

Literary forms and semantic representations of focus

Kyoko Sano*

Abstract. Fabb (2004) made a distinction between linguistic forms and literary forms. Linguistic forms hold of a text by virtue of being generated by a linguistic representation of the text, while literary forms hold of a text by virtue of being the content of thought about the text. The present article discusses whether the observed emphatic construction in Old Japanese texts is a linguistic form or implied literary form. The emphatic construction is [p-*koso* q-*e*], concordance of the emphatic particle *koso* with the sentence ending form -*e* (conjunctive subordinator), which is found primarily in literary contexts. Ohno (1993) argued that *koso* -*e* shifted its uses over the period of Old to Early Middle Japanese. The process of shift involves three stages: i) the contrastive uses, ii) the concessive uses, and iii) the simple emphatic uses. In Ohno’s analysis, the shift from (i) to (ii) is non-distinctive, but (ii) is aesthetically more complex. I argue that the shift of *koso* -*e* from (i) to (ii) is a semantic change from literal form to linguistic form, and that linguistic form may appear less distinct due to the literary form associated with the emphatic construction.

Keywords. contrast; topicalization; focus; semantic form; Old Japanese

1. Background.

1.1. KAKARI-MUSUBI “HANGING AND TYING”. *Kakari-Musubi* refers to the phenomena where a certain *kakari* particle (“k-particles” hereafter) “hangs” on a word/phrase and “ties” the end of the sentence with a certain *Musubi* (sentence-ending form). In Japanese grammar, *Kakari-Mubusi* (KM) refers to a concordance between *Kakari*-particles and their *Musubi* “sentence-ending forms.”¹ KM constructions are associated with literary forms in that they are tied to the literary effects such as contrast, emphasis, rhetoric, and so on. K-particles are most often interpreted as an emphatic particle, and *musubi* is a verbal conjugation that matches the k-particle. For example, -*ka*, -*so/zo*, and -*koso* are all k-particles. As shown in (1) below, the adnominal ending -*uru* is used corresponding to *ka* in (1a), *so/zo* in (1b), and the exclamatory ending -*ture* is used corresponding to *koso* in (1c):

- (1) a. ...iduku yu **ka** imwo ga iri-ki-te ime ni mi-ye-**uru**
 where from Q love GEN enter-come-GER dream LOC see-PASS-PERF.ADN²
 (MYS³ 12: 3117⁴)

* I am grateful for Nigel Fabb and Kristin Hanson for organizing the session “Literary Linguistic Form” and their comments and guidance at the LSA 2022 meeting. Also, I would like to express my thanks to the session members for hospitality and feedback to my presentation. Any errors are of my own and will be addressed accordingly.

Author: Kyoko Sano (sano@uw.edu), University of Washington

¹ The *Kakarimusubi* construction (concordance between k-particles and the sentence-ending forms) has gone extinct, but the meaning of particles remains almost unchanged. (Hando 2003a: 115-131, 2003b: Ch. 8)

² I follow Frellesvig (2010) for the gloss of original texts.

³ MYS is an abbreviation of *Man'yōshū*.

⁴ All numberings of citations in this paper follow those of “Shinpen Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshu.”

‘Whence did you, dear one, enter to appear in my dream?’
 (Nippon Gakujutsu Shinkokai translation: 284)

b. ...a ga kwopuru kimi **so** kizo no ywo ime-ni mi-ye-**туру**
 I GEN long.ADN you-SO last.night GEN night dream DAT. see-PAST-PERF.ADN
 (MYS 2: 150)

‘Lord whom I long for, I saw you in a dream.’ (Levy 1981: 108)

c. Hamamatsu no na ni **koso** kimi-wo mati.watari-**ture**.
 Hamamatsu GEN name DAT KOSO you ACC waiting.been-PERF.EXCL
 (Kokin 17: 915)

‘I have been waiting for you at Hama-matu (homophonous with *matu* ‘wait’).’

Frellesvig (2010) described that the concept of KM constructions is not dissimilar from that of the Theme-Rheme relation. The overall KM patterns are summarized in Table 1. One group of KM makes Topic-Comment relations, while the other group makes up Focus-Presupposition relations. The former includes Topic markers *pa*, *mo*, or null, and they end with conclusive form. The latter group includes Focus marker, *koso*, which ends with exclamatory form, and the rest, *ka*, *ya*, *so/zo*, and *namu* end with the adnominal ending form.

