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Aims of this presentation

- Introduce the Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese
- Demonstrate some basic properties of Provisional and Conditional clauses in OJ, inferred through anaphoric relations
- Examine the location of genitive-marked NPs in sentences embedding Provisional and Conditional clauses
- Demonstrate an asymmetry in the distribution of genitive-marked NPs in those contexts
Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese

Comprises all poetic texts from the Old Japanese period (approximately 90,000 words)

website: http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/

- Provisional clauses: 1053 instances
- Conditional clauses: 674 instances
Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese: Annotation

- Orthography
- Lexeme and morpheme ID (link to Lexicon)
- Part of speech, Morphology
- Syntactic constituency: noun phrases, clauses, topics, right dislocated elements
- Argumenthood

XML Markup, Text Encoding Initiative
この文は日本語です。
Two clause types

In the linear order

\[ \ldots V_1 S_1] \ldots V_2 S_2] \]

where \( V_1 \) is Provisional, Conditional, etc. we refer to the clause headed by \( V_1 \) as \( S_1 \) and the clause headed by \( V_2 \) as \( S_2 \).

- Provisional (ending in -(e)ba), sometimes called ‘realis conditional’: ‘when \( S_1, S_2 \)’ or ‘since \( S_1, S_2 \)’ or ‘given that \( S_1, S_2 \)’
- Conditional (ending in -(a)ba), sometimes called ‘irrealis conditional’: ‘if \( S_1, S_2 \)’

Provisional: \textit{yukeba} “When/because (I) go”
Conditional: \textit{yukaba} “If (I) go”
‘When I cross, making an offering at Ōsaka Mountain of Ōmi Road, (...) I will look back on (all this) again.’ (MYS.13.3240)
Pronominalization types

(2) a. Right pronominalization:
\[
[S_2 \ldots [S_1 \ldots NP_i \ldots V_1] \ldots e_i \ldots V_2]
\]

b. Left pronominalization:
\[
[S_2 \ldots [S_1 \ldots e_i \ldots V_1] \ldots NP_i \ldots V_2]
\]

c. Binding:
\[
[S_2 \ldots NP_i \ldots [S_1 \ldots e_i \ldots V_1] \ldots V_2]
\]
No Left Pronominalization between coordinated clauses in NJ

(3) a.  *Nakoo do ga e ki ma de e_i* muka e ni it te kure te,
match maker NOM station ABL to.meet go.give.GER

[**watashi ga**]_i_  hitori.de kaijō ni ikō to sita.
I NOM alone meeting.hall DAT go.VOL COMP do.PAST

(intended) ‘The matchmaker went to meet (me) at the station, and I headed off for the meeting hall on my own.’

b.  Nakoo do ga e ki ma de e_i muka e ni it te kure ta no ni
match maker NOM station ABL to.meet go.give.PAST although

[**watashi ga**]_i_  hitori.de kaijō ni ikō to sita.
I NOM alone meeting.hall DAT go.TENT COMP do.PAST

‘Although the matchmaker went to meet (me) at the station, I headed off for the meeting hall on my own.’
There is Left Pronominalization into Provisional clauses

(4) \[ S_2 \left[ S_1 \ masurawo \ no \ e_i \ ywobi-tate-sikaba \right] \]
    fine.man GEN call-stand-SPAST.PROV

\[ NP \ sawosika \ no_i \ ] \quad munawake-yuka-mu \]
buck GEN press.through-go-CONJ

‘Because the fine men flushed (it) out, the buck must be pressing through (the brush).’ (MYS 20.4320)

- We conclude Provisional $S_1$ is subordinate to $S_2$. In this case we refer to $S_2$ as the ‘matrix’ clause.
No negative markers in $V_2$ may scope over $S_1$

(5) $[S_2 [S_1 topo-kuareba] pito-pi.pito-ywo mo$
$[far-ACOP.PROV] one-day.one-night even$

omopa-zute.aru ramu] mono to
think-NEG.PROG PCONJ person COP.INF

omoposi-myesu na
think-RESP PRB

‘Don't think (of me) as someone who, just because (he) is far away, doesn't think of you day and night!’
(MYS.15.3736)
No aspect markers in V₂ may scope over S₁

(6) [S₂ [S₁ kasumi tatu nwo no pe no
mist rise field GEN above GEN

kata ni yuki-sikaba] ugupisu
slope DAT go-SPAST.PROV warbler

naki-tu]
cry-PERF

‘When I was going to (once I arrived at) the slope over the field where mist rises, a warbler began to sing.’
(MYS.8.1443)
No illocutionary markers in $S_2$ may scope over $S_1$

(7)  
\[ [S_2 [S_1 \text{ okure wite wa ga kwopwi woreba}] \text{ be.left.behind PROG.GER I GEN yearn PROG.PROV} \]

\text{sirakumo no tanabiku yama wo kyepu ka}

\text{white.clouds GEN stretch mountain ACC today Q}

\text{kwoyu ramu] cross PCONJ}

‘As I am yearning, being left behind, would it be today that you cross the mountain over which the white clouds stretch?’

