

April, 2005

On the Syntax of Old Japanese

S.-Y. Kuroda

University of California, San Diego and Internaional Institute for Advanced Studies, Kyoto

1. Introduction

In the late nineteen eighties, I introduced a parameter Agreement which take one of the two values, Forced or Non-Forced.¹ This parameter was assumed to control a variety of grammatical phenomena such as wh-movement, subject and object Abstract Case marking. I maintained that English is a Forced Agreement language, while Japanese is a Non-Forced Agreement language, and claimed that the opposite value settings for this parameter account for major typological differences between two languages.

In this paper, I would like to demonstrate that Old Japanese was a Forced Agreement language. Old Japanese, I claim, had obligatory Abstract Case marking, both for subjects and objects. It had obligatory Focus Movement; as a consequence, we can also recognize the existence of an obligatory wh-movement as a special case of this focus movement. Old Japanese, unlike Modern Japanese, lacked head internal relative clauses; this fact can also be accounted for by means of obligatory movement of the relative clause head, as opposed to the optionality of this movement in Modern Japanese. In all these respects, Old Japanese was rather like English. However, the Case system in Old Japanese was not an accusative system like in English. I would like to claim that the Case system in Old Japanese was neither accusative nor ergative, but rather a system that conceptually neutralizes this division, a system unmarked as to accusative or ergative.

¹See Kuroda 1986, 1988 (cited henceforth as WhorN). This paper is a much revised version of a paper presented at The Second Linguistics Seminar-International Symposium: the History and Structure of Japanese, held at St Catherine's College, Oxford, Kobe Institute, September 29, 2004. I would like to thank the organizers of this conference for providing me with a chance to work on the history of Japanese. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Satoshi Kinsui, Yasuhiro Kondô, Takashi Nomura, Akira Watanabe, Janick Wrona, Yuko Yanagida and in particular Shigeo Tonoike, who helped me in various ways during the preparation of this paper.

Akira Watanabe in a series of recent papers claimed that Old Japanese had wh-movement and more generally a focus movement.² In this respect this paper follows his work and incorporates it as a special case of a more general claim. However, his claim on wh-movement is contingent on the assumption that bare noun phrases that precede wh-phrases in Old Japanese are topics, but he did not provide a formal proof of this assumption. I will show that such bare noun phrases are indeed topics. The proof of this fact is intimately connected to the claim that the Case system of Old Japanese was unmarked.

Another difference between this work and Watanabe's on wh-questions in Old Japanese must be noted. I recognize two different wh-question constructions in Old Japanese. One type involved obligatory movement, as special case of focus movement. There was another type of wh-questions in Old Japanese which did not involve movement: wh-phrases in this construction stayed *in situ* and, I assume, was licensed directly by binding. In fact, I would assume that the wh-question construction in Modern Japanese is a descendant of this type of wh-question.

I will first review the hypotheses and the claims made in [WhOrN] about Modern Japanese and add one phenomenon that was not discussed in it but can also be accounted for by the same hypotheses. Then, I propose the hypothesis according to which the Agreement parameter was set for Old Japanese at the value opposite to the one for Modern Japanese. For this paper, I mostly follow a rather classical framework of the so-called Government and Binding theory as a vehicle of exposition.

For ease of later reference, I will formulate the major hypotheses that I maintain hold for English and Old and Modern Japanese.

(1) Main Hypotheses

[1] The Forced Agreement Hypothesis for English

English is a Forced Agreement language.

[2] The Non-forced Agreement Hypothesis for Modern Japanese

Modern Japanese is a Non-Forced Agreement language.

² See Watanabe 2001, 2002a, b, 2003.

[3] The Forced Agreement Hypothesis for Old Japanese

Old Japanese was a forced Agreement language.

By Old Japanese, I designate the language recorded in such documents as *Nihonshoki* and *Kojiki*, the two earliest collections of chronicles, and *Manyōshū*, an anthology of poems, all compiled in the 8th Century. I use the term Classical Japanese to refer to a later stage of Japanese as recorded in the Heian literature, the language served as the model of the literary style of writing until the mid 19th century.

2. Modern Japanese as a Non-Forced Agreement Language

2.1. General Remark 1: Agreement and Movement

Agreement, as it was conceived in [WhOrN], is a specified interaction between a head X, in the sense of X-bar theory, and a maximal category YP governed by X, either at an external (i.e., Specifier or subject) or an internal (i.e., object) position. As conceptual possibilities, the interaction involved in Agreement could be formalized either in the transformationalist approach in terms of derivation or in the lexicalist approach in terms of constraint, i.e., either as derivational feature specification or as selectional feature constraint, acted on a maximal category by an element in a head position. For ease of exposition I use the transformationalist terminology and call the head and the maximal category involved in Agreement the trigger and the target of Agreement.

For Agreement to take place, a target must be found at an expected position. However, it may not originally be generated at this position. Under such circumstances, Forced Agreement appears to take the form of obligatory Movement; one might equivocate Forced Agreement and obligatory Movement. But Agreement and Movement are conceptually independent. Movement is in general subject to certain constraints by the principles of grammar; then, if obligatory Movement fails due to constraints imposed on it, so does Forced Agreement, and the derivation clashes with the consequence that the expected sentence form is doomed as ill-formed.

2.2. Wh-questions

In English a *wh*-phrase must be put at the beginning of an interrogative clause while in Modern Japanese *wh*-phrases can remain *in situ*. We capture this difference in terms of Agreement between the *wh*-phrase in Spec(C) and the interrogative complementiser in C. In English, the Agreement is forced, hence a *wh*-phrase must be present at Spec(C); in consequence, a *wh*-phrase must be moved from an argument or adjunct position to Spec(C). In Japanese, Agreement is not forced, and as a consequence, as is well known, a *wh*-phrase may remain *in situ* at an argument or adjunct position.

Since Agreement is forced in English, *wh*-Agreement entails the existence of obligatory *wh*-movement. In contrast, Non-Forced Agreement does not entail the existence of non-obligatory *wh*-movement. *Wh*-movement, if it exists in Japanese, must be optional, but whether it exists or not is an empirical question. At the level of simple observation, the fact is consistent with either the existence or the absence of *wh*-movement: *wh*-XP can be fronted, but this fronting can be achieved by scrambling, a process required independently of accounting for *wh* questions. Consequently, either of these possibilities, the existence or the absence of *wh*-movement, is open for argument. Indeed, arguments have been presented for both possibilities in the literature: Takahashi (1993) argues for the existence of *wh*-movement in Japanese on the basis of the radical reconstruction phenomenon observed with scrambling by Saito (1989); Kitagawa and Deguchi (2002) question Takahashi's argument on the basis of their analysis of prosody associated with *wh*-questions.

2.3. General Remark 2: VP Internal Subject Hypothesis

I now wish to move on to the issue of Case Marking as Agreement, but before going into specifics, I need to add another preliminary general remark. In [whOrN], I introduced the VP Internal Subject Hypothesis. It assumes that the verb, and in general, any of the lexical categories N, P, A, as well, has its own Spec position, where its subject, if there is any, is originally generated and theta-marked by it. This hypothesis contrasts with the classical as well as the present standard assumption on the structure of simple clauses. In the classical standard assumption, V is defective and lacks a Spec position; the subject of V is generated and theta-marked at Spec(I). The VP Internal Subject Hypothesis removed this asymmetry. In the later

development of the Government and Binding theory, the V-shell scheme was introduced; the V-shell partially incorporated the idea that motivated the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis and may have been taken as a substitute for it.

The V-shell scheme went hand in hand with another later development in the Government and Binding theory, according to which object case marking is also executed at Spec of an Agr position. This expanded Agr scheme appears to provide our Agreement approach with a conceptual advantage: we can assume that Agreement is uniformly an operation between an Agr head and its Spec position.

The V-shell scheme appears to have some functional plausibility, to the extent that transitive verbs are syntactically decomposed into the unergative and unaccusative components. But not all transitive verbs are functionally causative. Nor is the lexical decomposition of causative transitive verbs, even if desirable, inconsistent with the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis in the original form; it is simply a matter of how causative transitive verbs are analyzed. For now, then, I take a conservative stand and will steer clear of the V-shell and the expanded Agr scheme and stay with the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis in the original form for this presentation of the Agreement Hypotheses.

2.4. Case Marking

2.4.1. English Case marking

With the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis at hand, then, the direct object of a transitive verb is Case Marked as its internal argument. This Object Case Marking is obligatory in English, though phonetically visible only for personal pronouns. I take it as an instance of Forced Agreement, between a transitive verb and its internal argument.

The subject of a verb is Case Marked as a subject only in finite, tensed clauses, at Spec(I), not at Spec(V). In English, this Subject Case Marking is obligatory, as it is manifest in personal pronouns as subjects of tensed verbs; it is taken as another instance of Forced Agreement, between a finite Infl and Spec(I). Forced Subject Agreement entails the obligatory movement of a subject DP from Spec(V) to Spec(I) in a finite clause.

2.4.2. Japanese Case Marking

2.4.2.1. Bare DPs vs. *ga/o* marked DPs: Case Particle "Drop"

Turning our attention to Modern Japanese, in conformity with Non-Forced Agreement Hypothesis for Modern Japanese, I claim that Subject and Object Case Marking is not forced in Japanese. But for a proper understanding of this hypothesis, it is in order here to explain what I mean by Case marking.

The particle *ga* and *o* are usually identified as nominative and accusative case markers in the literature of Japanese linguistics. It is also common that Japanese linguists talk about "case drop": *ga* and *o* may optionally drop and as a consequence subjects and objects may be bare DPs, without *ga* or *o* attached to them. It appears that subject and object case marking is optional in Japanese. A plausible step to take for implementing the Non-Forced Agreement Hypothesis for Modern Japanese might appear to be the assumption that *ga* and *o* are the targets of Agreement, but since Agreement is not forced, DPs can appear as subjects and objects without these particles. But this is not my claim.

I distinguish abstract Case and morphological case. Abstract Case in Japanese is phonologically null; DPs marked as subjects or objects are bare, without particles, like English common nouns. The particle *ga* and *o* are morphological case markers. Agreement concerns Abstract Case; bare DPs are targets of Agreement by the finite Infl and the transitive V, respectively. Morphological case marking is a separate process that licenses DPs as arguments. Since Case Agreement is not forced, a subject or object DP may fail to be licensed as a bare DP. But it may still be licensed by morphological case by means of *ga* or *o*.

If DPs' being bare or marked with *ga* or *o* is simply a matter of case drop, *ga* and *o* marked DPs should freely alternate with bare DPs. In other words, *ga* and *o* as subject and object markers must appear to "drop freely". This prediction, however, does not hold; the fact is that we observe more constrained distribution for bare DPs as subjects or objects than for *ga* or *o* marked DPs, as we will see below.

2.4.2.2. The morphological case *ga*

Certain subordinate clauses appear to abhor bare subjects: Observe³:

- (2) mosi asita paatii ni Masao *(ga) ku-reba
if tomorrow party to Masao ga come-if
'if Masao comes to the party tomorrow'
- (3) oya *(ga) kane (o) mookete i-nagara
parent ga money o make be-though
'even though a parent is making money'

This skewed distribution of bare DPs is precisely what is predicted if we assume that a bare DP is licensed as a subject at Spec(I) by a finite Infl in Japanese, as in English. The subordinate clauses in the above examples are plausibly non-finite. In these clauses *ga* phrases function as subjects. But this situation should not surprise us. In English, subjects are licensed by genitive case or by preposition *of* in gerund phrases and derived nominals, not by abstract Case. It is in fact worthy of note that historically *ga* was a genitive case marker.

Two sets of facts seem to counter this analogy between Japanese and English. First of all, subordinate clauses that disallow bare DP subjects extend beyond what is usually taken as tenseless clauses: Observe:

- (4) Hanako wa Masao *(ga) gohan (o) tukuru-to yorokobu
Hanako wa Masao ga meal o make-if is-pleased
'if Masao cooks Hanako is pleased'
- (5) Hanako wa dareka *(ga) yaki-imo (o) katte kita-node yorokonda
Hanako wa someone ga baked-yam o buy come-since was-pleased
'Hanako was pleased since Masao bought and brought baked yams..'

In these clauses, the verbs are in the so-called present and past forms. They are apparently tensed, but *ga* may not "drop." In earlier work, however, I pointed out that there is some fact,

³ I will generally not gloss case markers, particles and auxiliaries. Not only is glossing them cumbersome, but also casual tags for grammatical morphemes could be misleading. I decide that providing translations to examples would suffice for the understanding of the role of functional items in examples.

marginal though it may be, that suggests that the so-called present ending is not a finite tense marker; see Kuroda (1990, 1993). As far as the so-called past ending *ta* is concerned, it is well known that its function is not easy to characterize. It is also well known that *ta* has an aspectual character. Aspect markers are not incompatible with non-finite clauses. Then, it is possible that the clauses in the above examples with verbs in *ru* and *ta* endings are non-finite subordinate clauses and their Infs are incapable of licensing bare DPs with abstract subject Case.

Secondly, we face an opposite problem. Not only subordinate clauses but main clauses may have *ga* phrases as subjects. Observe the following contrast exhibited by subordinate and main clauses:

- (6) mosi asita paatii ni Hanako *(ga) ku-reba, Masao (ga) kitto yorokobu yo
 if tomorrow party to Hanako ga come-if Masao ga surely pleased yo
 'if Hanako comes to the party tomorrow, Masao will surely be pleased'
- (7) gakusei *(ga) yaki-imo (o) katte kita-node, sensei (ga) yorokonde sore (o) tabete iru
 student ga baked-yam o buy come since teacher ga pleased it o eat is
 'since students bought and brought baked yams, the teacher is please and eating it.'

We compared *ga* phrases in Japanese subordinate clauses with genitive subjects in English gerundive clauses. This comparison breaks down here, but the comparison happens to be a superficial analogy. A more significant way of describing a parallelism between the situations in English and Japanese would be this: the English gerundive clause cannot Case mark its subject by its Infl, but the genitive case is available to license its subject. Likewise, in Japanese, the non-finite clause cannot mark its subject by abstract Case but morphological case *ga* is available to license its subject. Unlike English, however, even in the finite sentence its Infl may leave its subject unmarked since Agreement is not Forced, But, then, the morphological case *ga* is available to license it. Hence the possibility of main clauses with *ga* marked DPs is accounted for.

2.4.2.3. The morphological case *o*

In contrast to subjects, object DPs are Case-marked *in situ* as an internal argument of V. Whether a clause is finite or non-finite does not matter for object Case Agreement; abstract Case marking is always available *in situ*. For this reason, *o* cannot be shown to be a morphological case marker in a simple way as *ga* can as a matter determined by the type of Infl. Is there any construction where bare DP objects and *o*-marked objects do not alternate?

