1. Introduction

A great deal of work in the history of Japanese centers on change of meaning. Works within the theory called ‘grammaticalization’ are to be considered as a part of the study of semantic change as well, lending themselves to concepts such as ‘concrete meaning’ and ‘abstract meaning.’ Syntactic change, on the other hand, has been paid little attention even from a descriptive perspective, let alone from a theoretical point of view. The goal of this paper is to present a syntactic path from connective to focus particles and situate this change in a general picture with respect to the emergence of kakari-musubi, which, I believe, constitutes the fundamental study to construct a theory of the change of syntax.

In section 2, we have a brief look at previous studies on the grammatical items which we will refer to in the following sections. After proposing a syntactic path from connective to focus particles in section 3, we see the
historical data in terms of this path in section 4. Section 5 is devoted to analyzing the motivations for the change and its relation to the emergence of kakari-musubi construction.

2. Previous Studies and Problems
The fact that the historical studies in Japanese are mainly concerned with the meaning change is true of the words such as naritomo and demo, which we discuss in this paper. Konoshima (1966) refers to the historical change of demo, stating that ‘Demo... had changed into ‘exemplification’ from ‘concessive’ in its usage’ (p. 351, translation my own). Yake (1997), claiming that naritomo had undergone the same type of change as demo, said ‘we found examples of demo which, having lost its original function to constitute the conditional phrase, merely convey the meaning ‘exemplification’ (p. 37, translation my own).

I argue in this paper, admitting that their meanings have evolved into ‘exemplification’, that their change doesn’t occur for a particular meaning, and a syntactic analysis gives a unified account for the phenomena at issue and explains the motivation for their semantic change as well.

3. Concept of the Syntactic Change
The syntactic change which I propose is the following process from Phase 1 through Phase 2 to Phase 3.

(1) Phase 1 | Phase 2 | Phase 3
---|---|---
IP | IP | IP
CP | Top | IP
VP$_1$ | NP$_1$ naritomo | IP
...NPnari tomo | ...e$_1$...V | ...x naritomo...

In Phase 1, nari is the head of the VP and tomo a subordinator. Nari and tomo, in phase 2, merge into one word which is base-generated in the higher position as ‘Top’$^2$, and the NP in the topic position, if it is an argument, has a relation to the empty category (zero pronoun) co-indexed with it in VP. In

$^2$ I use the term ‘Topic’ as referring to an NP which occupies (and is assumed to be base-generated in) sentence-initial positions and (thus) can not focus the verb of the main clause.
Phase 3, *naritomo* is inserted and attached to one of the elements under the VP (I assume here the ‘attachment’ analysis proposed by Kuroda 1979).

Given the above assumptions, we can expect the following phenomena of the three stages in the historical materials of Japanese. *Tomo* takes a predicate nominal in Phase 1 and the subordinate clause has only concessive or conditional relation to the main clause. In Phase 2, *Naritomo* takes an NP which can be an argument or an adjunct of the main clause. *Naritomo* with the property of Phase 3 can focus the verb or the VP besides the NPs in the main clause. Let me turn to the empirical research based on this expectation in the next section.

4. Data

4.1. *Naritomo*

We see in the following that the three stages considered in section 3 show a close correspondence to what actually happened in the history of Japanese.³

The statistics related to the examples of *naritomo* I found are given in Table 1.⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VP(S)</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>VP(M)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amakusa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toraakira</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of *naritomo*⁵

The fact that most examples are distributed under VP(S) in *Genji Monogatari* can be accounted for, if we assume the structure of this period as in Phase 1. Some of these examples are illustrated below.⁶

³ See ‘Texts’ for the chronology of materials in the tables.
⁴ I won’t touch upon the floating-quantifier-like construction such as ‘oni futari naritomo turete (bring two demons) (Toraakira Seirai)’ in the following discussion. ‘Oni (demon)’ is a host NP and ‘futari (two) naritomo’ functions like a floating quantifier. I found 1 example of this type in *Amakusaban Heike* and 18 examples in *Toraakirabon Kyōgenshū*.
⁵ Let me note the abbreviations used for tables. VP(S) in the upper line means that the NPs before *naritomo* function as predicate nominals of the subordinate clause. NOM, ACC, Oth and Adj refer to the NPs with *naritomo* which are interpretable as Nominative cases, Accusative cases, other cases or adjuncts of the main clauses respectively. ‘Other cases’ here includes examples which can be understood with case particles such as *ni, he, kara or nite* supplied. Examples are classified under VP(M) when they focus the verb or the VP of the main clause.
⁶ I will use the following abbreviations for glosses. ACC(Accusative case), CAU(Causative), CLA(Classifier), CONC(Concessive marker), COND(Conditional marker), DAT(Dative case), DIR(Directive case), EMPH(Emphatic particle), FIN(Sentence final particle),
(2) a. kutiwošiki shina nari-tomo ... kokoro mo tomari-namu-kashi humble class heart also stay-Guess-FIN
   ‘Even if she were in the humble class, I would be attracted to her.’
   (Genji Yadorigi)

