Preface

The third international conference on historical linguistics organized by the Institute of English, Adam Mickiewicz University, at Blażejewko near Poznań, was devoted to historical syntax. It aroused a lot of interest and enthusiasm among linguists and forced the organizers to increase the number of invited scholars to over a hundred from the originally planned sixty. Alas, the political unrest in Poland in March 1981 reduced the ranks of participants finally to the number of 46 courageous ones, who came to the conference to present and defend their own ideas and debate the ideas of their colleagues thereby contributing to a further development of their field of interest. To all of them go our sincerest words of thanks. Their lively participation, endless discussions in the conference room and outside allowed many to clarify their views and revise the final versions of papers printed in this volume.

The present volume contains a selection of twenty-nine papers and two comments on papers (Martinet and Vennemann). Out of those twenty-nine, thirteen papers were not presented and discussed at the conference (i.e., Akiba-Reynolds, Birnbaum, Hamp, Harris, Mitchell, Mithun, Pilch, Ramat, Rissanen, Romaine, Rudes, Seefranz-Montag, Stockwell and Winter) but have been included here with the permission of their authors.

The papers cover a wide range of issues within different theoretical paradigms from traditional to advanced transformational-generative. Among the more central theoretical problems confronting a historical syntactician appear, for example, syntactic change, syntactic reconstruction and typology in historical syntax. All these issues found an appropriate place at the conference and consequently in the present volume.

Numerous contributions in the volume refer to particular developments in the history of syntax of various languages. Among them several papers are concerned with non-Indo-European languages.

The Blażejewko conference has not solved or even attempted to solve any particular problems of historical syntax. It seems that the prevailing atmosphere there as well as the tenor of the papers included in the present volume adequately characterize the situation in historical syntax today, a search for
theoretical solutions in the atmosphere of general confusion in syntactic
theory paralleled by data-oriented research concerning various details of
syntax.

We hope that in this situation the conference and the present volume con­
tain at least some elements which can be considered a step forward, even if a
small one, towards a better understanding of some fundamental and several
perhaps less fundamental but still important aspects of historical syntax.

The Blażejewko conference could not have materialized without the sup­
port of the Adam Mickiewicz University Vice Rector for Research and
Foreign Exchanges, Professor Stefan Kozarski, to whom we owe our deep
gratitude.

The efficiency and administrative skills of Barbara Plocińska, M.A., have,
as usual, guaranteed the smooth progress of the conference and have contrib­
uted to its success.

Joznari, July 1981

Jacek Fisiak
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Internal reconstruction in pre-Japanese syntax*

In this paper, I will propose a reconstruction of part of the pre-Japanese syntax based on synchronic data from Old Japanese (approx. 8–10th century) and will discuss some consequences of the proposed reconstruction for the theory of internal reconstruction and the question of the genetic affinities of the Japanese language.

1. There are a number of problems in Old Japanese grammar that defy synchronic solutions and thus call for historical explanations. The problems relevant for the present reconstruction all involve ni.

1.1 Case particle ni

In Old Japanese sentences, oblique nominals including locatives, datives, directionals and temporals were marked with the same particle ni as illustrated in the examples below.²

(1) Okina ... toguti ni wori.  
   Okina door OBL be=U  
   ‘Okina was at the door.’ (T, 61)

(2) kana me ni yuki=i-te ...  
   that house OBL go=I-SS  
   ‘(he) went to that house, and .. .’ (T, 31)

(3) kono tuki no zyuugo-ni ni ... hito-bito maudeko-n· zu.  
   this month ASS fifteen-day OBL people come=4-FUT-EMPH  
   ‘The people will surely come ... on the fifteenth day of this month.’ (T, 59–60)

(4) onna ni kahar=i-te ...  
   woman OBL substitute=I-SS  
   ‘(I) substitute for the woman, and .. .’ (Ise, 174)
One can notice that the semantic range of the case marked with *ni* was much wider than any known oblique case. A more curious fact about this case particle is that it was followed by *te*, a conjunctive particle, when the oblique nominal was not an argument (i.e., complement) nominal as seen in the following examples.

(5) Mukas: yama *ni-te* mituk=e-tar=U.
long ago mountain OBL.SS find =I-PERF-URU
'(She) is the one that (I) found on a mountain long ago.'
(T, 56)

(6) Mine *ni-te* su- be=ki yau osh=e-
mountain+peak OBL.SS do=URU must=KI way teach=I-
tamah=U.
HON=U
'(He) taught (them) the way (they) must do at the mountain peak.'
(T, 67)

The conjunctive particle *te* was used more typically to conjoin clauses, being suffixed to the Conjunctive Form (to be discussed shortly) of a verb or auxiliary at the end of the first clause to be conjoined. It also had the function of indicating that the subjects of the clauses on both sides are the same in reference. For example:

(7) kore wo mi-te, hune yori or=e-te, "..." to toh=U.
this DO see=I-SS boat from alight=I-SS COMP ask=U
'(He) saw this, alighted from the boat, and asked, "..."'
(T, 38)

The *te* in examples like (5) and (6), therefore, must be treated as an exception in the synchronic grammar of Old Japanese if *te* is analyzed as a conjunctive particle, as is generally accepted among Japanese grammarians. And the question "Why did it exceptionally occur with the case particle *ni*?" remains to be answered.

