

Chapter 7

A diachronic perspective on differential object marking in pre-modern Japanese: Old Japanese and Early Middle Japanese

Bjarke Frellesvig

University of Oxford

Stephen Horn

University of Oxford

Yuko Yanagida

University of Tsukuba

An exhaustive search of Old Japanese object NPs associated with weak floating quantifiers and question-focussed object NPs containing interrogative words confirms the suggestion made in Yanagida & Whitman (2009), confirmed by Frellesvig et al. (2015), that Old Japanese had differential object marking (DOM) with specificity (defined by Frellesvig et al. 2015 as D-linking) as a necessary condition. Testing the same hypothesis on Early Middle Japanese, however, shows that this condition no longer obtained by the Heian Period. The resources for the expression of specificity and the set of conditions for differential object marking clearly changed over this span of the history of the Japanese language.

1 Introduction

Throughout its attested history Japanese has exhibited variable object marking: Some object NPs are marked by the accusative case particle *wo*,¹ others are not. We give two

¹The accusative case particle *wo* has been in use through the history of the language. Its phonemic shape changed to /o/ around the year 1000 AD due to regular sound change; we will refer to the Japanese accusative particle as ‘*wo*’ throughout the paper, except when citing examples, which have ‘*wo*’ or ‘*o*’ depending on the age of the source. Like accusatives in many other languages, the Japanese accusative has functions in addition to marking direct objects, mainly: marking adjuncts (path and source) and marking subjects raised to object and subjects in a few absolute constructions.



simple examples from Old Japanese in (1)–(2).^{2,3}

- (1) [_{NP} *kwomatu ga sita no kaya wo*] *kara-sane*
 small.pine GEN under GEN grass ACC cut-RESP.OPT
 ‘(I) want (you) to cut some of the grass under the small pine.’ (MYS 1.11)
- (2) *akami-yama* [_{NP} *kusane* Ø] *kari-soke*
 Akami-mountain grass cut-remove
 ‘cutting and removing grasses at Mount Akami...’ (MYS 14.3479)

Phenomena suggesting the existence of differential object marking (DOM) in Old Japanese (OJ) have long been noted, and hypotheses about the trigger for DOM in OJ have been developed and refined in recent decades (Motohashi 1989; Yanagida 2006; Yanagida & Whitman 2009) to the point where a robust formulation of a condition on DOM in OJ has now been proposed and tested in a survey of OJ object noun phrases of a few selected types Frellesvig et al. (2015).

In the present study we present an expanded and exhaustive survey of OJ along the same lines as in Frellesvig et al. (2015), and then proceed to extend these same techniques to a body of texts representative of the immediately following historical variant of Japanese, Early Middle Japanese (EMJ), in order to ascertain whether the DOM system of the Japanese of the Asuka and Nara periods (as represented by texts from 712 CE to 797 CE) persists into the Heian period (as represented by texts from 900 CE to 1110 CE).

First we define the necessary condition for triggering DOM in OJ, viz. specificity defined as D-linking (see §2 below). Next we describe how we used the Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese Frellesvig et al. (2014) to determine that reference to this condition contributes to an observationally adequate description of DOM in OJ. Next we present the methods and results of a similar survey of EMJ using the Historical Corpus of Japanese National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL) (2014), which show clear and significant differences in object marking between Old Japanese and the immediately following period of Early Middle Japanese. In the discussion in §4, we summarize and discuss these findings and identify areas for further research.

2 The conditions for DOM in OJ

In the data set used for the study on DOM in OJ (described in more detail below) there are in total 4094 direct object noun phrases (NPs). Of these object NPs, 1946 (47.5%) are

²Like modern Japanese, Old Japanese is head-final, has postposed particles, verbal suffixes in derivational and inflectional morphology, and pervasive pro-drop (whence many of the examples we cite have no overt subject). Old Japanese has an extensive inventory of inflecting verbal suffixes, which are not found in modern Japanese, expressing aspect, tense and mood. Old Japanese does not have a nominative case particle; subjects are sometimes bare and sometimes marked by one of the two genitive case particles *no* and *ga*. In modern Japanese *ga* has become a nominative case particle, whereas *no* remains a genitive in modern Japanese. See further Frellesvig (2010) about premodern Japanese.

³Examples are transcribed in a time-appropriate phonemic transcription (see Frellesvig 2010: 33, 176 for simple transcription guidelines).

marked with the accusative case particle *wo*. It is evident that there is variation in object marking (cf. also (1), (2) above), and the initial question is whether that is dependent on some factor or combination of factors. Following Frellesvig et al. (2015), we find that the alternation found in Old Japanese is related to a non-inherent discourse-based argument property. In this respect the distribution of OJ accusative case marker *wo* is similar in many respects to that of the Turkish accusative case suffix *-i* for direct objects (Enç 1991). Also note that object marking alternation in OJ is found in *wh*-NPs under question focus (e.g. *idure wo ka wakite sinwopamu* ‘Which (of them) shall I praise, separating it out?’), which means that *wo*-marking does not imply topichood. Rather, we find that a necessary condition for DOM in OJ is a weak form of *specificity* which we define in terms of D-linking, the working definition of which we set out as follows:

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

Pesetsky (1987) used the term D(iscourse)-linking to characterize *wh*-NPs such as ‘which student’ as having a special property due to their membership in a definite superset, this being, moreover, a property with consequences for syntax. Generally, *X* in *which X* is linked with a definite discourse entity insofar as ‘which’ is uninterpretable without a presupposed superset, thus such D-linked *wh*-NPs are weakly ‘specific’ (Cinque 1990; É. Kiss 1993). As an example with an overt superset rather than a merely presupposed one, consider the expression *Among the students in this year’s cohort, which is the best?*

Extending this idea, it is clear that this weak specificity can accrue to *wh*-NPs other than those containing ‘which’: For example, the contextual material accompanying the *wh*-NP ‘whom’ in the expression *Among the students in this year’s cohort, whom should we trust?* is sufficient to render that *wh*-NP D-linked. The phrase ‘what else’ in the expression *What else do you want?* is D-linked to a definite discourse entity by the relation of exclusion, as that narrows the possible reference of the NP ‘what else’.⁴

Further extending the idea, we see that the same kind of weak specificity can be a significant property of indefinite NPs that do not contain *wh*-words at all, established through the same kinds of D-linking relations, a typical example being that of a definite possessive NP complement, as in *the farm’s products*, but potentially established in a variety of ways (e.g. *a man on the bus, a limb off the tree, another glass of beer*, etc.). We also stipulate that D-linking is not an irreflexive relation. Thus a definite NP is D-linked through the relation of identity it has with itself. By this we also include co-indexing through previous mention and pronominal reference as a way to establish D-linking. Thus we account for the distribution of accusative case marking on both definite objects and indefinite specific ones by reference to one principle.

Needless to say, there are also many ways for the definite discourse referents upon which these various relations depend to find their way into the common ground: pre-

⁴It follows that DOM conditioned by D-linking can trigger an interpretation of weak specificity in a *wh*-NP that would otherwise be construed as non-specific (as Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011: 210–211 observe for Persian). While all of the examples of *wo*-marked *wh*-NPs in our OJ data are accompanied by contextual material for D-linking (see §2.2), this is valuable new information for the interpretation of *wo*-marked objects in general in Old Japanese texts.

vious mention, ostension, presupposition accommodation, uniqueness, etc. In OJ, the effect of weak specificity can be seen in the near-minimal pair (1) and (2) given above. The object NP in (1) is modified by an NP complement containing the NP *kwomatu* ‘small pine’ and is marked by accusative case particle *wo*. Because *kwomatu* (‘the small pine’) is definite, as the context in the poem shows, the reference of the object NP *kaya wo* ‘grass’ is at least weakly specific due to the D-linking relation which maps the whole object NP to the definite discourse entity denoted by the NP complement. Accordingly, we translate the object NP here as a having at least a partitive relation: *some of the grass under the small pine*, but the NP also could potentially refer to *all the grass under the small pine*. The marking of the object NP conforms to the fact that it has at least weak specificity, which property satisfies a necessary condition for object marking. By contrast, the object NP in (2) *kusane* ‘grass’ is unmodified and unmarked, consistent with non-specific reference, which we translate here with an English plural common noun ‘grasses’. When we look at the wider context of the expression in (2) we see that a non-specific amount of grasses are cut in order to open a space for lying down. The presence and absence of object case marking seen respectively in (1) and (2) corresponds to the presence and absence of specificity in the reference of the NPs.