Kakari	Musubi	Example
Topic	Comments	
<i>pa</i> , <i>mo</i> , \emptyset	V-conclusive	<i>Ware pa ari-kyeri</i>
Focus	Presupposition	
<i>koso</i>	V-exclamatory	<i>na ni koso kimi-wo mati.watari-ture</i>
<i>ka</i> , <i>ya</i> , <i>so</i> , <i>namu</i>	V-adnominal	<i>iduku yu ka mi-ye- туру</i>

Table 1. showing concordance patterns in KM (Frellesvig 2010: 249)

In the *koso -e* construction, for example, *koso* functions as a k-particle, and the clause ends with the verbal inflection $-e^5$. *Koso* concurs with IZEN conjugation $-e$ on the verb, as the sentences containing *koso* consistently end with IZEN. The IZEN conjugation is characterized as ‘realis’ in Japanese grammar (Shibatani 1990) and ‘exclamatory’ by Frellesvig (2010). Even though these characterizations fit well with emphatic use of *koso -e* but it is silent about the initial uses, subordinating conjunction.

1.2. DIACHRONIC VARIATION OF *KOSO -E* IN EARLY JAPANESE The previous studies show that *koso -e* construction has a variety of uses in the Old Japanese texts. One of the original functions of this construction is to place emphasis on a word or phrase by invoking a contrast between two conjoined propositions as in (2) and (3):

⁵ $-e$ is a short-hand of IZEN conjugation on verbs and auxiliaries. Note that not all verbs have $-e$ for IZEN conjugation. According to traditional Japanese grammar, the term IZEN (to represent the conjugation such as $-e$) stands for *kitei* ‘actual’ which is to be contrasted with MIZEN (to represent the conjugation such as $-a$) for *mitei* ‘non-actual.’ Quinn (2015) argues that IZEN is a presupposing infinitive. Whitman (1997) argued that KMs are focus constructions; in *koso -e* construction, for example, $-e$ marks the focus closure of $-koso$ (focus) phrase.

- (2) Mukasi **koso** nanipa winaka to ipa-re-kyeme,
 In.the.past KOSO Nanipa country COMP say-PASS-PAST.CONJL.IZ,
ima-pa miyakwo piki miyakwo bwi-ni-kyeri.
 now-TOP. capital resemble.INF capital be.like-PERF.INF-MPAST.CONCL
 (MYS 3: 312)

‘In the old days, they called it rustic Naniwa. But now we have moved our palace here, how like a capital it’s become!’ (Levy 1981: 176)

- (3) Pito **koso** sira ne, matu pa siru ramu
 Person koso know NEG.IZ. pine TOP know PCONJL.CONCL
 (MYS 2: 145)

‘Men do not know it, but pine must know.’ (Levy 1981, I: 105)

‘No one knows (his spirit might come back) except the pines.’
 (Honda 1967: 17)

In (2), *koso* attaches to the time adverbial *mukasi* “in the old days,” as underlined; it is contrasted with *ima* “now” in the second (main) clause. In (3), *pito* ‘a person’ in the subordinate clause is contrasted with *matu* ‘pine’ in the main clause. As you can see, *koso -e* forms subordinate adjunct clauses in these examples. The subordinate clause and the main clause make a parallel structure, being conjoined by IZEN ending, *-e*. According to Ohno’s theory, this is the original use of *koso -e* construction. In this use, the IZEN ending is a (concessive) subordinator whose meaning is close to English *but*. Ohno states that the original grammatical function of IZEN is a subordinator. The IZEN ending turns a proposition into a subordinating clause and connects it to the main clause.

According to Ohno, this use is slowly taken over by a “stand-alone” *koso -e* construction in which no contrastive clause is expressed, as in (4):

- (4) Sikama gapa taye-mu pi ni **koso**, a ga kwopwi yama-me
 Shikama River end-CONJ.ADN day DAT KOSO, I GEN longing cease-CONJ.EXCL
 (MYS 15: 3605)

‘The Shikama River, it is on the day when it ceases its flow, that my love for you will end.’ (Frellesvig 2010: 250)

In (4), *koso -e* is not followed by a contrastive clause. This construction possesses a strong emphatic effect, which is compared to English *it-cleft*.⁶ Interestingly, this *koso -e* comes with a negative implication. The Modern Japanese translation of *koso -e* is often translated as follows:

- (5) [p *koso* q-*e*] translates
 “p is q; (but non-p is non-q).”