1.2 Copula *ni*

In Old Japanese, a verb assumed slightly different forms largely depending on the syntactic or semantic context where it occurred. This phenomenon has traditionally been treated as conjugation by Japanese grammarians. Major conjugational forms and their contexts are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>Type-I</th>
<th>Type-II</th>
<th>Type-III</th>
<th>Type-IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Unrealized    | Stem=a- | Stem=e- | Stem=i-  | Stem=\$
| Conjugative   | Stem=i- | Stem=e- | Stem=i-  | Stem=\$
| Final         | Stem=u  | Stem=u  | Stem=u   | Stem=ru
| Nominal       | Stem=u  | Stem=uru| Stem=uru | Stem=ru
| Realized      | Stem=e- | Stem=ure| Stem=ure | Stem=ru

Most of the Old Japanese verbs belonged to Type-I, -II or -III. Type-IV verbs, the stem of which consists of a single consonant and *i*, were limited in number. In addition to these regular verbs, there were several irregular verbs.

Curious was the fact that not only main verbs but also auxiliary suffixes expressing voice, honorification and tense-aspect conjugated exactly in the same manner except that some of them did not fully conjugate. The predicate consisting of a main verb and one or more auxiliary suffixes, therefore, had a dual structure as illustrated in Figure 1.

The similarity in the conjugational pattern between the verb and the auxiliary suffix may very well be taken as due to the verbal origin of the auxiliary suffixes. In fact, most of the auxiliary suffixes are identical with or similar to some main verbs in the phonological form. (E.g., *ki*: PAST is identical with *ki*, the Conjunctive Form of *ku* 'to come,' and *tamahu*: HONORIFIC with *tamahu* 'to give.') The conjugational suffixes are, on the other hand, ex-
(9) kehahi share nar=i.
appearance pitiful COP=U
'the appearance was pitiful (i.e., It appeared to be pitiful).'

It is well established that the copula nari was derived from ni-ari through a standard fusional process ia→a. This is evidenced by the fact that ni appeared unchanged in honorific copular sentences or in emphatic sentences in which the condition for the fusion was not met. The following sentences illustrate this point.

(10) sama no yo=ki hito ni ohas=ni.
appearance also good=KI person NI be+HON=U
'(he) is a person whose appearance also is good.'

(11) tama no eda ni zo ar=i-ker=ni.
jewel ASS spray NI EMPH be=I-PAST=URU
'(it) was a jewel spray, indeed.'

There is no doubt about the change ni-ari→nari. What is more curious is the ni. What was it? Where did it come from?

A clue to these questions seems to come from the fact that ni alone appeared as the copula in the Conjunctive position and the conjunctive particle te directly followed it as seen in the following sentence.

(12) tuki no miyako no hito ni-te moon ASS City+Royal ASS person Ni-SS

'titi haha ar=ni.
father mother be=U
'(I) am a person from the City Royal of Moonland, and have a father and a mother.'

This is one of the two major positions in which the Conjunctive Form of the verb or auxiliary suffix occurred. In the other position, i.e., the position followed by an auxiliary suffix, the copula nari exhibited its regular conjunctival pattern as in the following example.

(13) mi-si-hito nar=i-ker=i.
see=PAST=URU person COP=I-PAST=U
'(it) was a person (I) had seen.'

This distributional irregularity gives rise to another question: Why did ni alone occur in the conjunctive position while the regular Conjunctive Form nari was available in the pre-auxiliary position?

Some Japanese grammarians contend that the ni in these examples was the case particle ni. Such analysis, however, does not answer the above questions.
and it is rather difficult to understand why the predicate nominal was regularly marked as an oblique nominal. The formal identity between the ni in question and the case particle ni certainly needs to be explained, if it was not accidental, but the explanation must also answer the above questions concerning the ni in copular sentences.

1.3 Auxiliary nu

Another morpheme which should be taken into account together with the oblique case particle ni and the copula particle ni is the perfect auxiliary nu, which is often compared with tu, another Old Japanese perfect auxiliary. Here are examples of nu and tu in the Conjunctive and Final Form.

**Conjunctive**

(14) ito yowa=ku nar=i: tamah=i· ker=i.
    very weak=KU become=/·Hon=/·PERF=/·PAST=U
    ‘(he) had become very weak.’  (T, 53)
(15) Ohoku no hito koros=i·t=e· ker=u kokoro
    many ASS person kill=I-PERF=I-PAST=URU mind
    ‘.the mind (with which) (she) had killed many people.’
    (T, 55)

**Final**

(16) Yatuhasi to ih=u tokoro ni itar=i·n=u.
    Yatuhasi COMP call=URU place OBL arrive=I-PERF=U
    ‘(He) has arrived at a place called Yatuhasi’.  (Isé, 116)
(17) Akita Nayotake=no=Kaguyahime to tuk=e· r=u.
    Akita Nayotake=no=Kaguyahime COMP name=I-PERF=U
    ‘Akita named (her) Nayotake=no=Kaguyahime.’  (T, 30)

Although the functional differences between the two auxiliaries are not clearly summarizable, they were not interchangeable in Old Japanese. The following discrepancies in distribution are observed among other things.

