1. Introduction

This paper proposes an analysis of wh-movement in old Japanese of the 8th century, arguing that this was clause-internal movement to a focus projection between T and vP.

(1) Low Focus Movement (Current proposal)

\[
\text{TopP XP}_{\text{Top}} [\text{TP DP}_{\text{Subj}} [\text{Foc YP}_{\text{Foc/Wh}} [vP \ldots ]]]
\]

This proposal stands in contrast to that put forth by Watanabe (2002, 2005), which claims that this movement targeted a position external to TP.

(2) High Focus Movement (Watanabe 2002, 2005)

\[
\text{TopP XP}_{\text{Top}} [\text{Foc YP}_{\text{Foc/Wh}} [\text{TP DP}_{\text{Subj}} \ldots ]]
\]

Watanabe’s proposal is based primarily on data from the verse text Manyoshu, whose most recent poem dates from the mid-8th century. Watanabe (2005) supplements this position with examples from the Kojiki. The Kojiki is a prose chronicle, completed in the early 8th century. However, as I show below, evidence from the Kojiki cannot be taken at face value. This text was not written directly in Japanese but rather in a style of modified Chinese which is read in Japanese through a translation process. Therefore, in order to use this text as a primary source for Japanese linguistic study, it is necessary to first establish the principles governing this translation process.

In this paper, I present evidence from both the Manyoshu and the Kojiki which argues against Watanabe’s proposal of high wh-movement and in favor of short focus movement analysis. I first summarize Watanabe’s position, based on his data from the Manyoshu (section 2) and from the Kojiki (section 3). I show that the data, when viewed directly, appear to argue for a wh-in-situ analysis, which contradicts the evidence from the Manyoshu. In section 4, I then undertake an investigation of word order in the Kojiki and identify a general rule for the translation process between Japanese and the pseudo-Chinese of the text. I show that the translation process favors the short movement analysis over the high movement analysis. In section 5, I add support for the short movement analysis by showing that wh-questions in the Kojiki mirror the pattern exhibited by wh-questions in old Chinese, which can only be analyzed as clause-internal focus movement. In section 6, I provide corroborating evidence from the Manyoshu that old Japanese wh-movement must have targeted a clause-internal position and could not have moved above TP.

2. Evidence for High Focus Movement

Watanabe’s (2002, 2005) proposal is based on Nomura’s (1993) generalization regarding word order in the Manyoshu. Nomura shows that focused constituents like wh-phrases follow topics but precede subjects case-marked with no or ga.
Examples are shown in (4). In (4a), the subject following the \textit{wh}-phrase is marked with \textit{no}; in (4b) it is marked with \textit{ga}.

(4)a. 何物鴨 御狩人之折而 将揮頭
何をかも 御狩の人の折りて 挾頭さむ¹
\begin{center}
\text{Nani=wo=kamo} [\text{mikari=yo hito}=no \text{ori-te} \text{kazasa-mu}]
\end{center}
“What should the hikers pick and wear on their hair?”

b. 何処従鹿 妹之入来而 夢所見鶴
何処ゆか 妹が入り来て 夢に見えつる。
\begin{center}
\text{Izuku=yu=ka} \text{imo=ga iriki-te yume=ni mie-tsuru}?
\end{center}
“From where did my wife come and appear in my dream?”

This generalization forms the basis for Watanabe’s proposal in (2), that \textit{wh}-phrases move to a focus projection the topic position and TP.

3. \textit{Wh}-Questions in the \textit{Kojiki}

Watanabe (2005) draws additional examples from the \textit{Kojiki} to support his hypothesis. The \textit{Kojiki} is written in pseudo-Chinese (\textit{hentai kambun} 変体漢文), whose word order is a modified form of Chinese but (as I will argue in section 4) can be converted to Japanese through a simple translation process. In particular, VPs and PPs typically exhibit the Chinese head-complement word order pattern.

\begin{center}
\text{採 其 地 之 青菜} \hfill (Kojiki, Nintoku)
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\text{pick} \quad \text{[Dem place Gen vegetable]}
\end{center}

When the text is read, however, these elements are reversed, to yield Japanese complement-head order. Lexical items are also replaced by their Japanese equivalents, resulting in a Japanese prose text.

\[
\text{DP} \quad \text{V} \\
(7) \quad \text{そこの青菜を} \quad \text{つむ}\quad 2
\]

\[
\text{[soko=no awona]=wo tsumu} \quad \text{there=Gen vegetable=Acc pick}
\]

“pick the vegetables of that place”

Watanabe (2005) cites examples like the following to show that the position of the wh-phrases is higher than the subject.

\[
(9) \quad \text{何 由 汝 泣 伏？} \quad (\text{Kojiki, Ohokuninushi})
\]

\[
\text{what from you cry lie.down}
\]

“Why are you lying here crying?”

\[
=> \quad \text{何の由にか汝が泣き伏せる。}
\]

\[
\text{Nani=no yoshi=ni=ka na=ga naki-fuseru?} \quad \text{what=Gen reason=Dat=Foc 2s=Gen cry-lie.down}
\]

“Why are you lying here crying?”