This translation has two components; one is “p is q” and the other is the contrastive proposition “non-p is non-q.” The former proposition corresponds to the preadjacent of the literal meaning of [p *koso* q-*e*]. Tsuta (2011) claimed that the contrastive effect of *koso* contributes to an implica-

⁶ Frellesvig (2010) described *koso* as “unique identification” and translated “p *koso* q-*e*” as “It is p (and only p) that is q.” *Koso* is presumably a focus particle and the semantic contribution of *koso* is selection among all the possible alternatives to the exclusion of others.

ture “non-*p* is non-*q*.” Because of this negative implicature, this use of *koso -e* has been called “concessive” by Ohno.

The last use of *koso -e* is simple emphatic. According to Hando’s (1993, 2003) classification of the type of *koso -e* construction, the lexical item selected by this type of *koso* is being emphasized by degree and not by selection out of limited alternatives. This type of *koso -e* is represented by the poem such as (6):

- (6) Tuki mire-ba tidini mono **koso** kanasi kere
Moon look-PROV. manu.ways things koso sad ACOP.EXCL
(*Kokin* 4: 193)

‘I am burdened with a thousand vague sorrows when I gaze upon the moon.’
(McCullough 1985: 255)

This use of *koso -e* does not come with the exclusive implicature, as we have seen in the focus examples in (2-4). The poem (6) simply asserts the prejacent: I am burdened with sorrows. Ohno (1993) described that the simple emphatic use of *koso -e* is considered an innovative use.

According to Ishida (1939) and Ohno (1993), the formations of the above mentioned *koso -e* constructions involve two grammatical factors: insertion of k-particle *koso* to make a contrast, and formation of a subordinating clause with a subordinator *-e*.

Ohno considers that the stand-alone *koso -e* construction in (4) is a derived form of the fully extended form such as (2) and (3). Ohno also considers that the stand-alone *koso -e* carries the meaning of [non-P is non-Q] as implicature, which is explicitly expressed by the contrastive proposition in (2) or (3). The only difference between contrastive uses and stand-alone uses is that there is no overt expression corresponding to “non-P is non-Q” in (4) since they are to be ‘understood’ by inference.

2. Literary forms. In this section, I will discuss how *Kakari-Musubi* is associated with literary forms. First, I will review the definition of literary forms. Then I present some examples of literary effects brought by *koso -e* construction: contrast, rhetorical question, omission/ pause, and comparative, in turn.

2.1. KM AS LITERARY FORM. There are many interesting aspects to KM constructions, but one of the main functions of KM is to make emphasis. The uses of KM are stylistic choices of the speaker, as KM constructions are not directly tied to grammatical functions such as that of Case particles. Fabb (2004) states the definition of literary form as follows:

- (7) A text has a literary form if certain statements are true of the text. (Fabb 2004: 1)

In Fabb (2004), literary forms are defined in terms of phonetic forms, metrical systems. In the present paper, this notion is taken more generally and applied to syntactic-semantic forms. More specifically, I argue that the concord patterns of KM are literary forms, or at least started out as literary forms. This means that KM is not originated in linguistic forms, and they carry contextual information. Let me start with the following description of KM, as the following conditions are true of the texts:

- (8) KM is true of the text when
- a. K-particle selects a phrase and emphasize it.
 - b. K-particle concords with Musubi (the predicate form at the end of the sentence).
 - c. KM-construction make literary effect such as emphasis, contrast, stylistic inversion, quote, rhetorical question, etc.

For example, the semantic functions of literary forms are categorized under contrast, emphasis, and figure of speech. For each literal effect, there are some choices for expressions.

Contrast	Emphasis	Figure of speech
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parallel structure ▪ Comparison ▪ Omission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stylistic inversion ▪ Iteration/Alliteration ▪ Rhetoric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simile ▪ Metaphor ▪ Personification

Table 2. Semantic functions of literary forms

In the following subsections, I show how these semantic functions of literary forms are exemplified in the earlier uses of *koso -e* construction.

