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Abstract

In this paper I discuss the historical change of the Japanese question particle *ka* and argue that its development goes in the opposite direction to the one assumed under the view named ‘subjectification’. *Ka* has been used as a direct question marker since Old Japanese, but it evolved an indirect question use in Middle Japanese. This change is characterized as a loss of speaker-oriented meanings since direct questions are more speaker-oriented than indirect questions, as can be shown by scope relations. The loss of speaker-orientedness can also be observed in the development of indirect question use of *ka*. In its early stage, *ka* entails the speaker’s uncertainty, inherited from direct questions. However, it does not exhibit that uncertainty in its later stage, used in contexts where the speaker knows the answer of the embedded question. Since speaker-orientedness is a defining property of ‘subjectivity’ and the changes exhibited by *ka* are considered to be a natural process of language change, those changes of *ka* constitute a significant piece of counter-evidence to the hypothesis of ‘subjectification’.
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1. Introduction

In a series of papers (Traugott 1982, 1986, 1989, 2007, 2010, Traugott and Dasher 2002), Traugott claims that ‘subjectification’ is the dominant type of semantic change, particularly in the process of grammaticalization. Traugott first developed the idea that meaning change is more likely to go “from propositional through textual to expressive than in reverse direction” (Traugott 1982: 256) using the concepts of Halliday and Hasan (1976). One of her main concerns is the claim that the change is unidirectional: That is, “(t)he reverse change, from expressive > textual > propositional, is highly unlikely in the history of any one grammatical marker” (Traugott 1989: 31).

The process is called ‘subjectification’ because “meanings tend to come to refer less to objective situations and more to subjective ones (including speaker point of view),
less to the described situation and more to the discourse situation” (Traugott 1986: 540). The view that change along this axis is unidirectional is maintained to this day. Traugott and Dasher (2002) write that “(s)ubjectification and intersubjectification are typical of “internal” change in the sense that they are natural changes”, going on to say that exceptions are only permitted in the domain “susceptible to extralinguistic factors such as change in the nature or the social construction of the referent” (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 3-4). Constructions of meanings are often affected by the circumstances of language use. For example, ‘armor’ once only referred to clothing that soldiers wore, but it refers now to metal covers for protecting military vehicles as well. Apart from those cases in which extralinguistic factors are involved, including redefinitions of terms and borrowings, semantic change, Traugott argues, unidirectionally proceeds from objective to subjective meanings. 

In this paper I argue against Traugott’s view and propose instead that semantic change is not a unidirectional shift toward subjectification, and that the meaning of a grammatical item can shift from a subjective to an objective one even as the result of a natural process of change. To discuss this issue, it is necessary to take a closer look at Traugott’s definition of the terms ‘subjectivity’ and ‘subjectification’. 

In Traugott and Dasher (2002), four defining properties of ‘subjectivity’ are given, in part defined with reference to speaker/writer (SP/W), and with reference to the operative heuristic of interpretation called the ‘R-heuristic’, under which what is said implies that more is meant.

(i) overt spatial, and temporal deixis,

(ii) explicit markers of SP/W attitude to what is said, including epistemic attitude to the proposition,

(iii) explicit markers of SP/W attitude to the relationship between what precedes and what follows, i.e. to the discourse structure; many aspects of discourse deixis are included here,

(iv) The R-heuristic predominates. (T&D 2002: 23)

Among these properties, I consider that the involvement of speaker/writer (SP/W) attitude expressed overtly in grammatical morphemes plays the central role in defining subjectivity (cf. Narrog 2010). Note that if we accept that deixis usually involves speaker’s viewpoint, the first three properties can be characterized in terms of speaker’s perspective. Furthermore, Traugott and Dasher (2002) define subjectification as a process of encoding speaker’s perspectives:

1See Traugott (2010) for her more recent views on subjectification. Traugott (2010) notes that “diachronic work has shown repeatedly that for some lexical item or construction X, subjectified polysemies of that item or construction arise later than ideational ones (subjectification)” (p. 34).

2In this paper, I will focus on the concept ‘subjectification’ discussed by Traugott and not discuss what Langacker proposes using the same terminology, since only the former explicitly hypothesizes about the path of the language change using historical data. See Smet and Verstraete (2006) for a comparison of these two different notions of ‘subjectification’.

3The R-heuristic evokes the implications of what is said. However, implications and the inferences used to draw them (viz. the R-heuristic) should be distinguished from the SP/W attitude in that while the latter can be expressed through the meaning of a lexical item, the former cannot by definition. Instead
Subjectification is the semasiological process whereby SP/Ws come over time to develop meanings for Ls that encode or externalize their perspectives and attitudes as constrained by the communicative world of the speech event, rather than by the so-called “real-world” characteristics of the event or situation referred to. (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 30, underline my own)

Or more simply put, subjectification is:

the mechanisms by which meanings are recruited by the speaker to encode and regulate attitudes and beliefs, (Traugott 2010: 35)

based on the definition of subjectivity as ‘expressions the prime semantic or pragmatic meaning of which is to index speaker attitude or viewpoint.’ (Traugott 2010: 32)

Insofar as subjectification is a process whereby the speaker’s perspective increases in one lexical item (L), any change in which a grammatical morpheme loses the speaker’s perspective in its meaning constitutes a counterexample to the hypothesis of subjectification. This is the characteristic of the change which I will focus on in subsequent sections.

This paper is organized as follows. After looking at the brief history of one specific question particle in Japanese in section 2, in section 3 I will establish that the change in meaning which it exhibits go in a direction counter to that of subjectification. In section 4, I present evidence outlining the historical process whereby speaker’s perspective was lost from the semantics of embedded questions, thus disconfirming Traugott’s hypothesis. The last section concludes the paper, reviewing problems of subjectification and exploring how the attested change in Japanese may be accounted for under other views of language change.

2. Types of Questions and their History in Japanese

For the sake of the discussion, I classify questions into four types in this paper. The first pattern is a hearer-addressed question, the example of which is given in (1). 4
This pattern is not directly related to the issues discussed in this paper since we are concerned with the appearance of embedded questions in Japanese. In this paper hearer-addressed questions are assumed, without any further discussion here, to have no direct consequences for the emergence of embedded questions.5

More relevant are what we call speaker-addressed questions or self-addressed questions. Speaker-addressed questions can be classified into two types according to the syntactic positions of the question particle. In (2), the particle occupies the sentence final position. In (3), the question formed by ka is conjoined with another utterance and used to express the speaker’s wonderment at why Taro bought a pink shirt. I call the first pattern conclusive use and the second adjoined use.