However, Watanabe also lists examples in which the wh-phrase appears to occupy a low position in the structure. In (10a), the wh-phrase functions as a nominal predicate. It follows the topicalized subject but seems to occur in clause-final position, with the exception of the question particle to its right. Watanabe claims that this is not a counterexample to his proposal, since the wh-phrase follows only the topic. (10b), on the other hand, shows the nominal predicate wh-phrase following an overt copular verb. Watanabe suggests that exceptions of this type may be due to structural characteristics of copular constructions.

\[
(10)a. \quad \text{坐 其 神 腹 之 御子 何 子 與？} \quad (\text{Kojiki, Chuai})
\]

\[
[[\text{be.in Dem god belly}] \quad \text{Gen Hon.child} \quad \text{what child Q}]
\]

\[
2 \quad \text{The old Japanese readings are taken from the Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei (Iwanami). Translations are the author’s.}
\]
其の神の腹にます御子は、何づれの御子ぞや？

“What kind of child is the child which is in the god’s belly?”

b. 是 有 何 表 也？

“What sign is this?”

However, a more thorough examination of the text reveals additional examples in which the wh-phrase follows a lexical verb.

(11)a. 亦 使 何 神 之 吉？

“If we send which god will it be fortuitous?”

b. 令 副 誰 人 者 吉？

“If we have whom accompany him, will it be fortuitous?”

We might naively conclude from this that wh-questions in the Kojiki are cases of wh-in-situ. However, such a conclusion is not corroborated by evidence from the Manyoshu, which clearly shows that wh-phrases must be dislocated. Another possible conclusion would be to dismiss the data in the Kojiki as a mere imitation of Chinese. As I will show in section 5, middle Chinese was a wh-in-situ language, exhibiting a pattern of wh-questions roughly consistent with that found in the Kojiki.

However, I will pursue a different approach. Pseudo-Chinese is widely believed to encode more characteristics of Japanese syntax than Chinese. Therefore it would be premature to dismiss (10b) and (11) as mere imitations of Chinese. In the following section, I examine word order patterns, particularly verb positions, in the Kojiki and propose a principle for translating the pseudo-Chinese into Japanese. This translation principle in turn shows word order in wh-questions in the Kojiki to be consistent with a short focus movement analysis. This also suggests, naturally, that Watanabe’s high movement analysis is unlikely.
4. Verb Position in the Kojiki

This section proposes a process for deriving the pseudo-Chinese word order, particularly verb position, of the Kojiki. I reject Aldridge's (2001) proposal that verbs are in their base positions in VP and show rather that the verb can be as high as T. This suggests for post-verbal wh-constituents that they can be located in a focus projection immediately following the verb, which has raised to T.

4.1. Evidence for a Low Verb Position

As seen in the preceding section, verbs precede objects in monotransitive clauses in the Kojiki. However, word order in ditransitive clauses presents a surprising picture. In contrast to the classical Chinese order in which the verb precedes both of its objects, the verb is placed between its two objects in the Kojiki.

(12) Ditransitive word order

Chinese: V ACC PP (give something to someone)
V DAT ACC (give someone something)

Kojiki: ACC V DAT
DAT V ACC

(13) shows examples in which the direct object precedes the verb.

ACC V DAT

(13)a. 名 賜 曙立 王 (Kojiki, Suinin)
name give Aketatsu prince
=> 曙立の王に名を賜ひて、
Aketatsu=Gen prince=Dat name=Acc give-Conj
“(He) gave a name to Prince Aketatsu, and….”

b. 多 禄 給 其 老 女 (Kojiki, Oryaku)
many thing give Dem old woman
=> 多の禄を其の老女に給ひて、
many thing=Acc Dem old.woman=Dat give-Conj
“He gave many things to the old woman, and….”

In (14), the indirect object precedes the verb.

DAT V ACC

(14) 於 其 隼人 賜 大臣 位。
to Dem Hayabito give minister rank
=> 其の隼人に大臣位。
Sono Hayabito=ni daijin=no kurai=wo tamahi,
Dem Hayabito=Dat daijin=Gen rank=Acc give
“(He) gave the Hayabito the rank of ‘daijin’, ….”
Based primarily on this pattern, Aldridge (2001) proposes that verbs are located in the head position of VP in the *Kojiki*. The direct and indirect object DPs are merged in complement or specifier position of VP in either order, following Miyagawa’s (1997) analysis of short ‘scrambling’ that dative and accusative objects can be base merged in either order.

