

Japanese Particle *i*: A Study in Early Middle Japanese

John Bundschuh

The Ohio State University

Abstract

The meaning of early Japanese particle *i* remains contested. It is most often described in the *kokugogaku* tradition as an ‘emphatic’ particle, but has also been analyzed as an accusative marker, active marker, nominalizing suffix, nominative marker, demonstrative pronoun, and a quasi-free noun meaning ‘person’ or ‘thing’. However, the above conclusions are drawn from particle *i*’s quite limited use in Old Japanese (OJ), since it was thereafter restricted to *kundokugo*, the linguistic variety used in Japanese renderings of Sinitic texts. Whitman & Yanagida (2012) examine *i* in Early Middle Japanese *kundokugo* sources, concluding it acts as a broad focus particle after indeclinable noun phrases. This study however, supplies evidence that the focus and emphasis often noted of particle *i* can be attributed to its being a bound referential pronominal used to increase the specificity and referentiality of the marked noun phrase.

Key words

Early Middle Japanese, Old Japanese, historical linguistics, *kundokugo*, referentiality

1. Introduction

The semantic nuances of early Japanese particle *i* remain contested. The description of this particle in *A History of the Japanese Language* (Frellesvig 2010) is perhaps the least settled analysis within the monograph, describing as a nominative marker, apparently emphatic, and perhaps either originally an accusative marker (Miller 1989) or an “active” marker (Vovin 1997). In their most recent scholarship on this particle, Whitman & Yanagida (2012) argue it marks broad focus, much like *ga* does in contemporary Japanese, when it attaches to a non-inflected noun phrase (NP). They separate this from *i* that follows a predicate in its adnominal (*rentaikei*) form, which they call “bound pronominal *i*.”

The present study examines the use of *i* through all of its 8th century sources: namely, its 6 tokens in the *Man'yōshū*, a collection of Old Japanese poetry, the 17 in the *senmyō* (imperial edicts),¹ and the approximately 300 in the Early Middle Japanese (EMJ) rendering of the *Saidaiji-bon Konkōmyō saishō'ōkyō*, one of the earliest extant *kunten* annotations of the Golden Light Sutra (GLS) in Japanese. It finds the most likely candidates for *i*-marking to be discourse referents both from within the text, i.e. those previously mentioned, or from an intertext, all sources well-known enough to be deictically referable.² This referential nature of particle *i* stems from its etymology, being originally a demonstrative noun meaning, ‘that which (is)’ (Martin 1987, Francis-Ratte 2016). This use is also reflected in its entry in the *jōdai hen* of the *Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten* (Omodaka 1967), an authoritative dictionary of early Japanese. It gives a referential emphasis meaning (*shiji kyōchō*).

This paper argues that particle *i*, as found in the three eighth-century works above, is an enclitic, or bound, referential pronominal.³ It finds the evidence for Korean influence in the particle’s development in *kunten* works given in Whitman & Yanagida 2012 compelling, but supplies additional examples from the GLS both countering the claim that particle *i* served to mark broad focus and supporting the argument that the significance of *i*-marking of (a) bare NPs, (b) NPs marked with comitative particle *to*, and (c) predicates in their adnominal form is equivalent.

The first section of this paper contains a history of *i* from proto-Korean-Japanese (pKJ) to today. The second section begins by considering examples from the GLS used in Whitman & Yanagida 2012 to promote a broad focus definition of particle *i* then provides counterexamples from the sutra that more strongly suggest a referential pronominal hypothesis. Section three brings evidence supporting the semantic continuity of particle *i* regardless of the nature of the NP it marks. Old Japanese data examined in the fourth section demonstrate the referential nature of *i* before its extended use in *kunten* materials. In its conclusion, this paper recognizes that Japanese researchers have remarked this referential use of particle *i* for over fifty years (Inagaki 1953, Ōtsubo 1961) and advocates English scholarship give this analysis the credit its explanatory power warrants.

2. A History of *i* in Japanese

The linguistic relationship between Korean and Japanese has been a subject of renewed debate in recent scholarship (cf. Unger 2009, Vovin 2010), but the most recent reconstruction found in Francis-Ratte 2016 is convincing and reconstructs *i* in pKJ as a demonstrative noun meaning ‘that which is’ (cf. Martin 1987, who also reconstructs pKJ *i* as ‘that which’). This noun later became more morphological, resulting in an affix used to make bound (B) nominal

¹ According to Whitman & Yanagida’s (2012) count.