b. tato fī makotoni fīto nari-tomo kitune kodama
even if really human fox ghost
yaumonomono-no ajamukite torimotekitaru-nikoso-faber-ame
something-NOM deceive bring-Copula-POL-Guess
‘Even if it really were a human being, I think it was deceived and
brought here by something like a fox or a ghost.’
   (Genji Tenarafi)

c. ito kataki koto nari-tomo, waga if-amu koto fa
much difficult thing my say-Guess thing TOP
tabakari-temu-ya accommodate-Guess-Q
‘Even if it’s very difficult, will you accommodate my request?’
   (Genji Ukifune)

Kutiwošikisina in (2a) can not be construed as an argument of the main clause. Because the main clause ‘I would be attracted to her’ has no argument position for ‘humble class’, and thus it can only be a concessive clause. In (2b), the object of torimotekitaru (bring) is the object they are looking at; a princess called Ukifune. The speaker is wondering whether the property of Ukifune is human or not. Incapable of denoting this object, fito before nari-tomo must be a predicate of the subordinate clause.

Although we have examples interpreted as an argument of the main clause in Genji Monogatari, they are few in the number and not incompatible with the status of the predicate of the protasis as well. (3) are all the instances I classified as arguments.

(3) a. imijiki mononofu adagataki nari-tomo, ... utiwe mare-nubeki extreme warrior hostile enemy smile-Guess
shama-no shi-tamafere-ba
tique-NOM do-HON-COND
‘Because he has a figure toward which even the warriors or hostile
enemies should smile.’
   (Genji kiritubo)

b. imijiki miti nari-tomo, onomuki-gataku oboje-tamafu
extreme road proceed-difficult think-HON
‘It would be difficult to renounce the world however precious it is,
Genji thinks.’
   (Genji Momidinoga)
Contrary to the situation in *Genji Monogatari*, the examples in *Amakusa*-
*aban Heike* ranges evenly from VP(S) to Adj. I gave an example of subject
in (4a), object in (4b), indirect object in (4c) and adjunct in (4d) with their
counterparts in earlier versions of *Heike Monogatari*. 7

(4) a. sanbiacu-nin-no mono-no vchi tare nari tomo
   three hundred-CLA-GEN one-GEN inside someone
core-uo sucoxí qiq-eba
   this-ACC a little hear-COND
   ‘If someone in that three hundred people hears this a little,’
   (Amakusa 1-1)

b. ima ychido facanai fude-no ato-uo nari tomo
   one more again short pencil-GEN trace-ACC
tatematçutte von votozzure-uo qi-cô
   send news-ACC hear-VOL
   ‘I want to send a short letter and hear the news about him.’
   (Amakusa 1-8)
ima ichido fakanaki fude no ato wo mo tatematuri
   (Kakuiti 2)

c. moxi izzucu-no vra-ní nari tomo cocoroyasú
   if somewhere-GEN shore-LOC relievedly
vochitçuita-naraba,
   get settled-COND
   ‘If I get settled at some shore relievedly,’
   (Amakusa 3-7)
mosi idukuno ura ni mo kokoro yasuku oitukitaramu tokifa
   (Hyakunizikku 7)

d. nanitoyôni nari tomo vocoye-uo sotto idasa-xerare-i
   somehow voice-ACC naturally let out-HON-IMP
   ‘Please let out a cry in some casual way or other.’
   (Amakusa 1-3)
ikasamanimo ookoje no idubeu sauru
   (Kakuiti 2)

Let me remark the fact that case-marker-attached NPs are used with *nari tomo*
as in (4b) and (4c). This evidently indicates that *nari tomo* does not constitute
the VP of the subordinate clause but the argument of the main clause. At

7 See Kiyose (1982) on the relationship between *Amakusa*-
*aban Heike Monogatari* and its earlier versions.
the same time, in *Kakuitibon Heike Monogatari*, one of the earlier versions of *Amakusaban Heike*, we have no such example, which implies that these examples began to be used around the 14th or 15th century.

