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Chapter I

Introduction.

A. Form and objectives.

The period consisting of the latter half of the eighteenth and former half of the nineteenth centuries saw the culmination of traditional grammatical study in Japan. Since this grammatical work was largely carried out by scholars involved in the intellectual movement termed kokugaku, it will be referred to henceforth as kokugaku grammar. The creators of kokugaku grammar, as we shall see below, achieved not only a complex grammatical description of the Japanese language, but also elaborated a grammatical theory of considerable sophistication. Within Japan, the kokugaku grammatical tradition has remained well known, at least to some segments of the academic community, and has exerted a repeated formative influence on grammatical descriptions of Japanese to the present time. Outside Japan, however, kokugaku grammar has remained virtually terra incognita; in particular there has been no awareness, so far as I have been able to discover, of the theoretical side of kokugaku grammar.

In the succeeding chapters, I shall attempt to characterize concisely the grammatical theory behind
kokugaku grammar, and to demonstrate in some detail how it has continued to affect the grammatical description of Japanese. The constant frame of reference for the discussion will be the notion of linguistic theory developed in generative grammar by Noam Chomsky and others. Studies with any explicitly theoretical orientation are rare in the substantial and still growing Japanese literature on kokugaku grammar, and, again to the best of my knowledge, the subject has never been approached from this particular point of view before.

An essay such as this, then, might contribute to the general study of linguistic theory an introduction to a hitherto insufficiently known grammatical tradition, and to the literature on kokugaku grammar, a new perspective based on the theoretical background from which I shall be examining it. The difficulty which immediately presents itself is the magnitude of the gap to be bridged between these two hypothetical contributions. In the former case, a proper understanding of the basic sources of kokugaku grammar depends on familiarity with several more or less independent fields: the grammar itself of literary Japanese, in which the sources are written and which they describe; the intellectual history of Japan, of which the development of kokugaku grammar was an integral part; and Chinese philosophy and grammar, from which the kokugakusha drew
their original inspiration. From a practical point of view, familiarity with the subsequent Japanese literature on **kokugaku** grammar is likewise indispensable; indeed without that literature this essay could never have been contemplated.

A thorough introduction to **kokugaku** grammar should include comprehensive discussion of all these areas, as well as a summary of the contents of the sources themselves, a project far beyond reasonable limits here. On the other hand, any effort to assess **kokugaku** grammar from a new theoretical point of view must, to be meaningful, ground itself in just such a matrix. The organization of this essay is my solution to the dilemma. So far as is convenient, necessary background information is woven into the body of the essay; where so doing would disrupt the progression of ideas, or where such material would be superfluous to those readers already familiar with Japanese grammar in general, it has been extracted in appendix form. Since, however, most readers will want to consult the appendices at some point in the course of the main text, it will be useful to describe briefly their content and purpose before proceeding.

So far as is practicable, I have employed throughout those conventions of reference and citation usual in the relevant disciplines. In a few cases, I have adopted what seemed to me convenient, though new,
conventions. Appendix A is a concise explanation of the conventions in force in each section of this essay, and should be consulted whenever a reference or citation is unclear.

Appendix B is a brief description of the chronological development of kokugaku grammar and its wider intellectual roots in Japan. It contains the essential biographical and bibliographical data on the kokugakusha and their grammatical works. Readers unfamiliar with Japanese intellectual history will want to read this appendix between chapters I and II; others may wish to consult it for specific grammarians or works discussed.

Appendix C is an annotated translation of one of the important sources for kokugaku grammar. As far as I know, it is the first such complete translation to be made into any foreign language. It is included primarily to provide readers who do not know Japanese a taste of the real substance of kokugaku grammar. It can also be read, however, using supplementary material referred to in the notes, as a short introduction to the grammar of literary Japanese.

Appendix D is a partially annotated list of references. Aside from the usual function of bibliography to the essay as a whole, this appendix is intended as a key to the Japanese literature on kokugaku grammar. As such, it is not complete of course; it reflects only
those works familiar to me and used in the preparation of this essay. Readers interested in following up my remarks and suggestions in the literature should find it useful.

This collection of supplementary material cannot replace the thorough introduction described above, which I hope will someday become available. However, I do believe that this essay as it stands is self-contained and intelligible to the general linguistic public outside Japan. If so, it is another step toward the more complete introduction that is needed, and is offered in that spirit. In part for similar reasons, the dream of a new theoretical formulation is likewise only partially achievable here. And again the form of this essay has been in part dictated by its ability to permit only the essentials to be presented.

The choice of sources has been limited both by space considerations and by the coverage of the secondary literature. In chapter II, in which kokugaku grammatical theory is defined and examined, selected works by six grammarians are analyzed. Many more sources by the same or other men might have been included; these were, however, less generally available and less often discussed, and ipso facto less important for the tradition as a whole. Similarly questionable might be the starting point assumed for the source material; kokugaku grammar
certainly had predecessors worthy of consideration. Here, however, the distinct historical and philosophical backgrounds have reduced the accessibility of such predecessors and thereby their relevance for the purposes of this essay.

Somewhat more arbitrary is the selection of sources to be discussed in chapters III and IV, where the amount of relevant material is several dimensions greater. I have therefore aimed at no more than a suggestion of the continual influence of kokugaku grammar which might be documented. The discussion is divided into two parts: the synthesis of kokugaku grammar with European traditional grammar, treated in chapter III; and the conflict of kokugaku grammar and some forms of modern structural linguistics, treated in chapter IV. Each chapter is organized around the work of one man, and in each case the most obvious representative has been selected. In addition, both are influential modern Japanese grammarians in their own right, and major contributors to the secondary literature on kokugaku grammar. Therefore, I believe that a representative, if not complete, coverage of kokugaku grammar, both as traditional grammar in Japan and as living force in modern Japanese grammar, has been attained in the material which I have chosen to include in this essay.
The order of topics discussed within each chapter is determined by relevance to an orderly descriptive presentation, no attempt being made to exhaust the contents of the works mentioned, or to distinguish consistently the system of one grammarian from that of another. This results in a manageable theoretical construct here, but raises some doubts about the relation of that construct to its sources. This anecdotal approach is made possible by certain assumptions which I have attempted to motivate in chapter II, section A. The remainder of this chapter will constitute a brief explanation of the theoretical point of view adopted, and a suggestion of the general value of studies like this essay.

B. Generative grammar.

In the most general sense, any meaningful study must have some purpose and some activity which is relevant to the achievement of that purpose. In the case of linguistics, we may associate that purpose with the notion 'linguistic theory', and that activity with the notion 'linguistic description'. Furthermore, a study which is concerned with some aspect of objective existence we may call a science. Linguistics is a science, in this sense, and that aspect of objective existence with which it is concerned we may associate with the
notion 'language'. To the extent that the substance and logical interrelations of these three notions are independently and freely manipulable, we may have many different varieties of linguistics.

In the approach to linguistics which I presuppose, language is taken to be an abstract object which establishes an association between classes of complex noises (sounds) and mental representations of a more general sort (meanings). It is itself among the mental faculties of human beings, and they can utilize it to transmit and receive various kinds of messages. Particular languages are then particular examples of such abstract objects. Linguistic theory is taken to be the search for a correct and adequate characterization of language in general, including all particular languages. Particular linguistic theories are then particular proposed characterizations of this sort. Linguistic description is taken to be the attempt to express in some way what can be known or deduced about some aspect of any particular language. Particular linguistic descriptions are then particular proposed expressions of this sort.

From an inductive point of view, linguistics begins with the interface of language and observable fact, namely the physical properties of sounds, and all those conscious mental judgments which can be made about
them.\textsuperscript{12} It develops a representation of these data, which constitutes a particular linguistic description. By comparing and synthesizing many such descriptions, their general characteristics and individual peculiarities may be distinguished, yielding a linguistic theory which covers each particular language included. On the basis of considerations relevant to theory alone, it may then be necessary to re-evaluate some of the original data.\textsuperscript{13}

From a deductive point of view, linguistics begins with a linguistic theory having various consequences for the descriptions of particular languages, in all their aspects and detail. These consequences are explored through the construction of such descriptions, which in turn make claims about what sounds occur and what mental judgments human beings make about them. On the basis of the correlation between predicted and actual sounds and judgments, it may then be necessary to reformulate some aspects of the original theory.\textsuperscript{13}

Real linguistics is never a purely inductive or deductive affair; at all times there must be both a linguistic theory of some sort and linguistic descriptions of some sort. Linguistic description cannot be carried out in the absence of linguistic theory; that is in the absence of a general notion of the nature of language and a general purpose to be served by the
description of language. Otherwise there is nothing to describe nor any motivation for describing it. On the other hand, linguistic theory without linguistic descriptions; that is without consequences for the physical properties of sounds or the judgments of human beings about them, if conceivable at all, has disqualified itself from any acceptable role in a study to be called linguistics.  

In other words, language is a predominantly mentalistic phenomenon. Therefore its study must involve the construction of abstract hypotheses to be evaluated against facts only via long chains of reasoning, and to a small portion of the deductive consequences of the hypotheses. The gaps must be filled in by considerations on the theoretical level. The generative grammatical literature contains ample argument that this approach is the most natural and rewarding, both in itself and in comparison with alternative approaches taken seriously by contemporary linguists. I support the argument, but will not attempt to recapitulate it here. More relevant to present purposes is the suggestion in the same literature that this approach has been widely adopted in pre-modern linguistics, and is indeed characteristic of most significant contributions to linguistics throughout its history.
As it happens, explicit metatheory, or discussion of the role of a theory of language in linguistics, is extremely rare in pre-modern linguistics. How, then, can it be meaningful to claim that it adopted the psychological approach just outlined, or any other? How can we know, in fact, how the creators of pre-modern linguistics approached their work? The only way, of course, is to compare the methodology and results of the pre-modern work in question against the favored methods and objectives of various conceivable metatheories. In other words, we must interpret the documents which we have as the consequences of some such approach, and try to determine by hypothesis-and-consequences what that approach was. The problem is similar to that of developing a theory of language, except that the relevance of the 'data' and the degree of 'internal structure' to be assumed are significantly less. Therefore we can probably never expect to reach further than tentative conclusions.

C. Traditional grammar.

It is now time to replace the term 'pre-modern linguistics' with 'traditional grammar'. My preference for the latter over the former as a key technical term is easily explained. With a few notable exceptions, the two are extensionally equivalent. This is because
the study of phonology (as opposed to phonetics) is typically underdeveloped in traditional grammar. Moreover, it seems to me that there is a definite but intuitive similarity of atmosphere in most of what we think of as traditional grammar. If this can be defined and delineated, then a content can be given to 'traditional grammar' as a technical term which cannot be given to a purely chronological term such as 'pre-modern linguistics'. 'Traditional grammar' itself is not entirely felicitous in this respect, since grammatical study of any sort is part of some tradition or other; it is already in general use, however, and a better term does not come readily to mind. In line with this change, I also adopt 'grammatical theory' and 'grammatical description'.

We may now assay an independent definition of traditional grammar as characterized by the three criteria already mentioned: namely, 1) a concern with syntactic rather than phonological analyses, 2) no explicit metatheoretical position, and 3) an implicit or explicit mentalistic theory of language. Naturally we will want to further categorize specific types of traditional grammar according to how they develop away from these bases. The amount of documented traditional grammar in this sense is quite large; virtually every language which possesses a written literature has some
form of traditional grammar. However, the more or less independently developed bodies of traditional grammar are much fewer in number, and generally correspond with the more important culture areas of world history.

While we must typically infer the metatheoretical context for instances of traditional grammar, we do occasionally find explicit formulations of grammatical theories based on fairly complete grammatical descriptions. Naturally these provide major evidence for metatheoretical inference in the particular traditional grammar under investigation, and may in that way help to confirm the general validity of certain metatheoretical positions. Probably more often we will find developed grammatical descriptions with only disconnected fragments of evidence for a grammatical theory. In such cases, the inference must proceed in two stages; first to the theory itself, and on that foundation to the metatheoretical matrix. The conclusions will be a little less firm, of course, but may still be worthwhile.

Secondly, we can look at the grammatical theories, both explicit and inferred, to be found in traditional grammar in terms of their correctness as such. They are naturally related to certain facts and analyses by some chain of reasoning which we can evaluate in
our own terms. Then the theoretical statements and positions of traditional grammar, in so far as they are valid or suggestive, may help to confirm the general validity of certain aspects of a better grammatical theory. Since traditional grammar seems to exist in some form or other for most of the languages of the world which possess a written literature, this body of material takes on a particular significance at this time when the greatest possible breadth of coverage is imperative.

Thirdly, the facts themselves brought out and analyzed in traditional grammar are of intrinsic and permanent interest. In the case of traditional grammars of dead languages, they may bridge otherwise unbridgeable gaps, and add to the total accessible data of linguistics as a whole. To the extent that the analyses and theory of traditional grammar are found wanting, then either the 'facts' in question must be discredited, or a more revealing treatment discovered. In either case something may be contributed to our understanding of the relation between fact and theory in grammar.

The study of traditional grammar may thus provide valuable evidence on all levels of linguistic study from metatheory through theory to descriptions of particular facts. This is all quite apart from its
intrinsic interest as a part of the history of linguistics and by extension, of the general history of ideas. Questions of mutual influence between different strains of traditional grammar on the one hand, or between traditional grammar and modern linguistics on the other, which are often brought to light in this kind of historical investigation, may in analogous ways provide somewhat less direct evidence bearing on general linguistic issues. The experience provided by the development of generative grammar renders the strongest possible argument that anything in the past of linguistics may at any time prove relevant to current problems.

The intrinsic interest of the traditional grammar of any particular language is usually a function of its originality on two main dimensions: 1) independent theoretical origin, or 2) application to a language of widely different type from that for which it was first devised. It is this second phenomenon which most often accounts for the appearance of an explicit theory of language. **Kokugaku** grammar is a traditional grammar as defined above in every sense, as I will try soon to demonstrate. It is attractive to us on both these grounds; as a form of traditional grammar of independent origin from our own, and as an instance of the application of a grammatical theory to a language
(Japanese) of very different structure from that of the language (Chinese) for which it was created. We shall return to these points in the next chapter.
Footnotes to chapter I.

1. Approximate translation: 'national learning'.
   See appendix B for a discussion of the significance of this word.

2. Outside of passing references, I know only of Fomin (1959), McEwan (1949) and Yanada (1950).
   See appendix B for more detail.

3. See section B of this chapter and its notes for a discussion of this variety of linguistics.

4. Interesting are Tanabe (1955) and Takeoka (1961-62). See appendix D for further details.

5. The Japanese term is bungo, which refers to all written Japanese prior to this century as well as later literature in archaic form. There is tremendous variation of periods and styles concealed in this term, but the ambiguity is traceable to the sources, and is not my doing. See appendix C and the references cited there.

6. There is the German version of Mabuchi's Bun'ikō and Goikō by Dumoulin (1955), but these are not really grammatical works.
7. The syntactic and theoretical aspects of this approach are customarily known as generative grammar, or transformational grammar. The following sketch attempts to present a common denominator of generative grammar and traditional grammar in my sense (to be defined in section C of this chapter). Therefore, many of the important issues and findings of generative grammar are not mentioned, because they are not shared with traditional grammar as a whole. In the immediately following notes (8 through 18), I attempt to relate the theoretical issues relevant here to others usually raised in connection with generative grammar. The bibliographies to Chomsky (1965) and (1966b) provide an introduction to the literature, and the latter work itself, especially chapters I and III, forms a convenient summary of the field.

8. Since these two classes are in fact infinite, language and any serious model of it which we contemplate must incorporate recursive or generative devices. Hence the term 'generative grammar', which is inadequate to the extent that there can be various sorts of 'generative' grammar with totally different assumptions on other points.
9. Universal features of language, whether formal or substantive, may be explained on the assumption that they are given in the innate mental equipment of human beings, and are not part of what a child must learn when he acquires his language. Included here is a learning strategy, called a 'simplicity metric' or 'evaluation measure', which the child uses to analyze the data with which he is presented.

10. A completely explicit formal representation is a prime desideratum here, and serves to distinguish traditional grammar sharply from modern linguistics. Strict attention to formalism has led to a realization of the inadequacies of several proposed linguistic theories. In generative grammar, formal systems of recursive rules have been extensively investigated as models for language. Transformations are one class of rules which have been shown to be required in such a framework, and which mediate 'deep structure', the level of language at which most semantic relationships are defined, and 'surface structure', the level at which most of the phonological entities appear. Hence the term 'transformational grammar', which really refers to a third dimension, independent of either generativeness, or the metatheoretical assumptions stressed.
here. Aside from their role of making clear the claims entailed in theoretical proposals, formal systems may be studied for themselves with interesting conclusions for linguistic theory.

11. Katz and Postal (1964) use the term 'linguistic description' for a complete description of a particular language. My sense is somewhat looser, including also partial description (the only kind actually available).

12. There has been a long controversy in modern linguistics on the permissibility of using 'introspective' evidence such as meaning, intuitions of structure and grammaticality, and so on, in linguistic analysis. Quite apart from the fact that no one has yet proven it possible to dispense entirely with such evidence, language is a sufficiently complex phenomenon that any a priori restriction on relevant data is dangerous. This does not imply, of course, that we must accept intuitive evidence at face value, or compromise in any other way a critical approach to all the data of linguistics.

13. Language being an abstract object relating sounds and meanings, there is always the possibility of systematic or random distortion being introduced
in putting the relationships so defined into prac-
tice. Thus observed data may not necessarily be
relevant to the underlying realities. This is
the distinction between 'competence' and 'per-
formance'. When a discrepancy between theory
and fact becomes apparent, there will often be
doubt about which of these two levels it pertains
to.

14. Chomsky (1966a) has suggested that this is in
fact the situation which confronted Humboldt in
the early nineteenth century, and accounts in part
for the subsequent neglect of his theory of lan-
guage. If so, then we must recognize the logical
priority of theory to description. Nevertheless,
if we were not able to draw some of the consequences
of Humboldt's theory today, we could never take it
seriously.

15. One may take the extremity of language to be not
sounds themselves, but rather sets of instructions
to the speech organs. If we do this, language
becomes wholly mentalistic. However, for the
purposes of this essay, these are only equivoca-
tions in terminology.
16. In particular, by collecting a wide range of analyses from different languages, postulating universal constraints, and enriching the evaluation measure which is built into the formal representation. See note 3 above.

17. The principal alternative has been that approach usually labelled 'structural linguistics'; see especially Postal (1964).

18. See especially Chomsky (1964) and (1966a).

19. I know of no such cases.

20. This is not surprising, being a typical scientific procedure.

21. Indian linguistics, particularly Pāṇini's Āstādhyāya, comes immediately to mind for its phonological sophistication. Linguists have always perceived a qualitative gap between Pāṇini and European traditional grammar, however, and it may be that his exclusion from 'traditional grammar' is the correct move.

22. This definition is of course preliminary. Only one case is under consideration here.
23. I do not suggest that, on the basis of any traditional grammar, we can attain the same detailed knowledge of a dead language that we can, say, of English or modern Japanese. This does not detract from the importance of those facts and analyses which compose traditional grammar, however.
Chapter II

The content of kokugaku grammatical theory.

A. External considerations.

1. Some questions.

Three judgments often made about kokugaku grammar (not necessarily all by the same critics) are the following: 1) that the value of kokugaku grammar lies in its pure description of the surface aspects of Japanese structure; 2) that the differences between the descriptions made by the kokugaku grammarians and later scholars can be explained with the observation that the ultimate objectives of kokugaku grammar went beyond a linguistic description of the language; and 3) that kokugaku grammar is a development which is entirely indigenous to Japan, and captures the uniqueness of the Japanese language. There is a certain degree of aptness in each of these judgments; nevertheless, it seems to me that each is seriously misleading and misses the fundamental quality of kokugaku grammar.

In a paper called 'Japanese linguistics (Nihon no gengogaku)', Hattori Shirō summarizes the developments of the period which includes kokugaku grammar:

Through the efforts of the kokugakusha led by Keichū (1640–1701), Nabuchi (1697–1769), Norinaga (1730–1801) and others, linguistic
studies gradually became scientific. However, these were by and large confined to descriptive studies of the Japanese of the Nara and Heian periods; usually the contemporary language was looked down upon as vulgar, and never became an object of study. Dialects were paid attention to chiefly as they could play a role in the interpretation of the ancient language. The koku-gakusha made studies of ancient Japanese culture their objective, and the study of language was no more than a means to that end. However, because their method of study was a strict one, a unique method of descriptive grammar came to be developed.¹

Roy Andrew Miller, in his recent book The Japanese Language, discusses kokugaku grammar from a little more sympathetic point of view:

[Fujitani Nariakira] was the first Japanese to make a serious attempt to classify the forms of the language according to their grammatical function. Since he necessarily did his work in isolation from the grammatical traditions of both India and Western Europe, the bold originality of his analysis is not surprising....

This completely indigenous grammatical tradition begun by Fujitani, Gimon, and others was unfortunately nipped in the bud by the introduction of Western learning at the end of the Tokugawa period....The scientific and descriptive approach of pioneer scholars like Fujitani was cast aside in favor of a wholesale and usually disastrous attempt to identify within Japanese the categories of Indo-European grammar,
particularly those of Dutch and English. It was not until the 1940's, when foreign linguists began work on the description of Japanese, that the analysis of Japanese grammar in the tradition of Fujitani and Gimon was begun again.  

The most salient characteristic of remarks like these is their total disregard for the theoretical side of kokugaku grammar. Or, to put it more accurately, their tacit assumption that the linguistic theory of modern neo-Bloomfieldian structuralism, which they equate with scientific linguistics, and look upon as a kind of natural null hypothesis, was shared by the best of kokugaku grammar. But this assumption is quite vulnerable, as even a superficial examination of the actual sources of kokugaku grammar will show. In sections B and C of this chapter, I shall argue that the description of Japanese presented in kokugaku grammar is comparable to the grammatical descriptions provided by European traditional grammar, and has very little in common with this kind of structuralism. Furthermore, I shall argue that kokugaku grammar explicitly develops a mentalistic grammatical theory based on putative universal properties of language, which implies a metatheory much like that sketched in chapter I, section B, above.

The view of kokugaku grammar represented by Hattori and Miller faced one principal problem: how to explain
the failure of the kokugakusha to study the things which their assumed theory should have led them to study. When we revise our view of kokugaku grammatical theory along the lines which I am proposing, this quickly becomes a pseudo-problem. Two other problems present themselves, however, when we begin to look carefully at the theory. How far can we go in attributing a single theory to kokugaku grammar as a whole, and where did it come from? Of course these questions were there all along, and the answer which suggests that a theory demanding purely descriptive work can be expected to be present unless there is evidence to the contrary will never suffice. I think that natural answers can be given to these questions in my framework, which entail no gratuitous assumptions.

2. Limitations.

The most usual criticism of kokugaku grammar was that reflected by Hattori above, that its approach was too narrow. Tokieda Motoki sums this argument up over the entire field of pre-modern language studies in Japan as seen by the early modern Japanese linguists:

In general, because Japanese language studies in the past did not extend to the comparative historical or dialect studies taken as subject matter by modern linguistics, it had little value [for them]. Hoshina Kōichi took the extreme
position: 'One may say that past language studies in our country have produced virtually no results which can contribute to contemporary linguistics.'

Those who did not want to go as far as Hoshina were left with the need for an explanation. If, in particular, the grammatical descriptions of the kogakusha are to be attributed to a theory which aims merely at surface description, why did they limit their attention in this way? The solution offered by almost everyone is the one Hattori adopts. Kokugaku grammar was the slave of the ulterior motives of the kokugaku movement. Again we can turn to Tokieda for a convenient summary:

Japanese language studies in the Edo Period developed to achieve the goals of kokugaku: the interpretation of ancient literature, and expression in the style of the ancient language. In other words, Japanese language studies were dependent on kokugaku throughout, and never held any independent objective.

The external facts referred to in this statement are of course true, but they are relevant criticisms only if we are already assuming something resembling neo-Bloomfieldian structural linguistics as the goal of grammatical study. Of this Tokieda is fully aware:

For post-Meiji students of the history of Japanese linguistics, the fact that past linguistic studies had always been a means to something else was a principal reason to doubt that those past
linguistic studies were scientific. However, this fact has no relation to whether the discipline as such was scientific or not. On the contrary, I think it may be said that by observing the Japanese language in such applications we can often get a better idea of its concrete aspects. This has produced in the present book a completely opposite evaluation of the history of Japanese linguistics.7

As we shall see in chapter IV, Tokieda took this very seriously, and made it one of the bases of his own grammatical theory, in which the process of communication is the crux of the problem of understanding language.

Miller has a different explanation which, as far as I know, is original with him. He asserts that kokugaku grammar was 'nipped in the bud' by the introduction of European traditional grammar into Japan. On his interpretation, kokugaku grammar, left to its own devices, would eventually have resulted in an analysis comparable to that of Bernard Bloch and his students.8 We ought to ask, first of all, in what sense the study of European grammar could have been responsible for the decline of kokugaku grammar; and secondly, what reason there is to think that the evolution in question would actually have occurred. In spite of some forerunners,9 European grammar did not come to occupy the attention of a significant number of Japanese scholars until some years after the Meiji Restoration. And in spite of some holdouts,10 kokugaku grammar had stopped producing new ideas some
years before the Restoration. Clearly the demise of kokugaku grammar as an academic institution and its replacement in that capacity by European grammar were both symptoms of the intellectual upheaval which centered on the year 1868. On the small scale as much as on the overall, it would be dangerous to attribute the changes entirely to external influences; an internal decomposition had also taken place.

On the other hand, as I shall argue in chapter III, the grammatical doctrines of the kokugakusha were not 'cast aside', but continued as a main stream in Japanese grammar. And while the excesses of a slavish adherence to European grammatical models certainly deserve Miller's scorn, the confrontation of the two traditions could produce, in the hands of more careful scholars, an enrichment of the study of grammar in Japan. A rapprochement was possible in this case which has not yet proven possible between kokugaku grammar and neo-Bloomfieldian structuralism. The theoretical gap between the two, argued in sections B and C of this chapter but overlooked by Miller, throws doubt on his postulation of a natural evolution from the kokugaku analysis of Japanese grammar to Bloch's.

When we recognize that the kokugakusha were trying to formulate a mentalistic theory of language as a basis for assessing the characteristics of Japanese, the
criticisms reviewed above lose their point entirely. The theory was thus an integral part of what Hattori calls 'the study of ancient Japanese culture', rather than something separate prompted by it. In the construction of such a theory, any level of linguistic data may legitimately be brought to bear. In any case, it is difficult to see how a more detailed consideration of Edo period standard spoken Japanese or dialects, synchronic or diachronic, might have materially altered the theory arrived at. And this conclusion was drawn by the kokugakusha themselves, as we shall see in section B of this chapter. They treated the comparatively superficial differences between historical stages, geographical variants and social functions of language in just the right way, if we attribute to them a mentalistic metatheory.

3. Theoretical unity.

As mentioned in chapter I, one assumption underlying the form of this essay is that a single grammatical theory was originated in kokugaku grammar, or at least in that part of it which we are reviewing here. This seems a more or less innocuous assumption if the theory is taken to involve nothing beyond a description of the surface phenomena of Japanese structure. When we realize that a mentalistic theory of language is being aimed at,
however, the problem must be taken rather more seriously. I cannot fully document here the development and individual differences of kokugaku theory, but some suggestion of the range of variation and some justification for ignoring it may be useful at this point.

There are two sorts of relevant evidence in justifying my assumption of a single theory. Most important, of course, is the contents in terms of data presented, and the analyses themselves. It would be on that basis that a full documentation would have to be made. Also important are the personal relationships of the kokugakusha, particularly where the internal evidence may be inconclusive, or where its full range cannot be discussed.

We may roughly associate the six principal kokugaku grammarians into three 'generations', each composed of two men. Generally speaking, the theory is elaborated more fully in succeeding generations, each producing quantitatively more relevant text than the previous. We may illustrate in the following table:

1. Motoori Norinaga ←--→ Fujitani Seishō
   ↓
2. Motoori Haruniwa ←--→ Suzuki Akira
   ↓
3. Gimon ←--→ Togashi Hirokage

Here the solid arrows show a master-and-disciple
relationship and the broken arrows an obvious influence without such a relationship.

The most striking exception to this general picture is Seishō, who in many ways represents the highest elaboration of kokugaku grammatical theory. Parts of his system are reflected through Norinaga, other parts through Akira, to Haruniwa, Gimon and Hirokage. Seen from Seishō's work as a foundation, each of the other men (except possibly Gimon) presents only a partial theory, their combination covering roughly the same ground. On the other hand, Seishō's theoretical writings are short and hard to interpret without supporting material from those others whom he influenced. This situation, more than anything else, argues for the existence of a single theory of grammar uniting the work of all these scholars.

Like Seishō, Gimon was not a member of Norinaga's chain of students. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that he was thoroughly familiar with kokugaku grammar as developed particularly by Norinaga and Haruniwa. In fact, his explicit goal was to systematize, correct and complete their work. An examination of his writings shows that he largely succeeded in this project. Hirokage was attempting the same sort of thing, and occasionally found himself in conflict with Gimon. Even in this case of open controversy, however, no serious theoretical
points were at issue, only relatively minor or superficial analyses.

Therefore, the assumption of a single theory is at least plausible. There is no immediately apparent reason to believe otherwise, and a good deal of supporting external evidence. Grammatical theories are not lightly created out of nothing; therefore we should expect a 'school' of grammarians such as the kokugakusha did constitute, to have operated within a single theoretical framework. The fact that the sources do not often overlap, or that there is rather little explicit evidence of mutual theoretical influence in some ways reinforces the assumption. The kokugakusha did not need to document the relationship of their actual research to their theory since for them that theory was the only possible one.


A much more serious problem, in terms of our ability to solve it satisfactorily, is where this involved mentalistic theory of grammar came from. Takeoka Masao, in his long study of Seishō's work, has claimed that every major strand of kokugaku grammatical theory can be traced back to Seishō's system more or less intact. The later developments can then be looked upon as a gradual incorporation, or perhaps rediscovery, of all
the ramifications of his more basic tenets. But the attribution of the whole to Seishō's 'bold originality', as Miller does above, should be considered only as a last resort. It cannot be over-emphasized that a linguistic theory, particularly a psychological one like this, is a sophisticated and abstract notion, and is unlikely to have appeared out of nowhere.

Miller's assumption that Seishō 'necessarily did his work in isolation from the grammatical traditions of both India and Western Europe' is therefore a curious one. Some knowledge of Sanskrit had passed to Japan with the introduction of Buddhism and was gradually enriched in succeeding generations. There are instances of men, principally Buddhist monks, who knew the language, though they probably learned it in China. More telling, Sanskrit phonetics was widely practiced in Japan and applied to Japanese hundreds of years before the appearance of kokugaku grammar. This discipline, called in Japanese shittangaku, heavily influenced the phonological work of the kokugakusha. Of course, this phonetic knowledge also filtered through China to Japan, and there is no good reason to believe that some knowledge of Sanskrit grammar could not have done likewise.

Beginning around 1540, when the first Jesuits came to Japan, a Japanese grammar in the European tradition
gradually took shape. It appeared in several versions with dictionaries and plenty of romanized texts, published by the Jesuit Press at Amakusa and elsewhere. By the time the Jesuits and other missionaries were expelled from the country a hundred years later, a body of grammatical work had been accomplished which remains one of the high points of missionary grammar. While the ultimate purpose of this work was to enable other missionaries to learn Japanese, it is obvious from the detail incorporated that numbers of native informants were consulted in the preparation of these grammars. There must therefore have been educated Japanese who understood something of European traditional grammar, at a time not long before the beginnings of kokugaku grammar.

From these historical considerations, it would not be surprising if kokugaku grammar had been influenced, if not created, by a discovery of Indian grammar, European traditional grammar, or both. Rather, it is surprising that, as far as I know, Miller is right. The evidence is all negative, of course; there simply is not a sufficient similarity of detail in the respective systems. The similarity that does appear, as outlined in the next section, is well enough explained by the fact that all were working with human languages of not fundamentally different structures. Any burden
of proof concerning influences of this sort would be on anyone who wanted to claim their existence. Still, there are some facts which help us to understand why these influences did not appear.

First of all, the hypothetical acquaintance of educated Japanese with Indian or European grammar would have been among converts to alien religions, Buddhist or Christian as the case may be. Each was under suspicion in Japanese academic circles during the Edo period, both by the Confucian official ideology in general and by the kokugakusha in particular.¹⁸ As we shall see, however, such suspicion did not protect kokugaku grammar from outside influence; so this situation in itself is not enough to account for the lack of influence in these two cases. On the Indian side, there is the fact that most of what reached Japan came via China. And given the grammatical structure of Chinese, there was obviously a barrier to the dissemination of grammatical doctrine which could not be assumed to hold for phonetics. In the European case, there is the persecution which accompanied the rejection of Christianity. Tens of thousands of martyrs were made, among whom may have been many potential grammarians.

Apparently, Miller moved from considerations like those just above to the conclusion that kokugaku grammar was a completely indigenous creation. He knew of no other alternative. Japanese linguistic historians have less excuse for drawing the same conclusion. Most of the discussions I have seen leave completely out of account Chinese grammatical theory, yet this is the obvious place to look for influence. Only those who feel the origin to be no problem, or who would prefer that kokugaku grammar be indigenous, would fail to investigate this possibility. And there are two distinct aspects from which Chinese grammar is crucial to kokugaku grammar.

On the one hand there is the role played by grammars of Chinese in Fujitani Seishō's work. Seishō's elder brother, whose name was Minagawa Kien,¹⁹ was a noted authority on Chinese grammar of the period. While this has always been well known,²⁰ its importance has not been appreciated until recently, through study of Kien's writings by Takeoka Masao. Takeoka has shown that Seishō's own work can be looked upon as an attempt to apply to Japanese the grammatical theory which his brother had used in the analysis of Chinese. Seishō's key position in kokugaku grammar as a whole has already been referred to, and will become very clear when we look into details in section B below. He is the only
kokugakusha who has something original to say on every important issue in kokugaku grammatical theory. Therefore, the relationship which Takeoka has uncovered is extremely significant.

On the other hand, there is the explicit comparison of Chinese and Japanese which underlies the general theory of grammar arrived at by the kokugakusha. One thing shown immediately by this is that there existed a description of Chinese grammar of approximately equal degree of sophistication to that which they developed for Japanese, and which was well known to them. Section C of this chapter, a summary of kokugaku universal grammatical theory, will review the passages relevant to this claim. No description of Chinese, however, is fully or connectedly presented in any source for kokugaku grammar, or indeed for any other aspect of kokugaku. These two points of contact between Chinese grammar and kokugaku grammar suggest compellingly that there is an important influence from the former to the latter.

There remains one equivocation, however. 'Chinese grammar' may be either grammar originated in China by Chinese, or simply grammar applied to the Chinese language. All that is clear from the literature, both source and secondary, on kokugaku grammar, is that Chinese grammar in the second sense exercised some influence on it. Then, of course, we must ask where this
Chinese grammar came from, and the logical answer is from Chinese grammar in the first sense, plus some original contribution by the Japanese in adapting it to their needs. This logical answer is blocked by the dogma that Chinese grammar in the first sense did not exist before the turn of the present century which saw the publication of Ma Shih Wen T'ung.\textsuperscript{21} Earlier Chinese grammar in China is supposed to have been limited to very simple speculation.\textsuperscript{22} If this view is accurate, then we must assume that the original leap took place in the elaboration of Chinese grammar by Japanese, perhaps \textit{kangakusha} like Minagawa Kien.\textsuperscript{23}

I prefer to believe, however, that the view is not accurate. There may well exist Chinese sources for this grammatical theory, even though there is scant reference to them in \textit{kokugaku} grammar or modern Chinese linguistics. There certainly exists no secondary literature dealing with such sources that I know of. There is precious little about Chinese grammar as practiced in Japan. That is the main reason why I cannot go more deeply into the matter here. A study of either of these areas would be likely to involve a corpus of source material as large or larger than \textit{kokugaku} grammar proper. And with no commentary on those sources in modern terms, an essay such as this in either case would certainly require a much greater effort.
I cannot help feeling that an approach like the one I am using here to even the well known pre-modern Chinese 'grammatical' works can prove very revealing, but it is entirely beyond the scope of this essay. Kokugaku grammar is a reasonably well contained entity which can be approached in its own terms. We must simply accept for the moment that its origin is inaccessible to us, and keep in mind that many important, and possibly relevant questions of its relation to Chinese linguistics and the role of the Chinese language in Japan are being left open.