This analysis is supported by Yanagida’s (2006) observation that a great preponderance of unmarked object noun phrases in OJ are composed of unmodified common nouns, while *wo*-marked object NPs are frequently modified by NP complements as in (1) or by relative clauses. Overt modification, while restricting the possible reference of the NP so modified, does not by itself ensure a D-linking relationship, but reference to a definite discourse entity within the modifying material is one way to establish D-linking, which in turn licenses object marking. Needless to say, stronger types of specificity, including epistemic specificity and definiteness, also license object marking in OJ.

Furthermore, as observed by many (Matsuo 1944; Matsunaga 1983: 48; Miyagawa 1989; Yanagida 2006), object-marking in OJ is associated with leftward movement, so that, for example, in this SOV language, *wo*-marked object NPs co-occurring with genitive-marked subject NPs appear to the left of those subject NPs (e.g. example (16) below), with extremely few exceptions. Yanagida & Whitman (2009) identify this as a movement to a position outside of the domain of existential closure in the verb phrase. This is a phenomenon common to specific object NPs, as described by Diesing (1992), *inter alia*. In contrast, bare, unmodified, common noun-headed object NPs in OJ commonly appear adjacent to the verb (Yanagida 2006; Yanagida & Whitman 2009). These distributions conform very well with what we observe here.⁵

We also note that object NPs composed of personal pronouns (Wrona & Frellesvig 2010, *inter alia*) and NPs modified by demonstratives are also fairly regularly object marked. However, we also find clearly specific object NPs that are unmarked. For example, we found 47 object NPs containing demonstrative *ko* ‘this’ at some structural level. All of these NPs are specific, and indeed many of them are definite, but while 25 are accusative case marked as predicted, e.g. (4), 22 of them are bare, e.g. (5).

⁵Note, however, that there are rare examples of unmodified *wo*-marked NPs that appear adjacent to the selecting verb (possibly cases of vacuous movement). Conversely leftward movement does not imply specificity, as *wh*-items in question focus are regularly left-shifted, and many of these are non-specific.

- (4) *ko no miki wo kami-kyemu pito pa*
 this GEN wine ACC chew-must.have person TOP
 ‘as for the person who must have brewed **this wine**’ (KK 40)
- (5) *Yamato no womura no take ni sisi pusu to tare ka*
 Yamato GEN Womura GEN peak DAT game lie COMP who FOC
ko no koto opomapye ni mawosu?
 this GEN content Emperor DAT say
 ‘That deer lie on the peaks in Womura in Yamato –who is it that says **this thing**
 to His Majesty?’ (NSK 75a, b)

The pattern for object marking in OJ outlined above may be summarized as follows:

- (6) a Accusative case marked objects are specific;
 b non-specific objects are not accusative case marked;
 c not all specific objects are accusative case marked.

This leads us to form the following hypothesis:

- (7) *Condition on DOM in OJ*: Specificity is a necessary condition for object marking in OJ, the weakest form of specificity being D-linking. However, specificity is not a sufficient condition for object marking in OJ.

In this paper we focus on this condition and its falsifiability, but do not to any significant extent discuss the – important – issue of when specific objects in OJ are not accusative case marked. See, however, §4 for some remarks on this.

The hypothesis that some kind of specificity is a necessary but not sufficient condition for DOM is falsifiable by finding an unambiguously non-specific NP which is also accusatively marked. Unfortunately, there is no linguistic pattern in OJ that can be said to be an unambiguous and categorical marker of non-specificity, making it difficult to search for counterevidence to our hypothesis on the basis of linguistic forms in an electronic corpus. But there are at least two classes of object NPs which, other things being equal, have reference that is normally non-specific: (i) object NPs associated with weak Floating Quantifiers (FQs) of the form [numeral + classifier],⁶ and (ii) object NPs containing *wh*-words (except for *idure* ‘which’, discussed in more detail below) and having question focus.⁷ As it is, variable object marking is attested among both of these classes of NPs, suggesting that under marked conditions both types of NP can have specific reference. In order to establish a systematic and exhaustive method which can also be

⁶For example, in the Modern Japanese (NJ) expression *Dooro de sika o rop-piki mita* ‘On the road I saw six deer’, a non-specific object NP *sika* ‘deer’ is associated with the FQ *rop-piki* ‘six-animal’. For this first class of object NPs, in special cases the reference can be specific, and indeed even definite, but the function of the FQ ceases to be weakly quantifying in such cases (discussed in more detail below) (Kim 1995, *inter alia*).

⁷For example, in the NJ expression *Mado kara dare o mimasita ka* ‘From the window, whom did you see?’ the object NP *dare o* ‘whom’ is under question focus. For this second class of object NPs, the reference is at most only weakly specific, and that only under special conditions (discussed in more detail below).

applied to following stages of the language, with much larger volumes of material available, we therefore examined all attestations of these two classes of object NPs using the *Oxford Corpus of Old Japanese* (OCOJ, Frellesvig et al. 2014), with the aim of demonstrating whether a D-linking relation would be retrievable for the *wo*-marked object NPs. If not, such examples could constitute counterevidence to the hypothesis about DOM.

The data set we used for the OJ survey was extracted from the September 2014 version of the OCOJ (Frellesvig et al. 2014), which primarily uses sources from the *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* (Iwanami shoten, 1957–1962) as critical editions. We used a sub-corpus comprising all extant poetic texts from 712 CE to 797 CE, drawing material from the following sources: *Kojiki kayō*, *Nihon shoki kayō*, *Fudoki kayō*, *Bussokuseki-ka*, *Shoku nihongi kayō*, *Manyōshū*. It is thought that some of the poetic texts in these works are considerably older than the earliest date of compilation. The volume of the corpus is 4,979 poems, comprising 89,419 words.

We looked at the two types of NPs which would under normal, unmarked conditions be non-specific. As predicted, the exhaustive examination of these object NPs showed that:

- (8) a There is a correspondence between accusative case marking and specific interpretations for these two types of NPs (corroborated by the presence of contextual clues); and
- b NPs of these two types receiving unambiguously non-specific interpretations (again corroborated by contextual clues) are bare.

Details for both types of NP are presented together with examples in the sections that follow. In the remarks that follow we only discuss the reference of marked object NPs, as only these serve as potential counterevidence to the hypothesis for a condition on DOM in OJ (7).

2.1 Specificity of object NPs associated with weak floating quantifiers in OJ

Out of the attested 100 expressions with the form of weak FQs in the data set, we found 4 attestations of FQs both indexed with *wo*-marked object NPs and functioning as adverbial modifiers of the predicate selecting their respective host NPs (see examples (9)–(11)). In all cases the reference of the host NP was in fact definite. When an FQ that, other things being equal, would be interpreted as weakly quantifying (e.g. a cardinal FQ) is paired with a definite host NP, the resulting expression is construable in two ways; either as meaning ‘*n*-members of a definite superset,’ (i.e. ‘*n* of them’, where the FQ behaves as what we might call a partitive quantifier), or as a cardinally specified universal quantifier (e.g. ‘both’, i.e. ‘all of them, with a cardinality of 2’). The interpretations presented in the examples below are derived accordingly. We present all four examples in the following.