(15)

a.   
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{VP} \\
    \text{DP=Acc} \\
    \text{V'} \\
    \text{V} \\
    \text{DP=Dat} \\
    \end{array} \]

b.   
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{VP} \\
    \text{DP=Dat} \\
    \text{V'} \\
    \text{V} \\
    \text{DP=Acc} \\
    \end{array} \]

However, this presents an immediate problem for the analysis of *wh*-questions in which the *wh*-phrase follows the verb. If Aldridge (2001) is correct, then these *wh*-phrases would have to be analyzed as being in situ in VP.

(16)

a. 亦使何神之吉？ (Kojiki, Ashiwara)
    now \[ \text{V'} \text{send [what god]} \] Part fortuitous
    \=> 亦～いづれの神を使はせば吉けむ？
    Mata izure=no kami=wo tsukahase-ba yoke-mu?
    now which=Gen god=Acc send-Cond good-Mod
    “If we send which god will it be fortuitous?”

b. 是有何表也？ (Kojiki, Suinin)
    this \[ \text{V'} \text{be [what sign]} \] Decl
    “What sign is this?”
    \=> 是何の表にか有らむ。
    Kore nani=no shirushi=ni=ka ara-mu?
    this what=Gen sign=Dat=Foc be-Mod
    “What sign is this?”

4.2. Evidence for a Higher Verb Position

However, more extensive examination of the text suggests that the verb and its following object must be located outside of VP in certain contexts. Yanagida (2006) shows that definite objects in the *Manyoshu* are marked with *wo* and must raise out of VP. In contrast, nontopicalized bare objects remain in their base positions, adjacent to the verb.

**Object Position in the Manyoshu**

(17)  
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{DP_{no/ga}} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP_{wo}} \\
\text{DP_{no/ga}} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array} \]
(18a). *Shika-no ama-no sio yaku keburi* (MYS 1246)
Shika-Gen fishermen-Subj salt burn smoke
"the smoky hazy rising when fishermen of Shika burn salt"

b. *Akidu no-wo fito-no kakure-ba* (MYS 1405)
Akizu field-Obj man-Subj speak.of-when
"When a man speaks of the moorland of Akizu…"

Yanagida proposes that *wo*-marked objects raise to the edge of *vP*, where they receive a presuppositional interpretation, as per Diesing (1994). She shows additionally that *ga/no* (genitive)-marked subjects are licensed in their base positions in *vP* and do not raise to [Spec, TP].

(19) $[CP [_{vP} DP=wo [_{v} DP=ga/no [_{vP} ...]]]]$

The *Kojiki* contains numerous examples of definite objects which appear in post-verbal position in the pseudo-Chinese order of the text.

(20a). 天児屋命 布刀玉命 指出 其の鏡、 (Kojiki, Amaterasu)
A F [hold.out Dem mirror]
=> 天児屋命、布刀玉命、其の鏡を指し出して、
Amenokoyanenomikoto, Futodamanomikoto sono kagami=wo
A F Dem mirror=Acc
sashi-idashi-te,
hold-out-Conj
“Amenokoyanenomikoto and Futodamanomikoto held out the mirror, and….”

b. 神産巣日御祖命 令 取 ら兹 (Kojiki, Amaterasu)
K Hon [take them]
=> 神産巣日御祖命、これを取らしめて、
Kamimusuhinomioyanomikoto kore=wo tora-shime-te,
K them=Acc take-Hom-Conj
“Kamimusuhinomioyanomikoto took them, and….”

Following Yanagida (2006), I assume that these objects occupy a position no lower than the outer specifier of *vP*. Given this, we must then assume that the verb is positioned outside this projection, possibly in *T*.

(21) 神産巣日御祖命 令 取 ら兹 (Kojiki, Amaterasu)
$[_{TP} K [_{T} Hon.take [_{vP} them [_{v} tSubj [_{vP} tObj ]]]]]$

Further evidence for the high positioning of verbs comes from the fact that they appear in the text fully inflected. In the causative example in (22a), the causative marker appears adjacent to the causee, following the causee. Note that the causee would follow the causative verb in the corresponding order in Chinese in (22b).

(22a). 思金神 令 思 而 (Kojiki, Amaterasu)
O Caus think Conj

=> 思金神に思はして、
Omohikanenokami=ni omoha-shime-te
O=Dat think-Caus-Conj
“(They) made Omohikanenokami think, and….”

b. 令之思 (Chinese order)
Caus 3s.Obj think
“make him/her think”

The following example shows the verb with a modal affix.

