1. Introduction

Yanagida & Whitman (Y&W) (2009) propose that two major clause types in Old Japanese (OJ, 8th century), traditionally labeled as shūsi ‘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 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
determined by the semantics of NPs, as widely assumed, DSM associated with \textit{ga} and \textit{zero} is closely linked to the \( \theta \) 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; \textit{Norito} and \textit{Senmyo}. It is shown that \textit{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) \textbf{Three Types of Alignment}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominative-Accusative</th>
<th>Ergative-Absolutive</th>
<th>Active-inactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A S O</td>
<td>A S O</td>
<td>A S_A S_O O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

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 (S\( \_A \)) are marked by active case. Non-agentive subjects (S\( \_O \)) 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 Voin’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
    \begin{quote}
    papa i moredomo…
    
    mother Agt guard-Ger
    \end{quote}
    (MYS 3393)
    ‘Though [my] mother guards [me]…
b. 菅原壮士伊 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) 去来見乃山乎 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 尔保敞類妹乎 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
人嬬故尔 吾撫目八方 (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, wo [pro, V] V] in which the object
marked by \textit{wo} in fact appears in the higher clause and the embedded clause contains the phonologically null subject (\textit{pro}) coindexed with it.

Takeuchi’s (2007) proposal that OJ has active alignment is primarily based on Vovin’s (1997) observations about \textit{wo}. (6) is cited by Takeuchi (2007).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[6] \text{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 \textit{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)}
\end{enumerate}

Takeuchi (2007) claims that the \textit{wo} marked argument is the sole argument of the intransitive verb \textit{kiko-yu} ‘can be heard’. Note, however, that (6) has exactly the same structure as (5). In (6), the \textit{wo}-marked argument that precedes the embedded \textit{domo}-clauses is in fact the associative object of the matrix verb \textit{makura-maku} ‘sleep together’.\footnote{As shown in section 3, \textit{wo} in OJ marks a much wider range of internal arguments than ModJ \textit{o}.} Aside from DP \textit{wo-\ldots-mi} constructions, neither Vovin nor Takeuchi present convincing evidence that \textit{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 \textit{no}.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[7] a. \text{真木乃立 荒山中尔 makwi no tatu ara yama naka (MYS 241)}
\text{tree Gen stand rough mountain inside ‘in the rough mountains covered with trees’}

\item[7] b. \text{宇能花能 佐久都奇 u no pana no sak-u tukwi (MYS 4066)}
\text{utugi Gen blossom Gen bloom-Adn month ‘the month when the utsugi blossom is in bloom.’}
\end{enumerate}

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

We leave open the status of the NP \textit{wo-\ldots-mi} pattern in (3). But note that Tsumi (2005), summarizing previous literature on this construction, convincingly argues that the diachronic source for \textit{-mi} is the infinitive of the transitive verb \textit{mi-} ‘see’. Under this analysis, the subject
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, anagalous 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
    [Asp tabi wo [vp kurusi ] mi ] kofigwor-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)

(9) Raam-ne nahaayaa
    Ram-Erg bathe-Perf
    ‘Ram bathed.’

(10) Raam Ø giraa.
    Ram fall-Perf
    ‘Ram fell hard.’

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 ut³aayaa.
    Ila-Agt one child-Acc lift/carry-Perg
    ‘Ila lifted a child.’

(12) Ilaa-ne haar Ø ut³aayaa.
    Ila-Agt necklace(Abs) lift-Perg
    ‘Illa 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-ropehí** ‘I am sleepy.’

In Guaraní, 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. 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 side of the nominal hierarchy (Dixon 1979).

Importantly, in languages like Guaraní, 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 jaguande-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), Guarani (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 constrution (20) and the
ergative/active construction (21) are structurally identical. Johns (1992) develops a synchronic account of Inuktitut ergativity based on possessive constructions.  

**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.  

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.
The conclusive form of the predicate in OJ is used in main clauses as in (22) and clauses preceding the complementizer to ‘that’ (23). Adnominal clauses, on the other hand, show active alignment. The genitive *ga*, the ancestor of ModJ nominative *ga*, marks both the possessors of NP (24), and the agent subjects of transitive verbs (25) and active intransitive verbs (26).

**Possessor-possessed NP**

(24) 和我勢故我 夜度

[wagimo ò… natu kusa ò karu mo] (MYS 1272)

my.wife summer grass mow.Concl Excl

‘My wife is mowing the summer grass.’