The definiteness of the host NP in example (9) derives from the fact that the relative clause modifying the head noun *kamwi* ‘god’ serves to define a definite superset: ‘those

gods known as Chinese Tigers'.⁸ The FQ *ya-tu* 'eight-thing' functions as a partitive quantifier 'eight members of the superset'.

- (9) *karakuni no twora to ipu kamwi wo ikedorini*
 China GEN tiger COMP say god ACC live.take.as
ya-tu tori-moti-ki
 eight-thing take-hold-come
 '...taking and bringing by capturing live **eight of those gods called Chinese Tigers...**' (MYS 16.3885)

In (10) the definiteness of the host NP *sinokipa* 'arrow' derives from a combination of metaphor and previous mention, explained in detail in Frellesvig et al. (2015). The FQ functions as a cardinally specified universal quantifier 'both'.

- (10) ...*adusa-yumi yu-bara puri-okosi sinokipa wo puta-tu*
 catalpa-bow bow-belly swing-raise arrow ACC two-thing
ta-basami panati-kyemu pito si kuti-wosi
 hand-pinch loose-must.have person RES mouth-regrettable
 'Deplorable, the person who (...) must have raised a bow, pinched **both those arrows**, and shot them away!' (MYS 13.3302)

The definiteness of the two host NPs in example (11) *u* 'cormorant' is inferred from the method of fishing referred to in this poem, which involves using exactly eight cormorants carried four to a basket, two baskets to a pole (see Frellesvig et al. 2015: 202). Thus, the two FQs function as cardinally specified universal quantifiers 'all eight'.

- (11) *kami tu se ni u wo ya-tu kaduke simo*
 upper GEN stream DAT cormorant ACC eight-thing make.dive lower
tu se ni u wo ya-tu kaduke
 GEN stream DAT cormorant ACC eight-thing 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)

Again, the reference for every *wo*-marked host NP of FQ is definite. Given our definition of D-linking in (3) and the stipulation that definite NPs are D-linked by reflexive identity, we determine that all *wo*-marked object NPs associated with FQs in OJ are at least weakly specific in reference. Accordingly, for this class of NPs, no counter-evidence to the hypothesis is found.

⁸It is well-known that NPs of the form *X to iu Y* 'Y which is called X' regularly form definite descriptions.

2.2 Specificity of object NPs containing *WH*-words with question focus

The set of *wh*-words in OJ is as follows:

- (12) *WH*-words in OJ: *ta, tare* ‘who’; *idu* ‘where’; *iduku* ‘where’; *idura* ‘where (abouts)’; *idupye* ‘which direction’; *idure* ‘which’; *idusi* ‘which side’; *iduti* ‘which direction’; *ika* ‘how’; *iku* ‘how many’; *ikubaku* ‘how much’; *ikuda* ‘how much’; *ikupisa(sa)* ‘how long ago’; *ikura* ‘how much’; *ikutu* ‘how much’; *itu* ‘when’; *nado, ado* ‘why’; *na, nani* ‘what’; *ani* ‘how’; *uremuso* ‘why’

The OCOJ has 469 occurrences of *wh*-words. Out of these, we identified 70 that are contained in object NPs, of which 21 are *wo*-marked. Of these *wo*-marked NPs containing *wh*-words, there are 18 which have question focus (i.e. are themselves *wh*-NP objects). As for the remaining 3 object NPs, they do not have question focus, either due to the focus being discharged within a complement clause embedded in a relative clause, or due to the *wh*-word functioning as a quantifier, or both. For example, in (13) below, the *wh*-word (*itu* ‘when’) is contained in an adverb NP (*itu si ka mo*) of a complement clause (*itu ... mimu to*) embedded in a relative clause (*itu ... omopisi*) modifying the head (*apasima*) of an object NP. The force of the *wh*-word is discharged at the level of the complement clause. The whole utterance forms a yes/no question.

- (13) [_{NP} *itu si ka mo mi-mu to omopi-si apa-sima wo*]
 when RES FOC ETOP see-will COMP think-SPST Awa-island ACC
yoso ni ya kwopwi-mu
 afar DAT FOC yearn-will

‘Shall [I] have to yearn from afar for Awa Island, about which [I] thought, “When will [I] see it?”?’ (MYS 15.3631)

Non-question focus object NPs such as these are excluded from consideration, because they can easily have definite reference, as does in fact the example in (13).

Out of the *wh*-words in OJ, listed above, only the following appear in the formation of *wo*-marked object *wh*-NPs: *ika* ‘how’; *ta, tare* ‘who’; *nani* ‘what’; *idure* ‘which’. Under normal, unmarked conditions, NPs containing such *wh*-words (with the exception of *idure* ‘which’) would be non-specific. However, significantly, in these 18 examples, the NPs containing them are *wo*-marked and in fact weakly specific in reference. For example, in (14) immediately below, the reference of the *wh*-NP headed by *yosi* ‘opportunity’ is associated with a definite event that occurred by chance, the D-linking established through the relationship of exclusion: ‘what manner of opportunity other than by chance’. In all 18 examples (14)–(31), the *wo*-marked object *wh*-NP is accompanied by contextual material by which that NP is construable as related to a definite discourse entity. While we cannot include here all the considerations by which the judgments on reference status were made due to lack of space, we reflect as much as possible in the translations.

2.2.1 *ika* ‘how’

- (14) *tamasakani wa ga mi-si pito wo ika nara-mu*
 by.chance I GEN see-SPST person ACC how COP-will
yosi wo motite ka mata pito-me mi-mu
 opportunity ACC holding FOC again one-glimpse see-will
 ‘The person whom I met by chance –having **what other manner of opportunity** is it that [I] will see a glimpse of her again?’ (MYS 11.2396)

2.2.2 *ta/tare* ‘who’

- (15) *yamato no takasazinwo wo nana yuku wotomye-domo tare wo*
 Yamato GEN Takasazino ACC seven go girl-PL who ACC
si maka-mu
 RES wrap-will
 ‘As for the seven maidens walking along the plain Takasazi in Yamato – **whom (of them)** will [you] wed?’ (KK 15)
- (16) *nagatukwi no sigure no ame no yama-gwiri no asibuseki*
 9th.month GEN shower GEN rain GEN mountain-mist as fretful
a ga mune ta wo miba yama-mu
 I GEN breast who ACC see.if stop-will
 ‘As for my breast which is fretting like the mountain mist of the rain showers of the 9th month, if [I] see **whom (other than you)** shall it quieten?’ (MYS 10.2263a)
- (17) *maywone kaki tare wo ka mi-mu to omopitutu*
 eyebrow scratch who ACC FOC see-will COMP think.while
ke-nagaku kwopwi-si imo ni ap-yeru kamo
 days-long yearn-SPST beloved DAT meet-STAT SFP
 ‘Scratching [my] eyebrow, thinking, “**Whom (other than you)** am [I] about to see?” here [I] am meeting my beloved (i.e. you) whom [I] have longed for day in and day out!’ (MYS 11.2614b)
- (18) *kapyeru beku toki pa nari-kyeri miyakwo nite ta ga*
 return ought time TOP become-MPST Capital COP who GEN
tamoto wo ka wa ga makuraka-mu
 sleeve ACC FOC I GEN lie.upon-will
 ‘The time has come for [us] to return. In the capital, **the sleeve of whom (other than my departed wife)** shall I use as my pillow?’ (MYS 3.439)
- (19) *asigara no ya-pye-yama kwoyete imasi-naba tare wo*
 Ashigara GEN eight-fold-mountain Crossing come-PFV.if who ACC
ka kimi to mitutu sinwopa-mu
 FOC lord COMP seeing praise-will
 ‘If [you] cross the eight-fold mountains of Ashigara, then **whom (else)** shall [I], thinking [it] to be my lord, admire?’ (MYS 20.4440)