I will note in passing that a very curious sort of influence is being postulated here. The kokugakusha were ideologically dedicated to reconstructing Japanese culture as it existed before contact with China, and to showing that things Japanese, including the language, were superior to things Chinese. That to do this in grammar they were obliged to work within the Chinese theoretical framework, which was presumably the only one available, is an ironic comment on the history of ideas and of linguistics. This may well be a more common situation in that history than working thinkers can afford to admit.

6. Conclusion.
I have been suggesting in the foregoing paragraphs that the existence of a mentalistic grammatical theory in the works of the kokugakusha can be reconciled with a solution to some interpretive problems found in the literature. And I have claimed that other problems raised by the postulation of such a theory can be dealt with naturally in the same context. My argument that such a theory is indeed to be discovered in the sources will make two principal points. First, that the description of Japanese given by kokugaku grammar can be understood only on the recognition that mentalistic goals similar to those of European traditional grammar are being aimed at. Second, that the explicit comparisons of Chinese and Japanese grammar used by the kokugakusha can be properly understood as attempts to define explicitly this mentalistic theory of grammar.

B. The description of Japanese.

1. The divisions of kokugaku grammar.

Observers of the history of Japanese grammatical studies have tried to isolate three strands of thought in its overall development. These are usually called teniwoha, which refers to the study of grammatical particles; katsuyo, which refers to the study of verb and adjective inflection; and bunpō, which means roughly what 'grammar' means in ordinary English. Teniwoha
covers all pre-kokugaku grammar as well as the important early sources of kokugaku grammar such as Seishō's Ayui shō and Kazashi shō, and Norinaga's Kotoba no tama no wo. It reached its apex in these works and did not continue as a serious focus of interest after kokugaku grammar.² Katsuyō covers most of the important later sources of kokugaku grammar, such as Haruniwa's Kotoba no yachimata, and Gimon's Yamaguchi no shiori and Katsugo shinan. It was developed and perfected within kokugaku grammar, and continued to indirectly influence post-kokugaku grammar. Bunpō covers the vast majority of post-kokugaku grammar, but its beginnings are often traced back to the 'parts of speech' studies of Seishō, Akira and Hirokage.

All three strands are, therefore, to be found within kokugaku grammar, and it is the pivotal period for this scheme of development. Bunpō as such had no technical term attached to it by the kokugakusha, though there was a whole treatise devoted to its study (Akira's Gengyo shishu ron). As I shall try to show, it was concerned with grammatical categories as defined semantically and the representation of these categories by the phonological forms of the language. Therefore it is quite analogous to the doctrine of parts of speech in European traditional grammar. Katsuyō, or hataraki as it was often rendered by the kokugakusha,³ is a logical development from the parts of speech theory. The term
means something like 'activity', and characterizes one part of speech in Japanese. It refers to changes in the form of a word depending on its position or function in a sentence, and corresponds well to the study of 'accidence' or inflection in European traditional grammar.

Teniwoha is then what is left, and is predominantly concerned with grammatical relations defined semantically and the representation of these relations by the phonological forms of the language. Actually, because of the historical development of these notions, the term teniwoha is used vaguely and ambiguously. It may mean the study of grammar as a whole, as it did before kokugaku grammar; or it may refer to whatever has not been independently organized at any particular period. It thus corresponds to both 'grammar' and 'syntax' in European traditional grammar.

Under the general heading teniwoha, or syntax, I will discuss the four topics which seem to me most revealing of kokugaku syntactic thought. The first of these is the kire-tsuzuki distinction, referring to verb endings which end a sentence and those which show a dependency on a following noun. I will try to show that underlying this distinction the kokugakusha had discovered the noun-phrasal modifier-head relation. The rule of kakari-musubi, a kind of agreement between
a noun phrase particle and the verb ending in a sentence, is the second topic. I will try to show that underlying this rule the kokugakusha had discovered the subject-predicate relation. The third topic is the case system as reflected by grammatical particles, in other words the structure of verb phrases. This was approached largely from a lexicographical point of view, but there are some interesting points raised. Last is the study of processes which alter these basic relations, namely passives and causatives. Here, too, interesting issues are dealt with.

It should become apparent when we have looked at these matters in some detail, that, as in the case of the parts of speech, accidence and syntax of European traditional grammar, the divisions of kokugaku grammar are no more than different access points to one and the same picture of the structure of Japanese. They constantly overlap each other in describing the same phenomena from different points of view. Naturally, it is the single underlying conception that we are interested in characterizing. The most salient point which emerges is that the semantic categories and relations need not be perfectly represented by the phonological forms of the language. We will return to this point in the next section in greater detail, but it is important even within the description of Japanese, and in spite of
the general claim by the kokugakusha that one variety of
Japanese does represent completely this underlying struc-
ture. It is this two-level conception which most clearly
indicates the mentalistic character of kokugaku grammati-
cal theory.

2. Kokugaku syntax.

a. The noun-modifier relation. In the Kotoba no
tama no wo, Norinaga distinguishes between two forms of
inflected words, which he calls kiruru kaku and tsuzuku
kaku, which we may translate as 'breaking form' and
'joining form', respectively.

In any question of grammar, one should first
of all be aware of the distinction between a 'break-
ing' and a 'joining'. If we look at the examples
-nu, -tsu, -ru, and -nuru, -tsuru, -ruru mentioned
above, the -nu, -tsu, and -ru of expressions like:
hana sakinu
'Flowers blossomed.'
uguisu nakitsu
'A nightingale sang.'
momijiba nagaru
'Red leaves are floating by.'
are 'breaking' teniwoha. If on the other hand, we
say:
sakurabana chirinuru kaze no...
'Of the wind by which the cherry blossoms
were scattered,'
uguisu no nakitsuru eda wo...
'The branch on which a nightingale sang.'
momijiba no nagaruru kawa ni...
'By the river in which red leaves are floating by.'
then, since in forms like chirinuru kaze, nakitsuru eda, and nagaruru kawa there is a 'joining' to the right, the -nuru, -tsuru, and -ruru are 'joining' teniwoha. Expressions chirinu kaze, nakitsu eda, and nagaru kawa are difficult to 'join'. Further, if we say:

hana chirinuru
uguisu nakitsuru
momijiba nagaruru,
we understand that the sentences are not 'broken'. Thus, to think that one may 'break' a sentence by saying -nuru, -tsuru, -ruru, and the like, is a modern-day error. I will speak about this in greater detail below. 5

It should be clear from Norinaga's examples, that kiru 'breaks' can be taken to mean 'end a main clause', and tsuzuku 'joins' to mean 'end a clause subordinate to the following noun'. This use of the 'joining' form is in fact a major device in literary Japanese for sub-ordination, including both relative clauses, as here, and noun complements. Attributive adjectives also appear in a 'joining' form. The kiruru kaku and tsuzuku kaku are two of the inflected forms which compose the katsuyo system, and are therefore usually discussed in that context. Seishô's remarks in the Ayui shô fall in that category, and are moreover nothing but a passing notice. Still, they are of some interest. His term for kiruru
kaku is sue 'ended', and for tsuzuku kaku, either hiki 'pulled' or nabiki 'bent'.

In the colloquial language, it has become the custom to drop the sue and say only the nabiki form. On account of this, those ayui which take a preceding sue [in the literary language] all take a preceding nabiki in the colloquial language.

Those ayui which take both a preceding sue and a preceding hiki or nabiki, normally take a sue, and whenever a hiki or nabiki precedes, the meaning is as if a noun following the hiki or nabiki has been deleted. Understanding this, the colloquial language adds the word no to hiki and nabiki forms. No stands for a noun. For example, with the ayui to, which takes both a preceding sue and a preceding hiki or nabiki, when it takes a sue as in

hito ku to

'a man is coming',

this may be rendered

hito ga kuru to

in the colloquial language. And when it takes a nabiki as in

kokoro no kuru to

'it is my love',

this may be rendered

kokoro ga kuru no to

'it is the one I love'

in the colloquial language. This is because we understand it as if the noun hito in

kokoro ga kuru hito to

'it is the person I love'

had been deleted.
[The ayui wa], when it takes a preceding hiki or nabiki, may be rendered no wa in the colloquial language. (For example
iu wa
'what [he] says'
wabishiki wa
'that [he] is miserable'
[correspond to
iu no wa
wabishii no wa]).\footnote{11}

These passages will perhaps illustrate the different approaches to grammar of Norinaga and Seishō. The first serves to explain Norinaga's last comment by stripping away some of his prescriptivism. One of the principal syntactic changes from literary to modern Japanese is the coalescence of the two forms we have been looking at. The interesting point is that it was the tsuzuku kaku, seemingly the marked and specialized member, which predominated as Seishō points out. That this was a syntactic change and not merely phonological is shown by co-occurring changes, notably that of the particle ga from a genitive to a subject marker.\footnote{12} It is no doubt also related to the change Seishō notes in the second and third passages. Here Seishō is discussing the uses of ayui, or those teni-woha which follow the words they relate to, and his remarks are made relevant to that focus of interest.

The other issue of interest raised in the latter two passages is the complement forming function of the tsuzuku
kaku, or hiki-nabiki. Seishō explains the first case by supplying a suitable noun which might have been deleted from the construction. In the second case, the head noun is completely abstract, and as far as I know, no existing noun could be inserted which would preserve the full range of meaning of the two expressions. This is quite consistent in Seishō's analysis, since wa cannot take a preceding suke. He doesn't discuss this second type in general, but he clearly recognizes its existence.

In the Kotoba no yachimata, Haruniwa gives a definition of kiruru kaku and tsuzuku kaku which is closely modelled on his father's. But he brings up another new point:

All words called 'joining words' are 'joined' to nouns. However, words which 'join' to other verbs or adjectives have a different form, and ordinarily are not called 'joining words'.¹³

This further integrates the tsuzuku kaku into the katsuyō system. The other form referred to has uses in conjoining clauses, and in forming compound verbs. In any case, it indicates a completely different relation between words than does Norinaga's tsuzuku kaku. Eventually a new terminology was developed by Gimon which called these two katsuyō forms rentaigen 'the form leading into nouns' and renyōgen 'the form leading into verbs' respectively. These names persist in the modern grammar of literary Japanese.
There are three aspects of this analysis which seem to me to show that the relation implied in the *tsuzuku kaku* is a basically semantic one which the *kokugakusha* are trying to relate to surface representation. The first of these is the existence of verbs which do not mark the *kiruru kaku-tsuzuku kaku* distinction.

Norinaga says:

Moreover there are words which may equally be a 'breaking' or a 'joining'. The *-ku, -su, -tsu, -u*, and *-ru* of *kiku, nasu, matsu, iu*, and *shiru, or -n, -ran* and *-nan* are such cases. Depending on the arrangement of the words, they either 'break' or 'join'.

The cases of this phenomenon are by no means a small minority of inflected words. Moreover, it is a property of general inflectional classes. Yet Norinaga still recognizes a 'breaking' or 'joining', as the case may be. He is talking about an abstract relation of some sort, which is independent of any overt surface realization.

More interesting still are the diachronic facts brought out so clearly by Seishō. Norinaga's puristic approach has prevented him from taking these into account, but Seishō's handling of them is quite consistent with his analysis as well. The neutralization of one surface distinction has created another surface distinction, namely the insertion (or retention) of a 'dummy noun' in cases where ambiguity or confusion might arise.
with a hiki or nabiki form. Seishō attributes this change to a sort of Sprachgefühl which is somehow able to pick out such cases. His frame of reference is always the meaning of the expression in question, and it seems quite clear that the relationships on that level remain constant, however radically their overt representations may shift.

The third important piece of evidence concerns certain well-defined cases in which the tsuzuku kaku of a verb or adjective loses its 'joining' function and takes on the 'breaking' function. This is one instance of the kakari-musubi rule, which we will soon look at in more detail. Its relevance here is that it shows again how the underlying relation is independent of the surface representation. This time we have the tsuzuku kaku representation without the 'joining' relation, and the discrepancy is attributable to a syntactic rule of agreement instead of morphological neutralization.

These three aspects of the kokugaku analysis show conclusively that the kokugakusha were not simply describing a surface regularity of Japanese. They were not, in other words, applying any naive form of structuralism. This is not to claim that the facts they discussed are beyond description by a sophisticated variety of structuralism. It would have been a striking coincidence indeed if they had happened to hit upon any crucial facts
which showed structuralism to be fundamentally inadequate. Thus the first case of neutralization could likely be taken care of by a distributional analysis such as Zellig Harris (1951) has proposed. The third case would require more involved techniques, but could probably be done. The diachronic facts would pose a real problem, but a convinced structuralist would probably deny responsibility for handling them.

The point I wish to make, which applies equally to similar remarks below, is that the kokugakusha are in fact treating these phenomena as parts of a description of Japanese quite like European traditional grammars. The question they are implicitly, perhaps, answering is 'How are the meanings of sentences reflected in their phonological form?' Behind this question, there must have been independent notions of semantic and phonetic elements. This is clearly the only way to understand the quoted passages. The issue of whether a structural grammar is possible could not be less relevant to the analysis which they contain.

It seems to me that what is involved in the tsuzuku kaku, nabiki or rentaigen is in fact what we now describe as the grammatical relation which obtains within a noun phrase between the head noun and an embedded clause. The analysis given by Norinaga and accepted by the other kokugakusha, however, is somewhat different from this. It
is taken to be a relation between a verb or adjective and a noun, rather than between a clause and a noun. It is of course the case that clauses and verbs stand in a one-to-one relation to each other, so that the difference might not be serious. But we look in vain for any deciding evidence in kokugaku grammar.

While, as I have argued above, Norinaga's treatment is not based on surface phenomena, it is clearly influenced by them; in this case, by the contiguity of the verb or adjective and the noun in question, and by the type of mark which appears. In a deeper sense, it is quite likely there is a fundamental connection between the order 'clause followed by noun', the verb-final order of clauses, and the marking rule within the Japanese language, a connection which will have to be a part of any theory of grammar. Lacking access to other types of relative clause or complement structures, the kokugakusha have not attained a consciousness of all the possibilities.

A more important difference lies in Norinaga's handling of the two forms in relation to one another. He does not suggest, for example, that there is any process of 'embedding', whether on a performance or an abstract level, relating, say, *uguisu nakitsu* and *uguisu no nakitsuru eda wo* .... While his examples show parallelism where possible, they are clearly not constructed so as to bring
out any syntactic relation between the expressions. For example, the question of noun-identity is not raised by the kokugakusha. Norinaga might have drawn a parallelism something like:

kaze wa hana chirinu
'The flowers were scattered by the wind.'
uguisu wa eda ni nakitsu
'A nightingale sang on a branch.'
momijiba wa kawa ni nagaru
'Red leaves are floating by in the river.'
hana chirinuru kaze no...
uguisu no nakitsuru eda wo...
momijiba no nagaruru kawa ni...

That he does not do so shows that he is not concerned with establishing such a relation between these two sets of cases. Most modern Japanese grammarians would argue that Norinaga is right in this case, and that there is a fundamental difference between relative clauses in European languages and in Japanese, where there is no relative pronoun. The argument would be to the effect that, for example, uguisu no nakitsuru eda should be translated: 'a branch related to which a nightingale sang', where 'related to which' is part of the meaning of nakitsuru, and is indeed that part contributed by the tsuzuku kaku.
The rest of the meaning must be supplied from one's extra-linguistic knowledge.
The important thing to keep in mind here is not that this argument based on the absence of a pronoun is wrong, though I think that could be argued. Rather, it is that we must not interpret Norinaga, or any of the other kokugaku grammarians, as taking a stand on this issue, or similar ones, where no evidence that there was any recognition of the different possibilities is available. Thus we should not say that Norinaga originated the argument from the absence of a relative pronoun. Neither should we say that Seishō, who is willing to assume deleted nouns in some cases, would necessarily have accepted the deletion of an identical noun for relative clause formation. Norinaga's examples are not inconsistent with my claim that he is describing the noun-modifier relation in some way. Neither do Seishō's remarks save kokugaku grammar from the verdict of having missed some basic syntactic facts, which they might have used to elaborate a more sophisticated analysis.

b. The subject-predicate relation. Another syntactic phenomenon to be closely scrutinized by kokugaku grammar was the rule of kakari-musubi, to which Norinaga's chart Teniwoha hinokagami and treatise Kotoba no tama no wo are principally devoted. There is a form of verbs and adjectives which is normally used to end a sentence. Norinaga, as we have seen, calls this form kiruru kaku. In the normal case this form is used as a musubi, or
'binding':

**Musubi** means the conclusion of an utterance. Not only at the end of a poem, but of any sentence, any 'breaking' of a word forms such a conclusion, and becomes the 'binding' for a preceding **teniwoha**. However, certain **teniwoha** require other forms as their **musubi**. There are three classes of **teniwoha** in all, and the **Teniwoha himokagami** shows in tabular form which **teniwoha** take which forms as **musubi**.

In the right-hand column of the **Himokagami** are the **musubi** forms governed by **wa**, **no** and **tada**. In the center column are those governed by **zo**, **no**, **ya**, and **nani**. In the left-hand column are those governed by **koso**. Thus, as I have said above, those in the right-hand column are all the 'breaking' forms, and therefore no difficulty arises in making them **musubi**. However, although those in the center column are the joining forms, they become the **musubi** of **zo**, **yo** and **nani**. Since this fact may raise doubts in the uninitiated, I will illustrate it in detail now.

The form governed by **koso** is another member of the **katsuyo** system, distinct from the **kiruru** **kaku** and **tsuzuku** **kaku**. It is also different from the **renyogen** noted above by Haruniwa.

All the **teniwoha** which may be the **musubi** of **koso**, when there is no **koso** preceding and they 'break', usually indicate a command (the so-called 'abrupt command'). However, when related to a **koso**, they are no longer command **teniwoha**. (Expressions
like

omoe 'think!!'
yuke 'go!!'

when no koso precedes, mean a command; with a koso they do not.) Again, if there is no koso preceding and they 'join' to other words, they always 'join' to the teniwoha ba or do.
yokereba 'since [it] is good'
ashikereba 'since [it] is bad'
yokeredo 'though [it] is good'
ashikeredo 'though [it] is bad'

and

iishikaba 'since [he] said [it]'
kikishikaba 'since [he] heard [it]'
iishikado 'though [he] said [it]'
kikishikado 'though [he] heard [it]'

and

omowamedo 'though [he] may think'
yukamedo 'though [he] may go'

are such cases. -Kere, -shika, and -me are all musubi teniwoha of koso. The others are all to be regarded analogously, and there are no exceptions. 17

The hundreds of pages of the Kotoba no tama no wo amply illustrate these phenomena with thousands of poems. That data is difficult to summarize, and I will borrow some examples from Yanada (1950). 18 Norinaga is talking about paradigms like:

ha otsu 'Leaves are falling'
ha wa otsu 'Leaves are falling' (or 'The leaves are falling')
ha no otsu 'Leaves are also falling'
ha zo otsuru 'Leaves are falling!'
ha no otsuru 'the falling of leaves'
ha ya otsuru 'Are leaves falling?'
nani otsuru 'What is falling?'
ha koso otsure 'Leaves are falling!!'

The first point raised by these examples is the lack of a preceding teniwoha in the first of them. This is an example of tada 'ordinary [use]' as Norinaga explains:

Tada is a convenient term for cases where there is no wa, no, zo, no, ya, nani or koso.19

It thus indicates merely the absence of one of the other teniwoha which governs a particular musubi.

Neither is there any particle in the seventh example. The word nani, by which Norinaga refers to this case, is an interrogative pronoun. Norinaga expands this:

Because nani 'what?', nado 'why?', nazo 'why?', tare 'who?', taga 'whose?', ikani 'how?', ikade 'how?', izure 'which?', izura 'where?', itsu 'when?', and iku 'how much?' all govern the same teniwoha, I group them together into the nani class. (By and large whenever I mention nani in this book, it should be understood to include all the members of this class.)20

These words participate in the kakari-musubi rule only when they have an interrogative sense. They regularly also have an indefinite sense, and in such a case do not govern a 'joining' form as musubi.
These are not the only cases of 'classes' used by Norinaga. The teniwoha ka, also an interrogative particle, goes with ya, and governs the same class of musubi. The teniwoha ga, also a genitive particle, goes with no and governs the same class of musubi. And the teniwoha namu, also an emphatic particle, goes with zo and governs the same class of musubi. In the last case, Norinaga notes that namu does not occur often in poems, but is characteristic, instead, of prose. Thus the names wa, mo, tada, zo, no, ya, nani, and koso are abstract technical terms which may cover not only the teniwoha whose phonological form is used, but a class of teniwoha having some similarity to one another.

A slightly different question arises with the fifth example. It is in fact not a sentence but a noun phrase, as the translation indicates. However, such noun phrases are often found in Japanese poetry with an exclamatory force, and this is the usage which Norinaga has in mind. Strictly speaking, then, the occurrence of the tsuzuaku kaku here is not due to government by no (or ga as the case may be), but rather to the complement function of the whole clause. This is a mistake, or rather a failure to note an important distinction, in Norinaga's analysis, and has been so recognized by later scholars. I will not, therefore include these cases in my examination of the analysis.
There is one other revealing remark which Norinaga makes:

However, among the three [musubi] changes, the rule which fixes the musubi of zo, [no], ya, nani and koso as the center and left-hand columns of the Himokagami respectively is haphazard and difficult to apply in the other cases. The musubi of wa, no, and tada, while excluding the center and left-hand columns, need not necessarily be a member of the right-hand column according to the rule, but may be a teniwoha, or any of a number of other things. Therefore, my rule that these must always take the right-hand column applies only when some member of the three columns is present. This is because the opposition with Zo, No, Ya, Nani and Koso is fixed in such cases.

One of the 'other' cases referred to is nominal sentences, like those with no mentioned above, but where the word following no is not a verb or adjective, and therefore may not show any musubi change.

As is clear from this remark, Norinaga looks upon the relation he has formulated as obtaining in every main clause, although the rule changing verb and adjective endings will not apply in every case. He has attempted to find a comprehensive system of surface representation for what he takes to be the fundamental semantic fact of predication, and as we shall see in section C of this chapter, claims that such a surface system is one of the glories of the Japanese language. In the opening words
of the Kotoba no tama no wo,

Since the age of the gods, there has existed
the teniwoha to organize and complete the infinity
of sentences with a rule to bring agreement between
the beginning and the end. Norinaga in fact identifies the rule of kakari-musubi
with the teniwoha in the sense of 'grammatical structure'.

Norinaga's analysis of the kakari-musubi rule is
full of the same kind of mentalistic evidence which we
saw for the tsuzuku kaku above. The fact that he employs
a zero term in opposition is a striking example. Notice
he would not, on strict distributional grounds, have to
include wa and mo in the first group of teniwoha; when
they occur, it could just as well be a case of tada.
But the semantic and syntactic analysis of these parti-
cles which Norinaga, apparently intuitively, appreciates,
shows that this is the correct treatment. Again in
the case of the nani group there is a crucial dependence
on semantic judgments not represented on the surface.

What seems to me the most revealing instance of all
is his remark about those verbs and adjectives which do
not distinguish a kiruru kaku and tsuzuku kaku.

Moreover there are words for which the musubi
for wa, mo, and tada do not differ from the musubi
for ze, no, ya, and nani. These are the same
words which I mentioned above as having one and the
same form for 'breaking' and for 'joining'. There-
fore, those words which change between the 'breaking'
and the 'joining' form also change the arrangement of their teniwoha [according to the rule]. Those words which have the same form for 'breaking' and 'joining' also have the same arrangement of their teniwoha. Surely no one can dispute the awesome regularity of the spirit of language.  

What he shows here is that the change induced by the kakari-musubi rule goes much deeper than a simple phonological change. The musubi for zo, ya and nani are syntactically (he would say semantically) affected as well.

Norinaga's treatment of this phenomenon was so exhaustive that later kokugakusha had little of substance to add. The most important gap he left concerns the governing teniwoha, wa, mo, zo, ya, nani and koso. He treats them as a group, but says little about what else they have in common. He has no technical term to refer to them, but uses the verb kakaru, 'depend' or 'relate', to describe their governing action. On that basis a later and minor kokugakusha, Hagiwara Hiromichi, called them kakari teniwoha, and attempted to explain them semantically.

Hiromichi's explanation is not very interesting, but it apparently influenced Yamada Yoshio, who finally made explicit what Norinaga seems to have been driving at. He has a class of kakari particles which includes the above, except for nani, which he regards as a case of
the deletion of an interrogative particle such as ka.

Not only verbs or adjectives as predicate words, but also nouns and other words, whether the predicate verb or adjective has been deleted, or a particle added, all these things may serve to cut off the intonation pattern of a sentence. Because of this, anything related to the musubi at the same time expresses something related to the predication element of a sentence. Therefore calling these kakari particles brings out clearly the fact that they are related to this predication element. In my interpretation, because the so-called kakari particles influence the predication, those words which are their musubi become the predicate words. Only in this way does the true nature of kakari-musubi become clear, and we can avoid the mistake of putting the cart before the horse.\footnote{27}

What Yamada calls 'putting the cart before the horse' is worrying about the surface facts at the expense of the inner relations, like predication.\footnote{28} In Chapter III we will come back to look at this in more detail, and point out the differences between Yamada and Norinaga. Here I would stress only the similarity of overall conclusions.

It seems to me that there is something fundamental about clause structure reflected by the syntactic phenomenon we have been examining second-hand. I have associated it with the subject-predicate relation because that relation is taken to be the fundamental something about
clause structure in European traditional grammar. There are two important differences which must be brought out, however. Obviously, the rule can't apply to subordinate clauses containing the tsuzuku kaku as described above, and Norinaga's clear restriction of the kakari-musubi relation to the sentence level recognizes this. Therefore Yamada's interpretation of the relation as predication is apt, since relative clauses, attributive adjectives and noun complements do not involve predication.\textsuperscript{29} But they clearly do involve a subject-predicate relation. Secondly, the kakari teniwoha may be joined to any noun phrase in the sentence, without restriction to agents or other such semantic categories. Thus if we were to look at English translations of such sentences, the noun phrase which contains the kakari teniwoha, and is presumably directly related to the musubi, may correspond to the subject, the object, or any of a number of adverbial noun types. This looks more like a topic-comment relation than a subject-predicate relation.

The problem of whether a subject-predicate relation in the European sense exists in Japanese probably occupies more pages of modern Japanese grammatical discussion than any other single topic. As in the case of the relative clause controversy mentioned above, any attempt to solve it would be far beyond the scope of this essay. As I emphasized before, we must not interpret Norinaga as
having taken any kind of stand on it, because the facts on which the issue is based were not known to him. Yamada, on the other hand, was quite well aware of what is involved, and certainly did take a stand as we shall see later. It does seem to me, nevertheless, that these three phenomena, namely the subject-predicate relation, predication, and the topic-comment relation, may very well be intimately interconnected at some level. If so, then the analyses of the kokugakusha as well as those of later grammarians like Yamada may have something important to contribute to an explication of that interconnection.

c. The structure of verb phrases. Aside from the two general areas just discussed, the kokugakusha had little to say about the structure of sentences. Again one can undoubtedly understand this as a reflection of what is going on in Japanese surface structure. Their attention was naturally drawn to certain surface phenomena as related to semantics, and it is a fact that the notion 'object of a verb', for example, is not superficially clear in Japanese. Things are not much better with the other topics touched on here. While the surface representation of locatives and directionals are not particularly difficult, they seem to be attributable entirely to the semantic content of the teniwoha involved. The only kokugakusha to give them much attention
was Seishō, and his treatment is far from satisfying.
The means of expressing these ideas is another class of
post-nominal particles, called by modern grammarians
'case particles'. Wo, ni and e, among others, fall in
this class.

Wo is a particle which may mark the direct object
of verbs. Seishō says about it in the Ayui shō:

Generally, wo in ancient times was a word
which expressed emotion. In later times the ayui
wo ya has retained a similar meaning. In the ex-
pression

ureshiki kana ya, nani nani wo

'is nani nani not a happy thing?'
it reflects the older usage. The 'heavy wo' which
follows is also close to this sense.

NANI Wo: (nani may be a noun, a kazashi, an ayui,
a hiki or nabiki. In the Nara period, a kishikata
could also precede: oi wo sereru; ői wo yasumi. Since
the Heian period this is rarely seen.) There
are two types. The first is called 'light wo'.
In the expressions kore wo, sore wo, there can be
no difficulty, and I give no example poems. However,
when following a hiki or nabiki, it may also be
rendered no wo in the colloquial language. The dif-
ference between expressions with and without wo
is known, and I omit it here.

Seishō goes on to the other type of wo, which he
calls 'heavy wo', and which is not a case particle, but
a clause conjunction. He then discusses special types
of constructions with wo and combinations of it with other
particles, such as *mono wo*, and *wo ba*. This is the structure of a typical entry of the *Ayui shō*, and illustrates the general nature of the book. The last remark refers to an interesting fact, which is discussed in the corresponding place in the earlier manuscript version of the *Ayui shō*:

Someone may ask if there is a difference in meaning according to the presence of *wo*, as in

*hana miru*   'see flowers'
*tsuki miru*   'see the moon'

and

*hana wo miru*   'see flowers'
*tsuki wo miru*   'see the moon'.

I answer that there is a difference. With the *wo* present it is as if to say

*hana wo shimo miru*   'the same, with contrastive stress on *hana* or *tsuki*.'

*Wo* doesn't always have this stronger sense, but only when in contrast with its absence. For example, to say

*sake nomu*       'drink sake'
*fumi miru*       'read a letter'

the absence of *wo* is normal. This is because *sake* is brewed to be drunk, and letters are written to be read. However, in unexpected circumstances, if

*(wazurai hito no) sake wo nomu*   '(a sick person) drinks sake',

or

*(me naki hito no) fumi wo yomu*   '(a blind man) reads a letter',

then the use of *wo* is normal. Moreover, we may say *sake nomu*, but not

*sake kōsu*       'freeze sake',
because there is no reason to do this. Similarly, we may say fumi miru, but not fumi yarisutsu 'tear up a letter and throw it away'.

I shall cite two more examples of the sort of information Seishō presents concerning these particles. In the entry for ni, following the syntactic notation, he says:

'Nani ni', 'kore ni' and so on are the same in the colloquial language. They are expressions which locate a thing in a place. Strictly speaking, the colloquial language follows places and directions with e (see the e entry for details). The colloquial language has de for nite. Further, when following a hiki or nabiki, depending on the poem, no as in no ni may have to be supplied in the colloquial language version. I give no example poems.

Under e, he says:

[E means] not yet arrived in a place, and going toward it. E means the same as the graph 方 [kata] and when the word yukue ['future!'] is written with that graph in the Manyōshū, that is the meaning. This word is also used in the colloquial language. However, 'nani ni' and 'nani e' must be distinguished. Kyōto people, even in cases where 'nani ni' is proper, say only 'nani e'. Country people often say 'nani ni' where 'nani e' is proper. Both of these differ from the standard, but of the two, the Kyōto system is a late development. On the other hand, is not the country system what was said in the colloquial language even in
ancient times? In the reading of Chinese texts
also, 'nani e' is not found, but only
higashi ni nagaru 'flow east'
nishi ni yuku 'go west'
In the colloquial language, this would be 'nan no
kata e', 'nani sama e'.

As should be obvious from these examples, Seishō's
books are compendia of facts about Japanese. His prin-
cipal topic is the teniwoha (which he divides into ayui
and kazashi, and the inflectional system of yosoi or verbs
and adjectives) of the poetic literary language, but he
constantly brings in material from the spoken language
of his time, other styles of the literary language, the
older texts, kanbun, dialects, and diachronic facts
where he finds them. This material is always treated in
terms of the relation between sound and meaning; some
contrast in this relation from poetic literary Japanese
to some other form of the language is usually the point.
It is important to realize that, even in the case of the
colloquial glosses, this material is not mainly intended
to make the examples intelligible, or even to allow them
to be used as models. Rather it seems clearly discussed
for its intrinsic interest as grammatical data.

Seishō recognizes an extremely complex set of rela-
tions between sounds and meanings. He is willing to
assume deletion, as in the wa case quoted before; inser-
tion, as with the change in the use of hiki and nabiki
forms between literary and colloquial Japanese; and the relevance of specific extralinguistic knowledge to grammatical phenomena, as in the second remark about うo. If we look at the Ayui shō and Kazashi shō as wholes, and as contributions to the larger project Seishō was engaged in, the significance of these details becomes clear. There is a complex metalanguage involved, as well as several non-grammatical aspects of the general theory of literary expression, so that I cannot document very much here. Fortunately, Takeoka Masao, in his studies of Seishō, has worked the system out at length, and I shall confine myself to summarizing his findings briefly.

Seishō assumes an abstract level of semantics at which lexical items are the units. He further assumes a concrete level of actual utterances. The difference between the two levels is just the teniwoha as a grammatical system, including the ayui, the kazashi and the katsuyō, as we shall see when that is discussed. In other words, among the things not represented on the abstract level are oblique clause types, such as questions, imperatives, and subordinate clauses of various kinds; affective elements, such as exclamation; case relationships, as discussed above; pronouns; tenses; aspects; and many other 'grammatical' features. All
these things are taken by Seishō to be a sort of performance accretion to language.

The material in the books, which consists of such accretions, is arranged according to how it fits into this picture. Each entry, such as the one for みて described above, covers a number of surface forms which are in some way taken to be variants of each other. The entries are arranged by reference to semantic categories and surface relationships, and integrated into the system as a whole. The interesting details that come out in the discussion, then, show how the abstract level and the utterance level are to be related. Much of the semantic intuition brought in, however, is not relevant on the abstract level, and must be 'contained' in the teniwoha, as in fact we see from the quoted passages. The thing that renders this descriptive technique less than satisfying is Seishō’s tendency to pass over the basic relations in favor of the less significant details. He defines に and が, though rather vaguely; he makes no attempt to define みて. It is not difficult to appreciate why this is so, but it does reflect an inherent weakness of his approach.

Another treatment of verb phrase structure (and also noun phrase structure) is that of Haruniwa in the last volume of his Kotoba no kayoji. The section is called Teniwoha no kakaru tokoro no koto, 'Relations of
the teniwoha', where 'relation' is an extension of kakaru in his father's sense. Haruniwa analyzes one hundred and nineteen poems in these terms. To take a simple example:

Sumizome no

kimi ga tamoto wa kumo nare ya

taezū namida no ame to nomi furu. 40

'Is it because the sleeve of your mourning robe is a cloud that your tears fall ceaselessly like the rain?'

The relations are shown by the lines drawn between the teniwoha and the words to which they are related. The line — is a contiguous relation; the line ∥ shows relations between separated phrases; underlined teniwoha participate in the kakari-musubi rule. Two other notations not illustrated here are also used. The line (which is on the left in the usual Japanese top-to-bottom orthography) shows a relation where the order is reversed, and the line | (horizontal in the usual orthography) shows a 'breaking', or the internal end of a sentence. The relations shown are modifier-head relations in the respective phrases. With the addition
of labels and a few other refinements, tree diagrams could be reconstructed from these analyses.

As I pointed out above with the tsuzuki kaku, the relation shown here is not taken to be that of a clause or phrase to a word which it modifies, but rather of the teniwoha at the end of the clause or phrase to that word. This is clear from the way the lines are drawn. To reconstruct the structure of the poem, we must draw a different sort of diagram:

```
Sno  kimiga  Twa  Knareya  Tzu  Nno  Ato  nomi  F
```

where capital letters represent lexical items, teniwoha are written in full with small letters, and each branching node represents a phrase in which the branch or branches to the left are each modifying the rightmost branch. We may gloss the terminal elements as follows:

- Sno       'of the mourning robe'
- kimi ga  'your'
Twa 'sleeve'
Knare ya 'because [it] is a cloud?'
Tzu 'ceaselessly'
Nno 'tears'
Ato 'like the rain'
nomi 'only'

This is not, it seems to me, an unreasonable interpretation of the claims made by Haruniwa's diagram about the relations obtaining in this poem. We must ask, however, what significance these relations have. It is clear first of all that this is a kind of surface structure, although Haruniwa seems to be trying to describe semantic facts. But much more crucially, there is no evidence for assuming that these 'relationships' have anything to do with a psychological theory of language. They seem to be no more than an interesting notation for textual analysis. As such, they don't have much claim on our attention. These diagrams were used by other kokugakusha notably Hagiwara Hiromichi, following Haruniwa's lead; but as far as I know, only in this restricted analytical function.