(23) 将入海時
Mod enter sea time

=> 海に入りたまはむとする時に
umi=ni hairi-tamah-mutosuru toki=ni
sea=Dat enter-Hon-Mod time=Dat
“when (she) was about to enter the sea”

It could be argued that the position of the modal is a mere imitation of Chinese, since this modal also occurs between the subject and the VP in this language.

(24) 吾將問之。
Wu jiang wen zhi.
I Mod ask 3.Obj
“I will ask him.”

However, the next example clearly demonstrates that the modal is attached to the verb in the Kojiki text. The scope of the modal is the entire sentence. In order to interpret this sentence in Chinese, the modal would have to precede both clauses it takes scope over. However, it appears together with the second verb. This indicates that the head-complement order of pseudo-Chinese for auxiliary verbal elements applies at the level of the word and not the level of the phrase.

(25) 其御子令拝其大神宮
Dem prince Caus pray Dem great god shrine

=> 其の御子をして其の大神の宮を拝ましめに遣はさむとせし時
sono miko=wo shite sono Oh kami=no miya=wo
Dem prince=Acc do Dem great god=Gen shrine=Acc
orogama-shime-ni tukahasa-mutoseshi toki
pray-Caus-Purp send-Mod time
“when (he) was about to send the prince to pray at the shrine of the great god”
(26) shows another example involving a purpose clause. The embedded verb has clearly been raised and adjoined to the matrix verb, since the embedded verb precedes the matrix verb, which separates the embedded verb from its object.

(26) 今 更 平 遣 東 方 十 二 道 之 悪 人 等。
now again quell send [VP tv eastern 12 region Gen bad person Pl]

=> 今更に東の方十二道の悪しき人等を平けに遣はすらむ。  
(Kojiki, Keiko)

Ima sarani hingashikata=no towomarifutamichi=no
now again eastern=Gen 12=Gen
ashiki hito-domo=wo kotomuke=ni tukahasu-ramu.
bad person-Pl=Acc quell=Dat send-Supp

“Now it seems that (he) sends (me) to quell the bad people of the twelve eastern regions.”

The preceding examples have shown that the verb in the Kojiki can be higher than definite shifted objects. Verbs in the Kojiki are also fully inflected and can appear in a dislocated position. I will propose below that there is no fixed verb position in the Kojiki, but I will tentatively conclude here that a verb can be located as high as T. That the verb is never higher than T is suggested by the fact that the verb never precedes subjects. It also follows adverbs and adjuncts other than locatives.

(27)a. 静 遊 幸行
quietly play be

=> 静かに遊び幸行です。
Shizukani asobi-idemasu.
quietly play-be.Hon

“(He) is playing quietly.”

b. 山 河 之 物 悉 備設
[mountain river `Gen thing] completely prepare

=> 山河の物を悉に備へ設けて、
Yama-kaha=no mono=wo kotogotoni sonahe-mouke-te
mountain-river=Gen thing=Acc completely prepare-Conj

“(You) completely prepare products of the land and of the sea.”

Note further that verbs tend to be located as low in the structure as possible. This is the case with ditransitive clauses, in which the verb follows one, but not both, of its objects. Placement of adpositions mirrors this situation. Adpositions often appear inside their complement DPs, typically following the possessor of this constituent.

(28)a. 是 於 河 下
[PP [DP this [D on [NP river lower]]]]

=> この河の下に
kono kaha=no shimo=ni
this river=Gen lower=Dat

“on the lower reaches of this river”
In summary, I suggest the following informal generalization to account for placement of verbs and adpositions in the *Kojiki*. The surface Japanese string is taken as input, and the pseudo-Chinese of the text is created by moving verbs and adpositions to the left of their complements or the first major constituent inside their complements. Specifically, verbs and adpositions are placed in a leftward head position. Only internal arguments can follow a verb or adposition. External arguments are never post-verbal. And no more than one major constituent can follow a verb or adposition.

In a simple VP or PP, the verb would be moved to the left of its complement.

(29) そこの青菜をつむ

\[\text{V} [\text{DP} \text{soko=no awona=wo}]] \text{ tsumu} \]

“The pick the vegetables of that place”

=> 採 其 地 之 青菜  

pick [Dem place Gen vegetable]

In a ditransitive clause, the verb is moved to the nearest head position preceding a major constituent. This could be the head position of VP. If the preverbal DP is analyzed as having been scrambled or shifted, then \(\text{v}\) could be an available head position.