(2) nani-o kangae-te-iru-no-daroo-ka?
what-Acc think-State-FN-Guess-Q
‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

(3) nani-o kangae-te-iru-no-ka, Taro-wa pinku-no syatu-o katta.
‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’

The last type subsumes embedded (or indirect) questions where the question is embedded as the argument, rather than the adjunct, of the verb in the main clause.

(4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-te-iru-ka wakar-anai.
I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-State-Q know-Neg.
‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

Indirect questions like that in (4) are distinguished syntactically and functionally from the unembedded direct questions in (1), (2) and (3).

Speaker-addressed questions formed by ka can be found in any period of Japanese. I illustrate this fact by giving examples of conclusive and adjoined uses of ka for each of Old, Middle and Pre-modern Japanese.

The examples for Old Japanese are taken from the Man’yōshū, 6 which was compiled in the mid-8th century. Ka appears in the sentence final position in (5a) and attaches to the causal subordinate clause in (5b).

---

5In Miyako dialects of Ryukyuan, which is a sister language of Japanese, an embedded question marker gara can be used in speaker-addressed questions but not in hearer-addressed ones. This supports the assumption that hearer-addressed questions and embedded questions are less related. But I leave the details of this issue to another paper for reasons of space.

6I draw from poems for the examples in (5) due to the unavailability of prose in Old Japanese. This does not affect the discussion, however, since there is no significant difference in Japanese texts between the status of speaker-addressed questions found in poetry and those found in prose.
(5) a. wa-ga furu sode-wo imu mitu-ramu-ka. (妹見都良武香)
I-Nom wave sleeve-Acc wife saw-Guess-Q
‘Did my wife see me wave my sleeves?’  Man’yōshū, 132, 8th C.7
b. Kurafasi-no yama-wo taka-mi-ka(y山乎高可) yogomorini idekuru
Kurafasi-Gen mountain-Acc high-because-Q late.night come.out
tuki-no fikari tomosiki.
moon-Gen light poor
‘Is it because the mountain of Kurafasi is high, the light of the moon which came out late is faint.’  Man’yōshū, 290, 8th C.

Middle Japanese refers to the language spoken in the period from the 9th to the 16th century. I give an example here for each type of use from two versions of the Heike monogatari, the first written in 1371 and the second in 1593.

(6) a. Nanitonau yo-no mono sawagasin-saurai-si-wo, reino yamafausi-no somehow world-Gen thing noisy-Pol-Past-Conj usual buddhist-Nom
kudaru-ka-nando, come.down-Q-Quo
‘Since people were making a commotion somehow, I was thinking “Do those Buddhists come down (from Mt. Fiei)?” ’  Kakuichibon Heike, Jō 88, 1371
that thought-Gen accumulate-Cop-Q Yokobue-Top . . . soon died
‘Was it due to the accumulation of worry, Yokobue died soon.’  Amakusa Heike, 309, 1593

The language used in the Edo Period (1603-1868) is called Pre-modern Japanese. Below are examples from the 18th and the 19th century which show ka being used conclusively and adjoinedly as direct questions.

(7) a. Yoidore-no kenka-ko-to omoote yoku kik-eba drunken quarrel-Q-Quo think carefully hear-Cond
‘Thinking, “Is it a drunken quarrel?,” I listened carefully, and . . . ’  Adabotasensei, 9.364, 1780
b. Mago-no koto-wa kimotuk-azu roogan-no nani nite-ka, grandchild-Gen thing-Top notice-Neg presbyopia-Nom what see-Q
‘mumuu, madu syokunin-ni niaw-anu, ano bintuki-ga um above.all craftsman-Dat suit-Neg that hair.style-Nom
kiin-anu . . . ’  like-Neg

7At the end of each example, I note the text name, the poem or page number and the (approximate) publication date. See also the list of texts given at the end of this paper for details of publication date.
‘Not realizing that the guy was his own grandchild, what do aged eyes see, ‘Um, first of all, I don’t like his hair style, which is not suitable for craftsmen.’

Shinjū kasaneizutsu, 2.166, 1707

Even though the examples given here do not cover every stage of Japanese in detail, they are enough to show that ka is used to form speaker-addressed questions through all periods of Japanese. The use of indirect questions is, however, not entailed by the existence of patterns such as (5)-(7). We know that the indirect question use of ka does not appear until Late Middle Japanese by the groundbreaking work of Takamiya (2005). Table 1 shows the numbers of examples of indirect questions collected from representative texts listed in the end of this paper.8

Table 1: Indirect Questions with ka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14th</th>
<th>15th</th>
<th>17th</th>
<th>18th</th>
<th>18-19th</th>
<th>19th</th>
<th>20th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although we will show the development of patterns of indirect questions in section 4, I give here some early occurrences of indirect questions with ka for illustration. (8a) is the earliest example which I found from the historical texts I investigated, and (8b) and (8c) are examples from the 15th century text Shikishō.

(8) a. itidyan kaferi irase tamafu-ka mite maire.
   certainly back enter.Hon Hon-Q see go.Hon
   ‘Go and see whether the sacred treasures are certainly back to the Imperial Palace.’
   Kakuichibon Heike, Ge 302, 1371

b. Siba Teizitu-ni Sya Sen-to in mono-ga monzin-ka sir-azu.
   Siba Teizitu-Dat Sya Sen-Quo say one-Nom pupil-Q know-Neg
   ‘I don’t know whether Shiba Teizitu had a pupil named Sya Sen.’
   Shikishō, 2.9, 1477

c. kurogane-no kina-mo aru-ka iza sir-azu.
   iron-Gen yellow-also exist-Q at.all know-Neg
   ‘I don’t know whether there is an yellow iron.’
   Shikishō, 2.71, 1477

The data presented in this section suggest that direct questions, conclusive or adjoined, precede indirect questions in the development of the uses of ka. If the subjectification view on language change is correct, this should mean either that indirect questions are more subjective than direct questions, or that the change is not relevant with respect to subjectivity. However, those expectations are not born out: That is, direct questions are more subjective than indirect questions, disconfirming the subjectification hypothesis. This is the subject we will turn to in the next section.

