

Language without Future? On the Notion of Future Time Reference in Pre-Modern Descriptions of Japanese Grammar

Sven Osterkamp

This paper examines three different grammatical traditions of Japanese in pre-modern times, focusing on the notion of future time reference in each: the Western tradition (16th to 19th centuries) with its beginning with the Christian mission, the Japanese adaptation of the Western tradition in the field of Dutch learning (18th to 19th centuries) and, finally, the Japanese *tenioha* tradition, specifically in the time prior to the 18th century. In doing so, it will become apparent that there is a caesura in the Western tradition in the mid-19th century, chiefly as a reflection of diachronic changes in the tense–aspect–mood system of Japanese. It also becomes apparent that the notion of future as opposed to past and present was *not* first introduced into the description of Japanese from the Graeco-Latin tradition, as might be assumed. In fact, it already existed in the native tradition prior to the first contacts with European scholarship.

Japanese is among the somewhat unlucky group of languages that are occasionally said to “lack a future tense,”¹ or to “lack future forms,”² or suchlike—a claim that is more often than not paired with far-reaching inferences about the speakers’ psychology or alleged intellectual ability. It is not always sufficiently clear what exactly is meant by such allegations when they are raised: Is it, for instance, the (alleged or actual) lack of some *inflectional* (or possibly also *derivational*) *form* of the verb employed to express future time reference which such observers are concerned about?

The author would like to thank the editors of this volume as well as Gordian Schreiber and André Podziński (both Bochum) for reading and commenting on earlier versions of this paper.

¹ A footnote seems the most appropriate place to hide an example or two. See, for instance, Kensy (2001: 82) who writes: “Thus Japanese mythology never comments on future worlds, distant skies or even on life after death. The absence in Japanese grammar of a future tense linguistically reflects this, with the result that it is extremely difficult to express the future in anything but indirect terms.” Worse still, Richie (2003: 169) comments: “The Japanese language has no equivalent to ‘will’ or ‘shall’ because there is no future tense. Consequently, the Japanese have no intention that must be expressed in such a tense. Aims are seen in a present-tense form. Lacking a future tense, Japanese traditionally believe only in present reality: *utsutsu*, that which is right before your eyes. Future and past alike tend to be seen as insignificant.”—It seems futile even to attempt improving on Goethe’s (1824: 11) wording: “Ein Jeder, weil er spricht, glaubt auch über die Sprache sprechen zu können.”

² A case in point is Munzinger (1894: 132, again 1898: 49), who was well aware that the so-called ‘present tense’ can be employed for future time reference, though he took great interest in the lack of (presumably inflectional) future tense forms (“Von hohem Interesse ist das Fehlen der Futurformen”). I will come back to Munzinger in the course of this paper.

If so, Modern Standard Japanese (MSJ) is in good company, for example, with English and German, among a multitude of other languages.³—Are those who put forward such allegations possibly concerned about the (alleged or actual) lack of linguistic means *used exclusively* to express something along the lines of future time reference? If so, Japanese is again in good company—to quote Lyons (1977, 2: 816):

“What is conventionally regarded as the future tense (in languages that are said to have a future tense) is rarely, if ever, used solely for making statements or predictions, or posing and asking factual questions, about the future. It is also used in a wider or narrower range of non-factive utterances, involving supposition, inference, wish, intention and desire.”

In fact, if we claim that MSJ lacks a ‘future tense,’ we might as well hold that it lacks a ‘present tense’—and the same reasoning applies to any number of other languages. Having a shared means (namely *V+Ru*) for both present and future time reference, the interpretation chiefly depending on the subclass of the verb or context, does not render Japanese unusual or exotic. On the contrary, it is still in very good company. Again, a random look at the linguistic literature can be of help here, be it Lyons (1977, 2: 677f.) again or, for instance, Comrie (1985: 44):

“[M]any languages, including most European languages, have a clear grammatical distinction between past and non-past (the latter subsuming present and future time reference), but either no grammatical distinction or a much less clear grammatical distinction between future and non-future, in particular between future and present. In many European languages, the so-called present tense is in fact the normal verb form used to indicate future time reference [...].”

Or is it even the alleged lack of *any linguistic means at all* to express something with future time reference? That this is not the case for MSJ, just as it is not the case for any textually attested stage in the history of the language, should be self-evident to anybody with at least a rudimentary command of Japanese.

A quite different question to ask is whether the current state of Japanese—with linguistic means for future time reference, but without any *exclusive* means to do so—has always been the case throughout its history? Now, an awareness of diachronic developments in the tense, aspect and mood (TAM) system cannot be expected from the proponents of generalizing statements lamenting the “lack of a future tense” in Japanese, but even if authors disagree on a number of details it is a fact that Japanese has indeed undergone radical changes in its TAM system.

If any form of the verb in MSJ receives the label of future at all, it is certainly *V+Yoo*.⁴ It cannot be stressed enough, however, that this is nothing more than a label, not an exhaustive description of its grammatical function, not even necessarily an

³ See the chapter “The Future Tense” in *The World Atlas of Language Structures* and the accompanying map 67A (viewable online at <http://wals.info/chapter/67>).

⁴ The notation and analysis of Japanese in this paper follows Rickmeyer (2012, 2014 etc.).

indication of a tense-based interpretation. In fact, there is probably not a single serious account of MSJ grammar which claims that *V+Yoo* is the ‘future tense’ form of the Japanese verb, serving (either exclusively or primarily) to indicate (either in absolute or relative terms) future time reference—which is quite different from labeling the same form ‘future’ for want of a satisfactory alternative,⁵ while still explaining its function without reference to the concept of tense as such.

Now the etymological precursor of modern *V+Yoo* is *V+Am.u* as found in Old (OJ) and Classical Japanese (CJ). The two, needless to say, show some overlap, but they are not identical either in terms of their respective functions or in terms of their syntactic distribution. Accordingly, if asking for the presence or absence of ‘a future’ in Japanese, language history has to be taken into account so that whatever may be said about modern *V+Yoo* does not necessarily apply to OJ or CJ *V+Am.u* as well. In fact, it is (and has been for centuries, as we will see repeatedly in the course of this paper) widely acknowledged that there is *a correlation of some sort* between *V+Am.u* and future time reference, even if this not necessarily taken to be its primary function. For instance, Tranter (2012: 231) explains *V+Am.u* as a form “used for a range of modal functions, including cohortative (‘let’s ...’) and expression of uncertainty (‘shall I ...?’, ‘maybe’ etc.),” noting further that “[b]y itself, it largely involves future events.” Here, future time reference is as it were an accidental (secondary) feature of a (primarily) modal *V+Am.u*.

Somewhat more explicit references to the future abound whenever *V+Am.u* is contrasted with other modal markers, especially within the tripartite division into CJ *V+kem.u* vs. *V+Ru=ram.u* vs. *V+Am.u* (or OJ *V+kyem.u* vs. *V+u=ram.u* vs. *V+Am.u*) as a means of expressing conjectures about the past, present and future respectively (see, for instance, Takayama 2010: 60; 2011: 57; or Fukuda 2012: 116–9 [for which cf. 125, n. 12]; cf. Oda 2007: 99–103). This entanglement of mood and tense seems quite typical of *V+Am.u* and its interpretation. Frellesvig (2010: 78) goes beyond this when he notes that “[l]ike modals in many languages, the conjectural (= *V+Am.u*; S.O.) can also be used to refer to future time with little or no modal meaning,” taking the latter circumstance as the reason why the form in question is “sometimes termed a ‘future tense’” in the literature.

Even if short-lived and nowadays largely forgotten, the mid-20th century even saw a controversy concerning the original function—tense or mood?—and thus the direction of the functional change of *V+Am.u* between Bruno Lewin and Günther Wenck. In Lewin’s view (esp. 1959: 160 [§170]; 1960: 247—but cf. already 1955: 249, n. 33) *V+Am.u* was still primarily an expression of future time reference in OJ, with modal categories (dubitative, voluntative) gaining ground only subsequently in CJ. In his review of Lewin (1959), Wenck (1960: 316) dissented from this view; the exchange apparently ended with a response by Lewin (1960: 247f., n. 36) in defense of his earlier claims, providing further evidence drawn from the OJ *norito* 祝詞. Decades later and relying chiefly on Lewin (1959), Miller (1986: 173, also see 252,

⁵ For some alternatives found in the literature, see the end of section 1.

n. 25) explains that “Old Japanese had a formal verb category whose semantic correlative implied a clear, unequivocal reference to future time.” He speaks further of “future verb forms, which in the earliest Old Japanese texts are used for straightforward semantic reference to simple future time” before undergoing semantic changes. Unlike Lewin, he does not however provide any examples to illustrate this.

The chief difficulty here lies in the fact that even in many of the cases that lend themselves to a purely temporal interpretation a modal (usually dubitative) component may well have been present—in the end this seems impossible to decide. Without any native speakers to consult, the interpretation becomes quite arbitrary. See, for instance, *ki-mas.am.u* ‘will (probably?) deign to come’ and *kwopwi.m.u* ‘will (probably?) long [for you]’ in the following poems for likely, but still not rock-solid cases of V+*Am.u* expressing nothing but future time reference.

- (1) 豫 公来座武跡 知麻世婆 門尔屋戸尔毛 珠敷益乎 (*Man'yōshū* 万葉集 6.1013)⁶
 ARAKAZIME / “KIMI KI-MAS.Am.u #”=to / SIR.Ama.seba, / KADWO=ni YADWO=ni=mo / TAMA SIK.Ama.si=wo #
 “Had I known beforehand that my lord will deign to come I would have spread out pearls at the gate as well as at my abode.”
- (2) 可久婆可里 古非牟等可祢弓 之良末世婆 伊毛乎婆美受曾 安流倍久安里 家留 (*Man'yōshū* 15.3739)
 “ka.ku=bakari / kwopwi.m.u #”=to kanete / sir.ama.seba, / imo=wo=ba mi.zu=so / ar.u=be.ku ari.kyer.u #
 “Had I known beforehand that I will long [for you] this much, I should have not made the acquaintance of [you,] my dear!”

These cases show V+*Am.u* in sentence-final position—even if these sentences are quotations embedded inside larger syntactic structures by means of the quotative complementizer =*to*—but it is at least just as easy if not easier to find cases of presumably non-modal V+*Am.u* in adnominal position or in combination with nominalizing V+*URaku* as V+*Am.aku*.⁷

- (3) 故如此之状^乎聞食悟而歎將仕奉人者其仕奉^{礼良牟}状随品々讚賜上賜治將賜物^曾
 (*Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀, *senmyō* 宣命 no. 1 [697])
 KARE KA.KU=NO SAMA=WO KIKI-TAMAPE SATORI.TE, ISWOSI.KU TUKAPE-MATUR.AM.U PITO=PA, SO=NO TUKAPE-MATUr.er.am.u SAMA=NO MANIMA=NI SINA-ZINA, POME-TAMAPI AGE-TAMAPI WOSAME-TAMAP.AM.U MONO=so #

⁶ The Old Japanese examples in this section are quoted from the following editions: NKBT vol. 3 and vols. 4–7 for the poems in the *Kojiki* 古事記 and *Man'yōshū* 万葉集 respectively, and Kitagawa (1982) for the *senmyō* 宣命 recorded in the *Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀.

⁷ V+*Am.aku* might turn out to be just another instance of V+*Am.u* in adnominal position, as a derivation of V+*Am.aku* from V+*URu* (i.e. V+*Am.u*) plus **aku* suggests itself due to the entirely parallel distribution of allomorphs between attributive V+*URu* and nominalizing V+*URaku*.

“Thus, those who will serve Us diligently, having heard and understood this, are whom We will variously praise, promote and take care of in accordance with how they will have served Us.”

- (4) 前日毛 昨日毛今日毛 雖見 明日左倍見卷 欲寸君香聞 (*Man'yōshū* 6.1014)
 WOTOTUPI=mo / KINOPU=mo KYEPU=mo / MI.T.URE=DO=MO, / ASU=sape MI.m.aku /
 POSI.ki KIMI=ka=mo #
 “Oh, my lord, whom I wish I will see also tomorrow, despite having [already] seen you today, yesterday and the day before!”
- (5) 吾里尔 大雪落有 大原乃 古尔之郷尔 落卷者後 (*Man'yōshū* 2.103)
 WA=GA SATWO=ni / OPO-YUKI PUR.ERI # OPOPARA=no / PURI.ni.si SATWO=ni /
PUR.Am.aku=PA NOTI #
 “In my village, heavy snow has [already] fallen. It is [only] later that it will fall in the village, grown old, of Ōhara.”

The last of the three instances of V+*Am.u* in (3) might well be taken as volunative, though simple future time reference would also work, whereas this interpretation can be ruled out for the first two—which likewise do not seem to allow a dubitative reading either. As for (4), one might be tempted to regard the allomorph *-m-* of *-Am-* in *mi.m.aku posi.ki* ‘[I] wish that I will see’ as volunative,⁸ but a comparison with (5) suggests that it is exclusively *posi-* ‘want; wish (to have)’ that contributes to the overall volunative semantics here, whereas V+*Am.aku* in both examples is neither volunative nor dubitative, but merely serves to mark future time reference. Or so it may seem.

The unlikeliness of a volunative or dubitative reading is especially obvious in case of V+*Am.u* in adnominal position to a temporal noun such as *toki* ‘time’ as in the examples below, but also for instance *noti* ‘afterwards,’ *pi* ‘day’ or *yo* ‘generation, age.’ Here, a purely temporal interpretation again strongly suggests itself.

- (6) 阿麻登夫 / 登理母都加比曾 / 多豆賀泥能 / 岐許延牟登岐波 / 和賀那斗波佐泥
 (*Kojiki* 古事記, no. 85)
 ama-tob.u / tori=mo tukapi=so # / tadu=ga ne=no / kik.oye.m.u toki=pa / wa=ga na
 twop.as.ane #
 “The birds flying in the sky, too, are [my] messengers. When the voice of the crane will be heard, please ask my name!”
- (7) 和我世故我 / 可反里吉麻佐武 / 等伎能多米 / 伊能知能己佐牟 / 和須礼多麻布奈
 (*Man'yōshū* 15.3774)
 wa=ga se-kwo=ga / kapyeri-ki-mas.am.u / toki=no tame / inoti nokos.am.u # / wasure-
 tamap.u=na #
 “For the time when my beloved will come back I will keep myself alive. Do not forget me!”

