s classification of Types 0, I, II, and III of S-Mkg *ga*. All but Type 0 can be represented as [[[RT]$_{CL1}$ ga Y]$_{CL2}$]. As for clause linkage, Ishigaki (1955: 30-31) argues that the tie between X and Y becomes progressively weaker in Type I, II, and III, in this order. His explanation is as follows. In Type I, the RT clause X refers to an event or situation (i.e. no specific substantive entity as the semantic head), and the whole X serves as the subject for Y. In Type II and III, however, X functions as an HIRC, and only a part of it (i.e. the semantic head) functions as the subject for Y; the remaining part of X is an elaboration of the semantic head. If I represent the semantic head of the HIRC X as “x”, the relationship between X and Y in Type II and III can be described as [X ⇒ x] and [x-ga-Y], while that of Type I would be simply [X-ga-Y].

Therefore, the linkage between X and Y is stronger in Type I than in Type II and III. In Type II, x is the subject inside X, and the subject for Y. Thus, x functions as a pivot (*kaku* 'nucleus' in Ishigaki’s term) for X and Y. In Type III, however, x is the direct object in X, while it is the subject for Y; there is no pivot in Type III. Thus, the relationship between X and Y is stronger in Type II than in Type III.

Now we move on to Ishigaki’s classification of seven types of CONJ *ga*. In the following, I will present his definitions assuming the structure of [X ga Y], in which X and Y represent distinct clauses.

---

52 These representations are my attempt to present Ishigaki’s logic as clearly as possible; he does not use these himself.

53 See Ishigaki (1955: 51) for his summary.
In Type 1, Y contains a subject and predicate (i.e. can formally be a complete sentence), but still there is some sense that Y predicates X. The subject in Y is close to being merely a part of the complex predicate Y (ibid.: 43, 45, 51). Ishigaki’s definition of Type 1 is not rigorous, and perhaps more than one example will be helpful in explaining his point. I present one example below, and two later:

(24) Oti-iri-keru toki mi no toki bakari nari-keru ga,
fall-enter-Evi(RT) time snake GEN time about COP-Evi(RT) ga
fi mo yauyaku kure-nu.
sun too gradually grow.dark-Perf(SS)
(Konjaku 16.24)
‘The time when (he) fell into (the sea) was about 10 a.m., and it has gradually grown dark.’

Regarding (24), Ishigaki explains that fi mo kure-nu [sun too grow.dark-Perf] in Y of [X ga Y] is semantically the same as fi kure-nu or even simply as kure-nu, and that fi ‘sun’ can be regarded as just a part of the complex predicate Y (Ishigaki 1955: 43). For the claim that Y predicates X, he argues that (24) can be interpreted as (lit.) When he fell into the water, it was about 10 a.m., (the situation of) which has gradually grown dark. Thus, X is almost like a subject for the predicate Y, and Type 1 of CONJ ga is closest to S-Mkg ga, according to Ishigaki.

Ishigaki pushes his argument for (24) (especially for the predicative nature of Y in relation to X in [X ga Y]), but somehow it is understandable since clause X in (24) can be

---

54 See the exact wording in his summary (Ishigaki 1955: 51):

“Kooken wa keisiki-zyoo bun o keisei site i-nagara, nao zekken ni taisite zyutubu-teki seisitu ga nookoo de,
kooken no syutai ga kiwamete teizi-go ni tikai mono”

‘The latter part formally forms a sentence, but at the same time its predicative nature is strong, and the subject in the latter part is very close to a teizi-go (topic).’

He does not explain what he means by teizi-go (teizi-go).

55 This translation is my attempt for a literal approximation. Ishigaki’s original sentence in ModJ is:

“Otikonda toki ni mi no toki bakari de atta no ga, yoyaku hi-gure ni natta.”
read with the abstract notion of time as the subject of the predicate in clause Y. However, he even forces his explanation to (25a) below, which contains concrete subjects. For (25b), he provides no explanations:

(25) a. Nagato-zenzi to ifi-keru fito no musume futari
             Nagato-ex.govemor Comp say-Evi(RT) person GEN daughter two.persons
            ari-keru ga, ane fa fito no tuma ni te ari-keru.
            exist-Evi(RT) ga big.sister TOP person GEN wife at Conj COP-Evi(RT)
‘A person known as Nagato-zenzi (the ex-governor of Nagato) had two daughters, and the older sister was the wife of a certain person.’
(Uji-shûi 3.15)

b. Am ani-nin ki no ne wo tutafi ori-kudaru ga,
    nun two-Clsf(person) tree GEN root ACC hang.on get.off-descend(RT)
    saki ni tat-ta fa sikimi tutuzi fujii no fana wo
    ahead at stand-Perf TOP sikimi azalea wisteria GEN flower ACC
    ire-ta fana-gatami wo fliz ni kake, ima-iti-nin fa...
    put.in-Perf(RT) flower-basket ACC elbow at hang the.other-one-Clsf TOP
    (Amakusa Heike, 4)
‘Two nuns came down hanging on the root of the tree (lit.), and the one who stood up first had a flower basket with sikimi, azalea, and wisteria flowers on her arm, and the other one ...’

In (25a), clause X (in [X ga Y]) is ‘a person called Nagato-zenzi had two daughters,’ and clause Y is ‘the older sister was the wife of a certain person.’ Ishigaki (1955: 45) claims that Y is still greatly predicative of X, and that ane ‘older sister’, the subject in Y, is rather merely a part of the predicate Y. This explanation is not so well reasoned. Even if X can be regarded as an HIRC with its semantic head ‘two daughters’, Y is only about the older sister, and so cannot be said to be predicative of X. The same criticism applies to (25b).

---

56 Usually there is no overtly specified subject in predications of time in Japanese, and thus one can regard any time-related event nominalized by the abstract nominalizer no as subject. See, for example, go-zî ni natta [5-o’clock to became] ‘It became 5 o’clock’; Ohiru datta no ga, moo go-zî ni natta [noon was NMZ ga already 5-o’clock to became] ‘What was noon has already become 5 o’clock’ (but cf. *Ohiru datta koto ga, moo go-zî ni natta, with the nominalizer koto); Ohiru ni gohan o tabeta no ga, moo go-zî ni natta [soon at meal ACC ate NMZ ga already 5-o’clock to became] ‘(My) eating a meal at noon has already become 5 o’clock.’
Nonetheless, the shared characteristic in (25a) and (25b) seems to be that the subject in Y is a member of the plural subject in X.

Ishigaki’s next three types of CONJ ga, Type 2, 3, and 4, are defined by the relationship between subject and object in X and Y. In Type 2, the referent of the subject in X is the same as that of the subject in Y. Below is an example:

(26) Ko futari ‘two children’ is the subject in clause X (in [X ga Y]), while kono ko-domo ‘these children’ is the subject in clause Y, and these two subjects refer to the same persons. Thus, (26) is of Type 2, according to Ishigaki’s classification.

In Type 3, the referent of the object in clause X is the same as that of the subject in clause Y. Below is an example:

(27) Mata Sizuka, woman seeing to send(RT) ga
also Shizuka woman one-Clsff(person) seeing to send(RT) ga
wonna fodo nau run-return Conj
‘Also, Shizuka sent a woman to have a look, and the woman soon ran back, ...’

In (27), wonna ‘woman’ is used twice, referring to the same person. The first one is the object in clause X, and the second one is the subject in clause Y. Thus, (27) is of Type 3.

In Type 4, the referent of the subject in X is the same as that of the object in Y, as in the example below:
In (28), the subject in X is Yori'ie ga ko [Yori'ie GEN child] ‘the child of Yori'ie’, and the object in Y is kono zensi [this Title(monk)] ‘this monk’, and both refer to the same person.

Thus, (28) is of Type 4.

If there is no relationship between the subject and object in clause X and clause Y of [X ga Y] as there is in Types 2, 3, and 4, this use of CONJ ga is categorized as Type 5. An example is provided below:

(29) (tuzi-kaze) ku-zyou no kata yori okori-keru ga, spiral-wind nine-street GEN direction from start-Evi(RT) ga
Kyoo-zyuu no ife a mi fa marobi Kyoto-all GEN house some TOP turn.upside.down(RY)
arui fa fasira bakari nokore-ri. some TOP pillar only remain-Res(SS)

‘(A tornado) started from the direction of 9th Ave., and (of) houses throughout Kyoto, some turned upside down, and (of) others only pillars remained.’

In (29), tuzi-kaze ‘tornado’, which is not overtly expressed in X but presented in the preceding sentence, is the subject, and the subjects in Y are arui fa [some TOP] ‘some (houses)’, which is a topic at the same time, and fasira ‘pillar’ (the second arui fa being a
There is no object in X and Y, and no co-referential relationship between subject and object in X and Y. Thus, (29) is of Type 5, according to Ishigaki’s classification.

Type 6 of CONJ ga is similar to Type 5 in that there is no co-referential relationship between subject and object in X and Y of [X ga Y]. In addition, however, X and Y in Type 6 should stand in an antithetical relationship:

(30) Onore fa furo ni tada fito ri aru to iju-ta ga, you TOP bath at only one.person be Comp say-Perf ga
kono kunzyu fa tun e yori mo ofai fa nani goto zo. this crowd TOP usual from even many TOP what thing Emph
‘You said that you would be alone in the bath, but what is going on that this crowd is larger than usual!?’ (Amakusa Isoho)

In (30), clause X is ‘you said that you would be alone in the bath,’ while clause Y is ‘what is going on that this crowd is larger than usual!’ X and Y are in an antithetical relationship, connected by ga. For the first time in the development of CONJ ga, it came to be used for antithetical conjunction in Type 6, which is the most common use in Std-ModJ.

Type 7 is rather different from the other types of CONJ ga. As seen in (31) below, there is only an [X ga] part, and no Y:

(31) Kono tuma-do wo ba kau koso ide-sase-rare-ta ga. this corner-door ACC Emph like.this Emph go.out-Caus-Pass-Perf ga
ano ki wo ba mizukara koso uwe-sase-rare-ta ga. that tree ACC Emph by.oneself Emph plant-Caus-Pass-Perf ga
‘(I) was made to get out from this comer door like this, (but ...).
(I) was made to plant that tree by myself, (but ...).’ (Amakusa Heike)

Arui fa [some TOP] is a set expression, and the use of arui without the topic marker fa (pa in OJ) is very rare; Ōno S. et al. (1974) provide one example from reading of Konkomyō-saishō-ōkyō (a sutra translated to Chinese) rendered into Japanese in the early Heian period (794-). In EMI, aru fa [exist(RT) TOP] without -i was also commonly used, but it was replaced by aru-i fa starting in MJ. Thus, the -i can be regarded as a noun-forming suffix, cf. kore wo tamotu i pa [this ACC keep(RT) NMZ TOP] ‘keeping this’ or ‘the one who keeps this’, and suturu i pa [discard(RT) NMZ TOP] ‘discarding (this)’ or ‘the one who discards (this)’ (SN, Semmyō 45). In Modern Korean, the particle i (< y in Middle Korean) functions as a nominative particle, nominalizer, and a bound pronominal ‘person’. See Chapter 6, Section 6.4.3 for more discussion about the particle i from a viewpoint of a possible Korean/Japanese relationship.
In (31), there are two sentences. Each sentence is stopped at CONJ ga without the following part, which seems to add some implication to its interpretation.\(^{58}\)

Below is a summary of Ishigaki's classification of different types of CONJ ga

(Ishigaki 1955: 51):

(32) Different Types of CONJ ga as in \([X \text{ ga } Y]\)

Type 1: The predicative nature of \(Y\) to \(X\) is still strong;
Type 2: (Subject in \(X\)) = (Subject in \(Y\));
Type 3: (Object in \(X\)) = (Subject in \(Y\));
Type 4: (Subject in \(X\)) = (Object in \(Y\));
Type 5: \(X\) and \(Y\) are in neutral conjunction;
Type 6: \(X\) and \(Y\) are in antithetical conjunction;
Type 7: There is no \(Y\). (Type 7 is not mentioned here in Ishigaki’s original.)

As in the case of S-Mkg ga, Ishigaki (1955: 52-53) argues that clause linkage became weaker and weaker in the development of CONJ ga. According to him, Type 1 of CONJ ga is closest to S-Mkg ga since \(Y\) in \([X \text{ ga } Y]\) still has some predicative force in relation to \(X\), and thus the tie between \(X\) and \(Y\) is stronger in Type 1 than in the other types of CONJ ga, in which clause \(Y\) is not predicative of clause \(X\). As for Types 2 and 3, his argument is similar to these for Types II and III of S-Mkg ga. In Type 2, the subject in \(X\) and the subject in \(Y\) refer to the same entity, and thus the subject NPs can be regarded as a pivot (a shared \(kaku\) ‘nucleus’ in Ishigaki’s term) between clause \(X\) and clause \(Y\). In Type 3, however, the object in \(X\) and the subject in \(Y\) refer to the same entity; the referent NP does not work as a syntactic pivot. Therefore, clause linkage is stronger in Type 2 than in Type 3. Type 4 exhibits a relationship opposite to that of Type 3; the subject in \(X\) and the object in \(Y\) refer to the same entity. According to Ishigaki, clause linkage is weaker in Type 4 than in Type 3, since the subject referent in \(Y\) is newly introduced in Type 4. As for Type 5,

\(^{58}\) As indicated in the translation, a similar use of the antithetical conjunctive \(but\) is observable in colloquial English.
there is no subject-object co-referential relationship, and clause X and clause Y are in neutral
conjunction,\(^\text{59}\) and thus clause linkage became weaker in Type 5 than in Type 4. Finally in
Type 6, CONJ ga came to connect X and Y in an antithetical relationship. (Ishigaki does
not say any more about Type 7.)

Concerning both S-Mkg ga and CONJ ga, Ishigaki claims that the consistent
driving force for their development was the tendency of the connection between X and Y (as
in \([X \text{ ga } Y]\)) being weakened (ibid.: 53), and that his classification of different types of S-
Mkg ga and CONJ ga reflects their developmental sequence, i.e.:

\[(33) \quad \text{Type I} > \text{II} > \text{III} > \text{Type I} > 2 > 3 > 4 > 5 > 6 > 7\]

One thing to note is that (33) represents only a sequence, not a developmental process; it
does not mean that a certain type on the right was derived from the type immediately to its
left. As seen in Table 5.5, Konjaku monogatari (ca. 1120?) contains the first material to
attest CONJ ga, and Ishigaki (ibid.: 41) claims that CONJ ga emerged in the Insei period
(i.e. late Heian from 1086, EMJ).\(^\text{60}\)

Above is a brief review of Ishigaki’s claim about the development of CONJ ga,
which is, as mentioned, generally accepted among Japanese scholars. In my judgment,
Ishigaki’s claim is convincing in two major respects: (i) CONJ ga was derived from S-Mkg
 ga; and (ii) there was an overall weakening trend in the development of CONJ ga.

However, his observation in Table 5.5 does not seem sufficient for his claim about the fine
developmental sequence in (33), although his theoretical comparison of clause linkage
among different types of S-Mkg ga and CONJ ga is reasonable (except for Type 1 of

\(^\text{59}\) In Ishigaki’s wording (1955: 48, 51, 52), the relationship between X and Y of Type 5 is “taitoo de
toototu” “even and abrupt”.

\(^\text{60}\) There are some scholars who regard some uses of ga in Genji monogatari (ca. 1001-14) as CONJ ga
(e.g. Imaizumi 1939; Saeki 1953; Aoki 1956).
CONJ ga). In order to discuss this point, the relevant portion of Table 5.5 is re-provided below with (estimated) dates of literary works and some corrections in their ordering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>Subject-Marking</th>
<th>CONJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Heian: EMJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taketori</td>
<td>(ca. 900?)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ise</td>
<td>(before 905)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosa</td>
<td>(ca. 935)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamato</td>
<td>(ca. 951)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>(ca. 1001-14)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Late Heian, Insei Period: EMJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konjaku (- B.20)</td>
<td>(ca. 1120?)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konjaku (B.22 -)</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kamakura: MJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uji-shūi</td>
<td>(ca. 1212-22)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gukanshō</td>
<td>(1220)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chomonjū</td>
<td>(1254)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hōgen</td>
<td>(early 13c?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiji</td>
<td>(early 13c?)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(After Muromachi: Late MJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amakusa Heike</td>
<td>(1592)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amakusa Isoho</td>
<td>(1593)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Subject-Marking and CONJ ga over time (modified from Ishigaki 1955: 53)

Apparently, various types of S-Mkg ga developed in the Heian period before Genji monogatari. In Table 5.6, there are four works before Genji, but they contain only seven examples of S-Mkg ga. Among them, only Taketori monogatari contains Type I of S-Mkg ga, but Taketori is in fact notorious for its uncertain date of origin, as well as the involvement of later grammar due to story modification and hand-copying. Therefore, it

61 The corrections are as follows: Tosa nikki is placed between Ise monogatari and Yamato monogatari, and Amakusa-bon Heike is placed before Amakusa-bon Isoho.
should be said that Ishigaki’s claim about the developmental sequence of S-Mkg *ga* (i.e. Type I > II > III) is not strongly supported by his observation, although he may be right after all.

Type I of S-Mkg *ga* is qualitatively different from Types II and III. The RT clause marked by *ga* in Type I refers to a certain situation or event described by the clause, while the RT clause in Type II or III functions as an HIRC, having an internal subject (Type II) or object (Type III) as its semantic head. As for Types II and III, it may well be the case that Type II historically preceded Type III due to the universal tendency for subject to be generally more accessible than object in relative clauses (Keenan and Comrie 1977). It is beyond the scope of this study, but there is something further to consider in the development of Types I, II, and III. The use of RT clauses as NPs is observable not only with *ga*, but also with other particles, such as DAT/LOC *ni*, ACC *wo*, TOP *pa* (*fâ* in MJ), and the inclusive focus *mo*. Therefore, if we study these cases following the same categorization as Type I, II, and III, it may be suggestive for the developmental sequences followed by different types of nominalization.

As for the developmental sequence among different types of CONJ *ga*, Types 1, 2, and 3 appeared all at once in *Konjaku monogatari* (ca. 1120?) in the Insei period. Therefore, the data do not tell anything about the developmental sequence among Types 1, 2, and 3. As mentioned above, Ishigaki’s classification of Type 1 is rather problematic (see (24) and (25)). In Type 1, the subject in clause Y (as in [X *ga Y]*) is a member of the plural subject in clause X. In Type 2, the subject in Y is the same as that of X. Thus, it seems

---

62 Note also the fact that S-Mkg *ga* of Type II is generally used more often than that of Type III in Table 5.6.

63 In this generalization, I consider Ishigaki’s (24) exceptional since it is a time expression.
better to treat Type 1 as a variation of Type 2. We might even suspect that Type 1
developed later than Type 2, since plural is a more complex notion than singular.

The overall weakening trend in clause linkage seems plausible, but it may be
questionable whether the developmental process exhausted all possible weakening steps
only one by one. In fact, there is no theoretical reason for Type 2 to have necessarily
preceded Type 3. As Ishigaki (1955:42) notes, Type 2 of CONJ ga parallels Type II of S-
Mkg ga, while Type 3 parallels Type III. These parallels are illustrated below:

(34) a. Type II (S-Mkg ga):
    Type 2 (CONJ ga):
    [SUBJ, Pred(RT)] ga Predy
    [SUBJ, Pred(RT)] ga [SUBJ, Predy]

b. Type III (S-Mkg ga):
    Type 3 (CONJ ga):
    [OBJ, Pred(RT)] ga Predy
    [OBJ, Pred(RT)] ga [SUBJ, Predy]

Let us look at (34a) first. In Type II of S-Mkg ga, the RT clause functions as an HIRC,
and its internal subject is the semantic head, which serves as the subject for Predy. In Type
2 of CONJ ga, the RT clause is no longer an HIRC, and the subject for Predy, which has
the same referent NP as the subject NP in the RT clause, is added. Given this structural
similarity, Type 2 of CONJ ga seems to have been derived from Type II of S-Mkg ga.

The relationship between S-Mkg ga and CONJ ga in (34b) is similar to that in
(34a). In Type III of S-Mkg ga, the RT clause functions as an HIRC. In this case, its
internal object is the semantic head, serving as the subject for Predy. In Type 3 of CONJ
ga, the subject for Predy, which has the same referent NP as the object NP in the RT clause,
is added. Thus, Type 3 of CONJ ga seems to have been derived from Type III of S-Mkg
ga.

In both (34a) and (34b), the change from S-Mkg ga to CONJ ga was induced by
the addition of subject NPs for Predy, which have the same referents as the subject NP or
the object NP used in the RT clauses. In other words, the assumable change in (34a) is similar to that in (34b). According to Table 5.6, both Types II and III of S-Mkg ga were already developed in the Heian period (EMJ). After their emergence, it is theoretically possible that both Types 2 and 3 of CONJ ga developed around the same time, given the assumption that Types II and III of S-Mkg ga were the sources for Types 2 and 3 of CONJ ga respectively. At the least, the observation in Table 5.6 does not deny this possibility.

Moving down to the Kamakura period (1192-), Types 4 and 5 first appeared in Gukanshô (1220), but Uji-shûi (ca. 1212-22), which contains only Types 1, 2, and 3 of CONJ ga, is of about the same time period. Thus, it can only be said that Types 4 and 5 became observable in the early Kamakura period.64 The case of Gukanshô and Uji-shûi reminds us of the fact that historical data are limited, and thus even if there are no target data in a certain document, it does not guarantee that those expressions were not used at that time.65 Again, the observation in Table 5.6 does not tell anything about the developmental sequence between Type 4 and 5. Type 4 still maintains a subject-object co-referential (i.e. the subject in X = the object in Y as in [X ga Y]), while in Type 5 there is no such relationship, and X and Y are in neutral conjunction. Despite this difference, both Types 4 and 5 should introduce new subjects in Y, and in that sense, there is no S-Mkg construction which could be the direct source for Type 4 or Type 5, unlike the cases of Types 2 and 3. In this respect, Types 4 and 5 are on equal footing; it is not improbable for Type 5 to have preceded Type 4. As mentioned, the developmental process may not have exhausted all possible weakening steps only one by one. Once the use of ga as a conjunctive was established (perhaps the emergence of Type 2 and 3), the likelihood of the development of  

---

64 There is about a 100-year span between Konjaku (ca. 1120?), in which Types 1, 2, and 3 first appeared, and Gukanshô (1220), which contains Types 4 and 5.

65 Note also that Tosa nikki (935) does not contain Types I, II, and III of S-Mkg ga, while Ise monogatari (before 905), which was written earlier than Tosa nikki, contains Type II.
Type 4 may have been no greater than that of Type 5; Types 4 and 5 could have developed around the same time. Again, at least the observation in Table 5.6 does not deny this possibility.

As for Type 6 of CONJ ga, Kokon chomonjū (1254) contains the first material in which we can confirm this type. Based on the historical data in Table 5.6, it is safe to say that Type 6 developed at a very late stage in the overall development of CONJ ga. As a summary, my alternative view of the developmental sequence is presented as follows:

(35) \[ \begin{array}{ccc}
& \text{S-Mkg ga} & \text{CONJ ga} \\
\text{Stage 1} & \text{Stage 2} & \text{Stage 3} \\
I (eventive) & II > 2 & 5 \\
II, III & III > 3 & 6 (antithetical) \\
\end{array} \]

In (35), the time axis goes from left to right. In Type I of S-Mkg ga, the subject RT clause functions as an eventive NP. In Type II, the RT clause functions as an HIRC with its internal subject the semantic head. In Type III, the clause-internal object is the semantic head. Given the accessibility hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977), perhaps Type II preceded Type III. However, the chronological relationship between Type I on the one hand, and Type II/III on the other, is not determinable.

The development of CONJ ga can possibly be divided into three stages. At Stage 1, Types 2 and 3 were derived from Types II and III of S-Mkg ga respectively. Their chronological relationship is not determinable. The emergence of Types 2 and 3 can be regarded as the emergence of ga as a conjunctive particle, and Type 4 (with a new subject-

\[ \text{66 As discussed above, I regard Ishigaki's Type I of CONJ ga as a variation of Type 2, and thus it does not appear in (35).} \]
object co-referential pattern) and Type 5 (no subject-object co-reference) developed at Stage 2. Finally, the antithetical use, Type 6, developed at Stage 3.

As critically reviewed above, Ishigaki's developmental sequence in (33) (i.e. Type I > II > III of S-Mkg ga > Type 1 > 2 > 3 > 4 > 5 > 6 > 7 of CONJ ga) is not thoroughly supported by the historical observations in Table 5.6, although he may still be right after all. His claim appears to be theoretically ideal (except for Type 1 of CONJ ga), but the real developmental sequence may have been more complex, as suggested in (35).

Despite the need for reservations in regard to his developmental sequence, Ishigaki's two major claims are still plausible and significant: (i) CONJ ga developed from S-Mkg ga; and (ii) there was a clause linkage weakening trend. The former can be induced from the changes discussed with regard to (34), i.e. Type II of S-Mkg ga > Type 2 of CONJ ga; Type III of S-Mkg ga > Type 3 of CONJ ga. The latter is discussed in detail by Ishigaki, following his developmental sequence. Even if the sequence is not totally accurate, (ii) can still be induced from a general comparison between constructions with S-Mkg ga on the one hand, and constructions with CONJ ga on the other. Both constructions can be expressed as [X go Y]. When ga was still S-Mkg ga, X was a subject constituent for the entire construction (either X being a clausal eventive subject, or X being an HIRC specifying its semantic head), and [X ga Y] was a single sentence. When ga became CONJ ga, X was no longer an embedded subordinate clause; X and Y were both independent clauses. Therefore, it can be claimed that the clause linkage between X and Y weakened as ga developed from S-Mkg ga to CONJ ga.

Finally, what about GEN no? Do we have a corresponding CONJ no? In general, GEN no was not used to mark RT clauses, and thus it does not seem to have developed into a conjunctive particle. However, at least one set expression can be noted, i.e. V(RT) mono

---

67 It may be possible to find some examples in dialects or classical data.
no, e.g. *taberu mono no*, ... ‘despite the fact that (I) eat, ...’; *to wa iu mono no*, ... ‘despite the fact (of what was just said), ...’. This expression, which is attested as early as EMJ, can in fact be explained by the view given above (i.e. GEN > NOM > CONJ for both *ga* and *no*). Otherwise, the use of *no* as an antithetical conjunctive is puzzling in ModJ.

5.3.2 CONJ *ga* and Grammaticalization Theory

In the previous subsection, I have reviewed Ishigaki’s (1955) study about the development of CONJ *ga* in Japanese. As he claims, we can observe a weakening of clause linkage as CONJ *ga* developed from S-Mkg *ga*. In this subsection, I would like to put this language change in Japanese into crosslinguistic perspective.

Section 5.3.2.1 examines the unidirectionality hypothesis in grammaticalization theory as proposed by Hopper and Traugott (1993), and Section 5.3.2.2, what I will call “the duality hypothesis” put forward by Harris and Campbell (1995). Neither the former nor the latter provides an account for the development of CONJ *ga* in Japanese. Section 5.3.2.3 offers further crosslinguistic observations from Korean, Tibeto-Burman languages, Australian languages, Rama, and Laz, and proposes morphological and syntactic conditions for the change from subordination towards parataxis.

5.3.2.1 Hopper and Traugott (1993): the Cline of Clause Combining

So-called “grammaticalization theory” (e.g. Heine and Reh 1984; Traugott and Heine 1991a/b; Hopper and Traugott 1993) can be understood as an attempt to integrate theories about language change. One of its major claims is that linguistic items change unidirectionally from “more semantically concrete” to “more grammatically functional”. This unidirectionality hypothesis is also applied to clausal relationships. Hopper and

---

68 Saeki (1953) provides a support for this view about *mono no*. 283

(36)  
a. “Parataxis” or relative independence, except as constrained by the pragmatics of “making sense” and relevance; two or more clauses are juxtaposed, and the semantic relationship between them is by inference only.

b. “Hypotaxis” or interdependency, in which there is one nucleus, and one or more clauses which cannot stand by themselves, and are therefore relatively dependent. E.g. a phenomenon known as “clause chaining” (e.g. cross-clause linkage indicated with RY forms of verbs/adjectives with or without the conjunctive te in Japanese); appositive relatives in English; adverbial clauses such as temporals (‘when’-clauses), causals (‘because’-clauses), conditionals (‘if’-clauses), and concessives (‘although’-clauses).

c. “Subordination”, or in its extreme form, “embedding”, in other words, complete dependency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parataxis</th>
<th>&gt; hypotaxis</th>
<th>&gt; subordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-dependent</td>
<td>+dependent</td>
<td>+dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-embedded</td>
<td>-embedded</td>
<td>+embedded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this cline, grammaticalization theory dictates that clausal relationships develop from left to right; the degree of grammaticalization is higher on the right. From the viewpoint of the tie between clauses, (36) suggests that clause linkage unidirectionally becomes tighter. In support of this cline, Hopper and Traugott (1993:171) cites Givón (1990: 826): “The more two events/states are integrated semantically or pragmatically, the more will the clauses that code them be integrated grammatically.”

69 While this observation by Givón correctly describes the characteristics of parataxis, hypotaxis, and subordination, it does not say anything about the directionality of changes. Givón (1979: 209) himself proposes the following developmental path: discourse > syntax > morphology > morphophonemics > zero. See also Bybee (1985) for the relationship between a degree of fusion and semantic relevance in verb morphology.
To demonstrate the directionality of changes on the cline, Hopper and Traugott (1993: 177-203) discuss ‘that’-complementation in English, relative clauses in English and Hittite, a change from clause chaining to verb inflection in Lhasa (a Tibeto-Burman language), and a change from main clause construction to sentential adverb in English, while mentioning examples from other languages as well. According to them, there is overwhelming evidence of the preponderance of changes from more to less paratactic modes of clause combining, although they admit the presence of counterexamples (ibid.: 185).

Interestingly, Hopper and Traugott (ibid: 184) introduce a change attested of the conjunctive ga in Japanese, taken from Matsumoto Yô (1988: 340), as a counterexample to the cline in (36):70

70 The representations of (37a) and (37b) are slightly modified from the original (Matsumoto 1988: 340) due to some inappropriate interpretations. For example, (37b) is presented as follows: Taro-wa wakai-ga, yoku yar-u(-yo). As for “wakai-ga” [young-ga], Matsumoto explains that ga is attached to the predicate, which made Hopper and Traugott (1993: 184) to state: “ga is not a conjunction at the beginning of the second clause, ... , but a suffix on the predicate of the first clause.” However, ga does not form a word with wakai ‘young’, and is therefore not a suffix; it is more accurate to regard it as a conjunctive particle. (Treating SFP yo as a suffix is also inappropriate.) Given the non-suffix status of ga, the second sentence with ga in (37a) can be regarded as more like an afterthought uttered when a person realizes s/he failed to complete the sentence as in (37b).

71 Matsumoto’s (1988) major concern is with ModJ data. Developments similar to the case of (37) are observable in many conjunctive expressions in ModJ, such as dakedo ‘but’, dakara ‘because’, and nanoni ‘in spite of it’. By presenting these examples, he argues against the unidirectionality towards higher boundness, while arguing for the unidirectionality of pragmatization.

72 Despite the given translation, the use of ga in (37b) is not perfectly equivalent to although in English. The dependency of the ga-marked clause is less than the although-clause, and (37b) is closer to ‘Taro is young, but he does a good job,’ although ga occurs at the end of the first clause.

(37)  a. Taro wa wakai (yo). Ga, yoku yar-u (yo).
      Taro TOP young (SFP) but well do-PRES (SFP)
      ‘Taro is young. But he does a good job.’

       b. Taro wa wakai ga, yoku yar-u (yo).
          Taro TOP young but well do-PRES (SFP)
          ‘Although Taro is young, he does a good job.’72

As indicated, SFP (sentence final particle) yo ‘assertion’ can possibly be used twice in (37a), but only once in (37b). Thus, (37a) consists of two sentences, while (37b) is a single
sentence, which is also supported by prosodic analysis.

The cline of clause combining in (36) predicts that (37b) is derived from (37a). However, historical data suggest the opposite; sentences of the type in (37b) are antecedents of the type in (37a), which is in fact a relatively recent development first attested in the seventeenth century. This is the only counterexample to (36) provided by Hopper and Traugott (1993), and they regard it as an “exception” to grammaticalization theory. A question to be asked here is, can we rationalize the treatment of these counterexamples as exceptions, or is grammaticalization theory too strong and predeterministic? If they are exceptions, what kind are they?

In fact, the change illustrated in (37) is not the only change involving CONJ ga. As examined in the previous subsection, CONJ ga developed from S-Mkg ga around the late eleventh century or the early twelfth century. S-Mkg ga was a special use of GEN ga, and thus ga took the following developmental path: GEN ga > S-Mkg ga > CONJ ga. Along this developmental path, the change from (37b) to (37a) can be understood as a further little stretch of the weakening trend of clause linkage.

Section 5.3.1 has provided detailed comparisons of the strength of clause linkage among various types of ga, and we have observed the weakening trend in the development of CONJ ga. Let us now take the pivotal uses of ga, and consider them in the perspective of the cline of clause combining in (36). GEN ga, Type II of S-Mkg ga, Type 2 of CONJ ga, and Type 5 of CONJ ga in Ishigaki’s (1955) classification are discussed below:

---

73 They state (ibid.: 185): “The presence of counterexamples once more shows that the continua of grammaticalization are not exceptionless.”

74 As examined in Section 5.2, GEN ga also developed into NOM ga.
As in (38a), prototypical functions of GEN ga do not involve clauses. Nonetheless, in terms of the relationship between NP1 and NP2 in (38a), it can be said that NP1 is subordinate to NP2, which is the head of the whole noun phrase. As indicated in (38b), Type II of S-Mkg ga can possibly be analyzed in two ways, one involving an HIRC, and the other as a no-ga appositive construction. In the first analysis, the RT clause in Type II of S-Mkg ga functions as an HIRC, and its internal subject is the semantic head, which serves as the subject for Predy (see (22) for this analysis). In the second analysis, i.e. as a no-ga appositive construction, the subject marked by no is outside the RT clause, and the RT clause functions as an appositional elaboration of the subject (see (16) for this analysis).

Based on the appositional analysis, Type II can be considered closer to a hypotactic construction (i.e. [+dependent, -embedded]). As in (38c), Type 2 of CONJ ga can be derived from Type II of S-Mkg ga by adding a same-referent subject NP (see (26) for an example). There is no clausal embedding in Type 2. Also, CONJ ga in Type 2 does not entail any semantic dependency (e.g. of the 'when', 'if', 'because', and 'although' variety).

The two clauses have the same subjects, which is the only possible indication of dependency. Thus, Type 2 conjunction belongs to somewhere between hypotaxis (i.e. 

75 Even if based on the HIRC analysis, the degree of embeddedness and dependency of Type II can be considered less than that of subordination. Compared to the adnominal use of relative clauses, in which overt NP heads follow predicates in their RT forms (i.e. [... Pred(RT) NP]), HIRCs are formally less NP-like, and semantics and pragmatics often determine which internal NP functions as the semantic head (Kuroda 1974-77, 1992). Also, HIRCs are sometimes regarded as adverbial clauses (e.g. Kuroda 1974-77, 1992; Mihara 1994). These analyses are based on ModJ data, but they also seem applicable to OJ and MJ data.
[+dependent, -embedded]) and parataxis (i.e. [-dependent, -embedded]), but is a little closer to hypotaxis. As in (38d), Type 5 of CONJ ga is structurally the same as Type 2, but the two clauses no longer have same-referent subjects. In that sense, the dependency in Type 5 is less than that of Type 2, and Type 5 is closer to parataxis.

When we put them into the cline of (36), we have the following:

(39) \[
\text{parataxis} \quad \text{hypotaxis} \quad \text{subordination} \\
\text{Type 5} \quad \text{Type 2} \quad \text{Type II} \quad \text{GEN ga}
\]

The historical data in Table 5.5 (also Table 5.6) show that these uses of ga took the following developmental sequence: GEN ga > Type II (S-Mkg) > Type 2 (CONJ) > Type 5 (CONJ). In other words, the direction of change is completely opposite to the one suggested in (36), i.e. subordination > hypotaxis > parataxis.\textsuperscript{76} From GEN ga in OJ to CONJ ga in ModJ, this weakening trend in clause linkage has continued for more than twelve hundred years, and is by no means an isolated, temporary change.

5.3.2.2 Harris and Campbell (1995): Duality Hypothesis

Harris and Campbell (1995: 282-313) argue against the claim that hypotaxis develops out of parataxis.\textsuperscript{77} In other words, they argue against the process described by the cline in (36). Let us examine their hypothesis and see if it can account for the development

\textsuperscript{76} I have used GEN ga as an example of subordination. In fact, Type I of S-Mkg ga exhibits clausal subordination, which might be a better example. In Type I, the nominalized RT clause representing a situation or event functions as the subject (see (21) for an example); the RT clause is thus completely embedded. Unfortunately, however, the developmental sequence between Type I and II of S-Mkg ga is not determinable with the historical data in Table 5.6.

\textsuperscript{77} Unlike the three-way distinction in Hopper and Traugott (1993: 170), Harris and Campbell (1995) follow the traditional two-way distinctions, i.e. parataxis vs. hypotaxis and coordination vs. subordination. Although they discuss other types of subordinate clauses, Harris and Campbell typically refer to finite relative clauses when they use "hypotaxis" and "subordination" in their claim about the origins of complex constructions.
of CONJ ga in Japanese. They claim that no special mechanism but the following is needed for the first introduction of subordination:

(40) Non-finite verb forms - deverbal nouns and adjectives - have an inherent dual nature, which can lead naturally to dual analysis. (...) Since they are formed on verbal bases, they are open to an interpretation as a verb. In many languages a clause frequently consists of only a verb, and it is natural for a verb, even without specified arguments, to be open to analysis as a clause. (...) We are proposing not that all non-finite verb forms have complex initial structures, but that, being at once substantival and (de)verbal, they have the potential for being diachronically reanalyzed as having a complex initial structure.