² An example of referentializing a NP in English would be changing the sentence, *A man is tall* to *That man is tall*.

³ The pronoun “he” in the sentence, *The man, he is tall*, is an example of a referential pronominal in English. Referring to a NP directly after it is uttered leads to an emphatic interpretation, in English and in both ancient and modern Japanese.

stems unbound (UB) (Itabashi 1999); bound stems being only used in compounds or in phrases joined with a genitive particle. Hence, the pronominal nature of *i* was used to make the NP specific:

(1) **ama-* ‘rain(B)’ + **-i* > *ame*⁴ ‘rain(UB)’

(2) **ko-* ‘tree(B)’ + **-i* > *ki* ‘tree(UB)’

It is widely accepted that Proto-Japanese had a phonotactic constraint against diphthongs, leading to crasis in cases of two front vowels, such as **ama-i* > *ame* and deletion of the preceding vowel when there was a difference in fronting, such as **ko-i* > *ki*. By pre-Old Japanese (pre-OJ), the phonological rule against diphthongs was no longer in place, making *i* more transparent and open to being used as a particle. The sparse particle *i* data in OJ texts suggest it was of peripheral status at best, but was indeed being used as a pronominal particle to referentialize NPs it marked, as will be demonstrated in Section 4 below.

By EMJ, particle *i* is non-existent in secular works, such as vernacular literature, poetry, and diaries. However, by the early 9th century the frequency of *i* marking had dramatically increased in *kunten* renditions of Chinese Buddhist texts. Contact with scholars from the Korean peninsula, who taught the Japanese aristocrats and Buddhist practitioners how to decipher Chinese works using *kugyōl* (口訣), the Korean equivalent of *kundoku*, led to linguistic contact effects in *kundokugo* that did not affect the secular vernacular. Whitman & Yanagida (2012) argue the increased use of particle *i* in EMJ *kunten* texts is thus from a borrowing of the Korean nominative particle, also pronounced *i*. This paper proposes Korean contact did cause a renewal of particle *i* in EMJ *kunten* texts, but the core meaning of the morpheme remained deictic from its use in earlier stages of Japanese.

By the late Heian period, *i* marking was becoming less frequent in *kunten* materials, likely due to both the decreased Korean influence and pressure from spoken EMJ. However, it remained in use in more conservative Buddhist sects, including a particular use in the Lotus Sutra in Late Middle Japanese clearly marking an accusative NP (Kobayashi 1959 p. 66), which further supports the argument below that its primary function was not broad focus, most often represented by particle *ga* today.

Finally, the word *aruiwa* in today’s Japanese contains the final remains of particle *i* in a lexicalized construction. Section 5 below contains an example demonstrating the frequency of the phrase *aru i wa* ‘another such case’ that led to univerbation and a semantic shift to ‘(inclusive) or’ by the ca. 900 CE *Taketori monogatari*. This vestigial *i* has remained in the language for over a millennium even though its source has been lost to most speakers today.

3. Assessing Particle *i* as a Broad Focus Marker in the Golden Light Sutra⁵

Whitman & Yanagida (2012) cite three examples of *daishu* (大衆) ‘crowd, great multitude’ leading up to their argument that *i* is a “broad focus particle,” similar to *ga* in today’s Japanese. They specifically note the absence of *i* in example 3, contrasting with the *i* marking found in example 4 below:

(3) *Toki ni moromoro no bisshu oyobi daishu kotogotoku mina kokoro wo itashi... to tansu*
time at all GEN monk and crowd completely all mind ACC extend COMP intone
‘At this time the monks and the crowd all focused their minds, and intoned...’

(Kasuga 1985 p. 188, cf. Whitman & Yanagida 2012 p. 129)

⁴ Here and throughout the paper, romanizations are based on today’s pronunciation of Japanese for increased readability. See Frellesvig 2010 for a more accurate phonological reconstruction of pJ, OJ, and EMJ.

⁵ The *kunten* glossing of the version this sutra cited here has been dated to the late eighth century (Kasuga 1985).