(MYS.9.1681)

- We conclude Provisional clauses are ‘high’ within the matrix clause.
There is Right Pronominalization from an NP in a $S_1$ to a null argument in $S_2$

\[(8)\quad [S_2 (*e_i) [S_1 [NP \textit{oposaka-}ni \textit{apu ya} \textit{wotomye-}wo_i \text{big.hill-DAT meet FOC girl-ACC}]

\textit{miti twopeba]} \textit{tadani pa} \text{e}_i \textit{nora-zu}]

\textit{road ask.PROV straight TOP tell-NEG}

‘When I asked the way from the young woman I met on the big hill, (she) didn't tell me the direct way.’ (NSK 64)

- Principle C of the Binding Theory requires that $S_1$ be higher than the null subject argument.
There is also Binding from a matrix subject NP into $S_1$

(9) $[_{S_2} [_{NP} \text{nubatama} \ no \ \text{ywogwiri} \ no \ \text{tatite} \\
\text{black.jewel} \ \text{COP} \ \ \text{night.mist} \ \text{GEN} \ \ \text{stand.GER} \\
\text{opoposi-ku} \ \ \text{ter-eru} \ \ \text{tukuywo} \ no]_i \\
\text{vague-ACOP} \ \ \text{shine-STAT} \ \ \text{moon.night} \ \text{GEN} \\
[_{S_1} e_i \ \text{mireba}] \ \ \text{kanasi-sa} \\
\text{see.PROV} \ \ \text{be.touching-ACOP.EXCL} \\
\\
‘How touching, when you look at (it), is the moon that shines dimly when the jewel-black night mist rises.’
(MYS.6.982)
More Binding from a matrix subject NP into $S_1$

(10)  

$[S_2 \ [NP(...)] \ inoti \ mo \ sutete \ araswopi.ni$

life even discard.GER competing

tumadopi si-kyeru wotomye-ra ga]_i
engagement do-MPAST young.woman-SFX GEN

$[S_1 e_i \ kikeba] \ kanasi-sa$
hear.PROV touching-ACOP.EXCL

‘How touching, when you hear about (her), is the young girl whom the two men wooed, in competition, even throwing their lives away (...)’ (MYS.19.4211)
Interim summary of the properties of Provisional clauses

- They are subordinate.
- They are generally high enough to be outside the scope of negation, aspect, modals, and question markers (unless the PROV clause itself is Q-marked: see (15) below), etc.
- They are high enough to c-command matrix subject argument positions.

However,
- There are (rare) instances where matrix NP-GENs can c-command Provisional clauses.
Question:

In the linear order

(11) NP-GEN … V₁ … V₂

where there is both an overt NP-GEN on the left and another subject argument which is null, is there a way to distinguish between Binding and Right Pronominalization?

We looked at all examples satisfying the description in (11). There are no examples in the corpus where a NP-GEN is unambiguously a constituent of the matrix clause and also coreferences to a null subject argument in a Provisional clause to its right. In all of subject argument sharing cases there is some grammatical element indicating that the NP-GEN is a constituent of the Provisional S₁ (e.g., in example (1) above).
‘(...) when my lord pacified the realm under heaven (he) made manifest again and again signs that had not existed since early times.’ (MYS.19.4254)
While \([_{NP(...)} \text{wa go opokimi no}]\) in (12) is the subject of both \(S_1\) and \(S_2\), we concluded that this is an instance of Right Pronominalization because the inflection of \(V_2\) is Conclusive, and genitive subjects are only found with Conclusive predicates under a limited set of conditions, none of which apply here.
(13) \([S_2 [S_1 \text{ okure wite left.behind PROG.GER} \quad [_{\text{NP}} \text{ wa ga}]_i \quad \text{kwopwi yearn}]
\]
\]

\text{woreba]} \quad \text{e}_j \quad \text{sirakumo no white.clouds GEN} \quad \text{tanabiku stretch}

\text{yama wo} \quad \text{kyepu ka} \quad \text{kwoyu ramu]} \quad \text{mountain ACC} \quad \text{today Q} \quad \text{cross PCONJ}

‘As I am yearning, being left behind, would it be today that you cross the mountain over which the white clouds stretch?’ (MYS.9.1681)
We determined that there is no Pronominalization between \( \text{[NP wa ga]} \) in (13 (repeated from (7)) and the null subject of \( S_2 \), because the predicate heading \( S_2 \) includes \textit{ramu}, an extension which is used to mark tentative assertions based upon indirect evidence (i.e., evidence outside the direct experience of the speaker), and, crucially, excluding first person reference for subjects of active verbs. In (13), the subject of \( S_1 \) is 1\(^{st}\) person, and the predicate in \( S_2 \) is active, so the referents of the subjects of \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) must be disjoint.
Hypothesis

(14) A genitive-marked NP that precedes and is the subject of a Provisional $S_1$ is never also the subject of $S_2$.