(i) Causative predicates (derived or lexical) took only tu and passives only nu with some exceptions.

(ii) Typical action verbs (e.g. kudaku ‘to crash,’ huru ‘to shake,’ and musubu ‘to tie’) took only tu and nonaction verbs (e.g. aku ‘to dawn,’ aru ‘to become devastated’ and saku ‘to bloom’) only nu.

It seems that tu was used when an animate subject, i.e. agent, was involved, emphasizing completion of an action by the agent, while nu was less restricted as to the animacy of the subject and it was perhaps used to focus on the state resulting from a completed action.

The etymology of these auxiliaries is far from being clear. It is generally contended among Japanese grammarians (e.g., Matsumura 1971) that nu and tu had come from verbs inu ‘to go away’ and utu ‘to throw away,’ respectively. Ide (1969) objects to this and suggests that there were main verbs nu ‘to go away’ and tu ‘to throw away’ to begin with which often occurred with prefixes i and u, respectively, and that it was this main verb nu that changed into the Old Japanese auxiliary nu. However, these conjectures have no support except for the formal and semantic resemblances.

I would like to call attention to a fact that has so far been completely overlooked, i.e., the formal identity of the Conjunctive Form of the auxiliary nu with the two particles we have just discussed. This may be crucial for the history of this perfect auxiliary suffix as well as that of the copula particle ni and the case particle ni. Furthermore, the fact that the Conjunctive Form of the auxiliary tu and the same-subject marking conjunctive particle te had the same form may not be accidental.

2. In order to answer the questions raised above, I stipulate that there was a locative BE *nu at a certain stage of pre-Japanese. By “locative BE” I mean a verb which takes an unmarked locative nominal as one of the arguments. The following Twi sentence depicts a locative sentence with such a BE-verb.

(18) sukuu w? Kumase.
    school be+at Kumase.
    ‘The school is at Kumase’.

The locative nominal Kumase is not particularly marked as such but the meaning of the verb w? signals that Kumase is a locative nominal. Locative verbs like w? are not rare in world languages. Clark (1970) mentions several languages including Syrian Arabic, Eskimo and Kurukh as having such verbs.

If we assume that the perfect auxiliary nu, the copula particle ni and the case particle ni were all derived from this locative verb, we can account for all the attested forms as in Table 3.
Although the conjugation of the perfect auxiliary nu was irregular, most of the forms were the same as those of the Type-I verb. It is likely that the auxiliary IIU was originally conjugated as a Type-I verb but underwent some minor changes in the Nominal and Realized Forms. There are two factors that possibly implemented the modification of the conjunctive pattern of nu. Compare the conjugation of the reconstituted locative BE-verb *nu with those of the auxiliary nu and the negative suffix zu in Table 4.10

Table 4: Conjugation of *nu, tu, nu and zu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*nu</th>
<th>tu</th>
<th>nu</th>
<th>zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized</td>
<td>*na</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td>*ni</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>*nu</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>*nu</td>
<td>nure</td>
<td>nure</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized</td>
<td>*ne</td>
<td>nure</td>
<td>nure</td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the perfect auxiliary nu would have merged with the negative suffix in the two forms in question if it had remained unchanged. Thus, there was a good motivation for these two forms to change. The choice of the new forms, however, must have been made by analogy to the conjunctive pattern of tu, the already existing perfect auxiliary.

Figure 2: From main verb to case marker

The case particle ni may have had the specification [+Location] at first and may have been used only for the purpose of marking locative nominals, but it must have gradually become a more general oblique case marker by losing this specification. Thus, it appeared in Old Japanese marking almost any oblique nominals as well as locative nominals from subject and direct object nominals.

