THE DESCRIPTION
OF THE INTERJECTIONAL FUNCTION OF *WO*:
FROM THE *RENGA* TREATISES TO YAMADA YOSHIO

Corinne D'Antonio

ABSTRACT

The description of the interjectional function of wo: from the renga treatises to Yamada Yoshio

This paper aims to follow the evolution of the description of the interjectional function of the particle *wo*, in order to clarify the confusion arisen in its analysis in the Old and Middle Japanese corpus. In fact, in Yamada's grammar – that influenced the 20th century scholarship – the interjectional particle *wo* was identified only on a semantic basis, as formally it could follow nouns, verbs or other particles, and its position in the sentence was rather free. However, if we look at the earliest descriptions of *wo* in the Medieval poetic treatises, we find well-defined grammatical contexts in which it could be identified as interjectional (*yasumeji*, after *ni*, *to* and gerunds). An interesting innovation is proposed by Motoori Norinaga, who distinguishes between a *yasumeji ni oku wo*, whose distribution is consistent with what stated in the treatises, and a *tasukeji wo*, whose value overlaps *yo* and follows mostly nouns. Motoori's description of the interjectional function seems to have influenced Tsurumine Shigenobu's and Ōtsuki Fumihiko's stances, which would in turn serve as basis for Yamada's study. Thus, it could be useful to trace the history behind Yamada's description in order to understand the contemporary scholarship dealing with the interjectional function of *wo*.

1. The particle *wo* in Yamada Yoshio's classification

The classification traditionally used to describe the function of the Japanese particles (*joshi*) and applied to every stage of the Japanese language (Frellesvig 2010) appeared for the first time in Yamada

Yoshio's *Nihon Bunpō-ron* (1908). Yamada divides six classes of particles, namely the ones marking the noun-verb relation (case particles, *kaku joshi*, e.g. *ga*, *ni*, *wo*)[1], the ones signalling pragmatic roles such as topic or focus (pragmatic particles, *kakari joshi*, e.g. *wa*, *mo*, *koso*), those forming adverbial phrases (restrictive particles, *fuku joshi*, e.g. *bakari* 'approximately', *dani* 'even'), the ones expressing subordinate clauses (conjunctional particles, *setsuzoku joshi*, e.g. hypothetic/temporal *ba*, concessive *do*), those occurring necessarily at the end of the sentence (final particles, *shū joshi*, e.g. *gana*, *kashi*) and those conveying emotions (interjectional particles, *kantō joshi*, e.g. *yo*, *ya*).

As Yamada himself explained in his *Bunpō-ron* and in subsequent texts, his classification is based on the relations the particles express rather than on morpho-syntactic parameters, such as the position in the sentence, or the kind of stem to which they are bound – even though he does employ such formal criteria in several sections of his texts[2]. Therefore, as one particle may express more than one function or relation, each morpheme may be classified in more than one group: for instance, in the *Bunpō-ron*, the morpheme *ya* serves both as a pragmatic particle and an interjectional one, and *ga* as a case, conjunctional and final particle.

The same issue arises regarding the particle *wo*, whose analysis is the main focus of the present paper. In Yamada's text, *wo* is regarded as a case particle, expressing the "objective of an action towards the verb" (Yamada 1908: 560), but also as a conjunctional particle and an interjectional one.

Regarding the case particle *wo*, Yamada explains that it follows the constituent whose referent is more affected by the action expressed by the verb or by which the action may be performed.

---

[1] Albeit it is plausible that the identification of the category of case may not be needed nor possible in the Japanese language, we will use the expression "case particles" Throughout the paper in order to be consistent with Yamada's classification.

[2] For instance, as already noted, the so-called final particles are mainly described by Yamada according to their position in the sentence, so the definition of this very class may serve as a counterargument to Yamada's assertion. In fact, there is no consensus regarding the difference between interjectional and final particles, as many authors argue that both these kinds of particles convey the same value and are distinct only on a syntactic basis (the interjectional ones used rather freely in the sentence, while the final ones only in sentence-final position). See for instance Izuhara (2011).

Accordingly, Yamada lists mainly two of the functions expressed by this particle, i.e., its use as a direct object marker in sentences like *mizu wo nomu* 'to drink water', and its function as a locative marker, expressing both the source and the path, as in *ie wo hanaru* 'to leave one's house' and *mon wo sugu* 'to pass through the gate'. Moreover, he quotes five classical poems, showing that *wo*, in its locative function, signals the so-called "dynamic object" (*dōteki mokuhyō*), as opposed to *ni* (which expresses the "static object", *seiteki mokuhyō*). The classical poems cited in Yamada include famous verses from the *Kojiki* (hereafter KK, 712 AD, example (1)), the *Man'yōshū* (hereafter MYS, 758 AD, example (2)) and the *Kokinwakashū* (hereafter *Kokinshū*, 920 AD, example (3), (4)), that – as we will see below – have been used as examples in Japanese grammatical texts since the 18th century:

(1)　おほさかにあふやをとめをみちとへば
Oposaka ni apu ya wotome wo miti tope-ba
Ōsaka LOC meet.ATTR PART girl PART way ask.PFV-TEMP
'on asking the way of the maiden we met at Ōsaka' (KK 77, transl. Basil Chamberlain);

(2)　ははをわかれて
papa wo wakare-te
mother PART be separated.INF-GER
'being separated from my mother' (MYS 20.4348, transl. Vovin 2013: 96);

(3)　逢阪にて人をわかれける時
Apusaka nite pito wo wakare-keru toki
Ōsaka LOC person PART be separated.INF-PAST.ATTR when
'in Ōsaka, when parting from someone' (*Kokinshū* 8.374 introd.);

(4)　かの家のあたりをまかりけるに
ka no ipe no atari wo makari-keru ni
this ATTR house ATTR vicinity PART pass.INF-PAST.ATTR PART
'passing in the vicinity of this residence' (*Kokinshū* 16.848 introd.).

In all the examples given by Yamada, both in the *Bunpō-ron* and in his subsequent texts (Yamada 1912, 1913, 1936), the case particle (*kaku joshi*) *wo* always follows nominal stems. However, this syntactic feature is never explicitly recognised in Yamada, who seems to distinguish the case particle *wo* only according to the relation expressed.

Its use as a conjunctional particle, according to Yamada (1908: 607), directly arises from the function of expressing case, and it has concessive, temporal or causal values. Yamada overtly writes that, unlike the rest of the conjunctional particles, which only follow predicates, *wo* may follow both attributive form of the verb (5) and nominals (including classifiers, as in (6)), thus highlighting a formal criterion to identify it:

(5) 雪とのみ降るだにあるを
yuki to nomi furu dani aru wo
snow PART only fall.ATTR even COP.ATTR PART
桜花いかに散れとか風の吹くらむ
sakura-bana ikani tire to ka kaze no fuku ramu
cherry-flower how fall.IMP QUOT INTER wind blow.FIN CONJ
'the cherry blossoms fall just like snow, how can the wind blow telling them to scatter?' (*Kokinshū* 2.86).

