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Introduction: The OCOJ

- The Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese (OCOJ) is an annotated digital corpus of all extant texts from the Old Japanese (OJ) period (7th and 8th century CE).
- It consists of about 90,000 words.
- Funding bodies:
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People:
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- A poem (MYS.8.1606)

君待跡
吾戀居者
我屋戶乃
簾令動
秋之風吹
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- A romanized version of poem (MYS.8.1606)

君待跡
吾戀居者
我屋戸乃
簾令動
秋之風吹

kimi matu to
wa ga kwopwi-woreba
wa ga yadwo no
sudare ugokasi
aki no kaze puku
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- Plain text view generated from the markup:

```
MYS.8.1606 gloss tree

君待跡  kimi matu to
吾戀居者  wa ga kwopwi-woreba
我屋戸乃  wa ga yadwo no
簾令動  sudare ugokasi
秋之風吹  aki no kaze puku
```
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- Glossed view showing constituency, generated from the markup:
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- Tree view generated from the markup:
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- More information can be found on the OCOJ webpage: http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/
  - A fully romanized version of all OJ texts
  - Markup and display conventions
This paper investigates logical subjects in several mood-related constructions in central Old Japanese (OJ), the language of 8th century Japan. We focus on imperative, prohibitive and optative constructions, expressing the desire of the speaker for either the speaker or another entity to perform (or not) an event (or situation) (cf. Aikhenvald 2010, Bybee et al. 1994).

These forms have not been discussed in any detail for OJ. Previous literature (e.g., Frellesvig 2010, Vovin 2009) briefly describes them, but does not investigate the grammatical properties.
Introduction: The present study

- OJ has several forms expressing these categories:
  - *yuk-* ‘go’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperative:</th>
<th>Prohibitive:</th>
<th>Optative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>yukye</em></td>
<td><em>yuku na</em></td>
<td><em>yukana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na-yuki</em></td>
<td><em>na-yuki-so</em></td>
<td><em>yukane</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na-yuki-sone</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>yukanamu/yukanamo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Go!’</td>
<td>‘I want to go./Let’s go.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Don’t go!’</td>
<td>‘I want you to go.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Don’t go!’</td>
<td>‘I want him/her/it to go.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I don’t want you to go.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three mood forms

- Imperative
- Prohibitive
- Optative
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 encodes a Directive speech act (Searle 1975) on the part of the speaker (the one who “commands”).

A structural difference that sets imperatives apart from declaratives and interrogatives, is that the logical subject is often null, even for languages like English which typically require overt subjects.
In OJ, the logical subject of the imperative is also often null: it is null in 160 of the 264 examples in the OCOJ (roughly 60%).

The remaining 104 examples (40%) have overt logical subjects.

- Of these examples, 86 do not occur with any particle.
- The logical subject can be topicalized or focused.
- What is significant is that the subject is never marked for case.
Imperatives

- Example of imperative with an overt subject, no particle (86 examples)

```
pito-pi ni pa ti-pye sikusiku-ni wa ga
1-day DAT TOP 1000fold frequent-COP I GEN
kwopuru imo ga atari ni [sigure]_LS
love beloved GEN area DAT [drizzle]_LS
pure mimu
fall.IMP see-CONJ

‘For one day, [drizzle]_LS fall 1000 times at the house of my beloved whom I love. I will see it.’ (MYS.10.2234)
```
The logical subject is marked with the topic particle *pa* (12 examples):

```
aratama  no  tosi  yuki-gapyeri  paru  tataba
rough.jewel  COP  year  go-return  spring  begin
madu    wa  ga  yadwo  ni  [ugupisu  pa]_{LS}
first   I   GEN  hut   DAT  [bush.warbler  TOP]_{LS}
nakye
sing.IMP
```

‘If spring begins, the rough jewelled year has come and gone, first, [bush warbler]_{LS}, *sing* at my hut!’ (MYS.20.4490)
The logical subject is marked with the emphatic topic particle *mo* (2 examples):

```
[ametut]no kamwi mo]_{LS} tasukeyo kusa
[heaven.earth GEN god ETOP]_{LS} help.IMP grass
makura tabi yuku kimi ga ipye ni itaru
pillow travel go lord GEN house DAT reach
made RES

‘[Gods of heaven and earth]_{LS} help (him) – until my lord, who is on a grass-pillowing journey reaches his home!’ (MYS.4.549)
```
The logical subject is marked with the restrictive particle *dani* (2 examples):

```
koto  sige-mi  kimi pa  ki-masa-zu
rumours lush-ACOP lord TOP come-be-NEG
pototogisu [nare *dani*]_LS ki-nakye
cuckoo  [you RES]_LS come-sing.IMP
asatwo  piraka-mu
morning.door open-CONJ
```