---

8Since ka acquired the disjunctive use in Middle Japanese, I exclude examples with two or more ka-clauses in apposition in order to limit our data to genuine indirect questions. See section 5 for the disjunctive use of ka and further Kinuhata and Iwata (2010) for details.
3. Properties of Direct and Indirect Questions

Intuitively speaking, direct questions convey the doubt of the speaker. When you ask ‘Who came to the party?’ to yourself, you have that question in your mind at the utterance time, and it entails your uncertainty about which propositions are correct. On the other hand, indirect questions need not be questions entertained by the speaker. They might be entertained by a third person (e.g. John does not know who came to the party) or entertained by no one at all (e.g. Everyone knows who came to the party!).

We assumed in the previous section that the class of direct questions is comprised of conclusive uses and adjoined uses. Thus the empirical question to be addressed is whether or not, if a clause headed by ka is used conclusively or adjoinedly, it always expresses the question of the speaker. If those unembedded clauses with ka in the conclusive and the adjoined positions always denote questions of the speaker, then ka was only used to express the speaker’s perspective before the 14th century, since ka appeared in only those positions up to that period.

In traditional studies of Japanese grammar, Kindaichi (1953) tried to explain the subjective/objective dichotomy in terms of the involvement of the speaker’s perspective in lexical meanings. Kindaichi (1953) argued that both the verbal affix -o and the nominal tumori express volition, but the former encodes the volition of the speaker, whereas the latter does not. This distinction can be tested by using embeddability into reported contexts. 

Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol-Cop Comp-Acc conveyed.

Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol Comp-Acc conveyed.

‘Taro conveyed that he will go to the party.’

In (9a), tumori can be embedded in the clause modifying koto in order to attribute volition to the subject Taro. However, in (9b), o cannot be embedded and it must express the volition of the speaker.

We can use this same test to see the difference in subjectivity between direct and indirect questions with ka. As particles cannot intervene between adnominal clauses and the nouns they modify in Modern Japanese, only the adjoined use of ka-questions lends itself to this kind of test. When ka is used to mark indirect questions, it can be embedded in the clause headed by koto as in (10a), where the indeterminacy about Yoko’s attendance can be attributed to the subject Taro. The adjoined use of ka, however, cannot be embedded as in (10b): (10b) cannot be interpreted to mean that feeling bitter

9I use koto instead of to for the embeddability test. Since to can embed any element as a direct question marker, it is not suitable for tests to see semantic properties: to can even embed nonsense expressions.

(i) John-wa gluhbulga-to itta.
John-Top gluhbulga-Quo said
‘John said ‘Glubibulga.”
is the reason for Yoko’s crying. The only possible interpretation is the one in which the adjoined *ka*-clause modifies the matrix clause like the given translation, ascribing the doubt expressed by *ka* to the speaker of this utterance.

   Taro-Top Yoko-Nom when come-Q-Acc worry-State that-Acc conveyed.
   ‘Taro conveyed that he worries about when Yoko will come.’

b. sono otoko-wa kuyasii-*ka* Yooko-ga naite-iru koto-o
   the man-Top feel.bitter-because-Q Yoko-Nom cry-State that-Acc
   osiite-kure-ta.
   teach-Ben-Past.
   ‘Does he feel bitter about it, the man told me that Yoko is crying.’

This means that the *ka* in adjoined use involves the perspective of the actual speaker of the utterance in its lexical meaning whereas that in embedded questions does not. Thus we can conclude that the former *ka* is more subjective than the latter since the involvement of speaker’s perspective characterizes the definition of subjectivity.

Another piece of evidence for the subjective/objective distinction of *ka* comes from its scope interpretations with negation and modals. It is widely observed that formal nouns like *no* extend the scope of negation in Japanese (see Kuno 1980, Takubo 1987). Quantifiers in the object position can be in the scope of negation more easily in (11b) than in (11a). Note that (11b) can be paraphrased as ‘We invited less than one hundred students.’

(11) a. 100-nin-izyoo-no gakusee-o paatii-ni syootaisi-*nakat*-ta.
    100-Cl-more.than-Gen student-Acc party-Dat invite-Neg-Past
    ‘There were more than 100 students whom we did not invite to the party’

b. 100-nin-izyoo-no gakusee-o paatii-ni syootaisita-no dewa-*nai*.
    100-Cl-more.than-Gen student-Acc party-Dat invited-FN Cop-Neg

10 One might raise a question as to whether or not the criteria adopted here are exactly the ones held in Traugott’s works. While the test we are using in this section tells us whether a morpheme must be indexed to the actual speaker of the context, Traugott’s examples of subjectivity also include ones where the ‘speaker’ can be the subject of complement-taking verbs. The ‘subjective’ use of epistemic modalities in English is one of those examples: In ‘John thinks that it must rain tomorrow’, the epistemic necessity is not assessed against the knowledge of the actual speaker of the context but against that of the matrix clause subject ‘John’. However, since Traugott uses honorific verbs as examples of subjectification (Traugott and Dasher 2002), it is reasonable to consider a morpheme which must refer to the actual speaker as a ‘subjective’ expression in Traugott’s sense: Potts and Kawahara (2004) observe that honorific verbs always tell us about the actual speaker’s belief in the utterance situation, outscoping any semantic operators. This means that expressions referring to the actual speaker constitute a subset of expressions which Traugott considers ‘subjective’. Given that the subjectification hypothesis applies to those ‘subjective’ expressions, it is predicted that meanings which refer to the actual speaker appear in the late stage of semantic development, and a morpheme which loses the speaker-oriented meanings should be considered to falsify the hypothesis. Since Traugott does not give a clear test to tell whether morphemes are considered to be ‘explicit markers of SP/W attitude’, in this paper I employ the relevant test to determine the subjectivity of a given morpheme. Note that, without an explicit test, her hypothesis of subjectification would be unfalsifiable.
We did not invite more than hundred students to the party.'

Negation cannot be extended to include the causal clause in its scope without the aid of *no*. This is illustrated by the contrast in (12). In contexts like (12), negation must scope over the causal clause; otherwise the sentence receives infelicitous interpretations. The contrast in felicity in (12) shows how *no* is necessary to expand the scope of negation.