Understanding the development of the oblique case particle ni this way, the occurrence of the conjunctive particle te immediately after the case particle would not be surprising. When the conjunctive particle te came into existence in Japanese, ni must still have been the Conjunctive Form of the locative BE verb. The reason that the te could suffix to ni only when the ni was marking a non-argument nominal would be the following. Verbs such as 'to be/exist' and 'to live' have a strong implication of a location where the 'being' or 'living' takes place and they are rarely used without expressing or implying a locative nominal. The locative nominal occurring with such a verb often has more semantic prominence than the verb itself. It is very rare that being or living itself is asserted. Verbs such as 'to cry' and 'to kick', on the other hand, have more focus on the action of 'crying' and 'kicking' itself.
or the object that is affected by such an action than the place where it takes place although it does occur somewhere. Let us distinguish these two types of verbs for our purposes and refer to the former as "locative verbs" and to the latter as "non-locative verbs". Argument and nonargument locative nominals will then be defined as locative nominals that are in construction with a locative verb or a non-locative verb, respectively. Thus, the Los Angeles in I live in Los Angeles is an argument locative but the Los Angeles in I played golf in Los Angeles a non-argument locative. Supposing that pre-Japanese had no locative case marker and the conjunction construction such as the one shown in (A) in Figure 2 was the regular way of expressing location, it is likely that the change from the Conjunctive Form of the locative BE to the locative case particle took place first where the verb of the second clause was a locative verb, for locative verbs almost always occurred with a locative nominal. In other words, the compression of conjunction sentences such as ((OKINA DOOR AT) & (OKINA EXIST)) occurred earlier than that of conjunction sentences such as ((OKINA MOUNTAIN AT) & (OKINA CHILD FIND)). Thus, the conjunctive particle, which developed around this time, could suffix to the ni marking the location of a nonlocative verb because it was still verbal, but it could not suffix to the ni marking the location of a locative verb because it was no longer a verb. Some time later, after the Old Japanese period, however, the ni-te together was reanalyzed as the marker for the nonargument oblique case and underwent a series of phonological changes: nite > nte > nde > de. Thus, modern Japanese distinguishes the argument oblique and the nonargument oblique by marking the former with ni and the latter with de.

2.2 From locative BE to copula

Given that the *nu was a two-place predicate taking a subject and a locative, the change from locative BE verb 'to be at' to copula BE 'to be' is quite easy to understand: by bleaching out its locative sense, its most specific semantic feature that one of the arguments is locative, *nu should have been able to become a copula with little difficulty since the semantic distinction between the locative sentence 'NOM1 is at NOM2' and the copula sentence 'NOM1 is NOM2' is sometimes very slight. A copula sentence like:

(19) Mr. Jones is the chairman of the department.

can be paraphrased with a locative sentence like:

(20) Mr. Jones is in the position of the chairman of the department.

It is possible that the locative sentence pattern was used for certain copula expressions first and the locative verb in such sentences gradually lost the feature [+Locative]. Such a bleaching process is one of the most common channels for semantic change.

The reason this copula is found only in the Conjunctive Form is not clear for the moment. It may have developed only in the conjunctive position from the outset because predicate nominal sentences did not require a copula in the sentence final position in Old Japanese.11

2.3 From main verb BE to auxiliary BE

Serial constructions have provided Japanese with historical sources for auxiliary verbs, verb affixes and adverbs throughout the history of the language.12

There were two kinds of conjunctions in Old Japanese that developed into serial constructions, which I call zero-conjunction and te-conjunction. In a zero-conjunction sentence, nominal conjunct clauses ended with a verbal element in the Conjunctive Form and there was no conjunctive morpheme between conjunct clauses. In a te-conjunction sentence, nonfinal clauses were marked by the conjunctive particle te suffixed to the Conjunctive Form of the clause-final verb element. Compare the following zero-conjunction sentence with the te-conjunction sentence (7).

(21) kono hito-bito ... mono wo omoh=i, inori wo s=i, gan wo tat=u.

this people thing DO think=I pray DO do=I wish DO make=U

'these people ... thought of things, did praying, and made wishes'.

(T, 31)
tion was historically earlier than the te-conjunction. Most of the serial constructions found in Old Japanese were from zero-conjunctions. That is, the nonfinal verbs in a series were in the Conjunctive Form and there was no conjunctive morpheme between verbs. The serial constructions with te between serialized verbs are never or very rarely found in Old Japanese though they are common in modern Japanese.13

The fact that the Old Japanese perfect auxiliary nu required the preceding verbal element to be in the Conjunctive Form (Stem=1) suggests that this auxiliary had a serial verb origin. Taking into account all the facts about this auxiliary discussed in previous sections together with this possibility, one can reasonably infer that auxiliary nu came from the serialized *nu as two-clause conjunction sentences collapsed into single-clause sentences as schematized in Figure 3.

![Figure 3: From main verb BE to auxiliary BE](image)

A sentence like (16), for instance, would have been analyzed before the reanalysis as a two-clause conjunction sentence meaning 'He arrived at a place called Yatuhasi and (he) is (there)'. In Old Japanese, in which nu no longer occurred in the main verb position, sentences like this were always given single-clause interpretations such as 'He has arrived at a place called Yatuhasi'.

2.4 From perfect auxiliary to conjunctive particle

It has been implied in previous sections that the conjunctive particle te came into existence in Japanese at a certain point in the period when *nu 'to be at' was getting reanalyzed as the oblique case particle and so forth. The question of where it came from has some bearing on the changes that we have been discussing.