(23) 吾妹 生友

[wagimo ò i-keri to mo…] (MYS 3298)

my.wife alive-Past.Concl that even

‘Even if my wife was alive…’

Adnominal Clauses

(25) 佐欲比売能故何 比列布利斯夜麻

[Saywopimye no kwo ò pire ò puri-sì] yama (MYS 868)

Sayohime Gen child Agt scarf wave-Pst.Adn mountain

‘the mountain where Sayohime waved her cloth’

(26) 君我由久 道

[kimi ga yuku miti] (MYS 3724)

you Agt go road

‘the road my lord (you) travels.’

The patient subjects of inactive intransitive verbs (27), on the other hand, behave like the objects of transitive verbs (25) in that they are zero-marked. Zero-marked subjects appear predominantly with unaccusative verbs and appear strictly adjacent to the verb.

(27) a. 安伎能野尔 都由於弊流波疑乎 多乎良受弓

[aki no nwo ni tuyu òop-ye-ru pagwi wo ta-wora-zu-te] (MYS 4318)

fall Gen field Loc dew cover-Stat-Adn bush.clover Acc hand-break-not-Ger

‘without breaking off the dew-laden bush clover in the fall meadow’
b. うらみ未欲理 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-PI 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 \textit{Man'yōshū} are given in Yanagida 2007:178-179)

(31) a. 楠乃京師乃佐保川尔伊去至而
\begin{tabular}{l}
Nara no miyakwo no Sapo kawa ni \textit{i-yuki} itarite \textit{(MYS 79)}
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Nara Gen capital Gen Saho river \textit{–Loc} \textit{i-go} reaching
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘I reached the River Sahokawa in Nara.’
\end{tabular}

b. 久米能若子我伊触家武礒之草根
\begin{tabular}{l}
Kume no wakugwo ga \textit{i-pure-kyem-u} iswo no \textit{kusa no ne} \textit{(MYS 435)}
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
Kume Gen youth Agt \textit{i-touch-PConj-Adn} rock Gen grass Gen root
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘the root of the grass that the youth of Kume would have touched.’
\end{tabular}

(32) b. 左宿の妻屋爾朝庭出立偲
\begin{tabular}{l}
sa-ne-si tumaya ni asita ni pa ide-tati sinopi \textit{(MYS 481)}
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
sa-sleep-Pst.Adn bedroom in morning in Top leaving remembering
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘remembering, leaving the bedroom where (I) slept’
\end{tabular}

c. 狭丹頬相吾大王
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{sa-niturap-u} wa ga opo kimi \textit{(MYS 420)}
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{sa-shine-Adn} I Gen great lord
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘my great lord who shiness’
\end{tabular}

d. 楚野爾左乎騰流雉
\begin{tabular}{l}
[\textit{VP Sugi-no no-ni sa-wodoru} kigisi] \textit{(MYS 4148)}
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
cypress-GEN field-in SA-dance pheasant
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘The pheasant dances in the cypress field.’
\end{tabular}

The predicates that appear with -i includes \textit{yoseru} ‘put aside’, \textit{puru} ‘wave’, \textit{yuku} ‘go’, \textit{wataru} ‘cross’, \textit{toru} ‘take’, \textit{karu} ‘mow’, \textit{kakuru} ‘hide’, \textit{wogamu} ‘pray’, \textit{maporu} ‘go around’, \textit{poru} ‘dig’, \textit{wakaru} ‘part from’, \textit{kogu} ‘row a boat’, \textit{mukapu} ‘head out’, \textit{pirou} ‘pick up’, \textit{mureru} ‘gather’ etc. The predicates that appear with the prefix \textit{sa-} includes \textit{neru} ‘sleep’, \textit{niturapu} ‘shine’, \textit{pasiru} ‘(fish) run’, \textit{wodoru} ‘(birds) dance’, \textit{wataru} ‘(toads) cross’, \textit{nebapu} ‘spread roots’, \textit{narabu} ‘(birds) line up’, \textit{kumoru} ‘get cloudy’, \textit{nituku} ‘get reddened’. Although these prefixes are already somewhat vestigial in OJ, the distribution of of \textit{i-} and \textit{sa-} strongly suggests that \textit{i-} appears with active verbs, while \textit{sa-} appears in inactive intransitive verbs. A piece of evidence that these prefixes relates to active/inactive division is that \textit{sa-} occurs as a noun prefix, as in \textit{sa-yo} ‘night’, while \textit{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.\textsuperscript{5} Furthermore, on both nouns and verbs as in (33), sa- triggers the process known as \textit{rendaku}. The initial voiceless obstruents of a noun or a verb becomes voiced.