(6) 白露の色は一つを
shira-tuyu no iro pa pito-tu wo
white-dew ATTR color TOP one-CLASS PART
いかにして秋の木のはをちぢに染むらむ
ikani shi-te aki no ko no pa wo tidi ni somu ramu
how do.INF-GER autumn ATTR tree ATTR leaf OBJ many PART dye.FIN CONJ
'the colour of the glistening dew is one: how can it dye the leaves of autumn tree of thousands of shades?' (*Kokinshū* 5.257).

Thus, in Yamada's view, *wo* seems to appear after nominal stems in its usages both as a case particle and as a conjunctional one. We should note that there is little consensus among the scholars as to which occurrences of *wo* need to be regarded as conjunctional particle: for instance, every occurrence of *wo* in the *Kokinshū* is glossed as a case particle in the Corpus of Historical Japanese by NINJAL, while the glossing as a conjunctional particle appears only when *wo* is preceded by the noun *mono*.

Similarly, when *wo* is used as an interjectional particle (the third possibility allowed by Yamada), it may follow nominals as well. In Yamada's theory, interjectional particles may follow nominals, verbs and adjectives, adverbs and so forth, and their position in the sentence is rather free. In particular, Yamada (1908: 691) explains that

in its interjectional usage *wo* may appear after nominals (7), before case particles, or after *ni* and *to* (8), after expressions of desire and request (9), or following the attributive form of the verb (10), but many of the examples he provides in Yamada (1913: 459 ff.) show that it may also follow gerunds[3].

(7) 香をだに匂へ人の知るべく
ka wo dani niope pito no shiru beku
fragrance PART only smell.PFV person AG know.ATTR DEB.INF
'at least let out your fragrance, so that people may know your presence'
(*Kokinshū* 6.335);

(8) 昔もいまもしらずとをいはん
mukashi mo ima mo shira-zu to wo ipa-n
then TOPEN now TOPEN know.IPFV-NEG.FIN QUOT PART say.IPFV-CONJ
'I shall say I know nothing of you now, nor have I known before'
(*Kokinshū* 13.630);

(9) 渡り守舟渡せをと
watarimori pune watase wo to
ferryman boat cross.IMP PART QUOT
'ferryman, cross the river!' (MYS 10.2072);

(10) 昨日今日とは思はざりしを
kinopu kepu to pa omopa-zari-shi wo
yesterday today QUOT TOP think.IPFV-NEG.INF-PAST.ATTR PART
'I never thought that it would be so soon' (*Kokinshū* 16.861);

(11) ぬれてをゆかむ
nure-te wo yuka-mu
get wet.INF-GER PART go.IPFV-CONJ
'I will go, dampened' (*Kokinshū* 4.224).

If we recall that *wo* as a case particle follows nominals, and as a conjunction is used after nominals and the attributive form of the verb, we notice that the syntactic constraints of *wo* as an interjectional particle partially overlap with the ones found in its other two usages.

---

[3] All the examples given below are taken from Yamada (1908), except (11), taken from Yamada (1913)

This approach allows Yamada (1912: 521) to regard as interjectional occurrences like (12), on which later scholars argue differently.[4]

(12) 八重垣つくるその八重垣を
ya-pye-gaki tukuru sono ya-pye-gaki wo
eight-CLASS-fence build.FIN that eight-CLASS-fence PART
'build an eight-fold fence, that eight-fold fence!' (KK 1)

Interpretations as the one illustrated above, and the general absence of straightforward formal criteria in Yamada's work to help distinguishing among the three values of *wo* (as in all three functions *wo* may follow nominals, and in two of them it may follow attributive forms) inevitably led later scholars to classify every occurrence using only a semantic point of view,[5] and eventually resulted in theories like Matsuo (1938, 1944), Hiroi (1957) and Oyama (1958). Analysing the alternation between *wo* and zero in OJ and EMJ texts, those scholars argued that the Japanese language did not show any object marker until the 11th century and all the occurrences of *wo during* that period were to be regarded as interjectional.[6]

Unfortunately, very few scholars tried to determine syntactic criteria to analyse the distribution of *wo* in OJ and EMJ corpora. One worth mentioning is Kondō (1980), who focuses only on the OJ texts. In his study, the case particle *wo* generally marks nominals, but may also mark attributive form of the verb followed by the nominalizer

---

[4] Aston (1904: 113), even before Yamada, regarded it as an interjection, and Samson (1928: 282) shares the same view. The Japanese scholars usually regard this occurrence as an interjectional particle, following Yamada: see for example Iwai (1974: 586), but Frellesvig (2010: 19) glosses it as EXCL (exclamatory) as well. Konoshima (1966: 63) argues that it may be interpreted both as a case particle and an interjectional one. On the other hand, Hida et al. (2007: 236) includes the example (12) in his analysis of the case particle *wo*, and Vovin (2005: 290) glosses this occurrence as ACC (accusative), thus regarding it as a case particle.

[5] See for example Hashimoto (1969). See also Shirane (2005: 253), who writes that interjectional *wo* may be placed at the end or in the middle of the sentence and may follow nominals, particles, attributive or imperative forms of the verb.

[6] See Shibatani (1990: 340 ff.) for a summary of Matsuo's theory, but refer to the original articles for detailed explanations and examples. Frellesvig (2010: 125) argued that it is possible that scholars glossed OJ particles as 'emphatic' because of the influence of the rhetorical style of the OJ poetry, full of exclamations and lamentations. See below.

koto or other kinds of nominalised clauses (*ku gohō* and the like). Similarly, the conjunctional particle[7] follows nominals, attributive form plus the nominalizer *mono*, or attributive form without the nominalizer: thus, it may be mistaken for a case particle, but, while the latter is generally used after nominals or *koto*, the former usually follows the nominalizer *mono* (while the use after nominals and attributive forms is infrequent). Lastly, the interjectional particle is identified when the following syntactic criteria are met: *wo* must appear after an infinitive form of the verb (that can be followed by suffixes such as the iterative *tsutsu*)[8] or the case particles *ni* and *to*, and at the end of the sentence there must be an imperative form, a conjectural expression (using the conjectural auxiliary *mu*), or a desiderative particle.

Such precise syntactic criteria allow Kondō to identify only few occurrences in the OJ texts that may be regarded as interjectional (but his hypothesis may be applied to the EMJ corpus as well), and his findings seem to contradict Matsuo's theory concerning the presence of the interjectional particle only, both in OJ and EMJ.