(30) 曙立の王に名を賜ひて、

\[\text{VP} [\text{Aketatsu=no Ohokimi}=ni [\text{v} [\text{VP} \text{tDat} [\text{v} [\text{na=wo}]]]] \text{ tamahi-te} \]

“(He) gave a name to Prince Aketatsu, and…”

=> 名 賜 曙立 王  

name give Aketatsu prince

An adposition is placed in the head position of its complement DP.

(31) この河の下に

\[\text{PP} [\text{DP} \text{this} \text{on} [\text{NP} \text{river lower}]]] \]

“on the lower reaches of this river”

=> 是 於 河 下  

[Kojiki, Suijin]
In the case of a definite object, which has shifted to the vP phase edge, the head position available for the verb is T.

(32) 神産巣日御祖命、これを取らしめて、
    [TP K [T _ [vP kore=wo [v tSubj [vP tObj ]]]] tora-shime-te
    K them=Acc take-Hom-Conj
    “Kamimusuhinomiyanomikoto took them, and….”
=> 神産巣日御祖命 令取 弊 (Kojiki, Amaterasu)
    K Hon.take them

The question at this point is the location of a verb preceding a wh-phrase. Under Watanabe’s (2002, 2005) analysis, this would have to be the head of TopP, which precedes the focus projection in the C domain. However, there is no other evidence that the verb is located that high in the structure, since it never precedes the subject. The current proposal, however, that wh-movement targets a focus projection below T is supported. The verb under that analysis is located in T.

(33) 亦いづれの神を使はせば吉けむ?
    Mata [T _ [FocP [izure=no kami=wo [vP tSubj [vP tObjwh ]]]] tsukahase-ba
    now which=Gen god=Acc send-Cond
    “If we send which god …?”
=> 亦 使 何 神 之 吉? (Kojiki, Ashiwara)
    now send what god Part fortuitous

5. Wh-Questions in Chinese

The preceding section has offered evidence which suggests that the target of wh-movement in old Japanese was a TP-internal position. However, it must be noted that this evidence is not conclusive. This is because the pseudo-Chinese of the text is not a natural language but a code which was consciously manipulated by the writer. Therefore, it could be argued that wh-questions in the Kojiki are simply an imitation of middle Chinese. As I will discuss below, old Chinese had short movement of wh-phrases to a clause-medial focus projection. But this movement was lost beginning in the Han period (2nd century BCE), and middle Chinese of the 5th century was already a wh-in-situ language.

Adjuncts: Preverbal

(34)a. 何由 能 德?
    Heyou neng de?
    how can get
    “How can (I) get (it)?”

b. 何以 故 來?
    Heyi gu lai?
    why still come
    “Why did (you) still come?”

---

3 Late 5th century Chinese translation of a Buddhist text.
Internal arguments: Inside VP

(35)a. 証 [VP xu he wu]? sacrifice need what
“For the sacrifice, what do (I) need?”

b. 欲 [VP zuo he deng]? will make what story
“How many stories will you make?”

This leads us to conclude that Kojiki wh-questions are modeled on contemporary Chinese wh-in-situ. Internal arguments which normally appear post-verbally in Chinese are post-verbal in the Kojiki, while adjunct wh-phrases precede the verb. I suggest that this is indeed the case. The author of the Kojiki text endeavors to follow the Chinese model to the extent that verb placement does not violate the translation principle, i.e. that the verb be located no higher than T, only internal arguments can follow the verb, and no more than one major constituent follows the verb.

Furthermore, examination of the range of wh-questions in the Kojiki reveals an interesting pattern. The examples of wh-phrases occupying a high position are repeated in (36). These are examples of adjuncts, and can be said to follow the Chinese model or to adhere to Watanabe’s wh-movement analysis. They are also consistent with the low movement approach, with the wh-phrase in [Spec, FocP] and the subject in its base position in vP.

(36) 何 由 汝 泣 伏？
what from you cry lie.down
“Why are you lying here crying?”
=> 何の由にか汝が泣き伏せる。
Nani=no yoshi=ni=ka na=ga naki-fuseru?
what=Gen reason=Dat=Foc 2s=Nom cry-lie.down
“Why are you lying here crying?”

However, there are other examples which cast doubt on the high movement proposal. In (37), the wh-phrase follows a scrambled object. If we assume that scrambling is adjunction to TP, then the wh-phrase would have to be located inside TP.

(37) 吾 御子 為天降 之 道 誰 如此而 居？
[TP [my prince descend Gen path] [TP ... who thus be]]
=> 吾が御子の天降りする道を誰ぞかくて居る。
[A=ga miko=no amorisuru michi=wo 1s=Gen prince=Gen descend path=Acc
tare=zo kakute oru?
who=Emph thus be
“Who is thus on the path by which my prince will descend?”