⁸ See for instance Vovin (2009: 798) who quotes a poem involving *mi.m.aku=no posi.ki kimi* 美麻久能富之伎吉美 ‘my lord, whom I wish to see’ from the *Man'yōshū* (20.4449) as an example of *-Am-* taken to express intention (out of the three categories of “intention,” “suggestion” and “supposition” into which the examples are divided).

At the same time a perusal of the available OJ and CJ texts shows that future time reference (with or without a modal component) *alone* cannot account for the entirety of uses of V+*Am.u*. This is especially obvious for cases of V+*Am.u* in adnominal position, many of which have traditionally been ‘explained’ as expressing *enkyoku* 婉曲 ‘euphemism, circumlocution,’ sometimes paired with a claim of untranslatability into MSJ (on the inappropriateness of the latter claim see Oda 2007: 88). A more appropriate interpretation has been put forward by Takayama in his study of such cases. He concludes that it instead acts as “a marker indicating non-reality” (2005: 15). This is reminiscent of Rickmeyer (1986: 225), who terms it “suffix-verb of ‘unreality,’” or also of various earlier characterizations of V+*Am.u* as pertaining to ‘unreality’ (*higenjitsu* 非現実); see for instance Yoshida (1973: 377) or even already Yamada (1908: 453), whose work is also the point of departure for recent studies such as Ijima (2016). And indeed, if one were to decide on a *single* function for V+*Am.u* in *any* context, the result should be along these lines. That is, it can be argued that V+*Am.u* is a marker of irrealis rather than future time reference, even if the latter forms a large subset of the former. Whether this is also its original function is however open to question.

Against this backdrop the following survey will introduce three different (but in part interconnected) grammatical traditions of Japanese in pre-modern times, with a focus on their respective notion of future time reference: first, the Western tradition, which spans the 16th to 19th centuries and has its beginnings in the context of the Christian mission in Japan; second, the Japanese adaptation of the Western tradition in the field of Dutch learning (18th to 19th centuries); and third, the native Japanese *tenioha* tradition, here with a focus on the time prior to the 18th century, i.e. before the advent of Dutch grammatical studies. The aim of this study is to demonstrate how the division of time in Japanese was conceptualized in these traditions, and what the linguistic means associated with the future were, be it a ‘future tense’ in the strict sense or more generally future time reference.

1 The ‘future’ in Western grammars of Japanese

The earliest extant accounts of Japanese based in the Graeco-Latin grammatical tradition date from the late 16th and early 17th centuries, the earliest case being a reprint executed in Amakusa in 1594 of *De institutione grammatica libri tres*, the standard grammar of Latin by Manuel Álvarez (1526–1583). Here, the Japanese language figures only in so far as translation equivalents are given for the Latin forms discussed, just as the title page announces. The cases of Latin nouns, for instance, are explained by giving the Japanese particles corresponding to them (3v), and the various verbal conjugations treated in the tables on fol. 12v–62v are given together with their Japanese and Portuguese equivalents. Here we find, to take *amare* ‘to love’

as an example: future indicative *amabo*, *amabis* etc. translated as *Taixetni vomouōzu* (18r), future imperative *amato tu*, *amato ille* etc. as *Vomōbexi* (18v), future optative *utinam amem*, *ames* etc. translated as *Vomoye caxi*, *A, gana* (19v), future indicative passive *amabor*, *amaberis* etc. as *Vomouareōzu* (26r) and so on. Apart from imperatives and optatives, such Latin forms are thus usually translated as V+YOOz.u(ru), i.e. as something we may refer to as the extended ‘future’ form as opposed to short V+YOO, both of which were in general use in the Middle Japanese (MJ) colloquial. The appearance of =*be.si*, belonging to the literary rather than colloquial register is noteworthy in view of the parallels in the Japanese tradition of the study of *tenioha* to be discussed further below—but also if we take a slightly different perspective in the direction from Latin to Japanese: namely that of the treatment of the Latin tenses in contemporary translations into Japanese. For in the examples treated by Matsuoka (1982: 28; 1985: esp. 116 [= 1991: 184f.]; 1993: 54), the Latin future is generally rendered into literary Japanese by means of some form of =*be.si*.

From the early 17th century onwards we have several grammars of Japanese at our disposal, chiefly the *Arte da lingoa de Iapam* (Nagasaki 1604–1608) and *Arte breve da lingoa Iapoa* (Macao 1620) compiled by João Rodriguez and written in Portuguese, as well as the Latin language *Ars grammaticæ Iaponicæ linguæ* (Rome 1632) edited by Diego Collado, which is based on a Spanish original preserved in two manuscripts.⁹ Stemming from the same tradition, there is also the much later *Arte de la lengua Japona* (Mexico 1738; see 56f., 60 etc.) by Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688–1747). First and foremost, it is again the short V+YOO or the extended V+YOOz.u(ru) that are given here as corresponding to Romance future forms.

Whereas the MJ colloquial is in the focus of all these grammars, the two works by Rodriguez especially also treat literary Japanese in considerable detail. As representatives of the future in literary Japanese, Rodriguez (1604–1608: 12r; 1620: 68v) takes both V+Añ (from the above-mentioned V+*Am.u*, as the counterpart of colloquial V+YOO) and expressions involving some form of =*be.si* into consideration. The Latin print of Collado’s grammar also contains a short section on the literary language, in which, among other things, readers are told that in it the future is formed by adding =*be.si* or negative =*be.kar.azu* to the verb (Collado 1632: 74), which is well in line with the missionaries’ actual translation practice as hinted at above.¹⁰

As these early missionary grammars are occasionally accused of pressing Japanese into an inappropriate Graeco-Latin framework—round pegs in square holes—it seems worthwhile here to consider the nature of these works for a moment. Need-

⁹ For details on the two Spanish manuscripts as well as on an incomplete Italian version, see Osterkamp (2014).

¹⁰ In addition to the above-mentioned cases, also see Kojima (1984) for a contemporary case of translation from Portuguese into Japanese. The correspondences between Portuguese and Japanese forms are manifold here, but again there is a strong correlation between future forms and =*be.si* as well as V+Añ (see esp. pp. 286f.).

less to say, they are not neutral descriptive accounts of Japanese grammar in a modern linguistic fashion. In the first place, they are practical grammars for learners from a specific background. They thus depart not from their object, the Japanese language as such, but from what their readers already know (be it Latin, Portuguese or Spanish) and are presented in the traditional mode of description, including standard concepts and terminology. The focus is on answering the question “what if anything in Japanese corresponds to our category X?” rather than for instance “what are the forms of the Japanese verb in its own right and how can we describe their respective function?” It is thus only to be expected that the early missionaries identified some equivalents when searching for ‘future’ verb forms.

What is probably more striking at first sight is that not one of the aforementioned grammars seems to contain an explanatory passage in which a *caveat* is added to the extent that, for instance, V+*YOO* is not a *neutral* way of expressing nothing but future time reference but usually involves a modal component. Before jumping to hasty conclusions along the lines that the missionaries were simply led astray by their Graeco-Latin grammatical tradition, thus pressing Japanese modals into foreign tense categories, we should consider another possibility: The so-called ‘future tense’ forms in Romance languages and elsewhere are not themselves limited to marking future time reference. Put differently, such forms were probably much better matches for V+*YOO* and related forms than one might at first think—it is only the label ‘future’ (which as part of the grammatical tradition is taken as a given and thus left unexplained in these grammars) that is misleading here if equated with neutral future time reference. This is not how the ‘future tense’ is actually employed in Romance languages and elsewhere, so it seems inappropriate to expect anything different from some Japanese form labeled as ‘future tense.’

The picture we may derive from these early missionary grammars is by and large retained up until the middle of the 19th century in Western accounts of Japanese grammar, given that they were typically written under the influence of these missionary grammars or otherwise of the application of the Dutch grammatical tradition to the Japanese language (on which see below). For instance, observers such as Engelbert Kaempfer (1651–1716), Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866) and Janus Henricus Donker Curtius (1813–1879) derived the lion’s share of their knowledge of Japanese from the interpreters of Dutch in Nagasaki. Accordingly, their understanding of the ‘future tense’ in Japanese is akin to that of Dutch learning in 18th and 19th century Japan: They all identify V+*Yoo* as the colloquial ‘future’ form, Donker Curtius further adds literary V+*Añ* (Kaempfer, *Collectanea Japonica*, fol. 372r; Siebold 1826: 120f.; Donker Curtius 1857: 140f.). Both traditions eventually even merge when Léon Pagès (1814–1886) translates Donker Curtius’s grammar into French—*Avec de nouvelles Notes extraites des Grammaires des PP. Rodriguez et Collado*, as the title adds (see for instance Pagès 1861: 175f. for such additions relating to the ‘future tense’).

The situation up to this time is in stark contrast to what is seen in the decades that were to follow. In the new wave of grammatical descriptions of (especially then-

current colloquial) Japanese that set in during the closing years of the Edo period (1603–1868) around the middle of the 19th century we may observe two things which reflected the changes that had occurred in the TAM system since the MJ period:

(a) The so-called ‘present tense’ form of the verb (V+*Ru*) in the colloquial is now found to be commonly used for future time reference.

“キマス *Kimas*. Present; may be employed for future; as アノヒトガキマス *Anohitoga kimas*, ‘He will come’” (Alcock 1861: 23).

“Future tense.

アロウ *Arō* or アラン *Arang*, ‘shall or will have.’ Both these forms, however, imply a certain doubt, a decisive future would better be conveyed by the present form of the verb アル *aroo* or アリ *ari*” (Alcock 1861: 40).¹¹

“INDICATIVE MODE.

Pres. Aru, Arimas’ or Gozarimas’ [...]

Fut. Aroō, Arimashoō or Gozarimashoō or like the present” (Brown 1863: xxiv).

“The real distinction between *kasō* the so-called future, and *kasu*, the so-called present indicative, is not that of time. Both *kasō* and *kasu* may be either present or future. The real difference is that *kasō* expresses an opinion, *kasu* a fact” (Aston 1869: 21f.).

The earliest grammar quoted above, i.e. that by Rutherford Alcock (1809–1897), draws our attention to a significant change in the TAM system of Japanese, which was still far from complete in the MJ period, the language of which is reflected in the above-mentioned missionary grammars. In MJ, the old resultative (V+*Tari*, more precisely attributive V+*Tar.u*) yielded the relative past V+*Ta*, while its etymological equivalent V+*Te ar.u* as well as the parallelly constructed V+*Te i.ru* (or *wor.u* etc.) gained ground as new means to express resultatives.¹² In its continuative reading V+*Te i.ru* now performed part of the duty the simple ‘present tense’ form V+*URu* (later V+*Ru*) had formerly fulfilled. However, V+*URu* did not merely lose ground to V+*Te i.ru*—for our present purposes it is at least as important that it encroaches upon the domain of the ‘future tense’ in V+*YOO* (later V+*Yoo*), especially in adnominal position. This was already noted by Fujitani Nariakira 富士谷成章 (1738–1779) in his *Ayui-shō* あゆひ抄 (printed 1778, 4: 9v–10r) and has also been the object of linguistic research in recent years (see for instance Yoshida 2011 and the literature quoted therein). Put differently: while MSJ V+*Ru* and V+*Yoo* are direct descendants of MJ V+*URu* and V+*YOO* (and these in turn of CJ attributive V+*URu* and V+*Am.u*), they differ significantly in terms of their function in the respective

¹¹ Alcock writes <oo> for what is <u> in most other Romanization schemes, so that his <aroo> corresponds to *ar.u*, not to *ar.oo* (his <arō>).

¹² A well-known remnant of this is the resultative use of V+*Ta*, which can still be generally observed in MSJ in adnominal position, whereas MJ also shows the same usage in sentence-final position. This non-past use of V+*Ta* did not escape the attention of the early missionaries; see for instance Rodriguez (1604–1608: 11v) or Collado (1632: 18f.).

TAM system. When Western observers arrive at different conclusions around 1600 and 1850 respectively, this is in part simply because they encountered different varieties of Japanese.

(b) At the same time what have been called “future tense” forms (i.e. *V+Am.u* and its derivatives including colloquial *V+Yoo*) are now subject to reinterpretation, with an increasing number of authors abandoning the older interpretation as a marker of ‘future tense’ in favor of a modal one. Indicative as it is of a temporal interpretation, the designation ‘future’ is qualified as being inappropriate by some authors, although it is rarely avoided altogether—as it tends to be by numerous authors from the 20th century onwards. Thus, Alcock (1861: e.g. 45) already distinguishes between a “Future absolute” (*V+Ru*) and a “Future dubitative” (*V+Añ*, *V+Yoo*) just as does, for instance, Basil Hall Chamberlain (1850–1935) later on with his “Certain” vs. “Probable Present or Future” (1888: 149 [§240], 151 [§257]), whereas Johann Joseph Hoffmann (1805–1878) notes that *V+Am.u* and its derivatives have “been called *Futurum dubium*. For convenience’ sake we retain this name, even were that of *modus dubitativus* better fitted” (1868: 208). Samuel Robbins Brown (1810–1880) retains the label “future,” but points out that it “essentially denotes uncertainty” and further that “[t]he future of Japanese verbs simply predicts, but never expresses determination as in English” (1863: xii, xx). He thus presents us with a useful reminder that a mere label of some grammatical item is not tantamount to an exhaustive explanation of the function of its referent.¹³ Towards the end of the century Chamberlain summarized the problem of terminology and the confusion it may cause as follows:

“The Japanese verb does not, like ours, clearly distinguish present from future time. It has one form serving to denote any certain action or state, whether present, future or habitual, and another serving to denote any merely probable action or state, whether present or future. It is the question of certainty or uncertainty that forms the criterion, not the question of time. Still, as future actions and events are, in the nature of things, more often uncertain than present actions and events, the form denoting certainty is applied in a majority of cases to present time, while the form denoting mere probability is applied in a majority of cases to future time. It is this which has led most writers on Japanese grammar to term the former the present tense and the latter the future tense. But such a terminology is really incorrect, and it has been the cause of much mutual misunderstanding between Europeans and natives” (Chamberlain 1888: 155f. [§273]).

