

Quasi-Kakarimusubi in Irabu

This paper aims to show that Irabu (a north-west variety of Miyako Ryukyuan, Japonic) possesses a syntactic phenomenon that is very similar to *Kakarimusubi* (KM) in Old Japanese and in well-known Ryukyuan varieties, but shows an interesting divergence from a standard KM (see below). I call this Irabu phenomenon *Quasi-Kakarimusubi* (QKM). I will note how Irabu QKM is similar to and different from a standard KM, demonstrating that Irabu QKM is a ‘negative’ concordance, in which the presence of a focus marker blocks a specific inflected verb form, while a standard KM is a ‘positive’ concordance, in which the presence of a focus marker requires a specific verb form. Also, I explain why such a negative concordance occurs in Irabu, showing that Irabu QKM is not a mere syntactic concordance phenomenon but a functionally motivated phenomenon in which the epistemic stance and information structure of an inflected verb form results in the blocking of this form in the QKM predicate position.

The standard definition of KM in the literature of Japanese and Ryukyuan linguistics is that KM is a syntactic construction in which the use of a focus particle triggers the use of an adnominal form, or ‘*rentaikei*’ instead of the expected finite, or ‘*shushikei*’ (based on Shinzato and Serafim 2003: 189). Given this, Miyako Ryukyuan varieties lack KM as such in a strict sense, since the distinction between adnominal and finite is absent (Karimata 1999). However, a close examination of Irabu reveals that there exists a reasonably similar version of KM, or QKM, and that there are interesting divergences from the KM as attested in Old Japanese and in other well known Okinawan varieties (Shinzato 1998; Shinzato and Serafim 2003). Specifically, this paper shows the following two striking features of Irabu QKM, both of which have been unreported in the literature.

- (1) QKM involves focus marking (=du in declarative; =ru in Yes-No question; =ga in Wh-question) and one of three major inflected verb forms: ***m* form (3a)**, which only appear in main clauses, and which corresponds to the unmarked form plus potential particle **mu* (Karimata 1999), **Unmarked form (3b)**, which can appear in main clauses as well as in adnominal clauses and complement clauses, thus corresponding to the adnominal form in Old Japanese, and **Optative-Future form (3c)**, which only appears in main clauses, and which corresponds to a variety of complex predicate forms in Old Japanese. When a focus marker appears within a clause, an Unmarked form or an Optative-Future form as opposed to an *m* form must be chosen (see (3a-c) below).
- (2) This concordance is not simply syntactic, but functionally motivated. On one hand, an *m* form has a modal value of strong assertion with certainty (thus ‘realis’) and always carries new information to the hearer. See (4) where the hearer has a wrong assumption to which the speaker makes a correction with his certain assumption that ‘this one knows well’. On the other hand, an Unmarked form and Optative-Future forms do not express ‘realis’ modality, covering a wide range of non-asserted epistemic modal features. Thus an *m* form cannot co-occur with QKM by its very nature, since the predicate in QKM should be

presupposed (as in KM; cf. Shinzato 1998: 204). In effect, when a focus marker appears within a clause, an Unmarked form or an Optative-Future form is selected.

The above features tell us that in Irabu QKM the presence of a focus marker *blocks* the appearance of a specific inflected form (i.e. an *m* form), rather than *requiring* a specific inflected form (i.e. an Unmarked form = adnominal form) as is the case in a standard KM. Here, in comparison with a standard KM, we are particularly interested in the behaviour of an Unmarked form: given that an Unmarked form is not seen as a mere concord form of focus marking, it is predicted that an Unmarked form is independently motivated, thus may appear as a sentence-final predicate *without focus marking*. I will validate this by examining a corpus of twenty narrative texts that I collected. Out of 660 sentence-final predicates (403 Unmarked forms, 122 Optative-Future forms, and 135 *m* forms), there were 121 Unmarked forms that appeared as sentence-final predicates without focus marking. The Unmarked forms in such uses had clear modal meanings, such as (5) where the Unmarked form encodes mirativity.

- (3) a. *ba=a* *kuruma=u* *vv-tam.*
 1SG=TOP car=ACC=FOC sell-PST.m
 ‘I sold a car.’ [In response to, say, ‘What did you do?']
- b. *ba=a* *kuruma=u=du* *vv-tar.*
 1SG=TOP car=ACC=FOC sell-PST.UM
 ‘I sold a CAR.’ [In response to, say, ‘What did you sell?']
- c. *ba=a* *kuruma=u=du* *vva-di.*
 1SG=TOP car=ACC=FOC sell-INT
 ‘I will sell a CAR.’ [In response to, say, ‘What will you sell?']
- (4) *kari=a* *juu* *ssi-u-m.*
 3SG=TOP very know-PROG-NPST.m
 ‘He knows well.’ [Against hearer’s expectation that s/he is ignorant]
- (5) *kari=a* *juu* *ssi-u-r.*
 3SG=TOP very know-PROG-NPST.UM
 ‘He knows well.’ [E.g. against speaker’s expectation that s/he is ignorant]

I conclude that Irabu QKM is best characterised in light of a standard KM since there are important common features (focus marking, restriction on the predicate verb form in the presence of a focus marker), but QKM should be distinguished from a standard KM in terms of its negative concordance feature, and of its semantic-pragmatic nature of the concordance.

References

- Karimata, Shigehisa.** 1999. Miyako Shohogen no Doshi Shushikei no Seiritsu ni Tsuite. *Nihon Toyo Bunka Ronshu* 5: 27-51; **Shinzato, Rumiko.** 1998. Kakari Musubi: Its Functions and Development. *Japanese/Korean linguistics* 8:203-216; **Shinzato, Rumiko, and Leon A. Serafim.** 2003. *Kakari musubi* in comparative perspective: Old Japanese *ka/ya* and Okinawan *-ga/-i*. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 11: 189-202.