

Embedded imperative clauses in Old Japanese

Kerri L. Russell and Peter Sells
vsarpj@orinst.ox.ac.uk

The 14th International Conference of European Association of Japanese Studies
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, 27-30 August 2014

Overview

- ▶ Introduction
- ▶ Embedded imperatives
 - Type A
 - Type B
- ▶ Discussion
- ▶ Conclusion

Introduction

- ▶ This study is based on the Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese (OCOJ), a syntactically parsed corpus of the Old Japanese (OJ) language
 - Information about this corpus is available at:
<http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/>
- ▶ For this study we extracted all examples of morphologically marked imperatives in the OCOJ.

Introduction

- ▶ Imperatives canonically express a speaker's will to have an action performed with the expectation that someone (else) will perform the action.
- ▶ A canonical imperative expresses a 'directive' speech act (Searle 1975) on the part of the speaker (the one who "commands").

Introduction

- ▶ A structural difference that sets imperatives apart from declaratives and interrogatives is that the subject of an imperative is often null.
 - In OJ, it is null in 160 of the 263 examples in the OCOJ (roughly 61%).
- ▶ In Russell & Sells (in press), we investigated the marking of overt subjects of the imperative, and found that they are never marked for case.

Introduction

- ▶ It is often claimed that imperatives cannot be embedded, but several languages have embedded imperatives.
- ▶ OJ is one of them.
- ▶ The imperative in OJ occurs in two types of embedded constructions, both followed by the subordinating complementizer *to*.
 - Type A - canonical imperative, command
 - Type B - non-command structure

Embedded Imperative: Type A

- ▶ Type A, is a quotative construction, and uses the imperative in a typical command structure.
- ▶ There are 32 examples (out of 263 imperatives) in the OCOJ.
- ▶ There is only one example with an overt subject; it is not case marked.

Embedded Imperative: Type A

Type A embedded imperative with an overt subject:

[<watarimori> pune **watase** *wo to*]
[<ferryman> boat **ferry.IMP** **INTJ** **COMP**]
ywobu kowe no itara-neba ka mo kadi no
call voice GEN arrive-NEG FOC ETOP oar GEN
oto no se-nu
sound GEN do-NEG

“Is it because the voice that calls [‘<Ferryman> **ferry** the boat!’]
has not reached (us), that the sound of the oars are not heard?”
(MYS.10.2072)

Embedded Imperative: Type A

Type A embedded as argument of implied verb of saying/thinking:

[apa-mu	pi	no	katami	ni	seyo
[meet-CONJ	day	GEN	memento	COP	do.IMP
to]	tawayamye	no	omopi-midarete		
COMP]	weak.woman	GEN	think-be.confused		
nup-yeru	koromo zo				
sew-STAT	robe	FOC			

“‘Make (it) a memento of the day we met’ - the robe that (I) the woman with weak hands sewed while lost in thought.”

(MYS.15.3753)

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ Type B is a non-command structure used to mean ‘in order for X; (so) that X’ and is not used to imply the will of the speaker to have an action carried out.
- ▶ While predicates in Type B structures are morphologically encoded as imperatives, they are not true mood constructions.
 - Thus, they are not included in the count of 263 imperatives.

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ There are 31 examples of Type B.
- ▶ 8 examples have an overt subject:
 - 1 is \emptyset -marked
 - 2 are topicalized with *mo*
 - 5 are marked with accusative *wo* (but one of these examples is "no logo")

Embedded Imperative: Type B

Type B embedded with subject case marked with *wo*

ywo	narabete	[<kimi wo>	ki-mase
night	line.up	[<lord ACC>	come-RESP.IMP
<i>to</i>	tipayaburu	kamwi <u>no</u>	yasiro wo
COMP]	brutal	gods GEN	shrine ACC
noma-nu	pi	pa	na-si
pray-NEG	day	TOP	not.exist-ACOP

“There is not a day where I don’t pray at the brutal gods’ shrine night after night [**that** <my lord> **would come**].” (MYS.11.2660)

Embedded Imperative: Type B

Type B embedded with subject case marked with *wo*

[<*utusemi* no inoti *wo*> **naga-ku**
[<transient.world COP life ACC> **long-ACOP**
ari-koso *to*] tomar-eru ware pa *ipapite*
exist-do.for.me.IMP COMP] stop-STAT I TOP pray
mata-mu
wait-CONJ

“I, who remain behind, pray and wait [(in order) for <life in this transient world> to be long].” (MYS.13.3292)

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ In these examples, we see that:
 - the subject of the embedded clause is indeed a constituent of that clause.
 - the “addressee” of the matrix clause – e.g., the ones being prayed to – does not have the same referent as the subject of the imperative predicate.

