Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 334
Historical Linguistics 2013, John Benjamins (2015) pp.195-211

Differential Object Marking in Old Japanese: A corpus based study

Bjarke Frellesvig (University of Oxford, University of Oslo)
Stephen Wright Horn (University of Oxford)
Yuko Yanagida (Tsukuba University)

Within the past few decades, various proposals have been made about marking of objects in Old Japanese (OJ) (e.g., Matsunaga 1983, Motohashi 1989, Yanagida 2006, Kuroda 2008, Yanagida and Whitman 2009, Wrona and Frellesvig 2010, Kinsui 2011, Miyagawa 2012), but there is still no consensus about the exact circumstances determining when direct objects are bare or accusative case marked in OJ. We use the material in the Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese to examine in detail the distribution of bare and accusative case marked objects in OJ texts and show that OJ had 'differential object marking (DOM)' associated with a specific/non-specific distinction (Yanagida and Whitman 2009). Thus, in OJ, accusative marked objects are specific, but bare objects are non-specific. This paper briefly discusses cases in which accusative case is dropped from specific objects.

Keywords: Old Japanese; differential object marking; accusative case marking; objects; specificity; corpus; D-linking

1. Introduction

Like accusative case in other languages, in addition to marking direct objects, the accusative (marked by case particle *wo*) in Old Japanese (hereafter OJ, the earliest attested form of Japanese from the 6th to the 8th century CE), is used to mark NPs with a variety of grammatical functions, depending on such factors as the argument structure of the predicate associated with the NP in question, the inflection of that predicate, the voice of that predicate, and the speech act type of the utterance. Specifically, in OJ

accusative case marks 1) direct objects, 2) recipient NPs for a subclass of ditransitive verbs, 3) causees in morphological causative constructions, 4) adjuncts of various kinds, most notably those denoting temporal or spatial paths and sources, 5) grammatical subjects of absolutive constructions, 6) exclamative NPs.

We focussed on the variable use of accusative case to mark direct objects. In (1)[1] the NP *kwomatu ga sita no kaya wo* 'grass under the small pine' is accusative case marked and is the direct object of the verb *kar-* 'cut, harvest'. In (2)[2] the same verb appears as the first member of a compound verb *kari-soke* 'cut-remove' which selects as its direct object the bare NP *kusane* 'grasses'.

(1)

小松	下乃	草乎	苅核
kwomatu ga	sita no	kaya wo	kara-sane
small.pine GEN	under GEN	grass ACC	cut-RESP.OPT

"Please cut the grass under the small pine." (MYS 1.11)

(2)

安可見夜麻	久左祢	可利曾気
Akami-yama	kusane Ø	kari-soke
Akami-mountain	grass	cut-remove

"cutting and removing grasses at Mount Akami..." (MYS 14.3479)

It has long been claimed that the alternation between overtly case marked and bare objects, as shown in (1-2), is merely stylistic, but recent research shows that OJ had differential marking for objects both in terms of word

[1] The following abbreviations are used in glosses: ACC accusative; ACOP adjectival copula; ADN adnominal; CL classifier; COM comitative; CONJ conjectural; COP copula; DAT dative; ETOP emphatic topic; FOC focus particle; GEN genitive ; GER gerund; INF infinitive; IMP imperative; NEG negative; OPT optative; PASS passive; PST past; Q question; RES restrictive particle; RESP respect; SFP sentence final particle; STAT stative; TOP topic. The following abbreviations indicate sources: FK Fudoki Kayō; KK Kojiki Kayō; MYS Man'yōshū; NSK Nihon Shoki;

[2] We forgo including the original script in subsequent examples.

order and the semantic features of definiteness or specificity (Yanagida 2006, Yanagida & Whitman 2009).

Using poetic material from the Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese (OCOJ, approximately 90,000 words),[3] we examine the distribution of bare and accusative case marked objects in samplings of NPs in OJ. The present corpus based study presents new evidence to show that the difference between overtly case marked and bare objects in OJ fits into well established crosslinguistic patterns of differential object marking (DOM). The evidence supports the claim that the function of the OJ accusative *wo* is similar in many respects to the Turkish accusative case suffix *–i* for direct object (Enç 1991). Namely, the accusative case marks definite objects and also indefinite objects that stand in certain relations to definite discourse entities (discussed in detail in section 2 below), whereby their reference is rendered specific.