Yoko-Top sad-because cry-State-Neg.
♯‘Because she is sad, Yoko is not crying.’

b. Yooko-wa kanasii-kara naite-iru-no dewa-nai.
Yoko-Top sad-because cry-State-FN Cop-Neg.
‘It is not that Yoko is crying because she is sad.’

Clearer contexts are created by cleft sentences. When an element is in the clefted position, it must be in the scope of negation appearing at the end of the sentence. (13) is an example of a quantifier and (14) that of a causal clause. Both sentences must receive readings in which negation takes wider scope than the elements in the clefted position.

(13) gakusee-o paatii-ni syootaisita-no-wa [100-nin-izyoo] dewa-nai.
student-Acc party-Dat invited-FN-Top 100-Cl-more.than Cop-Neg
‘It is not (to the amount of) more than hundred that we invited students to the party.’

Yoko-Nom cry-State-FN-Top sad-because Cop-Neg.
‘It is not because she is sad that Yoko is crying.’

By using the scope expansion marker *no* and cleft sentences, we can test whether questions, direct or indirect, can be in the scope of negation or not. Indirect questions can appear in the scope of negation, as shown in the examples below.

Taro-Top Yoko-Nom when come-Q Acc worry-State-FN Cop-Neg
‘Taro does not worry about when Yoko will come or not.’

Taro-Nom worry-State-FN-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q copula-Neg
‘It is not whether or not Yoko will come that Taro worries about.’

On the other hand, negation cannot scope over the adjoined use of *ka* as in (16).

Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-State-FN Cop-Neg.
lit ‘It is not that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’
The contrast between (15) and (16) can be accounted for if we assume that speaker-orientedness is encoded in the meaning of ka in the adjoined use but not in indirect questions. Given this assumption, when the speaker uses adjoined questions, it cannot be negated that he has the question. If it were negated, the speaker does not have the question, which contradicts the assumption. The embedded question, on the other hand, can be negated since the speaker might not entertain that question.

A similar contrast is produced when we use modals instead of negation. An embedded ka-clause can be in the scope of the modal daroo, but a clause adjunct of the main clause cannot. In (17), the scope of the modal is extended by the expansion marker no as we saw in the case of negation. Although we can obtain an appropriate interpretation where the indirect question resides in the scope of the modal in (17a), (17b) sounds strange with the adjoined ka-clause outscoping the modal.11

   Taro-Top Yoko-Nom when come-Q-Acc worry-State-FN-Guess
   ‘It might be that Taro worry about when Yoko will come.’

   Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-State-FN-Guess
   lit ‘It might be that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’

Cleft sentences give us a clearer intuition about the difference of these patterns.

   Taro-Nom worry-State-FN-Top Yoko-Nom when come-Q-Guess
   ‘It might be when Yoko will come that Taro worries about.’

   Yoko-Nom cry-State-FN-Top sad-because-Q-Guess
   lit ‘It might be, is it because she is sad, that she is crying.’

Expressions in clefted positions must be interpreted within the scope of daroo due to the property of cleft sentences. However, ‘kanasii-kara-ka’ in (18b) cannot be interpreted under the scope of daroo, since adjoined ka has speaker-oriented meanings, that is, the question must be entertained by the speaker in the utterance world, and modals usually shift the element in their scope, a proposition or a question, to other possible worlds.12

---

11When adjoined ka is scoped over by a modal, the sentence becomes bad because adjoined questions take widest scope as discussed below. When the adjoined clause with ka scopes over the modal, the sentence is difficult to interpret because adjoined questions cannot modify non-factive propositions:

(i) [nani-o kangaete-iru-no-ka, [pinku-no syatu-o {kai-nasai/kau-daroo}]].
   what-Acc think-State-FN-Q pink-Gen shirt-Acc {buy-Hon/Imp/buy-Guess}.

‘What does he think, [[please buy/I guess he will buy] a pink shirt].’

12(18b) can be grammatical when the order of ka and daroo are reversed.
Embeddability into reported contexts and scope bearing elements is a diagnostic test for speaker-oriented meanings (Potts 2005). Therefore the phenomena presented in this section indicate that indirect questions do not necessarily have speaker-oriented meanings, whereas direct questions, including adjoined use, always do. Since ka was only used adjoinedly or conclusively before the 14th century, it can be concluded that ka had speaker-oriented meanings at least until then. The fact that ka got used as the argument of the verb suggests that the speaker-orientedness once encoded in the meaning of ka disappeared in the process of the change, thus disconfirming the hypothesis of subjectification, which claims that the speaker’s perspective in the meaning of one particular lexical item is maximized.  

4. Historical Change of Indirect Questions

In the previous section, I showed by looking at the data of Modern Japanese that in the historical process whereby indirect questions developed from forms encoding direct questions, the resulting expressions ultimately lose speaker-oriented meanings. The claim put forth in this paper is also supported by the historical data of indirect questions: It can be shown that indirect questions formed by ka expressed speaker-oriented meanings in the early stage of their development but lost that meaning later.

In order to show this clearly, let us confine our data to verbs which have ‘verbs of retaining knowledge’ (Karttunen 1977, henceforth ‘knowledge verbs’) as the predicate of the main clause. I give the list of verbs with the number of examples collected in the data below.

(19) siru(100), zonzite-iru(10), syootisite-iru(1) ........................................... know
    wakaru(62), kokoroeru(1), kaiseru(1), yoory-o eru(2), syui-ga tatu(1),
    toraeru(1), kokoroduku(1) .......................................................... understand

(i) Yooko-ga naite-iru-no-wa kanasii-kara daroo-ka.
    Yoko-Nom cry-State-FN-Top sad-because-Guess-Q
    ‘I’m wondering and guessing whether it is because Yoko is sad that she is crying.’

However, ‘kanasii-kara daroo’ is not in the predicate position in the appropriate interpretation. That is, the structure of (i) is not (iia) but (iib) where only ‘kanasii-kara’ resides in the clefted position.

(ii) a. [ e_i Yooko-ga naite-iru no] wa [kanasii-kara daroo], ka.
    b. [ e_i Yooko-ga naite-iru no] wa [kanasii-kara], daroo ka.

Since daroo is another grammatical morpheme which has speaker-oriented meanings, ka and daroo cannot stand in any scope relations as indicated in the translation of (i); ‘I guess that I wonder . . . ’ and ‘I wonder that I guess . . . ’ are improper translations of the given sentence (see Kondo 1987).