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ So, we can see that the Type B embedded imperative is not related semantically to the matrix clause or to the context, and that if the subject is case-marked, that case-marking must be due to internal properties of the embedded clause.

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ The numbers for overt and case-marked subjects in Type A (command) and Type B (non-command) embedded structures are summarized in Table 1:

		total examples	overt subjects	subjects marked with <i>wo</i>
Type A	command	32	1	0
Type B	non-command	31	8	5

Table 1. Comparison of imperative followed by complementizer *to* in command and non-command structures

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ For comparison, Table 2 shows the ratio of null to overt subjects in all the mood constructions.

	null	overt	% overt
Imperative (command)	160	103	39%
Prohibitive <i>na-V-so</i>	33	42	56%
Prohibitive <i>na-V-sone</i>	11	17	61%
Prohibitive particle <i>na</i>	39	25	39%
Prohibitive prefix <i>na-</i>	12	15	56%
Prohibitive Total	95	99	51%
Optative <i>-ana</i>	54	7	11%
Optative <i>-ane</i>	28	22	44%
Optative <i>-anamu/o</i>	8	13	62%
Optative Total	90	42	32%

Table 2: Case marking: potential hosts for case, ratios of null and overt subjects

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ Case marking of subjects is never found with any of these mood constructions.
- ▶ Case marking of subjects is only found with Type B embedded imperatives.

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ Further evidence for Type B not being a canonical imperative is that the negative equivalent of Type B (i.e, “lest; so that X doesn’t happen”) is not formed by the prohibitive, but by the negative conjunctural.

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ Prohibitives can be embedded; only 13 out of 194 prohibitives are embedded

Embedded prohibitive, negated version of a Type A

[**na-omopi to**] kimi pa ipedomo

[**PROH-think COMP**] lord TOP say

apa-mu toki itu *to* sirite *ka* wa ga

meet-CONJ time when COMP know FOC I GEN

kwopwi-zara-*mu*

yearn-NEG-CONJ

“Although you said ‘**Don’t think about me!**’, if I knew when we would meet, I wouldn't be yearning for you.” (MYS.2.140)

Embedded Imperative: Type B

- ▶ There are 3 examples of negative conjecturals used as the negative version of Type B.

[**moda arazi to**] koto no
[silent exist.NCNJ COMP] thing GEN
nagusa ni ipu koto wo kiki-sir-eraku
comfort COP say word ACC hear-learn-STAT.NML
pa asi-ku pa ari-kyeri
TOP bad-ACOP TOP exist-MPST

“Learning (about their feelings) by (only) hearing words which are said to comfort (you) [**so that (they) are not silent**], is a bad thing.” (MYS.7.1258)

Discussion

- ▶ Kaufmann (2014) presents a survey of different types of embedded imperatives which are found in a variety of languages, looking at how close or how far the semantics of an embedded imperative can deviate from the semantics of a matrix imperative.

Discussion

- ▶ In her survey an embedded imperative has some kind of canonical imperative-like use, and the subject is determined as:
 - (a) the addressee in the speech context; or
 - (b) an understood addressee in the local context of the embedded imperative, expressed in the immediately superior matrix clause; or
 - (c) an expressed subject within the embedded imperative.

Discussion

- ▶ In Kaufmann's data, overt subjects as in case (c) an expressed subject in the embedded imperative, are only possible if they actually pick out the addressee in the overall context, with data from Korean and Slovenian.
- ▶ According to her, modern Japanese and modern Korean allow embedded imperatives but only with covert subjects (Japanese) or overt subjects which must pick out the addressee in context (Korean).

Discussion

- ▶ Even the Type A embedded imperatives in OJ seem to more flexible, as the overt subject in an example like the following has no status in the overall context.

Discussion

Type A embedded imperative with an overt subject:

[<watarimori> pune **watase** *wo* *to*]
[<ferryman> boat **ferry.IMP** **INTJ** **COMP**]
ywobu kowe no itara-neba ka mo kadi no
call voice GEN arrive-NEG FOC ETOP oar GEN
oto no se-nu
sound GEN do-NEG

“Is it because the voice that calls [‘<Ferryman> **ferry** the boat!’]
has not reached (us), that the sound of the oars are not heard?”
(MYS.10.2072)

Discussion

- ▶ Standardly an imperative is about the preference of the speaker (e.g., I want the door closed and I want you to close it), but some uses can be about the preference of the hearer (e.g., if you need to relax, I can advise you to “have a warm bath before bed”).

