Syntax: a draft

Tomohide Kinuhata
Faculty of Humanities, Fukuoka University
8-19-1, Nanakuma, Jonan-ku, Fukuoka-city
tkinuhata@cis.fukuoka-u.ac.jp

Comments are welcome!

1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the historical change concerning syntax. Readers may expect this chapter to look at the evolution of syntax itself in Japanese. However, Japanese shows less clear evidence of the change of syntax than, for example, English, retaining major typological features from OJ to ModJ, such as head-final, SOV word order, dependent marking, nominative-accusative case alignment, etc. Verbs come to the final with a relatively free order of Subjects and Objects throughout any period of Japanese, which contrasts with the development of the fixed word order of English. Therefore, it is more fruitful to see the historical change of grammatical items in a rigid syntactic frame rather than to seek faint evidence showing the evolution of syntax of Japanese. The following discussion includes the development of case markers (mainly in Section 2), information-structural marking (Section 3), "up-the-tree" in grammaticalization (Section 4), negative-sensitive items (Section 5), and voice constructions affected by language contact (Section 6). The observations of these phenomena hopefully contribute to understanding what syntactic properties of grammatical items are susceptible to the historical change of the languages with the above typological features.[1]

2 Development of case particles

2.1 Nominative case marker

Despite the accepted assumption that OJ is a nominative-accusative language, as with ModJ,[2] their subject markings differ in subordinate and matrix clauses. As shown in (1), the subjects of transitive and intransitive verbs can be marked by *=no* and *=ga* in subordinate, i.e., here relative clauses In contrast, these particles do not appear in matrix clauses as indicated by ∅.

[1] A note to the editor. This chapter follows Frellesvig (2011) to transcribe examples pre-dating Modern Japanese with slight modifications: *kô-otsu* distinctions in OJ are ignored; bilabial fricative /ɸ/ is preferred to labiodental fricative /f/; long vowels are written as dipthongs etc.

[2] Some authors have argued that OJ partly reflected case patterns other than nominative-accusative alignment. Vovin (1997) was the first to find a connection between OJ and active case alignment based on the observation of the particles *=i* and *=wo*, though admitting its preference for a nominative case marking. See also Takeuchi (2008), who supported Vovin's 1997 view on OJ *=wo* with a historical perspective. Yanagida & Whitman (2009) found a split of case alignments between matrix and nominalized clauses: While OJ had nominative-accusative case alignment in the former, *=ga* marked only active subjects in the latter, which was, however, critically reviewed by Takeuchi (2020) recently.

(1) a. [wa=ga seko=**ga** uwe-si] akipagi pana ∅ saki-ni-keri.
1.SG=GEN hasband=NOM plant-PST.ADN bush.clover flower bloom-PRF-PST.CONCL
'The bush clover that my husband planted has just boomed.' (*Man'yô*, 2119)
b. [awo kumo=**no** tanabiku] pi=sura ko∼same ∅ sopo puru.
grey cloud=NOM trail.ADN day=even light∼rain drizzling fall
'Even the sunny day, it is drizzling (at Mt Iyahiko).' (*Man'yô*, 3883)

Thus, the theory for developing a nominative case marker has to explain how *ga* can extend its appearance to matrix clauses in ModJ. One of the prominent hypotheses is that the loss of the morphological distinction between adnominal and conclusive forms triggered this extension. The reason to adopt this hypothesis is that *=ga* and *=no* could mark the subject of matrix clauses in OJ only when adnominal forms demarcate the clause as in (2). Compare, for example, the adnominal form 'keru' in (2b) with its conclusive form 'keri' in (1a).

(2) a. iwane pumu Ikoma=no yama=wo koje-te=so wa=**ga** kuru.
rock step.on Ikoma=GEN mountain=ACC cross-GER=FOC 1.SG=NOM come.ADN
'I have come here, stepping over rocks during crossing Mt. Ikoma.' (*Man'yô*, 3590)
b. nani=si=ka kopi=**no** iro=ni ide-keru.
why=EMPH=Q.FOC love=NOM color=DAT appear-PST.ADN
'Why did my love come to light?' (*Man'yô*, 3035)

The verb form used for sentence-ending in ModJ is the remnant of OJ adnominal forms: 'kuru' in (2a), the adnominal form of 'come' in OJ, is the conclusive form of ModJ in contrast to the OJ conclusive form 'ku'. Therefore, it has some grounds to assume that the pattern in (2) replaced the pattern without overt subject markers in (1).

There are, however, theoretical and empirical problems with this assumption. Theoretically, if the pattern in (2) had replaced the matrix pattern in (1), not only *=ga* but also *=no* would develop the nominative case marking in ModJ. However, *=no* can only mark the subject in subordinate clauses also in ModJ, as shown in (3).

(3) Modern Standard Japanese
a. [otto={ga/no} ue-ta] hagi
hasband=NOM plant-PST bush.clover
'The bush clover that my husband planted'
b. otto={ga/*no} hagi=o ue-ta.
hasband=NOM bush.clover=ACC plant-PST
'My husband planted the bush clover.'

Empirically, Nomura (1996) showed that the examples of *=ga* ending with the conclusive form appeared in the late period of LOJ. The examples to which Nomura (1996) referred are those where *=ga* attaches to non-right-headed relatives such as left-headed, head-internal, headless, etc., as in (4).

(4) a. [ɸaku utu mono=no **tumanome**=no tosi sanzyuu-amari sizyuu-bakari
foil beat person=GEN wife=APPOS year thirty-over forty-around
nari-keru]=**ga** kono azyari=no bau=ni ki-tari.
COP-PST.ADN=NOM this priest=GEN room=DAT come-PST.CONCL
'The wife of a foil-maker in the late thirties or around forty came to the priest's room.' (*Konjaku*, 20: 6)

b. [itadaki ɸage-taru **oo∼warawa** = no omoraka = ni = mo mie-nu] = **ga**
crown bald-RES.ADN big∼kid = APPOS calm = DAT = also look-NEG = NOM
kono sake = no uma = no naka = ni ɸasiri iri-ni-keri.
this salmon = GEN horse = GEN center = DAT run enter-PRF-PST.CONCL
'The head-bald man who didn't look calm rushed into the horses that carried salmons.' (*Ujishûi*, 1: 15)

c. [Wakasa = no azyari Ryuugen = to iu **ɸito** utayomi = naru] = **ga** ki-tari.
Wakasa = GEN priest Ryûgen = QUOT say person poet = COP = NOM come-PST.CONCL
'A priest Ryugen from Wakasa, who was also a poet, came.' (*Ujishûi*, 3: 10)

In each example in (4), =*ga* appears with predicates ending in conclusive forms, e.g., 'tari', not adnominal 'taru'. Thus, (4) falsifies the hypothesis that =*ga* used in adnominal forms in (2) is the ancestor of Modern Japanese =*ga* in matrix clauses.

Before the appearance of =*ga* in matrix clauses as in (4), the subject NP was marked without case particles, complicating how to divide a sentence into the subject and the predicate, mainly when the subject includes non-right-headed relatives. The examples in (5), taken from *Genji Monogatari* (1008?), illustrate the point. They are structurally similar to those in (4) but precede *Konjaku* (1120?) and *Ujisûi Monogatari* (1242-52) in time. It is not straightforward to find the subject in (5), with several predicates juxtaposed.

(5) a. [**tatamugami** = no tenarai-nado si-taru] ∅ mi.kityau = no moto = ni
folded.paper = GEN practice-EXMP do-PRF.ADN HON.partition = GEN under = LOC
oti-tari-keri.
fall-PRF-PST
'A folded paper with letters written by someone was fallen near the partition.' (*Genji*, Sakaki)

b. [[nadeu koto naki **ɸito** = no susamazi-ki kao si-taru] ∅ naosi
something thing no person = APPOS boring-ADN face do-PRF informal.cloth
ki-te tati ɸaki-taru] ∅ ari.
wear-GER sword wear-PRF.ADN exist
'A usual person with a boring face, who wears informal cloth and a sword, is there.' (*Genji*, Azumaya)

c. [[**onnagimi** naki sidumi tama-eru] ∅ tamerai-te wi∼zari ide
noble.girl cry depressed RSP-PRF calm.down-GER sit∼leave go.out
tama-eru] ∅ tukikage = ni imiziu okasi-ge = ni-te wi tama-eri.
RSP-PRF.ADN moonlight = DAT very beautiful-air = COP-GER sit RSP-PRF
'The noble girl, who cried and was depressed, who (then) has calmed herself down and come out with her knees on the ground, is (now) sitting (near Genji) with a beautiful figure in the moonlight.' (*Genji*, Suma)

Nomura (1996) hypothesized that =*ga* developed its nominative use in matrix clauses to make explicit the subject-hood of non-right-headed relatives. His hypothesis nicely accounts for the underdevelopment of =*no*'s nominative use: i.e., =*no* could not attach to the adnominal form in the first place and thus cannot constitute the subject with such relatives. See the OJ example (6) where =*ga* can constitute the subject with head-less

relatives (note that the affix *-sa* makes the whole sentence nominalized); this is precisely the context that does not allow the use of *=no*.[3]

(6) [[amanogapa kogu punabito=wo miru]=ga tomosi-sa].
Milky.Way row boatman=ACC see=NOM envy-NMLZ
'It makes me envious to see a boatman rowing his boat on the Milky Way.' (*Manyô*, 3658)

2.2 From case marker to conjunction particle

As a precondition of *ga*'s development into nominative marking in matrix clauses, it must have marked the subject of non-right-headed relatives, like the OJ example given in (6). Importantly, Konoshima (1996: pp. 48–51) pointed out that this type of example significantly increased in the middle period of LOJ (the 11th century).