13The discussion in this section relates to the issue of scope increase/decrease in historical change. While Lehmann (1995) hypothesized that grammaticalization is accompanied by decrease in scope, scope increase has been frequently observed in subjectification (Tabor and Traugott 1998, Traugott and Dasher 2002: Ch.4, etc.). Particularly Shinzato (2007) maintains the correlation between the structural scope increase and subjectification, establishing the scope relation based on layered models of sentences proposed by Minami (1974) and Takubo (1987). If this is the case, the decrease of scope observed in the change from direct to indirect questions entails that the relevant change cannot be regarded as a case of subjectification. Since the primary concern of this paper is not the syntactic but the semantic aspect of the change and it is beyond the scope of this paper to assess the hypotheses on the change of scope against various types of language change, I will not discuss the issue of scope increase/decrease in detail in this paper and leave it for further studies.
As we discussed in section 3, direct questions have speaker-oriented meanings in that the speaker of an interrogative sentence is entertaining the question at issue, and thus is uncertain about the answer(s) of it at the time of utterance. Not only in direct questions but also in indirect questions can the speaker’s uncertainty be expressed, provided that some conditions are met. When a sentence including indirect questions has a knowledge verb as the predicate, the speaker’s uncertainty surfaces by having first-person subject, non-past tense and negation as in (20). 14

(20) Watasi-wa dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sir-anai.
    I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg
    ‘I don’t know who came to the party.’

We can, therefore, observe the loss of speaker-oriented uncertainty, inherited from direct questions, along the three dimensions discussed below.

When the subject of a sentence like (20) is in the first person, the sentence entails that the speaker is uncertain about the correct proposition(s) which correspond to the answer(s) of the embedded question. On the other hand, when the subject of a sentence like (20) is in the second or the third person, the sentence does not necessarily convey the uncertainty of the speaker as in (21).

(21) a. Anata-wa dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sir-anai no?
         you-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg-FN
    ‘Don’t you know who came to the party?’

b. Taro-wa dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sir-anai.
    Taro-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg
    ‘Taro does’t know who came to the party.’

Both (21a) and (21b) can be felicitously uttered even when the speaker knows who came to the party.

The second dimension is the tense of the main clause. When the predicate of the main clause takes the non-past tense form as in (20), the speaker does not know the true proposition(s) answering the embedded question at the utterance time. However, the speaker of the sentence referring to the past might know the answer(s) at the utterance time.

(22) Watasi-wa dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sir-anakat-ta.
    I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg-past.
    ‘I didn’t know who came to the party.’

14 ‘wasureru (forget)’ encodes negation in its lexical meaning of the verb, meaning ‘not to remember’.
The last pattern is characterized by the polarity of the predicate. When we use the affirmative form of knowledge verbs as opposed to the negative one, the speaker explicitly states that he has the knowledge of the correct answer(s).

   I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-State
   ‘I know who came to the party.’

The above observations lead us to conclude that when a sentence fails to satisfy any one of the three conditions above, *ka* included in that sentence is not necessarily interpreted to encode the speaker’s uncertainty.

I classified the examples taken from texts published in Kyoto and Osaka from the 15th to the 19th century according to the relevant dimensions. The result in Table 2 shows that until the 19th century no example fails to satisfy all three conditions of first person subject, non-past tense and negation in this dialect. The second line in Table 2 counts examples which lack one of the relevant properties. Two examples of sentences satisfying the conditions found in these periods are given in (24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15th</th>
<th>17th</th>
<th>18th</th>
<th>18-19th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Sj &amp; ~Past &amp; Neg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~((1.Sj) &amp; ~Past &amp; Neg)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(24) a. Hossin-no innen-wa, doo sita koto-ka sir-ane-domo
   religious.awakening-Gen reason-Top how did thing-Q know-Neg-but
   ‘Although I don’t know why you became a priest,’ *Satsumauta*, 1.309, 1704

b. Uti-ni ozyaru-ka zonze-nu-yo, mono mausu.
   home-in stay-Q know-Neg-SF, thing say.
   ‘I don’t know whether he is in or not. Hello?’ *Toraakira*, Jō 381, 1642

In the middle of the 18th century, the center of the publishing business moved to Edo area (later named Tokyo), a shift which was prompted by the moving of the capital of Japan from Kyoto to Tokyo in the early 17th century. The decline of the publishing culture in Kyoto/Osaka forces us to use texts of the Edo-Tokyo dialect to investigate the subsequent change of the question particle. Table 3 exhibits the number of examples taken from the texts published in Edo-Tokyo in each century. 15

---

15I did not count tokens of the form ‘kamosirenai’ (an expression with *ka* followed by *mo*), since it evolves the meaning of epistemic possibility in Modern Japanese. However, this does not affect the discussion here because it does not violate the subject-tense-polarity constraint.
The result gives us statistical evidence of a historical change in which ka in indirect questions loses speaker-oriented uncertainty. In the texts which were published before the 18th century, I have found no example violating any of the three conditions for necessarily interpreting speaker-oriented meanings. But in the texts published in the 19th century, I found a few examples where the relevant conditions are not met. (25a) and (25b) have a past tense marker and (25c) is an example in which the subject is second person and an affirmative form is used. In (25b), the context provides that the speaker now knows where the addressee was last night.

(25) a. donohen-de omenikakari-masi-ta-ka daibu gunzyu-yue issai
    where-at see.Hon-Pol-Past-Q very crowd-because entirely
    kokorozuki-mase-nanda.
    know-Pol-Neg.Past

    ‘I didn’t know at all where I met you since it was very crowded.’
    Yashoku no Katamari, 28.413, 1832

b. yuube-wa kotti-kae. doko-ni oideda-ka sappari sir-anakat-ta-yo.
    last.night-Top here-Q where-Dat exist.Hon-Q entirely know-Neg-Past-SF

    ‘You were here last night, weren’t you? I didn’t know at all where you were.’
    Shunshoku Umegoyomi, 156, 1833

c. uti-e kaet-tara gosinzoosan-ni iiukete yaraa. doo suru-ka
    home-to go.back-when wife-Dat tell Ben how do-Q
    oboete-iro.
    remember-State

    ‘When I get home, I will tell it to the wife of my master. See what will happen.’
    Ukiyoburo, 165, 1810

The number gets larger in the 20th century, however. The percentage of tokens failing one or more conditions is 10.5% (4/38) in the 19th century but rises to 22.1% (19/86) in the 20th century, a 210% increase over two centuries. I provide examples of this new use also from Wagahai wa neko de aru (I Am a Cat), published in 1905, in (26). The verb is affirmative, not negative, in (26a) and the past tense marker ta is attached in (26b).

