

SHIFT FROM SUBJECTIVE TO OBJECTIVE MEANING: EVIDENCE FROM THE HISTORY OF JAPANESE QUESTIONS

Tomohide Kinuhata

kinuhata@let.osaka-u.ac.jp

Osaka University

at The University of Göttingen

June 4-5, 2010

- 1 TRAUGOTT AND DASHER 2005
- 2 PARTIAL LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF QUESTION IN JAPANESE
- 3 PROPERTIES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 4 HISTORICAL CHANGE OF INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 5 NATURALNESS OF THE HISTORICAL CHANGE

CLAIM OF 'SUBJECTIFICATION'

- As we will discuss below, SP/W's central role calls for a production-oriented view of language change, and accounts for why the major type of semantic change is subjectification. (7)
- Subjectification and intersubjectification are typical of "internal" change in the sense that they are natural changes. (32)

CLAIM OF 'SUBJECTIFICATION'

- As we will discuss below, SP/W's central role calls for a production-oriented view of language change, and accounts for why the major type of semantic change is subjectification. (7)
- Subjectification and intersubjectification are typical of "internal" change in the sense that they are natural changes. (32)

STRONG CLAIM OF UNIDIRECTIONALITY

- It turns out, however, that irregular meaning changes seem to occur primarily in the nominal domain, which is particularly susceptible to extralinguistic factors such as change in the nature or the social construction of the referent. (3-4) 4
- The reverse change, from expressive > textual > propositional, is highly unlikely in the history of any one grammatical marker. (Traugott 1989:1)

STRONG CLAIM OF UNIDIRECTIONALITY

- It turns out, however, that irregular meaning changes seem to occur primarily in the nominal domain, which is particularly susceptible to extralinguistic factors such as change in the nature or the social construction of the referent. (3-4) 4
- The reverse change, from expressive > textual > propositional, is highly unlikely in the history of any one grammatical marker. (Traugott 1989:1)

OBJECTIVITY

- they are declarative, i.e. minimally marked with regard to modality,
- all participants in an event structure are expressed in surface structure,
- lexical items are minimally concerned with the interlocutors' perspective (i.e. minimally deictic),
- the Q-heuristic predominates, i.e. contexts for meanings are provided so that interpretation is strongly determined, and what is not said is implied not to be the case.

(22-23)

OBJECTIVITY

- they are declarative, i.e. minimally marked with regard to modality,
- all participants in an event structure are expressed in surface structure,
- lexical items are minimally concerned with the interlocutors' perspective (i.e. minimally deictic),
- the Q-heuristic predominates, i.e. contexts for meanings are provided so that interpretation is strongly determined, and what is not said is implied not to be the case.

(22-23)

OBJECTIVITY

- they are declarative, i.e. minimally marked with regard to modality,
- all participants in an event structure are expressed in surface structure,
- **lexical items are minimally concerned with the interlocutors' perspective** (i.e. minimally deictic),
- the Q-heuristic predominates, i.e. contexts for meanings are provided so that interpretation is strongly determined, and what is not said is implied not to be the case.

(22-23)

OBJECTIVITY

- they are declarative, i.e. minimally marked with regard to modality,
- all participants in an event structure are expressed in surface structure,
- **lexical items are minimally concerned with the interlocutors' perspective** (i.e. minimally deictic),
- the Q-heuristic predominates, i.e. contexts for meanings are provided so that interpretation is strongly determined, and what is not said is implied not to be the case.

(22-23)

SUBJECTIVITY

- overt spatial, and temporal deixis,
- explicit markers of *SP/W attitude* to what is said, including epistemic attitude to the proposition,
- explicit markers of *SP/W attitude* to the relationship between what precedes and what follows, i.e. to the discourse structure; many aspects of discourse deixis are included here,
- The R-heuristic predominate. (23)

SUBJECTIVITY

- overt spatial, and temporal deixis,
- explicit markers of **SP/W attitude** to what is said, including epistemic attitude to the proposition,
- explicit markers of **SP/W attitude** to the relationship between what precedes and what follows, i.e. to the discourse structure; many aspects of discourse deixis are included here,
- The R-heuristic predominate. (23)

SUBJECTIVITY

- overt spatial, and temporal deixis,
- explicit markers of **SP/W attitude** to what is said, including epistemic attitude to the proposition,
- explicit markers of **SP/W attitude** to the relationship between what precedes and what follows, i.e. to the discourse structure; many aspects of discourse deixis are included here,
- The R-heuristic predominate. (23)

SUBJECTIVITY

- overt spatial, and temporal deixis,
- explicit markers of **SP/W attitude** to what is said, including epistemic attitude to the proposition,
- explicit markers of **SP/W attitude** to the relationship between what precedes and what follows, i.e. to the discourse structure; many aspects of discourse deixis are included here,
- The R-heuristic predominate. (23)

SUBJECTIFICATION

- Subjectification is

SUBJECTIFICATION

- **Subjectification** is the semasiological process whereby **SP/Ws** come over time to **develop meanings for Ls that encode or externalize their perspectives and attitudes** as constrained by the communicative world of the speech event, rather than by the so-called "real-world" characteristics of the event or situation referred to. (30)

WHY (INTER)SUBJECTIFICATION?