2.2.3 *nani* ‘what’

- (20) *kasuga.nwo no pudi pa tiri-nite nani wo ka mo*
 Kasuga.field GEN wisteria TOP scatter-PFV.GER what ACC FOC ETOP
mi-kari no pito no worite kazasa-mu
 PFX-hunt GEN person GEN breaking.off don-will

‘The wisteria flowers on Kasuga fields having scattered, **what else** shall the hunters break off and wear on their heads?’ (MYS 10.1974)

- (21) *kokoro sape matur-eru kimi ni nani wo ka mo ipa-zu*
 heart even offer.up-STAT lord DAT what ACC FOC ETOP say-NEG
ipi-si to wa ga nusumapa-mu
 say-SPST COMP I GEN steal-will

‘To you whom [I] have given the very meaning (my very heart), **what (else)** would I steal from you by saying, “[It] is a thing which was said without speaking?”’ (MYS 11.2573)

- (22) *moti no pi ni sasi-iduru tukwi no takatakani kimi*
 mid.month GEN day DAT direct-come.out moon as refinedly lord
wo imasete nani wo ka omopa-mu
 ACC making.come what ACC FOC think-will

‘Having you come resplendently like the moon that comes out on the 15th of the month, **what (else)** could [I] wish for?’ (MYS 12.3005)

- (23) *yama-gapi ni sak-yeru sakura wo tada*
 mountain-saddle DAT bloom-STAT cherry.blossom ACC just
pito-me kimi ni mise-teba nani wo ka omopa-mu
 one-glimpse lord DAT show-PFV.if what ACC FOC think-will

‘If [I] managed to show my lord just once the cherry blossoms that bloom in the saddle of the mountain, **what (else)** could [I] wish for?’ (MYS 17.3967)

- (24) *ipye ni yukite nani wo katara-mu asipikwino*
 home DAT going what ACC recount-will (pillow.word)
yama-pototogisu pito-kowe mo nakye
 mountain-cuckoo one-chirp ETOP cry.IMP

‘Mountain cuckoo, sing even one note! Going home, **what (other than that)** shall [I] recount?’ (MYS 19.4203)

- (25) *ima-sarani nani wo ka omopa-mu uti-nabiki kokoro pa kimi*
 now-newly what ACC FOC think-will PFX-lie.down heart TOP lord
ni yori-ni-si monowo
 DAT depend-PFV-SPST given.that

‘At this late date, **what more** could [one] ask for, given that [my] heart, lying down, has given itself over to you?’ (MYS 4.505)

- (26) *ame-tuti wo terasu pi-tukwi no kipami naku aru*
 heaven-earth ACC illuminate sun-moon as limit lacking be
beki monowo nani wo ka omopa-mu
 ought given.that what ACC FOC think-will
 ‘Given that [it] must have no limit, just as the sun and moon which illuminate heaven and earth, **what else** could [one] wish for?’ (MYS 20.4486)
- (27) *sipo pwi-naba tama-mo kari-tume ipye no imo ga*
 tide ebb-PFV.if jewel-weed cut-gather.IMP home GEN beloved GEN
pama-dutwo kopaba nani wo simyesa-mu
 beach-souvenir beg.if what ACC proffer-will
 ‘When the tide goes out, cut and gather some jewel-seaweed. If my darling at home asks for a beach souvenir, **what (other than that)** would [we] proffer?’ (MYS 3.360)

2.2.4 *idure* ‘which’

The *wh*-word *idure* ‘which’ is inherently specific, and NPs headed by *idure* (e.g. in (29) below) or with *idure* as a direct NP complement to the head (e.g. in (28), (30), (31) below) are specific. There are 4 examples of an object *wh*-NP formed with *idure* as a head or as a direct NP complement, and as expected all are *wo*-marked.

- (28) *asipikwino tama-kadura no kwo kyepu no goto idure no*
 (pillow.word) jewel-vine GEN child today GEN like which GEN
kuma wo mitutu ki-ni-kyemu
 bend ACC seeing come-PFV-must.have
 ‘Oh child of the jewel-vine, seeing **which bends in the mountain road** must [you] have come here, as [I come] today?’ (MYS 16.3790)
- (29) *idure wo ka wakite sinwopa-mu*
 which ACC FOC separating praise-will
 ‘...**Which** shall [I] praise, separating [it] out? ...’ (MYS 18.4089)
- (30) *watatumi no idure no kamwi wo inoraba ka yuku*
 sea.god GEN which GEN god ACC supplicate.if FOC go
sa mo ku sa mo pune no paya-kye-mu
 way ETOP come way ETOP boat GEN fast-be-will
 ‘**Which god of the sea** is it that, if [I] beseech it, the boat will be fast both on the way out and the way back?’ (MYS 9.1784)

- (31) *ame-tusi no idure no kami wo inoraba ka utukusi*
 heaven-earth GEN which GEN god ACC beseech.if FOC dear
papa ni mata koto-twopa-mu
 mother DAT again word-ask-will
 ‘Which of the gods of heaven and earth is it that, if [I] beseech it, [I] will speak again to my dear mother?’ (MYS 20.4392)

Thus, for object NPs containing *wh*-words and having question focus, which under normal, unmarked conditions would be expected to have non-specific reference, all *wo*-marked examples are demonstrably D-linked and thereby specific, so that no counter-evidence to the hypothesis about the condition on DOM in OJ (7) is found.

3 Does the DOM system of OJ persist into EMJ?

In this section we will address the question of whether Early Middle Japanese (EMJ, 900 CE to 1110 CE) exhibits the same system of DOM as OJ, concluding that it does not. We will show that in EMJ both specific and nonspecific objects may be *wo*-marked or bare, unlike OJ which disallows non-specific *wo*-marked objects. We will first show three examples (all taken from *Makura no Sōshi*) which show that EMJ, like OJ, had *wo*-marked specific objects (32), bare specific objects (33), and bare non-specific objects (34). Following that we will present the results of an investigation of whether EMJ had non-specific *wo*-marked objects.

In (32) the object denotes particular body parts of previously mentioned people, and as such the reference is D-linked and specific. The object NP is *wo*-marked.

- (32) **Specific, *wo*-marked object NP**
uta-rezi to youi site tuneni usiro o
 hit-PASS.will.not COMP preparation doing constantly behind ACC
kokoro-dukawi si-taru kesiki
 heart-dispatch do-STAT sight
 ‘the sight of [them] constantly guarding [their] **behinds** taking care lest [they] be struck’ (Makura no sōshi, 3, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 18, p. 28)

In (33) previous mention of *augi* ‘fan’ and *putokorogami* ‘pocket paper’ is seen in the immediately preceding context, establishing D-linking through the relation of previous mention, and yet both object NPs are bare.