2. Differential object marking in Old Japanese

DOM is mostly described in terms of either semantic features or information structure (see Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2011) for an overview) and is a phenomenon that can be found for example in Hungarian, Turkish, and Hindi. The variable object marking in OJ exemplified in (1,2) above has been attributed to differences in the referential properties of NPs by some researchers. For example, Motohashi (1989: 80-81) claims that one of the factors determining the difference in case marking between examples such as (1) and (2) is the difference in definiteness/referentiality of the respective

[3] The OCOJ is a comprehensive, annotated corpus of texts from the Old Japanese period, see http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/. The OCOJ consists of files in XML mark-up (according to the standards of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI)) that include original text, phonemic transcriptions, and linguistic annotation of the OJ texts. Annotation provides information on writing, part-of-speech, lemmatization, morphology, inflection, argumenthood, and syntactic constituency. Syntactic constituency is specified at the level of sentence, clause, and NP.

NPs, but in general definiteness is not a necessary condition for accusative case marking in OJ. Motohashi includes definiteness among a set of factors that are claimed to be such that various combinations are sufficient to trigger accusative case marking, but no one factor is necessary.

More recently Yanagida and Whitman (2009) propose that the relevant property is *specificity* in the weak sense of partitivity as used by Enç (1991). Here we propose to define specificity as D-Linking (discussed further in section 3.2 below), the working definition of which we set out as follows:

> *D-linking*: a relationship between an NP and a definite discourse referent, whereby the possible reference of that NP is restricted.

An even looser condition than partitivity, D-linking here subsumes a variety of relationships. Generally, if a NP is linked with a definite entity in the domain of discourse, that NP is at least specific in reference. The linking can be accomplished by relations such as part-to-whole (e.g., *a limb off the tree*) or member-to-set (e.g., *a boy in my class*). But a relation sufficient for D-linking could be as weak as that of location (e.g., *a man on the bus*), or as strong as that of identity (e.g., *this, that, the aforementioned item*, etc.), this last relation being one which entails definiteness. Definiteness is a property of a significant proportion of accusative case marked NPs in OJ, but it is only a special case of specificity defined as D-linking. With regard to the definite discourse referents (or 'anchors') that figure in D-linking relationships, there are various possible sources for these: previous mention, ostention, accomodation, etc.

Given that old information tends to appear earlier in a sentence, the tendency for accusative case marked NPs in OJ to be occupy positions non-adjacent to the verb (Matsuo 1944, Matsunaga 1983:48, Miyagawa 1989,Yanagida 2006), compared to the normally fixed verb-adjacent

position of bare objects, is another reason to think that accusative case marked NPs are regularly discourse-linked. Furthermore, if we consider that specificity of reference for an NP is likely to increase proportionate to the degree to which that NP is modified, Yanagida's (2006, 2007) observation that verb-adjacent object NPs in OJ are not only often unmarked for case but also overwhelmingly consist of unmodified common nouns is further evidence to suggest that the correlation between syntactic position and case-marking is related to the specificity of the NP. Relating overt marking only to the separation of the NP from the element to which it is dependent does not account for this phenomenon.

A survey of accusative case marked and bare objects in OJ indicates that what is expressed by DOM in OJ is indeed the property of specificity. We observe that 1) Accusative case marked objects are specific; 2) non-specific objects are not accusative case marked; and 3) some specific objects are not accusative case marked. We present a few representative examples below.

As suggested above, there are various ways, both direct and indirect, in which discourse linking can be achieved. Modification by relative clause can be sufficient to establish discourse linking. In (3) below, the relative clause *tabari-taru* 'which (you) gave (me)' denotes a finite ditransitive event with a definite agent and a definite recipient, and this is enough to make the extracted object of the predicate involved in that event definite in reference. The resulting NP is accusative case marked.

(3) wa ga kimi ni wake pa kwopu rasi
I GEN lord DAT I TOP yearn seem

tabari-taru tubana wo pamedo
bestow-STAT.ADN bloodgrass ACC eat.though

yase ni yasu
waste.away

"It seems I am in love with my lord. Though I eat the bloodgrass flowers you sent me, I only grow thinner." (MYS.8.1462)

In contrast, the two object NPs in (4) below consist of unmodified common nouns and are construed as denoting unindividuated objects of generic activities. There is no discourse linking in either case, and the most natural interpretation of the object NPs is with non-specific reference.

(4) uri pameba kwo-domo omopoyu
melon eat.when children come.to.mind

kuri pameba masite sinwopa-yu
chestnuts eat.when surpassing admire-PASS

"When I eat melon, my children come to mind. When I eat chestnuts, they are even more dear." (MYS.5.802)

We also occasionally find unmarked specific NPs, most typically in main clauses. In (5) below there is a definite NP *wa ga te* 'my hand' appearing adjacent to the verb *tor-* 'take' (attested elsewhere with accusative marked object NPs) in the conclusive inflection in a main clause.

