

Word Order and Clause Structure in Early Old Japanese

Yuko Yanagida (University of Tsukuba)

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to show that there is a striking difference in word order between Modern Japanese (ModJ) and Old Japanese (the 8th century, OJ). In OJ when the subject of a transitive verb is marked by genitive *ga* or *no*, the object must be morphologically unmarked and appears immediately adjacent to the verb. When the object is marked by *wo*, it is obligatorily moved over the subject, resulting in [O *wo* S Gen V]. Following Miyagawa (1989) and Miyagawa and Ekida (2003), I argue that morphologically unmarked objects are assigned abstract case under a strict adjacency requirement, but that *wo* in OJ does not function as a structural accusative case. The particle *wo* differs crucially from the case particle *o* in ModJ in that it marks not only the direct object of a transitive verb, but all kinds of internal arguments of both transitive and intransitive verbs. Furthermore, *wo* conveys a definite interpretation. An element marked by *wo* moves to a particular structural position, namely Spec(*v*P) or Spec(CP), where it is assigned definite/topic interpretations.

1. Introduction

Although the study of the case particles *ga* and *wo* in Old Japanese (OJ) has received a great deal of attention among traditional Japanese grammarians, no research has ever been conducted on the distribution of these particles within the same clause. This is because Japanese is a pro-drop language and a large number of clauses in OJ texts lack overt arguments. In order to examine the clause structure of OJ, this paper investigates clauses whose arguments are overtly expressed. The study is primarily based on the *Man'yōshū* (*Collection of a Myriad Leaves*), an anthology of Japanese verse completed in the 8th century A.D.¹ The *Man'yōshū* is the earliest extensive written record of Japanese, comprising 4516

¹ *Man'yōshū* was originally written in so-called *Man'yō-gana*; Chinese characters used as

long and short poems. It is well known that while in modern Japanese the subject and the object take the overt case markers *ga* and *o* respectively, OJ allows these arguments to occur without case particles. As pointed out by Miyagawa (1989), while *wo*-marked objects can appear anywhere within a clause, an object lacking a case particle must occur immediately adjacent to a verb. In OJ, not only objects of transitive verbs, but all internal arguments of both transitive and intransitive verbs are allowed to be morphologically unmarked or marked by *wo*. The aim of this paper is to show that while a bare object must stay *in-situ*, the particle *wo* shows up obligatorily when the object is moved from inside the VP to a particular structural position; namely, Spec(vP) (i.e., Object Shift) or Spec(CP).² The movement of *wo*-marked objects differs crucially from scrambling in that it is obligatory and semantically driven movement.

2. Two Types of Objects in OJ

2.1. Bare and Wo-Marked Objects

In Modern Japanese (ModJ), the subject and object of a transitive sentence are marked by the case markers *ga* and *o* respectively, as illustrated in (1).

- (1) Hanako-ga hon-o yonda.
Hanako-Nom book-Acc read
'Hanako read a book.'

In OJ, the arguments of main declarative clauses tend to appear without case particles, while those in embedded clauses tend to manifest overt case morphology. This is illustrated in (2a-b).

phonographs to represent Japanese. The *Man'yō-gana* used for particles are written in parenthesis in each example. The transliterations used in the examples are based on Nakanishi (1980).

² The *v*-VP configuration originally comes from Larson (1988, 1990). The *V* overtly raises to the light verb *v*, taken to express the causative or agentive role of an external argument. Following Chomsky (1995), I assume that subjects are base-generated in Spec(vP) and that objects raise to the outer Spec of vP to check their features.

- (2) a. Nanipa-no miya-ni wago opokimi-Ø kuni-Ø sirasu-rasi. (MYS 933)
 Naniwa-Gen court-Loc my emperor country govern-Aux
 ‘In the Naniwa Court, the emperor might govern the country.’
- b. Umi-no soko oki kogu pune-wo (乎) pyeni yose-mu
 sea-Gen bottom offing row ship-WO neighborhood bring-Aux
 kaze-mo puka-nu-ka (MYS 1223)
 wind-Foc blow-Neg-Q
 ‘(Lit.) Does wind not blow so as to invite the ship far from the offing out on the sea? (I wish it would)’

In (2a) both the subject and the object are morphologically unmarked. In (2b) the object that appears in the embedded clause is marked by the particle *wo*. Miyagawa (1989) observes that these two types of objects behave differently, as indicated in (3).

- (3) Word Order (Miyagawa 1989:211(36))
- (i) An object NP without the particle *wo* must occur immediately adjacent to the verb.
 - (ii) If the object NP is overtly cased, it is free to occur virtually anywhere within the clause.

Miyagawa (1989) argues that bare objects are assigned abstract case from predicates in the conclusive form. The requirement that bare objects appear immediately adjacent to the verb is then considered to fall under head government within the Principles-and-Parameters approach.

In the *Man'yōshū*, not only the direct object of a transitive clause, but all types of internal arguments, including theme, goal or source, etc. can be morphologically unmarked and appear in the position strictly adjacent to the verb. This is illustrated in (4a-e).

- (4) a. akane sasu murasaki-nwo-Ø yuki (MYS 20)
 madder tint purple-field go
 ‘(you) going in the madder-tinted purple field tinted purple.’
- b. sakimori-no Poriye-Ø kogiduru Idu tebune (MYS 4336)
 frontiersman-Gen horie row-go-out izu boat
 ‘the boat of the Izu style that the frontiersmen row down from Horie’
- c. awokumo-no posi-Ø panare yuki... (MYS 161)
 blue cloud-Gen star leave go
 ‘The bluish cloud goes away from the star.’
- d. panatatibana-wo wotomye-ra-ga tama-Ø nuku made-ni (MYS 4166)
 irises-WO maiden-PI-Gen bead string until
 ‘Until the maidens string the irises as beads...’

Examples (4a) appear as the Goal argument, (4b-c) as the Source argument of the intransitive verbs, and (4d) as the locative argument of the ditransitive clause. The fact that the bare arguments must appear strictly adjacent to the verb suggests that they are assigned abstract case from the verb, as suggested in Miyagawa (1989).

2.2. *The Distribution of Wo*

If all internal arguments are assigned structural case inside VP, a question arises as to whether *wo* functions as a case assigner as well. Some grammarians believe that *wo* in OJ has a dual function, as a case particle and as an exclamatory particle (cf. Kondo 1980, Kinsui 1993, Miyagawa 1989). Others believe that *wo* in OJ has only exclamatory or emphatic meaning (cf. Hashimoto 1969, Kobayashi 1970). On this view, the exclamatory or emphatic meaning of *wo* gradually faded, and *wo* was reanalyzed as a pure case marker in Early Middle Japanese. The view that *wo* is an exclamatory particle is based on the fact that *wo* can appear in clause final position, as illustrated in (5a-b).

- (5) a. udi-gapa-wo pune watase-**wo** (呼) to ywobape-domo (MYS 1138)
 Uji-river-WO boat send-WO that call-though
 ‘Though I call to send the boat at the Uji River ferry...’
- b. imo-ga ipye-mo tugite mi-masi-**wo** (尾) (MYS 91)
 my-maid-Gen house-Foc forever see-Aux-WO
 my maid’s house I wish to see forever.

The particle *wo* in OJ marks various kinds of phrases other than objects. Internal arguments of intransitive verbs, as illustrated in (4a-c), are marked by the locative *ni* ‘to’ or *kara* ‘from’ in ModJ, but in OJ, they can be marked by *wo* (cf. Motohashi 1989, 2003a). This is shown in (6a-c).

- (6) a. Kisa-no wogapa-**wo** (乎) yukite (MYS 332)
 Kisa-Gen stream-WO go
 ‘...go to the stream in Kisa.’
- b. Nanipatwo-**wo** (乎) kogi-dete mire-ba (MYS 4380)
 Naniwa Bay-WO row-out see-Conj
 ‘When (we) row from Naniwa Bay...’
- c. Nara-**wo** (乎) ki-panare... (MYS 4008)
 Nara-WO come-leave
 ‘...come away from Nara.’

Furthermore, the particle *wo* marks adjunct phrases, as illustrated in (7a-c).

- (7) a. A-ga koromo sita-ni-**wo** (乎) ki-mase... (MYS 3584)
 I-Gen clothes underneath-WO wear-Aux
 ‘wear this robe of mine underneath.’
- b. adisawi-no yapye saku gotoku yatuyo-ni-**wo** (乎) imase... (MYS 4448)
 hydrangeas-Gen eight bloom as eight generations-Loc-WO live
 ‘As hydrangeas have eightfold flowers, so (my lord) live for eight generations

- c. Yworu-no ime-ni-**wo** (越) tugite miye-koso. (MYS 807, 3108)

night-Gen dream-in-WO continuously appear-Excl

‘(I hope) you will appear in a dream in the darkness of the night.’