Discussion

- ▶ In our Type B a preference of the speaker is actually what is typically expressed (e.g., she prefers it if her lord does come, better than if he does not), but the action to ensure that is indirect (e.g., praying to the gods).
- ▶ So an optative is just a wish, but a Type B imperative is a wish where someone is doing something to try to ensure the wish comes true.

Discussion

- ▶ As previously mentioned, Type B has case marked subjects, marked with accusative *wo*.
- ▶ There must be some mechanism for licensing an accusative subject in the Type B examples which exhibit this, but it is part of a larger pattern in the language.
- ▶ The OCOJ shows 198 examples of accusative-marked subjects in embedded clauses; the majority of those examples (167) involve the subject of an adjective with the infinitive inflection *-mi*.

Discussion

Example with Adjective-*mi*

<i>ywo</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>naga-mi</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>neraye-nu</i>
night	ACC	long-ACOP	sleep	GEN	can.sleep-NEG
<i>ni</i>	<i>asipikwi</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>yamabiko</i>	<i>toyome</i>	
COP	asipiki	COP	mountain.foot	resound	
<i>sa-wosika</i>		<i>naku</i>	<i>mo</i>		
PFX-male.deer		cry	ETOP		

“**The night is long** and [I] cannot sleep a sleep, the foot of the asipiki mountain is rumbling; a male deer cries.” (MYS.15.3680)

Discussion

Example with Adjective-*ku*

kwopwitutu	<i>mo</i>	noti	<u>mo</u>	apa-mu		<i>to</i>
yearn	ETOP	later	ETOP	meet-CONJ		COMP
omope	<i>koso</i>	ono	<u>ga</u>	inoti	<i>wo</i>	naga-ku
think	FOC	self	GEN	life	ACC	long-ACOP
pori	<i>sure</i>					
desire	do					

“Though [I] am yearning, thinking that [we] will meet later. **I wish that my life were long.**” (MYS.12.2868)

Discussion

Example with Adjective-*ku ar-*

<i>inoti</i>	<i>wo</i>	<i>si</i>	<i>mata-ku</i>	<i>si</i>	<i>araba</i>	
life	ACC	RES	safe-ACOP	RES	exist	
<i>arikinū</i>		<i>no</i>	<i>arite</i>	<i>noti</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>mo</i>
exist.clothes		GEN	exist	later	COP	ETOP
<i>apa-zara-me</i>			<i>ya</i>	<i>mo</i>		
meet-NEG-CONJ			FOC	ETOP		

“**If my life would be safe**, would we not meet later, in our same clothes? (MYS.15.3741a)

Discussion

Example with optative final particle

inoti *wo* *si* *ma-saki-ku* *mogamo*

life ACC RES PFX-fortunate-ACOP FNL

“I wish my life were fortunate.” (MYS.9.1779)

Example with necessitive extension *be-*

akipagwi *wo* *tiri-sugwi-nu* *be-mi*

bush.clover ACC scatter-pass-PERF NEC-ACOP

Surely the bush clover has completely scattered. (MYS.10.2290)

predicates	accusative marked subjects
infinitive	170
Adj-mi	167
Adj-ku	1
Adj-ku mogamo	1
Verb-nu be-mi	1
conditional	2
Adj-ku araba	2
gerund	21
Adj-mito	21
imperative (Type B)	5
Adj-ku are	2
ki-imase	2
verb-ye-ko*	1
Grand Total	198

Discussion

- ▶ The case-marking possibilities have been taken by some to indicate that OJ had a residual system of active/stative case marking (Vovin 1997), in which accusative had a use to mark subjects of “stative” predicates.

Discussion

- ▶ Another possibility is that the case marking is indicative of a kind of “absolute” construction, although the construction itself does not have the same adjunct-like distribution as the canonical absolute in an Indo-European language (e.g., the first part of *Them having nothing to their name, we were forced to take them in*).

Discussion

- ▶ This analysis for OJ would imply that the Type B imperatives are more like infinitives (as the English translation “in order to” would imply), and are able to license an accusative subject.
- ▶ These examples above support the view that OJ could license an accusative subject in a variety of constructions which are somehow less “active” or perhaps less “finite” than canonical clause-types.