I tentatively assume here that the NPs in (4) occupy the ‘topic’ position, because there is no instance focusing the verb of the main clause. But this assumption raises the question of how case markers in (4b) and (4c) are licenced. I will return to this point in the next section.

So far, we have seen that *Amakusaban Heike Monogatari* has a larger variety of examples than *Genji Monogatari* does, except for the one focusing the verb such as (5). This is the difference between *Amakusaban Heike* and *Toraakirabon Kyōgenshū*.

(5) a. nikusa mo nikushi, nabutte *naratomo* yar-au

\[
\text{hatefulness also hateful make fun of } \text{do-VOL}
\]

‘I hate him very much and so I’ll make fun of him.’

*(Toraakira Kuramamairi)*

b. yai koi, mizu *narito* nom-ase-taraba torikajesh-e

\[
\text{hey come on water drink-CAU-COND get back-IMP}
\]

‘Hey come on, if you let him drink water or did something, get it back.’

*(Toraakira Imamairi)*

c. kotoba *naratomo* kawashe-ba onaji koto-ja fodoni

\[
\text{word exchange-COND same thing-Copula since}
\]

\[
fonaite nagusam-au
\]

\[
talk comfort-VOL
\]

‘Since exchanging words is enough for us to feel comfort, let’s talk and give comfort to each other.’

*(Toraakira Finosake)*

*Naritomo* in (5a) is attached to the verb ‘*naburu* (make fun of)’, and a light verb ‘*yarou*’ is inserted. Although *naratomo* in (5b) and (5c) are attached to NPs, these foci should be considered not as the NPs but as the VPs, given appropriate interpretations from the context. *Naritomo* in (5b) focuses the event ‘*mizu wo nomasu* (let him drink water)’, as one of the actions to entertain a newcomer. ‘*Kotoba wo kawasu* (exchange words)’ in (5c) is contrasted with other events such as ‘*kawo wo awasu* (look at each other)’.

From the observations so far, it follows that *naratomo* had changed from Phase 1 through Phase 2 to Phase 3.\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) *Narito* is a variation of *naratomo* found in Pre-modern Japanese.

\(^9\) One might argue that the differences in distribution of examples between the texts in Table 1 are due to the amount of examples each text possesses; *Toraakirabon Kyōgenshū* has five times more instances of *naratomo* than *Genji Monogatari* or *Amakusaban Heike*, and thus has examples focusing the verb of the main clause. This argumentation might be applied only to the difference between *Toraakirabon Kyōgenshū* and *Amakusaban Heike*. Since *Genji Monogatari* is as long as
4.2. Demo

Demo appears to follow a similar pattern to naritomo. It is, however, difficult to detect its change from Phase 1 to Phase 2 because we find few instances of it before the 17th century. Here we see the change from Phase 2 to Phase 3. The distribution of the examples is given in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VP(S)</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>VP(M)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toraakira</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikamatsu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Distribution of demo

Toraakiranbon Kyôgenshû reflects the language in which demo was being used under Phase 2. It had come to be used as a Focus marker in Chikamatsu Joruri. The examples of ‘Topic’ are given in (6) and those of Focus in (7).

(6) a. soregashigami demo sheu yau mo nai
    I _____ demo do way also NEG
    ‘Even I cannot find the way to do.’ (Toraakira Fonekawa)
    b. yubi demo irowasu-mai-zo
    finger _____ touch-NEG/VOL-FIN
    ‘I won’t make him even touch your finger.’ (Toraakira Fanago)

(7) a. kuzetsu demo shiyatta do kishoku demo warui ka
    quarrel _____ do Q feeling _____ bad Q
    ‘Did you quarrel with him ... or does he feel bad?’ (Chikamatsu, Tanbuyosaku)
    b. konata-no you-GEN husband-DAT also word EMPH exchange-NEG
    tomo chiyotto kawo demo mi-tai
    CONC a little face _____ see-Wish
    ‘Even if I cannot talk with your husband, I want to take a brief look at his face.’ (Chikamatsu, Meidonofikyaku)