2.2. CONTRAST. Let us look at the examples of literary effect in the *koso -e* construction. The original function of this construction is to form a contrast. This effect is achieved by making the parallel structure of two propositions that are coordinated by the IZEN *-e*. In addition, the emphatic particle is added to make a special reference to the emphasized words/phrase.

- (9) Yanagi-koso kire-ba payesur-e,
willow-KOSO cut-COND. grow.(again).IZ,

yo-no pito-no kwopwi-ni sina-mu-wo ikani seyo to zo
world-GEN person-GEN longing-DAT. die-CONJ.ADN-ACC how do.IMP. COMP emphatic.
(MYS 14: 3491)

“Willow would grow again even if it is cut down, but what to do with a person in the world who die from longing (for someone)?”

- (10) Ima koso pa wa-dori ni ara-me,
Now KOSO TOP my-bird COP.INF. be-CONJ.IZ,

noti pa na-dori ni ara-mu wo
later TOP your-bird COP.INF be-CONJ. CONCL ACC

(Kojiki I: Ohkuninushi no kami 3)

‘(It is) now (that) I am my own, as opposed to later when I will be yours’
(Frellesvig 2010: 250)

- (11) Pito-pi koso pito mo machi-yok-i,
one-day KOSO person ETOP. wait-be.easy.to.ADN,

nagaki pi-wo kakusi mata-e-ba arikatu-masi-ji
long day-ACC like.this wait-INCHOATIVE-Cond. live.can-would-not
(MYS 4: 484)

“It is easy to wait for a person for a day, but it would be unbearable to wait like this for so many days.”

In these uses of *koso -e*, every phrase attached by *koso* is contrasted with the corresponding alternative phrase in the other conjunct (main clause). In (9), “willow” with “a person in the world”; in (10), “now” is contrasted with “later”; in (11), “one day” with “many days.”

2.3. RHETORICAL QUESTION. The literary effect of contrast is also expressed through Rhetorical Questions. In some cases, the rhetorical question is used in the contrastive clause to the *koso -e* subordinate clauses, as in (12) and (13):

- (12) Sinaba **koso** api -mi -zu ara-me,
 Die.COND KOSO recip.-see-NEG AUX.-CONJL.EXCL
iki-te _____ araba sirokami kwora ni opwi-zara-me-yamo.
 be.alive-GER. STAT.COND white.hair child.plural DAT. grow-NEG-CONJL.EXCL.-RQ
 (MYS 16: 3792)

‘If I died, I wouldn’t see my children, but if I were alive, wouldn’t I see my children grow gray hair?’
 (Translated based on Modern Japanese translation)

- (13) Uwe si uweba aki naki toki wa saka zara mu
 Plant Emph plant.COND autumn without at.the.time TOP bloom NEG CONJL.CONCL
 fana **koso** tira me, ne sae kare me ya
 flower koso fall CONJL.EXCL, roots even die CONJL.EXCL-RQ
 (Kokin 268)

“If chrysanthemum was planted as it should be, it may not bloom except in autumn. Though (chrysanthemum) flowers will fall, will roots die? (certainly not; flower will come back to full bloom in seasons)”
 (Translated based on Modern Japanese translation)

In (12), the subordinate clause is conditional: “If I were dead, I wouldn’t see my children” is contrasted against the conditional in the main clause, “If I were alive, would I not see my children grow gray hair?” (Rhetorical question). In (13), the subordinate clause is “(Chrysanthemum) flowers will die,” contrasted with the main clause “would even roots die?” (Rhetorical question). In both sentences, the subordinate clauses formed by *koso -e* are making a contrast with the main clause, which is emphasized by the rhetorical question.

2.4. OMISSION/PAUSE. Ohno argued that the earlier stand-alone *koso -e* construction is essentially non-distinctive from the contrastive uses. Ohno described this type of *koso -e* continues to form a “concessive” conjunction, leaving the main clause “omitted.” One example is provided in (14):

- (14) Miti no be ni simizu nagaruru yanagi kage
 Road GEN. side DAT. clear.water flow.ADN. willow shade
 sibasi tote **koso** tatidomari ture
 for.a.short.time thinking.that. KOSO stop.by PERF.EXCL
 (Shin Kokin 3: 262)

“In the shade of the willow where the river flows, I thought of stopping by only for a while...(but I stayed there for long time.)”
 (Translated based on Modern Japanese translation)

In (14), the adverbial phrase “for a while” is emphasized by *koso*. The IZEN ending seems to retain the meaning of subordinator and feels as if it is followed by the contrastive clause. In this case, “for a short time” is eventually refuted by the speaker as either not true or not to be taken seriously, and instead, it conveys that the speaker ended up staying there longer than expected as

implicature. The stand-alone *koso -e* is perceived as a literary form of contrast, using omission or pause to trigger implicature.