- (4) ... *toki ni muryō asokiya no nin.ten daishu i*
time at countless infinite GEN humans.celestials **crowd REF**
mina ōi ni kanashibi yorokobi-te... to tanshi-te
all greatly despair rejoicing-GER COMP intone-GER
‘at ... time a crowd of countless innumerable humans and celestials greatly despaired and rejoiced, and intoned...’ (Kasuga 1985 p. 200, cf. Whitman & Yanagida 2012 p. 129)

Their analysis of the above examples:

Looking back at [(3, 4)], we notice that there is an information structural difference in the three examples of *daisyu* ‘crowd’. The existence of the zero-marked ‘crowd’ in [3] can be inferred from prior discourse (it is the crowd that the Buddha has been addressing in the text). The crowds in [(4)], in contrast, are newly invoked; their existence cannot be inferred from prior discourse. (Whitman & Yanagida 2012 p. 130)

However, the *daishu* ‘crowd’ in examples 3 and 4 is one and the same—the crowd seated around the Buddha listening to him speak on the same occasion. The reason for the lack of *i*-marking on *daishu* in example 3 is, I suggest, its pairing (by means of *oyobi*) with *bisshu*. The Buddha had just spoken only to the monks (*bisshu*), and thus the conjoining of said monks along with the crowd surrounding the Buddha is a new development in the flow of the discourse, which means the NP *moromoro no bisshu oyobi daishu* is non-referential at this point. Buddha continues to address the entire crowd, and after his words are related, the phrase in (4) is properly marked with *i*, so that a more appropriate translation for example 4 might be, ‘at ... time **the** crowd of countless innumerable humans and celestials, **they** greatly despaired and rejoiced, and intoned...’.

The strongest counter-example to the “broad focus” argument is found in the repeated *i*-marking of NPs referring to the heroic figure Jalavāhana (流水 *ryūsui*)⁶ in Sections 24 and 25 of the sutra. Jalavāhana is introduced as the exceptional son of a merchant who was a great doctor. Two lines after his introduction he is marked with *i* (Kasuga 1985 p. 174 line 13). Almost all subsequent references to Jalavāhana, when not marked with particle *no* or particle *ni*, are thus marked with *i*. Particle *i* is clearly not marking a new referent; it is, rather, referring to ‘that Jalavāhana’, the hero of the parable. Here are two such examples:

- (5) *Zennyoten, sono toki ni chōjashi ryūsui i, manoatari so no chichi*
Noble.goddess that time LOC merchant’s.son Jalavāhana **REF** close that GEN father
ni happō no kaname to yondai no zōson to toki no
DAT eight.techniques GEN pivot COM four.great GEN gain.loss COM time GEN
fudō-naru koto to, kusuri wo kurau hōhō to wo toi-te, sude-ni yoku
unequal NMZ COM medicine ACC give method COM ACC ask-GER already well
ryōchishi-nu.
understand.PERF

‘Noble goddess, at that time, the merchant’s son Jalavāhana, **he** asked his close father about the main points of the eightfold technique, the four great gains and losses, the inequality of time, and the method of giving medicine, and thus understood well.’

(Kasuga 1985 p. 177)

- (6) *Zennyoten, ko no chōjashi i, ko no kuni no uchi ni aru*
Noble.goddess this GEN merchant’s.son **REF** this GEN country GEN inside LOC exist
hyakusenman’oku no shujō no byōku wo gotogotoku josasuru koto
countless GEN all.beings GEN sickness.pain ACC completely remove NMZ
e-shime-ki
gain-make-PAST

⁶ cf. Emmerick 1979 for romanized Sanskrit proper nouns.

‘Noble goddess, this merchant’s son, **he** was able to make the sickness and pain of all the countless beings that were within this country completely disappear.’

(Kasuga 1985 p. 178)

The merchant’s son is another way Jalavāhana is referenced in the parable. There are a few cases of *chōjashi* 長者子 ‘merchant’s son’ left unmarked. These occur between transaction points in the narrative, which involve a time reference or a vocative, such as the *sono toki ni* and *zennyoten* above. Jalavāhana is the topic of the entire parable, making repeated broad focus marking, even after vocatives, unlikely. Having supplied evidence against the broad focus interpretation of particle *i*, we now turn to the separation of *i*-marked nominalized (in their adnominal form) preterits (and the generally undiscussed *i*-marking of NPs ending in comitative particle *to*) from non-declining nominals.

