

To appear in Handbook of Historical Japanese Linguistics, De Gruyter Mouton

Alignment, Word Order and Argument Structure*

Yuko Yanagida (University of Tsukuba)

1. Introduction

Yanagida & Whitman (Y&W) (2009) propose that two major clause types in Old Japanese (OJ, 8th century), traditionally labeled as *shûsi* ‘conclusive’ and *rentai* ‘adnominal’ display different alignment and word order. While the subjects of conclusive verbs are *zero* marked, the subjects of adnominal verbs are realized with genitive *ga*, *no*, or *zero*. Y&W (2009) propose that genitive *ga*, the ancestor of Modern Japanese nominative, is the realization of active case on the external argument (i.e. the agent) of transitive or active intransitive verbs. Kikuta (2012) addresses certain problems with Y&W’s hypothesis, suggesting that variable subject marking in OJ is conditioned not by the theta role (i.e. agent) assigned by the verb, but by the place of the subject on the animacy hierarchy. First/second person pronouns are invariably marked by *ga*, but inanimate nouns are marked by *no*. Under Kikuta’s analysis, OJ has a nominative-accusative system with two differential subject marking *ga* and *no*. It should be noted that while the opposition between *ga* and *no* has gained much attention in traditional grammar, no previous work-including Kikuta’s- has integrated the discussion of *zero*-marked counterparts; they are simply set aside as instances of stylistic case drop.

In recent typological and theoretical literature, languages with variable case marking have been investigated from the perspective of a broader pattern of differential argument marking (DAM). Differential subject marking (DSM) occurs primarily in ergative languages, while differential object marking (DOM) is independent of alignment and attested widely in both ergative and accusative languages. This chapter explores the characteristic phenomenon of DAM in OJ. Under this approach, the crucial contrast is not merely between *ga* and *no*, but between case marked and *zero*-marked arguments. *Zero*-marked arguments cannot be characterized as simple case drop because they have both syntactic and semantic significance.

The chapter is organized as follows: Section 2 begins with a review of the analysis of alignment in OJ, proposed by Vovin (1997) and Y&W (2009). Section 3 describes the results of comprehensive survey of variable subject marking in OJ by using the Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese (OCOJ). The data reveals that while the alternation between *ga* and *no* is

* To prepare for this chapter I am deeply indebted to Makoto Yoshimura for providing me with the comprehensive data from the *Man’yôshû Kensaku* (Yamaguchi University). I am also very grateful to Stephen Horn for helping me use the data from the Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese.

determined by the semantics of NPs, as widely assumed, DSM associated with *ga* and *zero* is closely linked to the θ role assigned by the verb, implying a binary classification of predicates into active and inactive. Section 4 discusses the phenomenon of DOM by a close inspection of the two prose texts in OJ; *Norito* and *Senmyo*. It is shown that *wo* marks specific objects and the specific object moves out of VP.

2 Alignment

In typological literature, it has been widely assumed that languages are classified into three types. Following Dixon's (1979) familiar terminology, S refers to the subject of an intransitive verb, A to the subject of a transitive verb and O to the object of a transitive verb.

(1) Three Types of Alignment

Nominative-Accusative



Ergative-Absolutive



Active-inactive



In nominative-accusative languages, A and S are marked by nominative case, and O is accusative. In ergative-absolutive languages, S and O are marked by absolutive, and A is ergative. In active languages also known as active-stative (Klimov 1974, 1977; Mithun 1991), intransitive predicates are split into active and inactive; agentive subjects (SA) are marked by active case. Non-agentive subjects (SO) are marked in the same way as transitive objects. Many languages classified as ergative or active, however, exhibit split ergativity in which a nominative-accusative pattern shows up in certain grammatical contexts, typically conditioned by person or the tense/aspect of the verb (cf. Dixon 1979).

2.1 Vovin (1997)

Vovin (1997) originally proposes that OJ has active-inactive alignment. Under Vovin's analysis, the case marker *i*, which is treated as a nominative particle by traditional grammarians (cf. Yamada 1968), is, in fact, an active case marking the subjects of transitive and of active intransitive verbs. His examples are cited in (2):

- (2) a. 波播已毛礼杼母
 papa i moredomo... (MYS 3393)
 mother Agt guard-Ger
 'Though [my] mother guards [me]...

b. 菟原壯士伊 仰天

Unapi wotokwo **i** ame apugi...

(MYS 1809)

Unapi man Agt sky look up

‘The man from Unapi looked up at the sky and...’

Vovin observes that the subjects of inactive intransitives are overwhelmingly unmarked in the same way as the objects of transitive verbs. Similarly, morphological case *wo*, the ancestor of ModJ accusative *o*, marks not only the objects of transitive verbs, but also the subjects of inactive intransitives, in particular, the subject of adjectival predicates with *-mi*, which he calls ‘quality stative verbs’. This is illustrated in (3-4).

(3) 去來見乃山乎 高三香裳 日本能不所見

[**izami yama wo** taka mi] kamo Yamato no mie-nu

Izami mountain Abs high MI Q Yamato Gen see-not

國遠見可聞

(4) [**kuni** Ø topo-mi] kamo

(MYS 44)

province Abs far-Ger Part part

‘Is it because the Izami mountains are so high that I can’t see Yamato?’

Or is it because I came too far from my country.’

Given these observations, Vovin claims that the unmarked *zero*-form and *wo* are both absolutive in OJ.

Vovin’s analysis of *wo*, however, relies heavily on the *wo...-mi* constructions. Aside from this construction, the examples cited by Vovin do not necessarily show that *wo* marks the subject of intransitives. For example, consider (5).

(5) 紫草能 尔保蔽類妹乎 尔苦久有者

murasaki no nipopyer-u **imwo wo** niku-ku araba

Violet Gen be beautiful-Perf-Pt beloved Abs unpleasant-Ger-be Ger

人孀故尔 吾戀目八方 (MYS 21)

pito-duma yupe-ni ware **kwopi-m-e ya mo**

person-wife due to I (Sub) love-Fut-Excl Q even

‘If [my] beloved, who is beautiful like a violet, was not beautiful to me, would I love her even though she is another’s wife?’

In (5) *imwo* ‘my beloved’ is the subject of the adjectival predicate *nikuku* ‘unpleasant’, as observed by Vovin (1997), but it is at the same time the object of the matrix verb *kwopu* ‘love’. That is, the entire clause has the configuration [DP_i *wo* [*pro*_i V] V] in which the object

marked by *wo* in fact appears in the higher clause and the embedded clause contains the phonologically null subject (*pro*) coindexed with it.

Takeuchi's (2007) proposal that OJ has active alignment is primarily based on Vovin's (1997) observations about *wo*. (6) is cited by Takeuchi (2007).

- (6) 美知能斯理 古波陀袁登賣袁 迦微能碁登 岐許延斯迦杼母
 miti no siri Kwopoda **wotome wo** kami no goto kikoe-sika-domo
 road Gen back Kohada maiden Abs God Gen like heard-Foc-though
 阿比麻久良麻久
api makura-m-aku
 together sleep-Fut-Nml
 'Rumors about the Kohada maiden in her far off land rumbled like thunder, but we lie together.'

(*Kojiki Kayo* 45)

Takeuchi (2007) claims that the *wo* marked argument is the sole argument of the intransitive verb *kiko-yu* 'can be heard'. Note, however, that (6) has exactly the same structure as (5). In (6), the *wo*-marked argument that precedes the embedded *domo*-clauses is in fact the associative object of the matrix verb *makura-maku* 'sleep together'.¹ Aside from DP *wo...-mi* constructions, neither Vovin nor Takeuchi present convincing evidence that *wo* marks the subject of inactive intransitive verbs. On the contrary, there are a number of pieces of evidence that subjects of non-active intransitives are marked by genitive *no*.

- (7) a. 真木乃立 荒山中尔
makwi no tatu ara yama naka (MYS 241)
 tree Gen stand rough mountain inside
 'in the rough mountains covered with trees'
- b. 宇能花能 佐久都奇
u no pana no sak-u tukwi (MYS 4066)
 utugi Gen blossom Gen bloom-Adn month
 'the month when the utsugi blossom is in bloom.'

If *wo* was an absolutive case marker, we would have no explanation for why the subject is never marked by *wo* in adnominal contexts (7a-b).