(7) a. [[ito yamugotona-ki kiwa=ni=wa ara-nu]=**ga** sugurete tokimeki
very high.ranked-ADN status=COP=TOP COP-NEG=NOM especially be.favored
tamau] ari-keri. 'A lady who was not a high-ranked was extremely favored
RSP.ADN exist-PST
among others.' (*Genji*, Kiritsubo)

b. [wonna=no mada yo ϕe-zu=to oboye-taru]=**ga**
woman=APPOS yet romance experience-NEG=QUOT think-PRF.ADN=NOM
ϕito=no moto=ni sinobi-te mono kikoye-te,
person=GEN place=LOC sneak-GER thing say.HML-GER
'A woman, who was thought not to have experienced romances, sneaked into the place of a man and had affairs with him, ...' (*Ise*, 120)

c. [kono zuryoo-domo=no omosiro-ki iwe tukuri konomu]=**ga**
this middle.ranked-PL-APPOS elegant-ADN house build favor.ADN=NOM
kono miya=no kodati=o kokoro=ni tuke-te,
this residence=GEN grove=ACC heart=DAT attach-GER
'This middle-ranked nobles, who favored building an elegant house, attach themselves to the grove of this residence, ...' (*Genji*, Yomogifu)

In (7), *=ga* marks the preceding relative clauses as subjects of the following predicates as indicated by each translation. Note that the following predicates are in an adnominal form (7a) or a gerundive form (7b)(7c), not a conclusive form. Konoshima (1996) conjectured that this type of example caused the development of nominative *=ga* into matrix clauses.

Some readers might notice that *ga* in (7) does not necessarily mark the subject of the clause in which it appears but rather consider those occurrences to connect two independent clauses. For example, Arthur Waley translates *ga* in (7a) as conveying an adversative relation between the preceding and the following sentences, as indicated by the underline in (8).

(8) there was among the many gentlewomen of the Wardrobe and Chamber one, who **though** she was not of very high rank was favored far beyond all the rest; (Arthur 1970)

[3] Another difference between *=ga* and *=no* is its preference to take referential NPs such as demonstratives and proper nouns. See Nomura (1993) and Takeuchi (2020) for details.

This reinterpretation presumably motivates speakers in LOJ to develop the conjunctive use of =*ga*. Since Japanese is a right-headed language, it is unsurprising that addressees in LOJ frequently confuse a non-right-headed relative clause with a sentence (with *pro* supplied after the clause ending with =*ga*). If this analysis is correct, the motivation for the change is primarily syntactic, i.e., syntactic reanalysis of the preceding NP as an independent sentence.

Ishigaki (1955), however, showed that conjunctive use had not been established before the late period of LOJ(the 12th century). Though it looks =*ga* connects two clauses adversatively in (7), this interpretation is no obligatory: as shown by their translations, it is still possible to regard =*ga* in those examples as marking the subject.

On the other hand, there emerged examples of =*ga* in the late period of LOJ that cannot be a nominative case marker. In (9a) and (9b), the clauses following =*ga* have overt subjects as underlined; while the subject of the matrix predicate *oboe-ker* 'thought' in (9c) is a man, the *ga*-marked clause cannot be a relative clause headed by it.

(9) a. oti iri-keru toki mi=no toki=bakari=nari-keru=**ga**, <u>ɸi=mo</u> yauyaku
fall enter-PST time snake=GEN time=about=COP-PST=CONJ sun=also gradually
kure-nu.
get.dark-PRF
'Though it was around 10 a.m. when he fell into (the sea), it has gradually grown dark.' (*Konjaku*, 16-24)

b. ko ɸutari=wa ie=o kakumi wake-te i-tari-keru=**ga**,
child two=TOP house=ACC surround separate-GER live-PRF-PAST=CONJ
<u>kono</u> <u>kodomo=no</u> yama=yori kaeri ki-taru=ni,
this child=NOM mountain=ABL return come-PRF=CONJ
'The two children lived in different rooms that surrounded (the mother's room), and then, when these two children came home from the mountain, ...' (*Konjaku*, 27-23)

c. onna ito uresi=to ii-te iki-keru=**ga**, ayasi-ku kono onna=no
woman very be.glad=QUOT say-GER go-PST=CONJ weird-ADV this woman=GEN
ke osorosi-ki yau=ni oboe-ker-edomo,
atmosphere horrific-ADN state=COP think-PST-CNC
'Though the woman went saying that she is glad, the man weirdly thought the woman's atmosphere was horrific, but ...' (*Konjaku*, 27-20)

Thus, nominative and conjunctive =*ga* evolved from the same source, i.e., non-right-headed relative clauses. In both cases, speakers tended to confuse these clauses as simple sentences because Japanese is typologically right-headed. While they sometimes tried to keep them as relatives using =*ga*, extending its use to matrix clauses, they failed to identify these clauses as relatives at other, deriving a conjunctive use of =*ga*.

2.3 A note on accusative marker

In contrast to the nominative case particle, the accusative marker =*wo* is found not only in a subordinate but also in a matrix clause since OJ.

(10) a. [noti=no kokoro=**wo** siru] pito=so piku.
forward=GEN heart=ACC know person=FOC draw
'The person who knows the heart in the future draws (the bow).' (*Manyô*, 99)

b. ipe = naru imo = **wo** kake-te sinopi-tu.
home = COP.ADN wife = ACC pray-GER think.of
'I have thought of my wife living in my home from my heart.' (*Manyô*, 6)

Although there is various usage, i.e., part of speech classifications, of =*wo* in OJ, the examples (10a) and (10b) are enough to show its function as a case particle (Kondo 2000: §4.1). Therefore, there is no evidence for non-right-headed relatives at play in developing an accusative use of =*wo*. Conversely, these relatives were operative in =*wo*'s evolution into conjunctive particles because non-right-headed relatives frequently bore an accusative case, as with nominatives, in LOJ. (11) is an example including the conjunctive use of =*wo* (here realized as /o/) in LOJ, and Kondo (2000: §8.4) demonstrated that the conjunctive use of =*wo* was derived from the accusative use in the same way as conjunctive =*ga*.

(11) kokorozasi ɸuka-kari-keru ɸito yuki toburaɸi-keru = **wo** mutuki = no
love deep-ACOP-PST.ADN person go visit-PST = CONJ January = GEN
toɸoka-bakari = no ɸodo-ni ɸoka = ni kakure-ni-keri. 'The man, deeply
10th-about = GEN while-ADV other.place = LOC hide-PRF-PST
longing for the woman, went to her place. But she hid away somewhere on around January 10th.' (*Ise*, 4)

3 Marking information structure

3.1 Topic-focus articulation in OJ

One of the most striking differences between OJ and ModJ is that the former has an explicit focus marking. The focus markers have been extensively discussed in the context of *kakari-musubi*. It is a construction where the focus *kakari*-markers trigger the morphological alternation of the sentence-ending called *musubi*: the sentence with a focus marked by =*so/zo*, =*namu*, =*ya*, and =*ka* ends in the adnominal, and that with =*koso*-marking ends in the realis form (see Frellesvig (2011: §8.9) for an overview). It is more important here to note the word order of this focused constituent than to refer to the morphological concordance. That is, when the focus of an interrogative sentence is marked by =*ka* and =*ya*, it must follow topic phrases and precede nominatives marked by =*ga* and =*no*. Example (12) instantiates this word order.

(12) Patuse = no kapa = **pa** ura na-mi = **ka** pune = **no** yori ko-nu.
Hatuse = GEN river = TOP cove no-CAL = Q ship = NOM approach come-NEG
'As for Hatsuse River, is it because it has no cove, no ship comes to appear.' (*Manyô*, 3225)

This pattern has few exceptions in OJ texts (Sasaki 1996, Nomura 1993) and thus reminds us of a fine articulated topic-focus structure in Romance languages (Rizzi 1997). It is also interesting to note that the topic-focus order is limited to interrogative sentences. As with Italian word order (Rizzi 1997: §6), topic phrases can appear after focused constituents in declarative clauses (Sasaki 1996: pp. 10–11).According to Watanabe's (2007: §2.2) counting, topic =*pa*-phrases precede the =*so*-marked phrase in 31 examples, whereas 30 examples attest the opposite order: (13a) is an instance of the former and (13b) that of the latter.

(13) a. ima = **pa** wa = **pa** wabi = **so** si-ni-keru.
now = TOP 1.SG = TOP be.depressed = FOC do-PRF-PST
'I have now been depressed.' (*Man'yô*, 644)
b. oroka-ni = **so** ware = **pa** omopi-si.
usual-ADV = FOC 1.SG = TOP think-PST
'I thought it was not special.' (*Man'yô*, 4049)
c. mati-tutu = **so** wa = **ga** kopi wataru. 'I have been longing for you, wait-SIM = FOC 1.SG = NOM long.for ITR
waiting for your coming.' (*Man'yô*, 588)

Other constituents rarely intervene even when a topic phrase follows the =*so*-marked focus (Watanabe 2007: §4.1). Moreover, the order of =*so* and the nominative =*no/ga* is still observed as in (13c) (see Nomura (2005: §2) for counting). Thus, the left peripheral structure postulated for OJ may look as follows.[4]

(14) $[_{\text{TopP}}$ XP= pa [..... $[_{\text{FocP}}$ XP= ka/so ($[_{\text{TopP}}$ XP= pa) $[_{\text{IP}}$ ... XP= ga/no ... V]]]]]

The parenthetical topic phrase is allowed only in declarative clauses, i.e., when the focus is =*so*-marked, and some constituents might appear in the dotted part.