2. The analysis of *wo* until 18th century

To clear up such confusion in analysing the functions that the particle *wo* had in OJ and EMJ, a review of the discussion in the poetic treatises and *kokugaku* grammars regarding the distribution of this particle may be helpful.[9]

In particular, the 15th/16th century *renga* and *waka* treatises, in which each particle was shown and distinguished according not only

---

[7] Kondō (1980) regards the conjunctional usage as a final particle, but in Yamada's classification the final particles express desire, emotion and the like, while Kondō's final particle *wo* behaves like a conjunction, albeit used at the end of the sentence.

[8] The author analyses only the distribution of *wo* in the OJ corpus, but in EMJ we frequently find constructions made of the infinitive form of the verb, the gerund *te* and the particle *wo*, usually followed by the verb of the main clause, see for example (11).

[9] Refer to Kyōgoku (1973: 50) for a sketch of the discussion regarding the function of the particle not only inside the Japanese poetic treatises (like *Shunjukenpishō* and *Teniwohagikanshō*), but also in later texts like Toganoi Michitoshi's *Teniha Abikizuna* (1770). Kyōgoku makes use of the Fukui (1938) version of the texts (as regards the poetic treatises and the Fujitani Nariakira's *Ayuishō*), while he refers to Ōno (1970) for Motoori Norinaga's *opera omnia.*

to the semantic value ascribed, but also to its syntactic position and context, exerted a great influence on *kokugogaku* scholars such as Motoori Norinaga, that in turn influenced Meiji authors like Ōtsuki Fumihiko or Yamada himself.

At the beginning of the discussion regarding the Japanese particles, texts dealing with usages and functions of *wo* analysed only its conjunctional usage. The oldest description available of one of the values conveyed by *wo* is found in the *Teniha taigaishō* (15th cent.), which examines this particle only when preceded by *mono* in the construction *mono wo*, that Yamada – centuries later – regarded as a conjunctional particle.[10]

Similarly, the conjunctional usage is analysed in a collection of treatises called *Anegakōjishiki* (15th cent.), that considers not only *mono wo*, but also the sequence *shi wo* (where *shi* may be part of the speculative auxiliary *mashi* as in *iwarenamashi wo* 'although it may have been called', but see also the example (10), quoted in the *Anegakōjishiki* as well, in which *wo* follows the attributive form *shi* of the past auxiliary *ki*).

Furthermore, in the *Anegakōjishiki* we find the first discussion regarding the direct object-marking function of *wo*. The treatises examine one example of the so-called *kaeshi no wo*, identifying those occurrences in which the *wo*-marked constituent appears at the end of the sentence, but its correct syntactic position should be before its predicate (in a preceding section of the poem). The example given in the treatises is *kakete zo tanomu aufi tefu na wo* 'asking the day of the meeting' (*Gosenshū* 4.161), in which the direct object (*aufi tefu na wo*) is at the end of the sentence, and the treatises overtly state that the verse should be read as *aufi tefu na wo kakete tanomu*, moving the direct object in the expected position, before the verb *kakete tanomu*.[11] Although the treatises

---

[10] In the treatise, written in Chinese, we find 物遠者残詞之手爾葉以登之字押留也 and the commentary of the *Taigaishō* explains this construction using two examples from *Kokinshū* 14.721 and 17.906.

[11] Note that *aufi* literally means 'mallow' (*aoi*), but it is used as a *kakekotoba* for *au fi* 'the day of the meeting'. The importance of the post-predicative encoding of a constituent even in contemporary spoken Japanese has been highlighted in many studies that generally agree on the recoverability and deducibility of the post-predicative element (Kuno 1978 among others), but it may also convey emphasis and help disambiguating (Hinds 1982). Shimojo (2005) hypothesizes a system with the zero anaphor, the use of case particles like *ga* and *wo*, the *wa*-marking, and the zero

do not provide any overt explanation regarding the distribution of the conjunctional *wo*, we should notice that in the examples it generally follows attributive form (except in one sentence), while in the example offered to show the object-marking usage *wo* follows a nominal.

A similar explanation is given in a later treatise called *Shunjukenpishō* (16th cent.), that owes a great debt to the *Anegakōjishiki* and discusses the functions of *wo* in its chapter VI (Fukui 1938.7: 130-1). Like the *Anegakōjishiki*, it analyses the cases in which the direct object is placed at the end of the sentence (here called *ue e kaeru* 'going back in upper position'),[12] distinguishing it from the so-called *kokoro wo komete iimawasu* 'implying intentionally', in which the predicate is omitted on purpose. An example of the latter is (13):

(13) 秋の匂にほふかきりは
      aki no kiku nipopu kagiri wa
      autumn ATTR chrysanthemum smell.ATTR limit TOP
      かさしてんはなよりさきと
      kazashi-te-n pana yori saki to
      decorate.INF-COMPL.IPFV-CONJ flower COMP before QUOT
      知ぬ我身を
      shira-nu wa ga mi wo
      know.IPFV-NEG.ATTR I ATTR body PART
      'I shall decorate my hair with the autumn chrysanthemum until it keeps its charm, as I may be gone before its flowers fade' (*Kokinshū* 5.276).

Usages of *wo* such as (13) may be interpreted as conveying only an interjectional value but the paraphrase shown in the *Shunjukenpishō*

---

particle, and shows that the post-predicative encoding is used to express information for cataphoric defocusing. It should be noticed, however, that these studies focus on the contemporary language and that in poetic *corpora* such as the OJ or EMJ ones metric parameters should be taken into account as well.

[12] Again, in the provided example *wo* follows a nominal, placed at the end of the sentence, that is expected to be moved back before its predicate. The sentence is *tare shi kamo tomete orituru parugasumi tatikakusuran yama no sakura wo* 'who could have found and broken this mountain cherry (blossom), hidden in the spring mist?' (*Kokinshū* 1.58), where the direct object *yama no sakura wo* 'mountain cherry' is placed in the last verse but is linked to the predicate in the second verse *tomete orituru* 'search and break'. This particular poem is quoted in Motoori as well (Ōno 1970: 61), as he lists this particular occurrence of *wo* among the particles he calls *tomari yori ue e kaeru teniwoha* (implying that they should be moved back to the expected position).

seems not to allow such interpretation, as the constituent *wa ga mi* 'I', marked by *wo*, is explained as *wa ga mi wo kakugo nakute aran* 'I who had no resolution' (where *kakugo nakute aran* is not mentioned in the poem and serves as explanation in the treatise).

The *Shunjukenpishō*, again borrowing from the *Anegakōjishiki* and using the same examples, considers the conjunctional usage of *wo* as well, after both *mono* and *shi* (for example in *miyu ran mono wo* 'will it appear?' in *Shinkokinshū* 12.1124).

