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On the Notion of Future Time Reference in
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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 Podzierski (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. 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. 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
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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 seri-
ous 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 ab-

solute or relative terms) future time reference—which is quite different from label-
ing the same form ‘future’ for want of a satisfactory alternative,5 while still explain-
ing 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 uncer-
tainty (‘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
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 cor-
relative 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 straightfor-
w ard semantic reference to simple future time” before undergoing semantic changes.
Unlike Lewin, he does 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) compo-
nent may well have been present—in the end this seems impossible to decide. With-
out any native speakers to consult, the interpretation becomes quite arbitrary. See,
for instance, ki-mas.am.u ‘will (probably?) deign to come’ and kwoplwi.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) 阿拉賀城 / ‘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 / ‘kwoplwi.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 pre-
sumably non-modal V+Am.u in adnominal position or in combination with nominal-
izing V+URaku as V+Am.aku.7

(3) 故如此之状乎聞食悟而欵將仕奉人者其仕奉 (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 A GE-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 / M.I.TURE=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 大雪落有 大原乃 古里之郷汝 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 voluntative, 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 voluntative, but a comparison with (5) suggests that it is exclusively posi- ‘want; wish (to have)’ that contributes to the overall voluntative semantics here, whereas V+Am.aku in both examples is neither voluntative nor dubitative, but merely serves to mark future time reference. Or so it may seem.

The unlikeliness of a voluntative 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.ove.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）
w=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!”

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 vomouóżu (18r), future imperative amato tu, amato ille etc. as Vomõbexi (18v), future optative utinam amem, ames etc. translated as Vomoye caxi, A. gana (19v), future indicative passive amabor, amaberis etc. as Vomouareôzu (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+An (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-
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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+An (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 arī” (Alcock 1861: 40).11

“INDICATIVE MODE.
Pres. Aru, Arimas’ or Gozarimas’ […]
Fut. Arōō, Arimashōō or Gozarimashōō 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. \(V+Am.\).\) 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 \(V+Am.\) 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 Ähnlichkeit 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 志築忠雄 (alias Nakano Ryūho 中野柳圃; 1760–1806) come to mind. These include his Shihō shoji taiyaku 四法諸時對訳 (1805) or the somewhat earlier Rangaku seizenfu 蘭學前父母. 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 我と言ん for ik zal spreken (2v) or iw.añ go (or kotoba) 言語 and i.oo go 言ウ語 (besides jiang yan zhi yu 將言之語) for woorden die men spreeken 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Reference</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Dutch Translation</th>
<th>Japanese Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tegenaarden tij</td>
<td>現在</td>
<td>I learn</td>
<td>were manabu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onvolmaakte verleeden tijd</td>
<td>過去 (E: 子)</td>
<td>I have learned</td>
<td>were manabiki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volmaakte verleeden tijd</td>
<td>過去</td>
<td>I have learned</td>
<td>were manabitsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meer dan volmaakte verleeden tijd</td>
<td>過去ノ過去</td>
<td>I had learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toekomende tijd</td>
<td>[missing]  (E: mirai 未来)</td>
<td>I shall/will learn</td>
<td>were manaban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tweede toekomende of onbepaalde tijd (aanv. wijze)</td>
<td>不限時</td>
<td>I should learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derde toekomende of onbepaalde tijd (aanv. wijze)</td>
<td>不限時 (later: fugenji-no 過去)</td>
<td>I should have learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tweede onvolmaakte verleeden tijd of onbepaalde tijd (aanv. wijze)</td>
<td>過去… (E: 過去ノ未来)</td>
<td>when I would learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.

While the first three editions speak of “Derde Toekomende, of 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.

The 1756 edition simplifies this to “Tweede Onvolmaakte Verleeden Tyd,” which is not reflected in *Shihō shoji taiyaku*.
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+آن. 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+آن (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+آن=to omo.u んと思ふ whereas the en bloc translation of the entire sentence reads *naんzi=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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ik zal dat doen} & \quad \text{watakfoesi wa sore wo soeroe de aroo} \\
\text{Gy zult d——} & \quad \text{omaje wa sore wo soeroe de aroo} \\
\text{Hy zal dat —} & \quad \text{anofito wa sore wo soeroe de aroo}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Als ik dat gedaan zal hebben} & \quad \text{watakfoesi ga sore wo sita de aroo naraba} \\
\text{gy—— zult——} & \quad \text{omaje ga sore wo sita de aroo naraba} \\
\text{hy—— zal——} & \quad \text{anofito ga sore wo sita de aroo naraba}
\end{align*}
\]