(5) pasitate no kurapasiyama wo
Hashitate GEN Kurawashi.mountain ACC

sagasimito ipa kaki-kanete
being.steep rock grab-failing

wa ga te tora-su mo
I GEN hand take-RESP SFP

"Failing to grab the rock, Kurawashi Mountain in Hashitate being steep, Oh, how you take my hand!" (KK.69)

The observed distributions can be generalized as follows: 1) Accusative case marked objects are specific; 2) non-specific objects are not accusative case marked. However, we will attempt to explore a stronger

hypothesis, framed in the following way: 1) Non-specific objects are not accusative case marked; 2) Specific objects are accusative case marked; but 3) the accusative particle can be dropped in certain contexts. There appears to be a heterogeneous set of conditions under which accusative case marking is dropped from specific object NPs. We discuss some of these in section 5 below.

3. The semantic contribution of DOM

Given that D-linking can be achieved through fairly weak relations between an NP and entities in the discourse domain, combined with a situation in which it appears that not all D-linked NP objects appear with accusative case marking (apparently subject to a variety of conditions discussed in section 5), the hypothesis that specificity is a necessary but not sufficient condition for DOM in OJ is not easily falsifiable. Counterevidence would consist of an unambiguously non-specific NP which is also accusatively marked, but there is no categorical marker of non-specificity in OJ. To find new empirical support for the hypothesis presented here, we identified and investigated sets of NPs in which the semantic contribution of DOM would be clearly discernible.

In OJ we find many NPs that are specific independently of DOM. Some NPs are inherently definite by virtue of properties of the head noun (for example, NPs composed of unmodified pronouns and proper nouns). NPs headed by relational nouns and by nouns denoting unique entities are also regularly definite in reference. Some NPs are definite by virtue of the modifiers they contain (e.g., universal quantifiers, demonstratives, some types of relative clauses, etc.). Additionally, many NPs have their referential status determined by discourse context. For example, even if NPs are composed of unmodified common nouns, as long as their reference is

retrievable by some means (e.g. by previous mention, by indexing an entity present in the speech situation, by uniqueness, etc.), they have definite reference. Similarly, for NPs headed by common nouns an interpretation of indefinite specific reference is established by holding any one of a variety of non-identity relations with discourse referents (in terms of modification, for example, by containing a definite possessive NP complement). In OJ we observe that many accusative case marked NPs are independently definite or indefinite specific, but while this correlation with case marking conforms to our claim about DOM in OJ, examples of the sort just described do not show how DOM by itself makes a semantic contribution to interpretations of NPs.

As is the case in many languages, OJ lacks articles and has no obligatory category for NPs that indicates specificity/non-specificity. OJ also has no productive plural for inanimate common nouns such as is used to indicate non-specificity in, for example, English. Furthermore, pre-nominal cardinal quantifiers are more likely to receive interpretations of specific reference than of non-specific reference. In fact, there are no lexical items in OJ that correlate with unambiguously non-specific reference. Accordingly it is impossible to demonstrate the function of DOM by demonstrating a complementary distribution between overt indicators of non-specificity and marking of accusative case in objects NPs. Nevertheless, there are types of NPs for which non-specific interpretation is most likely, other things being equal. As a strategy for observing the function of DOM in the OCOJ, we used samples of such NPs with the expectation that in tokens appearing with accusative case marking, the semantic contribution of DOM could be corroborated through independent evidence.

There are arguably at least two types of NPs which tend to receive non-specific interpretations in neutral contexts: 1) unmodified or relatively unmodified common noun NPs associated with weak floating quantifiers (FQs), and 2) NPs headed by or modified by *wh*-words (excluding ‘which’).

Using the OCOJ, we exhaustively examined NPs of these two types and made the following findings: 1) there is a correspondence between accusative case marking and specific interpretations for these two types of NPs, corroborated by the presence of textual matter and contextual clues, and 2) NPs of these two types receiving unambiguously non-specific interpretations are regularly bare.

3.1 DOM with NPs associated with floating quantifiers

In Modern Japanese (NJ) the interpretation of FQs depends on the reference of the host noun from which they are floated. If the host noun is specific, the FQ takes either a partitive or a cardinal-universal interpretation:

(6)	rei.no panda ga	ni-too	tikurin kara	detekita.
	the panda NOM	2-CL	bamboo.grove from	came.out

"Two of the pandas came out of the bamboo grove."
"The two pandas (aforementioned) came out of the bamboo grove."