It may seem that the *Shunjukenpishō* does not propose any remarkable innovation, but this is not the case, as in chapter XLII it discusses a particular group of particles allowing the practice of *kana wo amashite yasumuru koto* lit. 'pausing and sparing a syllable'. It is the usage of particles such as *te*, *shi mo*, *kashi*, *wo* not only as *yasumeji* ('resting words', that added emphasis and emotion to the verse, Hida et al. 2007: 347), but also as decoration and embellishment (*kazari to nareri*, Fukui 1938.7: 162). Two examples regarding this usage of *wo* are provided, and they would later become widespread among the scholars: (11) *nurete wo yukan* 'I shall go, dampened' (Kokinshū 4.224, borrowed by Yamada as well) and (14):

> (14)   おそりはあらじとを知れ
>   *osori wa araji to wo shire*
>   worry TOP be.IPFV-CONJN QUOT PART know.IMP
>   'know that there shall be no concern' (*Goshūiwakashū* 20.6).

In expressions like (11) and (14) mentioned in the treatise, *wo* does not mark a direct object and may be interpreted as interjectional: it is worth-noticing that it does not follow a nominal, but a gerund of the verb in (11) (*nurete*) and the particle *to* in (14). This may seem a minor detail, but we shall see that important *kokugakusha* such as Fujitani Nariakira adopted a similar approach in dealing with the interjectional function of *wo*, and – as already seen – such explanation seems to overlap perfectly Kondō's (1980) theory regarding the distribution of the interjectional particle *wo*. Moreover, it should be noticed that the *Shunjukenpishō* seems to be the first treatise to recognize three distinct function of *wo*, that apparently overlap the ones Yamada described in the *Bunpō-ron* (namely, the case, the interjectional and the conjunctional usages).

In fact, such perspective is found in later poetic texts like the *Teniwoha gikanshō* (early Edo period, 17th century) as well. Similarly to the *Anegakōjishiki* and the *Shunjukenpishō*, in this treatise the discussion concerning *wo* encompasses both the function as a direct object marker and the conjunctional usage, but deals with the interjectional value as well.

In the first section, the text discusses cases in which *wo* follows nominals at the end of the sentence that should be placed before the verb (the so-called *wo mawashi* 'turning of *wo*', that *ue ni kaeru teniwoha nari* 'it is a particle that comes back up'), but also nominals that are not governed by a predicate, case that is called *iinokosu* 'leave unsaid'.[13] Furthermore, as regards the conjunctional usage, the treatise discusses the cases in which *wo* follows attributive forms or the construction *shi wo* (mostly with the auxiliary *mashi*).

Unlike the *Anegakōjishiki*, but following the steps of the *Shunjukenpishō*, it also deals with the so-called *yasumetaru wo* 'pausing *wo*': the *Gikanshō* mentions four poems as examples, that would be taken in great consideration by later scholarship. In the four sentences, the *yasumetaru wo* regularly follows verbal gerunds or other particles, for instance in the example (8) (*shirazu to wo ipan*, later borrowed by Yamada, in which it follows the quotative particle *to*), but also (15), in which it follows the locative particle *ni*.

(15) こひしくは下にをおもへ
   kopishiku-ba shita ni wo omope
   hold dear.IPFV-COND under LOC PART think.IMP
   'if you hold me dear, keep your love within' (*Kokinshū* 13.652).

Thus, the syntactic distribution of *wo* according to its functions as shown in the *Gikanshō* parallels perfectly the explanations found in the preceding treatises: in principle, *wo* as a direct object marker follows nominals, as a conjunction is used after attributive form of the

---

[13] The same opposition is found – as already noted – in the *Shunjukenpishō*, that defined the two possibilities as *sugu ni ue e kaeru* and *kokoro wo komete iimawasu*. It should be noticed also that the cases of *iinokosu* include a few examples that different treatises would mention as occurrences of *shi wo* (conjunctional usage): for instance, the *Gikanshō* quotes (5) *yuki to nomi puru dani aru wo* 'fall just like snow' (which Yamada would later borrow), or *futatu naki mono to omoishi wo* 'there is not a second one, I thought' (from *Kokinshū* 17.881).

verb, and its interjectional value is expressed when it follows infinitive or gerund forms of the verb and the particles *ni* and *to*. Before moving to the first linguistic description of the function of *wo*, we should highlight again that the three functions Yamada would later notice are already mentioned – albeit not sistematically – in the Medieval poetic treatises, and – as will be shown below – would be borrowed by the *kokugaku* scholars in the late 18th century.

3. The description of *wo* in the *kokugaku* grammars

The description found in the poetic treatises seems to have been accepted by 18th century Japanese scholars, such as Toganoi Michitoshi (1722-1785) in his *Teniha Abikizuna* (1770), Fujitani Nariakira (1738-1779) and Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801).

Toganoi provides several examples in which *wo* follows nominals or attributive forms, but its use as a *yasumeji* (paralleling the interjectional function) is limited to the same syntactic contexts shown in the poetic treatises: it always follows the particles *ni* and *to*, or the gerund formed by the morpheme *te*.

Similarly, Fujitani Nariakira borrowed the approach of the treatises and included it in his theoretical framework, laying emphasis on the syntactic context in which the particles were used. Thus, Fujitani discussed the occurrences in which *wo* follows nominals or attributive forms of the predicate: he identifies a *karoki wo*, lit. "light *wo*" (for example in *kore wo* "this (OBJ)") and an *omoki wo*, lit. "heavy *wo*", corresponding to the contemporary form *no ni* (concessive conjunction).[14] Moreover, he considers the cases in which *wo* follows the gerund *te* and the particles *to* and *ni* and highlights that the constituent following *wo* in this function must be a prohibitive or imperative particle, or the conjectural auxiliary *mu*: this value seems to parallel the interjectional particle in Yamada's classification.

While both Fujitani's and Toganoi's reasonings seem to be extremely similar to the explanations found in the treatises and their recognition of three different functions of *wo* parallel Yamada's description, Fujitani has the merit to have identified the syntactic contexts needed for the interjectional usage of *wo*, namely imperative,

---

14 See Nakada, Takeoka (1933: 185 n.1), who argue that the "light *wo*" corresponds to the case particle in Yamada's classification, while the "heavy *wo*" parallels Yamada's conjunctional particle.

desiderative and conjectural expressions (thus anticipating Kondō's 1980 analysis).