I contend that bare DP objects cannot be moved to sentence initial position by scrambling. However, some caution is necessary for confirming this fact. For, bare DPs may be moved to sentence initial position by topicalization. As a consequence, we cannot rule out the possibility that a sentence has a sentence initial bare DP object. We need to look for some conditions under which we can formally differentiate effects of bare DP topicalization and scrambling.

First, observe the following forms:

- (8) a. Masao Harvard e Yamada sensei ga suisen-sita
 b. Masao o Harvard e Yamada sensei ga suisen-sita
 'Teacher Yamada recommended Yamada to Harvard'
- (9) a. Ma no Yama MIT no gakusei ga san-nin katte itta
 b. Ma no Yama o MIT no gakusei ga san-nin katte itta
 'Three MIT students bought Magic Mountains'

Both forms are possible. I contend that *Masao* and *Ma no Yama* in the a-sentences must be topics. Indefinite nouns are hard to topicalize. The prediction is that if we substitute *dare* 'who' for *Masao* and *nani* 'what' for *Ma no Yama*, respectively, we should get a contrast between the a- and b-sentences and this predication is confirmed:

- (10) a. *Dare Harvard e Yamada sensei ga suisen-sita?
 b. Dare-o Harvard e Yamada ga sensei suisen-sita?
 'who did Yamada sensei recommend to Harvard?'
- (11) a. *nani MIT no gakusei ga san-nin katte itta?

- b. nani o MIT no gakusei ga san-nin katte itta?
 'what did three MIT students buy?'

Secondly, relative clauses cannot have topics. The prediction is that bare DP objects cannot be preposed inside relative clauses. Observe:

- (12) a *Harvard ga Masao Yamada sensei ga siusen sita daigaku da
 b Harvard ga Masao o Yamada sensei ga suisen-sita daigaku da
 'Harvard is the university to which Yamada-sensei recommended Masao'
- (13) a *Coop ga Ma no Yama MIT no gakusei ga katte itta honya da
 b Coop ga Ma no Yama o MIT no gakusei ga katte itta honya da
 'Coop is the bookstore where MIT students bought *Magic Mountain*'

In sum, if we filter out the effect of topicalization, sentence-initial position is where we can observe distributional asymmetry between bare and *o*-marked objects.

In my earlier work, I accounted for this asymmetry as a consequence from the following hypotheses: (i) the landing site of scrambling is Spec(I); (ii) bare DPs get the subject Case at Spec(I) and the object Case as an internal complement of V; (iii) Case-marked DPs may not move to Case position. From these hypotheses it follows that a bare DP object may not scramble. The motivation behind (iii) is to prevent a DP to get two Cases. However, I now assume, as I stated above, that there are clauses usually taken as tensed, for example relative clauses, that are non-finite and whose Spec, hence, is not a position for subject-Case marking. But *o*-marked objects, but not bare objects, may scramble in such clauses, too; see (12), (13) above. We can still keep the hypothesis (iii) with the understanding that Spec(I) is a Case-position independently of whether I is finite (and hence Case-marks) or not. Doing so, however, invalidates the original motivation behind (iii), that is, the prohibition against double Case marking. There is, however, an alternative account of the asymmetry between bare and *o*-marked objects we have observed above: the adjacency condition. The object DP must be adjacent to the verb in order to be Case-marked. Exactly how to formulate this condition and make it viable is

somewhat of a problem. Be that as it may, I take it that the asymmetry in scramblability is a good indication that bare objects and *o*-marked objects are licensed by different mechanisms, abstract Case and morphological case, respectively. Thus, since bare DPs and *o*-marked DPs are alternants as direct objects, I conclude, Agreement is not Forced for object Case marking, either.

2.4.2.4 Concluding remarks

To recapitulate, I maintain that bare DPs are licensed by Agreement, by finite Infl as subjects and by transitive verbs as objects. But unlike in English, this Agreement (Case assignment) is not Forced. Morphological case may also license DPs as subjects and objects with *ga* and *o*, respectively.

The particles *ga* and *o* may not "drop" in formal style of writing and speech. I assume that this is a constraint imposed on the language from outside of core grammar, largely a matter of style or register management.

Incidentally, bare DPs may also be derived from topic *wa* phrases by "dropping" *wa*. Thus, one could dispute my above argument by claiming, as Kuno (1973a:223ff) did, that all bare DP subjects are derived by "dropping" *wa*. Indeed, my point above that *ga* may not alternate distributionally with zero in subordinate clauses might even be cited as evidence for the claim that *wa* may, but *ga* may not be deleted. It is hard to counter this claim purely on formal/distributional grounds. In order to argue against this objection, we would have to use informal arguments based on intuitive judgment about a proper use of a given example in a plausible context: in the suggested context, the bare DP in question may be replaced by a *ga* phrase. Masunaga (1988) argued against Kuno's generalization in this manner effectively, though I do not necessarily agree with Masunaga's judgments for all the examples she discusses.

2.5. Relativization

Basically following Kuno's (1973b: 254) insight, I assume that *wa* topicalization and relativization are derivationally related, sharing a common step. However, I do not assume, as Kuno did, that relative clauses are derived from *wa*-topicalized sentences. I assume rather that relative clauses as well as *wa*-topicalized sentences involve a movement, as in the English

relative clause formation, the movement of an argument/adjunct from a clause internal position to a clause external position. See Kuroda (1992: Ch9). In our present approach, we can assume that this movement is effectuated by Agreement between a Complementiser and its Specifier position, Spec(C).

But according to the Non-Forced Agreement Hypothesis for Modern Japanese, Agreement is not forced, that is, the assumed movement must be optional. This prediction is indeed borne out for relativization. As is well known, unlike English, Japanese allows Head Internal Relative clauses. Details of exactly how to implement this idea need not concern us here. Let me just note that the idea was already suggested by Harada (1973).

The Non-forced Agreement Hypothesis appears to fail for *wa*-topicalization, since the *wa*-topic must be at sentence-initial position. One might take this as a vindication of the base-generation approach, as opposed to the movement approach, according to which *wa* topics are base generated *in situ*. But let me note that the forced movement for *wa*-topics has a basis of its own independently of the Forced/Non-Forced Agreement parameter. The Spec(C) position can and must be assumed to be semantically not vacuous for topics, even though it is theta-theoretically vacuous. The movement of a topic *wa* phrase to Spec(C) position is forced on semantic grounds in order for the sentence to be properly interpreted as intended.

3. Old Japanese

3.1. Sentence types and *kakari musubi*

Excluding imperative sentences, there are five types of clauses, with different conjugation forms of main predicates:

<i>Shūshi</i>	conclusive
<i>Rentai</i>	adnominal
<i>Izen</i>	<i>realis</i> /presuppositional
<i>Mizen</i>	<i>irrealis</i>
<i>Renyō</i>	adpredicative

Independent clauses can take either the *shûshi*, *rentai* or *izen* form. Adnominal subordinate clauses, in particular, relative clauses, take the *rentai* form. Hence the name *rentai*; cf *taigen* 'substantive' as opposed to *yôgen* 'predicative'.

The default independent sentence form is the *shûshi* form. However, certain particles select the *rentai* or *izen* form. This phenomenon is commonly known as *kakari-musubi* (suspense-resolution). The particles involved are called *kakari* particles.

(14) *Kakari* particles

With *rentai* resolution:

so/zo (focus/emphasis), *namu* (focus/emphasis), *ya* (question), *ka* (question)

With *izen* resolution:

koso

We are concerned primarily with *ka*. But some of the properties we discuss below are shared by other *kakari* particles with *rentai* resolution. To follow what follows, it is sufficient to be aware of the existence of this phenomenon. However, since, *kakari musubi* is one of the major issues in the traditional grammar, I add an appendix on this matter at the end of this paper.

3.2. Case Marking

3.2.1. Bare DPs as Case Marked Subjects and Objects by Agreement

What prediction does the Forced Agreement Hypothesis make about Case marking? We have maintained above that Agreement manifests itself in the form of bare DPs as subjects and objects in Modern Japanese, not as in the form of *ga* or *o* marked DPs. To recall, one may not "drop" morphological case markers *ga* and *o* in Modern Standard (formal) Japanese. One does, only in informal, colloquial speech. We may get the impression that "case dropping" is a symptom of corrupt speech. But bare DPs are common as subjects and objects in *bungo*, the literary style based on Classical Japanese and used in the texts of Japanese literature from the Heian period until the modern times. The status of bare DPs as subjects and objects is solid and invariant through the history of the Japanese language. Thus, the null hypothesis would be that subject and

object Case marking has realized in the form of bare DP, as it does in English with common DPs, through the history of Japanese:

(15) The Case Hypothesis

Both subject and object Case actualize as bare DPs through the history of Japanese.

In contrast, the status of *ga* and *wo/o* through the history of the Japanese language is the issue we need to concern ourselves with. We need to deal with *ga* and *wo* separately.

3.2.2. *ga* Marked Subjects

It is well known that *ga* marked subjects occur only in limited contexts in Old Japanese. In general they do not occur in clauses with predicates in *shûshi* form. Most prominently, they occur in "adnominal" contexts, where the predicates take the *rentai* form. Furthermore, unlike in Modern Japanese, in Old as well as Classical Japanese, *ga* and *no* shared the grammatical function of genitive, though apparently they are not free alternants in all contexts, distributionally and in terms of pragmatic/semantic functions. This sharing of a grammatical, if not pragmatic, function by *ga* and *no* extends to main clauses with predicates in the *rentai* form. In general *no* may mark subjects where *ga* may, whether in main or subordinate clauses.

3.2.2.1. *ga* Marked Subjects and the Non-Finiteness Assumption

A parallelism between English and an older stage of Japanese suggests itself. In English the genitive case functions not only as a marker of a broad relation that holds between two DPs, but also as a subject marker in clauses where the predicates take a non-finite gerundive form. Let us introduce the following assumption for Old Japanese:

(16) Hypothesis OJ-1. Finite and non-finite clauses

[a] Clauses whose predicates are in the *shûshi* form are finite.

[b] Clauses whose predicates are in the *rentai* form are non-finite.

These assumptions, with the Forced Agreement hypothesis, make the following four correct predications:

(17)

- [i] A bare DP can be the subject of a clause with a *shûshi* predicate.
- [ii] A bare DP cannot be the subject of a clause with a *rentai* predicate.
- [iii] A *ga* marked DP cannot be the subject of a clause with a *shûshi* predicate.
- [iv] A *ga/no* marked DP can be the subject of a clause with a *rentai* predicate.

I take [i], [iii] and [iv] non-controversial. [ii] appears to be contradicted by many counterexamples. The next section addresses this issue.

3.2.2.2. Bare subjects in *rentai* clauses are topics

Watanabe (2001.7:100) cites Nomura's (1993) count of 30 examples of (yes-no or wh-) questions in which a bare DP subject precedes a *ka*-phrase. Such a sentence ends in a *rentai* predicate due to *kakari musubi*, hence is a counterexample to (17)[ii]. Watanabe states that he is "tempted to conclude that [these examples] are similar to those where subjects are topicalized [by *ha*] and the particle has dropped from the subjects, but I for now leave this matter for future studies." I would like to argue that Watanabe was in fact tempted to the right direction. I will argue for the following hypothesis;

(18) Hypothesis OJ-2.

Bare subjects in *rentai* sentences are topics.

Let us first confirm that the subject of a sentence with a *rentai* predicate can be topicalized by *ha*.⁴

(19) M154

Sasanami no Oho-yama-mori ha ta ga tame ka yama ni sime yuhu kimi mo ara-naku ni

⁴ Old Japanese examples are from *Manyôshû* unless otherwise indicated. I transcribe Old Japanese texts by Hepburn Romanization of the *kana* reading given to the original by the editors of the texts I consulted. Thus, the Romanization is not phonetically faithful. The OJ particles *ha* and *wo* correspond to Modern Japanese *wa* and *o*, respectively.

Sasanami no Big-mountain-guardian ha who ga for ka mountain at sign tie you mo are-neg sfx
'For whom does the guardian of Sasanami's mountains put sacred signs, now that you, my Load,
are no longer?'

In this example, the *ha* phrase *Sasanami no Oho-yama-mori ha* is a topic.

Hypothesis OJ-2 (18) claims that a bare DP can also be a topic in a *rentai* clause.
Assume, to the contrary, that a bare DP can be a subject in a *rentai* clause without being a topic.
In other words, a bare DP can be licensed as a subject without being a topic in a *rentai* clause as
in a *shûshi* clause. Then, we would expect that such a bare subject can also appear in a relative
clause, which is a *rentai* clause. Hence, we can take Hypothesis OJ-2 as in effect equivalent to
the following hypothesis:

(20) Hypothesis OJ-2'.

No relative clause has a bare subject.

I will claim that this hypothesis is upheld.

A look at Old Japanese texts would suffice to give us the impression that this hypothesis
cannot be correct. However, remarkably, a closer examination leads us to the following
generalization:

(21) No relative clause whose main verb is transitive has a bare subject.

In other words, if a relative clause whose main verb is transitive has a subject in it, the subject is
marked by *ga/no*.

Before proceeding further, let us agree on a terminological point. An intransitive
predicate can have more than one argument; one of them gets case- or Case-marked as a subject
at the surface level, and others, if there are any, are inherently case-marked or appear as
prepositional phrases. Let us call the former as the UNMARKED argument of an intransitive verb.
By intransitive predicate, I mean intransitive verb or adjective. This terminological convention

allows us to refer to this argument at an observational level without committing ourselves to any analysis.

In contrast to (21), if the main verb of a relative clause is intransitive, we observe the following:

- (22) If the predicate of a relative clause is intransitive, its unmarked argument, if it appears inside the relative clause, is either a bare DP or a *ga/no* marked DP.

Hypothesis OJ-2 (18) predicts Hypothesis OJ-2' (21) but apparently is contradicted by (22). However, as far as I know (21) has virtually no exceptions. I have examined *Nihonshoki* and *Kojiki Kayô* and *Manyôshû* Volumes 1, 5, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20. The following table shows the number of (possible) exceptions to (21) and the number of relative clauses with transitive verbs whose subjects are marked with *no* or *ga*.⁵

(23)	<i>Nihonshoki</i>	2	18
	<i>Kojiki</i>	1	20
	<i>Manyôshû</i>	0	33

⁵ The two possible exceptions in *Nihonshoki* are poems no. 79 and 80. *Nihonshoki* 79 is given below following the interpretation in *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* Vol 3:

Yamanobe no Kosimako yue ni hito-derahu uma no ya-tugi ha wosikeku mo nasi
 'For the sake of Yamanobe no Kosimako, I don't feel sorry to lose eight horses that a man is showing off/proud of'.

Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshû, however, has *hito nerau uma* 'eight horses that men are pursuing', instead of *hito-derau uma* 'a man is showing off/proud of'. There are two points worthy of note. First, if we follow the reading of *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei*, the *rendaku* (sequential voicing) form *-derau* of the verb in question may indicate that we have here a compound word; then we do not have an exception to (21). If we follow *Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshû* and take the verb to mean 'pursue', would it not be possible to interpret *hito* as the object of the verb which was intended by the poet to refer to himself? Then we would have a plausible interpretation in the context in which the poem was composed: 'Because of Yamanobe no Kosimako (whom I violated), [they] pursue me. I would not feel sorry to lose eight horses[, if that is a deal they want]'. With this interpretation, poem no.79 is not an exception to (21). (I am grateful to Janick Wrona for bringing my attention to this poem.)

Poem no. 80 may not be a counterexample, either, but I am not going to discuss it here.

The only possible exception in *Kojiki* is found in song no. 47. But it is said to be a song by an indigenous ethnic group in Yoshino.

On the strength of (21) we must conclude that Hypothesis OJ-2' is upheld, in spite of the apparent conflict of this conclusion with (22). I conclude that predicates in the *rentai* form do not assign Case to their subjects.

Thus, I take how to account for (22) as a fundamental issue in the syntax of Old Japanese. Now, two questions arise:

(24)

[i] In a relative clause whose predicate is intransitive, what determines the choice between a bare and a *ga/no*-marked DP for the unmarked argument if it appears in it?

[ii] What licenses a bare DP argument in such a relative clause?

As for [i], I cannot rule out the possibility that more detailed philological study of texts than I have done so far may reveal some interesting lexical, stylistic and/or diachronic variations that are relevant for the distribution of the two types of DPs in question.⁶ For now, however, I assume that they are distributionally free alternants and address myself to the question [ii].

A plausible answer to question [ii] is to assume that the bare DP in question is licensed not as a subject, that is, as an external argument, but as an internal argument of the verb; this condition is satisfied if we assume that Old Japanese is an ergative language. Let us pursue this line of thought.

⁶ I give below a tentative count of bare and *ga/no* subjects in relative clauses with intransitive predicates. My count is very incomplete but there is some intriguing variations in the ratio of bare subjects and *ga/no* subjects in different volumes of *Manyôshû*. I am not in a position to make any comment on this matter, however.

	Vol	Bare	<i>ga/no</i>
<i>Nihonshoki</i>		6	5
<i>Kojiki</i>		3	4
<i>Manyôshû</i>	1	10	7
	5	7	10
	14	7	9
	15	10	8
	17	13	23
	18	12	9
	20	8	18

When we have discussed the Case marking of subjects and objects in the *shûshi* form of sentences, we take it for granted that the language has an accusative Case system. However, abstract Case is actualized by bare DP both for external and internal arguments, and no overt trace is left for the distinction between subject and object Case. Hence, as far as the Case marking mechanism in *shûshi* clauses is concerned, there is no empirical evidence for determining whether the unmarked argument of an intransitive verb is Case marked as an external argument or an internal argument. The ergativity assumption is compatible with the fact about the subject Case marking in transitive clauses as well. We can thus account for bare DPs in *rentai* (i.e., non-finite) clauses as well as *shûshi* (i.e., finite) clauses by assuming that Old Japanese is an ergative language.

Let us now return to the *ga/no* case marking mechanism. Recall that *ga/no* is a genitive case marker. We can entertain two alternatives, an accusative or an ergative case system: we can assume that the genitive case is assigned either to external arguments (the accusative hypothesis) or to absolutive arguments (the ergative hypothesis).

It might at first appear that the latter alternative should be chosen: we could then assume that the language is uniformly ergative: both the subject and object Case marking and the genitive marking in *rentai* clauses are uniformly assumed as ergative. But I would argue to the contrary that the accusative hypothesis for the *ga/no* marking provides us with a simpler grammar for two reasons.

First of all, under the ergative hypothesis the unmarked argument of an intransitive verb in a relative clause gets generated as an internal argument whether it is licensed by the abstract Case and appears bare or is licensed by the genitive case and appears as a *ga/no* marked phrase, a symptom of indeterminacy abhorred by Forced Agreement. Anticipating that the Forced Agreement Hypothesis is vindicated for Old Japanese for several other grammatical phenomena, the ergative hypothesis should be rejected.

In contrast, under the accusative hypothesis for the *ga/no* case marking, we would have to assume that the unmarked argument of an intransitive predicate is generated either internally and gets licensed by Case as a bare DP or is generated externally and gets marked genitively as a *ga/no* phrase. We seem to be simply trading the indeterminacy of Case/case marking at an

internal position with the indeterminacy of where the unmarked arguments of intransitive predicates get generated. Nonetheless, I would argue that the latter is a more innocent kind of indeterminacy. I need to proceed to the second reason for choosing the accusative hypothesis for the *ga/no* marking.

To recall, for *shûshi* finite clauses, either an accusative or an ergative Case system will do. But, then, it may be assumed instead that an accusative and an ergative Case system coexist as free alternants for *shûshi* finite clauses. If we apply the accusative system for the *ga/no* marking, we can also assume that the unmarked argument of an intransitive clause may be generated either as an external or an internal argument. The unmarked argument of an intransitive clause may be generated either as an external or an internal argument. Thus, we can conclude that Old Japanese is at the same time an accusative and an ergative language. If a clause is *shûshi* and hence finite, the argument is actualized as a bare DP in any case. If a clause is *rentai* and non-finite, then it is actualized in the genitive case or bare, depending on whether it is generated as an external or an internal argument. In this sense, the language might be characterized as a mixed Case/case system.

However, I would like to take a step further and claim that the situation in question deserves a better characterization. What we have is a situation where the opposition of an accusative and an ergative system is neutralized. If a grammar is not specified either accusative or ergative, there is no constraint as to where the unmarked argument of an intransitive predicate be generated, either as an external or an internal argument. This is a minimally specified system. Put it another way, it is an arche-system, representing a stage conceptually before an accusative and an ergative system diverge from it. Let me formally introduce the notion of arche-Case/case system and formulate a hypothesis on Old Japanese:

(25) A language has an Arche-Case/case system if the unmarked argument of an intransitive predicate may be generated either as an external or internal argument.

(26) Hypothesis OJ-3.

Old Japanese is an Arche-Case/case language.

To sum up, with Hypothesis OJ-3, we can finally account for (22), and in consequence have proved Hypothesis OJ-2' (20), and hence Hypothesis OJ-2 (18).

3.2.2.3. Conclusion: Subjects in Old Japanese

I maintain that the Forced Agreement Hypothesis (1) [3] and Hypothesis OJ-1 (16) make the right predictions for Old Japanese. The subjects in *shûshi* clauses are licensed by Agreement and bare. Subjects in *rentai* clauses are marked by *ga/no*. The Case marking of subjects by Forced Agreement in Old Japanese was eventually replaced by what we now have in Modern Japanese; there emerged a double system where in finite clauses the subject DP may be bare, licensed at Spec(I) by Agreement, or morphologically case marked by *ga*, inside VP, as I have maintained above for Modern Japanese.⁷

3.2.3. *wo* Marked Objects

If Agreement is forced in Old Japanese, the objects of transitive verbs must also be exclusively licensed by Agreement in the form of bare DPs. But it appears, contrary to the Forced Agreement Hypothesis, as though a DP was licensed as an object either in the bare form or in the form of a *wo* phrase in Old Japanese as in Modern Japanese.

3.2.3.1. The functions commonly attributed to *wo*

The object case marking, however, is not the only function attributed to *wo* by traditional Japanese scholarship. Commonly three functions of *wo* are recognized in Japanese grammar: *wo* is assumed to belong to three different subcategories of particles. It is a *kaku-joshi* 'case particle', a *kantô joshi* 'interjective particle' and a *setsuzoku joshi* 'conjunctive particle'. The conjunctive use of *wo* is a later development in a later stage of Old Japanese or in an earlier Classical Japanese period but it has eventually faded by the time of Modern Japanese; we need not concern ourselves with *wo* as a conjunctive particle. As a case particle, *wo* in Old Japanese has

⁷ I am not in a position at present to make any statement as to the status of bare DP subjects in clauses in the *izen* form. Perhaps, they are structurally ambiguous between finite and non-finite, but I have to leave this issue aside for now.

been commonly taken as an object case marker. As for the interjective use of *wo*, its semantic effect is hard to characterize; it apparently adds some emotional or emphatic effect of a greater or lesser degree of clarity. The interjective use of *wo* was prominent in Old Japanese but it has also faded away from the language.

3.2.3.2. What the Forced Agreement Hypothesis predicts and is confirmed by philological scholarship

If Agreement Case-marks bare DPs as objects in Old Japanese as it does in Modern Japanese, the Forced Agreement Hypothesis must exclude *wo* from the category of *kaku-joshi* in Old Japanese. We must assign only the function of *kantô joshi* to *wo*, contrary to the traditional description: a *wo* marked direct object is licensed as a direct object in the status of a bare DP and *wo* is added only for the interjective function.

This situation is much like a topic *ha/wa* phrase functioning as a direct object, rather a familiar situation we have both in Old and Modern Japanese. But we do not call *ha/wa* an object case marker just because there are *ha* phrases that function as direct objects for a good reason. In fact, not only can *ha/wa* phrases function as subjects or objects, but *ha* may also attach to DPs marked with an inherent case marker like dative *ni*, or to adjunct PPs like *DP to* and even to verb stems in the *renyô* form. This distributional property is not a characteristic of only *ha/wa*; it is shared by *kakari* particles in Old Japanese and focus particles like *mo* and *sae* in Modern Japanese.

Then, we can say that the Forced Agreement Hypothesis predicts that the distribution of *wo* must be like *ha/wa* or a *kakari*/focus particle. This is exactly what has since long been recognized by Japanese philological scholarship. Not only do we find *wo* attached to locative *ni* and *he* or comitative *to*: *DP-ni-wo*, *DP-to-wo*, *DP-he-wo*, but also we do find *wo* phrases functioning as subjects or attached to verb stems (Konoshima 1973: 67f, 439).

To sum up, the Forced Agreement Hypothesis predicts a distribution pattern of the particle *wo* in Old Japanese much different from the one we have of *o* in Modern Japanese. This distribution has long been recognized at least among Japanese philologists. What principle might be behind this distribution is a different matter, a question not raised by traditional philologists or

grammarians.

3.2.3.3. Stronger evidence the Forced Agreement Hypothesis: the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization

What we have seen shows us that *wo* shares a property of *kakari* particles, but it cannot yet by itself rule out the possibility that there are also instances of *wo* functioning simply as a case marker, contradicting the Forced Agreement Hypothesis.

Let me clarify the point I am now addressing myself to. We have confirmed that the distribution of *wo* is much like that of *ha* or a *kakari* particle. And yet I am still asking whether *wo* can also be a case particle. Then, on the same token, should we not also ask if *ha* or for that matter, any *kakari* particle, is functionally ambiguous between a *kakari* particle and a case particle? Formally that is correct. But we don't double-classify *ha* and *kakari* particles and put them also in the category of case particles. For a good reason. We know sufficiently well what semantic function *ha* and *kakari* particles have. When we see a *ha* phrase or a *kakari* phrase used as an object, we assume we can separate distinctly the function added to the object by that particle. In contrast, the function of *wo* as an "interjective" particle is too uncertain to give us confidence to rule out the presence of *wo* without it.

What is predicted by a hypothesis is after all only a necessary condition for it to be true. The distribution of *wo* phrases satisfies a necessary condition for the Forced Agreement Hypothesis for object Case marking; *wo* cannot simply be a case particle. But it is not a sufficient condition to rule out the possibility that *wo* can also function purely as a case particle. Instead assume that we find evidence that is not predicted by the hypothesis and yet can be accounted for by it. Such evidence would much strengthen the case for the hypothesis.

Recently, Satoru Kinsui and Yuko Yanagida independently made an observation to this effect for the Forced Agreement hypothesis. Let us first note that Nomura (1993, cited in Kinsui 2002: Observation 5) observed that in *Manyôshû*, *kakari* phrases, i.e., phrases marked as foci by *kakari* particles, must precede *ga* and *no* marked subjects. This fact suggests that *kakari* phrases are moved out of VP. I will return to this important finding later. Kinsui (2002: Observation 6) and Yanagida (2004) observed that *wo* marked objects may precede *karari* phrases, indicating

that *wo* phrases can also be placed out of VP. Furthermore Kinsui (Observation 1a, Observation 2) observes, as does Yanagida (2003, 2004), that *wo* phrases precede bare and *ga/no* marked subjects and not follow them, as shown in the following example.

(27) M2082

Amanokawa kahato yaso ari iduku ni ka **kimi ga mi-hune wo a ga** mati wora-mu

Milky-way ferry-port many be where at ka you ga sfx-boat wo I ga wait-aux

'There are many ferry docks along the Milky Way. Where shall I wait for your boat?'

Kinsui and Yanagida's generalization shows that independently of their relative order with *kakari* phrases, *wo* phrases must move out of VP. Note that the hypothesis that *wo* is not a case marker does not require *wo* to move out of VP; nor, for that matter, the Forced Agreement Hypothesis, either. Whatever forces *wo* out of VP, this fact can be taken as good evidence that *wo* does not function purely as a case marker. The Nomura's and Kinsui and Yamagiwa's findings provide us with strong support for the claim that no instance of *wo* counts as a case marker pure and simple, and consequently support the Forced Agreement Hypothesis for object Case marking.

3.2.3.4. Counterexamples to the *wo* phrase movement

3.2.3.4.1. Counterexamples to the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization: *DP-*ga/no* > DP-*wo*

There are three counterexamples to the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization I am aware of, that is, examples where *wo*-marked objects follow *ga/no* marked subjects.

(28) M872

Yama no na to ihi-tuge to ka mo **Sayo-hime ga** kono yama no uhe ni **hire wo** furi-kemu

Mountain no name as say-tell quote ka mo S-princess ga this mntn no upon at scarf wo wave-aux

'Was it for transmitting as the name of the mountain that Princess Sayo waved her scarf on this mountain?'

Yanagida (2003) lists this example as a possible counterexample, but suggests a different reading

of the text: *hire wo* should read *hire-wo*, a compound noun 'scarf-tip'. This reinterpretation makes this example conforming to the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization. However, I take this reinterpretation problematic. For one thing, it happens that this poem is among a group of poems with the same theme: Sayohime waving *hire* (M868, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875). Only in M872 is *hire* followed by a character representing the syllable *wo*. Secondly, this character, *en/on* in the *on* reading and *tooi* in the modern *kun* reading, is not a character usually used to represent the particle *wo* in *Manyôshû*; it is an idiosyncratic property of a limited part of *Manyôshû* that this particular character is used to represent the particle *wo*. From these considerations, I cannot accept Yanagida's reinterpretation of the poem and must take it as a counterexample. However, the part of *Manyôshû* in question is thought to originate in the collection of poems kept by YAMANOUE Okura, one of the prominent poets of *Manyôshû*, who, however, is believed to be a non-native speaker of Japanese. This fact may be relevant for this counterexample.

