1. Introduction
Unlike modern Japanese, which is a wh-in-situ language, old Japanese of the 8th century\(^1\) required dislocation of wh-phrases. Focused constituents such as wh-phrases preceded genitive subjects, though they generally followed constituents topicalized with the particle fa. The verb in the clause where the focused constituent takes scope appears with adnominal inflection (rentaikei). In (1), wh-phrases follow fa-marked topics.

(1) a. 吾勢枯波何所行良武 (MYS 43)
Wa=ga seko=fa iduku iku ra-mu?
l=Gen husband=Top where go Pres-Supp.Adnom
“(I wonder) where my husband is going?”

---

\(^1\) Old Japanese refers to Japanese no later than the 8th century. The primary source for 8th century Japanese, and the source of all examples used in this paper, is the poetry anthology Manyoshu. The examples in this paper are taken from Nakanishi (1978, 1980, 1981, 1983).
In (2), *wh*-phrases precede genitive subjects. Genitive case is marked with either *ga* or *no*. Note that the verbs in (1) and (2) take adnominal inflection. The conclusive (*shushikei*) and adnominal forms of the modal *–mu(0)*\(^2\) are identical, but the perfective auxiliary *tu* clearly shows the addition of the adnominal suffix *ru*.

(2) a. 何処従鹿 妹之 入来而

*Iduku=yu=ka imo=ga iriki-te*

*夢 所見鶴* (MYS 3117)

*yu me=ni mie-tu-ru?*

“From where did my wife come and appear in my dream?”

b. 何物鴨 御狩人之 折而

*Nani=wo=kamo mikari=no fto=no ori-te*

*kazasa-mu?*

“What should the hunters pick and wear on their hair?”

Based on this word order pattern, Watanabe (2002, 2005) proposes that old Japanese had a type of *wh*-movement which raised *wh*-phrases to a focus position above TP.

(3)  High Focus Movement

\[
\text{[TopP XP\text{Top} [Foc YP_{wh} [TP DP_{Gen} \ldots]]]}
\]

In this paper I argue against the high movement analysis in (3) in favor of the clause-internal movement analysis in (4). According to this proposal, old Japanese *wh*-questions were formed via short movement of the *wh*-constituent to a focus position between T and *vP*.

(4)  Low Focus Movement

\[
\text{[TopP XP\text{Top} [TP DP_{Nom} [FocP YP_{wh} [\phi DP_{Gen} \ldots]]]]}
\]

\(^2\) *-mo* is the eastern dialect pronunciation of *–mu*. 
...
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Recall from Section 1 that subjects in old Japanese wh-questions can appear with genitive case. Recall further that the verb in these constructions is required to be in the adnominal form. For example, the perfective auxiliary た in (2a) takes the adnominal suffix -ru. When this auxiliary appears in a declarative root clause, the adnominal suffix -ru is absent, as in (7a). -ru does appear when the auxiliary affixes to the main verb of a relative clause, as in (7b).

Recall from Section 1 that subjects in old Japanese wh-questions can appear with genitive case. Recall further that the verb in these constructions is required to be in the adnominal form. For example, the perfective auxiliary た in (2a) takes the adnominal suffix -ru. When this auxiliary appears in a declarative root clause, the adnominal suffix -ru is absent, as in (7a). -ru does appear when the auxiliary affixes to the main verb of a relative clause, as in (7b).

Recall from Section 1 that subjects in old Japanese wh-questions can appear with genitive case. Recall further that the verb in these constructions is required to be in the adnominal form. For example, the perfective auxiliary た in (2a) takes the adnominal suffix -ru. When this auxiliary appears in a declarative root clause, the adnominal suffix -ru is absent, as in (7a). -ru does appear when the auxiliary affixes to the main verb of a relative clause, as in (7b).