Some grammarians relate the conjunctive particle te to the Conjunctive Form of the perfect auxiliary tu, which was briefly discussed in 1.3. This is in fact the most plausible hypothesis in every respect. The Conjunctive Form of tu was used in the pre-auxiliary position as seen from the way it is used in sentence (15). Recall that the Conjunctive Form of verbs and most auxiliaries occurred in two positions: in the pre-auxiliary position and in the conjunctive position. Therefore, if we analyzed the Old Japanese conjunctive particle te, which was always in the conjunctive position, as having come from the Conjunctive Form of the perfect auxiliary tu, we would obtain the regular distributional pattern for the auxiliary tu at least in the historical context. But why did it become a conjunctive particle? The change seems to have been triggered by a change in the system of tense-aspect.

As mentioned earlier, the conjugational suffixes provide an important clue to the prehistoric state of the language. The contexts in which the Unrealized suffix A and the Realized suffix E occurred in Old Japanese suggest that these suffixes were aspect markers. A perhaps indicated irrealis aspect and E realis (or anterior) aspect. In conjunction sentences with different-subject marking conjunctive particle ba, the conjugation of the final element of the clause to which ba was suffixed was fully responsible for a conditional clause interpretation (e.g. (22)) and an anterior reading (e.g. (23)).

(22) shite tukau=matur=a-s=e- tamah=a-ba, forcefully serve+HON=A- CAUS=I-HON=A- DS
    kiyoe=us=e- n=a- n- zu., disappear=L-PERF=A-FUT-EMPH
    'if you forcibly make me serve (him), (I) will be gone'.
    (T, 55)

(23) sode wo torah=e-tamah=e-ba, sleeve DO catch=I-HON=E- DS
    omote wo htag=i-te- . . .
    face DO cover=I-SS
    'he) caught (her) sleeve, and (then) she covered
    (her) face . . .'
    (T, 56)

The final suffix U seems to fit perfectly in the aspectual category which Bickerton (1975) calls "nonpunctual". It indicated durative or iterative aspect for action verbs, and it was indifferent to the past-nonpast distinction. The fact that the existential 6ri and its derivatives, which were the only static verbs in Old Japanese, did not take the regular Final suffix u is also in accordance with the observation that nonpunctual aspect markers cannot
normally co-occur with stative verbs. Since no suffix is relatable to past tense, one may infer that the tense-aspect marked by the conjugaional suffixes was different from that expressed with auxiliary suffixes. There was probably a shift in the tense-aspect system in Japanese, from the system without the past-nonpast distinction to the one with it. In the older system, events were perhaps measured and marked in relation to each other. For example, in a conjunction sentence \( (S_1 \& S_2 \& S_3 \& \ldots \& S_n) \) describing a series of events \( (E_1 \& E_2 \& \ldots \& E_n) \), the final clause \( S_n \) may have been marked with the nonpastual aspect marker and all others \( S_1 \ldots S_{n-1} \) with the realis/ anterior marker to indicate that \( E_1 \) preceded in occurrence \( E_2 \), \( E_2 \) preceded \( E_3 \), \ldots, and \( E_{n-1} \) preceded \( E_n \). Such aspect markers are subject to attrition, loss of neighboring morpheme boundaries and phonological fusion, and eventually become defunct and give way to a new set of devices with the same or similar functions. It is quite possible that \( te \), the Conjunctive Form of a perfect auxiliary of the new generation, was used with anterior clauses to enforce the old tense-aspect system during the transition period from the system of conjugal suffixes to that of auxiliary suffixes. This conjecture is well supported by the fact that the conjunctive particle \( te \) did not occur in con­junction sentences describing simultaneously occurring events and the fact that there are many cases of \( te \) which are analyzable as the Conjunctive Form of \( nu \). Sentence (7), for example, can be given an equally plausible interpretation if the \( te \) at the end of the two nonfinal clauses is regarded as the perfect auxiliary as shown in (24).

\[
(24) \text{kore wo mi- } te, \quad \text{hune yori ori= } te,
\]

\[
\ldots \text{ to toh=U. COMP ask=U}
\]

‘(he) saw this, (and then) (he) alighted from the boat, (and then) (he) asked, “\ldots”’

(T, 38)

The reason the \( te \) in the conjunctive position came to be reinterpreted as the marker of the conjunctive position may be because it was used in this position more and more frequently as the older system lost its functional transparency. It must be after the reanalysis of \( te \) as a conjunctive morpheme that \( te \) became almost obligatory in the position after the locative BE and the copula of nonfinal clauses because these predicates are inherently stative and normally do not take an auxiliary of “completion”.

The changes that have been discussed in the present paper must have taken place, then, in the following order.

3. At the very beginning of the reconstruction of \( *nu \), I took notice of three morphemes which were distinct in meaning/function but the same in form. The formal resemblance, however, can be accidental and has little evidential value by itself. What is more important is the range of the irregularity in the synchronic grammar of Old Japanese that this reconstruction can account for and the naturalness of the postulated syntactic changes. The changes are considered to be natural in the following three respects.