- Subjectification draws on cognitive principles but takes place in the context of communication and rhetorical strategizing.

(31)

WHY (INTER)SUBJECTIFICATION?

- Subjectification draws on cognitive principles but takes place in the context of communication and rhetorical strategizing. It falls directly out of SP/W-AD/R interactions, and the competing motivations of speakers to be informative and of addressees to construe invited inferences. (31)

WHY (INTER)SUBJECTIFICATION?

- Subjectification draws on cognitive principles but takes place in the context of communication and rhetorical strategizing. **It falls directly out of SP/W-AD/R interactions, and the competing motivations of speakers to be informative and of addressees to construe invited inferences.** (31)
- It follows from the recursive operation of the IITSC model that meanings become increasingly pragmatic and procedural since the operative constraints are saliency, subjectivity, etc., i.e., constraints that flow from the linking of communicative and cognitive functions that is language. (40)

- 1 TRAUGOTT AND DASHER 2005
- 2 PARTIAL LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF QUESTION IN JAPANESE
- 3 PROPERTIES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 4 HISTORICAL CHANGE OF INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 5 NATURALNESS OF THE HISTORICAL CHANGE

TYPES OF QUESTIONS

- Hearer-Addressed Questions

- (1) nani-o kangae-teiru-no?
What-Acc think-Prog-FN
 ‘What are you thinking?’

- Speaker-Addressed Questions (Self-addressed)

- (2) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-daroo-ka?
what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Conj-Q
 ‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

Conclusive Use

- (3) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-ka, Taro-wa pink-no syatu-o
what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Q Taro-Top pink-Gen shirt-Acc
 katta.
bought.

‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’ Adjoined Use

- Embedded Questions

- (4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-teiru-ka wakara-nai.
I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-Prog-Q know-Neg.
 ‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

TYPES OF QUESTIONS

- Hearer-Addressed Questions

(1) nani-o kangae-teiru-no?

What-Acc think-Prog-FN

‘What are you thinking?’

- Speaker-Addressed Questions (Self-addressed)

(2) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-daroo-ka?

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Conj-Q

‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

Conclusive Use

(3) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-ka, Taro-wa pink-no syatu-o
what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Q Taro-Top pink-Gen shirt-Acc

katta.

bought.

‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’ Adjoined Use

- Embedded Questions

(4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-teiru-ka wakara-nai.

I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-Prog-Q know-Neg.

‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

TYPES OF QUESTIONS

- Hearer-Addressed Questions

(1) nani-o kangae-teiru-no?

What-Acc think-Prog-FN

‘What are you thinking?’

- Speaker-Addressed Questions (Self-addressed)

(2) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-daroo-ka?

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Conj-Q

‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

Conclusive Use

(3) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-ka, Taro-wa pink-no syatu-o

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Q Taro-Top pink-Gen shirt-Acc

katta.

bought.

‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’

Adjoined Use

- Embedded Questions

(4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-teiru-ka wakara-nai.

I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-Prog-Q know-Neg.

‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

TYPES OF QUESTIONS

- Hearer-Addressed Questions

(1) nani-o kangae-teiru-no?

What-Acc think-Prog-FN

‘What are you thinking?’

- Speaker-Addressed Questions (Self-addressed)

(2) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-daroo-ka?

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Conj-Q

‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

Conclusive Use

(3) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-ka, Taro-wa pink-no syatu-o

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Q Taro-Top pink-Gen shirt-Acc

katta.

bought.

‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’

Adjoined Use

- Embedded Questions

(4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-teiru-ka wakara-nai.

I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-Prog-Q know-Neg.

‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

TYPES OF QUESTIONS

- Hearer-Addressed Questions

(1) nani-o kangae-teiru-no?

What-Acc think-Prog-FN

‘What are you thinking?’

- Speaker-Addressed Questions (Self-addressed)

(2) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-daroo-ka?

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Conj-Q

‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

Conclusive Use

(3) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-ka, Taro-wa pink-no syatu-o

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Q Taro-Top pink-Gen shirt-Acc

katta.

bought.

‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’

Adjoined Use

- Embedded Questions

(4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-teiru-ka wakara-nai.

I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-Prog-Q know-Neg.

‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

TYPES OF QUESTIONS

- Hearer-Addressed Questions

(1) nani-o kangae-teiru-no?

What-Acc think-Prog-FN

‘What are you thinking?’

- Speaker-Addressed Questions (Self-addressed)

(2) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-daroo-ka?

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Conj-Q

‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

Conclusive Use

(3) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-ka, Taro-wa pink-no syatu-o

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Q Taro-Top pink-Gen shirt-Acc

katta.

bought.

‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’

Adjoined Use

- Embedded Questions

(4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-teiru-ka wakara-nai.

I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-Prog-Q know-Neg.

‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

TYPES OF QUESTIONS

- Hearer-Addressed Questions

(1) nani-o kangae-teiru-no?

What-Acc think-Prog-FN

‘What are you thinking?’

- Speaker-Addressed Questions (Self-addressed)

(2) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-daroo-ka?

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Conj-Q

‘(I wonder) What is he thinking?’

Conclusive Use

(3) nani-o kangae-teiru-no-ka, Taro-wa pink-no syatu-o

what-Acc think-Prog-FN-Q Taro-Top pink-Gen shirt-Acc

katta.

bought.