Recall from Section 1 that subjects in old Japanese wh-questions can appear with genitive case. Recall further that the verb in these constructions is required to be in the adnominal form. For example, the perfective auxiliary た in (2a) takes the adnominal suffix -ru. When this auxiliary appears in a declarative root clause, the adnominal suffix -ru is absent, as in (7a). -ru does appear when the auxiliary affixes to the main verb of a relative clause, as in (7b).
subjects and their adnominal verbs to a broader prohibition on the appearance of topics in nominal constituents.

The requirement that verbs in wh-questions take the adnominal inflection is one instantiation of the broader phenomenon of kakari-musubi. When a focused constituent appears in the clause, the verb must take an inflection other than the conclusive form. Most commonly, verbal inflection in kakari-musubi is the adnominal form. Whitman (1997) analyzes this pattern as a type of cleft construction, again suggesting a parallel with embedded nominalizations.

In sum, the preceding discussion leads to the conclusion that the genitive case particles ga or no appear only on subjects of embedded, typically nominalized, clauses and do not mark subjects of finite root clauses. Therefore, there is no reason to assume that they are structural nominative case-markers. This is consistent with Hashimoto’s (1969) characterization of the basic function of no and ga as being nominal modifiers. Yamada (1954) classifies no as marking nominal modifiers and ga as indicating possession. Nomura (1993) classifies no and ga as marking a more general category of modifier, which he terms ‘primitive modifier’. The general category is posited in order to include subjects of embedded clauses ending with the conjunctive inflection, as in (6b). Nomura does not question the nominal character or adnominal clauses such as relative clauses or wh-questions.

This brings us to the question of how nominative case was marked in old Japanese. Untopicalized, unfocalized nominative subjects in root contexts were simply bare, appearing with no morphological case-marker.

Although there is no foundation for the claim that genitive subjects have nominative case and reside in [Spec, TP], ga and no are, however, amenable to an analysis in which they mark inherent case assigned to a possessor of DP or subject of a nonfinite or nominalized clause located in its base position in [Spec, vP]. This is the position taken by Yanagida (2006) in her analysis of the word order alternation between bare and wo-marked objects. Bare objects located between the genitive subject and the verb are interpreted as nonspecific, while

---

3 The focused constituent also generally occurs with a focus particle of some sort. Ka is one of these particles and attaches to interrogative constituents like wh-phrases.
objects marked with the accusative particle *wo* receive a presuppositional interpretation and must precede genitive subjects.

(9) a. 之加乃白水郎之焼塩煙
(MYS 1246)
*Sika-no ama-no sifo yaku keburi*
Sika-Gen fishermen-Subj salt burn smoke
“the smoky hazy rising when fishermen of Sika burn salt”

b. 蜻野叫人之懸者
(MYS 1405)
*Akidu no-wo fito-no kakure-ba*
Akidu field-Obj man-Subj speak.of-when
“When a man speaks of the moorland of Akidu…”

Assuming that this is a type of object shift, the specific objects move to the outer specifier of *vP* and are mapped to the restrictive clause (as per Diesing’s 1992 Mapping Hypothesis), while nonspecific objects remain in *VP* and undergo Existential Closure. The genitive subject remains in its base position in [Spec, *vP*].

(10) \[ CP \[ vP DP=\[ vP'=\[ DP=\{ ga/no [vP …\}]]]]\]

Yanagida (2005) supports the claim that genitive case is not structural nominative by pointing out that there are no derived subjects with genitive case in old Japanese. These are either bare or marked with a discourse particle.

The point of this discussion in this section with regard to *wh*-fronting is that if genitive subjects remain in *vP*, then *wh*-movement can target a position above *vP* but need not leave *TP*. The next two sections offer evidence based on movement constraints that *wh*-movement must target the low focus projection.

3. Material Preceding *Wh*-phrases

The proposal that *wh*-fronting targets a position below *T* predicts that *wh*-phrases can be preceded by constituents other than topics. Indeed this is the case, as will be shown in this section. The crucial point illustrated here is that constraints on movement can only be satisfied by positing *wh*-movement to the lower focus projection.