\begin{enumerate}
\item *sa koromo > saNkoromo > sa-goromo ‘his clothes’
\item *sa pasiri > saNpasiri > sa-basiri ‘his running’
\end{enumerate}

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:

\begin{enumerate}
\item 遠等咩良何 佐那周伊多斗 乎意斯比良伎
\item wotomye-ra ga sa-nasu itado wo osipirak-i
\item maiden-Pl Agt sa-sleep door Obj push open-Inf
\end{enumerate}

‘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):

\begin{enumerate}
\item \[ NP \text{wotomyera ga } [[ \text{pro sa-nasu }] \text{ itado}]] \text{ wo } osipirak-i \]
\item maiden Gen sa-sleep door Obj push open-Cont
\end{enumerate}

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 \textit{Man’yôshû} (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.

\textsuperscript{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.
though if one put a bridge across the Milky Way, (they=Vega and Altair) would i-cross over on that’

‘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.
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 acquisititves 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.
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’yôshû data, she provides data for both subjects and possessors marked by ga.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>wa</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>ono</th>
<th>ta</th>
<th>si</th>
<th>kore</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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*.  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>待</th>
<th>泣</th>
<th>行</th>
<th>振</th>
<th>植</th>
<th>着</th>
<th>寄</th>
<th>渡</th>
<th>笑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ga</em></td>
<td>903</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>no</em></td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zero</em></td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>寝</th>
<th>座</th>
<th>居</th>
<th>有</th>
<th>濡</th>
<th>死</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ga</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>no</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zero</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb 座 is ambiguously interpreted as either the existential verb ‘be’ (inactive) or the active verb ‘go’ (active). Kikuta cites (39) as an 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.
4. Differential object marking

4.1 Specificity

Many languages classified as ergative or active, including Hindi and Guaraní, as shown above, have the phenomenon of DOM in which some direct objects are overtly marked by accusative case while others are unmarked. Yanagida (2006), following Motohashi (1988), proposes that objects marked by wo in OJ is interpreted as definite, while zero-marked objects are indefinite. However, since there are examples in which specific (i.e., D-linked) wh-phrases are marked by wo, Y&W revise Yanagida’s (2006) original claim, proposing that accusative case occurs when objects are specific. When wh pronouns are marked by wo, they receive a specific interpretation in contrast to bare wh pronouns, as shown by the contrast given in (41-42).

(41) 潮干去者　玉藻茆蔵　家妹之
sipo pwi-na-ba tamamo kari tum-ye ipye no imwo ga
tide recede-Perf-if seaweed cut gather-Imp house Gen wife Agt
濱衣乞者　何矣示
pamaduto kop-aba nani wo simyesa-m-u? (MYS 360)
shore.gift want-if what Obj proffer-Presum-Adn
‘If the tide has gone out, cut and gather the precious seaweed! If my wife at home asks for gifts from the shore, which (other) shall I offer her?’

(42) 真木乃板戸乎　押開　思恵也出来根　後者何将為　Maki no itatwo wo osi piraki siweya ide ko-ne noti pa nani sem-u? (MYS 2519)
wood Gen door Obj push open damn out come-Des after Top what do-Adn
‘Pushing open the door (I say) “Come out, dammit!” Then what will (I) do?’

In (41), the set of items that the speaker might offer his wife is defined as pamadutwo ‘gifts from the shore’. In this case nani wo ‘what/which Obj’ picks out specific items from that set. In (42), in contrast, the universe of things the speaker might do is completely undefined in previous discourse.

Frellesvig, Horn & Yanagida (2015) make a complete search for the two types of objects, using OCOJ, suggesting that a contrast between wo-marked and zero-marked objects in OJ follows typologically well-attested DOM effects. The minimal pair examples (43-44) are cited in Frellesvig, Horn & Yanagida (2015).

(43) 上瀬尓　鵜矣　八頭漬
kami tu se ni u wo ya-tu kaduke
upper 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) 毎年尓 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
可頭気氏 河瀬多頭祢牟
cadukete 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).