We leave open the status of the NP *wo...-mi* pattern in (3). But note that Tsumi (2005), summarizing previous literature on this construction, convincingly argues that the diachronic source for *-mi* is the infinitive of the transitive verb *mi*- 'see'. Under this analysis, the subject

¹ As shown in section 3, *wo* in OJ marks a much wider range of internal arguments than ModJ *o*.

of the adjectival predicate is in fact the matrix object of the verb **mi-*, at least in pre-OJ. Similarly, Y&W (2009) analyze the *wo...-mi* pattern as adjunct AspPs, analagous to Acc-ing gerunds such as ‘travel being painful’ in English. These have the following structure:

- (8) 久左麻久良 多婢乎久流之美 故非乎礼婆
 [_{AspP} tabi **wo** [_{VP} kurusi] **mi**] kofi wor-eba
 travel Acc painful MI long.for be-when
 ‘travel being painful, since I long for my wife,’

On this analysis, *-mi* is the spellout of the head of [+transitive] AspP. The subject of the adjectival predicate is susceptible to a matrix object (or ECM) analysis of the verb **mi-*.

The hypothesis that *wo* marks absolutive is based on the assumption of the whole-language typology that the object of transitive verbs is marked absolutive in ergative languages. However, the skewed ergative(active)-accusative pattern is widely attested, for example in Indic languages such as Hindi. Hindi, traditionally classified as ergative (cf. Mohanan 1994), in fact has active alignment: the agent subjects of unergative verbs are marked by *-ne*, but the theme subjects of unaccusative verbs are morphologically *zero* (Mohanan 1994:71).

Hindi (Indo-Aryan)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(9) Raam-ne nahaayaa Ram-Erg bathe-Perf ‘Ram bathed.’</p> | <p>(10) Raam Ø giraa. Ram fall-Perf ‘Ram fell hard.’</p> |
|---|--|

The animate objects of transitive verbs, however, are necessarily marked by the accusative *ko* (11). The inanimate objects are marked by *ko* when they are specific, but otherwise morphologically *zero* (12) (Mohanan 1994:79-80).

Hindi (Indo-Aryan)

- (11) Ilaa-ne ek bacce-**ko** ut^haayaa.
 Ila-Agt one child-Acc lift/carry-Perg
 ‘Ila lifted a child.’
- (12) Ilaa-ne haar Ø ut^haayaa.
 Ila-Agt necklace(Abs) lift-Perg
 ‘Ila lifted a necklace (non-specific).’

As shown in Hindi, many ergative languages have the phenomenon of differential object marking; certain objects are marked by accusative case but others are not, depending most typically on animacy, specificity or definiteness of NPs.

2.2 What is active?

Both typological and theoretical literature have tended to classify active as a subtype of ergative alignment, because both ergative and active case mark the agentive subjects (A) of transitive verbs, but not the patient arguments (S) of intransitive verbs. It is well known, however, that active-stative languages display considerable divergence in both morphology and syntax, which makes it difficult to find a coherent implementation of languages of this type. This section discusses characteristic properties of active alignment which give empirical basis for the claim that OJ is classified as an active-inactive language.

2.2.1 *The two classes of predicates*

Active languages divide intransitive verbs into active and inactive. The exact lexical division differs crosslinguistically, but the two classes of intransitive verbs are distinguished by case marking: active intransitive subjects (S_A , typically the agent argument of unergatives) have the same marking as transitive subjects, whereas inactive intransitive subjects (S_O , typically the patient argument of unaccusatives) have the same marking as transitive objects. We see such pattern in Hindi as illustrated in (9-10). Dixon (1979: 80-83) divides active into fluid-S and split-S systems. In fluid S systems, verbs are divided depending on the meaning of each particular token. The active pattern appears when the S argument has control over the activity and the inactive pattern appears when control is lacking. We see such a pattern in Batsbi, a fluid S language cited by Comrie (1978:366).

Batsbi (Northeast Caucasian)

- (13) **Txo** naizdrax qitra.
we to-the ground fell
'We fell to the ground (unintentionally).'
- (14) **Atxo** naizdrax qitra.
We (Erg) to-the ground fell
'We fell to the ground (intentionally).'

In (13) the activity is unintentional and the subject is marked absolutive, while in (14) the activity involves intention, and the subject is marked ergative/active.

In split-S systems, on the other hand, the two classes of intransitive verbs have fixed membership and whether they belong to the active or inactive class is based on their prototypical meaning. Guaraní, a head marking language, has a split-S system: *a*-cross-references S_A (15); *se*-cross-references S_O (16).

Guaraní (Tupí-Guaraní Mithun 1991)

- (15) a. **a-xá** 'I go.'
b. **a-puá** 'I got up.'
c. **a-mano** 'I die.'
- (16) a. **se-rasí** 'I am sick.'
b. **se-ropehií** 'I am sleepy.'

In Guraraní, the unaccusative verb 'die', which involves no intention or control, is classified as active. In other words, the binary classification of active and inactive is based on some ideosyncratic meanings of a given word.

2.2.2 Nominal hierarchy

It is important to note that active and inactive marking depends not only on the semantics of predicates but also on the place of S in the nominal hierarchy:

(17) **The Nominal Hierarchy** (Silverstein 1976)

first/second person > third person > proper nouns > human > animate > inanimate

Dixon (1979:86-87) interprets the nominal hierarchy (17) to "roughly indicate the overall 'agency potential' of any given NP," and observes that "a number of languages have 'split' case marking exactly on this principle. As Mithun (1991) points out, case systems based on agency are frequently restricted to nominals referring to human beings.² According to Mithun, Koasati shows agentive case marking on pronominal prefixes within verbs but accusative case marking on nouns. The active system in Batsbi (Tsova-Tush) is limited to first and second persons. Central Pomo has an active system in nominals referring to humans only. The Georgian active system is restricted to human beings. The Yuki system is restricted to animates. From these cross-linguistic observations, the implication follows that active marking is used with NPs from the left-hand side to the right-hand side of the nominal hierarchy; that is, if a language has agent marking in third person, it also has agent marking in first and second person. This is exactly opposite to ergative case used with NPs from the right-hand to the left-hand side of the nominal hierarchy (Dixon 1979).

Importantly, in languages like Guraraní, transitive verbs are marked by either active or inactive, depending on which of the two arguments is located higher on the nominal hierarchy. The argument that ranks higher on the hierarchy gets cross-referenced on the verb.

² Mithun (1991) identifies the semantic basis of the active marking of various West Hemisphere languages, both synchronically and diachronically.

Guaraní (Tupí-Guaraní, Velazquez-Castillo 1996:17)

Active Marking

- (18) a. **ai**-nupa la-jagua.
IAC-beat the-dog
'I beat the dog.'
- b. Maria **oi**-nupa i-memby
Maria 3Ac-beat 3IN-offspring
'Maria beats her child.'
- c. Rei-nupa **la**-jagua
you 2AC-beat the-dog.'
'You beat the dog.'

Inactive Marking

- (19) a. Nde **che**-nupa
you 1IN-beat
'You beat me.'
- b. Petei jagua **nde**-su'u
one dog 2IN-bite
'A dog bit you.'

When the subject outranks the object or two arguments are of the same rank (18), the agent gets cross-referenced on the verb (active marking). When the object outranks the subject (19), it is the patient that gets cross-referenced on the verb (inactive marking). In (18-19), the thematic role assigned by the verb is identical, thus, assignment of active case is strictly determined by the place of the subject on the nominal hierarchy. That is, the active-inactive division in Guraraní is a clause-level phenomenon defined as the type of the grammatical relation between subject and object NPs. Klimov (1974, 1979) emphasizes this point, stressing that in active languages both the semantics of the predicate and the subject NP govern the distribution of active case.

2.2.3 Active/Genitive syncretism

It has been widely acknowledged that many ergative/active languages show syncretism between active marking and possessive marking. (For example, Inuktitut (Johns (1996), Mayan (Coon 2008), East Caucasian (Authier 2013), Guaraní (Velazquez-Castillo 1996) and many others). Johns (1992) argues that in Inuktitut ergative case is homophonous with a genitive case (-*up* for ergative/genitive); thus, the possessive construction (20) and the

ergative/active construction (21) are structurally identical. Johns (1992) develops a synchronic account of Inuktitut ergativity based on possessive constructions.³

Inuktitut (Eskimo-Aleut)

(20) anguti-**up** qimmi-**a**

man-Erg dog-3s/3s

‘the man’s dog’

(21) anguti-**up** kapi-**ja-a**

man-Erg stab-pass.part-3s/3s

‘The man’ stabbed one the one that the man stabbed’ (Johns 1992)

A number of linguists has proposed that syncretism between agent marking and genitive marking arises as a result of reanalysis of a possessive construction with the copula ‘be’ as monoclausal structure. Under this approach, a possessor is reanalyzed as an external argument (i.e. agent), and the biclausal copular structure is reanalyzed as a monoclausal transitive clause. Such proposal, (labelled as “nominalist” hypothesis by Kaufman 2009), has been made for Mayan (Bricker 1981, Coon & Salanova 2009), Inuktitut (Johns 1992), Austronesian (Starosta et al. 1982, Kaufman 2009, Aldridge 2015), and Cariban (Gildea 1998, 2000), among others. In the case of OJ, Miyagawa (1989) proposes that while the conclusive form of the verb is truly verbal and assigns structural accusative case (*zero* in OJ) to the object, the adnominal form of the verb has nominal properties and is unable to assign accusative case. Miyagawa proposes that the emergence of structural accusative with *wo* results from increased use of the adnominal form in main clause functions. From a typological perspective, Miyagawa’s (1989) synchronic treatment of adnominal clauses in OJ shows one piece of evidence that adnominal clauses underwent alignment change from non-accusative to accusative alignment.⁴

3 Differential subject marking

3.1 Two types of predicates

As proposed in Yanagida (2007) and Y&W (2009), two major clause types, traditionally labelled *shusi* ‘conclusive’ and *rentai* ‘adnominal’ clauses show different alignment patterns. The conclusive clauses display nominative-accusative alignment in that both S and A are marked in the same way (i.e. morphologically *zero*), as shown in (22-23).