‘What is he thinking, Taro bought a pink shirt.’

Adjoined Use

- Embedded Questions

(4) watasi-wa Taro-ga nani-o kangae-teiru-ka wakara-nai.

I-Top Taro-Nom what-Acc think-Prog-Q know-Neg.

‘I don’t know what Taro is thinking.’

QUESTIONS IN OLD JAPANESE

- (5) a. wa-ga furu sode-wo imo mitu-ramu-ka. (妹見都良武香)
I-Nom wave sleeve-Acc wife saw-Guess-Q

‘Did my wife see me wave my sleeves? *Man’yosyu*, 132

- b. Kurafasi-no yama-wo taka-mi-ka(山乎高可) yogomorini
Kurafasi-Gen mountain-Acc high-because-Q late.night
 idekuru tuki-no fikari tomosiki.
come.out moon-Gen light poor

‘Is it because the mountain of Kurafasi is high, the light of the moon which came out late is faint.’ *Man’yosyu*, 290

QUESTIONS IN MIDDLE JAPANESE

- (6) a. Nanitonau yo-no mono sawagasiu-saurai-si-wo, reino
somehow world-Gen thing noisy-Pol-Past-Conj *usual*
 yamafausi-no kudaru-ka-nando,
buddhist-Nom come.down-Q-Quo

‘Since people were making a commotion somehow, I was thinking
 “Do those Buddhists come down (from Mt. Fiei)?” ’

Kakuichibon Heike, Jō 88

- b. Sono womoi-no tumori-ni-ka Yokobue-wa
that thought-Gen accumulate-Cop-Q Yokobue-Top
 ... fodonau sisita.
 ... *soon* *died*

‘Was it due to the accumulation of worry, Yokobue died soon.’

Amakusa Heike, 309

QUESTIONS IN *Ka*: PRE-MODERN JAPANESE

- (7) a. Yoidore-no kenka-ka-to omoo-te yoku kike-ba
drunk-Gen quarrel-Q-Quo think-Conj carefully hear-Cond
 ‘Thinking, “Is it a drunken quarrel?,” I listened carefully, and ...’
adabotasensei
- b. Mago-no koto-wa kimotuka-zu roogan-no nani
grandchild-Gen thing-Top notice-Neg presbyopia-Nom what
 mite-ka, ‘mumuu, madu syokunin-ni niawa-nu, ano
see-Q um above.all craftsman-Dat suit-Neg that
 bintuki-ga kiniira-nu...’
hair.style-Nom like-Neg

Mistaking the guy for his grandchild, what do aged eyes see, ‘Um, first of all, I don’t like his hair style, which is not suitable for craftsmen.’
Sinzhū kasaneidzutsu, 2-166



QUESTIONS IN *Ka*: PRE-MODERN JAPANESE

- (7) a. Yoidore-no kenka-ka-to omoo-te yoku kike-ba
drunk-Gen quarrel-Q-Quo think-Conj carefully hear-Cond
 ‘Thinking, “Is it a drunken quarrel?,” I listened carefully, and ...’
adabotasensei
- b. Mago-no koto-wa kimotuka-zu roogan-no nani
grandchild-Gen thing-Top notice-Neg presbyopia-Nom what
 mite-ka, ‘mumuu, madu syokunin-ni niawa-nu, ano
see-Q um above.all craftsman-Dat suit-Neg that
 bintuki-ga kiniira-nu...’
hair.style-Nom like-Neg

Mistaking the guy for his grandchild, what do aged eyes see, ‘Um, first of all, I don’t like his hair style, which is not suitable for craftsmen.’
Sinzhū kasaneidzutsu, 2-166

☞ *Ka* is used conclusively and adjoinedly through all periods of Japanese.

EMBEDDED QUESTION WITH *Ka*

- Embedded questions with *ka* appear in the late Middle Japanese (Takamiya 2005).

EMBEDDED QUESTION WITH *ka*

- Embedded questions with *ka* appear in the late Middle Japanese (Takamiya 2005).

TABLE: Embedded Questions with *ka*

14th	15th	17th	18th	18-19th	19th	20th
1	10	31	23	34	40	121

EMBEDDED QUESTION WITH *Ka*

- Embedded questions with *ka* appear in the late Middle Japanese (Takamiya 2005).

TABLE: Embedded Questions with *ka*

14th	15th	17th	18th	18-19th	19th	20th
1	10	31	23	34	40	121

- Takamiya (2005) and Kinuhata (2007) argues that embedded question use of *ka* derives from adjoined use of *ka*.

- 1 TRAUGOTT AND DASHER 2005
- 2 PARTIAL LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF QUESTION IN JAPANESE
- 3 PROPERTIES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 4 HISTORICAL CHANGE OF INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 5 NATURALNESS OF THE HISTORICAL CHANGE

SPEAKER'S DOUBT

- Intuitively, *ka* used in sentence final positions must express the speaker's doubt whereas embedded questions need not.

(8) a. Dare-ga paatii-ni kita-no-ka?
who-Nom party-Dat came-FN-Q

Who came to the party? (|= the speaker wonders)

Direct Question

SPEAKER'S DOUBT

- Intuitively, *ka* used in sentence final positions must express the speaker's doubt whereas embedded questions need not.