It is well known that the subject of an adjectival predicate suffixed by *mi* is marked by *wo*.

A subject and a predicate with *mi* form an adjunct clause generally translated as

‘because/since’, as shown below.

- (8) a. ikisini-no putatu-no umi-**wo** (乎) itopasi-**mi**... (MYS 3849)

life and death-Gen two-Gen sea-WO detestable-MI

‘Because the two seas of life and death are detestable...’

- b. ywo-**wo** (乎) naga-**mi** i no neraye-nu-ni (MYS 3680)

night-WO long-MI sleep-can-not-Conj

‘As the night is long, I can hardly fall to sleep.’

The subject of an adjectival predicate with *mi* never takes the particle *no* or *ga*. But it is allowed to be morphologically unmarked, as in (9).

- (9) Puruki miyakwo-pa yama-Ø taka-mi kapa toposiro-si. (MYS 324)

ancient Palace-Top mountains high-MI rivers broad-be

‘In the ancient Palace, mountains are high and rivers are wide.’

It is inconceivable that the subject of an adjectival predicate with *mi* is assigned accusative case, as proposed in Kinsui (1993), given that these adjectives take only one argument.

Finally, Motohashi (2003a) observes that the subject of a non-active intransitive verb is marked by *wo* in OJ in some contexts. Some examples cited in Motohashi (2003a) are given below.

- (10) a. minapito-**wo** (乎) neyo-to-no kane.... (MYS 607)

everyone-WO sleep-Conj-Gen bell

‘The bell (has been struck) so everyone go to sleep...’

- b. Kimi-wo (平) ki-mase-to tipayaburu kamwi-no yasiro-wo noma-nu. (MYS 2660)
 lord-WO come-Aux almighty god-Gen shrine-WO pray
 ‘I pray to the shrine of strong and almighty gods that my lord may call on me.’
- c. utusemi no inoti-wo (平) naga-ku ari-koso... (MYS 3292)
 present-world life-WO long be-Excl
 ‘(I wish my lord’s) life in this present world be prolonged.’

The above examples further indicate that *wo* is not an accusative case marker since it marks a locative PP, and the internal argument of both transitive and intransitive predicates.

Based on Matsunaga’s (1983) work, Miyagawa (1989) observes that the syntactic distribution of *wo* is predictable; in particular, predicates in the conclusive form take a morphologically bare object while those in the attributive form take an object marked by *wo*. According to Miyagawa (1989), while conclusive predicates assigns abstract case, the attributive form, which has substantive properties, has no ability to assign abstract case. To avoid a violation of the case filter, the object of an attributive predicate must receive morphological case from the particle *wo*. As discussed in detail in section 3, in the *Man’yōshū* we find 88 tokens of transitive clauses whose subjects are marked by the genitive case markers *ga* or *no*, while their objects are morphologically unmarked. 46 out of 88 tokens appear with attributive predicates whose objects are morphologically unmarked. This shows that, contrary to Miyagawa’s generalization, bare objects do occur with attributive predicates.

Kinsui (1993) notes that one of the counterexamples to Miyagawa’s (1989) generalization is an ECM construction, as given in (11).

- (11) yononaka-wo (平) usi to yasa-si to omope-domo ... (MYS 893)
 world-WO unpleasant Comp unbearable Comp think-though
 ‘Although I feel the world as being unpleasant and unbearable...’

In (11), the embedded subject marked by *wo* appears with the predicate in the conclusive form. Miyagawa and Ekida (2003) argue that in the ECM construction, the subject fails to be

assigned abstract case from the higher verb *omopi* ‘think’, since the adjacency requirement is not satisfied; thus, the embedded subject is assigned the morphological case *wo*. Now consider the ECM construction in ModJ, as given below.

- (12) Taroo-ga Hanako-**o** tensai da to omotteiru
 Taroo-Nom Hanako-Acc genius be Comp think
 ‘Taroo thinks Hanako is a genius.’

Kuno (1976), cited by Miyagawa and Ekida (2003), observes that an adverb that modifies the matrix verb does not appear after an embedded subject marked by *ga* (13a), but that it can appear after a subject marked by *o* (13b).

- (13) a. *Taroo-ga Hanako-**ga** orokanimo tensai da to omotteiru
 Taroo-Nom Hanako-Nom stupidly genius be Comp think
 ‘Taroo stupidly thinks Hanako is a genius.’
 b. Taroo-ga Hanako-**o** orokanimo tensai da to omotteiru
 Taroo-Nom Hanako-Acc stupidly genius be Comp think

Miyagawa and Ekida argue that in (13b), the subject marked by *o* is moved over the adverb *orokanimo* ‘stupidly’ to the matrix clause. Note that the Proper Binding Condition requires that the trace left behind in the embedded clause be properly bound. (14), where the embedded clause is scrambled, is not acceptable because the trace of the embedded subject is not bound.

- (14) * [t_i tensai da to]_j Taroo-ga Hanako-o_i t_j omotteiru
 genius be Comp Taroo-Nom Hanako-Acc think

Now if (11) in OJ is an instance of the ECM construction parallel to (12), we would expect that sentences like (14) are unacceptable in OJ. The following examples, however, appear to show that the OJ counterpart of (14) is acceptable.

- (15) a. Sanwo-tu tori... natukasi to ware-**wo** (矣) omope-ka. (MYS 3791)
 plain-Gen bird lovely that 1P-WO think-Q
 ‘May a bird in the plain be thinking that I am lovely?’
- b. Wosoro-to ware-**wo** (乎) omoposa-mu-kamo. (MYS 654)
 flippant-that 1P.WO think-Aux-Excl.
 ‘(She will perhaps) think that I am such a flippant man.’

Given that the ungrammaticality of (14) is due to the Proper Binding Condition, the embedded clause marked by *to* ‘that’ in (15) contains no trace and the *wo*-marked phrase is the object of the matrix clause. (The embedded clause probably contains a *pro* coindexed with the matrix object.) It is then natural to assume that the *wo*-marked phrase in (11) is the object of the matrix clause and moved from the position adjacent to the verb *omopi* ‘think’, resulting in [O *wo*_i [*pro*_i...] -to t_i V]. In this configuration, the object is assigned abstract case by the verb *omopi* ‘think’ and moved beyond the *to*-clause. The above observations suggest that OJ did not have an ECM construction. Since there seems to be no substantial evidence that *wo* functions as a case assigner, I suggest that objects are uniformly assigned abstract case from the verb, and that *wo* has no case assigning property in OJ.

Vovin (1997), developing the hypothesis that OJ is an active language, proposes that *wo* is an absolutive case marker, because it marks not only the objects of transitive verbs, but also the subjects of non-active intransitives, primarily the subject of adjectival predicates with *-mi*, which he calls ‘quality stative verbs’, as in (8a-b) above. He further argues that the case marker *i*, which is treated as a nominative particle among traditional grammarians, is, in fact, an active case marker used with the subject of transitive and of active intransitive verbs. His examples are cited in (16):

- (16) a. papa-**i** moredomo... (MYS 3393)
 mother-Act guard-Ger
 ‘Though [my] mother guards [me]...

- b. unapiwotokwo-i ame apugi... (MYS 1809)
 unapiman-Act sky look up
 ‘The man from Unapi looked up at the sky and...’

The strongest argument against the idea that *wo* is an absolutive marker is that the subject of non-active intransitive verbs is never marked by *wo* in adnominal clauses. I maintain that *wo* does not function as a case assigner in OJ, and that objects are uniformly assigned abstract case under the strict adjacency requirement.

3. The Clause Structure of OJ

In OJ, the subject is either morphologically unmarked or marked by the genitive particle *ga* or *no*. When the subject is marked by a genitive particle, we find the following generalizations concerning word order in OJ.

(17) Word Order in Old Japanese

- (i) A bare object must appear strictly adjacent to the verb (SOV).
- (ii) A *wo*-marked object must move over the subject (OSV).

When a subject is case-marked, an object must appear morphologically unmarked, resulting in SOV order. When an object is marked by *wo*, it is raised over the subject, resulting in OSV order. This indicates that *wo* shows up obligatorily when the object is moved outside VP.