It seems as if the elements of a reasonable conception of sentence structure are there in the descriptive techniques which Seishō brings to bear, and in the diagrammatic experiment of Haruniwa and others. We might have
expected their syntheses to have been catalyzed by the extremely interesting treatment of predication by Morinaga that we examined from two points of view above. That reaction never took place, however.

d. Passives and causatives, transitives and intransitives. Our consideration of kokugaku syntax will conclude with a look at another section of Haruniwa's Kotoba no kayoji. This one comprises the first volume, and is called Konata-kanata no koto. It analyzes a distinction in verbs between those which describe a 'self-contained' action (konata) and those which describe action 'stimulated from outside' (kanata). What Haruniwa means by this distinction will be clearer after we look at some examples, but modern grammarians have isolated three separate factors involved, namely transitive and intransitive, passive, and causative. My reason for including this under syntax is that changes in the basic grammatical relations are involved with all these categories. Both Haruniwa and the modern grammarians, in common with European traditional grammar, however, treat the distinctions as a matter of morphology and associated semantics. This means in particular that Haruniwa gives no sentence examples, which is a serious barrier to a valid evaluation of his analysis.

Haruniwa divides the verbs he considers into six classes. The only example he finds of a set of verbs
derived from one base which possesses all six members
is kiku:

Class I: kikoyuru 'be audible, sound'
Class II: kiku 'hear'
Class III: kikasuru 'inform, tell'
Class IV: kikoesasuru 'cause to be audible, cause to sound'
Class V: kikaruru 'be heard'
Class VI: kikaruru 'be heard (by someone)'

The examples are all cited in the tsuzuku kaku, probably because this form shows the difference between the 'conjugations', which is one of the variables which Haruniwa is interested in.41 For this verb, classes V and VI have the same form, but this is not necessarily the case. To take other examples:

I: izuru 'go out'
II: idasu 'put out'
III: --
IV: idasasuru 'cause to put out'
V: ideraruru 'be put out'
VI: idasaruru 'be put out (by someone)'

I: kurushimu 'suffer'
II: kurushimaru 'torment'
III: --
IV: kurushimesasuru 'cause to torment'
V: kurushimaruru 'be tormented'
VI: kurushimeraruru 'be tormented (by someone)'

Haruniwa gives a table of sixty such columns in each of which a group of verbs is entered according to these six classes. The basic meaning of each class is defined as follows:

I: (a) onozukara shikaru 'be of itself'
   (b) mizukara shikasuru 'do by oneself'
II: mono wo shikasuru 'do a thing'
III: ta ni shikasuru 'do by outside agency'
IV: ta ni shikasasuru 'cause to do by outside agency'
V: onozukara shikaseraruru 'be done of itself'
VI: ta ni shikaseraruru 'be done by outside agency'

The main body of the work is a list of example pairs illustrating the konata-kanata distinction. These are classified according to the details of morphological variation. There are four major types: 1) change of conjugation alone; 2) change to a form in -su; 3) change to a form in -ru; and 4) a pair in -su and -ru without
an existing verb related to either by a type 2 or 3 alternation. Type 4 is rare. All four major types are in turn subdivided according to the direction of morphological variation, conjugation changes, and final stem consonants. In all, some fifty-six subtypes are exemplified.

There are some inconsistencies between the table and the body of the work. The two subclasses of class I, which I will call Ia and Ib as above, are kept distinct in the main text, but not in the table. More seriously, some verbs are classified one way in the table, another way in the main text. For example, in the table, *satoru* 'understand' and *satosu* 'advise, persuade' are put into classes II and III, respectively. In the main text, they are put into classes Ia and II, respectively. Furthermore, the main text concentrates on only a small segment of the pairs shown in the table.

Pairs illustrated in the main body of the work are of the following types:

```
  Ia  --  Ib
   ∶   ∶
  II   --   
   ∶   ∶
  III  --  IV
      ∶    ∶
  V    VI
```
where a line connecting two classes shows that at least one such pair is given by Haruniwa to illustrate a konata-kanata alternation. It should be clear from this that konata and kanata are relative terms with respect to these classes. Thus tatsu 'stand' and tatsuru 'erect, set up' form a pair; so, however, do tatsuru and tatesasuru 'cause to erect'.

Later scholars have renamed Haruniwa's classes corresponding to the terminology of European traditional grammar. Thus his classes Ia and Ib are called intransitives, classes II and III transitives, class IV causatives, and class VI passives. Class V is sometimes called jihatsu or the 'spontaneous' form. All verbs alternating within classes I to III involve derivation from one verb to another; that is, the patterns are not productive and the semantic relations are irregular. On the other hand, alternations involving one verb from classes I to III and another from classes IV to VI are productive within certain groups of verbs, and the semantic relations are quite regular. They are therefore sometimes made a part of the verb conjugation. Haruniwa is often criticized for not recognizing this fact, yet it is built into the structure of his analysis, as we have seen. It is true that he seems more interested in the phonological similarities between the two types of alternations.
Both involve the two elements -ru and -su. But the vast majority of his examples illustrate the derived (and irregular) cases. The regular cases are illustrated by only a few example pairs.

Haruniwa's analysis of these alternations between verbs is a paradigm case of traditional grammatical description. It attempts to relate the two levels of semantics and surface phenomena. More importantly, he can be shown to be taking the semantic structure as basic, and classifying what happens on the surface in terms of meaning. In the case of causatives and passives, there are no real discrepancies between the two levels, but with intransitives and transitives there certainly are. To take a simple example, the verbs tsuzuku 'continue' and tsuzukeru 'continue (tr.)' show an alternation of Ia with Ib, while the verbs tokeru 'melt' and toku 'melt (tr.)' show the same alternation with precisely the opposite surface representation. Haruniwa explicitly points this out, and there are many such instances cited. Haruniwa's work is descriptive in the sense of describing the surface manifestations of an autonomous and central semantic system. It is not descriptive in the modern sense of describing surface manifestations as the basic fact of language, with or without footnotes on possible meanings.
The foregoing discussion should suffice to show that syntax as we now understand it was not well developed in kokugaku grammar, any more than it was in European traditional grammar. Yet it is not true to say, in either case, that interesting syntactic problems are not raised, or even not solved. I have gone into these syntactic issues and analyses in greater detail than I shall in the other, quantitatively more impressive parts of kokugaku grammar for two reasons. First, I think the secondary literature has slighted them; second, I think they are better evidence of the theoretical distinction which I am trying to draw than either the katsuyō system, to which we now turn, or even the parts of speech studies.

3. Accidence in kokugaku grammar.

The study of katsuyō, or the inflection of Japanese verbs and adjectives, was really the central problem studied in kokugaku grammar. Every kokugakusha I discuss had something to say about it. We have already had to do with some of the parts of the katsuyō system, but the time has come to outline the whole. I cannot go into much of the great detail to be found in the sources, and will confine myself to the more obvious theoretical implications. As usual, Seishō was the first to use the idea of inflection as a part of a grammatical
system. He uses the various inflected forms of verbs and adjectives in describing the syntactic environments of ayui in the Ayui shō. Therefore in the introduction to that work we find a comprehensive description of the system.

Inflected words in general are called vosoi by Seishō, and are one of his four parts of speech. On criteria of the inflectional changes, he subdivides them into koto, or verbs, and sama, or adjectives, which are further subclassified by still more detailed formal differences. These categories form the vertical columns of a chart called vosoi no kata which is itself the principal illustration of the terminology. The horizontal rows are the individual inflected forms. Seishō has ten names for inflected forms, though they overlap, and no one verb or adjective has more than seven. ⁵¹

The most interesting feature of his analysis is the inclusion of an abstract underlying form, which he calls moto 'base'. This is the verb with the syllable showing inflectional change cut off. ⁵² In the case of one-syllable verbs, where this would result in a zero base, he calls the sue form the base, and terms those verbs 'without sue'. This means, of course, no more than that the base and sue are the same. As we saw before in the discussion of kakari-musubi, there is a
class of verbs for which the sue and nabiki forms are identical. Seishō terms this class 'without nabiki', in like fashion. These terms are used because in the yosoi no kata, the spaces for the relevant forms may be left blank. These two distinctions give Seishō his verb 'conjugations'. There are four of them: 1) without sue, without nabiki; 2) without sue, with nabiki; 3) with sue, without nabiki; and 4) with sue, with nabiki. The classification extends to adjectives also, but does little work in that case.

The use of the underlying 'base' form shows how this fits into Seishō's general theory. On the abstract semantic level, only this 'base' appears. Transforming it into an appropriate inflected form is a part of using it in a real situation. All the terms referring to the classes verb, adjective and so on, as well as the names of the individual forms, are suggestive of a common semantic content of that class or that form. While there is no direct evidence that Seishō meant these terms to have more than mnemonic value, it is very likely, in view of his general theory, that they do. On the other hand, his terms for the verb conjugations are simply descriptions of surface categories, as are the analogous constructs in European traditional grammar.
The weakest part of Seishō's treatment is just his verb 'conjugations'. They are based on an arbitrary selection of formal features, and do not in general prove very revealing. This defect was rectified with a vengeance by Haruniwa in his Kotoba no yachimata, which is principally a study of this very problem. Therefore, while noting the existence of adjectives in his general statement, Haruniwa does not include them in his detailed discussion. The Kotoba no yachimata presupposes not only Seishō's work, but also Norinaga's Mikuni kotoba katsuyō shō and Akira's Katsugo danzoku no fu, and is a kind of synthesis of all three. Whereas the Ayui shō treated the inflectional system as an auxiliary explanation of the teniwoha, Haruniwa reverses this relationship. This technique of listing the various teniwoha which may follow different inflected forms was introduced in the Katsugo danzoku no fu. The Kotoba no yachimata combines it with lists of verbs arranged by stem consonant\(^{53}\) such as Norinaga first gave in the Mikuni kotoba katsuyō shō.

The Kotoba no yachimata then consists of a series of charts, one for each stem consonant, which shows the conjugations which are represented by verbs with that consonant. Haruniwa has four regular conjugations and three irregular conjugations. The regular conjugations are:

I. yodan no hataraki 'four step conjugation'

II. ichidan no hataraki 'one step conjugation'
III. naka nidan no hataraki    'middle two step
conjugation'

IV. shimo nidan no hataraki   'lower two step
conjugation'

Each verb subsumed has three or four forms, which cover
the same ground as those treated by Seishō, except that
no 'base' is given, and the imperative is discussed sepa-
ately, outside this system. The 'steps' referred to
are vowel changes directly following the stem consonant.

For example:

yodan, fuku 'blow'                   ichidan, kiru 'wear'

1 fuka       } ki
2 fuki
3 fuku       } kiru
4 fuku
5 fuke       kire

naka nidan, okuru 'get up'  shimo nidan, uru 'can'

1 oki        } e
2 oki
3 oku        u
4 okuru      uru
5 okure      ure

The naka nidan is called 'center' because of the position
of the vowels i and u with respect to the sequence a i u
e of the usual alphabetical order in Japanese. Similarly,
the shimo nidan is called 'lower' because it uses the
vowels e and u.
Haruniwa has no names for the different functions of the inflected forms (numbered 1 to 5 above). He describes 3, 4, and 5 by terms similar to those we saw in the Kotoba no tama no wo, namely kiruru kotoba, tsuzuku kotoba, and koso no musubi kotoba, respectively. 2, as we also saw before, is distinguished from 4 as joining to inflected words, rather than to nouns. He doesn't say much about 1, except that it cannot be used without some following teniwoha. It is only present among yodan verbs in any case.

The irregular conjugations are those which contain few verbs, and which vary only slightly from one of the regular cases. Haruniwa recognizes three of these, the verb kuru, 'come'; the verb suru, 'do', and its compounds; and the verbs shinuru, 'die', and inuru, 'go away'. He shows advances over his predecessors in using the most general and consistent criteria for classifying conjugations. In fact, his terms are still dominant in Japanese grammar to this day, with a few trivial improvements. His recognition of regular and irregular patterns is particularly original, and shows progress over both Akira and Seishō, who listed each distinct pattern as equally important.

In some other fundamental points, however, Haruniwa has restricted the explanatory power of the system as compared with Seishō's treatment. First, of course, he
has eliminated the 'base' form. Secondly, he takes surface forms, rather than semantic or syntactic functions as the units of inflection. Whenever two of Seishō's forms are phonologically identical, he collapses them into a single form with overlapping distribution of following teniwoha and meaning. Thirdly, he lists the forms as entirely parallel to one another, without trying to exploit the fact that, in the ichidan and nidan cases, forms 4 and 5 are really another form plus -ru or -re.

Differences of this sort don't show conclusively that Haruniwa was merely segmenting and classifying surface representations, but they do indicate that the Kotoba no yachimata, of all the sources of kokugaku grammar, comes closest to being interpretable in those terms. 55

No doubt, given the nature of the problem he was studying, namely the morpho-phonemic categories of verb inflection, this was the best method of attack, and did in fact provide quite satisfactory results. As we have seen in his study of transitives and intransitives, which is really a kind of appendix to the Kotoba no yachimata, he employed psychological methods where they were appropriate.

The work of Gimon supplemented and completed that of Seishō and Haruniwa. While Gimon's main effort, as can be seen from a glance at any of his grammatical books, was to collect and arrange details, particularly irregularities found in the older literature, he also contributed
to the general structure of the description of the katsuyō system. His major work in this area is his resurrection of a system of inflected forms resembling Seishō's. He recognized six of them; as outlined in his Katsugo shinan:

1. Shōzengen. (not yet so) ...It means something in the future. However, this name is only a convenience which singles out one aspect. It could also be called Mizangen. ...To say hana sakaba 'if a flower should bloom'
is to say this before the blooming, but to say hana sakeba 'since a flower has bloomed'
is to say that the blooming has already taken place (this is the Izengen). The two names are in contrast in this sense.

2. Renyōgen. ...It joins one yōgen (inflected word) to another.

3. Setsudangen. (breaks) ...It indicates the end of a sentence.

4. Rentaigen. ...It joins a yōgen (inflected word) to a taigen (uninflected word)...

5. Izengen. (already so) It means something is already done. It stands in opposition to Shōzen or Mizen...Sakaba is 'not yet', sakeba is 'already completed'...

The above five are arranged with Shōzen and Izen at the beginning and end, Renyō and Rentaig next in opposition. In the center is the Setsudan, which completes and governs all words in the sentence, which is a truly mysterious and awesome thing...
6. **Keizugon**. (begs, asks or requests) It is usually called the *gechi no kotoba* (abrupt command). Thinking this term inappropriate, in the *Tomokagami* I called it *Shirei* (command); but this also leaves something to be desired, so in the *Ryakuzu* I again changed its name to *Kezu*... 56

1 to 5 here are the same as 1 to 5 given above for the *Kotoba no yachimata*. Gimon, however, applies this classification regardless of phonological identity of different forms of the same word. Furthermore, he characterizes each form in terms of its meaning or grammatical function. Haruniwa had said of 1 that it could not stand alone; Gimon defines it, and selects a technical term incorporating his definition. Similarly, for 5, Haruniwa had merely described it as the 'musubi of koso'; Gimon defines and names it accordingly. It is clear from his remarks that he took his technical terms and their arrangement very seriously. The terms themselves apply directly to segmentations and classifications of surface representation, but they build in, individually and as a system, the semantic relationships which underly that surface representation. This procedure is typical of Gimon's approach to grammatical description, and shows that he is no neo-Bloomfieldian structural linguist in idea or practice. 57 Still, he did not go so far as to reintroduce
Seishō's 'base' forms or his attempted further analysis of the inflectional endings.

We could go on to investigate interesting facts, particularly diachronic, noted by Gimon about the katsuyō system. However, little of theoretical interest would be raised by such investigation. Seishō's treatment of inflection, as we have seen, is the most suggestive and psychologically oriented. But it is difficult to find concrete use of it in the other kokugakusha. I would like to believe that this is because the issues at that level were already settled. This is made more plausible by the parts-of-speech analyses of Akira, Gimon and Hirokage, to which we now turn. Nevertheless, there is a strong tendency in katsuyō work after Seishō to deal principally with the surface aspects of the phenomenon.

4. The parts of speech in kokugaku grammar.

Seishō is generally recognized as the first scholar to design a part-of-speech classification for Japanese. In so doing, he obviously was aware of previous word classes, like teniwoha, or the yōgen-taigen distinction (inflected versus uninflected words). Before his time, no one had assumed, apparently, that all words could be so classified in an exhaustive system. His part-of-speech analysis appears in the introduction to the Ayui sho for reasons quite similar to those for his analysis of
inflection. And for similar reasons, only a brief sketch appears.

Seishō has four parts of speech, as enumerated in the opening sentences of the Ayui shō:

Our teacher said: by using nouns, we explicate things; by using verbs and adjectives, we determine things; by using kazashi and ayui, we assist expression. Only with all four of these is language possible. 58

The Japanese terms are:

na  'name'
yosoi  'gown'
kazashi  'comb (worn in the hair)'
ayui  'binding cord (decoration on bottom edge of gown)'

Yosoi, as we have seen, refers to the inflected lexical items, verbs and adjectives. Kazashi are those teniwoha which precede the lexical item they modify; ayui those which follow it. Seishō seems to have in mind an involved metaphor with ancient Japanese dress styles, in which the gown was the principal item of apparel, but decoration could be applied at the top with combs, or at the bottom with the string which gathered the lower edge of the gown.

As is pointed out by Nakada Norio and Takeoka Masao, the term na is not a part of this system, and is in fact used ambiguously by Seishō. 59 It may mean: 1) a noun
as a representative of one of the four parts of speech; 2) a semantic category of abstract lexical representations, namely those which correspond to substances; or 3) any abstract lexical item. Type 3 reflects the possibility of using any speech material as a noun. For example, in the metalinguistic sentence "'go' is a verb", when we refer to the lexical item 'go' rather than using it, it always becomes a noun. In the earlier manuscript Ayui shō, na was not yet a part of speech, but used only in senses 2 and 3.

These parts of speech are a basic element of Seishō's linguistic theory. At the abstract level, no such divisions are present. Only when language is used does the different behavior of na and yoso, or uninflected and inflected words, manifest itself. Of course, all teniwoha, whether kazashi or ayui only appear on the performance level. So the part of speech system is something which applies mainly to language used in concrete situations. It is in this context that inflectional properties of teniwoha are considered. Those kazashi which 'resemble nouns' are the pronouns. There are uninflected ayui, namely the noun phrase particles which 'resemble nouns'; there are inflected ayui, namely tense and aspect suffixes and auxiliary verbs and adjectives, which 'resemble yoso'. In this way, Seishō makes this part of speech system the organizing principle of grammar. His katsuyō system is
merely a further elaboration of the behavior of one of the parts of speech.

Most of the vital questions raised by Seishō's treatment cannot be answered because his explicit remarks are so sketchy. Some indications can be gained from a careful consideration of Akira's Gengyo shishu ron, which is entirely devoted to the analysis and characterization of the parts of speech. Akira also recognizes four, but there are two important differences with Seishō found in his treatise. His terms are:

- **tai no kotoba**  
  'noun (equals Seishō's na)'

- **arikata no kotoba**  
  'state word'

- **shiwaza no kotoba**  
  'action word'

- **teniwoha**

He has divided Seishō's yosoi into two parts, adjectives and verbs, and does not distinguish between kazashi and ayui. Since this treatise appears in translation as appendix C below, I will not quote extensively from it here, but merely summarize the evidence which suggests a mentalistic theory behind it.

Two sorts of phenomena are cited by Akira in his discussion of each of the four parts of speech. On the one hand he refers to general semantic properties of words, and on the other to phonological shapes which represent them. In each case, his discussion centers on
the relationship between these two levels. It is clear, however, that he takes the former to be more basic than the latter, and is in fact cataloguing surface correspondences to semantic structure rather than the other way round. For example, he says about nouns that they may end in any of the five vowels. This serves to distinguish the class of nouns from the classes of verbs and adjectives, which do not have this property; but it can never decide whether a particular word is or is not a noun, and thus can never be used to establish the class of nouns. Only if the classes are independently defined is this fact even discoverable. Similarly, he states that nouns are uninflected words, and immediately proceeds to list exceptions, making no attempt to explain them away. Again it is clear that the semantic characterization of nouns, which comes just before these remarks, is considered sufficient to establish the class. Then, surface facts which happen to correlate, if only in a general way, are brought out.

This general structure of exposition is maintained in the other chapters as well. The deciding evidence is always the meaning of the form concerned. We know that words in う are verbs and words in い are adjectives through the existence of related pairs like たのし 'happy' and たのしむ 'rejoice'. We know that words in し and words in じ, although not formally similar in other respects,
belong together as adjectives through the existence of pairs like *ari 'exists'* and *nashi 'does not exist'*, or *yoshi 'good and yokari 'good'* . The examples of verbs and adjectives being used as nouns are also cases in point. Such usages are formally identical to one of the usual inflected forms, and recognizable only in their meaning as a 'name'. Adjectives mean something intermediate between nouns and verbs; that explains why they may be used in some ways which are typical of nouns, such as with no following in *ari no mama* and so on.

The distinction which Akira draws between *teniwoha* and lexical items, which comprise the other three parts of speech is given by metaphor in the famous passage at the beginning of the *teniwoha* chapter. It goes beyond semantics as we usually understand the term, and postulates a fundamental difference in psychological function. As summarized in the final chapter on the origin of language, nouns embody an analysis of the human mind. Verbs and adjectives are composed of both elements. Akira's six classes of *teniwoha* seem to be based on mainly syntactic criteria, and he lists them all. But there is some question as to how he regards these syntactic criteria, whether of a semantic or phonological nature. It seems to me that in fact the former is involved rather than the latter. Among the syntactic criteria used are isolation from other words, which must be apparent mainly
semantically; coming before a lexical item, appearing between lexical items, and following a lexical item. It is clear that mere contiguity is not what is at issue in the case of these criteria of surface order, but rather modification, which is presumably available only through an understanding of the particular sentence. Akira goes even further than this to assign basic meanings to the verb-and-adjective-forming teniwoha in his chapter which deals with verbs and adjectives.

The parts of speech analyses of Seishō and Akira are by no means incompatible with one another. On the contrary, they are quite close on most basic points. Their most obvious differences come when we ask which distinctions are available at the highest level. Seishō takes the order criterion for teniwoha to be active at the highest level, but Akira makes of it a sub-category. Similarly, Akira takes the verb-adjective distinction to be active at the highest level, but Seishō treats it as a sub-category. This discrepancy was resolved by Gimon and Hirokage, who treated both as sub-categories, retaining only three major parts of speech. Gimon's discussion is scattered in various places as notes to other analyses, but Hirokage in his Kotoba no tamahashi gives a useful short summary of the subject as he and Gimon see it:
First of all we must distinguish nouns, inflected words, and teniwoha (...); and further, five types of nouns, six types of inflected words, and five types of teniwoha (these secondary distinctions will be discussed later). To characterize these three: we distinguish all the things of the world with nouns; we determine the actions and states of things with inflected words; and we complete our thoughts concerning things with teniwoha. Since this is the case, even for the colloquial language, in which the three are not harmoniously ordered, there can be no word which is not distinguished as one or the other. Even though the correct distinction of the three parts of speech was discovered only recently by me, it should be kept in mind that it is constant throughout the ages. Since all nouns are sounds which are uttered in relation to distinguished forms of things, their vowels are not caused to vary by outside agency, and we say only, for example:

- tsuki 'moon'
- hana 'flower'
- koto 'thing'
- waza 'affair' (...).

Verbs like:

- salu 'bloom'
- chiru 'be scattered'
- miru 'see'
- iru 'be'
- tozuru 'close'
- hirakuru 'open'
- kuru 'come'
- suru 'do'

or adjectives like:
**yoki** 'good'
**ashiki** 'bad'

are sounds which elaborate on nouns to determine the actions and states of things, and their vowels vary accordingly (...). Teniwoha, as in:

- hana wa sakikeri 'flowers have bloomed'
- mono wo omou kana '[he] thinks about things'

are sounds which interrelate nouns and inflected words, assist them in forming utterances, and complete the expression of our inner thoughts (...). Thus there can be no inflected words if there are no nouns; and without nouns and inflected words, there would be no place to use teniwoha. Further, without the addition of inflected words, nouns cannot be elaborated on; and if teniwoha are not used to relate and assist in the formation of utterances, the expression of the meaning of nouns and inflected words cannot be completed. The clarity of this miraculous and divine distinction will surely be a cause for worship and joy.  

This statement obviously owes a great deal to both Seishō and Akira, in spite of Hirokage's claim of originality. His basic terms are:

- **koto** 'noun'
- **kotoba** 'inflected word'
- **teniwoha**

but koto and kotoba are nothing but na and yosoi with different names. In his further sub-categories, there are some differences with Akira, but only on relatively detailed points. One important innovation of his
treatment is explicit quotation from Chinese works. These are the notes left out in the above quoted passage, and marked by (...). They will be discussed in the next section, since they seem to represent an attempt to find universal aspects of the analysis of the parts of speech.

This concludes my examination of the parts of speech analysis in kokugaku grammar, and with it, of the description of Japanese developed by the kokugakusha whose works I have quoted and referred to. In the next section, we will look in particular at those aspects of kokugaku grammar which suggest that a mentalistic theory involving a use of grammatical universals as well as an independent semantic level was entertained by these scholars. I will postpone a general summary of the descriptive aspects enumerated in the previous pages in order to be able to summarize kokugaku grammatical theory as a whole in the following section.

C. Kokugaku grammar and universal grammar.


Virtually all educated persons in Japan during the period we are dealing with could read literary Chinese; many could also write it, both prose and poetry, and this had been true for centuries. Classical Chinese literature enjoyed high prestige, particularly at this period.
No doubt these facts help explain the interest in Chinese grammar which I noted in section A of this chapter. The kokugakusha were ideologically opposed to this situation; nevertheless, themselves a product of it, they had to attack from within, as it were. One of Norinaga's favorite topics was the inferiority of everything Chinese to everything Japanese. He felt the same way about grammar, and said so clearly in the Kotoba no tama no wo:

Recently some have said that the teniwoha are like Chinese particles. Since this seems to be so, there are many people who believe it. However, though they do resemble one another in some ways, no one who really understands the teniwoha could hold this opinion. The reason is that the Chinese particles lack the harmony of agreement between the beginning and the end [of a sentence], while in the teniwoha there is unmistakable surface evidence of this harmony, the absence of which destroys the proper arrangement of words. Poems and what have you may seem very carelessly done, and in such matters the uninitiated think that poems may be easily written nowadays; however, for all but the most careful poets, the poems are many which are ruined by mistakes [in the use of teniwoha]. To think in this way that teniwoha and Chinese particles are the same, not worrying about the harmony of the beginning and the end, and leaving everything to implicit understanding is to commit a grievous blunder.¹
This is of course an admonition about writing *waka*, but Norinaga's point that Chinese lacks the *kakari-musubi* rule applies generally. The important aspect he brings out here is that the underlying relation between 'the beginning and the end', the semantic reality of predication, topic-comment, or whatever we want to call it, applies equally well in Chinese or in that barbarous form of Japanese which Norinaga himself spoke every day, or in any other conceivable language. In the proper form of Japanese for poetic expression, however, that underlying relationship must be marked on the surface. This is the 'magnificent and wonderful' quality of the *teniwoha* and the Japanese language which employs them.

The same point of view is further developed by Akira in the *Gengyo shishu ron*. Again I refer to the translation which constitutes appendix C below. In the preface to the treatise, he explicitly states that his part of speech system is universal. However, languages may differ in the degree to which the parts of speech are overtly represented in the surface structure. In fact, only Japanese represents them in their pure form. In the chapter on verbs and adjectives, he remarks on the effect of not having those *teniwoha* which form verbs and adjectives. This is the situation in Chinese, and it means that the categories of noun, verb and adjective in that language 'are a matter of meaning only, and not
distinguished in form. This is why, according to Akira, difficulties arise in the interpretation of old Chinese literature, since relevant factors such as tense and mood are left unexpressed. Such problems, of course, never arise in Japanese.

The parallelism between this view of the structure of literary Chinese and that of nineteenth century European linguists such as Humboldt (1827; 1836), Steinthal (1861), and Gabelentz (1881) is striking. It is perhaps worthy of note that Humboldt and Akira were roughly contemporaries. Humboldt at one point took the position that Chinese was a kind of primitive language, but later admitted it as an autonomous language type, with its own peculiar virtues. Akira takes no stand on this issue, but his remarks in the final chapter on the 'origin of language' suggest that such interpretation is but a short step away. Nouns and teniwoha, he says, are the basic elements of language; and these are just what Chinese has, with no extra elaboration. So he could look upon Chinese as a primitive form of expression which has yet to be developed according to the common potential, or he could claim that it possesses a 'purity' of its own, different in nature from that of the Japanese teniwoha system.

A rather different point of view is developed by Hirokage in his discussion of the parts of speech, which
I quoted in the previous section. Apparently, at variance with Norinaga and Akira, he speaks as if the underlying universality of the predication relation and the part of speech system is more important than whether or not it is marked on the surface. In fact, he goes so far as to quote Chinese works in support of his own definitions of the various parts of speech. He quotes from three works: the K'ang hsi dictionary, the Shuo wen chieh tzu,3 and the I hsi tz'yu, a commentary on the I ching or Book of Changes. These three books come from different periods of Chinese history, and deal with different subject matter. Therefore there is some question as to whether the technical terms they use could possibly constitute a single part of speech system as Hirokage claims, or indeed whether he is even close to a real understanding of the passages he refers to. Nevertheless, his intent is clear, I think. He is reinforcing his own position by appeal to Chinese sources, and at the same time stressing the universal side of grammar. All this does not imply, of course, that he is insensitive to the peculiar virtues of the Japanese language.

References to Chinese grammar such as the three we have just examined play only a peripheral role in the entirety of kokugaku grammar. By and large, the kokugakusha were not particularly interested in other languages except in so far as they could be used to
show the superiority of Japanese. While there were Japanese of the period who knew some Sanskrit, and others who were proficient in Portugese and Dutch, apparently these resources were never tapped by the major kokugaku grammarians. The circumstance that their experience was limited to Chinese is both fortunate and unfortunate; fortunate in that there was an obvious gap in the possibilities of surface expression between it and their own language, unfortunate in that little of a constructive nature was suggested by the superficial comparison of the two.

Still, these scattered references to Chinese grammar are quite crucial to a proper appreciation of the grammatical theory with which the kokugakusha were operating. They distinguish quite clearly between those aspects of language which Chinese and Japanese possess in common, namely the basic cognitive structure; and those which Japanese possesses, but which Chinese lacks, namely reflections in phonological representation of certain essential features of those basic cognitive structures. Akira, at least, was prepared to project this into an explicit universal claim about all human language. These universals are not the sort of universals that one can arrive at by performing operations of segmentation and classification on the surface forms of various languages with subsequent extraction of common cross-linguistic
features. Rather, they require the assumption of an autonomous level of semantic organization which cannot necessarily be arrived at from a consideration of surface phenomena alone.⁴

2. Literary and colloquial Japanese.

Not so obvious perhaps as in the case of Chinese, there were also structural differences between literary Japanese and the colloquial language of the period. To these differences the kokugakusha adopted a prescriptive attitude, the force of which varied from simply an attempt to teach the literary language, as with Seishō, to deep ideological and nationalistic implications, as with Norinaga. This situation is unfortunate, since it apparently served to prevent any systematic investigation of the differences. Even Seishō, who constantly brings in explanatory references to the colloquial language of his time, as we have already seen, fails to provide any consideration of the question in general terms.⁵ And no Akira ever came along to confront the more fundamental issues which were involved.

Still, Seishō's observations, Norinaga's admonitions, and even a passage in the Kotoba no yachimata where Haruniwa points out some differences in the verb conjugations between literary and colloquial Japanese,⁶ show that the kokugakusha were perfectly well aware of the range of
structural variation between the two. And in fact, some
of those differences which were noted can serve to rein-
force the conclusions about universals in kokugaku grammar
which we were able to reach on the basis of comparisons
with Chinese. The cases in point are, of course, the
loss of the kire-tsuzuki surface distinction and the
disappearance of the rule of kakari-musubi in colloquial
Japanese. Norinaga condemns both of these, the former in
his definition of kire-tsuzuki which I quoted in the fore-
going section, and the latter just above, when he was
discussing Chinese particles as compared with the teniwoha.
Synchronically he judged it significant that the class
of verbs which do not distinguish a kiruru kaku from a
tsuzuku kaku phonologically also do not distinguish the
musubi of wa, mo and tada from that of zo, no, ya and
nani. He did not go on to appreciate, however, that the
obvious connection between these two phenomena extends
to their joint disappearance in colloquial Japanese.

If Chinese grammar played a peripheral role in koku-
gaku grammar, the grammar of colloquial Japanese (which
did not exist as a systematic description) played virtually
no role at all. The hints that I have mentioned here do
suggest, however, a tendency to look at the differences
between literary and colloquial Japanese in the same light
as those between Chinese and Japanese. As far as this
is the case, it is indeed corroborative evidence for the
theoretical conclusions which I wish to draw.


This chapter has attempted to bring out some of the aspects of kokugaku grammar which are relevant to the determination of the grammatical theory which it put into practice. In the course of presenting this material, I have pointed out particularly facts referred to and analyses offered which show that the kokugaku grammarians were approaching grammatical description and theory construction from a much more comprehensive point of view than the 'descriptive and scientific' linguistics of Hattori and Miller. The argument is quite straightforward, and presumably those who agree with Hattori and Miller would be willing to agree also that the facts and analyses I have singled out do indeed show discrepancies between kokugaku grammar and their version of linguistic theory. They would no doubt claim, however, that no more is thus demonstrated than a failure on the part of kokugaku grammar to be sufficiently 'descriptive' or 'scientific'. Therefore, in reviewing the material covered here, I will concentrate on arguing that the various theoretical points I have mentioned do reflect a coherent whole which is itself more comprehensive in certain senses than the alternative implied.
As I have repeatedly pointed out, the kokugaku grammarians assumed the existence of an autonomous mental organization to which the phonological side of language is related. We may begin our summary by trying to describe that organization as a whole. There exist, first of all, mental entities which represent external things. We may call these entities concepts. These concepts may be grouped into certain classes on the basis of what sort of things they represent, for example, objects, actions, or states. There exists as well a faculty which is able to make use of these concepts. We may call this faculty the mind. The attitudes which it adopts toward the concepts, or the ways in which it makes use of them, may also be grouped into certain classes, for example, emotion, doubt, or assertion. It is noteworthy that the literary Japanese word for a concept, for one of these attitudes of the mind, and for the mind itself, is the same: kokoro. Thus kokoro may have to be translated either 'mind' or 'meaning', depending on the context, and is even more vague than the English word 'meaning'.

We see concepts explicitly mentioned in the 'base' forms of Seishō's treatment of inflection, and in the 'original' nouns of Akira. In Seishō's own equivocal use of the term noun, the third sense is equivalent to 'concept'. The semantic classes of concepts are, of course, what is behind Seishō's part of speech distinction;
one of these classes is his second sense of noun, another
the 'base' form. Direct reference to the mental status
of these classes is made by Akira when he attributes
them to Chinese 'only in the mind'. There are also the
various verbal subcategories of Haruniwa's Kotoba no
kayoiji,10 and noun subcategories like abstract and con-
crete. The semantic categories of the mind's action
upon concepts are most exhaustively found in the classi-
Fication of teniwoha and katsuyo in Seishō's and Gimon's
works respectively. However, certain important omissions
such as predication and modification are raised by Nori-
naga.11 We know these have mental status by the exceptions
and irregularities in their surface representations
which are constantly brought out.