Next consider the post-verbal wh-phrases. As Watanabe points out, some of them are nominal predicates in copular constructions, as in (38).
I have cited additional examples in which a *wh*-phrase follows a lexical verb. Careful examination of these sentences, however, shows that the *wh*-phrase occurs inside an adjunct clause, e.g. a conditional.

(39)a. 亦 使 何 神 之 吉？  
now send *what* god Part fortuitous

=> 亦いづれの神を使はせば吉けむ？

Mata [izure=no kami=wo tsukahase-ba] yoke-mu?

now which=Gen god=Acc send-Cond good-Mod

“If we send which god will it be fortuitous?”

This strongly suggests that *wh*-phrases cannot be moving to the C domain of their scope positions, since this movement would invoke a violation of the CED. The possibility does remain, however, that short movement takes place inside the adjunct. I discuss this possibility for old Chinese in the following discussion. I propose an analysis for the Japanese cases in section 6.

At this point, I take a brief look at *wh*-movement in old Chinese. Late archaic Chinese of the warring states period (5th – 3rd centuries BCE) was not a *wh*-in situ language but rather required short movement of interrogative *wh*-phrases to a position between the subject and VP.

(40)a. 吾 誰 欺？  欺 天 乎？  
Wu shei [VP qi tshei]? Qi tian hu?

I who deceive deceive Heaven Q

“Who do I deceive? Do I deceive Heaven?” (Analects, Zihan)

b. 天下 之 父 归 之, 其 子 焉 往？
Tianxia zhi fu gui zhi qi zi yan [VP wang tyan]?

world Gen father settle here 3.Gen son where go

“If the fathers of the world settled here, where would their sons go?” (Mencius, Lilou 1)
Wh-movement in this period was short focus movement and did not target [Spec, CP]. This is clear, first, from the surface position of the wh-words. In (40), we see that the landing site of wh-movement follows the subject position. (41) shows that wh-words follow modal adverbs like jiang ‘will’.

(41) 我 將 何 求？
    Wo jiang he qiu?
    I will what ask for
    “What will I ask for?”

Furthermore, wh-occur inside islands, while retaining matrix scope for the interrogative interpretation. (42a) shows wh-movement inside a relative clause. (42b) shows movement inside a coordinate structure. If these movements targeted matrix [Spec, CP], i.e. a position outside these islands, then the Complex NP Constraint and the Coordinate Structure Constraint would be violated and the examples should be ungrammatical, contrary to fact.

(42)a. 天 何 欲 何 惡 者 也？
    Tian [he_i yu t_i he_j wu t_j zhe] ye?
    Heaven what desire what despise Det Decl
    “Heaven is one who desires what and despises what?” (Mozi, Fayi)

b. 何 恃 而 不 恐？
    [TP pro [vp He_i shi t_i] er [vp bu kong]?]
    what depend Conj Neg fear
    “Based on what are (you) not afraid?” (lit. “What do you depend on and are not afraid?”)

Furthermore, wh-questions functioning as nominal predicates also appear in situ, exhibiting the same pattern as wh-predicates in the Kojiki.

(43)a. 君 與 我 此 何 也？
    [Jun yu wo ci] he ye?
    lord give me this what Decl
    “Why is it that my lord gives me these things?”

b. 追 我 者 誰 也？
    [Zhui wo zhe] shei ye?
    pursue me Det who Decl
    “Who is the one pursuing me?”

Aldridge (2006) proposes the following analysis of old Chinese wh-movement which targets a focus projection between T and vP. Wh-phrases in predicate position undergo string-vacuous movement and thus maintain the appearance of remaining in situ. Wh-phrases in adjuncts move to the focus projection within the adjunct. The matrix interrogative interpretation is obtained via binding by matrix C.
The parallelism between old Chinese focus fronting and *wh*-questions in the *Kojiki* is indeed striking and suggests an areal typological connection. Rather than proposing that old Japanese *wh*-movement targets the C domain, as it does in *wh*-movement languages like English, a more plausible cross-linguistic parallel would be short focus fronting as in its neighbor Chinese.

In section 4, I have shown that post-verbal position of *wh*-phrases in the *Kojiki* can be accounted for under a short movement analysis, given the translation principle which places the verb in T. In the following section, I present additional evidence from the *Manyoshu* which shows that the position of old Japanese *wh*-phrases had to be inside TP.

6. Confirmation from the *Manyoshu*

The *wh*-question patterns found in the *Kojiki* are mirrored in the *Manyoshu*. *Wh*-phrases can appear inside islands, while taking matrix scope. The following are examples of relative clauses.