3.1. Topics and Scrambling

(11) shows that a *wh*-constituent can follow nominative subjects and temporal adverbials. A natural analysis here is that the adverbs are adjoined to *TP*, while the subjects are topicalized to their left. This would place the *wh*-phrases in the *TP*-internal focus position.
(11) a. 保登等芸須  都奇 多都 麻泥爾  奈仁加  
Fototogisu  [tuki  tatu  made=ni]  nani=ka  
Cuckoo.Nom  moon  rise  before=Dat  why=Q  
吉奈可奴  ki-naka-nu  
come=sing-Neg  
"Why does the cuckoo not come to sing before the moon rises?"

b. 吾 背子 奥裳 何如 荒海藻  
Wa=ga  seko  oku=mo  ika=ni  ara-me  ?  
I=Gen  husband.Nom  future=Foc  how=Dat  become-Supp  
“What will become of my husband in the future?”  (MYS 659)

(12) shows *wh*-phrases following a scrambled object, accusative in (12a) and 
dative in (12b).

(12)a. 世間乎 何物爾 将譬  
Yononaka=wo  nani=ni  tatofe-mu  ?  
life=Acc  what=Dat  compare-Supp  
“To what should I compare this life?”  (MYS 351)

b. 島 御橋爾 誰加 住舞無  
[Sima=no  mi-hasi]=ni  tare=ka  suma-fa-mu  ?  
island=Gen  Hon-step=Loc  who=Q  live-continue-Supp  
“(I wonder) who continues to live at the steps of the island palace?”  (MYS 187)

In (13), the *wh*-phrases follow both a scrambled object and an adverb.

(13)a. 和備西 物尾 中中荷  
[Wabi-nisi  mono]=wo  nakanakani  
Worry-Past  thing=Acc  half-heartedly  
奈何 辛苦 相見始兼  
nani=ka  kurusiku  afimi-some-ke-mu  .  
how=Q  reluctantly  meet-begin-Past-Supp  
“How could (I) have begun to meet the one I once had so much concern 
for?”  (MYS 750)

b. 都祢 斯良農 道乃 長手袁 久礼久礼等  
[Tune  sira-nu  miti=ni  nagate]=wo  kurekureto  
normally  know-Neg  road=Gen  journey=Acc  in.dark  
伊可爾可 由迦牟  
ika=ni=ka  yka-mu  ?  
how=Dat=Q  go-Supp  
“How should I proceed in the dark on a journey on a road I normally do 
not know?”  (MYS 888)
On the standard approach that scrambling is either adjunction to TP (Saito 1989, 1992, 2003, 2005; Miyagawa 1997; Yatsushiro 2003; others) or movement to [Spec, TP] (McGinnis 1999; Miyagawa 2001, 2003, 2005), we can say that the scrambled object marks the left edge of TP. Consequently, a *wh-*phrase following a scrambled object must be located internal to the TP.

However, it is also possible to analyze all the constituents preceding the *wh-*phrases in (11)-(13) as topics, since topics were not required to be marked with the topic particle *fa* in 8th century Japanese. Where two moved constituents precede the *wh-*phrase, as in (13), we could assume that these two XPs occupy multiple specifiers of a high topic projection.

(14) \[ T_{Top} \, DP=\textit{kawo} \, [T_{Top} \, XP_{Adv} \, [FocP \, XP_{wh} \, [TP \ldots ]]] \] (13a & b)

On the other hand, if we are to posit movement to multiple specifiers of a single functional head to check the same [Top] feature, then we also expect to find Minimality or superiority restrictions. In other words, the prediction is that the order within TP should be preserved in the C domain. The expected order does occur, as shown in (15). Here, the subject is followed by a scrambled dative argument, which in turn is followed by a *wh-*phrase.