(29) M2831

Misago wiru su ni wiru hune no yuhu-siwo wo matu-ramu yori ha ware koso masare

Misago be beach at be boat no evening-tide wo wait aux than ha I emph best

'I wait (for you) more than the boat on the beach where there are misago birds would be waiting for evening tides'

It is likely that in this example, the *no* subject phrase *misago wiru su ni wiru hune no* is moved to the left of the *wo* phrase *yuhu-siwo wo* by the heavy noun phrase shift to the left.

(30) M3689

Ihatano ni yadori suru kimi **ihebito no** idurato **ware wo** toha-ba ikani ihamu

Ihatano at stay do you family no where I wo ask-if how say-aux

'You, sleeping (buried) at Ihatano! if your family should ask me where (you are), how would I respond?'

Formally it is not impossible to take *ihebito no* as the subject inside the embedded question; then,

the violation of the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization is removed. The poem, then, should be glossed as 'You, sleeping (buried) at Ihatano! if you should ask me where your family is, how would I respond?' But this is a less likely interpretation of the poem.

The verb *tohu* 'ask' is subcategorized for a dative *ni* argument in Modern Japanese. A number of such verbs took *wo* phrases as objects in Old Japanese. It is conceivable that *wo* in such phrases was exceptional and functioned as an inherent case marker. If that is the case M3689 is not a counterexample. But I have no empirical support for this speculation.

3.2.3.4.2. A counterexample to a generalization of the Kinsui/Yanagida observation: *bare DP > PP-*wo*

Kinsui and Yamagiwa were concerned with *wo*-marked objects. But, as I pointed out earlier, *wo* as an interjective particle can be attached to other types of arguments and adjuncts. We have to be also concerned with such uses of *wo*. In this widened perspective, we need to examine the relative word order of bare objects and non-object *wo* phrases, a task not faced by Kinsui or Yanagida. From the Kinsui-Yamagiwa generalization, it would be natural to draw a broader generalization than suggested by them. If *wo* is taken as responsible for the movement of an object out of VP when *wo* is attached to it, we would expect that *wo* moves other arguments and adjuncts out of VP as well when it attaches to them. I have not done extensive research on this issue, but there is one counterexample I am aware of:

(31) M3584

Wakare-na-ba ura-ganasi-kemu **a ga koromo sita ni wo** ki-mase tada ni ahu made ni
 Part-aux-if suf-sad-aux I ga clothes under ni wo wear aux directly ni meet till at
 'if we part, we would feel sad. Please wear my clothes under until we see face-to face'

Here, *wo* is attached to a *ni* phrase *sita ni wo*, which follows a bare object *a ga koromo*.

3.3. wh-Questions and *kakari musubi* constructions

3.3.1. Two types of wh-questions in Old Japanese

In Modern Japanese the indeterminates like *dare* and *nani* are directly followed by a case marker or a postposition, as in *dare ga*, *nani ni* etc. and the question particle *ka* is put at clause final position. In informal speech, this *ka* may be elided:

- (32) Masao wa nani o tabe(masi)ta ka?
(33) Masao wa nani o tabeta (ka)?
(34) Masao wa nani o tabe ta no (desu ka)?
Masao wa what o ate
'What did Masao eat?'

If *ka* is attached to an indeterminate, we get an indefinite/existential reading, not a wh-question:

- (35) Masao wa nani-ka (o) tabe masita (ka?)
'Masao ate something (did Masao eat anything?)'

In Old Japanese, unlike Modern Japanese, if *ka* is attached to an indeterminate, we have a wh-question. But indeterminates can also occur without *ka* attached to them and form wh questions in Old Japanese. We must thus recognize two different wh-constructions in Old Japanese, the *ka*-wh question and the bare-wh question. These two types of questions have the following different properties:

- (36) The *ka*-wh question:
[k1] The particle *ka* is attached to an indeterminate phrase.
[k2] The predicate is in the *rentai* form.
[k3] The subject is a *ga/no*-marked DP phrase, unless it is at the same time a topic.
[k4] The indeterminate phrase with *ka* is moved out of VP.
- (37) The bare-wh question:
[b1] It contains an indeterminate phrase without *ka* attached to it.
[b2] The predicate is either in the *shushi* or *izen* form.

[b3] The subject is a bare DP.

[b4] The indeterminate phrase remains *in situ*.

The following two pairs show the contrast between these two constructions:

(38)

M3749 (*ka*-wh question)

Hito-kuni ni kimi wo imasete **itu-made ka** a ga koho-wo-ramu toki no siranaku ni
Foreign land to you wo let-go when-till ka I ga miss-be-aux time no know-neg
'letting you go to a foreign land, till when will I miss you, not knowing the time (when)?'

M3742 (bare-wh question)

Aha-mu hi wo sono hi to sira-zu toko-yami ni **idure no hi made** are koho wo-ramu
See-aux day wo the day as know-neg eternal-dark at which no day till I miss be-aux
'without knowing the day we will see, until when will I miss you in pitch darkness?'

(39)

M795 (*ka*-wh question)

Ihe ni yukite **ikani ka** a ga se-mu makuraduku tuma-ya sabusiku omohoyu-besi mo
Home at go how ka I ga do-aux pillowed spouse-house sad feel aux emotive
'What would I do after returning home? Our bedroom with pillows would look sad.'

M4046 (bare-wh question)

Kamusaburu Taruhime-no-saki kogi-meguri mire domo aka-zu **ikani** ware se-mu
Awesome Taruhime-Point row-around see though bore-neg how I do-aux
'After having rowed around it while seeing it, the awesome Taruhime Point never gets boring.
What would I do?'

3.3.2. Wh-question type 1: the *ka*-wh question

The *ka*-wh question, to begin with, is a subtype of *ka*-focus questions with an indeterminate phrase as a focus; the *ka*-focus question, in turn, is a subtype of the *rentai kakari musubi*

construction. The properties [k1] - [k4] listed above are properties the *ka*-focus question and the *rentai kakari musubi* construction in general:

(40) The *rentai kakari musubi* construction

[k/m1] A *kakari* particle is attached

(i) to a focused phrase, if there is any;

(ii) to the sentence final predicate, if there is no focused phrase.

[k/m2] The predicate is in the *rentai* form.

[k/m3] The subject is a *ga/no*-marked DP phrase, unless it is at the same time a topic.

[k/m4] The focus phrase, if there is any, is moved out of VP. [Nomura's generalization]

The *rentai kakari* particles are emphatic *so/zo* and *nam*, and interrogative *ya* and *ka*. Only *ka* can attach to an indeterminate and form a wh-question. *Ka* may also attach to a non-indeterminate phrase and form a focused yes-no question:

(41) M 1742 (cited in *Jidaibetsu Kokugo Jiten*)

tada hitori i-watarasu ko ha **waka-kusa no tuma ka** aru ramu kasi-no-mi no hitori ka neramu

only one prf-cross girl ha young-glass no spouse ka be-aux acorn no one ka sleep

'does the girl who is crossing [the bridge] alone have *a new husband*? Does she sleep *alone* like an acorn?'

[k/m1](i) and [k/m2] together are in effect the traditional definition of the *rentai kakari musubi*. According to Mizutani (1974:31), however, examples where *ka* is attached to a non-indeterminate phrase and where the predicates are *unambiguously* in the *rentai* form are relatively few: he cites M220, 290, 712, 2525, 2917. [k3], in particular, and [k/m3], in general, mean that we find not only bare DPs but also *ga/no* marked DPs that function as subjects in *ka*-wh questions and *rentai kakari musubi* sentences. We have already established that bare DP subjects in *rentai* clauses are topics. [k/m3] thus follows from [k/m2].

3.3.3. *Kakari* particles as functional elements and the *kakari* phrase movement

[k/m1](ii) corresponds to the observation that "*kakari* particles in Old Japanese have the function of final particles at sentence final position in addition to their *kakari* function at sentence internal position". (Konoshima 1966:357) Konoshima attributes this generalization to YAMADA Yoshio. Note that the "interjective" *wo* also has the sentence final function. The following example illustrates this point concerning *wo* as well as [k/m1](ii) with the interrogative particle *ka*:

(42) M 2899

Nakanakani moda mo ara-masi **wo** adukinaku ahi-misomete mo are ha kohuru **ka**
 rather silent mo be-aux *wo* in vain sfx-fall-in-love mo be ha be-in-love ka
 'I should rather have kept silent. Having fallen in love in vain, am I yet in love? '

Note that an indeterminate in a *ka*-wh question can be assumed as focused. [k1] is hence a special case of [k/m1](i). It follows that a *ka*-wh question cannot have *ka* at sentence-final position. From this fact, we can draw an important analytic conclusion. We can account for this apparent complementary distribution of *ka* if we assume that *ka* is a functional element and marks a clause as interrogative at clause-final position but attaches to an indeterminate phrase if there is one and forms a clause internal wh-phrase. I will leave aside for now and return later to the question as to where *ka* is generated and how it gets attached to an indeterminate phrase. For the moment it suffices to keep in mind that this attachment is obligatory, in conformity with the Forced Agreement Hypothesis.

We can extend this attachment of *ka* to an indeterminate phrase in a wh-question to the attachment of *ka* to a focused constituent in a *ka*-yes-no question. We can further generalize this attachment to *kakari musubi* clauses in general. Let us formulate our observation in the form of a descriptive generalization.

(43) *Kakari* Particle Attachment. A *kakari* particle is a functional element. It is forced to attach to a focused phrase, if there is any.

(43) is a restatement of a traditionally well-known fact that *kakari* particles have both clause-final and clause-internal functions as *shûjoshi* (final particles) and *kakari joshi*, respectively. I have brought out the sense of the Forced Agreement parameter in this formulation.

3.3.3.1. Pied-piping

The *kakari*-particle is attached to an argument or adjunct that contains an indeterminate pronoun, not necessarily to an indeterminate pronoun itself, a familiar pied-piping phenomenon. Note that *ka* is attached to *ta ga ta ni* in the following example.

(44) M4141

Haru makete mono-ganasikini sa-yo hukete ha-buki naku sigi **ta ga ta ni ka** sumu
 spring wait sfx-sad sfx-night get-dar wing-flap sing sandpiper who ga paddy ka live
 'Being melancholy as spring has come, in whose paddy, I wonder, does a sandpiper live flapping
 and singing as the night wears?'

3.3.3.2. Counterexamples (Apparent) to *Kakari* Particle Attachment

3.3.3.2.1. Predicate nominal indeterminates

There are examples where *ta/tare* is (part of) a predicative nominal followed by a copula to which *ka* is attached:

(45) M 776

koto desi ha **ta ga koto** naru ka wo-yama-da no nahasiro midu no naka yodo ni site
 word put-out ha who ga word be ka sfx-hill-paddy no seedling-bed water no in pool
 'whose is the first word? And now like a stagnant pool of water in seedling beds of a hillside
 paddy.'

The poem consists of two sentences. The first sentence *koto desi ha ta ga koto naru ka*, where *koto desi ha* 'what is put out' is a topic, *ta ga koto* 'whose words' is a predicative nominal and *naru* is a copula in the *rentai* form. The wh question means something like 'whose words is what is put out in words?' It appears that *ka* is at clause final position and fails to move. But we can

assume that a predicative nominal forms a constituent with a copula and *ka* moves and pied-pipes this constituent. The point is more apparent with the following example where *tare* 'who' by itself is a predicate nominal followed by a copula:

(46) M2916

Tamakatuma aha-mu to ihu ha **tare naru ka** aheru toki sahe omo kakusi suru

Epithet meet-aux quot say ha who be ka meet time emph face hide do

'Who said 'let's meet'? You hide your face even when we meet.'

In the following example, however, the copula *nari* is reanalyzed and reverts to its etymological origin *-ni aru*. *ka* pied-pipes a predicative nominal *ni*-phrase *ta ga sono no ume ni* 'plum flowers of whose garden':

(47) M2327

Ta ga sono no ume ni ka ari-kemu kokodakumo sakini-keru ka mo mi ga hosi made ni

Who ga garden no plum ni ka be-aux this-much bloom-aux ka no see ga want till at

'(From) plum trees of whose garden were [these blanches], I wonder? They are blooming this much! To the extent that I wish I can see the trees myself.'

3.3.3.2.2. A counterexample 2: M259

I am aware of one counterexample to (43):

(48) M259

Itu no ma mo kami-sabi keru **ka** Kagu-yama no hokosugi ga ure ni koke musu made ni

When no during mo godly aux ka Kagu-mountain no cedar ga top ni moss grow made ni

'when has it turned so godly aged that moss covers up to its top, the cedar tree of Kagu-Mountain?'

The translation given above follows the interpretation of *Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei*. But here the indeterminate phrase *itu no ma* 'during what time' is followed by *mo*. One conceivable

way out of this apparent counterexample is to take *mo* with the force of universal quantification. Then, the poem should read 'has it been turning so godly aged during all times that moss crept up to its top, the cedar of Kagu Mountain?' For related matters, see section 3.3.4.1.

3.3.3.3. Counterexamples to Nomura's generalization [k/m4]

So far I have concentrated on the phenomenon of how *kakari* particles attach to focused phrases. But the real grammatical significance of *kakari musubi* was hidden until an important finding was recently made in philology. According to Nomura (1993a), as already mentioned above, *kakari* phrases must precede *ga* or *no* marked subjects in *Manyôshû*. I take this fact as strong evidence for [k/m4], that is, that *kakari* phrases, in particular, *ka*-wh phrases, must be moved out of VP. I would indeed take [k/m4] as an analytical equivalent of the distributional observation formulated in Nomura's generalization.⁸ I will later propose to account for this movement and the attachment of *kakari* particles to focused constituents in terms of Agreement at Spec(I) in section 3.4.2. For now, I will consider the problem of apparent counterexamples to Nomura's generalization as it is understood in the form of [k/m4].

Any constituent found to the left of a *kakari* phrase is a *prima facie* counterexample to [k/m4]. However, there are factors other than *kakari* movement that are responsible for placing phrases to the left of VP. We need to sort them out first. To begin with, topics obviously may precede *kakari* phrases. In particular, we must remember that there are examples where bare DPs function as subjects and precede *kakari* phrases. I have already claimed that such bare subject DPs are at the same time topics. Hence they don't count as counterexamples to [k/m4].

Secondly, I distinguish bare-wh questions from *ka*-wh questions. Nomura's generalization does not apply to wh-phrases without *ka*. I am not claiming that wh-movement in the usual sense existed in Old Japanese; [k/m4] does not entail such a claim. (56) below, where a subject

⁸Many examples of *ga/no* subjects found in *Manyôshû* are adjacent to main verbs. Lest one wonder if *ga/no* phrases move to the right to adjoin to verbs instead of *kakari* phrases moving to the left of *ga/no* phrases, let me note that this fact must be largely due to the length constraint imposed by the format of *tanka* 'short poems'. It is easier to find *ga/no* subjects not adjacent to verbs in *choka* 'long poems', though we can find relevant examples in *tanka*, too, for example, in M1919: *Kunisu ra ga wakana tumu-ramu Siba no No* 'the Siba Field where the Kunisu people pick young grasses'.

precedes such a *wh*-phrase, would be a counterexample to *wh*-movement in the usual sense, but not a counterexample to [k/m4]; see Tonoike (2002) on this point.