In a similar vein, more recent authors generally tend to adopt designations such as “presumptive,” “tentative” or “conjectural” for instance rather than “future (tense)”

¹³ For a more elaborate wording see Miller’s (1986: 151) urge that “we must remember that while all the terms [...] have been chosen with care, and while they are believed to be as informative as possible, these terms are, for all that, still nothing more than convenient identification tags for the morphological categories to which they have been attached. They do not attempt to be comprehensive, watertight definitions of the total semantic configuration of those categories. No one should ever expect that it will be possible to learn the details of a language by memorizing the identification tags for its grammatical categories.”

to label V+*Yoo* and related forms (much in line with the common *suiryō-no jodōshi* 推量の助動詞 ‘auxiliary of conjecture’ in Japanese), whereas the “present (tense)” V+*Ru* has been variously re-labelled “non-past,” “non-perfect,” “imperfect,” “present-future” etc.

The paradigm change in the mid- to late-19th century grammatical tradition of Japanese in the West eventually paved the way for allegations of the kind alluded to at the beginning of this paper. Among the earlier proponents of such views apparently was missionary Carl Munzinger (1864–1937), who after four years of studying Japanese (see Munzinger 1894: 139) presented his views on “the psychology of the Japanese language” in a paper read before the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens on 26 September 1893 and 25 October 1893. Among other ‘infantile,’ ‘rural’ or down-right ‘underdeveloped’ aspects of colloquial Japanese he took special interest in the “absence of future forms” (132), comparing—as he also did in other respects—the situation that obtained in Japanese in general to that of the “rural population” in “our [i.e., German; S.O.] dialects”:

“Dass das Futurum dem Naturmenschen mit seinem concreten Sinn überhaupt ferne liegt, sehen wir noch sehr klar und deutlich in unsern Dialecten, besonders bei der ländlichen Bevölkerung, deren Ausdrucksweise mit der japanischen in der Sache grosse Aehnlichkeit hat; denn bei bestimmter Zukunft gebraucht der Bauer stets die Form des Praesens, wie der Japaner seinerseits thun muss; wendet aber der Bauer einmal wirklich die Futurform an, so meint er dieselbe in der Regel nicht als Futur, sondern als Wahrscheinlichkeitsform” (Munzinger 1894: 133).

For Munzinger the “absence of future forms” together with various other features of the languages was a manifestation of a “still undeveloped, infantile, yet healthy spirit,” concerned chiefly with the concrete, “having taken only shy glimpses at the realm of abstract thinking” (140f.).—Presumably, Munzinger would not be amused to find that the ‘rural’ use of ‘present tense’ forms for future time reference is the rule rather than the exception in current German usage.

2 The ‘future’ in *rangaku* approaches to Japanese

Given that Western grammars of Japanese, particularly the older ones, all feature a future in some way or another, we may expect to get similar results when examining grammatical treatises from the context of Dutch learning (or *rangaku* 蘭学) that set in during the 18th century. As the earlier missionary grammars appear to have remained unknown in Japan until their scientific rediscovery in Meiji times and could thus not exert any influence on linguistic thought, it is in fact this *rangaku* context that first provides us with numerous examples of the import and adaptation of Western linguistic thought.

Part and parcel of the Dutch dictionaries and grammars brought to Japan was the Latin-based grammatical tradition as applied to Dutch (and sometimes other European languages), both its categories and the respective terminology. This also includes the

toekomende tijd ‘future tense’ posited in Dutch grammar. Sources of interest to us here fall into two categories: (a) explanations of the tense–aspect system of Dutch with Japanese equivalents added (see for instance Okada 2004 for a brief overview of relevant sources) and (b) accounts of Japanese grammar grounded in the Dutch grammatical tradition.

Materials of the second kind emerged only later, namely with the well-known *Gogaku shinsho* 語学新書 (printed 1833) by Tsurumine Shigenobu 鶴峰戊申 (1788–1859), so I will concentrate on those of the first kind in the following. As prime examples in this context the writings of Shizuki Tadao 志筑忠雄 (alias Nakano Ryūho 中野柳圃; 1760–1806) come to mind. These include his *Shihō shoji taiyaku* 四法諸時対訳 (1805) or the somewhat earlier *Rangaku seizenfu* 蘭学生前父. Almost right in the beginning of the latter, “the names of the three times in Dutch” (“Rango sanze meimoku” 蘭語三世名目; 1v) are listed, but of more interest is the “diagram of the three times” (“sanze[-no] zu” 三世図; 7v–8r), which illustrates in the form of a matrix with past and present on the *x* axis and past, present and future on the *y* axis, the interrelation between six TAM (rather than pure tense) categories, such as *hebben*, *heb* etc. as “past in the present” (perfect) vs. *hadden*, *had* etc. as “past in the past” (pluperfect). This is clearly also the backdrop for the terminology used in his *Shihō shoji taiyaku*, discussed below. No Japanese translations of the Dutch verbs are provided in the diagram—only Classical Chinese ones, thus illustrating the well-known reliance of Dutch learning (and also more generally Western studies, or *yōgaku* 洋学) on Sinological knowledge when it comes to matters of language and translation. Japanese translation equivalents, both literary and colloquial, to the Dutch future forms and related ones are however found scattered throughout the manuscript, as for instance in *ware iw.añ* 我^レ言^ル for *ik zal spreken* (2v) or *iw.añ go* (or *kotoba*) 言^ル語 and *i.oo go* 言^ウ語 (besides *jiang yan zhi yu* 將言之語) for *woorden die men spreken zal* (4r). Leaving aside questions concerning the naturalness or even appropriateness of some of the translations from Dutch into Japanese, it is easy to find examples here for the equation of the *toekomende tijd* in Dutch with literary V+Añ, colloquial V+Yoo and related forms.

Nakano’s short treatise *Shihō shoji taiyaku* (Translation of the four modes and the various tenses), begins with an account of what he calls the *shoji* 諸時, or “various tenses,” for as he explains in a comment to the heading: “I call them ‘various tenses’ as there is a more fine-grained distinction to the three tenses” (三時ニ細分アル故ニ諸時ト云). The following categories are set up and illustrated on the pages that follow, for the majority explicitly in reliance on some unspecified edition of Willem Séwel’s *Nederduytsche spraakkonst*.¹⁴

¹⁴ Séwel’s *Spraakkonst* was first published in 1708 and saw further editions in 1712, 1733 and 1756. The exact edition used by Nakano is not known, but his treatment of “the various tenses” is clearly based on the account found on pp. 144–7 of the first edition of 1708, or on pp. 263–7 of

<i>tegenwoordige tijd</i>	<i>genzai</i> 現在	<i>ik leer</i> 'I learn'	<i>ware manabu</i> 我学ブ
<i>onvolmaakte verleeden tijd</i>	<i>kako-no genzai</i> 過去 (E:ノ) 現在	[missing] (E: <i>ik leerde</i>) 'I learned'	<i>ware manabiki</i> 我学ビキ (E: 我学ひき)
<i>volmaakte verleeden tijd</i>	<i>kako</i> 過去	<i>ik heb geleerd</i> (E: <i>geleerde</i>) 'I have learned'	<i>ware manabitsu</i> 我学ひつ (E: 我学びつ)
<i>meer dan volmaakte verleeden tijd</i>	<i>kako-no kako</i> 過去ノ過去	<i>ik had geleerd</i> 'I had learned'	<i>ware manabitsu,</i> <i>ware manabiki</i> 我学ひつ 我学ひき
<i>toekomende tijd</i>	[missing] (E: <i>mirai</i> 未来)	<i>ik zal leeren</i> 'I shall/will learn'	<i>ware manaban</i> 我学てん [sic] (E: 我学ばん)
<i>tweede toekomende of onbepaalde tijd (aanv. wijze)</i> ¹⁵	<i>fugenji</i> 不限時	<i>ik zou leeren</i> 'I should learn'	<i>ware manabu-beshi,</i> <i>ware manabitemashi</i> 我学ふへし 我学てまし (E: 我学ひてまし)
<i>derde toekomende of onbepaalde tijd (aanv. wijze)</i> ¹⁶	<i>fugenji</i> 不限時 (later: <i>fugenji-no kako</i> 不限時ノ過去)	<i>ik zou geleerd</i> (E: <i>geleerde</i>) <i>hebben</i> 'I should have learned'	<i>ware manabitsu-ran,</i> <i>ware manabu-bekariki</i> 我学ひつらん 我学ふへかりき
<i>tweede onvolmaakte verleeden tijd of onbepaalde tijd (aanv. wijze)</i> ¹⁷	<i>kako-no mirai</i> 過[去…] (E: 過去ノ未来)	<i>toen ik leeren</i> (E: <i>leerde</i>) <i>zoude</i> 'when I would learn'	<i>ware manabu-bekarishi toki</i> 我学ふへかりし時

either of the three later editions. The spellings of the terminology given in the first column have been normalized based on Séwel.

Quotes from *Shihō shoji taiyaku* follow the Wakabayashi manuscript as reproduced in Sugimoto (1991), but I indicate wherever the Ema manuscript ("E") as transcribed by Saitō (1973) differs.

¹⁵ Both manuscripts of *Shihō shoji taiyaku* depart from Séwel here in assigning this to the conjunctive mood (*aanvoegende wijze*) instead of to the indicative mood. Also, as already noted by Saitō (1973: 41), it is only the second half of the designation (i.e. *onbepaalde tijd*) that is translated here as *fugenji* 不限時.

¹⁶ While the first three editions speak of "*Derde Toekomende, óf Onbepaalde Tyd*" here, this is simplified to just "*Derde Toekomende Tyd*" in 1756. As this simplification is not reflected in *Shihō shoji taiyaku*, Nakano appears to have based his work on one of the earlier editions.

¹⁷ The 1756 edition simplifies this to "*Tweede Onvolmaakte Verleeden Tyd*," which is not reflected in *Shihō shoji taiyaku*.

<i>tweede toekomende tijd</i>	<i>mirai-no kako</i> 未来ノ過去	<i>ik zal geleerd</i> (E: <i>geleerde</i>) hebben 'I shall/will have learned'	<i>ware manabiten</i> 我学ひてん (E: 我学びてん)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--

Anyone acquainted with the TAM system of CJ will find several of the distinctions made in the Japanese translations to be rather contrived. Suffice it to say for our present purposes however that the *toekomende tijd* is again clearly identified with and translated into literary Japanese V+Añ. Now if we turn to other sources, the exact number of ‘tenses’ often varies, usually between five and eight categories are posited. For an example of (three expanded to) six categories, see Ōtsuki Genkan 大槻玄幹 (or Banri 磐里; 1785–1837) and his *Rangaku han* 蘭学凡 (1816). Importantly however, the fifth category, or *toekomende tijd*, is again associated with V+Añ (3: 1v, 4r etc.).

Lastly, as the earliest *printed* source of relevance here we may refer to Fujibayashi Fuzan’s 藤林普山 (1781–1836) *Oranda gohō kai* 和蘭語法解 (1815). This work is more clearly presented than some of the manuscript sources and posits “three times of the verb” (*katsugen*[-no] *sanze* 活言三世; 2: 33r), with a tripartite subdivision of the past, yielding a total of five tenses. (Nakano’s further categories are also treated however.) Of note is the fact that the Japanese examples provided are at times extended to include colloquial ones. Thus, we are told that the *toekomende tijd* should be translated along the lines of *yuki=ga hur.o* 雪が降ろ ‘snow will fall’ and *hana=ga sak.o* 花が咲こ ‘the flowers will bloom,’ i.e. as V+Yo(o);¹⁸ similarly the future form in the example sentence “wilt gy morgen komen?” is first glossed in literary Japanese as V+Añ=*to omo.u* んと思ふ whereas the *en bloc* translation of the entire sentence reads *nañzi=wa myootyoo kitar.o=to omo.u=ka* 汝ハ明朝来タ ろと思ふカ involving its colloquial counterpart V+Yo(o)=*to omo.u* (2: 35r; emphasis in original).

There is yet another way of rendering Dutch future forms into Japanese besides V+Yo(o) and V+Yo(o)=*to omo.u*, namely V+Ru=*de ar.oo*. While all of these involve the inflectional ending -Yo(o), it is attached to the stative =*de ar-* in the latter case, automatically leading to a conjectural reading under normal circumstances—whether or not this agrees with the exact function of the future form in the source language. The interpretational confusion that thus arises “when, as frequently, the presumptive-tentatives, with their largely deferential connotation of uncertainty and lack of positive determination, are used to render clear-cut futures in other languages” (Miller 1986: 174f.) can be shown to date back at least to the early 19th century, that is, to a time predating the cases involving =*de ar.oo* and =*dar.oo* discussed by Miller by more than a century. For instance, Ōba Sessai 大庭雪斎 (1805–1873) translates “ik

¹⁸ Matsuoka (1990 [1991: 398]) quotes these two examples together as 雪が降り、花が咲ン, thus deviating considerably from what is found in the print in the possession of Waseda University Library made use of here (see References), as well in the two other complete copies digitized by the same library.

zal maken” as *ware=ga nas.u=de ar.oo* 吾ガ為スデアラウ in his *Yaku Oranda bungo* 訳和蘭文語 (1855–1857; here: *zenpen* 前編, 2: 34v) and similar cases can be found in the preceding decades as well; see for instance Sugimoto (1962) for a number of earlier and later attestations in translations from Dutch or later also English into Japanese.