Toraakiranbon Kyôgenshû, the limited examples of the former should be attributed to the characteristics of naritomo in this text. However Amakusahan Heike Monogatari is shorter than them and we have to extend the research further. I have collected 47 examples from Môgyûshô and Chôkajabokashishô, which were transcribed in the early 16th century. Different though their style of writing may be, I found a similar distribution with Amakusahan Heike Monogatari, except one example ‘ta naritomo tukurite, tomo kaumo suru yauni seyo. (Making a field, you should manage to live.)’ (Môgyûshô, 4), which seems to focus VP. Although we have to do more wide-ranging research, I conclude here that the usage of naritomo focusing the verb was not common before the late 16th century.
In (7a), ‘kuzetsu wo shita’ is contrasted with ‘kisyoku ga warui’ as a reason for the absence of the hearer’s boyfriend. ‘Kawo wo miru’ is contrasted with ‘kotoba wo kawasu’ in (7b).

4.3. Nara(ba)

Contrary to the change of demo, we can only see the change from Phase 1 to Phase 2 in nara(ba) as illustrated in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VP(S)</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>VP(M)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toraakira</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikamatsu</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharebon</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Distribution of nara(ba)

Most examples come under the category VP(S) in Genji Monogatari. Some of the examples are as in (8)

(8) a. waga yado-no fana shi nabeteno iro nara-ba nanikafa
     my house-GEN flower EMPH normal beauty why
     sharani kimi-wo mat-amashi
     especially you-ACC wait-Guess
     ‘If the flower of my house weren’t so beautiful, would I invite you especially?’ (Genji Fananoen)

b. ware, onna nara-ba, kanarazu mutubiyori-namashi
     I woman surely get married-VOL
     ‘If I were a woman, I would surely get married to him.’ (Genji Wakana)

c. mameyakanaru mikokoro nara-ba konofodo-wo obooshizumete
     honest heart this time-ACC hold back
     ‘If you are honest, I want you to hold back your emotion this time.’ (Genji Takekawa)

Although the dominant use as predicate nominals remains the same, instances of NOM, ACC, Other and Adj increase little by little through the Pre-modern period. In addition, we have examples with case-marker-attached NPs used with nara(ba) in Sharebon as in (9).

(9) a. haimyo de nara ... Kinaga no kimi no yaitoya nado
     pen name LOC and the like
     ha yoku tohutta mono-jiya
     TOP well famous one-Copula
“Kinaga no kimi-no yaitoya’ is well known as a pen name.’

(Hokukwatōjō)

b. yausu de nara, manzara fukai tokoro-e mo
appearance by at all deep part-DIR also
hamari-masu-mai
fall into-POL-NEG
‘According to appearances, he won’t go into the serious situation.’

(Hokukwatōjō)

However we don’t have any examples of nara focusing the verb not only in the materials in Table 3, but also in the result gained from ‘Google Search’. This is reinforced by the intuition that the examples below are deviant.

(10) a. Tarō ha gohan-o tabe (ha/?? nara) shi-ta.
TOP dinner-ACC eat do-Past
‘Taro ate dinner.’

b. Yamada ha Tanaka-o naguri (ha/?? nara) shi-ta ga koroshi
TOP -ACC hit do-Past CONC kill
(ha/?? nara) shi-nakat-ta
do-NEG-Past
‘Yamada hit Tanaka but did not kill him.’

5. Motivations and Related Phenomena
5.1. Motivations for Change
The motivations of these syntactic changes should be considered in two separate parts; the motivation for Phase 1 to Phase 2 and that for Phase 2 to Phase 3.

The former change contains the process where nari and tomo merge into one word and the nominal preceding the copula is interpreted as an argument (or an adjunct) of the main clause. We may wonder what could be the rationale behind the reinterpretation from the predicate to the argument. I think that an answer may be found in the characteristics that Japanese has. Japanese has zero pronouns and is a verb final language. Kuroda (1999) and Kinsui (to appear) discuss the relationship between these characteristics and the reinterpretations of independent sentences as arguments of the main clause. Though there are still things that have to be explained, I confine myself here to pointing out the relevance with these studies.

As a result of the structural change, naritomo is not independent from the main clause in Phase 3. I think that the motivation behind this is that Japanese is a free word order language. Once the NP is interpreted as an argument of the verb, it is also probable to interpret it not as base-generated
in the sentence-initial position as in (11a) but as preposed to that position by scrambling as in (11b). (‘t’ in (11b) represents a trace of movement)

(11)  a. [ NP, naritomo [ VP ... e, ... V ] ]
     b. [ ... [ NP naritomo, [ VP ... l, ... V ]] ]

If the ‘NP naritomo’ is interpreted in the trace position in (11b), it is not unreasonable to assume that naritomo is inserted under the VP from the sentence-final position by the ‘attachment transformation,’ which enables naritomo to focus the verb of the main clause.