Within this mental structure, the kokugaku grammar-
ians did not clearly distinguish between syntax and
semantics; that is, they apply criteria of a purely sem-
antic nature and criteria of 'grammatical function' quite
indiscriminately. The contrast here is roughly that
between the mental side of Akira's parts of speech, which
hespeaks of in terms of 'names', 'states', and 'actions'
on the one hand; and the mental side of Hirokage's parts
of speech which are defined in terms of concepts, and
'elaborations' on concepts. What Hirokage seems to have
in mind with the term 'elaboration' is the function of
inflected words in the structure of the sentence.12
However, such notions do not form any kind of syntactic system. The only clear references to the sentence as a unit in fact are Norinaga's kakari-musubi rule and this, if my interpretation is correct.

By explicit statement in Akira's case, and strong implication for others, this mental organization is taken to be strictly universal. In particular, the classes of concepts, as determined by given classes of the things they represent, are universal. So are the categories by which the mind handles concepts. What is not universal is the degree to which these classes and categories are reflected in phonological form. As the kokugakusha state again and again, they believe that the phonological elements and their arrangements in Japanese reflect the universal mental classes and categories to a greater degree than is the case in Chinese or any other language. This is the reason why the Japanese language is superior to all others.

The manifestation of these mental phenomena in Japanese is the work of the teniwoha. In contrast to other words, which represent concepts and, by extension, external things, teniwoha have only an indirect connection with concepts. Specifically, they directly symbolize the operations of the mind in relation to concepts. That is the sense in which the position, attributed to Seishō that teniwoha are performance effects, must be taken.
Concepts are presumably contained permanently in the mind, whereas the mind's handling of concepts becomes a reality only when language is actually used in interpersonal communication. And interestingly enough, although the katsuyō system serves to distinguish the major classes of concepts, it does so by marking different ways in which the mind handles these classes of concepts, in other words, by the attachment of teniwoha. ¹⁵

In view of the lack of syntactic elaboration in the mental organization, it seems that the kokugakusha looked to the teniwoha to account for the physical arrangement of phonological material, though this subject is not specifically discussed anywhere that I know of. The syntactic relations between words which we dealt with, predication and modification, are marked with teniwoha. This implies that the relations in question are bestowed by the mind in handling the concepts between which they hold. The act of predicking something of a subject, or attributing something to a noun is then, basically similar to expressing emotion toward a noun or doubting a proposition.

All these direct expressions of mental activity, which are the teniwoha, are not universal however. In particular, Chinese lacks the reflection of predication, of modification, and, according to Akira, of tense and mood. The whole Chinese particle system is 'crude and
imperfect. The kokugakusha don't say whether every such marking is unnecessary, but the example of Chinese suggests they might have gone that far, save the order of words, which presumably cannot be dispensed with. Thus the scope for grammatical variation open to languages, aside from possibly the trivial area of size and range of vocabulary, is tightly restricted. It is just the matter of phonologically marking the concept-handling activity of the mind to a greater or lesser degree.

This picture of kokugaku grammatical theory is of course somewhat oversimplified, both from the side of leaving out some facts or analyses which don't fit well, and from the side of extrapolating into some areas which the kokugakusha paid little attention to. Nevertheless, subject to the considerations raised in section A of this chapter, I think it is a reasonable summary of the theory which animates the study of grammar by the kokugakusha, and is at the same time their most general achievement. It is a mentalistic theory beyond any doubt. In fact, one might argue that the basic distinctions between concept words and teniwoha is really not linguistic at all, but psychological. No difference is ever noted between the mental aspects of language and thought itself.

The texture of this sort of grammatical theory is very similar, it seems to me, to that of other sorts of traditional grammar, in particular European grammar.
Both start with a certain range of phonological linguistic data, and a certain range of intuitions about what this phonological material 'means' and how it 'means' it; in other words, the semantic and phonological 'levels' we have referred to are in a sense intuitively given. On this basis each tries to develop a set of notions which will make the interconnections between the levels comprehensive. This is nothing but a naive version of the linguistic metatheory which I outlined in chapter I. The result of such a program is a linguistic theory with associated descriptions such as those studied here.

*Kokugaku* linguistic theory, in common with the theories developed by other varieties of traditional grammar, suffers principally from the speculative character of its method. It has not developed a sufficiently sophisticated means of evaluating particular analyses, and bringing relevant evidence to bear on problems. Thus, although many promising and suggestive facts and theories are contained in it, its creators and practitioners are unable to distinguish such valuable things from mistakes, misunderstandings, and incomplete analyses of various sorts.

Of course this is to say no more than that they were not as experienced as we are. We can say that traditional grammar is superior to structural grammar if we mean that it is more likely to have given a reasonable analysis
of a particular phenomenon. This is because structural grammar, with its self-imposed restrictions, is able to give no analysis of so many phenomena. On the other hand, structural grammar, for all its faults, has a highly developed idea of what constitutes evidence and proof within its narrow scope. To confuse the two, as Hattori and Miller have done, in the passages I quoted to open this chapter, betrays a basic misunderstanding of kokugaku grammar.
Footnotes to chapter II.

A.

1. Hattori (1960, p. 42); the paper quoted from was written in 1949.

Keichū (1640-1701), Mabuchi (1697-1769), Norinaga (1730-1801) ra wo sendatsu to suru kōgakushatachi no doryoku ni yotte, gengokenkyū ga shidai ni kagakuteki to natte kita ga, sono kenkyū wa shu to shite Nara, Heian jidai no nihongo no kijutsuteki kenkyū no han'i wo dezu, gendaigo wa zokugo to shite sagesumare, kenkyūtaishō to naranai no ga futsū de atta. Hōgen ga chūi sareta no mo omo ni kogo no kaishaku ni yakudataseru tame ni suginai. Karera wa kodai nihongo no bunka wo kenkyū suru koto wo mokuteki to shi, gengo no kenkyū wa daitai ni oite sono shudan ni suginakatta. Shikashi, kenkyūhōhō ga genmitsu datta no de, dokutoku no kijutsubunpō no hōhō ga hattatsu shite kita.


3. A detailed understanding of these passages would require some familiarity with the similar, but by no means identical, linguistic views of their authors. Both, I believe, would consider themselves neo-Bloomfieldian structuralists if the issue were raised.
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4. 'Modern linguistics' for Tokieda means the work of the *Junggrammatiker*, the Saussurean school, or both, as reflected by Japanese scholars who went to Europe between about 1880 and 1930, and who then introduced European ideas into Japanese academic circles.

5. Tokieda (1956, p. 42); no reference is given here to Hoshina's work, but the preface to Hoshina (1934) contains a similar remark.

...ippanteki ni itte, kako no kokugokenkyū ni wa, kindai gengogaku no kadai to suru hikaku-kenkyū mo, rekishi teki kikenkyū mo, hōgenkenkyū mo mitaranai tokoro kara, sono hyōka wa kiwamete hikuku, Hoshina Kōichi wa, 'kako ni okeru waga-kuni no gengokenkyū wa, hotondo konnichi no gengogaku jō ni kōken su beki kekka nashi to itte yokarō to omou' to made kyokugen suru ni itatta.


Kinsei ni okeru kokugokenkyū wa, kokugaku no yōkyū suru tokoro no kodaibunken no kaishaku to, kogoteki hyōgen no tame ni hattatsu shite kita mono de aru. Iwaba kokugokenkyū wa, shūshi, kokugaku ni ison shite, sore jishin dokuritsu shita mokuhyō wo mochienakatta.


...kako ni okeru kokugokenkyū ga, tsune ni nanimono ka no shudan de atta to iu koto wa,
Meiji igo no kokugogakushika wo shite, kako no kokugokenkyū no kagakusei wo utagawaseru ōki na riyū to sareta no de aru ga, sore wa, gaku sono mono no kagakusei to wa mukankei na koto de atte, kokugo wo, sono yō na jitsuyō no ba ni oite kansatsu shita koto ni yotte, mushiro, gyaku ni, kokugo no gutaisō ni me wo hirakaseru koto ga ōkatta to iiuru to shi, koko ni kokugogakushi ni taisuru mattaku aihanshita kachihyōka wo usu koto to natta.

8. See Bloch (1946), Martin (1952) and Jorden (1955).

9. The first Westernized Japanese grammar was Tsurumine Shigenobu's Gogaku shinsho (1833).

10. Minor kokugakusha like Hori Hidenari and Gonda Naosuke were active into the 1880's.


12. See appendix B.

13. This influence can be seen in the order of vowels and consonants in the 'fifty sound table (gojūon zu)!: a i u e o; k s t n h m y r w. See Miki and Fukunaga (1966, pp. 14-5).

14. Shittan is said to be Sanskrit siddham borrowed through Chinese. It refers either to the Sanskrit orthography, or to the language as a whole.
15. See Miki and Fukunaga (1966, pp. 57-62), and Doi (1942).

16. While Japanese and the Indo-European languages hardly have identical structures, they are more similar to each other than either is to Chinese.

17. See appendix B.

18. Seishō was born into the Minagawa family, but as a younger son, he was adopted into the related Fujitani family.


20. Ma (1898), the first Chinese grammar by a Chinese which attempted to apply European traditional grammar to the language.

21. See the discussion of pre-modern Chinese grammar in Chūgokugogaku kenkyūkai (1958, pp. 357-9). The chapter of which this is a part (pp. 293-410) is the most complete history of Chinese linguistics that I have seen. It devotes only three pages to pre-modern grammar. Hiroike (1915) contains a longer bibliography, but is less informative about the items.
22. See appendix B.

23. For example, the *Shuo wen ch'ien tzu*, an early etymological dictionary, or the *K'ang hsi* dictionary. See the references in note 21.

B.

1. See the chapter headings in Saeki, Nakada and Hayashi (1961) or Tanabe (1965).

2. This does not mean that no one has paid any attention to it later. For example, Matsuo (1940) is an attempt to develop the ideas of the *Kotoba no tama no wo* into a complete grammatical system. Such work has never become a major stream of modern grammar, however.

3. The problem here is one of reading Chinese graphs. In the texts, usually there is either 陆 or 话 陆, which may be read either katsu and katsuyō, respectively, or hataraki. Most often the kokugakusha seem to have intended the latter.

4. The word kaku means 'rank' or 'qualification'. It is used here for a particular grammatical function. In modern grammar, it has become specialized as a translation of 'case'.
5. Yoshizawa hakase kanreki kinenkai (1943, pp. 442-3).

Subete no kotobazukai ni, kiruru tokoro to tsuzuku tokoro to no kejime aru koto wo, mazu wakimaeoku beshi. Kore wo ue no kudan ni ieru nu tsu ru to nuru tsuru ruru to no rei nite iwaba 'hana sakinu' 'uguisu nakitsu' 'momijiba nagaru' nado to iu tagui no nu tsu ru wa kiruru kotoba nari. Kore wo 'sakurabana chirinuru kaze no unnun' 'uguisu no nakitsuru eda wo unnun' 'momijiba no nagaruru kawa ni unnun' nado to iu toki wa, 'chirinuru kaze' 'nakitsuru eda' 'nagaruru kawa' to yō ni shita e tsuzukeba, nuru tsuru ruru nado wa tsuzuku kotoba nari. ('chirinuru kaze' 'nakitsuru eda' 'nagaruru kawa' nado wa tsuzukigata-shi. Mata, 'hana chirinuru' 'uguisu nakitsuru' 'momijiba nagaruru' nado iite wa, kotoba kirezu to kokoru beshi. Kaku no gotoku tada ni nuru tsuru ruru to iite mo kiruru gotoku omou wa, kōseijn no higakoto nari. Sono yoshi wa shita ni kuwashiku iu beshi.)

6. The difference between hiki and nabiki is a matter of morphology; whether the syllable indicating the form replaces a syllable of the sue (in the case of the hiki), or is added onto it (in the case of the nabiki).


...satogoto, yosoi no sue wo ushinaite tsune ni nabikashite nomi iu narai to nareri. Kono yue ni, sue wo uketaru ayui ni satogoto wo atsuru ni wa, mina nabikashite ukuru nari.
8. From a poem (Kokinshū 1011):

Ume no hana
mi ni koso kitsure
uguisu no
hito ku hito ku to
itoi shimo oru.

'I came to see the plum blossoms, but the
nightingale cried 'someone is coming!' in
alarm.'

9. From a poem (Goshūi 980):

Koma ni koso
makasetarikere
aya naku mo
kokoro no kuru to
omoikeru kana.

'I let the horse have his head, for somehow
I thought it was my love I saw.'


...Sue wo mo hiki nabiki wo mo ukuru ayui
wa, sue wo ukuru ga tsune nite, hiki nabiki wo
ukuru toki wa, nabiki ni na wo tsugite uku beki
wo habukitaru kokoro nari. Kore wo kokoroete,
hiki nabiki ni 'no' to iu satogoto wo kuwaete
atsu. 'No' moji wo na ni kauru nari. Tatoeba,
'to' to iu ayui, sue wo mo hiki nabiki wo mo
ukuru ni, 'hito ku to' to sue wo uketaru wo ba
'hito ga kuru to' to satoshi, 'kokoro no kuru to'
to nabiki wo uketaru wo ba 'kokoro ga kuru no to'
to satosu. 'Kokoro no kuru hito to' to iu beki
wo 'hito' to iu na wo habukitari to kokorouru yue nari.


Yosoi no hiki nabiki wo uketaru wa 'no wa' to iu. (Iu wa, wabishiki wa no tagui nari.)


Subete tsuzuku kotoba to iu wa taigen e tsuzuku wo iu nari. Tadashi yōgen e tsuzuku wa hataraki mo betsu nite so wa uchimakasete wa tsuzuku kotoba to wa iwazaru nari.


Sate mata, kiruru tokoro mo tsuzuku tokoro mo onajiki kotoba mo ari. Kiku nasu matsu iu shiru nado no ku su tsu u ru no tagui, mata n ran nan nado no tagui nari. Korera wa kotoba no tsuranezama ni shitagaite, kire mo tsuzuki mo suru nari.


Musubi to wa, kotoba no tojime wo iu. Saru wa hitouta no tojime nomi ni mo arazu, izure no ku ni mare, kotoba no kiruru tokoro wa, mina sono tojime nite, ue ni okeru teniwoha no musubi nari.


Himokagami no migi no kudari no dandan wa wa mo tada no musubiteniwoha nari. Naka no kudari
no dandan wa zo no ya nani no musubiteniwoha nari. Hidari no kudari no dandan wa koso no musubiteniwoha nari. Kakute migi no kudari wa, ue ni ieru gotoku mina, kiruru teniwoha nareba, moto yori musubī ni magai naki wo, naka no kudari wa mina, shita e tsuzuku teniwoha naru ni, zo no ya nani no musubi to naru koto, imashiki tomogara wa utagai arinu bekereba, ima sono kokoro wo kuwashiku iu beshi.

17. Yoshizawa hakase kanreki kinenkai (1943, p. 584).

Subete koso no musubi to naru teniwoha wa, ue ni koso nakute, kiruru toki wa, ōku wa ōsuru teniwoha (iwayuru gechi no kotoba nari) naru wo, koso to kakareba, ōsuru teniwoha ni narazu. (Omoeyukede nado iu tagui, ue ni koso naki toki wa ōsuru teniwoha naru wo, koso to icbā ōsuru kotoba ni narazu.) Mata ue ni koso nakute, kotoba no tsuzuku tokoro ni aru toki wa, mina kanarazu ba to do to no futatsu no teniwoha e tsuzuku nari. (Yokereba ashikereba, yokeredo ashikeredo, mata iishikaba kikishikaba, iishikado kikishikado, mata omowamedo yukamedo nado no tagui nari. Kere shika me nado mina koso no musubiteniwoha nari. Amari wa kore ni nazoraete kangaekokoromu beshi. Kono kaku no tagau wa hitotsu no nashi.)

18. Yanada's article may be consulted on all issues regarding Norinaga's grammatical works.


(Tada to wa wa mo zo no ya nani koso nado in teniwoha no naki wo ima kari ni kaku iu nari.)

Nani nado nazo tare taga ika ni ikaga ikade izure izura itsu iku kudari no tagui mina teni-woha no musubi no kaku onajiki yue ni hitotsu ni awasete nani no bu to su. (Ōkata kono sho ni nani nado to iu wa, kudari no teniwoha domo wo subeawasete hitotsu ni ieri to kokorou beshi.)

21. See Yamada (1908; pp. 615-9); also Yanada (1950).


Tadashi mitsu no utسري no uchi, zo va nani koso no musubi wa Himokagami naka no kudari hidari no kudari no sadamari no gotoku nite, sono hoka wa Ōkata midari ni musubigataki wo, wa no tada no musubi wa, mitsu no utسري no naka no kudari hidari no kudari no teniwoha wo nozokite sono amari wa, kanarazu shimo migi no kudari no musubi no sadamareru teniwoha nomi narazu, teniwoha nite mo nan nite wo hiroku tomaru nari. Shikaru ni ima kore wo kataku migi no kudari ni sadamuru koto wa, kano mitsu no utسري no teniwoha nite musubu toki, zo no va nani koso ni taishite, kanarazu sadamari aru ga yue nari.


Teniwoha wa, kamiyo yori onozukara yorozu no kotoba ni sonawarite, sono moto sue wo kanaeawasuru sadamari nan arite,...

24. Yanada's (1950) discussion on this point is very revealing.

Sate mata, wa mo tada no musubi mo, zo no
va nani no musubi no hitotsu nite, kawaranu mo
ari....Kono dandan no teniwoha domo wa, kiruru
tokoro mo tsuzuku tokoro mo mata hitotsu nite,
kawarazaru koto ue ni ieru ga gotoshi. Somo-somo
kiruru tokoro to tsuzuku tokoro to kawareru kotoba
wa, teniwoha no totonoe mo kawari, kiruru tsuzuku
onaji kotoba wa, teniwoha no totonoe mo mata
onajiki wa, ito mo ayashiki kotodama no sadamari
ni shite, sara ni arasoigataki waza nari kashi.

26. See Yamada (1908, pp. 616-8).

27. Yamada (1908, pp. 615-6).

Yōgen no jutsugo to nareru mono wa mochiron,
taigen sono hoka nite jutsugo taru yōgen wo habu-
keru mono joshi no sowareru mono no mina kore
bun no chinjutsu no gosei no danshi seru mono
nari. Kono yue ni musubi ni kankei su to ieru
wa dōji ni jusso ni kankei suru koto wo arawaseru
mono nari. Sareba gojin no kore wo kakari joshi
to shōsuru wa jusso ni kankei su to iu i wo yosu
to iu jijitsu wo hyōmei seru mono nari. Gojin
no kaishaku ni yoreba, kakari kotoba to shōsuru
mono wa jusso ni eikyō wo oyoboseru joshi to ieru
yoshi ni shite musubikotoba to shōsuru mono wa
jutsugo to nareru kotoba nari to su. Kaku no
gotoku kaishite hajimete kakari-musubi no shingi
wa akiraka ni shite gaikei ni kōdai shi, sue ni
hashiru hei wo tamuru wo u beshi.

28. Yanada (1950) has an interesting note on the
similarity of this analysis to Jespersen's two notions of 'nexus' and 'junction'.

29. Norinaga doesn't mention it, but to clauses, which are another type of complement, do contain predication in this sense, and the rule operates for them as well.

30. In Japanese, kaku joshi; the kakari particles are called kakari joshi. These are Yamada's terms, and have been widely accepted.

31. The use of nani in these cases is a part of Seishō's metalanguage. It is a variable which stands for some word. When reduplicated, it stands for a string of words. It is used also in ordinary language, similarly to English 'such and such'.

32. These are citations of the Manyōshū (196 and 93, respectively). Since, however, modern scholarship has revised both these readings, it is hardly worthwhile to translate them here. Kishikata is Seishō's term for Gimon's renyōgen.


ōyoso, wo wa jōko nite wa, aware to iu kokoro wo fukumeru kotoba nari. Kōsei ni wa wo ya to iu ayui ni, kore ni nitaru kokoro nokoreri. Mata, ureshiki kana ya nani nani wo to fumi ni kakeru wo,
inishie no omokage aru kotoba nari. Tsugi ni iu 'omoki wo' nado kono kokoro ni chikashi.

Nani wo: (Nani wa, na, kazashi, ayui, hiki nabiki nado nari. Kamitsuyo ni wa, kishikata wo mo ukete 'oi wo sereru' 'ōi wo yasumi' nado yomeri. Nakamukashi yori nochi wa mare ni miyu.) Mirei. Daiichi 'karoki wo' to iu. Satogoto onaji. 'Kore wo' 'sore wo' nado iu kotoba, utagai nakereba, hiki-uta ni oyobazu. Tadashi, hiki nabiki wo uketaru wo ba 'no wo' to satoru mo yoshi.

Wo moji, iri iranu kotoba no kokoroe, kono tsuide ni tsutaeraru. Ima kore wo ryakusu.


Aru hito tou, hana miru tsuki miru to mo, mata hana wo miru tsuki wo miru nado, wo no ji iri iranu ni mo kokoro arī ya? Kotaete iwaku, kokoro naku wa aru bekarazu. Wo no ji iritaru wa hana wo shimo mi, tsuki wo shimo miru to iwan ga gotoshi. Wo no ji tsune ni kaku fukaki kokoro aru ni aranedo, wo no ji naki ni takurabete iu nari. Tatoeba sake nomu to iu, fumi miru to iu wa, wo no ji naki ga tsune nari. Sake wa noman tame ni kami, fumi wa min tame ni kaku mono nareba nari. Saredo, toki narazu shite, (wazurai hito no) sake wo nomi, (me naki hito no) fumi wo yomaba, mata wo no ji aru ga tsune nari. Mata sake nomu to wa iu beku, sake kōsu to wa yue naku wa iu bekarazu, fumi miru to iu beku, fumi yarisutsu nado yue naku wa iu bekarazu.

'Nani ni' 'kore ni' nado satogoto onaji.
Sasu tokoro no naka ni mono wo yarisuete iu kotoba nari. Komaka ni iwaba, kata tokoro wo ukete wa sato e to iu. E ie ni kuwashii. Mata, nite to mo iu bekiki kokoro naru wo ba de to satosu. Mata hiki nabiki wo uketaru toki, uta ni yorite wa noni to no wo kuwaete satosu beshi. Nikiuta ni oyobazu.

Sono tokoro ni imada itarazu shite, sono kata wo sashite yuku kokoro nari. E sunawachi no kokoro arite, Manyō ni yuku wo mo kaku to kakeru, kono kokoro nari. Sato ni mo iu koto nari. Tadashi, 'nani ni' 'nani e' no futatsu, yoku wakimaue beshi. Miyako no hito wa 'nani ni' to iu bekiki wo mo 'nani e' to nomi iu. Inakabito wa 'nani e' to iu bekiki wo mo 'nani ni' to iu koto oshi. Izure mo katabukite kanaigataki uchi ni, miyako no wa moto yori iwarenashi. Inakabito no iu wa, sato ni furuku ieru koto ni ya. Jusho no kundoku ni mo 'nani e' to wa yomazu shite 'higashi ni nagaru' 'nishi ni yuku' nado nomi yomasetari. Sato 'nani no kata e' 'nani sama e' to iu kokoro nari.

37. Kanbun is a literary Japanese style which originated through the word-for-word translation of Chinese texts. In the course of time it became autonomous, so that it could be originally written in such a way that the Japanese was representable by an apparently Chinese text. Naturally it contains
many peculiar usages, some of which have since passed into ordinary written Japanese.

38. See Nakada and Takeoka (1960, pp. 45-85) and Takeoka (1962, pp. 1035-215).

39. See especially Nakada and Takeoka (1960, pp. 46-8).


41. To convert to the kiruru kaku, which is the usual dictionary form, apply the following rule: 
   \[ ru \rightarrow \emptyset / u \quad --. \]

42. Motoori (1927, pp. 59-60).

43. Motoori (1927, p. 70).

44. Miki and Fukunaga (1966, p. 159) seem to have made a mistake in designating only class I as konata, the rest as kanata.

45. Motoori (1927, p. 63; p. 72).

46. This form is also used as a potential, but Haruniwa does not seem to have that sense in mind.

47. See Sansom (1928, pp. 158-73).


50. Hattori's (1960) work on semantics seems to fit this description.

51. We have already noted, or here note moto, sue, hiki, nabiki and kishikata. There are in addition aramashi, me no mae, fushi me no mae, nabiki fushi and tachimoto. For the precise meanings of these terms, see Nakada and Takeoka (1960, pp. 58-9).

52. It is interesting that in the earlier manuscript version of the Ayui shō, this form is given no phonological shape, but merely the Chinese graph which represents the word. This shows more clearly the abstract status of the form.

53. This arrangement is suggested by the policy of the kokugakusha in making cuts only between kana, which in this case means that the stem-final consonant must go with the ending. A glance at the phonological work of the kokugakusha will show that they did not lack a notion of vowels and consonants, or ways of talking about syllabic components when they wished to do so. In the case
of Seishō and Haruniwa, this policy resulted in nothing more than a slight arbitrariness to the analysis. As we shall see with Akira, however, who tried to claim that these distinct final syllables were teniwoha and defined them accordingly, it was not always so innocuous.

54. The improvements in question are the establishment of another ichidan conjugation, composed of the single verb keru 'kick', and the recognition of another irregular conjugation, composed of ari and its compounds. Haruniwa put keru, under a variant form, into another conjugation, and merely noted the irregularity of ari without setting up a whole other conjugation. This system has remained intact as a part of the school grammar in Japan. Only recent recognition of the morphological distinction of consonant stem versus vowel stem verbs has called it into any serious question. See McCawley (1965, pp. 107ff.).

55. In Miller's (1967, pp. 309-12) discussion of kokugaku grammar, Seishō and Gimon are singled out for praise on their theoretical soundness; Haruniwa is not mentioned.

Shōzengen (masa ni shikaran to suru kotoba)
...Kore kara yuku saki no koto wo iu. Tadashi
kore wa ittan ni tsuki shibaraku nazuketaru
myōmoku nari. Mizengen nado yō ni iite mo ka
nari...Hana sakaba to ieba sakanu saki ni ieru
nīte, kano sakēba to ieru wa chanto saite suna
wo iu (sore wa Izengen) ni taisuru myōmoku nari.

Renyōgen ...Ugokihataraku kotoba kara ugoki-
hataraku kotoba e tsuzuku.

Setsudangen (kireru) ...Kotoba no tomarι-
dokoro nari.

Rentaijen ...Hatarakiugoku yō no kotoba
kara ugokanu kotoba e tsuzuku....

Izengen (sude ni shikaru) Shikatte suna
tokoro nari. Shōzen mizen ni taishikangau beshi.
...Sakaba wa imada nari, sakēba wa chanto nari.

Migi no itsutsu no aru yō, Shōzen Izen
hajime owari ni mukai, Renyō Rentai zengo ni
aimukaite, sono naka naru Setsudan kore arayuru
kotoba no suwariosamaru tokoro naru teikaku,
shizen no myōyō kiki tae naru mono nari....

Kegugen (koinegaimotomuru) Yo ni iwayuru
gechi no kotoba nari. Ko wa gechi to iite wa
ika ni zo ya oboyuru koto mo aru kara ni Tomo-
kagami ni wa shirei to ieredo, sore mo yahari
ataranu wake aru yue, Ryakuzu ni wa mata arata-
mete kegu to nazuketaru nari....

57. While it is correct, I believe, to call attention
to the distance between Gimon's studies and modern
American structuralism, there are certain simil-
arities between his general approach and that of
European structuralism, particularly the Prague school. Note particularly the 'feature analysis' embedded in his terminology.

58. Nakada and Takeoka (1960, p. 89). In the first case of 'things', the Japanese is mono, in the second case, koto. The usual distinction between these two words is that the former is somehow concrete, the latter abstract. In this context, however, it is not entirely clear what independent value they have.

Shi iwaku, na wo mote mono wo kotowari, yosoi wo mote koto wo sadame, kazashi ayui wo mote kotoba wo tasuku. Kono yotsu no kurai wa hajime hitotsu no kotodama nari.

59. Nakada and Takeoka (1960, pp. 52-3).

60. Strictly speaking this should be noun phrases rather than nouns. There is, however, no evidence that Seishō made any such distinction. But note Akira's apparent attribution of creativity to this class.

61. Again, noun phrases would seem to be more appropriate, but Seishō doesn't raise the issue.


...Hajime ni koto kotoba teniwoha no mikusa wo wakachi (...) mata sono mikusa no naka ni koto ni gosho kotoha ni rokushu teniwoha ni gosho no kejime aru koto wo wakatsu beshi. (Sore-zure no kejime no koto wa shita ni ieri.) Sore wa tori-subete iwaba koto mote yo ni arayuru monogoto wo iiwakachi kotoha mote monogoto no hataraki arikata wo iisadame teniwoha mote monogoto ni tsukite omou kokoro wo arawashitsukusu mono ni shi areba kono mitsu sonawarade wa tsune ni mochiiru hinabikoto to iedomo hitokoto wo iiwakatsu koto atawazaru kotowari narazu ya. Kono mikusa no tadashiki kejime wa chikagoro Hirokage ga mihirakite iisometsuru koto ni aredo kokon ni oshiwatashite hitotsu ni tsuranukeru wo satorite yoku kokoro ni shimete oboeoku beshi. Subete koto to wa yorozu no monogoto no katasama wo sashiwakuru ni tsukite izuru koe nite sono hibiki hoka ni hatarakazu, tsuki hana koto waza nado iu ni kagiru wo iu. (...) Kotoba to wa saku chiru miru iru tozuru hirakuru kuru suru mata yoki ashiki nado monogoto no hataraki arikata wo iisadame koto no aya wo nasu koe nite sono hibiki no kusa-gusa ni kayoihataraku wo iu. (...) Teniwoha to wa hana wa sakikeri, mono wo omou kana nado koto kotoba ni kaketasuke monoii wo nashite fukaki kokoro wo arawashitsukusu koe nite ugoku no suwareru mo aru wo iu. (...) Shikaru kara ni koto naki ni kotoba aru koto naku, koto kotoba nakute wa teniwoha wo mochiiru tokoro nashi. Mata kotoba
wo soezareba koto no aya naku, teniwoha wo kake-
tasukete monoi wo nasazareba koto kotoba no
kokoro wa arawashitsukusu bekarazu. Yoku kangaem-
mite kejime no akiraka naru kamiwaza no ito tae
naru wo aogiyorokobu beki koto nari kashi.

64. On the general subject of the parts of speech in
kokugaku grammar, see Fomin (1959).

C.

440-1).

Chikaki yo ni aru hito, teniwoha wa karabumi
no joji no gotoshi to ieri. Kono kotoba atareru
yō naru yue ni, saru koto to nomi kokoroeoru hito
ōkameri. Makoto ni ito yoku nite wa aredo no,
shika omou wa nai teniwoha wo yoku shiranu mono
ni nan arikeru. Sono yue wa kano karabumi no
joji to iu naru mono wa, sono moto to sue to wo
aiterashite, kanaeawasuru sadamari wa naki mono
naru wo, teniwoha wa, tashika ni kono sadamari
no ato arite, isasaka mo tagainureba, koto no
ha totonowazu, uta mo nani mo subete itazuragoto
ni nan naru meru wo, imadashiki tomogara wa saru
mono nite, chikaki yo ni wa uta yoku yomu to omoite,
itaku kore ni kokorosuru hito dani, torihazushite
wa, hoho yugame moto sokonau tagui, yo ni 5ki zo
kashi. Saru wo kano joji to iu mono to, mohara
onaji koto to nomi omoitoritara ni wa, kono motosue
wo ba kanaen mono to no omoitadorade, tada ono ga
kokoro ni nomi makasetsutsu monosu bekamereba,
iyo-iyo imijiki higakoto nomi hikide nan mono wo ya.
2. One of the usual knock-down arguments against the nineteenth century European conception of Chinese grammar is that nobody in Europe at the time really knew Chinese very well. The Japanese probably knew it as well as any non-Chinese ever have, and came up with approximately the same general characterization.

3. See section A, note 21 and the references cited there.

4. As in note 57 of section B, there are certain similarities with Prague school structural grammar, in particular the notion of a store of 'universals' which are available for use in language, but which need not be actually found in every language.

5. Seishō's failure to raise issues of this sort calls into some question the status of his linguistic theory vis-a-vis his descriptive work. In following Takeoka's interpretation of that work, I have been assuming that the theory is in fact a hypothesis about human mental organization which is intended to account for some aspects of the use of language by human beings. There is another possibility which should not be overlooked, however; namely, that the 'theory'
is nothing more than a convenient framework for systematically arranging the many facts which Seishō wishes to catalog, with no special implications for mental structure. It seems to me that it is possible to interpret Seishō's general remarks in the Ayui shō and Kazashi shō to fit either of these two hypotheses. Since Takeoka has access to materials unavailable to me, I have taken his word for it here. Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine situations which might confirm or disprove Seishō's 'theory', whereas in the case of Norinaga, Akira and the others, more obviously testable claims are being made.

Notice that even should it be demonstrable that Seishō's theory is of this extrinsic variety, his position as a key figure in kokugaku grammar would not be jeopardized; nor would Hattori and Miller's characterization be shown correct in his case. What would be clear is that he failed to attain the mentalistic grammatical theory which appeared soon after, probably, then, the contribution of Norinaga. Even so the sort of facts he is most interested in are not the formal regularities which interest neo-Bloomfieldian structural linguists. This interpretation of the development of kokugaku grammar would, however,
conflict with the dominant trend of recent interpretive work in Japan, which has been to value Seishō rather at the expense of Norinaga an his students.

6. The changes Haruniwa notes are phonological, but have consequences for the 'conjugations' which are his principal object of study. It is not clear whether or not he realized this.

7. The question of the nature of this 'representation' is the still unsolved problem of the semantics of lexical items. The kokugakusha, as we might have expected, have nothing in particular to say on the subject, and it is difficult to tell how sophisticated their assumptions were.

8. It is not clear whether the mind so conceived includes the concepts in itself or not. In fact the whole question of psychological assumptions has not been made clear by any modern student of kokugaku grammar.

9. Sometimes an orthographic device is made use of to disambiguate such cases, namely to represent the same word by means of different Chinese graphs. Thus kokoro may occasionally be written こころ, when the semantic interpretation is intended, つの when
the psychological one is appropriate. The trouble is that such devices are seldom used entirely consistently, and often merely add to the overall confusion.

10. The usual interpretation of this section is that Haruniwa does not regard the relations which he describes as a part of the teniwoha system. Rather they are independent verbs which happen to show both semantic and phonological similarities. This interpretation is questionable, as I suggested in note 48, section B, and the remark to which it refers.

11. Both these things have a place in Seishō’s system, so they are not strictly omissions. In the spirit of note 5, however, Seishō merely notes them along with hundreds of other facts. Norinaga builds a linguistic theory on them.

12. The Chinese graph Hirokage uses (尺) seems to imply this interpretation. His reading, indicated by furigana, has suggested my translation.

13. This seems strongly to suggest that the kokugakusha regarded the abstract side of language as identical to thought. This is remarkable in a civilization which lacked any development of systematic logic.
14. Some of the statements which are made suggest that Japanese was regarded as perfect in this respect. Nevertheless, discrepancies and inconsistencies were pointed out, often in the spirit of Korinaga's treatment of that class of verbs which do not distinguish their kiruru kaku and tsuzuku kaku.

15. Haruniwa, in the Kotoba no tama no wo, does not take Akira's position that the inflecting syllables are independent particles. He clearly does include them in the teniwoha as a grammatical system, however.
Chapter III
Kokugaku grammar and European traditional grammar.


Kokugaku grammar did not come to an end with the deaths of Gimon and Hirokage, or with the political and cultural upheavals which took place in Japan from 1850 to 1880. It did acquire a rival, however, which was the application to Japanese, in a gradually more sophisticated fashion, of European traditional grammar. The beginnings of this development are usually traced to Tsurumine Shigenobu's Gogaku shinsho (1833), which was consciously modelled on the grammars written by the rangakusha in connection with their study of the Dutch language. ¹ As the movement gained adherents after the Meiji Restoration of 1868, the preferred models generally shifted from Dutch to English and German. The rivalry of the 'old school' and the 'new school' persisted into the 1890's, when a thoroughgoing attempt to reach a new synthesis began to be made. The first substantial product of this synthesis was Ōtsuki Fumihiko's Kō nihon bunten, of which the final definitive version was published in 1897.