4. Particle *i* Marking Beyond Bare Nominals

As noted above, *i* found marking adnominals is described as “bound pronominal *i*” in Whitman & Yanagida 2012. It must be conceded that such adnominal NPs marked with *i* are the only ones which are followed by particle *wa* in the GLS. However, the parallelism of *i*-marking found on indeclinable NPs, on phrases ending with comitative particle *to*, and on adnominally inflected NPs in the following passage from the twenty-second section of the GLS supplies strong evidence suggesting that those who inscribed the *kunten* markings found them both semantically and structurally equivalent:

- (7) *Kariteiboshin to gohyaku yakusha shū to i kano hito wo*
 Mother Goddess Hārītī COM 500 yaksha group COM **REF** this person ACC
nemuri-tari tomo sadame-tari tomo tsune ni ki-te ai yōgose-mu
 sleeping CONC awake CONC always LOC come-GER together protect-will
 ‘The Mother Goddess Hārītī with five hundred yakshas, **they** will always come together and protect this person whether they are asleep or awake.’
- (8) *Senda to Sendari to Yakushasenchinyo to Kontei Kōtashi to no*
 Caṇḍā COM Caṇḍālikā COM Yakṣṇī.Caṇḍikā COM Kuntī.Kūṭadantī COM GEN
shujō no seiki o sū mono kō no gotoki moro no jinshu no
 all.beings GEN spirit ACC absorb ones this GEN like many GEN gods GEN
dairiki mo ari jinzū mo aru i tsune ni tokkyō
 great.strength also have supernatural.powers also haveRT **REF** always LOC possess.sutra
no mono wo mamori-te hiru mo yoru mo tsune ni hanare-ji.
 GEN person ACC protect-GER day also night also always LOC part-will.not
 ‘Caṇḍā, Caṇḍālikā, Yakṣṇī, Caṇḍikā, Kuntī, and Kūṭadantī, who absorb the spirits of all beings, all gods such as these, who have great strength and supernatural powers, **they** all protect the one who holds this sutra and will never leave their side day or night.’
- (9) *Jōshu no Benzaiten to muryō no moro no tennyō to Kisshōten o kubi*
 head GEN Sarasvatī COM infinite GEN many GEN goddess COM Śrī ACC head
to seru to awase-te amari no moro no kenzoku to ko
 TRANSL make COM combine-GER remainder GEN many GEN subordinate COM this
no daichi no megame to kajitsuenrin no kami to kodama to
 GEN earth GEN goddess COM fruit.pasture.forest GEN god COM tree.god COM
kōgajin to seitei no moro no kami to no gotoki ko no gotoki moro no
 river.god COM sacred GEN many GEN god COM GEN like this GEN like many GEN
tenjin i kokoro ni daikanki wo jōshi-te kare mina ki-te ko no kyō wo
 god **REF** heart LOC great.joy ACC rise-GER they all come-GER this GEN sutra ACC
dokujuse-mu hito wo yōgose-mu.
 recite-will person ACC protect-will

‘Sarasvatī at the head, the limitless many goddesses, Śrī taking the lead, together with her remaining many subordinates, the Earth goddess, the gods of fruits, crops and forests, the tree gods and the river gods, like the many sacred gods, many gods such as these, **they** feel great joy in their hearts and they all will come and protect the person who would recite this sutra.’
(Kasuga 1985 p. 170)

In the same passage prior to (7–9) in the GLS there are six predicates in the adnominal form marked by *i*, as in example 8 above, and there are two additional examples of a series of NPs connected by comitative particle *to*, the last of which is marked by particle *i*, as in example 7. Thus, including examples 7–9, there are eleven lines using particle *i* in a parallel structure, listing the Buddhist deities who will protect the listener of the GLS. All the supernatural beings listed are both well-known and have been introduced earlier in the sutra, making them likely targets for referentialization. Moreover, these examples also display another prototypical use of *i*-marking, that of referring to a known group, much like the *shujō i* ‘all beings, they’ cited in Section 2 above.