If the host noun is non-specific, the FQ takes a simple cardinal interpretation, as in (7) below. In (7) the canonical word order of presentational sentences (location > subject > existential predicate) encourages a non-specific reading of the host NP:

(7)	tikurin kara	panda ga	ni-too	detekita
	bamboo.grove from	panda NOM	2-CL	came.out

"Out of the bamboo grove came two pandas."

The same principles hold for the interpretation of FQs in OJ. In (8) below, the NP *sinokipa wo* 'arrow' is a metaphor for a previously mentioned pair of lovers who were unjustly separated. Once associated with that antecedent, the reference of the NP is definite, and the associated FQ

receives a cardinal and universal interpretation: ‘both’. Given the context, this interpretation is not controversial. What is notable is the accusative marking on the unmodified common noun host NP, which marks the NP as specific and prompts the hearer to retrieve an antecedent from the context.

(8) adusayumi yubara puri-okosi sinokipa wo
catalpa.bow bow.belly swing-raise arrow ACC

puta-tu ta-basami panati-kye-mu
two-CL hand-pinch loose-PST-CONJ

pito si kuti-wosi
person RES mouth-regrettable

“Deplorable, the person who raised a bow by its belly, pinched both those arrows, and shot them away!” (MYS.13.3302)

This situation can be contrasted with that of a non-specific NP hosting a FQ. We know from context that the poem in (9) below is a complaint from the first wife of the emperor, who deplores that the emperor should take comfort with a second woman. In (9) the host NP *pimusi no koromo* ‘silkworm robes’ is a metaphor for consorts of the emperor. The host NP *pimusi no koromo* is not accusative case marked and is non-specific. If the host NP were definite (‘these two silkworm robes’), its denotation would include a metaphor for the empress herself (as one of the two), so this is ruled out as incompatible with the intent of the complaint. If the interpretation of *puta-tu* were partitive, that would imply that *pimusi no koromo* denoted a superset of potential consorts, which also does not fit with the intention of the wife that she should be the sole consort. Rather, the interpretation of the FQ is cardinal, most likely in the very non-specific sense of ‘two or more’ (i.e., ‘more than one’). Non-specific, unindividuated reference in the object NP also fits with a generic interpretation of the predicate *ki-* ‘wear’ (attested elsewhere with accusative marked object NPs).

(9) natumusi no pimusi no koromo puta-pye kite
summer.insect GEN silkworm GEN robe two-CL wearing

kakumi-yadari pa ani yo-ku mo ara-zu
hide-shelter TOP at.all good ETOP be-NEG

"A summer moth's coccooning wearing two silk-worm robes is not at all acceptable." (NSK.49)

The contrast between examples (8) and (9) shows how the interpretation of FQs can cast the referential properties of the host noun into relief. We can illustrate the same point with something that is close to a minimal pair in examples (10, 11) below. In OJ the FQ *ya-tu* 'eight-CL' is frequently used in the non-specific sense of 'many', as well as in the sense of a precise cardinality, so the interpretation of the reference of the object NP in (10) is, ceteris paribus, potentially ambiguous. According to commentaries, the poem in (10) describes daytime fishing on foot using tethered cormorants carried four to a basket, two baskets to a pole. Given this contextual knowledge, the interpretation of the FQ *ya-tu* 'eight-CL' in (10) is completely clear as being cardinal and universal (i.e., meaning 'all eight'). This interpretation is of course consistent with the presence of the accusative case marker on the host noun *u wo* 'cormorant'.

(10) kami tu se ni u wo ya-tu
upper GEN stream DAT cormorant ACC eight-CL

kaduke simo tu se ni u wo
make.dive lower GEN stream DAT cormorant ACC

ya-tu kaduke
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.13.3330)

In contrast to (10), commentaries suggest that the poem in (11) describes night fishing, in which each of a group of handlers carry a fire-basket in one hand and a cormorant in the other. It also appears that the poet accompanies the fishing party but does not himself carry a cormorant. The (unexpressed) subject of the sentence 'we', then, cannot serve as a discourse anchor for a link to *u* 'cormorant'. The interpretation of the host NP is accordingly non-specific and the interpretation of the FQ is most likely in the very non-specific sense of 'many'. This is of course consistent with the absence of accusative case marking on the host NP.