Based on the structure (14), some generative scholars have assumed the leftward movement of wh-phrases to the Spec of Foc as a case of focus movement. This wh-movement is also supported by "pied-piping": i.e., *kakari*-particles do not attach to the wh-word inside the NP island.

(15) pa buki naku sigi [ta = ga(* = ka) ta] = ni = **ka** sumu.
feather flap sing sandpiper who = NOM = FOC.Q paddy = LOC = FOC.Q live
'In whose paddy does the flapping and singing sandpiper live?' (*Man'yô*, 4041)

If =*ka* would directly attach to the wh-word, it would violate the Subjacency constraint, i.e., an extraction from inside the syntactic islands to the left periphery.

Though movement is more or less necessary to account for the position of *kakari*-particles, it is still controversial what moves to where in *kakari-musubi* constructions. While Watanabe (2002) assumed the phrase including *kakari*-particles to move, Kuroda (2007) considered that only wh-phrases move with =*ka* occupying the head of the landing site, i.e., the head of Foc. As for the position of the landing site, Watanabe (2002) and Kuroda (2007) assumed a left-peripheral structure for topic and focus. On the other, Aldridge (2009) argued that the wh-phrase moves within a small clause, a clause without tense, assuming =*ga/no* to be genitive case markers appearing in nominalized clauses (cf. Section 2.1). Moreover, the free word order of arguments and adjuncts in Japanese obscures a rigid topic-focus structure in the left periphery. For example, contrary to the strict word order of nominative =*no/ga*, the accusative =*wo* freely appear relative to the topic and focus. *NP*=*wo* follows the focus in (16a), precedes it in (16b), and precedes both topic and focus in (16c).

(16) a. makura = yu kukuru namida = ni = **so** uki∼ne = **wo** si-keru
pillow = ABL flow tear = LOC = FOC float∼sleep = ACC do-PST
'I slept floating on the tear flowed from my pillow.' (*Manyô*, 507)

[4] While Watanabe (2007) considered =*so*-marked phrases above topic =*pa* as a contrastive topic, I consider that they reside in the focused phrase in (14). One of Watanabe's (2007) problems is that he did not differentiate contrastive "topic" from contrastive "focus". So the examples of =*so*-marked phrases that he considered as a (contrastive) topic can be (contrastive) focus.

b. na = **wo** = to a = **wo** pito = **so** saku-naru.
2.SG = ACC = CONJ 1.SG = ACC person = FOC separate-EVI
'I heard someone is trying to destroy our relationship.' (*Manyô*, 660)

c. patako-ra = ga yoru hiru = to ipa-zu yuku miti = **wo** ware = **pa**
farmer-PL = NOM night day = QUOT say-NEG go road = ACC 1.SG = TOP
kotogoto miya∼di = ni = **so** suru.
whole court∼road = DAT = FOC do
'I am using the whole road where farmers pass day and night as my road to the court.' (*Manyô*, 193)

These facts indicate that phrases, whether it is a topic-focus or not, can move freely above IP in OJ and cast doubt on the structure exclusively constituted by the topic and focus projection, contra. Italian (Rizzi 1997: p. 287).[5]

3.2 Decline of focusing function of *kakari*-particles

Although focus *kakari*-particles completely disappeared in LMJ, particularly in the Muromachi period, the symptoms of their decline take some shapes even in LOJ.

First, the focus particle *=ka* for interrogatives became dedicated to marking wh-interrogatives in LOJ, and, as a result, it divided the labor with *=ya* marking the focus of yes/no-interrogatives (see Kinuhata (2014) for the history of interrogative particles).

(17) a. tosi = wa **ikutu** = ni = **ka** monosi tamai-si?
year = TOP how.old = COP = Q.FOC do RSP-PST
'How old was she?' (*Genji*, Yûgao)

b. sono anegimi = wa Asomu = no otooto = **ya** mot-aru?
DEM elder.sister = TOP courtier = GEN little.brother = FOC.Q have-PRF
'Does the elder sister have (bear) your brother?' (*Genji*, Hahakigi)

Since *=ka* always came to mark wh-phrases, it partly lost the function of exhibiting where the focus is.

On the other hand, traditional grammarians have assumed that the function of *=ya* showing the focus is weaker than that of *=ka*, and it frequently widens its focus to the whole sentence (Fujitani 1773: §1.2, Sakakura 1975: §3.3, Kondo 2000: §6.5). When compared with *=ka* in OJ, *=ya* in LOJ tended to attach less to reason-clauses and more to the predicate of matrix clauses (Nomura 2005). In the former pattern, it is rather evident that the focus is on the subordinate clause, as shown in (18a). In the latter, the focus is blurred, as in (18b).

(18) a. yama = wo taka-mi = **kamo** Yamato = no miye-nu.
mountain = ACC high-CAL = FOC.Q Yamato = NOM see-NEG
'Is it because the mountain is high, we cannot see the town of Yamato.' (*Manyô*, 44)

[5] One way of circumventing the problem that *=wo* poses in (16) is to assume that the particle *=wo* is not a case marker in OJ. Kuroda (2007) advances this line of argument based on the Yanagida's (2006) observation that *=wo*-marked phrases appear before *=no/ga* genitive phrases.

b. asa yuu=no miya∼dukawe=ni tuke-temo ϕito=no kokoro=o=nomi
morning evening=GEN court∼service=DAT attach-CNC person=GEN heart=ACC=always
ugokasi urami=o ou tumori=ni=**ya** ari-kemu.
move enmity=ACC incur pile=COP=FOC.Q COP-PST.EPI
'Was it because she always stimulated the other's hearts and incurred their enmities in her everyday court service?'(*Genji*, Hahakigi)

According to Nomura (2005), 32% of *ka* in OJ attached to reason clauses, but *ya* attaching to them reduced to 0.5% in *Genji Monogatari*. On the other hand, the ratio of *ka/ya* appearing in matrix predicates, as in (18b), increased from 15.7% (my counting) to 42.8% (Nomura's 2005) between *Man'yô* and *Genji*. Thus, the function of exhibiting the focus weakened in these *kakari*-particles in LOJ.

In parallel to the above changes, the word order of the focus phrases preceding *=no/ga*-marked nominatives disappeared. According to Nomura (2005), though there are not many examples where those phrases co-appear in the same clause, it is not exceptional that *=no/ga*-marked nominatives precede *kakari*-marked phrases. This disturbance of the word order may stem from the change of the function of *kakari*-particles: i.e., they did not necessarily land on the left-peripheral focus position in LOJ.

After the demise of *kakari*-particles, the function indicating focus was, presumably, taken over by a prominence. In that case, the prominence came to actualize on bare or case-marked NPs or PPs. The texts written in LOJ partly attest to this transmission. Yamada (2010), surveying the examples with focused subjects in the conversational part of these texts, showed that *=zo*, the LOJ descent of OJ *=so*, and nominative *=ga* were used complementarily with respect to their attaching nouns. Particularly in the sentences with verbal and adjectival predicates, the subject must be marked by *=ga* when attaching to first and second person pronouns and proper pronouns. On the other hand, *=zo* exclusively marks common nouns, whether animate or inanimate. Interrogative sentences exhibit a similar distribution where *=ya/ka* alternates with *=ga* depending on the subject noun. Since the focus is unlikely to depend on the choice of nominal properties, the above distribution indicates that *kakari*-particles partly transferred their focusing function to case particles *=ga* (with prominence).

These facts indicate that the focusing marker, and thus topic-focus articulation, started to collapse in LOJ, far earlier than the demise of the morphological concordance characterizing *kakari-musubi*.

4 On "up-the-tree" grammaticalization

4.1 In the verbal domain

Tabor & Traugott (1998) hypothesized that grammaticalization could accompany an "increase of structural scope" but not a decrease. Given a verb complex of Japanese, such as (19), this hypothesis states that a grammatical morpheme in an inner bracket can develop into those in the category of outer brackets, but not vice versa.

(19) a. yom-ase-rare-te irassyar-anakat-ta=rasii. (ModJ)
read-CAUS-PASS-GER PROG.RSP-NEG-PST=EVI
b. [… [… Verb Voice] Aspect] Hnorifics] Negation] Tense] Epistemic Modality/Evidentiality]

Though the "scope" has been variously interpreted in different frameworks (see Narrog 2012: 3.3.1), Tabor & Traugott 1998 defined it syntactically with C-command relations. Thus, we can find here a close relationship between grammaticalization and syntax, which generative scholars have rephrased as "upward reanalysis" (Roberts & Roussou 2003: §5.2.2) or "climbing up the tree" (van Gelderen 2004: p. 29).

One instance materializing this hypothesis and well discussed in Japanese is the formation of a tense morpheme from an aspect marker with a phonological reduction *-tari>-taru>-ta*. *-tari* included *ari*, an existential verb in OJ (Kinsui 2006: Chapter 2), and expressed a resultative meaning without contraction as in (20). Even the non-contracted from *-te ari* did not appear in the poems of *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*.

(20) tama=pa midare-**te** **ari**=to ip-azu=yamo
jewel=TOP scatter-GER exist=QUOT say-NEG=Q
'The jewels are now scattered around, isn't it?' (*Man'yô*, 424)

They were frequently contracted to *-tari* and used to mark the continuity of an event, expressing basically resultative but partly progressive (Nomura 1994, Kinsui 1995) through the Heian and Kamakura period, i.e., LOJ and early LMJ.

