

The verbals and insubordination in Altaic-type languages

KAZAMA, Shinjiro

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

This paper aims to show that intra-clausal syntax is crucially related to inter-clausal syntax and the development of insubordination. It also examines Evans's (2007) claim that the insubordination phenomenon often pertains to evidential and modal meaning. The term "Altaic-type language" (Kamei, Koono, and Chino 1996: 499) refers to a typologically coherent group of languages rather than to a genetically related group of languages. In this study, I use this term for the group of languages where the modifier always precedes the head, and most importantly, the predicate comes sentence-final. The languages examined in this study can be classified into two or three groups: on one hand, Korean and Nivkh have "verbal encoding adjectives" (i.e., adjectives that behave like, or can be treated as a subclass of, verbs); on the other, Nanai, an Altaic language has "nominal encoding adjectives." Old Japanese is classified as the latter, but Contemporary Japanese constitutes yet another group, or a language that has particular adjectives for one class of lexemes and nominal adjectives for the other.

Keywords: Verbal, Insubordination, Altaic-type language, Nominal encoding adjective, Verbal encoding adjective

1. Introduction
2. The languages of nominal encoding adjectives: Nanai (an Altaic)
3. The languages of verbal encoding adjectives: Korean and Nivkh
4. The languages of merged encoding adjectives: Japanese
5. Conclusion

1. Introduction

1.1. The purpose of this paper

This paper aims to show that intra-clausal syntax is crucially related to inter-clausal syntax and the development of insubordination. It also examines Evans's (2007) claim that the insubordination phenomenon often pertains to evidential and modal meaning.

As Evans (2007) pointed out, some of the expressions of insubordination represents evidential meanings or modal (illocutional) meanings. For example, the following expression of insubordination represents the modal meaning of a polite request.

(1a) (I wonder) If you could give me a couple of 39c stamps please

(1b) If you could give me a couple of 39c stamps please,

“I’d be most grateful”

(Evans 2007: 380)

In this study, I will consider the insubordination of some languages paying attention to such meanings of insubordination.

1.2. The target languages

The term “Altaic-type language” (Kamei, Koono, and Chino 1996: 499) refers to a **typologically** coherent group of languages rather than to a **genetically** related group of languages. In this study, I use this term for a group of languages in which the modifier always precedes the head, and most importantly, the predicate comes sentence-final; concretely Nanai (an Altaic), Korean, Nivkh, and Japanese (the Altaic languages are constituted from Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic languages. However, the genetic relationship between these three groups is not yet clear. In this study, the Altaic languages are represented by Nanai—a Tungusic language).

As detailed below, the languages dealt with in this study are divided into two or three groups based on the morphological character of the adjectives. In Korean and Nivkh, the adjectives behave morphologically as verbs, while in the Altaic languages, they behave as nouns. In old Japanese, adjectives also seem to demonstrate nominal character. In contemporary Japanese, the adjectival meaning is divided into two classes according to their morphological behavior (cf. 4.1.). In the following, I refer to the languages like Korean and Nivkh as “the languages of verbal encoding adjectives,” and those like Altaic languages and old Japanese as “the languages of nominal encoding adjectives.”

1.3. The verbals in Altaic-type languages

Here, I will explain the features of verbals in Altaic-type languages and explain some terms and frameworks that are original in this study.

The term “verbal” is usually used for the verbal forms that are not finite, such as gerunds, infinitives, and participles. In languages like Russian, converbs can be added. This framework goes well with most European languages like English (henceforth referred to as “European-type languages”), but not with the Altaic-type languages discussed in this paper. Specifically, European-type languages and Altaic-type languages differ on the following points:

- The verbals in the European-type languages are formed through a kind of derivational word class change; however, the forms of verbals in the Altaic-type languages are counted among the inflectional paradigm of verbs.
- The forms of verbals in the Altaic-type languages keep the function and character of verbs well, e.g., the argument structure.

- The modifying phrase/clause is always formed by the “attributive” form (Comrie 1998) despite the independence of the phrase/clause. Therefore, there are no relative pronouns or relative clauses containing finite verbs. The boundary between phrases and clauses is unclear in the Altaic-type languages. Although the attributive form of verbs is traditionally called verbal nouns or participles, neither term is appropriate. As mentioned above, this form of a verb is ranked among inflectional paradigm. In the following, I refer to this form as “adnominal (verb) form” (this term is in the glossary as ANF). In Altaic languages and Japanese, this form not only has a noun-modifying function but also a nominal function by itself. Thus, I call this form adnominal-nominal (verb) (in the glossary as ANNF).
- Altaic-type languages generally have many types of converbs, and the converbs of these languages are always used in high frequency. These converbs are also counted among the verb paradigm. Therefore, I do not call this form as a converb, but as an adverbial (verb) form (in the glossary as ADVF).
- Although in European-type languages the adverbial clauses are formed with high independency by relative adverbs or conjunctives, they are formed by an adverbial or an adnominal-nominal plus a case particle in Altaic-type languages. Conversely, Altaic-type languages use conjunctives in low frequency and conjunctives are not well developed.
- In every Altaic-type language, the adverbial form is used with high frequency to realize the broad meaning, from narrative chain to cause and reason. Therefore, the boundary between coordination and subordination is not clear, but forms a gradual sequence. In Altaic-type languages, real coordination barely exists. Ono (1993) described the situation above as demonstrated by the most frequent adverbial form (*te*-form) in Japanese (1993).

2. The languages of nominal encoding adjectives: Nanai (an Altaic)

In Altaic languages, the verbs are conjugated by their “dependentness” and are in a finite, an adnominal(-nominal), or an adverbial form. Therefore, on a verb it indicates that either the sentence ends with a verb or, if it does not, what kind of function does the verb depict as it proceeds to the next word. We regard this function as the verbal category “dependentness.”

The finite forms are subdivided in some cases by tense and modality; the adnominal(-nominal) and the adverbial forms are also subdivided. Here, let us see the paradigm of Nanai (one of the Tungusic languages).