3.1. Basic Pattern

In the *Man'yōshū*, we find a total of 88 tokens of clauses whose subject is marked by the genitive particle *ga* or *no* and whose object is morphologically unmarked. Some examples are given in (18a-h).

- (18) a. wago opokimi mikwo-no mikoto-no (乃) ame-no sita-Ø sirasi-myesise-ba
 our prince-Gen noble man-Gen heaven-Gen under reign- Pol-when
 ‘If our noble Prince was to govern the land...’ (MYS 167)

- b. waga pi-no mikwo-no (乃) yorodu-yo-ni kuni-Ø sirasa-masi
 my sun-Gen prince-Gen for ever land govern-Aux
 Sima-no miya-pa mo (MYS 171)
 shima-Gen palace
 ‘the Palace of Shima where the Prince of the Sun might govern the land for ever’
- c. Saywo pimye-no kwo-ga (可) pire-Ø puri-si yama-no na (MYS 868)
 Sayo-Hime-Gen dear-Gen scarf wave-Past hill-Gen name
 ‘the name of the hill where Sayo-Hime waved her scarf’
- d. Idukuni-ka kimi-ga (之) pune-Ø pate kusa-Ø musubi-kyemu. (MYS 1169)
 where-Q you-Gen ship stop grass tie-Past
 ‘Which port in the world did your ship cast anchor at?’
- e. Sika-no ama-no (之) sipo-Ø yaku keburu (MYS 1246)
 Shika-Gen fishermen-Gen salt burn smoke
 ‘the smoky haze raising when fishermen of Shika burn salt’
- f. Kunisu-ra-ga (之) paruna-Ø tumu-ramu Siba-no nwo (MYS 1919)
 kunisu-Pl-Gen spring greens pick-Aux Siba-Gen plain
 ‘the plain of Shiba where the people of Kunisu pick the soft greens of spring’
- g. panatatibana-wo wotomye-ra-ga (我) tama-Ø nuku made-ni (MYS 4166)
 irises-WO maiden-Pl-Gen bead put into until
 ‘Until the maiden string irises as beads...’
- h. sakimori-no (能) Poriye-Ø kogi-duru Idu tebune (MYS 4336)
 frontiersman-Gen Horie row go-out Izu boat
 ‘the boat of the Izu style that the frontiersmen row down from Horie’

Examples (18a-h) illustrate the canonical clause structure in OJ, in which the subject is marked by *ga/no* and the internal argument is not overtly marked. Importantly, however, the

[S *ga*/no O *wo* V] pattern as illustrated in (1) is not attested in OJ (see the Appendix for some problematic cases).³

3.2. OSV Order in Matrix Clauses

Although the [S Gen O *wo* V] pattern is not attested in *Man'yôshû*, we find 60 tokens in which an object marked by *wo* precedes a subject, which is either marked or unmarked. This means that when an object appears with a case particle, it is necessarily raised over the subject. Examples (19a-c) illustrate OSV order in matrix clauses.

- (19) a. Aki yama-**wo** (乎) ikani-ka (何) kimi-**ga** (君之) pitori kwoyu-ramu. (MYS 106)
 autumn mountain-WO how-Q you-Gen alone cross-Aux
 ‘How do you cross the autumn mountain alone?’
- b. Aga te-**wo** (乎) koyopi-mo-ka (毛可) tonon wakugwo-**ga** (我)
 my hand-WO tonight-Foc master-Gen young-son-Gen
 torite nageka-mu (MYS 3459)
 hold grieve-Aux
 ‘My master’s young son may hold my hand this evening and heave a sigh of sorrow.’
- c. Ware-**wo** (乎) yamwi-ni-ya (也) imo-**ga** (我) kwopwitutu aru-ramu. (MYS 3669)
 1P-WO dark-Loc-Foc maid-Gen long for be-Aux
 ‘My maid may long for me in the darkness.’

In (19a-c), the *wo*-marked objects move to the left edge position of the so-called *Kakari-musubi* ‘focus concord’ construction, characterized by a morphological dependency

³ In examples like (i), the *no/ga*-marked subject and *wo*-marked object do not appear in the same clause.

(i) ipabito-no (乃) [ware-wo (乎) miokuru-to] tatarisi-mo-koro (MYS 4375)
 family-Gen 1P-WO see off that stood-look-like
 ‘It seems that my family stood to see me off.’

The subject appears in the higher clause and the object in the lower clause. (For other examples, see MYS 4094, 4211.)

between a focus phrase and a matrix predicate. Nomura (1993) observes that in OJ, a phrase marked by a *kakari*-focus particle must precede the case-marked subject, as illustrated in (20).

- (20) Iduku-ni-**ka** kimi-**ga** (之) pune pate kusa musubi-kyemu (MYS 1169)
 which-Loc-Q you-Gen ship stop grass tie-Past
 ‘Which (port) did your ship cast anchor at?’

Watanabe (2001, 2002) takes this fact to argue that OJ possesses overt *wh*-movement and that the *ka*-marked phrase in (20) appears in Spec(CP). Importantly, the same ordering restriction holds between a non-interrogative focus phrases and a case-marked subject. Given that focus phrases marked by a *kakari*-particle appear in Spec(CP), a question arises as to what kind of semantic interpretation is assigned to the *wo*-marked phrases in (19a-d). Assuming that *wo* has some discourse-semantic properties, the *wo*-marked objects that occur in the left edge position of the *Kakari-musubi* construction are either topics or focus.

In order to account for the clause structure of OJ, I adopt Rizzi’s (1997) hypothesis that CP is split into several independently motivated subcategories, each of which heads its own projection. Under Rizzi’s (1997) split CP analysis, Topic and Focus are optional categories in the C-system and they head their own projections: TopP and FocP respectively. Rizzi (1997) hypothesizes that while TopP is cyclically recursive, recursion of FocP is not allowed. Note that a focus phrase marked by a *kakari* particle is not iterative; there is only one *kakari* focus phrase per clause. The fact that a clause does not allow more than one structurally represented focus is widely attested by other languages as well (cf. Kiss 1995).

Given that a clause contains only one focus position, it is natural to assume that in (19a-d) the *wo*-marked objects that precede the *kakari* focus phrase are interpreted as topics. *Wo*-marked phrases can appear with the topic marker *ba*, as in (21a-b).

- (21) a. **Kimi-wo-ba** (乎婆) asu-yu yoso-ni-kamo (可聞) mi-mu. (MYS 423)
 you-WO-Top tomorrow-from other-Loc-Q see-Aux
 ‘From tomorrow on, shall I see the Prince as someone in the different world?’
- b. **Momiti-wo-ba** (乎婆) torite-so (曾) sinwopu. (MYS 16)
 leaves-WO-Top take up-Foc feel alone
 ‘I take up red and yellow leaves feeling alone.’

In (21a-b) the *wo-ba* phrases are topics and they precede the focus phrase marked by the *kakari*-particle. *Wo*-marked phrases can also appear with a *kakari* focus particle, as in (22a-c).

- (22) a. **Wa-wo-ka** (乎可) matu namo? (MYS 3563)
 1P-WO-Q wait-Aux
 ‘Will he be waiting for me?’
- b. **Nani-wo-ka** (乎可) omopa-mu? (MYS 3967)
 what-WO-Q think-Aux
 ‘What do I think?’
- c. **Tama-wo-so** (乎曾) nukyeru. (MYS 1975)
 bead-WO-Foc string
 the beads, I string’

In (22a-c) the *wo*-marked phrases are necessarily focused. Based on the fact that *wo*-marked objects must move out of VP, I propose that examples (19) and (21) are represented as in (23a), and (22) as in (23b).

- (23) a. [_{TopP} NP-wo (ba) [_{FocP} XP-Foc [NP-ga....]]]
 b. [_{FocP} XP-wo-Foc [...V]]

In (23a), the *wo*-marked phrase moves to Spec(TopP) and in (23b) it moves to Spec(FocP). Note that, importantly, a *wo*-marked phrase can follow a focus phrase marked by a *kakari*-particle, as illustrated in (24).

- (24) iduku-ni-**ka** kimi-ga mipune-**wo** (乎) waga (吾) mati-wo-ramu (MYS 2082)
 where-Loc-Q the lord-Gen ship-WO 1P.Gen wait-be-Aux
 ‘Where shall I wait for your ship?’

In (24), the *wo*-marked phrase does not move beyond the *wh*-phrase marked by *ka*. As discussed in detail in section 3.4, I propose that in (24) the *wo*-marked phrase does not move into the CP domain, but that it moves only up to Spec(*v*P) (i.e., Object Shift).