(21) aki=no no=o ɸaruka-ni tukuri-**taru**, sono koro=ni awi-te,
autumn=GEN field=ACC spacious-ADV make-RES that season=DAT match-GER
sakari-ni saki midare-**tari**.
peak-ADV bloom scatter-RES
'(The palace is) made with a spacious garden with autumn plants. In accordance with the season, (the flowers) bloom vigorously (with their leaves) scattered around.' (*Genji*, Otome)

In these periods, *-tari* only took non-stative verbs as an aspectual marker. On the other hand, during the Muromachi period, i.e. middle and late LMJ,[6] *-taru>-ta* had gradually attached to state predicates. The following example from *Amakusaban Heike Monogatari* (published in 1592) importantly shows that *-ta* had moved out of the Aspect slot, which novel aspectual markers *-te iru/aru* occupied after that (Yuzawa 1958: §9.9, Fukushima 2004).

(22) kuge-tati ɸyausi=o kae-te 'ana kuroguro kuroki tou=kana.
court.noble-PL rhythm=ACC change-GER EXCLM black black head=SFP
ika-naru ɸito=no urusi nuri-ken'=to yuu-te ɸayas-are-te
what-ACOP.ADN person=NOM lacquer paint-PST.EPI=QUOT say-GER tease-RSP-GER
at-**ta**.
exist-PST
'The court nobles made fun of the person, changing the rhythm and saying, 'What a black head! Who lacquered his head?' (*Amakusa-Heike*, 1-1)

Another piece of evidence showing the syntactic change of *-ta* comes from the order relative to negation. While the resultative *-tari* appeared before negation (23a), *-ta* surfaced after negation, grammaticalizing to a past tense morpheme (23b). See Yuzawa (1958: §9.15-16) for other examples from the Muromachi period.

[6] A question to the editor: do you still want to use LMJ, with EMJ replaced by LOJ? What period's name should we use for the Kamakura and Muromachi periods?

(23) a. utitoke-**tara**-nu motenasi
be.relaxed-RES-NEG manner
'the manner (of the woman) who is not relaxed' (*Genji*, Yugao)
b. sono itai=de aru=to yuu koto=o zonze-zat-**ta**
DEM son=COP COP=QUOT say NMLZ=ACC know-NEG-PST
'(I) did't know I was your son.' (*Shiganikkai*, completed in 1536, 22-4)

These facts reveal that *-tari>-ta* climbs up the syntactic tree until the Tense slot past the Negation slot.

Another instance of upward grammaticalization is traced in the polysemous morpheme *-(r)are* in ModJ. ModJ *-(r)are* has the four functions of marking passive, spontaneity, potential, and subject honorifics. Among these meanings, OJ *-(r)are*, or *-(r)aye*, only had the former two usages, indicating the latter two derived from the former. It is uncontroversial that the potential use of *-(r)are* emerged from spontaneity, commonly considered as a result of its use with negation (Narrog (2012: §4.4.2), but see Yoshida (2019: ch. 7, 8) for a different view). On the other hand, the meaning of *-(r)are* in OJ that brought about the honorific use has been under debate. Among many studies, Karashima's (2003) work is persuasive in detecting the close relationship between passivization and honorification in the early Heian materials. Given the 'spontaneity > potential' and 'passive > honorific' cline, we are now concerned with whether they conform to the syntactic change under discussion. Unfortunately, contrary to their semantic changes, their syntactic aspects are rarely documented in the literature. I tentatively point out here that potential and honorific use of *-rare* began to appear after an aspectual form in late LMJ as in (24a) and (24b), despite that *-rare-* must have precede it in LOJ as spontaneous (24c) and passive (24d) examples illustrate.

(24) a. nanto si-te kono yau=ni si-te i-**rare**-u=zo.
how do-GER this state=DAT do-GER STT-FUT=SFP
'How can I be like this? (I cannot be like this anymore.)' (*Kyôgen*, koshiinori)

b. ozi~bauzu=ga ... tera=o mot-te i-**raruru**
uncle~priest=NOM ... temple=ACC have-GER STT-RSP
'His uncle, a priest, has a temple.' (*Kyôgen*, tsurigitsune)
c. mi-te=wa uti wem-**are**-nu-beki sama
see-GER=TOP a.little smile-SPT-PRF-EPI appearance
'the appearance with which (anyone) has spontaneously smiles, ' (*Genji*, Kiritsubo)
d. uki miru=no nami=ni yose-**rare**-taru
floating sea.pine=NOM wave=DAT send-PASS-RES
'the floating sea pines which were sent by waves.' (*Ise*, 87)

Thus, *-rare* extends its position from the Voice slot to the outside of the Aspect slot, i.e., the Honorific and Dynamic modal slot in (25), climbing up the structural tree.

(25) [... [... Verb Voice] Aspect] Hnorifics/Dynamic modality] Negation ...]

The causative affixes *-sime* and *-ase* also acquired an honorific use in LOJ but it is still being determined whether they changed syntactically because the latter use preceded aspectual markers in LOJ as well. Some morphemes in verb complex changed their status to illocutionary markers, which scope out the whole complex in (19b). Narrog (2012) refers to ModJ *=daroo* (§4.3.2), which has the use to confirm the propositional content

to the addressee in addition to epistemic modal use, and a question marker *-kke* derived from an OJ tense morpheme *-keri* (§4.5.1). Investigating this area would reveal other instances that substantiate the hypothesis under discussion.

4.2 Outside the verbal domain: a counter-example

Recall from Sections 2.2 and 2.3 that case particles such as *=ga* and *=wo* evolved into conjunctive markers. These cases instantiate the "up-the-tree" hypothesis outside the verbal domain as illustrated in (26), in which *=ga* obviously widens its argument from an NP (or DP) to a sentence (or CP) (here I assume that *=ga* and *=wo* mark subjects and objects for simplicity).

(26) a. [$_S$ NP = **ga** NP = wo V]
b. [$_S$ NP = ga NP = wo V] = **ga** [$_S$ NP = ga NP = wo V]

This characterization of the change from case to conjunctive particles gives us a clear counter-example to the hypothesis because Japanese also shows a change in the opposite direction. As an illustration, this section concentrates on lexical items *=naritomo*, from a connective to an adverbial particle (Kinuhata 2007b), and *=yaran*, from a sentence-final particle to an NP affix (Kinuhata 2007a).

=Naritomo originally consisted of a copula verb *=nari* and a concessive marker *-tomo*. In LOJ, *-tomo* constituted concessive clauses, occasionally taking nominal predicates formed by *=nari*. In (27), for example, *-tomo* composes a different clause from the matrix, taking the predicate 'be a sibling'.

(27) onna = nara-ba, onazi ɸarakara = **nari-tomo**, kanarazu mutubiyori-na-masi.
woman = COP-COND same sibling = COP-CNC surely love-PRF-IRR
'If I were a woman, I would be surely attached to him even if we were a sibling.'
(*Genji*, xxx)

In late LMJ, however, there is evidence that the phrase including *=naritomo* did not constitute an independent clause. In *Amakusaban Heike Monogatari*, many instances of *=naritomo* marked an argument of the predicate, among which (28a) has case-marked NPs preceding *=naritomo*. (28b) is an example of *=naritomo* attaching to the verb but, the expletive *do* is inserted for tense, which crucially shows that *=naritomo* resides inside IP.

(28) a. ɸakanai ɸude = no ato = o = **naritomo** tatematut-te, 'I will at least send
short pencil = GEN trace = ACC = at.least send-GER
a short letter , and ...' (*Amakusa-Heike*, 1-8)
b. Niku-sa = mo nikusi, nabutte = **naritomo** yar-au. 'I hate him very much,
hate-NMLZ = also hateful tease = EXMP do-FUT
so I'll kind of make fun of him.' (*Kyôgen*, Kuramamairi)

These examples show the change of syntactic status of *-tomo*: i.e., from a clause-external to a clause-internal element with the help of copula =nari, as in (29).

(29) a. [$_S$ NP = ga NP = **nari] -tomo** [$_S$ NP = ga NP = o V]
b. [$_S$ NP = ga NP = o = **naritomo** V]

=Yaran was used as a question particle in early LMJ, appearing in the sentence-final position, as in (30a). The question formed with *=yaran* frequently presented the reason

of some facts, syntactically left-adjoining to the proposition denoting that fact, as in (30b).

(30) a. are=wa ikanaru zyaurau=nite masimasu=**yaran**.
that=TOP what noble.person=COP COP.RSP=Q
'Who is that noble person?' (*Kakuichi-Heike*, 5)

b. yo=ni=wa ikanisite more-keru=**yaran**, aware-ni yasasi-ki tamesi=ni=zo
world=LOC=TOP how leak-PST=Q sad-ADV lovely-ADN instance=COP=FOC
ɸitobito mausi∼aeri-keru.
people say.HML∼ITR-PST
'How did people come to know, they were talking about the story, seeing it as sad and lovely.' (*Kakuichi-Heike*, 1)

In the 15-16th century, it developed to constitute an indeterminate NP as in (31b), presumablFuy by way of constructions like (31a). In (31a), the question with *=yaran* only concerns the referent of the subject in the following sentence, as the index *i* indicates.