(ibid.: 310-11)78

To illustrate this process, Harris and Campbell provide an example from Udi, one of the Lezgian languages, a subgroup of Northeast Caucasian language family (ibid.: 311-12):79

(41) a. azak'e xinâr-ax gölôsp-i
   I.saw girl-DAT dance-PTCPL
   'I saw the girl who danced' or 'I saw the dancing girl.'

b. azak'e xinâr-ax mat'in-te gölôs-ne-p-i
   I.saw girl-DAT who-REL dance1-3SG-dance2-Perf80
   'I saw the girl who had danced.'

The sentence in (41a) involves a past participle of a type inherited from proto-Lezgian.

According to Harris and Campbell, the adjectival phrase (AP) gölôsp-i 'danced', which is derived from the verb gölôsp- 'dance', could be analyzed as a finite verb. Udi, like many other languages, permits clauses consisting of just a finite verb in the surface structure, such

78 For syntactic analysis, Harris and Campbell (1995) adopts Chomskyan framework (e.g. CP, S, VP, PP, NP, and their tree diagrams). By "initial structure", they seem to be referring to Chomsky's "deep structure".

79 In the gloss, "PTCPL" stands for "participle", and "REL" for "relative marker".

80 There is no specific explanation provided, but the third person singular -ne- seems to be infixed to the verb gölôsp 'dance', and thus there are two "dances" in the gloss.
as gölôś-ne-p-i ‘s/he had danced.’ Thus, the AP could eventually be reinterpreted as a sentence, which opens up all the possibilities of expansion (e.g. adding arguments), and in this way, Harris and Campbell claim, the finite relative clause in (41b) developed in recent times.81

Harris and Campbell’s account above is, at its best, only an attempt to connect two stages with speculation; in fact the two sentences in (41a) and (41b) do not work in any way as historical evidence for their claim about this process. If the process is simply an expansion based on sentential status after reanalysis, how is it explained that there are possibly two subjects for the verb ‘dance’, i.e. the third person singular -ne- and the relative pronoun mat ‘in ‘who’? Also, where did the relative marker -te come from? Harris and Campbell do not offer the duality mechanism in (40) as merely a possible mechanism for the development of subordination; they are claiming that it is the “ultimate” process (ibid.: 308). In addition to the shortcomings noted above, it should be said that the one case of a relative clause in (41) is not sufficient for their claim, considering its purported general significance for the development of subordination. Their account is prescriptively syntactocentric.82

If we look at the development of CONJ ga in Japanese, it agrees with Harris and Campbell’s claim only in the sense that the duality of nominal verb forms (i.e. as for Japanese, the duality of RT forms) is the key to later changes. It does not, however, provide a proper account for overall changes, since the constructions pertaining to ga changed from

---

81 In their tree diagram, Harris and Campbell (1995: 312) suggest that mat ‘in ‘who’ originated in front of gölôśp-i, and then moved out to the the front of te [REL].
82 Before presenting their own hypothesis, Harris and Campbell (1995) spend most of the chapter refuting the effect of structures higher than sentences (i.e. discourse) on the development of subordination. They state (ibid.: 308): “Our account makes it unnecessary to rely on the vague structures proposed for parataxis (...). Under our analysis there is no need to go beyond the syntax to the structure of discourse to explain syntactic change.”
subordination to hypotaxis, and then toward parataxis (in Hopper and Traugott’s three-way distinction), while the only process that Harris and Campbell propose is a development of subordination from a simple sentence structure, due to the duality of deverbal nouns.

5.3.2.3 Further Crosslinguistic Observations

As seen above, neither the cline of clause combining in grammaticalization theory (Hopper and Traugott 1993), nor the duality hypothesis based on a syntactocentric analysis (Harris and Campbell 1995) provides a proper account for the development of CONJ ga from GEN ga in Japanese, i.e. subordination > hypotaxis > parataxis. Is it because this development is exceptional? Certainly there are other cases in which case particles developed into conjunctives. Japanese internally, ACC wo and LOC ni also developed into conjunctive particles. All the three conjunctives, ga, wo, and ni, can be used for both neutral (‘and’) and antithetical (‘although’) conjunction.

In Korean as well, case particles seem to have developed into conjunctive postpositions (see Martin 1992):

(42) a. Modern Korean

... kes i [fact i] or ... kes ul [fact ul] ‘... but; although ...’

cf. NOM i, and ACC ul

cf. also ModJ ... mono no [thing no] ‘although’ and GEN no

---

83 The use of the terms “case particles” and “postpositions” vary depending on scholars and contexts. In the following discussion, I use “case particles” loosely including those that indicate oblique cases.
84 According to Kyōgoku (1987: 191), CONJ wo and CONJ ni emerged in the Heian period (EMJ: 794-). While CONJ ga has survived into ModJ, CONJ wo and ni became obsolete in ModJ.
85 Note that these Korean conjunctive expressions involve overt nominalizers; i (< NOM), ul (< ACC), and oy (< LOC) do not by themselves function as conjunctives. Thus, I have used “conjunctive postpositions” for them, instead of “conjunctives”.
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b. Middle Korean

... 's oy [NMZ oy] cf. LOC 'oy

'because'

cf. LOC 'oy

cf. also ModJ ... no ni [NMZ LOC] 'despite the fact that ...';
also OJ/EMJ/MJ Pred(RT) ni [Pred(RT) LOC] 'when, since; in spite of'

According to Genetti (1986, 1991), the syncretism between case postpositions and conjunctives ("subordinators" in her terms) is commonly observable in the Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman languages:

(43) a. in the modern Dolakhali dialect of Newari

chê-ku yer-na [house-LOC come-when] 'when he came to the house'

cf. INSTR -na

b. in Classical Tibetan

me yod na [fire be if] 'if there is fire'

cf. LOC na

c. in Lhasa Tibetan

stag mango yod pa-s

tiger many have NMZ-ERG 'because there are many tigers'

cf. ERG/INSTR -s.

By examining three sets of data, each from the eighteenth century, nineteenth century, and the twentieth century, Genetti (1991) claims that in Newari (spoken in the Katmandu Valley of Nepal) case postpositions first came to mark "fully inflected finite nominal verbs" (ibid.: 246), and then later the postpositions are reanalyzed as subordinating morphemes,

---

86 NMZ ‘s in Middle Korean came from GEN ‘s. See Chapter 6 for details.

87 Usually “finite” does not agree with “nominal”, while “non-finite” agrees with “nominal”. Genetti does not provide her definition, but I agree with her disassociation of “finite/non-finite” from the notion of “nominal”. I will come back to this topic at the end of this section. To avoid confusion, I use “tense/aspectually marked” for “finite”, and “tense/aspectually unmarked” for “non-finite”, except for when I cite other scholars.
marking non-nominalized verbs.\textsuperscript{88} Thurgood (1986) provides some data about the syncretism between postpositions and conjunctives in Lolo-Burmese branch of Tibeto-Burman.\textsuperscript{89}

A similar syncretism between case suffixes and subordinate markers is also observable in some Australian languages in conjunction with their switch-reference systems.\textsuperscript{90} See an example from Diyari (Austin 1981a).\textsuperscript{91}

\begin{equation}
\textit{wilha} \quad \textit{wapa-rna} \quad \textit{kuda-rnani}, \quad \textit{kupa} \quad \textit{yinda-yi}.
\end{equation}

\textit{woman-ERG go-Participial go.away-REL(different subject) child-ABS cry-Pres}

'when the woman goes away, the child cries.'

\textsuperscript{88} In fact, her claim seems inconsistent with her data. She observes that "There was a clear trend away from suffixing subordinators to the long base [i.e. non-finite forms - Y.H.] to suffixing them to finite verb morphology" (ibid.: 242). If based on this observation, marking non-finite forms (by her definition) seems to be the first step in the development. There may be a problem in the analysis of verb inflections in Newari used by Genetti, in terms of the dichotomy between finite and non-finite, and its association with non-nominal or nominal status. Another thing is that she only deals with changes since the eighteenth century, but apparently the syncretism between case postpositions and conjunctives already existed in Classical Newari in the fourteenth century. Due to the lack of historical data, perhaps, the developmental process prior to the fourteenth century is not considered in Genetti (1991).

\textsuperscript{89} As for the syncretism, Genetti (1991) also mentions Reesink (1988) and Lichtenberk (1991) for Papuan and Austronesian languages respectively. However, it does not seem that we find many good examples in Papuan languages, including Usan (of the Trans New Guinea phylum) (Reesink 1987). Usan is an SOV language, but oblique arguments can occur after verbs. There are no overt case markings for subject and object. In Usan, conditionals, temporals, and reason clauses exhibit many similarities to relative clauses; they all function as preposed presuppositional nominal clauses (ibid.: 207-70). Locatives seem to exhibit syncretism with purposive (e.g. -am ‘locative; infinitive purposive marker’ in Siroi of the Rai Coast stock). However, purposives are also expressed by the verb equivalent to ‘to say’ in many Papuan languages (ibid.: 256).

Lichtenberk presents data from To’aba’ita, an Austronesian language spoken on one of the southeast Solomon Islands, and from other related languages. In this case, however, the syncretism is between prepositions (not “post-”) and subordinators (“complementizers” in his terms) (e.g. allative for reason clauses, and ablative for positive purpose clauses), and their developmental processes seem different from subordinators in other languages discussed in this study. Lichtenberk calls them “verb-like prepositions” and “verb-like complementizers”, and shows that they have been derived from verbs. Note that To’aba’ita is an SVO language.

\textsuperscript{90} Đhori (1992) offers a study of the conjunctive particles \textit{te} and \textit{ba} in OJ from the viewpoint of switch-reference.

\textsuperscript{91} Austin (1991: 317) explains that a relative clause in Diyari has one or more of the following interpretations, depending on context and the lexical items selected: a) time; b) reason; c) possibility; and d) restrictive or non-restrictive.
The morpheme -manhi is a relative clause marker indicating a different subject, and -nhi is analyzable as a locative suffix. Likewise, LOC -mu, -mu-, -nyi, and -yi are observable in relative markers in the neighboring languages, Ngamini, Yarluandi, Yawarawarga, and Yandrunwandha respectively (ibid.: 319-20). In Diyari, subordinate clauses are marked by six suffixes attached to (non-finite) subordinate verbs (ibid.: 312). For more examples, see Austin ed. (1988), which is a collection of studies about complex sentence constructions in Australian languages. It should also be noted that not all Australian languages have the association of relative clause markers with locative or any other case suffix, e.g. the Mantharta languages, including Dhargari and Djiwarli (Austin 1991: 323).

Craig (1991) presents a similar case from Rama, a Chibchan language of Nicaragua. Examples of correspondence between postpositions and subordinators are as follows:

(45) 
ba(ng) ‘goal, target’ vs. bang ‘purposive’
kama ‘beneficiary’ vs. kama ‘purposive’
ka ‘ablative, source’ vs. ka ‘temporal, conditional’
su ‘locative’ vs. su ‘succession (upon, and then, since)’

Craig (ibid.: 469) notes that these subordinators are suffixed to tenseless verbs, while in some of his examples subordinators are suffixed to aspectually marked verbs, e.g. nah kaafi ngu-atkut-ka [I coffee drink-ASP-ka(Subordinator)] ‘when I have drunk up my coffee’.

92 Austin (1981a: 319-20) explains that the relative clause markers for different subject in these languages consist of a (vowel)-consonant-vowel sequence plus the common noun locative case suffix.
93 It sounds rather contradictory to “attached to (non-finite) subordinate verbs”, but Diyari has what Austin calls “perfective relative clauses” and “imperfective relative clauses”.
94 For this very reason, I hesitate to regard subordinators in Rama as conjunctives.
Harris and Campbell (1995: 291-92) offer a few examples from Laz, a language of the Kartvelian (South Caucasian) family, citing K’art’ozia (1968) and others’ studies. In Laz, genitive and allative cases and several postpositions are used as conjunctives:

(46)  

a. *guin-c'k'ed-u-si* [around-look-3SG-GEN] ‘while he was looking around’  
b. *me-xt-u-si* [there-go-3SG-GEN] ‘when he arrived’.

As shown above, various languages exhibit syncretism between (case) postpositions and subordinators (or conjunctives). It is, however, rather hasty to conclude, based only on the outcome (i.e. the common syncretism), that all developmental processes are similar to that of CONJ *ga* in Japanese, in which the weakening trend of clause linkage is observable. Unfortunately, the past studies cited above do not answer all questions of our concern, and a detailed examination of each language is beyond the capacity of this study. Nonetheless, it appears that their developmental processes are partly common, but partly different.

The common part is that case morphemes (in a broad sense), regardless of being postpositions, prepositions, or affixes, came to mark nominalized verbs (or deverbal nouns). This process must be extremely common, since every language supposedly has some sort of conversion mechanism between verbs and nouns.\(^{96}\) Also, we can observe common

---

\(^{95}\) It is not indicated in the glosses, but Harris and Campbell note (1995: 292) that in each example the genitive is affixed to a fully inflected finite verb form. According to Holisky (1991: 460), it is thought that not only the genitive and allative, but also the dative serves as a subordinator.

\(^{96}\) In this respect, Harris and Campbell’s (1995) claim is reasonable, although I have argued that it does not provide an account for every development of complex construction. Craig (1991: 471) presents a similar view: “Structurally, it has to do with subordinate clauses being treated like nominal constituents and the analogical use of the marking of oblique nominal arguments of a simplex sentence (monoclausal) for oblique clausal arguments of a complex sentence.”
semantic developments in their functions. In her study of twenty-six languages of the Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman languages, Genetti (1991: 229) presents the following patterns:

(47)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Pattern Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>if/although, when/while/after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>when/while/after, because, non-final in clause chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative/Instrumental</td>
<td>because, when, while</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These patterns basically apply to most of the examples cited above, and even to English, e.g. *to understand him* [allative/dative > purpose]; *on arriving at the airport* [locative > when]. However, the later development in each language seems to vary depending on its verbal morphology and syntax.

Regarding the differences, another thing to note from the crosslinguistic data above is that while the semantic developments in (47) are widely observable, conjunctives for 'and' or 'but/although' are relatively rarely developed from case particles, i.e. among the languages discussed above, Japanese, Korean, and three Tibeto-Burman languages, Ladakhi, Purki, and Lhasa (Genetti 1986: 391). The extension of locative to 'upon, and then, since' in Rama seems to be a close example. There are differences among these languages, too. In Japanese, S-Mkgga, ACC wo, and LOC *ni* all developed into 'and' or 'but/although'. In Korean, it was NOM *i* and ACC *ul*, and in the three Tibeto-Burman languages and Rama, it was only locatives.

---

97 There are other variations. For example, Reesink (1987: 255) mentions the relationship between locatives and purposives in Papuan languages. It is not that surprising since locatives and datives are related in many languages.

98 The case of Ladakh, Purki, and Lhasa is slightly different from that of Japanese and Korean. In the former three languages, LOC *na* is concatenated with the particle *yang* 'even, also' to express 'although' (Genetti 1986: 391). Basically such extra help is not necessary in Japanese and Korean, although Korean needs a nominalizer in front of the conjunctive postpositions (see (42)). (But cf. a possible sequence ... ni *mo* [LOC even] 'even if' in Japanese.)
The conjunctives equivalent to ‘and’ or ‘but/although’, which appear to be most often derived from locatives among the case morphemes, seem to be semantically more bleached than the other conjunctives, such as ‘when’, ‘after’, ‘because’, and ‘in order to’. In other words, the former two types are further developed. This is perhaps a process contradictory to grammaticalization theory; as more and more semantic meanings of conjunctives are bleached out (i.e. in accord with grammaticalization theory), the clausal dependency decreases, and the clause combining changes in the direction from hypotaxis towards parataxis (i.e. a reversal of the cline in (36) by Hopper and Traugott). Compared with the development of conjunctives from locatives, the development from nominatives (or subject-marking function of genitives) and accusatives is more difficult to associate with semantic bleaching. In this respect, the development from nominatives and accusatives seems to be more constrained by structural features (e.g. morphology and syntax) than by semantics.

For the development of functions corresponding to ‘and’ or ‘but/although’, plausible morphological and syntactic conditions can be induced. Note that CONJ ga in Japanese developed from S-Mkg ga, not directly from prototypical GEN ga (e.g. possession or belonging). The particles ga, wo, and ni were originally genitive, accusative, and locative respectively, but they could mark nominalized clauses (i.e. RT clauses).\(^\text{99}\) The nominalized clauses marked by ga, wo, and ni functioned as clausal subjects, clausal objects, and clausal locatives (e.g. situation, condition, etc.) respectively for the following clauses. Then, the clausal linkage (i.e. dependency) weakened in discourse, and the particles developed into conjunctives equivalent to ‘and’ or ‘but/although’. I propose the following two conditions:

\(^{99}\) The development of RT forms is prehistorical, and we do not know for sure if ga, wo, and ni first only marked NPs and then came to mark RT forms, although it is theoretically reasonable.
Conditions for Changes towards Parataxis

a. Morphological Condition: the verbal morphology allows case particles to mark tense/aspect-marked verbs as nominalized constituents (with or without the help of a nominalizer);

b. Syntactic Condition: it should be a verb-final language.

Of course (48) assumes the existence of overt case marking. The first condition, (48a), is necessary for clausal NPs to become less dependent and less nominal (i.e. not necessarily non-nominal). Next, conjunctives most naturally develop at the periphery of clauses, and (48b) is necessary for the positional requirement. These are necessary but not always sufficient conditions; (48a) and (48b) do not assure that clause combining always evolves to a stage of paratactic 'and' or 'but/although'.

Japanese, Korean, and Newari (a Tibeto-Burman language) satisfy the morphological and syntactic conditions in (48), and it is likely that the developmental processes were similar in these languages. As will be discussed below, Rama does not perfectly meet the conditions in (48), but it seems somehow satisfactory.

Diyari satisfies (48b) (i.e. the syntactic condition), but not (48a) (i.e. the morphological condition). It is basically an SOV language, although topicalization can involve word-order adjustments (Austin 1981b: 1), and oblique arguments can occur after verbs. Subordinate markers in Diyari are usually attached to tenseless/aspectless verb forms (Austin 1981a: 312), which suggests that the subordinators are extensions of oblique cases in simplex sentences. There is a conflicting observation, however. In many

\[\text{100 Newari is a rigidly verb-final language, and four of the finite verb forms in Classical Newari can be used as nominal constituents (Genetti 1991). It has relative clause constructions very similar to those of Japanese. Modifying clauses precede head NPs, and the predicates in the clauses take particular inflectional forms. According to Genetti (1991: 244), those clauses can be used as nominals without head NPs or nominalizers in Classical Newari, while those heads are required in modern Kathmandu Newari; cf. the use of RT clauses as nominals in OJ/MJ, and the requirement of the overt nominalizer no in Std-ModJ. A difference seems to be, according to Genetti's data, that modifying clauses and head NPs are often connected by the genitive particle; cf. relative clauses in Mandarin Chinese.}

\[\text{101 However, there is a construction which Austin (1981b) calls "perfective relatives".}
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Australian languages, including Diyari and its neighboring languages discussed in Austin (1981a), subordinate clauses are of the so-called "adjoined" type (Hale 1976); they always occur on the margins of the main clause, never interrupting main-clause constituents.102 This characteristic supports the possibility that subordinate clauses in these languages may have developed from paratactic constructions.103 I cannot draw any conclusion in this study, but there is no reason that all types of subordinate clauses must have undergone the same developmental process.

Rama seems to meet the conditions in (48) not perfectly, but satisfactorily. According to Craig (1991:458-59), it is an SOV language, but oblique arguments can occur after verbs; (48b) (i.e. the syntactic condition) is thus satisfied. There are no overt markings for subject and object. The verbal complex follows the order of [V-ASP-TNS] (ibid.: 474),104 and subordinators are suffixed to tenseless verbs (ibid.: 469); (48a) (i.e. the morphological condition) is thus half satisfied. To date, LOC su has developed into a subordinator for succession 'upon, and then, since', e.g. nais tum-ting-atkut-su [right dark-happen-ASP-su] 'upon getting dark' (ibid.: 471). In this example, note that the -su is suffixed to the aspectually marked verb. Thus, there is already a seed for reanalyzing tense/aspectually unmarked clauses as fully tense/aspectually marked clauses. Not surprisingly, aspect and modality markers in Rama are very likely to have been derived from

102 Austin (1981b: 188) also notes that subordinate clauses typically follow the main clause although relative clauses can fairly freely precede the main clause.
103 In the languages discussed in Austin (1981a), subjects in subordinate clauses do not exhibit the genitive (dative) marking; the subject-marking system is the same in subordinate clauses and main clauses. This observation seems to be in favor of the paratactic origin of subordinate clauses. However, it is only suggestive since the relationship between genitive marking of subjects and the formation of subordinate clauses has not been proven. Note also that Diyari does not have a designated genitive morpheme; most typically the dative indicates possession as in [possessor-DAT possessed]. Possessor pronouns may precede or follow the head noun. There are other ways to express possession (see Austin 1981b: 137-47).
104 Simple tense markers: -i 'present'; -ut 'past'; -ut 'future'. Complex tense markers: -aing 'now, for sure'; -ating 'used to'; -ating 'will for sure, every time'. Aspect markers, e.g. -atkul- 'complete'; -atkar- 'repetitive'; aakar 'stative/resultative'; etc.
verbs (ibid.: 475). We cannot really predict the future, but it seems probable in Rama that
some subordinate constructions will decrease their dependency and move toward parataxis
(not necessarily to the end point) while aspect markers and tense markers are
grammaticalized further.

The examples of Laz presented by Harris and Campbell (1995) are somewhat
suspicious. In (46), the genitive expresses temporal subordination ((46a): guin-c'k'ed-u-ši
[around-look-3SG-GEN] ‘while he was looking around’), which seems unusual, given the
widely observable semantic correspondences in (47). As Harris and Campbell report, there
are expressions in which a temporal postposition comes after the genitive, e.g.
υ-imt'i-š-k'ule [1.SG-flee-GEN-after] ‘after I ran away’, note that the verb root -mt ' is
suffixed by the aorist marker -i. I suspect that this construction is the original, and then the
temporal postposition was dropped after the genitive, which added the temporal
interpretation to the genitive, cf. the development of pronominal genitive (Pro-GEN) in
Chapter 6, e.g. watasi no [I GEN.one] ‘mine’. Perhaps, this development is exceptional.
Nonetheless, it is also reported that the allative and the dative serve as subordinators. Laz
seems to be a verb-final language,¹⁰⁵ which satisfies condition (48b), and its postpositions
occur with fully inflected finite verb forms, which agrees with (48a). Due to the limited data,
I cannot be conclusive, but there seems to be a potential for some of the clause combining in
Laz to move towards parataxis.

¹⁰⁵ It is a little puzzling, but one of the examples in Harris and Campbell (1995: 292) exhibits the order of
[V DO IO] (their (19)).
5.3.3 Conclusion

In Section 5.3, I have first reviewed Ishigaki's (1955) study of the development of CONJ ga in Japanese in Section 5.3.1. He observes that there was a weakening trend in clause linkage throughout the development. His developmental sequence (i.e. Type I > II > III of S-Mkg ga > Type 1 > 2 > 3 > 4 > 5 > 6 > 7 of CONJ ga) appears to be theoretically ideal, but I have raised some questions on details. Except for those points, his overall claim is supported by historical evidence.

In Section 5.3.2, I have discussed the development of CONJ ga from a crosslinguistic viewpoint. As part of the grammaticalization theory they advocate, Hopper and Traugott (1993) argue for the following unidirectional change in clause combining: parataxis > hypotaxis > subordination. Harris and Campbell (1995), on the other hand, argue against the hypothesis that hypotaxis develops out of parataxis, and claim that finite subordinate clauses (i.e. hypotaxis) develop out of simplex constructions based on the duality of non-finite verb forms. If we adopt Hopper and Traugott's classification of clausal relationships, the development of CONJ ga displays the following pattern: subordination > hypotaxis > parataxis. This is completely opposite to the unidirectional change claimed by Hopper and Traugott. As for Harris and Campbell, in fact they only deal with the origination of relative clauses, despite the purported scope of their hypothesis. Nor does it provide any account for the case of CONJ ga in Japanese, i.e. the development from subordination, regardless of whether their hypothesis is right or wrong.

Grammaticalization theory generally treats those cases which do not agree with the unidirectionality hypothesis, such as the case of CONJ ga in Japanese, as "exceptions". The examination of the wide range of crosslinguistic data in this section suggests that the development towards parataxis is not so exceptional. I claim that it is just constrained by
the morphological and syntactic conditions in (48). In other words, whether the
development towards parataxis is exceptional is a question that comes down to whether
(48a) and (48b) are exceptional conditions. The syntactic condition in (48b) (i.e. being a
verb-final language) is by no means exceptional. I argue in the following that there is no
reason in principle to consider the morphological condition of (48a) (i.e. case particles
marking tense/aspect-marked verbs as nominalized constituents) exceptional, although it
may not be satisfied by many languages.

In an attempt for universal generalization, there seems to be an assumption that all
languages employ similar fundamental structural systems (morphological and syntactic),
and that hence they follow similar historical footsteps. For example, it has been traditionally
suggested that hypotaxis (in the traditional sense, e.g. involving fully tense/aspectually
marked relative clauses) appears later in the history of languages, since it is more
sophisticated than parataxis. In Japanese, however, the appearance of relative clauses (i.e.
head NPs modified by preceding RT clauses) dates back to prehistoric times; it is already
confirmable in the earliest historical documents of the eighth century. As a modification
system, it is noteworthy that the function is directly incorporated into the verb inflection, i.e.
RT forms.

RT forms in OJ are an example which shows that verbs in every language do not
necessarily inflect for categories common in western languages, such as tense, aspect,
person, number, and gender. To our immediate concern, the application of the notions of
"finite" and "non-finite" to each inflectional category can sometimes be misleading, since
verbs do not necessarily inflect for tense/aspect in all languages. For example, the six

---

106 See Shibatani (1990:221-35) for his summary of different analyses of Japanese verb inflection by
different scholars. For example, Bloch (1946) proposes the following categories for Std-ModJ: non-past
indicative (mi-ru ‘see’); past indicative (mi-ta); non-past presumptive (mi-yoo); past presumptive (mi-
tarōo); imperative (mi-ro); provisional (mi-reba); conditional (mi-tara); alternative (mi-tari); infinitive (mi-
θ); gerund (mi-te).
inflectional categories in OJ (i.e. MZ, RY, SS, RT, IZ, and MR) basically have nothing to do with tense/aspect. The notions of finite and non-finite are most generally associated with (or defined by) the notion of tense/aspect, i.e. finite being marked for tense/aspect, and non-finite being unmarked. Assigning the finite/non-finite labels to each inflectional category in OJ creates a contradictory situation, since aspectual auxiliaries (*jodōshi*) also inflect for the six categories (see Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2.2 for aspectual auxiliaries), although their paradigms are not always complete. For example, RY forms of verbs are often regarded as infinitives (e.g. Martin 1987; Quinn 1987, 1990), but it causes a problem in treating the RY forms of the aspectual auxiliaries. Also, the imperfective aspect (including present and future) is expressed with verbs in SS forms in unmarked indicative sentences. However, we cannot associate SS forms with imperfective, since the perfective auxiliaries also have SS forms. Thus, the verb morphology and the tense/aspect system in OJ did not develop in a way that we can assign the finite/non-finite labels to each inflectional category.

The association of "finite/non-finite" with "non-nominal/nominal" is also problematic (see Chapter 4 for the nouniness of each inflectional category). In OJ, RT clauses can contain full aspectual information, while they can function as nominal constituents. The situation is similar to what Genetti (1991: 246) describes as "fully inflected finite nominal verbs" for Newari.

It is now well known that tense markers tend to develop from aspect markers, and aspect markers from verbs (e.g. Bybee 1994). In this type of development, then, we should not be surprised that aspect markers may still keep verb inflections, although it is often the case that forms are reduced and some or all inflections are lost in the course of grammaticalization. Also, nominalization mechanisms (e.g. RT forms in OJ, *that*-clauses in

---

107 In marked contexts (e.g. *kakari-musubi*, or exclamation), verbs take RT forms. See Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2.2 for RT main clauses.
English) need not be associated with the notion of tense/aspect, and languages may develop them as part of their verb morphology. Therefore, essentially there is no reason to regard verb inflection in OJ as exceptional, even if we may not find many similar cases. Given the above discussion about a possible separation of nominalization from the notion of tense/aspect in verb morphology, (48a) (i.e. case particles to mark tense/aspect-marked verbs as nominalized constituents) does not seem to be an exceptional condition. That is, there is essentially no reason to regard the changes toward parataxis as exceptions.

Perhaps what can be said about the direction of change is that "other things being equal", and given the similar psychological processes shared by human beings, linguistic changes show similar tendencies across languages. However, the critical factors that determine the direction of change are the social, cultural, and linguistic conditions in which a language and its speakers are situated. Thus, given the fundamental structural system in Japanese and the developmental situation at the time, the change exhibited in the process of [GEN ga > S-Mkg > CONJ] is by no means "exceptional".

5.4 Theme-marking Particles

In Std-ModJ, semantic themes (i.e. entities affected by actions or states expressed by predicates) for so-called "stative predicates" (e.g. wakaru ‘understand’, suki da ‘be

---

108 It may be fruitful to distinguish nominalization (e.g. RT forms) from deverbal nouns (e.g. the same forms as RY forms of verbs). While nominalization concerns the whole event or state, deverbal nouns are basically the names of events and states, which are not necessarily associated with the notion of tense/aspect (the same idea is presented in Quinn 1987, except that he regards RY forms as infinitives). In fact, Quinn (p.c.) has pointed out to me that RY forms of verbs are accented differently from deverbal nouns that are formally the same as RY forms. Also, it is well known that not every RY form has a corresponding lexical noun.

109 It is not confirmable in historical documents, but I suspect that adnominal modification was the original function of RT forms, and that nominalization was a later development by omitting the head NP.
fond of, *nomi-tai ‘want to drink’) are usually marked by *ga*. For some stative predicates with higher transitivity, ACC o-marking is also fairly acceptable. See some examples:

(49)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(I) want to drink water.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>mizu ga nomi-tai.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>water NOM drink-Desi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>mizu o nomi-tai.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>water ACC drink-Desi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>ringo ga suki da.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>apple NOM fond COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>ringo o suki da.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>apple ACC fond COP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This theme-marking (TM) *ga* in ModJ apparently came from GEN *ga* in OJ. In fact, both GEN *ga* and *no*, as well as zero and ACC *wo*, can be seen in theme marking in OJ.

It appears that theme markers have developed in different ways in different constructions. For example, the development of TM *ga* for spontaneous expressions (*jihatsu*, e.g. OJ *miyu*, Std-ModJ *mieru ‘can be seen, come into one’s sight’) parallels that of NOM *ga* in that zero-marking in main clauses changed to *ga*-marking. As for desiderative ‘want to’ expressions, Yanagida (1987) argues for the following historical development, as if Japanese had always consisted of a single variety: GEN *ga/no*-marking in OJ (710-) > ACC *wo*-marking dominant in EMJ (794-) > gradual increase of GEN

---

110 For these predicates, Japanese sentences are perfectly grammatical without overt experiencers, which certainly have some subjecthood properties (cf. Shibatani 1977). When necessary, however, they can be overtly expressed while being marked by either NOM *ga*, TOP *wa*, DAT *ni*, inclusive focus marker *mo*, or zero, depending on the predicate, type of the sentence, and conversational context, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(It is) Taro (who) understands French.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>Taro ga huronsugo ga wakaru.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taro NOM French NOM understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>Taro wa huronsugo ga wakaru.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taro TOP French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>huronsugo ga wakaru.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>Taro ni huronsugo ga wakaru no?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taro DAT French NOM understand SFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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go/no-marking since MJ (1192-) > ga-marking dominant since EModJ (1603-). His claim is simply based on numbers of examples, and even overlooks zero-marking. This section examines data from Man’yōshū (ca. 759), Genji monogatari (ca. 1001-14), and dialect data from Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo (1989), and makes the following two claims: (i) a fundamental restructuring of the desiderative theme-marking system occurred in EMJ; and (ii) ga-marking in Std-ModJ was not a predetermined outcome from the competition among GEN ga/no, ACC wo, and zero.

5.4.1 Desiderative Expressions in OJ

In OJ, there are several variations in desiderative expressions, but they can basically be divided into two groups, one with the adjective posi ‘desirable’, and the other with the verb poru ‘want’. Among them, V-maku posi [V-Conjec(Ku) desirable] (MYS 285, 1857, etc.) and V-maku poru [V-Conjec(Ku) want] (MYS 1753, 3957, etc.) are representative expressions for each group. In these constructions, V-maku is the ku-nominalized form of V-mu ‘conjecture/volition’ and serves as an argument for posi ‘desirable’ or poru ‘want’.

Man’yōshū data show that themes for the expressions with posi ‘desirable’ are generally marked by GEN ga/no, and those for the expressions with poru ‘want’ by ACC wo. The GEN-marking in the former is attributable to some sort of nominal quality (e.g. the ku-nominalization in V-maku posi or the use of RT forms), and ACC-marking in the

111 Variations include: V-posi, only one example, i.e. ki-posi [wear(RY)-desirable] ‘want to wear’ (MYS 14:3350); Deverbal-N ga posi, e.g. ari ga posi [being GEN desirable] ‘want to be (there)’ (MYS 6:1059, only one example), mi ga posikara/posiku/posi [seeing GEN desirable[MZ/RY/SS]] ‘want to see’ (MYS 3985, 4111, 4170, etc.); Deverbal-N wo poru/pore, e.g. mi ga poru [seeing GEN want] ‘want to see’ (MYS 2327); V-maku no posiki [V-Conjec(Ku) GEN desirable(RT)] ‘want to V’ (MYS 584, 1742, 2992, 4449); Adj pori suru, e.g. nagaku pori suru [long(RY) want(RY) do] ‘want (it to be) long’ (MYS 975, 2358, etc.).

112 For ku-nominalization, see Chapter 1, Section 1.4.2.6.
latter to the transitivity of *poru* 'want'.\textsuperscript{113} The following table shows the numbers of different kinds of theme markers (TMs) for expressions with *posi* 'desirable' in *Man'yōshū*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>ga</th>
<th>wo</th>
<th>pa</th>
<th>si</th>
<th>mo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mi</em> <em>ga</em> <em>posi</em> [seeing GEN desirable(SS)]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ki</em> <em>posi</em> [wear(RY) desirable(SS)]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ki</em> <em>posiku(RY)</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ki</em> <em>posiki(RT)</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V-maku</em> <em>posi</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V-maku</em> <em>posiki(RT)</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5\textsuperscript{114}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V-maku</em> <em>posikyeye(Ku)</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V-maku</em> <em>posikyeku(Ku)</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 1 | 4.5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Table 5.7: TMs for desiderative expressions with *posi* 'desirable' in *Man'yōshū* (OJ)

As seen above, *wo*-marking is not observable with *posi* 'desirable'. There are five (and a half) cases of *ga/no*-marking, and only one zero-marking. The GEN-marking in these examples is attributable to the use of the deverbal noun *mi* 'seeing', the RT form *posiki*, or the *ku*-nominalization in *V-maku*. The use of the other TMs, *pa* [topic], *si* [emphasis], and *mo* 'also', are contextually motivated.

\textsuperscript{113} For spontaneous (*jihatsu*) expressions, which do not involve nominalization, themes are usually zero-marked in main clauses, e.g. *suzu ga oto kikoyu* [bell GEN sound come.to.ear] '(I can) hear the sound of the bell' (MYS 14:3438).

\textsuperscript{114} This example is as follows: *taku-pire no* / *kake-maku posiki* / *imo no na* *wo* [paper.mulberry-scarf GEN/ put on-Conjec(Ku) desirable(RT)/ beloved GEN name ACC] '(my) beloved's name which I want to speak out' (MYS 3:285). The first line *taku-pire no* 'paper mulberry scarf' is a *makura kotoba* (pillow word) to introduce *kake-* 'put on; address', and it is usually untranslated. However, it can be regarded as the semantic theme of *kake-* 'put on', so I counted it as "0.5".
Next, the following table shows the numbers of different kinds of TMs for expressions with poru ‘want’ in Man’yōshū:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>ø</th>
<th>wo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nagaku pori suru/sure/se-mu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[long(RY) want(RY) do(RT)/do(IZ)/do(MZ)-Vol(RT)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-maku pori(RY)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-maku pore(IZ) koso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 7 13

Table 5.8: TMs for desiderative expressions with poru ‘want’ in Man’yōshū (OJ)

Unlike the expressions with posi ‘desirable’ in Table 5.7, only zero-marking and wo-marking are observable in expressions with poru ‘want’. The ACC-marking is attributable to the transitivity of poru. For song numbers of the examples in Table 5.7 and 5.8, see Appendix D.

Below are four examples of -maku posi [Conjec(Ku) desirable] and -maku poru [Conjec(Ku) want] from Man’yōshū, in which semantic themes are marked by GEN ga, GEN no, ACC wo, and zero:

---

115 Sō-sakuin and Taeke read this example (MYS 4:704) as pore koso, while Zenshū reads as pori koso.
116 The number of wo-marking includes instances of wo ya [ACC KP] and wo mo [ACC also].
117 When a theme is placed after the predicate as the head of a relative clause, we do not observe theme marking, e.g. mi-maku posiki kimi kamo [see-Conjec(Ku) desirable(RT) you Excl] ‘you who I want to see!’ (MYS 6:1014).
In (50a) and (50b), the themes wagimokwo ‘my lover’ and imo ga me ‘(my) lover’s eyes’ are marked by GEN ga and GEN no respectively. As explained above, this GEN-marking seems due to the ku-nominalization. In (50c), however, the theme naku kowe ‘singing voice’ is marked by ACC wo, which seems due to the transitivity of poru ‘want’. As seen in (50d), zero-marking is also possible.

Among the variety of desiderative expressions of OJ, Yanagida (1987) only discusses -maku posi, and seems to regard ga/no-marking in (50a) and (50b) as the only possible theme marking in OJ.