3.3. OSV Order in Subordinate Clauses

Let us now turn to embedded clauses having OSV order. Among the 60 tokens of OSV order, some appear in embedded clauses as in (25a-b).

- (25) a. Yamasirodi-**wo** (乎) pitoduma-no (乃) uma-ywori yuku-ni (MYS 3314)
 Yamashiro-WO other woman-Gen horse-by go-CONJ
 ‘when other women’s men go traveling on horseback to Yamashiro...’
- b. Akidunwo-**wo** (叫) pito-no (之) kakure-ba (MYS 1405)
 Akizu field-WO man-Gen speak of-when
 ‘when a man speaks of the moorland of Akizu...’

Unlike matrix clauses, OSV order in adjunct clauses cannot be derived by raising the object to the domain of CP because topicalization into CP is in general not allowed inside adjunct clauses. I propose that the OSV order in the adjunct clause in (25a-b) is derived by Object Shift (OS), by which the object raises to Spec(*v*P). (25a-b) have a structure in which the light verb *v* takes multiple Specs, as illustrated in (26).

- (26) [_{vP} O wo [_{vP} S Gen [_{vP} ... V ...]]]

The subject originates in Spec(*v*P) and the object moves to the outer Spec position of the light verb *v* (cf. Chomsky 1995). A question then arises as to why a *no/ga*-marked subject fails to move over a *wo*-marked object, resulting in the [S *no/ga* O *wo* V] order. I will return to this issue in section 4.

Motohashi (1989) observes that *wo* in OJ tends to appear with definite/referential nouns, while non-referential indefinite nouns are generally unmarked.⁴ According to Motohashi (1989), examples (27-28) show this contrast.

Definite vs. Indefinite

- (27) a. sigeyama-no tanipye-ni opuru yamabuki-**wo** (平) ...pikiuwete (MYS 4185)
 wooden mountain-Gen valley-Loc grow yellow-rose-WO transplant
 ‘transplant the yellow-roses that grow about the valley of the wooden mountain...’
- b. pitomoto-no nadesikwo-Ø uwe-si sono kokoro (MYS 4070)
 one-Gen fringed pink plant-Past that heart
 ‘the heart that planted a flowering pink’

Referential vs. Nonreferential

- (28) a. kwomatu-ga sita-no kusa-**wo** (平) kara-sane (MYS 11)
 small pine-Gen under-Gen grass-WO cut-mood
 ‘Please cut the grass under the small pine.’
- b. Akami yama kusane-Ø kari-soke (MYS 3479)
 Akami Mt. grass cut remove
 ‘Mt. Akami I mowed and cut all the grasses’

As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, there are patterns opposite to the pair in (27), as illustrated in (29).

- (29) a. *nadesikwo-wo* (平) yadwo-ni makioposi... (MYS 4113)
 pink-WO house-Loc plant
 ‘I plant a pink in the garden of my house...’

4 A correlation between Object Shift and definiteness /referentiality is well known across languages. Laka (1993) observes that in Basque, VP external objects are DPs headed by the determiner *a*, while VP internal objects are simply NPs in that they do not appear with the determiner *a*. A correlation between definiteness and overt accusative case is also attested in Hindi and Turkish (cf. Mahajan 1990, Enç 1991).

b. natu-no nwo-no sa-yuri-Ø piki-uwete... (MYS 4113)

summer-Gen field-Gen lily plant

‘I plant a lily of the field in summer time.’

Note that in (29a) *wo* is required because the object is not adjacent to the verb. Under my analysis it is moved at least to Spec(vP). A question arises as to whether this movement gives rise to the discourse/semantic effect. Since Japanese is known to be a language lacking morphological means to express definiteness and referentiality, it is not always easy to provide clear-cut semantic interpretations of the noun phrase with respect to definiteness and referentiality. Note that personal pronouns in Japanese are necessarily definite and referential; and hence, if *wo* is associated with definite/referential nouns, we expect object pronouns to be necessarily marked by *wo*.⁵ I counted the occurrences of personal pronouns in both subject and object positions, and the result was straightforward. While subject pronouns are either marked or unmarked, object pronouns are necessarily marked by *wo*. The following table shows the results of the study.

⁵ Non-referential bound variable interpretations of personal pronouns are not allowed in Japanese, as shown in (i) (cf. Hoji 1985).

- (i) **dono hito-mo_i kare-no_i hahaoya-o aisiteiru*
Everyone he-Gen mother-Acc love
‘Everyone_i loves his_i mother.’
- (ii) **dare-ga_i kare-no_i hahaoya-o aisiteiru-no?*
Who-Nom he-Gen mother-Acc love-Q
‘Who_i loves his_i mother?’

(i-ii) are unambiguous in that *kare* ‘he’ refers to a particular individual in a given discourse context, but cannot be construed as a variable bound by the quantifier in the subject position.

(30) Presence or Absence of Case Particle on Personal Pronouns⁶

	Subjects		Objects	
	Bare	Case-marked	Bare ⁷	Case-marked
Ware ‘I’	60	---	1	44
Na(nare) ‘you’	(1)	17(0)	0(0)	16(2)
Kimi ‘you’	29	103	20	116

OJ has morphologically distinct series of pronouns; namely, full pronominal forms such as *ware* ‘I’ and *nare* ‘you’ and morphologically reduced forms, such as (*w*)*a* and *na* respectively. Case-marked first person pronouns in subject position appear exclusively in the form of (*w*)*a* suffixed by the case particle *ga*, while there is no example of the full pronominal form *ware* suffixed by the case particle *ga*. The table shows that 60 tokens of the unmarked *ware* appear in subject position, as in (31a), with only one example of the unmarked *ware* in object position, as in (31b). 44 tokens of *ware* are marked by the particle *wo*, as in (31c).

(31) a. ware-Ø tati-nuru-to... (MYS 1696)

I stand-Aux-that...

‘...that I am standing..’

b. Imo-pa ware-Ø matu ramu so. (MYS 4072)

my-dear-Top me wait-Aux Prt

‘My dear may be waiting for me.’

c. ware-wo (乎) nurasaku (MYS 1697)

1P-WO drench

‘...drench me.’

As for the second personal pronouns *na/nare*, there are 33 tokens of the reduced form *na*; 17 with the subject case *ga*, as in (32a), and 16 with the object case *wo*, as in (32b). There is no example of an unmarked object.

⁶ The data are taken from the electronic text of *Man’yōshū* by Yoshimura (<http://yoshi01.kokugo.edu.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp/manyōu/manyōu.html>).

⁷ In all cases, unmarked objects are used with the verb *matu* ‘wait’.

- (32) a. na-ga (奈我) ku to omope-ba... (MYS 528)
 2P-Gen come that think-if
 ‘If I think you will come...’
- b. na-wo (汝乎) mire-ba... (MYS 309)
 2P-WO see-as
 ‘As I see you...’

Finally, 29 tokens of *kimi* ‘you/lord’ (the honorific use of the second personal pronoun) in subject position appear unmarked, as in (33a) and 103 tokens are case marked, as in (33b). 16 tokens of *kimi* in object position appear case marked, as in (33c), and 20 tokens are unmarked, as in (33d).

- (33) a. Kimi-Ø ki-kyemu-ka? (MYS 1949)
 you hear-Past-Q
 ‘Did you hear?’
- b. Aki yama-wo ikani-ka kimi-ga (君之) pitori kwoyu-ramu. (MYS 106)
 autumn mountain-WO how-Q you-Gen alone cross-Aux
 ‘How do you cross the autumn mountain alone?’
- c. aranwo-ni kimi-wo (君乎) okite... (MYS 227)
 wilderness-Loc you-WO leave
 ‘...leave you in the wilderness’
- d. kimi-Ø mati kane-te... (MYS 2289)
 you wait unable
 ‘...unable to wait for you’

Importantly, however, 19 out of the 20 tokens of the unmarked *kimi* ‘you’ in object position are used with the verb *matu* ‘wait’, as in (33d). The object *ware* ‘I’ without a case particle is also used with the verb *matu* ‘wait’ in example (31b). Although I have no explanation for why the unmarked personal pronouns in object position are possible with the verb *matu*

‘wait’, what is crucial is the fact that they are not productively used with other verbs. This leads us to safely conclude that definite and referential NPs, in particular, personal pronouns in object position are necessarily marked by *wo*. Assuming with Chomsky (2001) that discourse related interpretations arise as a result of movement to the edge of the phase (i.e., *v*P and CP), an element marked by *wo* has a definite interpretation at the edge of the phase.