(11) tosi no pa ni ayu si pasiraba sakitakapa
every year sweetfish RES run.when Sakita River

u ya-tu kadukete kapase
cormorant eight-CL make.dive river.stream

tadune-mu
search-CONJ

"Each year when the sweetfish run, making many cormorants dive, we shall scour rivers and streams."
(MYS.19.4158)

We found 15 FQs associated with object NPs in the OCOJ. 10 of these are associated with accusative case marked object NPs which have specific reference, and the interpretations of the FQs are either partitive or universal. 4 are associated with bare object NPs which have non-specific reference and the interpretations of the FQs are cardinal. Only 1 is associated with a host NP (object of the verb *wasure-* 'forget' attested elsewhere with accusative marked object NPs) where that NP has definite reference but is not accusative case marked, namely (12) below, which is found in a grammatical context very similar to (5). The FQ in (12) is unambiguously cardinal and universal in interpretation (meaning 'both'), so

the absence of case marking needs to be explained. This is discussed in section 5.

(12) sapogapa no kiywo-ki kapara ni naku tidwori
Sao.River GEN pure bank DAT cry plover

kapadu to puta-tu wasure-kane-tu mo
frog COM 2-CL forget-fail-PERF SFP

"Oh, how I can't forget both the frog and plover that sing on the pristine banks of the Sao River!" (MYS.7.1123)

We found no unambiguously non-specific host NPs that were accusative case marked. This suggests that, other things being equal, the interpretation of unmodified common noun NPs associated with FQs is normally non-specific, and that, at least among NPs that would be interpreted as non-specific, other things being equal, specific object NPs are regularly accusative case marked (with some exceptions).

3.2 DOM with wh-*NPs*

Since Pesetsky (1987) the term D(iscourse)-linking has been used to indicate situations such as that in which a *wh*+NP such as 'which student' implies membership in a definite superset of students. That is, *X* in *which X* is linked with a definite discourse entity. D-linked *wh*+NPs are interpreted as being partitive in reference. In this sense, they are recognized as being specific (Cinque 1990, Kiss 1993) and are a special case of D-linked NPs in general as discussed in section 3. It has been observed that D-linked vs. non-D-linked *wh*-phrases show syntactically different behaviours; for example, D-linked *wh*-phrases behave in parallel with topics in that they are extracted across weak islands while non-D-linked *wh*-phrases are not (Pesetsky 1987). D-linking of *wh*-words is not limited to *which*, but is possible in principle for normally non-D-linked *wh*-words as well, given the right context or the

right textual material (e.g., *Among these people, whom should we trust?*). We observe that the function of DOM on object NPs headed by normally non-D-linked *wh*-words in OJ (such as *ta* 'who') is similar: *ta wo* 'which person/who else'. By extension, when a normally non-specific OJ *wh*-word appears as a NP head or as an NP complement, the resulting NP is interpreted as non-specific (explained in the discussion immediately following (13) below) unless it accusative marked.

(13) a. ta ga koto
who GEN words
"whose words"

b. ta ga koto <u>wo</u>
who GEN words ACC
(lit.) "<u>which</u> of whose words"

The semantics of (13b) cannot be completely expressed by an English gloss, but a parallel can be drawn to the function of the normally specific *wh*-word (e.g., *idure* 'which') when it directly modifies an NP (e.g., *idure no kamwi* 'which god'). In such an instance, *idure* 'which' acts as a determiner, rendering the NP specific. Aside from these special cases, a NP complement headed by a *wh*-word (itself regularly indefinite) will render the host NP non-specific, because its head is linked to an indefinite NP complement rather than to a definite discourse entity. This generalization includes the *wh*-word *idure* 'which'. In fact, while there are no lexical items in OJ that unambiguously indicate non-specificity (as we noted in section 3), in general the construction $[_{NP}\ [_{NP}$ *wh*-word GEN $N_1]$ ... $N_2]$ where N_n is a common noun is regularly non-specific, and our hypothesis predicts that accusative case marking is impossible for NPs that fit this description.

We looked exhaustively at NPs involving the following *wh*-words in OJ: 1) *ta, tare* 'who' (indefinite, normally non-specific); 2) *nani* 'what'

(indefinite, normally non-specific); *idure* ‘which’ (indefinite, always specific).

3.2.1 DOM with ta *‘who’*

Out of 95 examples of NPs containing *ta, tare* ‘who’, the *wh*-word always appeared as either an NP head or an NP complement (and never modifying the head of an NP complement). Accordingly we did not find a token that is necessarily non-specific, but we did find tokens where DOM can apply, and among these we may examine the semantic contribution of DOM where it does apply: We found 10 NPs appearing as direct objects. Out of these, 6 are specific and have accusative marking. 4 are non-specific and bare. In (14) *ta* ‘who’ appears as an NP complement, which, other things being equal, would render the NP non-specific, but textual material in the previous sentence anchors the reference of the object NP, rendering it specific (‘who among those in the capital’), and furthermore, the NP is accusative case marked.