Thirdly, we have seen above that *wo* phrases move out of VP. The object of a verb is often a *wo* phrase; if such an object precedes a *kakari* phrase, as in the following example, cited in Tonoike (2002:87), it would count as a counterexample to *wh* movement in the usual sense, but it does not count as a counterexample to [k/m4].

(49) M 2396

tamasaka ni wa ga mi-si hito wo *ikanaramu yosi wo motite ka* mata hito-me mi-mu
 by-chance ni I ga see-aux person wo what fate wo by again one-sight see-aux
 'a person I happened to see, by what chance will I see again?'

Furthermore, as I spell out later, I assume that *kakari* movement lands *kakari* phrases at Spec(I), not at Spec(C). I assume also that adjuncts can generally be generated outside of VP; they can be adjoined to IP. It follows that examples in which an adjunct precedes a *kakari* phrase may not be taken counterexamples to [k/m4], either.

What remain as possible counterexamples are those in which we find a bare DP functioning as an object or a postpositional phrase which is an internal complement of the verb. According to Tonoike's (2002:88) count, there are 67 examples in *Manyôshû* where objects and other complements "precede *wh* phrases". On the one hand, this count does not exclude those with *wo* phrase objects like M2396 above (Tonoike's (6)b), nor does it exclude examples with bare *wh* phrases like (58) below. On the other hand, the count concerns only *wh* phrases and not *kakari* focus phrases in general. Given Tonoike's count, I am not in a position to estimate the size of the type of possible counterexamples we have to be concerned with. But let me add couple of remarks here.

3.3.3.3.1. Counterexamples (Apparent) 1. Heavy noun phrases preceding a *kakari* adjunct

In section 3.2.3.4.2, we noted an example where an adjunct *wo* phrase follows a bare object, a counterexample to the claim that *wo* phrases move out of VP. There are similar counterexamples

with *kakari* particles, too. As Tonoike (2002) pointed out, there is an instance where a bare object phrase precedes a *ka* marked adjunct:

(50) M83

Wata no soko okitu sira-nami Tatutayama *itu-ka* koe-na-mu imo ga atari mi-mu
ocean no bottom offing white-wave Tatutayama when cross-aux-aux wife neighborhood see aux
'When would I go over Tatuta mountain? And look at where my wife lives?'

Here the *ka*-phrase *itu-ka* is preceded by the direct object *Tatutayama*. The phrase *wata no soko okitu sira-nami* 'white waves rising from the ocean bottom' modifies Mount Tatuta: rising high like white waves do from the bottom of the ocean. Tonoike's is not an isolated such counterexample. There seem to be quite a few examples of this type, but most of those that have come to my attention so far all have heavy noun phrases as direct objects. Let me add a couple of more examples:

(51) M3966.

uguhisu no naki tirasu-ramu haru no hana *itusika* kimi to taori kazasa-mu
bush-warbler no sing disperse-aux spring no flower when you with hand-break-aux
'When could I with you break and put on the head (twigs with) flowers that bush warblers would now dispersing while singing?'

(52) M279

Wagimoko ni Winano ha mise-tu **Nasugi-yama Tuno-no-Matuhara *itu ka*** simesa-mu
My-wife to Winano ha show-aux Nasugi-mountain Tuno-Pine- when ka let-see-aux
'I let my wife see Wagino. When could I show her the Nasugi Mountain and Tuno Pines?'

In each of these examples, an object precedes a place or time adverbial *ka*-wh phrase. If an adjunct is adjoined to IP, however, we expect that there must be some reason the object is put before the *ka* phrase. In the above examples, the objects are heavy noun phrases.

Heavy noun phrase shift must be responsible for the apparent violation of [k/m4].

3.3.3.3.2. A Counterexample (Apparent) 2: A heavy noun phrase preceding a *kakari* subject phrase; an example of philological interest

(53) M 840

Haru-yanagi kadura ni orisi ume no hana tare ka ukabesi sakaduki no he ni

Spring willow hair-pin ni break plum no flower who ka float sake-cup no upon ni

'who set afloat the plum flowers in sake cup that we picked for putting in willow hairpins?'

This example also involves a heavy noun phrase like those in the preceding subsection; the *kakari* phrase preceded by it, however, is the subject. Besides, M 840 may be of some philological interest, because the grammatical issue we are concerned with may be relevant to choosing a proper reading from among variants in manuscripts. M840 as given in *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* as well as in *Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* is an apparent counterexample to [k/m4], since a *ka wh* subject follows a bare direct object. However, it is significant that *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* gives crucial variant readings in manuscripts. The third line of this poem *ume no hana* given above should read *ume no haru*, according to three manuscripts, and *ume noru ha*, according to one manuscript. What draws our attention is the second variant *ume noru ha*. The poem then should read as follows:

M 840

Haru-yanagi kadura ni orisi *ume noru ha* tare ka ukabesi sakaduki no he ni

This reading makes the first three lines (17 syllables) read not as a noun phrase but as a *rentai* clause followed by the topic *ha*. The verb *noru* means 'be/ride in/on a boat/car/horse etc'. The clause can be interpreted as describing an event 'a plum [flower] picked for hair decoration is [as if] on a boat'. In the poem this event description is made a topic: 'A plum flower being on board, who has made this [scene] float on sake in a cup?' Then, M840 is not a counterexample to [k/m4].

It may even be tempting to interpret the first three lines as a topicalised head internal relative clause: 'a flower [that is as if] on a boat, who has set [it] afloat in a sake cup?' For topicalised *rentai* clauses, see below section 3.5.

The first variant reading *ume no haru* makes both interpretation and analysis much harder; I will not be concerned with it, but it might be the result of a desperate attempt by a later copier of the manuscript for correcting a perceived or real violation of the *kakari* phrase movement.

3.3.3.3.3. Summary; one counterexample to [k/m4]

To sum up, crucial possible counterexamples to [k/m4] are such ones in which a "light" bare object or a "light" complement precedes a *kakari* phrase, in particular *ka-wh* phrase. My admittedly not complete but fairly extensive search has so far come up with only one such example:

(54) M187

Ture mo naki Sada no woka-he ni kaheri wi-ba **sima no mi-hasi ni tare ka** sumaha-mu
 company mo neg no hill-side at return be-if island no sfx-bridge at who ka live-aux
 'If we have returned to the hill-side of Sada where there are no acquaintance, who will reside on the bridge-house of the island?'

Here, *sima no mi-hasi ni* must count as the complement selected by *sumahu* 'reside', but it precedes *tare ka* 'who'. Let us recall that we have also one such relevant counterexample to the extended Kinsui-Yanagida generalisation that *wo* phrases move out of VP; see (31) where a "light" bare object precedes a *wo* phrase.

An obvious way to account for such apparent counterexamples as these if they turn up in a significant number is to have recourse to scrambling. For this reason, they deserve our attention of their own merits. For, the process of scrambling could have different theoretical significance in languages where Agreement, in particular, Case marking, is forced or not; it should hence be of particular interest to us to find out if and how scrambling worked in Old Japanese. In any event we need more research on this matter.

3.3.4. Wh Questions Type 2: Bare-wh Questions

In contrast to the type of wh-questions we have discussed so far, there are cases where indeterminate phrases are not accompanied by *ka* attached to it. This type of wh-question does not contain *ka* at all, either attached to an indeterminate phrase or at clause-final position. For *tare/ta* 'who' my tentative count based on *Manyôshû Sôsaquin* come up with about 30 examples of this type in *Manyôshû*, slightly less than examples of type 1 wh questions.

Let me repeat four properties I listed in (37).

[b1] It contains an indeterminate phrase without *ka* attached to it.

[b2] The predicate is either in the *shûshi* or *izen* form.

[b3] The subject is a bare DP.

[b4] The indeterminate phrase remains *in situ*.

[b1] is the definition of this type of wh-question. In many examples the predicates are in a form that is morphologically ambiguous between *shûshi* and *rentai*, as in M3742 and M4046 in (38) and (39). But none has a predicate unambiguously in the *rentai* form, except for those which contain *kakari* particles other than *ka*, for example, M2654 and M3791. We can find a precious few that contain predicates definitely in the *shûshi* form:

(55) M869

Tarasihime kami no mikoto no na turasu to mi-tatasi-seri-si isi wo tare **mi-ki**

Tarasihime god no honorific no fish fish quote sfx-stand aux-aux rock who see-aux

'Who saw the rock where Goddess Tarasihime stood in order to fish?'

There are also examples with predicates in the *izen* form:

(56) M1389

Iso-no-ura ni ki-yoru sira-nami kaheri-tutu sugi-kate-naku ha tare ni **tayutahe**

Iso-no-cove at come-in white-wave return-sfx pass-can -neg ha who to waver
'White waves not being able to return back, to whom is it wavering?'

Some examples end in a *wh*-phrase functioning as a predicative nominal:

(57) M4397

miwatase-ba mukatu wo no he no hana nihohi terite tateru ha **hasi-ki ta ga tuma**
look-around-as yonder peak no upon no flower scent shine stand ha dear who wife
'as I look around [I wonder], whose wife is [she], flowers on hills yonder blossoming and
reflecting sunshine?'

From [b2] we can conclude that *kakari musubi* is not involved in this type of *wh*-questions not only because there is no *kakari* particle attached to an indeterminate phrase, but also because the predicate is not in the *rentai* form.

[b3] was noted by Saeki (1963: 6). As far as the case where the predicate is in the *shûshi* form, [b3] follows from the hypothesis that the subject Case marking is forced. As I mentioned earlier, I leave *izen* clauses for future studies.

I maintain [b4] on three grounds. First of all, there is no overt evidence that movement of any kind is involved with bare-*wh* constructions. Secondly, bare-*wh* phrases may be in subordinate clauses, even in conditional clauses as in the second example below, a clear violation of an island condition if a movement is involved:

(58) M 4070

Hito-moto no nadesiko uwesi sono kokoro **tare ni** mise-mu to omohisome-kemu
One stem no pink plant that heart who to show-aux quote think-aux
'who did I think of letting know my thought of planting a pink stem?'

(59) M 2263

nagatuki no sigure no ame no yama-giri no ibuseki a ga mune **ta wo** mire ba yamu
September no shower no rain mountain-fog no melancholy I ga heart who wo see if stop
'will my melancholy heart like mountain fogs in September rain heal if I see whom?'

Thirdly, wh questions in Modern Japanese do not involve movement; wh-phrases are licensed directly by binding. I assume that the wh-question in modern Japanese is a descendant of the bare-wh question of Old Japanese. The *kakari musubi* construction has transformed into the modern focus particle construction, and in particular has been incorporated in the syntax of indeterminates, but the *ka*-wh question was removed from this development; only the bare-wh construction has survived in Modern Japanese. See Kitagawa and Deguchi (2002) and Kuroda (forthcoming).

3.3.4.1. Negative concord and universal quantifier indeterminates

We can find a few examples of indeterminates accompanied by *mo* with the force of negative concord or universal quantification in *Manyôshû*. Such indeterminates are of course functionally different from bare ones in bare-wh questions.

(60) M2628

Inisihe no situhata obi wo musubi tare tare to iu hito mo kimi ni ha masa-zi

Old-times no situhata obi wo tie hang who quote say person mo you to ha superior-neg

'Nobody is superior to you, with a *situhata obi* tied and hanging around'

(61) M2782

Sa-ne-gani ha tare to mo ne-me do okitumo no nabikisi kimi ga koto matu ware wo

Sfx-sleep-? ha who with mo sleep though offing seaweed no bend you word wait I wo

'whomever I might sleep with, I wait for your words, you to whom I bend like seaweeds in the offing'

(62) M2783

Wagimoko ga nani to mo ware wo omowa-ne-ba huhumeru hana no ho ni saki-nu-besi

My-wife ga what quote mo I wo think-neg ba bud flower no spike ni bloom-aux-aux

'As my wife thinks of me nohow, a budding flower would open on the spike'

In M2628 and M2783, *tare* and *nani* are accompanied by *mo* and followed by negation. The indeterminate *tare* in M2782 functions in the same way as free choice indeterminates in *temo/demo* clauses in Modern Japanese. See Ôno (1993:29) for similar examples, though Ôno takes the indeterminates in his examples as *gimon-shi* 'interrogative words'.

3.3.5. Conclusion

To conclude, there were two wh-interrogative constructions in Old Japanese, the *ka*-wh question and the bare-wh question. The *ka*-wh question is a subtype of the *rentai kakari* construction and as such involves forced movement. Bare wh-questions do not involve movement, and I assume that indeterminates in them that function as wh-words are licensed *in situ* by binding.

3.4. Functional categories and movements

Let me now formulate an account of the descriptive claims made above. I assume a classical GB framework based on the internal subject hypothesis. I introduce only two functional categories, I(nfl) and C(omp), and leave open the possibility of finer distinctions. In addition, I assume that as far as functional categories are concerned, the phrase structure is free of linear order. I assume without going into any discussion that morphological and other factors determine linearization. For example, both (63) and (64) are possible linearisations of IP:

(63) Spec(C)-[[Spec(I)-[I-[VP]]]-C]

(64) Spec(C)-[[Spec(I)-[[VP]-I]]-C]

3.4.1. C(omp) and I(nfl)

Shûshi clauses are finite and *rentai* clauses are non-finite (Hypothesis OJ-1 (16)). I introduce two complementisers, C_s for *shûshi* clauses and C_r for *rentai* clauses. C_s selects Agr, a finite empty Infl. Following the standard assumption, the subject DP moves from Spec(V) to Spec(I) and

Agrees with Agr to get subject Case. Thus, bare DPs are licensed as subjects in *shûshi* clauses. We have the following linearisation.

(65) [Spec(C) [[DP-[Agr-[[t] [X V]_{V'}]_{VP}]_{I'}]_{IP} C_s]_{C'}]

In contrast, C_r selects a non-finite Infl. The subject DP of a *rentai* clause does not move to Spec(I). It must get genitive case and is marked by *ga/no in situ* inside VP.

(66) [Spec(C) [[Spec(I) [Infl [DP-*ga/no*-[X V]_{V'}]_{VP}]_{I'}]_{IP} C_r]_{C'}].

3.4.2. *Rentai kakari* clauses: *kakari* phrase raising

I assume that *kakari* particles *so/zo*, *nam*, *ya* and *ka* are non-finite Infs and can be selected by C_r. A *kakari* particle Agrees with a focus constituent, if there is any. Note that since the subject does not move to Spec(I) to get Case in *rentai* clauses, Spec(I) is left empty; a focus phrase, and in particular, an indeterminate phrase, if there is any, can, and indeed must, move to Spec(I) and gets the *kakari* particle attached to it. Take, for example, interrogative *ka* and assume that a non-subject XP is focused. Then, we will get the following structure:

(67) [Spec(C) [[XP-[*ka* [DP-*ga/no* [.._I.._V]_{V'}]_{VP}]_{I'}]_{IP} C_r]_{C'}].