Table 1: Paradigm of a Nanai verb

Table 1. Paradigm of a Noun Verb			
Finite forms	Indicative	Present	<i>-ra(n)</i>
		Past	<i>-ka</i>
		Future	<i>-ǰaan</i>
	Imperative	Present	<i>-roo</i>
		Future	<i>-xaar</i>
	Others (omitted)		
Adnominal-nominal forms	Present		<i>-(ri)i</i>
	Past		<i>-xan/-kin</i>
Adverbial forms	Simultaneous		<i>-mi</i>
	Consequential		<i>-raa</i>
	Conditional		<i>-očia</i>
	Others (omitted)		

(The description in this table is simplified considerably. For example, the allomorphs by vowel harmony, assimilation, or dropping are not reflected. The grammatical labels of each form are rough. The situation is the same for other languages such as the following: see Kazama (2010a) for detailed grammar of Nanai. And the sentences below are compositions by the author checked by a native consultant, or are sentences from texts collected in author's fieldwork.)

As mentioned above, generally, adjectives almost behave as nouns in Altaic languages. Generally no copulas are needed in the sentence of a nominal/adjectival predicate if the sentence is affirmative and in the present tense.

(2a) *təi nai aloosimǰi.*
that person teacher
‘‘That person is a teacher.’’

(2b) *təi nai uləən.*
that person good
‘‘That person is good.’’

If the sentence is negative or in past tense, the verb *to exist* ‘‘bi-’’ is used for a copula.

(3a) *təi nai aloosimǰi bi-čĭn.*
that person teacher be-ANNF.PST
‘‘That person was a teacher.’’

(3b) *təi nai uləən bi-čĭn.*
that person good be-ANNF.PST
‘‘That person was good.’’

(4a) *təi nai aloosimǰi bi-əsi.*
that person teacher be-ANNF.NEG.PRS
‘‘That person is not a teacher.’’

(4b) *təi nai uləən bi-əsi.*
that person good be-ANNF.NEG.PRS

“That person is not good.”

Nouns and adjectives show the difference when they modify nouns. The possessive construction in Nanai is a type of head-marking, and there are no genitive cases in most Tungusic languages.

(5a) *aloosimji dan̄sa-ni*
teacher book-3SG.POSS
“a book of the teacher”

(5b) *uləən dan̄sa*
good book
“a good book”

Adjectives have nominal characteristics, and they conjugate by directly taking a case suffix such as the accusative.

(6a) *aloosimji-wa ičə-xən.*
teacher-ACC see-ANFN.PST
“(Someone) saw a teacher.”

(6b) *uləəm-bə ičə-xən.*
good-ACC see-ANFN.PST
“(Someone) saw a good one.”

The adnominal-nominal form of verbs has three functions: [1] the function of the finite verb at the end of a sentence ((7a), (7b)), [2] the function of modifying a noun ((8a), (8b)), and [3] the function as a verbal noun ((9a), (9b)).

(7a) *təi nai tutu-i.*
that person run-ANFN.PRS
“The person runs/is running.”

(7b) *təi nai tutu-xən.*
that person run-ANFN.PST
“The person ran/was running.”

(8a) *tutu-i nai*
run-ANFN.PRS person
“running person/a person who runs”

(8b) *tutu-xən nai.*
run-ANFN.PST person
“the person who ran/was running”

(9a) *mii təi nai tutu-i-wə-ni* *ičə-xəm-bi.*
I that person run-ANFN.PRS-ACC-3SG see-ANFN.PST-1SG
“I saw that the person was running.”

(9b) *mii təi nai tutu-xəm-bə-ni* *ičə-xəm-bi.*
I that person run-ANFN.PST-ACC-3SG see-ANFN.PST-1SG
“I saw that the person had run.”

The copula “*bi-*” can be used in a sentence with adnominal-nominal predicate. The past tense of “*bi-*” is the irregular form.

- (10) *təi nai tutu-i bi-č̣i-ni.*
 that person run- ANNF.PRS be- ANNF.PST-3SG
 “That person had been running.”

As seen above, the character of the adnominal-nominal verb form corresponds well to that of adjectives. On the other hand, generally, the adverbial forms of a verb cannot appear at the end of a sentence and cannot form a sentence without a finite verb, i.e., cannot realize the insubordination.

- (11) **təi nai tutu-mi / tutu-rəð / tutu-uč̣iə-ni.*
 that person run-SIM.ADV / run-ANT.ADV / run-COND.ADV-3SG
 “The man is running and at that time, ... / The man has run and then, ...
 / When the man is running, ...”

When the adverbial form of verbs comes at the end of the sentence by inversion, it must take the marker of inversion (=da / =də).

- (12) *əsi=tənii ənə-xən, piktə-ji kuu-rəð=də.*
 now=CLT go-PST child-REF.SG nurse-ANT.ADV=CLT
 “Now she has gone, after she nursed her own baby.”

The length of vowels is different, but this inversion marker is derived from the marker of accumulation.

- (13) *səpə sɨŋakta-nɪ=daa bi-i, gormaxon=daa bi-i,*
 sable fur-3SG.POSS=CLT be-ANNF.PRS rabbit=CLT be-ANNF.PRS
xat=daa xəm bi-i.
 what=CLT all be-ANNF.PRS
 “There are also sable furs, and also rabbit furs. There are all kinds of furs.”

Because the function of adverbial forms is to modify the main verb of the main clause, it is inconsistent to finish the sentence with the adverbial form or to make sentences using the adverbial form alone with the main function of adverbial forms. Therefore, it is natural that there are no insubordinations by adverbial forms. However, it is not true that there are no insubordinations in Altaic languages. The exceptional insubordinations will be presented at the end of this section.

The frequency of finite forms is low, and the use of finite forms is generally limited only for the action of 1st and 2nd person in a direct conversation. The use for the action of

3rd person is very rare; they are observed only in the case when the speaker sees the scene of the action directly by {him/her}self. i.e., from the evidential viewpoint, the use of finite forms is limited to the direct experience of the speaker.

- (14) *sii* *sia-ka-si?* *ii,* *mii* *sia-ka-i=a.*
 you eat-PST-2SG yes I eat-PST-1SG=CLT
 “Did you eat something? Yes, I did.”

- (15) *əi-du* *ao-ra=tanii.*
 this-DAT sleep-PRS=CLT
 “(Oh,) (s)he is sleeping here!”

However, the situation is different in the east dialect of the Ewen language (also a Tungusic language). The following examples are according to Malchukov (1995: 17, with some changes especially on notation). We can observe that the adnominal-nominal forms also have three functions in this dialect: adnominal, nominal, and finite.

- (16) *əm-čə* *bəj* *gəən-ə-ni.*
 come-ANFN.PST person say-FNT.NONFUT-3SG
 “The person who had come said.”

- (17) *ətikən* *əm-čə-wə-n* *haa-ra-m.*
 old.person come-ANFN.PST-ACC-3SG know-FNT.NONFUT-1SG
 “(I) know that the old man has come.”