First, the changes conform to the condition which Timberlake (1977) convincingly argued for, the condition that the given output must be sufficiently ambiguous with respect to syntactic analysis for reanalysis to take place. For example, the two analyses (A) and (B) in Figure 2 are equally plausible for the output \( \text{Okina togari ni wort} \). That is, the output is ambiguous between the two analyses and the reanalysis of (A) as (B) could occur without affecting the meaning.

Second, syntactic changes similar to those that I have postulated have been observed in so many other languages that one can reasonably suspect that such changes are motivated by some universal factors although it is difficult to discuss them in formal terms.

Third, the changes are all consistent with the general tendency that Japanese has been increasing surface differentiation, adding new grammatical devices.

The third point will be most clearly seen in the development of the case markers. As one may have already noticed, nominals were not as distinctively marked for case in Old Japanese as in modern Japanese: the subject was regularly left unmarked unless it was marked as the topic with \( ha \); the direct
object was only optionally marked by *wo; and all other cases were almost indiscriminately marked with the general oblique case marker *ni except associatives (nominals linked with other nominals rather than with verbs, e.g. Okina in Okina no ihe: Okina ASS house ‘Okina’s house’ and tuki in tuki no miyako: moon ASS city royal ‘the city royal of the moon’) and peripheral oblique cases such as ablatives and illatives. There is some evidence that *wo used to be an emphatic particle, the use of which came to be limited to the direct object. If this is the case and if the reconstruction I am proposing here is accepted, we would be able to say that associatives were the only major case markers that existed since the earliest time of the history of Japanese and that oblique case particle *ni and direct object marker *wo were added to the grammar in the course of time prior to the Old Japanese period. During the period between Old Japanese and modern Japanese, *ga, one of the associative particles, was reanalyzed as the subject marker, *ni-te (which I have analyzed as the Conjunctive Form of the locative BE plus the conjunctive particle *te) became the nonargument oblique case marker and underwent a series of phonological changes to yield *de in modern Japanese, and *to, which was used mostly to conjoin nominals and occasionally to mark comitatives in Old Japanese, established its status as the comitative marker.

The case system of Old Japanese and that of modern Japanese will be summarized as in (A) and (B) in Figure 4, respectively.

![Figure 4: Change in case marking](image)

It is clear that modern Japanese reflects the underlying meanings in a much more one-to-one fashion than Old Japanese. That is, Japanese has been moving towards a language with a richer case marking system. It would be unnatural to think that the drift started all of a sudden in Old Japanese. It is more likely that the language had been changing in the same direction before the Old Japanese time. Thus, the reconstruction of *nu, which virtually makes the claim that pre-Japanese had no oblique case marker, is quite compatible with the direction of the drift that the language has been undergoing throughout its history.

The tendency towards more surface differentiation is not restricted to the case system alone, but it is observed in conjunction, in subordination and in the auxiliary system as well. It seems that the direction in which the language has been changing as a whole suggests where the language came from.

4. In this section I will discuss several hypotheses advanced for the origin of Japanese and will argue that comparative data alone are not sufficient in choosing a correct hypothesis.

4.1 The hypotheses that have been proposed as explanations for the genetic relationship of Japanese to other languages are basically of two categories, the Altaic hypothesis and the mixed language hypothesis.

The proponents of the Altaic hypothesis — the hypothesis that Japanese was derived from proto-Altaic like Mongolian, Tungus and Korean — point out (i) that Japanese resembles Altaic languages in syntax, (ii) that there is a considerable amount of lexical correspondence between Japanese and Altaic languages, especially Korean, and (iii) that Japanese had vowel harmony, which is characteristic of Altaic languages. However, these arguments are not convincing enough. The lexical correspondence is too scanty and there are other languages, as will be mentioned later, which seem to share a greater part of the vocabulary with Japanese. Vowel harmony applies only for a very limited number of items and it has been pointed out by Murayama (1969) that the vowel harmony is not necessarily ascribed to the genetic relationship of Japanese with Altaic languages. The syntactic argument that Japanese has the same basic word order, Subject-Object-Verb, and has case markers placed after nominals much in the same way as Altaic languages is not tenable given the theory of typological universals as of Greenberg’s (1972). The common syntactic features such as Modified-Modifying order and Main Verb-Auxiliary may be due to the fact that Japanese and Altaic languages belong to the same type, SOV language, rather than to the genetic relationship between these languages. Moreover, Japanese did not have as rich a case system as it is generally believed to have had as we have already seen. Thus, syntactic arguments also fail to support the genetic relationship between Japanese and Altaic languages.