Regarding adnominals marked by *i*, Whitman & Yanagida (2012) concede, “the bound pronominal function of *i* and the subject marking function of *i* (which we have hypothesized to mark broad focus) are sometimes difficult to distinguish” (p. 130). This difficulty stems from the two sharing a common source, interpreted slightly differently depending on the grammatical relation of the NP being referentialized.

5. Particle *i* in Old Japanese Texts

Sections 2 and 3 above demonstrated how particle *i* served as a referential pronominal in the late-eighth century *kunten* rendition of the GLS. This section looks to earlier sources, namely, the *senmyō* and the *Man’yōshū*, to determine whether *i* served a similar function in OJ.

Although few when compared to the over 300 tokens of particle *i* in the GLS, the 17 found in the *Shoku Nihongi senmyō* is almost triple that of the 6 found throughout the entire *Man’yōshū*. Example 10 is an instance of *i*-marking in two consecutive two lines:

- (10) *Ima Wake ni noritamawaku saki ni Naramaro-ra ga muhon no koto*
 now Wake DAT say.honor before LOC Naramaro-PL GEN rebellion GEN thing
oki-te ari-shi toki ni wa Nakamaro i tadashiki ōmi to shi-te
 arise-GER be-PAST time LOC TOP Nakamaro REF loyal retainer TRANSL do-GER
haberi-tsu. Shikaru-ni sakanma-ni-aru kokoro wo mot-te mikado wo
 carry.out-PERF however rebellious heart ACC have-GER emperor ACC
ugokashi-katabuke to shi-te ikusa wo sonōru toki ni Wake i mōshi-te ari.
 move.against TRANSL do-GER battle ACC prepare time LOC Wake REF say-GER be
 ‘Now [the emperor] said to Wake, “Before when Naramaro and company were fomenting a rebellion Nakamaro, **that one**, was a loyal retainer.” However afterwards when he was preparing to move against the emperor with a rebellious heart Wake, **that one**, said,’

SM 34.1

Here, Nakamaro is a well-known figure and Wake is a discourse referent from the previous line. Both are thus referential and likely candidates for *i*-marking. Particle *i* appears to be acting contrastively as well, which may have influenced the spread of the ‘or’ interpretation of *aruiwa*, as discussed in Section 2 above and which will be touched upon further in the conclusion below.

Now we turn to the *Man’yōshū*. As a collection of poetry, it generally lacks referential NPs, such as proper nouns, leading it to have fewer instances of particle *i*. It is also restricted by poetic meter, meaning that particle *i*, which appears to have been in decline by OJ, would only be employed when it has the most emotional impact. Example 11 is representative of *i* marking a person dear to the composer:

(11) *ie naru imo i ibukashi mise-mu*
 home be.at wife **REF** worrying show-FUT

‘(My) girl who is at home, **she** will worry [about me].’ MY 12.3161

In Miller’s (1989) analyses of *i*-marking in OJ, which does not take referentiality into account, he concedes, “it [is] impossible to pin-point the function of the *i*” in the above poem (p. 262). It is clear the composer’s wife, being referred to as ‘(my) girl’, holds a position in his heart that is deserving of referentialization, much like the deities marked with *i* in the GLS. The rules of poetic composition limiting the length of clauses likely restricted nominalized predicates marked with *i*. Example 12 is one of the two instances of adnominal *i*-marking in the work:

(12) *Mukatsuo no wakakatsura no ki shizue tori*

Mukatsuo GEN young.katsura GEN tree lower.branch taking

hana motsu i ma ni nageki-tsuru kamo

flower holdRT **REF** time LOC lament-PERF EXCLAM

‘Taking the lower branch of a young katsura tree of Mukatsuo, the one who waits for the flowers, **he** in time will lament.’ MY 7:1359

Both instances of *i* marking an adnominal NP in the *Man’yōshū* precede *ma* ‘(period of) time’. Thus, both cases lead to the well-known earlier Japanese poetic device of pivoting. This use of a pivot word *i* (*ma*) allows the listener to interpret the poem as both *hana matsu i ma ni* (花待つ間に) ‘one who waits for the flowers, he in time’ and *hana matsu ima ni* (花待つ今に) ‘now when I wait for the flowers’.

Although there are no examples of *i*-marking of NPs ending in comitative particle *to*, the above examples of *i* marking referential NPs demonstrate that particle *i* holds the same properties in OJ as it does in the GLS examples cited in Sections 2 and 3 above.