- (18) *bii* *əm-čə* *bi-sə-m.*
 I come-ANFN.PST be-FNT.NONFUT-1SG
 “I have (already) come.”

According to Malchukov (1995: 17), in the case the subject is 3rd person and the tense is non-future, the copula *bi-* can be omitted and the adnominal-nominal form functions as a finite past form.

However, according to the author’s own research, it is quite rare that the sentences end with the adnominal-nominal form. And even if the sentence does end with the form, the form loses most of its verbal character, and a sentence like (18) shows the character of nominal-predicate sentences (in detail, see Kazama 2010b: 24–26).

Here, I would like to propose the following scenario for the history of Tungusic languages. Initially, the finite usage of adnominal-nominal forms is established on the

basis of the nominal character of adjectives, after which, the range of the usage is expanded and settled. Namely, the east dialect of Ewen reflects the older stage, and that of Nanai reflects the newer. Moreover, such a historical shift is thought to have occurred in the history of Japanese (see 4.2.).

The situation in Nanai seen above is almost the same in the case of the Mongolian and Turkic languages. Namely, adjectives have nominal character and adnominal-nominal forms often close the sentence, but insubordination by adverbial forms are rare. Further and deep investigations are necessary because the author has not investigated all the descriptions of Mongolian and Turkic languages. Some of these languages show a kind of insubordination. Here, I site the instances of Turkic, Khalkha-Mongol, and Manchu.

In the Turkic language, the conditional adverbial form can form a sentence of insubordination, which means counter-factual simulation by the help of Persian adverb *keşke* “if only.”

- (19) *keşke daha çok para-m ol-sa.*
 if.only more much money-1SG be-ADVF.COND
 “If only I had much money!”(Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 359))

In Khalkha-Mongolian also the similar expression is possible. The following two sentences are from a consultant born 1988 in övörxangaj, by popular transcription from cyllirc alphabets.

- (20) *ug n' nadad möngö baj-san bol.*
 more 3SG I.DAT money be-PST if
 “If only I had much money!”

It is not so stable an expression, but the consultant says it is possible to say the sentence of insubordination by an adverbial form as follows.

- (21) *terdandaa l uurla-ǰ baj-dag-ijg n',*
 he always EMPH get.angry-ADVF be-ANNF-ACC 3sg
med-seer baj-ǰ,
 know-ADVF be-ADVF
(tege-ǰ xel-e-x xereg=güj baj-san jum).
 be.like.that-ADVF say-E-ANNF necessity=not be-ANNF thing
 “Although you know that he is quick-tempered...
 (why did you say such a thing in such a way!?)”

As seen above, the insubordination with the strong modal meaning is easier to form in many languages. Therefore, many of this type of insubordination can be found in other languages. Similar insubordinations are observed in Korean and Japanese as seen below.

Manchu has an instance of insubordination by the conditional adverbial form (Tsumagari 2000: 140).

- (22) *bi umai šolo baha-rakū, šolo baha-ci*
 I entirely free.time find-NEG free.time find-ADVF.COND
esi ji-ci.
 of.course come-ADVF.COND
 “I do not have time to come; if I find it, of course I will come.”

This insubordination is formed by the agreement between the adverb *esi* “of course” and the conditional adverbial form. This sentence also has a strong modal meaning such as “of course (I) do” and has the nuance of contrast with another situation. Tsumagari (2000: 141, 145) pointed out the similarity with the *kakarimusubi* (a kind of coordination) by = *koso* in old Japanese (see 4.2.).

3. The languages of verbal encoding adjectives: Korean and Nivkh

Verbs conjugate by dependentness in Korean language too. However, they conjugate not only by the finite, adnominal, and adverbial forms, but also by the nominal form. The transcription from the Hangul alphabet is according to Koono (1979[1947]: 96–97).

Table 2: Conjugation of Korean verbs

Finite forms	Indicative	non-past	-(ny)nda
	Witness		-dera
	Imperative		-ra
	Cohorative		-ja
	Other modality (omitted)		
Adnominal forms	Past		-(y)n
	Non-past		-nyn
	Past-progressive		-den
	Future		-(y)r
Nominal forms	Nominal 1		-(y)m
	Nominal 2		-gi
	Nominal 3		-ji
Adverbial forms	Simultaneous		-go
	Consequential		-‘a / -‘e
	Conditional		-(y)myen
	Conditional-adversative		-gedyn
	Cause		-(y)nigga
	Adversative		-nyndei
	Others (omitted)		

(Because Korean has distinctive forms by politeness and also has a series of interrogative forms, the paradigm of Korean verbs shows a complex system. Here, I have selected only the non-polite forms.)

In Korean language, the adjectives behave like verbs morphologically. In the past tense, the adjectives themselves take the suffix of the past tense, and must take the adnominal form to modify a noun.

(23a) gy saram=‘yn sensaing-nim-‘i‘ia.
that person=TOP teacher-mister-COP
“The person is a teacher.”

(23b) gy saram=‘yn ‘ieibb-‘e.
that person=TOP beautiful-ADVF.ANT
“The person is beautiful.”

- (24a) *gy saram='yn sensaing-nim-'i-'ess-'e.*
 that person=TOP teacher-mister -COP-PST-ADVF.ANT
 “That person was a teacher.”
- (24b) *gy saram='yn 'ieibb-'ess-'e.*
 that person=TOP beautiful-PST-ADVF.ANT
 “That person was beautiful.”
- (24c) *gy saram='yn 'o-ass-'e.*
 that person=TOP come-PST-ADVF.ANT
 “The person has come.”
- (25a) *sensaing-nim caig*
 teacher-mister book
 “the book of the teacher”
- (25b) *joh-'yn caig*
 good-ANF.PST book
 “a good book”
- (25c) *'ilg-'yn caig*
 read-ANF.PST book
 “the book which (someone) read”

The nominal form never appears at the end of sentences and is never used nominally. For example, to make a complement clause, the clause is formed by modifying a dummy noun *ges* “thing.”

- (26) *na=nyn gy saram='i darri-go 'iss-nyn ges='yr*
 I=TOP that person=NOM run-ADVF.SIM be-ANF.NONPST thing=ACC
bo-ass-'e.
 see-PST-ADVF.ANT
 “I saw that the man was running.”

Most adverbial forms cannot appear at the end of the sentence like the finite form.