4. Tense

In the previous sections, I show that when the two arguments are case-marked, [O *wo* S *ga/no* V] order is the basic word order pattern in OJ. A question now arises as to why [S *no/ga* O *wo* V] is not found in OJ. In this section, I will propose that while in ModJ, the subject is moved to Spec(TP), OJ simply lacks the functional category Tense, and the subject must stay *in-situ*. That is, movement of subjects is a historical innovation caused by the rise of Tense. In order to show that the phenomenon we are considering is not internal to Japanese syntax, it is crucial to take into account a cross-linguistic comparison to the similar phenomenon.

Since Lightfoot’s (1991) pioneering work, generative grammarians have consistently maintained that from a learnability perspective, historical linguistics are tied closely to language acquisition. A controversial issue in language development concerns whether functional categories are available throughout all stages of development or whether such knowledge increases over time. Within the framework of generative grammar, van Gelderen (1993) follows the model of syntactic change developed by Lightfoot (1979, 1991) and argues that functional categories are only included in the structure of a language if there exists positive evidence, such as elements that exist outside VP. Since in modern English the existence of Tense is evidenced by a number of syntactic phenomena, Old English (OE) lacks all the properties that indicate the existence of Tense. Namely, *there*-expletive constructions do not appear until the latter half of the fourteenth century. Modal auxiliary verbs were still main verbs. The first instance of *do*-support occurs in the late fourteenth century. *To* in *to*-infinitives is treated as a clitic that appears inside a VP (cf. Los 1999). Given that OE lacks

elements that appear in Tense, Gelderen claims that OE simply lacks Tense and that the clause is either a VP, or a CP:

(34) [_{CP} C [_{VP} ... V]]

The absence of the functional category Tense, however, does not mean an absence of tense and agreement features. Tense and agreement can be seen as sets of features not necessarily connected with the head of TP. Van Gelderen (1993) proposes that in OE the tense and agreement features occupy a Comp.

4.1. *Small Clauses*

There has been a long-standing debate about whether the subject in Japanese raises to Spec(TP) or appears inside the VP. A problem has to do with the fact that contrary to English, Japanese has little positive evidence for the existence of Tense, leading some researchers to believe that Japanese clauses do not project to the TP, and that the subject stays inside the VP (cf. Fukui 1986, Kuroda 1988). Takezawa (1987), however, provides a piece of evidence showing that the nominative subject is licensed by Tense. Consider the examples below:

- (35) a. Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga/o utsukusii to] omotta
Taroo-Top Hanako-Nom/Acc beautiful that thought
'Taroo thought that Hanako was beautiful.'
- b. Taroo-wa [Hanako-*ga/o utsukusi-ku] omotta.
Taroo-Top Hanako-Nom/Acc beautiful thought
'Taroo thought Hanako beautiful.'

The finite form of the adjective in (35a) can take either *ga* or *o*, whereas the non-finite form of the adjective in (35b) fails to co-occur with the subject marked by *ga*. Example (35b) is viewed as an adjectival small clause, and the subject is exceptionally case marked by the matrix predicate. A relationship between *ga* and finiteness suggests that the subject in modern Japanese moves to Spec(TP).

In OJ, the verb *pori* ‘want’ and *posi* (the adjective counterpart of *pori*) take a small clause as their complement similar to (35b). This is illustrated in (36a-b).

- (36) a. [_S wa-ga inoti-**no** (之) nagaku] posi-kyeku... (MYS 2943)
 I-Gen life-Gen long want
 ‘I want my life to be long...’
- b. [_S Aka-kinu-no pitura-no koromo-Ø nagaku] pori (MYS 2972)
 scarlet lining-Gen dress long want
 ‘(I) want a dress of scarlet lining to be long.’

The subject marked by *no* in (36a) and the unmarked subject in (36b) form a small clause with the adjectival predicate *nagaku* ‘long’. Given that examples (35a-b) provide positive evidence for the Tense category in Modern Japanese, (36a-b) suggest that the genitive subject in OJ is licensed independently of Tense. Furthermore, it is known that the suffix *-(a)ku* nominalized the predicate that it attaches to. Following Koji’s (1980) observations, the verbs *omopi* ‘think’ and *wosi* ‘regret’ often take a complement clause containing a subject and a predicate suffixed by *-(a)ku*, as shown in (37a-c).

- (37) a. [musupisi pimo-**no** (乃) tokur-aku] mope-ba (MYS 4427)
 tie lace-Gen loosen-Nmlz think-when
 ‘When I think my dress-laces that he tied get loose...’
- b. [satwo-**no** (乃) kakur-aku] wosi-mo (MYS 1205)
 home-Gen recede-Nmlz sad-Prt
 ‘I am sad that my home recedes from sight.’

Given that finite subordinate clauses require a marker of subordination such as *to* ‘that’, as in (35a), I assume that the subject and the predicate with *-(a)ku* in (37a-b) form a nominal small clause. It must be pointed out that although the case particle *no* in OJ can be used as a subject marker in both finite and non-finite clauses, *no* is more frequently used as a genitive marker modifying the following noun phrase. The view that the *no*-marked NP and the predicate

taking the suffix *-(a)ku* in (37a-b) form a subject-predicate relation rather than a noun phrase is supported by the fact that the predicate suffixed by *-(a)ku* can freely take an unmarked subject as in (38).

- (38) [s ume-no pana-Ø tira-maku] wosi-mi (MYS 824)
 plum-Gen blossom fall-Nmlz regret
 ‘(They) regret the plum-blossoms falling down.’

The above observations show that in OJ, unlike ModJ, case-marked subjects can freely occur inside a small clause. This suggests that subjects in OJ are licensed independently of Tense, and that case-marked subjects must appear in base position, namely Spec(vP).

4.2. Modal Auxiliaries

A reviewer points out that OJ has various kinds of modal auxiliaries, such as *mu*, *ramu*, *kemu*, *masi*, *rasi*, and that these auxiliary verbs may appear in Tense. Modal auxiliaries in OJ differ from verbs in that the conjugation paradigm is highly defective. In particular, they lack the continuative/conjunctive form that is used in tenseless subordinate clauses. Furthermore, the reviewer points out that it is unlikely that clauses containing the predicate with *-(a)ku* excludes Tense given that the past tense auxiliary is nominalized with *-(a)ku*. Before getting into the discussion of OJ modals, let me first illustrate modal auxiliaries in Old English.

Modals in Old English (OE) differ from those in Modern English in that they have a number of main verb properties. It is, however, well known that the inflectional paradigm of modals in OE is not complete, but certainly fuller than modals in Modern English. For example, in (39a-b), cited from Kemenade (1993), the modal verbs *maeg* and *mot* have an epistemic reading.

(39) a. *flaet hie his word gehyran **moston*** (Bl.Hom., 219, 34)

that they his words hear must

b. *flonne **magon** hie cweflan* (Oros, 113, 18)

then may they say

Since Lightfoot's (1989, 1991) work, it is widely acknowledged that while modals in Modern English appear in Tense, those in OE stay inside the VP and select a VP complement (cf. Gelderen 1993, Roberts 1997, Roberts and Roussou 2003). That is, in (39a) the modal auxiliary appears inside the VP, and in (39b) it moves to Comp in the matrix Verb Second clause. If the modal auxiliary in the embedded clause in (39a) appears in Tense, it is necessary that Tense in OE appear on the right of the VP (i.e., head final) and Comp appear on the left of TP (i.e., head initial). A number of linguists, however, argue against the view that OE and related Verb Second languages, such as Dutch and German, have a head final TP structure (cf. Zwart(1997), Vikner (1995), van Gelderen (1993), Roberts (1997), Roberts and Roussou (2003) and others).

Let us now consider whether modals in Japanese appear in Tense. Note that modals in ModJ fail to appear inside a relative clause. Thus (40) is not acceptable.

(40) *[[*kimi-ga matteiru **daroo** hito*]]

you-Nom wait-Aux person

'the person who might be waiting for you'

Suppose that ModJ has a TP and the modal auxiliary *daroo* 'may/will' appears in Tense. A question arises as to why *daroo* 'may/will' cannot appear inside the relative clause. The ungrammaticality of (40) is explained under the assumption that *daroo* appears in a position higher than TP, namely, in the domain of CP. Relative clauses, whose syntactic status is a TP excludes modal auxiliaries. This indicates that we cannot simply stipulate that modals appear in Tense. Modals in OJ, on the other hand, freely appear inside a relative clause, as illustrated in (41).