³ Johns argues that *-jaa* constitutes two morpheme. *-ja* being the nominalized passive participle and *-a* encoding agreement.

⁴ In the typological/theoretical literature, nominative-accusative languages are simply called “accusative” language, while ergative and active languages “non-accusative” languages.

- b. 宇良未欲理 可治乃於等須流波 安麻乎等女可母
 Uramwi ywori **kadi no oto** Ø suru pa ama wotomye kamo (MYS 3641)
 PN from oar Gen sound make Top fisherfolk maiden Q
 Is the sound of the oar from Urami a maiden of the fisherfolk?

Other ‘nominalized’ clause types, which show the same patterns, are clauses inflected in the realis (*izenkei*) (28), irrealis (*mizenkei*) conditionals (29), and nominal clauses in *-(a)ku*.

(28) **Realis (*izenkei*) conditional**

- 和我乎礼婆 宇良之保美知久
 wa ga wor-e-ba ura sipo miti ku. (MYS 3707)
 I Agt be-Rls-when bay tide be.full comes
 ‘When I was present the tide was high in the bay.’

(29) **Irrealis (*mizenkei*) conditional**

- 真幸而 伊毛我伊波伴伐
 masakikute imo ga ipap-a-ba (MYS 3583)
 safely wife Agt bless-Irs-if
 ‘if you bless me godspeed’

(30) **V-*aku* Nominal form**

- 乎登賣良我 伊米尔都具良久
 wotome-ra **ga** ime ni tug-uraku (MYS 4011)
 maiden-Pl Agt dream in recount-Noml
 ‘what the maidens recounted in my dream’

Each of the nominalized clause types in (28-30) share the active alignment properties of the adnominal clauses in (25-26), in that the external arguments of transitive verbs are marked by *ga*, but not by *zero* (For further discussion, see section 3.4).

3.2 Active/Inactive Prefixes

Further evidence that OJ has active alignment comes from the verbal prefixes *i-* and *sa-*. It is known that OJ has various verbal prefixes on verbs whose semantic/syntactic functions have traditionally been left unexplained. Crosslinguistically, active alignment can be manifested in the morphological case marked on nouns, but many active languages are strictly head marking: they mark agreement with NP arguments on the verb. Y&W provide a comprehensive study of these prefixes, suggesting that *i-* is attached to active verbs, and *sa-*

to inactive verbs. (31) and (32) are cited in Y&W (2009:117). (All 75 occurrences for *-i* in the *Man'yōshū* are given in Yanagida 2007:178-179)

- (31) a. 檜乃京師乃 佐保川尔 伊去至而
 Nara no miyakwo no Sapo kawa ni i-yuki itarite (MYS 79)
 Nara Gen capital Gen Saho river –Loc i-go reaching
 ‘I reached the River Sahokawa in Nara.’
- b. 久米能若子我 伊觸家武 礪之草根
 Kume no wakugwo ga i-pure-kyem-u iswo no kusa no ne (MYS 435)
 Kume Gen youth Agt i-touch-PConj-Adn rock Gen grass Gen root
 ‘the root of the grass that the youth of Kume would have touched.’
- (32) b. 左宿之妻屋尔 朝庭出立悞
 sa-ne-si tumaya ni asita ni pa ide-tati sinopi (MYS 481)
 sa-sleep-Pst.Adn bedroom in morning in Top leaving remembering
 ‘remembering, leaving the bedroom where (I) slept’
- c. 狹丹頰相 吾大王
 sa-niturap-u wa ga opo kimi (MYS 420)
 sa-shine-Adn I Gen great lord
 ‘my great lord who shines’
- d. 梶野尔 左乎騰流雉
 [_{VP} Sugi-no no-ni sa-wodoru] kigisi (MYS 4148)
 cypress-GEN field-in SA-dance pheasant
 ‘The pheasant dances in the cypress field.’

The predicates that appear with *-i* includes *yoseru* ‘put aside’, *puru* ‘wave’, *yuku* ‘go’, *wataru* ‘cross’, *toru* ‘take’, *karu* ‘mow’, *kakuru* ‘hide’, *wogamu* ‘pray’, *maporu* ‘go around’, *poru* ‘dig’, *wakaru* ‘part from’, *kogu* ‘row a boat’, *mukapu* ‘head out’, *pirou* ‘pick up’, *mureru* ‘gather’ etc. The predicates that appear with the prefix *sa-* includes *neru* ‘sleep’, *niturapu* ‘shine’, *pasiru* ‘(fish) run’, *wodoru* ‘(birds) dance’, *wataru* ‘(toads) cross’, *nebapu* ‘spread roots’, *narabu* ‘(birds) line up’, *kumoru* ‘get cloudy’, *nituku* ‘get reddened’. Although these prefixes are already somewhat vestigial in OJ, the distribution of *i-* and *sa-* strongly suggests that *i-* appears with active verbs, while *sa-* appears in inactive intransitive verbs. A piece of evidence that these prefixes relates to active/inactive division is that *sa-* occurs as a noun prefix, as in *sa-yo* ‘night’, while *i-* does not. This parallels exactly the distribution of agreement prefixes in active languages such as Sateré-Mawé (Meira 2006): inactive prefixes

occur on both nouns and inactive verbs, while active prefixes occur on active verbs only.⁵ Furthermore, on both nouns and verbs as in (33), *sa-* triggers the process known as *rendaku*. The initial voiceless obstruents of a noun or a verb becomes voiced.

- (33) a. **sa koromo* > *saNkoromo* > *sa-goromo* ‘his clothes’
 b. **sa pasiri* > *saNpasiri* > *sa-basiri* ‘his running’

This process involves an earlier syllable of the form nasal+vowel (NV). It is suggested in the literature that the sequence NV is the earlier form of the genitive particle *no*. What (33) shows is that *sa* may reflect an original possessive S argument.

Y&W (2009) cited one apparent counterexample to the generalization in MYS 804, where *ga* and prefixal *sa-* appear to surface in the same clause:

- (34) 遠等咩良何 佐那周伊多斗 乎意斯比良伎
 wotomye-ra ga **sa**-nasu itado wo osipirak-i
 maiden-Pl Agt *sa*-sleep door Obj push open-Inf
 ‘pushing open the door where the maidens sleep.’ (MYS 804)

Kojima et al (1972), however, interpret *wotomyera ga* ‘maidens GA’ as the genitive possessor of *itado* ‘(wooden) door’, a metonymic expression for ‘bedroom’; the entire NP then has the interpretation ‘pushing open the maiden’s (bedroom) door where they sleep’ and the structure in (35):

- (35) [_{NP} wotomyera ga [[*pro sa*-nasu] itado]] wo osipirak-i
 maidens Gen *sa*-sleep door Obj push open-Cont

On this interpretation *wotmyera ga* is not the clausemate subject of *sa-nasu* ‘*sa*-sleep’.

3.3 wataru ‘cross’

Y&W observe that a verb, *wataru* ‘cross’ appears with either *i-* or *sa-*. There are 4 examples of *i-watar-* in the *Man’yōshū* (MY 1742, 2081, 4101, and 4126), and 6 examples of *sa-watar-* (MY 800, 971, 1960, 1976, 2450, and 2804). The S of *i-watar-* is [+human] and volitional in all four examples: ‘the young woman,’ ‘Tanabata’ (Vega, the weaver star), ‘the fisherfolk,’ and ‘Vega and Altair.’ The S of *sa-watar-* is [-human] in all six examples: (‘toads’ (800, 971), ‘a cuckoo’ (1960, 1976), ‘the moon,’ ‘a teal’). Typical examples of each pattern are given in (36-37) cited by Y&W.