(14) kapyeru beku toki pa nari-kyeri miyakwo nite
return ought time TOP become-come.STAT capital at

ta ga tamoto wo ka wa ga makuraka-mu
who GEN sleeve ACC Q I GEN lie.upon-CONJ

“The time has come for us to return. In the capital, which sleeve of whom shall I use as my pillow?” (MYS.3.439)

Similarly, in the example in (15) *ta* ‘who’ appears as an NP head, which, again, other things being equal, would render the NP non-specific, but discourse context restricts the reference of the NP in the following way: It was a superstition in Old Japanese culture and a trope in OJ poetry that an itching eyebrow was a harbinger of a meeting with one of one’s admirers. This context provides a discourse link that renders the reference of the NP

specific (i.e., either ‘whom out of those who love me’ or ‘whom else’), and again, the object is accusative case marked.

(15) maywone kaki tare wo ka mi-mu to omopitutu
eyebrow scratch who ACC Q see-CONJ that think

“Scratching my eyebrow, thinking, ‘Which person/whom else am I about to see?’ ” (MYS.11.2614)

In contrast with (14, 15), in example (16) *ta* ‘who’ appears as an NP complement, but the reference is non-specific (‘who in the world’), and the object NP is bare.

(16) tukupane ni apa-mu to ipisi kwo pa
Tsukuba Peak at meet-CONJ that said girl TOP

ta ga koto kikeba ka
who GEN word hear.because Q

mi-ne apa-zu-kye-mu
HON-sleep meet-NEG-PST-CONJ

“The girl who said we would meet on Tsukuba Peak, because she heard whose words must it have been that she won’t come to sleep with me?” (FK.2)

3.2.2 DOM with nani ‘*what’*

Out of 99 examples of NPs containing *nani* ‘what’, the *wh*-word always appeared as either an NP head or an NP complement (and never modifying the head of an NP complement). Among these we found 11 NPs appearing as direct objects. 8 of these are specific and have accusative marking. 3 are non-specific and are bare. In (17) *nani* ‘what’ appears as an NP head, but textual material in the preceding subordinate clause provides anchors for discourse links, rendering the reference of the object NP specific (i.e., either ‘which thing among beach souvenirs’ or ‘what other than jewelweed’), and as predicted, the object NP is accusative marked.

(17) sipo pwi-naba tamamo kari-tumye.IMP ipye no imo ga
tide ebb-if jewelweed cut-pile home's beloved

pamadutwo kopaba nani wo simyesa-mu
beach.souvenir beg.if what ACC proffer-CONJ

"When the tide goes out, cut and pile up some jewel-seaweed. If my darling at home asks for a beach souvenir, which (of those)/what else shall we proffer?" (MYS.3.360)

In contrast with (17), in (18) *nani* 'what' appears in an NP modifier, and the reference is non-specific ('what inanity'), so the object NP is bare.

(18) adukinaku nani no tapakoto imasarani
pointlessly what COP inanity at.this.point

warapagoto suru oipito nisite
babbling do old.person being

"Pointlessly, what inanity, at this late date, are (you) babbling, in spite of (your) being old?" (MYS.11.2582)

3.2.2 DOM with idure '*which'*

Out of 14 examples of NPs containing *idure* 'which' the *wh*-word appeared as either an NP head or an NP modifier in 13 instances, and in 1 instance it appeared modifying the head of an NP complement (in 20) below). Among the 14 examples, we found 5 NPs appearing as direct objects. 4 of these are specific and have accusative marking. 1 is non-specific and is bare. In (19) *idure* 'which' modifies an NP head. Remember that *idure* 'which', having within its semantics an inherent member-set relation to a discourse entity, is always indefinite specific. Also, as noted above, the *wh*-word *idure* is also unique in that the expression *idure no* preceding a NP head functions as a determiner rather than as a NP complement. Thus in contrast to NP heads modified by indefinite NP complements formed with other *wh*-words, which are normally non-specific,

NP heads preceded by *idure no* are normally indefinite specific, and the object NP in (19) is no exception to this. Predictably, it is also accusative case marked.