(8) a. Dare-ga paatii-ni kita-no-ka?
who-Nom party-Dat came-FN-Q

Who came to the party? (|= the speaker wonders)

Direct Question

b. Taro-wa dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sira-nai
Taro-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-NEG

'Taro doesn't know who came to the party.'

c. Minna dare-ga party-ni kita-ka sitteiru.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know

'Everyone knows who came to the party.'

Indirect Question

EMBEDDABILITY OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- If a lexical item cannot be embedded into the clause headed by *koto*, it has speaker-oriented meanings. (cf. Kindaichi 1953)

(9) a. Taro-wa [paatii-ni iku-tumori-dearu] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol-Cop Comp-Acc convey.

b. *Taro-wa [paatii-ni iko-o] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol Comp-Acc convey.
 ‘Taro conveyed that he will go to the party.’

- By this assumption, ‘ikoo’ has speaker-oriented meanings.

EMBEDDABILITY OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- If a lexical item cannot be embedded into the clause headed by *koto*, it has speaker-oriented meanings. (cf. Kindaichi 1953)

(9) a. Taro-wa [paatii-ni iku-tumori-dearu] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol-Cop Comp-Acc convey.

b. *Taro-wa [paatii-ni iko-o] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol Comp-Acc convey.

‘Taro conveyed that he will go to the party.’

- By this assumption, ‘ikoo’ has speaker-oriented meanings.

EMBEDDABILITY OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- If a lexical item cannot be embedded into the clause headed by *koto*, it has speaker-oriented meanings. (cf. Kindaichi 1953)

(9) a. Taro-wa [paatii-ni iku-tumori-dearu] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol-Cop Comp-Acc convey.

b. *Taro-wa [paatii-ni iko-o] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol Comp-Acc convey.
 ‘Taro conveyed that he will go to the party.’

- By this assumption, ‘*ikoo*’ has speaker-oriented meanings.

EMBEDDABILITY OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- If a lexical item cannot be embedded into the clause headed by *koto*, it has speaker-oriented meanings. (cf. Kindaichi 1953)
 - (9) a. Taro-wa [paatii-ni iku-tumori-dearu] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol-Cop Comp-Acc convey.
 - b. *Taro-wa [paatii-ni iko-o] koto-o tugeta.
Taro-Top party-Dat go-Vol Comp-Acc convey.
 ‘Taro conveyed that he will go to the party.’
- By this assumption, ‘ikoo’ has speaker-oriented meanings.

EMBEDDABILITY OF QUESTIONS

- *Ka* of indirect questions can be embedded into *koto*-clause whereas that of direct questions cannot.

(10) a. Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-ka-ga
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-Q-Nom
 wakara-nai] koto-o hakuzyosita.
know-Neg Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he does not know whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

b. *Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-daroo-ka]
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-guess-Q
 koto-o hakuzyosita.
Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he is wondering whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

- The weirdness of (10b) may come from the morphological reason.

EMBEDDABILITY OF QUESTIONS

- *Ka* of indirect questions can be embedded into *koto*-clause whereas that of direct questions cannot.

(10) a. Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-ka-ga
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-Q-Nom
 wakara-nai] koto-o hakuzyosita.
know-Neg Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he does not know whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

b. *Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-daroo-ka]
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-guess-Q
 koto-o hakuzyosita.
Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he is wondering whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

- The weirdness of (10b) may come from the morphological reason.

EMBEDDABILITY OF QUESTIONS

- *Ka* of indirect questions can be embedded into *koto*-clause whereas that of direct questions cannot.

(10) a. Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-ka-ga
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-Q-Nom
 wakara-nai] koto-o hakuzyosita.
know-Neg Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he does not know whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

b. *Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-daroo-ka]
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-guess-Q
 koto-o hakuzyosita.
Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he is wondering whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

- The weirdness of (10b) may come from the morphological reason.

EMBEDDABILITY OF QUESTIONS

- *Ka* of indirect questions can be embedded into *koto*-clause whereas that of direct questions cannot.

(10) a. Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-ka-ga
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-Q-Nom
 wakara-nai] koto-o hakuzyosita.
know-Neg Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he does not know whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

b. *Taro-wa [sensei-ga paatii-ni kuru-daroo-ka]
Taro-Top teacher-Nom party-Dat come-guess-Q
 koto-o hakuzyosita.
Comp-Acc confessed

‘Taro confessed that he is wondering whether or not the teacher comes to the party.’

- The weirdness of (10b) may come from the morphological reason.

EMBEDDABILITY OF PARENTHETICAL QUESTIONS

- (11) a. Taro-wa, [[sensei-ga Taro-nokoto-o omot-te]_i keiki-o
Taro-Top teacher-Nom Taro-about-Acc think-Conj cake-Acc
 mottekite-kureta] koto-o utagatteiru. Sikasi, watasi-wa [soo
bring-Ben Comp-Acc doubt but I-Top so
 omot-te]_i da-to kakusinsiteiru.
think-Conj Cop-Quo be.sure

lit Taro doubts that the teacher brought a cake [having Taro in mind]_i. But I am sure he did [having (him) in mind]_i.