- (33) **Specific, bare object NP**
augi tatau-gami nado yobe makura-gami ni
 fan folding-paper etc. last.night pillow-head DAT
oki-sikado onodukara pika-re tiri-ni-keru o motomuru
 put-SPST.although naturally pull-PASS scatter-PFV-MPST ACC search
ni kurakereba ikade ka wa mi-mu idura idura
 DAT dark.because how FOC TOP see-will where where

tataki-watasi mi-idete augi putaputato tukawi putokoro-gami
 pat-cross see-putting.out fan (mimetic) use pocket-paper
sasi-irete makari-na-mu to bakari koso iu rame
 stick-put.in go.home-PFV-will COMP RES FOC say EXT

‘Although [he] had put [his] fan and folded paper and such at the head of his pillow the night before, when [he] searches [for them] among the things that naturally became disturbed and scattered, it being dark, how shall [he] ever find them?— saying, “Where? Where?” patting the whole area, and finding them, [he] uses [his] fan, “woosh-woosh,” and sticking [his] pocket-paper in, what [he] would surely say is something like, “[I’ll] be going now”’. (Makura no sōshi, 61, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 18, p. 117)

The example in (34) is the first entry in a list entitled “Despicable things”. There is no previous context other than the title of the list, and given the public nature of the list and the negative evaluations levied on the items therein, anything more than a non-specific reference would be unthinkable. The object NP is bare.

(34) Non-specific, bare object NP

nadeu koto naki pito no we-gati nite mono
 any.in.particular thing lacking person GEN laugh-tending COP thing
itau iwi-taru
 extremely say-STAT

‘A person who has nothing to commend himself, smugly saying things volubly.’
 (Makura no sōshi, 26, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 18, p. 65)

As mentioned, (32)–(34) conform to the observed OJ distribution of specificity and case marking. In order to examine whether the DOM system of OJ is also found in EMJ we investigated systematically the existence of *wo*-marked non-specific objects, which were disallowed in OJ. We used the methodology outlined above and examined object NPs associated with weak FQs and object *wh*-NPs with question focus, using the Heian Japanese sub-corpus of the Historical Corpus of Japanese (NINJAL 2014) in conjunction with the Chūnagon search application available from the National Institute of Japanese Language and Linguistics. The Heian Japanese sub-corpus of the Historical Corpus of Japanese represents prose and poetry in texts produced between 900 CE to 1110 CE, using texts from the *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* (Shogakkan, 1994) as critical editions. The Heian sub-corpus is composed of the following texts: *Kokin wakashū*, *Tosa nikki*, *Taketori monogatari*, *Ise monogatari*, *Ochikubo monogatari*, *Yamato monogatari*, *Makura no sōshi*, *Genji monogatari*, *Murasaki Shikibu monogatari*, *Izumi Shikibu monogatari*, *Sarashina nikki*, *Sanuki no suke nikki*, *Heichū monogatari*, *Kagerofu nikki*, *Tutumi Chūnagon monogatari*. The texts are primarily prose, with some poetry. The sub-corpus contains 738,153 words.

Exhaustively examining NPs in EMJ fitting the same description as that for OJ outlined above, we found that the Condition on DOM in OJ in (7) does not hold for EMJ. The evidence for this conclusion comes in the form of *wh*-marked non-specific object NPs.

In a situation where there are no overt forms that can be used to unambiguously mark NPs as having non-specific reference, a demonstration of this evidence relies on close examination of the previous context, and various considerations about the most plausible interpretations of NPs that appear in the text.

3.1 Specificity of object NPs associated with weak floating quantifiers in EMJ

A search of the sub-corpus for object NPs associated with weak FQs in EMJ yielded results from texts produced between 900 CE (*Taketori monogatari*) and 1010 CE (*Genji monogatari*). We found 512 expressions of the form [numeral+classifier] in Heian texts. Among these we found 80 examples associated with object NPs. Of these 80 object NPs, 8 are accusative case marked, and if the OJ system of DOM were to persist in EMJ, we would expect all 8 *wo*-marked object NP hosts of FQs to be specific in reference. However, of the 8 *wo*-marked objects, 3 are arguably non-specific. We give all three examples below. For example, in (35) below, a simile is drawn to a hypothetical situation in which two plums are stuck in the place where eyes should be. There is no mention of these plums in previous context, and they have no links to definite discourse referents.

- (35) *karouzite oki-agari-tamap-eru wo mireba kaze ito omoki*
 barely sit.up-rise-RESP-STAT ACC see.when illness very heavy
pito nite para ito pukure konata kanata no me ni
 person COP belly very swell this.side that.side GEN eye DAT
pa sumomo wo puta-tu takeru yau nari
 TOP plum ACC two-thing attach appearance COP
 ‘... looking at [him] as [he] barely managed to raise himself, [he] was like someone with a terrible cold, [his] belly swelled up and it was as if [someone] had stuck **two plums** to [his] eyes on the one side and the other.’ (Taketori monogatari, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 12, p. 48)

In (36) below, there is no previous mention of bridges in relation to the place called Yatsunashi. They are newly introduced and are unlinked to any definite discourse referent.

- (36) *Mikapa no kuni yatupasi to ipu tokoro ni itari-nu*
 Mikawa GEN country Yatsunashi COMP say place DAT arrive-PFV
soko wo yatupasi to ipi-keru pa midu yuku kapa
 this.place ACC Yatsunashi COMP say-MPST TOP water go river
no kumo-de nareba pasi wo ya-tu watas-eru ni
 GEN spider-hand COP.because bridge ACC eight-thing cross-STAT DAT
yorite namu yatupasi to ipi-keru.
 depending FOC Yatsunashi COMP say-MPST
 ‘[They] came to a place called Yatsunashi. As for its being called Yatsunashi, it was due to the fact that [they] spanned **eight bridges** over it, because the river of

water divided into spider legs, that [they] called it “Yatuhashi”.’ (Ise monogatari, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 12, p. 120)

In (37) below, the main character is depicted as doing something unexpected and marvelous: releasing fireflies into a woman’s bedchamber. Both the fireflies and the cloth panel he used to conceal them are newly introduced into the scene and have no links to a definite discourse referent.

- (37) *yori-tamawite mikityau no katabira wo pito-pe*
 depend-RESP.GER standing.blind GEN panel ACC one-layer
uti-kake-tamau ni awasete sa.to pikaru mono ga
 PFX-hang-RESP DAT matching suddenly glow thing GEN
 ‘...and just as [Otodo], drawing near, draped a panel from a standing blind (over the crossbeam), suddenly something glowing ...’ (Genji monogatari: ‘Hotaru’, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 22, p. 200)

Non-specific expressions of this form are unattested in OJ and violate the condition on DOM (7), indicating that the OJ system of DOM is no longer operative in EMJ.

3.2 Specificity of object NPs containing WH-words in EMJ

Given the fact that the EMJ sub-corpus does not include mark-up of constituents larger than the unit ‘word’, and has made no provision for the annotation of grammatical role, it is impossible to mechanically identify object NPs in general, including those associated with FQs (as above) and those containing *wh*-words (as below). Rather, attestations of the distinguishing part of speech have to be examined individually to determine their syntactic position and to determine the grammatical roles of the constituents which they distinguish. Given the difficulties of working with the EMJ sub-corpus, for this study we restricted our search to just variants of two *wh*-words for comparison with OJ: *ta, tare* ‘who’ and *na, nani* ‘what’. It will be recalled that the *wh*-words in OJ which figure in the formation of *wo*-marked object *wh*-NPs are the following: *ika* ‘how’; *ta, tare* ‘who’; *na, nani* ‘what’; *idure* ‘which’.