- (27) **gy saram='i darri-go.*
 that person=NOM run-ADVF.SIM
 “The man is running and at the same time ...”

Among the adverbial forms, the consequential form *-a / -e* appears at the end of sentences and even in high frequency. This is the default form used for younger persons, and for senior persons, the form added = *'yo* to this form is also used. These forms are by no means a marked form concerning modality.

(24c) (again)

gy saram='yn 'o-ass-'e.
 that person=TOP come-PST-ADVF.ANT
 "The man came."

(28) gy saram='i {darri-'e / darri-'e='yo} .
 that person=NOM {run-ADVF.ANT / run-ADVF.ANT=CLT}
 "The person runs."

The predicate of sentences like (24c) and (28) that end with the adverbial form is called "*banmal*" in Korean traditional linguistics. This type of predicate did not exist in middle Korean. Ordinarily, the -'a / -'e form was followed by a kind of ending; however, when the ending was dropped, the new form was developed (Tsuji 1997: 64).

In addition, the conditional and purposive adverbial forms may be used for insubordination through the process of inversion or ellipsis.

(29) 'irdyng ha-r-tei-ndei. gy saram='i darri-mien.
 first.prise get-ANF-DN-ADVF.ADVS that person=NOM run-ADVF.COND
 "(He) would get first prize, if he runs."

(30) 'uri=ga 'igi-'e. gy saram='i darri-nigga.
 we=NOM win-ADVF.ANT that person=NOM run-ADVF.CAUSAL
 "We will win, because he runs."

Concerning the insubordinations in Korean, I have carried out an investigation from a corpus, "the King Sejong the Great's corpus" (10 million phrases; among the whole corpus, the written language is 90%, and the colloquial speech is 10%). The target forms are the seven forms shown in table 3 below. According to Kanno et al. (1988: 1023–1025), among the adverbial forms, five forms (-ndei, -nyndei, -dendei, -gedyn, -'a / -'e) can be used at the end of a sentence. I retrieved these forms, -(y)myen and -(y)nigga, mentioned above.

Table 3: Result of the corpus investigation concerning the insubordination in Korean

	<i>-(y)myen</i>	<i>-(y)nigga</i>	<i>-ndei</i>	<i>-nyndei</i>	<i>-dendei</i>	<i>-‘a / -‘e</i>	<i>-gedyn</i>
The function of adverbial form	Conditional	Causal	Adver -sative	Adver -sative	Adver -sative	Conse -quential	Conditional
Written	71	378	547	576	24	3,395	81
Colloquial	38*	980	574	470	95	6,451	416

There are many tokens of *-(y)myen*, and thus I limited the corpus of the written language only to novels. At first sight, the tokens of insubordination in the colloquial speech are not many; however, because the colloquial speech occupies only 10% of the whole corpus, the number should be estimated to be 9 times more.

First, all of the three forms (*-ndei*, *-nyndei*, *-dendei*) are adversative, and if they are used as an insubordination, they realize modal meanings such as criticism, objection, and exclamation.

- (31) *giengci=ga mai‘u joh‘y-ndei.*
 view=NOM very good-ADVF
 “What a nice view it is!” (Yutani et al. eds. 1993: 332)

- (32) *gyre-nigga ga-ji mar-ra gyrai-ss-nyndei.*
 be.so-CAUSAL go-N stop-QUOT be.so-PST-ADVF
 “So I said that you should not go (but you did).” (Yutani et al. eds. 1993: 424)

-gedyn is a conditional or an adversative adverbial form, but in recent years, the adverbial usage is declining. Examples like (33) can be paraphrased by *-(y)myen*, and the expression *-(y)myen* is used much more today.

- (33) *bi-ga gyci-gedyn ga-ja.*
 rain-NOM finish-ADVF.COND go-COHOR
 “If the rain stopped, let us go.” (Yutani et al. eds. 1993: 73)

However, examples like (34), where *-gedyn* is used at the end of the sentence, are quite common in colloquial speech even today. The function of the insubordination is “to show another reason.”

- (34) *‘oai gyre-n ge sa-ss-‘e?*
 why be.so-ANF thing buy-PST-ADVF.ANT

‘*emeni=ga* *johaha-si-gedyn*.
 mother=NOM like-HONOR-ADVF.COND
 “Why did you buy such a thing? Because my mother likes such (I bought it).”
 (Yutani et al. eds. 1993: 73)

Moreover, in Nivkh, adjectives show verbal inflection. According to Hattori (1988: 1413), there are set forms of “verbal adverb” in Nivkh. And they express the inflection as shown below.

Table 4: Verbal adverbs in Nivkh

	Non-future	Future		
	Normal	Perfective	Normal	Perfective
1sg, 1pl, 2pl, 3pl	<i>-t</i>	<i>-dot</i>	<i>-n</i>	<i>-non</i>
2sg, 3sg	<i>-r</i>	<i>-ror</i>	<i>-r</i>	<i>-ror</i>

The verbal adverbs are the forms that function like adverbial forms in other languages. If there are more than two subjects, both predicates will be the verbal adverbs. This means that not only is the verb in the middle of the sentence a verbal adverb but the verb at the end of the sentence is also a verbal adverb.

(35) *Ni caj ra-t wi-nt.*
 I tea drink-ADVF.1SG go-FNT
 “I drank a cup of tea and went.” (Hattori 1988: 1413)

(36) *ci caj ra-r Ni damx da-t (< ra-t).*
 you tea drink-ADVF.2SG I cigarette drink-ADVF.1SG
 “You drank a cup of tea, and I smoked.” (Hattori 1988: 1413)

The verbal adverbs in Nivkh are similar to the adverbial form -‘a / -‘e in Korean on the following points, although they differ from -‘a / -‘e on the point that they are used with different subjects in principal.

- Both of Nivkh and Korean have the default form in high frequency, which are used to express consequential actions or events. cf. (35)
- Both of the forms of Nivkh and Korean do not imply the marked modal meaning, which is often observed in insubordinations. cf. (28), (36)

4. The languages of merged encoding adjectives: Japanese

4.1. Contemporary Japanese

The forms in the inflectional paradigm of verbs in Japanese are also divided into three groups: finite, adnominal(-nominal), and adverbial. Finite forms are subdivided by modality and tense.