- b. Taro-wa, [[sensei-ga Taro-nokoto-o omot-te]_i-ka
Taro-Top teacher-Nom Taro-about-Acc think-Conj-Q
 keiki-o mottekite-kureta] koto-o utagatteiru. #Sikasi,
cake-Acc bring-Ben Comp-Acc doubt but
 watasi-wa [soo omot-te]_i da-to kakusinsiteiru.
I-Top so think-Conj Cop-Quo be.sure

lit Taro doubts that, [did he have Taro in mind]_i, the teacher brought a cake. But I am sure he did [having (him) in mind]_i.

SCOPE BEARING ELEMENTS: NEGATION

- Negation scopes over the indirect question with *no* scoping over the entire proposition. (Kuno 1980)

(12) Taro-wa Yoko-ga kuru-ka-o kinisiteiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Taro-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q-Acc worry-FN Cop-Neg
 ‘Taro does not worry about whether Yoko will come or not.’

- Or more directly,

(13) Taro-ga kinisiteiru-no-wa [Yoko-ga kuru-ka] dewa-**nai**.
Taro-Nom worry-FN-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q copula-Neg
 ‘It is not whether or not Yoko will come that Taro worries about.’

SCOPE BEARING ELEMENTS: NEGATION

- Negation scopes over the indirect question with *no* scoping over the entire proposition. (Kuno 1980)

(12) Taro-wa Yoko-ga kuru-ka-o kinisiteiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Taro-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q-Acc worry-FN Cop-Neg
 ‘Taro does not worry about whether Yoko will come or not.’

- Or more directly,

(13) Taro-ga kinisiteiru-no-wa [Yoko-ga kuru-ka] dewa-nai.
Taro-Nom worry-FN-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q copula-Neg
 ‘It is not whether or not Yoko will come that Taro worries about.’

SCOPE BEARING ELEMENTS: NEGATION

- Negation scopes over the indirect question with *no* scoping over the entire proposition. (Kuno 1980)

(12) Taro-wa Yoko-ga kuru-ka-o kinisiteiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Taro-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q-Acc worry-FN Cop-Neg
 ‘Taro does not worry about whether Yoko will come or not.’

- Or more directly,

(13) Taro-ga kinisiteiru-no-wa [Yoko-ga kuru-ka] dewa-**nai**.
Taro-Nom worry-FN-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q copula-Neg
 ‘It is not whether or not Yoko will come that Taro worries about.’

SCOPE BEARING ELEMENTS: NEGATION

- Negation scopes over the indirect question with *no* scoping over the entire proposition. (Kuno 1980)

(12) Taro-wa Yoko-ga kuru-ka-o kinisiteiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Taro-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q-Acc worry-FN Cop-Neg
 ‘Taro does not worry about whether Yoko will come or not.’

- Or more directly,

(13) Taro-ga kinisiteiru-no-wa [Yoko-ga kuru-ka] **dewa-nai**.
Taro-Nom worry-FN-Top Yoko-Nom come-Q copula-Neg
 ‘It is not whether or not Yoko will come that Taro worries about.’

ADJOINED QUESTIONS IN NEGATION

- Causal clauses can be in the scope of negation with the aid of *no* (Takubo 1987). However, *ka* blocks this effect.

- (14) a. Yoko-wa kanasii-kara nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
 ‘It is not that Yoko is crying because she is sad.’
- b. #Yoko-wa kanasii-kara-ka nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
lit ‘It is not that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’

- Or more directly,

- (15) *Yoko-ga nai-teiru-no-wa [kanasii-kara-ka] dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Nom cry-Prog-FN-Top sad-because-Q Cop-Neg
lit ‘It is not, is it because she is sad, that she is crying.’

ADJOINED QUESTIONS IN NEGATION

- Causal clauses can be in the scope of negation with the aid of *no* (Takubo 1987). However, *ka* blocks this effect.

(14) a. Yoko-wa kanasii-kara nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.

‘It is not that Yoko is crying because she is sad.’

b. #Yoko-wa kanasii-kara-ka nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.

lit ‘It is not that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’

- Or more directly,

(15) *Yoko-ga nai-teiru-no-wa [kanasii-kara-ka] dewa-nai.
Yoko-Nom cry-Prog-FN-Top sad-because-Q Cop-Neg

lit ‘It is not, is it because she is sad, that she is crying.’

ADJOINED QUESTIONS IN NEGATION

- Causal clauses can be in the scope of negation with the aid of *no* (Takubo 1987). However, *ka* blocks this effect.

- (14) a. Yoko-wa kanasii-kara nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
 ‘It is not that Yoko is crying because she is sad.’
- b. #Yoko-wa kanasii-kara-ka nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
lit ‘It is not that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’

- Or more directly,

- (15) *Yoko-ga nai-teiru-no-wa [kanasii-kara-ka] dewa-nai.
Yoko-Nom cry-Prog-FN-Top sad-because-Q Cop-Neg
lit ‘It is not, is it because she is sad, that she is crying.’

ADJOINED QUESTIONS IN NEGATION

- Causal clauses can be in the scope of negation with the aid of *no* (Takubo 1987). However, *ka* blocks this effect.