(45)a. 伊豆久欲利 枠多利斯物能曽
where=from come-Past thing Emph
“Izuku=yori ki-tarishi mono] so.
“They are (things which come from where)?”

b. 伊可爾安良武日能等伎爾可母 許恵之良武比等能比射乃倍 和我麻久良可武
how-Dat be-Mod day=Gen time=Dat=Foc
“On the day which will be like what will I rest my head on the knee of someone who understands me?”

(46) shows examples involving adjunct clauses.
(46)a. 此時者伊可爾之都都可汝代者和多流
この時は、如何にしつつか、汝が世は渡る。
Kono toki=ha [ika=ni] shi-tutu]=ka
this time=Top how=Dat do-while=Foc
na=ga yo=ha wataru?
2s=Nom world=Top pass
“At this time, you pass through this world doing what?”

b. 鷺之翅乃何処漏香霜之零異牟
雁のつばさの覆羽の何処漏りてか、霜の降りけむ。
[Kari=no tsubasa=no ohohiba=no izuku mori-te]=ka
goose=Gen wing=Gen great.wing=Gen where leak-Conj=Foc
shimo=no furi-kemu.
frost=Nom fall-Past.Mod
“The frost has fallen, because what part of the great wings of the wild goose is leaking?”

c. 何色摺者吉
いかなる色に摺りてば、よけむ。
[Ika naru iro=ni surite-ba] yoke-mu?
how be color=Dat dye-Cond good-Mod
“It would be good, if (we) dye (it) what color?”

d. 吾胸誰乎見者将息
吾が胸、誰を見ば、息まむ。
A=ga mune, [ta=wo mi-ba], yama-mu?
1s=Gen heart who=Acc see-Cond lighten-Mod
“My (heavy) heart will lighten if I see whom?”

As I suggested in section 5, examples like (45) and (46) rule out an analysis which requires the
wh-phrase itself to move to the matrix C domain. However, this does not discount the possibility
of massive pied-piping of the relative clause or adjunct to matrix FocP, along the lines of

(47) 吾胸誰乎見者将息
吾が胸、誰を見ば、息まむ。
[Top A=ga mune, [Foc [ta=wo mi-ba] [TP … yama-mu]]?]
1s=Gen heart who=Acc see-Cond lighten-Mod
“My (heavy) heart will lighten if I see whom?”
The pied-piping analysis is also, of course, consistent with the short movement analysis, and I tentatively assume that pied-piping does in fact take place to the clause-internal focus projection. The true deciding argument between the long and short movement analyses is the nature of material preceding the \textit{wh}-phrase. Another parallel between the \textit{Manyoshu} and the \textit{Kojiki} is that a \textit{wh}-phrase can follow a scrambled object.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(48)]
  \begin{quote}
    \textit{世間乎 何物爾 将譬}
    \textit{世間を 何に 譳へむ。}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
    Yononaka=wo \hspace{1em} \textit{nani=ni} \hspace{1em} tatohe-mu?
    \textit{life=Acc} \hspace{1em} \textit{what=Dat} \hspace{1em} \textit{compare-Mod}
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item “To what should I compare this life?”
    \end{enumerate}
  \end{quote}

  \item[(49)a]
  \begin{quote}
    \textit{和備西物尾 中中荷 奈何辛苦 相見始兼}
    \textit{わびにしものを、 なかなかに 何か苦しく 相見そめけむ。}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
    [Wabi-nisi \hspace{1em} \textit{mono}=\hspace{1em} \textit{wo} \hspace{1em} nakanakani]
    \textit{worry-Past} \hspace{1em} \textit{thing=Acc} \hspace{1em} \textit{half-heartedly}
    \textit{nani=ka} \hspace{1em} \textit{kurushiku} \hspace{1em} \textit{ahimi-some-kemu.}
    \textit{how=Foc} \hspace{1em} \textit{reluctantly} \hspace{1em} \textit{meet-begin-Past.Mod}
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item “How could (I) have begun to meet the one I once had so much concern for?”
    \end{enumerate}
  \end{quote}

  \item[(49)b]
  \begin{quote}
    \textit{都祢斯良農道乃長手袁 久礼久礼等 伊可爾可}
    \textit{常知らぬ道の長手を}
    \textit{くれくれと 何か行かむ。}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
    [Tsune=shira-nu \hspace{1em} \textit{Michi}=\hspace{1em} \textit{no} \hspace{1em} nagate]=\hspace{1em} \textit{wo} \hspace{1em} kurekureto}
    \textit{normally} \hspace{1em} \textit{know-Neg} \hspace{1em} \textit{road=Gen} \hspace{1em} \textit{journey=Acc} \hspace{1em} \textit{in.dark}
    \textit{ika=ni=ka}
    \textit{ika-mu?}
    \textit{how=Dat=Foc} \hspace{1em} \textit{go-Mod}
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item “How should I proceed in the dark on a journey on a road I normally do not know?”
    \end{enumerate}
  \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

