

Two Focus Constructions in Old Japanese *Kakari-musubi*

Edith Aldridge

In Old Japanese *kakari-musubi* constructions, a focused constituent marked by a particle appears in clause-initial or clause-medial position, while the main predicate takes a nonfinite inflection. What is particularly interesting is that the inflection seems to co-vary in part with the focus particle appearing in the clause. The sentence ends in adnominal (連体) inflection in most types of *kakari-musubi*, but realis (已然) inflection appears when the *kakari* particle is *koso*. This relationship between particle and inflection is often treated as a form of agreement, specifically as a type of *wh*-agreement in the generative syntactic literature. In this presentation, I argue against the agreement approach and propose instead that the difference between these *kakari-musubi* constructions is due to the nature of the type of focus expressed, which in turn is the product of the different structural properties of the two constructions.

In previous work, I have proposed that the *kakari-musubi* construction expressing *wh*-questions is a type of cleft. The *wh*-constituent is marked by the interrogative *kakari* particle *ka*. This constituent is followed by a reduced relative clause consisting of a nominalized *vP*, which expresses the presupposition. The fact that this *vP* is nominalized accounts for the appearance of the adnominal inflection on the verb. Given that this is a *wh*-question and takes the form of a cleft, the focus expressed is clearly exhaustive.

(1) 吾待君乎誰留流 (MYS 2617)

[_{TP} [_{DP} Wa=ga mat-u kimi=wo] tare=ka [_{vP} ... tomu-ru]]?
 1SG=GEN wait-ADNOM lover=ACC who=Q stop-ADNOM

‘Who is it who detains the lover I await?’

The non-interrogative counterpart of *ka* is *zo*. Unsurprisingly, *zo* also appears in the same type of cleft construction. The verb takes adnominal inflection, and the focus expressed is exhaustive.

The realis inflection appears when the *kakari* particle is *koso*. However, it is unlikely that the role of the inflection is merely to register an agreement relation signaling the appearance of *koso*, as opposed to *ka* or *zo*. This is first and foremost due to the fact that the type of focus expressed in a *koso kakari-musubi* clause is not exhaustive focus but is rather contrastive focus. This is clear from examples like (2) in which the *koso* clause is contrasted with the following clause. The *koso* construction also differs structurally from the cleft type of *kakari-musubi* construction. In the *koso* construction, the verb ending in realis inflection is not the main verb. Rather, the *koso* construction as a whole is an embedded clause type, as can also be seen in (2).

(2) 人社不知 松者知良武 (MYS 145)

Pito koso sira-ne, matu=pa sir-u ramu.
 person FOC know-NEG.REAL pine=TOP know-CONC SUPP

‘Though people do not understand, the pine may know.’

I propose that the *koso* construction is not a cleft but rather a nonfinite embedded clause, possibly a

type of participial construction, which is adjoined to the main clause. The focused constituent is also not a cleft predicate, but rather is located in a clause-medial contrastive focus position.

Given these interpretive and structural differences between the two types of focus construction, it is unlikely that the adnominal and realis inflection are agreement markers with the focus particles.