3.2.1 WH-word *tare* ‘who’

A search of the sub-corpus for object NPs containing *wh*-word *ta, tare* ‘who’ yielded results from texts produced between 900 CE (*Takekoto monogatari*) and 1110 CE (*Sanuki no suke nikki*). We found 553 NPs containing the *wh*-word *tare, ta* ‘who’. Of those, 21 are grammatical objects. Of the 21 grammatical objects, 18 are accusative marked. Again, if the OJ system of DOM were to persist in EMJ, we would expect all 18 accusative marked examples to be specific. However, of these 18, 7 have question focus, and thus would have a non-specific interpretation under normal, unmarked circumstances. Upon inspection, we find no evidence to indicate that the reference for these is indeed anything but non-specific. For example, in the question in (38), there is a background assumption that no

one is supposed to know the things that the addressee speaks about as a matter of course. Accordingly it is extremely unlikely that there is assumed in the question a definite set of people from whom the addressee might learn such things.

- (38) *tare ga osiwe o kikite pito no nabete siru*
 who GEN teaching ACC hearing people GEN lining.up know
beu mo ara-nu koto o-ba iu zo
 should ETOP exist-NEG word ACC-TOP say FOC

‘Having heard **whose teachings** is it that [you] say these things which people invariably aren’t supposed to know?’ (Makura no sōshi, 131, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 18, p. 248)

In (39) below, the combination of question particle *ka* and topic particle *wa* form a rhetorical question: there is no expectation of a concrete answer, so the reference of *tare* is arguably non-specific.

- (39) *ima wa katazikenaku mo tare o ka wa yoru-be ni*
 now TOP regrettably ETOP who ACC FOC TOP depend-place COP
omowi-kikoe-tamawa-n
 think-RESP-RESP-will

‘From here on – and [I] am terribly sorry to be saying this, but – **whom(ever)** might [you] consider as a benefactor?’ (Genji monogatari, ‘Yūgiri’, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 23, p. 451)

In (40)–(42), the questions focus on previously unintroduced third-person entities. There is no obvious source of any basis for D-linking.

- (40) *aki.kaze ni patu.kari ga ne zo kikoyu naru tare*
 autumn.wind DAT first.goose GEN cry FOC be.audible EXT who
ga tamaadusa wo kakete ki-tu ramu
 GEN missive ACC hanging come-PFV EXT

‘The voices of the first geese can be heard on the autumn wind. **Whose missives** do [they] come bearing?’ (Kokin wakashū, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 11, p. 101)

- (41) *momidiba no tirite tumor-eru wa ga yado ni tare wo*
 red.leaves GEN scatter pile.up-STAT I GEN dwelling DAT who ACC
matu.musi kokora naku ramu
 await.insect around.here cry EXT

‘In my dwelling on which autumn leaves, falling, have piled up – **whom** must the matsumushi be awaiting? – the matsumushi cries around here’ (Kokin wakashū, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 11, p. 100)

- (42) *puna.ko-domo no araarasiki kowe nite uraganasiku mo tooku*
 boat.man-PL GEN rough voice COP mournfully ETOP from.afar
kana to ki-ni-keru utau o kiku mama ni puta-ri
 SFP COMP come-PFV-MPST singing ACC listen thus COP two-people

sasi-mukawite naki-keri puna.bitō mo tare o kou to
 direct-face cry-MPST boat.man ETOP who ACC yearn.for COMP
ka ō-sima no ura kanasi-geni kowe no kikoyuru
 FOC Ō-island GEN bay sad-appearing voice GEN be.audible

‘Even as [they] heard the boatmen in their rough voices singing, “Heartlorn, [we]’ve come so far!” the two faced each other and cried. So **whom** do the boatmen long for? Voices from Ō Island Bay sound so heartsick.’ (Genji monogatari, ‘Tamakazura’, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 22, p. 90)

Finally in (43)–(44), there is no mention in the previous context of a definite superset of suitors out of which one specific suitor might be picked. It may be argued that the social context might delimit a definite set of candidates, so the claim of non-specificity for these two examples is not as strong as that for the previous five.

- (43) *medetaki ya tare wo ka tori-tamau to notamaweba*
 fortunate SFP who ACC FOC take-RESP COMP say.when
sa.daisyau.dono no sakon.no.seusyau to ka
 Left.Major.Captain GEN Minor.Captain COMP FOC

‘As [he] said, “That’s fortunate. **Whom** is [she] receiving (as a groom)?” [she] replied, “(I am given to understand) that it is the son of the Major Captain of the Left, the Minor Captain,” ...’ (Ochikubo monogatari, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 17, p. 89)

- (44) *omuko no seusyau tare wo tori-tamau zo to*
 groom GEN Minor.Captain who ACC take-RESP FOC COMP
towi-kereba sa.daisyau no sakon.no.seusyau.dono to
 say-MPST.when Left.Major.Captain GEN Left.Minor.Captain COMP

‘As the husband, Minor Captain Kurauto, asked, “**Whom** will [she] take (as a groom)?” [she] replied, “(Mother says) [it] is the son of the Major Captain of the Left, the Minor Captain of the Left,” ...’ (Ochikubo monogatari, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 17, p. 147)

Again, non-specific expressions of this form are unattested in OJ and violate the condition on the OJ system of DOM, providing further evidence that the OJ system of DOM is no longer operative in EMJ.

3.2.2 WH-word *nani* ‘what’

A search of the sub-corpus for object NPs containing *wh*-word *na*, *nani* ‘what’ yielded results from texts produced between 900 CE (*Taketori monogatari*) and 1110 CE (*Sanuki no suke nikki*). We found 825 NPs containing the *wh*-word *na*, *nani* ‘what’. Of those, 113 are grammatical objects. Of the 113 grammatical objects, 39 are accusative marked. Of the 39 *wo*-marked grammatical objects, 13 have question focus and are arguably non-specific in reference. For example, in (45) below the speaker is expressing dismay at not being summoned in time for a funeral. The underlying assumption in the question is that there

could only have been some unknown sort of prohibition preventing the addressee from sending an invitation. There is no mention of prohibitions in the previous context, nor does the speaker actually wait for an answer to the question, suggesting the absence of any presupposed superset related to *nani no monoimi o* ‘what manner of prohibition?’. Similarly, in the remaining examples, open-ended questions are asked: ‘what in heaven’s name?’; ‘whatever?’

- (45) *ana kokoro u ya rei-sama ni mi-pirake-tamai-tu ran*
 Ah heart despondent SFP usual-way COP see-open-RESP-PFV EXT
o ima pito-tabi mi-maira-se-zu nari-nuru kokoro usa
 ACC yet one-time see-HUM-CAUS-NEG become-PFV heart dependency
o nani no monoimi o site yobi-tamawa-zari-turu zo
 ACC what COP prohibition ACC doing call-RESP-NEG-PFV FOC
 ‘... “Oh, how sad! In the face of the sadness of the fact that [we] will never again be able to see his honourable face with his eyes open, observing **what prohibitions** was it that [you] didn’t call [me]?” ...’ (Sanuki no suke nikki, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 26, p. 420–421)

- (46) *moto no sina toki yo no oboe uti-awi yamu-goto naki*
 original GEN class time age GEN lesson PFX-meet stop-fact lacking
atari no uti-uti no motenasi kewawi okure-tara-mu wa
 spot GEN inside-inside GEN demeanour bearing be.late-STAT-will TOP
sarani mo iwa-zu nani o site iki-owi-ide-kyemu
 newly ETOP say-NEG what ACC doing live-grow-come.out-must.have
to iu kawi naku oboyu besi
 COMP say point lacking be.thought.of ought
 ‘... “There is nothing more to be said about those who, while coming from a venerable home where the original class and the repute of the world at large are in accord, nonetheless are lacking in the demeanor and bearing appropriate thereto. Doing **what** must it have been that [they] were raised, (I wonder)? [They] should be thought of as not worth mention.” ...’ (Genji monogatari, ‘Hahakigi’, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 20, p. 60)