Among the Dutch-Japanese materials preserved in the Siebold Collection at Ruhr University Bochum—presumably (and at least in part demonstrably) going back to the polyglot interpreter Yoshio Gonnosuke 吉雄権之助 (1785–1831) who is well known for his then rare competence in Dutch, but also English and French—we find lists reminiscent of the tables in the reprint of Álvarez’s grammar: various conjugations of the verb and other expressions are listed in Dutch first and accompanied by translations into (more or less) colloquial Japanese, albeit with more than a hint of translationese. A large number of cases involving *=de ar.oo* to render Dutch future forms can be gleaned from these lists. The following examples are taken from the convolute of manuscript fragments kept as no. 1.372.000:

<i>Ik zal dat doen</i>	<i>watakfoesi wa sore wo soeroe de aroo</i>
<i>Gy zult d—</i>	<i>omaje wa sore wo soeroe de aroo</i>
<i>Hy zal dat —</i>	<i>anofito wa sore wo soeroe de aroo</i>

Or with even stronger Dutchisms, from another fragment in the same convolute:

<i>Als ik dat gedaan zal hebben</i>	<i>watakfoesi ga sore wo sita de aroo naraba</i>
<i>gy ——— zult ———</i>	<i>omaje ga sore wo sita de aroo naraba</i>
<i>hy ——— zal ———</i>	<i>anofito ga sore wo sita de aroo naraba</i>

The way “presumptive-tentative” *=de ar.oo* is used here to mechanically render “clear-cut futures” in Dutch, to borrow Miller’s words, seems rather difficult to reconcile with its original function beyond the realm of translation. Then again, what seems striking at first sight is much less so in view of the many calques, including grammatical calques that can be observed in Chinese–Japanese translational practices. Should *V+Am.u* once have been capable of expressing pure future time reference (cf. the introduction), its successor *V+Yoo* eventually reacquired this function that had earlier been lost. That is, at least as far as Dutch–Japanese and other forms of translationese are concerned.

3 The ‘future’ in the study of *tenioha* in pre-modern Japan

In the above we have seen that both grammatical descriptions by Western observers and grammatical descriptions by Japanese scholars who were at home in the Dutch grammatical tradition had little difficulty in identifying expressions in Japanese that could be termed along the lines of ‘future tense’ and also be equated with corresponding expressions in various European languages. This will all hardly come as a surprise to most observers. However, the idea of relating linguistic forms to past,

present and future time did not first reach Japan from the West—such ideas in fact go back at least to the 15th century and thus to times predating the arrival of the first Europeans in Japan. The ground for such concepts to develop was the study of the so-called *tenioha* てにをは (a spelling-pronunciation of four ubiquitous functional morphemes, namely CJ *-te* ‘participle,’ =*ni* ‘dative,’ =*wo* ‘accusative,’ =*fa* ‘selective’), chiefly as they were used in poetry.

Now, the discussion of linguistic matters always requires some sort of meta-language. It is possible to refer to the linguistic units one wishes to discuss by simply naming them. This may well suffice initially but turns out to be insufficient when considering functional details or when treating several items of similar or even identical shape. To give a concrete example of a context that facilitates the development of specific terminology: In the realm of linked verse (*renga* 連歌), the concept of the so-called *kireji* 切れ字, or sentence-final and other expressions indicating a caesura in the opening stanza, is of utmost importance. Accordingly, treatises on linked verse poetry commonly include lists of such *kireji*, an early example being the list of 18 items given by *renga* poet Senjun 専順 (1411–1476) in his *Senjun hōgen-no shihi-no koto* 専順法眼之詞秘之事 (26–9).

For instance, in a script- and syllable-based analysis both negative $V+An.u$ and perfective $V+n.u$ end up as simply *nu* ぬ. However, as the two belong to different inflectional classes resulting also in their complementary distribution in terms of syntactic environments (i.e., $V+An.u$ is chiefly an attributive form, contrasting with negative $V+Azu$ in final position, while $V+n.u$ —as opposed to attributive $V+n.uru$ —is a final form) and have highly divergent semantics, it is easy to see how the desire to distinguish between them by using a specific designation for each might have arisen. This is especially so as only one of the two, namely perfective $V+n.u$, counted as a *kireji*, whereas the other did not, due to their different syntactic distribution. The result in this case was the terminological pair *fu-no nu* 不のぬ ‘the *nu* of negation’ vs. *owannu* 畢ぬ (or often simply *をはんぬ*) ‘the *nu* of completion.’ Whereas the former refers to the Classical Chinese adverb of negation *bu* 不 (Sino-Japanese *fu*) as the functional equivalent of $V+An.u$, the latter takes *owannu* ‘has ended, has completed’ (*owañ.n.u*, from CJ *wofari.n.u*; commonly employed as the second half of verbal compounds to mark the completion of the action expressed by the first half) as an example involving exactly the same $V+n.u$ which it is now used to label.

A similar situation obtained with several forms involving *shi* し, in the first place the final form of adjectives $A+si$ as opposed to the attributive preterite of verbs $V+si$. Again, only the former is considered a *kireji*, but not the latter. The situation is slightly more complex however: Unlike today’s standard orthography with its obligatory use of *dakuten* 濁点 as diacritical marks to indicate voiced rather than voiceless initial consonants, earlier *kana* orthography often ignored the phonological distinction between, say, /kV/ vs. /gV/, and thus made use of the same (set of) *kana* for both /ka/ and /ga/, for instance. Although there were means to remedy the situation if need be, typically this need was apparently not felt and thus no diacritics were used for general purposes. In fact this indifference towards voicing distinctions in the script is

crucial in understanding how to make sense of countless plays on words, or perhaps rather ‘plays on *kana*,’ in classical poetry.¹⁹ In other words: whereas *nu* above could only mean *nu*, for a case like *shi* we also have to reckon with cases of *ji*, i.e. the counterpart of *shi* with voiced initial consonant. The list of forms relating to *shi* that need to be distinguished is therefore extended to include cases such as the ‘negative future’ V+*Azi* ‘will (probably) not do,’ which typically occurs in final position—thus again qualifying as a *kireji* for various authors.

To come back to Senjun and his list, two out of a total 18 items given by Senjun are relevant to the present discussion. Under normal circumstances, both would end up as し in writing, and without the examples following the list we could not know that the former refers to A+*si* and the latter to V+*Azi*. At least in the Naikaku bunko manuscript the author takes the trouble to explicitly mark the first instance as *shi* and the second as *ji*, namely by adding a *fudakuten* 不濁点 (°) and *dakuten* (˘) respectively to the otherwise ambiguous *kana* し (see p. 26 in the edition). As only A+*si* and V+*Azi* as sentence-final expressions are to be expected in a list of *kireji*, the solution adopted in this manuscript is thus sufficient for its own purposes. However, it is insufficient if A+*si* (a valid *kireji*) is also to be distinguished from cases such as V+*si* (not a valid *kireji*) for instance. Hence, naming the item in question alone does not do the trick here, much the same as in the case of *nu* referred to above.

Whereas a Classical Chinese equivalent for V+*An.u* was readily available to serve as the basis for a designation such as *fu-no nu*, the situation was more difficult with the several *shi* and *ji*. As however A+*si* and V+*si* typically refer to the present and past respectively, these forms were soon labelled *genzai-no shi* 現在のし ‘the *shi* of the present’ vs. *kako-no shi* 過去のし ‘the *shi* of the past,’ although different designations are found as well.²⁰

¹⁹ For instance, it takes little to find voicing mismatches between what is said on the surface and the word that is “hidden” in *mono-no na* 物の名 poems (e.g. *Kokinshū* 古今集 10: 422, 423, 427 etc.). Likewise, the *Ise monogatari* 伊勢物語 (Tales of Ise) contains a story (no. 9) in which an acrostic poem is composed taking the five syllables of the word *kakitubata* ‘rabbit-ear iris’ as the first syllable of each verse—but of course the fourth verse starts with *fa*, not *ba*. Examples along these lines abound.

²⁰ Thus, instead of *kako-no shi*, Toganoi Michitoshi 樽井道敏 (1722–1791) repeatedly speaks of a *kiō-no shi* 既往のし ‘the *shi* of what is bygone’ in his *Tenihā abiki-no tsuna* てには綱引綱 (1770 print; see for instance 1: 4r, 7r). Cf. Kaibara Ekiken 貝原益軒 (1630–1714) who explains *kiō* by *kako* “as it is called colloquially” in his *Tenrei* 点例 (1703; 1721 print, 1: 12v), suggesting that the difference between the two terms is chiefly one of register.

Aruga Chōhaku 有賀長伯 (1661–1737) first speaks of *kako* vs. *genzai-no shi* but notes that the latter is also called *mukō shi* むかふし ‘the *shi* of what one is presently facing’ in his *Waka yaegaki* 和歌八重垣 (1700), whereas in his *Shunju kenpi zōshō* 春樹頭秘増抄, expanding upon the earlier *Shunju kenpi shō* 春樹頭秘抄, he directly contrasts the *kako-no shi* with *mukō shi* (158), similar to earlier treatises such as Mokujiki Ōgo’s 木食応其 (1536–1608) *Mugenshō* 無言抄 (1597; 2: 61r [1603 print]). The same designation *mukō shi* is still given as an alternative to *genzai-no shi* by Ozaki Masayoshi 尾崎雅嘉 (1755–1827) in his *Waka kuretake-shū* 和歌呉竹集 (1797; here 303v).

Given that the tripartite division of (in the first place extra-linguistic) time into *kako*, *genzai* and *mirai* 未来 was already firmly rooted in the language at the time these various treatises were written, it took little for a third kind of *shi* to emerge, thus rendering the originally Buddhist concept of the *sanze* 三世, or ‘the three temporal worlds,’ complete: this is where the *mirai-no shi* 未来のし ‘the *shi* of the future’ makes its first appearance.²¹

Mitsuden-shō 密伝抄 by *renga* poet Sōzei 宗砌 (d. 1455) appears to be the earliest treatise to mention a tripartite distinction into *kako* vs. *genzai* vs. *mirai-no shi* (Furuta/Tsukishima 1972: 170, 173). The late 15th century *Jinkei-shō* 塵荊抄 (5: [7r]) contains a near-identical account of the three and also helps resolve an apparent lacuna in the text of the *Mitsuden-shō* (on which cf. below). All three of them together are also found, for instance, in the *Tōfū renga hiji shikimoku kojitsu* 当風連歌秘事式目故実 (1542; see Ijichi et al. 1973: 189) transmitted from *renga* poet Tani Sōboku 谷宗牧 (d. 1545) to his son Tani Sōyō 谷宗養 (1526–1563), and again in the *Renga hishū-shō* 連歌秘袖抄 (1555) which carries the names of both (despite the fact that Sōboku had already been dead for a decade in 1555). The latter work collectively refers to them as *sanze-no shi-moji* 三世のし文字 ‘the *shi* of the three temporal worlds’ (2r). By and large the same designation, namely *sanze-no shi*, is commonly seen in later sources such as the Kunaichō Shoryōbu manuscript of *Renpai hiketsu* 連俳秘決 (1676; see Ozaki 1997: 353) and various related manuscripts bearing similar titles (e.g. *Renpai hiketsu-shō* 連俳秘決抄), or also commentaries on any of these, such as *Renpai hiketsu-shō wakumon* 連俳秘決抄或問 (1724; see Morikawa 1982: 343 for the passage in question) by Tani Bokuin 谷木因 (1646–1725). The same applies to the *Maki-bashira* 真木柱 (1697; see 103r) by Kyodō 挙堂. Occasionally they were also simply termed *mi(t)tsu-no shi* 三つのし ‘the three *shi*,’ as in the second half of the *Hakusajin-shū* 白砂人集 (1693; see Asano 1963: 76; Kobayashi 1968: 11)—or simply listed without giving them an umbrella term, as for instance in the *Haidō tetaimatsu* 誹道手松明 (1690 print; see Asano 1963: 59f.) of Deguchi Teiboku 出口貞木 (1626–1696).

Often however the terminological evidence is somewhat sketchy: for instance, in the eminently well-known *Teniha taigai shō-no shō* 手爾葉大概抄之抄 (1483) by

Note that the appendix of *Waka kuretake-shū*, entitled “*Teniha taigai*” てには大概, in which these designations are mentioned, was translated early on into German by August Pfizmaier (1808–1887), as pointed out by Lewin (1982; 1984: 29); see Pfizmaier (1873b: 363) for his rendering of *mukō shi* as “das entgegenstehende *si*.” Contrary to Lewin’s claim, however, the copy of the work which Hoffmann made available to Pfizmaier and which is now in the possession of Leiden University Library (Ser.767) was not brought to Leiden by Philipp Franz von Siebold in 1830. In fact, it came to Hoffmann from Johann Wilhelm de Sturler (1774–1855) in 1855 (see Okuda 2011: 37). The earlier date of 1795 given by Pfizmaier (1873a: 229) and likewise Hoffmann (1878: 2) is based on that of the author’s preface.

²¹ The idea that it is the Buddhist notion of ‘the three temporal worlds’ that is applied here to linguistic phenomena is not new, but has already been suggested by Sada (1957: 37; 2004: 182, 223) and Yamaguchi (1972 [1976: 161]) for instance.

renga poet Iio Sōgi 飯尾宗祇 (1421–1502), a disciple of Sōzei and Senjun, only *genzai-no shi* is mentioned in order to specify the reference of *shi* in the given context (46; cf. Lewin 1984: 10 and 32, n. 28), as it seems in contradistinction to one or more other kinds of *shi* that are left implicit here—arguably at least the *kako-no shi*, but possibly also the *mirai-no shi*.²² In terms of the chronology, at least, this seems a reasonable assumption. The same applies even more so to much later cases, such as when only *kako* and *genzai-no shi* are mentioned explicitly in the *Renga shihō-shō* 連歌至宝抄 (1585; 1627 print: 10v–11r) of Satomura Jōha 里村紹巴 (ca. 1525–1602), the leading *renga* poet of his time—whereas a few dozen lines earlier *kireji* are illustrated with a poem each, including one each for A+*si* (8v) and V+*Azi* (9r). On the other hand, *Baikun-shō* 梅薫抄 (ca. 1500) by the poet Inawashiro Kensai 猪苗代兼載 (1452–1510), who joined Sōgi in compiling the *renga* collection *Shinsen Tsukuba-shū* 新撰菟玖波集, contains a list of 13 *kireji* which includes an entry for *mirai-no shi* (presumably V+*Azi*), whereas *genzai-no shi* and *kako-no shi* as such are left unmentioned. As we are dealing with terminological oppositions here, we may at least assume that the opposing terms were known to the authors.