‘The rumours are thick, so my lord doesn’t come. Cuckoo, [only you]_LS come sing! The morning door will open.’ (MYS.8.1499)
The logical subject is marked with the particle *sapeni* (1 example):

piru pa saki yworu pa kwopwi-nuru
day.time TOP bloom night TOP love-sleep
nebu no pana kimi nomwi mi-me ya
onion GEN flower lord RES look.at-CONJ FOC
[wake sapeni]_{LS} miyo
[you RES]_{LS} look.at.IMP

‘Will only my lord will look at the onion flowers, which in the daytime bloom and at night sleep yearning? [You]_{LS} look at them too!’ (MYS.8.1461)
The logical subject is marked with the particle *yo* (1 example):

`tukur-eru  ipye  ni  ti-yo  madeni`
`make-STAT  house  DAT  1000-generations  RES`
`ki-mase  [opon-kimi  yo]_LS  ware  mo`
`come-RESP.IMP  [PFX-lord  VOC]_LS  I  ETOP`

Kaywopa-mu
return-CONJ

*Come* to the home that was built for 1000 generations, *[my lord]_LS!*
I will also return.’ (MYS.1.79)
Imperatives may be embedded with complementizer *to*, in two different types. One type, Type A, retains a command interpretation, i.e., “(I said) do X!”.

There are 30 tokens of the command type embedded construction. (out of a total of 264 imperatives).

Of these examples 2/30 have overt logical subjects; they are not followed by any particles.
Imperatives

- Example of embedded command-type imperative with overt logical subject (2 examples):

[watarimori]_LS  pune  watase  wo  to
[ferrymen]_LS  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 “[Ferrymen]_LS ferry the boat!” has not arrived, that the sound of the oars are not heard?’
(MYS.10.2072)
Example of embedded command-type imperative with overt logical subject (2 examples):

‘(Saying) “[Four boats]$_{LS}$, come back quickly” attaching perfume on the hem of my skirt, I will wait praying.’ (MYS.19.4265)
Imperatives

- The second type, Type B, is used to mean “in order to do”; (so) that X” and is not used to imply the will of the speaker to have an action carried out.
- There are 32 examples of Type B embedded “imperatives”, which share an interpretation of some future action with true imperatives, but differ in that there is no Directive speech act.
- There are 6 examples with an overt subject. Significantly, 4 of these examples are case marked with the accusative wo. (But 1 of the examples is not a reliable example.) The subjects of other 2 examples are followed by the particle mo.
Example of embedded non-command-type imperative with overt logical subject (6 examples):

My heart, offering a staff at each of heaven’s river’s shallows, is (doing this) in order for [my lord]$_{LS}$ to come safely.’
(MYS.10.2069)
The properties of overt subjects in Type A and Type B are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total examples</th>
<th>overt subjects</th>
<th>subjects raised and marked with wo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>command</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>non-command</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two facts of primary interest in these data:
- Case marked logical subjects do not occur with the imperative in a command structure (either embedded or main clause), they do occur with embedded Type B (non-command structure) imperatives.
- Case-marked logical subjects must be raised.
Prohibitives are “negative imperatives”. Aikhenvald (2010: 165) notes that negative imperatives have different morphology and/or syntax from both negative declaratives and positive imperatives in many languages.

There are a total of 194 examples of prohibitive constructions in the OCOJ.
There are 4 ways to create prohibitive structures: *na-verb-so*; *na-verb-sone*; final particle *na*; and prefix *na*, as shown below, listed by order of frequency in the OCOJ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prohibitives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>na-verb-so</em></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na-yuki-so</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>final particle na</em></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>yuku na</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na-verb-sone</em></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na-yuki-sone</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>prefix na</em></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>na-yuki</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-linguistically, it is common for the logical subject of prohibitives, like imperatives, to be null.