The main arguments for the mixed language hypothesis are as follows. First, as Ono (1970) points out, the mixed language hypothesis is more consistent with the findings in archeological and anthropological studies about
the evolution of the Japanese. It is almost established that the first inhabitants on the island of Japan were related to oceanic people but some northern (Altaic) people with a more advanced culture migrated to the island and began to live with the aborigines. Second, Old Japanese had a considerable number of Malayo-Polynesian elements. For example, Murayama (1969) has presented data to show (i) that Old Japanese had prefixes like Malayo-Polynesian in addition to suffixes (Altaic languages are consistently suffixal), (ii) that the CVCV syllable structure is characteristic of Malayo-Polynesian, (iii) iteration/reduplication, a characteristic mechanism for word formation in Japanese, is more commonly utilized in Malayo-Polynesian than in Altaic and (iv) that prenasalization of certain consonants, another characteristic feature of Malayo-Polynesian, did exist in Japanese also. Murayama concludes from these facts that Japanese is a hybrid language whose most important components are Altaic and Austronesian. Kawamoto (1974) added to the data in favor of the mixed language hypothesis and made a more specific claim than Murayama that Japanese developed from a pidgin whose main source language was a Melanesian one. Although it is not totally clear what kind of process Murayama meant by "hybrid", I assume the claim made by Murayama does not crucially differ from Kawamoto's pidgin hypothesis. Whinom (1971), who makes a clear distinction between hybridization and pidginization, claims that a hybrid language does not become stabilized to the extent it can be used as a common vernacular unless it undergoes pidginization.

It is undeniable that there were two or more languages in close contact in the early history of Japanese which contributed in one way or other to the formation of Japanese. This fact alone, however, does not immediately lead us to a pidgin hypothesis, for it is still possible that the process involved could be borrowing rather than mixing, i.e., pidginization. In order for a pidgin hypothesis to be more fully justified, it must show that the language had grammatical features which are sufficiently characteristic of pidgins. Pidginization simplifies the grammar of the source languages to such an extent that the grammar of the resultant pidgin would be no longer comparable with the grammar of the source languages. Thus, internal reconstruction of pre-Japanese grammar and comparison between the reconstruction and pidgins would play a crucial role in establishing the pidgin hypothesis.

4.2 As implied in the present reconstruction, pre-Japanese grammar seems to resemble pidgin-creole languages in a significant number of respects. First of all, the fact that Old Japanese had very few case markers found in pre-Japanese corresponds perfectly to the observation that pidgin-creoles have very limited noun inflections. Second, I have previously suggested that the zero-conjunction was the oldest device for conjoining clauses that developed in the history of Japanese and the te-conjunction followed it. I have shown elsewhere (Akiba (1977) and (1978)) that Old Japanese was developing several conjunctive particles in addition to te and that modern Japanese abounds in subordinate conjunctions which can specify various relationships between conjoined clauses. It is certain that Japanese has been changing as a whole towards more surface differentiation in the conjunction system. Paratactic conjunction as found in pre-Japanese is another characteristic feature of pidgin-creoles.

Third, Old Japanese did not distinguish nominalization, relativization and complementation. All the subordinate clauses except direct quotations were uniformly marked by the same morphology, i.e., by the Nominal Form of the clause final verbal element. It was after the period of Old Japanese that the language came to possess different devices for different types of subordinate clause messages. There are some indications that the conjunctive suffix used for the Nominal Form was once an associative particle. If it is really the case, pre-Japanese perhaps had no productive method for subordination, either. This is, again, the situation that is commonly found in pidgins and creoles.

Fourth, the pre-Japanese tense-aspect system that I suggested in 2.4 strikingly resembles the system that Bickerton (1975) has claimed to be that of creoles. If further examinations do not disprove the suggestion, this feature will be taken as another piece of evidence for the pidgin-creole origin of Japanese.

Finally, to mention a phenomenon which is not directly related to the reconstruction of *nu, reduplication was an important mechanism in Old Japanese for word formation, pluralization and intensification. Old Japanese abounds in iterative adverbs which seem to be onomatopoetic or mimetic in origin: the yo=yo=to in yo=yo=to nak+i-tamah+i-n-u (...) cry+HON=F-PAST;V) a languid and lonely state of being. Certain nouns were reduplicated for pluralization: yama-yama: mountain-mountain 'mountains', hito-bito: (< hito+hito): person-person 'people', kuni-guni (< kuni+kuni): country-country 'countries', ki-gi (< ki+ki): tree-tree 'trees'. Reduplication of the Final Form of a verb expressed an iterative or durative action accompanying another action.

(25) Taketori nak=U-nak=U maus=U.
Taketori cry=U-cry=U say+HON=U
'Taketori said (while) crying'. (T. 61)
Reduplication of the Conjunctive Form of a verb indicated iterative/durative aspect of the verb.

(26) yuk=i-yuk=i-te Suruga no kuni
go=i- go=i- SS Suruga ASS country
ni itar=i-n=u.
OBL arrive=i-PERF=U
(He) went on and on and arrived in the country of Suruga.

If these processes utilizing reduplication were no longer productive in Old Japanese, these examples should be taken as residues of pre-Japanese rules. Reduplication is said to be one of the conspicuous features of many pidgins and creoles.

Pidgin and creole studies are still in their adolescence, although their recent progress is remarkable in quantity and quality, and pidgin-creole characteristics have not yet been defined to the extent that they can be used as criteria for recognizing all pidgins and creoles. Future studies may reveal inadequacies of these crude criteria, but this line of investigation of language development is basically correct and it is especially important for the genetic question of Japanese.