Table 5: Inflectional paradigm of verbs in Japanese

Finite forms	Indicative	Non-past	-(<i>r</i>) <i>u</i>
		Past	-(<i>i</i>) <i>ta</i>
	Imperative		- <i>e</i> / <i>-ro</i>
	Cohorative		-(<i>y</i>) <i>oo</i>
	Other modality (omitted)		
Adnominal(-nominal) forms	Non-past		-(<i>r</i>) <i>u</i>
	Past		-(<i>i</i>) <i>ta</i>
Adverbial forms	Simultaneous		-(<i>i</i>) <i>nagara</i>
	Consequential		-(<i>i</i>) <i>te</i>
	Conditional I		-(<i>r</i>) <i>eba</i>
	Conditional II		-(<i>i</i>) <i>tara</i>
	Other modality (omitted)		

The words that have adjectival meaning are divided into two word classes. One of them shows almost the same conjugation (negative, past, and so on) as nouns, while the other shows different conjugations from both nouns and verbs. In the following, I call the former *na*-adjectives, and the latter *i*-adjectives. *Na*-adjectives form a subclass of nouns. The finite form and the adnominal form of *na*-adjectives are different ((37b) and (40b)), but those of *i*-adjectives are the same ((37c) and (40c)).

(37a) *kare=wa sensee=da.*
 he=TOP teacher=COP
 “He is a teacher.”

(37b) *kare=wa genki=da.*
 he=TOP fine=COP.PRS.FNT
 “He is fine.”

(37c) *kare=wa kasiko-i.*
 he=TOP clever-PRS
 “He is clever.”

- (38a) *kare=wa sensee=da-tta.*
 he=TOP teacher=COP-PST
 “He was a teacher.”
- (38b) *kare=wa genki=da-tta.*
 he=TOP fine=COP-PST
 “He was fine.”
- (38c) *kare=wa kasiko-katta.*
 he=TOP clever-PST
 “He was clever.”
- (39a) *kare=wa sensee=zya na-i.*
 he=TOP teacher=CLT not.exist-PRS
 “He is not a teacher.”
- (39b) *kare=wa genki=zya na-i.*
 he=TOP fine=CLT not.exist-PRS
 “He is not fine.”
- (39c) *kare=wa kasiko-ku na-i.*
 He=TOP clever-ADVF not.exist-PRS
 “He is not clever.”
- (40a) *sensee=no hon*
 Teacher=GEN book
 “the book of the teacher”
- (40b) *genki-na hito*
 fine-ANF person
 “a fine person”
- (40c) *kasiko-i hito*
 clever-ANF.PRS person
 “a clever person”
- (41a) *sensee=o mi-ta.*
 teacher=ACC see-PST
 “(someone) saw a teacher.”
- (41b) *?genki=o mi-ta. / genki-na=no=o mi-ta.*
 fine = ACC see-PST / fine-ANF=DN=ACC see-PST
 “(someone) saw that (he) was fine.”
- (41c) **kasiko-i=o mi-ta. / kare=ga kasiko-i=koto=o mi-ta.*
 clever-ANF=ACC see-PST / he=NOM clever-ANF=event=ACC see-PST
 “I saw that he was clever.”

The adnominal(-nominal) verb form and the finite verb form are the same. Therefore, we can analyze this situation as that the adnominal(-nominal) forms appear at the end of the sentence and function as a finite verb. However, in this paper, I treat them as different forms according to the tradition of Japanese linguistics.

- (42a) *kare=wa hasir-u.*
 he=TOP run-NONPST
 “He runs.”
- (42b) *kare=wa hasit-ta.*
 he=TOP run-PST
 “He ran.”
- (43a) *kare=wa hasir-ana-i.*
 he = TOP run-NEG-PRS
 “He does not run.”
- (43b) *kare=wa hasir-ana-katta.*
 he = TOP run-NEG-PST
 “He did not run.”
- (44a) *hasir-u hito.*
 run-ANF.NONPST person
 “person who runs”
- (44b) *hasit-ta hito.*
 run-ANF.PST person
 “person who ran”

The adnominal(-nominal) forms cannot behave like nouns by taking a case suffix. They must constitute a noun phrase/clause by modifying a (dummy) noun, and this noun phrase/clause can take a case suffix.

- (45a) **kare=ga hasir-u=o mi-ta.*
 he=NOM run-ANF.NONPST=ACC see-PST
 / *kare=ga hasir-u=no=o mi-ta.*
 / he=NOM run-ANF.NONPST=DN=ACC see-PST
 “I saw that he ran.”
- (45b) **kare=ga hasit-ta=o mi-ta.*
 he=NOM run-ANF.PST=ACC see-PST
 / *kare=ga hasit-ta=no=o mi-ta.*
 / he=NOM run-ANF.PST=DN=ACC see-PST
 “I saw that he ran.”

Only in idiomatic expressions in written language can there be observed examples of an adnominal(-nominal) form followed directly by a case suffix (Horie and Prashant 2009: 154). The examples are limited to the expression of events, not actions. The following examples ((46)–(48)) are from Horie and Prashant (2009: 154, with some changes). This usage is the remnant of the adnominal-nominal forms of Old Japanese, see 4.2.

- (46) *ie=o kaw-u=ni atat-te syakkin=o s-ita.*
 house = ACC buy-ANF = DAT confront-ADV debt = ACC do-FNT.PST
 “(I) borrowed from a bank to buy a house.”

- (47) *eiga=ni ik-u=yori ne-te i-ru=hoo=ga i-i.*
 film=DAT go-ANF=than sleep-ADVF be-ANF=DN=NOM good-FNT
 “I had better be sleeping than to go to see a film.”
- (48) *sono kaisya=wa toosan+s-uru=ni itat-ta.*
 that company=TOP bankruptcy+do-ANF=DAT go-PST
 “In the end, the company went bankrupt.”

It is impossible to put the copula particle =*da* after the adnominal(-nominal) form (possible only in some dialects, e.g., in Nagano dialect). Here, again the adnominal(-nominal) form must constitute a noun phrase/clause by modifying a (dummy) noun, and this noun phrase/clause can take the copula particle =*da*.

- (49a) **kare=wa hasir-u=da.* (49b) *kare=wa hasir-u=no=da.*
 he=TOP run-ANF.NONPST=COP he=TOP run-ANF.NONPST=DN=COP
 “(I am sure that) he runs.” “(I am sure that) he runs.”
- (50a) **kare=wa hasit-ta=da.* (50b) *kare=wa hasit-ta=no=da.*
 he=TOP run-ANF.PST=COP he=TOP run-ANF.PST=DN=COP
 “(I am sure that) he ran.” “(I am sure that) he ran.”