However, an important innovation is seen in Motoori Norinaga's *Kotoba no tama no o* (1777),[15] in which the discussion regarding *wo* seems at first to adhere to the account of the treatises, but in fact adds an unprecedented observation in a subsequent part of the work. Similarly to the treatises, it begins with few examples on the *ue e kaeru teniwoha* (lit. 'particles moving back up'), showing that in several cases the direct object placed at the end of the sentence needs to be linked to the predicate appearing in a preceding verse of the poem. Motoori calls the object marking usage *tsune no wo* 'the usual *wo*', while the conjunctional value – regularly distinguished from the former – is called *mono wo no i no wo* '*wo* meaning *mono wo*'. In Motoori's view, *wo* in its conjunctional function may be used at the end of the sentence or in the middle, and it may follow either attributive forms or nominals: in the latter case, Motoori glosses it as *naru mono wo* (with the copula and the concessive conjunction) to overtly distinguish it from the object marker (his *tsune no wo*), that may appear in the same syntactic context.[16]

Moreover, as Fujitani, he recognises the interjectional function as well, naming it *yasumeji ni oku wo* '*wo* as a *yasumeji*' (Satō 1984: 164), and quotes ten different poems to explain it: even if – unlike Fujitani – Motoori does not mention it overtly, the syntactic context in which *wo* appears in these poems perfectly abide by the principles found in the treatises, as *wo* always follows the particles *ni* and *to*, the gerund *te*, or the iterative morpheme *tsutsu*. Examples used by Motoori can be found in the treatises as well, e.g. *mite wo wataran* 'I will cross, watching' (*Kokinshū* 5.305), *nurete wo yukan* 'I shall go, dampened' (mentioned by Yamada, example (11), *Kokinshū* 4.224), *shirazu to wo ipan* 'I shall say I know nothing' (mentioned in (8), in Yamada, *Kokinshū* 13.630), *mitutu wo woran* lit. 'I will be looking continuously' (*Ise* XXIII, MYS 12.3032).

Thus, at first glance the syntactic contexts recognised by Motoori for each function are quite similar to the traditional ones. However, in

---

[15] See in particular Ōno (1970: 196-7), but Motoori's reasoning about the functions of *wo* is to be found in several sections of the *Kotoba no tama no o*.

[16] For instance, Motoori quotes the example (13), that the *Shunjukenpishō* treatise already defined as a *kokoro wo komete iimawasu wo* (the cases in which something is willingly left unsaid). In fact, Motoori treats this occurrence as a conjunctional particle, glossing the expression *pana yori saki to shiranu wa ga mi wo*, as *pana yori saki to shiranu wa ga mi naru mono wo*.

a subsequent portion of the *Tama no o* he takes *wo* in consideration again discussing its usage in the Nara period corpus (Ōno 1970: 285). He argues that in OJ *wo* conveyed a semantic meaning much closer to the one expressed by the particle *yo*, thus calling this function *yo ni nitaru wo* '*wo* resembling *yo*'. He states that in this function *wo* may be classified as a *tasukeji* ('helping words', whose function overlaps *yasumeji*'s one, adding emphasis, Iida 1984: 250-1) and that it may be defined as *yobau koe* 'calling expression'. The examples provided by Motoori show *wo* following the adverbial particle *bakari* 'just, approximately' (16), the past auxiliary in attributive form *shi* (17), or nominals that he does not recognize as direct objects (18).

(16) いつはりをよくする人をとらふばかりを
     itupari wo yokusuru pito wo torapu bakari wo
     lies OBJ do skillfully.ATTR person OBJ arrest only PART
     '(I want that) people good at telling lies get arrested' (MYS 12.2943);

(17) すめらみくさに我はきにしを
     sumera mi-(i)kusa ni wa pa ki-ni-shi wo
     sovreign HON-warrior be.INF I TOP come.INF-COMPL.INF-PAST.ATTR PART
     'I have come as an imperial warrior' (MYS 20.4370);

(18) いのちをしまたくしあらば
     inoti wo shi mataku shi ara-ba
     life PART PART safe.INF PART be.IPFV-COND
     'if my life is safe' (MYS 15.3741);

(19) 妹まつわれを
     imo matu ware wo
     beloved wait.ATTR I PART
     'in fact, I am waiting for my beloved' (MYS 13.3002).

Despite the obvious disagreement among the contemporary scholars regarding the correct interpretation of the occurrences quoted by Motoori,[17] it is worth mentioning that he seems to be the

---

[17] For instance, *wo* in (17) may be regarded as a conjunctional particle (Vovin 2013: 125), while in (18) it seems to be used as a case particle whose value is interpreted according to the morpho-syntactic alignment ascribed to OJ. Thus, Vovin (2009a: 180) glosses it as an absolutive particle, as he argues OJ to be a nominative-accusative language partially showing an active-stative alignment in some occurrences, and in

first to ascribe an interjectional value to cases not identified by the medieval treatises. Thus, albeit traditionally the interjectional function used to be implicitly recognised only in definite and precise syntactic contexts (after gerunds and particles *ni* and *to*), Motoori extends it to occurrences of *wo* following nominals (typical of a case particle), and attributive forms (usually interpreted as conjunctional usage).

This important feature would later be borrowed by the most influential scholars of the 19th century up to Yamada, who – as we have already seen – appears to use the same syntactic criteria to ascribe an interjectional value to *wo*.

4. The description of *wo* in the 19th century grammars

In the 18th/19th century Western grammar textbooks and their descriptive categories were imported to Japan influencing the Japanese scholars who either adopted this approach or tried to conciliate it with the traditional models (like Yamada did).

Example of the former method is shown in the *Gogaku shinsho* (1833) by Tsurumine Shigenobu (1788-1859), whom Yamada (1908: 41) himself recognised as the first grammarian to apply Western categories to the description of Japanese.[18]

In Tsurumine's text, the first function of *wo* is that of a *sashikotoba*, a category that broadly overlaps the particles of modern Japanese descriptions but originates from the Dutch class of prepositions. Tsurumine explains it with few examples in which *wo* marks either the semantic role of goal or the one of origin, and is always placed after nouns (using examples like (1), (2), and (4) that Yamada would quote as well).

Moreover, *wo* may be used as an interjection (that Tsurumine calls *nagekikotoba*), specifically as *yobu nagekikotoba*, which we may translate as 'vocative interjection', together with *ya*, *yo*, *na*, *wi*, *i* (Fukui 1938.2:

---

this framework the morpheme marking the patientive (absolutive) participant is *wo*. On the other hand, in the ONCOJ *wo* in the same poem is glossed as accusative.

[18] In particular, Tsurumine's descriptive approach is influenced by the *Orandagohōkai*, a grammar of Dutch language written in Japanese by Fujibayashi Fuzan (1781-1836) in 1815, based on the Dutch grammar *Nederduytsche Spraakkonst* (composed by Wilelm Sewel in 1708). See Sakurai (1986) and Vos (2000) among others for an introduction regarding the Dutch scholars' influence on the Japanese grammarians.