5.4.2 Desiderative Expressions in EMJ

Data from Genji monogatari of EMJ suggest that a fundamental restructuring of the theme-marking system for desiderative expressions occurred in EMJ. Two changes were involved: (i) -maku posi developed into -mafosi and became the primary desiderative expression, and (ii) -maku poru and other variations became obsolete. The ku-nominalization became unrecognizable in mafosi, and this morphological fusion, I claim,

---

118 This is the Taikei version. The Zenshû version ends with mi-maku posiki mo [see-Conjec(Ku) desirable(RT) Excl].
made zero-marking the default. Accordingly, GEN-marking was used when clausal
nouniness is high (i.e. mostly in subordinate clauses), just as subjects were generally
marked by GEN ga/no in subordinate clauses. Meanwhile, ACC-marking also became
common with -mafosi, despite the fact that it is not attested with -maku posi of OJ. It seems
that the grammaticalization of -mafosi made ACC-marking possible, depending on the
transitivity of V in V-mafosi. Perhaps ACC-marking was also prompted by analogy with V-
maku poru.

The following table is compiled based on the concordance by Kinoshita (1974).\textsuperscript{119}

It shows the numbers of different kinds of TMs for various forms of -mafosi in Genji
monogatari:

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Form & Numbers of TMs \\
\hline
-mafosi & \\
\hline
-keisi & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{119} I looked up exact examples in the Taikei version of Genji monogatari, using the correspondence table
among various versions at the end of Kinoshita (1974).
Table 5.9: TMs for various forms of -mafosi in Genji monogatari (EMJ)

In Table 5.9, we can observe a change in trend of theme marking, compared with Table 5.7 for expressions with posi 'desirable'. Zero-marking became most common (32.6%), and wo-marking also fairly common (19.1%), while GEN ga/no-marking was rather limited. See Appendix D for page information about the examples in Table 5.9.

Yanagida (1987) offers his observation about theme marking for -mafosi in Genji monogatari, based on the concordance by Kinoshita (1974). According to him, there are

1. The suffix -ge forms a nominal from adjectives and verbs, meaning 'appearance of...', e.g. medurasi-ge naku [rare-ge lacking] 'seemingly not rarely' (KKS 680); ari-ge naru wo [exist-ge COP(RT) Excl] 'it seems likely' (GM, Kiritsubo). It could also be used with nouns (but not in ModJ), e.g. en-ge ni mo [attractiveness-ge LOC even] 'not even attractively' (GM, Shii ga moto); daizi-ge nari [importance-ge COP] 'seems important' (Chomonjû 291).

2. As mentioned with regard to Table 5.7, the use of pa [topic], si [emphasis], mo 'also', as well as kakari particles (KPs) for theme marking, depends more on contexts, and I do not include them in the discussion. The particle mo has never been used together with GEN ga and no for marking subjects/themes. It is also exclusive to TOP wa. Martin (1975: 53) states that reflexes of ga wa and ga mo are observable at least in certain dialects in Okinawa and Yonaguni. But he does not provide any examples or the source of his information.
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fifteen examples of wo-marking, five of no-marking, and one unclear case. He does not
distinguish the other sixty two examples with different markings (e.g. zero- and mo-
marking), and even claims that those are all in the wo-case ("wo-kaku" in his terms), despite
the fact that themes are not overtly marked by ACC wo.122 Combining these sixty two
examples with the fifteen examples with overt wo-marking, Yanagida argues that wo-
marking came to be the norm at the beginning of the Heian period (794-: EMJ).123

Apparently, his analysis is inappropriate due to the treatment of TMs other than ga/no and
wo.

The increase of zero-marking seems associated with the change from -maku posi in
OJ to -mafosi in EMJ. Due to the morphological fusion, -mafosi lost any trace of ku-
nominalization, which had been the motivation for GEN-marking in OJ. Based on the data
in Table 5.9, I argue that zero-marking became the default marking for themes in the
desiderative construction in EMJ, and that the other markings were used accordingly, e.g.
wo-marking (ACC) due to the transitivity of the predicate and context (e.g. focus), ga/no-
marking (GEN) due to clausal nouniness (see Chapter 4 for clausal nouniness), and mo-
marking due to context (i.e. mo ‘even, also’).

First, some examples of zero-marking:

(51) a. kiyau ni kokoro wo irete yomi-tamaferu sama
    sutras in heart   ACC enter read-Hon(RT) appearance

we ni mo kaka-mafosi.
    picture to   even draw-Desi(SS)

'(Her) appearance reading the sutras with focus is even desirable to draw on a
picture.'

122 This analysis is based on Yanagida’s two predetermined views: (i) themes are either in the ga/no-case or
in the wo-case, and (ii) there is no example in which no is omitted (1987: 141). There is no evidence
provided for (i), and with regard to (ii), Yanagida does not specify the types of constructions in which no is
always present. His use of wo-case, no-case, and ga-case is also problematic.

123 Yanagida (1987: 144) explains that themes in desiderative expressions came to take the wo-case (i.e.
ACC) in EMJ because of the loss of the trace of ku-nominalization in -mafosi. However, ACC-marking
was already possible in OJ, as seen in (50c).
b. *kesiki* *mi-mafosiku te, ofomu-fumi tukafasu.* (GM, Ukifune)
   condition see-Desi(RY) Conj Hon-letter send
   ‘(He) wants to see how things are going (for her), and sends a letter.’

In (51a) and (51b), the themes *sama* ‘appearance’ and *kesiki* ‘condition’ are zero-marked in the SS clause ending with *kaka-mafosi* [write-Desi(SS)] and in the RY clause ending with *mi-mafosiku te* [see-Desi(RY) Conj] respectively. As seen in Table 5.9, zero-marking is most common in RY clauses. This tendency agrees with the observation in Chapter 4 that subjects in SS clauses and RY clauses exhibit GEN-marking less often than the other environments due to their lower degree of clausal nouniness.

Next, some examples of wo-marking (ACC):

(52) a. *ari-si yo wo tori-kafesama-mafosiku obosi-keru.* (GM, E-awase)
   exist-Evi(RT) life ACC get-reverse-Desi(RY) think-Evi(RT)
   ‘(he) wanted to get back the past (in the throne).’

b. *fito-fusi wo obosi-sira-se-mafosiku te,* (GM, Agemaki)
   one-knot ACC think-know-Caus-Desi(RY) Conj
   ‘wanting to make (him) understand one thing (the hardship of cold treatment),’

c. *fito no ofomu-kokoro bafe wo mo mi-mafosiu,* (GM, Hashihime)
   person GEN Hon-attitude ACC also see-Desi(RY)
   ‘wanting to see the person’s attitude, ...’

The use of wo-marking seems attributable to two major factors: one, the high transitivity of the predicates, and the other a focus on semantic themes. Example (52a) offers a case of a highly transitive predicate by itself (in contrast to the use of causative), i.e. *tori-kafes‘* get something back’. As seen in Table 5.9, there are seventeen examples of wo-marking, of which eight contain predicates with (presumably) high transitivity by themselves, i.e. *togeticomplete’, *ike-fate-te-mi-’ [live-end-Perf-see] ‘(lit.) see someone live to the end > make someone live long’, *ifi-tutafe-’ hand down’, *nas-’ make something to’, *wake-mi-’ distinguish’, *tori-kafes‘ get something back*, *itadak-‘ receive*, and *uti-ide-’ make something out*. Four examples contain causatives, as in (52b). As for the focus on themes,
there are seven examples in which themes are not marked by wo alone, but by wo safe ‘even’, wo mo ‘also’, wo ba ‘emphasis’, or wo dani ‘even’, as in (52c).124

It is noteworthy that ACC-marking became common with -mafosi in EMJ despite the fact that it is not attested in OJ with -maku posi [Conjsec(Ku) desirable]. This seems due to the grammaticalization of -mafosi and the disappearance of the use of poru ‘want’ for desiderative expressions. In V-maku posi of OJ, the governing element was the adjective posi ‘desirable’, which disagrees with the use of ACC wo. In EMJ, however, -maku posi was grammaticalized as -mafosi, functioning as an auxiliary (jodôshî); -mafosi was not a free morpheme. This grammaticalization seems to have made ACC-marking possible, depending on the transitivity of the V in V-mafosi. As seen in Table 5.8, ACC-marking was common with desiderative expressions with poru ‘want’ due to its transitivity. It seems likely that ACC-marking for V-mafosi was also prompted by analogy with these expressions with poru (e.g. -maku poru) as they became obsolete in EMJ.

As for ga/no-marking (GEN), there are only six examples of no-marking and no ga-marking in Genji, as seen in Table 5.9. Four of those occur in RT clauses and IZ clauses. This tendency agrees with the observation in Chapter 4 that subjects in RT clauses and IZ clauses are generally marked by GEN ga/no due to their high degree of clausal nouniness.125 The other two examples are found in RY clauses, which have been shown to exhibit low nouniness in Chapter 4. However, no-marking of themes in RY clauses does not necessarily contradict my claim about clausal nouniness, since GEN-marking does not

124 There are some instances of double-counting for the types of (52a) (high transitivity), (52b) (causative), and (52c) (focus), and there are two more examples (in the seventeen examples of wo-marking in total) which I did not categorize into these three types. They are: icer kagiri no yo wo sugusa-mafosikere do [live(RT) limit GEN life ACC pass-Desi(IZ) Conj] ‘(I) want to spend (my) life (as I wish) as much as possible’ (GM, Fuji no uraba), and kono kimi wo tadune-mafosi-ge ni obosi [this person ACC visit-Desi-NMZ LOC think(Hon/RY)] ‘(he) thought (he) would like to visit her,...’ (GM, Yadorigi).
125 The use of no-marking in one of the RT clauses can also be attributed to the nominalization with the suffix -ge ‘appearance of’, i.e. mi-mafosi-ge naru wo [see-Desi-ge COP(RT) Conj] ‘appears to be wanting to see’ (GM, Shii ga moto).
exhibit a categorical behavior in each type of clause; it is observable in all types of clauses (except for imperative clauses) albeit with different frequencies. In fact, the two examples of no-marking in RY clauses in this case seem to agree with the clausal nouniness account if we examine them carefully. The two examples are:

(53) a. wosanakari-turu yukufe no nafo tasika-ni sira-mafosiku te,
    juvenile-Perf(RT) future GEN still surely know-Desi(RY) Conj
    tofti-tamafe ba, ...
    ask-Hon(IZ) Conj
    ‘(He) wants to know even surely about the one’s future who was infant, and asks (about it), (then) ...’

b. Ito wokasi-ge ni, omo-yase-tamafe-ru sama no
    very beautiful-ge COP face-become.thin-Hon-Res(RT) appearance GEN
    mi-mafosiu, rautai koto no sofita-tamafe-ru ni
    see-Desi(RY) delicate(RT) thing GEN accompany-Hon-Res(RT) LOC
    tukete mo, ...
    attach(RY) even
    ‘(She) looks very beautiful, (her) haggard look is desirable to see, and on top of the fact that delicacy accompanies (her), ...’

In (53a) and (53b), the themes yukufe ‘future’ and sama ‘appearance’ are marked by GEN no in the RY clauses ending with sira-mafosiku te [know-Desi(RY) Conj] and mi-mafosiu [see-Desi(RY)] respectively. In (53a), the RY clause ‘he wants to know ...’ is in fact the reason for the following clause ‘he asks (about it).’ All the three clauses in (53b) provide situations considering which Genji (the main character) regrets relinquishing the woman to another man. Thus, unlike most RY clauses used as paratactic and-clauses, the RY clauses in (53a) and (53b) seem to exhibit a high degree of subordination, which might have motivated the GEN-marking of themes.

In this subsection, I have claimed based on the Genji data that a fundamental restructuring of the desiderative theme-marking system occurred in EMJ, and that zero-marking became the default.
5.4.3 Desiderative Expressions in MJ and EModJ

*V-mafosi* in EMJ was later replaced by *V-tasi* (> *V-tai* in ModJ), which has been common since the Kamakura period (i.e. MJ: 1192-) (Ôno S. et al. 1974). Past studies provide observations about *ga/no*-marking (GEN) and *wo-*marking (ACC) for themes of *V-tasi*.¹²⁶ Yanagida (1987: 142) notes that *ga/no*-marking gradually became more common from the second half of the Heian period (i.e. late EMJ). According to Yasuda (1977: 301), *wo*-marking was still more common than *ga/no*-marking in the late MJ period, but became less common around the Genroku period (1688-1704: EModJ).

Contrary to what Yanagida and Yasuda suggest, however, it does not seem that the Japanese language changed as a whole in terms of the use of *ga/no*-marking and *wo*-marking of themes. Matsumura (1951: 257-64) provides observations on data from various genres from different time periods, and suggests that *ga/no*-marking and *wo*-marking always coexisted, and that neither of them became predominant over the other. According to him, the materials which contain more examples of *wo*-marking than *ga/no*-marking include *shō-mono* (a genre) in MJ, *Amakusa-bon Heike* (1592: MJ), *Amakusa-bon Isoho* (1953: MJ), *nō-kyōgen* (a genre, based on the *Tora'akira-bon* script in 1642), *share-bon* (a genre, around the end of 18c: EModJ), *kokkei-bon* (a genre, 1750s-1840s: EModJ), and *ninjō-bon* (a genre, 1810s-1860s: EModJ). The materials which contain more examples of *ga/no*-marking than *wo*-marking include *sewa-jūruri* (a genre), *kabuki* (a genre), and *kyōgen* (a genre) plays by Chikamatsu (1653-1724: EModJ), and *shingaku-dōwa* (a genre, 18c: EModJ). Basically, MJ materials (wo-preference), Chikamatsu’s works (EModJ, ga-preference), and *shingaku-dōwa* (EModJ, ga-preference) are of Kansai (western) dialects, while the other EModJ materials (wo-preference) are of Edo (today’s Tokyo) dialects.

¹²⁶ It appears that zero-marking is overlooked in past studies.
Based on Matsumura’s observation, therefore, the change of preference from wo-marking to ga-marking seems to have occurred in Tokyo dialects in the ModJ period (1868-).

5.4.4 Dialectal Variations in Desiderative Expressions

There is significant dialectal variation in theme marking in ModJ, and not only ga-marking and o/wo-marking,\(^{127}\) but also zero-marking and some other types are observable in modern dialects. The dialect study by Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo (NLRi: National Language Research Institute) (1989) includes data about expressions equivalent to *Sake ga nomi-tai* [sake TM drink-Desi] ‘(I) want to drink sake’ in Std-ModJ (sake ‘rice wine; alcoholic beverage’). See Map 5.1.\(^{128}\)

Nara was the capital in the OJ period, Kyoto in the EMJ period, and Tokyo in the EModJ and ModJ periods. Nara dialects exhibit zero-marking, Kyoto dialects a split between zero-marking and ga-marking, and Tokyo dialects

---

\(^{127}\) In most dialects, ACC wo has been reduced to o, but some dialects still maintain w.

\(^{128}\) Map 5.1 is simplified from the original dialect map in NLRI, and thus not entirely accurate in details. See Map 4 in NLRI.
ga-marking, which is generally thought to be the standard.\textsuperscript{129} Zero-marking is predominant in the Tōhoku (Northeast) region. Also, there is a zero-marking belt from Nara to Kyoto, then onto the Noto peninsula. As for o/wo-marking, it is predominant in the central Japan (i.e. Shizuoka, Yamanashi, and Nagano prefectures). It is also predominant in Kagoshima prefecture (i.e. the south end of Kyushu). As for ga-marking, it is widely observable in the bottom half of Japan. Other interesting varieties include ba-marking (ACC) in northwest Kyushu, i-marking on the border between Oita and Miyazaki prefectures (only two locations), and du-marking on Ishigaki and Iriomote islands (Okinawa prefecture).

It is most likely that this complex geographical distribution of ga-, ACC-, and zero-marking is a result of dialect-internal developments, not dialectal spread. Therefore, it should be concluded that the development of ga as TM in Std-ModJ was not the outcome of inevitable historical changes.

5.4.5 Conclusion

This section has examined the change of theme marking in desiderative constructions. In OJ, GEN-marking was most common with posi ‘desirable’ expressions, and ACC-marking with poru ‘want’ expressions. The \textsl{Man yōshū} data suggest that GEN-marking is attributable to some sort of nominal quality (e.g. the ku-nominalization in \textit{V-maku posi} or the use of RT forms), and ACC-marking to the transitivity of poru ‘want’. In EMJ, \textit{-maku posi} [Conjec(Ku) desirable] changed to \textit{-mafosi}, and the ku-nominalization became unrecognizable. This morphological fusion made zero-marking the default, and GEN-marking was used when clausal nouniness was high (e.g. RT clauses and IZ clauses).

\textsuperscript{129} Matsumura (ibid.: 240) notes that it was taught that ga-marking was correct while o-marking was incorrect in textbooks in the 1940s. He argues against this kind of prescriptive approach to theme marking. In another example, Yoshizawa (1932) states that o-marking, which is sometimes found in novels, etc., is an artificial expression, and is not a natural linguistic phenomenon.
The grammaticalization of \textit{-mafosi} also made ACC-marking common in EMJ. From the second half of the EMJ period, GEN-marking increased. Based on the claim that zero-marking was the default in EMJ, the increase of GEN-marking of themes can be regarded as a parallel to the increase of GEN-marking of subjects in main clauses (see Section 5.2 in this chapter for the change from GEN \textit{ga} to NOM \textit{ga}), which eventually led to the preference of \textit{ga} over \textit{no} for theme marking, as is the case for subject marking.\footnote{As mentioned, Yanagida (1987) argues that themes in the desiderative construction were predominantly in the \textit{wo}-case at the beginning of EMJ, and attributes the increase of \textit{ga}/\textit{no}-marking to a particular construction, namely \textit{-mafosi-sa ni} [Desi-NMZ LOC], which functions similarly to IZ clauses for ‘because’ (ibid.: 144-47). (For the development of conjunctives from locatives, see Section 5.3.2.3 in this chapter.) Compare (a) with (b) below:}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textit{sono yuku-kata no sira-mafosi-sa ni, ...} \hspace{1cm} (Yoru no nezame 1, ca. 1058?)
\begin{itemize}
\item that \hspace{1cm} go-direction GEN know-Desi-NMZ LOC
\item ‘because of the desire to know that person’s whereabouts, ...’
\end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{On-arisama no mi-tatematura-mafosikere ba, ...} \hspace{1cm} (Yoru no nezame 2)
\begin{itemize}
\item Hon-condition GEN see-Humb-Desi(I\text{Z}) Conj
\item ‘since (I) would like to see (your) conditions, ...’
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

In (a), the predicate \textit{sira-mafosi} ‘want to know’ is nominalized by the suffix -\textit{sa}, which leads to the use of GEN \textit{no} for theme marking. (For \textit{sa}-nominalized clauses, see also Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2.8.) Yanagida claims that the \textit{-mafosi-sa ni} construction as in (a) served as an analogical model for the use of \textit{ga}/\textit{no}-marking in IZ clauses for ‘because’ as in (b). Due to the high nouniness of IZ clauses, however, \textit{ga}/\textit{no}-marking is reasonable, and there is no reason to posit an analogical change.

\textit{...}
desiderative theme marking seems to be another example that demonstrates that
predeterministic approaches to language change do not provide proper accounts.\textsuperscript{131}

5.5 \textit{Juntai-joshi} (quasi-nominal particle) \textit{no}

This section provides historical information about the use of \textit{no} that is traditionally
called "\textit{juntai-joshi}" (quasi-nominal particle) or "\textit{keishiki meishi}" (lit. formal noun).
Unlike the changes examined in the previous sections, the origination of the quasi-nominal
\textit{no} is uncertain in past studies (e.g. Martin 1975, 1990; Horie 1995, 1997). In fact, it
constitutes a broad category, in which I would like to distinguish pronominal genitive (Pro-
GEN), bound pronominal (Bd-Pro), and nominalizer (NMZ ‘fact that ...’). An example of
each use in Std-ModJ is repeated below from Chapter 1, Section 1.5.2:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(54)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Pronominal Genitive (GEN + bound pronominal)
\begin{align*}
\text{Taro no wa takakatta.} \\
\text{Taro GEN.one TOP expensive(Perf)} \\
\end{align*}
\text{‘Taro’s was expensive.’}
\item b. Bound Pronominal
\begin{align*}
\text{Akai no ga ii.} \\
\text{red one NOM good} \\
\end{align*}
\text{‘The/A red one is good.’}
\item c. Nominalizer
\begin{align*}
\text{Nedanga takai no ga mondai da.} \\
\text{price NOM high NMZ NOM problem COP} \\
\end{align*}
\text{‘That the price is high is the problem.’}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

In (54a), Pro-GEN \textit{no} combines the function of genitive and a bound pronominal, and thus
\textit{Taro no} [Taro GEN.one] refers to something in Taro’s possession that is identifiable by
the context. In (54b), \textit{no} functions as Bd-Pro (bound pronominal), equivalent to the
pronominal \textit{one} in English, and thus \textit{akai no} [red one] means ‘a/the red one’. In (54c), \textit{no}

\textsuperscript{131} The same conclusion will be drawn in Chapter 6 based on dialectal variations in a variety of genitive
derivatives.
functions as NMZ (nominalizer). Unlike Bd-Pro no, NMZ no does not have a referent on its own, but instead the whole nominalized clause (i.e. including NMZ no) refers to a certain event or situation, similar to *that*-clauses in English.

Overall developmental processes of Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, and NMZ will be discussed in Chapter 6, but I will present in this section a particular claim about the use of Bd-Pro and NMZ after RT forms, arguing against Yoshikawa (1950) and Yasuda (1977). My claim is that the use of the quasi-nominal no after RT forms (i.e. \( [X(RT) no] \)) was derived from a regular relative clause construction (i.e. \( [X(RT) NP] \)), not from the construction in which GEN no is inserted between the RT form and the head NP (i.e. \( [X(RT) no NP] \)).

5.5.1 Pronominal Genitive (Pro-GEN)

Pro-GEN can already be found in OJ materials, although there are not many examples. Four examples are provided below:

(55)  

a. *sipwi no* ga *sipwi-gatari*  
Shihi GEN.one GEN insisting-talk  
‘the insistent talk of (the old lady) of the Shihi clan’  

b. *sena no* ga *swode mo saya-ni pura-si-tu*.  
husband GEN.one GEN sleeve even clearly wave-Hon-Perf  
‘My (lord/honorable) husband clearly waved a sleeve.’  

c. *wotomye-ra ga* *kike ba kanasi-sa.*  
girl-Dim GEN.one hear(IZ) Conj sad-NMZ  
(lit.) ‘when (I) hear (the story) of the girl, the sadness!’  

d. *kusurisi pa tune no* *mo are do*  
doctor TOP usual GEN.one also exist(IZ) Conj  
‘Speaking of doctors, although there are the usual ones, ...’

In (55a), *sipwi no* [Shihi GEN.one] ‘Shihi’s’ can be understood as *sipwi no omina* ‘the old lady of the Shihi clan’, which is presented in the headnote of the song. In (55b), *sena no* [husband GEN.one] can be understood as a shortening of ceremonial appositive expressions such as *sena no kimi* [husband GEN lord] or *sena no mikoto* [husband GEN
honorable.person] ‘honorable husband’, based on similar set expressions, cf. wa ga se no kimi [I GEN husband GEN lord] ‘my admirable husband’ (MYS 59, 4006, etc.); tuma no mikoto [wife/husband GEN honorable.person] ‘honorable wife/husband’ (MYS 194, 3962); imo no mikoto ‘honorable beloved’ (MYS 794, etc.). In (55c), wotome-ra ga [girl-Dim GEN.one] ‘the girl’s’ can be understood as wotome-ra ga panasi [girl-Dim GEN story] ‘the story of the girl’ by the context, i.e. kike ba ‘when listening to’. In (55d), tune no [usual GEN.one] ‘usual’s’ can be understood as tune no kusurisi [usual GEN doctor] ‘usual doctors’ since kusurisi is given as a topic in the sentence. Note that both ga and no could be used as Pro-GEN in OJ.

In the EMJ corpus, it appears that tokens of Pro-GEN are more plentiful (cf. Kazama 1960):132

(56) a. Kono uta fa aru fito no ifaku this song TOP certain person GEN say(ku)
Ofotomo no Kuronushi ga nari. (KKS 899, 905 A.D.)
Ôtomo GEN Kuronushi GEN.one COP
‘This song is, according to some person, Ôtomo no Kuronushi’s.’
b. tare ga wo narasi-taru ni ka. (Ochikubo 1, end of 10c?)
who GEN.one ACC follow-Res(RT) LOC KP
‘Whose did (he) follow?’
c. ta ga zo. (Ochikubo 1, end of 10c?)
who GEN.one Emph
‘Whose (is this)?’
d. saki no kami ima no mo morotomo-ni ori te.
former GEN head now GEN.one also together get.off(RY) Conj
ima no aruzi mo saki no mo te tori-kafasi te
now GEN master also former GEN.one also hand get-exchange(RY) Conj
‘The former governor, together with the current one, gets off, and the current master and the former one join hands, and ...’ (Tosa Dec. 26th, ca. 935)

132 Kazama refers to Pro-GEN as the use of GEN without the following noun.
There is no carp, (but) starting with crucian carp, (someone) sent river fish, sea fish, and various foods, one after another, carrying (them) in the long box.

In (56a), (56b) and (56c), we observe Pro-GEN ga, i.e. Kuronusi ga ‘Kuronushi’s’, tare ga ‘whose (pronominal)’ and ta ga ‘whose (pronominal)’. In (56d) and (56e), we find Pro-GEN no, i.e. ima no (kami) ‘the current one (governor)’, saki no (aruzi) ‘the former one (master)’, kafa no ‘(lit.) rivers’ things’ > ‘river fish’, and umi no ‘(lit.) the sea’s things’ > ‘sea fish’.

In MJ, both Pro-GEN ga and no are continuously productive. In the following, (57a) contains both Pro-GEN ga and no, (57b) only Pro-GEN no, and (57c) both Pro-GEN ga and no:
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Especially when Pro-GEN *ga* and *no* are used together, such as in (57a) and (57c), the distinction between *ga* and *no* is generally thought to be associated with the pejorative/honorific distinction (see Chapter 2).

At the beginning of EModJ, Pro-GEN *ga* can still be found, but it seems to have become obsolete later, as far as data in historical documents are concerned. Pro-GEN *no* has been productive all the way into Std-ModJ. See examples from EModJ materials:

(58) a. *ware ga wo hito ni,* (Seisuishô, 1623)
   I GEN.one ACC others LOC
   *hito no wo ware ga ni tugi-kahe-tari.*
   others GEN.one ACC I GEN.one LOC join-exchange-Res(SS)
   ‘(He) exchanged and joined mine (i.e. my legs) to someone else’s,
   (and) someone else’s to mine.’

b. *ano o-ko-sama no mesi-hurusi ha* (Ukiyoburo 2-Jô, 1809-16)
   that Pol-child-Address GEN wear-old stuff TOP
   o-imoto-go-sama no ni nari-masu kara
   Pol-younger.sister-Address GEN.one to become-Pol(SS) because
   ‘because that child’s old clothes become the younger sister’s, ...’

The differentiation between *ga* and *no* is still found in (58a), in which Pro-GEN *ga* is used with the first person pronoun *ware*, while Pro-GEN *no* is used with the indefinite *hito* ‘person, others’. It is beyond the scope of this study to identify around when Pro-GEN *ga* became unproductive in the EModJ period, but it is no longer observable at all in Std-ModJ.

A particular use of Pro-GEN *no* (as well as Bd-Pro *no*) developed in EModJ. In this use, Pro-GEN or Bd-Pro is attached to a word (either a noun or an adjective) that characterizes a person, and used in addressing the person:

(59) a. *Mosi kami-gata no.* (Hizakurige)
   excuse.me upper-direction GEN.one
   ‘Excuse me, (you), the person from Kamigata (i.e. Osaka/Kyoto area).’

b. *Kore mausi o-tonari no* (Hirakana-seisuiki, a jôruri work)
   this excuse.me Pol-next GEN.one
   ‘Hey, excuse me, Neighbor.’
c. Kore kore wakai no. (Aburashōnin-kuruwabanasi, a kabuki work)
   this this young one
   ‘Hey, hey, young person.’

In (59a) and (59b), no functions as Pro-GEN [GEN.person]; it is attached to a noun, and kamigata no, for example, is understood as kamigata no hito [Kamigata GEN person]. In (59c), however, no functions as Bd-Pro [person] since it is attached to an adjective. Note that **wakai no hito [young GEN person] does not occur.

To summarize, both Pro-GEN ga and no are already observable in OJ materials. There are more tokens of them in EMJ. While Pro-GEN no has been productive all the way into Std-ModJ, Pro-GEN ga became obsolete (in historical materials) sometime in the EModJ period.

5.5.2 Bound Pronominal (Bd-Pro)

Gathering data from studies about the quasi-nominal no, it seems that Sotanshū (also known as Yoshitada-shū) in the late tenth century is one of the earliest, if not the earliest, historical materials that contains Bd-Pro (cf. Nakata et al. 1983; Nakamura et al. 1994). Consider the following:

(60) Fito-duma to/ wa ga no to futatu/ omofu ni fa (Sotanshū 457)
    others-wife and I GEN one and two think(RT) LOC TOP
    ‘Thinking about both, another person’s wife and mine, ...’

---

133 Sotanshū is a collection of waka (Japanese songs) by Sone no Yoshitada. See Taikei, vol.80.
In this example, the possessor wa ‘I’ and Bd-Pro no ‘one’ is connected by GEN ga, and thus wa ga no [I GEN one] means ‘mine’. Bd-Pro no is apparently derived from GEN no (see Chapter 6), and I call this kind of constructions “double genitive derivatives”.134

The use of Bd-Pro must have been limited to possessive expressions and must not have spread to the environments following adjectives or verbs for a long period of time, because RT forms of predicates could also be used as pronominal constituents without the following NP in OJ/EMJ/MJ. Compare the following examples of RT forms:

(61) a. kiyoki nagisa (MYS 15:3706)
clean(RT) beach
‘the clean beach’
b. yama ni siroki pa (MYS 10:2324)
mountain LOC white(RT) TOP
‘the white thing on the mountain’

In (61a), the RT form kiyoki ‘clean’ is used as a modifier for nagisa ‘beach’. In (61b), the RT form siroki [white(RT)] functions as a pronominal constituent, i.e. [white.thing] ‘white thing’.

The use of Bd-Pro after RT forms seems to have developed in late MJ. In terms of historically certain examples, according to Yoshikawa (1950),135 it is not until the late sixteenth century that we can find the use of Bd-Pro after verbs in Jiteiki (the Keicho era: 1596-1615):136

---

134 See also Chapter 2 for i-tu-tu [five-GEN-one] ‘five (pronominal)’ and a hypothesis about numeral pronominals, such as puta-tu (?< *pu-ta-tu [two-GEN-thing]) ‘two (pronominal)’ as double genitive derivatives. The double genitive derivatives are also found in possessive expressions in modern dialects, e.g. ore ga tu [I GEN one] in Fukuoka and ore n ga [I GEN one] in Toyama for ‘mine’. See Chapter 6.

135 Yoshikawa (1950) examines the use of no after RT forms, but he does not make a distinction between Bd-Pro and NMZ.

136 Jiteiki is a handbook of waka (Japanese songs) by Karasumaru Mitsuhiro (1579-1638).
Sarimaga, ofomune kakeafi no aru no nari, 
nevertheless mostly interaction GEN exist one COP
‘Nevertheless, mostly (they) are the ones which have interactions.’
(Jiteiki 2, Keicho 4-nen 3-gatsu)

According to Yoshikawa, there are not abundant examples of the quasi-nominal no (both Bd-Pro and NMZ) in the seventeenth century. Consider the following examples of Bd-Pro from EModJ materials (Yoshikawa 1950; Yasuda 1977):

(63)

a. ore ga no ga migoto zya. (Iruka-daijin, 1743)
I GEN one NOM excellent(N) COP
‘(It is) Mine (that) is excellent.’

b. Sendō sotira he watahi-ta no ha nan-to si-ta zo.
last.time your.side to pass-Perf one TOP how do-Perf SFP
‘What did (you) do with the one (I) gave you?’
(Tora’akira-bon kyōgen, Kari-nusubito, 1642)

c. Soregasiga sui te yomu no ha, Genji-Heike no monogatari
I NOM like(RY) Conj read one TOP Genji-Heike GEN story
nado wo yomu hodo ni,... (We-iri kyōgen-ki, Himenori)
such.as ACC read while LOC
‘What I like to read is, (I) read the tale of Heike and such, and ...’

d. Koto ni teisyu suki-masuru no ga hagi de gozari-masu.
special LOC master like-Pol(RT) one NOM bush.clover COP COP-Pol
‘What (my) master especially likes is bush clovers.’
(We-iri kyōgen-ki, Hagi-daimyō)

Note that in (63a) the double genitive derivative, i.e. ore ga no [I GEN one] ‘mine’, is still observable. In Std-ModJ, we only find Pro-GEN expressions, such as ore no [I GEN.one] ‘mine’. The other examples all contain Bd-Pro no after the RT forms of the predicates.

According to Yoshikawa (1950 [1977:259]), the use of no after RT forms (i.e. both Bd-Pro and NMZ) became common after the Genroku years, i.e. after 1705.

To summarize, it seems that Bd-Pro no developed in EMJ (the late tenth century as latest). Its use must have been limited to possessive expressions until the use of Bd-Pro no
after RT forms developed in the late sixteenth century (later MJ). It came to be more commonly used since the eighteenth century (EModJ). Note that we only find Bd-Pro no, not ga in the examples cited above.

5.5.3 Nominalizer (NMZ)

Since RT forms of predicates without the following nouns could also function as nominalized constituents in OJ and MJ (e.g. (61b)), NMZ no seems to have emerged in the late MJ of the sixteenth century, and have become common in the early EModJ of the seventeenth century. According to Yoshikawa (1950 [1977: 253]), the use of the quasi-nominal no started in the seventeenth century at the latest, and became more common in the eighteenth century.

_Taue-zōshi_, which is generally thought to have appeared in the late Muromachi period (1338-1573), contains the following example: 137

(64) _mizu-kusai no wa ine-tori-zake no narafi ka, ... _ (Taue-zōshi, 47)
reserved NMZ TOP rice-get-sake GEN custom Q
‘Is being reserved due to _inotorize_kake, (or ...)?’

In this example, _no_ does not refer to a concrete thing or person, but rather the whole nominalized phrase _mizu-kusai no_ refers to the observed state of being reserved.

Yoshikawa provides quite a few examples from EModJ documents. Three more examples follow:

(65) _a. Mukasi kosi-wore-uta to ihu no ha husigi na past lower.back-bent-song Comp say NMZ TOP wonder COP(RT)
koto nari._ (Shikata-banasi 2, 1634 A.D.)
thing COP
‘It is curious that (it was) called “kosi-wore-uta” in the past.’

137 Yoshikawa (ibid.: 254) notes that the materials recorded in _Taue-zōshi_ possibly date back before the Muromachi period, but the existing copy was made in the later Edo period (1603-1867).
b. *hudan ogami-yaru no ni* (Tora'akira-bon kyôgen, Busshi, 1642)
   usually bow.to-give(RT) NMZ LOC
   ‘usually for the purpose of bowing to (it)’

c. *Teisyu mousi-masuru no ni ha, ...* (We-iri kyôgen-ki, Hagi-daimyô, 1699)
   master say-Pol(RT) NMZ LOC TOP
   ‘in (my) master’s saying, ...’

As noted in the previous subsection, the use of the quasi-nominal *no* (both Bd-Pro and NMZ) became more common after the Genroku years, i.e. after 1705, according to Yoshikawa.

Yoshikawa (1950: 259-64) and Yasuda (1977: 303) attribute the emergence of the quasi-nominal *no* (both Bd-Pro and NMZ) after RT forms (i.e. [X(RT) no]) to the use of GEN *no* between RT forms and NPs (i.e. [X(RT) no NP]). See examples of [X(RT) no NP] in MJ, one from *Jiteiki* (Keicho years: 1596-1615) and two from *Jinkaishû* (1536):138

(66) a. *faru mo mada asa-sawa to ifu no tuduki fa*
   spring also yet morning-swamp Comp say(RT) GEN sequel TOP
   ‘(I) certainly remember what follows *faru no mada asa-sawa.*’

b. *nusumi-mono kafu no tokoro ni, ...* (Jinkaishû, 1536)
   stealing-thing buy(RT) GEN situation LOC
   ‘as (someone) buys a stolen thing’

c. *tuki-fi wo utusu no ufe, ...* (Jinkaishû, 1536)
   month-day ACC pass(RT) GEN above
   ‘since (it) takes time, ...’

However, Yoshikawa and Yasuda’s claim is not so convincing. First of all, the construction of [X(RT) no NP] has never been common throughout the history of Japanese, except for *kanbun-kandoku* (i.e. transliteration of Chinese as Japanese) or written language assimilated to it. It is generally thought with regard to classical Japanese (OJ/EMJ/MJ) that GEN *no* does not occur after RT forms while GEN *ga* does (e.g. Hashimoto 1969; ôno T.

138 *Jinkaishû* is Date clan’s *goseibai-shikimoku* (a code of behavior, regulations). According to Yoshikawa, *Jinkaishû* contains many examples of [X(RT) no NP]. He provides twenty of those.
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1978). The simple noticeable exception is ... gotoki no NP [... like(RT) GEN NP] ‘NP like ...’, which developed in the Insei/Kamakura periods (1086-: late EMJ and MJ) (Yasuda 1977: 302).

Second, even in a written language in which [X(RT) no NP] is observable, its use seems to have been rather limited to particular constructions. According to Yasuda (ibid.: 302), Rodriguez explains in his grammar books (1604-8) that the construction of [X(RT) no NP] is mostly used in written language when verbs are followed by particular nouns such as yosi ‘reason’, aida ‘interval’, dyou ‘line’, yuwe ‘reason’, tokoro ‘place’, and tomogara ‘comrade’. Most of these nouns were already grammaticalized as subordinators in MJ. Yoshikawa (ibid.: 261) observes that many examples in Jin’kaishû, which is written in a rather legalistic style as official regulations, are one of the following: ... no tokoro [... GEN situation] ‘as ...’; ... no yosi [... GEN reason] ‘the reason that ...’; ... no yuwe [... GEN above] ‘since ...’; ... no yuwe [... GEN reason] ‘because of the fact that ...’; and ... no toki [... GEN time] ‘when ...’. In other words, the use of [X(RT) no NP] was concentrated in forming (non-relative) subordinate clauses, departing from the original function of RT forms to form relative clauses. If the use of quasi-nominal no (both Bd-Pro and NMZ) after RT forms (i.e. [X(RT) no]) had been derived from the construction of [X(RT) no NP],

139 In fact, there are a few counterexamples, e.g. taye-mu no kokoro [cease(MZ)-Conjec(RT) GEN heart] ‘intention of ceasing (the relationship)” (MYS 12:3072) in OJ; ware ya yuka-mu no/ isayofi ni [I Intj go(MZ)-Vol(RT) GEN/ hesitation LOC] ‘with the hesitation of (whether) I go (or you come)’ (KKS 690) in EMJ.