I investigated insubordinations in contemporary Japanese using the corpus BCCWJ (Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese) by NINJAL (National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics), retrieved from the genre of literary works (about 30 million words), diet records (about 4.9 million words), and Yahoo! Chiebukuro ‘Yahoo Answers’ (about 5.2 million words). Shirakawa (2009) treats *-(i)te*, *-(r)eba*, *-(i)tara*, *=kara*, *=kedo*, *=noni*, and *=si* as the elements of insubordination. In this research, I retrieved seven forms as targets (added =*ga* and omitted *-(i)te* from the forms listed above). Regarding *-(r)eba*, *-(i)tara*, only the forms followed by a question mark were retrieved. The number of tokens of Yahoo Chiebukuro are not credible sufficiently because of some technical problems.

Table 6: Result of the corpus research on the insubordinations in Contemporary Japanese

	<i>-(r)eba</i>	<i>-(i)tara</i>	<i>=kara</i>	<i>=ga</i>	<i>=kedo</i>	<i>=noni</i>	<i>=si</i>
Adnominal meaning	conditional	conditional	causal	adversative	adversative	adversative	cumulative
Literary works	15	80	1,964	935	616	376	372
Diet records	0	0	406	223	1	2	9
Yahoo Chiebukuro	98	133	1,562	2,599	921	262	1,080

Because insubordinations have the colloquial character, the tokens from diet records are few. Although all of *=ga*, *=kedo* and *=noni* have adversative meaning, *=ga* has more formal character among them. Therefore, the tokens from the diet records are relatively many.

Followings are the examples of insubordination of each target form. It is observed that every form realizes modal meaning.

- (51) *zya, yame-tya-eba?*
 then cease-PRF-ADVF.COND
 “(To the person who says that if she talked over some matters with her husband wanting sympathy, but rather he advises her instead) Then, (how about) stopping it?”
 (Yahoo Chiebukuro)

- (52) *tamani=wa nakami=de eran-de mi-tara?*
 Sometimes=TOP inside=INS chose-ADVF.ANT try-ADVF.COND
 “(To the person who always chooses her boyfriend by looks and comes to no good) How about choosing your boyfriend by his personality?”
 (Yahoo Chiebukuro)

Most examples of this type are thought to be the ellipsis of the main clause as *i-i=n=zya na-i=ka?* “It is better to do so, isn’t it!?” And most examples are that of recommendation to a 2nd person. There are many examples in which the auxiliary verb *-te mi-ru* “try to do” occurs (53).

- (53) *ki=ni nar-u=nara sirabe-te mi-tara!?*
 anxious become-ANF.NONPST=COND research-ADVF.ANT try-ADVF.COND
 “(How about) checking on it if you are anxious about it!?” (Yahoo Chiebukuro)

Most examples of this type are thought to be the ellipsis of the main clause as *doo?* “How about ~.” Moreover, most examples are recommendations to a 2nd person. There are many examples in which the auxiliary verb *-te mi-ru* “try to do” occurs.

- (54) *ganbat-te!* *watasi=mo* *ganbar-u=kara.*
 try.one’s.best-ADVF.ANT I=CML try.one’s.best-FNT=CAUSAL
 “Try your best! I try my best too.” (Yahoo Chiebukuro)

In most of the examples of insubordination by *=kara*, the content of the ordinal main clause was explained in the former sentences. Therefore, this type of insubordination is almost the same as inversion, and the expression has not been grammaticalized completely. There are many examples that state the objective reasons and have no strong modal meaning.

Let us see examples of the adversative adverbial forms *=kedo* and *=noni*.

- (55) *karate yat-te* *i-ru* *oyazi* *doo omow-u?*
 karate do-ADVF.ANT be-ANF.NONPST middle.age how think-FNT.NONPST
 “What do you think about middle age men playing Karate?”
kakkoi-i=to *omo-imas-u=kedo.*
 cool-FNT=QUOT think-POLT-FNT.NONPST=ADVS
 “I think they are cool.” (Yahoo Chiebukuro)

It is observed in (55) above that in this case the one who asked a question predicts a negative answer, and the one who replies uses insubordination by *=kedo*.

- (56) *ur-u=ki=ga* *na-i=nara*
 buy-ANF=intention=NOM not.exist-ANF = COND
syuppin *si-na-kya* *i-i=noni.*
 put.at.auction do-NEG-COND good-ANF=ADVS
 “If they do not intent to buy them, they had better not put them up at auction.”
 (Yahoo Chiebukuro)

The example of insubordination by *=noni* does not have a strong modal meaning either. The ordinal main clause can be easily supplemented by the context.

It is reported that the use of insubordination by *=si* is increasing, and that some new usage is appearing. According to Bak (2005: 31–32), there are the following usages.

- [1] To signify the speaker’s complaint or refusal to the hearer

- (57) *watasi=mo yar-u=si.*
 I=CML do-FNT.NONPST=CML
 “(You are complaining about as if only you were doing hard work, but)
 I am doing it too.”

- (58) *mi-te na-i=si.*
 see-ADVF.ANT not.exist- PRS=CML
 “You don’t even see it!”

- (59) *ik-ita-ku na-i=si.*
 go-OPT-ADVF not.exist-PRS=CML
 “I don’t want to go there.”

[2] To signify the speaker’s pride.

- (60) *sit-te-ru=si.*
 know-ADVF.ANT- FNT.NONPST=CML
 “(of course) I know it.”

[3] Just to comment about the event or situation at the very moment.

- (61) *terebi mi-ta=si.*
 television watch-PST=CML
 “I have watched TV.”

4.2. Old Japanese

Different from the case in contemporary Japanese, the finite form and the adnominal-nominal form are different in old Japanese.

Table 7: Finite forms and adnominal-nominal forms in old Japanese

	yodan	kami-nidan, shimo-nidan	kami- /shimo- ichidan	ka-hen	sa-hen	ra-hen	na-hen
finite	<i>kak-u</i>	<i>tasuk-u</i>	<i>mi-ru</i>	<i>k-u</i>	<i>s-u</i>	<i>ar-i</i>	<i>sin-u</i>
adnominal -nominal	<i>kak-u</i>	<i>tasuk-uru</i>	<i>mi-ru</i>	<i>k-uru</i>	<i>s-uru</i>	<i>ar-u</i>	<i>sin-uru</i>
meaning	“to write”	“to help”	“to see”	“to come”	“to do”	“to exist”	“to die”

Unlike its usage in contemporary Japanese, adnominal-nominal forms are used as nouns in old Japanese. That is, these forms take a case suffix directly even if they mean concrete objects and not events.