(19) ametusi no idure no kami wo inoraba ka
heaven.earth GEN which GEN god ACC pray.if Q

utukusi papa ni mata koto-twopa-mu
adorable mother DAT again word-exchange-shall

"If (I) beseech which god of heaven and earth is it that (I) may speak to my dear mother again?" (MYS.20.4392)

In contrast to (19), in (20) *idure* 'which' appears as a determiner to an NP complement, the host object NP thus matching the description of unambiguously non-specific NPs presented above. As noted, containing *idure no* renders the NP complement's reference indefinite specific. This means that the head of the object NP is strongly linked to an indefinite NP complement, rendering its reference non-specific ('a shelter in which village'), and the object NP is bare, as predicted.

(20) kamunadukwi amama mo oka-zu puri-ni-seba
tenth.month rain.gap also put-not fall-PERF-PAST.if

idure no satwo no yadwo ka kara-masi
which is village GEN shelter Q borrow-SBJV

"In the tenth month if it had rained without a break, (I) would have borrowed a shelter in which village?" (MYS.12.3214)

3.3 Conclusions drawn from the survey

We have examined variable object marking in OJ in several contexts where any semantic contribution it may have should be clearly discernible. We find the hypothesis that accusative case marking in OJ is DOM

expressing specificity to be consistent with the data we examined. For normally indefinite NPs, DOM can make a crucial difference in the interpretation of the NP. Particularly for NPs involving *wh*-words, the correspondence between accusative marking and specificity is complete. This suggests that for NPs which would be interpreted as non-specific, other things being equal, specific object NPs are regularly case-marked. Now we will show how adding this to our knowledge of the grammar of OJ can enrich our interpretation of texts.

4. Applying the hypothesis to otherwise underdetermined cases

As an intensional (or opaque) verb, *motome*- 'seek' allows for a referentially ambiguous interpretation of its object, and frequently takes object NPs without links to definite discourse entities, that is, object NPs with non-specific reference. Accordingly, for an object NP composed of an unmodified common noun, the context for interpretation is underdetermined. Note that in (21) there is nothing else in the context to suggest that the object NP *omo* 'wet-nurse' is not specific except the lack of accusative marking. In fact, the unmodified common noun appears as a low topic in preceding sentence, and crucially is bare in its second mention. We propose that the unmarked form of *omo* 'wet-nurse', together with its position adjacent to the verb, are factors that contribute to expressing that it is non-specific here.

(21)

midorikwo no	tame koso	omo pa		motomu to ipe
baby GEN	sake FOC	wet-nurse TOP		seek that say
ti nome ya	kimi ga	<u>omo</u>	motomu ramu	
milk drink Q	lord GEN	<u>wet-nurse</u>	seek must.be	

"(We) say it's for a child that one seeks a wet-nurse. Could it be that my lord seeks a wet-nurse because he drinks milk?" (MYS.12.2925)

We now examine some examples of object NPs for which, aside from the presence of DOM, there is no discernable motivation, either textual or contextual, for an interpretation of specific reference. In many commentaries such underdetermined NPs have been interpreted as non-specific, but we inform new readings with the DOM hypothesis. In contrast to (21), in (22) an NP object of the same verb *motome-* 'seek' and again composed of an unmodified common noun appears accusatively case marked. Assuming specific reference for accusative marked NPs, the interpretation below changes:

(22) paru sareba tuma wo motomu to ugupisu no
Spring come.when spouse ACC seek to warbler GEN

konure wo tutapi nakitutu motona
branch ACC transit cry in.vain

"When Spring comes, the warbler hopping between the branches to find its mate, crying all the while, but alas, in vain." (MYS.10.1826)

Under the assumption that accusative marked objects are specific, the interpretation of (23) changes from a generalization to a judgment about specific things rooted in context. This interpretation enhanced by our hypothesis is reflected in the gloss for (23).

(23) sirusi na-ki mono wo omopa-zu pa pito-tuki no
impact none thing ACC think-not TOP one-CL GEN

nigor-eru sake wo nomu be-ku aru rasi
cloudy wine ACC drink should STAT seem

"Rather than worrying about this thing which has no impact, it seems better to drink this cup of cloudy wine."

(MYS.3.338)

The interpretations we present for (21-23) are predicated on our hypothesis that DOM in OJ expresses specificity, and while they differ from the interpretations found in the commentaries, they are every bit as plausible and arguably enhance our understanding of the texts.