(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 安流良卒
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 \( \textit{wo} \) appears strictly adjacent to the verb, resulting in the canonical word order [Subject=\( \textit{ga} \) Object=\( \textit{Ø} \) 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  \( \textit{pire} \) \( \textit{Ø} \) 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-\( \textit{ro} \) ga  \( \textit{ninwo} \) \( \textit{Ø} \) posaru kamo  (MYS 3351)
    beloved child-Aff Agt cloth dry Q
    ‘Is my beloved drying woven cloth?’

The quantitative data taken from the \textit{Man’yôshû} reveals that the objects that follows the \( \textit{ga} \)-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 \( \textit{pire} \) ‘scarf’ and \( \textit{ninwo} \) ‘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 \( \textit{kosi o kakeru} \text{ vs. } \textit{kosikakeru} \), \( \textit{tema o toru} \text{ vs. } \textit{temadoru} \) 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 \( \textit{ga} \) is followed by the \( \textit{wo} \)-marked object, as illustrated in (47).

(47) 夜麻能奈等 伊賓都夏等可母 佐用比賣何 許能野麻能門仁
    Yama no na to ipi-tuge to  Sayopimye \( \textit{ga} \) kono yama no upe ni
    hill Gen name as say-tell that Sayo princess Agt this hill Gen upon at
    \( \textit{pire wo} \) 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 \( \textit{man’yôgana} \) \( \textit{遠} \) in (47) is read \( \textit{wo} \). Yanagida (2006) suggests the possibility that this character is used to write the noun \( \textit{緒} \) \( \textit{wo} \) ‘long cloth/string/thong/cord’, in which case \( \textit{pirewo} \) is a compound noun ‘long sash’ functioning as the object of the verb \( \textit{puri} \) ‘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).
there seems to be no instance in which the character 遠 is used to write the noun 野緒, this character is rarely used to write the case particle 野 either. (Most such examples appear near MYS 872, (868, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875).) In contrast, the character 乎 is predominantly used to write the particle 野, but it can also be used for the noun 緒(MYS 3536, 3775). Kuroda (2007), however, casts doubt on Yanagida’s proposal, suggesting an alternative interpretation for MYS 872. He notes that “the part of Man’yôshû in question is thought to originate in the collection of poems kept by Yamanoue Okura, one of the prominent poets of Man’yôshû, who, however, is believed to be a non-native speaker of Japanese. This fact may be relevant for this counterexample (Kuroda 2007:282).” However a close examination of the Norito (Engisiki Norito), as discussed in detail in section 4.2, shows that Yanagida’s original interpretation may be correct. Example (48) is cited from the Norito.

(48) 皇御孫命

sumemima (no) mikoto (no) asa no mike yupu no mike (ni) tukape matu-ru
Godness (Gen) emperor (Gen) morning Gen meal evening meal Dat serve-give-Adn.

pire Ø kakuru tomo(no)wo,   tasuki Ø kakuru tomo(no)wo wo
sash put on fellow (Gen) head   sash put on group (Gen) head Obj

手躓   足躓   不令為(420p.) (御門祭)
hand (Gen) mistake foot (Gen) mistake do-Caus-not

‘As for the head of the group of the women, who serves for the emperor’s morning and evening meals, and who puts her sash on over her shoulder, not making any mistakes with her hands and her feet.’

Tsugita (2008: 262-264) points out that the word pire, which appears in the Man’yôshû as in (47) and in the Norito in (48), both refer to the long sashes symbolically worn by noble women in the Nara period. According to Tsugita, the women who serve meals for the emperor ritually put on a sash over their shoulder. The word 野緒 in (48), which originally means string/thong/cord, here refers to the head/top of the fellow (group of) women who serve meals. The fact that pire is used in combination of the noun 野緒 in the Norito favors the interpretation given in Yanagida (2006) that 野 in MYS 872 is used not to write the case particle but rather the noun 緒.
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.\(^\text{13}\)

(49) 父母乎 美礼婆多布斗斯 妻子見礼婆 米具斯宇都久志

\textit{titi papa wo} mire-ba taputosi \textit{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 \textit{ba} ‘when’. Nonetheless, the first occurrence of the object is marked by \textit{wo}, and the second occurrence of the object is morphologically unmarked. Note, however, that the second occurrence of \textit{mekwo} ‘mother and child’ ends with the labialized mid back vowel, on one interpretation homophonous with the case particle \textit{wo}. This raises the possibility that deletion of the second occurrence of \textit{wo} is simply a case of haplology, or rather the poet taking advantage of haplology to preserve the meter.\(^\text{14}\) 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: \textit{Senmyō} and \textit{Norito}, where metrical questions are not at issue.