Now, as pointed out by Furuta and Tsukishima (1972: 173), the distinction between the three kinds of *shi* tends to be discussed in the context of *renga*, with varying ideas however as to what exactly is covered by the term *mirai-no shi*. While most authors throughout time appear to have shared a common understanding of what *kako-no shi* and *genzai-no shi* refer to, there is considerable variation as to the actual referent of *mirai-no shi*. The Table below summarizes the major different positions found in the *tenioha* studies mentioned above; additionally, the *Arte da lingua de Iapam* is taken into account here, as Rodriguez was well aware of the native grammatical tradition and refers to its contents, concepts and terminology on several occasions (see already Doi 1938 [1971: esp. 281–3]). Judging from the number of different items subsumed under the label *mirai-no shi* by him, he must also have had access to native works which have proved difficult to identify accurately so far.²³

Source	- <i>Ama.si</i>	- <i>Azi</i>	= <i>be.si</i>	= <i>rasi</i>	- <i>ta.si</i>	= <i>kasi</i>
<i>Mitsuden-shō</i> (1455 or earlier)			111 ²⁴			
<i>Senjun hōgen-no shihi-no koto</i> (1476 or earlier)		28				

²² Cf. already Iida (1984: 60) on this point.

²³ See Rodriguez (1604–1608: 184r) for the titles of a few works he refers to. With regard to works on linked verse, he specifically names *Fidenxō* and *Xifūxō* (sic), identified as *Renga hidden-shō* 連歌秘伝抄 and Jōha's (*Renga*) *Shihō-shō* (連歌) 至宝抄 by Doi (1955: 660).

²⁴ Although the passage in question is frequently quoted without comment (e.g. Nagayama 1954: 35; Furuta/Tsukishima 1972: 170 etc.), I assume with Ijichi (Ijichi et al. 1973: 189, n. 6) and Iida (1984: 75) that the text contains a lacuna here, so that what supposedly should be of the structure

<i>Jinkei-shō</i> (late 15th c.)			5: [7r]			
(Sōgi, 1502 or earlier) ²⁵			yes			
<i>Tōfū renga hiji shikimoku kojitsu</i> (1542)			189			
<i>Renga hishū-shō</i> (1555)		2r	7v			
Rodriguez (1604–1608)	39v, 41r	39v, 41r, 62r (?) ²⁶		39v, 41r, 62r ²⁷		
Rodriguez (1620)	69r					
<i>Haikai umoregi</i> (1673)		18v, 19r	18v			
<i>Renpai hiketsu</i> (1676)	○					

“*kako-ni shi*: <examples>, *genzai-no shi*: <examples>, *mirai-no shi*: <examples>” ends up without the underlined portion. The examples involving =*be.si* are thus given here under the designation *genzai-no shi*, which does not seem to agree with any other source.

The assumption of textual corruption is also supported by the late-15th century *Jinkei-shō* mentioned above, which contains almost exactly the same passage, without the supposed lacuna however—so that the examples featuring =*be.si* are given here for *mirai-no shi* (whereas those for *genzai-no shi* do not contain any =*be.si*). See already Kidō (1985, 3: 111) for a comparison of this passage in the two texts.

²⁵ *Ippo* 一步 (on which see further below) vaguely mentions “a work on *tenioha* by Sōgi” (宗祇てにをはの書; 1: 38v) as its source, but it is unclear what exactly this refers to. The examples given are likewise found in *Mitsuden-shō* and *Jinkei-shō*.

²⁶ In fact, none of the examples given by Rodriguez on these pages ends in ...*aji* as one would expect for V+*Azi* in the Romanization scheme he uses. He does, however, give several puzzling verb forms which are probably the result of spelling pronunciations (see above on the common non-distinction of voiced vs. voiceless in pre-modern *kana* usage). As noted by Doi (1955: 162) in his translation of Rodriguez’s grammar, the form *quegasaxi* found in the poem quoted from the *Hosshinshū* 発心集 on fol. 39v is clearly an error for *quegasaji*, i.e. *kegas.azi* ‘will not defile.’ Given this, we may feel justified in interpreting forms such as *furaxi* (39v) and *masaraxi* (39v, 41r) along the same lines, even if Doi does not comment on these: namely as intended *furaji* and *masaraji* respectively, both again involving the form V+*Azi*.—Interestingly, nothing but V+*Ama.si* is found in the examples of *mirai-no shi* in the second grammar by Rodriguez (1620: 69r). His rejection of V+*Azi* as cases of that category might well have been due to the voicing contrast (his *xi* vs. *ji*), at least as soon as the forms given here as ending in ...*axi* are corrected into ...*aji*.

²⁷ While the forms in the examples as such—i.e. *yomuraxi*, *aruraxi* (39v), *fururaxi*, *masaruraxi* (41r) and *Aruraxi* (62r)—are unproblematic, their appearance as instances of *mirai-no shi* is unexpected. The fact that Rodriguez (1620: 69r) no longer mentions such cases might possibly be taken as an indicator of their problematic nature as well.

<i>Ippo</i> (1676)	38r–v ²⁸	39r	36v, 38r–v ²⁹		38v	
<i>Haidō tetaimatsu</i> (1690)		59	59		59	
<i>Hakusajin-shū</i> (1693)			76			76
<i>Maki-bashira</i> (1697)	103r	103r	103r			

Table: Expressions subsumed under the label *mirai-no shi* in various *tenioha* studies, 15th to 17th centuries.

Given the substantial number of possibilities subsumed under the general label of *shi* pertaining to past, present and future, it takes little to appreciate why an understanding of these expressions is considered by the author of *Renpai hiketsu* to be of foremost importance in poetry (歌道第一の心得; see Ozaki 1997: 353). Here, a brief outline of what these various expressions are seems in order, even if the labels provided below cannot possibly do justice to their actual usage throughout time:

V+ <i>Ama.si</i> ‘counterfactual’	=	(in post-CJ also:) determination, conjecture etc.
V+ <i>Azi</i> ‘negative future’	=	negative determination, conjecture etc.
V+ <i>Ru=be.si</i> ‘potential’	=	determination, conjecture, imperative etc.
(V+ <i>Ru=rasi</i> ‘dubitative’	=	conjecture) [cf. note 27]
V+ <i>ta.si</i> ‘voluntative’	=	wish
V _{base} = <i>yo=kasi</i> ‘imperative’ ³⁰		

It is impossible to overlook the fact that virtually all of these expressions labelled as *mirai-no shi* by some author or another are situated within the domain that is functionally covered by ‘future’ V+*Am.u*: conjecture, determination, irrealis. As homophony or homography are irrelevant in the case of V+*Am.u*, however, it itself typically

²⁸ *Ippo* quotes from a source merely described as “a work on the secrets of *tenioha* in linked verse” (連歌手尔於葉秘伝の書; 1: 38v). Its exact identity is uncertain, but judging from the wording here (as well as from the wording of other quotes [e.g. 1: 59v on the “*ran* pertaining to the future,” but also see 34v, 36v] from what is likely the same work, even if no source is indicated) it must have been close to *Renpai hiketsu* (-*shō*) with respect to the content.

²⁹ This is mentioned with reference to “a work on *tenioha* by Sōgi”; see note 25 above.

³⁰ The only example given in *Hakusajin-shū* is *some=yo=kasi* ‘dye!’, but other imperative forms might be subsumed here as well. Note that where Asano (1963: 76) has 染よかし in his manuscript, the printed edition transcribed by Kobayashi (1968: 11) reads と[!]めこ[!]かし, maybe as the result of a scribal error for or a misreading of そめよかし at some stage. The Toyama ms. has suffered some damage at the position of the first two *kana*, but overall appears to read と[?]めよかし.

does not receive any label at all in early grammatical treatises of the *tenioha* tradition, or worse, is it not even mentioned explicitly. A notable exception is found in *Ippo* for instance—a work I will consider in more detail in the following section.

Before moving on to *Ippo* we may recapitulate that the tripartite division into past, present and future had been applied to little else but *shi* within the *tenioha* tradition until well into the 17th century. Rare exceptions predating this work are found for instance in Sōgi's late 15th century *Sōgi sodeshita* 宗祇袖下 (p. 1079), here with reference to the particle =*ni* (or rather combinations of =*ni* preceded by an inflected verb),³¹ or in the *Renga amayo-no ki* 連歌雨夜記 (1519) by Sōchō 宗長 (1448–1532), a disciple of Sōgi. As already pointed out by Satō (1972: 129), Sōchō mentions that there are cases of past, present and future interpretations with *ran*,³² giving examples for each of the three (73v–74v).³³ Dating from 1676 and thus from the same year as *Ippo*, the *Tomoshihi-shū* 登母之火集 by Nishiyama Sōin 西山宗因 (1605–1682) likewise contains an entry deals with ‘the understanding of *shi* and *ran* pertaining to past, present and future’ (過去現在未来しと覽の分別; see Ozaki 1997: 353f.). Note that in all of these cases the tripartite division is utilized in order to distinguish homophonic (or, as the case of *shi* vs. *ji* shows, rather homographic) expressions—we are therefore not dealing here with categories applied across the board.

It is also necessary to direct our attention if only briefly to the field of Sinological studies in pre-modern Japan, especially to Sino-Japanese translation and glossing traditions. An important source to consider here is Keian Genju's 桂菴玄樹 (1427–1508) *Keian oshō kahō waten* 桂菴和尚家法倭点 (1501), a treatise on how Classical Chinese texts should best be translated into Japanese and glossed accordingly. While this is not an attempt at describing Japanese grammar or a portion thereof and is thus rather different in nature from the various writings in the *tenioha* tradition, it is almost impossible to avoid the occasional necessity of naming linguistic phenomena in the target language of translation. Thus, in a section of this work that addresses *kana* usage, here specifically on the partly overlapping *-n* ン, *nu* ヌ and *mu* ム,³⁴ the

³¹ A reference to this passage in *Sōgi sodeshita* is found in Nagayama (1954: 41) and Iida (1984: 75). A similar passage—here however restricted to the past and present—can also be found in Sōgi's *Renga shotai hiden-shō* 連歌諸体秘伝抄.

³² Sōchō's (and other authors') *ran* 覽 conflates two distinct cases, namely =*rañ* ← =*ram.u* and ...*r.añ*, i.e. V+*Añ* ← V+*Am.u* with *r*-final verb stems. See *Ippo* (1: 59v–60r) for criticism of this kind of conflation, even if reference is made to an unnamed work—the wording of what is quoted suggests *Renpai hiketsu-shō* or a similar source—rather than to Sōchō's writings.

³³ At least cases of *ran* pertaining to past and present are also already mentioned in Sōzei's aforementioned *Mitsuden-shō* (see Nagayama 1954: 35; Furuta/Tsukishima 1972: 171).

³⁴ The overlapping derives chiefly from the fact that *-n* ン was used to write literary V+*Añ* from V+*Am.u* besides colloquial V+*Añ* from V+*An.u* and from the fact that *mu* ム (formerly also used

first of these three is identified as (representing in writing) a function word indicating future (*mirai-no ji* 未-来'之_辞; 1624 print: 15r, cf. Kawase 1959: 68). It seems likely that when writing this Keian had in mind a tripartite division of time into past, present and future and only left the first two unmentioned, as they are simply irrelevant to the passage in question. However, it is only later that such a tripartite division is *explicitly* referred to in the metatexts on Sino-Japanese translation traditions. For instance, in his *Tenrei* 点例 (1703), Kaibara Ekiken 貝原益軒 (1630–1714) draws attention to the appropriate use of the *kiō*, *genzai*, *shōrai-no teniha* 既-往見-在将来ノテニハ, or “grammatical markers of the past, present and future” (1721 print, 1: 12v–13r), with *kiō* and *shōrai* being explained as meaning as much as *kako* and *mirai* respectively. The glossed examples from the Confucian *Analects* feature both V+Añ and its negative counterpart V+Azi for the latter category of *mirai*.

If we expand our view to include other areas of Sinological studies, we may also note works such as the *Inkyō-zu* 韻鏡図 (printed 1646 [non vidi]). While its title *Charts to the Yunjing* might suggest a work exclusively concerned with Chinese traditional phonology, the rime tables lead the author to the similarly structured ‘table of fifty sounds’ and the inflectional system of the Japanese verb it may serve to systematize. According to Takeda (1932: 703) and Sada (2004: 224), we thus find various forms of the verb *kik.u* ‘hear’ together with their respective designations, arranged in the usual order of the vowels: hypothetical conditional *kik.aba* ‘should ... hear,’ *kik.añ* ‘will hear’ as *mirai*, *kiki.si* ‘heard’ as *kako*, *kik.u* ‘hears’ as *genzai* and *kik.e* ‘hear/listen!’ as *geji* 下知 ‘command.’

The identification of V+Añ with *mirai* in such cases is in line with what we have already seen in the Western grammatical tradition, including its adaptation in the context of Dutch learning in Japan. There is nothing however to suggest the existence of a direct line of influence from the latter to the former.