⁵ Sateré-Mawé (Tupian) has an active system marked by two series of personal prefixes on the verb (cf. Mithun 1991). Meira (2006) shows that in Mawé nonactive verbs are strikingly similar to (possessed) nouns: the same set of personal prefixes appears on nouns and nonactive verbs; these prefixes do not select active verbs.

- (36) 安麻能我波 波志和多世良波 曾能倍由母 伊和多良佐牟乎 (MYS 4126)
 ama no gawa pasi watasera-ba sono pe yu mo **i-watar**-as-am-u wo
 sky Gen river bridge span-if that over from too *i-cross-Hon-Prop-Adn Conj*
 ‘though if one put a bridge across the Milky Way, (they=Vega and Altair) would
i-cross over on that’
- (37) 雲間從 狭化月乃 於保々思ク 相見子等 (MYS 2450)
 kumo ma ywori **sa-wataru** tukwi no *opoposiku* api misi kwo
 cloud among from *sa-cross moon-Gen* faintly join saw child
 ‘the girl I saw faintly like the moon *sa-crossing* from among the clouds’

I-watar- ‘cross (over the bridge)’ is agentive, volitional and telic, a stereotypical active verb. *Sa-watar-* is non-agentive and designates not a completed action, but the moon passing before the speaker’s view; in other words, a stereotypical inactive predicate. Commenting on (37), Kojima et al (1995, vol. 3: 191) observe exactly the distinction we describe here between *i-watar-* and *sa-watar-*. They note that while *i-watar-* occurs only with human subjects, *sa-watar-* is restricted to nonhuman subjects.

To summarize this section, OJ nominalized clauses show not just an active case marking system, but at least the vestiges of active prefixal morphology. This is evidenced by a strict opposition between active and inactive verbs in both dependent and head marking strategies. Dependent marking of active S by the case marker *ga* is in opposition to marking of inactive S by *zero*. Head marking of active predicates by the prefix *i-* is in opposition to the prefix *sa-* on inactive predicates.

3.4 Predicates

In recent work, Kikuta (2012) addresses some problems of Y&W’s hypothesis, and suggests instead that Japanese has never undergone alignment change: adnominal clauses show a nominative-accusative pattern throughout the history; but in OJ with two differential case markers *ga* and *no*. Kikuta’s proposal is primarily based on the assumption that *ga* marks not only on the subjects of active verbs but also on the subjects of inactive intransitive verbs. Possible counterexamples cited by Kikuta (2012) are examined in details below.

3.4.1 Psych Predicate

Kikuta (2012) points out that OJ *ga* appears on the non-agentive theme subjects of experiencer verbs, such as *wasur-* ‘forget’ *omop-* ‘think’, *mi* ‘see’ etc.

- (38) a. 伊毛賀古比之久 和須良延奴加母
imo ga kopisiku wasura-**ye-nu-kamo** (MYS 4407)
 my.lover Agt miss forget-Mid-Neg-Q
 ‘Did I miss my dear and cannot forget her?’
- b. 山越去之 公之 所念良國
 yama kopeni-si **kimi ga** omopo-**yu-raku-ni** (MYS 3191)
 mountain cross-Pst you/lord Agt think-Mid-Nmlz-Loc
 ‘when you came to my mind as I was crossing over the mountains’

According to Kikuta, this raises a problem for Y&W’s (2009) hypothesis that *ga* marks active case in OJ. However a closer examination of the data reveals that these specific psych verb constructions with *ga*-marked theme subjects contain an unspecified 1st person experiencer and a form of the auxiliary *yu* (stem *ye-*), which derives middles, passives, and potentials and.⁶ *-Yu* is arguably related to the acquisitive light verb *u* (stem *e-*) ‘get’, which Whitman (2008) proposes as the source of the well-known transitivity alterations in *-e-* in OJ and later stages of the language. *-E* derives both transitives and intransitives, a property of acquisitives such as English auxiliary *get*. If this analysis is correct, experiencer middles such as (38) may have an original transitive source, i.e. ‘my dear got me to forget’ ‘my lord got me to think’. That is, (38) can be analyzed as a complex causative construction. The theme subject serves as the causer argument of the verb *+yu*, and thus, (38b), for example, literally means ‘you reminded (made) me of thinking of you when I crossed over the mountain’.⁷

3.4.2 Active/Inactive predicates

If *ga* is an active case, we expect that it does not cooccur with non-agentive stative verbs. However, as pointed out by Kikuta, there are some possible counterexamples, as shown in (39-40):

⁶ The productive passive auxiliary *-yu* in OJ appears after the irrealis (*mizenkei*) stem of the verb as in (38a). With a small number of verbs such as *omopoyu* in (38b) *-yu* appears after a different stem vowel, probably reflecting an older fossilized pattern.

⁷ A parallel construction can be seen, for example, in Assamese, cited by Woolford (2008), where the theme subject of an experiencer verb is marked ergative when the light verb *make/do* is added to the verb:

- (i) gan-tu-e xap-tu-k khogal korile
 song-Class-Erg snake-Class-Dat anger made/did
 ‘The song angered the snake.’

The subject is the external argument of the light verb *korile* ‘make/do’ and is assigned ergative in Assamese. Facts like these show that languages may differ as to which argument is mapped to the external argument position. The agent subject is invariably an external argument, but in some languages the causer argument of a psych-verb can be an external argument, and thus agent, marked with ergative.

(39) 妹我 灰而座者

imo ga papi nite **imase**-ba... (MYS 213)

lover Agt ash into be/go-when

‘when my dear has gone into ashes...’

(40) 手兒奈我 安里之<可婆>

tegwona ga **ari**-sika-ba... (MYS 3385)

maid Agt be-Pst.Real-Cond

‘When there was a maid...’

These verbs are generally treated as inactive; the subject has no control or intention over the activity denoted by the verb. Assuming that *ga* is a nominative case marking both A and S, Kikuta (2012) argues that differential case marking in OJ is conditioned not by the semantics of the predicates, but by the semantics of the nominals. Using Koji’s (1988) *Man’yōshū* data, she provides data for both subjects and possessors marked by *ga*.

Table 1: Pronominal subject and Pronominal possessives marked by *ga* (Kikuta 2012)

| | <i>wa</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>na</i> | <i>ono</i> | <i>ta</i> | <i>si</i> | <i>kore</i> | total |
|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| subject | 45 | 31 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 86 |
| Possessive | 89 | 34 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 141 |

Table 2: Nominal subject and nominal possessives marked by *ga* (Kikuta 2012)

| | <i>kimi</i> | <i>imo</i> | <i>wag-imo</i> | <i>waga-seko</i> | <i>wotome</i> | <i>papa</i> | <i>ko</i> | others | total |
|------------|-------------|------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|--------|-------|
| subject | 90 | 49 | 37 | 28 | 16 | 9 | 6 | 23 | 258 |
| possessive | 39 | 97 | 26 | 25 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 76 | 288 |

The data in Tables 1 and 2 indeed shows that the alternation between *ga* and *no* is determined by the semantics of the subject NPs, as widely observed in the literature (cf. Ohno 1987 and Nomura 1993). *Ga* is obligatory for first/second personal pronouns; *w(a)* and *na*, and the nominals intimate to the speaker, such as *kimi* ‘you/lord’, *imo*, *seko* ‘lover’, *papa* ‘mother’, *ko* ‘child. *No*, in contrast, is used for the nominals lower on the nominal hierarchy.

We must however, note that no previous work – including Kikuta’s - has included a discussion of *zero* case in OJ. The crucial contrast, however, is not merely between *ga* and *no*, but between *ga* and *zero*. If *ga* and *zero* are associated with the active/inactive division, as argued in Y&W (2009), we expect that *ga* appears with active predicates whose subject is not marked by *zero*, but possibly with *no* if the subject NP is located lower in the nominal hierarchy. The data in Table 3 and 4 are taken from Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese (OCOJ),

the syntactically annotated corpus, through an exhaustive search designed to select predicates whose subjects are marked by *ga*, *no* and *zero*.⁸

Table 3: Verbs with high volitionality (non-conclusive form)⁹

| | Total | 待 | 泣 | 行 | 振 | 植 | 着 | 寄 | 渡 | 笑 |
|------|-------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| ga | 903 | 43 | 30 | 24 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| no | 1255 | 8 | 26 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| zero | 2054 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 3 includes the total number of subjects marked by *ga/no/zero* with predicates in the non-conclusive form. This study reveals that those verbs which most frequently appear with *ga*-marked subjects never appear with *zero*-marked subjects. Table (4), on the other hand, shows possible counterexamples in which *ga* appears with predicates with low volitionality. (For the complete data taken from the OCOJ, see Appendix I.)