(41) [[Kimi-wo matu **ramu**] pito]-si kanasi-mo. (MYS 3693)

lord-WO wait Aux people-Foc sad-Excl

‘How sad are people are who may be waiting for the lord.’

The fact that the modal auxiliary can appear inside a relative clause in OJ suggests that modal auxiliaries in OJ, unlike those in ModJ, can appear inside the VP in the embedded clause.

This is exactly parallel to OE modals. As is the case in OE, modals in OJ have verbal properties. Although modals lack continuative/conjunctive forms, they have other parts of their conjugational paradigm that is completely absent in ModJ. Furthermore, the fact that modal auxiliaries can be nominalized with *-(a)ku* strongly suggests that modals in OJ have verbal properties since verbs are freely nominalized with *-(a)ku*.

Although modals in OJ originate inside the VP, they move to Comp in the matrix clause. This is a plausible analysis, given that the presence of CP is attested to by a number of syntactic phenomena, such as the focus concord system and topic/focus movement, as discussed above. The modal auxiliary *ramu* frequently occurs in the *Kakari-musubi* construction, as in (42a-c).

(42) a. Pitori-**ka** kimi-ga yamadi kwoyu-**ramu**. (MYS 1666)

alone-Q lord-Gen mountain cross-Aux

‘My lord may cross the mountain alone.’

b. Yamwi-ni-**ya** imo-ga kwopwi-tutu aru **ramu**? (MYS 3669)

dark-in-Foc maid-Gen long-for be-Aux

‘Might my maid be longing for me in the darkness?’

c. Nani-**so-mo** kimi-ga miye ko-zaru **ramu**? (MYS 3202)

how-Foc lord-Gen see come-not-Aux

‘How might my lord not have come back to me yet?’

I suggest that in (42a-c), the phrases with the *kakari*-particle and the auxiliary verb *ramu* stand in a Spec-head relation within the domain of CP.

As pointed out by van Gelderen (1993), the lack of the functional category Tense does not mean an absence of tense. Given recent theorizing, tense and mood can be seen as sets of features, which are not connected to the head of TP, but to the head of CP. I assume that modal auxiliaries have mood/tense features, but that they originate inside VP. Although OJ lacks TP, there is substantial evidence that two other functional categories, *v*P and CP are present in OJ. The modal auxiliaries stay inside the VP or else they move to Comp to check the tense/mood features. This is the line of the argument proposed by van Gelderen (1993) for modal auxiliaries in Old English (OE). From a comparative perspective, I suggest that this holds for modals in OJ.

Finally, if OJ had the same structure as ModJ in that Tense is present and the subject moves to Spec(TP), an important question cannot be accounted for. Why does OJ disallow the [S *ga*/no O *wo* V] pattern? When the two arguments are case marked, the word order is [O *wo* S *ga*/no V]. If TP is available in OJ, there is no explanation for why a case-marked subject fails to move to Spec(TP), resulting in the word order [S Gen O *wo* V].

4.3. *The Rise of Tense*

It has been widely observed among traditional grammarians that the frequency of the use of *ga* in root clauses gradually increases after the *Heian* Period and that the use of *ga* in genuine declarative contexts was established after the end of the *Muromachi* period (1336-1573) (cf. Ohno 1977, Yanagida 1985, Adachi 1992). Yamada (2000) examined the occurrence of *ga* by comparing the *kana-kanji* version of Tale of *Heike*, which is believed to reflect the language of the fourteenth century, with the later text of *Heike* known as the *Amakusa Heike*, which was published in 1592 in roman alphabet transcription. According to his findings, there are 1600 tokens of bare subjects in *Heike*, of which 290 are marked by *ga* in *Amakusa Heike*, as indicated in the following table.⁸ (Subject NPs marked by other particles are not included in (43)).

⁸ The *Amakusa Heike* contains many of the same stories as *Heike*. It was written as a textbook to teach Japanese to foreign missionaries. Miyagawa (1989) also compared these two texts, showing that there is a significant increase of *wo* in *Amakusa Heike*.

(43) Marked vs. Unmarked Subjects in Amakusa Heike (Yamada 2000)

	Relative clause	Subordinate	Main	Complex	Total
Ga	36(20.2%)	152 (33%)	84 (27.5%)	18 (2.7%)	290 (18%)
No	42(23.6%)	10(2.25)	4(1.35)	1(0.2%)	57(3.6%)
unmarked	96(53.9%)	227(50%)	123(40.2%)	526(80.4%)	972(61.1%)

Despite the predominant use of bare subjects, the table reveals that the occurrence of *ga* significantly increased in the *Amakusa Heike*. 27.5% of subjects in the matrix clause came to be marked by *ga* in *Amakusa Heike*. Yamada observes that although the matrix use of *ga* increased drastically in *Amakusa Heike*, the distribution of *ga* in this period differs significantly from that in ModJ. The following table shows the distribution of *ga* in main clauses, cited from Yamada (2000).

(44) *Ga* and Predicate Type in Main Clauses (Yamada 2000)

	Noun	transitive	unergative	adjective	unaccusative	total
Ga	0(0%)	2(2%)	13 (16%)	15(18%)	54(64%)	84(100%)

In OJ, *ga* was used as a genitive particle modifying the following noun phrase, but the data reveals that nouns with genitive *ga* had already disappeared by the time the *Amakusa Heike* was written. Although the particle *ga* started to select verbal predicates, it was restricted to intransitive verbs, in particular, unaccusative verbs, and rarely occurred with transitive verbs. This indicates that the [subject-*ga* object-*wo* V] pattern had not yet been fully established in the language of this period.

Given that *wo*-marked objects in OJ appear in Spec(*v*P), the canonical [S *ga* O o V] word order pattern in ModJ is derived in a way that the subject came to be moved to Spec(TP). That is, example (1) in ModJ has the structure given in (45a), and in the scrambling counterpart the subject stays in Spec(*v*P) and the object moves to Spec(TP), as given in (45b).

(45) a. [_{TP} Hanako-*ga*_i [_{vP} hon-o_i [_{vP} t_i [_{vP} t_i yonda]]]]

b. [_{TP} Hon-o_i [_{vP} t_i [_{vP} Hanako-*ga* [_{vP} t_i yonda]]]]

Spec(TP) in MJ can be either occupied by the subject or by the object, as suggested in Kuroda (1988) and Miyagawa (2001). In OJ, the case particle *wo* conveys discourse-semantic interpretations such as definiteness and referentiality. In ModJ, on the other hand, the case particle *o* has no such semantic effects. This is exactly the kind “reanalysis” known as “desemanticization” with subsequent “grammaticalization” (e.g., Lehmann 1985).

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have examined the word order and clause structure of OJ, based on a thorough investigation of *Man'yōshū*. I show that there are two types of objects; while bare objects must stay *in situ*, *wo*-marked objects obligatorily move at least to Spec(vP) (i.e., Object Shift) or further to the domain of CP. When the two arguments are case-marked, the basic word order pattern is [O *wo* S Gen V]. Van Gelderen (1993) claims that Old English lacks a Tense category, and that the rise of Tense gives rise to a major change in the structure of English. From a comparative perspective, I suggest that Japanese underwent a similar historical process. The category Tense is present in ModJ, but it was absent in OJ. The view that OJ lacks Tense is primarily based on the following two observations: (1) case-marked subjects are licensed independently of Tense, and (2) OJ lacks the canonical [S *ga/no* O *wo* V] word order pattern. I suggest that this pattern is derived from movement of the subject over the object, which is a historical innovation caused by the rise of Tense. A question that remains is why bare objects disappeared in ModJ.⁹ The loss of bare objects may be accounted for in relation to Miyagawa’s (1989) proposal that Japanese underwent change in the case-assigning mechanism. A possible explanation for this historical shift is discussed in Yanagida (2005b).

⁹ It has been pointed out that in *wh*-questions the case particle on the object can be left out in ModJ, as in (i) (cf. Kuroda 1988).

(i) Taroo-wa nani yonda-no?

Taroo-Top what read-Q

This does not mean that ModJ allows objects lacking a case particle. A bare object in the declarative sentence is significantly degraded, as in (ii).

(ii) *? Taroo-ga hon yonda.

Taroo-Nom book read

Appendix: Problematic Cases

The problematic cases for the word order generalization suggested in (17) are exhaustively listed below.