Simultaneously with these strictly grammatical
developments, linguistics as understood in Europe at the time was being introduced into Japan. This meant that interest was awakened in comparative studies of various kinds, attempting to discover the genealogical affinities of the language, its historical development, dialect interrelationships, and so on. The Meiji government, recognizing the problem of language reform as one facet of modernizing the country, played a direct role in much of this study through the support of various commissions.

All these interests led away from, rather than toward, an increase in grammatical study; nevertheless, the synthetic grammar espoused by Ōtsuki and others was a part of this general trend, and it was against this background that Yamada Yoshio (1873-1960) appeared on the scene in the early years of the present century.

Yamada was a self-educated man who became interested in grammatical study as a means of developing the Japanese language for its new role in Japan and the world. His magnum opus, Nihon bunpō ron, was partially published in 1902, and completely in 1908. To the synthetic grammatical movement he brought a systematic mind and an erudition which far surpassed any of his predecessors in post-Meiji Japanese grammar. Indeed, his work soon eclipsed theirs for most practical purposes. Yamada continued to advocate and develop his ideas in an impressive succession of books over the following fifty years.
He popularized his work in *Nihon bunpō kōgi* (1922a) and *Nihon bunpō yōron* (1931); he extended his analysis to the spoken language in *Nihon kogohō kōgi* (1922b); and he revised his theory comprehensively in *Nihon bunpōgaku gairon* (1936).

In addition to these works principally concerned with grammatical theory and the living language of his time, Yamada also wrote a series of books on various historical stages of Japanese as found in the classical literature, on the writing system, on particular problems such as honorifics or constructions borrowed from Chinese, and on the history of grammatical studies in Japan. In the last category were *Kokugogaku shi yō* (1935) and *Kokugogaku shi* (1943). Aside from grammar, Yamada wrote several books on Japanese literature and history; he was at the same time an adherent of some of the ideological doctrines of kokugaku, and took a conservative position on most questions of language reform.\(^3\)

In this chapter, we are going to look at Yamada's grammatical theory from the point of view of its relation to kokugaku grammar. We will be dealing principally with the *Nihon bunpō ron* as the basis of his work, with occasional reference to the books on the history of Japanese linguistics, where he explicitly evaluates the work of the kokugaku grammarians. It should be pointed out that, although these books were published rather
late, already in 1902 Yamada shows a good acquaintance with all the books and authors I have discussed in the previous chapter. He quotes extensively from them, and also from the major post-Meiji grammarians of both schools, and from English and German books, which show his first-hand knowledge of European traditional grammar. His principal European sources were Sweet's *New English Grammar* (1891-8), Heyse's *Deutsche Grammatik*, possibly one of the turn-of-the-century revisions by Lyon, and Wundt's *Die Sprache* (1900). While it cannot be argued on this basis that Yamada, or any other Japanese scholar of the period, knew European grammar thoroughly, clearly he did possess a broad base for comparison which went beyond a superficial knowledge of pedagogical grammars.

Yamada's attitude toward European grammar is worth quoting in his own words. In the introduction to the *Nihon bungō ron*, he says:

Surely today there is no one who would propose to judge Japanese on the model of Chinese. Why then are there so many who offer the grammars of English and German in the same capacity? Grammar is a description of the rules of a language. The properties of words in Japanese differ from those of English or German; so how can the latter be directly applied to the former? One can only lament that there exist those who practice such foolishness.
Western grammar is a description of the rules of Western languages. To take its forms and judge Japanese is like cutting the foot to fit the shoe, or wrapping the head in cloth to fit the helmet. Nevertheless, it is only the outer form of the refined European system which should not be taken over. Probably we cannot avoid adopting the basic truths it contains. Since the basis of grammar springs from the basis of human thought, and since the basis of human thought is universal, there is no reason why we should not be able to benefit from their grammatical work. Therefore, while it would be an error to be led astray by the refinement of European grammar and adopt it indiscriminately, it would also be a mistake to take its surface inapplicability as a denial of the basic truths in it. My intention is to avoid both of these weaknesses.  

This is to be compared with Yamada's attitude toward kokugaku grammar as expressed in a subsequent passage:

...There is nothing like using others as a mirror for self evaluation. Therefore even if the linguistics developed in old times is not so refined, it is not to be totally discarded. I have studied our traditional theory, and tried to preserve its strong points; at the same time, by taking into consideration the principles of European grammar, I have tried to remedy its failings, and on this basis to construct a new theory.  

Yamada feels himself to be an heir of the kokugakusha who has access to other work and can use it to improve on their results.
Out of the many interesting issues raised by Yamada's analyses, I have selected three as illustrative of his synthesis of kokugaku grammar with European traditional grammar: 1) his treatment of the grammar of sentences as opposed to that of words; 2) his part of speech system; and 3) his explicit evaluations of the kokugakusha, in particular Fujitani Seishō. These are interpenetrating problems, and in my opinion can serve as a general introduction to Yamada's grammatical theory as well as fulfilling their specific purpose here.

B. Yamada's view of sentence structure.

Yamada divides grammar into two parts, goron and kuron, which we may loosely translate 'word grammar' and 'clause grammar', respectively. The more familiar terms 'morphology' and 'syntax' are inappropriate here, since the general area of the functions of words and relations between them is included in word grammar. The distinction Yamada has in mind is as follows:

We must here clearly distinguish the study of clause grammar from that of word grammar. Word grammar is the study of the materials of the expression of our thoughts. As a study which concentrates on the materials themselves, both their intrinsic properties and their functions, its principal object is words. Clause grammar also studies words, but does not make them an object of study solely as materials. Rather, words are
secondary to clauses or sentences in this respect. Clause grammar studies the way words are handled in the expression of thought, but it does not directly deal with the properties or relations of individual words. Since clause grammar thus deals with the method of expression of thought, we see its basic difference from word grammar.\textsuperscript{7}

To paraphrase a rather diffuse discussion,\textsuperscript{8} clause grammar may be methodologically distinguished as syntactic, dynamic and relational, as against word grammar, which is analytic, static and intrinsic. In terms of subject matter, clause grammar may be distinguished as particularistic, analytic and centrifugal, as against word grammar, which is systematic, synthetic and centripetal. The former deals with constructs, the latter with materials. As for relations with other disciplines,

We must proceed [in word grammar] by grasping the true nature of Japanese words on the one hand, and the principles of logic on the other... However, since clause grammar involves a situation which combines human thought and language, we must constantly cross-refer to facts about psychology and about language.\textsuperscript{9}

Clause grammar is to be distinguished from rhetoric on the one hand, which is concerned with value judgments about the form of expression and from logic on the other which is concerned with value judgments about the content of expression.\textsuperscript{10}
The selection of topics which Yamada deals with under clause grammar shows as well as anything the sense of the distinction. First of all, there is the matter of clause types. He classifies questions and exclamations together as kantai no ku, or 'appeal clauses'; and declaratives and imperatives as juttai no ku, or 'judgment clauses'. Crosscutting this distinction is that of complete versus incomplete clauses. Secondly, there is the matter of clause structure. Here Yamada discusses the complexity of clauses, which means their internal bracketing; and word order in clauses, which means types of superficial order change under contrastive stress, and so on. Lastly, there is the matter of the use of clauses. Here are included the distinctions between subordinate and main clauses, between clauses and sentences, and between simple, compound and complex sentences. Yamada's treatment of these topics is worthy of some attention, but is too specialized to go into in any depth here.

The gist of Yamada's understanding of sentence formation is as a psychological process which takes place in concrete situations. It is reminiscent of Saussure's suggestion that sentence structure belongs to parole rather than langue. However, for Yamada, parole is no less subject to principled description than langue, and he proceeds to give such a description. To restate the issue in contemporary terms, Yamada is concerned to show
the basic dependence of sentence structure on facts about performance, which he does not clearly distinguish from semantics. Each of the distinctions made is seen in these terms. This is why, although Yamada quotes the definitions of the sentence from Sweet and Heyse, he rejects them as insufficient and turns instead to Wundt for corroboration. One of his favorite points is that clausehood, or predication, does not necessarily presuppose a subject and a predicate. In this connection he quotes the discussion of 'sentence equivalents' in Wundt.11

The ultimate derivation of this line of argument from kokugaku grammar is clear, it seems to me. Nevertheless, Yamada can assert that:

The study of syntax was almost completely lacking in our traditional grammars. There was only the matter dealt with under the heading of kakari-musubi and two or three other trivial details. Therefore, what we can really speak of as syntax began with the imitation of European grammar.12

His immediate predecessors had introduced syntax in the European sense into Japanese grammar. As we shall see in the next section, Yamada was prepared to accept a European analysis of the parts of speech, but he drew the line at syntax; instead he relegated many of the issues raised by European syntax to the context of word grammar. For his own syntax he turned to psychological grammar, which is the direction already indicated in the
kokugaku syntax we have examined, and which is a consistent and natural development of kokugaku grammatical theory, whether or not Yamada was conscious of it.

C. Yamada's version of the parts of speech.

The first part of the Nihon bunpō ron is devoted to an elaborate examination of the development of the notion of parts of speech, both in the East and in the West.

For Japanese, Yamada proceeds as follows:

When we regard all words from the point of view of similarity, they coincide in possessing the necessary properties of words. However, from the point of view of the differences among them, we must subclassify them. This is the recognition of difference within similarity. Thus, if we differentiate on the basis of whether or not they contain an independent concept, there are words which express a single idea by themselves and can therefore form a so-called 'word sentence' and those which cannot. The former are concept words; the latter are words which do not contain an independent concept. Moreover, those words which cannot express a single idea by themselves are the category of teniwoha and are used exclusively to assist concept words and indicate the relations among them. The distinction between words which show relations and those which may be assisted by the words which show relations corresponds to that of words which contain a single independent concept and those which do not. Therefore, we shall here classify words into two large groups, concept words and relation words. The concept words are the so-called nouns, pronouns,
numerals, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, conjunctions, and interjections. All of these may on occasion express a single idea by themselves, and moreover, contain some concept. In other words, concept words refer clearly to some concept, and relation words attach to these concept words and indicate the relationships between them. In fact this distinction corresponds to that of kotoba and teniwoha of our traditional grammarians. Suzuki Akira's theory of the teniwoha is a metaphoric explanation of it.  

Regardless of Yamada's claim that he has correctly translated the kokugaku notion of teniwoha into modern psychological jargon, it seems clear that he has in fact missed the fundamental point, and substituted for it the notion of 'relation' between concepts, which was quite likely suggested to him by the theory of case systems or prepositions in European grammar. The notion of relation between concepts, vague though it is, is distinct from that of the modes of activity in concept handling. This is directly reflected in the narrowness of Yamada's category of relation words. Not only does he exclude the inflectional endings on verbs and adjectives, but he relegates all inflected teniwoha to the status of verbal suffixes. Not to mention interjections and conjunctions, to which he accords full concept status. Even so, it requires considerable gymnastics to make the notion of relation between concepts cover the residue of grammatical particles which Yamada does treat. There are four
subclasses: case particles, adverbial particles, conjunctive particles, and kakari particles. Among concept words further subdivision is also possible:

Thus while concept words all have certain common properties when looked at from the same point of view, again we must divide them into two classes on the basis of their differences. Therefore, among concept words there is the distinction between those which are logically independent, and those which are logically subordinate. The logically independent words are those which express a concept alone, and form a part of the skeleton of sentences on the basis of predication. They are the so-called nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, and so on, which correspond to what were traditionally taigen and yogen. The logically subordinate words express concepts in the same way as the logically independent ones, but they do not directly form a part of the skeleton of sentences, but always become a part of a sentence by depending on and combining with another word. This type of word comprises the so-called adverbs, conjunctions, and interjections. The distinction is quite clear in Japanese.

Furthermore, in the same spirit, among the logically independent words there is room for a further distinction. They are all equally capable of serving as sentence elements, but looking from another point of view, the composition of a sentence requires both concepts as materials, or 'lexical concepts' and the force of predication. Here I will call lexical concept words those which express only lexical concepts. The members of this class are the
so-called taigen, or nouns, pronouns, numerals, and so on. Words which indicate predication I will call predicative words. They are the so-called verbs, adjectives, and so on. Thus all words are contained in this classification. We may illustrate it in the following chart:

```
words
  concept words
    logically independent words
      predicative words
        yogen
    lexical concept words
      taigen
  relational words
    logically subordinate words
      adverbs
        teniwoha
```

The logically subordinate words, or adverbs, correspond to Seishō’s category of kazashi, but the infrastructure of the distinctions does not correspond to Seishō’s conception, which grouped kazashi and ayui, or, as Yamada calls them, adverbs and teniwoha, together in opposition to taigen and yogen. Yamada accords all adverbs full concept status, whereas Seishō and Akira had not; but he apparently considers this less significant than surface relationships:

First of all, when we look at the positional relation of concept words and relation words, the
teniwoha, which are relation words, always show the relation by following the concept word, and never precede. Next, when we look at the positional relation of logically subordinate words and predicative words, which are logically independent, the former always precede the latter, and never follow. This is what accounts for Seishō's terms kazashi and ayui. 17

Again we see that Yamada has substituted a notion derived from European grammar for the original notion developed by the kokugakusha. The situation that two grammatical functions, conjunction and verb modification, are distributed in psychologically different categories on the basis of criteria of surface order is a serious problem in his analysis, but not in Seishō's.

Yamada and the kokugakusha are even further apart in the remaining distinction, that between taigen and yōgen. His discussion makes no reference at all to the presence or absence of inflection, which the kokugakusha took to be crucial, Gimon going so far as to make it the sole criterion. He regards it as a completely secondary epiphenomenon:

Yōgen express the unifying function of human thought, but the circumstances which create this unifying function are not always the same. Accordingly, the form of the yōgen changes in the various circumstances. Thus together with the change in form there is a difference in the application of the word. However, the thing which differs with
the change in form is only the usage, and not the basic meaning of the word. These changes are called the inflected forms of the vogen. They compose what has traditionally been called katsuysu or hataraki. 18

Far from treating these as teniwoha expressing the activity of the mind in handling a certain class of concepts, Yamada deprives them of all semantic content. Although he does not really say so, he seems to regard them as a kind of predictable phonological variant, though the environment for the rule may be rather abstract. 19 This is certainly connected with his general restriction on the category of teniwoha, as I noted above. The basic distinction of the presence or absence of the predication function has been developed partly out of Norinaga's kakari-musubi and partly out of Wundtian psychology.

Yamada believes that he is vindicating the parts of speech analysis developed by the kokugakusha, and it is proverbial in the secondary literature on Japanese grammar that he resurrected Seisho's system. However, as we have seen, he differs at every step with Seisho's conception, not to mention the general kokugaku theory. There is, of course, a similarity in their results, but Yamada has totally recast the interior significance of the distinctions. The reasoning Yamada brings to bear is in fact much more closely derived from European ideas than from the actual kokugaku theory, and at the one
point where he does build on **kokugaku** ideas, namely the concept of predication, he does it on a concept which never entered into the parts of speech system of any **kokugakusha**.

D. **Yamada's evaluation of kokugaku grammar.**

As has been noted in the foregoing pages, Yamada's objective was to create a native Japanese grammar to replace the imitative grammar of his immediate predecessors. To accomplish this, he explicitly builds upon the work of the **kokugaku** grammarians, and tries to eke out their system through reference to European ideas. Naturally, in so doing he needed to make value judgments on the work of various **kokugakusha**. In large part, his understanding of the subject coincides with the one presented in Chapter II of this essay, but there are several important points at which his evaluation differs from mine, or where he does not seem to understand **kokugaku** grammar properly. In this section we will examine some of these points briefly.

In the first place, he regards Fujitani Seishō as the greatest of the **kokugaku** grammarians:

To summarize, Seishō's work was adapted to its time, and based on facts; it was the first to be so oriented, and at the same time possessed to a surprising degree the power of logical precision. It must be said that it is a monument to
grammatical method, and without equal before or since. Thus he is probably the greatest figure in the history of Japanese linguistics after Keichū... 20

This judgment is based mainly on the part of speech system which Seishō explains in the introduction to the Ayui shō, and which animates both that book and the Kazashi shō. However, as I pointed out above, although Yamada believes he has taken over this system intact, actually he does not understand the theory behind it very well. This is characteristic of Yamada's approach to kokugaku grammar. He is less concerned with the truth of the theoretical claims inherent in analyses than with the fullness of their coverage of the data and the logical consistency of the system which they form.

The pattern fits also Yamada's discussion of Norinaga:

Norinaga's greatest contribution to the development of Japanese linguistics is his study of kakari-musubi... 21

The Tama no wo has been called the great original work in the study of kakari-musubi. Why does it enjoy this reputation? This study drew its conclusions based on an epoch-making case-by-case inductive method of proof. This shows the appropriateness of its method, but the statement applies to Seishō as well. The individual discussions of the so-called teniwoha in volumes III, IV, and V of the Tama no wo are occasionally more detailed than those in the Ayui shō. However, the
study as a whole is fragmentary, and falls far short of the systematic quality of Seishō's work. 22 We have already observed the place Yamada accords to predication in his grammatical system, and his interpretation of kakari-musubi in terms of it. Although equally valuable to him, and though he seems to be on much firmer ground in his interpretations of Norinaga than in some other cases, his opinion of Norinaga suffers from the narrow scope of the latter’s work.

Akira’s Gengyo shishu ron suffers by comparison with Seishō’s work:

In setting up four parts of speech, he resembles Seishō; however, first of all, his teniwoha are partly one of the four parts of speech, and partly the ‘inflected endings’ on verbs and adjectives. Therefore he recognizes as teniwoha full words on the one hand, and parts of words on the other, which is a logical error. Further, while there is something to be said for his distinction between verbs and adjectives, which he himself admits have been traditionally grouped together as ‘yō no kotoba or hataraku kotoba’, it is also a logical error to raise this subcategory of yōgen to the same level as the distinction between yōgen and taigen. 23

This judgment is not compatible with the theoretical distinction which Akira attempts to draw between kotoba and teniwoha. Yamada’s criticisms are valid only if one first accepts his version of the motivation for a part of
speech system. Yamada considers the Katsugo danzoku no fu as Akira's most valuable contribution because it ties together Seisho's and Norinaga's analyses of inflection; in other words it increases the completeness of coverage.

Haruniwa, too, comes in for compliments for his comprehensiveness and consistency:

The Yachimata is indeed the work which demonstrated clearly the fixed system which underlies the inflection of our yōgen.\(^{24}\)

The Kotoba no kayoijī, on the other hand, is dismissed as valueless because it contained no 'important results'. Again, Yamada's fancy is caught not by the truth or insightfulness of theoretical claims, but by completeness of data handled, and consistency of method of study. This applies also in his treatment of Gimon and Hirokage, with whom he deals at lesser length. Gimon is criticized for misinterpreting Norinaga in his books on teniwoha, complimented for extending the coverage of the inflectional system in his books on katsuyō. Nevertheless, his work as a whole is fragmentary and therefore not up to the standards of his predecessors. Hirokage, too, is given short shrift in his parts of speech work:

His three part system of koto, kotoba, and teniwoha, though he claims in the Tamahashi that it covers the entire Japanese language, in fact does not include the traditional category of kyoshi,\(^{25}\) or what Seishō called kazashi. Thus there is nothing
contained in the book which ought to be taken over. 26

It should be clear from these observations that Yamada's appreciation of kokugaku grammar was to some extent preconceived, and in part dependent on European grammatical ideas. But it also worked the other way, as for example in Yamada's strong feeling that clauses need not necessarily be composed of a subject and a predicate. He did not appreciate the deep similarity of this notion with his own notion of predication, but clearly saw them as incompatible analyses. Since kokugaku grammar, or the Japanese language as he viewed it, did not contain the subject-predicate structure, his side was obviously the correct analysis. In either case, what Yamada looked for in others and aimed at for himself was completeness of accounting for data and logical niceness of structure. He did not always give sufficient weight to explanatory theory.

E. Yamada's grammatical theory in relation to kokugaku grammatical theory.

Yamada's grammatical theory, as I have tried to briefly show in the preceding sections, is a psychological one parallel to kokugaku theory on the one hand and European theory on the other. It apparently owes its inspiration to a kind of cross-fertilization of the two. The area where Yamada feels he is most closely following his
kokugaku predecessors, namely in his part of speech sys-
tem, is in fact an area where the influence of European
grammar and the characteristic turn of his own mind have
prevented him from really understanding the kokugakusha,
and reconciling the differences between the two theories.
Nevertheless, that his theory is a version of kokugaku
theory rather than of European theory seems clear. No
doubt this is due more to the nature of the language to
which it has been applied rather than to any compelling
theory-internal reasons.

One important point at which Yamada's position is
rather weaker than that of the kokugakusha is in the
matter of universal grammar. Being familiar as he was
with English and German grammar he naturally had at his
disposal much more comparative data than they had; and
he often points out structural contrasts of various
sorts between Japanese and these languages. But the only
theoretical role played by these observations is the
negative one already noted, of attacking certain univer-
sals proposed by European grammarians. He never turns
his attention to postulating universals to replace these,
or pays any attention to the passages in the kokugaku
grammatical books which show their interest in these
matters. On the contrary, one of Yamada's main foci of
interest is showing the uniqueness of Japanese, particu-
larly in relation to Western languages. This is, of
course, also not without precedent in kokugaku grammar.

The vehicle of the principal inroads made by European grammatical ideas into Yamada's system is the use of the 'auxiliary sciences' of logic and psychology. Of course this concept itself is entirely of European origin. While kokugaku grammar has deep psychological implications, and might be interpreted as itself a sort of speculative psychology, it presupposed no independent study of the properties of the mind. And the notion of logic was largely lacking. 27

By psychology, Yamada clearly has in mind not the speculative psychology of kokugaku grammar, which he apparently missed completely, but Wundt's system, which had implications for grammar, but was established independently by introspection or experiment. By logic, Yamada apparently has in mind the ordinary Aristotelian one with a system of categories and correct forms of reasoning. It is the former which is relevant in the establishment of a correct part of speech system, and the latter which must be distinguished as prescriptive from syntax, which is descriptive.

Yamada's grammatical theory is a hybrid, but an elaborate and exhaustively worked out one. It deserves more serious attention than it has received, either in Japan or outside, in spite of its weaknesses and inconsistencies. Moreover, it is useful in the study of
kokugaku grammar when applied with sufficient care. In general, Yamada's clear statements of assumptions and step-by-step arguments, which render his weaknesses so obvious, also make his thought accessible in a way which cannot be said of some other modern Japanese grammarians. All this is quite apart from the value of his voluminous writings as repositories of facts about Japanese grammar, which is inestimable.
Footnotes to chapter III.

1. See appendix B on the role of rangaku. The Gogaku shinsho is reprinted in Fukui (1938).

2. It is this complex of interests which is referred to by Tokieda in the passage quoted in the previous chapter, pp. 28-9 above.

3. On Yamada's life and works, see Kokugogakkai (1955, p. 928).


5. Yamada (1908, pp. 5-6).

Ima no yo ni arite, Shinago no hōshiki wo torite kokugo wo rissen to kuwadatsuru mono wa nakaru beshi. Shikaredomo Eidoku shokokugo no bunten wo motarashikitarite ware ni kuwaen to suru mono ōki wa naniyue zo? Bunpō wa gengo no hōsoku wo kijutsu shitaru mono nari. Kokugo to Eidoku shokokugo to gosei ni oite, sude ni kotonari. Ikade tadachi ni kore wo tekiyō shiu beki? Shikaru ni nao kono oroka wo nasan to suru mono aru wa tanzu beki nari.

Seiyōbunten wa Seiyōgo ni kanshite no hōsoku no kijutsu nari. Kono katachi wo motte waga kokugo wo rissen to su, kutsu no tame ni ashi wo kezuri,
kanmuri no tame ni atama ni nuno wo matou rui ni arazaran ya? Shikaredomo taiseijin seichi no kufū ni ideshi mono, sono gaikei koso kūwau bekarazare. Sono konpon naru shinri ni itarite wa, osoraku wa tekiyō serarezaru koto nakaru beshi. Bunpō no kontei ni shite ningenshishō no kontei yori shoţeshi mono to seba, shikashite ningen no shisō wa kontei ni oite, hitotsu naru mono to seba, gojin wa karera no bunten ni yorite ekisuru tokoro nakaru beki ri nashi. Kono yue ni, kare no seichi ni kuramite midari ni ware ni mochiin to suru wa rō nari, hyōmen ware ni teki-sezaru wo motte sore ga konpon no shinri made wo kyohi sen to suru wa mō nari to iu beshi. Gojin no kito suru tokoro wa kono mō tari, rō taru soshiri wo manukaren to hossuru ni ari.

6. Yamada (1908, p. 6)

...tanin wo kagami to shite, jika no hansei suru ni shiku wa nashi. Sareba, korai kono kuni ni hattatsu seshi gogaku wa tatoe seichi narazu to iedomo, kotogotoku, sutsu beki mono ni no arazaran. Kono yue ni gojin wa korai no gakusetsu wo kensan shite sono chō wo tori, Seiyōbunten no shugi wo sanshaku shite, waga tan wo oginai, motte gakusetsu wo kensetsu sen koto wo kokoro-mitari.

7. Yamada (1908, pp. 1157-8).

Koko ni oite kuron no kenkyū to goron no kenkyū to no sai wa akiraka ni kubetsu sezaru bekarazu. Goron wa gojin no shisōhappō no zairyō no kenkyū nari. Sono seishitsuron mo un'yōron mo tomo ni zairyō sono mono wo shu to shite no kenkyū
ni shite sono daiichitaishō to suru mono wa go nari. Kuron no mata go wo kenkyū suredo, kore wo zairyō to shite miru nomi ni shite, kenkyū no shutai to suru ni arazu. Sunawachi go wa dainii no taishō ni sugizu shite, sono shu taru mono wa ku mata wa bun nari. Kuron wa shisō no happyōhōhō to shite go wo ika ni toriatsukau ka to iu koto wo kenkyū suredomo koko no go no sei-shitsu oyobi sono kankei wa chokusetsu ni taishō to seru ni arazu. Kaku shisōhappyō no hōhō wo kenkyū suru ga kuron nareba, goron to wa konpon ni sa aru wo miru beki nari.

8. Yamada (1908, pp. 1158-60).


...Gojin wa, migi ni kokugo no honsei wo tori, hidari ni ronri no gaku wo sanshite homu wo susumezaru bekarazu...Shikashite sono kuron wa ningen no shisō to gengo to no kōshō no jōtai wo kenkyū suru ni hoka narazaru mono nareba, kore ga kenkyū ni jūji suru mono wa, shinri no gaku to kokugo no jōtai to wo sankōkenkyū sezaru bekarazaru nari.


Waga kuni korai no bunpōsho iwayuru bunshōhō wo kenkyū suru mono hotondo naki nari. Tada kakari-musubi to iu myōmoku no shita ni oite tokeru mono sono hoka ni san no reisai naru kenkyū
aru nomi. Kakute bunshōhō wo un'i suru ni itari-sshi wa jitsu ni Seiyōbunten ni mohō seshi yori hajimareri.


Issai no tango wa kore wo dō no hōmen yori mireba, so ga tango taru ni oite itchi su. Shikaredomo, gojin wa sono uchi ni i wo motomete kore wo bunrui sezaru bekarazu. Kore dōchūi wo motomuru nari. Kakute kore wo dokuritsukannen no umu ni yorite kubetsu sureba, ichitango nite ichishisō wo arawashiuru mono, sunawachi iwayuru a word sentence wo nashiu beki mono to shikarazaru mono to ari. Hitotsu wa iwayuru kannengo ni shite hoka wa dokuritsukannen wo yūsezaru mono nari. Shikashite kono ichitango nite ichishisō wo arawashiezaru mono wa kano teniwoha no rui ni shite moppara kannengo wo tasukete sorera no kankei wo shimesu. Kono kankei wo shimesu mono to kankei wo shimesu kotoba ni yorite tasukeraru mono to no kubetsu wa kano kannen wo tandoku ni yūsuru mono to yūsenu mono to ni gaitō su. Kono yue ni koko ni tango wo nidaibetsu shite, kannengo to kankeigo to ni wakatsu. Kannengo to shōseraruru mono wa, iwayuru meishi, daimeishi, sūshi, keiyōshi, dōshi, fukushi, setsuzokushi, kandōshi nari. Korera wa minna toki to shite, ichigo nite ichishisō wo arawashiu beku mata nanra ka no kannen wo yūsu. Sunawachi kannengo wa, aru kannen wo meiryō ni shitei seru mono ni shite, kankeigo wa sono kannengo ni fuzui shite, sorera no aida no kankei wo shimesu mono nari. Korera no kubetsu wa jitsu ni jūrai shoka no kotoba to teniwoha to no kubetsu ni sōto su.
Suzuki shi no teniwoha no setsu wa kore wo hiyuteki ni setsumei shitaru nari.

14. There is some ambiguity which results in translation here. For example, I have used the English expression 'concept word' to render kotoba in my translation of Akira's Gengyo shishu ron (which appears as appendix C), and here to render kannengo. In the former case, the translation must involve some interpretation of what the translated terms refer to. In the latter case, where modern terminology is in use, a much more literal rendering is possible. Kotoba is, my translation claims, a technical term identical in phonological shape with an ordinary word meaning 'word' which is used by Akira in the sense of 'concept word'; no complex internal structure is assumed in the word kotoba, nor is there any related term in Akira which might be translated 'concept'. Kannengo, on the other hand, means 'concept word' in the direct sense; kannen means 'concept', and is so used independently by Yamada; go is a bound suffix which means 'word', and appears in many similar situations. When Yamada, for example, refers to Akira's term kotoba, I have left it untranslated. The same problem arises with yogen, chinjutsugo,
and 'predicative word', respectively, and similar problems with other such sets.

15. This inclusion of all inflected teniwoha as verbal suffixes has proven one of the most controversial of Yamada's policy decisions. He has taken a fairly large class of what most people like to treat as auxiliary verbs and adjectives, and made them into an extended conjugation system. See Sansom's (1928) notion of 'compound conjugation'.


Kakute kono kannengo wo dō no ichimen yori mireba, minna itchi suru ten aru mono naredo, nao susumite koko ni i no hōmen yori mite mata nibun sezaru bekarazu. Kono yue ni kono kannengo chū ni arite ronrigakujō ni iwayuru jiyōgo to naru mono to fukuyōgo to naru mono wo kubitsu su. Jiyōgo to wa sore jishin ni dokuritsu shite kannen wo arawashi, bun wo keisei suru kosshi to nari, chinjutsu no kiso to naru mono nari. Iwayuru meishi, daimeishi, keiyōshi, dōshi to ni shite, mata kyūrei no taiyōnigen wa kore ni ataru. Fukuyōgo to wa kannen wo arawashiru koto wa jiyōgo ni onajikeredo, chokusetsu ni bun no kosshi to naru koto naku, kanarazu hoka no go to ketsugō shite sore ni ison shite bun no seibun to naru mono nari. Kono shu no go wa kano iwayuru fukushi, setsuzokushi, kandōshi to shōseraruru
rui no mono nari. Kakute kokugo nite wa kono kubetsu mata akiraka nari.

Sate mata onaji ri ni yorite, kono jiyōgo no uchi nite mo mata kubun wo hodokosu koto wo u beshi. Korera wa minna bun no soshikiyōso taru ten ni oite itchi su. Kore wo i no hōmen yori mireba, bun wa jitsu ni sore ga shiryō taru kannen mata wa gainen to chinjutsu no seiryoku to wo yōsu. Koko ni oite, sono gainen nomi ni arawasaretaru mono wo ima kari ni gainengo to iwan. Kore ni zokusuru mono wa iwayuru taigen, mata meishi daimeishi sūshi tō nari. Chinjutsu no seiryoku no yoseraretaru go kore wo ima kari ni chinjutsugo to iwan. Iwayuru keiyōshi dōshi tō nari. Koko ni oite issai no tango wa bunrui seraretari. Kore wo hyō ni yorite shimesu toki wa hidari no gotoshi.

17. Yamada (1908, p. 157)

Mazu daiichi ni kano kankeigo to kannengo to no ichijō no kankei wo miru ni, kankeigo naru teniwoha no rui wa tsune ni kannengo no shita ni
arite sono kankei wo shimesu. Kesshite, ue ni aru koto nashi. Tsugi ni fukuyōgo to jiyyōgo taru chinzutsugo to no ichijō no kankei wo miru ni fukuyōgo wa kanarazu chinzutsugo no ue ni arite, shita ni aru koto nashi. Kore Fujitani shi no kazashi ayui no meimei no okorishi tokoro nari.


...Yōgen wa ningenshīsō no tōitsusayō wo hyōji suru mono naru ga sono tōitsusayō no hatsugen suru baai wa kesshite ichiyō narazu. Koko ni oite sono shuju no baai ni ozen ga tame ni yōgen wa sono gokei wo henzu. Kakute gokei no henka ni tsurete sono go no ōyō no baai wo koto ni seri. Shikaredomo sono gokei no henka ni tsurete henka suru mono wa yōgen no un'yō no baai no kotonaruu nomi ni shite sono konpon no igi wa sara ni henzuru koto nashi. Kono gokei no henka wo shōshite yōgen no katsuyōkei to iu. Jūrai katsuyō mata wa 'hataraki' to ieru mono kore nari.

19. The problem is of course what the relevant 'circumstances' are. They certainly are not merely phonological in Yamada's view.


Yōsuru ni, Fujitani no kenkyū wa mazu sono jidai ni sokushi, jijitsu ni motozuki, sorera wo kiso to shi, sono ue ni tatte hajimete rondan wo kudashita mono de, sore to tomo ni odoroku beki ronriteki na chimitsu na kansatsuryoku wo
yūshi, bunpōgaku no kenkyūhō to shite wa dōdō taru mono de, sono kōseki jitsu ni kokon ni kanzetsu suru to iwareba naranu. Kaku no gotoku Fujitani no kokugogakushi no ue ni okeru ichi wa kano Keichū igo no daijinbutsu to shite tokuhitsu su beki mono de arō. . . .


Norinaga no kokugogakujō ni okeru mottomo ōki na kōseki wa kakari-musubi no kenkyū de aru.


Tama no wo wa kakari-musubi no kenkyū ni oite kūzen no daichojutsu to shōseraruru. Nani wo motte kono meiyo wo ninau no de aru ka. Kano kenkyū wa jidai wo kitte ichiichireishō ni yotte kinōteki ni rondan shita. Kore wa sono kenkyūhō no seito na koto wo shimesu mono de aru ga, kayō na koto wa Fujitani mo kore wo okonatta. Tama no wo no daisanshigo no maki-maki ni wa iwayuru 'teniwoha' no koko ni tsuite ronjite iru ga, sono bubun ni wa Ayui shō no kenkyū yori mo seisai na ten ga nai de mo nai. Shikashi, sono kenkyū wa danpenteki de, Fujitani no kenkyū no soshikiteki na mono ni kurabureba tōku oyobanu ten ga aru.


Kono yō ni shishu aru koto wo shuchō suru ten wa Fujitani no setsu ni nite iru yō de aru keredomo, sono setsu de wa daiichi ni sono 'teniwoha' to iu mono wa ippō de wa shishu no ichi
to shite iru to tomo ni, tahō de wa arikata no
kotoba shiwaza no kotoba no 'owari ni tsukite
hataraku' mono wo mo 'teniwoha' to itte iru.
Sunawachi kano 'teniwoha' to iu mono wa ippō de
wa tango to mitome, ippō de wa tango no naibu
ni sonsuru bubun to mitometa to iu yō na ronrijō
no kekkan ga aru. Mata arikata no kotoba, shiwaza
no kotoba no futatsu wa kare mo iu gotoku, 'yō
no kotoba hataraku kotoba' nado itte korai ichi
ni shite kita mono wo nishu ni waketa koto wa
sansei shigatai wake de wa nai keredo, ganrai,
yōgen no naibu no shōkubun to su beki mono wo
taigen to dōretsu ni ronjita koto mo ronrijō
no kekkan de aru.