- (47) *nani wo site mi no itadura ni oi-nu ramu tosi*
 what ACC doing body GEN in.vain COP grow.old-PFV EXT year
no omopa-mu koto zo yasasiki
 GEN think-will content FOC embarrassing
 ‘Doing **what** must it be that [my] body has grown old in vain? How shameful [to me], what the years must be thinking!’ (Kokin wakashū, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 11, p. 404)

- (48) *tati-wi no kewawi tawe-gata-geni okonau ito*
 stand-sit GEN bearing withstand-hard-appearing undertake very

aware ni asa no kiri ni koto nara-nu yo o
 pitiful COP morning GEN mist DAT otherwise be-NEG world ACC
nani o musaboru mi no inori ni ka to kiki-tamau
 what ACC gobble.up body GEN prayer COP FOC COMP listen-RESP
 ‘Standing up and sitting down in a manner that appeared unbearable, (the old man) carried out the rites in a way that was so truly pitiful, [he] listened (to the old man), thinking, “Given that this world is no different than morning mist, these are the prayers of an earthly body hoarding up **what**, (I wonder)?” ...’
 (Genji monogatari, ‘Yūgao’, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 20, p. 158)

- (49) *kono miko ni mawosi-tamapi-si pourai no tama no eda*
 this aristocrat DAT say-RESP-SPST Hōrai GEN jewel GEN branch
wo pito-tu no tokoro ayamata-zu motite opasimas-eri nani
 ACC one-thing GEN place differ-NEG having come-STAT what
wo motite to.kaku mawosu beki
 ACC having that.this say ought
 ‘[He] has brought the branch with the jewels of Hōrai that [you] spoke to this lord about, with not a point of difference [in it]. Having **what** (as grounds) am [I] supposed to tell [him] this and that (as excuses)?’ (Taketori monogatari, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 12, p. 29)

- (50) *saru koto ni wa nani no irawe o ka se-mu nakanaka*
 such thing DAT TOP what GEN reply ACC FOC do-will awkward
nara-mu
 be-will
 ‘With respect to such a thing, **what reply** am [I] to make? [It] will be awkward.’
 (Makura no sōshi, 131, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 18, p. 248)

- (51) *kakerite mo nani wo ka tama no kite mo mi-mu*
 flying ETOP what ACC FOC soul GEN coming ETOP see-will
kara pa ponopo to nari-ni-si monowo
 shell TOP ember as become-PFV-SPST given.that
 ‘Even flying, **what** would [my] soul, coming here, see? Given that [her] remains are already turned to embers.’ (Kokin wakashū, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 11, p. 418)

- (52) *ausaka no seki pa yoru koso mori-masare kurureba*
 Ōsaka GEN checkpoint TOP night FOC guard-excel grow.dark.when
nani wo ware tanomu ramu
 what ACC I rely EXT
 ‘It is at night that [they] guard the Osaka checkpoint more strongly. When the day ends, **what** shall I rely on?’ (Heichū monogatari, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 12, p. 459)

- (53) *miya.no.omawe ni uti.no.otodo no maturi-tamaw-eri-keru*
 empress DAT Minister.of.the.Centre GEN give-RESP-STAT-MPST
o kore ni nani o kaka-masi uwe.no.omawe ni wa
 ACC this DAT what ACC write-SBJV emperor DAT TOP
siki to iu pumi o namu kaka-se-tamaw-eru
 chronicle COMP say text ACC FOC write-CAUS-RESP-STAT
 ‘On the occasion of the Minister of the Centre giving [them] to the Empress, (she said), “**What** shall [I] write on these? On the Emperor’s part, [he] is writing texts called ‘Chronicles.’ ...’ (Makura no sōshi, 327, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 18, p. 467)
- (54) *ka bakari kokoro.zasi oroka nara-nu pito.bito ni*
 this.way RES resolve negligent be-NEG person.person COP
koso a mere kaguya.pime no ipaku nani bakari no
 FOC exist EXT Shining.Princess GEN saying what RES GEN
pukaki wo ka mi-mu to ipa-mu isasaka no koto nari
 depth ACC FOC see-will COMP say-will trifling GEN thing be
 ‘... “It seems that [they] are people not lacking feeling to this degree.” The Shining Princess’s reply: “[I] shall tell [you]: **What degree of depth** do [I] want to see? [It] is a mere trifling.”...’ (Taketori monogatari, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 12, p. 23)
- (55) *aware-gari medurasi-garite kaweru ni nani o ka*
 impression-exhibit rareness-exhibiting return DAT what ACC FOC
tatematura-mu mamemamesiki mono wa masa nakari namu
 give-will practical thing TOP appropriateness lacking SFP
 ‘... making many signs of delight and interest (in me), when it was time [for me] to go home (she said), “**What** shall [I] give to you? Something practical just won’t do.” ...’ (Sarashina nikki, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 26, p. 298)
- (56) *ware wa to omowi.agareru tiuzyau.no.kimi zo kanete zo*
 I TOP COMP presuming Chūjō FOC from.before FOC
miyuru nado koso kagami no kage ni mo
 be.visible and.the.like FOC mirror.cake GEN image DAT ETOP
katarawi-paberi-ture watakusi no inori wa nani bakari no
 talk-HUM-PFV private COP prayer TOP what RES GEN
koto o ka nado kikoyu
 word ACC FOC and.the.like say
 ‘(The one to speak was) Chūjō, who presumed (to herself that if anyone has something to wish for, then) surely myself! “[I] was saying to [your] image in the mirror-cake, ‘(your thousand-year image) appeared from earlier,’ and so on. As for prayers for myself, **how much of a boon** (could I possibly ask)?” [she] continued in this vein.’ (Genji monogatari, ‘Hatsune’, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 22, p. 144)

- (57) *yoki kakemono wa ari-nu bekeredo karugarusiku wa*
 good wager TOP exist-PFV ought.however lightly TOP
e-watasu maziki o nani o ka pa nado
 can-hand.over impossible given.that what ACC FOC TOP and.the.like
notamawa-suru mi-kesiki ikaga miyu ranee
 say-RESP PFX-visage how be.visible EXT
 ‘...However must the sight [of him] saying such things as “Though there ought to be a good wager, [I] can’t be handing anything over too lightly, so **what** (shall I wager)?” have appeared (to others)?’ (Genji monogatari, ‘Yadorigi’, Shinpen Zenshū, vol. 24, p. 378)

Our evidence for the non-specificity of these items is perforce negative in nature: there is no positive way to rule out the possibility of a D-linking relationship for any of the *wh*-NP objects in the examples above, and the strength of the grounds for our judgments of reference status varies for some of the examples we present here.⁹ However, most of our judgments carry a high degree of confidence. Given that non-specific expressions of this form are unattested in OJ and violate the condition on DOM (7), the evidence shows that the OJ system of DOM is no longer operative in EMJ.

4 Discussion and conclusion

Like all other attested stages of Japanese, both OJ and EMJ have variable object marking. However, the results reported in this paper show clearly that EMJ does not share the OJ system of DOM in which a correlation between accusative case marking of objects and specificity is observed. As described through §2, we examined NPs in OJ which under normal (unmarked) conditions were predicted to be non-specific in reference, namely object NP hosts of FQs and *wh*-object NPs with Q-focus. The distribution of object NP hosts of FQs in OJ (Table 1) gives a good reflection of the more general situation with regard to specificity and *wo*-marking:

Table 1: Object NP hosts of FQs in OJ.

	<i>wo</i> -marked	zero-marked
specific	10	1
non-specific	0	4

In general, OJ *wo*-marked objects are specific (e.g. (1)), unspecific objects are bare (e.g. (2)), and some specific objects are bare (e.g. (5)), but there are no *wo*-marked objects which are non-specific. This distribution is summarized in Table 4 further below.