4 *Ippo*—First steps towards conceptualizing time reference in Japanese

Ippo, or *First Steps*, was written by an unnamed and thus unknown author for a likewise unnamed but explicitly addressed person (see the preface, 1: 3r) at a point in time that is impossible to specify in detail, but probably close to the date of its publication in print in the year 1676.³⁵ It consists of two parts of which the former is concerned with the correct use of *tenioha*, whereas the latter focusses on *kana* orthography. Together the two halves are intended to cover the basics—the first steps as it were—of what is required to compose linked verse and more. At the end of the preface the author instructs his (?) addressee not to show the work to anybody else. The publisher’s postscript does not help to identify either of these two persons,

to render syllable final *-m*) was to some extent still used interchangeably with *-n* ン in and beyond Keian’s time due to the merger of former *-m* vs. *-n*.

³⁵ See footnote 28 on the proximity of several passages in *Ippo* to *Renpai hiketsu* (*-shō*).

but merely states that he had managed to acquire the top secret *Ippo* “thanks to a wondrous turn of fate” (以不思議縁) and that he had the desire to make it widely available in acknowledgement of its merits in rectifying common errors.

The analytical framework employed in *Ippo* is founded on the following di- and trichotomies, which are applied here to categorize and explain various linguistic phenomena:

- *kako* 過去 vs. *genzai* 現在 vs. *mirai* 未来 (past vs. present vs. future)
- *ji* 自 vs. *ta* 他 (pertaining to oneself vs. to others)
- *utagai* 疑ひ vs. *jijō* 治定 (in doubt vs. fixed)

These categories were not necessarily all new at the time of *Ippo*, but they had hitherto only been used sporadically for certain specific forms or phenomena, rather in an ad-hoc fashion and not as components of an entire system (cf. Satō 1972: 129). It is in *Ippo* and within the framework outlined above that the tripartite division of time into past, present and future finally frees itself entirely from serving as little more than an ad-hoc means of distinguishing between homophonous and homographic forms. Now ‘the three temporal states of existence’ no longer pertain simply to different kinds of *shi*. Rather, the author devises a new way of conceptualizing time reference in the Japanese language, focusing on but not limited to the TAM system.³⁶ In fact, the author even appears to aim at a somewhat more fine-grained conceptualization by introducing, for instance, *genzai-no uchi-nite-no kako* 現在の内にての過去 ‘the past in the present’ (1: 40v) or *genzai-no uchi-nite-no mirai* 現在の内にての未来 ‘the future in the present’ (1: 55r). These are reminiscent of what one can find in later *rangaku* approaches to TAM systems, as we have already seen.

As is apparent from the Table, *Ippo* continues the older *tenioha* tradition in labeling a number of expressions as *mirai-no shi*. In part this is done with explicit reference to earlier writings from that context: Thus, *V+Ama.si* and *V+Ru=be.si* as examples for *mirai-no shi* are said to be taken from “a work on the secrets of *tenioha* in linked verse” and “a work on *tenioha* by Sōgi” respectively (38r–v). *V+Azi* appears likewise to be quoted from an earlier work (39r), but the details are unclear. When it comes to *V+ta.si*, however, the author explicitly identifies this as a further case of *mirai-no shi* which he came upon himself (此外に予が見あたりたる未来のしあり; 38v). Subsuming *V+ta.si* under this label was without doubt inspired by the author’s equating of the function of *V+ta.si* with that of *V+Ru=be.si* (可の字とおなじ心にて; 54v). After all, “words expressing wishes all pertain to the future” (ねがふ詞は皆未来也; 55r).

³⁶ For instance, nouns commonly used as adverbials of time are addressed and classified into the three temporal categories as well, such as *mukashi* ‘days of old,’ *kozo* ‘last year,’ *kinō* ‘yesterday’ etc. (all given under *kako*; 44r). An interesting case is that of (*tada*)*ima* (只) 今 ‘(just) now,’ which is explained in some detail as being capable of referring to either the past, present or future, depending on the context (45r–v).

Vastly expanding upon the then already long-standing tradition of positing various *mirai-no shi* is the relatively long section entitled “grammatical and lexical items pertaining to the future” (未来のてにをは同詞; 54r–65v). Commands (*geji-no kotoba* 下知の詞;³⁷ 59v), covering both imperatives and prohibitives, are explained to refer to the future in general. This is in stark contrast to the somewhat later *Haku-sajin-shū* which takes commands into account as well, but limits this to V=*yo*=*kasi* as yet another instance of a *mirai-no shi* (see Table). The most notable addition to the list of expressions of future time reference is however literary V+Añ together with its colloquial counterpart V+*Yoo* (55v–59r),³⁸ possibly inspired by precedents in the Sinological tradition, such as those briefly addressed above. Finally, *Ippo* also adds means expressing hypothetical conditionals to the list of *mirai*-related expressions, namely V+*Aba* (54r, 59r–v) and =*ni oi.te*=*wa* (59v). What exactly the author has in mind here can be gathered from the first half of the two examples given earlier (1: 18v–19v), which are also of interest from a different angle:

御出候はゞ忝候 (19v)

o.ide-sooraw.aba katazikenaku sooroo #

“I am (for: will/would be) grateful if you would come.”

於御同心者本望也 (18v)

go.doosiñ=*ni oi.te*=*wa* hoñmoo=*nari* #

“It is (for: will/would be) to my satisfaction should you accompany me.”

Note that the coming and accompanying of the addressee is still a matter of the future here, whereas the gratefulness and satisfaction might be taken (even if this is unlikely

³⁷ On earlier examples of using *geji* ‘command, order’ as a technical term of sorts referring to imperatives, see Satō (1972: 117).

³⁸ This is incidentally by no means the only instance referring to the then-current colloquial language. Already in the preface *tsune-no kotoba* 常の詞 (1: 1r), or ‘everyday speech,’ is mentioned, as it is deemed to contain erroneous usages of *tenioha* just as they can be observed in poetry and elsewhere. In a passage treating the aforementioned *fu-no nu* vs. *owannu*, it is pointed out that the latter is not employed in everyday speech (1: 33r); elsewhere, literary expressions are provided with a paraphrase into the colloquial, here termed *zokugo* 俗語 (58r–v), e.g. *sa=koso ar.am.e* さこそあらめ vs. *soo=de ar.oo* さうであらふ ‘I suppose so.’

Colloquial forms are also adduced to explain or distinguish literary expressions, apparently however with reference to an earlier work such as *Renpai hiketsu* (-*shō*), in which the same approach is already seen. For instance, *genzai* and *kako-no shi* can be distinguished by checking whether a paraphrase into colloquial A+*i* (*genzai*) or else V+*Ta* (*kako*) is possible (see 1: 36v, 1: 34v respectively).

The need to comment on colloquial forms stems from the fact that besides traditional linked verse, *Ippo* also takes popular linked verse (*haikai* 俳諧) into account, sometimes contrasting the two. To give some examples: V+*Ta* as a new development in the MJ colloquial rather than the older V+*Tari* or V+*Tar.u* is said to be acceptable in *haikai*, but not in *renga* (40r). On another occasion =*be.i* and =*byoo* are identified as *haigon* 誹言, or *haikai* diction, in contrast to literary forms such as =*be.ki* and =*be.ku* (54r).

to be what is actually meant in each case) as referring to the time of utterance. For the author of *Ippo*—who often takes a rather prescriptive approach towards language, be it Japanese in its classical variety as found in linked verse or in its then-current colloquial variety as used by and around the author—these examples demonstrate a startling lack of agreement between protasis (*mirai*) and apodosis (*genzai*). He suggests rewording the two sentences as follows introducing a form of =*be.si* (and thus expressing *mirai*) at the end:

かたじけなかるべし	or	かたじけなかるべく候 (19r-v)
katazike.na.kar.u= <u>be.si</u> #		katazikenakar.u= <u>be.ku</u> sooroo #
本望たるべし	or	本望たるべく候 (19r)
hoñmoo= <u>tar.u=be.si</u> #		hoñmoo= <u>tar.u=be.ku</u> sooroo #

In other words, what we see here is the ‘abuse’ for future time reference of expressions which in the author’s view refer to the present. From a diachronic perspective this can be interpreted as a reaction to the aforementioned changes in the TAM system of Japanese, which were later also recognized by Western authors writing in the 19th century. The author of *Ippo* was incidentally not alone with his concerns, as like-minded scholars can be found in other fields of study as well. I have already referred briefly to the Sinological discourse on the proper way of glossing and translating Classical Chinese texts—and here we similarly encounter criticism targeted at Japanese renderings showing a lack of agreement.³⁹

As the author of *Ippo* thus sees a clear-cut dividing line between expressions of the *genzai* and *mirai* categories, he had to come up with an explanation for the fact that certain staves involving the existential verb *ari* may be taken as having either present or future time reference, depending on the case, i.e. N=*nar.añ* ‘probably is/will be N(oun)’ and A+*kar.añ* ‘probably is/will be A(djective)’ based on *ar.añ* ‘probably exists/will exist.’ In his words, there is both a ‘*naran/karan* of the present’ and a ‘*naran/karan* of the future.’ He manages to maintain the classification of V+Añ as belonging exclusively to the *mirai* category by explaining the *naran* and *karan* of the *genzai* category as short for =*nar.u=rañ* (60v–62r) and -*kar.u=rañ* (62r–65v) respectively, so that both are taken to actually involve =*rañ* from =*ram.u*, itself classified as pertaining to *genzai*. Cases of the *mirai* category on the other hand are interpreted along the same lines as other cases of V+Añ, i.e. simply =*nar.añ* and -*kar.añ*. The actual explanation probably rather lies in the distinction between stative vs. non-stative (or dynamic) verbs, which is still of importance in MSJ when it comes to

³⁹ For hypothetical conditionals required to agree with ‘future’ forms as in *Ippo*, even if involving double negations this time, see for instance Dazai Shundai 太宰春台 (1680–1747) in his *Wadoku yōryō* 倭読要領 (1728), 2: 10v, 11r, 16r etc. In case of a protasis in V+Azuñba (i.e. the negative counterpart of V+Aba as in the first of the two examples in *Ippo*), Dazai considers it obligatory for the apodosis to end in V+Azi as the negative counterpart of V+Am.u or V+Añ, rather than in negative V+Azu. If the latter is to be used, it requires a corresponding protasis in V+URe=ba.

deciding on the exact function of V+*Yoo* in an actual context. Nevertheless, the explanation as such works reasonably well. It also demonstrates the author's attempt at a systematic and consistent approach to time reference in the Japanese language, which is difficult to find in earlier writings to such a degree.

In closing I would like to draw attention to an easily overlooked merit in the conceptualization of time and its terminology in *Ippo*: For its author, *mirai* is apparently a descriptive rather than just a conventionalized label, so that *mirai* actually meant *mirai*—that is, a category concerned with time reference. Such a straightforward interpretation of *mirai* or also of “future (tense)” in Western grammars is often taken for granted, but this seems rather inappropriate in a large number of cases, no matter to which of the three grammatical traditions addressed herein they belong. Can we really take it for granted that nothing but time reference is ever meant when, for instance, the missionaries identified some or other form of the verb as expressing the ‘future tense’? Can the various expressions identified as *mirai-no shi* by some or other early Japanese scholar be taken as having been interpreted exclusively in terms of time reference? The list of such questions can be expanded indefinitely—and the answer is likely to be negative in a number of cases.

Definitions of what exactly is meant by *mirai* in the Japanese grammatical tradition are not easy to come by, but they do exist. The afore-mentioned *Maki-bashira* of 1697 (103r; also in Asano 1963: 51), for instance, provides both examples and a definition for each of the *sanze-no shi*:

赤し ちかし はやし うれし
かくのごとく目前なるがいづれも現在也

“*aka.si* (is red), *tika.si* (is near), *haya.si* (is fast), *uresi* (is joyful). Such cases, where something is right before one's eyes, are all [pertaining to] *genzai*.”

来るへし 咲なまし きかじ
かくのごとくかねておもふはみなみな ^{ミライ}未来なり……

“*kitar.u=be.si* (will come), *saki.n.ama.si* (would [have] bloom[ed]), *kik.azi* (will not listen). Such cases, where one anticipates something, are all [pertaining to] *mirai*.”

青かりし さりし 見し
これらの類いづれも過去也……

“*ao.kari.si* (was blue), *sari.si* (departed), *mi.si* (saw). The likes of these are all [pertaining to] *kako*.”

While the definitions all have a strong focus on time reference, it seems highly doubtful whether any one of the three examples cited for the category of *mirai* can be interpreted along the same lines (and exclusively so) in actual context. Compare also the earlier *Hakuhatsushū* 白髮集 (p. 1116), which distinguishes A+*si* vs. V+*Azi* as ‘expression of what is right before one's eyes’ (*mokuzen-no kotoba* 目前の詞) and ‘expression of conjecture’ (*suiryō-no kotoba* 推量の詞) respectively. Although *Mirai* as such is not mentioned, the description involving *suiryō* ‘conjecture’ is applied here to what is otherwise almost universally classified simply as *mirai*, without further explanation.

Concluding remarks

The sketchy account presented in the preceding pages cannot do justice to the complexities of the issues involved in each of the grammatical traditions addressed, much less to each single author and their respective works. It seems nevertheless possible and worthwhile to make an observation or two at this point.

For one, we can clearly discern a caesura in the Western tradition at some time in the middle of the 19th century, chiefly as a reflection of diachronic changes in the tense–aspect–mood system of Japanese. It was apparently only *after* this caesura that some observers started to feel the “lack of a future tense” or the “lack of future forms.”

Second, it can be demonstrated beyond doubt that the notion of future as opposed to past and present was *not* first introduced into the description of Japanese via the Graeco-Latin tradition, as might be assumed. Instead, it is already found in the native *tenioha* tradition prior to the first contacts with European scholarship. It is, in other words, not necessarily the result of a Eurocentric worldview when some expression or another in the language is identified as conveying a ‘future’ or *mirai* sense. To some extent the native tradition might even have fostered the use of the label ‘future’ in descriptions of Japanese, as the same tradition was all but unknown to Rodriguez as the author of the earliest two extant grammars of Japanese—and one may assume that he was not the only early missionary to learn of the study of *tenioha*.