As the context given in the parenthesis indicates, the speaker in (26b), a cat, knows at the utterance time why people hang a basket.

\[\text{(25a) is the example which is classified into the column headed ‘18-19th’ century in Table 3. But} \]
\[\text{the publishing date of the text from which the example is taken is in the 19th century.} \]
表 4: Edo-Tokyo における非叙事話の例

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-19th</th>
<th>19th</th>
<th>20th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; -Past &amp; Neg</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>～(1st &amp; -Past &amp; Neg)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage rises from 10.3% (3/29) to 16.7% (7/42) between the 19th and the 20th centuries, a 161% increase. Though indirect questions not expressing speaker’s perspective can be found more in narratives than in non-narratives, there is no significant difference in the distribution of the examples in I Am a Cat: $\chi^2=1.404$, df=1, $p > .05$.

The subject of (27a) is in second person and that of (27b) in third person, both examples taken from dialogues in I Am a Cat. Negation does not appear in the predicate of the example in (27a).


You are rude. Do you know who I am? I am Kaneda, you know?

Wagahai wa neko de aru, 1905

One might conjecture that the result gained in Table 3 can be attributed to the reformation of the writing style occurring in the Meiji period (1868-1912). Before the Meiji period, narratives were written in Classical Japanese, a fossilized register which is based on the grammar of Heian Japanese. But starting in the Meiji period, writers tried to compose novels in a register closely reflecting the language as currently spoken: Modern Japanese. In order to eliminate the influence of these differences in narrative style, I counted tokens taken from written dialogues in Table 4. The data taken from language in this register still exhibit the same tendency as Table 3.
b. Kooban-zya dare-ga totta-ka wakar-anee-kara, sonotanbini
police.box-at.Top who-Nom caught-Q know-Neg-because each.time
gosen-zutu kureru-zyaneeka.
5 sen-each give-TQ

‘Since the police in the station do not know who caught the mice, they give
5 sen each time, don’t they?’ Wagahai wa neko de aru, 1905

The contexts of those examples tell us that the speaker in each sentence knows the correct
proposition answering the embedded question. This is evident in (27a) since the speaker
knows who the speaker is. In (27b) the identity of the referent in the answer to ‘who
caught the mice’ is the speaker of the sentence, a cat. Therefore we can conclude that
the speaker’s uncertainty is absent from both of these instances of ka.

So far, by limiting our data to knowledge verbs, we have demonstrated the process
where the speaker-oriented meanings were lost from the lexical meaning of ka. Indirect
questions having other verbs than knowledge verbs also support the idea that ka preserves
speaker-oriented meanings in the beginning. I give in Table 5 the numbers of verbs other
than knowledge verbs used in the texts before and after the 20th century. See Karttunen
(1977) for the classification of verbs.

Table 5: Verbs selecting Indirect Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Pre-20th</th>
<th>20th</th>
<th>Examples of Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitive verbs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ask, wonder, be interested in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of acquiring knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>learn, notice, discover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion verbs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>be certain about, have an idea about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>tell, show, inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision verbs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>decide, determine, agree on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of conjecture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>guess, predict, imagine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of relevance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>matter, relevant, be important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In pre-20th century data, I found 36 examples of non-knowledge verbs, among which
33 instances take inquisitive verbs as their predicates. Inquisitive verbs usually do not
entail the speaker’s knowledge about the embedded question, i.e. inquiring an answer
does not entail knowing the answer. In the texts I investigated, inquisitive verbs take
imperative forms as in (28a) or volitional markers as in (28b).

(28) a. musin-wo ii-tai koto-ga aru-ga, kiite kuren-ka toye
request-Acc say-want thing-Nom have-but grant Ben-Q ask[Imp]

‘Since I’ve got a favor to ask him, ask him whether he grants my request or
not.’ Toruakira, Jō 258, 1642

b. ora-a Kitibee obaa-ga dete-iru-ka mi-te iko-o.
I-Top Kitibee Miss-Nom come.out-State-Q see-Conj go-Vol
‘I will go to see whether Miss Kitibee comes out or not.’ Ujishäi, 347, 1783

The speaker in (28a) orders his servant and the speaker in (28b) has a volition to go. Such patterns tell us that the speaker does not know the answer(s) to the question embedded. There are only four exceptions to this generalization, among which two are still contextually interpreted with volitional meanings. Other two examples’ predicates are *be interested in* with first person occupying subjects: ‘I am interested in whether or not...’ which does not indicate the speaker’s acquaintance with the answer.

The remaining 3 examples attested in the representative texts all have verbs of acquiring knowledge. Those acquiring-knowledge verbs have first person subject, non-past tense and negation, which entails the speaker’s uncertainty as in the case of verbs of retaining knowledge. All those patterns are compatible with the interpretation of *ka* having speaker-oriented uncertainty.

On the other hand, various kinds of verbs are used with indirect questions in *I Am a Cat* and some of them have no implication of speaker’s uncertainty. Among the data from the 20th century, I found examples such as those in (29) which seem not to have speaker-oriented meanings of questions.

(29) a. kore-kara...syuzin-ga ikani yabo-o kiwameta-ka-o
   this-from master-Nom how boorishness-Acc did.extremely-Q-Acc
   tikuiti kaite gorannireru.
in.detailed write show
   ‘From now, I will write and show in detail how my master took stupidity to an extreme.’

b. sonna tokoro-ni doosite baiorin-ga aru-ka-ga daitii
   such place-Dat why violin-Nom exist-Q-Nom in.the.first.place
   gohusin-kamosirenai-desu, kore-wa kangaete-miru-to atarimae-no
doubt-might-Pol but this-Top think-try-then natural-Gen
   koto-desu.
things-Pol
   ‘You might wonder in the first place why they have violins in such places but this is natural if you think about it.’ Wagahai wa neko de aru, 1905

The sentence in (29a) is followed by telling a story in which the master of the narrator was made fun of by junior high school students, and the speaker of this sentence, the narrator, also knows how his master responded to it. In (29b), the speaker himself does not have a doubt why they have violins, since he considers it natural, telling after this sentence that female high school students use violins in their classes. Those sentences suggest that *ka* loses the speaker-oriented uncertainty at least by the 20th century.