- (14) a. Yoko-wa kanasii-kara nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
 ‘It is not that Yoko is crying because she is sad.’
- b. #Yoko-wa kanasii-kara-ka nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
lit ‘It is not that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’

- Or more directly,

- (15)*Yoko-ga nai-teiru-no-wa [kanasii-kara-ka] dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Nom cry-Prog-FN-Top sad-because-Q Cop-Neg
lit ‘It is not, is it because she is sad, that she is crying.’

ADJOINED QUESTIONS IN NEGATION

- Causal clauses can be in the scope of negation with the aid of *no* (Takubo 1987). However, *ka* blocks this effect.

- (14) a. Yoko-wa kanasii-kara nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
 ‘It is not that Yoko is crying because she is sad.’
- b. #Yoko-wa kanasii-kara-ka nai-teiru-**no** dewa-**nai**.
Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-Prog-FN Cop-Neg.
lit ‘It is not that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’

- Or more directly,

- (15)*Yoko-ga nai-teiru-no-wa [kanasii-kara-ka] **dewa-nai**.
Yoko-Nom cry-Prog-FN-Top sad-because-Q Cop-Neg
lit ‘It is not, is it because she is sad, that she is crying.’

ADJOINED QUESTIONS IN MODALS

- Modals and conditionals cannot scope over adjoined *ka* in the same way.

(16) a. Yoko-wa kanasii-kara nai-teiru-**no-daroo**.

Yoko-Top sad-because cry-Prog-FN-Guess

‘It might be that Yoko is crying because she is sad.’

b.^{??} Yoko-wa kanasii-kara-ka nai-teiru-**no-daroo**.

Yoko-Top sad-because-Q cry-Prog-FN-Guess

lit ‘It might be that, is it because she is sad, Yoko is crying.’

- Directly,

(17)* Yoko-ga nai-teiru-no-wa [kanasii-kara-ka]-**daroo**.

Yoko-Nom cry-Prog-FN-Top sad-because-Q-Guess

lit ‘It might be, it is because she is sad, that she is crying.’

INTERIM SUMMARY

- Outscoping attitude verbs and scope bearing elements are diagnostic tests for speaker-oriented meanings (Potts 2005).
- The phenomena above show that the conclusive and adjoined use of *ka* have speaker-oriented meanings whereas indirect question use does not.
- This means that the emergence of indirect question use of *ka* is characterized as a loss of speaker-orientedness, thus a loss of subjectivity.

INTERIM SUMMARY

- Outscoping attitude verbs and scope bearing elements are diagnostic tests for speaker-oriented meanings (Potts 2005).
- The phenomena above show that the conclusive and adjoined use of *ka* have speaker-oriented meanings whereas indirect question use does not.
- This means that the emergence of indirect question use of *ka* is characterized as a loss of speaker-orientedness, thus a loss of subjectivity.

INTERIM SUMMARY

- Outscoping attitude verbs and scope bearing elements are diagnostic tests for speaker-oriented meanings (Potts 2005).
- The phenomena above show that the conclusive and adjoined use of *ka* have speaker-oriented meanings whereas indirect question use does not.
- This means that the emergence of indirect question use of *ka* is characterized as a loss of speaker-orientedness, thus a loss of subjectivity.

- 1 TRAUGOTT AND DASHER 2005
- 2 PARTIAL LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF QUESTION IN JAPANESE
- 3 PROPERTIES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 4 HISTORICAL CHANGE OF INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 5 NATURALNESS OF THE HISTORICAL CHANGE

VERBS OF KNOWLEDGE

- Takamiya (2005) observes that the indirect-question-taking verbs before Pre-modern Japanese had negation or modals.
- We look at the data closely first by considering examples of indirect questions with verbs of retaining knowledge (hence, 'knowledge verbs').
- The list of verbs we collected are:

(18) *sira-nai*(知らない), *wakara-nai*(分からない), *zonzi-nai*(存じない), *syootide-nai*(承知でない), *yooryo-o e-nai*(要領を得ない), *kentoo-ga tuka-nai*(検討が付かない), *koryosi-nai*(顧慮しない), *soozo-ga tuka-nai*(想像が付かない), *kokoroe-nai*(心得ない), *kiduka-nai*(気付かない), *kaise-nai*(解せない), *kokoroduka-nai*(心付かない), *oboetei-nai*(覚えていない), *syui-ga tata-nai*(主意が立たない), *wasureteiru*(忘れている)

VERBS OF KNOWLEDGE

- Takamiya (2005) observes that the indirect-question-taking verbs before Pre-modern Japanese had negation or modals.
- We look at the data closely first by considering examples of indirect questions with verbs of retaining knowledge (hence, 'knowledge verbs').