(31) a. [iduku=no onzausi=**yaran**]$_i$. [iro siro-ku mime kao=mo yo-ki
where=GEN son.of.noble=Q color white-ADV figure face=also good
syaunen]$_i$=no uma=o odorasi-te kuru=nari. 'Who is that noble boy,
boy=NOM horse=ACC prance-GER come=COP
a boy with white skin and good-looking is coming prancing a horse.' (*Chûka-jaboku*, 151)

b. nani-**yarau**=de kono tyuu=o mi-ta=zo.
what-INDT=LOC this annotation=ACC see-PST=SFP
'I saw the annotation of this in some books.' (*Shikishô*, Kyôdo)

The development of *=yaran* is similar to that of *=naritomo*: both started by linking two independent clauses and arrived at a function working in a single clause. However, *-yaran*, unlike *=naritomo*, became a nominal affix appearing before case particles as (31b) (see Kinuhata (2007a) for its reason). Thus, the summary of the change with =yaran is as (32) ((32b) is a case where 'N-yaran' occupies the subject position), which confirms *-yaran* instantiating the "down-the-tree" development.

(32) a. [$_S$ [NP=ga NP=o V]=**yaran**], [$_S$ NP=ga NP=o V]
b. [$_S$ [$_{NP}$N-**yaran**]=ga NP=o V]

The change reducing its arguments from clausal to non-clausal is not rare in the history of Japanese (see also Kinuhata et al. 2009). It is not surprising because simplifying a bi-clausal to a mono-clausal structure is attested cross-linguistically (Harris & Campbell 1995: ch. 7), and the above examples instantiate this simplification. It is also interesting to note that Lehmann (2015: 4.3.1) assumed an opposite direction, i.e.,"scope-decreasing", as a defining property of grammaticalization referring to bi-clausal to mono-clausal change. Then, the question arises of how the "up-the-tree" grammaticalization theory can reconcile with these apparent downward changes. One possibility to protect the "up-the-tree" hypothesis would be excluding the change of *=naritomo* and *=yaran* from a case of grammaticalization. These entries can be viewed as fully grammaticalized from the beginning as a conjunctive and question particle.[7] However, the history of these particles indicates that syntactically speaking, grammatical expressions can

[7] Still, they pose a challenge for the "up-the-tree" grammaticalization because they involve the decategorization of copula verbs (*=yaran* also includes copula *-ara*).

evolve in both upward and downward directions. Thus, the relevant change undermines purely syntactic accounts of grammaticalization that only involve "up-the-tree" reanalysis (Roberts & Roussou 2003, van Gelderen 2004).

5 Negation-sensitive expressions

5.1 Loss of NPI *dani*

The reason for adopting the term "up-the-tree" instead of "scope-increase" in the title of Section 4 is to highlight the fact that the changes discussed there are basically syntactic. If the "scope" of Tabor and Traugott's (1998) term were semantic, it would become not straightforward to detect scope relations between, for example, modality and negation due to ambiguities such as $\diamond\neg$ and $\neg\diamond$.

However, this choice of terms does not mean, however, that semantic scope is not relevant to the historical change. In this section, we will see that the scope ambiguity, primarily semantic but concomitantly syntactic, triggered a historical change of *dani*, a Negative Polarity Item in OJ.

Dani is a scale-inducing particle like English *even*, but it could not occur in affirmative declaratives in OJ. Conversely, negation, imperatives, volitives, desideratives, and conditional antecedents can license it (Kano 1938), as in (33): (33a) is an example of *dani* used with negation and (33b) is that with volitives.

(33) a. mi∼maturi-te imada toki=**dani** kapara-n-eba,
see∼HML-GER yet time=even change-NEG-CNC
'Even though it has not yet passed even a brief period since I met you (I miss you already.)' (*Man'yô*, 579)

b. imo=wo ime=ni=**dani** pisasi-ku mi-mu=wo, ake-ni-keru=kamo.
wife=ACC dream=LOC=even long-ADV see-FUT=SFP dawn-PRF-PST=EXCLM
'I would love to see my wife over an extended period, at least in my dream. Nevertheless, the night has dawned.' (*Man'yô*, 3714)

Kinuhata (to appear: §2) considered the sentence with *dani* except for that with negation to share one semantic feature "wish" and tried to account for its license by "wish" and negation, proposing *dani*'s semantics and a constraint to use it. According to his analysis, *dani*'s semantic contribution is to add a presupposition that *dani* attaches to a "more-likely" proposition than the alternatives, and it can be licensed only when the statement including those licensers entails the alternatives, i.e., the strengthening constraint in the sense of Kadmon & Landman (1993).

Given these semantics and constraint, example (33a) licenses *dani* as follows. The proposition 'it passed a brief period' is more likely than alternatives such as 'it passed a long period', and the negative statement 'it doesn't pass a brief period' entails the negative alternative 'it doesn't pass a long period'. As this interpretation shows, *dani* is inside the scope of negation in the same way as usual NPIs.

(34) [[..... *dani* .....] NEG]

As for the licenser "wish", Kinuhata (to appear) proposed a semantics closely connected to counterfactuality because because the speaker's wish does not come true, as seen in (33b). We can explain the license of dani in (33b) as follows. It is more likely that the speaker sees his wife in a dream than the speaker sees his wife in reality (in the speaker's

thoughts). In addition, wishing an unrealized more-likely proposition entails wishing an unrealized less-likely proposition (see Kinuhata (to appear) for the formal definition).

Dani extended its appearance in LOJ: it came to be used not only in the above contexts but also with non-wishing affirmative predicates, as in (35). This extension means that *dani* lost its NPI property in LOJ.

(35) ɸakana-ki oon-kudamono = o = **dani** ito monou-ku si tamai-te 'She feels a.little-ADN HON-foods = ACC = even very gloomy-ADV do RSP-GER pain even to eat a little meal, ' (*Genji*, Wakana)

Kinuhata (2005) argued that the trigger of this expansion is the reanalysis of the scope of *dani* with respect to negation as (36).

(36) [..... *dani* [..... NEG]]

The interpretation of the sentence (33a) with *dani* taking a wide scope is that it is less likely not to pass a brief period than not to pass an extended period. Thus, the scopal reinterpretation coincides with the meaning change of *dani*: it now adds a presupposition that the argument of *dani* is "less likely". Once *dani* scopes over negation, as in (36), there is no reason to prevent the substitution of predicates to affirmatives, giving rise to examples like (35). As evidence for the scope-as-trigger hypothesis, Kinuhata (2005: §4) showed that in early LOJ, the number of examples of *dani* with negation significantly increased, germinating a small number of affirmative examples. Succeedingly, the semantic transfer of *dani* from taking the more-likely to the less-likely proposition was completed during the Muromachi period, making it less appear with wishing predicates (Kinuhata to appear: §3.2, 3.3). This fact also shows that the appearance of *dani* in affirmative predicates was more closely related to its with negative ones than with wishing ones.

5.2 Rise of Neg-concord *sika*

An expression can require negation, residing outside the scope of negation. For example, *nanimo* (what-also) and *daremo* (who-also) in ModJ are universal quantifiers that must be with negation in the same clause. Since these sentences are translated with a universally negative quantifier *no*, as in (37), the scope of these quantifiers is wider than negation.

(37) Zyon = wa **nanimo** {yom-anakat-ta/ *yon-da}.
John = TOP everything read-NEG-PST/ read-PST
'John read nothing.' ($\rightsquigarrow \forall x[\neg read(John, x)]$)

The above scope relation indicates that these quantifies are not NPIs, correctly predicting their non-occurrence in downward entailing contexts (Ladusaw 1979).

(38) syukudai = o **nanimo** *dasi-tara (das-anakat-tara) home-rare-ru = desyoo.
homework = ACC everything submit-COND submit-NEG-COND
'*If you (don't) submit any homework, you will be praised.'

Though the dependency of *nanimo* and *daremo* on negation has been firmly established during EModJ (Yamanishi 1987, Kawase 2011), their connection with negation may be accidental as shown by another quantifier-like adverb *zenzen* (at all). This adverb emerged in the Meiji period (1876-). In the beginning, it could modify both affirmative and negative predicates, then had strengthened links with negation during 1920-40 (Wakatabe 1991), but recently came to allow itself with affirmative predicates again (see

Noda 2000). Even if accidental, it is worth pursuing the history of these neg(ation)-sensitive expressions as long as they show interesting properties of syntactic change, which we can find in the "cyclic" development of *sika*.

Sika introduces an exception to a universally quantified statement whose predicate must come with negation. As with *nanimo* and *zenzen*, the universal quantifier concealed in (39), for example, must take scope over the negation in the predicate; otherwise, 'John' cannot be the only exception to the generalization.

(39) Zyon=**sika** (gakusei=ga) partii=ni {ko-nakat-ta/ *ki-ta}.
John=except student=NOM party=DAT {come-NEG-PST/ come-PST}
'No one (student) except John came to the party.'

Since the exceptive phrase marked by =*sika* associates with this quantifier, it is natural to assume it also to scope out negation. *Sika* is not an NPI due to this assumption, which its ungrammaticality confirms in downward entailing contexts: it receives the same judgments as *nanimo* in (38). In sum, *sika* is similar to *nanimo* and *zenzen*, having a universal quantifier scoping over negation, except for the exception marking.

Since *sika* was unique to Eastern dialects, examples before EModJ are not attested. When it appeared in history, it had already had the same function as today's use, according to Miyachi (2007). The following is the earliest example given in Miyachi (2007), with the page number given there.

(40) mukoo=wa oira=ga tukaikon-de=demo iru=to=**sika** omow-anee=wana.
over.there=TOP 1.SG=NOM embezzle-GER=EXMP STT=QUOT=except think-NEG=SFP
'They think nothing but that I am embezzling.' (*Kakutamago*, published in 1784, p. 57)

Even though the genesis and the etymology of *sika* are not necessarily clear, *sika* affected the creation of other *sika*-like neg-sensitive expressions. In the Meiji period, another neg-sensitive expression *kiri* was born through the influence of *sika* as in (41).