⁹For example, there are conceivably exclusion relationships available to the object *wh*-NPs in (51)–(52).

In EMJ, by contrast, the distribution of object NP hosts of FQs (see §3.1) is as summarized in Table 2.¹⁰ This reflects the general situation in EMJ, where both specific and nonspecific objects may be *wo*-marked or bare, as shown in §3, where we demonstrated that EMJ has ample attestation of non-specific *wo*-marked object NPs.

Table 2: Object NP hosts of FQs in EMJ.

	<i>wo</i> -marked	zero-marked
specific	5	
non-specific	3	72

In general, the values for specificity and those for *wo*- or zero-marking on objects are seen to cross-classify in EMJ. This distribution is summarized in Table 5 below. That pattern is not found in OJ and is in direct contrast to the system seen in OJ, which disallows *wo*-marked non-specific objects.

Thus, this paper identifies a major grammatical difference between OJ and EMJ shown by the absence of non-specific *wo*-marked objects in OJ, but their presence in EMJ. We observe a change from the OJ system with morphological expression (accusative marking on direct objects) of specificity in some contexts, to the EMJ system with no morphological expression (through case marking) of specificity, that is, to a system where specificity is determined exclusively by context or NP modification or by the semantics of the head noun (e.g. proper noun, relational noun, etc.). This is an important descriptive finding.

This does not mean, of course, that EMJ does not have some form of rule governed DOM, but it does show that the OJ system of DOM, which takes part in expressing specificity, is not found in EMJ. For EMJ, the variability in case marking must be investigated throughout the large amount of available data in order to identify a system which governs the observable variable case marking of objects.

Now, in this paper we have not addressed the – important – issue of specific object NPs in OJ which are not *wo*-marked (3), and which therefore show that there is no simple one-to-one correlation between specificity and *wo*-marking on objects in OJ. In Frellesvig et al. (2015) we discuss this briefly and outline some of the hypotheses which have been or may be proposed for absence of accusative case marking on some specific objects, including conditions which may be formulated in terms of clause types (e.g. main (disfavoring *wo*-marking), embedded, relative, nominalized (favoring *wo*-marking)), or other factors which may play a role, such as phonological form, or lexical idiosyncrasy (of both verbs and nouns). While a number of tendencies and individual factors may be identified, it remains clear that no strong condition or set of conditions for the absence of accusative case marking on some specific objects in OJ has been established yet.

¹⁰Note that Table 2 does not break down the bare objects into specific and non-specific. As the point of interest for the comparison with OJ was the reference of *wo*-marked objects, we did not classify and quantify the reference of the bare objects. But as we already demonstrated by examples (33) and (34), the category of bare objects in EMJ contains both specific and non-specific NPs.

Much work remains to be done on this for OJ, empirically involving careful scrutiny of the more than 2,000 bare objects in the OJ corpus. An important part of the interpretation of the data will be to consider whether the distribution observed in OJ, summarized in Table 4, represents a stable system with (combinations of) conditions for absence of accusative case marking on specific objects, which so far has proven too complex to be described; or whether in fact the distributional facts of OJ in Table 4 reflect a system in transition, from a stable, simple pre-OJ DOM system with straightforward rules for expression of the specificity of direct objects, such as that hypothesized in Table 3, to the system of variable object marking we see in EMJ, summarized in Table 5, which takes no part in the expression of specificity.

Table 3: Possible system of case marking and specificity of objects in pre-OJ.

	<i>wo</i> -marked	zero-marked
specific	+	-
non-specific	-	+

Table 4: Accusative case marking and specificity of objects in OJ.

	<i>wo</i> -marked	zero-marked
specific	+	+
non-specific	-	+

Table 5: Accusative case marking and specificity of objects in EMJ.

	<i>wo</i> -marked	zero-marked
specific	+	+
non-specific	+	+

This would mean that OJ represents a stage in the actualization of the change from a system like that in Table 3 (pre-OJ) to that in Table 5 (EMJ) and that in itself would provide a ready explanation for the fact that we observe variability in case marking of specific objects in OJ. Much further research will be needed to determine whether that is the case, and if so, what governed the progression of the actualization of this change. A clearer understanding of the factors bearing on variable object marking in post-OJ stages of Japanese would be of enormous help, but this too needs much further research. Determination and interpretation of markedness values in a wide range

of contexts will undoubtedly play an important role in investigating these questions (cf. Andersen 2001a,b).

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	OPT	optative
COM	comitative	PASS	passive
COMP	complementizer	PFV	perfective
COP	copula	PFX	prefix
DAT	dative	PL	plural
ETOP	emphatic topic	RES	restrictive particle
EXT	extension	RESP	respect
FOC	focus particle	SBJV	subjunctive
GEN	genitive	SFP	sentence final particle
GER	gerund	SPST	simple past
HUM	humble	STAT	stative
IMP	imperative	SUBJ	subject
MPST	modal past	TOP	topic
NEG	negative		

The following abbreviations indicate sources:

KK *Kojiki Kayō*; MYS *Man'yōshū*; NSK *Nihon Shoki*.

References

- Andersen, Henning. 2001a. Actualization and the (uni)directionality of change. In Henning Andersen (ed.), *Actualization: Linguistic change in progress*, 225–249. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Andersen, Henning. 2001b. Markedness and the theory of change. In Henning Andersen (ed.), *Actualization: Linguistic change in progress*, 21–59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Irina Nikolaeva. 2011. *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1993. WH-movement and specificity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11(1), 85–120.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(1), 1–25.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A history of the Japanese language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke, Stephen W. Horn & Yuko Yanagida. 2015. Differential object marking in Old Japanese: A corpus based study. In Dag T. T. Haug (ed.), *Historical linguistics 2013: Selected papers from the 21st International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Oslo, 5–9 August 2013*, 195–212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Frellesvig, Bjarke, Stephen Wright Horn, Kerri L. Russell & Peter Sells. 2014. *The Oxford corpus of Old Japanese*. <http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/ojcorpus.html> (24 July, 2017). <http://vsarpj.orinst.ox.ac.uk/corpus/ojcorpus.html>, accessed 2017-07-24.
- Kim, Alan Hyun-Oak. 1995. Is quantifier-floating in Japanese a recent innovation? – Contextual analysis of the numeral quantifier construction in Old Japanese. In John Charles Smith & Delia Bentley (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1995: Selected Papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995*, vol. 1: General issues and non-Germanic Languages, 169–190. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Matsunaga, Setsuko. 1983. *The development of case marking in Japanese*. Columbus: Ohio State University dissertation.
- Matsuo, Osamu. 1944. Kyakugo hyōji no joshi ‘o’ ni tuite. In Hashimoto Hakase Kanreki Kinenkai (ed.), *Kokugogaku ronshū*, 617–644. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and case marking in Japanese*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Motohashi, Tatsushi. 1989. *Case theory and the history of the Japanese language*. Tucson: University of Arizona dissertation.
- National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL). 2014. *Historical Corpus of Japanese: Heian period*. http://www.ninjal.ac.jp/corpus_center/chj/ (24 July, 2017). http://www.ninjal.ac.jp/corpus_center/chj/, accessed 2017-07-24.
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In Eric Reuland & Alice G. B. ter Meulen (eds.), *The representation of (in)definiteness*, 98–129. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wrona, Janick & Bjarke Frellesvig. 2010. The Old Japanese case system: The function of *wo*. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 17. 565–580.
- Yanagida, Yuko. 2006. Word order and clause structure in Early Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15(1). 37–68.
- Yanagida, Yuko & John Whitman. 2009. Word order and alignment in Old Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 18(2). 101–144.