5. Discussion

The loss of speaker’s orientedness in the meaning of *ka* is confirmed by the historical expansion of the use of *ka* to include indirect questions (section 2 and 3), and also by the change in use of indirect questions (section 4). Given that the speaker-orientedness is one
of defining properties of subjectivity (section 1), those changes constitute the counter-evidence to subjectification. However, this line of reasoning presupposes that the change at issue is ‘internal’ rather than ‘external’ change.

It is obvious that the change of questions is an internal one in the sense that it is not affected by change of the nature or redefinition of terms by professionals. Although, in the Meiji period, Japanese borrowed a large number of words from European languages, these borrowings did not have much influence on the grammar of Japanese. Kinsui (1997) points out that niyotte-passives (passives which, in Kuroda (1979)’s analysis, involve movement) were introduced by the literal translation of Modern Dutch, but their use is basically restricted to the written language. But there is ample evidence that indirect questions with ka were commonly used in dialogue as well as in writing. Furthermore, in addition to the fact that indirect questions which lack speaker’s perspective came to be used before the Meiji period (see Table 3), the derivation of the following uses from the direct question marker ka reinforces the view that the loss of speaker-oriented meanings is unexceptional and a natural process of language change.

(30) a. Disjunction

Taro-wa John-ka Mary-ka-ga ronbun-o yonde-kureru-koto-o sinzite-iru.  
\textit{Taro-Top John-or Mary-Nom paper-Acc read-Ben-Comp-Acc believe-State.}  
‘Taro believes that John or Mary will read his paper.’

b. Indeterminate

Taro-wa dareka-ga paatii-ni kite-kureru-koto-o sinzite-iru.  
\textit{Taro-Top someone-Nom party-Dat come-Ben-Comp-Acc believe-State}  
‘Taro believes that someone will come to the party.’

c. Exemplification

Taro-wa John-toka Mary-toka-ga paatii-ni kite-kureru koto-o  
\textit{Taro-Top John-such.as Mary-such.as-Nom paatii-ni come-Ben Comp-Acc believe-State}  
‘Taro believes that John, Mary, etc. will come to the party.’

The above uses of ka do not encode speaker-oriented meanings. (30a) can be followed by the speaker’s denial of the disjunctive meaning like ‘But I know that no one will read his paper’, and (30b) by that of the existential meaning ‘But I know that no one will come to the party.’ Kimuhata and Iwata (2010) reveal that the disjunctive use of ka emerges in the 15th century and the indeterminate use in the late 18th century by scrutinizing historical texts (see also Kimuhata and Whitman (2011) for the emergence of indeterminate use). Exemplification arises in the meaning of ka combining with to in the Meiji period according to Iwata (2010). Those successive changes cannot be accounted for by the borrowings of grammatical patterns from other languages, especially because Japanese did not undergo large-scale language contact particularly at those periods. These facts show that the loss of speaker-orientedness in the meaning of ka was not an accidental but a gradual, pervasive change in Japanese.
Another argument for the productivity of losing speaker-orientedness comes from a characteristic of grammaticalization: a process called ‘semantic bleaching’ (Hopper and Traugott 1993), ‘generalization’ (Bybee and Pagliuca 1985) and so forth.\(^{17}\) Considering the meaning of one word as a bundle of features, we can represent the loss of speaker-oriented meanings of \textit{ka} in embedded questions as \([\textit{spo, indet, C}] > [\textit{indet}, C]\), where \textit{indet} refers to the indeterminateness and \textit{C} a syntactic function to form a clause. If there is no reason to distinguish the loss of speaker-orientedness from the other cases of losing semantic features, we are led to the conclusion that the change discussed in this paper underwent a common process characteristic of grammaticalization.

The development from direct to indirect questions, moreover, conforms to Givon (1979)’s notion of ‘syntacticization’. Using relativization, causativization and other subordinations as illustrations, he claims that ‘such constructions arose diachronically, via the process of syntacticization, from looser, conjoined, paratactic constructions’ (p. 222). If adjoined use of direct questions such as (3), in which the question loosely conjoins with the following clause, is a source of indirect questions (see Takamiya 2005, Kimuhata 2007 and Kimuhata and Whitman 2011), the relevant change is a clear case of syntacticization since indirect-question clauses are tightly embedded as the argument of the verb. An important issue to be noted here is that Givon’s work paves the way for a new understanding of grammaticalization: Grammar emerging not only from lexical items but also from discourse/pragmatic functions. It is recognized without difficulty that this way of understanding language change goes against the view of subjectification, since interlocutors’ perspectives are more involved in discourse pragmatics than in syntax. Such an observation encourages Herring (1991) to argue, upon observing the polysemous use of rhetorical questions as relativizers in Tamil, that the semantic change between expressive and propositional meanings is not unidirectional (see also Herring (1988) and Hopper (1979, 1982) for relevant discussions). My claim follows Herring (1991), but this article argues against subjectification by giving clear evidence of diachronic change, something which has been absent from previous criticisms of the claim of subjectification.

Given the above theoretical and empirical grounds for the loss of speaker’s perspectives, one might wonder what led Traugott to the conclusion that subjectification is unidirectional. It is not a straightforward matter to answer this question, since Traugott’s definition of ‘subjectivity’ is broader than what I assume in this paper: While I only discuss whether a morpheme refers to the actual speaker of the utterance, her ‘subjectivity’ includes more than that. (see footnote 9 for the relation between the concept ‘speaker-orientedness’ and subjectivity in Traugott’s sense).\(^{18}\) Even though the broad range of subjectified expressions in Traugott’s sense prevents me from thoroughly answer-

\(^{17}\)Generalization’ is used to mean either that ‘a morpheme has a more general distribution’, used in more contexts, or that ‘it lacks certain specific features of meaning,’ according to Bybee and Pagliuca (1985: 63). Even though I use the term here in the sense of latter, \textit{ka} can be considered to have a wider distribution in Modern Japanese than in Old and Middle Japanese, since it not only can be used in direct questions but also in indirect questions in Modern Japanese.