[S ga O wo V] 3 examples

- (46) [Wagimokwo-ga (之) nani-to-mo ware-wo (吾) omopa-ne-ba] pupumyeru
my-maid-Gen anything-Foc 1P-WO think-Neg-Conj closed
pana-no po-ni saki-nu-besi. (MYS 2783)
flower-Gen ear-Loc bloom-Aux

‘Because my maid pays me no heed, I should be ready to bloom like flowers.’

It is important to note that the character 之 used for the subject *wagimokwo* ‘my maid’ can be read in three different ways, the case marker *ga*, *no* or the adverbial focus particle *si*. It is read *ga* in the traditional literature, as in Nakanishi (1980). However, there is reason to believe that 之 in (46) is read *si* rather than *ga*. When the focus particle *si* is used in an embedded clause, it is predominantly used inside *ba*-clauses (cf. Koji 1988:583).

- (47) a. [Putari-**si** (之)wore-ba]...tukwi-pa tera-zu tomo yosi. (MYS 1039)
two people-Foc be-Conj moon-Top shine-not fine
‘Because we two are together, it matters little if the moon shines.’
- b. [tukwi-**si** (之) are-ba] aku-ramu waki-mo sira-zu-site... (MYS 2665)
moon-Foc be-Conj dawn-Aux difference-Foc know-not-do
‘Because there was a bright moon, I could not discern it was break of day.’

According to Koji (1988), there are 194 examples of the particle *si* inside embedded clauses, and most of them appear in *ba*-clauses. Furthermore, when the subject is marked by the focus particle *si*, it can be followed by the case-marked object and in the matrix clause, *si* takes the predicate in the conclusive form, as in (48a-b) (cf. Sasaki 1996).

(48) a. Imo-**si** (志) a-wo (乎) mati kanete nageki-su rasi-mo. (MYS 3147)

maid-Foc 1P-WO wait hard grief-do may-Prt

‘Maybe my maid is having a hard time waiting for me, heaving a sigh.’

b. Wagimokwo-**si** (之) a-wo (乎) sinwopu rasi. (MYS 3145)

my maiden-Foc 1P-WO think may

‘My maiden may be longing for me.’

(48a-b) are not canonical transitive sentences, but they have a structure in which the subject marked by the focus particle *si* moves overtly to the domain of CP, where it is assigned a focus interpretation. It is then natural to assume that 之 in (46) is read *si* rather than *ga*. The subject marked by *si* in (46) may appear inside the *ba*-clause, as is generally assumed. It can possibly appear in the matrix clause and is associated with the predicate *besi* in the conclusive form, in which case, (46) is translated as ‘although my maid pays me no heed, she should be ready to bloom like flowers’. (Note that the concessive reading of *ba* with the predicate in the *Izenkei* realis conditional is possible in OJ.) Since the *Man’yôshû* is written in *man’yôgana*, there arise potential ambiguities in the interpretation of the Chinese characters.

(49) Saywopimye-ga (何) kono yama-no pe-ni pire-wo (遠) puri-kyemu. (MYS 872)

Sayohime-Gen this hill-Gen up-Loc scarf-WO wave-Aux

‘Sayohime waved her scarf upon this hill.’

In (49), the character 遠 is read *wo* in *Manyogana*. I speculate that this character can be used for the word 緒 *wo* ‘long cloth’, in which case 領布緒 *pirewo* ‘long scarf’ is the object of the verb *puri* ‘wave’. Although I find no example in which 遠 is used for the word 緒 ‘long cloth’, this character is rarely used for the particle *wo* either. (Most of them only appear near MYS 872.) Note, however, that the character 乎, which is predominantly used for the particle *wo*, can also be used for the word 緒 (for example, see (MYS 3536, 3775)). Example (50) may be a genuine counterexample.

- (50) Kokodaku-ni kimi-ga (我) mise-mu-to ware-wo (乎) todomuru. (MYS 4036)
 so much-Loc you-Gen invite-Comp 1P-WO stay
 ‘You invited me and tried to make me stay me so much.’

[S no O wo V].... 6 examples

- (51) a. Parusame-no (乃) yokuredo ware-wo (乎) nurasu. (MYS 1697)
 spring rain-Gen avoid-though 1P-WO drench
 ‘The spring rain, however hard I may shun it, it drenches me.’
- b. Pito-no (之) topona-wo (乎) tatu beki-mono-ka. (MYS 2772)
 people-Gen rumor-WO spread should-Q
 ‘Should people spread rumors?’
- c. Ipyebito-no (乃) idura-to ware-wo (乎) topa-ba ikani ipamu? (MYS 3689)
 family-Gen where-Comp 1P-WO ask-if how say
 ‘If your family should ask me where you are now, what should I reply to them?’
- d. Misagwo wiru su-ni wiru pune-no (之) yupusipo-wo (乎) matu-ramu
 osprey be nest-Loc be ship-Gen evening tide-WO wait-Aux
 ywori-pa ware-koso masare. (MYS 2831)
 than-Top I-Foc more
 ‘I am waiting more than a ship that is driven against the seashore where some ospreys are feeding, waiting for the evening tide to flow.’

In (51a-d), the subjects marked by *no* occur in clause initial position in the main clause. These examples may involve movement of the *no*-marked subject to the domain of CP. In Yanagida (2005a), I counted all the transitive clauses in *Konkoumyou Saishou Oukyō* ‘The Sutra of Golden Light’, the best-known Buddhist sutra in Japan. This text was originally written in India and was translated into Chinese in 703. It is believed that this Chinese text was translated into Japanese in the early Heian Period, using a system called *haku-ten* ‘white glosses’, a way of translating Chinese into Japanese (cf. Kasuga 1969). In this text, we find

39 tokens of the [S no O wo V] pattern in the matrix clause. I argue that in the language of this period, *no*-marked subjects started to be able to undergo topicalization to the domain of CP, while *ga*-marked subjects must stay *in-situ*. In other words, [O wo S no V] becomes [S no_i O wo t_i V] after topicalization. Examples (51a-d) may involve topicalization of the *no*-marked subjects although this kind of topicalization is rare in the *Man'yōshū*.

(52) a. Soko-mo-ka pito-no (之) [wa-wo (乎) koto(言)] nasa-mu.
 that-Foc people-Gen 1P-WO say do-Aux
 ‘People say this and that of me.’ (MYS 512, 1329,1376)

b. Nani-si-kamo wago opokimi-no_i (能) [_S [e_i tatase-ba] e_j tamamo-no
 why-Q my princess-Gen rise-when water-weeds-
 mokoro]] [_S[e_i koyase-ba] e_j kapamo-no gotoku nabikapi-si]] yorosiki
 like lay-when water weeds-Gen like wave-Past loving
 kimi-ga asamiya-wo_j(乎) wasure-tamapu-ya? (MYS 196)
 lord-Gen Asamiya-WO forget-Hon-Prt
 ‘Why could the Princess forget the Prince, (who rose) like those water-weeds
 when (she) arose, and (lay) as if those water-weeds were waving when (she) lay?’

(52a-b) may not involve topicalization since the phrase marked by the kakari-particle precedes the subject. Thus, if (52a) has a mono-clausal structure, it is clearly counterevidence to my analysis. It seems that in (52a) the word 言 *koto* ‘talk’ is a verbal noun and *nasu* is the light verb that corresponds to *suru* ‘do’.¹⁰ If (52a) is an instance of the light verb construction, it can be analyzed in as proposed by Grimshaw and Mester (1988). Namely, the nominal *wa* ‘I’ is assigned its theta role from the verbal noun *koto* ‘talk’, not from the verb *nasu*, in which case the nominal and the verbal noun form an NP constituent. This NP constituent is the

10 The verbal noun is a noun that has its origin in Chinese (sometimes referred to as Sino-Japanese) and denotes “process.” It appears with the light verb *suru* in Modern Japanese, for example, *benkyo-suru* ‘study’ and *idoo-suru* ‘move’. (For the analysis of the light verb construction in Japanese, see Grimshaw and Mester (1988), Miyagawa (1989), Matsumoto (1996), Miyamoto (1999) and many others.)

object of the verb *nasu*. (52a), then, has a canonical word order pattern in which the subject is marked by *no* and the object NP *wa-wo koto* is morphologically unmarked.