They can also follow an adverb and a scrambled object.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(49)a]
  \begin{quote}
    \textit{和備西物尾 中中荷 奈何辛苦 相見始兼}
    \textit{わびにしものを、 なかなかに 何か苦しく 相見そめけむ。}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
    [Wabi-nisi \hspace{1em} \textit{mono}=\hspace{1em} \textit{wo} \hspace{1em} nakanakani]
    \textit{worry-Past} \hspace{1em} \textit{thing=Acc} \hspace{1em} \textit{half-heartedly}
    \textit{nani=ka} \hspace{1em} \textit{kurushiku} \hspace{1em} \textit{ahimi-some-kemu.}
    \textit{how=Foc} \hspace{1em} \textit{reluctantly} \hspace{1em} \textit{meet-begin-Past.Mod}
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item “How could (I) have begun to meet the one I once had so much concern for?”
    \end{enumerate}
  \end{quote}

  \item[(49)b]
  \begin{quote}
    \textit{都祢斯良農道乃長手袁 久礼久礼等 伊可爾可}
    \textit{常知らぬ道の長手を}
    \textit{くれくれと 何か行かむ。}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
    [Tsune=shira-nu \hspace{1em} \textit{Michi}=\hspace{1em} \textit{no} \hspace{1em} nagate]=\hspace{1em} \textit{wo} \hspace{1em} kurekureto}
    \textit{normally} \hspace{1em} \textit{know-Neg} \hspace{1em} \textit{road=Gen} \hspace{1em} \textit{journey=Acc} \hspace{1em} \textit{in.dark}
    \textit{ika=ni=ka}
    \textit{ika-mu?}
    \textit{how=Dat=Foc} \hspace{1em} \textit{go-Mod}
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item “How should I proceed in the dark on a journey on a road I normally do not know?”
    \end{enumerate}
  \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

This still leaves the possibility multiple specifiers of \textit{TopP}.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(50)]
  \begin{quote}
    \textit{TopP DP=wo [TopP XPAdv [FocP XPh \textit{TP} ...]]}
  \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

However, multiple specifiers is not an option when the \textit{wh}-phrase is preceded by two DPs, the higher one a scrambled object and the lower one the subject.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(51)a]
  \begin{quote}
    \textit{朝霞棚引野邊}
    \textit{足檜木乃山藿公鳥}
    \textit{何時来鳴}
    \textit{(MYS 1940)}
    \textit{朝霞たなびく野辺に}
    \textit{あしひきの山ほととぎす}
    \textit{何時か来鳴かむ。}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{tabular}{l}
    [Asagasumi tanabiku nohe=ni \hspace{1em} [ashihikinoyama hototogisu]
    \textit{morning.mist hang} \hspace{1em} \textit{field=Dat} \hspace{1em} \textit{mountain} \hspace{1em} \textit{cuckoo}
  \end{tabular}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item “How could (I) have begun to meet the one I once had so much concern for?”
    \end{enumerate}
  \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}
When will the mountain cuckoo come to the mist-hung field to sing?

“What would I do with the seven treasures admired and desired by the people of the world?”

If the two DPs were analyzed as moving to multiple specifiers of TopP, then this movement would violate Minimality. In other words, the object would have to be attracted first, skipping over the subject.

 Predicate wh-phrases also appear to occupy a low position, analogous to their position in the Kojiki and in old Chinese.

The following example serves to argue against a possible analysis based on string vacuous movement out of TP. The wh-phrase follows a scrambled object in an embedded clause. Assuming that embedded clauses do not have topic positions, the object can only be scrambled to the edge of TP, meaning that the wh-phrase must be located internal to TP.
7. Conclusion

I have argued that old Japanese wh-fronting was short movement to a clause-internal focus position. The preceding discussion additionally converges on the following analysis of old Japanese clause structure. I agree with Watanabe (2002, 2005) that topicalized constituents occupy a position above TP. However, the focus position must be located internal to TP, as argued in section 6. Following Yanagida (2006), this places genitive ga/no-marked subjects in their base positions in vP. The [Spec, TP] position is most likely the position for bare subject DPs.

This paper has additionally proposed a principle for translation between Japanese and the pseudo-Chinese text of the Kojiki. It is hoped that greater understanding of the language of this text can serve as an aid to future syntactic analysis of 8th century Japanese.
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