5. To summarize, I have attempted to show that there was a locative BE verb *nu in pre-Japanese and that the verb was reanalyzed as a case marker, a copula and a perfect auxiliary in subsequent periods. The reconstruction is evaluated as highly plausible in terms of the number and value of synchronic facts (especially anomalies) of Old Japanese grammar which are explained by it and the naturalness of the postulated syntactic changes. I have also suggested that the reconstruction has important bearings on the genetic question of the language, supporting the hypothesis that the language evolved from a pidgin-creole largely based on Altaic and Malayo-Polynesian.

Notes
* I must indicate my gratitude to Prof. Sandra A. Thompson, UCLA, for her generous assistance and constant encouragement, to Prof. Susumu Ono, Gakushuin University, Tokyo, for inspiring comments, and to Prof. Takeo Kawamoto, Joetsu University of Education, Japan, for sharing valuable information with me.
1. The term "pre-Japanese" does not refer to a single stage in the history of Japanese, but to the time preceding the earliest records in the language.
2. In transliterating Japanese examples, I have employed the system of romanization used in Intensive Course in Japanese, Japanese Language Promotion Center, with some minor deviations, which seems to be more convenient for our purposes of discussing historical changes than the Hepburn system.
Since the conjunctival suffixes vary from type to type, I have indicated the conjunctival form in which verbs and auxiliaries are actually used in sample sentences with italic capital letters, A, I, etc. As to which letter represents which conjunctival form, refer to Table 1.

(26) yuk=i-yuk=i-te
Suruga no kuni
ni itar=i-n=u.
OBL arrive=i-PERF=U
(He) went on and on and arrived in the country of Suruga.

Conjugational suffixes of the adjective (e.g. K1) are quite different from those of the verb but they are not our present concern. In examples, the following conventions are used.

Symbols
-: between bound morphemes
=: between the stem and the conjunctival suffix
+: to show that the elements connected by this sign correspond to a single Japanese element.

Abbreviations
DO: Direct Object
ASS: Associative Particle
OBL: Oblique Case Particle
SS: Same-Subject Marking Conjunctive Particle
DS: Different-Subject Marking Conjunctive Particle
COP: Copula
HON: Honorable
EMPH: Emphatic
FUT: Future
PAST: Past Tense
PERF: Perfect

The examples used in this study are from Taketori Monogatari (T) 'Tale of a Bamboo-Collector,' Genji Monogatari (G) 'Tale of Genji' and Isे Monogatari (Ise) 'Tale of Ise.' The page number indicated in parentheses at the end of each example is based on the texts of the Iwanami Koten Bungaku Taikei 'The Iwanami Series of Japanese Classics.'

3. Akiba (1977) discusses the same-subject-marking conjunctive particle and different-subject-marking conjunctive particles in Old Japanese.
4. The list of the contexts is not exhaustive but rather skeletal.
5. These verbs were problematic, because if they conjugated like Type-I verbs, they would have had only one consonant segment constant in all the conjugated forms, which is extremely undesirable from the conceptual point of view.
6. There were some suffixes which seemed to have been derived from adjectives. E.g. -best 'must,' ending with ni like most Old Japanese adjectives, followed the conjunctival pattern of adjectives.
7. Kawamoto (1979) postulates the following forms as the elements that developed into the Old Japanese conjunctival suffixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Unrealized Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a</td>
<td>Conjunctive Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*wu</td>
<td>Nominal/Final Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ai</td>
<td>Realized Suffix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names in parentheses are Kawamoto's and they suggest what Kawamoto thinks to be their original functions.
8. This Twi sentence was taken from Ellis and Boadi (1969).
9. S. A. Thompson (UCLA) reminded me of the Mandarin locative verb *zai, as another example. Also see in SSiwati, le in Ewe.
10. The negative must have come from two different sources, one of which was nu. Whether this nu was related to the perfect auxiliary nu is not known.
11. Ferguson (1971) states that there are some languages in which copula shows up only in independent clauses. Pre-Japanese may have been such a language.

12. There were a number of verb prefixes which had the function of adding some subtle connotations to the meaning of the stem. For example, uti-flaku: HIT~ 'to cry bitterly'; sa・ori-agu: PIERCE 'to raise high'; etc. There were some other verbs which were suffixed to the main verb and modified the meaning of the main verb. For example, hashi・aru: crawl ENTER 'to crawl in'; kaki・aru: write SEND 'to write to'; etc.

13. There are several auxiliary-like verbs with some discourse or aspectual function: tah・te-miru: eat SS SEE 'to eat for taste'; it・te-oku: say SS LEAVE 'to say for future reference'; tah・te-sima・u: eat SS FINISH 'to have eaten.'

14. According to Murayama, this hypothesis was first advanced by E. D. Polivanov half a century ago.

15. Since the distinction between pidgins and creoles is irrelevant here, the terms "pidgin," "creole" and "pidgin-creole" are used rather loosely.
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