- (62) *matu=ni yuki=no hur-i+kakar-i=tar-i=ker-u=wo*
 pine=DAT snow=NOM.GEN fall-ADVF+powder-ADVF=PRF-ADVF=PST-ANNF=ACC
or-ite
 break-ADVF.ANT
 “(someone) broke the branch powdered with snow and,” (Yamato monogatari)

- (63) *kore-ra=no hito=no waraf-u=wo kik-ite*
 this-PL=NOM.GEN person=NOM.GEN laugh-ANNF=ACC hear-ADVF.ANT
 “(someone) heard those people laughing...” (Tosa nikki)

There was a kind of agreement that the predicate verb must be an adnominal-nominal form when a constituent of the sentence was emphasized by =*zo*, =*namu*, =*ya*, or =*ka*. In the traditional Japanese linguistics, this phenomenon is called *kakarimusubi*.

- (64) *yama=no oku=ni=mo sika=zo nak-u nar-u.*
 mountain=GEN.NOM bottom=DAT=CML deer=EMPH call-FNT hear(EVD)-ANNF
 “It was a deer that calls deep in the mountain.” (Senzaishuu 1148)

Later, a sentence ending by the adnominal-nominal forms became more common, the ordinal finite forms declined more, and the present situation in contemporary Japanese realized. But some dialects, such as Ryuukyuu, retain the opposition between finite and adnominal-nominal forms and *kakarimusubi*.

There was another type of *kakarimusubi* in addition to the ones mentioned above, which was established through the process of insubordination. Ordinarily, the

imperfective form *-(r)e* (called *izen* form in Japanese traditional linguistics) was an adverbial form that had constituted an adverbial clause with a particle of emphasis =*koso*, meaning conditional or adversative in the Nara period.

- (65) *hito=koso sir-an-e matu=ha sir-u=ram-u.*
 person=EMPH know-NEG-ADVF-ADVS pine=TOP know-FNT=INFER-FNT
 “People do not recognize me, but pine trees probably remember me.”
 (Manyoosyuu 145)

The expression of insubordination had generalized in the Heian period.

- (66) *tir-u=yara tir-an-u=yara, arasi=koso sir-e.*
 (flower.) fall-FNT=or fall-NEG-FNT=or storm=EMPH know-ADVS
 “Only the storm knows that the flowers fall or not.” (Kanginsyuu 27)

Other particles such as =*zo* or =*namu* have gone out of existence but =*koso* survived in contemporary Japanese. The particle =*koso* has had the tendency to attach to a conditional or causal clause. Even now, we can observe this tendency in the following example.

- (67) *kimi=o sinzi-reba=koso / kimi=o sinzi-te*
 you=ACC believe-COND=EMPH / you=ACC believe-ADVF
i-ru=kara=koso kimi=ni sono sigoto=o makase-ta=n=da.
 be-FNT=CAUSAL=EMPH you=DAT that work=ACC leave-PST=DN=COP
 “I left you to do the work because I believe in you.”

We can observe =*koso* in an adversative clause that has remained since Nara period.

- (68) *kono kyuuri = wa katati = koso waru-i=keredo,*
 this cucumber = TOP form = EMPH bad-FNT=ADVS
azi = wa yo-i.
 taste = TOP good-FNT
 “This cucumber looks bad, but tastes good.” (Iori and others 2001: 349)

The adjectives are considered to have similar character to that of verbs because they are conjugated by themselves in contemporary Japanese linguistics (see 4.1.). But adjectives in old Japanese had a character similar to that of nouns.

- The past form of adjectives had developed later, with the help of the auxiliary verb *ar-* (e.g., *taka-katta* < *taka-ku at-ta*).
- To make compounds from adjectives, the stem of an adjective is used, and the way to make compounds from adjectives is similar to that of nouns (e.g., *haya* + *asi* fast + leg ‘a quick march’, *ama* + *asi* rain + leg “streaks of pouring rain”).
- In the Nara period there are instances in which the stem of adjectives modify the noun directly (e.g., *mizika/yo* short/night “a short night”). Even now, such instances are observed in Miyako dialect in South Ryukyuan.

This study formed a hypothesis that in languages that contain adjectives of nominal encoding, the verbals have the function of both adnominal and nominal, i.e., such languages have some adnominal-nominal forms. If this hypothesis is valid, it is quite natural that adjectives in old Japanese were a subgroup of nominal word class rather than that of verbal word class.

5. Conclusion

According to the analysis of the languages above, I formed the following conclusions (i)–(iv).

- (i) Languages that contain adjectives of nominal encoding, such as Altaic languages, can end a sentence with the adnominal-nominal (verb) form, whereas languages that have adjectives of verbal encoding, such as Nivkh and Korean, cannot.
- (ii) In languages that have adjectives of nominal encoding, where a sentence may be terminated with the adnominal-nominal form or with the finite verb form, evidentiality may be a crucial factor that determines this choice.
- (iii) In languages that have nominal adjectives, it is not common for the adverbial form to end a sentence. Whereas, in languages that have adjectives of verbal encoding, there do exist adverbial forms that may end a sentence with high frequency.
- (iv) Generally, when an adverbial form is used to end a sentence, the sentence carries a certain modal feature. However, in languages that have adjectives of verbal encoding, this does not hold true, and the sentence carries an unmarked modal feature.

Regarding (i), the syntax of complex sentences is considered to be based on that of simple sentences. Therefore, it is predictable that the syntactic character of adnominal forms is similar to that of adjectives cross-linguistically. Most of the Indo-European languages also have adjectives of nominal encoding, and have participles that function

like nouns and adjectives. In Altaic languages, where no copulas are necessary in the affirmative and present sentences, the ground had been prepared for the adnominal-nominal forms to develop into finite verbs at the end of the sentences. Against this background, sentences that end with adnominal-nominal forms have developed in Nanai and Japanese.

Regarding (ii), it can be considered that finishing a sentence with an adnominal-nominal form means throwing a verb-predicate sentence into a noun-predicate syntax. It is easy to understand this if we remember the cleft sentences in English. Moreover, generally, nominal-predicate sentences (i.e., X is Y) have X as a known and specific thing or event and Y as a judgment or knowledge of a constant state by the speaker. Therefore, it is predictable that contents of these are different from those of verb-predicate sentences from the viewpoint of evidentiality. *Kakarimusubi* in old Japanese is crucially related to the change in information structure such as emphasis or interrogation. I would like to write an article about these problems sometime in the future.