`inoti  araba  apu  koto  mo  ara-mu  wa  ga
life  exist  meet  thing  ETOP  exist-CONJ  I  GEN
yuwe  ni  pada  na-omopi-so  inoti
reason  COP  frequently  PROH-think-PROH life
dani  peba
RES  elapse

‘If we have life, we will meet. For me, don’t think (of me) often – even if life passes (by).’ (MYS.15.3745)
In OJ, however, it is more common for the logical subject to be overt in 3 of the 4 prohibitive constructions.

Only the prohibitive formed by the particle *na* (and this is the sole prohibitive which survives into NJ) has more null logical subjects than overt ones.

The total number of overt subjects for all prohibitive constructions is just slightly higher than null subjects.

The logical subject is never case marked; it can be followed by the topic particles *mo* or *pa* or focus particle *ya*, but is most frequently not marked at all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>null</th>
<th>overt</th>
<th>% overt</th>
<th>particles with LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na-V-so</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-V-sone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particle na</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefix na</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>79 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The logical subject of a prohibitive is Ø-marked:

```
asamo      yo-si      kwi       pye     yuku     kimi   ga
morning.cloth good-ACOP Ki     ALL   go      lord  GEN
matutiyama kwoyu   ramu   kyepu   zo     [ame]_LS
Mt. Matuti  cross    CONJ today  FOC    [rain]_LS
na-puri-sone
PROH-rain-PROH
```

‘It is today that my lord, going to Ki, where the morning cloth is good, will probably cross Mt. Matuti. [Rain]_LS don’t fall!’ (MYS.9.1680)
Prohibitives

- The logical subject of a prohibitive is topicalized with *pa*:

```
[yasumisisi wa ga opo-kimi pa]_{LS} ubenaubena
[8.corner.ruler I GEN PFX-lord TOP]_{LS} indeed
ware wo twopa-su na akidusima yamato
I ACC ask-RESP PROH Akidu.island Yamato
no kuni ni kari kwo-mu to
GEN country DAT goose lay.egg-CONJ COMP
ware pa kika-zu
I TOP hear-NEG
‘[My great lord, ruler of the eight corners]_{LS}, indeed, please do not ask me! I have not heard that in Akidu island in the province of Yamato the goose has laid an egg.’ (NSK.63)
```
The logical subject of a prohibitive is topicalized with *mo*:

```
yupubye  ni  nareba  iza  neyo  to
evening  DAT  become  INTJ  sleep.IMP  COMP
te    wo  tadasapari  [titipapa  mo]_{LS}
hand  ACC  join.hands  [father.mother  ETOP]_{LS}  upe
pa  na-sagari
TOP PROH-go.down
```

“When it became evening, (we said) “now, go sleep!” and (our child) clasped his hands (and said), “[Father, mother]_{LS}, don’t leave (me) up here!”” (MYS.5.904)
The logical subject of a prohibitive is focused with *ya*:

```
[daniwoti]_LS  ya]_LS  sika  mo  na-ipi-so
[Daniwoti]_LS  FOC]_LS  thus  ETOP  PROH-say-PROH
satwowosa  ga  etukwi  pataraba  imasi  mo
village.leader  GEN  pay.tribute  levy  you  ETOP
naka-mu  cry-CONJ

‘[Daniwoti]_LS, don’t talk like that! If the village leader levies a
tribute, you will cry.’ (MYS.16.3847)
```
All languages have an imperative and a prohibitive (Sadock & Zwicky 1985), but not many have a dedicated optative; thus OJ, which has optatives as part of the inflectional system, is unusual.

The optative is used to indicate the wish of a speaker for an event to occur, but, unlike the imperative, there is no expectation on the part of the speaker that the logical subject will perform the event or situation; the optative expresses a desire while the imperative expresses a command.
OJ has 3 inflectional optative forms depending on agreement with the logical subject, i.e., the entity the speaker wishes to do something.

This is unusual, as it is the only inflection in OJ for which there is agreement between the verb and an argument.
There are three types of optatives in OJ, depending on whether the logical subject is 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, or 3\textsuperscript{rd} person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optative \textit{ana}</td>
<td>‘I want to go./Let’s go.’</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optative \textit{ane}</td>
<td>‘I want you to go.’</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optative \textit{anamu/o}</td>
<td>‘I want him/her/it to go.’</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optatives

- An overt logical subject with optative -*ana*:

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
8-1000\text{-grass} & \text{GEN} & \text{flower} & \text{TOP} & \text{change} & \text{eternal}\text{.rock}\\
naru & \text{matu} & \text{no} & \text{sa-yeda} & \text{wo} & [\text{ware} \text{ pa}]_{\text{LS}} \\
\text{COP} & \text{pine} & \text{GEN} & \text{PFX-branch} & \text{ACC} & \text{I} & \text{TOP}]_{\text{LS}} \\
\text{mu} & \text{subana} & \text{tie.OPT} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The flowers of the 8000 grasses will change. I want [me]_{\text{LS}} to tie the branch of the pine tree, which is like the eternal rock.’