6. Conclusions

Having demonstrated the referential nature of particle *i* and its morphological constellation (cf. Janda & Joseph 1999) of marking (a) bare NPs, (b) NPs marked with comitative particle *to*, and (c) predicates in their adnominal form, this paper concludes with a prototypical example of *i*-marking in the GLS that ties this particle to the Japanese of today:

(13) *Mata tsugi ni zendanshi sanshin wo bunbetsusuru ni yonshu no*

also next LOC gentlemen three.body ACC separate LOC four.types GEN

kotonaru koto ari. Aru i wa keshin ni shi-te ōshin

differ thing be beRT **REF** TOP⁷ transformation TRANSL do-GER incarnation

ara-nu, aru i wa ōshin ni shi-te keshin ni

be-not beRT **REF** TOP incarnation TRANSL do-GER transformation TRANSL

ara-nu, aru i wa keshin ni mo mata wa ōshin ni

be-not beRT **REF** TOP transformation TRANSL also also TOP incarnation TRANSL

mo aru, aru i wa keshin ni mo ara-zu mata wa ōshin

also be beRT **REF** TOP transformation TRANSL also be-not also TOP incarnation

ni mo ara-nu nari.

TRANSL also be-not be

‘In addition, gentlemen, when you separate the threefold body, there are **four** differing types. **One such (case)** is the transformations without the incarnations, **another such (case)** is the incarnations without the transformations, **another such (case)** is the transformations and the incarnations, and **another such (case)** is neither transformations nor incarnations.’

(Kasuga 1985 p. 31)

This strongly confirms the pronominal analysis of *i*. Here each instance refers to one of the existing four types (四種 *yonshu*) mentioned in the first line of example 13. The high frequency

⁷ This is also known as contrastive *wa*. This goes for the *wa* in *mata wa* below as well.

of *aru i wa* ‘another such (case)’ led to univerbation within *kundokugo*, which then spread in to the spoken language of aristocrats of the Heian court (Tsukishima 1963) and lives on in Japanese today as the word *aruiwa*.

The examples and analyses presented in this paper support the definition of *i* in the *Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten jōdai hen*: particle *i* supplies referential emphasis. The broad focus Whitman & Yanagida observe is a result of the referential nature of particle *i*. Its proclivity for marking subject NPs, which caused Frellesvig (2010) to primarily define it as a nominative marker, is a result of the high likelihood of nominative NPs to be known discourse referents. Inagaki (1953) and Ōtsubo (1961), used data from *kunten* sources to respond to the native *kokugogaku* tradition of defining particle *i* as simply emphatic. They both concluded that the emphasis noted was secondary due to the referential nature of the particle. Particle *i* is a referential pronominal that marks discourse referential NPs, known entities. This leads to a “re-referentialization,” akin to changing, *This particle is referential to This particle, it is referential*. The referential pronominal nature of *i* has been reconstructed in proto-Japanese (Martin 1987, Francis-Ratte 2016) and recognized by scholars in Japan for over fifty years. This paper serves to demonstrate the descriptive power of such an analysis throughout the religious, secular, and poetic works of eighth-century Japanese.

Abbreviations

COM	comitative
COMP	complementizer
CONC	concessive
DAT	dative
EXCLAM	exclamative
FUT	future
GER	gerund
MY	<i>Man'yōshū</i>
NMZ	nominalizer
PERF	perfective
PL	plural
RT	<i>rentaikei</i> = adnominal
REF	referential pronominal
SM	<i>senmyō</i>
TOP	topic
TRANSL	translative

References

- Emmerick, R.E. 1979(1970). *The Sūtra of Golden Light*. London: The Pali Text Society.
- Francis-Ratte, Alexander. 2016. *Proto-Korean-Japanese: A New Reconstruction of the Common Origin of the Japanese and Korean Languages*. Dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inagaki, Mizuho. 1953. “Kokunten ni arawareta seiten no ‘i’.” *Kokugo kokubun*, Vol. 22. No. 11, 788–799.
- Itabashi, Yoshizo. 1999. “On Cognateship of Old Japanese *i/si* with Old Korean *i/si*.” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Vol. 52, No. 1, 17–44.
- Janda, Richard & Brian Joseph. 1999. “The Modern Greek Negator *mi(n)(-)* as a Morphological Constellation.” *Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Athens: Elinika Gramata, 341–351.