Kono Yachimata wa jitsu ni waga yōgen no
katsuyō ni ittei no jōri ga aru to iu koto wo
meikaku ni shimeshita daicho de aru.

25. The term kyoshi is the 'empty word' of one version
of Chinese grammar, as used by Kien equivalently
with kazashi.


Kano koto, kotoba, teniwoha no sanshubetsu
wo motte issai no kokugo wo bunrui shita hoseta
yō ni Tamahashi ni wa itte iru keredo, kano
kyūrai kyoshi to ii, Fujitani ga 'kazashi' to
itta ichirui wa doko ni mo kazoete irete inai.
Honsho wa kaku no gotoku naiyō no ue kara mite
toru beki ten ga nai no de aru.
27. Logic existed in Confucianism in the so-called 'school of names'; also of course in the Buddhist tradition. The Japanese seem to have paid little attention to either of these sources, and to have carried on no work of their own which might be describable as logic.
Chapter IV

Kokugaku grammar and structural linguistics.

A. Tokieda Motoki's place in Japanese grammar.

Yamada's Nihon bunpō ron ushered in a tremendously productive period in the study of Japanese grammar. While it cannot be said that his work inspired it, his general approach did become its keystone: the expansion and revision of the kokugaku grammatical system by methods and ideas borrowed or adapted from European linguistics. Scholars like Matsushita Daizaburō (1878-1935) and Matsuo Sutejirō (1875-1948) made important contributions, but the dominant figure in the period before World War II was unquestionably Hashimoto Shinkichi (1882-1945). Hashimoto's grammatical system as described in his Koku-go-hō yōsetsu (1934) and Shinbunten bekki (1938-9) was less an original construction than a kind of lowest common denominator of all the work that had been going on. It has the reputation of being based on formal criteria to the exclusion of semantics, but there is little in reality to distinguish it from the other systems of the period, beyond the tacitness of its assumptions, and its reluctance to make claims that were not generally accepted by the scholarly community of the time. It is in this
sense that the disillusion of structural linguistics with it is quite comprehensible.4 Hashimoto's stature as a grammarian is based on the acceptability of his version of grammar for the educational system, and his personal qualities as a teacher, which were evidently considerable.

Simultaneously with these developments, and reflecting the Meiji tradition, the introduction and spread of European linguistic ideas continued. The emphasis shifted in time from comparative and historical study to early structuralism, in particular Saussure and his students. A full translation of the Cours de linguistique générale was published in 1928 by Kobayashi Hideo (1903- ),5 and Japanese students continued to study in Europe, so that many of the subsequent theoretical developments in Europe and America found Japanese interpreters and apologists, a situation which continues into the present. Japan also had, it seems, its own early structuralists, like Jimbō Kaku (1883-1965).6 Grammar, of course, was only one of the areas these men were interested in, and much more work was done on phonology. It is sometimes assumed that Hashimoto's grammatical thought was crucially influenced by this development of structuralism.

While there are some similarities of approach, and while Hashimoto may well have been aware of the ideas in question, the degree to which he understood and accepted them is a controversial question. The whole problem of
mutual influence among Japanese grammarians after the 1920's has not been adequately studied to my knowledge. 7

If the nature of kokugaku grammatical theory was incompletely understood by Yamada, it was hardly understood at all by Hashimoto and his contemporaries. The forms persisted, as in Yamada's work, without appreciation of their original significance. Of course, this is no criticism per se; it might indeed be the case that the kokugaku grammarians achieved useful analyses without understanding the nature of the phenomena involved. No doubt those attracted to structuralism would have made such a case; they felt themselves, as did structuralists elsewhere, at the beginning of a science which should correct 'pre-scientific' mistakes. Hashimoto, on the contrary, took a deep interest in pre-modern Japanese linguistics, and some of his most important work came in the analysis of it; we miss in him Yamada's sense of belonging to the same tradition, however. His basic approach to older linguistic work was to use it as data for his own analyses, rather than to try to deal with it in its own terms. 8

It was in this atmosphere that Tokieda Notoki (1899-1967) became a productive scholar. Tokieda's early work concentrated on pre-modern linguistics, in particular the kokugaku grammarians. His dissertation at Tōkyō Imperial University (1924) was entitled 'The development of the
consciousness of language, and the purpose and methods of language study in Japan.¹⁹ His first book, Kokugogaku shi (1932), was a history of Japanese linguistics which appeared in a revised and expanded version in 1940. In contrast with Yamada, who developed a systematic treatment of kokugaku grammar only after his own theoretical ideas were firmly established, Tokieda began with the attempt to understand pre-modern grammar, and his own grammatical theory was deliberately developed out of his work with kokugaku grammar. In his book, Kokugogaku genron (1941), he combined the exposition of his personal linguistic theory, called the 'process theory of language (gengo kateisetsu)', with strident criticism of all post-Meiji linguistic work. In tune with the nationalism of the period, he deplored the Western influence which he detected everywhere and preached a return to the methods, if not the specific analyses, of kokugaku grammar.

After World War II, Tokieda moderated the tone of his criticism, but broadened its scope. Whereas grammar as a system had received only token treatment in the Kokugogaku genron, his Nihon bunpō, a comprehensive grammar, appeared in 1950 (the colloquial language volume) and 1954 (the literary language volume). A supplement to the Kokugogaku genron appeared in 1955, and a comparative study of systems of Japanese linguistics (Gendai no
kokugogaku) in 1956. While Tokieda's grammatical system has probably attracted more attention than any other in the post-war period, it has not attained the broad consensus which Hashimoto's enjoyed in the pre-war period. This is partly because of the resistance of structural linguistics, by this time well intrenched, to anything resembling a psychological approach to grammar; but it is also partly because of the situation of Tokieda's grammatical work in the context of the 'process theory of language'. The theory as a whole is controversial in many respects, and serious criticisms can be brought against its broad application and some of the claimed kinship with pre-modern linguistic work; the grammar, however, is by and large a conservative system which departs at only a few points from its predecessors. It seems to me that the logical relation between the two is not a necessary one, and I will treat Tokieda's grammatical theory as a more or less independent sub-system without paying much attention to the full range of his ideas.¹⁰

In order to deal in a parallel way with issues raised in the previous chapter I will discuss three topics in Tokieda's grammatical thought: his famous critique of Saussure's Cours; his version of the distinction between kotoba and teniwoha, or shi and ji; and his explicit evaluations of kokugaku grammarians, in particular Suzuki
Akira. This should suffice to demonstrate the nature of Tokieda's quarrel with structuralism and his interesting relationship to *kokugaku* grammar.

**B. Tokieda's critique of the Cours de linguistique générale.**

Recognizing the influence that the Japanese translation of Saussure's book was having on Japanese linguists, Tokieda devoted a section of his *Kokugogaku genron* to an explicit critique of Saussure's linguistic theory. This critique is made from the point of view of Tokieda's own 'process theory of language', the basic nature of which I will try to make clear in the following examination of the critique.

The main focus of attack is Saussure's notion of *langue*:

For [Saussure], the method of linguistic study is not to take the concrete linguistic activity which we experience as the object whose nature is to be made clear and of which a general characterization is to be given. Instead, he seeks to discover a unitary thing in the midst of the heterogeneous and confused mass of concrete linguistic activity, and explain that activity in terms of it. At the same time he takes this unitary element to be the true object of language study and calls it *langue*. *Langue* is supposed to be composed of combinations of auditory images and concepts, and a purely psychological object, but since it exists as a social
construct which has no interaction with individual users, it is no different in conception and form of existence from a completely physical object. Therefore *langue* has an internal structure. *Langue* comes into contact with individuals only when it is used, but it is not at all clear what the nature of that interaction is.\(^\text{12}\)

The characterization of the notion of *langue* given by Tokieda is an apt one, and one which I think captures as well as any the limitations of Saussure's approach. According to Tokieda, the real motivation for its introduction was the desire to construe language as a physical object accessible to the methods of natural science as understood at the time. Therefore it was necessary to concoct an artificial construct around which the various aspects of the linguistic phenomenon might be arranged, even at the cost of losing contact with the actuality of language. In particular, the restriction of *langue* to a collection of 'lexical items' and logical relations between them fails to explain the communication process. Although *langue* resides in the brain, it is really only a pseudo-psychological entity, since it does not itself partake of the activity of the mind, but is merely a tool, though an abstract one. A truly psychological phenomenon is one which forms a part of the constant activity of the mind, and language is just such a thing in Tokieda's view.\(^\text{13}\)
According to Saussure, langue is composed of unit combinations of auditory images and concepts. However, in our concrete experience of the communication cycle, there is no thing which combines an auditory image and a concept; there is only the process of combination of the two. To go from the existence of combination to assume the existence of entities directly resulting from the combination is a large logical jump.¹⁴

The difficulty and the interesting part comes in when Tokieda reveals his alternative to this conception of the nature of language. For him, language is simply the psychological process of communication, from which no artificiality such as langue can be abstracted. The best way to make sense out of Tokieda's conception of language in relation to grammar is against the background of kokugaku grammatical theory. The kokugakusha seem to have assumed the existence of some kind of lexical representation in the mind which I have usually referred to as concepts. This sort of semantic structure underlying lexical items they opposed to the handling activity of the mind on these concepts which forms the semantic content of the teniwoha. What Tokieda seems to have done is view concept formation in this sense as itself a psychological process, though still distinct from the handling activity. This can be interpreted as a kind of radical, or extended kokugaku grammatical theory, in which all the problems of lexical semantics are introduced
en masse into grammar. In that sense, all of language is a psychological process which goes from 'situations' to phonological shapes and vice versa. Grammar is, then, only a small part of the complex, and Tokieda so views it.

In a certain sense, and it is particularly so in the case of grammar, no more is involved in this shift of frame of reference than a new terminology. However, Tokieda never comes to grips with the problem of linguistic creativity, and takes his refutation of the concept of langue as a refutation of any even slightly abstract principle which might be proposed. In this sense also he seems to go beyond the most reasonable interpretation of kokugaku grammar, although it may be that no more is at stake than terminological confusion. He does take grammar to be the collection of describable regularities at the appropriate stage of the communication process, and he does recognize that errors may occur in performance situations. This theoretical stand, which is at once radically mentalistic and radically particularistic, forms a strange contrast with the actual forms of his grammar, to which we now turn.

C. Tokieda's notion of shi and ji.

Like Yamada, and most other modern grammarians, a part of speech system forms an important element of Tokieda's grammar. The basis of his system is the
distinction between shi and ji, which is directly modelled
on Akira's kotoba and teniwoha.\textsuperscript{15}

The process theory of language which locates
the basic nature of words in the expression process,
naturally locates the basis for the classification
of words in the formal structure of the process.
When we investigate the process of the expression
of thought in all words, we find the following
two different types:

1) Forms which include the concept realization
   process,

2) Forms which do not.\textsuperscript{16}

Type 1), which Tokieda calls shi, represent things indi-
rectly, via a process of objectification or conceptuali-
zation.

When we say 'a flower bloomed', a part of the
process through which the word 'flower' comes to
express a particular flower is the objectification
of that flower. At the same time, the individual
flower itself is not directly expressed, but is
referred to by means of the generalized concept of
flower. Suzuki Akira calls the activity involved
in this expression 'pointing out'.\textsuperscript{17}

Type 2), which Tokieda calls ji, represent things directly,
as a kind of accompanying gesture.

In contrast to the expression process above,
there are also words which express subjective
feelings, such as joy or sadness directly, without
objectification or conceptualization. The best
known of these are the so-called interjections...
Suzuki Akira calls this type of word 'the voice of
the mind' in contrast to 'pointing out'. I believe that this means the direct expression of the mind involving no process of objectification or conceptualization.18

Since words of type I may express not only things external to the mind, but its interior activity as well, there exist pairs like 'surprise' and 'oh!', 'pain' and 'ouch!', 'be annoyed' and 'damn!' in which the same activity of the mind appears either as shi or ji.

This is a reasonably accurate translation of the traditional distinction into contemporary terms, and among modern Japanese grammarians Tokieda seems alone in appreciating the significance of it. Consistently with most of Akira's analysis, he regards grammatical morphemes such as conjunctions, particles and auxiliaries as being fundamentally like interjections rather than nouns or verbs. He does not accept quite the wide range which Akira does, however, and fails to mention adverbs or inflectional endings. He also excludes, on introspective grounds, the causative and passive forming suffixes -sasu and -raru, which were mentioned above as treated by Naruniwa in the Kotoba no kayoji. But to demonstrate the completeness of the debt to Akira, further details are in order:

Shi and ji are both forms of expression, but we can recognize the existence of a difference in dimension between the two forms of expression. Ji
always express only things belonging to the subjective point of view of the language user. The difference in dimension comes in that *shi* always express the objective world, but *ji* express the feelings, emotions, will or desires which the language user directs toward the objective world.19

The *shi* and *ji* distinction, which is a difference in dimension, is not a peculiarity of Japanese, but I believe it is a universal fact of language. However, in Japanese, the fact that the distinction had already come to the attention of scholars in the thirteenth century can probably be explained by the structural suitability of the Japanese language to suggest such a theory. In other words, whereas in the European languages *shi*-like expression and *ji*-like expression are often united in a single word, in Japanese the two are most often distributed in separate words. For example, in Latin the *ji* which express case relationships are amalgamated with *shi*, and are expressed by inflectional changes in the word. One word in Latin, therefore, can be said to correspond to the combination of a *shi* and a *ji* in Japanese. Of course, there are in European languages also such categories as prepositions and conjunctions, which may be thought of as isolable *ji*.20

Tokieda's originality lies not in the *shi* and *ji* distinction itself, which is taken directly from *kokugaku* grammar, but in extending the scope of *kokugaku* theory and integrating many aspects of language that the *kokugakusha* never included in their data base. As I showed
in the previous section, Tokieda assumed the role of defender of kokugaku grammar against not only the kind of hybridization with outside ideas seen in Yamada, but against the wholesale rejection of mentalistic grammar which was represented in the growth of structural linguistics in Japan. It was in the exercise of the defense of mentalistic grammar against structural linguistics that Tokieda showed himself to best advantage; where he differed from his kokugaku predecessors it was seldom to good advantage.

D. Tokieda's evaluation of kokugaku grammar.

Tokieda's first linguistic work involved studies of kokugaku grammar, and its influence was decisive in the development of his own grammatical theory, as has been mentioned. Therefore, his statements about the grammarians and their works take on even more importance in the evaluation of his theory than in the case of Yamada. But regardless of his detailed reliance on Akira which we have noted, it makes little sense to go down the list of kokugaku grammarians one by one quoting Tokieda's remarks as was done above with Yamada's evaluations. He hardly seems to notice superficial differences in analyses, and concentrates only on the theoretical content of the works in question, and the best way to appreciate it. The following observation is typical of his approach:
Norinaga and Seishō have come to be regarded in later times as the founders of the study of teniwoha. However, their work extended over many areas of what has later been called teniwoha and katsuyō study, and in reality it consists of undeveloped and undifferentiated studies which preceded the true teniwoha or katsuyō work. We ought to look to their works not for studies of teniwoha per se, but for the disparate origins of Japanese language study. Moreover, discarding the preconceived notion produced by the later appearance of teniwoha studies that their books are unified treatments of a unified subject matter, we should carefully examine the books as they are, and try to capture the differences in the linguistic consciousness which they show. The nature of Japanese appears in one aspect in Norinaga's work, and in another in Seishō's, and in the two together there is a suggestion of how the Japanese language was conceived of.\textsuperscript{21}

The 'study of teniwoha' referred to here is that of post-Meiji grammar, including, no doubt, Yamada's grammatical system.

Tokieda's approach to kokugaku grammar is in contrast to Yamada's; he sees them not as individuals with particular grammatical systems to be judged each according to its particular merits or defects, but as contributors to a single grammatical system, or as he terms it, linguistic consciousness.\textsuperscript{22} The consciousness at which they arrived is in sharp contrast with an opposing 'school' which originates ultimately in European ideas.
This gives rise to the two principal antagonists of his own writings; the process theory of language and the construct theory of language. The latter includes variously the ideas of *rangaku* and early Meiji imitative grammar, the ideas of comparative and historical linguistics, and the ideas of structural linguistics, especially as represented by Saussure. The major effort of Tokieda's interpretive writings is to demonstrate that *kokugaku* grammar exemplifies the former theory instead of the latter. The difference between the *kokugakusha* and Tokieda himself is the explicitness of the theoretical formulation:

In the early history of Japanese linguistics, it is hard to say that the notion of language as the process of expression and understanding was openly presented. Rather this was grasped only intuitively, and the process theory of language, building on this basis, and thoroughly revising it, tries to construct a theory of the formative circumstances of language structure.\textsuperscript{23}

Thus, while Yamada had dealt extensively with *kokugaku* grammar from a history-of-ideas point of view, showing where each grammarian succeeded in advancing the search for the correct analysis, or where he strayed from that course, Tokieda's approach emphasizes the interpretation of theoretical status in each case. He seldom dwells on errors or statements which do not corroborate his interpretation. Instead of adopting a
critical view, however sympathetic, he imposes a rationalization and defense, but one which is closely derived from the view to be rationalized and defended.

E. Tokieda's grammatical theory in relation to kokugaku grammatical theory.

Tokieda's own grammatical theory is the same thing as his interpretation of kokugaku grammatical theory. Therefore the subject of this section is really his accuracy as an interpreter. This is true particularly in the matter of the distinction between concept words and teniwoha which is such a crucial part of kokugaku grammatical theory. More importantly, his approach to the whole problem is the same as mine: to deal with kokugaku grammar as a theoretical phenomenon, and from a unitary point of view. In fact, the conception of this essay began in consideration of Tokieda's work and has been influenced strongly by it, much more so than by Yamada's work, or that of any other modern interpreter. In my opinion, no other modern interpreter has come remotely close to Tokieda's understanding of kokugaku grammar; nevertheless, there are many pitfalls in an uncritical approach to his work, and it is these to which we now turn.

Tokieda's style of argument is a completely non-logical one for all its pretenses to the contrary. This
means that unless one is willing to follow the intuitive
drift of his thought, what he says can make little sense.
He has two styles of writing, a polemic style for stating
his position and an anecdotal style for proving it. He
first describes how some aspect of language functions,
then supplies some metaphors or examples with total dis-
regard of the details of applying the analysis at issue,
or of his opponents' position or criticisms. He has a
very loose conception of the role of evidence in demon-
strating the correctness of claims about language in
general or Japanese in particular.

Tokieda's most serious fault is connected with his
way of thinking as illustrated in his style of argument.
While a non-logical thinker, he is still a systematic
thinker, and that leads him to push his insights too far.
We have noted the extension he gave to the idea of lan-
guage as a psychological process, which is basically an
extension of the idea which the kokugakusha had with
regard to teniwoha to all of language. Taken literally,
it would simply result in the study of language being
only a part of psychology. Tokieda does not take it
seriously in the sense that he makes no attempt to develop
a psychological system, and in fact fails to come to
grips with most of the important issues from a specula-
tive psychological point of view, such as linguistic
creativity. There is, of course, some truth to the
characterization of language as a kind of speculative psychology, but it is not enough merely to proclaim the relationship.

All of these faults Tokieda shares with the kokugaku grammarians themselves, and his work needs interpretation in almost the same sense that theirs does. If this were not so, then perhaps there would have been no place for the present essay. Tokieda sees very clearly the deficiencies of structural linguistics as compared with his own psychological theory, but not vice-versa. Therefore his work has really not contributed much in any immediate sense to Japanese linguistic theory. His criticisms of structuralism have not been taken seriously, and counter-criticisms against him, at least on the theoretical level, have been generalized blasts at all mentalistic linguistics which miss all that is really subject to criticism in his work. It is to be hoped that a more sympathetic and constructive dialogue might appear in the long run which could lead to some real understanding of the spirit of Tokieda's work and an appreciation of its real merits.

Kokugaku grammar then, has had various effects on later Japanese grammar. It has influenced the creation of new systems of grammar in conjunction with European ideas, as in the case of Yamada, and it has found its own extenders and defenders, as in the case of Tokieda.
And through men like these it has accounted for the discussion within more standard varieties of grammar in Japan of issues not so often raised in our tradition; issues like the nature of predication, and the semantic difference between lexical items and grammatical morphemes. It seems to me that a wider acquaintance with the results of such studies, both of the kokugakusha themselves, and of later scholars sympathetic and critical, might prove valuable in the construction of a more correct picture of the nature of language than we now command. If so, then the exposure given here to the matrix in which these ideas have developed can perhaps contribute to their proper appreciation.
Footnotes to chapter IV.

1. See Matsushita's Kaisen hyōjun nihon bunpō (1930a) and Hyōjun nihon kōgobō (1930b), and Matsuo's Kokubunpō gairon (1933) and Kokubunpō ronkō (1936). Matsushita developed an original logical structure for grammar, and Matsuo elaborated some of Norinaga's ideas, in particular kakari and musubi.


3. The central concept in Hashimoto's grammatical work is the bunsetsu, or minimum phonological phrase, a unit with both phonological and syntactic significance. Somewhat later, Hashimoto introduced composition of bunsetsu to reach a kind of simple phrase structure grammar.


5. This translation was revised in 1940, correcting several important errors.

6. Jimbō was primarily a phonetician, but in an early book on linguistic theory, Gengogaku gairon
(1922), he appears to have independently duplicated much of Saussure.

7. Far and away the best book on the theoretical issues involved is Tokieda's *Gendai no kokugogaku* (1956). Tokieda pays little attention to the differences among his various opponents, however.

8. See *Kohon setsuyōshū no kenkyū* (with Ueda Kazutoshi, 1916) and *Bunroku gannen Amakusa-ban Kirishitan kyōgi no kenkyū* (1928).

9. Original title: *Nihon ni okeru gengoishiki no hattatsu oyobi gengokenkyū no mokuteki to sono hōhō.*

10. Tokieda would no doubt have objected to any separation of this sort.

11. Tokieda (1941, pp. 57-83).

12. Tokieda (1941, pp. 82-3)

   ...Kare ni totte gengokenkyū no hōhō wa, wareware no keiken suru gutaiteki na gengo wo taishō to shite, sono honshitsu wo akiraka ni shi, sono zenbō wo rinkakuzuikeru koto de wa naku shite, tashitsuteki konshitsu teki na gutaiteki gengo no naka ni, tan'iteki na mono wo motome, sore ni yotte gutaiteki na gengo wo setsumei shiyō to suru to dōji ni, kakaru tan'iteki yōso koso gengokenkyū no shin no taishō de aru to
shi, kore wo 'rangu' to nazuketa. 'Rangu' wa chōkakueizō to gainen to no ketsugō to iu jun-
shinriteki jittai to shite mitomerareta mono de
wa aru ga, sore wa nanra gengoshutai to no kōshō
no nai shakaiteki jijitsu to shite no sonzai de
atte, sono sonzaikeishiki wa mattaku buttekitaishō
to kotonaru tokoro no nai mono de aru. Shitagatte,
'rangu' wa hoka no buttai to dōyō ni, kōseiteki
kōzō wo motsu mono de aru. 'Rangu' wa, shutai no
yō ni kyōserareru toki, hajimete shutai to kanren
wo motte kuru no de aru ga, kono yō ni shite mochi-
irareru mono to, shutai to ga ika ni shite kōshō
suru ka no ten ni tsuite wa nanra akiraka ni sarete
inai.

13. One is strongly reminded here of Humboldt's notion
of language as energeia, as opposed to ergon. Any
direct influence from this quarter has been denied
by Tokieda, who told me that he was unfamiliar
with European linguistics outside that which exists
in Japanese translation. Humboldt's ideas were
known in Japan, however, so that the possibility
of an indirect connection must not be discounted.
I have come across no such documentary evidence
as yet.

14. Tokieda (1941, p. 64). Note here Tokieda's uses
of mono and koto as 'object' and 'process', respec-
tively. Compare chapter II, section B, note
58.
Soshūru ni shitagaeba, 'rangū' wa, chōkaku-eizō to gainen to no rengō shita mono de aru to iu. Shikashinagara, wareware no gutaiteki na genjunkō ni oite keiken shiuru mono wa, chōkaku-eizō to gainen to no rengō shita mono de wa naku shite, chōkakueizō ga, gainen to rengō suru koto igai ni wa nai. Rengō suru to iu jijitsu kara, tadachi ni rengō shi, ketsugo shita ittaiteki na mono ga sonzai suru to kangaeru no wa, ronri no ōki na hiyaku de nakereba naranai.

15. The difference between shi and kotoba on the one hand, and ji and teniwoha on the other, is just the native or Chinese reading of the graphs 石 and 略 , respectively.


Go no konpon teki sei kaku wo, hyōgen katei ni motometa gengo kate i kan wa, go no ruibetsu no konkyo wo mo, tozen sono kateiteki kōzō-keishiki ni motomeru no de aru. Issai no go ni tsuite, sono shisō no hyōgen katei wo kensuru no ni, tsugi no yō na futatsu no jūyō na soi wo mi dasu koto ga de kiru.

1) Gainen katei wo fukumu keishiki
2) Gainen katei wo fukumanu keishiki.

17. Tokieda (1950, p. 60).

'Hana ga saita' to itta baai no 'hana' to iu go wa, mokuzen no gutaiteki na 'hana' wo arawasu koto ni oite, sono hana wo kyakutaika shite iru to dōji ni, gutaiteki na hana sono
mono wo arawashite iru no de naku, kore wo gainenka shite, hana ippan to shite hyōgen shite iru no de aru. Suzuki Akira wa, kono yō na hyōgen ni okeru hataraki wo, 'sashiarawasu' to yonde iru no de aru.


Ijō no yō na keika wo toru hyōgen ni tai-shite, yorokobi, kanashimi tō no shukanteki jōi wo, kyakutaika sezu, mata gainenka sezu, sono mama chokusetsu ni hyōgen suru go ga aru. Sono ichijirushii mono wa, iwayuru kandoši de atte... Suzuki Akira wa, 'sashiarawasu' tokoro no go ni taishite, kono yō na go wo 'kokoro no koe' to yonde iru. Kokoro no chokusetsuteki na hyōgen de, kyakutaika, gainenka no sayō wo fukumanu imi de arō to omou no de aru.


...Shi to ji to wa, sono hyōgen de aru koto ni oite kyōtsū shite iru no de aru ga, kono ryōsha no hyōgen no aida ni wa jigen no sōi ga sonzai shite iru koto ga mitomerarete iru koto to, ji wa tsune ni gengoshutai no tachiba ni zokusuru mono shika hyōgen dekinai to iu koto de aru. Jigen no sōi to iu koto wa, shi ga tsune ni kyakutaikai wo hyōgen suru no ni taishite, ji wa, kyakutaikai ni shikō suru gengoshutai no kanjō, jōsho, ishi, yokkyū tō wo arawasu koto wo iu no de aru.

20. Tokieda (1950, pp. 64-5).
Go ni jigen wo koto ni shita shi to ji no kubetsu no sonzai suru koto wa, nihongo tokuyū no genshō de wa naku, oyoso gengo to iware ru mono ni wa, tsūyū no jijitsu to kangaerareru no de aru ga, nihongo ni oite, kono kubetsu ga, sude ni furuku seiki daijūsan seiki ni gakusha no chūmoku suru tokoro to natte ita to iu koto wa, nihongo ga, kono yō na riron wo michibiki dasu ni tsugō no yoi kōzō wo nashite ita to iu koto ga shuyō na gen'in de atta to ieru no de aru. Sunawachi, Yoroppa no gengo ni oite wa, shiteki hyōgen to jiteki hyōgen to ga, shiba-shiba gattai shite ichigo to shite hyōgen sareru no ni taishite, nihongo ni oite wa, kono ryōsha ga ōku no baa ni betsu-betsu no go to shite hyōgen sarete iru tame ni hoka narana no de aru. Tatoeba, Ratengo ni oite wa, kokugo ni okeru kaku wo arawasu ji ga, shi no naka ni yūgō shite, go no henka to iu keishiki ni yotte arawasarete iru gotoki ga sore de aru. Ratengo ni okeru ichigo wa, iwaba kokugo ni okeru shi to ji no gattai shita mono ni sótō suru mono de aru to ieru no de aru. Yoroppago ni oite mo, zenchishi, setsuzokushi no gotoki wa, sore jishin ji to kangaeru koto ga dekiri hinshi de aru.


Norinaga Seishō no ryōkenkyū wa, kōsei, teniwoha kenkyū no shiso no gotoku kangaerarete kita ga, ryōsha no kenkyū wa, kōsei no iwayuru teniwoha aruwa katsuyō no izure no ryōiki ni no matagatte, jitsu wa teniwoha kenkyū katsuyō kenkyū izen no, sunawachi mihatten mibunka no
kenkyū de atta no de aru. Wareeware wa, kono ryōsha no kenkyūchū ni teniwoha sono mono no kenkyū wo miyō to su beki de naku, mushiro koku-gokenkyūhatten no shuju naru hōga wo miyō to su beki de aru. Tsugi ni mata, kono ryōsha no kenkyū wo, teniwoha kenkyū to in gainen wo nuri-tsubushi, dōitsukenkyūjikō no dōitsukenkyū de aru to in kiseikannen wo sutete, hitasura ryōsha no kenchi wo aru ga mama ni kansatsu shi, soko ni arawareta kokugoishiki no sōi wo kanshu su beki de aru. Kokugo no honshitsu wa, sono ichimen wo Norinaga no kenkyūchū ni arawashi, hoka no ichimen wo Seishō no kenkyūchū ni arawashite, ryōsha no kenkyū wo tōshite, kokugo ga ika ni ishiki seraru beki ka wo anji suru no de aru.

22. Although kokugaku grammar, as the topic of this essay, is stressed here, Tokieda's synthesis of Japanese linguistics extends over all pre-Meiji studies, including kokugaku grammar as an important part, but by no means confined to it. This is closely related to his identification of linguistic theory and linguistic consciousness, which we need not accept here. If we do not, then his tracing of some kokugaku grammatical ideas into earlier periods also becomes suspect.


Moto yori, kokugogaku shi wa, gengo ga hyōgenrikai no kōi de aru to suru kagae wo, shōmen ni uchidashita to wa iigataku, kiwamete
hisoka ni sore wo kanshu dekiru teido ni todomaru no de aru ga, gengo kateisetsu wa, sore wo dodai to shite, sore ni zenmenteki na hoshū wo kuwae, sore wo motte, kokugogaku no taikei wo kōchiku suru baaai no kisoriron to shiyō to suru no de aru.

24. I was fortunate enough to be able to discuss some of these matters personally with Tokieda in the summer of 1967 in Tōkyō, and also to hear him speak on kokugaku grammar on several occasions. His death the following November is a great loss, both to Japanese grammar in general, and to the study of kokugaku grammar in particular.
Appendix A

Conventions.

Transcription. The Japanese language is herein transcribed in the standard modified Hepburn system, as employed for example in Katsumata (1954). This has certain disadvantages particularly when dealing with literary Japanese from a linguistic point of view. But it seems quite impossible to preserve both absolute consistency and a readable transcription. I have opted for the latter. Therefore, the reader will find the objective particle sometimes written お, and sometimes お, and so on. Since we are not dealing with phonological questions here, I think this will not cause serious trouble. Complete transcriptions have been provided for all the translations in the essay, to facilitate reference to the original works. The sources for kokugaku grammar employ a bewildering array of graphic devices which it is impossible to reproduce here. The usual devices of underlining, parentheses, brackets, and single quotes have been adapted to capture what is important in each case, but they are not used consistently from one text to another. With this caveat, the usage should be clear immediately in each case.
Proper names. Japanese personal names, when given in full, are always written in the conventional Japanese order, family name followed by personal name. When referring to a person by only one of his names, in the case of pre-Meiji individuals, the personal name is used, otherwise the family name. This corresponds with one common Japanese convention. An exception is with members of the Buddhist clergy, who are referred to by a single name throughout. In case where alternate names exist, or where the reading of a name is in doubt, the most usual form is employed, without regard for logical or historical consistency.

Dates. Dates are given throughout in Western calendar years. In the case of the source literature, the dates quoted are the years of composition, if known. Otherwise, a publication date may be listed. Generally speaking, inferences of relative chronology of the books should not be made on the basis of the dates listed here. Any of the standard histories of Japanese linguistics, for example Niki and Fukunaga (1966) will present some chronology of the writings. I have not gone into the problem here since it is beside the point at issue.
Appendix B

Historico-bibliographical introduction
to kokugaku grammar.

Sketch of the intellectual history of the Edo period.

Kokugaku (usually glossed 'national learning') is opposed to kangaku ('Chinese learning', or Confucian studies) and, somewhat later, to rangaku ('Dutch learning', or Western studies). These terms refer to three more or less distinguishable intellectual traditions of the Edo period (1600-1868), each consisting of a body of scholars associated in a descending hierarchy of personal master-and-disciple relationships. Of course there were individuals, including some famous scholars, who cannot conveniently be attached to any of these larger traditions; and Buddhism, though disestablished from its thousand-year domination of Japanese intellectual life, was still able to exercise considerable underground influence.

Still, their development is by and large the intellectual history of Japan for two hundred and fifty years.

Kangaku. For various political reasons, kangaku came to be the academic orthodoxy. This meant that it controlled education almost everywhere, and that its scholars were eligible for employment in an advisory capacity by the central government or one of the many
local governments. As the only tradition with an official raison d'etre and recognized place in society, it was numerically predominant; on the other hand, it split at an early date into several competing schools, some of which developed unorthodox doctrines and from time to time incurred official sanctions.

In keeping with its Confucian origin, kangaku emphasized study of the Chinese classics and application of their teachings to government and social life in general. The ground for factionalism was supplied by different interpretations of those classics. The orthodox school accepted the heavily metaphysical and moralistic interpretation of the Sung philosopher Chu Hsi. Similarly, many of the unorthodox schools were related to developments in Ming or Ch'ing China. The general program of these schools was to reject the later commentaries as spurious and preach a return to the unadulterated originals. This was accompanied by varying degrees of emphasis on esthetic values as opposed to intellectual and moral values, and a pragmatic approach to social problems.

Kokugaku. Kokugaku grew up as a deliberate alternative to the transplanted kangaku. As such, it channeled the nationalistic feeling of Japanese in the face of the Sinophilic atmosphere of official academic circles together with whatever opposition arose to the Tokugawa regime
which sponsored them. These circumstances account both for the lack of real _kokugaku_ influence on the political and social development of Edo period Japan, and for its simultaneous profound influence on popular thinking. In this role, as well as in many doctrinal aspects, _kokugaku_ overlaps with, and owes much to, the unorthodox _kangaku_ schools.

The task which _kokugaku_ set itself was in part determined by the nature of its principal opponent. The order of business was to establish some Japanese classics, and on that basis to elaborate a distinctively Japanese view of the world. Just as Confucianism had its religious side, so _kokugaku_ attempted to assimilate _Shinto_, the native Japanese religion. The new classics included both the early ritual and mythology associated with _Shinto_, and the literary monuments of old Japan. The Japanese way as found in them could then be realized through the purging of foreign corruption, whether Buddhist or Confucian, in Japanese life. The result was a systematization of the anti-intellectual, esthetically oriented world view which we still associate with Japan.

_Rangaku_. Japan's contact with the West had begun in the middle sixteenth century with the arrival of Jesuit missionaries under Portuguese auspices. After almost a hundred years of relatively unrestricted intercourse, the new Tokugawa regime, afraid of foreign
intervention, the spread of Christianity, and the economic effects of international trade on its delicate balance of power, closed the country. For the next two hundred years, almost the only direct contact between Europeans and Japanese took place among the small colony of Dutch merchants permitted to operate under strict government control in Nagasaki. This was the origin and focus of rangaku. The Japanese were always well aware of the existence of the Europeans, and those few who chose could find out a great deal about them. On the other hand, until well into the eighteenth century, it was rather dangerous to show much interest in their affairs. The rangakusha formed, therefore, a small and somewhat underground group, coming into prominence only toward the end of the Edo period.

There were two principal areas where the Japanese were willing to take the necessary risks in learning from the Dutch: military science and medicine. In either case, the superiority of the Europeans was well known, and no close connection with Christianity could be alleged. By extension, knowledge was also imported dealing with Western technology and natural science in general, but rangaku never competed with kangaku or kokugaku as a comprehensive program with social or religious implications. Its adherents typically took it as a means which
would permit Japan to maintain her own such program, whatever its content might be.