(MYS.20.4501)
Optatives

An overt logical subject with optative -ane:

```
[asipikwi no yama tobi-kwoyuru kari ga
[ashipiki COP mountain fly-pass.over geese GEN
ne pa]_{LS} miyakwo ni yukaba imo
cry TOP]_{LS} capital DAT go beloved
ni apite kone
DAT meet come.OPT

‘[Cries of the geese flying over the Ashipiki mountain]_{LS}, if you go
to the capital, I want (you) to meet my beloved and come back.’
(MYS.15.3687)
```
Optatives

- An overt logical subject with optative -anamu ~ anamo:

```
ware nomwi si kikeba sabusi mo [pototogisu]LS nipu
I RES RES hear sad ETOP [cucko]LS Nipu
no yamapye ni i-yuki nakanamo
COP mountain.side DAT PFX-go sing.OPT
‘When I hear it alone, I am saddened. I want [the cuckoo]LS to sing
going to Nipu mountain side.’ (MYS.19.4178)
```
Optatives

- As with the imperatives and prohibitives, the logical subject is often null for -ana and -ane, but not as frequently null for -anamu ~ -anamo. This may be because the logical subject of -ana and -ane is 1st person or 2nd person respectively, and recoverable from context, whereas the logical subject of -anamu ~ -anamo is a 3rd person referent and it may not always be clear from context who the referent is.
- The ratio of overt subjects in each type:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>null</th>
<th>overt</th>
<th>% overt</th>
<th>particles with LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optative <em>ana</em> 'I want to go./Let’s go.'</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 <em>mo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optative <em>ane</em> 'I want you to go.'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 <em>si</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 <em>mo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optative <em>anamu/o</em> 'I want him/her/it to go.'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 <em>si mo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dani mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22 Ø-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 <em>mo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 <em>si</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 <em>si mo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dani mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: Subjects of imperatives

- In languages where imperatives are built on the 2nd person form of the verb, the verb would restrict any overt subject to be one with 2nd person features (i.e., you).
- 1st or 3rd person phrases would be vocatives, as in examples like:

[getting ready for a photo]

**Boys**, you stand on the left; **girls**, you stand on the right
Discussion: Subjects of imperatives

- In a study of imperative subjects, however, Zanuttini (2008) argues that overt subjects in examples like this are not vocatives:

[getting ready for a photo]

**Tall people** stand in the back, **shorter people** stand in the front!
Due to differences in the grammars of English and OJ, Zanuttini’s arguments do not carry over directly to OJ. However, we can still argue that OJ mood clause subjects are not vocatives. The evidence is very direct – there is a vocative marker in OJ, and it appears exactly once in all the mood constructions, repeated here:

```
tukur-eru    ipye   ni   ti-yo   madeni
make-STAT   house   DAT   1000-generations   RES
ki-mase      [opo-kimi yo]_LS
come-RESP.IMP [PFX-lord VOC]_LS
kaywopa-mu
return-CONJ
```

‘Come to the home that was built for 1000 generations, [my lord]_LS! I will also return.’ (MYS.1.79)
Discussion: Subjects of imperatives

- What is significant is that this is the only instance of vocative marking on any of the overt subjects in our examples. We would surely expect to find many more examples of overt subjects marked with the overt vocative marker *yo* if they were indeed vocative phrases.

- There are also quite a few examples of imperatives with right-dislocated subjects, 48 out of 264 imperatives, which might favour vocative marking, but only this one example has the vocative marking.
One approach to the meaning of imperatives is the “Semantic Type View” as described in Zanuttini et al. (2012) and Portner (2012).

This view takes an imperative to be formally interpreted as a property, an instruction on a To-Do List, and the subject of the imperative is the one whose To-Do List is at issue. So if “Close the door” is directed to John, then John’s To-Do List gets the instruction on it; it is on his list of things to do.