\(^{18}\)See Iwasaki (1993) for a broad range of phenomena which are considered ‘subjective’, but not necessarily in the sense of the word as it is used in this paper: For example, deictic verbs such as ‘go’ and ‘come’ can be embedded into the belief context and the viewpoint is relativized to the subject of the matrix clause. Lyons (1982), to which Traugott (2010) refers as the starting point of her thinking about subjectivity, also provides examples of subjectivity not in the sense of speaker-orientedness: Raising constructions can describe the non-speaker’s experience as shown by his example ‘John remembered switching off the light.’
ing the above question, one might conjecture that lexical resources affect the changes that actually happen. In order to illustrate this, let us assume that the distinctions between functional/lexical and between speaker-oriented/non-speaker-oriented are independent of each other. This allows us to cross-classify words in a given language as in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker-oriented</th>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. affixes</td>
<td>C. wh-words, demonstratives, speaker-oriented adverbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clitics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-speaker-oriented</td>
<td>B. affixes</td>
<td>D. common nouns, adjectives verbs, most adverbs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clitics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We saw in this paper that the functional word ka once had only speaker-oriented meanings but acquired non-speaker-oriented ones later. This means that ka changes from A to B, in contradiction to the hypothesis of subjectification, which expects change to go from B to A. Suppose now that we are particularly concerned with the phenomena called grammaticalization and the changes judged to undergo this process are mostly attested from lexical words (C or D) to functional words (A or B). The more words in C, the greater the likelihood that we may observe counterexamples of subjectification in this process. However, the proportion of lexical words that encode speaker-oriented meanings in the first place is small. Thus the preponderance of items that have a potential to change status originates in the class of non-speaker-oriented lexical words, that is, D. This leads to the low attestation of examples of semantic change going in a direction counter to that expected under the subjectification view.

It is not immediately concluded that the uneven distribution of words is the only reason why the language change seems to be inclined toward subjectification, since we are only concerned with the speaker-oriented/non-speaker-oriented distinctions in the current discussion. It should be accentuated, however, that taking into account all the factors which bear on a given pattern of change is important, especially if we want to really understand what cognitive abilities dominate grammatical development in language.

---

19 Another possible counterexample is found in Shinzato (2007), who argues that a concessive conditional marker is derived from imperatives (see Narrog (to appear) for another interpretation on this change). Iwasaki (1993) also notes the loss of honorific meanings of the Japanese particle no countersubjectification (p. 93). The phenomena pointed out in studies such as these suggest that there may be even more counterexamples in the functional domain.

20 The lexical words having inherently speaker-oriented meanings that come to mind are demonstratives and wh-words. Demonstratives sometimes lose speaker-oriented meanings in compounded words such as ati-koti ‘here and there’ and kare-kore ‘for a long time’: While kore ‘this’ must refer to the speech situation, kare-kore need not. In Old Japanese, wh-words such as nani, iku, ika, etc. were used only to signal direct questions but they acquired universally quantified meanings in Early Middle Japanese when accompanied by particle mo, e.g. nani-mo [whatever], iku-mo [whichsoever] etc. Another candidate is speaker-oriented adverbs, though they seem to be derived from usual adjectives, i.e. surprising > surprisingly.
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Texts in Tables

In the second line for each text, I noted the number of orthographic characters (2 bytes per character), the year, the texts that I used. After the slash, some comments on materials are given.

- Kyoto/Osaka Dialect

14th Century: Heike monogatari (Kakuichibon).
395,000 characters. Written in 1371. Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei./ The tale was recited by biwa minstrels in the 13th century. This means that the language therein can be regarded as that spoken in the late 13th century.

mid-15th Century: Shikishō.
740,000 characters. Written in 1477. Shōmono shiryou shuisei.

17th Century: Ōkura toraakirabon kyōgenshū.
447,000 characters. Transcribed in 1643. Ōkura toraakirabon kyōgenshū no kenkyū, Hyōgensha./ The language is usually assumed to be that used in late 16th century.

18th Century: Plays written by Chikamatsu Monzaemon.
510,000 characters. Performed from 1703 to 1720. Chikamatsu Monzaemon shū 1,2 Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū.

18th-19th Century: Kamigata sharehon.
284,000 characters. Published from 1757 to 1827. The following 21 stories selected from Sharehon taisei, Chūokoronsha.

Hiziriguruwa (1757), Shin Gekkayōjō (1757), Fūryū Hadakaningō (1778-9), Adabolasensei Anasaigiri (1780), Tankauzuiō (1781), Iki no Sūjigaki (1794), Kotoba no Tana (1794), Hokukatijō (1794), Ukareshō (1797), Orandakagami (1798), Suigakamonom (1799), Ikaiosuwa (1827), Shindai Yamabukiuro (1799), Nangyūki (1800), Shōheiraku (date unrecorded), Uso no Kawa (1804), Teike no Hana (1807), Sui no Abebono (1820), Hakomakura (1822), Irafukami Sorane no Yume (1826), Hokusen Shijimi no Kara (1827)
• Edo-Tokyo Dialect

18th-19th Century: Edo sharehon.
323,000 characters. Published from 1770 to 1832. 16 stories selected from Sharehon taisei, Chūōkōronsha, and 8 stories form Kibyōshi sharehon shū, Koten Nihon bungaku taikai.

Nankō Ekiwa (1770), Kyōsha Hōgen (1771), Ryōgoku no Shiori (date unrecorded), Fukagawashinwa (1779), Shinagawayōjī (1798), Usomakoto Nasake no Yozakura (1880), Köhenyūgarō (1802), Niobukuro (date unrecorded), Gotairiki (1802), Yoshiwaradango (1802), Sendōshinwa (1806), Tsukyakuippaikigen (1807), Sendōbeya (1807), Keisei Kaichūkagami (1818), Seirōirodōshi (1828), Yashoku no Katamari (1832)

19th Century: Ukiyoburo, Shunshoku Umegoyomi.
318,000 characters. The former published in 1809-10, the latter in 1832-5. Nihon koten bungaku taikai.

20th Century: Wagahai wa neko de aru.
313,000 characters. Published in 1905. CD-ROM Shinchōbunko meiji no bungō.

Other Texts

Man'yōshū.
8th C. Hoteiban Man'yōshū Honmonhen, Hanawashobō.

Amakusaban Heike Monogatari.
Published in 1593. Amakusaban Heike Monogatari Taishōhonmon oyobi Sōsakuin, Meijishoin.
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