Regarding (iii), we have observed the insubordinations by adverbial forms, which have no strong modal meanings and are used frequently. Thus far, I have not found any logical reason for developing such insubordinations. It must be investigated why such phenomena have developed in these languages.

Regarding (iv), *-ci* in Manchu (22), *-gedyn* in Korean (34), and *-(r)e* in old Japanese (66) are similar to each other in terms of the following points.

- All of them are insubordination from adverbial forms of the conditional or the adversative.
- All of them have illocutionary force to the hearer stating the reason in a contrastive context.

To verify that the conclusions (i)–(iv) above are valid cross-linguistically, it will be necessary to further investigate the situation in other languages than Altaic-type.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my thanks to H. Ito for instruction about Korean data, to P. Han for investigating Korean language through the corpus, and to Y. Satoo for investigating contemporary Japanese language by the corpus. I also wish to express my gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments.

Abbreviation

ACC: accusative	INS: instrumental
ADVS: adversative	N: nominal form
ADVF: adverbial form	NEG: negative
ANF: adnominal form	NOM: nominative
ANNF: adnominal-nominal form	NONFUT: nonfuture
ANT: anterior	NONPST: nonpast
CAUSAL: causal	OPT: optative
CLT: clitic	PL: plural
COHOR: cohortative	POLT: polite
CML: cumulative	POSS: possession
COND: conditional	PRF: perfect
COP: copula	PRS: present
DAT: dative	PST: past
DN: dummy noun	QUOT: quotative
E: epenthetic	REF: reflexive
EMPH: emphatic	SG: singular
EVD: evidential	SIM: simultaneous
FNT: finite	TOP: topic
GEN: genitive	
HONOR: honorific	= boundary before particles
INFER: inference	+ word boundary in compounds

Transcription rules

The Old/contemporary Japanese and Nanai examples are basically on the phonemic transcription. The followings are different from IPA (in Nanai): č(ɕ), ʃ(dʒ), ɲ(n)

References

- Bak, S-H. 2005. *Setsuzokujoshi de owaru nihongo no iisashi hyoogen: Taijin kankee o chuushin ni*. [the expressions of insubordination ending with conjunctive particles: Focusing on the Interpersonal relations.] MA thesis, Graduate School of Languages and Cultures in Nagoya University.
- Comrie, B. 1998. "Attributive Clauses in Asian Languages: Towards an Areal Typology". W. Boeder et al. eds. *Sprach in Raum und Zeit, In Memoriam Johannes Bechert*, Band 2, Tübingen: Grnter Narr. pp. 19–37.
- Evans, N. 2007. "Insubordination and its uses". *Finiteness*, ed. by Irina Nikolaeva. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 361–431.
- Göksel, A. and C. Kerslake 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Hattori, K. 1988. "Giriyaaku-go. [Gilyak language.]" T. Kamei, R. Koono and Chino eds. *Gengogaku Daijiten dai I-kan*. [The Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics, Vol. I] Tokyo: Sanseidoo. pp. 1408-1411.

- Horie K. and P. Pardeshi 2009. *Gengo no taiporojii*. [*Typology in Languages*.] Tokyo: Kenkyuusha.
- Iori, I., S. Takanashhi, K. Nakanishi and T. Yamada 2001. *Chuijookyusya o oshieru tame no nihongo handobukku*. [*The Handbook of Japanese Grammar for teaching intermediate students*.] Supervised by H. Shirakawa. Tokyo: 3A network.
- Kamei, T., R. Koono and E. Chino eds. 1996. *Gengogaku Daijiten dai 6-kan*. [*The Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics, Vol. 6*.] Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Kanno, H., Y. Hayakawa, S. Shibu, K. Hamada, T. Matsubara, H. Noma, K. Shiota, and H. Ito eds. 1988. *Kosumosu choowa jiten*. [*Cosmos Korean-Japanese Dictionary*.] Tokyo: Hakusuisha.
- Kazama, S. 2010a. "Naanaigo bunpoogaisetsu. [A Grammatical Sketch of Nanai Language.]" *Naanai no minwa to densetsu* 12. Tsunguusu gengo bunka ronsyuu 48. [*Nanai Folktales and Legends* 12.] Fuchu: ILCAA. pp. 207-266.
- Kazama, S. 2010b. "Tsunguusugo no setsuji -ča ni tsuite. [The suffix -ča in Tungusic Languages.]" *Ajia afurika no gengo to gengogaku* 5. [*Asian and African Languages and Linguistics* 5.] ILCAA. pp. 17-34.
- Koono, R. 1947. "Choosengo no roomaji tenshaan. [A proposal for romanizing transcription of Korean.]" *Tōyōgo Kenkyū* 2, included in Koono (1979), pp. 96-97.
- Koono, R. 1979. *Koono Rokuroo chosakushuu I*. [*Selected writings of Rokuroo Koono I*.] Tokyo: Heebonsha.
- Malchukov, A. L. 1995. *Even: Languages of the World/Materials* 12. München - Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Minami, F. 1974. *Gendai nihongo no koozoo*. [*The structure of contemporary Japanese*.] Tokyo: Taishuukanshoten.
- Ono, Yoshiko 1993. "Does Japanese have coordination?" In Ebert, Karen (ed.) *Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Zürich*.
- Shirakawa, H. 2009. *'Iisashibun' no Kenkyuu*. [*An investigation on insubordination*.] Tokyo: Kuroshioshuppan.
- Tsuji, S. 1997. Choosengoshi ni okeru 'Shookaishingo'. [*'Shookaishingo' (a Japanese textbook in modern Korea) in the history of Korean Language*.] Okayama: Okayamadaigaku Bungakubu. [The faculty of Literature in Okayama University.]
- Tsumagari, T. 2000. "Manshuugo dooshigobi -ci no bunmatsuyooohoo to -cina ni tsuite. [The Manchu Sentence-final Converb in -ci with Reference to the Origin of -cina.]" *Altai Hakpo* 10. [*Journal of the Altaic Society of Korea*.] Seoul: Altaic Society in Korea. pp. 139-150.
- Yutani, Y., S. Kadowaki, I. Matsuo and Y. Takashima eds. 1993. *Choosengo jiten*. [*Shoogakukan Korean-Japanese Dictionary*.] Tokyo and Seoul: Shoogakukan and Kinseeshuppansha eds.