- The list of verbs we collected are:

(18) *sira-nai*(知らない), *wakara-nai*(分からない), *zonzi-nai*(存じない), *syootide-nai*(承知でない), *yooryo-o e-nai*(要領を得ない), *kentoo-ga tuka-nai*(検討が付かない), *koryosi-nai*(顧慮しない), *soozo-ga tuka-nai*(想像が付かない), *kokoroe-nai*(心得ない), *kiduka-nai*(気付かない), *kaise-nai*(解せない), *kokoroduka-nai*(心付かない), *oboetei-nai*(覚えていない), *syui-ga tata-nai*(主意が立たない), *wasureteiru*(忘れている)

VERBS OF KNOWLEDGE

- Takamiya (2005) observes that the indirect-question-taking verbs before Pre-modern Japanese had negation or modals.
- We look at the data closely first by considering examples of indirect questions with verbs of retaining knowledge (hence, 'knowledge verbs').
- The list of verbs we collected are:

(18) sira-nai(知らない), wakara-nai(分からない), zonzi-nai(存じない), syootide-nai(承知でない), yooryo-o e-nai(要領を得ない), kentoo-ga tuka-nai(検討が付かない), koryosi-nai(顧慮しない), soozo-ga tuka-nai(想像が付かない), kokoroe-nai(心得ない), kiduka-nai(気付かない), kaise-nai(解せない), kokoroduka-nai(心付かない), oboetei-nai(覚えていない), syui-ga tata-nai(主意が立たない), wasureteiru(忘れてる)

VERBS OF KNOWLEDGE

- Takamiya (2005) observes that the indirect-question-taking verbs before Pre-modern Japanese had negation or modals.
- We look at the data closely first by considering examples of indirect questions with verbs of retaining knowledge (hence, 'knowledge verbs').
- The list of verbs we collected are:

(18) sira-nai(知らない), wakara-nai(分からない), zonzi-nai(存じない), syootide-nai(承知でない), yooryo-o e-nai(要領を得ない), kentoo-ga tuka-nai(検討が付かない), koryosi-nai(顧慮しない), soozo-ga tuka-nai(想像が付かない), kokoroe-nai(心得ない), kiduka-nai(気付かない), kaise-nai(解せない), kokoroduka-nai(心付かない), oboetei-nai(覚えていない), syui-ga tata-nai(主意が立たない), wasureteiru(忘れてる)

DIMENSIONS OF LOSS OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- We will see the loss of speaker-orientedness with three dimensions noted below.

DIMENSIONS OF LOSS OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- We will see the loss of speaker-orientedness with three dimensions noted below.

- Subject

- (19) a. **Watasi-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka **sira-nai**.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg
 ‘I **don’t know** who came to the party.’
- b. **Anata-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sira-nai no?
you-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg FN
 ‘Don’t **you** know who came to the party?’
- c. **Taro-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sira-nai.
Taro-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg
 ‘**Taro** does’t know who came to the party.’

DIMENSIONS OF LOSS OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- Tense

- (20) a. **Watasi-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka **sira-nai**.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg
 ‘I **don’t know** who came to the party.’
- b. Watasi-wa dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sira-**nakat-ta**.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg-past.
 ‘I **didn’t** know who came to the party.’

DIMENSIONS OF LOSS OF SPEAKER-ORIENTEDNESS

- Tense

- (20) a. **Watasi-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka **sira-nai**.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg
 ‘**I don’t know** who came to the party.’
- b. **Watasi-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka sira-**nakat-ta**.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg-past
 ‘**I didn’t know** who came to the party.’

- Polarity

- (21) a. **Watasi-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka **sira-nai**.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know-Neg
 ‘**I don’t know** who came to the party.’
- b. **Watasi-wa** dare-ga paatii-ni kita-ka **sitteiru**.
I-Top who-Nom party-Dat came-Q know
 ‘**I know** who came to the party.’

KYOTO/OSAKA DIALECT UNTIL 19TH CENTURY

TABLE: Kyoto/Osaka until 19th Century

	15th	17th	18th	18-19th
1.Sj & \neg Past & Neg	9	16	13	9
\neg (1.Sj & \neg Past & Neg)	0	0	0	0

EDO-TOKYO DIALECT FROM 18TH CENTURY

TABLE: Edo-Tokyo from 18th Century

	18-19th	19th	20th
1st & \neg Past & Neg	16	35	71
\neg (1st & \neg Past & Neg)	1	4	22

EDO-TOKYO DIALECT FROM 18TH CENTURY

TABLE: Edo-Tokyo from 18th Century

	18-19th	19th	20th
1st & ¬Past & Neg	16	35	71
¬(1st & ¬Past & Neg)	1	4	22

TABLE: Non-narratives in Edo-Tokyo Dialect

	18-19th	19th	20th
1st & ¬Past & Neg	14	27	35
¬(1st & ¬Past & Neg)	1	3	8

EXAMPLES FROM *I Am a Cat*: NARRATIVES

- (23) a. Ikani tintyo sa-re-nakat-ta-ka-wa, konniti-ni itaru-made
how prize do-Pass-Neg-Past-Q-Top today-Dat reach-until
 namae-sae take-tekure-nai no-de-mo **wakaru**.
name-even attach-Ben-Neg FN-by-also know.

‘You can understand how they did not prize me by the fact that they have not named me until today.’

- b. Kono hako-wa nan-no-tameni turusu-no-ka... yooryoo-o
this basket-Top what-Gen-for hang-FN-Q reason-Acc
 e-nakat-**ta** ga
get-Neg-Past but,

‘(When I came to this house,) I didn’t know why they hung this basket but, (since I realized that they put foods in it in order to keep them from cats, I felt the ill-nature of human beings from the heart.)’

EXAMPLES FROM *I Am a Cat*: NON-NARRATIVES

- (24) a. Omae-wa sikkei-da-yo. Watasi-o dare-da-ka **sitteiru**-no-kai?
you-Top rude-Cop-SF me-Acc who-Cop-Q know-FN-Q
 Kaneda-da-yo.
Kaneda-Cop-SF

‘You are rude. Do you know who I am? I am Kaneda, you know?’