In (52b), the subject *wago-opokimi* ‘my princess’ is marked by *no* and the object *kimi-ga Asamiya* ‘the Prince Asamiya’ is marked by *wo*. The object NP is modified by the two relative clauses. These two clauses, however, are not tightly embedded, but loosely associated with the main clause object. This is a typical example of what is referred to as “hypotaxis,” and widely observed in OJ literary texts (cf. Ohori 1992). “Grammaticalization” is widely known as a process by which loose, paratactic structure develops over time into tight, “grammaticalized” syntactic structure. Givón (1979) shows that relative clauses are developed from topic sentences, which are loosely connected to the main clause, and that some languages have unembedded paratactic patterns, indistinguishable from sentence concatenation. He notes that “while this cannot be documented for all languages, it is still possible that all embedded syntactic relative clauses in language arose diachronically from loose, paratactic concatenations” (Givón 1979: 213). Example (52b) contains a “nucleus” (i.e. main clause), and the two clauses modifying the object are dependent. However, they are only loosely connected to the constituent of the nucleus. The [S no O wo V] pattern appears in this peculiar hypotactic clause structure, not in the simple clause in a strict sense.

Texts (Primary Sources)

Nakanishi Susumu (1980) *Man'yōshū*, Koudansha Bunko, Tokyo (reprinted in 2002).

Man'yōshū, *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei*, 4-7 (1957-1962) Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo.

Teruo Suga (1991) *The Man'yōshū*, Kanda University of International Studies, Makuhari.

Electronic Texts

Japanese Text Initiative Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library
(<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/japanese/jti.texts.euc.html>)

National Institute of Japanese Literature (http://www.nijl.ac.jp/contents/d_library/index.html)

Yoshimura, Makoto, *Man'yôshû Kensaku*, Yamaguchi University
(<http://yoshi01.kokugo.edu.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp/manyou/manyou.html>)

References

- Adachi, Ryuichi (1992) "Kokugo Kôbunshi no Ichisokumen: Shukaku Muhyôji Koubun kara Shukaku Hyôji Koubun-e [An Aspect of the Grammatical History of Japanese: From Bare Subjects to Morphologically Marked Subjects]," In Chikao Inoue and Yoichiro Yamauchi (eds.), *Kodaigo no Kouzou to Tenkai* [Structure and Development of Earlier Japanese], Izumi Shoin, Osaka, pp.1-23.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT press, Cambridge.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001) "Derivation by Phase," In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT press, Cambridge, pp. 1-52.
- Enç Mürvet (1991) "The Semantics of Specificity," *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 1-25.
- Fukui, Naoki (1986) "A Theory of Category Projection and its Applications," Doctoral dissertation, MIT. Revised version published as *Theory of Projection in Syntax*, CSLI Publications, Stanford (1995).
- Givón, Talmy (1979) *On Understanding Grammar*, Academic Press, New York.
- Grimshaw, Jane, and Armin Mester (1988) "Light Verbs and Theta-Marking," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 205-232.
- Hashimoto, Shinkichi (1969) *Joshi, Jodôshi no Kenkyu* [Research on Particles and Auxiliary Verbs], Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo.
- Hoji, Hajime (1985) "Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structure," Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Kondo, Yasuhiro (1980) "Joshi wo no Bunrui: Jôdai [A Classification of the Particle wo: Old Japanese]," *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* Vol.57:10.
- Kemenade, Ans van (1993) "The History of English Modals; A Reanalysis," *Folia Linguistica Historica* 13, 143-166.

- Kinsui, Satoshi (1993) "Kotengo no *wo* ni tsuite [On the Particle *wo* in Earlier Japanese]," In Nitta Yoshio (ed.), *Nihongo no Kaku o Megutte*, Kurosio Publisher, Tokyo, pp. 191-224.
- Kiss, Katalin (1995) *Discourse Configurational Languages*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Koji, Kazuteru (1980) *Man'yôshû Jodôshi no Kenkyu* [Research on Auxiliary Verbs in the *Man'yôshû*], Meiji Shoin, Tokyo.
- Koji, Kazuteru (1988) *Man'yôshû Joshi no Kenkyu* [Research on Particles in the *Man'yôshû*], Kasama Shoin, Tokyo.
- Kuno, Susumu (1976) "Subject Raising," *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani, pp. 17-49, Academic Press, New York.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1988) "Whether We Agree or Not: A Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese," *Linguisticæ Investigationes* 12,1, 1-47.
- Kobayashi, Yoshiharu (1970) *Nihon Bunpoushi* [A History of Japanese Grammar], Tokyo Shoin, Tokyo.
- Larson, Richard (1988) "On the Double Object Construction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335-391.
- Larson, Richard (1990) "Double Objects Revisited: Reply to Jackendoff," *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 589-632.
- Laka, Itziar (1993) "Unergatives that Assign Ergative, Unaccusatives that Assign Accusative," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 18, 149-172.
- Lehmann, Christian (1985) "Grammaticalization: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Change," *Lingua e Stile* 20, 303-18.
- Lightfoot, David (1979) *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lightfoot, David (1991) *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*, MIT Press, Cambridge.

- Los, Bettlou (1999) *Infinitival Complementation in Old and Middle English*, Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.
- Mahajan, Anoop K. (1990) "The A/A-bar Distinction and Movement Theory," Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Matsunaga, S. (1983) "Historical Development of Case Marking in Japanese," Masters thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Matsumoto, Yo (1996) *Complex Predicates in Japanese: A Syntactic and Semantic Study of the Notion 'Word'*, Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Miyamoto, Tadao (1999) *The Light Verb Construction in Japanese: The Role of the Verbal Noun*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (1989) *Syntax and Semantics: Structure and Case Marking in Japanese* 22, Academic Press, New York.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2001) "The EPP, Scrambling, and *Wh-in-situ*," In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 293-338.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru and Fusae Ekida (2003) "Historical Development of the Accusative Case Marking in Japanese as Seen in Classical Literary Texts," *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 19, 1-95.
- Muranaka, Shigeo (1981) *A Prehistory of Japanese Language*, Kirihara Shoten, Tokyo.
- Motohashi, Tatsushi (1989) "Case Theory and the History of the Japanese Language," Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Motohashi, Tatsushi (2003) "*Nara* Period: The Handbook of Historical Japanese Grammar," Ms. Sophia University.
- Nomura, Takashi (1993) "Jōdaigo no *no* to *ga* ni tsuite [On the Particles *no* and *ga* in Old Japanese]," *Kokugo-Kokubun* 62, 1-17.
- Nomura, Takashi (1996) "*Ga*-shūsikei e [The *Ga*-Conclusive form]," *Kokugo-Kokubun* 65:524-541.

- Ohno, Susumu (1977) "Shukaku Joshi *ga* no Seiritsu [The Development of the Nominative Case Particle *ga*]," *Bungaku* 45, 102-117.
- Ohori, Toshio (1992) "Diachrony in Clause Linkage and Related Issues," Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281-337.
- Roberts, Ian (1997) "Directionality and Word Order Change in the History of English," In Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, pp. 397-426. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Roberts Ian, and Anna Roussou (2003) *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*, Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Sasaki, Takashi (1996) *Jōdaigo no Kōbun to Hyōki* [Grammar and Orthography in Old Japanese], Hituzi, Tokyo.
- Takezawa, Koichi (1987) "A Configurational Approach to Case-Marking in Japanese," Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Van Gelderen, Elly (1993) *The Rise of Functional Categories*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Vovin, Alexander (1997) "On the Syntactic Typology of Old Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 273-290.
- Vikner, Sten (1995) *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Watanabe, Akira (2001) "Loss of Overt *Wh*-Movement in Old Japanese and Demise of *Kakarimusubi*," In Inoue, Kazuko (ed.), *Proceedings of the COE International Symposium*, Kanda University of International Studies, Makuhari.
- Watanabe, Akira (2002) "The Loss of Overt *Wh*-Movement in Old Japanese," In David W. Lightfoot (ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp.179-195.

- Yamada, Masahiro (2000) “Shugo Hyôji *ga* no Seiryoku Kakudai no Yôso [The Expansion of the Use of the Subject Denoter *ga*],” *Kokugogaku* 51-1, 1-14.
- Yanagida, Seiji (1985) *Muromachi Jidai no Kokugo* [The Japanese Language of the *Muromachi* Period], Tokyo Doo, Tokyo.
- Yanagida, Yuko (2005a) *The Syntax of Focus and Wh-Questions in Japanese: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Hituzi, Tokyo.
- Yanagida, Yuko (2005b) “Ergativity and Bare Nominals in Early Old Japanese,” Paper presented at Workshop on Theoretical East Asian Linguistics 3, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1997) “The Germanic SOV Languages and the Universal Base Hypothesis,” In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax*, pp. 246-267, Longman, London.