(41) a. tooken=wa minna ut-te simat-te ima sasi-te iru nihon=**kirisika**
sword=TOP all sell-GER PRF-GER now wear-GER STT two=except
nai.
no
'Since I have sold all my swords, I have none except for the two I now wear.' (*Fuku'ôziden*, published in 1899, p. 58)

b. tatoi genbun'itti=o tukat-temo sooroobun-teki=na naiyoo=**kiri**
even colloquial.style=ACC use-CNC epistolary.style=ADN content=except
kake=soo=mo nai.
write=EVI=also NEG
'Even if I use a colloquial style, I cannot write any content except for something written in epistolary style.' (*Ôtsu Junkichi*, published in 1912, p. 59)

Miyachi (2007: ch. 2, §3.1) argued that the same process is detectable in the Kyoto-Osaka dialect, in which *hoka* supported the development of *yori* through their compositon *yorihoka*. They all marked exceptive phrases to universal quantification as with ModJ *sika*. Further, she (ch. 3) concluded it fairly probable for the following process to have occurred, using data in the Grammar Atlas of Japanese Dialects (NINJAL 1989: no. 51).

(42) a. *sika* > *yorisika* > *yori* (Akita)

b. *sika* > *yokasika* > *yoka* (Oki in Shimane)
c. *sika* > *kirisika* > *kiri* (Saitama and Nagano)
d. *sika* > *girisika* > *giri* (Iki-Tsushima in Nagasaki)

These data show that the change driving the genesis of the above neg-sensitive expressions is cyclical. While it is a well-known fact that negation can emerge as a result of cycle cross-linguistically, i.e., Jespersen's Cycle, the process has not been witnessed in negative morphemes of Japanese. The same negative morpheme has consistently occupied post-verbal positions in the history of Japanese: *zu*>*nu*>*n* in Western Japanese and *napu* (OJ) or *nai* (Modern) in Eastern Japanese.[8] Is it incidental for a clear case of cyclical change to attest to expressions that intimately relate to negation? Or is it possible to integrate the above change into a more universally attested cyclical change of negation? Though neg-sensitive expressions, particularly NPIs, appear as the source or the result of the negative cycle (Hoeksema 2009; van der Auwera 2009), no study has reported an instance of neg-sensitive expressions' cycle itself. In that sense, the emergence of *sika*-like expressions can open up a hitherto uninvestigated area of language change.

6 Syntactic borrowing: a case of passive

6.1 Rise of *niyotte*-passive

This last section looks at borrowing a syntactic pattern. While it is undeniable that lexical items are more susceptible to borrowing than syntax, language contact creates many syntactic patterns across languages (Harris & Campbell 1995: ch. 6). Among these constructions, the topic most debated in the literature on Japanese is passive. It has been discussed in the literature on Japanese passives what subclass is native to Japanese and what is not. A simple assumption for the native/non-native opposition is that Japanese originally subcategorizes the passive that has sentient subjects, passives with non-sentient subjects, called "non-sentient passives", considered to be imported from European languages. However, as pointed out earlier by Yamada (1908), the non-sentient theme has been able to occupy the subject of the passive sentence since Old Japanese. The following examples are from Yamada (1908: p. 376), with (d) added from Okabe (2018).

(43) a. tokorosek-ari-si mi~gusi=no sukosi heg-**are**-taru=si=mo imiziu
thick-ACOP-PST HON~hair=GEN a.little thin-PASS-RES=EMPH=also extreme.ADV
medetaki=wo
praiseworthy.ADN=CONJ
'The hair being thinned a little, which was thick before, is extremely beautiful.' (*Genji*, Akashi)

b. saide=no osi~ɸes-**are**-te sausi=no naka=nado=ni
cloth.scrap=NOM push~compress-PASS-GER book=GEN inside=EXMP=DAT
ari-keru
exist-PST
'A piece of cloth that was compressed and left in a book' (*Makura*, 28)

[8] The markers for prohibition may undergo a cyclical change (Konoshima 1996: §6.2) because one of the markers, i.e., *na*, can occupy a pre-verbal position. If this is the case, the change of prohibitive construction proceeds as 'na V' > 'na V so' > 'V so'. However, 'V so' was relatively rare, and 'V na' became dominant toward ModJ (at least in Standard Japanese).

c. sitomi kaze=ni sibuk-**are**-te tani=no soko=ni tori=no
lattice.shutter wind=DAT blow-PASS-GER hollow=GEN bottom=LOC bird=GEN
iru=yau-ni yaora oti-ni-kere-ba
stop=like-ADV slowly fall-PRF-PST-CAL
'With the lattice shutter (that the man holds) blown by the wind, he slowly fell to the bottom of the hollow like the landing of birds.' (*Ujishûi*, 4)

d. ka-no Akasi=no ɸune ko-no ɸibiki=ni os-**are**-te
DEM-ADN Akashi=GEN ship DEM-ADN bustle=DAT overwhelm-PASS-GER
sugi-nuru koto=mo kikoyur-eba
pass-PRF COMP-also say.hmlCAL
'When he reported that the ship of Akashi was overwhelmed by this bustle and passed (the Sumiyoshi Shrine), ...' (*Genji*, Miotsukushi)

Although Matsushita (1930) concluded that the native passive construction of Japanese must have sentient subjects, he considered it a result of the function of passives, which expressed an influence on the subject from the event involved. Kuroda (1979) elaborated a similar view by analyzing his *ni*-passives, i.e., passives whose agents are marked by the dative marker *=ni*. Comparing the *ni*-passive with the *niyotte*-passive, he proposed that while *niyotte*-passive describes the event neutrally only with the change of their grammatical relations, *ni*-passive is always characterized as having a connotation of "affectivity". This concept induces various pragmatic effects and is not easy to pin down. In (44a), for example, the *ni*-counterpart tends to convey John's relief through the rescue by his friend Bill, whereas the *niyotte*-pattern sounds objectively and as if written in a newspaper. Thus, *=niyotte* is more suitable in (44b), where the Sino-Japanese counterpart of 'rescue', *kyuuzyos*, adds more objective nuances.

(44) a. Zyon=wa Biru={ni/?niyotte} tasuke-**rare**-ta.
John=TOP Bill=DAT/by rescue-PASS-PST

b. Zyon=wa soosakutai={ni/niyotte} kyuuzyos-**are**-ta.
John=TOP search.party=DAT/by rescue-PASS-PST
'John was rescued by {Bill/the search party}.'

Kuroda (1979), as well as Matsushita (1930), presumed that the *ni*-passive is native to Japanese, whereas *niyotte*-passive is innovation through contact with European languages.

Extending Kuroda's (1979) idea might be able to explain the non-sentient passives given in (43c) and (43d). Though the subjects of these examples are inanimate, some human beings can be "affected" by the event denoted by the passivized predicates. That is, the man who could safely land thanks to his shutter blown and Akashi, with her ship overwhelmed, respectively. On the other hand, (43a) and (43b) are a type of passives classified by Masuoka (1987: pt. 3, §2.5) as not involving affectivity ("demotional passive" in his terminology). They describe states such as the hair thinned and a piece of paper compressed from a neutral viewpoint, backgrounding ("demoting") the agents of their events. Since the majority of non-sentient passives attested in LOJ is this "demotional" type (Kosugi 1979), which was named "scene-description sentences" by Kinsui (1991), we have to absorb the fact that there are (at least) two types of passive native to Japanese (see Kawamura (2012: §3.2.5), Okabe (2018) for other types).

Given that Japanese originally had a passive that described relevant states neutrally, the question remains what type of passives came into use in Japanese through language contact. The clue to answering this question is that the agents do not surface in (43a)

and (43b).[9] Even if *ni*-marked phrases appear in non-sentient passives, they must be inanimate, as exemplified by (43c) and (43d) (Kinsui 1991). This constraint is also true of "scene-description" passives, as shown in (45).

(45) uki miru=no nami=ni yose-**rare**-taru ϕiroϕi-te
floating sea.weed=NOM wave=DAT carry-PASS-PRF.ADN collect-GER
'(The girls) collected the seaweeds that were carried by waves, ...' (*Ise*, 87)

Since inanimate participants are not typical agents but rather a cause of an event, this restriction indicates that, before Modern Japanese, there was no passive converting the grammatical relations of the agent and the theme. This conversion is exactly the one that the innovation of *niyotte*-passives achieved, as the agent of "demotional passives", usually backgrounded as in (46a), must be *niyotte*-marked as in (46b) when it appears (Masuoka 1987: pp. 192–193).

(46) a. too'an∼yoosi=ga kaisyuus-**are**-te iru.
answer∼sheet=NOM collect-PASS-GER RES
b. too'an∼yoosi=ga sikenkan={*ni/niyotte} kaisyuus-**are**-te iru.
answer∼sheet=NOM proctor=DAT/by collect-PASS-GER RES
'The answer sheets have been collected (by the proctor).'

With the prediction that the *niyotte*-passive is an innovation under the influence of European languages, Kinsui (1992) detected the source of the *niyotte*-passive (47) in the literal translation of the textbook for Dutch grammar named *Grammatica of Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* and found it extended to the translation of the English *by*-passive in the Meiji period.