(15) \[ \text{神名火乃 斑瀬之 社之 鳥公鳥} \]
\[ \text{[TopP [kamunabinoifase=mo no mori=mo fototogisu],} \]
\[ \text{Kamunabi Ihase=Gen forest=Gen cuckoo} \]
\[ \text{毛無乃 岳爾 何時 来将鳴} \]
\[ \text{[TopP [kenasi=mo oka=ni],} \]
\[ \text{itu [TP tlj wh tj ki-naka-mu]]} \]
\[ \text{baren=Gen hill=Dat when come-sing-Supp} \]
\[ \text{“When will the cuckoo of Kamunabi Ihase forest come to the baren hill to sing?”} \]
\[ \text{(MYS 1466)} \]

However, the other order is also attested. In other words, it is possible for the dative object to appear first, followed by the subject, followed finally by the *wh-*phrase.

(16) \[ \text{朝霞 棚引 野邊} \]
\[ \text{[Asagasumi tanabiku nofe=ni],} \]
\[ \text{morning.mist hang field=Dat} \]
\[ \text{足檜木乃山 鳥公鳥} \]
\[ \text{[asifikinoyama fototogisu],} \]
\[ \text{mountain cuckoo} \]
when = Q come-sing-Supp

“When will the mountain cuckoo come to the mist-hung field to sing?”

If this is analyzed as movement to multiple specifiers of TopP, then (16) violates Minimality. This is because the internal argument would have to be attracted first and raised over the subject.

(17) a. \([\text{TopP } \text{DPSubj}] [\text{TopP } \text{DPDat/Acc} [\text{FocP } \text{XPwh}] [\text{TP} \ldots ]]\) (=15)
   b. *\([\text{TopP } \text{DPDat/Acc} [\text{TopP } \text{DPSubj} [\text{FocP } \text{XPwh}] [\text{TP} \ldots ]]\) (=16)

(15) and (16) present no difficulties for the short wh-motion analysis. If we analyze the dative argument as scrambled to the edge of TP in both cases, then we can place the subject in a topic position in (15) and leave the subject in [Spec, TP] in (16). No Minimality restrictions are expected, since the features driving the relevant movements are different. In (15), the subject checks a topic feature, while the dative argument is scrambled. In (16), the dative argument is scrambled, but the subject remains in [Spec, TP]. In both cases, the wh-phrase moves to the low focus projection to check a focus feature.

(18) a. \([\text{TopP } \text{DPSubj} [\text{TP } \text{DPDat} [\text{TP } \text{tSubj} [\text{FocP } \text{XPwh} [\text{TP} \ldots ]]]]]\) (=15)
   b. \([\text{TP } \text{DPDat} [\text{TP } \text{DPSubj} [\text{FocP } \text{XPwh} [\text{TP} \ldots ]]]]\) (=16)

3.2. Multiple Foci

This subsection confirms the conclusion of Section 3.1 that material preceding a wh-phrase constitutes evidence for the low movement analysis. The crucial piece of evidence in this subsection is the position of the interrogative particle ka in clauses with multiple foci. Up to this point in the paper, I have not differentiated between wh-phrases with ka and those without ka, assuming instead a uniform analysis of wh-motion. Furthermore, the purpose of the preceding sections has been to demonstrate that wh-constituents do not reside in a position external to TP, and the evidence so far suggests that this is true for wh-phrases with and without ka. However, the presence of ka is crucially relevant when two interrogative constituents appear in a single clause.

Before examining the data, let me first clarify one point regarding Watanabe’s high movement analysis. Watanabe’s proposal, which is based on an earlier observation by Nomura (1993), makes specific reference to ka-marked wh-phrases: ka-marked constituents generally follow fu-marked topics and precede genitive subjects.

(19) Nomura’s Generalization

\(\text{XP}_{fu} \ldots \text{YP}_{ka} \ldots \text{DP}_{Gen} \ldots \text{V}_{Adnom}\)
I have found no examples of bare wh-phrases violating this generalization, but since Watanabe makes specific reference to Nomura’s Generalization, I address the position of ka-constituents in this subsection. What we find is that the position of ka in clauses with multiple foci argues strongly against Watanabe’s high movement analysis. Let us examine the multiple question in (20). The embedded verb has been elided. But it is clear that this is an interrogative construction, since ka appears in the clause. What is important for the discussion at hand, though, is the fact that ka appears with the lower of the two wh-words and not with the higher one. The high movement analysis would require that the ka-marked constituent move to [Spec, FocP] in the C domain. However, such an analysis cannot account for (20). It might be possible to posit that the first wh-word has moved to this position but not the one with ka. Note that we cannot analyze (20) as involving multiple wh-movement to the high focus projection. This is because of the adverb koyohi, which is part of the presupposition of the clause but intervenes between the two wh-words.