Here, Infl *ka* is actualized at the left edge of I', so that it might directly follow XP in Spec(I) and Agree with it. If, on the other hand, the clause does not contain focussed constituent, Spec(I) is left empty. The particle *ka* is enclitic. Looking for a host inside IP, it forces the Infl node to actualize at the right edge of I':

(68) [Spec(C) [[Spec(I) [[DP-*ga/no* [X V]_{V'}]_{VP} [*ka*]_I]_{I'}]_{IP} C_r]_{C'}].

The two structures are illustrated by the following examples.

(69) M40

[[[[[Aminoura ni huna-nori su-ramu wotome-ra ga tama-mo no suso ni [siho mitu-ramu]_{VP}]_{VP}]_{I'}]_{IP}]_{CP}

Aminoura at boat-board do-aux girl-pl ga sfx-robe no hem at tide rise-aux ka
 'Would the tide arise to the hemlines of the clothes of the girls who were to ride in the boat at Aminoura?'

(70) M3891

[Aratu no umi siho hi siho miti toki ha are-do [[idure no toki]-[[ka]_I [wa ga [t] kōhi-za-
 ramu]_{VP}]_I]_{IP}]_{CP}

Aratu no sea tide ebb tide risse time ka be-sfx when no time ka I ga long-neg-aux
 'The tides of Aratu ebb and rise at times, but when will I not long for you?'

3.4.2.1. The target of *kakari* movement

Recall that *ka* in general pied-pipes the constituent that contains an indeterminate. That is, what moves to Spec(I) is not necessarily an indeterminate pronoun but an argument or adjunct that contains an indeterminate pronoun. Schematically, we have the following structure where *Wh-pro* is an indeterminate pronoun and [t] is a trace of an argument or adjunct that contains *wh-pro* and has moved to Spec(I):

(71) S = [[....Wh-pro.....]_{XP}-[[ka]_I [...[t]...]_{VP}]_I]_{IP}

3.4.2.1.1. Pied piped subordinate clauses

The attachment mechanism of focus particles to various constituents in Modern Japanese must be a descendent of the *kakari* particle attachment in Old Japanese, even though much change has taken place as to which particles participate in the process and with what function. See Appendix. The interrogative *ka* is not movable any more in Modern Japanese. It is remarkable that *ka* in Old Japanese attaches to, and thus pied-pipes kinds of constituents that we would not expect from the syntactic behavior of focus particles in Modern Japanese. Old Japanese *ka* pied-pipes subordinate adverbial clauses. First, observe that *ka* pied-pipes a *ba* conditional clause in the following example:

(72) M4392

Ame-tusi no idure no kami wo inoraba ka utukusi haha ni mata koto tohamu
 heaven-earth no which no god wo pray-ba ka dear mother to again word ask
 'Can I talk with my dear mother again if I pray to which god of the universe?'

We find a similar example in M1784. Furthermore, in Old Japanese a presuppositional-conditional clause can be formed without *ba*, and even such a clause can be pied-piped, as shown in the following example:

(73) M2380

hasikiyasi ta ga sahure-ka-mo, tamahoko no miti mi-wasurete kimi ga ki-masa-nu
 ah, ah who ga interfere-ka-mo epithet no way see-forgot you ga come-aux-neg
 'Ah, with who interfering have you not come forgetting the way?'

In this example the indeterminate *ta* 'who' is in a clause with the main verb *sahure* followed by a clause-final *ka(-mo)*. We have a couple of interesting philological and grammatical issues. To begin with, the verb *sahure* is represented ideographically in the original text. Thus, it is up to philological interpretation how to read this verb and to assign a proper morphological form. The traditional reading reproduced above takes the verb as in the *izen* (*realis* conditional) form *sahure*. It is conceivable to take the verb as in the *rentai* form. Then, the poem would consist of two sentences: "Ah, who is interfering? You have lost the way and have not come." But, then, we would have a violation of the *kakari* particle attachment. The reading assigned in the philological tradition rightly stays clear of this violation. Secondly, even with the *izen* reading assigned to the verb in question, it would still be conceivable that the poem is taken as consisting of two sentences. For, independent sentences, though rare, can take verbs in the *izen* form. But, then, again, we would have a violation of the *kakari* particle attachment. So, we are led to take *hasikiyasi ta ga sahure-ka-mo* as a pied-piped adverbial clause. But, then, thirdly, this pied-piped *kakari* phrase must be resolved by a predicate in the *rentai* form. However, the final predicate *ki-masa-nu* is a form morphologically ambiguous between *shûshi* and *rentai* and it appears that the reading we are trying to justify, though not inconsistent with this verb form, is not determined unambiguously from the text. The subject of this predicate *kimi* 'you' is also ideographically

represented in the original text without any indication of a particle attached to it. But we cannot have *kimi* as a bare DP here prosodically; we need a three mora word to make the last line of this *waka* poem seven mora long. The traditional reading supplies *ga*. This decision entails that the predicate is taken as *rentai*, resolving the *kakari* suspense introduced by a pied-piping *ka*.

In sum, the traditional interpretation of M2380 is a convergence of a number of philological considerations; if we follow it, as I do, M2380 provides us with an interesting example of pied-piped subordinate clause.

3.4.2.2. The landing site of *kakari* movement

Thanks to the pied-piping of subordinate clauses of the type demonstrated above, an indeterminate pronoun, a *kakari* trigger, may be located in an adjunct island and separated from the *rentai* predicate that resolves its *kakari* suspense. The pied piping *ka* so to speak serves as a ferry to the island. If *kakari* movement were to apply to the indeterminate directly, the island constraint would be violated. The question that naturally arises, however, is whether *kakari* movement can be long distance from inside a complement of a bridge type, or it is inherently clause-bound. This is a difficult question to settle due to the limited quality and quantity of the data available. But if we follow Watanabe (2002:82), *kakari* movement is a long-distance movement. His claim, according to him, is based on a lone example he has found in *Manyōshū*, but the example deserves close attention, since it raises interesting questions.

(74) M2573

Kokoro sahe matureru kimi ni nani wo ka mo iha-zu ihi-si to wa ga nusuma-ha-mu
 Heart even offer you to what wo ka mo say-neg say-aux quote I ga cheat-aux-aux
 'What would I (say) to you, and keep cheating you, that I said without having said it, to you to whom I have offered my heart?'

The poem is not easy to understand. The verb *nusumu* means 'steal' in Modern Japanese but in Old Japanese it can also be used with the meaning 'do something stealthily', a type of verb unfamiliar in the Modern Japanese vocabulary and the argument structure of this use can only be surmised. According to *Jidaibetsu Kokugo Daijiten* two usage types are exemplified:

- (75) Ono ga inoti wo *nusumi* sise-mu
 I ga life wo steal kill-aux
- (76) Ono ga inoti wo sisemu to *nusum*[u]
 I ga life wo kill-aux to steal

Both should mean something like 'pro will sneakily kill me (my life)'. In (75) *nusumu* is used as the first member of a serial verb, while in (76) *nusumu* takes a quotative *to* complement. Our example (74) conforms to the second pattern. There are two points that call our attention, one grammatical and the other philological. Grammatically it is significant that the predicate inside the *to* complement, *ihi-si* 'said' is a *rentai* form. Thus, *kakari* triggered by the indeterminate *nani* is resolved inside the *to* complement clause. The matrix predicate *nusuma-ha-mu*, on the other hand, is morphologically ambiguous between *shûshi* and *rentai*. In addition, its subject, the first person pronoun is only ideographically represented. It could be read either as *wa ga*, as given in (74), or as *ware*, 'I', a bare DP. From a strictly morphological and philological standpoint, an alternative reading is conceivable for M2573:

(77) M2573

Kokoro sahe matureru kimi ni **nani wo ka** mo iha-zu ihi-si to ware nusuma-ha-mu

'I would sneakily keep asking you, whom I have offered my heart: what did I say without having said it to you'

With this reading the *kakari* triggered by *ka* is resolved inside the subordinate clause; long distance movement is not involved.

The commentators of both *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* and *Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* choose the reading *wa ga*. This choice implies that the main predicate *nusuma-ha-mu* is taken as in the *rentai* form, and hence can also be taken as the *musubi* corresponding to the *kakari* phrase *nani wo ka*. With this interpretation, the *kakari* phrase is presumably raised long-distance to the matrix clause, as Watanabe determined. With this interpretation, it is noteworthy

that the *kakari* phrase movement has left a chain of *rentai* forms <*ihi-si, nusuma-ha-mu*>, indicating that it obeys subadjacency. I do not know whether the philologists have a good reason to exclude the other interpretation, which is consistent with the hypothesis that *kakari* movement is clause-bound.

3.4.3. Topics

Bare DPs as well as *wa* phrases can be topics. I have earlier claimed that bare subjects of transitive verbs in *rentai kakari* clauses must be topics. The bare subjects of intransitive predicate may not necessarily be topics in *rentai* clauses, and indeed cannot in relative clauses; they can be Case marked by the intransitive predicate. But bare DPs can of course be topics in intransitive clauses, too. The following variant forms of the same *waka* are good evidence for these points:

(78) M232/M234

Mikasa-yama nobe yuku miti ha kokidakumo sizini aretaru ka hisa ni ara-naku ni

Mikasa-yama nobe yu yuku miti kokidakumo sizini aretaru ka hisa ni ara-naku ni

Mikasa-mountain field (from) go road (ha) very thickly overgrown ka long be-neg ni

'Is the road through the fields of Makasa Mountain very overgrown with weeds? Not long since [he] has gone.'

The bare noun *Mikasa-yama* modifies *nobe* and form a DP *Mikasa-yama nobe*. This DP is bare in M232; it is accompanied by *yu* in M234 as an argument of the verb *yuku*. Our main concern here is the bare DP *Mikasa-yama nobe yu yuku miti* in M234. This bare DP in M234 must be a topic, as the *wa* phrase *Mikasa-yama nobe yuku miti ha* in M232 is.

Incidentally, a bare object may also become a topic:

(79) M4238

Kimi ga yuki mosi hisani ara-ba **ume-yanagi** tare to tomo ni ka wa ga kadura-kamu

You ga go if long be-sfx plum-willow who with ka wa ga make-ornament

'if your journey lasts long, with whom will I make hairpins with plum and willow branches?'

I assume that *ume yanagi* is a topic.

I assume that topics are moved to Spec(C). There are two types of apparent counterexamples to this assumption. First of all, there are examples where *wa* topics are preceded by *kakari* phrases. According to Sasaki (1992), such examples are very few as far as *ka* and *ya* are concerned. It would be fair to assume, following Sasaki that such *kakari* phrases are dislocated to the left and adjoined to CP. In contrast, there are a substantial number of such examples with *so/zo*. Many of such examples can be explained away by means of heavy noun phrase shift, but not all of them. I leave the issue with *so/zo* for future studies.

Secondly, there are cases where bare subjects are preceded by *kakari* phrases. Watanabe (2001:100) cites the following counts in *Manyôshû* from Nomura (1993):

(80) Word order: *ka* > bare subject 13 examples

(81) Word order: bare subject > *ka* 30 examples

Watanabe is concerned with wh-movement, not with case marking; for him (81) is problematic but not (80). In contrast, for me (80), not (81), is a problem. I have already demonstrated that the bare subject in (81) is a topic. (80), however, appears to be problematic; it shows wrong word order, since I have claimed that *kakari* phrases move to Spec(I). However, in all the 13 examples Nomura counts for (80) the predicates are either intransitive verbs or adjectives, as in the following example:

(82) M2206

Maso-kagami Minabuti-yama ha kehu mo ka mo siratuyu okite momiti tiru-ramu
Sfx-mirror Minabuti-mountain ha today mo ka mo white-dew lay maple fall-aux
'At Minabuti Mountain today, too, are there dews and are maple leaves falling?'

Thus, we can conclude that the bare subject in (80) is not a topic but Case marked by the verb. Not only are these examples not counterexamples, but they are rather supporting evidence of our

hypotheses, since their existence is exactly what our hypotheses predict.

3.4.4. The landing sites of *wo* phrases

Following the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization, I have claimed earlier that *wo* phrases move out of VP. As I have also already mentioned, *wo* can be attached to adjunct postpositional phrases, and can also be a clause-final particle. In these two respects, *wo* may appear to share characteristics of *kakari* particles. However, *wo* is not a *kakari* particle.

First of all, the predicate of a clause that contain a *wo* phrase can be in the *shûshi* form:

(83) M 126

miyabi wo to ware ha kikeru wo yado kasa-zu ware **wo kahese-ri** oso no miyabi wo
courtly wo quote I ha hear-aux wo shelter offer-neg I wo turn/away-aux dull courtly man
'Though I have heard you were a courtly person, you turned me away, you a dull courtier!'

(84) M 869 (= (55))

Tarasihime kami no mikoto no na turasu to mi-tatasi-seri-si isi **wo** tare **mi-ki**
Tarasihime god no honorific no fish fish quot sfx-stand aux-aux rock who see-aux
'Who saw the rock where Goddess Tarasihime stood in order to fish?'

Luckily, we have here the predicate *kahese-ri* 'turned away' in M126 and *mi-ki* 'saw' in M869, unambiguous *shûshi* forms.

The distribution of the *wo* phrase corroborates this conclusion. Unlike *kakari* phrases, *wo* phrases can occupy any position relative to bare subjects (but not *ga/no* marked subjects), *kakari* phrases, and topics. I maintain, then, that *wo* phrases can be adjoined freely to VP, IP or CP:⁹

(85) XP-*ka* > DP-*wo*

Adjunction to VP

M 3153

mi-yuki huru Kosi no Oo-yama yuki-sugite **idure no hi ni ka wa ga sato wo** mimu
sfx-snow fall Kosi no big-mountain go-pass where no day ka I ga homeland wo see-aux

⁹ Yanagida (2004) also drew a similar conclusion.

'When would I see my homeland by passing Oyama Mountain of Koshi where it snows?'

Here *idure no hi ni ka* occupies Spec(I), hence *wa ga sato wo* 'my homeland' must be adjoined to VP.

(86) DP-*wo* > bare subject Adjunction to IP in a finite clause

See (84) above. Note that (84) is a bare-wh question. The indeterminate *tare* is bare, but as an interrogative pronoun, it cannot be a topic; it is a subject pure and simple of a finite clause and occupies Spec(I).

(87) M1486

Wa ga yado no hana-tatibana wo hototogisu ki naka-zu tuti ni tirasite-mu to ka

I ga lodge no flower-orange wo cuckoo come sing-neg ground disperse-aux quote ka

'the [flowers of] orange trees in blossom in my house cuckoos, without having come and sung, let fall, do they? '

The quotative particle *to* takes a predicate in the *shûshi* form. Hence, the bare noun *hototogisu* is the subject of a finite clause in Spec(I).