There are however numerous unresolved issues requiring further study. For instance, the apparently self-explanatory label ‘future’ or *mirai* turns out to be rather elastic in terms of its definition, so that whatever verb form or other linguistic expression is termed as such does not necessarily refer to future time. The interpretation of the many pre-modern sources relevant to the present topic is complicated by the fact that they do not simply refer to the same ‘Japanese’ as a linguistic entity that is homogenous throughout space, time and domain of usage. The exact *synchronic* functions of the (short as well as extended) ‘future’ forms in the MJ colloquial which early European visitors to Japan encountered, for instance, are as much open to debate as the original function of their ancestor *V+Am.u* in OJ. It thus comes as no surprise that the far-reaching *diachronic* changes in the TAM system of Japanese are not yet fully understood either. On top of this there is the difference between colloquial and literary varieties of Japanese, the latter being subject to constant re-interpretation by their (out of necessity non-native) users. For instance, Nakano Ryūho’s understanding of literary verb forms around the year 1800 as sketched above will hardly be identical with that of an author in the Heian period, even if morphologically speaking exactly the same forms are concerned. These and other issues, however, might be addressed in future studies.

References

Primary sources (Western languages)

- Alcock, Rutherford (1861): *Elements of Japanese Grammar, for the Use of Beginners*. Shanghai: n.p.
- Álvarez, Manuel (1594): *Emmanuelis Alvari e societate Iesu De institutione grammatica libri tres: Coniugationibus accessit interpretatio Iapponica*. Amacusa: Collegium Societatis Iesu.
- Aston, William George (1869): *A Short Grammar of the Japanese Spoken Language*. Nagasaki: F. Walsh.
- Brown, Samuel Robbins (1863): *Colloquial Japanese, or Conversational Sentences and Dialogues in English and Japanese*. Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press.
- Chamberlain, Basil Hall (1888): *A Handbook of Colloquial Japanese*. London: Trübner & Co.
- Collado, Diego (1632): *Ars grammaticæ Iaponicæ linguæ in gratiam et adiutorium eorum, qui prædicandi Euangelij causa ad Iaponiæ Regnum se voluerint conferre*. Roma: Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.
- Donker Curtius, Janus Henricus / Hoffmann, Johann Joseph (comm., ed.) (1857): *Proeve eener Japansche spraakkunst*. Leiden: A.W. Sythoff.
- Donker Curtius, Janus Henricus / Hoffmann, Johann Joseph / Pagès, Léon (comm., trans.) (1861): *Essai de grammaire japonaise*. Paris: Benjamin Duprat.
- Hoffmann, Johann Joseph (1868): *A Japanese Grammar*. Leiden: E.J. Brill; A.W. Sythoff.
- (1878): *Japanische Studien: Erster Nachtrag zur japanischen Sprachlehre*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kaempfer, Engelbert: *Collectanea Japonica*. Ms. in the possession of the British Library, call no. Sloane MS 3062.
- Munzinger, Carl (1894): “Die Psychologie der japanischen Sprache.” In: *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 53: 103–42.
- (1898): *Die Japaner: Wanderungen durch das geistige, soziale und religiöse Leben des japanischen Volkes*. Berlin: A. Haack.
- Oyanguren de Santa Inés, Melchor (1738): *Arte de la lengua japona, dividido en quatro libros segun el arte de Nebrixa*. Mexico: Joseph Bernardo de Hoyal.
- Pfizmaier, August (1873a): “Die poetischen Ausdrücke der japanischen Sprache.” In: *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe* 22: 229–324.
- (1873b): “Die Lehre von dem Te-ni-wo-fa.” In: *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 74: 333–82.
- Rodriguez, João (1604–1608): *Arte da lingua de Iapam composta pello Padre Ioão Rodriguez Portugues da Cõpanhia de Iesu diuidida em tres livros*. Nangasaqui: Collegio de Iapão da Companhia de Iesu.

- (1620): *Arte breve da lingoa Iapoa tirada da arte grande da mesma lingoa, pera os que começam a aprender os primeiros principios della*. Macao: Collegio da Madre de Deos da Companhia de Iesu.
- Séwel, Willem (1708): *Nederduytsche spraakkonst*. Amsterdam: Assuerus Lansvelt.
- (1712): *Nederduytsche spraakkonst: De tweede Druk*. Amsterdam: Robert Blóklant.
- (1733): *Nederduytsche spraakkonst: De derde Druk*. Amsterdam: Erven van J. Ratelband, en Comp.
- (1756): *Nederduytsche spraakkonst: De vierde Druk*. Amsterdam: Jacob ter Beek.
- Siebold, Philipp Franz von (1826): “Epitome linguae japonicae.” In: *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 11: 63–136.

Primary sources (Japanese)

- Aruga Chōhaku 有賀長伯: *Shunju kenpi zōshō* 春樹顯秘増抄. Edition based on ms. in the possession of the University of Tokyo, among others. In: Fukui Kyūzō 福井久蔵 (ed.) (1938): *Kokugogaku taikei* 国語学大系, vol. 14: *Teniha* 手爾波, pt. 1. Tōkyō: Kōseikaku, 117–70.
- Dazai Shundai 太宰春台: *Wadoku yōryō* 倭読要領 (1728). Printed edition in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. ホ 2-4738. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/ho02/ho02_04738/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Deguchi Teiboku 出口貞木 (1929 [1690]): *Haidō tetaimatsu* 誹道手松明. In: Iwaya Sazanami 巖谷小波 et al. (eds.): *Haibungaku taikei* 俳文学大系, vol. 1: *Sahōhen* 作法編, pt. 1. Tōkyō: Taihōkaku shobō [cf. Asano (1963: 58–60) for the portion in question].
- Fujibayashi Fuzan 藤林普山 (1815):⁴⁰ *Oranda gohō kai* 和蘭語法解. Printed edition in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. 文庫 8-C523. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/bunko08/bunko08_c0523/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Fujitani Nariakira 富士谷成章 (1778): *Ayui-shō* あゆひ抄. Printed edition in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. ホ 2-948. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/ho02/ho02_00948/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Hakuhatsushū* 白髮集. In: Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一 (ed.): *Zoku gunsho ruijū* 続群書類従. Tōkyō: Zoku gunsho ruijū kanseikai, vol. 17B, 1103–19 (fasc. 496).
- Hakusajin-shū* 白砂人集 (1693). Transcription of a ms. in the possession of the transcriber, Asano (1963: 61–83); transcription of an undated (18th century) printed ed. in the possession of Tenri Central Library: Kobayashi (1968); ms. formerly in the possession of Yamada Yoshio 山田孝雄, Toyama City Public Library, call

⁴⁰ Concerning the date—1815, not 1812 as it is given in the catalogue of Waseda University Library and sometimes elsewhere—see the last preface, written entirely in Dutch by Baba Sajūrō 馬場佐十郎 (1787–1822) “in het jaar boenkwa twaalfde,” i.e. Bunk(w)a 文化 12.

- no. 5567. Online at: http://www.library.toyama.toyama.jp/wo/rare_book/index?rare_book_list_flg=1&value_id=5567 (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Inawashiro Kensai 猪苗代兼載 (ca. 1500): *Baikun-shō* 梅薫抄. Ms. from the collection of Ōta Takeo 太田武夫, now in the possession of the National Institute of Japanese Literature, call no. 貴重書 99-89. Online at: http://dbrec.nijl.ac.jp/KTG_B_200008314 (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Iio Sōgi 飯尾宗祇 (1483): *Teniha taigai shō-no shō* 手爾葉大概抄之抄. Edition based on ms. then in the possession of Fukui Kyūzō, among others. In: Fukui Kyūzō 福井久蔵 (ed.) (1938): *Kokugogaku taikai* 国語学大系, vol. 14: *Teniha* 手爾波, pt. 1. Tōkyō: Kōseikaku, 39–60 [translation: Lewin (1984)].
- (late 15th c.): *Sōgi sodeshita* 宗祇袖下. In: Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一 (ed.): *Zoku gunsho ruijū* 続群書類従. Tōkyō: Zoku gunsho ruijū kansaikai, vol. 17B, 1067–81 (fasc. 494).
- Ippo* 一步 (1676). Facsimile of printed edition in the possession of Kamei Takashi 亀井孝 [see Nakada 1985].
- Jinkei-shō* 塵荊抄 (late 15th c.). Ms. in the possession of the National Diet Library, call no. WA16-128. Online at: <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2606667> (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Kaibara Ekiken 貝原益軒 (1703): *Tenrei* 点例. Printed edition dated 1721 (publisher's advertisement) in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. ホ 2-4732. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/ho02/ho02_04732/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Keian Genju 桂菴玄樹 (1501): *Keian oshō kahō waten* 桂菴和尚家法倭点. Printed edition dated 1624 in the possession of Komazawa University Library, call no. H086/32. Online at: <http://repo.komazawa-u.ac.jp/opac/repository/collections/41052/> (accessed 5/16/2019) [Edition chiefly based on a late Muromachi period ms. in the possession of Kawase Kazuma: Kawase (1959: 55–72)].
- Kyodō 挙堂 (1697): *Maki-bashira* 真木柱. Printed edition in the possession of Hōsei University, Masaoka Shiki bunko 正岡子規文庫, call no. 911.3/73/MASAOKA. Online at: http://www.hosei.ac.jp/library/rare/911_3_73/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Mokujiki Ōgo 木食応其 (1597): *Mugenshō* 無言抄. Printed edition dated 1603 in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. へ 5-913-1~2. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/he05/he05_00913/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Nakano Ryūho 中野柳圃 (1805): *Shihō shoji taiyaku* 四法諸時対訳. Facsimile of ms. in the possession of Wakabayashi Shōji 若林正治. In: Sugimoto (1991: 583–91). Transcription of ms., presumably in the hand of Ema Ransai 江馬蘭齋 (1747–1838) (Saitō 1973: 27), in the possession of Ema Shōjirō 江馬庄次郎: Saitō (1973: 29–40).

- (before 1805): *Rangaku seizenfu* 蘭学生前父. Ms. from the collection of Udagawa Yōan 宇田川榕菴 (1798–1846), now in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. 文庫 8-B57. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/koten_seki/html/bunko08/bunko08_b0057/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Nishiyama Sōin 西山宗因 (1676): *Tomoshihi-shū* 登母之火集. Ms. in the possession of Tenri Central Library, Nishikiya bunko 綿屋文庫. Non vidi; see Ozaki (1997: 353f.) for a quote from the relevant entry “Kako, genzai, mirai[-no] *shi-to ran-no bunbetsu*” 過去現在未来しと覽の分別.
- Ōba Sessai 大庭雪齋 (1855–1857): *Yaku Oranda bungo* 訳和蘭文語. Printed edition in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. ホ 10-714. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/ho10/ho10_00714/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Ōtsuki Genkan 大槻玄幹 (1816): *Rangaku han* 蘭学凡. Ms. in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. 文庫 8-C12. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/bunko08/bunko08_c0012/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Renpai hiketsu* 連誹秘決 (1676). Ms. in the possession of Kunaichō Shoryōbu 宮内庁書陵部, call no. 154-502. Non vidi; see Ozaki (1997: 353) for a quote from the relevant entry “Sanze-no *shi-to yū koto*” 三世のしと云事.
- Renpai hiketsu-shō* 連誹秘決抄. Ms. in the possession of Hiroshima University Library, Fukui bunko 福井文庫, call no. 4633. Online at: http://dbrec.nijl.ac.jp/KTG_B_100019175 (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Satomura Jōha 里村紹巴 (1585): *Renga shihō-shō* 連歌至宝抄. Print dated 1627 in the possession of Waseda University Library, Ijichi Tetsuo bunko 伊地知鉄男文庫, call no. 文庫 20-205. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/bunko20/bunko20_00205/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Senjun 専順 (n.d. [1476 or earlier]): *Senjun hōgen-no shihi-no koto* 専順法眼之詞秘之事. Ms. in the possession of Naikaku bunko, call no. 202-0274. Online at: <http://www.digital.archives.go.jp/das/meta/F1000000000000046460> (accessed 5/16/2019). Edition based on the Naikaku bunko ms. In: Fukui Kyūzō 福井久蔵 (ed.) (1938): *Kokugogaku taikai* 国語学大系, vol. 14: *Tenih* 手爾波, pt. 1. Tōkyō: Kōseikaku, 15–37.
- Sōchō 宗長 (1519): *Renga amayo-no ki* 連歌雨夜記. Printed edition based on the blocks of the 1697 edition in the possession of Waseda University Library, call no. 文庫 20-189. Online at: http://www.wul.waseda.ac.jp/kotenseki/html/bunko20/bunko20_00189/index.html (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Sōzei 宗砌 (n.d. [1455 or earlier]): *Mitsuden-shō* 密伝抄. Ms. in the possession of Kyōto University Library. In: Kidō (1985: 109–24).
- Tani Bokuin 谷木因 (1724): *Renpai hiketsu-shō wakumon* 連誹秘決抄或問. Ms. in the possession of Yamashita Tsuna 山下つな. In: Morikawa (1982: 340–7).
- Tani Sōboku 谷宗牧 / Tani Sōyō 谷宗養 (1542): *Tōfū renga hiji shikimoku kojitsu* 当風連歌秘事式目故実. Ms. in the possession of Kunaichō Shoryōbu 宮内庁書陵部, call no. 155-40. Online at: http://dbrec.nijl.ac.jp/KTG_B_100069499 (accessed 5/16/2019). In: Ijichi et al. (1973: 161–96).

- (1555): *Renga hishū-shō* 連歌秘袖抄. Ms. in the possession of Naikaku bunko, call no. 202-0238. Online at: <http://www.digital.archives.go.jp/das/meta/F100000000000046470> (accessed 5/16/2019).
- Toganoi Michitoshi 桐井道敏 (1770): *Tenihā abiki-no tsuna* てには綱引綱. Printed edition dated 1770 in possession of the National Institute of Japanese Literature, call no. マ 5-72-1~2. Online at: http://dbrec.nijl.ac.jp/KTG_B_200016747 (accessed 5/16/2019).