140 See an example from Hôjôki (1212: MJ):

a. waka kuwangen Wauzyayau’ ausifu gotoki no seu-motu wo ire-tari.
Japanese song instruments ôjôyôshû like(RT) GEN booklet ACC enter-Perf(SS)
‘(There I) put in booklets like Japanese song stuff, music stuff, and ôjôyôshû.’

The expression ... gotoki no NP [... like(RT) GEN NP] coexisted with the ku-nominalized version ... gotoku no NP [... like(Ku) GEN NP], e.g. kaku no gotoku no zaihatsu [this.way GEN like(Ku) GEN crime] ‘a crime like this’ (Konjaku 9.38).

141 Each interpretation may be slightly different depending on the context. The given interpretations are just examples.
as Yoshikawa and Yasuda claim, there should have been omission of the noun after GEN no. However, the noun after GEN no in these attested tokens of \([X(RT) \text{ no NP}]\) functioned as a subordinator in many cases, and it is rather difficult to posit its omission.

Instead, I would claim that NMZ no developed from the regular relative clause construction. As seen in (60), Bd-Pro no [one] had already appeared in EMJ, i.e. \(wa \ ga \ no\) [I GEN one] ‘mine’ in Sotanshū. Once Bd-Pro no [one] emerged, the seed for modifying it by verbal or adjectival phrases, i.e. relative clauses, as in \([X(RT) \text{ no}]\) ‘the one that ...’ had been sown. This modification pattern did not develop for a long time, however, since RT forms in OJ and MJ had functioned as nominalization when used without the following nouns (see (61)). The structural change which enabled Bd-Pro no to occur after RT forms was necessary for the development of NMZ no, too. It seems certain that the development from Bd-Pro no to NMZ no is related to the historical fact that RT forms took over the functions of SS forms in late MJ. By this morphological change, RT forms lost their distinctiveness; SS and RT functions were now both served by the same forms. The loss of morphological distinctiveness seems to have prompted the loss of the nominalizing function.
of RT forms, accompanied by the use of Bd-Pro no or NMZ no after RT forms.\textsuperscript{142} The overall change can also be regarded as a structural leveling. In OJ, relative clauses and nominalized clauses had two different constructions, i.e. the former, \([X(\text{RT}) \text{NP}]\) with \(X\) being a clause, and the latter, \([X(\text{RT})]\). In late MJ, there came to be only one construction for relative clauses and nominalized clauses, i.e. \([X(\text{RT}) Y]\), with \(Y\) being a regular NP or Bd-Pro/NMZ no, which is nominal.

As for the origin of the quasi-nominal no, Yoshikawa claims that it came from GEN no based on the use of \(ga\) as a quasi-nominal in Toyama dialects,\textsuperscript{143} while Martin (1975, 1990) speculates that it came from the common noun \(\text{mono}\) ‘thing’. In Chapter 6, I will consider three kinds of evidence, namely a wide range of dialect data in modern Japanese, developmental processes, and historical data, and demonstrate that different genitive particles took the same developmental path in different dialects, i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP.

\textsuperscript{142} It was not the case that the merger of SS forms and RT forms, as well as the loss of nominalizing function of RT forms, occurred instantly; these were gradual changes. Nominalization by RT forms without following nouns coexisted with nominalization by NMZ no for a long time, at least in written texts; the former was still very productive in late EModJ, but became obsolete (but not completely) in ModJ. For the use of the former nominalization in ModJ, see Martin (1975), Hayashi (1977), Horie (1995, 1997). Horie’s (1995) approach to the development of NMZ no is mechanical. He states (ibid.: 200): “When rentai-forms [i.e. RT forms in this study - Y.H.] lost their nominalizing function, it became necessary for Classical Japanese to fill the slot immediately following rentai-forms of predicates which is marked by \(\sigma\) in Table 2.” He then claims that no was chosen to fill the slot from four candidates that are quasi-nominals, namely no, \(\text{mono}\) (< ‘concrete thing’), \(\text{koto}\) (< ‘abstract thing’), and \(\text{tokoro}\) (< ‘place’), since no carries the least semantic meaning. However, his explanation is inadequate in that it is not that the loss of the nominalizing function was recognized first, and then the necessity of filling the slot arose; rather, the loss of the nominalizing function was unrecognizable until NMZ no was actually used. Also, the quasi-nominal no’s characteristic that it carries the least semantic meaning can only be identified after it came to be used for nominalization; such no did not exist on its own for people to choose for nominalization. He does not discuss the development of the quasi-nominal no prior to its use for nominalization. Further, the developmental process of NMZ no was obviously not due to a choice from the four candidates since the other three quasi-nominals (i.e. mono, koto, and tokoro) have always been used after RT forms since OJ all the way into ModJ.

\textsuperscript{143} It was long after I wrote Chapter 6 that I found this Yoshikawa’s claim.
5.6 Conclusion

This chapter has provided historical information about a few well-recognized changes undergone by the genitive particles, the change from GEN ga to NOM ga in Section 5.2, GEN ga to CONJ ga in Section 5.3, GEN ga to TM ga in Section 5.4. Also, Section 5.5 has examined the quasi-nominal no (i.e. Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, and NMZ), although its origin is uncertain in past studies (e.g. Martin 1975, 1990; Horie 1995, 1997).

While describing various historical changes, I have presented two major claims in this chapter. With regard to the change from GEN ga to CONJ ga, I have argued against the unidirectionality hypothesis (i.e. parataxis > hypotaxis > subordination) advocated in grammaticalization theory (Hopper and Traugott 1993). By examining crosslinguistic data, I have proposed morphological and syntactic conditions for the change from subordination towards parataxis, and presented evidence to show that the case of CONJ ga in Japanese is by no means an “exception”.

In Section 5.4, I have claimed that a fundamental restructuring of the desiderative theme-marking system occurred in EMJ, and that the development of TM ga in desiderative expressions in Std-ModJ is merely one possible result that emerged from the competition among GEN ga/no, ACC wo, and zero. The complex geographical distribution of different markings in modern dialects cannot be accounted for by linguistic inevitability in language change.

The historical study in this chapter will be referred to in Chapter 6, where I will examine a wide range of dialect data and crosslinguistic data for GEN, NOM, TM, Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP.
6.1 Introduction

The historical changes undergone by the genitive particles *ga* and *no* in OJ have attracted the interest of many scholars. It is generally agreed that *ga* of OJ has developed into the nominative particle of Std-ModJ, while *no* has maintained its genitive function. In fact, in addition to their nominative and genitive functions, *ga* and *no* have several different functions in Std-ModJ. The origins of these functions and the relationships among them, however, are not made entirely clear in past studies. By examining dialectal variation and historical data, this chapter demonstrates that different genitive particles in competition took a common developmental path for these functions in Japanese dialects. Also, crosslinguistic data from English, Mandarin Chinese, Korean, German, and French are adduced to show that this developmental process is not peculiar to Japanese, although it is constrained by the lexicon, morphology, and syntax of each language.

In historical linguistics, Japanese data have not, in general, been extensively studied. This particular study of language changes in Japanese as well as some crosslinguistic data confirms two basic points of historical linguistics, namely: (i) so-called “standard”
“standard” languages in general represent just one possible outcome of earlier varieties, and do not necessarily represent what all speakers must do (or must have done) with their languages; and (ii) so-called “grammaticalization theory” does not account for all possible grammatical changes in human language.\(^1\)

6.1.1 Specific Purposes

In Std-ModJ, the particles \(ga\) and \(no\) have several different functions. This chapter examines their dialectal variations and historical developments. Given dialectal correspondences and historical evidence, I argue that different genitive particles took a common developmental path as they developed the functions we observe today.

First, let us look at the representative functions of the particles \(ga\) and \(no\) in Std-ModJ. Synchronically, it seems best to consider most of them homonymns. Among these functions, \(ga\) is most commonly found as a nominative(-like) case marker, and \(no\) as a genitive case marker:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \quad \text{GEN (no): } & \quad \text{\(Taro \ no \ hon\)} \\
& \quad \text{Taro \ GEN book} \\
& \quad \text{‘Taro’s book’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) \quad \text{NOM (ga): } & \quad \text{\(Ame \ ga \ hutte-kita\).} \\
& \quad \text{rain \ NOM fall-came} \\
& \quad \text{‘The rain came to fall.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Also, \(ga\) marks a semantic theme (i.e. an entity affected by the action or state expressed by the predicate) for so-called “stative predicates”, such as \(wakaru\) ‘understand’, \(dekiru\) ‘can do’, \(suki\ da\ ‘be fond of’, and \(nomi-tai\ ‘want to drink’. In some analyses (e.g. Kuno 1973), these themes are regarded as syntactic objects, while in some others (e.g. Martin

---

\(^1\) Most recently, the validity of grammaticalization theory has been seriously challenged by Joseph (2001), Janda (2001), and other scholars in the same issue of *Language Sciences*. 
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1975), they are regarded as syntactic subjects. To avoid possible confusion, this use of $ga$
is called "theme marker" (TM) in this study:

(3) TM ($ga$): \[Biiru \ ga \ nomi-tai.\]
\[beer \ ga \ drink-Desi\]
\[\text{'I want to drink beer.'}\]

The particle $no$ can also function as a pronominal genitive (Pro-GEN), which conflates the
genitive function and a bound pronominal, equivalent to the pronominal $one$ in English.
Thus, $watasi \ no$ below means 'mine':

(4) Pro-GEN ($no$): \[Watasi \ no \ desu.\]
\[I \ GEN.one \ COP\]
\[\text{'(It) is mine.'}\]

The particle $no$ can also function as a bound pronominal (Bd-Pro), which is always bound
to some modifying element; it cannot be used on its own. This use of $no$ is equivalent to the
pronominal $one$ in English:

(5) Bd-Pro ($no$): \[akai \ no\]
\[red \ one\]
\[\text{'the/a red one'}\]

Another use of $no$ is as a nominalizer (NMZ). NMZ $no$ does not refer to anything on its
own, but nominalizes its preceding clause to refer to an event or situation described by the
clause. Thus, in the following example, the phrase $taberu \ no$ refers to an act of eating, but
$no$ itself does not have any referent:

(6) NMZ ($no$): \[Taberu \ no \ ni \ ii.\]
\[eat \ NMZ \ for \ good\]
\[\text{'For eating, (it's) good.'}\]

---

2 The notion of subjecthood assumed here is basically that of Keenan (1976) and others (e.g. Cole et al. 1980, Comrie 1989 [1981], Givón 1995), who claim that it consists of various behavioral and coding properties, which may be distributed to different constituents in a sentence.
Lastly, no can function as a sentence final particle (SFP) which is involved in determining various moods, such as assertion, orders, questions, explanations, and surprise, functioning together with particular intonation patterns and contexts. For example, by Tabe-nai no? in (7) below with the rising intonation, we understand that it is a question about a certain situation:

(7) SFP (no): Tabe-nai no?
      eat-Neg   SFP
      '(Is it that) (you) aren't going to eat (it)?'

We know from the texts of classical literature that ga and no were both genitives in OJ, and it is generally agreed that GEN ga in OJ subsequently developed into a nominative particle, while no maintained its genitive function. If we look at all the functions of ga and no in Std-ModJ, however, their origins and the relationships among them are not entirely clear in past studies. Thus, this chapter aims to provide an integrated account of these functions.

3 The particle no can be used at the end of most sentences with finite verbs and adjectives. But unlike other SFPs in ModJ (e.g. agreement-seeking ne; assertive yo), it cannot be used after certain kinds of words, such as nouns, demonstrative words koo ‘this way’ and soo ‘so; that way’, or the blunt style copula da. (Another SFP, ka (for questioning), can be used after nouns and the demonstrative words, but not after the blunt style copula da, except in a few fixed phrases.) Compare examples on the left and right below:

   student   SFP
   '(I see.) (S/he is a) student.'

   so    SFP
   '(Yes,) it is.'

e. Taihen da ne         f. *Taihen da no.
   trouble COP SFP
   '(It) is trouble, (isn’t it?)'

Despite these syntactic differences, I regard the particle no at the end of sentences as SFP. One reason is that this is a common view in dictionaries (e.g. Matsumura 1971; Nishio et al. 1980). Another more legitimate reason is that the moods and the intonation patterns associated with the use of SFP no (e.g. assertion, questions, and explanations) should be attributed to its sentence-final position. These moods (except for explanations) cannot be obtained by the use of no in different positions, which change the intonation patterns as well.
From a methodological standpoint, there has not been any rigorous consideration of
the wide range of empirical dialect data in past studies, although some dialects have
occasionally been referred to as anecdotal evidence. By taking the relevant data from
Hirayama (1997-98), and Martin (1975), this chapter examines dialectal variations in GEN,
NOM, TM, Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP. As shown in the examples above, Std-
ModJ uses ga for NOM and TM, and no for the other functions.

Based on dialectal correspondences, in conjunction with two other pieces of
evidence, i.e. consideration of functional/semantic developmental processes and historical
evidence, I make the following three specific claims:

(8) a. The morphemes for NOM, TM, Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP in ModJ are
all genitive derivatives;
b. The particular distribution of ga and no for these functions in Std-ModJ is not
due to some intrinsic linguistic necessity. In other words, it represents just one
possible outcome of competition among various genitive forms;
c. Different genitives in different dialects took the same developmental path as
follows:4 GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP

6.1.2 Broader Implications

While examining specific language changes in Japanese, I would like to argue for a
pair of general claims in historical linguistics. One is that we should be cautious about
deterministic theories which are based solely on available historical data and so-called

---

4 The other two functions, NOM and TM, have also been derived from GEN, but this is a separate
development from the one above. Thus, NOM and TM are not included here. As a reference in English,
see Martin (1975) for NOM and TM under the particle ga. In Japanese, see Ōno (1977a/b) among others for
NOM, and Yanagida (1987) and his references for TM.
"standard" varieties of modern languages. The most common practice in past studies in Japanese has been to compare available historical data and Std-ModJ, and to attribute historical changes to some linguistic inevitability posited from the comparison. Dialectal variation in this chapter demonstrates that Std-ModJ is merely one variety among several, and thus it does not represent the inevitable outcome of historical changes. Meanings and functions do not simply inhere in linguistic forms. Rather, they are the products of speech behavior in particular speech communities. Different dialects - in space or in time - may, therefore, develop different forms in their own grammatical and sociolinguistic systems to realize the same function.

The other claim is quite simply that grammatical changes in human language do not necessarily fall into so-called "grammaticalization" (e.g. Heine and Reh 1984; Traugott and Heine 1991a/b; Hopper and Traugott 1993, among others). Despite recent progress in the field, the fundamental assumption in grammaticalization theory remains the same as in its earlier days, as Meillet (1912: 131) put it: "These two processes, analogical innovation and attribution of grammatical character to a previously autonomous word, are the only ones by which new grammatical forms are constituted" (trans. in Hopper and Traugott 1993: 21), although analogy is further ruled out as a primary source of new grammatical forms by Meillet himself.

Grammaticalization is a very common process in language change, but the first two developmental steps in this chapter do not quite fit into it. Unidirectionality (i.e. more lexical > more grammatical) is claimed to be a strong tendency, but all the functions in this chapter originated from genitive case particles, which are highly grammatical and thus likely
to be the end-point in grammaticalization. In the process described in this chapter, genitive morphemes became pronominal genitives (Pro-GEN) gaining an additional lexical meaning of a general pronominal out of a particular language usage, namely the omission of possessed nouns, i.e. \[\text{possessor GEN possessed}] > [\text{possessor GEN.one]}. Next, unlike the regular process in grammaticalization, the genitive function, instead of the lexical pronominal meaning, was bleached out; Pro-GEN [GEN.one] developed into Bd-Pro [one]. Subsequently, another cycle of grammaticalization followed, i.e. \([\text{lexical item} > (...) > GEN]_{\text{cycle1}} > \text{Pro-GEN} > [\text{Bd-Pro} > \text{NMZ} > \text{SFP}]_{\text{cycle2}}\).

This process is rather different from what Gabelentz (1891) and Meillet (1912) call “spirals”, or what Heine and Reh (1984) call “recursive cycles”, since it is not that different autonomous lexical words go through grammaticalization one after another to replace the same grammatical function. The key process here is the obtaining of a new lexical meaning by highly grammatical items (i.e. various genitive particles), the significance of which has been overlooked by past studies. Although it is specific to genitive expressions, this kind of change does not seem peculiar to Japanese. It seems to be a common change in some languages with certain properties, and I will discuss crosslinguistic data from English, Mandarin Chinese, Korean, German, and French.

---

5 Heine and Reh (1984) provide a thorough discussion about various processes involved in grammaticalization. According to their index of grammaticalization (ibid.: 269-81), case makers are not necessarily the end-point of grammaticalization, e.g. the changes from ablative to genitive, benefactive to dative, and dative to accusative are all possible. These are, however, the changes from case markers to other (similar) case markers. The process in which a case marker gains a lexical meaning is not reported.

6 See Chapter 3 for the origins of genitive particles in Japanese. Janda (2001: 281-82) discusses the dangers associated with taking too seriously the notion of cycle(s) - especially lifecycles - in historical linguistics. As he states (ibid.: 283), “it is a salient characteristic in most studies of grammaticalization that they are phrased in terms implying that morphemes exist apart from mortal speakers and so may undergo continuous evolution governed by processes lasting centuries.” As it is clear from my discussion (especially see Chapter 7), I am not separating language change from language users. I use the terms “cycle” and “grammaticalization” as cover terms for common changes observable in sequence; I do not regard grammaticalization as a process that motivates diachronic changes.
6.1.3 Genitive Particles in OJ

Since genitives in OJ are the starting point of the grammatical changes examined in this chapter, I will present a brief review of these particles in this subsection. See Chapters 2 and 3 for details.

There are three major genitive particles in OJ, namely *ga*, *no*, and *tu*. It is generally known that *no* was most widely used, *ga* somewhat limited, and *tu* further limited. With regard to differences between *ga* and *no*, the so-called "pejorative/honorific" distinction is the best-known hypothesis for their distribution in classical Japanese. That is, *ga* indicates intimacy or a pejorative sense, while *no* indicates psychological distance or an honorific sense, or is just neutral. Many examples, including the following, seem to comply with this distinction:

(9) a. *imo ga na* (MYS 3367) 'beloved's name'
    b. *opokimi no mikoto* (MYS 3480) 'words of the lord'

In fact, consciousness about the pejorative/honorific distinction can be confirmed in medieval literature. Extending back in time, Aoki (1952) claims that the pejorative/honorific distinction existed already in OJ. The *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) distinction claimed by Ôno (1977a/b) can be regarded as a variation of the pejorative/honorific distinction for the sake of our discussion. He claims that *ga* was used for inside referents, while *no* was used for outside referents. Despite these studies, I have claimed in Chapter 2 that the

---

7 The existence of the pejorative/honorific distinction in OJ is not widely accepted (e.g. Ôno T. 1978, Hashimoto S. 1969).

8 The notions of *uchi/soto* (inside/outside) are broadly applicable to Japanese linguistics, as well as Japanese studies in general. See Bachnik and Quinn (1994).
pejorative/honorific distinction was a socially motivated, temporary and regional
development, not a distinction essential to *ga* and *no*. This is not the main point of this
chapter, but it will be briefly discussed in the following sections.

As for GEN *tu*, it was used to mark some variety of locational words, such as *ama*
‘heaven’, *oki* ‘offing’, *kuni* ‘earth’, and *pye* ‘beach’, some common nouns, such as *tama*
gem’ and *toki* ‘time’, some numeral nouns, such as *ipo* ‘five hundred’ and *momo* ‘one
hundred’, and some bound nominals, such as *siko* ‘fool’ and *topo* ‘far (stem)’. It can still
be found in fossilized compounds in ModJ such as follows:

(10)  a. *ma-tu-ge*
     eye-GEN-hair
     ‘eyelash’

     b. *oto-tu-i*/*oto-to-i* (*< woto-tu-pi*)
     far.place-GEN-day
     ‘the day before yesterday’

As is the case for the genetic relationship of Japanese to other languages, there is no
agreement among scholars on the origins of GEN *ga*, *no*, and *tu*. What is relevant for this
chapter, however, is the fact that there were multiple, competing genitive particles in OJ.

6.2 Dialectal Variation

The Japanese language exhibits significant dialectal diversity, but I will present only
the most revealing five variations, namely so-called “standard Japanese” and dialects in
four other prefectures, Nara, Toyama, Fukuoka, and Okinawa (see Map 6.1 below).9

---

9 The map is just for expository purposes, and the following discussion has nothing to do with dialectal
spread (e.g. a concentric distribution among dialects). Also, I am not concerned with relative chronology
among these dialects. Standard Japanese is closest to one of the dialects of Tokyo, which has been the
capital of Japan since 1868. The capital was located in Nara prefecture in the OJ period (i.e. 8c). Toyama,
Fukuoka, and Okinawa are names of prefectures. Dialects in Okinawa belong to the Ryukyu dialects,
which may be better-known as a dialect group. Dialects are not homogeneous even in the same prefecture,
but the most prevalent and significant variations are taken up for discussion. Dialects in Fukuoka referred
to specifically in this chapter are the dialects of northwestern and southern Fukuoka.
"Standard Japanese" has never been defined clearly under language policies of the Japanese government, although the notion of "common language" or "standard language" became a focal point of language education at around 1900 (see Kokugo-gakkai [National Language Society] 1980). There was disagreement within the Meiji government (1868-1911) over whether to choose a Kyoto or Tokyo dialect as standard, but the latter has naturally won out due to the political, cultural, and commercial centralization in Tokyo. Some scholars proposed the following as definitions, e.g. "the language spoken by educated people in Tokyo" (Ôtsuki 1916); "a language system used in Tokyo, perhaps representable by its use of desyoo [COP]" (Jinbô 1941). Nevertheless, today it is generally thought that standard Japanese is a variation based on one of the dialects of Tokyo, which is taught at school and used publicly, such as on radio or TV.

The dialect data in this study are mostly based on Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyûjo (NLRI: National Language Research Institute) (1989). Hirayama (1997-98), Martin (1975), and other information from personal sources of the present author are used when

---

10 NLRI is a collection of dialect data based on nationwide personal interviews about the use of particles in 60 expressions, which were conducted from 1977 to 1982 at 807 locations throughout Japan.
necessary. Each dialect has a different phonology. In particular, Ryukyu dialects (including those of Okinawa) have several varieties, which are all quite different from the phonology of Std-ModJ. Also, each dialect may have different forms due to historical reasons (e.g. atui ‘hot’ in Std-ModJ but atuka in Fukuoka; minami ‘south’ in Std-ModJ but hee in Okinawa). Unfortunately, NLRI does not always provide full forms of sentences or phrases. This is sometimes the case with other sources, too. Variation in particle use is the focus of the following discussion, and other information is provided when available.

6.2.1 Genitive (GEN)

In most modern Japanese dialects, ga has lost its genitive function, while no has become the unmarked, exclusive genitive particle. In some dialects, however, we can still observe the use of ga as genitive. Even so, the pejorative/honorific distinction is not maintained in the use of genitive particles in those dialects.

For genitive expressions, NLRI provides dialect data about three different nouns as possessors, namely ore ‘I’, doroboo ‘thief’, and sensei ‘teacher’ (e.g. ore no tenugui [I GEN kerchief] ‘my kerchief’). The following table shows the variations:12

---

11 This particular choice of nouns is apparently due to NLRI’s intention to see if there is any pejorative/honorific distinction in the genitive use, contrasting sensei ‘teacher’ and doroboo ‘thief’.

12 The targets of comparison are underlined in the glosses and in Std-ModJ.
Dialect Standard
Nara ore no tenugui
Toyama ore no
Fukuoka ore ga
Okinawa waa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>ore no</th>
<th>tenugui</th>
<th>doroboo no</th>
<th>tenugui</th>
<th>sensei no</th>
<th>tenugui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>GEN kerchief</td>
<td>'my kerchief'</td>
<td>GEN kerchief</td>
<td>'the thief's kerchief'</td>
<td>GEN kerchief</td>
<td>'the teacher's kerchief'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyama</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ga, nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Variation in GEN

As seen here, Std-ModJ uses GEN no for all three possessors. Nara, Toyama, and Fukuoka exhibit the same pattern as that of Std-ModJ except for ore ga 'my' in Fukuoka. The use of GEN ga for the first person pronoun is a preservation of a feature of OJ; first person pronouns (e.g. wa, a, ono 'I') in the genitive case were always marked by ga in OJ.

Dialects in Okinawa, in contrast, exhibit a rather different pattern in the use of genitive particles. The expression waa 'my' seems to be a lexicalization of the first person pronoun in the genitive case in OJ (i.e. waa < wa ga [I GEN]). Nusuuru, equivalent to doroboo 'thief', is marked by GEN nu, which came from GEN no due to vowel raising in Ryukyu dialects (cf. Hôjô 1970; Martin 1975). The most intriguing case is sinsii (= sensei 'teacher'). It is marked by either GEN ga or nu, and they exhibit a complementary distribution in Okinawa; some dialects only use ga, and the others only nu.

There is no available explanation for this split distribution in the genitive use, but with regard to the nominative use, Hirayama (1997b) explains that ga marks personal (pro)nouns

---

13 In the following tables, when there are two forms in dialects in a certain prefecture, "A, B" indicates that some dialects use only A, while some others use only B (not A). In contrast, "A (B)" indicates that each dialect may use A or B.

14 Okinawa uses hikimaa for the standard tenugui 'kerchief'.

15 According to Hirayama (1997c), wan is used in Okinawa for the first person in the nominative case, e.g. wan ga hakun [I NOM write] 'I write'. He regards wan as coming from were 'I', which has been used since OJ.

16 The noun nusuuru in Okinawa came from nusubito (< *nusumi-hito [steal-person]).
while *nu* marks other common nouns in Amami, which is an island located northeast of the main island Okinawa. Nohara (1986) provides a similar explanation for the use of the nominative in Naha, the capital city of Okinawa. This distinction in the nominative use seems to be applicable to northern Ryukyu dialects. Perhaps the dialects which use GEN *ga* for *sinsii (= sensei)* 'teacher' have the same distinction as that for the nominative, while the other dialects with *nu* do not have such a distinction in the genitive use, and *nu* is their only productive genitive particle (with *waa* 'my' being lexicalized). In any case, it can be said that the dialects with *ga*-marking for *sensei* 'teacher' have developed a different set of categorization for the three kinds of possessors from that of all the other dialects.

If we consider the pejorative/honorific distinction in classical Japanese discussed above, the dialects in Okinawa which have *ga*-marking for *sinsii (= sensei)* 'teacher' make an interesting case. They exhibit the opposite pattern to the pejorative/honorific distinction; *sinsii (= sensei)* 'teacher' is marked by *ga*, while *nusuuru* 'thief' is marked by *nu* (< *no*). This suggests that the pejorative/honorific distinction was not something essential to *ga* and *no*. In other words, it was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development (see also Chapter 2). This is also supported by the nominative use below.

6.2.2 Nominative (NOM)

In OJ, subjects of main clauses were typically zero-marked, but those of subordinate clauses were usually marked by GEN *no* or *ga* (see Chapter 4 for details). It is generally agreed that GEN *ga* of OJ has developed into the NOM of ModJ (e.g. Hashimoto S. 1969; ôno S. 1977a/b; Akiba 1978; see also Chapter 5, Section 5.2). However, we can also observe NOM *no* in some modern dialects.
NLRI provides data about subject marking for three different nouns, namely *ame* 'rain', *sensei* 'teacher', and *doroboo* 'thief', e.g. *Ame ga hutte-kita* [rain NOM fall-came] ‘The rain came to fall, i.e. It started to rain.’ The following table shows the dialectal variations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>rain NOM fall-came</td>
<td>thief NOM entered</td>
<td>teacher NOM come-Hon(Perf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyama</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Variation in NOM

As seen here, the NOM particle is *ga* in Std-ModJ, and the subjects in the three sentences above are all marked by *ga*. The same is true for dialects in Toyama. Other dialects, however, exhibit revealing variations.

As is the case in OJ, dialects in Nara do not mark subjects with any particle in these sentences.

Dialects in Fukuoka exhibit *no*-marking for these subjects, which means that GEN *no*, instead of *ga*, has developed into NOM. Since there is no evidence in the history of Japanese that *no* was once a dominant subject marker in the central dialect(s), the nominative use of *no* in Fukuoka is not due to dialectal spread; it is a dialect-internal development.

In Okinawa, *?amii* (= *ame*) ‘rain’, *nusuuru* ‘thief’, and *sinsii* (= *sensei*) ‘teacher’ are marked by *nu, nu,* and *ga* respectively. As explained in the previous section, *ga* marks personal (pro)nouns while *nu* marks other, common nouns in Okinawa.¹⁷ Therefore,

¹⁷ Thus, *nusuuru* (= *doroboo*) ‘thief’ is not categorized as a personal noun.
dialects in Okinawa have developed their own categorization for subject nouns. Note also that the distribution of ga and nu (< no) in subject marking in Okinawa is completely opposite to the one expected from the pejorative/honorific distinction in MJ.18

If we compare OJ and Std-ModJ, it is reasonable to ask why GEN ga, instead of GEN no, has become NOM, and some scholars have attempted to provide “the” answer. For example, Ōno S. (1977a/b) claims that the choice of ga over no as NOM was due to the uchi/soto (inside/outside) distinction,19 and the later development of these particles was “retrodictable” from their uses in OJ. Akiba (1978) claims that GEN ga could be used only when there was a possessor-possessed or whole-part relationship between two nominals,20 and it was quite natural that ga, rather than no, became NOM because the nominals marked by ga were referential and definite.21

The tone of these studies is that there was a linguistic inevitability in the development of nominative from genitive in Japanese. First of all, Std-ModJ is not a direct descendant of OJ. As shown above, subjects of main clauses are most typically zero-marked in dialects in Nara, which are apparently the most direct descendants of OJ. Therefore, despite the claims of past studies, any difference between GEN ga and no in OJ

18 It is not that the pejorative/honorific distinction is not observable in any part of present-day Japanese. According to Hirayama (1997b, 1998a), some dialects in Kagoshima and Shimane prefectures have the pejorative/honorific distinction in subject marking; no is a marked subject marker for honorifics, which is used to display some respect to the referent of the subject (or even sometimes to the addressee), while ga is used otherwise.

19 Ōno S. claims that uchi (inside) entities, mostly first person pronouns and persons closer to the speaker, are generally associated with the notion of agent, while soto (outside) entities are associated with patient/theme. Since agentivity is the most prototypical subjecthood, GEN ga, which marked uchi (inside) entities, developed into nominative to mark a subject in main clauses.

20 Her observation is based on materials from EMJ. She does not consider the fact that GEN ga could mark RT forms of predicates. There were many expressions with GEN ga in OJ which did not have a possessor-possessed or whole-part relationship, e.g. imo ga tame [beloved GEN sake] ‘for the sake of (my) beloved’ (MYS 3993); nuru ga pe ni [sleeping GEN addition for] ‘in addition to sleeping’ (MYS 3465).

21 In short, her observation does not cover all uses. For example, ta ‘who’, which is indefinite by nature, was always marked by ga. Also, GEN no could mark nominals which were referential and definite.
has NOT resulted in favor of ga as NOM, or to be more precise, no feature of GEN ga has resulted in a development of any obligatory subject marker at all. Also, there are other variations. Dialects in Fukuoka have developed NOM no, instead of ga. Dialects in Okinawa have developed NOM ga, marking personal (pro)nouns, and NOM nu, marking other kinds of nouns. If we consider these dialectal variations, it must be said that the choice of ga over no as NOM in Std-ModJ was merely one of the possibilities. Each dialect has its own reasons to have developed a certain nominative particle(s), including the maintenance of zero-marking, in its grammatical and sociolinguistic system. The linguistic inevitability in the development of nominative from genitive suggested in past studies based on the comparison between OJ and Std-ModJ is thus an illusion.

6.2.3 Semantic Theme Marker (TM)

In Std-ModJ, semantic themes (i.e. entities affected by actions or states expressed by the predicate) for so-called "stative predicates" (e.g. wakaru ‘understand’, suki da ‘be fond of’, nomi-tai ‘want to drink’) are usually marked by ga. These predicate forms are rather new in Japanese, but we can find equivalent expressions in OJ and MJ. Take the expression of desire, for example. We find V-maku posi and V-maku poru ‘want to V’ in OJ, the former of which developed into V-mafosi ‘want to V’ in MJ, while the latter became unproductive. In Chapter 5, Section 5.4, I have claimed that zero-marking became the default in EMJ. Accordingly, GEN ga/no-marking was used mostly in subordinate clauses due to the clausal nouniness, while ACC wo-marking was used when the transitivity of the predicate is high. The desiderative suffix -tai in Std-ModJ developed in later MJ as -tasi, which gradually replaced -mafosî.

22 Experiencers, which share some subjecthood in stative constructions, may be overtly expressed and marked by various particles, such as NOM go, TOP ira, DAT ni, inclusive focus marker mo, or zero. See Note 110 in Chapter 5 for some examples.
NLRI provides two constructions for dialect comparison. One is *nomi-tai* ‘want to drink’, and the other is *suki da* ‘be fond of’. The following table shows the dialectal variations (*sake* ‘rice wine; alcohol beverage’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th><em>Sake ga nomi-tai.</em></th>
<th><em>Sake ga suki da.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> drink-Desi</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> fondness COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyama</td>
<td>θ, ga</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> drink-Desi</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> fondness COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>ga, no, ba [ACC]</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> drink-Desi</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> fondness COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> drink-Desi</td>
<td><em>sake ga</em> fondness COP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Variation in TM

Themes are zero-marked in dialects in Nara and Okinawa. Most dialects in Toyama also have zero-marked themes, while some exhibit ga-marking, which is the standard.

The situation in Fukuoka is more complicated. Northern dialects have ga-marking for these themes. One dialect in western Fukuoka has a no-marked theme for *nomo-gotaru*, equivalent to *nomi-tai* ‘want to drink’, but a ba-marked theme for *suitoo*, equivalent to *suki da* ‘be fond of’. This ba is a dialectal ACC-marker. Southern Fukuoka dialects have ba-marking for these themes. The ACC-marking is not peculiar to dialects in Fukuoka. Many speakers of Std-ModJ accept ACC o-marking for desiderative forms (e.g.

---

23 The predicate morphology is very different in Fukuoka. For the standard *nomi-tai* ‘want to drink’, northern dialects use *nomi-taka*, which allows both ga-marking and ba-marking for themes. In contrast, western and southern dialects use *nomo-gotaru* ‘want to drink’, which apparently came from *nomu gotoku aru* [drink like be]. As for the standard *suki da* ‘be fond of’, both northwestern and southern dialects have *suitoo*, which came from *sukite oru* [like(Gerundive) be].

24 Themes marked by no are rather rare throughout Japan, but it was observed in 14 locations for *nomi-tai* ‘want to drink’ expressions, and in 28 locations for *suki da* ‘be fond of’ expressions out of 807 survey points.
Sake o nomi-tai ‘(I) want to drink sake’), while the acceptability decreases significantly for
\(o\)-marked themes for suki da ‘be fond of’ (e.g. ??Sake o suki da ‘I like sake’).

As for marking themes for stative predicates, the competition has been not only
among \(ga\), \(no\), and zero, but also with ACC \(o\) (< wo in most dialects, but \(ba\) in Fukuoka) due
to the influence of the transitivity of main predicates. TM \(ga\) in Std-ModJ is by no means
the result of some linguistic necessity.

6.2.4 Pronominal Genitive (Pro-GEN)

Pro-GEN \(no\) in Std-ModJ combines the function of genitive and the meaning of a
bound general pronominal (e.g. \(ore\ no\) [I GEN.one] ‘mine’). If we consider its
developmental process, Pro-GEN appears to have started by omitting the noun after GEN,
when it was understood from context. We have examples such as the following in OJ:

(11) a. sipwi no (omina) ga sipwi-gatari
Shihi GEN (old.lady) GEN insisting-talk
‘the insistent talk of (the old lady) of the Shihi clan’

b. sena no (kimi/mikoto) ga swode mo
husband GEN (lord/honorable.person) GEN sleeve even
saya-ni pura-si-tu.
clearly wave-Hon-Perf
‘My (lord/honorable) husband clearly waved a sleeve.’

The song which contains the phrase (11a) was actually given from the emperor to sipwi no
omina ‘the old lady of the Shihi clan’. Her real name is unknown now, but sipwi no omina
seems to have been fixed as her nickname in court society at the time, and it could be
shortened to sipwi no ‘the Shihi’s’. The omitted omina ‘old lady’ is in fact recoverable for
us from the headnote of the song, which contains the phrase sipwi no omina. In (11b),
some noun is omitted after sena no [husband GEN], but it can be recovered as kimi ‘lord,
you’ if based on common set phrases such as wa ga se no kimi [I GEN husband GEN
lord] 'my admirable husband' (MYS 4006, etc.) and na-se no kimi [you-husband GEN
lord] 'admirable husband' (MYS 3885), or as mikoto if based on similar expressions such
as tuma no mikoto [wife/husband GEN honorable.person] 'honorable wife/husband' (MYS
194, 3962), imo no mikoto 'honorable beloved' (MYS 794, etc.), papa no mikoto
'honorable mother' (MYS 4164, etc.), and titi no mikoto 'honorable father' (MYS 4408,
etc.). In any of these cases, the whole phrase is a lengthened ceremonious appositive
expression for 'my husband (wife, etc.)'.

GEN no became Pro-GEN [GEN.one] in these environments by gaining the
function of a general pronominal, since it could substitute for various kinds of omitted
nouns. Next, the genitive function was bleached out (perhaps following the principle of
"one form - one meaning", cf. Anttila 1972), and the particle no came to be used as a
bound pronominal (Bd-Pro, e.g. akai no [red one] 'the/a red one'). This leads us to the
underlined part of the following developmental path: GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ >
SFP.