An advantage of this approach is that there can be lists of different types, and this immediately allows an account of the different “forces” that imperatives can have, as well as extending easily to prohibitives and optatives.
Discussion: Semantics of mood clauses

- A prohibitive can straightforwardly be interpreted with respect to a “Don’t-Do” list.
- For an optative, there is no expectation that the logical subject can or will bring about the action. Hence we can wish the clouds to part to reveal the sun, but we cannot order them to. An optative, then, involves a semantic “Wish list”.
As we have noted above, imperatives show a considerable proportion of overtly expressed subjects: of 264 imperative clauses (main and subordinate), 104 have an overt subject. This ratio of approximately 40% overt subjects appears to be consistent with other clause-types in OJ. As a comparison, we consider exclamative clauses, which are probably the closest comparison clauses for imperatives: both types are typically used as main clauses, both are non-declaratives, and both express some desire, affect, or emotion on the part of the speaker.
Discussion: Overt Subjects

- Exclamative example:

`sasu take no yo gomorite
grow bamboo GEN section be.secluded
are wa ga sekwo ga wa-gari si
exist.IMP I GEN beloved GEN I-SFX RES
kozupa [ware]LS kwopwi-me
come.NEG [I]LS yearn-CONJ.EXCL
ya mo FOC ETOP

‘Be secluded like a section of growing bamboo! If my beloved
does not come to me, would [I]LS yearn so much?’ (MYS.11.2773)"
Discussion: Overt Subjects

- The OCOJ shows 611 exclamatives, of which 247 have overt subjects. So this is a ratio of just about 40% overt subjects, once again.
Another surprising aspect of the syntax of all the mood clauses is that there are no examples of overt subjects which are case marked.

Overt subjects may appear as bare NPs, or be marked by various kinds of discourse or emphasis markers, but none have the grammatical case that one would expect to find on subjects, which is actually Genitive in OJ.

In OJ, Genitive case is found on overt subjects of most clause types, primarily those which are subordinate or non-declarative (Frellesvig 2010, 127).
If we look in the corpus, at least some instances of Genitive subjects are found with every inflectional form of the predicate, with the exception of the 3 mood types we discuss here. Again using exclamatives as a comparison, 59 out of 247 overt exclamative subjects are case marked (24%) – roughly 1 in 4.

However, in our three mood types, the ratios of case marked to overt subjects are as follows:

- Imperative: 0/104
- Prohibitive: 0/99
- Optative: 0/42
Discussion: Case marking

Nevertheless, as can be seen from the following chart, there are plenty of overt subjects which should have the potential to be case-marked:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>null</th>
<th>overt</th>
<th>% overt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperative</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibitive <em>na-V-so</em></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibitive <em>na-V-sone</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibitive particle <em>na</em></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibitive prefix <em>na-</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prohibitive Total</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optative <em>-ana</em></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optative <em>-ane</em></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optative <em>-anamu/o</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optative Total</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: Case marking

So there is certainly something to explain about why mood clauses do not show case-marked subjects. There must be a reason why subjects are never case marked in these clause-types.

One consequence of the Semantic Type view described above is that the subject of an imperative picks out the individual whose list is to be updated with a new instruction.

The imperative clause does not have a canonical subject-predicate relationship.
Discussion: Case marking

- It is possible that the lack of subject case marking with mood-marked predicates is a reflex of this non-canonical relationship – the subject picks out the one(s) whose To-Do list (or other list) is to be updated, and the rest of the clause specifies the update.

- It should be stressed that all other expected case marking (Accusative, Dative, oblique markers) is found in all three types of mood clause in OJ, so there is nothing otherwise unusual about the grammar of these clauses.
Conclusion

- We have shown here that mood constructions in OJ have the following notable properties:
  a. Imperatives allow overt subjects.
  b. Imperatives may be embedded.
  c. Prohibitives allow overt subjects.
  d. These overt subjects are not vocatives.
  e. OJ has a set of dedicated optative forms.
All mood forms allow overt subjects, but these subjects are never case-marked as regular clausal subjects (in contrast to subjects of every other form of the predicate). These aspects of OJ syntax are quite unusual.

In the development from OJ to NJ, the optative forms were replaced by other optative forms in EMJ (Frellesvig 2010), and then disappeared. NJ has a ‘desiderative’ form, which is formally unrelated to these earlier optative forms. The imperative and the prohibitive with post-verbal na remain in NJ. The other prohibitive forms have been lost.
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