When we do see subject argument sharing of this sort, an overt NP is always topic-marked, but these instances are extremely rare. Subject argument sharing between $S_1$ and $S_2$ is quite common when both subject positions have null arguments.
The girl who said she would meet me at Tsukuba Peak – because she heard *whose* rumors, must it be that she won't sleep with me?’ (FK.2)
Conditional clauses

- They are subordinate.
- They are generally high enough to be outside the scope of negation, aspect, modals, question markers, etc.
- They are high enough to c-command matrix subject argument positions.

Furthermore,

- There are no instances where matrix subject NPs c-command Conditional clauses.
Can we extend the hypothesis to Conditional clauses?

The short answer is, ‘Yes.’

When a NP-GEN precedes a Conditional clause and is the subject of both $S_1$ and $S_2$, in almost every case, there are overt grammatical elements clearly indicating the NP-GEN is internal to the Conditional clause.
NP-GEN ... V₁ ... V₂
(subject argument sharing)

(16) \[ S_2 \left[ S_1 [\text{NP } u\text{.no.pana no}]_i \text{ sugwiba} \right] e_i \]
deutzia GEN pass.by.COND]

wosi-mi ka] (...) regrettable-ACOP.INF Q (…)

‘Is it because it would be regrettable if the deutzia flowers passed by, (…)?’ (MYS.8.1491)
In (16), the semantics of the matrix adjective \textit{wosi}- "be regrettable" allow it to take the NP-GEN as its subject, but the infinitive form \textit{wosi-mi} requires an accusative-marked subject, so the NP-GEN is clearly internal to the Conditional clause.

(17) below the linear order [NP-GEN … V_1 … V_2] but the most natural reading does not allow subject argument sharing.
‘If only the child from Urashima in Mizunoe hadn't opened the box, (I, we, she) could have met (him) even again.’ (FK.15)
However in (18) below, unlike Provisional clauses, there does seem to be at least one case where the structural position of a NP-GEN is genuinely ambiguous. Specifically, the subject of *wosi-kye-mu "would be regrettable"* could either be ‘the snow’, or ‘the event of the snow melting’. This does not constitute compelling counterevidence against extending the hypothesis in (14) to Conditional clauses.
Position of NP-GEN is ambiguous

(18) [\text{NP} \text{okuyama no} \text{deep.mountain GEN} \text{suga no} \text{pa} \text{sedge GEN} \text{leaf}]

\text{sinwogi} \text{ puru} \text{ yuki no}]
\text{press.down.INF} \text{ fall} \text{ snow GEN}

\text{ke-naba} \text{ wosi-kye-mu}
\text{melt-PERF.COND} \text{ regrettable.ACOP-CONJ}

‘How \text{regrettable} would be \text{the snow that falls pressing down the leaves of the sedge of the deep mountains} \text{if (it) melted away.’}’ (MYS.3.299)
We conclude that the hypothesis in (14) (that genitive-marked NPs that precede and are subjects of Provisional clauses are never also subjects of predicates heading matrix clauses) can be extended to cover Conditional clauses as well. In fact, given that there are no examples of Binding from a matrix NP-GEN to a null argument in Conditional clauses, we can make an even stronger claim for the Conditional:

(19) Genitive-marked NPs appearing in the linear order [NP-GEN ... Conditional S₁ ... S₂ …] can have only a subject role with respect to a Conditional predicate, they are always internal to the clause which that predicate heads, and they never co-refer to a matrix subject argument.
Possibly related phenomena

It is a general fact of OJ that when a matrix genitive NP-\textit{ga} occurs, accusative-marked NPs (Yanagida 2006) and focus NPs (Nomura 1993) only appear to its left.

We can state that when a matrix NP-GEN (including NP-\textit{ga} and NP-\textit{no}) occurs, a Conditional clause only appears to the left of that NP-GEN.

For Provisional clauses the situation is more complicated because of the rare Binding examples we found (9, 10). But we can say that when a matrix NP-GEN occurs and there is subject argument sharing between a Provisional $S_1$ and the matrix clause, the Provisional clause only appears to the left of that NP-GEN.

How these phenomena are related is a question we leave for further research.
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