Unfortunately, NLRI does not have a nationwide study for what I call "Pro-GEN
expressions" (e.g. 'mine'). Thus, data for Nara and Toyama are taken from my
informants, Fukuoka from Hirayama (1997a), and Okinawa from Martin (1975). It turns
out that dialects may use Pro-GEN, or a combination of GEN and Bd-Pro for these
expressions:

25 As in Anttila (1972), the semiotic principle of "one form - one meaning" is usually applied to
analogical leveling; the original situation is "two (or more) forms - one meaning". The bleaching of the
genitive function in Pro-GEN is slightly different in that the original situation is "one form - two meanings
in one use", which is also different from polysemy and homonymy.
26 It is not peculiar to Japanese that a genitive morpheme also functions as Pro-GEN and Bd-Pro. For
example, the genitive suffix -s in English functions as Pro-GEN as in This is Tom's, in which the -s
combines two functions, genitive and a bound pronominal. Also, it functions as Bd-Pro as in your-s, 'your
thing'. In Mandarin Chinese, de functions as Pro-GEN as in wǒ de 'mine' and as Bd-Pro as in hóng de 'a
red one'. See Section 6.4 below for details.
Table 6.4: Variation in Pro-GEN Expressions

With regard to Pro-GEN, dialects in Nara are no different from Std-ModJ; they use *no* as Pro-GEN *[GEN.one]*. However, dialects in the other three prefectures exhibit intriguing variations.

Instead of Pro-GEN as a single morpheme for this function, dialects in Toyama and Fukuoka exhibit what I call “double genitive derivative” constructions (i.e. one morpheme being GEN, and the other Bd-Pro; e.g. *ore n ga* [I GEN one] ‘mine’ in Toyama).

---

27 In Fukuoka, the *possessor-n-to* type expression (e.g. *ore n to* ‘mine’) is more common in northern dialects, while the *possessor-ga-tu* type (e.g. *ore ga tu*) is more common in southern dialects.

28 One may sporadically hear *non* (perhaps, < *no no* [GEN one]) as Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, and NMZ in Kansai dialects (i.e. Osaka, Kyoto, Nara, and neighboring areas), but its exact distribution is uncertain.

29 As mentioned in Chapter 2, double genitive derivatives are fairly common. I repeat examples of double genitive derivatives from Note 57 in Chapter 2: possessive pronouns in standard English, e.g. *your-s w(eGEN-one)* and *our-s w(eGEN-one)*; possessive pronouns in dialects of southern England, e.g. *our-n w(eGEN-one)* and *her-n w(heGEN-one)* 'hers', modeling after *mine* and *thine*; a sort of triple genitive construction in English, *a friend of mine, a great country of ours*; possessive pronounal expressions in colloquial German, e.g. *sein(e)-s *[he(GEN)-one]*, as in *Dass ist (dem) Peter sein(e)s* ['that is Peter’s']; *i-tu-tu* [five(GEN-one) ‘five’ in OJ (Bussoku 19) as well as in ModJ; *wa ga no* [I GEN one] ‘mine’ (‘my wife’ in this particular case) in Sotanshū (ca. 10c, EMJ); *ore n ga* [I GEN one] ‘mine’ in northern Fukuoka, *ore ga tu* [I GEN one] in southern Fukuoka, and *ore ga no* [I GEN one] in eastern Fukuoka; *ore n ga* [I GEN one] in Toyama. The morpheme *non* in the Kansai area (including Kyoto, Osaka, and Nara), e.g. *ore non* ‘mine’, may have come from *no no* [GEN one], or possibly the lengthened *noo*.
seems to be a sort of "reverse formation". Once Bd-Pro [one] was established by bleaching the genitive function of Pro-GEN [GEN.one], the possessor (e.g. ore 'I') and the possessed Bd-Pro (e.g. ga 'one') were connected again by the genitive appropriate at the time.

Dialects in Okinawa present a clear case in which the same morpheme si functions as Pro-GEN [GEN.one] or Bd-Pro [one] for Pro-GEN expressions depending on the possessors, which supports a part of the developmental process claimed above (i.e. Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro). The morpheme si functions as Pro-GEN [GEN.one] for the first person and second person pronouns as in wa-s(i) 'mine' and na-s(i) 'yours', but as Bd-Pro [one] for the third person pronoun as in tyaa ga si [s/he GEN one] 'his/hers'. This indicates that wa-s(i) and na-s(i) are highly lexicalized while si was bleached out to become Bd-Pro in other environments.

As seen in the Pro-GEN expressions above, Toyama, Fukuoka, and Okinawa have Bd-Pro ga, to/tu, and si respectively. Bd-Pro ga in Toyama apparently came from GEN ga in OJ. What are the sources for Bd-Pro to/tu in Fukuoka and si in Okinawa, then? As explained in Section 6.1.3, there was GEN tu, which had rather limited use in OJ.

Following the developmental path [GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro], GEN no developed into

---

30 I use the term "reverse formation" instead of "backformation" since the latter usually refers to the formation of a base form from a derived form in a paradigmatic environment.

31 According to Nohara (1986), Torishima dialect in Gushikawa village in Kume island, which is isolated from surrounding dialects because of the immigration from Jo-Torishima, has ?aa ga si [I GEN one] 'my' and naa ga si [you GEN one] 'yours'.

32 As is the case for GEN no in OJ, the omission of nouns after GEN ga can be confirmed in MJ, which apparently initiated the development from GEN to Pro-GEN, then to Bd-Pro, e.g. ta(re) ga nara-mu to [who GEN.one COP-Conjec Comp] 'whose is this? (in quote)' (KKS 873, headnote: 905 A.D.); Ika nare ba ... Kanefisa ga fa warokaru-beki so [what COP Conj ... Kanehisa(person) GEN.one TOP bad-should Emph] 'why should Kanahisa's be bad?' (Uji-shûi 10: 1212 A.D.).
Bd-Pro no in Std-ModJ, and GEN ga into Bd-Pro ga in Toyama. Thus, it seems plausible that GEN tu (and/or GEN to) developed into Bd-Pro to/tu in Fukuoka.33

As for Bd-Pro si in Okinawa, there is a sound correspondence between tu in Std-ModJ and si in dialects in Okinawa, e.g. tukamu ‘grip’ vs. sikamun; tukareru ‘get tired’ vs. sikariin; tuku ‘attach’ vs. sikun.34 Also, Martin (1975) explains that Pro-GEN si came from the earlier su due to the systematic vowel shift in Okinawa. Another fact is that we have tu/su correspondence in other dialects. In the western part of Yamaguchi, which is across the straits from Fukuoka, su is found for genitive derivatives, which corresponds to tu in Fukuoka. Therefore, it appears that Pro-GEN si in Okinawa also came from GEN tu.

6.2.5 Bound Pronominal (Bd-Pro)

I have claimed above that Bd-Pro [one] came from Pro-GEN [GEN.one] with its genitive function bleached (i.e. Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro). For Bd-Pro, we can find one set of equivalent expressions in NLRI, in which Bd-Pro is used as the head of a relative clause. Data about another expression equivalent to ‘the/a long one’, in which Bd-Pro is modified by an adjective, are taken from other sources:35

---

33 Historical evidence for GEN to is very limited: cf. doublets woto-tu-pi and woto-to-pi [far.place-GEN-day] ‘the day before yesterday’.
34 Not every tu in Std-ModJ corresponds to si in Okinawa.
35 The Nara and Toyama examples are from my informants, Fukuoka from myself, and Okinawa from Hirayama (1997c).
Table 6.5: Variation in Bd-Pro

For the target sequence *no wa* [one TOP] in Std-ModJ, dialects in Nara have *noo*. It is generally known that one-mora nouns in the western dialect group (so-called "Kansai dialects"), to which dialects in Nara belong, are lengthened to two mora value when pronounced in isolation (e.g. Martin 1975: 393). In the topic position of the example, it seems that Bd-Pro *no* is lengthened to *noo* in Nara, instead of having a topic marker *wa*.

For the expression 'the/a long one', a dialect in Nara uses *no* as Bd-Pro.

For the other three prefectures, the situations are the same as what we have examined in the Pro-GEN expressions in the previous section. Toyama has *ga* as Bd-Pro, and Fukuoka *to/tu*. Although Okinawa exhibits a wide range of variation for the target sequence *no wa* [one TOP], they all seem to be related forms or derivatives of Bd-Pro *si* (< GEN *tu*). Martin (1975, 1990) speculates that Bd-Pro *no* in Std-ModJ came from shortening of *mono* ‘thing’. If so, however, the correspondence among Bd-Pro *no/ga/to/tu/si* in these dialects is left a remarkable coincidence that does not have any explanation.

Therefore, the various Bd-Pros are most likely to be genitive derivatives.

---

36 In southern Fukuoka, Bd-Pro *tu* can be used as the head of relative clauses if the preceding verbs are in perfective, taking the -*ta* form, e.g. *Koko ni atta tu wa nan ka* ‘What is the one which was here?’.

37 He is aware that the existence of dialects which use Bd-Pro *ga* make his account problematic.
Up to this point, we have examined how GEN ga, no, and tu in OJ have all developed into Bd-Pro in some modern dialects. There is no evidence that various Bd-Pros developed one after the other in OJ or MJ; dialects in Nara and Kyoto, which are usually the center of dialectal spread in Japanese, except for newer forms, have never developed Bd-Pro ga or to/hu/si. Nevertheless, Toyama has Bd-Pro ga, Fukuoka to/tu, and Okinawa si. Therefore, different types of Bd-Pros in different dialects are not due to dialectal spread, but due to dialect internal developments.38 This suggests that the situation of competition among GEN ga, no, and tu was different in each dialect. Given Bd-Pro ga, perhaps GEN ga was more widely used in Toyama. Likewise, given Bd-Pro to/tu, GEN tu seems to have been more widely used in Fukuoka, although it is generally regarded as an old genitive which was already unproductive in OJ (e.g. Ōno S. et al. 1974). Therefore, it can be said that the functional allocation (i.e. distribution) of GEN ga, no, and tu in OJ was not determined sheerly by intrinsic differences among the particles.39 There must have been dialect internal (grammatical and sociolinguistic) reasons for different competitive situations among these genitive particles, and the study of OJ, MJ, and Std-ModJ does not bring us to a conclusion of any linguistic necessity.

6.2.6 Nominalizer (NMZ)

Let us now consider the developmental process of NMZ. What distinguishes Bd-Pro no and NMZ no in Std-ModJ is that the former has its own referent, but the latter does not. Despite this difference, Bd-Pro no and NMZ no may occur in the same environment.

38 It is still possible that closer forms which originated from the same genitives (e.g. to/tu/si) are results of dialectal spread and some phonological change in certain dialect groups.

39 Unlike past studies, this study does not treat these particles (or any lexical item) as containing intrinsic meanings within themselves. What I mean by “intrinsic differences” essentially comes from a historical assumption that these genitive particles must have been derived from different lexical sources.
Consider the examples below:

(12)  a.  *Nedan ga takai no wa kawa-nai.*
     price NOM high one TOP buy-Neg
     ‘(I) don’t buy expensive ones.’

     b.  *Nedan ga takai no ga mondai da.*
     price NOM high NMZ NOM problem COP
     ‘That the price is high is the problem.’

In (12a), the particle *no* functions as Bd-Pro. In this use, Bd-Pro *no* has its own referent, and the phrase *nedan ga takai* [price NOM high] is an adjectival clause modifying the following pronominal *no* ‘one’. The phrase *nedan ga takai no* is literally ‘ones of which the price is high’, or ‘expensive ones’ in natural English. In contrast, the use of *no* in (12b) functions as NMZ. In this use, *no* does not have its own referent, but the whole phrase *nedan ga takai no* [price NOM high NMZ] presents an event or situation as a nominal constituent. This is similar to noun clauses introduced by “*that*” in English (i.e. *nedan ga takai no* ‘that the price is high’). In these examples, the string of words *nedan ga takai no* is the same, but the functions of *no* are different. The referent of *no* in (12a) is more concrete, while the function of *no* in (12b) is more abstract and grammatical. Therefore, NMZ seems to be a natural extension of Bd-Pro. This suggests the underlined portion of the following developmental path: GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP.

Let us look at dialectal variation in NMZ. The data on the left are taken from NLRI. The expressions on the right are from myself and my informants except for the one for Okinawa, which is from Nohara (1986):
Again, NMZ no in Std-ModJ corresponds to NMZ no, ga, to/tu, and si in the four prefectures.

6.2.7 Sentence Final Particle (SFP)

SFP no in Std-ModJ is involved in determining various moods, such as assertion, orders, questions, explanations, and surprise, functioning together with particular intonation patterns and contexts. Its uses for the first four moods in Std-ModJ, Nara, Toyama, and Fukuoka are compared below. Since NLRI does not provide any data about SFP, the examples below are from myself and my informants:

---

Table 6.6: Variation in NMZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>ictu no ni</th>
<th>omoi no ni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>‘For going, (it) is convenient’</td>
<td>‘despite (its being) heavy, ...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyama</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>omoi no</td>
<td>omoi ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>to ni</td>
<td>omoi to ni</td>
<td>omoka tu ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>si, sin, see</td>
<td>?ubusa siga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

40 Dialects in southern Fukuoka use NMZ tu when the preceding verb is in perfective, e.g.

a. Itta tu no bareta.
   went NMZ NOM came.out
   ‘That (I) went (there) got out (became revealed).’

b. Okor-areta tu wa syukudai ba wasureta ken tai.
   was.scolded NMZ TOP homework ACC forgot because COP
   (lit.) ‘That (you) were scolded is because (you) forgot the homework.’

41 Unfortunately, whether dialects in Okinawa have a corresponding SFP is uncertain. According to Hirayama (1997c), dialects in Okinawa do not have a SFP which corresponds to SFP no in Std-ModJ to express interrogative. Nohara (1986) provides an extensive study of particles in Ryukyu dialects, and notes that SFP sii in Benoki dialect in Kunigami village, which is located at the north end of Okinawa island, is used for assertion and questions, but its origin and relationships with other particles are unclear.
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Again, we can observe no/no/to/ga correspondence among Std-ModJ, Nara, Toyama, and Fukuoka in most functions.

One thing to note is that dialects may vary in terms of the sets of functions which these SFPs have. For example, the Nara dialect does not use expressions with SFP for assertion and orders, as indicated by “N/A” above. In Toyama, unlike SFP no in Std-ModJ, SFP ga cannot be used in affirmative imperative sentences, which instead require a verb suffix -rare, as shown below:42

\[(13)\]

\[
\text{Hayaku} \text{tabe-rare.}
\]

quickly eat-Imperative

“Eat quickly.”

42 Almost the same as its ancestor -(ra)ri- in OJ, the auxiliary -(r)are- in Std-ModJ is used for various functions such as passive, spontaneous (jihatsu), potential, and honorific. Japanese verb morphology has imperative forms, and this use of -rare in Toyama seems to have been derived from the imperative form of honorific -(ra)re-.
Another thing to note is that not all particles which we have discussed so far developed into SFP. Dialects in Fukuoka exhibit the to/tu correspondence in Bd-Pro and NMZ, but tu cannot be used as SFP. Compare the examples with to and tu below. Note that if tu is not at the very end of the sentences as in (14c) and (15c), it is acceptable:

(14) a. Nan ba sita to?
   what ACC did SFP
   ‘What did (you) do?’

   b. ??Nan ba sita tu?

   c. Nan ba sita tu ne.43
   what ACC did NMZ SFP
   ‘What did (you) do?’

(15) a. Kaimon ni itta to.
   shopping to went SFP
   ‘(It is that) I went shopping.’

   b. ??Kaimon ni itta tu.

   c. Kaimon ni itta-t-tai (<itta tu tai).
   shopping to went-NMZ-COP
   ‘(It) is that I went shopping.’

How have these functions of SFP developed? If we look at other lexical items koto ‘fact, thing, etc.’ and mono ‘thing’, which are often used as NMZ, we notice that they can also be used as sentence-final elements with various connotations. See examples below:

(16) a. NMZ koto
   Uwaki o sita koto de kenka ni natta.
   affair ACC did fact due.to quarrel to became
   ‘Because of (the fact that I) had an affair, (it) resulted in a quarrel.’

   b. Sentence final koto (surprise)
   Uwaki-mono desu koto. (female speech)
   fickle.person COP fact
   ‘The fact is that (you are) a fickle person.’ > ‘What a fickle person!’

   c. Sentence final koto (order)
   Yuu koto o yoku kiku koto.
   Say thing ACC carefully listen thing
   ‘The thing is that (you) carefully listen to what (I) say.’ > ‘Listen carefully.’

43 This sentence does not have a rising intonation at the end, so ‘?’ is not used.
d. NMZ mono
Ano koro wa yoku turi ni itta mono desu.
that time TOP often fishing to went thing COP
'The thing is that (I) often went fishing at that time.'
> 'I used to go fishing often at that time.'

e. sentence final mono (explanation)
Den'syaga okureta n desu mono. (female speech)
train NOM was late NMZ COP thing
'The thing is that (it is because) the train was late.'

All of these functions seem to have stemmed from nominalization with koto 'fact, thing, etc.' and mono 'thing'. Speakers have come to use this nominalization sentence-finally, which promoted contextual referentiality in these uses (i.e. nominals are referential), hence inducing various contextual connotations. Thus, SFP no/to/ga in various dialects seem to have come from NMZ (i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP).

6.3 Historical Evidence

The developmental sequence above (i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP) is supported by historical evidence as well. The capital was located in Nara in the OJ period. There are only a few examples of Pro-GEN [GEN.one] in Man'yōshū, two of which have been shown in (11).44 Another use of Pro-GEN in OJ can be found in Bussokuseki-no-uta (A.D. 752).45 For the majority of the MJ period, the capital was located in Kyoto. We can assume dialectal continuity from OJ to MJ since Nara and Kyoto

44 It seems possible that we do not find many examples of Pro-GEN in OJ because the omission of nouns after genitive was impractical in short verses, or full forms were preferred as a rhetorical technique (e.g. to form a contrasting pair of phrases). There are quite a few examples of the adverbial use of GEN no without the following nouns. It is generally thought to have developed from omitting the formal noun goto 'the same' after GEN no, but I did not include these in Pro-GEN uses, e.g. ima no goto [now GEN the same] 'like now' (MYS 3928); murasaki no [purple.grass GEN] 'like purple grasses' (MYS 21).

45 I.e. tune no mo [usual GEN.one too] 'the usual one, too' (Bussoku 15).
are in the same region, and since in fact the court officials moved from Nara to Kyoto. We come to find more examples of Pro-GEN in MJ materials. See Chapter 5, Section 5.5.1 for more historical data of Pro-GEN.

The use of Bd-Pro [one] is found in Sotanshû in the tenth century, but its use must have been limited to possessive expressions and did not spread to following adjectives or verbs for a long period of time because of the morphological feature in classical Japanese in which RT forms of predicates could also be used as pronominal constituents without the following NP. In terms of historically certain examples, it is not until the late sixteenth century that we can find the use of Bd-Pro after verbs in Jiteiki. See Chapter 5, Section 5.5.2 for more historical data of Bd-Pro.

The use of RT forms without the following nouns could also function as nominalizations in OJ and MJ, and NMZ no seems to have been established in EModJ, which begins from the seventeenth century when the political center was moved to Edo (present-day Tokyo). According to Yoshikawa (1977: 253), the use of NMZ no started in the seventeenth century at the latest, and became more common in the eighteenth century.

46 E.g. a. ima no arazi mo, saki no mo
now GEN master too, previous GEN one too
‘the current master as well as the previous one’ (Tosa Dec. 26th, ca. 935 A.D.)
b. koft to i fe ba yo no tune no to
love Comp say Conj life GEN usual GEN one Comp
‘Speaking of love, (it is) the usual one in life’ (Izumi Shikibu Nikki, 1004 A.D.)

47 I.e. a. firo-duma to wa ga no to
others-wife and I GEN one and
‘another’s wife and mine’ (Sotanshû, late 10c)

48 Compare the following examples of RT forms, in which one is used as a modifier, and the other as a pronominal constituent:
a. kiyoki nagiza [clean beach] ‘the clean beach’ (MYS 3706)
b. yama ni siroki pa [mountain on white one TOP] ‘the white one on the mountain’ (MYS 2524)

49 E.g. Sarinagara, ofonume kakefi no aru no nari.
nevertheless, mostly interaction GEN exist one COP
‘Nevertheless, mostly (they) are the ones which have interactions.’ (Jiteiki)

50 I was not able to trace the development of Bd-Pro non (< *no no [GEN one]) in western dialects (including those in Nara and Kyoto) in historical documents.
Dialectal variations are less problematic in this case since in Nara, Kyoto, and Tokyo, the same morpheme, GEN no, rather than ga or nu, was the source of the development (i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP). See Chapter 5, Section 5.5.3 for more historical data of NMZ.

As for SFP no, there seem to be two different types. One type developed in the fifteenth century from SFP nau, which expressed exclamation while seeking agreement from the hearer (Ôno et al. 1974). The other type, which is our concern, developed from NMZ no. As shown in Section 6.2.7 above, this type of SFP no involves various connotations depending on contexts, and seems to have become common in the nineteenth century (see Matsumura 1971; Nihon Dai-jiten Kankô-kai 1976).

We cannot trace through the history of one single dialect, nor do historical documents provide definite answers about the timing of emergence of each function. Even taking these shortcomings into account, however, historical data, examined as rigorously as possible above, still support the overall developmental sequence (i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP).

6.4 Crosslinguistic Considerations

Given the three kinds of evidence, i.e. the dialectal correspondences, consideration of functional/semantic developmental processes, and the historical evidence, it is most plausible that various genitive particles in different Japanese dialects took the same developmental path, i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP. This suggests that these changes were guided by shared linguistic properties among different dialects and by common linguistic practices by their speakers. Crosslinguistic data are suggestive in this regard. I will
consider the conditions for these changes of genitive morphemes in this section by examining English, Mandarin Chinese, Korean, German, and French.

6.4.1 English Possessive Pronouns

As mentioned in the note above, the genitive suffix -s in modern English (ModE) also functions as Pro-GEN [GEN.one] (e.g. It's Tom's [Tom's.one]) and as Bd-Pro [one] (e.g. your-s [your.one]). To my knowledge, there is no study which specifically discusses the developmental sequence among these uses of the -s, perhaps because possessive pronouns are regarded as secondary in the pronoun paradigm compared to the major cases (i.e. nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative), and also because it is obvious that the -s came from the Old English (OE) genitive singular suffix -es (< PIE GEN *-es, see Lass 1994, for example). However, the developmental process is not so clear, and I suspect that the -s may have taken a developmental path similar to that of the genitive particles in Japanese, i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro.51

The development of the -s into Pro-GEN [GEN.one] and then to Bd-Pro [one] seems to be English-internal. According to two etymological dictionaries, The Oxford dictionary of English etymology (ODEE) (Onions 1966) and The Barnhart dictionary of etymology (BDE) (Barnhart 1988), possessive pronouns with the -s date back to Middle English (ME) in the fourteenth century, e.g. yours < yours; hers < hires/hiris/hirs; ours <

51 I may well be wrong, and will appreciate corrections on the following discussion.
urs/oures/ours; theirs < thairs. ODEE (: 779) explains that the possessive pronouns with the -s were originally from Northern dialects, and the -s is presumably analogical after his.53

If so, however, how did his gain the meaning of a general pronominal in the first place? Was adjectival 'of him' reanalyzed as pronominal 'the one of him'? It seems less likely that his originally combined the meaning of 'genitive, third person, singular, masculine' and the general pronominal 'one'. If that had been the case, we should expect the same for the genitive forms of other pronouns; there would seem to be no reason for his to differ from the others in this respect. This analysis makes it difficult for us to explain the motivation for adding another morpheme -s to the genitive paradigm. For example, if your had meant both 'of you' and 'the one of you', what motivation would there be to add the -s to mean 'the one of you'? This process would create different forms for the two meanings (e.g. your and yours), despite the fact that his, which is allegedly the model for the analogy, has only one form. Therefore, it seems more likely that the genitive forms of pronouns, including his, did not combine the meaning of the general pronominal 'one', and that the addition of the -s was in fact the addition of the meaning 'one'. Thus, this is not an analogical change occurring only on surface forms without meaning changes, and we have to consider where this extra meaning 'one' came from.

52 According to Lass (1992: 119), these forms arose in the north and northwest midlands in the late twelfth to early thirteenth century. He calls them "a new genitive type," although their use was limited to the constructions where possessed nouns were not expressed.

53 In contrast, BDE explains that possessive pronouns came from the adjective (see the explanations on yours and ours in BDE), and the -s is the same suffix forming some adverbs, as in needs, unawares (see the explanations on yours and -s in BDE). However, this explanation does not account for the development of possessive pronouns with the -n in Southern dialects, as will be seen below. Lass (1992: 119) notes that genitive forms came to be used exclusively as noun attributes in ME (i.e. 'possessive adjectives'), losing other functions genitive had in OE, e.g. fanda mîn [try my] 'try me'; ònh kiôra [one their] 'one of them'.
In addition to the pronoun paradigm, perhaps we should also consider the influence from the -s used with proper nouns and common nouns, e.g. John's; boy's. Here, the same process as the case of genitive particles in Japanese seems to have occurred. Given the "guarantee" of contextual recoverability, the omission of possessed nouns after the productive genitive suffix -s seems to have become a common practice (perhaps originating in ME, but probably earlier): cf. That is Tom's in ModE. In this usage, the -s gained the meaning of the bound pronominal 'one' in addition to the genitive function; it functions as Pro-GEN [GEN.one]. This usage would seem to be the analogical model with which the pronoun paradigm created its possessive pronouns. However, if the -s had been employed in the pronoun paradigm as Pro-GEN [GEN.one], we would have had such forms as you-s [you-GEN.one] 'the one of you'. This kind of wholesale restructuring of the pronoun paradigm did not occur, and the -s was employed only as Bd-Pro [one] (e.g. your-s [your-one]), perhaps because the new meaning 'one' was salient in suffixing the -s, and also because analogical change is generally local. In this scenario, his was not the analogical model; it was just not affected by the analogical changes since it already had the -s ending.

It is interesting to note that Southern dialects developed hern, hisn, oun, and similar forms adding -n, after mine and thine. Despite the difference in the choice of suffixes, these changes seem to be in principle the same as in the case of the -s above.

According to ODEE and BDE, the first and second person pronouns took the following developmental paths: proto-Germanic *mīnaz > OE mīn > ME mī/mīn; proto-Germanic *thīnaz > OE thīn > ME thī/thīn. When the newer reduced forms arose in ME, mī and mīn and thī and thīn were allomorphs; mī and thī were used before consonants except for h, while mīn and thīn were used before vowels and h. Lass (1992: 120) notes
that "this pattern is common but not obligatory; both the types mi fend, min frend occur."

What seems to have happened is that the newer forms, mî and thî, originated as variants in particular phonological environments. As they expanded their distribution, however, the phonological rule became blurred and finally collapsed. There seems to have been a certain time period when the newer forms, mî and thî, and the older forms, mîn and thîn, were in competition without the phonological conditions. I suspect that this period of competition has some overlap with the time when the omission of possessed nouns after genitive with the -s became a common practice: cf. It's John's in ModE. There arose a new usage of genitive as Pro-GEN [GEN.one] involving an extra meaning of 'one'. Perhaps this extra meaning was associated with the extra sound n in the competing genitive forms, mî vs. mîn, and thî vs. thîn; the n had been merely an extra sound, but it was reanalyzed as a morpheme meaning 'one', and then employed to the genitive paradigm of all the pronouns in certain dialects. Thus, regardless of the difference between -s and -n, the formation of possessive pronouns in English may have involved a common linguistic practice - the omission of nouns referring to possessed entities - to obtain the new meaning 'one'.

Unlike the genitive particles in OJ, the morpheme -s in English did not develop into a full-fledged Bd-Pro [one], or further into NMZ and SFP; its use is limited to pronouns, e.g. your-s [your-one] vs. **red-s [red-one]. Apparently, one of the reasons is English morphology. While GEN ga/no/tu in OJ are particles, the morpheme -s in English is an inflectional suffix in noun paradigms, and its bond with its stem is stronger. Thus, it did not become a freer morpheme that could spread to environments other than the possessive pronouns. Another, secondary reason for the limitation on Bd-Pro -s seems to be the existence of Bd-Pro one. ODEE and BDE do not provide its etymology, but based on the
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fact that German has a cognate Bd-Pro *einer*, it seems likely that Bd-Pro *one* (and its ancestors) already existed in English long before the -*s* became Bd-Pro in ME. Bd-Pro *one* did not develop into NMZ in English, perhaps because English employs head-first relative clauses, and the use of *one* as the head of relative clauses has never been so common, compared with its use after adjectives. Even when it is used as the head noun of relative clauses, the preceding definite article and the following relative pronoun (i.e. *the one that*) seem to prevent the reanalysis of the head noun *one* as a grammatical NMZ.

English has another type of genitive expression with the preposition *of*. Unlike the suffix -*s*, *of* cannot be used as Pro-GEN or Bd-Pro; the development from GEN to Pro-GEN did not occur for *of*. This difference seems mostly due to their syntax, although their semantic distribution may have played some role. Generally speaking, it seems easier to omit an element and expect its recovery when some linguistic clue is given first (e.g. *John* being a clue: *John's picture* > *John's o*) than when it is given later (e.g. *a picture of John* > *o of John*), although it is not impossible. For this reason, the omission of nouns referring to possessed entities did not become common with *of*, and it never gained the meaning of a bound pronominal 'one'.

The case of English genitive -*s* and *of* suggests that the developmental process observed for the genitive particles in Japanese (i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP) is not necessarily peculiar to Japanese, but rather merely constrained by the lexicon, morphology, and syntax of each language. Like the genitive particles in Japanese, the genitive suffix -*s* in English seems to have become Pro-GEN by the omission of possessed nouns. Next, the genitive function was bleached out as it was applied to the pronominal system, and Pro-GEN became Bd-Pro. Unlike the case of Japanese, however, Bd-Pro -*s* did not spread to other environments and did not develop any further due to its
morphological characteristics. The existence of Bd-Pro *one* in the lexicon of English can be regarded as a secondary reason for the containment of Bd-Pro -*s*. Bd-Pro *one* did not develop into NMZ, either, due to the syntax of English (i.e. head-first relative clauses).

Also, the reason that another genitive morpheme of *did* not become Pro-GEN seems attributable to its syntax.

6.4.2 Mandarin Chinese *de*

Modern Mandarin Chinese (ModM) uses the form *de*, the phonetic realization of which is [də], to connect two nouns in various semantic relationships, including possession, e.g. wǒ *de* shū [I *de* book] ‘my book’. However, the function of *de* is not limited to genitive; its use is extremely versatile. From a descriptive perspective, Chao (1968) lists more than twenty different uses of *de*. In representing these various functions, past studies refer to it with a variety of terms, such as “genitive case marker”, “nominalizer”, “appositional phrase marker”, “relative clause marker”, and “adverbial marker”. In a synchronic theoretical analysis, Huang (1987) attempts to reduce these to five categories. In any case, it is one of the most controversial topics in Chinese linguistics, and it is not my intention to enter the fray.

In terms of the historical development of *de*, it seems that Ōta’s (1958 [1987: 323-30]) explanation is most comprehensive and most frequently cited, so I will present the relevant portion of his account below, while referring to other claims in notes. After that, I will discuss *de* in ModM in light of what I have demonstrated with regard to the historical changes of genitive particles in Japanese.
First, let us look at Ôta's categorization of de in ModM:

(17)  

a. Forming adverbial phrases

\begin{verbatim}
màn-màn de zōu  
slow-slow de walk
'walk slowly'
\end{verbatim}

b. Forming adjectival phrases

\begin{verbatim}
wō de shū  hóng de huā  zōu-lù de rén  
I de book red de flower walk de person
'my book' 'red flower' 'a person who is walking'
\end{verbatim}

c. Omitting the noun after de in (b)

\begin{verbatim}
wō de  hóng de  zōu-lù de  
I de red de walk de
'mine' 'a/the red one' 'the one who is walking'
\end{verbatim}

d. After a verb, within a sentence, providing an explanation

\begin{verbatim}
Wō zuótiān dào de Bēijīng.  
I yesterday arrive de Beijing
'(It is that) I arrived at Beijing yesterday.'
\end{verbatim}

e. At the sentence-final position, providing an explanatory mood

\begin{verbatim}
Tā bu hui dà ni de.  Nǐ shénme shíhou lái de?  
s/he Neg can hit you de you what time come de
'(It is that) s/he can't hit you.'  'When (is it that) you came?'
\end{verbatim}

f. After a verb, indicating a location or goal

\begin{verbatim}
zuò de zhèr  pāo de nàr  
sit de here run de there
'sit here'  'run there'
\end{verbatim}

g. Introducing complement phrases

\begin{verbatim}
Shuō de dàjiā dōu xiào le.  Lěng de fādōu.  
talk de everyone all laugh ASP cold de shake
'(I) said (so, and) everyone laughed.'  '(I) shiver with cold.' <
\end{verbatim}

This list is not exhaustive, but suffices for our discussion. See Chao (1968) and Huang (1987), among others, for de in ModM.

According to my Chinese colleagues, they do not use de this way. It is, however, discussed in Zhu (1961) as well. This usage is not relevant to my main discussion in any case.
The issue of *de* in ModM is more complicated than that of genitive particles in Japanese and the -s in English, since it apparently came from a few different sources. Presumably reflecting the different sources, *de* in ModM can basically be written with two (or more) different Chinese characters, depending on its function. A further complication is that the morphemes in older varieties of Chinese that are thought to be the sources of *de* are also written with another set of different Chinese characters. Despite recent progress in historical phonology, in traditional approaches historical morphology and syntax have mostly been done by using Chinese characters to refer to morphemes and words, assuming that continuities from older varieties of Chinese to ModM were bridged by the writing system. I will discuss this problem later, but nevertheless, ôta’s account of the historical development of *de* is schematized below. Since the pinyin system does not distinguish different types of *de* with different Chinese characters, I will adopt a different representation for relevant morphemes; they are presented in ModM pinyin readings in upper case accompanied glosses on their recognizable meanings in square brackets (see actual Chinese characters in the preliminary page). Basically I use this representation to refer to morphemes, but when specified, it may refer to Chinese characters, not morphemes:

---

56 See Karlsgren (1926) for a pioneering work, Pulleyblank (1984, among others) for a more recent work, and Li W. (1999) for the latest discussion, although reconstruction is not the main focus of the last study.
57 There seem to be many variations in the historical division of Chinese. For example, Sun (1996: 3) adopts the following: Old Chinese (OC: 500 B.C.-200 A.D.); Middle Chinese (MC: 201–1000); Early Mandarin (EM: 1001-1900); Modern Mandarin (ModM: 1901–). His periodization is an approximation and does not perfectly agree with politically defined periods. Li W. (1999) employs the following: OC (600 B.C.–265); Early MC (265–960); Late MC (960–1269); EM (1269–1455); Middle Mandarin (1455–1795); ModM (1795–). I adopt the latter, but nevertheless, given the significant language/dialect diversity in China, I do not assume any direct descendancy among them. I provide the names of dynasties to refer to the time periods in the figure, which may also suggest language/dialect varieties.
58 Each Chinese character is usually assigned some meaning(s) as a symbol, but I am not claiming that Chinese characters are totally ideograms. The phonogramic feature comes in when it is used to transliterate a language. In ModM, *DE [APPARENT]* seems to be a good example; its meaning as a character is not related to the functions of *de* synchronically or diachronically.
The writing conventions for *de* in ModM are somewhat unstable, and the characters *DE [LAND]* and *DE [BOTTOM]* are still sometimes used. However, the use of the character *DE [APPARENT]* is expanding, and even the distinction between *DE [APPARENT]* and *DE [OBTAIN]* is becoming obscured. In any case, all of these four characters can be read phonetically as `[dd]` in ModM.

Among the uses in ModM, (17f) (i.e. after a verb, indicating a location or goal) and (17g) (i.e. introducing a complement phrase) apparently belong to a different branch of *de*.

---

59 Wudai consists of the periods of five kingdoms; it is not a single dynasty.

60 *DE [APPARENT]* refers to the character which is most often used for *de* in ModM. The meaning ‘apparent’ is not easily recognizable in ModM, but can be seen in *diquè ‘indeed’*.

61 The character ZHI [THIS] can be seen in *zhìhòu ‘after’*. It is not used as ‘this’ in ModM, but it was, as in *zhìrén ‘this person’*, in OC.

62 This kind of observation may vary depending on the materials studied. For example, Shibata and Torii (1985: 169-70) explain that the character *DE [APPARENT]* replaced *DE [BOTTOM]* and *DE [LAND]* after the Yuan period (1279-1367), but these two characters were reintroduced for *de* in order to distinguish general adnominal modification (*DE [APPARENT]*) from possessive modification (*DE [BOTTOM]*) and adverbial modification (*DE [LAND]*) in ModM. The distinction between *DE [APPARENT]* and *DE [BOTTOM]* existed until around 1919, but it is lost in ModM. According to a Chinese colleague, this is what is taught at school; *DE [APPARENT]* should be used for general adnominal modification, including possession, while *DE [LAND]* should be used for adverbial modification. Also, see Øña (1988 [1991: 165]).

---

Zhou/Warring States  Tang  Wudai  Yuan  Qing  Present
(600-221 B.C.)  (618-907)  (907-960)  (1279-1367)  (1662-1911)
--- OC period ---  --- MC period ---

--- DE [APPARENT] ---

ZHI [THIS] (?) —► DE [BOTTOM] —► DE [APPARENT]

ZHE [PERSON] (?) —► DE [BOTTOM] —► DE [APPARENT]

(?) —► DE [APPARENT]

(X.shi Y de) —► (17e)

--- DE [OBTAIN] ---

ZAI [EXIST], DAO [ARRIVE] —► (17f)

DE [OBTAIN] —► (17g)

Figure 6.1: Development of *de*
As for (17f), Ōta speculates that dāi ‘stay’, which is written with DAI [DULL] or DAI [WAIT] (cf. zài ‘exist; stay’), and dào ‘arrive’ have gone through lenition, and have come to be written as de with the character DE [APPARENT].63 The usage (17g) of DE [OBTAIN], which involves verbs in complementation such as [V-de-V] and [V-de-S], has actually been derived from a verb ‘obtain’ and its derivative ‘be possible’ (see Sun 1996 for a detailed discussion). These uses are not of our concern in this study.