(20) 吾思君者何处今夜誰与可
Wa=ga omofu kimi=fa [idukufe=ni koyofi tare=to=ka]
I=Gen long.for you=Top where=Dat tonight who=with=Q

“[I long for you, but though I wait you do not come. (I wonder) where you are tonight and with who.]”

Therefore, we are forced to analyze the lower, ka-marked wh-phrase as residing in the lower focus projection. (21) shows the low focus movement analysis of (20). The lower wh-phrase has moved to the clause-internal focus position. The subject is a null pronominal. The adverb is adjoined to TP, and the higher wh-word resides in the focus position above TP.

(21) [CP [FocP idukuhe=ni [TP koyohi [TP pro [FocP tare=to=ka [v…]]]]]]

This analysis of multiple foci located in different focus positions is confirmed by a second example in which a wh-phrase precedes a focused VP. Once again, ka appears on the lower focused constituent.
(22) Fototogisu [idufe=no yama=wo naki=ka koyura-mu?]
cuckoo which=Gen mountain=Acc sing=Q cross-Supp
“Which mountain is the cuckoo singing as he crosses?” (MYS 4195)

Note that the two focused constituents cannot be analyzed as a single constituent. The wh-phrase is the object of main verb, not an argument of the VP adjunct. The matrix subject is the sole argument of the adjunct VP. Therefore, the most natural analysis places the wh-word in the high focus position and the ka-marked constituent in the TP-internal focus position.

(23) [TopP [Fototogisu], [FocP [idufe=no yama=wo]]
[TP [ei naki=ka] [vP [tj koyura-mu]]]]

In this section, I have provided evidence based on material which can precede a ka-marked constituent against the high focus movement approach proposed by Watanabe (2002, 2005). When two or more constituents precede a wh-phrase, Minimality need not be observed, indicating that these must have access to separate functional projections above TP, which eliminates the availability of the high focus projection for wh-movement in some cases. Secondly, when two focused constituents appear in a clause, it is the lower one which appears with the interrogative particle ka, indicating that it must be the lower focus projection which is associated with this constituent.

At this point, however, it must be said that the low focus movement analysis begs the question of the motivation for wh-movement, since TP-internal movement does not place the wh-in the interrogative scope position in the C domain. On the other hand, what I propose in the following section is that this is merely one more way in which old Japanese wh-movement is unlike canonical wh-movement in languages like English.

4. Wh-words as Indefinites
In the discussion so far, I have shown that old Japanese had wh-fronting to a low focus position inside TP. The low landing site has an interesting theoretical consequence. Since this movement did not serve to place the wh-constituent in its interrogative scope position in the C domain, the motivation for wh-movement in old Japanese could not have been to check an interrogative feature on C. Rather, I propose that the interrogative interpretation was obtained via unselective binding by interrogative C and that wh-words in old Japanese were indefinites and not quantificational operators.

First, let me spell out the finer points of focus movement in old Japanese wh-questions. Yanagida (2005) and Whitman (2001) have argued that old Japanese kakari-musubi constructions are sensitive to subjacency. A wh-word can be located inside an island, but the ka particle then must follow the island.
containing the wh-word. (24a) shows a wh-word inside an adjunct clause. (24b) is an example of a relative clause. Note that ka appears after both of the islands.

(24)a. 此時者 伊可爾 之都可
Kono toki=fa [YP ika=ni si-tutu]=ka
汝 代者 和多流
na=ga yo=fa wataru?
(K 892)
“At this time, you pass through this world doing what?”

b. 伊可爾 安良武 日能 等伎爾可母
[YP [i-ka-ni ara-mu] fi=no toki]=ni=kamo
許恵 之良武 比等能 比射乃 倍
[[kowe sira-mu] fto=no [fiza=no fe]]
和我 麻久良可武
wa=ga makuraka-mu?
(K 810)
“On the day which will be like what will I rest my head on the knee of someone who understands me?”