Table 4: The class of verbs with low volitionality (non-conclusive form)

| | 寝 | 座 | 居 | 有 | 濡 | 死 | total |
|------|----|---|---|----|---|-----------------|-------|
| ga | 12 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 37 |
| no | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 25 |
| zero | 0 | 5 | 0 | 31 | 6 | 5 ¹⁰ | 71 |

The verb 座 is ambiguously interpreted as either the existential verb ‘be’ (inactive) or the active verb ‘go’ (active). Kikuta cites (39) as a counterexample, but *imas-* in (39) has the meaning of ‘go’. The verbs *ne-*(寝) ‘sleep’, and *wor-*(居) ‘sit’ with low volitionality are in fact categorized as active in OJ, since their subjects are marked by *ga*, but never by *zero*. (Recall that in languages like Guaraní, the division of verbs into active/inactive subclasses involves some ideosyncratic properties of a given language (see 2.2.1)). Although the data contains some counterexamples, specifically, 5 tokens of *ga* with the verb 有 ‘be’, as illustrated in (40), the overall data taken from the OCOJ supports the hypothesis that *ga* and *zero* divide predicates into active/inactive in OJ.

⁸ I owe many thanks to Stephen Horn for his help to get the data from the OCOJ.

⁹ Note that the subjects of the predicates in the conclusive form are excluded since they are assigned nominative (i.e., zero) marking both S and A. Moreover, not included are subjects with *naku* meaning ‘make a cry’ (nonvolitional), as opposed to ‘sweep’ (volitional). They are all non-human animate (86 tokens). Inanimate bare subjects with *yuku* ‘go/pass/come’, as in (i), are not included either (14 tokens).

(i) aki yuke-ba kurenawi nipopu (MYS 3227)

autumn come-because crimson smell

(i) involves no volitional activity performed by the agent.

¹⁰ In all five instances, *sinu* ‘die’ appears with the subject *inoti* ‘life’, as in *inoti(S) sinu*, where the subject is possibly incorporated into the verb.

下瀬尔 鵜矣 八頭漬
 simo tu se ni **u wo** **ya-tu** kaduke
 lower GEN stream DAT cormorant ACC **eight-CL** make.dive

“...making all eight of my cormorants dive in the upper reaches, making all eight of my cormorants dive in the lower reaches...” (MYS.3330)

(44) 毎年尔 鮎之走婆 左伎多河 鵜八頭

tosi no pa ni ayu si pasiraba sakitakapa **u** **ya-tu**
 every year sweetfish RES run.when Sakita.River cormorant **eight-CL**

可頭氣氏 河瀬多頭祢牟
 kadukete kapase tadune-mu
 make.dive river.stream search-CONJ

“Each year when the sweetfish run, making many cormorants dive, we shall scour rivers and streams.” (MYS.4158)

In OJ the numeral quantifier *ya-tu* ‘eight-CL’ is ambiguous in that it can denote a precise cardinality or a non-specific sense of ‘many’. (43) describes fishing the eight cormorants in the upper reaches (specific) and eight cormorants in the lower reaches (specific). This interpretation is consistent with the presence of *wo* on the host noun *u wo* ‘cormorant’. In contrast, *ya-tu* ‘eight-CL’ in (44) denotes a non-specific sense of ‘many’; thus, the absence of *wo* on the host NP.

Finally, in languages in which specificity plays an important role in object marking, specific objects tend to move out of VP, while non-specific objects cannot (cf. Diesing 1992). We find such pattern in OJ. *Wo*-marked objects necessarily move over the *ga*-marked subject, resulting in the configuration [Object=*wo* Subject=*ga* V], as illustrated in (45) (see also Kinsui 2001 cited by Kuroda 2008).¹¹

(45) a. 秋山乎 如何君之 獨越武
aki yama wo ikani-ka kimi-ga pitori kwoyu-ramu (MYS 106)
 autumn mountain-Obj how-Q you Agt alone cross-Aux
 ‘How do you cross the autumn mountain alone?’

b. 和礼乎也未尔也 伊毛我古非都追珠 安流良牟
ware wo yami ni ya imo ga kwop-i-tutu aru ram-u? (MYS 3669)
 I Obj dark in Q wife Agt longing.for be PConj-Adn
 ‘Would my wife be longing for me in the dark?’

¹¹ See Yanagida (2007) for all the examples with OSV order in *Man'yōshū*. Possible counterexamples to this word order restriction are given in Yanagida (2006).

In contrast to (45), the object without *wo* appears strictly adjacent to the verb, resulting in the canonical word order [Subject=*ga* Object= \emptyset V]. These include examples like (46).

- (46) a. 佐欲比賣能故何 比列布利斯 夜麻能名
 Saywopimye no kwo ga **pire** \emptyset puri-si yama no na (MYS 868)
 Sayohime Gen child Agt scarf wave-Past.Adn hill Gen name
 ‘the name of the hill where Sayohime waved a scarf’
- b. 加奈思吉兒呂我 尔努保佐流可母
 kanasiki kwo-ro ga **ninwo** \emptyset posaru kamo (MYS 3351)
 beloved child-Aff Agt cloth dry Q
 ‘Is my beloved drying woven cloth?’

The quantitative data taken from the *Man’yōshū* reveals that the objects that follows the *ga*-marked subject are without exception non-branching noun heads and appear immediately adjacent to the verb (cf. Yanagida 2007). To account for this fact, Yanagida (2007) and Y&W (2009) propose that OJ possesses the phenomenon of “noun incorporation” in the sense of Baker (1988): zero-marked nouns, such as *pire* ‘scarf’ and *ninwo* ‘cloth’, are syntactically incorporated into the verb.¹² Note that Modern Japanese does not have noun incorporation in the strict sense. The patterns of incorporation discussed by Kageyama (1980) such as *kosi o kakeru* vs. *kosikakeru*, *tema o toru* vs. *temadoru* are not productive. These expressions are possibly analyzable as lexical compounds.

As indicated in Yanagida (2006:61), there is one possible counterexample in which the subject marked by *ga* is followed by the *wo*-marked object, as illustrated in (47).

- (47) 夜麻能奈等 伊賓都夏等可母 佐用比賣何 許能野麻能閑仁
 Yama no na to ipi-tuge to **Sayopimye ga** kono yama no upe ni
 hill Gen name as say-tell that Sayo princess Agt this hill Gen upon at
 必例遠 布利家牟
pire wo puri-kyemu
 sash Obj wave-Aux (MYS 872)
 ‘Was it for transmitting as the name of the mountain that Princess Sayo waved a sash upon this hill.’

The *man’yōgana* 遠 in (47) is read *wo*. Yanagida (2006) suggests the possibility that this character is used to write the noun 緒 *wo* ‘long cloth/string/thong/cord’, in which case *pirewo* is a compound noun ‘long sash’ functioning as the object of the verb *puri* ‘wave’. Although

¹² Note importantly that object incorporation is a salient feature of languages with active alignment as observed by Klimov (1977: 125-6) (also Sapir 1911).

Kinsui (2011:104), however, suggests, in response to Miyagawa (1989), that whether objects are marked by *wo* is purely stylistic, and that in some cases whether *wo* occurs is determined by poetic versification with the basic lines of 5-7-5-7 syllables.¹³

(49) 父母乎 美礼婆多布斗斯 妻子見礼婆 米具斯宇都久志

titi papa wo mire-ba taputosi **mye kwo** mire ba megusi utukusi (MYS 800)

father mother Obj see-when respect wife child see when cute beautiful

‘When I see my father and mother, I feel respect; when I see my wife and children, they are lovable and beautiful..’

In (49) the first and second objects appear in the same syntactic contexts; that is, inside a conditional clause headed by *ba* ‘when’. Nonetheless, the first occurrence of the object is marked by *wo*, and the second occurrence of the object is morphologically unmarked. Note, however, that the second occurrence of *mekwo* ‘mother and child’ ends with the labialized mid back vowel, on one interpretation homophonous with the case particle *wo*. This raises the possibility that deletion of the second occurrence of *wo* is simply a case of haplology, or rather the poet taking advantage of haplology to preserve the meter.¹⁴ I hypothesize that poetic versification does not override the core grammar of language, but it only comes into play when the grammar allows optionality. Below I strengthen the DOM hypothesis by a close inspection of the two prose texts in OJ: *Senmyô* and *Norito*, where metrical questions are not at issue.