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 (renge 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+Az. 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 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 兔耳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 椎井道敏 (1722–1791) repeatedly speaks of a kio-no shi 既往のし ‘the shi of what is bygone’ in his Teniha abiki-no tsuna てには網引綱 (1770 print; see for instance 1: 4r, 7r). Cf. Kaibara Ekiken 貝原益軒 (1630–1714) who explains kio 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 muko 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 春樹顕秘増抄, expanding upon the earlier Shunju kenpi shō 春樹顕秘抄, he directly contrasts the kako-no shi with muko shi (158), similar to earlier treatises such as Mokujiki Ōgo’s 木食応其 Mugenshō 無言抄 (1597; 2: 61r [1603 print]). The same designation muko 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 hishi-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* 連誹秘決 (1676; see Ozaki 1997: 353) and various related manuscripts bearing similar titles (e.g. *Renpai hiketsu-shō* 連誹秘決抄), or also commentaries on any of these, such as *Renpai hiketsu-shō wakumon* 連誹秘決抄或問 (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* 眞木柱 (1697; see 103r) by Kyodō 挙堂. Occasionally they were also simply termed *mit(s)u-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 Pzismaier (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. 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 shiihō-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 Tsukubashū 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 lingoa 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>-Ama.si</th>
<th>-Azi</th>
<th>=be.si</th>
<th>=rasi</th>
<th>=ta.si</th>
<th>=kasi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitsuden-shō (1455 or earlier)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senjun hōgen-no shiihō-no koto (1476 or earlier)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Fidenxô and Xiřuxô (sic), identified as Renga hiden-shō 連歌秘伝抄 and Jōha’s (Renga) Shiihō-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
“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 一歩 (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.
Given the substantial number of possibilities subsumed under the general label of \textit{shi} pertaining to past, present and future, it takes little to appreciate why an understanding of these expressions is considered by the author of \textit{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:

\begin{align*}
V+&{\text{Ama}.si} \text{ ‘counterfactual’} & = & \text{(in post-CJ also:) determination, conjecture etc.} \\
V+&{\text{Azi}} \text{ ‘negative future’} & = & \text{negative determination, conjecture etc.} \\
V+&{\text{Ru}=}{\text{be}.si} \text{ ‘potential’} & = & \text{determination, conjecture, imperative etc.} \\
(V+&{\text{Ru}}={\text{ra}.si} \text{ ‘dubitative’} & = & \text{conjecture}) \text{ [cf. note 27]} \\
V+&{\text{ta}.si} \text{ ‘voluntative’} & = & \text{wish} \\
V_{\text{base}}= & {\text{yo}}={\text{kasi}} \text{ ‘imperative’}\text{\textsuperscript{30}}
\end{align*}

It is impossible to overlook the fact that virtually all of these expressions labelled as \textit{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

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Ippo (1676)} & 38r–v\textsuperscript{28} & 39r & 36v, 38r–v\textsuperscript{29} & 38v \\
\hline
\textbf{Haidō tetaimatsu (1690)} & & 59 & 59 & 59 \\
\hline
\textbf{Hakusajin-shū (1693)} & & & 76 & 76 \\
\hline
\textbf{Maki-bashira (1697)} & 103r & 103r & 103r & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Expressions subsumed under the label \textit{mirai-no shi} in various \textit{tenioha} studies, 15th to 17th centuries.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Ippo} quotes from a source merely described as “a work on the secrets of \textit{tenioha} in linked verse” (連歌手尓於葉秘伝の書; 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 \textit{Renpai hiketsu}(-shō) with respect to the content.

\textsuperscript{29} This is mentioned with reference to “a work on \textit{tenioha} by Sōgi”; see note 25 above.

\textsuperscript{30} The only example given in \textit{Hakusajin-shū} is \textit{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 ぞめよかし at some stage. The Toyama ms. has suffered some damage at the position of the first two \textit{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), or in the Renga amayo-no ki (連歌雨夜記 (1519) by Sōchō (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, giving examples for each of the three (73v–74v). Dating from 1676 and thus from the same year as Ippo, the Tomoshibi-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’ (過去現在未来しと覧の分別; 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 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, 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 覧 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 の 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. 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* ヌ 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.doosi=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* そうであらふ ‘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* 謝言, 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:

かたじけなかなかべし or かたじけなかなかべく候 (19r–v)
katazike.na.kar.u=be.si # katazikena.kar.u=be.ku sooroo #

本望たるべし or 本望たるべく候 (19r)
hoñmoo=tar.u=be.si # hoñmoo=tar.u=be.ku 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 statives 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 倭讀要領 (1728), 2: 10v, 11r, 16r etc. In case of a protasis in V+Azûba (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+Az as the negative counterpart of V+Am.u or V+Añ, rather than in negative V+Az. 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 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 白髪集 (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 reinterpretation 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.
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