(47) takumi=naru gogakusya=niyotte sadame-**rare**-taru ichi∼ni=no ippan=naru
erudite=COP.ADN linguist=by establish-PAS-PRF one∼two=GEN general=GEN
kisoku
rule
'Some rules that are established by erudite linguists'
(*Sô-yaku Grammachika*, published 1856, taken from Kinsui 1997: 772)

Therefore, the innovation of the *niyotte*-passive is a case of borrowing a syntactic operation, which transforms the agent from the subject of an active sentence to an adjunct of a passive sentence without involving "affective" connotation (cf. Kuroda 1979: §25).

6.2 Insentient subject in causatives

Why was it impossible for insentient passives in Old Japanese to get along with an animate agent? If possible, the insentient participant would appear as the subject despite marking the animate participant with the dative or an oblique case. This alignment might counter the constraint that requires the writer of a sentence to sympathize with sentient rather than insentient participants, assuming the subject as the center of predication (Kinsui 1991: 10).

[9] Shiba (2018) argued that Japanese developed a subtype of insentient passives without surface agents. As the result, the passives in ModJ do not confine to "scene-description sentences". The emergence of this type was triggered by the decline of potential and spontaneous usage of the affix *-rare-* according to Shiba (2018). Since these changes seem not to relate to the language contact, the relevant change of the passive construction is beyond the scope of this section.

(48) Given sentient and insentient participants,
‘sentient > insentient’ preference for the subject holds.

Under this view, the rise of *niyotte*-passives indicates the loosening of this constraint, allowing the insentient participant to occupy the subject with the sentient agent marked by *niyotte*. The change of causatives also supports this loosening. Morioka (1999: 213–14) pointed out the increase of causatives that make insentient participants displace sentient ones from the subject position under the influence of the literal translation of European languages. (49a) is an example of a literal translation of English given below, which later made it appear in novels as illustrated by (49b).

(49) a. kyozin=no ooki-naru yubi=no betudan=no tuyo-ki pooku=ga
ginant=GEN big-ACOP.ADN finger=GEN extra=GEN hard-ADN poke=NOM
kare=osite kare=no kuti=o hirak-**asime**-si.
3.SG=with 3.SG=GEN mouth=ACC open-CAUS-PST
‘an extra hard poke of the giant’s big finger made him open his mouth…’
(A literal translation of *New national fourth reader* published in 1886: Morioka 1999: 214)

b. Otugi=no tasinami=o usinat-ta awatadasi-sa=ga Kanzi=o
Otugi=GEN control=ACC lose-PST clamorous-NMLZ=NOM Kanzi=ACC
niwa=ni hasir-**ase**-ta.
garden=DAT run-CAUS-PST
‘Otsugi’s bustle without control of herself let Kanzi to rush into the garden.’
(*Tsuchi*, published in 1910: Morioka 1999: 216)

Morioka (1999) extended this view to transitive sentences in general: he considered it rare in native Japanese that the insentient subject dominated sentient objects in transitive sentences (p. 90, 146). On the other hand, Aoki (2016: ch. 11) argued against Morioka (1999) that insentient participants could be the subject as the CAUSE of a transitive sentence since Old Japanese. Though most examples given in Aoki (2016) are those with insentient objects, some examples have sentient objects, as in (50) (Aoki 2016: 196).

(50) a. kaku=no goto-ki zis∼syu=no muyegyau=no in=pa moromoro
this=GEN like-ADN ten∼kind=GEN unreliable=GEN desire=TOP various
syuzyau=ni konpon=no tumi=wo okas-**asime**.
mankind=DAT serious=GEN crime=ACC commit-CAUS
‘The ten kinds of unreliable desire like this make all sentient beings commit serious crimes.’ (*Jizôjûrinkyô Gankeiten*, annotated in 883)

b. taki=no koe=wa itodo mono omo’u ϕito=o odorokasi-gao=ni
fall=GEN sound=TOP increasingly thing think person=ACC astonish-face=COP

‘The sound of fall seems like astonishing a distressed person.’ (*Genji*, Yûgiri)

Still, Aoki (2016) accepted Morioka’s (1999) view as a tendency and confirmed that the sentient objects in those examples are all EXPERIENCER, not AGENT (p. 196). If so, we must modify the constraint above according to the hierarchy equipped with thematic roles. The constraint inherent to Japanese was (51a) rather than (51b).

(51) Given sentient AGENT/EXPERIENCER and insentient CAUSE/THEME participants,
a. ‘sentient AGENT > insentient CAUSE/THEME’

b. 'sentient EXPERIENCER > insentient CAUSE/THEME'
preference for the subject holds.

This assumption leads us to conclude that the pattern in (49) is innovation through language contact because their indirect objects are AGENT. Moreover, it can still account for the innovative status of the *niyotte*-passive because =*niyotte* can mark agents of insentient passives.

Lastly, let us remark on the stylistic restriction of these passive and causative sentences: they are more often used in formal writings and scarcely in daily conversations. This preference means that the emancipation from the constraint (51), i.e., those observed in (49), was invited for stylistic reasons: the formal writings prefer to depict the fact objectively without committing to any sentient participants. In informal settings, conversely, the relevant hierarchy might still be active even in ModJ, secluded from formal ones by the characteristic of styles.

7 conclusion

This chapter has looked at the development of the case and conjunctive particles, loss of information-marking, grammaticalization, the fall and rise of neg-sensitive expressions, and borrowing of passive construction. The syntactic aspects of these changes are mostly reanalysis. The conjunctive particle *ga* ariose by reanalyzing the preceding NP as a clause. This reanalysis conforms to the "up-the-tree" grammaticalization process, but "down-the-tree" reanalysis was also possible, as seen in, for example, the change from a concessive to an adverbial particle (Section 4.2). The changes of neg-sensitive expressions also involved reanalysis: the reinterpretation of the scope of an NPI *dani* concomitantly accompanied the change of its semantics. Other two aspects of syntactic change are, according to Harris & Campbell (1995), extension and borrowing. The development of the nominative case marker *ga* is a case of the former, extending its occurrence from subordinate to matrix clauses. We saw in the last section borrowing of passive and causative constructions. The demise of information marking, i.e., *kakari-musubi*, does not fall under these characterizations of syntactic change because they are the force to derive new constructions. Therefore, it may scope out the theory of syntactic change to investigate the weakening of the focusing function of *kakari*-particles.

Texts

(only used for examples)
Man'yôshû (SKBZ), *Ise monogatari* (SKBZ), *Makura no sôshi* (SKBZ), *Genji Monogatari* (SKBZ), *Konjaku Monogatarishû* (SKBZ), *Ujishûi monogatari* (SKBZ), *Kakuichibon Heike monogatari* (SKBZ), *Shikishô* (*Shiki Tôgen shô no kenkyû*), *Chûkajabokushishô* (SKBT), *Shiganikkai* (Shômono taikei), *Amakusaban Heike monogatari* (*Amakusaban Heike Monogatari Taishôhonmon oyobi Sôsakuin*. Meijishoin.), *Kôgen* (*Ôkura toraakira nô-kyôgen shû*
SKBZ...*Sinpen Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshû*, Shogakukan.
SKBT...*Sin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei*, Iwanami Shoten.

Abbreviations

(not listed in the Leipzig Glossing Rules and the manual)

ACOP: adjectival copula	ADV: adverbializer	APP: appositive	CONC: conclusive
CONJ: conjunctive	EMPH: emphatic	EXCLM: exclamative	EXMP: exemplification
EVI: evidential	GER: gerundive	INDT: indeterminate	ITR: iterative
SFP: sentence final particle	SPT: spontaneous		

References

Aldridge, Edith. 2009. Short *wh*-movement in Old Japanese. In Iwasaki, Shoichi & Hoji, Hajime & Clancy, Patricia M. & Sohn, Sung-Ock (eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics* 17, 549–563. Stanford: CSLI.

Aoki, Hirofumi. 2016. *Nihongo rekishi tôgoron josetsu [Introduction to Japanese historical syntax]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Arthur, Waley. 1970. *The tale of Genji*. Tokyo: C. E. Tuttle. (Originally published in 1925–33).

Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2011. *A history of the Japanese language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fujitani, Nariakira. 1773. *Ayuishô [An excerpt of ayui]*. Kyoto.

Fukushima, Tatenobu. 2004. Chûsei makki Nihongo no *-teiru -tearu* to dôshi kihonkei [*-teiru/tearu* and the bare verbal form of last Middle Japanese]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 81(2). 47–59.

Harris, Alice C. & Campbell, Lyle. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoeksema, Jack. 2009. Jespersen recycled. In van Gelderen, Elly (ed.), *Cyclical change*, chap. 2, 15–34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ishigaki, Kenji. 1955. *Joshi no rekishiteki kenkyû [A historical study of particles]*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Kadmon, Nirit & Landman, Fred. 1993. *Any*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16. 353–422.

Kano, Kyozaburo. 1938. *Dani sura* no yôhôjô no sai ni tsuite [On the distinction of the use of *dani* and *sura*]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 15(6). 49–64.

Karashima, Mie. 2003. *Kana monjo no kokugogakuteki kenkyû [A Japanese-linguistic study on kana-written anciant records]*. Osaka: Seibundô Publishers.

Kawamura, Futoshi. 2012. Raru-*kei jutsugobun no kenkyû [A study on* raru-*predicate sentences]*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Kawase, Suguru. 2011. Johô fukushi *nanimo* no seiritsu [The development of the modal adverb *nanimo*]. *Nihongo no kenkyû* 7(2). 32–47.