- b. **Koban**-zya dare-ga totta-ka wakara-nee-kara,
police.box-at.Top who-Nom caught-Q know-Neg-because
 sonotanbini 5sen-zutu kureru-zyaneeka.
each.time 0.05yen-each give-TQ

‘Since the police in the station do not know who caught the mice, they give 5 sens each time, don’t they?’

OTHER VERBS THAN RETAINING-KNOWLEDGE VERBS

TABLE: Verbs selecting Indirect Questions

Verbs	until 19th	20th
Inquisitive verbs	31	6
Verbs of acquiring knowledge	2	6
Opinion verbs	2	2
Verbs of communication	0	6
Decision verbs	0	1
Verbs of conjecture	0	1
Verbs of relevance	0	6

BEFORE THE 19TH CENTURY

- (25) a. musin-wo ii-tai koto-ga aru-ga, kii-te
request-Acc say-want thing-Nom have-but grant-Conj
 kureu-ka toyē
Ben-Q ask[Imp]

‘Since I’ve got a favor to ask him, ask him whether he grants my request or not.’ Toraakira

- b. ora-a Kitibee obaa-ga deteiru-ka mi-te iko-o.
I-Top Kitibee Miss-Nom come.out-Q see-Conj go-Vol

‘I will go to see whether Miss Kitibee comes out or not.’ Ujishūi

IN THE 20TH CENTURY

(26) a. kore-kara ... syuzin-ga ikani yabo-o
this-from master-Nom how boorishness-Acc
 kiwameta-ka-o tikuiti kai-te goranniireru.
did.extremely-Q-Acc in.detail write-Conj show
 ‘From now, I will write and show in detail how my master took
 stupidity to an extreme.’

b. sonna tokoro-ni doosite vaiorin-ga aru-ka-ga
such place-Dat why violin-Nom exist-Q-Nom
 daiiti gohusin-kamosirenai-desu ga, kore-wa
in.the.first.place doubt-might-Pol but this-Top
 kangae-temiru-to atarimae-no koto-desu.
think-try-then natural-Gen thing-Pol
 ‘You might wonder in the first place why they have violins in such
 places but this is natural if you think about it.’

- 1 TRAUGOTT AND DASHER 2005
- 2 PARTIAL LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF QUESTION IN JAPANESE
- 3 PROPERTIES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 4 HISTORICAL CHANGE OF INDIRECT QUESTIONS
- 5 NATURALNESS OF THE HISTORICAL CHANGE

OTHER NEW USES OF *Ka*

- New uses of *ka* do not exhibit speaker-oriented meanings.
- *Disjunction* (since the 15th century)

(27) Taro-wa John-ka Mary-ka ga
Taro-Top John-or Mary-Nom paper-Acc
 ronbun-o yonde-kureru-koto-o sinziteiru.
read-Ben-Comp-Acc believe.

‘Taro believes that John or Mary will read his paper.’

- *Indeterminate* (since the 18th century)

(28) Taro-wa dareka-ga paatii-ni kite-kureru-koto-o
Taro-Top someone-Nom party-Dat come-Ben-Comp-Acc
 sinziteiru
believe

‘Taro believes that someone will come to the party.’

Indeterminate, 18th C.-

see Kinuhata & Iwata 2010

PROPERTY OF CHANGE

- Semantic bleaching (Hopper and Traugott 1993),
Generalization (Bybee and Pagliuca 1985)
[+*spo*; +*indet*; +*C*] > [+*indet*; +*C*]
- Syntacticization (Givon 1979)
“such constructions [note: relativization, causativization, subordinations etc.] arose diachronically, via the process of syntacticization, from looser, conjoined, paratactic constructions” (p. 222).
 - See Takamiya 2005 and Kinuhata 2007 for the source construction of indirect questions.

WHY SUBJECTIFICATION VIEW?

- If 'subjective/non-subjective' and 'functional/lexical' are orthogonal,

WHY SUBJECTIFICATION VIEW?

- If 'subjective/non-subjective' and 'functional/lexical' are orthogonal,

	Functional	Lexical
Subjective	A. auxiliaries particles	C. wh-words some adverbs?
Non-subjective	B. auxiliaries particles	D. nouns, adjectives verbs, most adverbs

WHY SUBJECTIFICATION VIEW?

- If 'subjective/non-subjective' and 'functional/lexical' are orthogonal,

	Functional	Lexical
Subjective	A. auxiliaries particles	C. wh-words some adverbs?
Non-subjective	B. auxiliaries particles	D. nouns, adjectives verbs, most adverbs

- there are not many items which are lexical and inherently subjective.

WHY SUBJECTIFICATION VIEW?

- If ‘subjective/non-subjective’ and ‘functional/lexical’ are orthogonal,

	Functional	Lexical
Subjective	A. auxiliaries particles	C. wh-words some adverbs?
Non-subjective	B. auxiliaries particles	D. nouns, adjectives verbs, most adverbs

- there are not many items which are lexical and inherently subjective.
- If we are concerned with ‘grammaticalization’, the change from subjective to non-subjective are less attested.