Secondary literature

- Asano Shin 浅野信 (1963): *Kireji-no kenkyū: shiryō-hen* 切字の研究——資料篇. Tōkyō: Nan'undō ōfūsha.
- Comrie, Bernard (1985): *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doi Tadao 土井忠生 (1971 [1938]): “Ro-shi bunten-to teniha kenkyū” 口氏文典と手爾波研究. In: *Kokubungakukō* 国文学攷 4.1. Reprinted as “Rodorigesu-cho Nihon bunten-to teniha kenkyū” ロドリゲス著日本文典と手爾波研究. In: *Kirishitan gogaku-no kenkyū* 吉利支丹語学の研究. Revised ed. Tōkyō: Sanseidō, 273–88 [first ed. 1942].
- (trans.) (1955): *Nihon daibunten* 日本大文典. Tōkyō: Sanseidō.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke (2010): *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fukuda Yoshiichirō 福田嘉一郎 (2012): “Chūkogo-no hi-setsuzoku johō taikai” 中古語の非接続叙法体系. In: Takayama Yoshiyuki 高山善行 / Aoki Hirofumi 青木博史 / Fukuda Yoshiichirō (eds.): *Nihongo bunpōshi kenkyū* 日本語文法史研究. Tōkyō: Hitsuji shobō, vol. 1, 107–26.
- Furuta Tōsaku 古田東朔 / Tsukishima Hiroshi 築島裕 (1972): *Kokugogakushi* 国語学史. Tōkyō: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1824): *Ueber Kunst und Alterthum: Fünften Bandes erstes Heft*. Stuttgart: Cotta'sche Buchhandlung.
- Ijichi Tetsuo 伊地知鉄男 et al. (comm., trans.) (1973): *Rengaron-shū, Nōgakuron-shū, Hairon-shū* 連歌論集・能楽論集・俳論集. (Nihon koten bungaku zenshū 日本古典文学全集; 51). Tōkyō: Shōgakukan.
- Iida Harumi 飯田晴巳 (1984): “Keiyōshi kenkyū-no rekishi” 形容詞研究の歴史. In: Suzuki Kazuhiko 鈴木一彦 / Hayashi Ōki 林巨樹 (eds.): *Kenkyū shiryō Nihon bunpō* 研究資料日本文法, vol. 3 (*Yōgen-hen* 用言編), pt. 2: *Keiyōshi, keiyō dōshi* 形容詞・形容動詞. Tōkyō: Meiji shoin, 47–107.
- Ijima Masahiro 井島正博 (2016): “Jōdai, chūkogo suiryō jodōshi-no rentai, juntai yōhō” 上代・中古語推量助動詞の連体・準体用法. In: *Kokugo-to kokubungaku* 国語と国文学 93.5: 3–16.
- Kawase Kazuma 川瀬一馬 (1959): “Keian oshō kahō waten-ni tsuite” 桂庵和尚家法倭点について. In: *Kiyō* 紀要 (Aoyama gakuin joshi tanki daigaku 青山学院女子短期大学) 12: 35–72.

- Kensy, Rainer (2001): *Keiretsu Economy: New Economy? Japan's Multinational Enterprises from a Postmodern Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Kidō Saizō 木藤才蔵 (comm.) (1985): *Rengaronshū* 連歌論集. Tōkyō: Miyai shoten.
- Kitagawa Kazuhide 北川和秀 (1982): *Shoku Nihongi senmyō: kōhon, sōsakuin* 続日本紀宣命——校本・総索引. Tōkyō: Yoshikawa kōbunkan.
- Kobayashi Shōjirō 小林祥次郎 (1968): “*Hakusajin-shū: honbun honkoku-to kaidai*” 白砂人集——本文翻刻と解題. In: *Oyama kōgyō kōtō senmon gakkō kenkyū kiyō* 小山工業高等専門学校研究紀要 1: 7–15 (72–64).
- Kojima Yukie 小島幸枝 (1984): “*Supiritsuaru shugyō-no buntai: jisei-no yaku-shutsu-yori mitaru*” 『スピリツアル修行』の文体——時制の訳出より見たる. In: *Kirishitan kenkyū* キリシタン研究 24: 241–90.
- Lewin, Bruno (1955): “Zur Frage der Verbalaspekte im Altjapanischen.” In: *Oriens Extremus* 2.2: 237–49.
- (1959): *Abriss der japanischen Grammatik auf der Grundlage der klassischen Schriftsprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz [sec. ed. 1975, third ed. 1990].
- (1960): “Zur Aufstellung von Modalkategorien im Japanischen.” In: *Oriens Extremus* 7.2: 234–54.
- (1982): “Kōen: Meiji shoki-ni okeru karon-no dokuyaku” 講演——明治初期における歌論の独訳. In: *Kokusai Nihon bungaku kenkyū shūkai kaigi-roku* 国際日本文学研究集会会議録 5: 93–105.
- (1984): “Die Geburt der japanischen Grammatik aus der Poetik: Das Teniha-taigaishō.” In: *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 7: 1–36.
- Lyons, John (1977): *Semantics*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuoka Kōji 松岡洸司 (1982): “Chūseiki-ni okeru Ratengo-no hon'yaku: Arubaresu Raten bunten-o chūshin-ni” 中世期におけるラテン語の翻訳——アルバレス・ラテン文典を中心に. In: *Sofia* ソフィア 31.2: 20–40.
- (1985): “Hon'yakuhō-to go-to-no kanrensei” 翻訳法と語との関連性. In: *Jōchi daigaku kokubungakka kiyō* 上智大学国文学科紀要 2: 105–28 [reprinted in: idem (1991): *Kirishitan gogaku: 16 seiki-ni okeru* キリシタン語学——16世紀における. (Kokugogaku kenkyū 国語学研究; 1). Tōkyō: Yumani shobō, 173–96].
- (1990): “Gengo-to bunka juyō-no henka” 言語と文化受容の変化. In: *Kirisutokyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* キリスト教文化研究所紀要 9: 47–70 [reprinted in: idem (1991): *Kirishitan gogaku: 16 seiki-ni okeru*. Tōkyō: Yumani shobō, 381–404].
- (1993): “*Giya do pekadoru-ni okeru in'yō Ratenbun-to hon'yaku*” ぎや・ど・ペかどるにおける引用ラテン文と翻訳. In: *Jōchi daigaku kokubungakka kiyō* 上智大学国文学科紀要 10: 49–68.
- Miller, Roy Andrew (1986): *Nihongo: In Defence of Japanese*. London: Athlone Press.
- Morikawa Akira 森川昭 (1982): *Tani Bokuin zenshū* 谷木因全集. Ōsaka: Izumi shoin.
- Nagayama Isamu 永山勇 (1954): “Renga-to tenioha: Rengagakusho-ni okeru tenioha-setsu-no tenkai” 連歌とテニヲハ——連歌学書におけるテニヲハ説の展開. In: *Risshō daigaku bungakubu ronsō* 立正大学文学部論叢 3: 27–49.
- Nakada Norio 中田祝夫 (comm.) (1985): *Ippo* 一步. (Benseisha bunko 勉誠社文庫; 126). Tōkyō: Benseisha.

- NKBT = *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系 (1957–1967). 100 vols. Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten.
- Oda Masaru 小田勝 (2007): *Kodai Nihongo bunpō* 古代日本語文法. Tōkyō: Ōfū.
- Okada Kesao 岡田袈裟男 (2004): “Rangakusha-no toraeta jisei hyōgen-to bunpō yōgo: Edo Rangogakushi-no nagare-no naka-de” 蘭学者のとらえた時制表現と文法用語——江戸蘭語学史の流れの中で. In: *Risshō daigaku bungakubu ronsō* 立正大学文学部論叢 120: 51–62 [reprinted in: Okada Kesao (2006): *Edo igengo sesshoku: Rango, Tōwa-to kindai Nihongo* 江戸異言語接触：蘭語・唐話と近代日本語. Tōkyō: Kasama shoin, 187–97].
- Okuda, Tomoko [奥田倫子] (2011): *Hoffmann’s Bookshelf: A Source for the Philological Study of the Japanese Language in Leiden*. Master’s thesis, Leiden University.
- Osterkamp, Sven (2014): “Notes on the Manuscript Precursors of Collado’s *Ars grammaticæ Iaponicæ lingvæ* in the British Library (Sloane Ms. 3459) and Especially Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Borg. lat. 771).” In: *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 36 (2012): 199–212.
- Ozaki Chika 尾崎千佳 (1997): “Sōin-setsu renga densho *Tomoshihi-shū-no haikai: Sōin-zō juyō-no ichi sokumen-to shite*” 宗因説連歌伝書『登母之火集』の背景——宗因像受容の一側面として. In: Shimazu Tadao sensei koki kinen ronshū kankōkai 島津忠夫先生古稀記念論集刊行会 (ed.): *Nihon bungakushiron: Shimazu Tadao sensei koki kinen ronshū* 日本文学史論——島津忠夫先生古稀記念論集. Kyōto: Sekai shisōsha, 348–61.
- Richie, Donald (2003): *The Image Factory: Fads and Fashions in Japan*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Rickmeyer, Jens (1986): “Verbal Inflexion and Auxiliary Verbs in Classical Japanese: A Structuralist Approach.” In: *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 9: 217–28.
- (2012): *Einführung in das klassische Japanisch anhand der Gedichtanthologie Hyakuniñ issu*. 4th edition. München: Iudicium.
- (2014): *Japanische Morphosyntax*. 2nd edition. Tübingen: Edition Julius Groos im Stauffenburg-Verlag.
- Sada Chiaki 佐田智明 (1957): “Chūsei kagakusho-ni mieru gengo ishiki-no seikaku” 中世歌学書に見える言語意識の性格. In: *Gobun kenkyū* 語文研究 6/7: 29–39.
- (2004): *Kokugo ishikishi kenkyū* 国語意識史研究. Tōkyō: Ōfū.
- Saitō Makoto 斎藤信 (1973): “Nakano Ryūho-no *Shihō shoji taiyaku-ni tsuite*” 中野柳圃の『四法諸時対訳』について. In: *Nagoya shiritsu daigaku kyōyōbu kiyō, Jinbun shakai kenkyū* 名古屋市立大学教養部紀要 人文社会研究 17: 27–51.
- Satō Nobuo 佐藤宣男 (1972): “*Ippo-ni okeru tenioha kenkyū*” 「一步」における「てにをは」研究. In: *Fuji joshi daigaku, Fuji joshi tanki daigaku kiyō* 藤女子大学藤女子短期大学紀要 9.1: 103–40.

- Sugimoto Tsutomu 杉本つとむ (1962): “Kindaigo-no hyōshō: *de-arui-tai-no hassei-to tenkai*” 近代語の標章——デアル体の発生と展開. In: *Kokubungaku kenkyū* 国文学研究 25: 282–90.
- (1991): *Kokugogaku-to Rangogaku* 国語学と蘭語学. Tōkyō: Musashino shoin.
- Takeda Tessen 竹田鉄仙 (1932): “Shittan sōtsūsetsu-to katsuyō kenkyū-ni oyoboseru sono eikyō” 悉曇相通説と活用研究に及ぼせる其の影響. In: Kanazawa hakushi kanreki shukugakai 金沢博士還暦祝賀会 (ed.): *Kanazawa hakushi kanreki kinen Tōyōgogaku-no kenkyū* 金沢博士還暦記念東洋語学乃研究. Tōkyō: Sanseidō, 641–703.
- Takayama Yoshiyuki 高山善行 (2005): “Jodōshi *mu-no rentai yōhō-ni tsuite*” 助動詞「む」の連体用法について. In: *Nihongo-no kenkyū* 日本語の研究 1.4: 1–15.
- (2010): “Modariti” モダリティ. In: Takayama Yoshiyuki / Aoki Hirofumi 青木博史 (eds.): *Gaidobukku Nihongo bunpōshi* ガイドブック 日本語文法史. Tōkyō: Hitsuji shobō, 59–71.
- (2011): “Jutsubu-no kōzō” 述部の構造. In: Kinsui Satoshi 金水敏 et al.: *Bunpōshi* 文法史. (Shirīzu Nihongoshi シリーズ日本語史; 3). Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten, 19–75.
- Tranter, Nicolas (ed.) (2012): *The Languages of Japan and Korea*. London: Routledge.
- Vovin, Alexander (2009): *A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Western Old Japanese. Part 2: Adjectives, Verbs, Adverbs, Conjunctions, Particles, Postpositions*. Folkestone: Global Oriental.
- Wenck, Günther (1960): Review of Lewin (1959). In: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 1960.5/6: 309–16.
- Yamada Yoshio 山田孝雄 (1908): *Nihon bunpō-ron* 日本文法論. Tōkyō: Hōbunkan.
- Yamaguchi Akiho 山口明穂 (1972): “Kako-no jodōshi” 過去の助動詞. In: Suzuki Kazuhiko 鈴木一彦 / Hayashi Ōki 林巨樹 (eds.): *Hinshibetsu Nihon bunpō kōza* 品詞別日本文法講座, vol. 8: *Jodōshi 2* 助動詞 2. Tōkyō: Meiji shoin [reprinted in: Yamaguchi Akiho (1976): *Chūsei kokugo-ni okeru bungo-no kenkyū* 中世国語における文語の研究. Tōkyō: Meiji shoin, 161–77].
- Yoshida Kanehiko 吉田金彦 (1973): *Jōdaigo jodōshi-no shiteki kenkyū* 上代語助動詞の史的研究. Tōkyō: Meiji shoin.
- Yoshida Nagahiro 吉田永弘 (2011): “*Tame-ni kōbun-no henshen: mu-no jidai-kara muhyō-no jidai-e*” タメニ構文の変遷——ムの時代から無標の時代へ. In: Aoki Hirofumi 青木博史 (ed.): *Nihongo bunpō-no rekishi-to henka* 日本語文法の歴史と変化. Tōkyō: Kuroshio shuppan, 89–117.