276-7, recall Motoori's *yobau koe*). Tsurumine's description of the interjectional value of *wo* resembles Motoori's analysis: both the examples provided and the syntactic contexts allowed by the interjectional *wo* in Tsurumine's view are identical to the *Tama no o*. For instance, Tsurumine mentions (18), in which *wo* follows a nominal,[19] but also (17), where *wo* comes after an attributive form of the verb. Moreover, he adds a few sentences which would later be borrowed by the Japanese scholarship, expanding even further the syntactic constraints governing the distribution of the interjectional *wo*: Tsurumine is one of the first scholars to quote the example (9) *fune watase wo to*, in which *wo* follows an imperative form of the verb and precedes the quotative particle *to*.

Therefore, Tsurumine's view apparently influenced contemporary studies as for the absence of a syntactic criterion to determine the difference between the direct object function of *wo* and the interjectional one: the interjectional *wo* may follow nouns, attributive forms of the verb, adverbs (such as *ina* 'not') but also imperative forms. Tsurumine's influence on Yamada's study is recognised by Yamada himself, but emerges clearly considering the example sentences provided by the latter, that perfectly overlap Tsurumine's.

Another influencing and quoted author in Yamada's *Bunpō-ron* is Ōtsuki Fumihiko (1847-1928). In his *Kō nihon bunten* (1897) and its commentary (*Kō nihon bunten bekki*) Ōtsuki distinguishes three functions of *wo*, that Yamada would borrow ten years later.

The first function is expressing the accusative case,[20] in which Ōtsuki includes both the direct object marking and the locative

---

[19] Another example quoted by Tsurumine in which the interjectional *wo* (*yobu nagekikotoba*) follows a nominal is (12), that – as already seen – Yamada and many other modern scholars would borrow.

[20] It is generally believed that the concept of case and the category of the case particles (*kaku joshi*) found in the *Bunpō-ron* is heavily influenced by the use of the term case (*kaku* 格) in Ōtsuki (Satō 1973: 10). However, Ōtsuki only states in the commentary (*Bekki*) that the particles he defines as belonging to the first group (i.e. the ones following nominals, as opposed to the second group – particles following different kinds of elements – and the third – particles following verbs) express the six cases he knew via Dutch, German and English grammars. Thus, Ōtsuki mostly defines the particle classes on syntactic criteria, not functional ones as Yamada does. I believe that the influence Yamada received needs to be looked for in other authors as well, such as Kurokawa Mayori (who is among the first scholars to recognize a specific category of particles expressing case) and the previous Japanese scholarship

functions (point of origin or transit). Ōtsuki quotes examples found both in Motoori and in Tsurumine like (1), (2), (3), as well as different verses not appearing in older grammars, but in all of them the accusative particle *wo* follows nominals only.

On the other hand, in Ōtsuki (1897: 204) the conjunction *wo* may follow both nominals and attributive forms of the verb, as in the aforementioned examples (10) and (13).

Lastly and most importantly, we shall analyse his description of the third interjectional function of *wo*. The examples Ōtsuki provides parallel again the ones found in the older treatises, e.g (8), or in Tsurumine's *Gogaku shinsho*, e.g. (9) and (12), and would be later taken into account by Yamada, for example (7). On the syntactic level, Ōtsuki's interjection *wo* – similarly to Tsurumine – may follow not only gerunds (with the morphemes *te* and *tsutsu*, as in *mitutu wo yukamu* 'I shall go, watching', *Bunpōhyakushū* 1613) and the particles *ni* and *to* (as in *kokoro ni wo omope* 'love me in your heart'), but also nominals as in (7), imperative forms as in (9), and attributive forms.

Moreover, Ōtsuki is one of the first scholars to discuss the construction called *mi-gohō* (usually translated as *Mi*-Usage) and considers the particle *wo* used in it as an interjection. The *Mi*-Usage is formed by a nominal, followed generally by the particle *wo* and the adjectival stem, to which the causal suffix *-mi* is attached, for example in (20), taken from Ōtsuki (1989):[21]

(20) 苫を粗み
      toma wo ara-mi
      roof PART rough-SUFF
      'the roof being rough' (*Hyakunin isshū* 1).

Even though to this day there seems to be no agreement on the interpretation that needs to be given to the function of *wo* in this construction,[22] Ōtsuki seems to be among the first to bestow an

---

that applied the category of case to verbs as well, anticipating Yamada's broad concept of *ikaku*.

[21] See Vovin (2009b), Motohashi (2009), Frellesvig (2010: 87 ff.) among others for an introduction to this construction and its different interpretations.

[22] It has been considered either as interjectional (Hashimoto 1969, Iwai 1974, among others), or as expressing case, thus a case particle in Yamada's classification

interjectional value to these occurrences, thus anticipating the contemporary discussion regarding the *Mi*-Usage.

On the syntactical level, Ōtsuki's analysis apparently does not provide any significant addition, as he adopts Motoori's and Tsurumine's intuitions, but his analysis is worth mentioning if we recall the influence he had on Yamada's study. As a matter of fact, it is possible that the distinction of three functions of *wo*, already noticed in the treatises and in *kokugakusha* like Motoori, was borrowed by Yamada through the fruition of Ōtsuki's work.

We may incidentally notice that several influential scholars operating during the same years as Ōtsuki distinguish more than three functions. For instance, Ochiai Naobumi's *Nihon daibunten* (1897) classifies five values, dividing the case and the conjunctional functions from three more different values (that may be linked to the interjectional function): the emotional one (as in (19) *imo matu ware wo*, already in Motoori), the ordering one (as in Tsurumine's example (9) *pune watase wo to*), and the one of an intensifier (as in (11) *nurete wo yukamu*, borrowed from the treatises).

Similarly, Mozume Takami's *Shogaku nihon bunten* (1878) distinguishes the case function (as in *yamaji wo yuku* 'go through the mountains') from the interjectional value expressing lamentation (as in (9) *pune watase wo to*) and an auxiliary function as in *mitutu wo yukamu* 'I shall go, watching'. On a syntactic level, the latter two functions in Mozume's work may overlap the interjectional value recognised by the treatises and the *kokugaku* scholars, but the distinction Mozume and Ochiai make regarding the interjectional value shows that the classification was not standardised until Yamada's *Bunpō-ron* began circulating.

