

Why *izenkei* in *koso*-focused *kakari-musubi*?—some considerations

Charles J. Quinn

While researchers have developed characterizations of the *kakari-musubi* construction’s varieties based on the semantics and pragmatics of the different *kakari* particles, similar examination of the two *musubi* forms—adnominal *rentai* or non-finite *izenkei*, as well as their respective relations-in-use to the various *kakari* particles—has not kept pace, as Frellesvig (2010) noted. Semantic and pragmatic similarities between these two inflected forms have been identified (e.g. Quinn 1987), the two have been related derivationally (e.g. Unger 1977, Martin 1987, Shinzato and Serafim 2013) and have been analyzed as having been at one point identical (Whitman 2004).

The *rentai* adnominal and the *izen* inflected forms may well have begun as two positional variants of one suffix. Like the adnominally inflected *musubi*, the *izen*-inflected *musubi* too presupposed a referent. These points do not necessarily preclude, however, the possibility that each *musubi* type was motivated by a function that its source expression did not share with the other. This paper explores the latter scenario, proceeding from the idea that both *rentai*-inflected and *izen*-inflected forms were initially spoken in utterance-final position as referent-clarifying afterthoughts. The *rentai* form was added as the ad-hoc nominal that it functioned as in other contexts. The *izen*-inflected form was originally added, we suggest, in its consequential conditional use, as an afterthought meaning ‘insofar as [predicate] is the case’, ‘as long as we’re talking about [predicate]’, etc. If we take the *X koso* in *X koso Y^{Iz}*. as originally the main predicate (‘X—this is it.’), and the *Y^{Iz}* as an afterthought conditional, the latter would have helped make *koso*’s identification exhaustive, by producing an utterance that meant, roughly, ‘It’s X—insofar as/when/since the conditions are Y.’ The right-dislocated afterthought *Y^{Iz}* would have added, as such, a frame-setting meaning, indicating that *koso*’s identification was *categorical* for Y.

References

- Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Samuel M. 1987. *The Japanese Language through Time*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Quinn, Charles J. 1987. *A Functional Grammar of Classical Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan. University Microfilms International.
- Shinzato, Rumiko and Leon Serafim. 2013. *Synchrony and Diachrony of Okinawan Kakari Musubi in Comparative Perspective with Premodern Japanese*. Leiden: Brill.
- Unger, James M. 1977. *Studies in Early Japanese Morphophonemics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Whitman, John B. 2004. ‘The form and function of the *rentaikei* and *izenkei* suffixes in Proto-Japanese.’ Paper Presented at the Second Oxford-Kobe Linguistics Seminar: The International Symposium on the Structure and the History of Japanese.