4.2. \textit{Senmyō} and \textit{Norito}

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

\(^\text{13}\) 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 \textit{wo} in order to avoid a violation of the Case Filter.

\(^\text{14}\) Thanks to John Whitman for this observation.

\(^\text{15}\) \textit{Shokunihongi Senmyō} is the sixty two imperial edicts preserved in the \textit{Shoku Nihongi} (Chronicles of Japan); an imperially commissioned Japanese history text, completed in 797. \textit{Engisiki Norito} contains \textit{Shinto} rituals and practices in their pristine form in Volume eight of the \textit{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 \textit{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 Senmyô 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 since there are many tokens which may or may not appear with wo. Ikeda’s (1996) data on Kitagawa (1982) excludes this phrase.
In both Senmyô (SM) and Norito (NT) wo-marked objects are consistently interpreted as specific. Some examples are given in (51-52).

(51) a. 誰奴加朕朝乎背面然為流 (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故… (NT: 祇年祭 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. 公民作作物乎…不成傷波 (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-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) 皇神能前爾白馬・白猪・白鶏種種色物乎 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
備奉乎 sonape maturi te prepare enshrine
‘Before the sovereign deities of the Grains, I will prepare for and provide various
kinds of offerings such as the white horse, the white boar and the white cock.’

‘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 opoyasimaguni 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.

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).

‘in order that the Emperor partakes of this year’s rice harvest’
b. 極懸伴緒

\( \text{tasuki} \) \( \text{Ø} \) \( \text{kakuru tomo} \) \( \text{no} \) \( \text{wo} \) \( \text{wo} \)... \( \text{magapi} \) \( \text{Ø} \) \( \text{nasa-sime-zu-si-te} \) 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’

\( \text{Senmyō} \), 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

\( \text{opodi} \) \( \text{opo-mapye tu kimi no tonokadwo} \) \( \text{Ø} \) arasi kega-su koto naku

grandfather great lord Gen dignitary gate disturn defile that not

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

b. 天皇朝

\( \text{sumyera ga mikadwo} \) \( \text{Ø} \) mamori tukape-maturu koto kayerimi-naki pito domo

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

‘people who selflessly serve and protect the emperor’

c. 中麻呂家物

\( \text{nakamaro ga ipye no mono} \) \( \text{Ø} \) kazwo-puru ni pumi no naka ni nakamaro to

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

通家流謀文有 (SM: Edict 30:331p)

kaywopasi-kyeru pakarikoto no pumi ari

lay-Past conspirachy 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 \( \text{Senmyō} \) does not pattern in the same way as \( \text{Norito} \). Note that \( \text{Shoku Nihongi} \), in which \( \text{Senmyō} \) was included, is about the Chronological history of the \( \text{ritsuryōsei} \), replicating China’s political system from the Tang Dynasty. Kotani (1986) argues that a different writing style in \( \text{Senmyō} \) and \( \text{Norito} \) lies in the fact that they have different origins. According to Kotani, \( \text{Senmyō} \) was written on the basis of \( \text{Shochoku} \) ‘emperial rescript’ written in Old Chinese. Thus, they contain many sentences in the \( \text{kanbun} \) ‘Chinese’ style, and even sentences in the Japanese style are based on \( \text{kanbun} \) and transcribed from \( \text{kanbun} \) to Japanese by changing word order and adding particles or verb endings to the original \( \text{kanbun} \) counterparts. \( \text{Norito} \), 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 \( \text{yomisoe} \) ‘supplied reading’, it is plausible to assume that the objects with specific interpretations, such as (58), are the ones presumably read with supplied \( \text{wo} \). \( \text{Norito} \),
on the other hand, provides supporting evidence that preverbal bare objects pattern like *Man’yōshū* 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.
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### Appendix I

#### Gar-marked Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Predicates</th>
<th>Evidentials</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYS.100</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS.110</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>anka</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS.144</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>sengi</td>
<td>wa</td>
<td>nenja</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS.1385</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-marked Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Predicates</th>
<th>Evidentials</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYS.5004</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nenja</td>
<td>nenja</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS.5001</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>kike</td>
<td>kike</td>
<td>kike</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS.13890</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>senga</td>
<td>senga</td>
<td>senga</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS.3487</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYS.13572</td>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>