Denouement. The Meiji restoration of 1868 was primarily a political event. Its immediate effect on the intellectual circles of Japan is most clearly seen in the disappearance of *kangaku* as a serious program for society. Respect for, and influence by, Chinese civilization continued, but the existence of a Confucian ethos ceased abruptly. Its place was filled by an uneasy hybrid of *kokugaku* with the comprehensive selection of European techniques and ideas which replaced *rangaku*. The life of *kangaku* was tied very closely to the Tokugawa political system; the two declined and fell together. Neither *kokugaku* nor *rangaku* had any such reckoning to make.

Language studies. The study of language formed an indispensable part of the three intellectual traditions just described. *Kangaku* and *rangaku* each depended on the mastery of a foreign language. Similarly, *kokugaku* was obliged to stress philological techniques to support its research into old Japanese literature. It is hardly surprising, therefore, to find linguistic work in all three traditions. In *rangaku*, towards the end of the eighteenth century, various descriptions of Dutch were written for pedagogical purposes, and later the descriptive techniques of European grammar were applied to create
a tradition of Europeanized Japanese grammar. In *kangaku*, particularly the unorthodox schools took a deep interest in linguistic aspects of written Chinese, producing grammars, semantic studies, and sufficient descriptive phonology to understand the Chinese dictionaries. It was in *kokugaku*, however, that the deepest commitment to linguistic study was made. We shall return to a detailed examination of *kokugaku* grammar after sketching the development of *kokugaku* as a movement.

The development of *kokugaku*.

Keichū. The first great figure of *kokugaku* was the Buddhist monk Keichū (1640-1701). Keichū's principal scholarly work is a series of commentaries on old Japanese poetry, notably the *Manyōshū* and *Kokinshū* collections. He is honored in Japan as the first to adopt a scientific approach to textual criticism, meaning that he studied the old texts carefully and based his arguments on evidence found there. While this characterization is not entirely accurate (previous students were not wholly arbitrary, nor was Keichū himself impeccable), there is enough insight in it to suggest that the tradition of poetical studies (*kagaku*), which goes far back into classical times in Japan, was never really a scholarly discipline until Keichū made it so. It was instead an active branch of literary theory, each version of which main-
tained its own evaluation of the classics. Of course this tradition of literary theory continued through and beyond Keichū's time; his achievement was to create a parallel tradition of scholarly research, one of the main currents of kokugaku.

Keichū's work took on a particular significance in one area which was more or less a by-product of his commentaries. He observed differences in spelling with kana between ancient and later texts. These differences are presumably due to phonological changes in the language between the times of the respective texts. It happened that the later system, codified in the thirteenth century and still in force in Keichū's time, showed numerous apparently arbitrary inconsistencies with both the older system of spellings and the contemporary system of phonetic values. Keichū's study and systematization of the older usage, the Waji shōranshō (printed 1695) was a center of violent controversy when first published. However, its system, with a few variations, soon replaced the other entirely, and came to be known as historical kana-spelling (rekishiteki kanazukai). It was in standard use in Japan until after World War II.

Kada Azumamaro. Often mentioned with, or instead of, Keichū as a founder of kokugaku is a younger contemporary, Kada Azumamaro (1669-1736). Azumamaro came from a family of Shinto priests, and early in life became
interested in the culture of old Japan as expressed in its literature. His scholarly work is mainly commentaries on classical literature in the manner of Keichū, but of a quality not quite up to his. Azumamaro is known, rather, as the first exponent of kokugaku as an ideology. Quite possibly influenced by similar ideas in some unorthodox kangaku schools, he came to believe that the ancient way could be rediscovered through close study of ancient texts. His treatise Sōgakokōkei (1728) is a memorial to the shogun proposing government support for this program. He received no support, but his ideas nonetheless constitute an important part of the second main current of kokugaku.

The core of kokugaku, then, can be traced to the work of Keichū and the ideas of Azumamaro. While Keichū doesn't seem to have been directly involved in the ideological side of kokugaku, his demonstration of a concrete example of an ancient way (the phonetic system of the language and its graphic representation) which had been lost through subsequent corruption provided a tremendous incentive to that ideology. And while Azumamaro's own scholarly research remained fragmentary and unproductive, seen from within the kokugaku ideological framework, he was the first to appreciate the real meaning of the achievements of scholars like Keichū.
Kamo Mabuchi. The next step was clearly to put Azumamaro's program into operation. This task was taken up by the third great figure of kokugaku, Azumamaro's student Kamo Mabuchi (1697-1769). A prolific writer, Mabuchi produced many commentaries as well as more specialized studies of philological subjects. He extended his attention in many new directions, notably the older Shintō ritual documents and later classical prose such as the Genji monogatari. Mabuchi's principal contribution to kokugaku theory, however, is his series of five treatises: Kokuikō (1764), Kaikō (1764), Goikō (1769), Bun'ikō (1769), and Shoikō (1769). In these works he develops his picture of the ancient way of Japanese language and culture, and its gradual corruption through the importation of alien religious, philosophical, and political concepts from China and India, with recommendations on how to revive the pure sources of Japanese life.

Mabuchi's kokugaku is already a mature ideological system. He attempted to put it into practice in his own personal life; a considerable stylist, he emphasized the writing of waka (the thirty-one syllable form prevalent in the classical poetry collections) and the purification of prose from borrowed Chinese words as a means of activating the ancient way. But more importantly, he established a school at his home near the city of
Hamamatsu for the purposes of proselytizing his ideas, exercising a strong influence within the school and without.

**Motoori Norinaga.** The fourth great figure of kokugaku, and probably the greatest of them all, was a student of Mabuchi, Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801). Norinaga combined the scholarly brilliance of Keichū with the ideological commitment of Azumamaro and Mabuchi, both in his person and in the intellectual system which he created. His work in classical literature ranged wider and deeper than that of any previous scholar. The study of the Kojiki, the oldest of the Japanese chronicles, which he reconstructed and interpreted in his monumental Kojikiden (1790-98), is said to have been suggested to him by Mabuchi. From the same inspiration perhaps, came his work on the Genji monogatari, which he elevated to the status of scripture, arguing that the esthetic values found there are basic to Japanese culture. Starting from where Keichū left off in the study of ancient phonology, Norinaga attempted to complete the analysis of the Japanese writing system in two treatises: Jion kanazukai (1775) and Kanji san'onkō (1785). And, as will be seen below, he deserves some credit as a founder of kokugaku grammar as well.

Norinaga's version of kokugaku soon became the definitive one, and he dominates most subsequent developments.
He stands out beyond this as a universal figure in Japanese history, at once the architect of kokugaku, a major philosopher of traditional Japan, an important literary critic, a key grammarian and linguist, and 'the greatest Shinto theologian'. Norinaga brought to perfection the gikobun (imitation of antiquity) prose style used by Mabuchi, and his belles-lettres classic Tamakatsuma (1801) is read today in Japanese high schools as an example of elegant language. Also like Mabuchi, Norinaga established his own school, which attracted hundreds of students and remained a major center of kokugaku long after the death of its founder.

**Denouement.** After Norinaga, and largely through his efforts, kokugaku emerged from the status of intellectual backwash to absorb a substantial part of intellectual activity toward the turn of the nineteenth century. As such, even a summary of its particular developments is beyond the scope of this outline. Suffice it to say that the movement as a whole split into two major branches, a literary-philological one and an ideological-religious one. This can be looked upon from one point of view as a failure of the synthesis of Keichū's scholarship and Azumamaro's ideology attempted by Nabuchi and Norinaga. Most kokugakusha, however, would not have accepted that verdict; the split probably seemed to them no more than the reflection of narrower interests on the part of
individual scholars. All could, and did, still locate themselves within Norinaga's grand scheme.

The literary-philological branch produced a vast amount of scholarship but no dominant figure comparable to the leader of the ideological-religious branch, Hirata Atsutane (1776-1843). Atsutane's historical importance lies in his influence on post-Meiji Japanese nationalism; in his scholarly work he showed a tendency to let ideological desiderata overrule the evidence (believing, for example, that there had existed a native orthography in Japan before Chinese influence). In this he prefigures the period of decadence in kokugaku which set in generally with the decay of Tokugawa society towards the middle of the nineteenth century. The grammarians and their work, which we now turn to in more detail, constitute one main strand of the literary-philological branch of kokugaku stretching from the time of Norinaga into the period of decadence.

Kokugaku grammar.

Fujitani Seishō. The founders of kokugaku grammar are generally considered to be Norinaga and Fujitani Seishō (1738-1779). Seishō's writings overlap with Norinaga's earlier work, but their broader scope makes them more suitable as a reference point. In turn, Norinaga's grammatical writings are more conveniently
evaluated against the background of Seishō's work. Seishō's extant writings are few and fall into two general classes, those dealing with poetry and literary theory, and those dealing with grammar. These two subjects were closely related in Seishō's system, and in the tradition in general. The language described in the Ayui shō (1778) and Kazashi shō (1769), his major grammatical books, is the language of classical waka poetry. The form of these books is each case that of a dictionary arranged on partly semantic principles, to be used as a reference by writers of waka. The items are mainly grammatical particles, prefixes and suffixes whose mastery was important for the composition of waka. The Kazashi shō deals with those which precede the word they modify, the Ayui shō with those which follow. Each item lists grammatical peculiarities, a definition, and several example poems or fragments.

The Ayui shō, as also several of the other works to be mentioned below, exists in an early manuscript form and a later published form which are somewhat different. In particular, the later version together with the Kazashi shō seem to have been edited by students of Seishō. Several other works are alluded to in the extant material, some of which apparently existed and have been lost; others seem to have merely been planned. A substantial fragment of another work, the Yosoi hon shō,
has more recently come to light. Seishō died prematurely and therefore had few students; as a result, his grammatical system remained fragmentary and had no direct offspring, in particular his terminology did not catch on. His books were widely read, however, and his ideas were familiar to and admired by Norinaga. It has been persuasively argued that his influence was as important within Norinaga's school as was that of Norinaga himself.

Motoori Norinaga. Seishō's work as projected would have formed a comprehensive description of the literary language of his time, Norinaga's approach was rather directed toward two specific problems. The more important of these is the so-called rule of kakari-musubi, a phenomenon of agreement between certain classes of particles and certain classes of verbal endings characteristic of the same poetic dialect described by Seishō. Norinaga took this rule to be a very significant difference between Chinese and Japanese grammar and investigated it thoroughly. His Teniwoha himokagami (1771) is a chart of the relationship in question. His Kotoba no tama no wo (1785) is a compilation and classification of example poems. Norinaga's other grammatical book, the Mikuni Kotoba katsuyō shō (1782), is a table of verbal endings (katsuyō), some of which are those participating in the kakari-musubi rule, which no doubt accounts for Norinaga's selection of this focus of interest.
First generation. These works of Seishō and Norinaga comprise the first generation of kokugaku grammar. In them the major fields of interest are established which continue throughout the entire development. Three such may be distinguished: the study of grammatical particles, or teniwoha; the study of verbal particles, or katsuyō; and the study of grammatical categories. These are all interrelated, of course. Historically, interest in teniwoha had long formed a part of the tradition of poetical studies (kagaku) mentioned above in connection with Keichū's commentaries. In fact, the term teniwoha is often to be understood in the sense of 'grammatical system' in pre-Edo materials. The teniwoha studies of Seishō and Norinaga led them directly to an elaboration of the system of katsuyō, suggested shortly before by Mabuchi and Tanikawa Kotosuga (1709-1776). In turn these studies on the behavior of two major grammatical categories (verbs and particles) led Seishō to the complete part-of-speech system described in the introduction to the printed version of the Ayui shō. Logically, this part-of-speech system provided the matrix in which the studies of the teniwoha and katsuyō could be taken together as a comprehensive system of Japanese grammar. The remaining major category, the noun, being invariable, could be passed over without extended comment.
The efforts of Seishō and Norinaga created a new discipline, *kokugaku* grammar, out of the speculations of traditional Japanese scholarship and *kokugaku* philology, much as Keichū had created that same philology a century earlier. It has recently been suggested that the originality of Seishō's contribution to this development far outweighed that of Norinaga, and indeed Norinaga's books contain little in the way of explanatory material which would support any claim on his behalf. However that may be, Norinaga's practical contribution was indispensable, and it was within his school and among his students that the study of grammar became institutionalized as an important part of the *kokugaku* movement.

**Suzuki Akira and Motoori Haruniwa.** The grammatical system of Seishō and Norinaga was given a new dimension by Suzuki Akira (1764-1837). Akira, one of Norinaga's students, left three treatises dealing with language; *Gago onjō hō* (1801), on etymology and the origin of language; *Katsugo danzoku fu* (1803), a restatement of the katsuyō system; and *Gengyo shishu ron* (1824), a psychological interpretation of the grammatical categories of Seishō. Akira's efforts also stimulated Norinaga's eldest son, Motoori Haruniwa (1763-1828), who wrote two important books, the *Kotoba no yachimata* (1803), a systematic grammar based on a minute description of the
katsuyō system, and the Kotoba no kayoji (1828), a collection of shorter treatments of interesting specific areas, including transitive and intransitive verbs, and compounds.

Second generation. The Kotoba no yachimata quickly came to occupy the position of definitive compilation of kokugaku grammar, both because of its clear and exhaustive treatment of its subject matter, and because of its relationship to the work of Norinaga and his position within the kokugaku movement. It was often printed and very widely distributed among all levels of Japanese intellectual circles. For some time it threw into the shade the works of Akira, which provide the missing link between it and the earlier generation. Akira's books in turn are very short and would be difficult to make sense of out of their context between these two high points. They lack the copious use of examples which characterize all the other monuments of kokugaku grammar. The works of Akira and Haruniwa depend on and complement each other much in the same way as do those of Seishō and Norinaga. This second generation of kokugaku grammar is a development from the first which fills out the katsuyō system in a more explicit way. It also further defines the grammatical category system which Seishō had originated.
Gimon. With the advent of the Buddhist monk Gimon (1786-1843), kokugaku grammar reached the point of self-criticism and controversy. Gimon was not a student of Norinaga or any other established kokugakusha and apparently this gave him a freedom to differ. His numerous grammatical books present an attempted new synthesis of kokugaku grammar, particularly the katsuyō system, in which he explicitly disagrees at some points with the Kotoba no yachimata. Nevertheless, he is clearly within the kokugaku tradition and represents no new theoretical departure. Gimon's earlier writings, the Kotoba no yachimata gimon (1810), the Sashide no iso (1815), and the Iso no suzaki (1820) are all more or less disconnected collections of specific problems and solutions, often criticisms of, or corrections to, the Kotoba no yachimata. The Yamaguchi no shiori (1818) is Gimon's first systematic treatment, in this case of the katsuyō system, which he reorganizes, introducing new terminology.

Gimon presented his reorganization in the chart Teniwoha tomokagami (1823), which synthesized the Teniwoha himokagami and the Kotoba no yachimata, and which he intended to replace the former. The Tomokagami soto no kage (1821) is a collection of notes to the Kotoba no yachimata which serve as an explanation of the Tomokagami. Another chart, the Wagosetsu no ryakuzu (1833) is an abbreviated presentation of the same material. Gimon
later wrote an introductory book on the katsuyō system, Katsugo shinan (1843), a reworking of the tennwoha theory, the Tama no o kuriwake (1841), and another collection of miscellanea, Katsugo zatsuwa (1839-42). He also left two books on phonology, the Namashina (1843) and the O wo kyōjūri (1827).

Togashi Hirokage. A younger contemporary of Gimon was a student of Haruniwa, Togashi Hirokage (1793-1873). Hirokage attempted the same sort of synthesis of kokugaku grammar which Gimon was carrying out, and felt himself to be the more legitimate successor to Norinaga and Haruniwa. He compiled a chart called the Kotoba no tamadasuki (1829), which is parallel to the Tomokagami, and wrote an accompanying systematic grammar, the Kotoba no tamahashi (1828), which returned to an interest in grammatical categories as the principle of linguistic description as Akira had done, but Gimon had neglected.

Third generation. The works of Gimon and Hirokage do not complement each other as do those of Norinaga and Seishō or Haruniwa and Akira; rather they compete with one another. Nevertheless, they form a distinguishable third generation of kokugaku grammar. The differences between the two, aside from the much greater detail shown in Gimon's more extensive writings, are largely terminological. One senses in these compendia an exhaustion of the original stimulus to grammatical
study. Kokugaku grammar had gone about as far as it could go; it was already a completed system which dealt satisfactorily with all the phenomena within its pur-
view.

Denouement. The foregoing sketch has left out of account grammar books, both within kokugaku and outside, which were not written by any of the men treated, and also many other books which deal with some other subject but make occasional reference to grammatical facts or analyses. The fact is that the vast majority of original work worthy of attention is subsumed in those works which are discussed. After the appearance of the major works of Gimon and Hirokage, grammar in the kokugaku tradition continued to be practiced, in some cases well into the early Meiji period. Such work was in major part repetitive or eccentric in one way or another. Issues which became important were, for example, the existence of native Japanese orthography, and the intrinsic connection between sound and meaning. Kokugaku grammar can and should be fairly summarized as above, disregarding other work. We turn now to a general consider-ation of the sources available for the material considered here.

Sources.

Japanese language. Naturally the Japanese literature
dealing with Edo period intellectual life in general and its branches, including kokugaku, is substantial. The standard histories and historical bibliographies provide good access to it. Important specific works used in the preparation of this thesis are entered in the list of references below. Basic sources for the great kokugakusha mentioned in section two are the complete works collections issued for each. They generally contain biographical material as well as the writings themselves.

The literature dealing with kokugaku grammar is itself substantial and rapidly expanding. It consists in larger part of histories of Japanese linguistics, or of sections of more general works on Japanese linguistics together with periodical material of more restricted scope. Recently, however, well-annotated editions of the original writings have been appearing which promise to put the field on a very solid basis. In the first category should be mentioned Tokieda (1940), Yamada (1943), and most recently Miki and Fukunaga (1966). In the second, Nakada and Takeoka (1960), Takeoka (1961-2) and Miki (1966-7) are outstanding contributions. It is to be hoped that new consideration of the work of Haruniwa will be forthcoming.

Western languages. Most histories of Japan contain some mention of intellectual life in the Edo period.
Kokugaku, however, is seldom treated at any length, and there are no full length studies of it that I know of. Articles about leading figures and some translations may be found in the journals Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan and Monumenta Nipponica. A useful book which doesn't really consider kokugaku is Dore (1966).

In the field of kokugaku grammar there is virtually nothing beyond passing mentions, as in Bloomfield (1933, p. 10). Important exceptions to this generalization are Yanada (1950), which discusses Norinaga's grammatical doctrines in detail and Fomin (1959), which describes in detail the development of the idea of parts of speech. Some brief reference to the work of the kokugakusha may also be found in Miller (1967) and Hattori (to appear).
Appendix C

Gengyo shishu ron

This appendix is a translation of the Gengyo shishu ron of Suzuki Akira, probably written sometime after 1803 and first published in 1824. It consists of three major parts: a translated text, a transliterated text, and notes.

The texts I have consulted are the Jingū bunko manuscript, and the published edition of 1824, both photographically reproduced in the Suzuki Akira memorial volume, Okada and Ichihashi (1967, pp. 310-48). The published version is also reprinted in the Kokugogaku taikei, Fukui (1938-44, vol. I, pp. 150-9). The differences between these various texts are quite insignificant, with one exception. In the Kokugogaku taikei text, some extra explanatory material is included which comes from a slightly revised version of the Gengyo shishu ron published in the Ryūen sōsho toward the end of the Edo period. Since this material adds nothing, and even if it was written by Akira, is much later than the original text, I omit it here.

The problems of deciding readings for those Chinese graphs which are not provided with furigana is a difficult one, and I do not presume to have contributed anything
to its solution in this case. Any one seriously interested in checking my translation will need to use the full kana majiri in any event.

To facilitate the understanding of the Gengyo shishu ron as a serious grammatical study, I have tried to annotate it as fully as possible. In particular, I have provided cross-references to the major English language work on the subject, G. B. Sansom's An Historical Grammar of Japanese (1928). Page references in parentheses in the notes refer to this work unless otherwise specified.
Treatise on the Four Grammatical Categories

Contents.

1. The distinction of the four grammatical categories.
2. The Noun.
3. The Adjective and the Verb.
4. The Particle.
5. The origin of language, or the process of generation of the four grammatical categories.

The distinction of the four grammatical categories mentioned above is universal in all languages. However, because foreign languages do not have the pure grammatical system of our Japanese language, they have only the general principle of the distinction. In our case, the distinction is clear and precise through the use of particles.¹ A detailed explanation will be found below.

written by Suzuki Akira

1. The distinction of the four grammatical categories.

Of the four grammatical categories, one comprises the category of the infinity of names,² called Nouns, or substantive words. Another comprises Particles, another
Adjectives, another Verbs; these last two are usually grouped together and called Predicatives. They are also sometimes called functional words, inflected words or living words. This is because their final syllables change depending on whether they end the sentence, or join to something else which follows. The details of this distinction and the peculiarities of each category will be discussed and explained one by one in the following chapters.

2. The Noun.

Although among nouns there is the subclassification into concrete and abstract, all words which are the definite names of something, whether object or abstraction, state or principle, or whatever, fall into this category.

The vowel in the last syllable of nouns may be any of the five from a to o without exception. For some reason, there seem to be relatively few which have the third vowel u in their final syllable.

In general there is no inflection of final syllables. However, in combination, alternations like the following occur:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ame} & \quad \text{[heaven]} \\
\text{ama} & \\
\text{ama no} & \\
\text{sake} & \quad \text{[wine]} \\
\text{saka} & \\
\text{take} & \quad \text{[bamboo]} \\
\text{taka} &
\end{align*}
\]
te [hand]  ta-____
hi [fire]  ho-____
ho no ____
ki [wood, tree]  ko-____
ko no ____

There occur nouns derived from verbs. In their final syllables, only the second vowel i or the fourth, e may appear. These are the level 4 forms of the Danzoku fu (my book also called Hatarakikotoba kiretsuzuki no fu). However, in the case of personal names, forms with the third vowel u may occasionally have noun status.

As for nouns derived from particles, there are cases like aware [oh!] in mono no aware wo shiru [know the pathos of the world; know the oh-ness of things]; ina [no] and u [yes] in ina no u no [like it or not]; or aya [oh!] in aya ni kashikoshi [wondrous indeed!]. Such cases are all really verbal gestures, and therefore particles; used in this way, however, they have been changed into nouns.

It is not unusual for a noun to become a predicative. If we cut off the inflectional particle at the end of a predicative, we often end up with the name of something, and even when this is not so, it has the same appearance. Therefore we may say that adding inflectional
particles to nouns produces predicatives. See my later discussion of this point.\textsuperscript{16}

There exist also nouns with particles added to them at the end, such as the -tsu\textsuperscript{17} of hitotsu [one] and futatsu [two], or the -chi\textsuperscript{18} of hatachi [twenty], misoji [thirty], momochi [hundreds (i.e. many)] and chiiji [thousands (i.e. many)].

3. The Adjective and the Verb.

The distinction of adjective and verb which I now make among what have hitherto been grouped together as predicatives, active words, or inflected words,\textsuperscript{19} is the distinction between the vowel \(\text{i}\) and the vowel \(\text{u}\) in the sentence ending syllable.\textsuperscript{20}

There are two types in \(\text{i}\), namely -shi and -ri. The meaning of -shi\textsuperscript{21} can be seen in the -shi of kirakirashi [brilliant, glittering] and sugasugashi [refreshing]. In the colloquial language, the meaning of -shii\textsuperscript{22} in constructions like nani-nani-shii is modelled after this usage. The -shi of

-keshi: \(\text{shizukeshi} \) [calm, quiet] \(\text{harukeshi} \) [distant, remote]\textsuperscript{23}
-tashi: \(\text{uretashi} \) [deplorable, detestable] \(\text{medetashi} \) [admirable, auspicious]\textsuperscript{24}
-mukashi: \(\text{furumekashi} \) [old-fashioned, trite] \(\text{obomekashi} \) [indefinite, unsettled]\textsuperscript{25}
and the -shi of takashi [high], hikushi [low], yoshi [good], ashi [bad], kanashi [sad] and tanoshi [happy] are all synonymous.

-Ri is ari. The a- is the same a- as in ari-ari [vividly, clearly], azakaya [bright, clear], arawaru [appear] and akiraka [clear, obvious] which is elided in combination. Wori [be] is wi-ari. Kikeri [have heard] and mitari [have seen] are kiki-ari and mite-ari. Yukeri [have gone] and kaereri [have returned] are yuki-ari and kaeri-ari. When the syllable -ri is added to the end of a word, even if it was basically a verb, it comes to mean a state. Therefore, words which end in either of the two syllables -shi and -ri all express the states of things.

As for the cases with u, there are twelve:

-ku: aku [open, dawn]
yaku [go]

-gu: agu [raise, complete]
sagu [hang down]

-su: sasu [stab, jab]
hasu [gallop]

-tsu: atsu [strike]
katsu [conquer]

-zu: nazu [pet, caress]
hazu [be ashamed]

-nu: inu [go]
kanu [overlap]
-u:  
au  [meet]^{34}

kau  [buy]

-bu:  
ukabu  [float]

narabu  [be in a row]

-mu:  
amu  [weave, knit]

kamu  [bite]

-yu:  
iyu  [cure]

kiyu  [disappear]

-ru:  
karu  [borrow]

saru  [leave, go]

-u:  
suu  [put]

tsukiu  [sit, squat].^{34}

-Ku is as in

-meku:  
adameku  [act frivolous]

komeku  [act childish],^{35}

-u is as in

-nau:  
tomonau  [accompany]

ninau  [carry],^{36}

and -su is su [do] or shimu [cause].^{37} Is not -bu synonymous with -buru?^{38} -u, -bu and -mu often alternate with one another.^{39} Although there are various differences in meaning among these twelve particles, when we group them together, they have the same vowel as su [do] and words which end in this vowel all express actions.^{40}

Even though predicatives are in opposition to nouns in expressing matters of motion, action and change, and
adjectives are included in predicatives, in some ways adjectives are similar to nouns. An indication of this is in the expressions *yoshi no* [good (attr.)] and *ashi no* [bad (attr.)]*41 and *ari no mama* [as it is], where the use of a following *no* is characteristic of nouns. Moreover, there is the phenomenon of deriving nouns from verbs by changing the final vowel to *i*.42 Examples are: *miyuki* [(hon.) going]; *mitorashi* [(hon.) business]; *tsukai* [servant, messenger]; and *omoi* [thought, idea]. This *i* has the meaning of a fixed form; could this be the reason why adjectives are similar to nouns? However, nouns have no inflection, whereas verbs and adjectives both have inflection in their final particles. Therefore, to group the latter two together as active words, living words or inflected words is just to draw this distinction.

If it should be proposed that even though the vowels of the adjective endings *-shi* and *-ri* are the same, still they can't be grouped together,43 I would answer that *ari* [exist] and *nashi* [not exist]44 are opposites. Further, *yoshi* [good] and *ashi* [bad] are the same in meaning as *yokari* and *ashikari*.45 Further, in reading Chinese,46 the expression *nani-nani-zentari*, which is *nani-nani-zen* to *ari*, corresponds to *nani-nani-shi*. While the meaning of the two syllables does differ, we see that the principle is identical in the two cases.
Kanashi [sad] and tanoshi [happy], which express states of the mind, when we say kanashibu [grieve] and tanoshibu [rejoice], come to express activities of the mind.\textsuperscript{47} Kou [desire] and ureu [worry], which express activities of the mind, when we say koishi [dear, beloved] and urewashsi [deplorable, to be worried about], come to express states of the mind.\textsuperscript{48} These are examples of mutual derivation among verbs and adjectives.

Particles may be added to nouns to derive verbs and adjectives, for example ao [blue], shiro [white] and kuro [black, dark] express states of being those colors. Aomu [become blue], shiramu [become white, lighten], kuromu [become black, darken] express activities of changing to those colors; further, aomeri [has become blue], shirameri [has become white, lightened] and kromeri [has become black, darkened] have again come to express states.\textsuperscript{50}

Particles may be added to other particles to derive predicatives, for example, the yo of yobu [call], the wo of womoku [shout], the aware of awaremu [feel emotion], and the ina of inamu [reject, deny] are all gestures rather than concepts,\textsuperscript{51} and therefore particles. Adding the syllable with $u$ turns them into verbs. Examples of adding a syllable with $i$ and deriving adjectives are ayashi [divine, mysterious], kanashi [sad], imadashi [immature, premature], and genigenishi [plausible, seemingly true].\textsuperscript{52}
Chinese words may be inflected and used as if they were Japanese, for example in the Heian Period, shūnen *gamashi* [tenacious] was rendered shūneshi, shūneku, and so on; sōzoku *suru* [inherit] was rendered sōzoku, sōzoki, and so on. In the modern colloquial there are many examples like: *ryōru* [cook], from *ryōri* *suru*; saishiku [paint], from saishiki *suru*; or kojiku [beg], from kojiki *suru*. The principle of distinguishing nouns from adjectives in the final particle is exactly the same.

I call a simple word which has no attached particle a noun. When an inflectional particle is attached, if the sentence ending vowel is ิ, I call it an adjective; if the sentence ending vowel is ุ, I call it a verb. Because these attached particles do not exist in Chinese, these three categories exist only in the meaning, and are not distinguished in form. Since all words look like our nouns, naturally their meaning is often confused. The reason that ancient Chinese literature is difficult to comprehend is that since there is no activity of particles, in words, one often cannot tell if something in the past, present, or future is referred to, or whether it is a statement or a command, or what have you. Therefore, various interpretations arise which are difficult to reconcile. Indeed, it is when we look at the pure grammatical system of our inflected words that we see the wonderful spirit of language in our great nation, which
is unequalled among all the languages of the world. This system is described in my teacher's Katsugo katsuyō kaku, and in my own Katsugo danzoku no fu, to which reference may be made.

4. The Particle.

Particles correspond to what are called in Chinese yǔ sheng, yǔ tz'u, chu tz'u, t'ian tz'u, fa yǔ tz'u, or yǔ chih yǔ sheng. Tz'u is also called tz'u ch'i, and means a verbal gesture. However, the Chinese particles are very crude and imperfect, while ours are delicate and precise, distinguish different meanings neatly, and are incomparable in their regularity. Indeed the superiority of our language over all others depends entirely on the virtues of our particles. See my teacher's Kotoba no tama no wo for further details.

When we examine the particles in comparison with the other three categories, we see that the latter have reference, whereas the former have none. The latter are concept words, whereas the former are gesture words. The latter become concept words by referring to things, whereas the former are gestures which attach to the concept words. Concept words are like beads, particles are like the string. Concept words are like tools, particles like the hand which uses or operates them. Therefore adding particles to nouns produces inflected words,
and further linking and organizing these inflected and
uninflected words together by means of particles produces
the infinity of utterances.61 Concept words could not
function without particles; particles without concept
words would have no place to attach.

There are, moreover, 1) particles which stand alone,
isolated from concept words;62 2) particles which precede
concept words;63 3) particles which come between concept
words;64 4) particles which follow concept words and end
the sentence;65 5) particles which are attached at the
end of inflected words;66 and 6) particles which follow
concept words without being attached, or may come between
them, and which may either end the sentence or join
to something following.67 Below, these will be discussed
one by one.

Particles which stand alone are:

- a (sound of weeping, or laughing)
- aware (cry of surprise)
- awaya (cry of surprise)
- aya (cry of surprise)
- ana (cry of surprise)
- anaya (cry of surprise)
- ya (sound of calling,
- yayo sound of calling, moreover, though
  the ya expressing grief seems at
  a glance to be attached to the end
of concept words, since it follows sentence ending forms, it cannot be said to be attached. It is the same as the -ya of awaya and anaya above.)

wo (sound of calling)
ina (sound of denial)
ō (sound of answering)
u (sound of assent)
iku (these three express uncertainty about things. They are often inflected by adding particles.) 68
nani
tare

These are basically of a different nature from concept words. They are also of a different nature from those particles which link concept words into sentences, but since they express verbal gestures, they are true particles. Of course, as particles which stand alone, they may become derived nouns, or by adding various particles, derived predicatives (as was demonstrated earlier). 69

Particles which precede concept words are:
hata [possibly]
mata [again]
ide [well]
ani [somehow]
nadoka [somehow]
somo-somo [to begin with]
mada [not yet]
nao [still, moreover]
Among these, the so- of somo-sama, the ma- of mada, hata,
and nao were originally nouns which seem to have become
particles.

Particles which come between concept words are:

no (shi)\textsuperscript{70}
tsu (as in ama tsu kaze [heavenly wind],
or oki tsu nami [waves in the offing])\textsuperscript{71}
i\textsuperscript{72}
wo\textsuperscript{73}
wa\textsuperscript{74}
ba\textsuperscript{75}
mo\textsuperscript{76}

kamo (the kamo of hitori kamo nen)
ka (same as the preceding)
zo (namo and nan are the same)
shi (as in hana wo shi mireba [when he
looked at the flower])
va (the question va)
koso
i (in ancient Japanese. It is like
yo, but yo may end a sentence,
whereas i cannot.)

to (the to of to in [say '...'] and to
omou [think '...'])\textsuperscript{77}
do (the do of domo [even])

Particles which come after concept words are:

ka
kamo
kana

ga (the ga of gamo)
gana
na
zo
yo
ne
mo
wa mo

ya
wa ya
ya wa
ba ya
kashi
rashi

zu (with a negative meaning. This zu inflected with the addition of ari is discussed below.)

The two particles which attach to concept words to form adjectives (shi and ri) and the twelve which form verbs (ku, gu, su, tsu, zu, nu, u, bu, nu, yu, ru, and u) have already been discussed.
There are particles which follow concept words and which, like the particles at the end of inflected words, may either end a sentence or join to the right. Just as with inflected words, the vowel which ends sentences is either ٰ or ٨, and the meaning of state or action respectively is also largely the same. These particles are:

\textit{gotoshi}

\textit{beshi}

\textit{mashi}

\textit{ri}

\textit{tari}

\textit{nari}

\textit{seri}

\textit{keri}

\textit{meri}

\textit{ki}

and also:

\textit{zu}

\textit{mu}

\textit{ramu}

\textit{kemu}

\textit{semu}

\textit{temu}

\textit{namu}

\textit{nu}
First of all, gotoshi belongs to class 27 of the Katsuyō kaku, and is a word which likens the state of a thing to something else. Next, beshi belongs to the same class, and it is a word which conjectures a state of affairs. The six beginning with ri are all ari. Tari is te-ari, or to-ari; nari is ni-ari; seri is shi-ari. Although keri and meri have no such expansions, their inflectional class is the same, and since they are words which evaluate a state of affairs, ri in them is undoubtedly ari. The meaning of ki resembles that of keri, but when joining to something following, it becomes shi. Zu is originally an uninflected particle. The inflected forms nu ne and ji have an added ari as in zu ari. In old Japanese ni (as in sen su beshira ni, and so on) is just zu ari. Nu is zaru or zu aru; ne is zere or zu are; ji is zu aru beshi. The particles from mu to namu have the inflected form -me, and mashi has the form maku. Nu both ends sentences and joins, mashi ends sentences and maku joins. Nu is inu [go, leave]; su is shimu [cause] and su [do], and all three are related to the final particles of verbs. Tsu has inflected forms te (meaning ji), tsuru and tsure, and is largely the same as class 9 of the Katsuyō kaku in the way it joins to the right.
5. The origin of language, or the process of
generation of the four grammatical categories.