This fact that ka follows the island suggests that the entire island is pied-piped to its landing site, along the lines of Nishigauchi (1990, 1999). This is essentially what Yanagida (2005) and Whitman (2001) propose. However, both Yanagida and Whitman assume that this movement targets the left periphery of the clause, a proposal which I have argued to be untenable. Therefore, I adopt their pied-piping analysis with the caveat that the movement targets the TP-internal focus position.

Moving on to the nature of old Japanese wh-words, it is important to observe that wh-movement did not take place within islands. In Nishigauchi’s (1990, 1999) analysis of modern Japanese wh-in-situ, when a wh-word occurs inside an island like a relative clause, the wh-word first undergoes covert movement to [Spec, CP] in the island. It’s [wh] feature is then percolated to the edge of the island, which then induces covert pied-piping of the entire island to the interrogative [Spec, CP].

(25) [TP [FocP [YP ... [VP DPGen ... XPwh...]] ka] [VP ...tYP...]]

(26)a. Kimi=wa [DP [CP nani=o katta] hito]=ni atta no?
you=Top what=Acc bought person=Dat met Q
“You met a person who bought what?”
However, \textit{wh}-movement is not observed inside islands in old Japanese. This is clearly shown in (27), where the \textit{wh}-constituent follows a genitive subject inside the island. The fact that a \textit{wh}-phrase follows a genitive subject in (27) clearly indicates that \textit{wh}-movement could not have taken place inside the island itself.

(27)

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] 福 何 有 人 香 黒 髪之
\[ \text{fortune=Gen how be person=Q black hair=Gen} \]
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[b.] 雁之 翅乃 覆羽之 何処 香
\[ \text{goose=Gen wing=Gen great.wing=Gen where leak-Conj=Q} \]
\end{itemize}

"A man who is how fortunate will hear his wife's voice until his black hair has turned white?" (MYS 1411)

"The frost has fallen, because what part of the great wings of the wild goose is leaking?" (MYS 2238)

The point here is that the lack of \textit{wh}-movement within islands makes it clear that old Japanese \textit{wh}-movement was not driven by the need to check \textit{[wh]} features, since \textit{wh}-words in islands are quite content to maintain a remote distance from the interrogative scope position. This is, of course, consistent with my proposal that old Japanese \textit{wh}-movement targets a TP-internal focus position and therefore is not motivated by a \textit{[wh]} feature in the C domain.

The question at this point concerns how the relationship between \textit{wh}-words and interrogative C is established. I propose that the mechanism is unselective binding. This is suggested first by the ability of \textit{wh}-words to appear in islands. Feature-checking under Agree would not be possible, since one or more phase boundaries intervene between the \textit{wh}-word and interrogative C. Additional support for the unselective binding approach comes from the more general behavior of \textit{wh}-words as variables. (28) shows old Japanese \textit{wh}-indefinites functioning as negative polarity items.
In this paper, I have proposed that old Japanese wh-movement targeted a focus position between T and vP. The motivation for this movement is a strong focus feature and not a [wh] feature. The interrogative interpretation is obtained through unselective binding by C. This is unsurprising, given that clause-internal wh-movement does not place the wh-word in the interrogative scope position in the left periphery. The unselective binding analysis is further supported by independent evidence that old Japanese wh-words are indefinites.

\[
(29) \quad [\text{CP} \ C_{wh} \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{FocP} \ [vP \ \ldots \ XP_{wh}\ldots \ k\alpha] \ [\text{XP} \ \ldots \text{tV} \ \ldots]]]]
\]

This analysis, which has been substantiated by the discussion in this paper, makes it clear that dislocation of old Japanese wh-words was of a fundamentally different type from that proposed by Watanabe (2002, 2005).
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