4.2. *Senmyô and Norito*

The analysis above is primarily based on the *Man’yôshû*, a collection of poems that have versification restrictions. This section attempts to show that the skewed distribution of *wo* is not due to poetic versification, as proposed by Kinsui (2011), by examining the two major prose texts in OJ, *Senmyô* (*Shokunihongi Senmyo*) and *Norito* (*Engisiki Norito*).¹⁵ The writing style of the *Senmyô* and *Norito* differs from the *Man’yôshû* in that it uses a set of writing conventions known as *Senmyo gaki*. In *Senmyôgaki*, grammatical particles, auxiliaries

¹³ Miyawaga (1989) provides a syntactic analysis of the difference between case marked objects and zero-marked objects in OJ. According to Miyagawa, the conclusive form of the verb is truly verbal and assigns abstract case to the object in underlying object position, while the adnominal form has nominal properties and has no case assigning ability. In adnominal clauses, the object is assigned overt structural case in the form of *wo* in order to avoid a violation of the Case Filter.

¹⁴ Thanks to John Whitman for this observation.

¹⁵ *Shokunihongi Senmyô* is the sixty two imperial edicts preserved in the *Shoku Nihongi* (Chronicles of Japan); an imperially commissioned Japanese history text, completed in 797. *Engisiki Norito* contains *Shinto* rituals and practices in their pristine form in Volume eight of the *Engisiki* compiled in the tenth century. These rituals are obviously of much earlier origin than the date of its compilation and believed to reflect the language of the *Nara* period.

and verb endings are, in some manuscripts, written phonographically in smaller size (but not exclusively). Lexical/content words such as nouns and verbs are written logographically in larger size (but not exclusively). Although the *Senmyô* contains a hybrid of phonogrammatic spellings and sections with a superficial Chinese-like style, it is known to reflect the language of Japanese in the 8th century. Wrona and Frellesvig (2010) present an extensive study of the distribution of *wo*- and *zero*-marked objects in these two prose texts. Contrary to Miyagawa's (1989) generalization, their quantitative study shows that there is no significant difference in the use of *wo* vs. *zero* marking between adnominal and conclusive clauses. Wrona and Frellesvig suggest that the *wo*- and *zero*-marking have no semantic effects either, and conclude that *zero*-marked objects are simply analyzed as stylistic case drop.

A problem with *Senmyô* which Wrona and Frellesvig fail to address is that objects without *wo* do not necessarily correspond to *zero*-marked objects, because the language used in this text does not reflect what was actually read, but has rather the status of a guide for reading. Thus, the phonographic particle or verb ending may not appear in the scripts but was presumably supplied when reading them orally. The annotated versions of *Senmyô* with so-called *yomisoe* 'supplied readings' are based on the original interpretation of Motôri (1803); all subsequent annotated texts basically follow Motôri's annotation. According to Ikeda (1996), Motôri's (1803) text contains 83 tokens of supplied *wo*. Kitagawa's (1982) version of the *Senmyo* text, which Wrona and Frellesvig's analysis is based on, contains 85 tokens of supplied *wo*. Neither Motôri nor Kitagawa, however, provide explanations about why *wo* is supplied in certain cases, but not in other cases. Given that the exact basis for *yomisoe* readings has never been made clear, it is extremely difficult to determine what counts as a *zero*-marked object. Note that this problem is less significant in the *Man'yôshû*, because in most cases, supplied *wo* occurs when the object is logographically written or in the *kanbun* 'Chinese' style. Crucially, *Man'yôshû* has versification, which makes it possible to predict to some degree of accuracy whether objects without phonographic *wo* are in fact should be read with *wo*.

I have counted the number of *wo* marked and phonographically "unmarked" objects in *Norito* and *Senmyô*. The result of the ratio between *wo* marked and unmarked objects is similar to Wrona and Frellesvig's. (The unmarked objects include tokens where *wo* is supplied by Kitagawa).¹⁶

¹⁶ The quantitative data for *Senmyô* is taken from Kitagawa (1982) and *Norito* from Kurano and Takeda (1958). I ignored 是以 since there are many tokens which may or may not appear with *wo*. Ikeda's (1996) data on Kitagawa (1982) excludes this phrase.

(50)

| Wo-Marked Objects | | Unmarked Objects | |
|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Senmyô | Norito | Senmyô | Norito |
| 498 | 261 | 256 | 166 |

In both *Senmyô* (SM) and *Norito* (NT) *wo*-marked objects are consistently interpreted as specific. Some examples are given in (51-52).

(51) a. 誰奴_加 朕朝_乎 背而 然為_流 (SM: Edict 16)

tare (si) (no) yatukwo ka **wa(ga) mikadwo wo** somuki-te... sika su-ru
 who Foc Gen retainer Q 1P.self Gen emperor Obj betray-Inf this do-Adn
 ‘Whose retainer betrays his emperor... and acts in this way’

b. 一毛 吾_乎 可怨事者 不所念 (SM:Edict 16)

pitotu mo **ware wo** uramu-beki koto pa omopoe-zu
 one Foc 1P Obj hate-would that Top think-not
 ‘I didn’t think anyone would hate me.’

(52) a. 四方國_乎 安國_登 平久知食_{須我} 故... (NT: 祈年祭 393p)

yomo-(no)-kuni wo yasu-kuni to tapirakeku sirosimyesu ga yuwe ni
 four-Gen-country Obj peaceful-country as tranquil rule Gen because
 ‘because [I] rule the country in peace, as a tranquil nation’

b. 公民_乃 作作物_乎... 不成傷_被 (NT: 竜田風神祭 401p)

opo-mitakara no tukuri **tukuru mono wo**... nasi-tamapa-zu sokonaperu pa...
 people Gen grow.Inf grow.Adn thing Obj do-Hon-not harm Top
 ‘not allowing what [my] subjects grow to ripen, and doing harm’

The personal pronouns and the possessor+NP in (51-52) are inherently specific. In (52b), *tukuru mono* ‘crops’ is marked by *wo* because it refers to specific crops grown by the people of the nation, mentioned in the previous sentence. *Norito* uses many instances of the expression “*kusagusa* Gen NP” ‘various/many NPs’. The NPs marked by *wo* are unambiguously specific, while *zero*-marked NPs are non-specific. This is illustrated in (53) and (54).

(53) 皇神_{能前} 白馬・白猪・白鷄 種種 色物_乎

sumegami no mape ni siroki uma siroki inosisi siroki tori **kusagusa (no) iromono wo**
 deity Gen before Loc white horse white boar, white cock various Gen things Obj

備奉_臣 (NT: 祈年祭 387p)

sonape maturi te
 prepare enshrine

‘Before the sovereign deities of the Grains, I will prepare for and provide various

kinds of offerings such things as the white horse, the white boar and the white cock.’

- (54) 御馬_尔 御鞍 具_氏 品品_乃 幣帛_〇 備_氏 (NT: 龍田風神祭 403p)
 mima ni mikura \emptyset sonapete **kusagusa no mitegura** \emptyset sonapete
 horse Loc saddle provide many offerings prepare for
 ‘Providing a saddle for the horse and preparing for various kinds of offerings
 (for the deity).’

In (53) the set of the items offered to the deity is defined in the previous context while in (54) the NP *mitegura* ‘offering’ is not defined in the previous discourse, thus the absence of *wo*.

Note that *opoyasima-no kuni* 大八嶋国 ‘the islands of Japan’ is always used in the unmarked form in the preverbal position of the verb form *sira-知* ‘govern’. But when it is specific and moved out of VP, *wo* shows up. The contrast between (55) and (56) cited from *Norito*, shows the point.

- (55) 明御神_能大八嶋國_乎 ... 安_久平_久知行_牟 事 (NT: 難祭詞:456p)
 akitu mikamwi no opo-ya-simaguni **wo**...tapirakeku sirosimyesa-mu koto
 Emperor Gen large-eight-island Obj... peacefully govern-Aux that
 ‘That the emperor governs the islands of Japan peacefully.’
- (56) 志貴嶋_爾 大八嶋國- \emptyset 知_志皇御孫命 (NT: 竜田風神祭: 400p)
 sikwi-sima ni **opo-ya-simaguni- \emptyset** sirasi-si sumyemima (no) mikoto
 Shiki-island Loc large-eight-island govern-Past God Gen Son
 ‘The Son of God (emperor) that governs the Shikisima.’

In (55), *opoyasimaguni* 大八嶋国 refers to the specific islands of Japan that is governed by the emperor. In (56), *opoyasimaguni* appears immediately adjacent to the verb *sira*-‘govern’. the NV complex is interpreted as the predicate ‘govern (lands) in general’.

A close examination, however, reveals that bare objects that appear in *Senmyô* behave quite differently from those in *Norito*. *Norito* shows the same pattern as the *Man’yôshû* in that preverbal bare objects in adnominal clauses invariably receive non-specific interpretations, as illustrated in (57).