The origin of particles is the expression of the
working of the human mind by means of vocal sounds.
Therefore particles are the marrow and soul of speech
and the basic principle of language. Taking these
vocal sounds, to designate and distinguish the infinity
of things by giving them names is the origin of nouns.
Taking particles and linking nouns together so as to
cause them to function, to join a noun and particle
into a single word creates a verb or an adjective.
This is the origin of verbs and adjectives. Therefore
to look back at the basis of the four grammatical cate-
gories, there are only those sounds which are particles
and those which are the infinity of names. The sounds
which are particles distinguish and express the con-
ditions of our mind; the sounds which are names distin-
guish and express the infinity of things. When we
use sounds to distinguish things, sometimes the sounds
reflect or imitate the state of things. I dealt with
this subject separately and in detail in my treatise
Onjo ko. In this treatise, in treating the principle
of the distinction of adjectives and verbs among the
inflected words, which have particles attached, I have
included the general distinction of the four grammatical
categories.
Gengyo shishu ron

Gengyo shishu ron mokuroku.
- Kotoba ni yokusa no wakachi aru koto.
- Tai no kotoba no koto.
- Arikata no kotoba shiwaza no kotoba no koto.
- Teniwoha no koto.
- Kotoba no minamoto mata yokusa no kotoba aishōzuru shidai.

Migi kotoba no yokusa ni wakaruru koto wa, ōkata bankoku no kotoba mina kawari nashi. Tadashi gaikoku wa, waga mikuni no gotoku naru kiyoshiki teniwoha naki yue ni, tada sono omomuki nomi no wakachi nari. Waga mikuni no wa, teniwoha nite sono sugata ito sadaka ni wakaretari. Kuwashiku wa honsho wo yomite shiru beshi.

Suzuki Akira shirusu

Kotoba ni yokusa no wakachi aru koto.

Kotoba ni yokusa no wakachi to wa, hitotsu wa yorozu no myōmoku nite, tai no kotoba, mata hatarakanu kotoba to iu. Hitotsu wa teniwoha, hitotsu wa arikata no kotoba, hitotsu wa shiwaza no kotoba, kono futatsu wo awasete, yo ni wa yō no kotoba to iu. Mata hataraku kotoba to mo, katsuyō no kotoba to mo, katsugo to mo iu. Owari ni tsuku moji, kiretsuzuki ni yorite kawaru yue nari. Kakute kono yokusa no wakachi no kuwashiki shisai, mata sono hitokusa goto ni, ono-ono isasaka zutsu no wakachi aru koto wa, tsugi-tsugi ni agetsurau wo miru beshi.
Tai no kotoba no koto.

Tai no kotoba wo futatsu ni wakureba, katachi aru mono to katachi naki mono to no tagai aredomo, subete mono nite mo koto nite mo, arikata nite mo kotowari nite mo, nan nite mo, hitokata ni sadamete sashiyobu myōmoku no kotoba wa mina kore nari.

Tai no kotoba no owari ni tsuku mojidomo no in, daiichi no a no in yori, daigo no o no in made, arazu to iu koto nashi. Sono naka ni wa daisan no u no in no moji no tsuku koto, yaya sukunaki yō ni oboyuru wa, sono yue aru koto naru beshi.

Owari ni tsuku moji no ugokihataraku koto nashi. Saredo ame wo ama-nan, mata ama no nan, sake wo saka-nan, take wo taka-nan to iu tagui ari, mata te wo ta-nan to ii, mata hi wo ho-nan, mata ho no nan, ki wo ko-nan, mata ko no nan to iu tagui ari.

Shiwaza no kotoba wo tenjite tair no kotoba to suru koto ari. Owari no moji, daini no i no in to, daiyon no e no in to ni kagireri. Danzoku fu (waga arawaseru Hatarakikotoba kiretsuzuki no fu nari) no daiyon tō kore nari. Tadashi hito no na to naru toki wa, daisan no in nite mo, yagate tair no kotoba no kaku nari.

Teniwoha wo tenjite myōmoku to suru koto, mono no aware wo shiru no aware, ina mo u mo no ina u, aya ni kashikoshi no aya, kono tagui mina kokoro no koe ni shite, teniwoha no tagui naru wo, kaku yō ni iu toki wa, tair no kotoba ni tenzeru nari.

Tai no kotoba no katsugo ni naru koto, kore wa moto mezurashikaranu koto nari. Katsugo no owari ni tsukeru, hataraku teniwoha wo torisutemireba, myōmoku no kotoba naru ga ōku, sa aranu mo matakumonaji sugata nari. Shikareba tair no kotoba ni hataraku teniwoha wo soetaru ga, yagate katsugo nari, to iite arinu beshi. Nao shita ni ronzuru wo miru beshi.
Myōmoku no ji no owari ni mo, teniwoha no tsukeru ga aru wa, hitotsu futatsu no -tsu, hatachi misoji momochi chiji no -chi nari.

Arikata no kotoba shiwaza no kotoba no koto.

Yō no kotoba, hataraku kotoba, katsugo nado, korai hitotsu ni iikitareru wo ba, ima arikata shiwaza to, wakachite futakusa no kotoba to seru wa, owari ni tsukite hataraku teniwoha no, hongo nite kiresuwaritaru moji no, daini no i no in naru to, daisan no u no in naru to no sabetsu nari. Daini no in naru wa, shi ri no futatsu nari. Shi wa, kirakirashi sugasugashi nado no -shi nite sono i shiraru. Sunawachi zoku ni nan-nan-shii to iu -shii no kokoro nite, sono arisama wo kata-dori ieru kotoba nari. -Keshi (shizukeshi harukeshi), -tashi (uretashi medetashi), -mekashi (furunekashi obomekashi) nado no -shi mo sono tagui nite, takashi hikushi yoshi ashi kanashi tanoshi no tagui no -shi, mina dōi nari. Ri wa ari nari. A- wa ari-ari azayaka arawaru akiraka no a- nite, mono ni tsuzuku toki wa habukarekiyuru nari. Wori wa, wi-ari nari. Kikeri, mitari wa, kiki-ari, mite-ari nari. Yukeri, kaereri wa, yuki-ari, kaeri-ari nari. Kaku ri moji wo owari ni tsukeru toki wa, moto shiwaza no kotoba naru mo, mina sono arikata ni naru nari. Sureba kono shi ri no futamoji nite tomaru kotoba wa, subete mina monogoto no arikata nari. Daisan no in naru wa, ku (aku yuku), gu (agu sagu), su (sasu hasu), tsu (atsu katsu), zu (nazu hazu), nu (INU kanu), u (SU kau), bu (ukabu narabu), mu (amu kanu), yu (iyu kiyu), ru (karu saru), u (suu tsukiu) no jūni nari. Ku wa -meku (adameku komeku) no tagui, u wa -nau (tononau ninau) no tagui, su wa su nari, shimu nari. Bu wa buru no i naran ka. U bu mu wa aikayou koto ari. Kono jūnimoji no teniwoha
no i ni wa, kusa-gusa wakachi aru bekeredomo, hitotsu ni ieba mina su to doin nite, kono in nite tomaru kotoba wa, mina shiwaza nari. Hito nite mo mono nite mo nan nite mo, ugokihatarakiutsurikawaru waza wo iu nite, kore wo koso wa yō no kotoba to shite tai no kotoba to hantai su beki ni, kano arikata no kotoba wo mo, hitotsu ni yō no kotoba to iikitaru wa, sukoshi ikaga nite, arikata wa tai ni chikaki tokoro ari. Sono shirushi wa, yoshi ashi no to ii, ari no mama to iu tagui, no moji ni tsuzuku sama, tai no kotoba no kaku ni onaji. Mata shiwaza no kotoba no owari wo, daini no in ni tenjite myōmoku to suru koto ari. Miyuki, mitorashi, tsukai, omoi no tagui nari. Kore daini no in ni wa sadamaritaru katachi no i wo mochite, arikata no kotoba no tai ni chikaki wa, kono yue nite mo aran ya. Saredomo tai no kotoba ni wa hataraku koto naki ni, kono futatsu tomo ni owari no teniwoha ugokihataraku yue ni, hitotsu ni shite kore wo hataraku kotoba, mata katsugo, mata katsuyō no kotoba nado iwan wa, saru koto nari.

Arikata no kotoba no owari, shi to ri to wa doin nagara, hitotsu ni wa iiigatakaran ya to tou ni kotaeraku, ari to nashi to wa, hantai no kotoba nari. Mata yoshi ashi to iu mo, yokari ashikari to iu mo, kotonaru i nashi. Mata karabumiyomi ni nan-nan-zentari to iu koto wa, nan-nan-zen to ari nite, sunawachi nan-nan-shi to iu ni onaji. Korera nite futamoji no i wa kotonari nagara, onaji omomuki naru koto wo shiru beshi.

Kanashi tanoshi to iu kokoro no sama, kanashibu tanoshibu to iu toki wa, shika kokoro no ugoku shiwaza to naru. Kou ureu to iu kokoro no shiwaza wo, koishi urewashi to iu toki wa, sono kokoro no sama to naru. Kore futakusa no kotoba no tagai ni aihenzuru rei nari.

Tai no kotoba ni teniwoha wo soete futakusa no kotoba to naru koto, tatoeba ao shiro kuro to iu wa,
saru irodomo no myōmoku ni shite, tai no kotoba naru
wo, aoshi, shiroshi, kuroshi to ieba sono arikata ni
nari, aomu, shiramu, kuromu to iu toki wa, sono ugoki-
henzuru shiwaiza, sore wo mata aomeri, shirameri, kuro-
meri to iu toki wa, mata sono arikata to naru nari.

Teniwoha ni teniwoha wo soete yō no kotoba to
suru koto, yobu no yo, womeku no wo, awaremu no aware,
inamu no ina, kono tagui mina kotoba ni aranu koe
nareba, teniwoha no tagui naru ni, daisan no in no
moji wo soete, shiwaiza no kotoba to shitari. Daini no
in nite arikata no kotoba to suru koto wa, ayashi,
kanaishi, inadashi, genigenishi no tagui nari.

Kango wo wago no kaku ni hatarakashimochiyuru
koto, nakamukashi ni wa shūnen gamashiki koto wo shū-
neshi, shūnemu nado ii, sōzoku suru wo sōzoku sōzoki
nado iu tagui ari. Ima no zoku ryōri suru wo ryōru,
saishiki suru wo saishiku, kojiki suru wo kojiku to iu
tagui ōshi. Kore mata shiwaiza to arikata to ni yorite
teniwoha no wakaruru omomuki, kawaru koto nashi.

Kotoba nomi nite tsukitaru teniwoha no naki wo tai
no kotoba to su. Hataraku teniwoha no tsukite, daini
no in nite suwaru wo arikata no kotoba to shi, daisan
nite suwaru wo shiwaiza no kotoba to su. Karakuni ni wa
kono tsukitaru teniwoha naki yue ni, kono mikusa no
kotoba no wakachi, tada i nomi ni arite, kotoba no ue
nite wa wakachi arazu. Mina konata no tai no kotoba
no yō naru mono yue ni, onozukara kokoro mo tagai ni
magiruru koto ōki nari. Kanata no kosho no kotoba no
satorigataki wa, subete no kotoba ni teniwoha no hata-
raki nōshite, sugitaru koto nari ya, ima no koto nari
ya, yukusue no aramashi ni ya, mata sa ari to iu ni
ya, sa seyo to ōsuru ni ya, nan to mo wakigataki koto
no ōki ni yoreri. Sareba chūshaku ni kusa-gusa no
setsu idekitarite, hitotsu ni ochigataki nari. Kono
katsugo no teniwoha no kiyoshiki wo mite koso wa, waga ōmikuni no kotodama no totoku tae ni shite, bankoku no kotoba no kakete mo oyobazaru koto wa shirarekere. Sono sadamareru nori wa, shi no Katsugo katsuyō kaku to ono ga arawaseru Katsugo danzoku fu to wo mite shiru beshi.

Teniwoha no koto.

Teniwoha wa, morokoshi nite wa gosei, mata goji, mata joji, mata tanji, mata hatsugoji, mata go no yosei nado iu tagui ni subete atareri. Ji wa jiki to mo iite, kokoro no koe nari. Saredomo morokoshi no goji wa ito-ito araki mono nite, waga mikuni no teniwoha no kiyoshiku tsumabiraka ni shite, suji no komayaka ni walare, nori no yoku sadamareru ni wa niru beku mo arazu. Mikuni no kotoba no bankoku ni sugure-taru tokoro wa, matakono teniwoha no medetaki ni yoreri. Kuwashiku wa waga shi no Kotoba no tama no wo wo mite shiru beshi.

Mae no mikusa no kotoba to, kono teniwoha to wo mukaemira ni, mikusa no kotoba wa sasu tokoro ari, teniwoha wa sasu tokoro nashi. Mikusa wa kotoba ni shite, teniwoha wa koe nari. Mikusa wa monogoto wo sashiarawashite kotoba to nari, teniwoha wa sono kotoba ni tsukuru kokoro no koe nari. Kotoba wa tama no gotoku, teniwoha wo wo no gotoshi. Kotoba wa kibutsu no gotoku, teniwoha wa sore wo tsukaiugokasu te no goto-shi. Sareba tai no kotoba ni teniwoha wo soete katsugo to nari, sono shikatsu no Kotobadomo wo ba, mata teniwoha shite nukitsuranetsukaiugokashite, yorozu no kotoba to naru. Kotoba wa teniwoha narade wa hatarakazu. Teniwoha wa kotoba narade wa tsuku tokoro nashi.

Saredo mata hitoridachite kotoba wo hanaretaru teniwoha ari, kore hitotsu, kotoba ni sakidatsu teniwoha kore futatsu, kotoba no nakara ni aru teniwoha
kore mitsu, kotoba no ato wo ukete tomaru teniwoha kore yotsu, katsugo no owari ni tsukitaru teniwoha kore itsutsu, tsuku ni wa arade ato wo uke, mata nakara ni mo arite, kire mo tsuzuki mo shite hataraku teniwoha wo soete mutsu nari. Shita ni ono-ono isasaka zutsu aguru wo miru beshi.

Hitoridachitaru teniwoha, あ (nageku koe, mata warau koe), あware, あwaya, あya, あん, あnaya (tomo ni odorokinageku koe nari), は, はyō (tomo ni yobu koe nari, mata nageki no は wa, kotoba no owari ni tsuku yō naredo, kiretaru kotoba wo uketareba, kanarazu tsukitaru kotoba to iu ni mo arazu. Ue no あwaya あnaya no は ni onaji), う (yobu koe), いな (inamu koe), う (kotauru koe), う (ubenau koe), いく, はん, たれ (kono mitsu tomo ni futei naru monogoto wo utagau koe nari. Nao teniwoha wo soete katsuyō ito おし). Korera moto yori mikusa no kotoba no tagui ni arazu. Mata kotoba ni tsuranaru teniwoha no tagui ni mo aranedomo, hito no kokoro no koe ni aravaruru nite, teniwoha no hontai nari. Sate kaku hitoridachitaru teniwoha naru yue ni, tenjite wa tai no kotoba to mo nari, mata kusa-gusa teniwoha wo soete katsugo to mo naru nari (shirushi wa mae ni izu).

Kotoba ni sakidatsu teniwoha, はた, また, いde, あni, nadoka, そono-somo, まな, なo wa, kono uchi そono-somo no そ, まな no は, はた, なo wa, まto wa kotoba naru ga, henjite teniwoha no おし ni nareru nari.

Kotoba no nakara no teniwoha, は (shī), つsu (ama- tsu kaze, おki tsu nami no tagui), に, うo, は, ば, も, kamo (hitore kamo nen no kamo nari. Mata tada), か (to mo iu), し (name, なn onaji), し (hana wo shi mireba no tagui), は (utagai no は nari), かoso, い (kogo ni ari. は no tagui naredomo, は wa tomaru koto ari. は wa tomarazu), と (to iu, と omou no と nari), do (domo no do nari).
Kotoba no shirie naru teniwoha, ka, kamo, kana, ga (gamo no ga nari), gamo, gana, na, zo, yo, ne, mo, wano, ya, waya, yawa, baya, kashi, rashì, zu (fu no ji no i nari. Kono zu ni ari wo soete hataraku koto wa shita ni iu beshi).

Katsugo ni tsukeru teniwoha, arikata no kotoba ni futatsu (shi ri), shiwaza no kotoba ni jūni (ku gu su tsu zu nu u bu mu vu ru ru u), ue ni sude ni iu.

Kotoba no ato wo ukete kire mo shi, mata hataraku shita ni tsuzuki no suru koto, katsugo no owari no teniwoha no gotoku naru iaru. Sono suwaru in no kanarazu daini to daisan to ni kagiru koto, katsugo ni onajiku, sono kokoro no arikata to shiwaza to ni wakaruru koto mo, ōkata wa onaji. Sono teniwoha wa, goto-shi, beshi, mashi, ri, tari, nari, seri, keri, meri, ki, sate wa zu, mu, ranu, kemu, semu, temu, nanu, nu, su, tsu, korera nari. Mazu gotoshi wa, Katsuyō kaku no dainiju nanakai no kaku nite, monogoto no arikata wo tatouru kotoba nari. Tsugi ni beshi wa, kore mo onaji kaku nite, koto no sama wo oshihakarisadamaru kotoba nari. Ri yori shita no matsu wa, mina ari nari. Tari wa te-ari, mata to-ari, nari wa ni-ari, seri wa shi-ari nari. Keri meri wa shirarendomo, hataraku kaku ue ni onajiku, sono ue koto no sama wo sadamehakaru kotoba nareba, sono ri wa utagai mo naki ari nari. Ki wa keri no kokoro ni nite, shita ni tsuzuku toki wa shi to naru nari. Zu wa moto ugokanu teniwoha nari. Nu ne ji to hataraku wa, ari wo soete, zu ari no hataraki nari. Kogo ni ni (sen su beshirani nado no tagui) to iu wa, sunawachi zu ari nari. Nu wa zaru zu aru nari. Ne wa zere zu are nari. Ji wa zu aru beshi nari. Nu yori nanu made wa me to hataraki, mashi wa maku to hataraku. Nu wa kire mo shi tsuzuki mo shi, mashi wa kire, maka wa tsuzuki nari. Nu wa imu, su wa
shimu to su nite, kono mitsu wa shiwaza no kotoba no
teniwoha no gotoku ni nareru nari. Tsu wa te (ji no i
nari), tsuru, tsure to hataraku koto, mata sono shita
ni tsuzuku sama, Katsuyō kaku no daikyūkai no kaku ni
ōkata onaji.

Kotoba no minamoto, mata yokusa no kotoba aishōzuru
shidai.

Hito no kokoro no ugokeru sama onsei ni arawanuru
wa, teniwoha no hajime nari. Sareba teniwoha wa kotoba
no kotsuzui tamashii ni shite, kotoba no ōmune nari.
Kakute sono onsei wo motte yorozu no monogoto ni myō-
moku wo tsukete shirushiwakatsu, kore tai no kotoba no
hajime nari. Tai no kotoba wo teniwoha wo motte nuki-
tsuranehatarakashimochiyuru toki, teniwoha to tai no
kotoba to hitotsu ni awasete, futakusa no kotoba to
naru. Kore arikata no kotoba to shiwaza no kotoba to
no hajime nari. Shikareba yokusa no kotoba wo moto ni
kaerihanachimireba, tada teniwoha no koe to, yorozu no
myōmoku no koe to no futatsu nari. Teniwoha no koe
wa, waga kokoro no sama wo wakachiarawashi, myōmoku
no koe wa, yorozu no monogoto wo wakachiarawasu.
Monogoto wo koe wo motte wakatan to suru ni wa koe wo
motte sono sama wo utushikatadoru koto ari. Kono
koto wa betsu ni Onjō kō to iu mono wo arawashite,
kuwashiku ronjiokeri. Koko ni tada, teniwoha no koe
no kotoba ni tsukitaru katsugo no naka ni, arikata to
shiwaza to no wakachi aru koto wo ba, isasaka omoi-
etaru omomuki wo ba monoshitsuru tsuide ni, yokusa no
kotoba no wakachi made ni oyoberu nari.
Notes to Gengyo Shishu Ron.

1. The term teniwoha varies in meaning from 'grammatical system' through 'syntax' to one of the parts of speech, 'particles'. Akira uses it as a technical term in the last sense, but sometimes, as in the first case here, a broader interpretation seems proper.

2. The phrase yorozu no, which I here translate 'the infinity of' is the closest thing I have found to a mention of linguistic creativity in kokugaku grammar. It does not literally mean infinity, but rather some number large enough not to be worth counting. The interesting thing is the way in which Akira uses it. Three classes are referred to by this phrase; the class of all external things (see note 88), the class of all utterances (see note 61), and the class of all names. The classes of adjectives, verbs and particles are not so referred to. If we could interpret 'name' here in the sense of noun phrase rather than noun, this would reflect a familiar distinction. The discussion Akira gives, though by no means conclusive, lends no support to the interpretation.
3. It is a commonplace analysis in Japanese grammar to group adjectives and verbs together in this way in opposition to nouns. Since there is no common term for such a category in English, my device is bound to cause dissatisfaction, but I can think of no better one.

4. This is the kire-tsuuki distinction often referred to in the body of this essay. I shall avoid such renderings with quotation marks as 'break' or 'join' in this translation.

5. The traditional order of vowels in Japanese is a i u e o, apparently influenced by Sanskrit phonology. See Sansom, Chapter I, especially pp. 46-7.

6. This is an interesting fact about Japanese nouns, disguised nowadays by the large numbers of Chinese loan words, which are not similarly constrained. I know of no satisfying explanation either.

7. This phenomenon occurs only in what we should call compounds. Akira does not seem to recognize any difference here and treats these cases as exceptions to the generalization that nouns are uninflected. Later grammarians, particularly Gimon, who wished to make the presence or absence of inflection crucial, did point out the fact, however.
8. All the grammarians interested in the parts of speech discussed changes from one to another, productive, derivational, or historical.

9. This is the inflected form which 'joins' to other inflected words, renyōgen, to use Gimon's term.

10. The book is Akira's study of the katsuyō system, and level 4 is the form referred to in the previous note.

11. For example, such personal names as Shigeru mean literally 'is luxuriant'.

12. This term mono no aware was used by Norinaga as a key term in literary criticism, a goal attained, for example, by the Genji monogatari.

13. Akira's term is kokoro no koe 'the sound (or voice) of the mind'. Implied is the position that normal lexical items represent concepts, but teniwoha the mind's handling of those concepts.

14. This is one of the more interesting aspects of Akira's system and has not found general approval in modern Japanese grammar. See Seishō's 'base' forms of inflected words.

15. Akira must be referring to a notion of abstract
base form here similar to Seishō's. Otherwise, his remark is beside the point.

16. See the chapters on verbs and adjectives, and the origin of language, where Akira develops this idea further.

17. This is the only reference I know of in kokugaku grammar to the problem of numerals and classifiers. Naturally the Chinese cases are not recognized, but Japanese had them too, as we see here. (pp.82-85)

18. This chi is strange. Akira seems to have confused two distinct suffixes, one of which means 'ten', the other 'thousand'.

19. This distinction between verbs and adjectives, as Akira points out at the end of the treatise, is the chief original aspect of the analysis in his view, and the point which he makes most completely. It has been accepted, with some differences, in modern grammar. (pp. 88-97)

20. This is the simple surface test which Akira suggests to correlate with the semantic differentiae of the two classes. Modern grammar generally defines only the words in -shi as adjectives; those in -ri it takes to be verbs. Professor Itasaka has pointed
out to me, however, that at least one modern gram-
marian, Ishigaki Kenji in his Joshi no rekishiteki
kenkyū (1955) follows Akira on this point.

21. Akira doesn't distinguish explicitly between two
separate, but similar, -shi's. There are in fact
two distinct 'paradigms':

'breaking' -shi -shi

'joining' -ki -shiki

in which the -shi of the right hand column is part
of the stem, the one on the left a suffix which
characterizes only the 'breaking' form. The second
-shi is not realized if the first is present.
(pp. 101-2)

22. -Shii is the modern reflex of -shiki, the 'joining'
form of -shi, an adjective-stem forming suffix in
these reduplicated cases. (p. 124)

23. These alternate with nouns in -ka, for example, shi-
zuka, haruka, which are used adjectivally. (p. 124)

24. These are not instances of the so-called desidera-
tive suffix -tashi.

25. This suffix is apparently related to -meku (see note
35) and -mekasu. All three have the meaning 'have
the appearance of'.

26. This -shi is the usual adjective former. The first three examples show the -shi, -ki pattern, the last three the -shi, -shiki paradigm.

27. Ari is the word meaning 'exist'. It is formally like verbs, except that its 'breaking' form is not aru, but ari. The analysis Akira gives here is generally accepted, at least as history, by modern grammarians. (pp. 202-214)

28. This sort of speculative etymology is characteristic of Akira. (see note 90)

29. Both wiru and woru mean 'be, dwell'. (pp. 155-6)

30. On mitari, see Sansom, pp. 177-9.

31. Ari forms a kind of perfect tense. (p. 142, p.319)

32. Compare the other examples mentioned among the teni-woha. (see note 81)

33. Whereas Akira's assumption that -shi and -ri are suffixes with independent semantic content is at least arguable, his extension of that idea to ordinary verbs causes some difficulty. Most of the consonants in these twelve 'teniwoha' are simply a part of the stems of the respective verbs. (pp. 130-132)
34. The two cases listed as -u are distinct, and collapsed only by the system of transcription used here. The first case is in the h- column, the second in the w- column. Later phonological change submerged the distinction, but it was retained in the kana as used in Akira's time. (pp. 47-50)

35. This is a real verb-forming suffix also with the form -mekasu, meaning 'act like...'.

36. This is the -u of the h- column. Akira's proposal that -nau is a suffix is questionable.

37. Neither of the verbs cited has anything to do, except historically, with the causative suffixes -su or -shimu.

38. -Burū is a verb-forming suffix with the meaning 'assume the airs of'.

39. The -u here is the one in the h- column. It is plausibly assumed to reflect an earlier p, which makes this alternation more familiar. (pp. 47-8)

40. This remark shows that Akira himself recognized the problems entailed by this particular analysis.

41. Only a few common adjectives participate in this sort of construction.
42. This is the same phenomenon observed by Akira in the noun chapter. There he points out that some verbs go to nouns ending in े. (see note 9)

43. Most kokugaku grammarians did in fact disagree with Akira.

44. This argument shows clearly the dependence of Akira on semantic over formal criteria.

45. The conjugation of adjectives with are fashionable at certain periods in Japanese history. (pp. 115-7)

46. 'Reading Chinese' refers to kanbun, a dialect of literary Japanese which came into being as a result of applying a kind of pony procedure to Chinese texts. (pp. 58-60)

47. This -bu is -mu in modern Japanese. (pp. 294-5)

48. Akira doesn't seem to note the difference between these two cases. Whereas the original adjectives would be predicated of the person whose mind is in the state in question, the derived adjectives would be predicated of some external thing by the person whose mind is in the state in question.
49. The independent usage of adjective stems like these supports Akira's treatment of -shi above. (see note 21; pp. 99-101)

50. This suffix -mu is the same as the -bu of note 47. The -ri is of course the perfect tense of note 31.

51. See the chapter on teniwoha for yo, wo, aware, and ina.

52. Aya and kana are listed in the teniwoha chapter. Imada means 'not yet'; ge ni means 'actually'.

53. This sort of thing goes on in modern times. For example:

saboru 'play hookey' (from sabotage, through German)

//

takuru 'take a taxi' (from takushii)

which are conjugated like ordinary Japanese verbs.

54. Two very vague Japanese words are used here, kokoro, which may mean 'mind' or 'meaning', and kotoba, which may mean 'language', 'word', or, as here, 'phonological form'.

55. Akira's teacher is, of course, Norinaga. The work referred to here is apparently a lost version of the Mikuni kotoba katsuyō shō.
56. I have found no use of these particular terms in Chinese grammar. Judging from their morphemic content, they are not all synonymous, but rather mean different classes of particles.

57. Particles in Chinese are usually restricted to certain sentence ending syllables indicating questions, exclamation, etc. Akira's reaction is understandable.

58. This reference to Norinaga's view of Chinese helps to explain where Akira learned these ideas.

59. Literally, 'have a place at which to point', or 'denote something'.

60. This metaphor is explained in the preface to the Tama no wo, and explains its title.

61. The term kotoba appears again. There is no particular evidence that it should be translated 'sentence' here. (see note 54)

62. This class is more usually termed interjections.

63. This class consists largely of simple adverbs.

64. This class consists largely of case particles and kakari particles.
65. This class consists largely of final particles which express moods and emotion.

66. This class is, of course, the inflectional suffixes listed and exemplified in the Verbs and adjectives chapter.

67. This class is the tense and aspect suffixes, which generally show inflection themselves, together with a group of auxiliary verbs.

68. Akira doesn't explain why these interrogative words are used 'in isolation'. Perhaps he refers to one-word questions like 'who?'. See the use of nani in Norinaga's Kotoba no tama no wo.

69. See notes 51 and 52.

70. (pp. 225-231) Shi (૦) is a way of writing no in Chinese.

71. (p. 235)

72. (pp. 238-243)

73. (pp. 235-7)

74. (pp. 256-263)

75. (pp. 273-5)
76. (pp. 263-4)

77. (pp. 245-50)

78. See notes 20-40.

79. I have not tried to gloss the teniwoha of these last four groups. They are discussed in any grammar of the language; see Sansom.

80. These cases are parallel with the addition of ari to verbs and adjectives. See notes 29-31, 45. (pp. 177-9)

81. (pp. 185-8)

82. (pp. 190-3)

83. (pp. 179-82)

84. (pp. 164-73)

85. (pp. 174-7) Ji (仍) is a way of writing he in Chinese.

86. See notes 2 and 61.

87. 'Things' here refers to extra-mental reality; the set of possible relata of concepts.

88. This is a reference to the ongisettsu, or theory
that there is an intrinsic relation between sound and meaning.

89. Akira's treatise Gago onjo ko used some aspects of the ongisetsu.

90. This statement reveals why Akira's treatment of teniwoha is so sketchy except for this particular class.
Appendix D

Partially annotated list of references.

The annotations are intended to provide a brief introduction to the Japanese literature on kokugaku grammar as explained in chapter I. Therefore only that literature, but not all of it, bears notes. The notes try to point out useful features of the works in question and give some idea of their up-to-date-ness.

Periodical literature of course exists in Japanese on kokugaku grammar in some quantity. It is not mentioned here because the tendency in Japan is to publish the most valuable of such work in book form is strong enough to make the vast majority of the periodical material redundant. My own rather cursory survey has failed to turn up any counter-examples to this generalization.
   Part I, Inflection, Journal of the American
   Part III, Derivation of inflected words, Journal
   of the American Oriental Society, 66, 304-
   15. All 1946.


3. Noam Chomsky, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory,
   The Hague. 1964.

4. -- , Aspects of the Theory of Syntax,
   Cambridge. 1965.

5. -- , Cartesian Linguistics, New York.
   1966a.

6. -- , Topics in the Theory of Generative

7. Chūgokugogaku kenkyūkai (Chinese Linguistics Society),
   ed., Chūgokugogaku jiten (Encyclopedia of

8. Doi Tadao, Kirishitan gogaku no kenkyū (Studies in
   Christian Linguistics), Ōsaka. 1942.

   1965.


A standard work. Arranged by individual scholars (kokugaku grammar section only).


Deals primarily with post-Meiji grammar.


17. Hashimoto Shinkichi and Ueda Kazutoshi, Kohon
setsuyōshū no kenkyū (A Study of the Ancient
Texts of the Setsuyōshū), Tōkyō. 1916.

18. — , Bunroku gannen Amakusa-ban
Kirishitan kyōgi no kenkyū (A Study of the
Doctrina Cristan in the Amakusa edition of
1592), Tōkyō. 1928.

19. — , Kokugohō yōsetsu (Essentials
of Japanese Grammar), Tōkyō. 1934.

20. — , Shin bunten bekki (Supplement

21. Hattori Shirō, Gengogaku no hōhō (Methods of Lin-

22. — , 'Descriptive linguistics in Japan',
in Sebeok, ed., Current Trends in Linguistics

23. J. C. A. Heyse, Deutsche Grammatik oder Lehrbuch
der deutschen Sprache, 26 Aufgabe vollständig
umgearbeitet von Otto Lyon, Hannover. 1900.

24. Hiroike Chikurō, Zōtei shina bunten (Revised and
enlarged Chinese Grammar), Tōkyō. 1915.

25. Hoshina Kōichi, Shintai kokugogaku shi (New History
of Japanese Linguistics), Tōkyō. 1934.

A standard work. Arranged by subdivisions,
e. g., teniwoha studies, etc.

27. ---, Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues, Berlin. 1836.


29. Jimbō Kaku, Gengogaku gairon (Linguistic Theory), Tōkyō. 1922.


33. Kobayashi Hideo, trans., Gengogaku genron (Cours de linguistique générale of F. de Saussure), Tōkyō. 1928, revised 1940.


38. --, Hyōjun nihon kōgo hō (Standard Colloquial Japanese Grammar), Tōkyō. 1930b.


40. --, Kokugohō ronkō (Lectures on Japanese Grammar), Tōkyō. 1936, revised 1940.

41. --, ed., Ayui shō, Tōkyō. 1932.

This and the following item have been largely superseded by Nakada and Takeoka (1960) and Takeoka (1961-2).

42. --, ed., Kazashi shō, Tōkyō. 1934.


44. J. R. McEwan, ‘Motoori's view of phonetics and linguistics in his Mojigoe no kanazukai and


A full scale examination of Gimon's life and work. Should serve as commentary to the following item.


A 'collected works' of Gimon; two volumes of a projected three so far in print. Volume I has phonological works, Tomokagami, Wagosetsu no ryakuzu, Katsugo shinan, two versions of Yamaguchi no shiori, and others. Volume II has Tomokagami soto no kage, two versions of Tana no wo kuriwake, Katsugo zatsuwa, and Wagosetsu no ryakuzu no kiki-gaki. Supersedes Yoshizawa hakase kanrekiki kinenkai (1943).


The most recent entry in the field. Readable, but somewhat simplified. Has valuable index of pre-modern Japanese linguistic works.


Contains, of course, all of Norinaga's works. Vol. XI contains also the complete works of
Haruniwa, which is just Kōtoba no yachimata, Kōtoba no kayoi and some poetry. This is the only convenient edition of these books so far available.


The most convenient edition of Ayui shō. The Introduction (pp. 25-85) is a valuable explication of Seishō's grammatical work.


Contains bibliographical data on Akira, some articles on his linguistic work, and reproductions of Gengyo shishu ron, Katsugo Danzoku fu (two versions each), and Gago onjō kō.

52. Ōtsuki Fumihiko, Kō nihon bunten to sono bekki (A large Japanese Grammar with Supplement), Tōkyō. 1897.


A kind of annotated bibliography of selected works, both pre-modern and modern, divided by subject.


   All the works of Seishō in two large volumes, with extensive annotations and discussion. A model for such work.


   Deals with some of the ideas of the kokugakusha.


   A readable recent work. Arrangement by subject.


A preliminary version of the next item.

65. -- , -- ,
Tōkyō. 1940.

A key work in any approach to kokugaku grammar. See Chapter IV, above.


74. Yamada Yoshio, Nihon kōgo hō kōgi (Lectures on Spoken Japanese Grammar), Tōkyō. 1922b.

75. --, Nihon bunpō yōron (Essentials of Japanese Grammar), Tōkyō. 1931.

76. --, Kokugogaku shi yō (Essential History of Japanese Linguistics), Tōkyō. 1935.
A preliminary version of Yamada (1943).

77. --, Nihon bunpōgaku gairon (General Outline of Japanese Grammar), Tōkyō. 1936.

78. --, Kokugogaku shi (History of Japanese Linguistics), Tōkyō. 1943.
A key work. See Chapter III, above.


Collects all Mabuchi's remarks about language into one section.


82. Yoshizawa hakase kanreki kinenkai (Committee for the celebration of Professor Yoshizawa's

Now superseded by Miki (1966-7) for Gimon, but contains also Norinaga's Kotoba no tama no wo.


A standard work. Approach is largely bibliographical and biographical.
Biographical note.

The author of this essay was born on March 6, 1940, in Tucson, Arizona. He was educated in the public school system in that city. He attended M. I. T. from 1957 to 1961, receiving an S. B. in June 1961; he then attended the University of Arizona from 1961 to 1964, receiving an M. A. in June 1964. He was privileged to spend the academic year 1966-67 in Japan on a Fulbright fellowship at which time the basic research for this essay was accomplished. He has accepted a position as Assistant Professor of Linguistics at the University of California, Los Angeles, to begin in September, 1968.