As for the usage (17a) of DE [LAND] (i.e. forming adverbial phrases), Ōta claims that it was grammaticalized from a noun ‘land, place’.64 There are only a few examples in the Sui period (581-617). It became more common after the Tang period (618-907), and the character DE [APPARENT] came to be used instead of DE [LAND] starting in the Yuan period (1279-1367). According to Ōta, this is because the pronunciations of the two characters became close,65 and DE [APPARENT], which had not been commonly used, was preferred to DE [LAND], which was easily confused with content words such as ‘land’ or ‘place’.

In terms of the uses of DE [BOTTOM] (17b) (i.e. forming adjectival phrases) and (17c) (i.e. omitting the noun after de), there are only limited examples in the Tang period (618-907). In the Wudai period (907-960), they became more common, i.e. for (17b), which takes the structure of [X + DE + N], DE [BOTTOM] may occur after a noun, adjective, verb, or a verbal noun, but not after a pronoun; for (17c), which takes the structure of [X + DE + 0], DE [BOTTOM] may occur after all the categories mentioned above. Although the

---

63 According to Huang C. (1987: 21), this use of de can be identified by its possible alternation with zài ‘at’ and dào ‘to’.
usage (17b) roughly corresponds to the use of ZHI [THIS] in OC and (17c) to ZHE [PERSON], Óta argues that it is likely that DE [BOTTOM] was derived from ZHE [PERSON], instead of ZHI [THIS], since ZHE [PERSON] later came to replace ZHI [THIS] in OC in many occasions.  

Next, the usage (17d) of DE [APPARENT] (i.e. after a verb, within a sentence, providing an explanation), according to Óta, is not found in the Song period (960-1279), but appeared when the character DE [APPARENT] came to be used widely (i.e. the Yuan period), although its source is not clear. Considering the three possibilities, DE [LAND], DE [BOTTOM], and DE [OBTAIN], he concludes that it must have come from DE [BOTTOM].

Lastly, Óta explains that the usage (17e) (i.e. the sentence-final use) involves the mood (yûqi) of explanation (see also Wang 1943 [1985: 232]). It is observable in the Ming period (1368-1661), but became more common in the Qing period (1662-1911), and thus it is a rather new usage. He claims that it is a reflex of DE [BOTTOM], and it was derived by omitting the copula shi in the construction of [X shi Y de] ‘X is that Y’.

The various developmental processes depicted in Figure 6.1 have not all been proven, but it is certain that the development of de in ModM is complex. Among the seven types of de in (17), four uses - (17b) (forming adjectival phrases), (17c) (without the head noun), (17d) (sentence-medially, providing an explanation), and (17e) (sentence-finally, providing an explanatory mood) - are relevant to our discussion. Even for these four uses,

---

66 There are various claims about the relationships among ZHI [THIS], ZHE [PERSON], DE [LAND], and DE [BOTTOM], the former two in the OC period, and the latter two in the MC period. Huang (1987: 5-6) states that de in ModM is known to be traced back to at least two sources in pre-Qin period (ca. 1000 B.C.-200 B.C.), namely ZHI [THIS] and ZHE [PERSON], which he regards as two different morphemes with different phonological values. Kôsaka (1971: 72) states that DE [LAND] and DE [BOTTOM] in the MC period were derived from ZHI [THIS]. Lü (1984) regards ZHI [THIS] and ZHE [PERSON] as two different morphemes, and claims that DE [BOTTOM] was derived from ZHE [PERSON], while ZHE [PERSON] expanded its uses to those of ZHI [THIS].
their origins and the relationships among them are not entirely clear in past studies. The historical changes undergone by genitive particles in Japanese may provide new insight into the development of *de* in Chinese. In the following, I will first discuss the issue of "standard language" in Chinese historical linguistics. After that, I will discuss the development of *de* in ModM in light of the common developmental process observed in Japanese, i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP.

Non-critical acceptance of the notion of "standard language" for some time frame is potentially a serious problem in all linguistic studies, either synchronic or diachronic. The studies of Chinese cited in this chapter all compare the current standard language, namely ModM, with available historical data, without any demonstrated direct descendancy, just as scholars of Japanese compare Std-ModJ with OJ data. This issue is particularly significant for historical Chinese, given the language/dialect diversity.

It is well known that more than a few so-called "dialects" in Chinese are, from a linguistic perspective, more like different languages. According to recent studies (e.g. Australian Academy et al. 1987, Li R. 1989), the Chinese language family is divided into seven language subgroups: Xiang, Gan, Wu, Min, Yue, Hakka, and the Northern Core. The Northern Core, to which ModM belongs, has the largest speaker population (about 662 million, Li R. 1989). The Northern Core is further divided into a conservative highland variety, Jin, and a progressive lowland variety, Mandarin. Mandarin consists of eight dialect groups (Liu 1995, Li R. 1989).

---


68 Liu's classification of Mandarin dialects is based on phonology; morphology and syntax are not considered.
Beijing Mandarin was first officially introduced as a replacement for the preceding artificial national language in 1923, and the National Language Reform Committee stated in 1955 that standard Chinese (i.e. pǔtōnghuà ‘Common Language’) “bases its pronunciation on the speech of Beijing, its lexicon on the vocabulary of the Northern Core, and its syntax on the norms of classic modern vernacular literature.”

Historically speaking, northern dialects were subjected to extensive language contact with Altaic languages starting in the tenth century. Janhunen (1996:165) states: “With some exaggeration, Mandarin could even be characterized as a Manchurian language, though it remains to be analyzed how closely, exactly, its origination was connected with the Manchurian region in the narrow sense.” According to Hashimoto M. (1986:89-91), the colloquial language in Beijing in the Yuan period (1279-1368), which is thought to have been different from the speech of the educated classes, was a type of Mongolian pidgin of Chinese.

This complex language situation is covered up on the surface by the shared writing system, namely by the use of Chinese characters, throughout the history of languages in China. They share Chinese characters, but the sound-character correspondences are very often extremely different between one branch of Chinese and another; readings by speakers of one branch are generally unintelligible to speakers of another. This is nothing new to scholars of Chinese, but so far I have not seen any study of historical morphology/syntax which begins its discussion by asking a very basic question, e.g. whether, or on what

---

69 In particular, scholars of historical phonology are well aware of this. For example, Karlgren (1926) includes a dictionary of dialectal variations in readings of Chinese characters. (I say “readings”, not “pronunciations”, since it is not always certain that those dialects use the same morphemes or words in spoken language.) Pulleyblank (1984) devotes the first section of his introduction to the history of standard Chinese, and is cautious about assuming a continuation from one stage to another in the speech of educated classes. Nevertheless, the reconstruction of Chinese phonology most commonly relies on the analysis of rhyme tables and other materials on phonology, which are thought to record the standard variety at the time; it is not conducted by comparing language/dialect variation.
grounds, we can actually compare ZHI [THIS], ZHE [PERSON], DE [LAND], DE [BOTTOM],
and DE [APPARENT], considering the language/dialect variation.

Caveats in mind, let us shift our discussion to the actual data. Having suggested a
lack of methodological rigor, we can still induce a valid parallelism between Chinese and
Japanese. Starting with a difference, however, we should note that the linguistic category
"genitive" does not quite fit the morphemes discussed above, namely ZHI [THIS] (OC),
ZHE [PERSON] (OC), DE [LAND] (MC), DE [BOTTOM] (MC), and DE [APPARENT]
(ModM). We have discussed the usage (17b), in which DE [BOTTOM] (MC) or DE
[APPARENT] (ModM) may occur after various word categories. ZHI [THIS] (OC) was also
used to form an adjectival phrase after a noun, adjective, or verb (see Wang 1983 [1990: 188]).
There is no historical evidence that these morphemes gained this syntactic
flexibility as an extension of the genitive function connecting two nominals. Rather, this
flexibility seems to be due to Chinese morphology; each category, such as noun, adjective,
and verb, is not morphologically distinguished.

Given this morphological characteristic of Chinese, the distinction between Pro-
GEN (pronominal genitive) and Bd-Pro (bound pronominal), which I have made in the
cases of Japanese and English, does not seem valid in Chinese. To review briefly, I have
claimed above that genitive morphemes (e.g. no in OJ and the -s in ME) first gained the
meaning of a bound pronominal ‘one’ by omitting the following noun (e.g. the -s in That is
Tom’s [Tom’s.one]), and that then the genitive function was bleached out (e.g. the -s in

---

70 Wang calls this use of ZHI [THIS] liàngjiéci (connective). In OC, the character ZHI [THIS] was used to
represent (i) a verb “leave for”, (ii) demonstrative pronoun “this”, (iii) third person accusative “her/him/them”
(a few examples of genitive use), and (iv) a connective particle (Wang 1981: 316-17, 1988: 344). In fact,
the character ZHI [THIS] is a pictogram expressing a shape of a footprint. Thus, the original usage of the
character ZHI [THIS] was to represent the verb “leave for”, but it was also employed for its homonyms.
Wang (1958 [1988: 363, 438]) claims that the personal pronoun ZHI [THIS], and the connective ZHI [THIS]
derived from a demonstrative pronoun.

71 I still use the term Pro-GEN, but it corresponds to [Connective.one] in Chinese.
your-s [your-one], i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro. In the case of Chinese, however, ZHI [THIS] and DE [BOTTOM] were used to connect two nouns (e.g. wǒ de shū [I de book] 'my book'), an adjective with a noun (e.g. hóng de huā [red de flower] 'red flower'),72 or a verb (phrase) with a noun (e.g. zōu-lù de rén [walk de person] 'a/the person who is walking'. Therefore, by omitting the head nouns in these noun phrases, Pro-GEN [GEN.one] and Bd-Pro [one] are likely to have developed at the same time in Chinese, e.g. wǒ de [I GEN.one] 'mine' and zōu-lù de [walk GEN.one] 'the one who is walking' as Pro-GEN; hóng de [red one] 'a/the red one' as Bd-Pro (see (17c)). Thus, we can assume the historical development as follows: Connective > Pro-GEN/Bd-Pro.73

In the previous studies cited in this chapter, however, I have been unable to confirm the developmental sequence above. One suggestive observation is that ZHI [THIS] (OC) was not used without the following noun (Guo et al. 1981: 342); it was used only as a connective, not as Pro-GEN/Bd-Pro. In contrast, the function of ZHE [PERSON] appears to be Pro-GEN/Bd-Pro (see Wang 1990: 96-98). However, it is not clear whether ZHE [PERSON] had been derived from the connective ZHI [THIS].

It is not particularly obvious in OC and ModM that ZHE [PERSON] (OC) and DE [APPARENT] (ModM) are used as NMZs (nominalizers) in a way similar to the complementizer that in English or NMZ no in Japanese. This is perhaps because: (i) due to

72 The adjective hóng 'red' can modify a noun directly, which in most cases seems to form a compound, e.g. hóng yán [red face] 'a young beautiful woman' (also 'the face of a cheerful boy' in classical Chinese).

73 The reverse order (i.e. Pro-GEN/Bd-Pro > Connective) seems less likely. If we hypothesize so, we have to posit a Pro-GEN which combines two completely different meanings (i.e. genitive and pronoun) in the first place. Or, in the case of Bd-Pro, we have to assume that adding a referent noun to a pronominal phrase became common, e.g. [red Bd-Pro] > [red Bd-Pro flower] (flower is added) > [red Connective flower] (the pronominal is reanalyzed as a connective). This process is not consistent with the function of pronouns.
Chinese morphology, verbs do not exhibit any inflection and can always be linked as nouns, and (ii) Chinese is a topic-comment language and uses no morphological topic marker, and thus longer clauses can be presented as topics as they are. Compare the following:

(18) a. E. *Walk is good. Walking is good.  
    J. *Aruku wa ii. Aruku no wa ii.  
    C. Zō-lù hên hǎo. walk very good

b. E. That the price is high is the problem.  
    J. Nedan ga takai no ga mondai da. price NOM high NMZ NOM problem COP  
    C. Jiàqián gāo shī wèntī. price high COP problem

However, there are some constructions which seem to involve nominalization with ZHE [PERSON] and DE [APPARENT]. According to Wang (1983 [1990:97]), one of the uses of ZHE [PERSON] is to mean ‘X, this is because Y’ in [X zhe, Y], in which X and Y are both clauses.74 This use of ZHE [PERSON] seems to have started out as a resumptive pronoun, but [X zhe] can be regarded as nominalization. In ModM, DE [APPARENT] can be used in the construction of [X shī Y de] ‘It is that XY’ or ‘It is X that Y’, in which X and Y are constituents in a single clause. In these constructions, ZHE [PERSON] and DE [APPARENT] do not refer to a person or thing as Bd-Pro. Rather, the whole clauses refer to certain events or situations described by the clauses. This seems to be an abstraction process from Bd-Pro to NMZ, which I have explained in the case of Japanese; there is a

74 In Wang’s examples, the meaning of ‘it is because’ seems to be due to a sentence final particle (SFP) yē, which expresses a mood of affirmation, functionally similar to a copula, or due to the overall context in conjunction with the nominalization by ZHE [PERSON]. Attributing ‘it is because’ only to ZHE [PERSON] is questionable. One of Wang’s examples is taken from Zhanzi (Sōshi, ca. B.C. 4c):

a. Jing-wā bū kāyī yī yī hái zhē. jū yī yī yē.  
   well-frog Neg can talk about ocean ZHE limited by house SFP  
   ‘(To) a well-frog, (you) cannot talk about the ocean, (which) is (because he is) limited by his abode.’
semantic leap from concrete to abstract if we compare Bd-Pro and NMZ. Thus, I suspect that the use of ZHE [PERSON] and DE [APPARENT] as NMZ was preceded by their use as Bd-Pro (or resumptive pronoun), i.e. Bd-Pro > NMZ.

Another parallel between ModM and Japanese is the usage illustrated with (17e), the sentence-final use of DE [APPARENT] to express a mood of explanation. This corresponds to the use of genitive derivatives as SFP (sentence final particle) in Japanese. Wang (1943 [1985: 232]) calls this DE [APPARENT] Ŷûqìci (mood particle) since “it indicates the reality of the situation, emphasizing the explanation of the cause, or interpreting the fact.”75 It is generally thought that this usage was derived by omitting the copula shi in the construction of [X shi Y de] ‘It is that XY’ or ‘It is X that Y’ (e.g. Ôta 1987: 329; Koshimizu 1985: 314). Ôta claims that the mood of explanation was originally something expressed by the copula shi, but people came to feel the mood in de after its omission. If we look at the parallelism to Japanese, however, it is most plausible to assume that the mood of de came from nominalization, which promotes various contextual connotations by making sentences referential. Thus, we are led to conclude the following development: NMZ > Mood Particle.

To summarize, although the historical evidence is rather sketchy, we can posit an overall developmental path for the connective particle in Chinese: Connective > Pro-GEN/Bd-Pro > NMZ > Mood Particle. Here again, the origination of the development seems to be the obtainment of a pronominal meaning by a genitive (or connective) morpheme through a common linguistic practice, namely the omission of head NPs after the genitive. I suspect that different connective morphemes might have undergone the same developmental path in other Chinese dialects.

---

75 As is the case of SFP in Japanese, the categorization of this DE [APPARENT] may vary. Some scholars do not regard it as Ŷûqìci (mood particle) (e.g. Koshimizu 1985: 314, also see Zhu 1980).
6.4.3 Korean Genitive Particles

Let us now look at Korean. The genetic relationship between Korean and Japanese has long been proposed, but is still controversial. The question is not this study’s primary concern, nor are the data in this section claimed to constitute reliable evidence for such a genetic relationship. Rather, it is hoped that the developmental process of genitive morphemes discussed in this section will provide new perspectives for further studies.

Just as is the case for Japanese, the origins of genitive particles in Korean are unclear. I will first present functional correspondences among Middle Korean (MK), Modern Korean (ModK), Old Japanese (OJ), Std-ModJ, and modern Fukuoka dialects of Japanese. In the following discussion, Korean data are taken from Martin (1992), which contains comprehensive explanations of Korean grammar and a dictionary of functional morphemes.

---

76 For a brief summary of the debate and references to studies in Japanese, see Shibatani (1990). Also, the preface in Unger (1993) provides an overview. For specific discussions about the relationship between Korean and Japanese, see Martin (1966, 1990), Unger (1993), and Whitman (1985). For origins of genitive particles in Japanese, see Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

77 MK refers to the language recorded with Hankul characters in the second half of the fifteenth century and somewhat later. Prior to the fifteenth century, we do not have sizable number of documents written in Korean except for some sparse data written in Chinese, some of which are accompanied by subscripts for Korean grammatical morphemes (e.g. case particles and inflectional endings). Thus, in comparative studies, it is generally thought that MK is the oldest variety of Korean which provides reliable data.

78 Martin (1992) adopts the Yale romanization system, instead of the popular McCune-Reischauer romanization, which “tries to approximate the way a Korean word sounds to the American ear” (ibid.: 5). The Yale system is almost symbol-by-symbol transliteration from Hankul to alphabet, and does not always represent sounds in a direct way.
Table 6.9: Functional correspondences between Korean and Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>ModK</th>
<th>OJ</th>
<th>Std-ModJ</th>
<th>Fukuoka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>s/t, 'uy'/oy</td>
<td>uy</td>
<td>ga, no, tu</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>'i</td>
<td>i, ka</td>
<td>(i)?</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-GEN [GEN] [GEN]</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>no, (ga)?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-Pro [one]</td>
<td>'i, kes</td>
<td>i, kes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>to, tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMZ</td>
<td>'i, s/t</td>
<td>i, kes</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>to, tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotive/SFP</td>
<td>('i)?, s/t?</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>to, (tu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For genitive expressions, MK has a two-way distinction: GEN s/t for inanimate or honorific animate (e.g. pwuthye s 'na.h [Buddha GEN age] 'Buddha’s age'), and GEN 'uy'/oy for non-honorific animates.\(^{79}\) In ModK, GEN s/t is no longer productive, and GEN uy is generally used (e.g. uysa uy ilum [doctor GEN name] 'the doctor's name').

The morpheme s/t is also used as nominalizer (NMZ) 'the fact that...' in MK, e.g. ...

- \(lq\) 's i- [-(verb ending) NMZ COP(stem)-] 'It is that ...';\(^{80}\) ...

- \(lq\) 's oy [-lg NMZ LOC] 'since, because ...'.\(^{81}\) Martin (1990) speculates that GEN s/t in MK is cognate with GEN tu in OJ, and NMZ s/t in MK were derived from GEN s.\(^{82}\) I agree with Martin, but would further point out that this reminds us of the development of NMZ to/tu in Fukuoka dialects of Japanese from GEN tu in OJ. Note also that Fukuoka is geographically the closest prefecture to Korea. Nevertheless, if we assume that NMZ to/tu in Fukuoka

\(^{79}\) As for the distinction between GEN s and t, the latter occurs before s or c. The choice between GEN 'uy and 'oy partly depends on the vowel in the preceding syllable. See Martin (1992: 923) for details. For the pejorative/honorific distinction between GEN ga and no in Japanese, see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1.1.

\(^{80}\) This construction is called an “extended predicate” (Martin 1992: 264), which corresponds to Japanese extended predicates, such as ...

- \(n(o)\) desu [NMZ COP] 'It is that ...'.

\(^{81}\) This construction corresponds to Japanese ... no ni [NMZ LOC] 'despite ...', although the conjunctive meanings do not match.

\(^{82}\) Yamada (1913) and Hashimoto S. (1969) make the same speculation on the relationship between GEN s in Korean and GEN tu in Japanese. See Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1 on this issue.
developed around the same time as NMZ no in MJ - it was certainly in the later middle ages - it seems most plausible that NMZ s/t in MK and NMZ to/tu in Fukuoka are results of parallel but separate developments.

In the preceding sections, I have argued for the developmental processes [GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP] in Japanese, and [Connective > Pro-GEN/Bd-Pro > NMZ > Mood] in Chinese. For MK, however, I was unable to find the use of s/t as Pro-GEN and Bd-Pro in Martin (1992). This seems primarily due to the use of another morpheme 'i as Bd-Pro, meaning 'a person, a man; one'. Martin's examples of Bd-Pro i are all from ModK, but its uses are said to have come from the same usage in MK, e.g. *ilk.nun i* [read one] 'the reader, the person reading'; *ciun i* [write one] 'the author, writer'; *cal nan i* [well born one] 'a nice-looking one'; *ik.un i* [to.be.boiled one] 'a well-boiled piece of meat'. There is another morpheme kes, which also functions as Bd-Pro [one] and NMZ 'the fact that'. Apparently, it was derived from a free noun kas 'thing' in MK, not from a particle, and its Japanese cognate is koto 'matter, thing, fact'. In ModK, kes is widely used as Bd-Pro [one] and NMZ just as no is in ModJ, e.g. *pissan kes* [expensive one] 'an expensive one'; *Kaps i pissan kes i mwuncey ita* [price NOM expensive NMZ NOM problem COP] 'That the price is high is the problem'. I would speculate that the use of s/t as Bd-Pro [one] did not become common in MK, due to competition with 'i and kes, unless it was simply neglected in Martin (1992). Given the cases in Japanese, English, and Chinese, it seems likely that GEN s/t in MK might have developed into Pro-GEN [GEN.one] by omitting the noun after GEN, which simply may not be listed separately in

---

83 In MK, the morpheme 'i was not used as GEN. Thus, it is not reasonable to expect its use as Pro-GEN [GEN.one], which develops by omitting the following noun after GEN.

84 Although these examples are taken from Martin (1992), a Korean colleague has informed me that 'i can only be used as a personal pronominal 'a person', not as 'a thing, one'. She offered another example *cal sayngtin i* [well look.like person] 'a handsome person'.
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dictionaries because it is regarded as a contextual use of GEN. I also suspect that there was a stage of Bd-Pro [one] bridging the stages between Pro-GEN and NMZ. Dating further back from MK, the genitive particle in the language of the Silla kingdom (57? B.C. - 935 A.D.) was also used in the sense of ‘one’s own’ (i.e. Pro-GEN), according to Ogura (1929) (cited in Yoshitake 1929).

On the other hand, if we pay attention to the morpheme ‘i in MK, it can be used as Bd-Pro and NMZ, but not as GEN, despite our expectation given the Japanese and Chinese data. Instead, ‘i functions as NOM in MK.85 In this regard, it should be noted that there is a particle i in OJ, the functions of which are controversial, but seem to include marking a subject.86 We can think of two possibilities for the GEN/NOM/Bd-Pro/NMZ situation in MK. One is that Bd-Pro/NMZ ‘i had nothing to do with genitive or nominative, but were instead derived from a noun-forming suffix *-i in proto-Korean/Japanese (pKJ), e.g. in Korean, kiph.i ‘depth’, nelp.i ‘width’, kwu.i ‘roasted/baked meat or fish’, mek.i ‘food’; in Japanese, kaer.i ‘return’, yasum.i ‘break, holiday’, hanas.i ‘talk, story’.87 The other possibility is that Bd-Pro/NMZ ‘i was derived from an obsolete GEN *‘i, which also

85 ModK has two nominative particles, i after a consonant, and ka after a vowel. The history of NOM ka is controversial. See Martin (1992: 594).

86 It is generally thought that i marks a subject (e.g. Yamada 1913; Hashimoto S. 1969), but i-marked subjects are not very common compared with zero-marked subjects in main clauses. Hashimoto S. mentions other possible functions, such as genitive and interjective. Ōno S. et al. (1974) lists genitive and nominative as its functions. Nonetheless, the particle i almost completely disappeared in MJ except for some Buddhist documents.

87 The noun-forming suffix -i is more widely used in Korean than in Japanese. In Korean, it derives a noun from an adjective, verb, mimetic adverb, or a noun. In Japanese, however, the derivation is limited to verbs, i.e. deverbal nouns that are formally the same as RY forms. RY forms of quadrigrade (yodan) verbs are formed by suffixing -i to the verb root. This -i is generally regarded as a noun-forming suffix (e.g. Ōno S. et al. 1974). Martin (1987) reconstructs *-Ci for this morpheme.
developed into NOM 'i in MK, just as GEN ga in OJ developed into NOM ga in ModJ. By the MK period, GEN s/t and 'uy/oy, which had been in competition with GEN *i, had swept out GEN *i (or *i > 'uy/oy ??), and we do not observe it in MK. In this scenario, we can further hypothesize that the noun-forming suffix -i above was derived from GEN *i in pKJ as Bd-Pro [one]. These hypotheses must be further examined, but dialectal studies of Korean might be one of the keys to better understanding what happened.

Now if we look at what Martin calls "emotives" (EMT) in MK, we observe the same morphemes -s/-t- as in NMZ. According to him (1992:263), "the emotive bound stems express a subjective statement, often poetic or exclamatory", e.g. -syas-ta [(modulated honorific)-EMT-(indicative assertive)]. They may also be modulated as -so/-to- or -swo/-two-, e.g. -tas-ongi 'ta [-(retrospective)-EMT-(polite) (indicative assertive)]; -two-ta [EMT-(indicative assertive)]. Even a double emotive can be made, e.g. -twos-ta [EMT-EMT-(indicative assertive)]. Yu (1973:349) associates this s/t with NMZ s/t '(it's) a fact (that...)'. Functionally, this seems very plausible given the developments of sentence final particles (SFPs) no/ga/to in Japanese dialects, which are involved in expressing such moods as assertion, questions, and explanations, and also given the development of the mood particle de in Mandarin Chinese, which is said to express the mood of explanation. These particles in Japanese and Chinese are most likely to have been derived from NMZ. In ModK, however, the emotive constructions above are no longer productive, perhaps partly because the constructions which use kes as Bd-Pro [one] or NMZ have become more common.

---
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---

Yoshitake (1929) hypothesizes that NOM 'i and GEN uy in Korean could go back to the same origin, i.e. the genitive case of the personal pronoun of the third person singular, closely related to the classical Mongol inu 'his, her, its'. On the Japanese side, Murayama (1956) speculates that i in OJ had a genitive function, which is closely related to the genitive suffix -i in Manchu. He does not, however, provide a specific argument.
Another relevant construction is the so-called “extended predicate”, which take the form of [Clause-NMZ COP] ‘It is that ...’, e.g.  ... -lq's is- [-(verb ending) NMZ COP(stem)-]. All the three NMZs, 'i, 's, and 't, can be used in extended predicates. According to Martin (1992: 264), the extended predicates in MK may also occur without the copula, which exactly corresponds to the process in which SFPs no/ga/to have developed in Japanese. Whether this use of 'i/s/t in MK developed connotations specific to the sentence-final position and particular intonation patterns is uncertain in Martin (1992), so it is premature to consider them different from NMZ. As in the case of the emotive constructions, the extended predicates with 'i/s/t are no longer productive; they have been replaced by the constructions with kes, e.g. Cey ka aphasssen kes ipnita [I NOM was.sick NMZ COP(Polite)] ‘(It is that) I was sick.’

Until it was unified by Silla in 676 A.D., the Korean peninsula had long been divided into three kingdoms, Koguryo in the north, Silla in the east, and Paekche in the west. It is generally thought that MK is a descendant of the language of Silla (e.g Ogura 1944: 408), but perhaps we should expect a complex dialect/language mixture (e.g. Ogura 1999: 18-26 [1964]). Unfortunately, we do not have enough documentation of the languages in those countries. Although the relationships among GEN/NOM/Pro-GEN/Bd-Pro/NMZ/EMT are not straightforwardly apparent in Korean, the data do not constitute a clear counterexample to the developmental process I have claimed. Instead, it sheds new light on relevant issues, not only on the relationships among those functions within Korean, but also on the origins of genitive particles in Korean and Japanese. It is unproven, of course, but my suggested developmental path seems possible and likely in Korean because

89 As is the case in Japanese, these extended predicates are observable when providing an explanation. The above example is possibly a reply to the Korean equivalent of Why are you late? The following answer is also possible: Nay (< na uy) cha ka kocangnan kes ita [I GEN car NOM got.broken NMZ COP] ‘(It is that) my car was broken.’
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of the morphological and syntactic similarities between Korean and Japanese, i.e. in both languages: genitive morphemes are particles, not desinences or suffixes in inflectional systems; neither has complex inflectional paradigms for nouns or pronouns; both have the word order of [possessor GEN possessed]; and both employ head-final relative clauses.²⁹ Despite this likelihood, the situation in ModK suggests that the developmental path can also be interrupted by other lexical items, such as kes (< kas ‘thing’ in MK).

6.4.4 German and French

Although I have claimed that the process of omitting the noun after a genitive is common in human languages, apparently not all languages have developed Pro-GEN [GEN.one] and Bd-Pro [one] from a genitive morpheme. Again, this seems to be due to the morphology and syntax of each language. To illustrate, I will provide some brief observations about German and French in this subsection.

First, German has almost exactly the same possessive expressions for proper nouns as does English; the genitive suffix -s may function as both GEN and Pro-GEN [GEN.one]:

(19) a. Das ist Peter-s Auto.
    that is Peter-GEN car
    ‘That is Peter’s car.’

b. Das ist Peter-s.
    that is Peter-GEN.one
    ‘That is Peter’s’

²⁹ Obviously I am not arguing for a genetic relationship between Korean and Japanese based on these similarities. What I am claiming is similar developmental processes in different languages constrained by their respective morphological and syntactic features.

³⁰ Also cf. the use of koto ‘thing; fact’ and mono ‘thing’ as nominalizers and sentence-final elements in Japanese, presented in (16).

³¹ The information about contemporary German is from my German colleagues.
Unlike English, however, the -s in German did not spread to pronoun paradigms as Bd-Pro [one], e.g. *mein-s [my.one] 'mine'. One of the reasons seems to be the existence of other possessive expressions:

(20)   *Das ist das Buch Peter-s.
       that is the book Peter-GEN
       'That is Peter's book.'

(21)   *Das ist das Buch von Peter.
       of DAT
       'That is the book of Peter.'

(22)   a. Das Auto gehoert Peter.
       that car belong DAT
       'That car belongs to Peter.'

       b. Das gehoert Peter.
       that belong DAT
       'It belongs to Peter.'

English does not allow the structure of (20), but (21) and (22) are syntactically possible. In contract, these expressions are very common in German. As explained in the case of [possessed of possessor] in English, the omission of possessed nouns is difficult (in fact impossible) in (20) and (21). If we compare (19b) and (22b), the latter seems more common than the former. Due to the use of these possessive expressions, the Pro-GEN expression in (19b) does not seem to have become so common in German; the -s did not become so established as a morpheme of Pro-GEN.

Another reason why the morpheme -s in German did not spread to pronoun paradigms as Bd-Pro [one] seems to be due to the complexity of possessive adjective morphology; possessive adjectives must agree with the possessed noun for case, gender, and number. The following is the paradigm for 'my':

---

93 There seem to be individual differences in the acceptability of the omission of possessed nouns after genitive. According to one of my colleagues, *Wo ist Peter-s [where is Peter-GEN.one] 'Where is Peter's?' is quite odd, while another said it is acceptable.

94 Other personal pronouns follow the same pattern.
German has a different set of paradigms for possessive pronouns. The paradigm for
‘mine’ is provided below (Durrell 1991: 81):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>meiner</td>
<td>meine</td>
<td>meines</td>
<td>meine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>meinen</td>
<td>meine</td>
<td>meines</td>
<td>meine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>meines</td>
<td>meiner</td>
<td>meines</td>
<td>meiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>meinem</td>
<td>meiner</td>
<td>meinem</td>
<td>meinen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to keep the paradigm intact, perhaps, the -s could not be simply added to possessive
adjectives as Bd-Pro [one].

The stems for possessive adjectives (e.g. mein in (23)) and the stems for possessive
pronouns (e.g. meiner in (24)) have both been derived from genitive forms, which are rarely
used as genitive in modern German (see Durrell 1991: 42, among others). Historically
speaking, the shorter genitive forms are older than the longer forms. According to Curme
(1922: 179), the longer forms probably arose in the fourteenth century under the influence
of the ending -er in the genitive plural forms unser and euer, and gained ascendancy over
the short forms by the end of the sixteenth century. By the time of Durrell (1991), it
seems that the short forms had been chosen as the stems for possessive adjectives, and the

---

95 Durrell explains that “endingless forms” (e.g. mein and dein) are now archaic except in set phrases, e.g.
Er kann mein und dein nicht unterscheiden ‘He can’t distinguish mine and yours’.

96 Wright (1907: 215) states that the longer forms presumably existed at first only in connection with
feminine nouns.
longer forms for possessive pronouns. This choice does not seem unrelated to the fact that possessive pronouns should have the extra meaning 'one'.

Possessive pronouns in German seem to have been unstable for a long time, since the extra meaning 'one' is not attributable to any specific morpheme. For example, the differentiation between possessive adjectives and possessive pronouns seems to have been more complex in the past. According to Curme (1922: 165), when used substantively, possessives were inflected like a descriptive adjective, and hence had three forms, i.e. the strong, the weak, and in the predicate the uninflected form. Also, the stems (e.g. mein and dein) were often lengthened by adding -ig and then inflected in the same way, and those lengthened forms then (i.e. 1900-1922) became more common than unlengthened ones.

Since the morpheme -ig is an adjective forming suffix (cf. OHG -ag, -ig; MHG -ec, -ic; Goth. -ag, -eig; OE -ig; ModE -y: Wright 1907: 156), it seems most plausible that its application to personal pronouns started out with possessive adjectives, which is said to have occurred between the fourteenth and the sixteenth century. Later, they developed into possessive pronouns due to the omission of the following noun. Perhaps the preference of the lengthened forms over the unlengthened forms (e.g. meinig over meiner and mein) as possessive pronouns was again due to the necessity to accommodate the extra meaning 'one'.

To summarize, three kinds of possessive adjectives developed in German, namely, the short forms (e.g. mein), the long forms (e.g. meiner), and the lengthened forms (e.g. meinig), the former two from genitives, and the last by adding the -ig. Unlike in English, the

---

97 OHG: Old High German (8c-1100); MHG: Middle High German (1100-1350); Goth.: Gothic (ca. 4c).
98 According to Mitzka (1967 [Kluge 1883]), the use of -ig for personal pronouns began in the fourteenth century. Curme (1922: 165) states that the -ig forms have gradually been established since the sixteenth century. Wright (1907: 221) states that their use as possessive pronouns did not exist in MHG, and they are N(ew)HG formations.
-s for proper nouns did not spread to the pronoun system to accommodate the extra meaning 'one' in the formation of possessive pronouns, perhaps due to complex morphological constraints in German, as well as the common use of other syntactic possessive expressions. It is likely that all three types developed into possessive pronouns by simply omitting the following noun, and that they competed with each other (cf. the competition between mī and mīn, and between thī and thīn in ME). Longer forms came to be preferred when expressing the extra meaning 'one', but nonetheless, the clear association between 'one' and a single morpheme has never been made due to the morphological complexity of pronoun paradigms.

The case of French also involves both morphology and syntax. French uses the following type of possessive expressions:

(25)  
a. la voiture de Pierre 'the car of Pierre'
b. celle de Pierre 'that of Pierre > Pierre's'
c. sa voiture 'his car'; notre voiture 'our car'
d. la sienne 'the his > his (possessive pronoun)'

la nôtre 'ours'

---

99 In colloquial German, the following possessive expressions seem common:

a. Das ist (dem) Peter sein Buch.
   that is DAT DAT his book
   'That is Peter's book.'
b. Das ist (dem) Peter sein(e)s.
   that is DAT DAT his.one
   'That is Peter's.'
c. Wo ist (dem) Peter sein(e)s?
   where is DAT DAT his.one
   'Where is Peter's?'

As for their structures, these expressions can be viewed as separation of possessive morphology from proper nouns. As for sein(e)-s [he(GEN)-one], it is another example of double genitive derivatives, cf. English your-s [you(GEN)-one].

100 The pronoun possessive paradigm in French generally distinguishes masculine, feminine, and plural. The examples given are based on a feminine noun voiture 'car'.
Unlike English, German, Japanese, and Chinese, French did not develop a construction of [possessor GEN possessed] for proper and common nouns; it uses the prepositional de-construction, as in [possessed de possessor]. As explained for the of-construction in English, it seems difficult to omit the possessed item in this word order. Also, the pronoun system has no common genitive morpheme, and thus there is no source for French to develop Pro-GEN [GEN.one].

According to Brachet (1878), possessive pronouns (le) mien ‘mine’ and (le) sien came from men and sen respectively, which are softened forms of possessive adjectives mon ‘my’ and son ‘his’. Both notre ‘our’ and (le) nôtre ‘ours’ were derived from Latin nostrum. These seem to be all differentiations of possessive adjectives from possessive pronouns by sound changes in single morphemes, not by adding an extra morpheme for ‘one’.

6.4.5 A Common Process and Its Implications

In the developmental process [GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP], the genitive suffix -s in English stopped its development at Bd-Pro [one], whereas de in Mandarin Chinese has taken on a mood function at the sentence-final position, just as GEN no/ga/to developed into SFPs in Japanese. The Korean genitive particle s/t seems to have developed up to NMZ, but its emotive status is not yet clear in this study. In German, the genitive suffix -s can be used as Pro-GEN [GEN.one] only for proper nouns, but it did not develop into Bd-Pro [one]. In French, neither Pro-GEN nor Bd-Pro developed. The whole process seems to be variously constrained by the lexicon, morphology, and syntax of each language.