- (57) a. 皇御孫命_能 大嘗聞食_牟 為故_爾 (NT:大嘗祭 434p)
 sumye-mima-(no)-mikoto no **oponipe** \emptyset kikosi-myesa-mu tame (no) yuwe-ni
 Son of God Gen harvest partake-Aux reason Gen for-Loc
 ‘in order that the Emperor partakes of this year’s rice harvest’

- b. 襴懸伴緒_乎 …古語云麻我比 不令為_豆 (NT:大殿祭 420p)

tasuki Ø kakuru tomo no wo wo... magapi Ø nasa-sime-zu-si-te

sash put.on companion Gen man Obj mistake do-Aux-not-do-Inf

‘making sure that officials who put on the imperial chef’s sash to not go wrong’

Senmyô, on the other hand, contains many counterexamples. That is, in (58), the bare objects of the adnominal verbs are unambiguously interpreted as specific.

- (58) a. 祖父大臣_乃殿門 荒穢_須事無_久 (SM: Edict 13)

opodi opo-mapye tu kimi no tonokadwo Ø arasi kega-su koto naku

grandfather great lord Gen dignitary gate disturb defile that not

‘without disturbing and defiling the gates of dignitaries and ancestors’

- b. 天皇朝 守仕奉事 顧_{奈伎}人等_爾 (SM: Edict 13)

sumyera ga mikadwo Ø mamori tukape-maturu koto kapyerimi-naki pito domo

emperor Gen lord protect serve-Hon that look back-not people PL

‘people who selflessly serve and protect the emperor’

- c. 仲麻呂_何家物 計_{夫流爾} 書中_爾 仲麻呂_等

nakamaro ga ipye no mono Ø kazwo-puru ni pumi no naka ni nakamaro to

NM Gen house Gen thing examine-Adn Loc letter Gen inside Loc NM. with

通_{家流}謀_乃文有 (SM: Edict 30:331p)

kaywopasi-kyeru pakarikoto no pumi ari

lay-Past conspiracy Gen letter exist

‘When (the emperor) examined things in Nakamaro’s house, among the letters was a secret letter in which (he) laid a conspiracy with Nakamaro.’

A question then arises as to why *Senmyô* does not pattern in the same way as *Norito*. Note that *Shoku Nihongi*, in which *Senmyô* was included, is about the Chronological history of the *ritsuryôsei*, replicating China’s political system from the Tang Dynasty. Kotani (1986) argues that a different writing style in *Senmyô* and *Norito* lies in the fact that they have different origins. According to Kotani, *Senmyô* was written on the basis of *Shochoku* ‘emperial rescript’ written in Old Chinese. Thus, they contain many sentences in the *kanbun* ‘Chinese’ style, and even sentences in the Japanese style are based on *kanbun* and transcribed from *kanbun* to Japanese by changing word order and adding particles or verb endings to the original *kanbun* counterparts. *Norito*, on the other hand, has its origin in oral tradition which takes the form of folktales, songs or chants, reflecting a genuine oral language. Although we leave open the issue concerning *yomisoe* ‘supplied reading’, it is plausible to assume that the objects with specific interpretations, such as (58), are the ones presumably read with supplied *wo*. *Norito*,

on the other hand, provides supporting evidence that preverbal bare objects pattern like *Man'yôshû* in that they receive non-specific interpretations.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has investigated two distinct levels of DAM attested in Old Japanese. DSM is associated with the semantic role assigned by the verb; more specifically, agentive subjects are marked by *ga*, whereas non-agentive subjects are marked by *zero*. The use of *ga* and *zero* is sensitive to the place of the subject on the nominal hierarchy. The human NPs higher on the hierarchy are associated with prototypical agents, which express volition and control, whereas the non-human or inanimate NPs lower on the hierarchy are not transitivity prototype. OJ data shows that transitivity is a clause-level phenomenon defined as the type of NPs which serves as a grammatical subject. DOM in OJ, on the other hand, is associated with a specific/non-specific distinction of object NPs. The distinctive [O *wo* S *ga* V] pattern of transitive clauses is consistent with the view that objects marked by *wo* is specific and that specific objects move outside VP.

Texts (Primary Sources)

- Kitagawa, Kazuhide 1982. *Shoku Nihongi Senmyo* Yoshikawa Koubunkan Tokyo.
- Kurano Kenji and Takeda Yukichi. 1958. *Kojiki Norito*, Nihon Koten bungaku Taikei 1, Iwanami Shoten
- Koji, Kazuteru. 1988. *Man'yôshû Joshi no Kenkyu*. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.
- Kojima, Noriyuki; Kinoshita, Masatake; and Tôno, Haruyuki. 1995. *Man'yôshû (1-4)*, *Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshû*. Tokyo: Shogakkan.
- Nakanishi, Susumu. 1978-1983. *Man'yôshû*. Tokyo: Kôdansha Bunko, (reprinted in 1978-2005).
- Satake, Asahiro, Kudô, Rikio, Ohtani, Masao and Yamazaki Yoshiyuki. 2002. *Man'yôshû Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei (1-4)*. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Electronic Texts

The Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese, <http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/>
Man'yôshû Kensaku, Yamaguchi University
http://infux03.inf.edu.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp/~manyô/ver2_2/manyô.php

References

Aldridge, Edith. 2015. A minimalist approach to the emergence of ergativity in Austronesian

- languaes. *Linguistics Vanguard* 1(1): 313-326.
- Authier, Gilles. 2013. The origin of two genitive cases and inalienability split in Budugh (East Caucasian). *Faits de Langues* 41:177-192.
- Baker, Mark, C. 1988. *Incorporation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bittner, Maria and Ken Hale. 1996. The structural determination of case and agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27:1-68.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89-156. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In Winfred Lehmann (ed.), *Syntactic typology*, 329-394. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Coon, Jessica 2008. When ergative=genitive: nominals and split ergativity. In Natasha Abner and Jason Bishop (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 99-107.
- Coon, Jessica & Andrés Pablo Salanova (2009) Nominalization and predicate-fronting: two sources of ergativity. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 15.1 45-54.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA. : MIT Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55: 59-138.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufman, Daniel. (2009). Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: A Tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35(1), 1-49.
- Kikuta, Ciharu. 2012. *Jodai Nihongo no ga-kaku nituite* (On the case marker *ga* in Old Japanese) *Dosisha Daigaku Jinbun Gakkai* (The Literary Association), Doshisha University 89. 89-123.
- Klimov, Georgij A. 1974. On the character of languages of active typology. *Linguistics* 131: 11-25.
- Klimov, Georgij A. 1977. *Tipologija jazykov aktivnogo stroja* [Typology of languages of the active type]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 2008. On the syntax of Old Japanese. In Bjarke Frellesvig, J.C. Smith and Masayoshi Shibatani (eds.), *Current issues in the history and structure of Japanese*, 263-318. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke and John Whitman. 2008. *Proto-Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke, Stephen Horn and Yuko Yanagida. 2015. Differential object marking in

- Old Japanese: A corpus based study. In Dag Haug et al. (eds.), *Historical linguistics: Current issues in linguistic theory*. 195-211. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gildea, Spike. 1998. *On Reconstructing grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gildea, Spike. 2000. On the genesis of the verb phrase in Cariban languages. In Spike Gildea (ed.), *Reconstructing grammar: Comparative linguistics and grammaticalization*, 65-106. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ikeda, Yukie, 1996. Senmyo no “wo” kaku hyouji [The objective case “wo” in Senmyo] *Machikaneyama Ronso* Vol. 30 19-32 The Faculty of Letters, Osaka University, Osaka.
- Johns, Alana. 1992. Deriving ergativity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(1), 57-87.
- Kageyama, Taro. 1980. *Goi no kozo* [The structure of lexicon]. Tokyo: Shohakusha.
- Kinsui, Satoshi. 2011. Togoron [Syntax] In Satoshi Kinsui, Yoshiyuki Takayama, Tomohide Kinuhata, Tomoko Okazaki (eds.), *Bunposhi* [The history of grammar]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Klimov, Georgij A. 1974. On the character of languages of active typology. *Linguistics* 131: 11-25.
- Klimov, Georgij A. 1977. *Tipologija jazykov aktivnogo stroja* [Typology of languages of the active type]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kotani, Hiroyasu. 1986. *Mokkan to senmyo no kokugogakuteki kenkyu* [A linguistic study of *Mokkan* and *Senmyo*]. Osaka: Izumi Shoin.
- Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 2007. On the syntax of Old Japanese. In Bjarke Frellesvig, J.C. Smith and Masayoshi Shibatani (eds.), *Current issues in the history and structure of Japanese*, 263-318. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Meira Sergio. 2006. Stative verbs vs. nouns in Sateré-Mawé and the Tupian family. In Grazyna J. Rowicka and Eithne B. Carlin (eds.), *What's in a verb: Studies in the verbal morphology of the languages of the Americas*, Lot Occasional Series, 189-214, Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics, Netherlands.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1991. Active/agentive case marking and its motivations. *Language* 67.3: 510-546.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and case marking in Japanese*. *Syntax and semantics* 22. New York: Academic Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2011. Genitive subjects in Altaic and specification of phase. *Lingua* 121:1265-1282.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru 2012. *Case, Argument Structure and word order*, Routledge, New York.
- Motohashi, Tatsushi. 1989. *Case theory and the history of the Japanese language*, PhD

- Dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Nomura, Takashi. 1993. Jôdaigo no *no* to *ga* ni tsuite [On the particles *no* and *ga* in Old Japanese]. *Kokugo Kokubun* 62: 1-17.
- Ohno, Susumu. 1977. Shukaku Joshi *ga* no Seiritsu [The Development of the Nominative Case Particle *ga*], *Bungaku* 45, 102-117.
- Sapir, Edward. 1911. The problem of noun incorporation in American languages. *American Anthropologist* 13: 250-282.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In R.M.W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, 112-171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Takeuchi Shiro. 2008. Kodai nihongo no kakujoshi “*wo*” no hyoji-iki to sono henka [The distribution and historical change of the case particle *wo* in earlier Japanese]. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 85:4 50-63.
- Tsuta, Kiyoyuki. 2005. *Mi no sekai* [The realm of *-mi*]. *Kokugo Kokubun* 73:12, 10-28
- Velazquez-Castillo, Maura 1996. The grammar of possession. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Vovin, Alexander. 1997. On the syntactic typology of Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 273-290.
- Whitman, John. 2008. The source of the bigrade conjugation and stem shape in pre-Old Japanese. In Frellesvig, Bjarke & John Whitman (eds.) *Proto-Japanese*, 159-174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Woolford, Ellen. 2008. Differential subject marking at argument structure, syntax and PF. In Helen de Hoop & Peter de Swart (eds.), *Differential subject marking*, 17-40. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Wrona, Janick and Bjarke Frellesvig. 2010. The Old Japanese case system: The function of *wo*. In Shoichi Iwasaki, Hajime Hoji, Patricia M. Clancy and Sung-Ock Sohn (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 17, 565-580. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Yamada, Yoshio. 1968. *Naracho Bunposhi*, Hobunkan, Tokyo.
- Yanagida, Yuko. 2006. Word order and clause structure in Early Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15: 37-68.
- Yanagida, Yuko. 2007. Jôdaigo no nôkakusei ni tsuite [On ergativity in Old Japanese]. In ed. Nobuko Hasegawa (ed.), *Nihongo no shubun genshō* [Main clause phenomena in Japanese], 147-188. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo.
- Yanagida, Yuko and John Whitman. 2009. Alignment and word order in Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 18, 101-144.

Appendix I

Ga-marked Subject

| citation | comment | genitive | predicate | clause | inflection | function | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|---|---|----------------|----------------|
| MYS.6.1000 | 有 | Subject- ga | araba | kwo ra ga araba | conditional | adjunct | |
| KK.110 | | Subject- ga | areba | si ga areba | conditional | adjunct | |
| MYS.3.466 | | Subject- ga | ari seba | pasikiyasi imo ga ari seba | conditional | adjunct | |
| MYS.14.3385 | | Subject- ga | ari sikaba | kadu sika no mama no tegwona ga ari sikaba | provisional | adjunct | |
| MYS.2.166 | | Subject- ga | ari to | misu be ki kimi ga ari to | infconc | adjunct | |
| MYS.2.213 | 座 | Subject- ga | imaseba | utusomi to omopi si imo ga papi nite imaseba | provisional | main | |
| MYS.4.610 | | Subject- ga | imasaba | tika ku areba mi zu tomo ari si wo iya topo ni kimi ga i masaba | conditional | adjunct | |
| MYS.3.307b | | Subject- ga | imasi kye mu | kume no waku gwo ga i masi kye mu | adnconc | relative | |
| MYS.3.307a | | Subject- ga | imasi kyeru | kume no waku gwo ga i masi kyeru | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.19.4280 | | Subject- ga | imasaba | tati wakare kimi ga imasaba | conditional | adjunct | |
| NSK.75a | | Subject- ga | imaseba | sisi matu to wa ga imaseba | provisional | adjunct | |
| NSK.75b | | Subject- ga | imaseba | situmaki no agwora ni tata si sisi matu to wa ga imaseba | provisional | afterthought | |
| KK.42 | | Subject- ga | imaseba ya | सानामि दि वो सुकुसुको तो वा गा इमसेबा या | provisional | adjunct | |
| MYS.2.108 | | 灑 | Subject- ga | nure kye mu | a wo matu to kimi ga nure kye mu | adnconc | relative |
| KK.19 | | 寝 | Subject- ga | ne si | asi para no sikyesi ki wo ya ni suga tatami iya saya sikite wa ga puta ri ne si | adnominal | afterthought |
| MYS.2.109 | Subject- ga | | ne si | opo bune no tu mori ga ura ni nora mu to pa masa si ni sirite wa ga puta ri ne si | adnominal | afterthought | |
| MYS.2.138 | Subject- ga | | ne si | tama no nasu nabiki wa ga ne si | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.2.210 | Subject- ga | | ne si | wagimo kwo to puta ri wa ga ne si | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.11.2650 | Subject- ga | | ne some kye mu | swogi ita moti puk ye ru ita me no apa zaraba ika ni se mu to ka wa ga ne some kye mu | adnconc | afterthought | |
| MYS.1.79 | Subject- ga | | ne taru | wa ga ne taru | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.12.2999 | Subject- ga | | nuru | wa ga pito ri nuru | adnominal | nominalization | |
| MYS.13.3274 | Subject- ga | | nuru | wa ga nuru | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.13.3329 | Subject- ga | | nuru | wa ga nuru | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.14.3554 | Subject- ga | | nuru | imo ga nuru | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.5.804 | Subject- ga | | sa nasu | wotomye ra ga sa nasu | adnconc | relative | |
| MYS.12.3111 | 死 | | Subject- ga | sinu be ki | subye mo na ki kata kwopwi wo su to ko no koro ni wa ga sinu be ki | adnominal | nominalization |
| FK.14 | 居 | | Subject- ga | woreba | kwo ra ni kwopwi asa two wo piraki wa ga woreba | provisional | adjunct |
| MYS.7.1204 | | | Subject- ga | woreba | pama kiywo ni iswo ni wa ga woreba | provisional | adjunct |
| MYS.10.2174 | | | Subject- ga | woreba | aki ta karu karipo wo tukuri wa ga woreba | provisional | adjunct |
| MYS.10.2298 | | Subject- ga | woreba | kimi ni kwopwi sinaye urabure wa ga woreba | provisional | adjunct | |
| MYS.15.3707 | | Subject- ga | woreba | aki yama no momidi wo kazasi wa ga woreba | provisional | adjunct | |
| MYS.7.1081 | | Subject- ga | woru | wa ga woru | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.16.3885 | | Subject- ga | woru | wa ga woru | adnominal | relative | |
| MYS.20.4398 | | Subject- ga | woru | yupu sipo ni pune wo uke suwe asa nagi ni pe muke koga mu to samorapu to wa ga woru | adnominal | relative | |

No-marked Subject

| citation | comment | genitive | predicate | clause | inflection | function |
|-------------|---------|-------------|--------------|--|--------------|----------------|
| MYS.5.804 | 有 | Subject- no | ara neba | sa ne si ywo no ikuda mo ara neba | provisional | adjunct |
| MYS.3.401 | | Subject- no | ari kyeru | yama mori no ari kyeru | adnominal | nominalization |
| MYS.14.3360 | | Subject- no | aritutu mo | idu no umi ni tatu sira nami no aritutu mo | continuative | main |
| MYS.14.3428 | | Subject- no | aritutu mo | adataro no ne ni pusu sisi no aritutu mo | continuative | main |
| KK.97 | 座 | Subject- no | imasi | yasumisisi wa ga opo kimi no sisi matu to agura ni imasi | infinitive | adjunct |
| MYS.3.454 | | Subject- no | imasi seba | sakaye si kimi no i masi seba | conditional | adjunct |
| MYS.3.355 | | Subject- no | imasi kye mu | opo namuti sukuna pikwo na no imasi kye mu | adnconc | relative |
| BS.8 | | Subject- no | imasu | yo ki pito no imasu | adnconc | relative |
| MYS.14.3491 | 死 | Subject- no | sina mu | yo no pito no kwopwi ni sina mu | adnconc | nominalization |
| MYS.11.2572 | | Subject- no | sini se si | itu ywori ka mi nu pito kwopwu to pito no sini se si | adnominal | afterthought |
| MYS.12.3075 | | Subject- no | sinu to | kaku site so pito no sinu to | conclusive | adjunct |