5. Contexts that allow or disallow accusative case drop

The weak form of the hypothesis is that non-specific objects are bare, and accusative case marked objects are specific. The results of our survey of objects associated with FQs and object NPs containing *wh*-words suggest that for NPs which would be otherwise be interpreted as non-specific, specific object NPs are regularly case-marked, but we find one exception in (12). In section 2 we proposed to explore a stronger interpretation of the facts of distribution: specific object NPs are accusative case marked, but in certain contexts the accusative case particle on specific objects can (or must) be dropped. Pursuing this line of inquiry, we see that much more detailed research on accusative case drop on specific objects is required, but at least we can say the following. The contexts which contribute to allowing or disallowing drop of the accusative case particle on specific objects include at least two kinds: clause type and lexical properties. With regard to clause type, it has been observed that certain clause types never allow accusative drop, while others do. In clauses where the predicate is in the Adnominal form (and to a large extent in Conditional, Provisional, and Nominal clauses) in OJ, specific objects are regularly accusative marked. In some types of main clause (Conclusive, Imperative, Optative, Exclamatory, Negative Conjectural) accusative case on specific objects can be dropped. The bare specific object NPs in (5) and (12) are examples of this.

With regard to lexical properties, animacy and person have predictable effects on specificity: For example, when 1st person pronouns (*wa, ware* 'I') and 2nd person pronouns (*na, nare* 'you') are direct objects they are regularly accusative marked. However, we also find that for example the verb *mat-* 'await' idiosyncratically allows accusative drop for its object NPs, overriding other factors, in (24) even showing accusative case drop on the 1st person pronoun *ware*. Clearly, the details of accusative case drop on specific objects in OJ are intricate and require a thorough investigation across a wide range of parameters.

(24) nubatama no ywo wataru tukwi wo iku-ywo
jewel COP night traverse moon ACC how.many-nights

pu to yomitutu imo pa <u>ware</u>
transpire that counting beloved TOP <u>me</u>

matu ramu so
await must.be FOC

"Measuring the moon that crosses the jewel-black night by how many nights pass, my beloved, no doubt (she) awaits <u>me</u>." (MYS.18.4072)

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have demonstrated the explanatory force of the hypothesis that OJ has DOM expressing specificity, in particular:

1) Non-specific objects in OJ are not accusative marked.
2) Specific objects in OJ are accusative marked; however, the accusative case particle can be dropped in some contexts.

An exhaustive survey of two types of context where we expect the effects of DOM to be most discernable (namely, NPs hosting FQs and containing *wh*-words) corroborates our hypothesis. We also offered examples of the utility of applying the hypothesis to texts to inform and improve their interpretations. Finally, we remarked briefly on conditions that allow and disallow accusative case drop.

References

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-bar dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Dalrymple, Mary and Irina Nikolaeva. 2011. *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enç, Mürvet. 1991. "The semantics of specificity". *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 1-25.

Kinsui, Satoshi. 2011. "Tōgōron [Syntax]". *Bunpōshi* [Historical grammar], ed. by Kinsui,Takayama, Kinuhata, and Okazaki, 77-166. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Kiss, Katalin E. 1993. "WH-movement and specificity". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11:85-120. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kuroda, S.-Y. 2008. "On the syntax of Old Japanese". *Current issues in the history and structure of Japanese*, ed. by Frellesvig, Shibatani, and Smith, 263-317. Kurosio.

Matsunaga, Setsuko. 1983. "The Development of Case Marking in Japanese". Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.

Matsuo, Osamu. 1944. "Kyakugo hyōji no joshi 'o' ni tuite". *Kokugogaku Ronshū*. ed. by Hashimoto Hakase Kanreki Kinenkai, 617-644. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2012. *Case, argument structure and word order*. Routledge.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and Case Marking in Japanese. Syntax and Semantics,* Vol. 22. New York: Academic Press.

Motohashi, Tatsushi. 1989. *Case Theory and the History of the Japanese Language.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona.

Pesetsky, David. 1987. "Wh-in-situ: movement and unselective binding."

The representation of (In)definiteness, edited by Eric J. Reuland and Alice G.B. ter Meulen, 98-129. Cambridge. MA: MIT Press.

Yanagida, Yuko. 2006. "Word order and clause structure in Early Old Japanese". *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 15*:37-68.

Yanagida, Yuko. 2007. "Miyagawa's (1989) exceptions: An ergative analysis". *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 55: 265–276, ed. Yoichi Miyamoto. Cambridge: MIT.

Yanagida, Yuko and John Whitman. 2009. "Word order and alignment in Old Japanese". *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 18:2.101-144.

Wrona, Janick and Bjarke Frellesvig. 2010. "The Old Japanese case system: The function of *wo*". *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 17.565-580. CSLI Publications.