(88) DP-*wo* > XP-*ka* Adjunction to IP in a non-finite clause ¹⁰

¹⁰ M2396 below is cited in Watanabe (2002:81). Watanabe takes *wo* as an object marker and is concerned about this example as a possible counterexample to wh-movement. He suggests that this *wo* phrase is a topic and wonders if the original case marker reappears when the topic marker is dropped in Old Japanese. We do not take *wo* as an object marker, nor do we take the *wo* phrase as a topic.

Incidentally, I have taken resort to heavy noun phrase shift for explaining apparent counterexamples on previous occasions; see sections 3.2.3.4.1, 3.3.3.3.1 and 3.43. We cannot doubt the existence of heavy DP shift as a non-core device. Consequently, in order to substantiate a claim about word order $X > Y$, it is important to find examples where X can qualify as a "light X ". Once such examples are found, examples with "heavy X " should count as legitimate examples, too. Here, I take M2722 as an example with a "light" DP that legitimize other examples of the word order we are interested in.

M 106

hutari yuke-do yuki-sugi gataki aki-yama wo ikani ka kimi ga hitori koe-namu

Two go-though go-pass hard autumn wo how ka you ga one-person cross-aux

'mountains in autumn, which are hard to pass even when we go together, how will you cross over by yourself?'

M 2396

tamasaka ni wa ga mi-si hito wo ikanaramu yosi wo motite ka mata hito-me mi-mu

by-chance ni I ga see-aux person wo what fate wo by again one-sight see-aux

'a person I happened to see, by what chance will I see again?'

M2722

Ootomo-no-mitu no tomari ni hune hatete **Tatuta no yama wo itu ka** koe ika-mu

Ootomo-no-mitu no port ni boat anchor Tatuta no Mountain wo when ka cross go-aux

'When will I cross Tatuta Mountain after anchoring the boat at Ootomo-no-mitu?'

(89) DP-*wo* > bare subject

Adjunction to CP in a non-finite clause

M132

Iwami no ya Takatuno-yama no ko no ma yori **wa ga huru sode wo imo** mi-tu-ramu ka

Iwami no ya Takatuno-mountain no tree no between from I ga wave sleeve wo now see-aux ka

'Would my wife see the sleeves I wave from between trees on Takatuno Mountain in Iwami?'

In M132 a *wo* phrase precedes a bare subject of a transitive verb in a *rentai* clause. The bare subject must be a topic, hence in Spec(C).

(90) DP-*wo* > DP-*ha*

M193

Hatakora ga yo hiru to iha-zu yuku miti wo ware ha koto-goto miyadi ni zo suru

Farmer ga night day-time quote say-neg go road wo I ha all road-to-palace ni zo make

'We all take to the palace the road where farmers go day and night '

M193 contains a *kakari* particle *zo*; the main predicate *suru* is in the *rentai* form.

(91) DP-*wo* > DP-*ha* Adjunction to CP in a finite clause

M808

Tatu no ma wo are ha motome-mu ao-ni-yosi nara no miyako ni ko-mu hito no tani

Dragon no horse wo I ha find-aux blue-in-beautiful no capital in come-aux person no for

'I will find a dragon horse for a person who will come to the beautiful capital Nara'

M4501

Yati-kusa no hana ha uturohu **tokiha naru matu no sa-eda wo ware ha** musuba na

8000-kinds no flower ha change evergreen be pine no sfx-branch wo I wa tie na

'All kinds of flowers come and go. I will tie branches of evergreen pines'

In M808, the predicate *motomemu* is morphologically ambiguous, but there is no reason why it is not in the *shûshi* form. M4501 ends in a suffix, which requires a verb in the *mizen* form. I presume that both M808 and M4501 are examples of finite clauses.

We have confirmed that *wo* phrases can be adjoined to any type of clausal maximal categories. In addition, *wo* phrases can be move into Spec(I) and Spec(C) by *kakari* movement and topicalization, respectively. The following sentence is a *ka*-wh question; the wh-phrase is a *wo* phrase:

(92) DP-*wo-ka*

M 439

kaheru-beki toki ha nari-keri miyako nite ta ga **temoto wo ka** wa ga makura-kamu

return-aux time ha become-aux capital at who ga arm wo ka I ga pillow

'The time to return has come. Whose arms will I pillow in the capital?'

In the next examples *wo* phrases are topics. The *ba* that follows *wo* in M2766 is commonly considered as a *rendaku* (sequential voicing) form of *ha*:

(93) DP-*wo-ha*

M423

Kimi wo ba asu yu soto ni ka mo mi-mu

You wo ha tomorrow out at ka mo see-aux

'I will see you in the other world from tomorrow'¹¹

M2766

Misimae no irie no komo wo kari ni koso **ware wo ba** kimi ha omohi-tari-kere

Misima no inlet no komo-plant wo cut/casually koso I wo ba you ha

'Did you care for me only casually (as if cutting komo plants at Misima Inlet)?'

From these observations I draw the following conclusion:

(94) A *wo* phrase may be the target of *wa* topicalization and *kakari* focusing. If not focused or topicalised, it moves and adjoins to VP, IP or CP.

The obligatory movement of *wo* phrases substantiates the claim that *wo* is not a case marker and cannot license object DPs. Subjects and objects must be licensed by abstract Case in Old Japanese. The movement of *wo* phrases confirms that Old Japanese is a Forced Agreement language. However, the nature of this movement is not certain. I don't claim that all movements are under the control of the Agreement parameter; other factors could also motivate and contribute to movements. I have suggested earlier that *wa* topicalization is obligatory in Modern Japanese, a Non-Forced Agreement language. It is not strictly controlled by the Agreement parameter. In the case of *wo* movement in Old Japanese, it is an obligatory movement in a Forced Agreement language, and yet the lack of restrictions of its landing sites suggests that a different force is behind this movement. I leave this issue for future studies.

3.5. Relative clauses

To recall, Modern Japanese has both head internal and head external relativization,

¹¹ It is of some interest to note that a variation recorded in the original text has *kimi wo asu yu ha*, instead of *Kimi wo ba asu yu*.

evidence for the claim that Agreement is not forced in Modern Japanese, as I have pointed out above. According to Kondô (1981; 2000:343f), head internal relative clauses were recorded only from around the beginning of the Heian Period (the 9th to 12th century). They apparently did not exist in Old Japanese, as the Forced Agreement Hypothesis correctly predicts. A couple of remarks may be in order to supplement this point.

First of all, there is one possible exception in *Manyôshû*:

(95) M4429

Umayu naru nawa tatu koma no okuru ga he imo ga ihi-si wo okite kanasi mo
 Stable is rope cut horse no left-behind ka ha wife ga say-aux wo left sad mo
 'I am sad as I left my wife behind who said she would not be left behind like a horse that would cut rope in the stable'

This poem was composed by a soldier recruit in the Eastern dialect, and poses some difficulty in interpreting it. For example, the commentators conjecture that the sequence *ga he* found in the poem as a dialect variant of *ka ha*. But *umayu naru nawa tatu koma no okuru ga he imo ga ihi-si* is presumably a head internal relative clause.¹²

Secondly, we can find examples in *Manyôshû* which one might, but should not, take as examples of head internal relative clauses. Consider, for example, earlier examples (56) and (57) which I repeat here:

M1389

Iso no ura ni kiyoru siranami kaheri tutu sugikatenaku ha tare ni tayutahe

M4397

Miwataseba mukatu wo no he no hana niohi terite tateru ha hasiki ta ga tuma

In M1389, *siranami* 'white waves' might be taken as the internal head of a head internal relative clause followed by the topic marker *ha*. In M4397, similarly, *hana* 'flower' might be taken as the

¹²Janick Wrona brought this example to my attention.

head of a head internal relative clause. It is not clear exactly how the commentators of *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* and *Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* structurally analyze these examples. But the clauses preceding the topic marker can be taken as nominalised clauses referring to events, as I did above; then the topic marker in effect functions to connect two event descriptions, rather than a topicalised subject in the form of a head internal relative clause and the rest of the sentence.

We can in fact find an interesting pair in *Manyôshû*. Compare (89), which I repeat here, with (96):

(89) M 132

iwami naru takatuno yama no ko no ma yori wa ga furu sode wo imo mituru ka mo

(96) M 134

iwami naru takatuno yama no ko no ma yu mo wa ga sode furu wo imo mikemu ka mo

M132 and M134 are almost identical, except that in the former the object of the verb *see* is a sleeve while in the latter it is the event of [my] waving a sleeve. In fact, if we were to assume that head internal relative clauses had existed in Old Japanese, we could say that M134 is structurally ambiguous between two interpretations. For ease of reference, let us call this type of examples head internal relative lookalikes.

Thirdly, it is important to distinguish clearly between head internal relative clauses and *no-relative clauses*.¹³ The latter type of relative clause must be analysed as headed by a *no*-phrase, not as a head internal relative clause; I take it as a left-headed relative clause. Examples that may be taken as *no*-relatives existed in Old Japanese. See Ishigaki (1955) and Kondô (2000: 341).

Finally, however, Ishigaki (1955:25) in his seminal work makes intriguing comments on this construction. He cites examples of the following structures from *Senmyau* 'imperial order':

¹³ I did not distinguish these two types of relative clauses in Kuroda (1974) but recognized *no*-relatives (*no*-introduced relatives) as a separate category in Kuroda (1975/76). Incidentally, *keijôsei meishiku*, the term/concept well-known and much discussed among Japanese grammarians, is sometimes understood as denoting the head internal relative clause. But the term must be taken as denoting exclusively the *no*-relative in Ishigaki (1941), where it was originally introduced. See Kondô (2000:341ff) for related comments.

(97)

[NP no ...Predicate₁] ha ...Predicate₂

[NP no ...Predicate₁] wo ...Predicate₂,

where Predicate₁ is in the *rentai* form and Predicate₂ is in the *shûshi* form. Ishigaki interprets these examples by supplying the elided head *mono* 'one (who)'. Ishigaki's examples have *ha* or *wo* following Predicate₁. No example is given with *ga* or other particles/postpositions. In fact, Ishigaki took a trouble of explicitly stating about this construction that "there is no case where the subject case particle *ga* follows a predicate [*yôgen*]" in Old Japanese (op. cit.: 20). It is significant that the examples of head internal relative lookalikes I cited above are also followed by *ha* or *wo*. We might paraphrase Ishigaki's comment thus: Left-headed *no*-relative clauses, if existed, should have given rise to examples that would contradict this claim by Ishigaki.

Speculating about the development of head internal relative clauses we might say: clauses were first juxtaposed by means of the topic marker *ha* or the interjective marker *wo*, to express a connection between two denoted events, as in the above examples from *Manyôshû*. This manner of connecting two clauses by a topic or interjective marker was extended to *no*-headed relative clause lookalikes, as seen in Ishigaki's Senmyau examples. Head internal relative clauses, and perhaps even genuine *no* relative clauses, did not appear before the Heian period, as Ishigaki's comment mentioned above suggests.¹⁴ We might say that the stage had been set and well prepared by the Nara period for the emergence of head internal relative clauses at the beginning of the Heian period, once the Forced Agreement parameter was reset to the opposite value.

Finally, examples like those from *Manyôshû* given above might at first appear to provide evidence against the claim that head internal relative clauses did not exist in Old Japanese, but I have argued against this conclusion. Once this counterargument is accepted, however, these

¹⁴There is, however, one example that may be taken as an exception to this statement. M3752 contains a phrase *haru no hi no uraganasaki ni*: if one take *ni* as the temporal postposition 'at, on', one can interpret the phrase as a *no* relative clause with the head *haru no hi* 'on a sad spring day'. But *ni* following a *rentai* predicate can also suggest a vague connection of two events; thus one can take it as an adverbial clause 'a spring day being sad, ..' Examples like this deserve special attention, as they might have served as an origin of the more prevalent use of *no* relatives. This example has also been brought to my attention by Janick Wrona.

examples of lookalikes from *Manyôshû* could, in an ironical way, be turned into data favorable for the position that head internal relative clauses did not exist in Old Japanese. For one might think that short poems, the main source of the Old Japanese data, would be a disadvantageous vehicle for head internal relative clauses; head internal relative clauses seem to have particularly thrived in the stylistic environment provided by the *Heian* prose literature that favored rather convoluted syntax; poems are too short to accommodate head internal relative clauses. But lookalike examples like those shown above from *Manyôshû* would suggest that there is no reason why *Manyô* poets would not have exploited head internal relative clauses, had they existed for their disposal.

4. Conclusion

I have argued for the Agreement Hypothesis for Old Japanese:

[1] Old Japanese was a Forced Agreement language.

I have claimed that this hypothesis accounts for the claims/generalizations [2]-[6]:

[2] Subjects in *shûshi* clauses must be Case-marked as bare DPs.

[3] Subjects (external arguments) in *rentai* clauses cannot be bare unless they are at the same time topics; they must be genitive and marked by *ga/no*.

[4] Objects must Case-marked by verbs as bare DPs.

[5] *Kakari musubi* focus phrases, in particular *ka-wh*-phrases, move to Spec(I).

[6] Head internal relative clauses did not exist.

[2] is a restatement of a classically well-known fact. [3] derives from the following generalizations ([7], [8]) that I have drawn and the claim [9] that I have made on the basis of [2] and [8]:

[7] The subject of a relative clause with a transitive verb was marked by *ga/no*.

[8] The unmarked argument of an intransitive predicate in a *rentai* clause is either bare or genitive and marked by *ga/no*.

[9] The Case system is an UNMARKED, arche-Case system, a system that transcends the accusative-ergative distinction.

[4] is dependent on [10], which is a refined restatement of the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization.

[10] *Wo* phrases must move and adjoin to CP, IP or VP

I assume that if a *wo* phrase functions as a direct object, it is Case marked (in the status of a bare DP) by a transitive verb *in situ* and moves out of VP due to *wo*. [5] is a restatement of Nomura's generalization. [6] is a fact reported by Kondô.

I presume that the Agreement parameter setting had changed to the opposite value by the time the Heian prose literature flourished. *Kakari* movement was lost in the Heian period; see Watanabe (2002b,2003). Head internal relative clauses were abundantly documented in the Heian literature; see Kitayama (1951), Kuroda (1974). I am not in a position to make definite and precise statements on the fate of Case marking. However, it would seem fair to assume that the Kinsui-Yanagida generalization was lost, perhaps, early in the Heian period.¹⁵ This indicates that *wo* started functioning as a case marker as well. As *wo* became an alternative for object marking, the unmarked case system must have settled to an accusative system. For the subject marking, the choice between bare and *ga/no* marked DPs depended on the finite/non-finite distinction encoded in the *shûshi/rentai* contrast in Old Japanese. This distinction started to collapse during the late Heian period. Perhaps *ga/no* subjects did not become alternative subject marker in finite clauses before this collapse. But this later shift does not contradict the hypothesis that the Agreement parameter had already switched to Non-Forced earlier in the Heian period; the parameter switch prepared a way for the emergence of an alternative, morphological subject marking.