5. Conclusive remarks

Yamada's influence on contemporary scholarship regarding the categorization of the particles, as well as his distinction of

---

(Shirane 2005, Vovin 2009b, Frellesvig 2010, among others). It may however be worth-noticing that syntactically *wo* in the *Mi*-Usage behaves exactly like a case particle, according to Kondō (1980: 60-1). He applied his criteria (§1) to the occurrences of this construction and observed that *wo* usually follows nominals, attributive forms with the nominalizer *koto*, and nominalized clauses, just like the other occurrences of the case particle *wo*. Conversely, the author found no occurrences of the particle *wo* following *ni* or *to* (as usually happens when it is used as an interjectional particle) or *mono* (as in the conjunctional usage).

three functions of *wo* (namely, the case marker, the interjectional particle and the conjunction) is evident in the fact that several Japanese and Western scholars adopted his framework (see for instance Hashimoto 1969, Iwai 1974, Kōji 1988, Shirane 2005, Frellesvig 2010 among others). However, there is no consensus on how to classify all the OJ and EMJ occurrences, and several contemporary descriptions, both by Japanese and Western scholars, use a semantic criterion without taking into account formal and syntactic parameters (see Hashimoto 1969, Iwai 1974 among others). This problem eventually led to the idea that in the older stages of the language each occurrence of *wo* had an interjectional value (hypothesis initially proposed by Matsuo 1938, but accepted by Konoshima 1966 as well).

This hypothesis arose from the observation of the alternation between *wo* and zero in OJ and EMJ when expressing the direct object, and it is in fact possible to recognise the pragmatic parameters governing this alternation as one of the main factors influencing Matsuo's theory (definiteness, specificity, newsworthiness, referentiality and the like)[23]. These parameters – which seem to hold for all the stages of the Japanese language – were yet to be studied at that time, and may have been confused with a general idea of emphasis and emotion. However, the classification introduced by Yamada and adopted by Matsuo played its part inasmuch as it provided no straightforward syntactic restriction to contribute to the interpretation of the function of each occurrence of *wo*.

Thus, if the history of the scholarship relying on Yamada's theories is well-known, the present article tackled a disregarded aspect, namely the influence Yamada himself received and how he achieved his classification.

---

[23] See recently Frellesvig et al. (2015; 2018), but also Motohashi (1989) for OJ and EMJ; refer to Endo Hudson, Sakakibara, Kondo (2006), Fujii, Ono (2000), Masunaga (1988), Matsuda (1996), Tsutsui (1984), Yasutake (2012) among others for the contemporary spoken Japanese. Note that Fujitani Nariakira in his *Ayuishō* had already postulated a criterion that we may define pragmatic to understand the alternation between *wo* and zero, as he argued that zero is used when the referent of the object is usually utilized to perform the action expressed by the verb, but when the connection is unusual, we use the particle *wo*. For example, he writes that we may say *sake nomu* 'to drink alcohol' because alcohol is brewed to drink, but we may not say *sake kōsu* 'to freeze alcohol' because alcohol is not made to be frozen.

It has been shown that, ever since the discussion concerning the *yasumeji wo* (which parallels the interjectional particle in Yamada) arose in the medieval poetic treatises, this function had been recognised only in precise syntactic positions, i.e., after *ni*, *to* and gerunds. This view has been adopted by *kokugakusha* such as Fujitani Nariakira, and even Motoori Norinaga accepted it at the beginning of his *Tama no o*. Motoori, however, was probably the first scholar to identify an interjectional value in syntactic contexts not established by the poetic treatises: in Motoori, the interjectional function may be expressed when *wo* follows nominals, attributive forms and adverbs as well. Thus, in Motoori's view the syntactic contexts in which the interjectional *wo* is allowed overlap the ones of both the case marker *wo* (his *tsune no wo*) and the conjunctional *wo*.

It is not clear whether Motoori's pupils such as Suzuki Akira (1764-1837) were influenced by their teacher's approach. Suzuki himself in the *Gengyo Shishuron* (1824) listed the particles without providing any example sentences, making it impossible to understand his classification of the occurrences of these morphemes. However, what is evident is that later scholars like Tsurumine accepted Motoori's view in recognising an interjectional function in the same syntactic contexts found in the *Tama no o*, to which Tsurumine adds the post-imperative form position.

Lastly, the same approach is borrowed by scholars publishing slightly before Yamada such as Ōtsuki, who discusses the occurrences of *wo* in the *Mi*-Usage understanding them as interjectional. Syntactically, he does not seem to recognise different contexts allowing the interjectional function, but his interpretation of *wo* would anticipate contemporary scholarship on the matter.

Thus, Yamada's classification seems to be heavily affected by the previous discussion concerning the interpretation of the occurrences of *wo*. He explicitly rejects formal criteria to distinguish the Japanese particles, but his analysis concerning *wo* seems to owe a great debt to Motoori's reasoning, borrowed by Tsurumine and Ōtsuki as well, inasmuch as they all overlap the syntactic context allowed by *wo* as an interjectional particle and as a direct object marker.

Therefore, through Yamada's work it is possible to observe the influence that both the traditional view found in the treatises and

the innovations proposed by modern grammarians such as Ōtsuki have exerted on the theories of scholars in the 20th century. Hence, an interesting perspective of research, concerning the analysis of the particles as well as of different parts of the speech, may be identifying a silver thread that ties the discussions found in the medieval treatises to contemporary research, in order to understand how the traditional view of the language came to shape modern scholarship.

REFERENCES

ASTON, William George. *A Grammar of the Japanese Written Language*. London, Luzae&Co, 1904.

ENDO HUDSON, Mutsuko, et al. "Zero-marked topics, subjects and objects in Japanese". *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 14*, edited by Timothy J. Vance, and Kimberly Jones, Stanford, Center for the Study of Language and Information, 2006, pp. 309-320.

FRELLESVIG, Bjarke. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, CUP, 2010.

FRELLESVIG, Bjarke, et al. "Differential object marking in Old Japanese: a corpus-based study". *Historical Linguistics 2013: Selected Papers from the 21 International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Oslo 5-9 August 2013*, edited by Dag T.T. Haug, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2015 pp. 195-212.

FRELLESVIG, Bjarke, et al. "A diachronic perspective on differential object marking in pre-modern Japanese: Old Japanese and Early Middle Japanese". *The diachronic typology of differential argument marking*, edited by Ilja A. Seržant, and Alena Witzlack-Makarevich, Berlin, Language Science Press, 2018, pp. 183-208.

FUJII, Noriko and Tsuyoshi ONO "The occurrence and non-occurrence of the Japanese direct object marker o in conversation". *Studies in Language*, 24, 1, 2000, pp. 1-39.

FUKUI, Kyūzō. *Kokugogaku Taikei*. Tōkyō, Kōseikaku, 1938, Vols. 1-2-7-8.

HASHIMOTO, Shinkichi. *Joshi Jodōshi no Kenkyū*. Tōkyō, Iwanami Shoten, 1969.

HIDA, Yoshifumi, et al. *Nihongogaku Kenkyū Jiten*, Tōkyō, Meiji Shoin, 2007.