This ‘scrambling’ analysis leads us to the question whether the case-marker-attached NPs used with naritomo are base-generated in the sentence-initial position as proposed in 4.1, because it is usual to assume the case marker to be licenced under VP.10 If this is the case, it seems reasonable to consider the relevant examples in Amakusaban Heike as taking a step forward into Phase 3.

One final remark. What triggers the semantic change from ‘concessive’ to ‘exemplification’? This meaning transition had taken place in the process from Phase 2 to Phase 3. Since the ‘concessive’ meaning can only be expressed by a relation between two independent phrases, the structure of Phase 3, which doesn’t have independent phrases especially if naritomo focuses the verb, forces naritomo to evolve its meaning into some other one. Consequently it happened to be ‘exemplification’.

5.2. Emergence of Kakari-musubi

It is acknowledged that Classical Japanese has a syntactic pattern called kakari-musubi where the scope of a constituent marked with a kakari particle (e.g. so, namu, ya, ka or koso) is demarcated by a particular predicate form (musubi, Rentai or Izen form).11 I give a typical example of this construction in (12) in which a kakari particle is attached to the NP.

(12) atamitaru tora ka foyuru
     hostile tiger bark
‘Does a tiger bark furiously?’ (Man-yō-shū 199)

Three sources are hypothesized about the origin of kakari-musubi; namely ‘annotative constructions’ (Nomura 1995, 2002), ‘insertion’ (Sakakura 1993) and ‘inversion’ (Ono 1993). Nomura (1995, 2002), discussing the disadvantages of the other two hypotheses, argues that the kakari-musubi, especially that with ka and so, traces its origin to the annotative clause such as (13).

10 See Hoji (1985: chapter 3) among others.
11 See Whitman (1997) among others for the structure of this construction.
(13) umashakewo Miwa-no fafuri-ga ifafu sugi te fure
-GEN priest-NOM bless Japanese cedar hand touch
-shi tumi ka kimi-ni afi-gataki
-Past crime you-DAT see-difficult
‘I cannot see you these days. I wonder if the reason is that I touched
the Japanese cedar which a priest of Miwa shrine blesses.’

(Man-yō-shū 712)

In our framework, the process is considered as follows; the annotative construction which constitutes a CP corresponds to Phase 1 and, through Phase 2 where the NP preceding ka can be interpreted as an argument of the main clause as in (12), ka can be attached to any element under the VP in Phase 3, including the verb of the main clause as in the examples below.

(14) yasumishishi wago ofokimi-no ofomifune mati-ka kofu-ramu
my Emperor-GEN ship wait-Guess
Shiganokarashaki
‘I’m wondering if Shiganokarashaki is waiting and longing for the
ship of our emperor.’

(Man-yō-shū 152)

Since this change is assumed to occur in Pre-Old Japanese, our study
gave empirical grounds that this process actually took place and reveals that
it is not an impracticable idea, through the history of naritomo, demo and
nara(ba).

6. Concluding Remarks
In this paper I have proposed a syntactic path from connective to focus particles and argued that this change doesn’t occur for a particular meaning, making reference to the emergence of kakari-musubi. More scrutiny should be given to the relevant changes and we have to clarify the resemblances and the differences between them, in order to build a theory for syntactic change.

Texts
Hoteiban Man-yō-shū Honmonhen (Hanawashobō, 8th C.), Genji Monogatari (Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshū, Shōgakukan, 11th C.), Heike Monogatari (Kakuitibon) (Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshū, Shōgakukan, 13th C.), Hyakunizikku bon Heike Monogatari (Shidōbunko Kotensōkan 2, 13th C.) , Amakusa ban Heike Monogatari Taishōmon oyobi Sōsakuin (Meijishoin, 16th C.), Ōkura Toraakirabun Kyōgenschū no Kenkyū (Hyōgensha, 17th C.),

12 The process in which a copula and C merge into one word is not involved in this change. This is because kakari particles can take NPs from the beginning.
Sonezakishinshū meidōohiyaku hoka gohen (Iwanami Bunko, Chikamatsu Monzaemon, 18th C.), *Sharebon Taisei* (Chūōkoron, 18-19th C., Selecting 23 texts of Kyoto and Osaka dialect)
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