What triggered the parameter switch is a question I have to leave open for future studies.

¹⁵On the basis of Yanagida, personal communication, October, 2004.

Watanabe (2003:551) proposes that "learnability considerations hold the key" for why wh-movement was lost. He hypothesizes that the increase in subject topicalization deprived children of the crucial word order cue for wh-movement. I am concerned with a parameter resetting, not the change in a single grammatical process. However, it is, I assume, not necessarily the case that all the grammatical processes that are controlled by a parameter must undergo changes together simultaneously. A parameter value represents a stable state. Circumstantial and contingent factors could drive one or more grammatical processes to undergo changes of their own; before the parameter is reset such changes could instead trigger other changes and drive the language to converge to a stable state. I earlier indicated that favorable environments already existed in Old Japanese for the emergence of head internal relative clauses. Much empirical research would be needed before we understand how Old Japanese transformed into a Non-Forced Agreement language.

Appendix. *Kakari Musubi*

A.1. Predicate Conjugation

Japanese verbs and adjectives are traditionally described as taking one of the five forms, *mi-zen* 'pre-*realis*' or 'irrealis', *ren-yô* 'ad-predicative', *shûshi* 'conclusive', *ren-tai* 'ad nominal' and *i-zen* 'post-*realis*' or 'presuppositional/conditional'. A clause ends in a predicate complex, consisting of a verb or adjective stem with or without one or more enclitic predicate stems. The last predicate stem determines the conjugation form of the predicate complex. The predicate complex may further be suffixed with an enclitic particle. The enclitic suffix, if there is any, selects the conjugation form of the predicate complex. The syntactic context determines the conjugation form of the word. For example, the main clause, in the default case, ends in a predicate complex in the *shûshi* form.

A.2. *Kakari musubi* in the narrower sense

The *kakari* particles drew particular attention of Japanese grammarians because they are responsible for making exceptions to this default rule for terminating a main clause. Instead, the rule of *kakari-musubi* intervenes: if a main clause contains an argument or adjunct with one of

the emphatic particles *so/zo* and *nam* or with the interrogative *ya* or *ka*, it terminates with a predicate complex in the *rentai* form; on the other hand, if a sentence contains an argument or adjunct with the emphatic/selective *koso*, it terminates in a predicate-complex in the *izen* form. We might call *kakari-musubi* 'suspense and resolution'; a *kakari* particle introduces a suspense and it is resolved by a non-*shûshi* form of a predicate.

A.3. *Kakari musubi* in the wider sense: MOTOORI Norinaga

Exactly speaking, however, this is a description of *kakari-musubi* in a narrower and commonly understood sense of the term. In more specific contexts of Japanese linguistic scholarship, the term may be understood more widely, including cases in which sentences terminate with a predicate complex in the *shûshi* form; in this wider sense, as conceived by MOTOORI Norinaga, the great philologist of the 18th century, *kakari-musubi* specifies the ways sentences are terminated in general depending on what constituents they contain. Thus, sentences in general are conceived of containing arguments with special particles that determine how the sentences end. The particle that determines the form of the predicate complex is a *kakari* and the predicate complex that is selected by the *kakari* is a *musubi*. Norinaga noted, for example, that the particle *wa*, among others, terminates a sentence in the *shûshi* form. As Mizutani (1974:23ff) pointed out, Norinaga even introduced in his theory of *kakari musubi* an empty category *tada* 'plain' as a *kakari*, in order to account for cases where bare subjects must be taken as selecting the forms of predicate complexes.

A.4. *Kakari joshi* 'kakari particle' in the modern sense: a residue of Norinaga's thought

Norinaga's theory of *kakari musubi* was not understood and did not properly influence modern Japanese scholarship; see Mizutani (1974) on this point. However, it indirectly influenced how the term *kakari-joshi* is used. *Kakari joshi* could be defined formally and narrowly, as those that trigger *kakari musubi* in the narrow sense. The term is commonly extended to cover those particles that are not original *kakari* particles but that share certain syntactic properties with them. The *kakari* particle, in the narrow sense, have a functional characteristic in common: they mark focused constituents; they hence also share certain syntactic characteristics. After the

demise of *kakari musubi* in the late Classical Japanese period, the *kakari* particles survived with this function and were joined by new particles with similar functions. As a matter of fact, the old *kakari* particles that participated in the classical *kakari musubi*, except for *koso*, eventually fell out of this category of particles. But the term *kakari joshi* is used even by scholars of Modern Japanese to refer to FOCUS particles such as *sae*, *dake*. We do not have to be concerned with Norinaga's theory of *kakari musubi* for our present purposes, but this so to speak anachronistic use of the term *kakari joshi* is not irrelevant to the study of Modern Japanese.

A.5. The aftermath of the *kakari musubi*

The *kakari musubi* scheme started to collapse during the era of Classical Japanese. We must note that, as I account for it in section 3.4, *kakari musubi* is not to be taken as a singular process. We need to factor it out in two processes and to trace the aftermath of *kakari musubi* in two lines separately.

A *kakari* particle, for example, *ka*, is selected by the *rentai* Comp as an Infl. A focused argument or adjunct moves to Spec(I). The phrase structure is linearised so that the *kakari* particle, which is enclitic, might be adjacent to the focused constituent and eventually be attached to it. Thus, two processes are separated at the observational level: the focus movement and the particle attachment.

The demise of *kakari musubi* is commonly understood as the disappearance of clause-final predicates in the *rentai* and *izen* forms. Another relevant fact is that the morphological distinction between the *shûshi* and *rentai* forms all but started to disappear during the Heian period. Besides there is another relevant factor that has not been paid attention to until recently: the obligatory focus movement and its loss before or early in the Heian period. It is plausible to assume that these changes were related, one change contributing to causing others. But this is not the place to engage ourselves in speculating on the question of which started what and how. What is relevant to our immediate concern is the effect of the loss of obligatory focus movement.

In my account, obligatory focus movement and a proper linearisation of Infl made it possible for an enclitic *kakari* particle, for example, *ka*, to attach to the lexical category and make a phonological word. But if focus movement is not obligatory, the actualization of this

morpho-phonological process is not assured. Two alternatives are conceivable to rescue relevant derivations from crashing.

First of all, the grammar may let *kakari* particles stay *in situ* at Infl and eventually attach to the clause-final predicates with a proper linearization and make phonological words. The attachment to a predicate is in effect what happened in Old Japanese when the clause did not contain a focused element and a *kakari* particle functioned as a *shû-joshi* 'clause-final particle'. Then, understanding a particular constituent as a focus is a matter of interpretation, perhaps aided by prosody, but not a matter of overt syntax.

Secondly, the grammar may let *kakari* particles somehow DESCEND DOWNWARD AND ATTACH to the focused constituents, which remain *in situ*. Downward attachment can be taken as an actualization of Agreement between a *kakari* particle and a focused constituent.

Before proceeding further, let me at this point clarify what were and what have been members of the class of *kakari* particles. As I have mentioned earlier, the particles that participated in *kakari musubi* in Old Japanese have all disappeared from the language except for *ka*. Furthermore, though *kakari* particles as a class have survived as a class, *ka* has not stayed in the class. New comers such as *sae* have been added to the class and sustained it. Besides, there are two that are usually taken as *kakari joshi* but that did not participate in *kakari musubi* in the narrow sense and have survived inside the class to the modern day: *ha/wa* and *mo*.

With this background, let us return to the discussion of the aftermath of *kakari musubi* and consider the second alternative above with the Agreement parameter set as Non-Forced, as in Modern Japanese. Since Agreement is not forced, a *kakari* particle may stay at clause final position (with the understanding of the clause being left to interpretation) or may descend and attach to a focused element. This is exactly what I assumed for the account of the syntax of *kakari* particles in Kuroda (1965) by means of transformations I called ATTACHMENT transformations, with the caveat that if a particle does not descend, it must eventually be attached to verb stem to make a phonological word; a light verb *suru* must be inserted to carry tense and

modal morphemes.¹⁶ Whether one takes it as theoretically viable or not, this description gives a convenient frame of reference as a correct description of the aftermath, if it is, of *kakari musubi* in Modern Japanese.

Let me return to Old Japanese. As I have mentioned above, *ha/wa* and *mo* are commonly put in the class of *kakari joshi*. Of these, *ha* was not used as a sentence final particle, nor was it attached to indeterminate phrases. In contrast, *mo* shares with *ka* two distinctive properties: (i) it can be at sentence final position; (ii) it can be attached to indeterminate phrases. I also stated above that *mo* as well as *ha* did not participate in *kakari musubi*. By saying this, however, I had in mind the traditional characterisation of *kakari musubi*: resolving the *kakari* in the *rentai* or *izen* form. Clauses containing *mo* phrases do not have such *musubi* restrictions. Nor did *mo* as a sentence final particle take the *rentai* form of a predicate as *ka* did. But now we know another characteristic property of *kakari musubi*. The *kakari* phrase must move out of VP. Did *mo* phrases also move? To wit, does Nomura's generalization extend to *mo* phrases? I am not in a position to answer this question one way or other

References

- Harada, S. I. 1973. 'Remarks on relativization'. *Annual Bulletin Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics* 8.133-144. Reprinted in Harada 2000, pp.237-248.
- Harada, S.-I. 2000. *Shintakkusu to Imi*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Ishigaki, Kenji. 1942. 'Sayôsei yôgen hanpatsu no hôsoku'. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku*.
- Ishigaki, Kenji. 1959 *Joshi no Rekishiteki Kenkyû*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Kinsui, Satoshi. 2002. 'On the nominative and accusative case markers in *Manyôshû*.' Handout.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa and Masanori Deguchi. 2002. Prosody in syntactic analysis. Ms. Indiana University.
- Kitayama, Keita. 1951. *Genji Monogatari no gohō*. Tokyo: Tōkō Shoin.

¹⁶ I used the term *huku-joshi* in Kuroda (1965) instead of *kakari joshi*, following the then standard Hashimoto grammar. Incidentally, downward movement was generally abhorred in the transformational grammar, perhaps one reason why the attachment transformation has not been accepted by the mainstream generative grammar. In the minimalist approach, however, a descriptive equivalent of the attachment transformation could be accommodated in the form of upward movement.

- Kôji, Kazuteru. 1980. *Manyôshû Joshi no Kenkyû*, Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Konoshima, Masatoshi. 1966. *Kokugo Joshi no Kenkyû : Joshishi no Sobyô*. Tokyo: Ôfûsha.
- Kondô, Yasuhiro. 1981. 'Chûko-go no rentai kôzô nitsuite'. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku*.
- Kondô, Yasuhiro. 2000. *Nihon-go Kijutsu Bunpô no Riron*. Kasugabe: Hitsuji Shohô.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973a. *Nihon Bunpô Kenkû*. Tokyo: Taishûkan.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973b. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1974. 'Pivot-independent relative clauses in Japanese, I'. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 3.59-93. Reprinted in Kuroda 1992, pp.118-145.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1986. '(D')Accord ou pas d'accord: Quelques idées générales concernant une grammaire comparative de l'anglais et du japonais'. Pierre Pica (Ed.) *Recherche Linguistique 14: Hommage à Mitsou Ronat*. Paris: Presse de l'Université de Paris VIII, pp. 189-206.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1988. 'Whether we agree or not: a comparative grammar of English and Japanese', in *Linguisticae Investigationes*. 12.2-44. Reprinted in W. Poser (Ed.) *Working Papers from the Second SDF Workshop in Japanese Syntax*, Stanford: CSLI, 1988, pp.103-144 and in Kuroda 1992, pp. 315-157.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1990. 'Shieki jodôshi no jiritsusei ni tsuite'. in Shigeru Tsuchida et al. (Eds.), *Bunpô to Imi no Aida*, Tokyo: Kurosio Shuppan, pp. 93-104.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1992. *Japanese Syntax and Semantics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1993. 'La syntaxe du causatif japonais et l'organisation de trois composantes syntaxiques de la grammaire', *Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes* 22, 75-93.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. Forthcoming. Prosody and the syntax of indeterminates. D. Rohers, O-H. Kim and Y. Kitgawa (Eds.). *Indiana University Working Papers in Linguistics-Syntax and Beyond*.
- Masunaga, Kiyoko. 1988. 'Case deletion and discourse context'. William J. Poser (Ed.), *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*. Stanford: CSLI, pp.145-192.
- Mizutani, Shizuo. 1974. *Kokugogaku Itsutsu no Hakken, Sai-hakken*. Tokyo: Sôbunsha.
- Nomura, Takashi. 1993. 'Jôdaigo no no to ga ni tsuite.' *Kokugo-Kokubun* 62.524-541.
- Ôno, Susumu. 1993. *Kakari Musubi no Kenkyû*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Saeki, Umetomo. 1963. *Manyô Gohô Kenkyû*. Tokyo: Yûhôtô.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1989. 'Scrambling as Semantically Vacuous A'-Movement'. In Mark Baltin and

- Anthony Kroch (Eds.) *Alternative Conceptions of Phrase Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sasaki, Takashi. 1992. *Nihongo no Kôbun to Hyôki*, Kasugabe: Hitsuji Shohô.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1993. 'Movement of wh-phase in Japanese'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11.655-678.
- Tonoike, Shigeo. 2002. 'Kodai Nihongo ni sahô wh idô wa atta ka', *Gengo* 31.3.86-91.
- Tonoike, Shigeo. 2004. Seisei Bunpô to *kakari musubi*. Handouts. Lectures at the University of Tokyo.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2001. 'Minimarisuto purogugamu nyûmon'. 6: Kodai Nihongo o miru', *Gengo* 30.6.98-95.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2002a. 'Nihongo ni okeru sahô wh idô saissetsu'. *Gengo* 31.8.78-81.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2002b. 'Loss of overt wh-movement in Old Japanese'. D. W. Lightfoot (Ed.) *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 179-195.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2003. 'Wh and operator constructions in Japanese', *Lingua* 113.519-558.
- Yanagida, Yuko. 2003. 'Obligatory movement and head parameter: evidence from early Old Japanese'. *Sophia Linguistica* 50.103-16.
- Yanagida, Yuko. 2004. Topic, focus and clause structure in early Old Japanese, ms. The University of Tsukuba.

Texts and Dictionaries

- Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei. Vol. 3. Kodai Kayô Shû. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. 1957.
- Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei. Vol. 4-7. Manyôshû. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. 1957-1962
- Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshû. Vol. 1. Kojiki, Jôdai Kayô. Tokyo: Shôgakkan. 1973.
- Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei Vol. 1-4. Manyôshû. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. 1999-2003.
- Jidaibetsu Kokugo Daijiten: Jôdai Hen. Tokyo: Sanseidô. 1977.
- Manyôshû Sôshakuin. Tokyo: Heibonsha. 1974.