HINDS, John. *Ellipsis in Japanese*. Edmonton, Linguistic Research Inc., 1982.

HIROI, Reiko. "Utsubo Monogatari ni okeru kyakugo hyōji no "wo" ni tsuite". *Nihon Bungaku*, 9, 1957, pp. 42-58.

IIDA, Harumi. "Kinsei izen no jojikenkyūshoshō". *Kenkyū Shiryō Nihon Bunpō*, edited by Ōki Hayashi, and Kazuhiko Suzuki, Tōkyō, Meiji Shoin, 1984, Vol. 5, pp. 246-325.

IWAI, Yoshio. *Nihongo: Hōshi Nara-Heian Jidai Hen*. Tōkyō, Kasama Shoin, 1974.

IZUHARA, Eiko. "Kantō joshi wa dono yō ni ichizukerarete kita ka". *Journal of Aichi Gakuin University*, 58, 3, 2011, pp. 1-12.

KŌJI, Kazuteru. *Man'yōshū joshi no Kenkyū*. Tōkyō, Kasama Shoin, 1988.

KONDŌ, Yasuhiro. "Joshi wo no bunrui jōdai". *Kokugo to kokubungaku*, 57, 10, 1980, pp. 51-66.

KONOSHIMA, Masatoshi. *Kokugo Joshi no Kenkyū*. Tōkyō, Ōfūsha, 1966.

KUNO, Susumu. *Danwa no bunpō*. Tōkyō, Taishukan, 1978.

KYŌGOKU, Okikazu. "Joshi to wa nanika – kenkyūshi no tenbō". *Hinshibetsu Nihon bunpō kōza 9: joshi*, edited by Ōki Hayashi, and Kazuhiko Suzuki, Tōkyō, Meiji Shoin, 1973, pp. 25-68.

MASUNAGA, Kiyoko. "Case deletion and discourse context". *Papers from International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*, edited by William J. Poser, Stanford, CSLI Publications, 1988, pp. 145-156.

MATSUDA, Kenjiro. *Variable Zero-marking of (o) in Tokyo Japanese*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1996.

MATSUO, Osamu. "Heianshoki ni okeru kakujoshi wo". *Kokugo to kokubungaku*, 15, 10, 1938, pp. 1389-1412.

MATSUO, Osamu. "Kyakugo hyōji no joshi wo nitsuite". *Hashimoto Hakushi Kanreki Kinen Kokugogaku Ronshū*, edited by Hashimoto Shinkichi, Tōkyō Iwanami Shoten, 1944, pp. 617-644.

MOTOHASHI, Tatsushi. *Case Theory and the History of the Japanese Language*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tucson, University of Arizona, 1989.

MOTOHASHI, Tatsushi "Mi-usage: its morphological, syntactic and semantic properties". *Sophia Linguistica: Working Papers in Linguistics*, 57, 2009, pp. 283-297.

MORI, Toshiro and Talmy GIVÓN. *Zero object-marking in colloquial Japanese: the pragmatics of optional deletion*. MA Thesis, Eugene, University of Oregon, 1987.

NAKADA, Norio and Masao TAKEOKA. *Ayuhishō Shinchū*. Tōkyō, Kazama Shobo, 1993.

ŌNO, Susumu. *Motoori Norinaga Zenshū 5.* Tōkyō, Chikuma Shobō, 1970.

OYAMA, Atsuko. "Hindo kara mita mokutekikaku hyōji no wo no kinō to hyōgenkachi". *Kokugogaku*, 3, 1958, pp. 116-140.

ŌTSUKI, Fumihiko. *Kō Nihon Bunten*. Tōkyō, 1897.

SAKURAI, Michiko. "Eibunpōjishi: hinshiron wo chūshin to shite". *Publications of the Institute for Comparative Studies of Culture affiliated to Tokyo Womans' Christian College*, 47, 1986, pp. 105-120.

SANSOM, George. *An Historical Grammar of Japanese*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1928.

SATŌ, Kiyoji. "Joshi no bunrui – Meiji igo". *Hinshibetsu Nihon bunpō kōza 9: joshi*, edited by Ōki Hayashi, and Kazuhiko Suzuki, Tōkyō, Meiji Shoin, 1973, pp. 8-24.

SATŌ, Nobuo. "Jojikenkyū no rekishi". *Kenkyū Shiryō Nihon Bunpō*, edited by Ōki Hayashi, and Kazuhiko Suzuki, Tōkyō, Meiji Shoin, 1984, Vol. 5, pp. 137-196.

SHIBATANI, Masayoshi. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

SHIMOJO, Mitsuaki. *Argument Encoding in Japanese conversation*. Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillian, 2005.

SHIRANE, Haruo. *Classical Japanese: a Grammar*. New York, Columbia University Press, 2005.

TSURUMINE, Shigenobu. *Gogaku Shinsho*, Tōkyō, 1833.

TSUTSUI, Michio. *Particle Ellipses in Japanese*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois, 1984.

VOS, Frits. "The influence of Dutch grammar on Japanese language research". *History of the Language Sciences*, edited by Sylvain Auroux et al., New York, De Gruyter, 2000, Vol. 1, pp. 102-104.

VOVIN, Alexander. *A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Western Old Japanese Part. 1.* Folkestone, Global Oriental, 2005.

VOVIN, Alexander. *Man'yōshū Book 15, a New English Translation Containig the Original Text, Kana Transliteration, Romanization, Glossing and Commentary*. Folkestone, Global Oriental, 2009a.

VOVIN, Alexander. *A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Western Old Japanese Part. 2*. Folkestone, Global Oriental, 2009b.

VOVIN, Alexander. *Man'yōshū Book 20, a New English Translation Containig the Original Text, Kana Transliteration, Romanization, Glossing and Commentary*. Folkestone, Global Oriental, 2013.

YAMADA, Yoshio. *Nihon Bunpō-Ron.* Tōkyō, Hōbunkan, 1908.

YAMADA, Yoshio. *Nara-chō Bunpōshi.* Tōkyō, Hōbunkan, 1912.

YAMADA, Yoshio. *Heian-chō Bunpōshi.* Tōkyō, Hōbunkan, 1913.

YAMADA, Yoshio. *Nihon Bunpōgaku Gairon.* Tōkyō, Hōbunkan, 1936.

YASUTAKE, Tomoko. "Esplicit vs. zero postpositional particles in modern Colloquial Japanese". *Bulletin of Aichi University of Education*, 61, 2012, pp. 81-91.

   National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (2018) "Oxford-NINJAL Corpus of Old Japanese" (Version 2018.9) http://oncoj.ninjal.ac.jp/

   National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (2018) "Corpus of Historical Japanese" (Version 2018.9, Chunagon Version 2.4.2) https://chunagon.ninjal.ac.jp/