101 The combinational use of a definite article and an adjective for a pronominal expression can also be seen in English and German, as in the rich ‘rich people’ and die Reichen.
In Japanese, the genitive morphemes are particles, and their boundness to the preceding noun is not so strong,\textsuperscript{102} and thus Pro-GEN \{GEN.one\} after a noun (e.g. *ore no* \{I GEN.one\} ‘mine’) could develop into Bd-Pro \{one\} after adjectives and verbs (e.g. *akai no* \{red one\} ‘a/the red one’, *taberu no* \{eat one\} ‘the one (I) eat’). In Mandarin Chinese, *de* seems to have been more than a genitive morpheme in the first place due to its morphology. As a connective particle, it can tie two nouns, an adjective with a noun, and a verb with a noun. Thus, Pro-GEN and Bd-Pro were free to develop at the same time when the head nouns were omitted in noun phrases, e.g. *wō de* \{I GEN.one\} ‘mine’ and *zōu-lù de* \{walk GEN.one\} ‘the one who is walking’ as Pro-GEN; *hóng de* \{red one\} ‘a/the red one’ as Bd-Pro. Both Japanese and Chinese have head-final relative clauses (and so-called gapless relative clauses) without relative pronouns. This syntactic feature promoted the further development from Bd-Pro to NMZ in the position after an adjective or verb. The morphological and syntactic conditions in Korean are similar to those of Japanese in this regard.

In contrast, the genitive *-s* in English is a suffix in noun paradigms, and the Pro-GEN *-s* (e.g. *It’s Tom’s* \{Tom’s.one\}) could not spread to environments other than pronoun paradigms, where it became Bd-Pro (e.g. *your-s* \{your.one\}). English has a bound pronominal *one*, but it did not develop into NMZ partly because of reasons having to do with English syntax; English has head-first relative clauses, which require relative pronouns and very specific semantic relationships between the head noun and the gap in the relative clause. In German, Pro-GEN *-s* could not be employed as Bd-Pro in the pronoun system because of the complex morphological constraints, i.e. agreement for case, gender, and

\textsuperscript{102} For example, the use of other particles between the preceding noun and GEN *no* is attested from the Insei (1086-) period (Hashimoto S. 1969: 96), e.g. *Kamakura yori no tukaf* [Kamakura from GEN messenger] ‘a messenger from Kamakura’.
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number. In French, neither Pro-GEN nor Bd-Pro developed because French syntax uses the prepositional de-construction for proper nouns, as in [possessed de possessor], in which the omission of possessed nouns seems difficult, and also because there is no particular genitive morpheme in the pronoun system.

The cross-dialect examination in Japanese, and the crosslinguistic data from English, Mandarin Chinese, Korean, German, and French, suggest that developments from genitive morphemes to Pro-GEN [GEN.one] are very likely to start out in any language given a common linguistic practice (i.e. omission of the possessed noun, or the head noun). They also suggest that whether or not those developments actually occur, or how far the changes go, are constrained by language internal properties (i.e. lexicon, morphology, and syntax).

6.5 Conclusion

By comparing correspondences among GEN, NOM, TM, Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP in Std-ModJ and other dialects, this chapter has demonstrated that the particles no/ga/to/tu/si for these functions are most likely all genitive derivatives. Each dialect has developed different forms for these functions in its own grammatical and sociolinguistic system through competition among various genitive forms. Therefore, despite the prevalent claims made in past studies, the particular functional distribution observed between ga and no in Std-ModJ is not due to linguistic inevitability stemming from features of these particles. Meanings and functions do not simply inhere in linguistic forms; they are products of speech behaviors in a certain speech community. Above all, OJ, MJ, and Std-ModJ do not represent the continuous development of a single dialect, and studies of them do not reveal any linguistic inevitability which "retrodicts" the current status of Japanese. The dialectal variations illustrated here simply cannot be explained by these studies. This
particular study of dialectal variation in Japanese suggests that so-called "standard" languages in general are just one of several possible varieties, and do not necessarily represent what speakers must do (or must have done) with their languages.

Despite differences in individual forms, I have also claimed that the development of those functions in each dialect was not totally random. Given the three pieces of evidence, i.e. the dialectal correspondences, consideration of functional/semantic developmental processes, and the historical evidence, it is most plausible to assume that various genitive particles in different dialects took the same developmental path, i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP. This suggests that these changes were guided by linguistic properties shared across different dialects and by linguistic practices shared by their speakers. Similar historical changes are observable in Mandarin Chinese and Korean.

In grammaticalization theory (e.g. Heine and Reh 1984; Traugott and Heine 1991a/b; Hopper and Traugott 1993), one hypothesis is about unidirectionality (i.e. more lexical > more grammatical). The series of changes described in this chapter does not quite fit into the general idea of grammaticalization. First, the starting point is genitive morphemes, which are already highly grammatical, but gain an additional lexical meaning of a general pronominal by speakers' common linguistic practice, namely the omission of possessed nouns (or head nouns) after genitive. As seen in the crosslinguistic data, this is not a rare change in human languages. Second, while lexical meanings are the ones that are usually bleached out in grammaticalization, it is the grammatical genitive function that is bleached out in the developmental process. The whole process (i.e. GEN > Pro-GEN > Bd-Pro > NMZ > SFP) is constrained by lexicon, morphology, and syntax, but such changes are certainly possible and not merely exceptional in human language.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION: GRAMMAR AND CATEGORY

7.1 Introduction

There exist fundamental questions about human language, such as relationships between synchrony and diachrony, variations among speakers, dialects, and languages, and why language changes. How we answer them all comes down to how we theorize grammar. To conclude this dissertation, I will discuss the nature of grammar in light of the various linguistic phenomena and language changes that have been examined in the previous chapters. Section 7.2 discusses grammar formation for competing forms. Section 7.3 discusses category formation in grammar. Section 7.4 discusses relationships between grammars of individuals and grammars of speech communities, and finally Section 7.5 provides some concluding remarks.

7.2 Formation of Grammar for Competing Forms

One influential view of human language is that of the generative approach (i.e. of Chomskyan syntacticians), which argues for the existence of only one Universal Grammar (UG), and attempts to explain all variations among languages by resorting to different parameter settings (e.g. Chomsky 1981). In this view, there is no such thing as a grammar of a language except for UG, which is a genetically encoded entity in the human brain. In
other words, grammar is autonomous. Lightfoot (e.g. 1979, 1991) applies this view to language change. In presenting a model of language change, Andersen (1973: 778) also assumes universal laws, what he calls “laws of language”, through which inputs are processed to form the grammars of individuals. In the generative framework, changes in human language are generally regarded as rule changes.1 In this section, I argue against the existence of autonomous grammar and the account of language change by rule changes.

As stated in Chapter 1, one recurring theme throughout this dissertation has been how grammars are formulated for competing forms, structures, and categories, and how these competitions project to language changes. None of the competing situations discussed in this dissertation can be accounted for by a clear-cut grammar internal only to language. The picture of grammar that emerges in this dissertation is that “grammar is not autonomous”; there is no grammar formulated without negotiations of meanings and structures among speakers. This view of grammar is essentially the same as that articulated by Joseph (1998).

In Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2, I have claimed that the pejorative/honorific distinction between GEN ga and no in MJ was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development. In other words, it was not a part of the core functions of these genitive particles. The social sensitivity of language users, particularly in court society, associated the characteristic distributions of the particles with social differentiations, and developed the particles into markers of social deixis (cf. also the honorific/neutral distinction between GEN s and GEN 'oy/oy in MK, as well as the T/V (tu-vous) distinction in European languages).

---

1 Andersen (1973: 766) does not take this approach, and raises the question of where rule changes come from. Instead, he argues for the importance of abduction in the process of language change.
The pejorative/honorific distinction apparently became a part of the grammar of genitives in some varieties of Japanese in the MJ period. Here we have a potential difficulty in drawing a line between "linguistically ungrammatical" and "socially unacceptable" (or less significantly, a "funny variety"). When first person pronouns (e.g. wa, a, ono) were marked by a genitive particle in OJ/EMJ/MJ, it was always by GEN ga. If GEN no (or another genitive, tu) had been used for marking first person pronouns in this clear-cut case, it would have been regarded as ungrammatical (or just a "wrong use" for non-linguists). There were, however, situations in which both GEN ga and no were possible. In a story in a medieval Japanese literary text, in which a man gets angry about the use of GEN ga in reference to him, he gets angry not because it is ungrammatical, but because it is socially unacceptable (for him, at least). Thus, a single linguistic phenomenon, such as the choice between GEN ga and no in MJ, may involve a scalar judgment between "ungrammatical" and "socially unacceptable". In Std-ModJ, no has become the only productive genitive particle. Thus, it is safe to state with regard to Std-ModJ that ore no hon [I GEN book] 'my book' is "grammatical" while ore ga hon is "ungrammatical". In some dialects, however, ore ga 'my' and its related forms (e.g. ori ga, oi ga) are still productive (without particular pragmatic implications except for its style). What is the essential difference between "ungrammatical" and "socially unacceptable" (or a "funny variety"), then? I would like to argue that essentially there is no difference but the degree of uniformity in speech behaviors. The more uniformly speakers behave (i.e. producing the same forms), the more it becomes a matter of dichotomy between grammatical and ungrammatical. The

2 Unlike the case of GEN ga and no in MJ, pragmatic implications are not involved in the following, but how do English speakers feel about You is ..., We are ..., Do he ...? on the one hand, and Who was she dancing with? (instead of With whom ...?), If I was you (instead of If I were you), What do you talking about? (instead of What are you talking about?), or What d'you got? (instead of What have you got?) on the other?

3 For example, modern dialects in Kagoshima, Kumamoto, Nagasaki, Fukushima, Tochigi, and Ibaragi prefectures have GEN ga for the first person pronoun ore (or its related forms). See NLRI (1989), Map 13.
less uniformly speakers behave, the more likely that variations are associated with particular social statuses and/or groups (e.g. honorifics for superiors, jargon, and dialects), and consequently it may become a matter of whether they are socially acceptable or not.

A predominant preference for a certain form over the others in a particular linguistic environment (i.e. condition) is generally treated as an agreement “rule” in linguistics. Does a set of rules (i.e. grammar) autonomously exist first and make every speaker comply with them? Or, is grammar something developed based on speech production (i.e. input forms) by each individual? The case of GEN *ga* and *no* in MJ, as well as the fact that agreement rules may change over time, suggests the latter. Every OJ speaker used GEN *ga* to mark first person pronouns on every occasion (admitting the limitation of historical data) not because such grammar had been given to them, but because such grammar was formulated by each of them based on the social norm at the time, i.e. conventions of speech production. Social norms change over time, and now every Std-ModJ speaker uses GEN *no* for any kind of NP, including first person pronouns.

In this view, grammar is not something passed on from generation to generation as a set of rules, or as something encoded in the human brain. What is passed on is, literally, “forms-in-use” (i.e. speech productions, while they keep changing over time), not a “grammar” (i.e. how to use forms). Grammar is constructed each time when a child acquires a language, based on input forms and his/her psychological processes (e.g. induction, deduction, abduction, and categorization), and is constantly modified, based on such factors as reanalysis, different inputs, and social negotiations of meanings. Individual grammar formation is the basis for the notion of grammar at higher social levels. At any

---

4 The discontinuous nature of cross-generational language transmission has been discussed in past studies from different schools, e.g. Meillet (1904-5: 6-7 [1926: 235-36], 1929 [1936: 74-75]), Kiparsky (1968: 175), and Lightfoot (1979: 148). See more references in Janda (2001: 272-82). Apparently, generativists attribute the fact that communication holds among different generations to the existence of Universal Grammar (UG).
social level - individual, speech community, dialect, and language - grammars are
generalizations of speech behaviors. Due to this nature, discrepancies in grammar are
inevitable among individuals, different speech communities, and different dialects.

Perhaps a good analogy for this nature of grammar would be the transmission of
oral literature (:: grammar as a result of individual reconstruction) based only on listening
and speaking, without a written script (:: grammar as an autonomous entity). For every
story teller, what s/he has mastered is, in his/her mind, “the story” (:: grammar), which does
not really exist except as his/her speech productions. No individual knows when the oral
tradition started, but individual variations are already inevitable. As a story is passed on to
the next generation, a child is told the story by many story tellers. The transmission process
is thus better regarded as his or her reconstruction of the story, not mere memorization.
Despite the effort to maintain the story as the essence of social life, tradition, and identity of
the group, it is always possible (and likely) that the story changes due to such factors as the
child’s psychological capacity, reinterpretation, misunderstanding, as well as surrounding
social factors at the time. The story (:: grammar) changes because it is a transmission based
on speech productions (i.e. forms used in particular circumstances), not because someone
changes the non-existing written script.5

The competition among forms discussed in this dissertation is not limited to GEN
ga and GEN no in MJ. As examined in Chapter 2, three major genitive particles, ga, no,
and tu (except for minor varieties such as na) were competing in OJ. While they exhibit
characteristic distributions (i.e. ga - predominantly with first and second person pronouns;
no - wide use, but not with first person pronouns; tu - many location words and no

5 A sort of anecdotal evidence for the existence of the autonomous grammar by Chomskyans (or the
autonomous syntax for their matter) is the fact that speakers have the capability of producing utterances that
have never been produced before. If we put this into the oral literature analogy, people may use a new way
of describing things, or even add sub-stories which have never been told while keeping the overall flow of
the story.
possessive expressions), there are quite a few overlaps between *ga* and *no*, and between *no* and *tu*. Due to the clear-cut distribution, **kimi tu** [you GEN] would have been regarded as ungrammatical (or *asi* 'essentially wrong' instead of *warosi* 'inferior' in OJ) if it had ever been used, while *kimi ga* and *kimi no* coexisted. Similarly, **ama ga** [heaven GEN] would have been regarded as ungrammatical, while *ama no* and *ama tu* coexisted. The examples of *ume ga pana* and *ume no pana* [plum.tree GEN blossom] 'plum blossoms' may present an intermediate case. In *Man'yôshû*, the former has only two examples, while the latter has more than thirty examples (even excluding the ones which do not have a Chinese character assigned to GEN *no*). If these numbers somehow reflect the actual situation in OJ, *ume ga pana* might have been regarded as a minor variation, or even associated with a certain social group.6

In addition to the general competition, there were also specific battlefields for the genitive particles and zero-marking in OJ. For numeral expressions, there seems to have been a competition between the use and the non-use of genitive particles (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2), e.g. *ipo-tu tori* [500-tu bird] 'many birds' (MYS 17:4011) vs. *ipo-tose* 'many years' (MYS 6:1025); *momo-na pito* [100-GEN person] 'many people' (NS Song 11) vs. *momo-tu sima* [100-GEN island] 'many islands' (MYS 3367) vs. *momo-pune* [100-boat] 'many boats' (MYS 1065). For marking bound nominals (including adjective stems), the competition seems to have been among *no*-marking, *tu*-marking, and zero-marking (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1), e.g. *siko-no mi-tate* [fool(Bd)-GEN Bt-shield] '(my) humble shield' (MYS 20:4373) vs. *siko-tu okina* 'a foolish old man' (MYS 17:4011) vs. *siko-ya* 'shabby hut' (MYS 13:3270). In these environments in OJ, GEN *ga* was not in the competition; it is not attested at all for marking numeral nominals, other bound nominals, or

---

6 According to *Zenshû* (for MYS 837), *ume ga pana* is said to be perhaps a remnant of some old dialect.
adjective stems. Thus, **ipo-ga tori [500-GEN bird] and **siko-ga okina [fool(Bd)-GEN old.man] would have been regarded as ungrammatical, if ever produced.

The significance of the competitions discussed above might be discounted by advocates of autonomous grammar as just being lexical choices among different genitive particles (or zero), and not as a core part of grammar. The following discussion, however, concerns case marking. In Chapter 4, I have examined subject marking in OJ, and have claimed that different frequencies of GEN-marking of subjects are attributable to different degrees of clausal nouniness. In other words, each clause is “nouny” (or “verby”) to a different degree. The use and the non-use of GEN-marking in a certain type of clause can be regarded as competition. As I have shown in Chapter 4, the GEN-marking of subjects in OJ is not something invariably found or not found in a certain type of clause, and in fact both GEN-marking and zero-marking are observable in all types of clauses (except for imperative sentences). Therefore, it does not seem to provide a clear-cut judgment for ungrammaticality. For example, GEN-marking is very rare in unmarked main clauses ending with SS forms (i.e. not RT main clauses ‘rentai-dome’), and thus it might have been regarded as a little unusual (or as a marked expression) by the speakers of OJ. On the other hand, zero-marking is rather rare in relative clauses, and thus it might have been regarded as a minor variation. Even if we want to attribute GEN-marking of subjects to some agreement rule in autonomous grammar, we have difficulty in defining clause types as discrete categories with which GEN-marking agrees. In Std-ModJ, GEN-marking has basically lost this competition, except in relative clauses, mostly due to the takeover of SS

---

7 In fact, in the theory of grammar discussed in this dissertation, there is no fundamental distinction between lexical choices and grammar. Grammar is constructed based on lexical choices.
functions by RT forms and the development of NOM ga from GEN ga. Thus, ungrammaticality with regard to the GEN-marking of subjects has become categorical in most clause types. For example, it is safe to say that "basu no ki-tara..." [bus GEN 'come-Cond] 'when the bus comes,...' is clearly ungrammatical in Std-ModJ. However, this is not because of some prescribed grammar given to all speakers of Std-ModJ; rather it is a collectively agreed-upon social norm of the moment, as a result of the leveling of individually reconstructed grammars over a long period of time.

In Chapter 5, Section 5.2, I have also reviewed the development of NOM ga. While the main battlegrounds in the discussion above were subordinate clauses, the development of NOM ga concerns the competition between zero-marking and ga-marking in main clauses. The development of NOM ga from GEN ga was not a sudden change when SS forms merged into RT forms, which was not a sudden change, either. As seen in Section 5.2.3, GEN-marking of subjects in unmarked main clauses gradually increased as time went by from OJ to EMJ, and then to MJ, under the influence of several key constructions. Based on this historical fact, it should be said that accounting for the development of NOM ga from GEN ga by some rule change in grammar is an implausible or even impossible conceptualization, since the rule needs to be changed an infinite number of times to accommodate the gradual increase of GEN-marking in main clauses.

In Chapter 5, Section 5.4, I have also examined the development of the theme marker (TM) ga for desiderative expressions. As I have argued, the competition came to be among

---

8 RT forms became the unmarked way of ending main clauses, and they lost their morphological distinctiveness (except for the copula da). In other words, previously nominal clauses (i.e. RT clauses) became the most basic sentence type. This morphological change seems to have led to the wholesale restructuring of the nouniness of each clause type. Also, ga-marking of subjects in subordinate clauses came to be recognized as NOM-marking, not as GEN-marking, due to the emergence of NOM ga.

9 As seen in Chapter 6, however, many dialects in Kyushu, including Fukuoka dialects, developed NOM no, instead of NOM ga. Thus, "basu no ki-tara 'when the bus comes,...'" is completely grammatical in those dialects.
zero-marking, GEN-marking, and ACC-marking, when \( V\)-\textit{maku posi} [\( V\)-Conj\( e c(Ku) \) desirable] "want to V" in OJ developed into \( V\)-\textit{mafosi} in EMJ.\(^\text{10}\) This competition is slightly different and in a sense more complex than the others discussed above, since it involves two different case marking systems, i.e. GEN-marking and ACC-marking.\(^\text{11}\) In Std-ModJ, \( ga\)-marking (< GEN \( ga\) ) has become the predominant preference; \( o\)-marking (< ACC \( wo\)) was even taught as an incorrect use in textbooks in 1940s. In other dialects, however, we can observe predominant zero-marking or ACC-marking. As shown in Section 5.4.4, the geographical distribution of zero-, \( ga\)-, and ACC-marking is very complex, and it seems more likely to be the result of dialect-internal developments, rather than dialectal spread. If it had been the result of dialectal spread, we might be able to assume a single autonomous grammar for the central dialect and to posit a couple of rule changes for the development of various theme-marking systems, which would have spread to other dialects.

In the case of dialect-internal developments, however, this account does not work. If all dialects had operated on a single autonomous grammar, and if rule changes had applied to it, we should not expect dialectal variations in grammar, perhaps except for lexical variations. Also, attributing a language change to a rule change in grammar does not explain where the rule change has come from (Andersen 1973: 766). It is most likely that the dialectal distribution of various theme-marking systems has been determined through competition among zero-marking, GEN-marking, and ACC-marking in speech production. We cannot attribute a particular development in a certain dialect to linguistic inevitability. After all, what appears to be a rule change is a generalized result of changes in speech behaviors. Anttila

\(^{10}\) To review briefly, there were two major desiderative constructions in OJ, namely \( V\)-\textit{maku posi} [\( V\)-Conj\( e c(Ku) \) desirable] and \( V\)-\textit{maku poru} [\( V\)-Conj\( e c(Ku) \) want]. GEN-marking was used due to the \( ku\)-nominalization in \( V\)-\textit{maku posi}, while ACC-marking was used due to the transitivity of poru 'want' in \( V\)-\textit{maku poru}. In EMJ, \( -maku posi \) was grammaticalized as \( -mafosi \), while \( -maku poru \) became obsolete. Since the \( ku\)-nominalization became unrecognizable, zero-marking became the default, and GEN-marking and ACC-marking were used according to clausal nouniness and transitivity of predicates respectively.

\(^{11}\) All the competitions discussed so far have been among different genitive particles and zero.
(1972: 129, 131) states: “What rule changes always describe, then, is the before-after relationship. They give a mechanism for description, not a historical explanation ... Rule change is not a primary change mechanism, but an effect.”

In Chapter 6, I have examined dialectal variations in GEN, NOM, TM, Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP, and demonstrated that all these functional morphemes have been derived from GEN (except for the use of ACC for TM). The following table presents a summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialects</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>Pro-GEN</th>
<th>Bd-Pro</th>
<th>NMZ</th>
<th>SFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Std-ModJ</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyama</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>o, ga</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ga, no, ba</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>to, tu</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>ga, nu</td>
<td>ga, nu</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>si, see</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Dialectal variations in genitive derivatives

In Std-ModJ, GEN ga developed into NOM and TM, while GEN no developed into Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP. Nara dialects, which are presumably the direct descendants of OJ, exhibit the same pattern as Std-ModJ, except for NOM and TM for which zero-marking is used. In Toyama dialects, it was GEN ga that developed into all NOM, TM (zero-marking, too), Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP. In Fukuoka dialects, GEN no developed into NOM, while GEN tu developed into Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP. Instead of Pro-GEN [GEN.one], Toyama and Fukuoka dialects use double genitive derivative constructions (e.g. ore n ga [I GEN one] ‘mine’ in Toyama, ore ga tu in southern Fukuoka). Okinawa dialects use both nu (< GEN no) and ga for GEN and NOM, zero-marking for TM, si (< GEN tu) or its related forms for Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, and NMZ (no reliable data for SFP).
I have referred to the probable competition among GEN *ga, no*, and *tu* in OJ (i.e. the central dialect in Nara) at the beginning of this section, but in fact other dialects must have experienced similar competitions, given the dialectal distribution of reflexes of GEN *ga, no*, and *tu*. Since there is no historical evidence that GEN *ga, no*, and *tu* developed into those functional morphemes (i.e. NOM, TM, Pro-GEN, Bd-Pro, NMZ, and SFP) one after another in the central dialect, it is most likely that the dialectal variations are due to dialectal internal developments, not due to dialectal spread. As in the other competitions discussed in this section, it is difficult to account for the historical changes of various genitive particles in different dialects by positing an autonomous grammar and rule changes.

Various cases of competition among different items examined in this dissertation suggest that language change is locally motivated, originating with particular linguistic forms. This claim agrees with the view that language change is not a rule change that applies to the members of a certain domain all together at once. If language change were global (i.e. based on categorical membership), we should not expect overlapping distributions of competing forms for the same environments, e.g. overlapping distributions between GEN *ga* and *no*, GEN *no* and *tu*, the use and the non-use of genitive for numeral expressions, and between GEN-marking and zero-marking for subjects.

The observations of competing linguistic items also suggest that grammar formation involves historical contingency, including social factors. That is, grammar is not autonomous; there is no grammar formulated without negotiations of meanings and
structures among speakers. No individual has exactly the same grammar as others'. What we can observe as a generalized grammar in a speech community is a result of negotiations through common communicative and psychological processes shared by the speakers.\textsuperscript{12}

If we accept this view of grammar, we cannot predict the outcome of language change only by studying language-internal conditions. This does not mean that language change is completely random. Certainly it is constrained by speech productions and social factors in that speech community. The reason why we observe many similar historical developments in different dialects/languages is perhaps not due to the existence of "universal grammar", but rather due to the fact that communicative and psychological processes of human beings are similar, i.e. a process-based universality.

Lastly, I repeat the same question which I have raised in Chapter 1: if grammar could only be developed based on forms-in-use, where did speech productions already preconstrained by grammar come from in the first place? My answer to this question is hypothetical and difficult to prove. It seems very likely that the relationship between forms and grammar is "chicken and egg".\textsuperscript{13} Just as we do not know essentially why and how 'sky' came to be called \textit{sky} in English and \textit{sora} in Japanese, we may not be able to find out why English speakers came to practice certain linguistic behaviors, such as subject-auxiliary inversion for questions, and why Japanese speakers use others, such as addition of interrogative particle without any change in word-order. Perhaps grammar, including the

\textsuperscript{12} See Harris (1995, 1996) for his theory of "integrational semiology", which views communication not as a process of transferring thoughts or messages from one individual mind to another, but as consisting in the contextualized integration of human activities by means of signs. My view of language is essentially the same as Harris's in terms of the social aspect of language, i.e. communication. In addition, I argue for the importance of the individual aspect of language, i.e. internalization of contextual (both socially and linguistically) behaviors, in other words, grammar formation. For individual grammar formation, psychological processes, such as induction, deduction, abduction, and categorization, play a significant role.

\textsuperscript{13} See Deacon (1997) for relationships between language development and human evolution. He shows that language has coevolved with the brain to accommodate distinctively human learning strategies, and that universals are the result, not the cause, of the fact that language works.
shapes of lexical items, has been formulated in the long history of human beings, after acquiring a certain capacity for psychological processes. If we assume that the relationship between forms and meanings is basically arbitrary and determined based on negotiations among speakers over a long history, grammar (i.e. how to use forms) may be no different.

7.3 Formation of Categories

In addition to competitions among various linguistic items, I have also examined several processes of category formation in this research. I claim in this section that linguistic categories are not given in grammar, but can only be first induced from speech production, as part of grammar formation. As mentioned above, a predominant preference for a certain form over the others in a particular linguistic environment (or under particular conditions) is generally treated as an agreement rule in linguistics. These “particular linguistic environments/conditions” constitute linguistic categories, e.g. singular/plural, masculine/feminine, and animate/inanimate, or even noun/adjective/verb.\textsuperscript{14}

In Chapter 2, we observed the pejorative/honorific distinction in the use of GEN ga and no in MJ. Such a distinction is not confirmable in OJ. Thus, the development of the pejorative/honorific distinction in genitives can be regarded as the development of a pair of contrasting noun categories. In this development, it seems most likely that the social sensitivity of language users associated the characteristic distributions of the particles with social differentiation. In other words, the categories developed through language use.

The categorization of the pejorative/honorific distinction in MJ was not as categorical as some other categorizations that are associated with more clear-cut linguistic differentiations, such as masculine/feminine/neuter and singular/plural in Indo-European

\textsuperscript{14} This is a bit of a stretch from the usual use of “agreement” in linguistics, but in a broader sense, the use of nouns, adjectives, verbs, or words in any category must agree with particular syntactic positions.
languages. I would claim, however, that there is no essential difference between the categorizations that are apparently socially motivated (e.g. the pejorative/honorific distinction) and some other categorizations that are now generally considered as linguistic categorizations (e.g. masculine/feminine/neuter). This claim parallels the argument in Section 7.2 that there is no essential difference between “linguistically ungrammatical” and “socially unacceptable” (or a “funny variety”). As shown in Chapter 2, the pejorative/honorific distinction in Japanese was a socially motivated, temporary and regional development. However, those gender and number distinctions that appear to be categorical are not stable or absolute categorizations, either. We can observe a variety of gender and number systems in the history of Indo-European languages. English, for example, has lost most of its gender distinctions. Also, the category of dual is not common in modern Indo-European languages. Thus, it is more likely that these categorizations were social norms at the time, induced based on speech production as part of grammar, no matter how categorical they appear to be.

As a case in which we observe the marking pattern opposite to the pejorative/honorific distinction, I have provided examples of the use of ga and nu (< no) in Okinawa dialects in Chapter 2 and 6. In northern Ryukyu dialects in general, it seems that personal (pro)nouns are marked by ga, while other common nouns are marked by nu in subject marking. Thus, sinsii (= sensei) ‘teacher’ is marked by ga, and nusuuru (= doroboo) ‘thief’ by nu, which is opposite to the use of ga and no in the pejorative/honorific distinction. A similar pattern is also observable in some Okinawa dialects in genitive marking (see Chapter 6 for details). Such differentiation is not observable outside

---

15 I am not claiming that all categorizations are essentially socially motivated. For example, the categories of noun, adjective, and verb are linguistically (semantically, syntactically, and morphologically) determined in use in discourse. The category of pronoun is determined also by discourse functions.
Ryukyuan dialects, and the distinction in categorization between personal (pro)nouns and other common nouns is most likely to be a development internal to some Ryukyu dialects, not something given in their grammar.

In Chapter 4, I have discussed GEN-marking of subjects in OJ, and claimed that different frequencies of GEN-marking are due to different degrees of clausal nouniness. In other words, each clause is “nony” (or “verby”) to a different degree. In this phenomenon, each clause type, such as RT clauses, RY clauses, and IZ clauses, can be regarded as a category with which GEN-marking agrees. Based on the OJ data, however, it is apparent that GEN-marking of subjects is a scalar matter (i.e. one of frequency and degree). It is not something invariably found or not found in a certain type of clause, and in fact both GEN-marking and zero-marking are observable in all types of clauses (except for imperative sentences). In other words, categories (e.g. clause types) may not develop as completely categorical domains.

I have also claimed that different degrees of clausal nouniness are the result of category management in the domain of the sentence. All (major) categories in a single sentence must be managed along the category squish (i.e. continuum) between noun and verb. In this view, each clause type developed as a category through speech behaviors; each clause type is not something given as a category in grammar. This claim is supported by the fact that Std-ModJ no longer provides an elaborate category squish for GEN-marking of subjects; the GEN-marking is basically limited to relative clauses in Std-ModJ (where it is known as so-called “Ga-No conversion”). The loss of the elaborate category squish is attributable to the merger of SS forms with RT forms, and to the establishment of NOM
Thus, it can be said that the configuration of categories (e.g. which categories agree with GEN-marking, and to what extent) may change as overall grammar changes according to further changes in speech production.

Let us now look at the GEN-marking phenomenon from the viewpoint of subject. In OJ, subjects were marked by GEN *ga* or *no* with varying frequencies in different types of clauses. In unmarked main clauses ending with SS forms (i.e. not RT main clauses), zero-marking was the default, and GEN-marking was rarely used. Subjects were usually marked by GEN *ga* or *no* in RT clauses (e.g. relative clauses), but not always. These observations suggest that subject was not established as a category which always exhibits categorical linguistic behavior or coding in a given linguistic environment. Also, it is observed in Chapter 5 that GEN-marking of subjects gradually increased in SS clauses as time went by from OJ to EMJ, then to MJ. GEN *ga* finally developed into NOM *ga* in Std-ModJ. This development of *ga* as nominative agrees with the acquisition processes of subjecthood in various languages observed by Cole et al. (1980). They have demonstrated that the coding properties of subject develop later than behavioral properties. Keenan (1976) argues that subjecthood consists of various coding properties and behavioral properties, but his original intention was to treat the notion of subject as a primitive, something given in Universal Grammar, while approaching the definition of subject from various properties. If we define subject based on these coding properties and behavioral

---

16 As explained in Note 8, RT forms, which used to be most nouny, replaced SS forms, and have become unmarked forms for main clauses. This simplification of verb morphology seems to have affected the overall nouniness structure in inflectional forms. Also, the use of *ga* for subject marking in Std-ModJ is no longer regarded as GEN-marking, due to the establishment of NOM *ga*.

17 I have to admit that there is a small problem in my argument. The two categories involved in this agreement phenomenon (not perfectly, though) are a certain clause type and subject. The inconsistency in the agreement is attributable to either the clause type or subject, or possibly both. In other words, there are three possibilities: (i) the clause type is not categorical, but subject is; (ii) the clause type is categorical, but subject is not; and (iii) neither the clause type nor subject is categorical. Since there is no evidence that either the clause type or subject constitutes a completely categorical domain or membership, I take the position for (iii).
properties, however, it seems most likely that the category of subject is not something given in grammar, but rather something which develops through a diachronic process, a process of syntactic consolidation of semantic categories, such as agent, experiencer, and in passive, patient. Keenan (1976) also claims that subjecthood may be distributed to different constituents in a sentence. This claim supports my argument that subject does not necessarily constitute a binary-membership category.

In Section 7.1, I have claimed that grammar is not autonomous, and that it is something developed based on speech production. Along the line of this argument, I have argued in this section that linguistic categories also develop based on speech production, as part of grammar formation. In other words, categories are not something given in grammar.

7.4 Grammars of Individuals and Grammars of Speech Communities

As mentioned in Section 7.2, the generative theory assumes the existence of only one Universal Grammar (UG). Since UG is a genetically encoded entity in everyone’s brain, according to the explanation by generativists, there is no need to pay attention to any social entities but individuals. Another view of human language is that of the Labovians, who analyze linguistic phenomena from the viewpoint of speech communities: “The grammars in which linguistic change occurs are grammars of the speech community” (Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog 1968: 188). In this view, grammars are properties of speech communities.

18 For example, it can be said that subjecthood is split between John and Nihongo 'Japanese' in the following sentence in Std-ModJ: John ni Nihongo ga wakaru ka naa [John DAT Japanese NOM understand Q SFP] '(I wonder) if John understands Japanese.' Identification of subjects has been an issue in this type of sentences with stative predicates. According to Martin (1975: 38, 196), Nihongo 'Japanese' is the “direct subject” in the example, while John is the “indirect subject”. According to Kuno (1973), Nihongo is the object. If we adopt Keenan’s (1976) view, however, we do not need to determine a single subject in the example. John carries some subjecthood because it is a semantic experiencer, while Nihongo is marked by NOM ga, which indicates some subjecthood, perhaps because it is the most relevant argument for the predicate wakaru 'understand' in Japanese grammar.
In Section 7.2 and 7.3, I have argued against the existence of autonomous grammar. At the same time, however, it does not seem appropriate to regard grammar only as a property of a certain speech community. The notion of speech community is an abstraction, which should include individuals at the base level. It can be best expressed as a continuum from an individual to human language as follows:

\[(1) \text{ individual } < \text{ speech community } < \text{ dialect } < \text{ language } < \text{ sister languages } < \text{ human language}\]

At any level, what we observe as a grammar is generalized speech behaviors. We should be able to talk about grammars of individuals as well as grammars of speech communities, and the issue here is the interface between these two levels.

If I put this view in the context of language change, a change in grammar originates in socialized individuals, but it generally becomes recognizable as a change when it is taken up to the level of a certain speech community, in other words, when it is spread. The more a certain change gains speakers in a speech community, the more likely the other individual speakers are to be affected by the change. As a result, that change may be promoted to a change in that language. This is an on-going dynamic process, and the interface medium between grammars of individuals and a grammar of their speech community is speech production. Change may happen at any time at the individual level, and adoption or rejection happens as a natural process at the interface between the individual level and the speech community level, i.e. when individuals interact with other individuals in their speech community.

This analysis provides a different perspective on the relationship between synchrony and diachrony. What is happening at the individual level is basically synchronic, and a change promoted to a certain speech community level can be regarded as diachronic. In this

---

\(^{19}\) Cf. Andersen (1973: 778) for a model of language change based on individual grammar.
view, synchrony is not merely a slice of diachrony, as is often figuratively described. There are dynamic interactions between synchrony (i.e. grammars of individuals) and diachrony (i.e. the grammar of the speech community). Usually speakers are not aware of the history of their language, and they acquire language as a synchronic phenomenon. However, the results of diachronic changes are kept as forms-in-use (i.e. speech production in the speech community), which serves as the input for each person’s synchronic grammar formation.

Generally speaking, it is difficult to identify changes in individual speech behaviors as language change, and thus we regard changes at the speech community level (or higher in (1)) as language change. Although language change is generally discussed from a diachronic perspective, the process of change itself originates in individual grammar as a synchronic social phenomenon. Therefore, language change cannot be explained by some diachronic principle alone (or tendency, if it is too strong), as often attempted by historical linguists.