Kinsui, Satoshi. 1991. Judôbun no rekishi ni tsuite no ichi kôsatsu [A consideration on the history of passives]. *Kokugogaku* 164. 1–14.

Kinsui, Satoshi. 1992. Ôbun honyaku to judôbun: Edo jidai o chûshin ni [Translating European literature and the passive: focusing on the Edo period]. In *Bunka gengogaku*, 547–562. Tokyo: Sanseido.

Kinsui, Satoshi. 1995. Iwayuru shinkôtai ni tsuite [On so-called progressive]. In editorial board, The (ed.), *Tsukishima Hiroshi hakase koki kinen kokugogaku ronshû*, 169–197. Tokyo: Kyuko shoin.

Kinsui, Satoshi. 1997. The influence of translation on the historical development of the Japanese passive construction. *Journal of pragmatics* 28(1). 759–779.

Kinsui, Satoshi. 2006. *Nihongo sonzaihyôgen no rekishi [History of existential expression in Japanese]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
Kinuhata, Tomohide. 2005. Fukujoshi *dani* no imi to kôzô to sono henka: Jôdai Chûko ni okeru [Focus particle *dani*: its syntax, semantics, and their evolution from the nara to the heian period]. *Nihongo bunpô* 5(1). 158–175.
Kinuhata, Tomohide. 2007a. Fukasetsu kara toritate e no rekishi henka no futatsu no pataan [Two patterns of the historical change from a adjunct clause to focus particles]. In Aoki, Hirofumi (ed.), *Nihong no kôzô henka to bunpôka*, 65–91. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
Kinuhata, Tomohide. 2007b. Syntactic change from connective to focus particles in Japanese. In McGloin, N. & Mori, J. (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 16*, 395–406. Stanford: CSLI.
Kinuhata, Tomohide. 2014. Nihongo gimonbun no rekishi henka: Jôdai kara Chûsei [A historical change of Japanese interrogatives: from Old to Middle Japanese]. In Aoki, Hirofumi & Koyanagi, Tomokazu & Takayama, Yoshiyuki (eds.), *Nihongo bunpôshi kenkyû*, 61–80. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
Kinuhata, Tomohide. to appear. Scope ambiguity and the loss of NPI feature: Evidence from the history of *dani* in Japanese. In Kishimoto, Hideki & Sawada, Osamu & Imani, Ikumi (eds.), *Polarity-sensitive expressions: Comparison between Japanese and other languages*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
Kinuhata, Tomohide & Iwata, Miho & Eguchi, Tadashi & Kinsui, Satoshi. 2009. Genesis of 'exemplification' in Japanese. In Takubo, Yukinori & Kinuhata, Tomohide & Grzelak, Szymon & Nagai, Kayo (eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics* 16, 87–101. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
Kondo, Yasuhiro. 2000. *Nihongo kijitsu bunpô no riron [A theory of Japanese descriptive grammar]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
Konoshima, Masatoshi. 1996. *Kokugo joshi no kenkyu: joshishi no sobyô [A study on Japanese particles: a description of the history of particles]*. Tokyo: Ôfûsha.
Kosugi, Shoichi. 1979. Hijô no ukemi ni tsuite [On insentient passive]. In editorial board, The (ed.), *Tanabe hakase koki kinen joshi jodôshi ronsô*, 473–488. Tokyo: Ôfûsha.
Kuroda, S.-Y. 1979. On Japanese passive. In G. Bedell, E. Kobayashi & Muraki, M. (eds.), *Exploration in linguistics: Papers in honor of Kazuko Inoue*, 305–347. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
Kuroda, S.-Y. 2007. On the syntax of Old Japanese. In Frellesvig, Bjarke & Shibatani, Masayoshi & Smith, John Charles (eds.), *Current issues in the history and structure of Japanese*, 263–317. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
Ladusaw, William. 1979. *Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations*: University of Texas at Austin dissertation.
Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization* (Classics in Linguistics 1). Berlin: Language Science Press 3rd edn.
Masuoka, Takashi. 1987. *Meidai no bunpô [A grammar of proposition]*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
Matsushita, Daizaburo. 1930. *Hyôjun Nihon kôgohô [Standard grammar of colloquial Japanese]*. Tokyo: Chubunkan Shoten.
Miyachi, Asako. 2007. *Nihongo joshi* shika *ni kakawaru kôbun kôzôshiteki kenkyû: bunpôshi no ichi shiron [The study of the history of construction and structure concering japanese particle* shika*: an attempt of historical grammar]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
Morioka, Kenji. 1999. *Ôbun kundoku no kenkyû: ôbunmyaku no keisei [A study of kun-reading of european literature: fomation of european veins]*. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
Narrog, Heiko. 2012. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/

9780199694372.001.0001
NINJAL. 1989. *Hôgen bunpô zenkoku chizu: dai isshû [The grammar atlas of Japanese dialects: No. 1]*. Tokyo: National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics.
Noda, Harumi. 2000. *Zenzen* to kôteikei no kyôki [Co-occurrence of *zenzen* and affirmative forms]. *Keiryô Kokugogaku* 22(5). 169–182.
Nomura, Takashi. 1993. Jôdaigo no *no* to *ga* ni tsuite jô [On Old Japanese *no* and *ga* no. 1]. *Kokugo Kokubun* 62(2). 1–17.
Nomura, Takashi. 1994. Jôdaigo no *ri* to *tari* ni tsuite [On Old Japanese *ri* and *tari*]. *Kokugo Kokubun* 63(1). 28–51.
Nomura, Takashi. 1996. *Ga*-shûshikei e [Towards *ga* ending with the conclusive form]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 65(5). 524–541.
Nomura, Takashi. 2005. Chûko kakari-musubi no henyô [Transformation of *kakari-musubi* in Late Old Japanese]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 82(11). 36–46.
Okabe, Yoshiyuki. 2018. Hijô no ukemi no bariêshon: Kindai izen no wabun shiryô ni okeru [Variation of insentient passives: in Japanese-coloquial texts witten before Modern Japanese]. In Okazaki, Tomoko & Kinuhata, Tomohide & Mori, Yuta & Fujimoto, Mariko (eds.), *Bariêshon no naka no Nihongoshi*, 159–173. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, Lilian (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Springer.
Roberts, Ian & Roussou, Anna. 2003. *Syntactic change: a minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486326
Sakakura, Atsuyoshi. 1975. *Bunshô to hyôgen [Writings and expressions]*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten Publishing.
Sasaki, Takashi. 1996. *Jôdaigo no kôbun to hyôki [Construction and transcription of Old Japanese]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
Shiba, Ayako. 2018. *raru* kôbun niyoru voisu taikei: Hijô no ukemi no ruikei ga kagirarete ita riyû o megutte. In Okazaki, Tomoko & Kinuhata, Tomohide & Mori, Yuta & Fujimoto, Mariko (eds.), *Bariêshon no naka no Nihongoshi*, 175–195. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
Tabor, Whitney & Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1998. Structural scope expansion and grammaticalization. In Ramat, Anna Giacalone & Hopper, Paul J. (eds.), *The limits of grammaticalization*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.37.11tab
Takeuchi, Shiro. 2008. Kodai Nihongo no kakujoshi *o* no hyôziiki to sono henka [The marking domain and its change of Old Japanese case particle *o*]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 85(4). 50–63.
Takeuchi, Shiro. 2020. Jôdaigo no jûzokusetsu, shubun rentaikei/izenkeisetsu ni okeru shugo hyôzi: *ga*, *no*, mujoshi ni okeru imiteki tôgotekina seigen no kentô [Subject marking in subordinate clauses and matrix clauses ending with adnominal and realis forms in Old Japanese: an examination of semantic and syntactic restrictions of *ga*-, *no*-, and bare-marked NPs]. In Aoki, Hirofumi & Koyanagi, Tomokazu & Yoshida, Nagahiro (eds.), *Nihongo bunpôshi kenkyû 5*, 41–72. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
van der Auwera, Johan. 2009. The jespersen cycles. In van Gelderen, Elly (ed.), *Cyclical change*, chap. 3, 35–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
van Gelderen, Elly. 2004. *Grammaticalization as economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.71
Vovin, Alexander. 1997. On the syntactic typology of Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6. 273–290.
Wakatabe, Akira. 1991. *Zensen* no goshi [Glossary of *zenzen*]. *Kaishaku* 440. 24–29.

Watanabe, Akira. 2002. Loss of overt wh-movement in Old Japanese. In Lightfoot, David W. (ed.), *Syntactic effects of morphological change*, 179–195. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watanabe, Akira. 2007. Topic-focus articulation in Old Japanese: *so/zo* and *koso*. In Kelepir, Meltem & Öztürk, Belkiz (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics*, 121–136. MITWPL.

Yamada, Masahiro. 2010. *Kakujoshi* ga *no tûziteki kenkyû [A diachronic study of the case particle* ga*]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Yamada, Yoshio. 1908. *Nihon bunpôron [Japan grammar theory]*. Tokyo: Hobunkan.

Yamanishi, Masako. 1987. *Daremo* kô [A consideration on *daremo*]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 47–66.

Yanagida, Yuko. 2006. Word order and clause structure in Early Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15. 37–67.

Yanagida, Yuko & Whitman, John. 2009. Alignment and word order in Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 18. 101–144.

Yoshida, Nagahiro. 2019. *Tenkan suru Nihongo bunpô [The Japanese grammar converting]*. Osaka: Izumi Shoin.

Yuzawa, Kokichiro. 1958. *Muromachi zidai no gengo kenkyû [Study on the language of the Muromachi period]*. Tokyo: Kazama Shobo.