Discussion

- ▶ In Russell & Sells (in press) we noted that all the mood forms (imperatives, prohibitives, and optatives) show quite a healthy ratio of overt subjects (see Table 2), but no genitive subjects at all.
- ▶ It is usually considered that genitive subject marking is a reflex of the clause being embedded or nominalised.
- ▶ The data suggest that the conditions for genitive subjects are never met by any of the true mood forms.

Discussion

- ▶ That is, true matrix clauses would not show overt case marking on their subjects, so our data for non-embedded mood forms would suggest that these are essentially found exclusively in matrix clauses – hence no case marking on the subjects of those clauses occurs.

Conclusion

- ▶ We have shown the existence of embedded imperatives, Type A, and other embedded constructions, Type B.
- ▶ The case marking in Type B is further support for the possibility of accusative case on subjects.
- ▶ This should provide further evidence regarding the question of the typological properties of OJ.
- ▶ The precise semantic properties of Type B, and their relation to canonical imperative semantics, also awaits further research.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford University Press.
- Bybee, Joan L. & Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. University of Chicago Press.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke, Stephen Wright Horn, Kerri L. Russell, & Peter Sells. n.d. The Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese. <http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/corpus.html>
- Ginzburg, Jonathan and Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative Investigations*. Stanford, CSLI Publishing.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2011. *On the Grammar of Optative Constructions*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2014. “Embedded imperatives across languages: Too rare to expect, too frequent to ban.” Handout for presentation at Colloquium Stony Brook, April 4, 2014 (updated April 11, 2014).
- Koyonagi, Tomokazu. 1996. “On the Expressions of Prohibition and Restraint in Ancient Japanese.” *Kokugogaku*, 184, 1-13.

References

- Martin, Samuel E. 1975. Reference Grammar of Japanese. Tuttle Publishing.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2009. Modality in Japanese: The Layered Structure of the Clause and Hierarchies of Functional Categories (Studies in Language Companion Series). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1991. Nihongo no Modality to Ninshō [Japanese modality and person]. Tokyo: Hituji-syoboo.
- Omodaka, Hisataka, ed. 1967. Jidai Betsu Kokugo Daijiten: Jōdai Hen [A Dictionary of the Japanese Language by Periods: Old Japanese Volume]. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- _____. 1984 [1957-1977]. Man'yōshū Chūshaku [Commentary on the Man'yōshū]. Volumes 1-22. Revised edition. Tokyo: Chuō Kōronsha.
- Portner, Paul. 2012. “Imperatives”. To appear in M. Aloni and P. Dekker (eds.) The Cambridge Handbook of Formal Semantics. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, Kerri L. and Stephen Wright Horn. 2012. “Verb semantics and argument realization in pre-modern Japanese: A corpus based study”. *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, 25, 129-148.

References

- Russell, Kerri L. and Peter Sells. In press. “The syntax of mood constructions in Old Japanese: A corpus based study.” In Dag Haug (ed.) *Historical Linguistics 2013: Selected papers from the 21st International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, Oslo. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. “Speech Acts Distinctions in Syntax”. *Language typology and syntactic description* ed. by Timothy Shopen, 155-196. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John. 1975. “Indirect speech acts.” *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts* ed. by P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, 59-82. New York: Academic Press.
- Takagi, Ichinosuke, Gomi Tomohide, & Ōno Susumu, eds. 1958-1962. *Man'yōshū. Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei [A Survey of Japanese Classical Literature]: 4-7*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Tsuchihashi, Yutaka and Konishi Jin'ichi. 1957. *Kodai Kayōshū [A Collection of Songs of the Ancient Period]*. *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei [A Survey of Japanese Classical Literature]*. Vol. 3. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2009. *A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Western Old Japanese, Volume 2: Adjectives and Verbs*. Folkestone, UK: Global Oriental Press.

References

- Vovin, Alexander. 1997. “On the Syntactic Typology of Old Japanese”. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 273-290.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2008. “Encoding the Addressee in the Syntax: Evidence from English Imperative Subjects”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 185-218.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella, Miok Pak and Paul Portner. 2012. “A Syntactic Analysis of Interpretive Restrictions on Imperative, Promissive, and Exhortative Subjects”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30, 1231-1274.

Questions and Comments Welcome

Kerri L. Russell & Peter Sells
vsarpj@orinst.ox.ac.uk