7.5 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have claimed that grammar is not an autonomous entity, but rather a linguistic system developed based on speech production. I have also argued that linguistic categories are first induced from speech production as well, not something given in grammar. Based on this view of grammar, I have discussed the notion of speech community and the relationship between synchrony and diachrony. Although this dissertation alone may not vindicate such ambitious claims beyond doubt, it is my hope that this research will in some way contribute to future studies regarding these fundamental issues, as well as other particular issues that I have discussed in the previous chapters.
APPENDIX A:

Overlaps between GEN ga and GEN no in Man’yôshû (See Chapter 2)

GEN ga and GEN no do not exhibit a clear complementary distribution in Man’yôshû, and the following list provides the nouns with which we can observe both ga-marking and no-marking:

(1) Creatures:

a. aka-gwoma ‘red-horse’; kamo ‘duck’; tadu ‘crane’; tori ‘bird’

a. aka-gwoma ga a-gaki [red-horse GEN foot-scratch] ‘the horse’s steps’
   (MYS 14:3540) (e3)
aka-gwoma no kwoyuru uma-se [red-horse GEN go.over(RT) horse-fence] ‘the horse fence which the red horse goes over’ (MYS 4:530) (zhil)
aka-gwoma no i-yuki pabakaru ma-Kuzupara [red-horse GEN Pref-go(RY) hesitate(RT) Pref-Kuzuhara(p.n.)] ‘Kuzuhara, winch the red horse hesitates to go’ (MYS 12:3069) (zhil)
aka-gwoma no para-bapu tawi [red-horse GEN belly-crawl(RT) rice.field] ‘the rice field on which red horses crawl’ (MYS 19:4260) (zhil)

b. kamo ga ne [duck GEN sound] ‘gaggling of duck’ (MYS 14:3570) (e3)
kamo no papo nosu [duck GEN crawl(RT) like] ‘like ducks crawl’ (MYS 14:3525) (neng2)
kamo no pa-gapi [duck GEN wing-overlap] ‘duck’s wings’ (MYS 1:64) (zhil)
kamo no pa-iro [duck GEN wing-color] ‘duck’s wing color’ (MYS 8:1451, etc.) (nai3, neng2)

c. tadu ga kowe [crane GEN voice] ‘gaggling of cranes’ (MYS 15:3595) (e3)
tadu ga ne [crane GEN sound] ‘gaggling of cranes’ (MYS 10:2138) (e3)
tadu no [crane GEN] ‘like a crane’ (MYS 14:3523, etc.) (nai3)
naku tadu no [cry(RT) crane GEN] ‘like crying cranes’ (MYS 4:509) (nai3)

1 Chinese characters used for GEN ga and no are provided in parentheses after song numbers, e.g. e3 and zhil. See Chapter 1, Section 1.4.1.4 for Chinese characters.
tadu no akatoki no kowe [crane GEN dawn GEN voice] ‘gaggling of cranes in dawn’ (MYS 6:1000) (nai3)
tadu no tomosiki [crane GEN enviable(RT)] ‘the cranes’ enviable move’ (MYS 7:1175) (nai3)

tori ga naku [chicken GEN cackle(RT)] ‘chicken cackling’ (MYS 18:4131, etc.)
(tori ga ne [bird GEN sound] ‘twitter of birds’ (MYS 6:1050) (he4 ‘celebrate’) tori no kowe [bird GEN voice] ‘singing of birds’ (MYS 17:3987, etc.) (neng2, nai3)

tobu tori no [fly(RT) bird GEN] ‘like flying birds’ (MYS 14:3381) (nai3)
tatu tori no [stand(RT) bird GEN] ‘like standing birds’ (MYS 14:3396) (neng2)
so-no tori no [that(mesial) GEN bird GEN] ‘like that bird’ (MYS 3:372) (nai3)

d. Plants:
asi ‘reed’; ume ‘plum tree’; sasa ‘bamboo leaves’; nadesikwo ‘pinks (flower)’; pama-matu ‘beach pine tree’; matu ‘pine tree’; wobana ga [susuki(Japanese pampas grass) GEN] vs. mi-kusa no [water-grass GEN]

a. asi ga naka [reed GEN inside] ‘inside the reeds’ (MYS 14:3445) (e3)
asi ga tiru Nanipa [reed GEN scatter(RT) Naniwa] ‘reed scattering Naniwa’ (MYS 20:4331, etc.) (e3)
asi no pa [reed GEN leaf] ‘reed leaves’ (MYS 14:3570) (neng2)
asi no ne no [reed GEN root GEN] ‘roots of reeds’ (MYS 7:1324) (e3)

b. ume ga ye [plum.tree GEN branch] ‘plum branches’ (MYS 8:1436) (e3)
ume ga pana [plum.tree GEN blossom] ‘plum blossoms’ (MYS 5:837) (he2)
ume ga sidu-ye [plum.tree GEN lower-branch] ‘lower branches of a plum tree’ (MYS 5:827) (e3)

---

2 Tori ga naku is a makura-kotoba (pillow word) for azuma ‘east’.
3 In these particular songs, tori ‘bird’ refers to cuckoos.
4 The phrase asi ga tiru is a makura-kotoba (pillow word) to introduce Nanipa.
5 Asi no ne no is a makura-kotoba (pillow word) to introduce nemokoro ‘being considerate’.
ume no pana [plum.tree GEN blossom] ‘plum blossoms’ (MYS 5:864, etc.) (neng2)
ume no sidu-ye [plum.tree GEN lower-branch] ‘lower branches of a plum tree’
(MYS 5:842) (neng2)
momo-kwi no ume no tiru pana si [hundred-tree GEN plum.tree GEN fall(RT)
blossom Emph] ‘falling blossoms of many plum trees’ (MYS 17:3906) (nai3)
c. sasa ga pa [bamboo.grass GEN leaf] ‘bamboo leaves’ (MYS 20:4431) (e3)
sasa no pa [bamboo.grass GEN leaf] ‘bamboo leaves’ (MYS 2:133, etc.) (si/o)
d. nadesikwo ga pana [pink GEN flower] ‘pinks (flower)’ (MYS 17:4008) (e3)
nadesikwo no pana [pink GEN flower] ‘pinks (flower)’ (MYS 8:1496) (nai3)
e. pama-matu ga ye [beach-pine.tree GEN branch] ‘a branch of a beach pine tree’
(MYS 1:34) (zhil)
pama-matu ga ne [beach-pine.tree GEN root] ‘the root of a beach pine tree’ (MYS 20:4457) (e3)
pama-matu no upe [beach-pine.tree GEN upper.part] ‘above the beach pine trees’
(MYS 3:444) (zhil)
pama-matu no kwi [beach-pine.tree GEN tree] ‘the beach pine tree’ (MYS 9:1716)6
(zhil)
f. matu ga ye [pine.tree GEN branch] ‘a branch of a pine tree’ (MYS 20:4439) (e3)
matu ga ne [pine.tree GEN root] ‘the root of a pine tree’ (MYS 3:431) (zhil)
matu no kwi [pine.tree GEN tree] ‘pine tree’ (MYS 10:1922)7 (nai3)
matu no ke [pine.tree GEN tree] ‘pine tree’ (MYS 20:4375) (neng2)
matu no pa [pine.tree GEN leave] ‘pine tree leaves’ (MYS 4:623) (zhil)
matu no pana [pine.tree GEN blossom] ‘pine tree blossoms’ (MYS 17:3942)
(neng2)
g. wobana ga sita [susuki GEN below] ‘under the susuki (Japanese pampas grass)’
(MYS 10:2270) (e3)
wobana ga ure [susuki GEN end.point] ‘the tops of susuki’ (MYS 8:1577) (e3)
cf. mi-kusa no pana no aye-nu gani [water-grass GEN flower GEN fall(RY)-

---

6 Song 34 and Song 1716 are almost identical, and also the Chinese characters for the GENs are the same.
But one reads ga, and the other no in Taikei and Zenshū.

7 In this song, matu is a pun for ‘pine tree’ and ‘wait (V)’: i.e. a ga matu no kwi so [I GEN wait/pine.tree
GEN tree SFP] ‘I’m waiting, (pine tree)’.
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Perf(SS) like] ‘like water grass flowers are about to fall’ (MYS 10:2272)8 (nai3) cf. mi-kusa no upe [water-grass GEN above] ‘above the water grass’ (MYS 10:1908) (zhi1)

(3) Nouns of personal reference:
imo ‘beloved’; kimi ‘you’; ta ga [who GEN] vs. tare no [who GEN] vs. tare si no [who Emph GEN]; titi-papa ga [father-mother GEN], cf. titi no mwi [chichi(plant) GEN nut] (titi, a pan for ‘father’); tuma ‘mate (wife, husband)’; tegwo/tegwo-na ‘beloved girl’; papa ‘mother’; wakugwo/warapa ‘child’; wotomye ‘girl’

a. imo ga pye [beloved GEN house] ‘beloved’s house’ (MYS 5:844) (e3)
imo no yama [Imo(beloved) GEN mountain] ‘Mt. Imo’ (MYS 13:3318)9 (nai3)
imo se no yama [beloved(female) beloved(male) GEN mountain] ‘Mt Imo and Mt. Se’ (MYS 7:1247, etc.) (neng2, nai3)
imo no ra [beloved GEN(? Dim(?)] ‘beloved’ (MYS 14:3528)10 (neng2)

b. kimi ga ipye-di [you GEN house-road] ‘your road to home’ (MYS 13:3343) (he4)
ki mi ga kokoro [you GEN heart] ‘your heart’ (MYS 20:4482) (e3)
kimi ga mi-pune [you GEN Bt-boat] ‘your boat’ (MYS 15:3656, etc.) (e3)
kimi ga mi-kyesi [you GEN Bt-clothes] ‘your clothes’ (MYS 14:3350) (e3)
mire do aka-zu/ imasi-si kimi ga/ momiti-ba no/ uturi i-yuke ba [see(IZ) Conj get.bored-Neg/ exist(RY)-Evi(RT) you GEN/ colored.leaves GEN/ shift Pref-go(IZ) Conj] ‘Since you, who were not bored seeing, passed away, just like colored leaves fall, ...’ (MYS 3:459) (e3)
kimi ga yo [you GEN age] ‘your age’ (MYS 14:3448, etc.) (e3)
kimi no mi-yo [lord GEN Bt-era] ‘the era of the lord’ (MYS 18:4094, etc.) (neng2)
kimi no mi-na [lord GEN Bt-name] ‘the name of the lord’ (MYS 20:4507) (neng2)

8 Wobana ‘susuki’ and mi-kusa ‘water grass’ are different plants. Nevertheless, it is rather pushing to explain that people felt intimacy for wobana but not for mi-kusa.
9 Two mountains across the Ki River in Wakayama are called Imo no yama [beloved(female) GEN mountain] and Se no yama [beloved(male) GEN mountain].
10 Cf. imo-ro [beloved-Dim(Pl)] (MYS 5:863, 13:3299, etc.); imo na ro [beloved GEN(? Dim(?)] (MYS 14:3446); imo-ro [beloved-Dim(Pl)] (MYS 14:3489, 20:4427).
kimi no imasi-se ba [master GEN exist(RY)-Evi(MZ) Conj] ‘if Master were here, ...
...’ (MYS 3:454)11 (nai3)

c. ta ga ke [who GEN tableware] ‘whose tableware’ (MYS 14:3424) (he4)
ta ga se [who GEN husband] ‘whose husband’ (MYS 20:4425) (e3)
tare no pito [who GEN person] ‘who’ (MYS 8:1547) (e)
tare si no pito mo [who Emph GEN person even] ‘whoever’ (MYS 11:2628)12 (neng2)

d. titi-papa ga nasi no manima ni [father-mother GEN production GEN following(N) at] ‘as our parents gave births to us, ...’ (MYS 9:1804) (he4)
titi-papa ga tono [father-mother GEN palace] ‘my parents’ house’ (MYS 20:4326)13 (e3)
cf. titi no mwi [chichi(plant) GEN nut GEN] ‘chichi nuts’ (MYS 19:4164, etc.)14 (neng2, nai3)

e. tuma ga te [wife GEN arm] ‘wife’s arm’ (MYS 10:2089)15 (e)
tuma ga me [wife GEN eye] ‘wife’s eye’ (MYS 10:2149)16 (zhi)
wa ga tuma no kwo [I GEN wife GEN girl] ‘my wife’ (MYS 2:138)17 (nai3)
so-no tuma no kwo [that(mesial) GEN husband GEN child] ‘that husband’ (MYS 10:2089, etc.) (nai3, neng2)

---

11 It is generally explained that kimi is marked by GEN ga or GEN no, depending on the meaning of kimi. When kimi means ‘you’, it is marked by ga. When it means ‘master, lord’, it is marked by no. While apokimi [big-lord] for ‘lord’ is common in Man'yōshū, the use of kimi for ‘master, lord’ is rather limited, and the ga/no distribution generally follows the explanation above. But compare Song 454 with no and Song 459 with ga, which are two of the six songs that were composed when Ōtomo no Tabito, who was at a very high rank in the court, passed away. It is clear from the endnote to the songs that Song 454 with no was composed by one of Tabito’s servants. However, it is not clear who composed Song 459 with ga. The use of the honorific language imasi ‘exist’ together with GEN ga is curious. His wife, who could apparently have called Tabito ‘kimi’ in conjunction with the use of imasi ‘exist’, had already passed away before Tabito.

12 Note that the demonstrative si ‘that (mesial)’ always takes GEN ga, not no.

13 Zenshū explains that the use of tono ‘palace’ is due to the respect/admiration to the parents, which does not seem to quite agree with GEN ga if it indicates intimacy (and/or a pejorative sense).

14 The word titi is a pun for ‘chichi plant’ and ‘father’. We do not know what kind of plant chichi is now.

15 There are more than 100 uses of tuma ‘mate (wife, husband)’ in Man'yōshū, but there is no clear case of tuma marked by GEN ga.

16 Sō-sakuin reads no, instead of ga.

17 GEN no after tuma in this example and the following example is of appositive use.
"pito-duma no uma yori yuku ni [others-husband GEN horse by go(RT) LOC] ‘while others’ husbands go on horses, ...’ (MYS 13:3314) (nai3)
"topo-duma no koko ni si ara-ne ba [far-wife GEN here LOC Emph exist-Neg Conj] ‘since my remote wife is not here, ...’ (MYS 4:534) (ə)
"wa ga pasi-duma no koto so kayopa-nu [I GEN sweet-wife GEN word KP come(MZ)-Neg(RT)] ‘words of my sweet wife don’t come through’ (MYS 8:1521) (nai3)

f. tegwo ga koto [beloved.girl GEN word] ‘words (contact) with the beloved girl’
(MYS 14:3398) (e3)
"Mama no tegwona ga ari-sika ba [Mama(p.n.) GEN beloved.girl GEN exist(RY)-Evi(IZ) Conj] ‘since Mama-no-tegwbna was there, ...’ (MYS 14:3385) (e3)
"tegwo no yobi-saka [beloved.child GEN call-slope] ‘Tego-no-yobi-saka (Beloved’s calling slope)’ (MYS 14:3442, etc.) (nai3)

18 There is a contrast between “others’ husbands” and “my husband” in the song. Taikei and Zenshū read ono-duma si kati yori yuku ba [I-husband Emph walk by go(IZ) Conj] ‘since my husband go by walk, ...’, while Sō-sakuin reads ono-duma no ... [I-husband GEN ...].

19 It is said that this slope was named after the legend that a female deity called a male deity at this place. The word tegwo is generally regarded as eastern dialects. Note that GEN ga is said to be more common in eastern dialects, but tegwo ‘beloved’ is marked by no in this case.

20 In [NP I GEN mikoto], GEN no is almost always used in front of the word mikoto (e.g. imo no mikoto ‘honorable beloved’ MYS 5:794; oto no mikoto ‘honorable younger brother’ MYS 9:1804; uma no mikoto ‘honorable wife’ MYS 17:3962), except for two instances of kimi ga mikoto ‘your words’ (MYS 2:113, 16:3811), in which mikoto means ‘honorable words’.

21 In this example, wa ga papa no [I GEN mother GEN] can also be analyzed as a subject of a relative clause: Wa ga papa no/ swode moto-nade te/ wa ga kara ni/ naki-si kokoro wο/ wasure-e-nu kamo [I GEN mother GEN/ sleeve by.using-stroke/ I GEN sake for/ weep-Evi feeling ACC/ forget-can.do-Neg SFP] ‘My mother’s feeling, she wept for me, stroking with her sleeves, (I) can’t forget it’.
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h. wakugwo ga mwi [baby GEN body] ‘baby’s body’ (MYS 16:3791) (wen2)
warapa ga mwi [child GEN body] ‘child’s body’ (MYS 16:3791) (wen2)
ta-warapa no goto [hand-child GEN as] ‘like a child’ (MYS 2:129) (nai3)
ta-warapa no [hand-child GEN] ‘like a child’ (MYS 4:619) (zhil)

i. wotomye ga mo [girl GEN skirt] ‘the girl’s skirt’ (MYS 15:3661) (e3)
wotomye-ra ga aka-mo [girl-Pl GEN red-skirt] ‘the girls’ red skirts’ (MYS 15:3610) (e3)
Patusu-wotomye ga te ni makye~ru/ tama p a ... [Hatsuse(p.n.)-girl GEN wrist LOC curl-Res(RT)/ gem TOP ...] ‘the gems which Hatsuse girl curled up to her wrist’ (MYS 3:424) (e3)
Unapi-wotomye no okutukwi [Unai(p.n.)-girl GEN tomb] ‘Unai girl’s tomb’ (MYS 9:1801, etc.) (nai3)
Katori-wotomye no yupi-si pimo [Katori(p.n.)-girl GEN tie-Evi string] ‘the string which Katori girl tied’ (MYS 14:3427) (e3)
cf. wotomye-ra si [girl-Pl Emph] ‘girls’ (MYS 10:1879) (si4)
cf. unemye no swode [servant.woman GEN sleeve] ‘sleeves of servant women’ (MYS 1:51) (nai3)
cf. tawaya-mye no [gentle-woman GEN] ‘like a gentle woman’ (MYS 6:935) (nai3)
cf. tawaya-mye no matwopi [gentle-woman GEN delusion] ‘delusion regarding the gentle woman’ (MYS 6:1019) (nai3)

22 This example and the next one are Taikei readings. But it notes that this reading disagrees with the A/B type distinction: mwi ‘body’ is of B type (otu), but the Chinese character that is used here is of A type (kô) (i.e. mî ‘see’). A possibility of incorrect hand-copying is suggested. On the other hand, Zenshû reads wakigwo-gami [baby-hair] and warapa-gami [child-hair]. The syllable mi in kamî ‘hair’ is of A type, and there are some descriptions about kamî in the song. However, the character wen2 ‘mosquito’, which is used in this phrase, is never used for a part of kamî ‘hair’ in Man’yôshû. Also, the clear occurrence of kamî in this song is written with one Chinese character for ‘hair’. The character wen2 ‘mosquito’ is sometimes used for GEN ga in Man’yôshû.

23 This song was composed by Shiki no miko ‘Prince Shiki’, who must not have had any honorific feeling for unemye ‘servant woman’; this GEN no must be neutral.

24 Tawaya-mye is Taikei’s reading. It is actually written with two Chinese characters for ‘servant’ and ‘woman’. Zenshû reads omi-no-mye [servant-GEN-woman]. Tawaya-mye seems too general in the context.

25 Tawaya-mye [gentle-woman] makes a pair with masura-wo [brave-man], which is always marked by no when it is marked by a genitive particle (e.g. MYS 804, 1183, 1800, 2354, 3921, 4011, 4220, etc.).

26 Tawaya-mye no matwopi refers to a misconduct with the widow of Fujiwara no Umakai.
cf. tawaya-mye no/ omopi midare te/ nupye-ru koromo so [gentle-woman GEN/ feeling get.disorganized Conj/ sew-Res(RT) clothes SFP] ‘(this is) the clothes which I (the helpless woman) sewed while losing my wits’ (MYS 15:3753) 27 (neng2)

(4) Others:
  kamwi ‘god/deity/spirit’; pimo ‘string’
  a. kamwi ga two [deity GEN gate] ‘the deity’s straits’ (MYS 7:1216) 28 (e3)
      kamwi no watari [deity GEN straits] ‘the deity’s straits’ (MYS 13:3335, 3339) (zhil)
      kamwi no mi-saka [deity GEN Bt-slope] ‘the deity’s slope’ (MYS 20:4402) (nai3)
      kamwi no mi-yo [deity GEN Bt-era] ‘the deities’ era’ (MYS 1:38) (nai3)
  b. pimo ga wo [string GEN string] ‘string’ (MYS 20:4404) 29 (e3)
      pimo no musubi [string GEN not] ‘the not of the string’ (MYS 12:2975) (zhil)
      pimo no wo [string GEN string] ‘string’ (MYS 12:2982) (zhil)

27 In this song, tawaya-mye refers to the composer herself. If GEN ga had been an indicator of intimacy/closeness/humbleness, she could have used ga. Thus, the use of no in this example is lexically determined, rather than consulting the pejorative/honorific distinction.

28 Zenshû explains that this use of ga for ‘the deity’ is due to the fear towards the deity in this song. However, as seen in the next example, GEN no is used in the same context.

29 The song was composed by a person from Kamitsukeno (Gunma prefecture), and Zenshû notes that this is a dialectal use of ga.
APPENDIX B:

GEN tu in Man’yōshū (See Chapter 2)

The following is a list of uses of GEN tu in Man’yōshū: 30, 31

*ama-tu-kamwi* [heaven/sky-GEN-deity] (5:904)
*ama-tu-kwiri* [-mist] (7:1079)
*ama-tu-sirusi* [-mark] ‘Milky Way’ (10:2007, etc.)
(cf. *ama-nu-gapa* [-river] ‘Milky Way’ (15:3658, etc.))
*ama-ty-swora* [-sky] (12:2887)
*ama-tu-pire* [-scarf] (10:2041)
*ama-tu-mikadwo* [-palace] (2:199)
*ama-tu-midu* [-water] (2:167, etc.) (MKR for *apugi*) (RY) ‘look up’

*tu-tose* [5-GEN-year] ‘five years’ (5:880)

*ipo-tu-tori* [500-GEN bird] ‘many birds’ (17:4011)
*ipo-tu-tudwopi* [500-GEN beads] ‘many beads’ (18:4105)
*ipo-tu-tuna* [500-GEN rope] ‘many ropes’ (19:4274)

*ipye-tu-tori* [house-GEN-bird] (13:3310) (MKR for *kakye* ‘chicken’)

*umi-tu-di* [sea-GEN-path] (9:1781)

---

30 This list follows the 50-on order. The underlined *tu* indicates that there is a Chinese character assigned to GEN *tu*. All examples are grouped by the first morpheme(s). Only the gloss for the last morpheme(s) in each example is provided except for the first example in each group. Morpheme/word separation is sometimes difficult to decide, but all examples are presented as [X-tu-Y]. “MKR” stands for *makura-kotoba* (pillow word), “JKT” for *jo-kotoba* (preface), and “p.n.” for “place name”.

31 Examples in other materials include, for example: in *Norito* (Minazuki no tsugomori no ḍiharse), *kuni-tu-tumi* [earth-GEN-sin] ‘sin on the earth’, *ama-tu-tumi* [heaven-GEN-sin] ‘sin in the heaven’, *taka-tu-kamwi* [high(Root)-GEN-deity] ‘thunder’, and *taka-tu-tori* [high(Root)-GEN-bird] ‘flying bird’; in *Kojiki*, *naka-tu-kuni* [middle-GEN-country] ‘this world (between Heaven and Hades)’, *Ama-tu-kuni-tama-no-kamwi* [heaven-GEN-country-gem-GEN-deity] (a deity’s name), and *naka-tu-mikwo* [middle-GEN-prince] (a prince’s name); and in *Nihonshoki*, *oki-tu-mo* [offing-GEN-seaweed] (Song 4), *toyo-atu-tu-pime* [It-Ata(p.n.)-GEN-princess] (preface to Song 4), *muka-tu-wo* [far-side-GEN-summit] (Song 108), *pama-tu-tidori* [beach-GEN-plover] (Song 4), *pina-tu-my* [countryside-GEN-woman] (Song 3), *yamye-tu-pimye* [Yame(p.n.)-GEN-princess] (Book 7, Keikau 18-nen), *yomo-tu-siko-mye* [Hades-GEN-ugly-woman] (Book 1, Kamiyo, J6), and *yomo-tu-piraxaka* [Hades-GEN-Hirasaka(p.n.)] (Book 1, Kamiyo, J6).
"oki-tu-ariswo [offing-GEN-reefy.coast] (11:2739) (a part of JKT)"
"oki-tu-ikuri [-reef] (6:933)"
"oki-tu-kaiz [-oar] (2:153)"
"oki-tu-kaze [-wind] (15:3616, etc.)"
"oki-tu-kadi [-oar] (7:1205)"
"oki-tu-Karishi [-Karishima(p.n.)] (6:1024) (a part of JKT)"
"oki-tu-two-sima [-small-island] (7:1401)"
"oki-tu-kuni [-country] (16:3888)"
"oki-tu-sipo-sawi [-roars.of.the.sea] (15:3710)"
"oki-tu-sima [-island] (18:4103, etc.)"
"oki-tu-sima-mori [-island-guard] (4:596)"
"oki-tu-sima-yama [-island-mountain] (11:2439) (a part of JKT)"
"oki-tu-sira-tama [-white-gem] (15:3628, etc.)"
"oki-tu-sira-nami [-white-wave] (15:3629)"
"oki-tu-su [-sandbank] (7:1176, etc.)"
"oki-tu-tama-mo [-gem-seaweed] (7:1168, etc.)"
"oki-tu-tori [-bird] (6:928, etc.) (MKR for Adihu (p.n.))"
"oki-tu-napa-nori [-rope-seaweed] (15:3663, etc.) (a part of JKT)"
"oki-tu-nami [-wave] (15:3583, etc.)"
"oki-tu-Pukaye (wata no soko/oki tu [-sea GEN bottom/offing GEN] is JKT for Fukae (p.n.)) (5:813)"
"oki-tu-ma-kamo [-wild.duck] (a part of JKT) (14:3524)"
"oki-tu-mi-ura [-Bt-bay] (15:3646)"
"oki-tu-mi-kamwi [-Bt-deity]"
"oki-tu-miyapye [-shrine] (18:4122)"
"oki-tu-mo [-seaweed] (2:131, etc.)"
(oki-tu-mo no: MKR for nabiku ‘flutter’)"

"oku-tu-kwi [inner.part-GEN-grave] ‘grave’ (18:4096, etc.)"

"Kami-tu-ke nwo ‘Kamitsukeno (p.n.)’ (14:3417, etc.)"
"kami-tu-se [upper.part-GEN-shallow] (1:38, etc.)"
"kami-tu-pusa ‘Kamitsufusa (p.n.)’ (14:3348, etc.)"
"kami-tu-yoporo [-drafted.servant] (20:4329, etc.)"

"kuni-tu-kamwi [earth-GEN-deity] (5:904)"
"kuni-tu-mi-kamwi [Bt-deity] (1:33, etc.)"
(cf. Kuni-no-miyakwo [Kuni(p.n.)]-GEN-capital] (3:475, etc.), kuni-no-kami [state-GEN-head] (12:3098, etc.))

"saki-tu-tosi [ahead-GEN-year]"

"siko-tu-okina [fool(Bd)-GEN-old.man] (17:4011)"
(cf. siko-no-mi-tate [-Bt-shield] (20:4373), siko-no siko-kusa ‘foolish grass’ (12:3062), siko-ya ‘shabby hut’ (13:3270), siko-pototogisu ‘foolish cuckoo’ (8:1507))

"sima-tu-tori [island-GEN-bird] (17:4011) (MKR for u ‘cormorant’)"
Simo-ty-ke' nwo 'Shimotsukeno (p.n.)' (14:3424, etc.)
simo-ty-se [lower.part-GEN-shallow] (1:38, etc.)
Simo-ty-pusa 'Shimotsufusa (p.n.)' (14:3349, etc.)
Simo-ty-mike 'Shimotsumike (p.n.)' (15:3644)

Tanabata-ty-mye [loom-GEN-woman] 'female weaver; Orihime' (10:2027, etc.)

Tama-ty-sima [gem-GEN-island] 'Tamatsushima (p.n.)' (7:1215)
Tama-ty-sima-yama [gem-GEN-island-mountain] 'Tamatsushima (p.n.)' (6:917)
(cf. Tama-ng-ira [-bay] 'Tamanoura')

toki-ty-kaze [time-GEN-wind] (2:220, etc.)

toko-ty-mikadwo [eternity(Bd)-GEN-palace] (2:174)
(cf. toko-pa [-leaf] (14:3436, etc.))

two-ty-miya(dokoro) [outside-GEN-palace] (13:3231, etc.)

topo-ty-asuka-no-miya [far(Root)-Asuka-GEN-palace] (2:90)

topo-ty-Apumi [-Ômi(p.n.)] (14:3429, etc.)
(cf. tika-ty-Apumi [close(Root)-GEN-Ômi(p.n.)])

topo-ty-Opoura [-Ôura(p.n.)] (11:2729)

topo-ty-kamwi [-deity] (1:5, etc.) (MKR for opokimi 'emperor')
(cf. topo-ty-imô [-beloved] (11:2460) in Sô-sakun, based on the Kan'ei text, but topo-ki-
imo in Taikei and Zenshû, based on the Nishi Honganji text)

topo-ty-kamu [-deity] (18:4096, etc.)

topo-ty-kuni [-country] (9:1804) 'the other world'
(cf. topo-ty-kuni 'far country (i.e. Korea)' (15:3688))

topo-ty-pito [-person] (5:857, etc.) (MKR for matu 'wait')
(cf. topo-duma [-wife] (7:1294, etc.), topo-to [-sound] (4:531, etc.), topo-ng-mikadwo [-
court] (15:3688, etc.)

Naka-ty-ye [middle-GEN-branch] (13:3239)
(cf. po-ty-ye (19:4289, etc.), sidu-ye 'lower part branch' (13:3239)32)

Nipa-ty-tori [yard-GEN-bird] (7:1413, etc.) (MKR for kakye 'chicken')
(cf. nipu-kusa [-grass] (10:2160))

Nwo-ty-tori [field-GEN-bird] (13:3310) (MKR for kigisi 'pheasant')
Sa-nwo-ty-tori [Pref-field-GEN-bird] 'pheasant' (16:3791)

Pana-ty-duma [flower-GEN-wife] (14:3370)

Pye-ty-kai [beach-GEN-oar] (1:153)
Pye-ty-nami [-wave] (6:931, etc.)
(cf. pye-nami (3:247, etc.))
Pye-ty-pye [-side] (3:257, etc.)
(cf. oki-tye 'offing side' (3:257, etc.))
Pye-ty-mo [-seaweed] (7:1206)

32 The morpheme sidu seems to be the same root as in sidum- 'sink', siduka 'being quiet', and siduku 'a
drop'; du does not seem to be a genitive morpheme.

426
po-ty-ye [jut-GEN-branch] 'upper part branch' (19:4289, etc.)
(cf. naka-ty-ye (13:3239), sidu-ye 'lower part branch' (13:3239))
(cf. ipa-po 'big tall rock' (20:4454))
po-ty-taka [jut-GEN-hawk] 'distinguished hawk' (17:4011)

mi-ke-ty-kuni [Bt-food-GEN-country] (6:933, etc.)

mi-wo-ty-kusi [water-stream-GEN-stick] (14:3429, etc.)

muka-ty-wo [far.side(Bd)-GEN-ridge] (14:3448, etc.)
(cf. muka-baki [-attachment] (16:3825), muka-busu [-lie.down] (5:800, etc.))

moto-ty-pito [past-GEN-person] (20:4437)
(cf. moto-pye [basis-side] vs. suwe-pye [end-side] (13:3222))

momo-dy-sima [hundred-GEN-island]33 (14:3367) (MKR for asigara-obune 'small boat made in Ashigara (p.n.)')
(cf. ipo-ty-tori [500-GEN-bird] (17:4011), momo-na pito [100-GEN person] 'many people' (NS, Song 11))

yama-ty-mi [mountain-GEN-spirit] (1:38)

yu-ty-ipamura [holy(Root)-GEN-rock.crowd] (1:22)
(cf. yu-sasa [-bamboo.grass] (10:2336), yu-tane [-seed] (7:1110))

wata-ty-mi [sea-GEN-spirit] (15:3597, etc.)
(cf. wata-no-soko [-bottom] (7:1223, etc.) MKR for oki 'offing')

woto-ty-pi [far.place(Bd)-GEN-day] (17:4011, etc.)

---

33 For the genitive in 'many islands', the Chinese character dou3 'bean' is used. Taikei reads du, while Zenshù reads tu.
APPENDIX C:
Subjects Marked by Genitives (See Chapter 4)

The following lists provide numbers for the songs which contain ga-marked subjects or no-marked subjects in Man'yōshū. Refer to Chapter 4 for some notes on the lists. Indexes in Sō-sakuin is arranged by Chinese characters, so that the song numbers provided below may go back to lower numbers when a different Chinese character is used for ga or no. Character breaks are indicated by a slash and semicolon. Book numbers are provided in square brackets [] only when they change. Notes in parentheses () are supplementary and may not be comprehensive. For both ga and no, the lists follow the order of Relative Clauses, RT main clauses (rentai-dome), IZ clauses, Headless RT-nominals, Ku-nominalized clauses, MZ clauses, RY clauses, Sa-nominalized clauses, To [Comp] clauses, Goto/gotosi/gotoku, SS clauses, Tutu [while] clauses, Gani clauses, Mi-nominalized clauses, and Unclear/non-SUB.

1. Man'yōshū songs which contain ga-marked subjects

RT main clauses (rentai-dome): [5] 795 (ka), 810 (ka mo), 887 (ka), 891 (ya); [14] 3351 (no KP), 3357 (ka), 3381 (so?), 3404 (ka), 3459 (ka), 3474 (ka), 3495 (ya), 3524 (so), 3539 (no KP), 3549 (ka mo); [15] 3589 (so), 3590 (so), 3633 (ya), 3663 (no KP), 3669 (ya), 3690 (ya), 3749 (ka); [17] 3936 (ya), 3938 (ya), 3998 (so), 4014 (ka mo); [18] 4106 (ka mo); [20] 4357 (so?), 4430 (to < so), 4439 (ya), 4497 (ya)/; [5] 804 (ka), 872 (ka mo)/; [14] 3473 (ka), 3552 (? no KP)/; [1] 20 (ya), 60 (ka); [2] 106 (ka), 206 (no KP), 223 (ka mo); [3] 327 (so), 421 (ka mo); [4] 490 (ya, TM, miyuru), 617 (ka, TM), 621 (no KP, TM), 662 (no KP, TM), 680 (ka mo), 745 (ya, TM), 767 (ka); [6] 984 (ya), 1008 (no KP, RT-clause omitted); [7] 1078 (ka mo, RY_RT), 1169 (ka_RY_RT), 1360 (ka); [8] 1501 (ya), 1519 (ka), 1583 (no KP); [9] 1666 (ka), 1730 (ka), 1807 (no KP); [10] 1918 (ya), 1988 (ya), 2039 (no KP); [11] 2549 (no KP, TM), 2560 (ya), 2569 (ya, TM), 2639 (ya), 2669 (no KP, SS?); [12] 2890 (ka mo), 2917 (ka), 2925 (ya), 2965 (ya?), 3000 (no KP), 3117 (ka_RY_RT), 3192 (ka), 3193 (ka), 3202 (ka mo), 3213 (ka); [13] 3318 (so), 3344 (ka_RT-to)/; [4] 685 (ya).


34 Following Zenshû, -naku ni is regarded as ku-nominalization of -zu 'Neg' plus ni. I did not provide notes for -naku ni in parentheses.
Goto/gotosi/gotoku.\textsuperscript{35} [16] 3835 (?), kimi ga pige naki gotosi, topic-like.


2. Man'yōshū songs which contain no-marked subjects


As noted in Chapter 4, GEN ga in [NP-ga goto] is regarded as connecting two nominals, and it is not counted here. What is counted in this category is a possible subject marking GEN in [NP GEN Pred(RT) (ga) goto].

This is an example of such cases, and I did not record all of them.


\(^{37}\) In this example, ipape, the IZ form, is treated as a noun. It is rare that IZ forms function as free nouns in sentences.
APPENDIX D:
Semantic Theme Marking Particles (See Chapter 5)

(1) The following list presents song numbers for the examples with posi ‘desirable’ in Man’yōshū in which we find theme markers (TMs). TMs are provided in parentheses:

a. *mi ga posi* [seeing GEN desirable(SS)] ‘want to see’:
   18:4112 (pa); 19:4169 (no); 19:4176 (no); 3:324 (si); 6:1047 (no); 18:4111 (pa)

b. *ki posi* [wear(RY) desirable(SS)] ‘want to wear’:
   14:3350 (si)

c. *ki posiku* [wear(RY) desirable(RY)] ‘want to wear’:
   7:1311 (pa)

d. *ki posiki* [wear(RY) desirable(RT)] ‘want to wear’:
   7:1314 (no)

e. *V-maku posi* [V-Conjec(Ku) desirable(SS)] ‘want to V’:
   11:2559 (ga)

f. *V-maku posiki* [V-Conjec(Ku) desirable(RT)] ‘want to V’:
   3:285 (no), in *makura kotoba* and 0.5 count.

g. *V-maku posikye do* [V-Conjec(Ku) desirable(IZ) Conj] ‘want to V, but ...’:
   7:1297 (o)

h. *V-maku posikyeka* [V-Conjec(Ku) desirable(Ku)] ‘want to V’:
   11:2666 (no)
(2) The following list presents song numbers for the examples with poru ‘want’ in Man'yōshū in which we find theme markers (TMs). TMs are provided in parentheses:

a. nagaku pori suru/sure/se-mu [long(RY) want(RY) do(RT)/do(K)/do(MZ)-Vol(RT)]:
   6:975 (wo); 11:2358 (wo); 11:2416 (wo mo); 12:2868 (wo)

b. V-maku pori [V-Conjec(Ku) want(RY)] ‘want to V’
   19:4209 (wo); 4:560 (wo); 4:778 (ə); 6:984 (wo ya); 7:1104 (wo); 7:1282 (ə);
   7:1302 (ə); 7:1318 (wo); 7:1391 (ə); 8:1516 (wo); 9:1753 (wo); 10:1943 (ə);
   11:2381 (wo); 11:2592 (ə); 11:2682 (ə)

c. V-maku pore koso [V-Conjec(Ku) want(IZ) KP] ‘want to V’:
   4:704 (wo)38

(3) The following list presents volume numbers and page numbers in the Taikei version of Genji monogatari for examples of -mafosi in which we find theme markers (TMs). TMs are provided in parentheses:

a. RY: mafosiu/mafosiku
     5:354; 5:429
   no: 1:190; 3:121
   wo: 2:182; 3:117 (wo mo: 2 themes for one predicate); 4:18 (wo safe); 4:298 (wo mo);
     4:309 (wo mo); 4:361 (wo mo); 4:471; 5:158; 5:348
   pa: 1:236; 4:248; 4:254
   KP: 4:450 (zo)

b. SS: mafosi
   ə: 5:400
   mo: 4:449; 5:294

c. RT: mafosiki
   no: 4:89
   wo: 2:432; 3:333; 5:131
   pa: 1:113; 5:100

38 Sō-sakuin and Taikei read this example (MYS 4:704) as pore koso, while Zenshū reads as pori koso.


KP: 1:204 (nan); 2:68 (zo); 3:338 (nan)

d. IZ: mafosikere
   no: 3:106; 3:311
   wo: 3:196; 4:198; 5:145 (wo ba)
   pa: 1:32; 4:237

e. RY: mafosikari
   a: 2:337; 4:84
   mo: 4:41

f. RT: mafosi-garu
   wo: 1:292 (wo danī)
   mo: 2:143

g. SS: mafosi-ge nari
   a: 1:133 (Head Internal Relative Clause)

h. RT: mafosi-ge naru
   a: 5:251
   no: 4:341

i. IZ: mafosi-ge nare
   mo: 1:206

j. NP: mafosi-ge ni
   wo: 5:124
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