- Kasuga, Masaji. 1985(1942). *Saidaiji-bon Konkōmyō saishōōkyō koten no kokugogakuteki kenkyū*. Tōkyō: Benseisha.
- Kobayashi, Yoshinori. 1959. “Joshi i no zanzon: Heian jidai no shiyōsha to yōhō.” *Tōyō Daigaku kiyō*. Tōkyō: Tōyō Daigaku.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1987. *The Japanese Language Through Time*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Miller, Roy A. 1989. “Old Japanese *i*.” In *Bruno Lewin zu Ehren: Festschrift aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*, ed. Irmela Hijjiya-Kirschner and Jürgen Stalpl, vol. I, 251–91. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Omodaka, Hisataka. 1967. *Jidaijiten kokugo daijiten jōdai hen*. Tōkyō: Sanseidō.
- Ōtsubo, Heiji. 1961. *Kuntengo no kenkyū*. Tōkyō: Kazama Shobō.
- Robbeets, Martine. 2015. *Diachrony of Verb Morphology: Japanese and Transeurasian Languages*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Tsukishima, Hiroshi. 1963. *Heian jidai no kanbun kundokugo ni tsukite no kenkyū*. Tōkyō: Tōkyō daigaku shuppan kai.
- Unger, James. 2009. *The Role of Contact in the Origins of the Japanese and Korean Languages*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Vovin, Alexander. 1997. “On the syntactic typology of Old Japanese.” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 273–90.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2010. *Koreo-Japonica: A Re-evaluation of a Common Genetic Origin*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Whitman, John & Yuko Yanagida. 2012. “A Korean Grammatical Borrowing in Early Middle Japanese *Kunten* Texts and its Relation to the Syntactic Alignment of Earlier Korean and Japanese.” *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 21, ed. Seungho Nam, Heejeong Ko and Jongho Jun, 121–135. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Appendix, Citations of Examples in Japanese Script⁸

- (3) 時に諸の苾芻及諸大衆咸ク皆心を至し...と歎す。
- (4) ...時に無量阿僧企耶の人天大衆い皆大に悲び喜(び)て...と歎して
- (5) 善女天、爾時に長者子流水い、親り其の父に八術の(之)要と四大の増損と時の不同なることと、薬を餌フ方法とを問(ひ)て、既に善(く)了知しヌ。
- (6) 善女天、是の長者子い、(於)此の國の内にある百千萬億の衆生の病苦を悉ク除差すること得(し)めキ。
- (7) 訶利底母神と五百薬叉衆とい(於)彼の人を睡(り)たりとも覺(め)たりとも、常に來て相ひ擁護(せ)む。
- (8) 旃荼と旃荼利と薬叉旃荼女と昆帝拘吒齒との衆生の精氣を吸フモノ是(の)如キ諸の神衆の大力もあり神通も有ルい、常に持經の者を護りて、晝も夜も恒に離レじ(不)。
- (9) 上首の辯才天と無量の諸の天女と吉祥天を首と為ると并(せ)て餘の諸の眷屬と此の大地の神女と果實園林の神と樹神と江河神と制底の諸の神との等キ是(の)如キ諸の天神い、心に大歡喜を生(し)て彼レ皆來て(擁護)此の經を讀誦(せ)む人を擁護(せ)む。
- (10) 今和氣ニ勅ク先ニ奈良麻呂等ガ謀反ノ事起テ在シ時ニハ仲麻呂イ忠臣トシテ侍ツ。然後ニ逆心ヲ以テ朝廷ヲ動傾トシテ兵ヲ備ル時ニ和氣イ申テ在。
- (11) 家なる妹いいふかしみせむ

⁸ See Kasuga 1985’s introductory notes (pp. 1–2) for orthographic conventions.

(12) 向つ峰の若桂の木下枝取り花待つい間に嘆きつるかも

(13) 復次に善男子三身を分別するに四種の異なること有り。有ルいは化身にして應身に非ヌ、有ルいは應身にして化身に非ヌ、有ルいは化身にも亦是應身にもある、有ルいは化身にも非ず亦是應身にも非ヌなり。