We will focus on the fact that there is a pragmatic effect of the stand-alone *koso -e*: non-at-issue implicature. Grice (1975) argued that utterance meaning is comprised of what is said and what is implicated. Roughly speaking, what is said corresponds to the meaning conveyed simply through the linguistic expressions. This part of meaning is defined by the truth conditions of the component propositions. However, viewed from the pragmatic perspective, the meaning conveyed by uttering something is not necessarily exhausted by the literal meaning. In other words, in uttering a *koso -e* construction, the speaker often conveys something more than what is said by the literal expressions. This is what makes *koso -e* construction ‘emphatic,’ by its implicative nature of the statement.

For example, in (14) above, “I stopped by thinking that I stay just for a while” is not what is intended by the speaker. This sentence is uttered to convey that “I actually ended up staying there longer than expected,” contrary to what is said. Since the IZEN ending is perceived as a pause, rather than the end of the sentence, it triggers the negative implicature that it is not actually the case.

There are many interesting examples to this type of *koso -e*. The example (15) is the typical example of this *koso -e* in which the dependent clause is a cause of the main clause.

- (15) Notise-yama noti-mo apa-mu to omope(-ba) koso,
 Nochise-Mountain later-ETOP meet-CONJL.CNCL COMP think.PROV KOSO,
 sinu-beki monowo kepu made mo ik-yere.
 die-should.ADN though today until ETOP. live-STAT.EXCL
(MYS 4: 739)

‘Only the hope that later we shall meet again like Nochise Mountain has kept me alive until today.’ (Levy 1981)

According to Ohno, in such an example such as (15), the speaker’s intention is to express an emotion of “reproach” to the addressee who had not visited the speaker.⁷ This additional meaning (reproach to the addressee) intended by the speaker is neither directly stated in the literal meaning nor directly relevant to what is said; it must be inferred from the context. The feeling of reproach is what is intended by this statement, they must be performing an “indirect” speech act.

2.5. EMPHASIS. The last category is emphasis. Emphasis is perceived as a type of amplification of linguistic meaning. As often pointed out in the literature, one of the semantic forms that expresses emphasis in *koso -e* construction is comparative or superlative forms.

- (16) Pana yorimo pito **koso** adani nari ni kyere
 Flower than person koso short-lived become PERF MPST
(Kokin 16: 850)

‘A person became more short-lived than a flower (cherry blossoms).’
 ‘Before the cherry tree comes into bloom the planter is gone; (for which then should I yearn first? I wonder.)’
(Honda 1970: 219)

⁷ The speaker exaggerates her emotion by stating that she has lived even though she should have died.

- (17) Tuyu **koso** aware nare
 Dew KOSO interesting.ADN COP.EXCL (Tsurezuregusa 21)

‘The dew moves me even more (the dew is the most delightful)’ (Keene 1998: 22)

In (16), the emphasized word “person” is compared with “flower” in terms of how long they live. In (17), the superlative-like meaning is assigned to the emphasized sentence “dew is delightful.” The “(non-comparative) emphasis” under Hando’s classification, is associated with “positive polarity” or positive scalar or degree expressions such as (6) repeated here as (18):

- (18) Tuki mire-ba tidini mono **koso** kanasi kere
 Moon look-PROV. manu.ways things koso sad ACOP.EXCL
 (Kokin 4: 193)

‘I am burdened with a thousand vague sorrows when I gaze upon the moon.’
 (McCullough 1985: 255)

The emphasis posed by *koso* amplifies “things”; it could mean “a thousand of things” as translation suggests. The emphatic effect of *koso -e* adds a positive scalar implicature to the degree of sorrow that the speaker is feeling.

To summarize, I showed that there are many ways that *koso -e* is understood as a literary form. This supports the idea that *koso -e* is a literary form. In the next section, however, I will argue that not all the uses of *koso -e* is explained by literary forms, and that the stand-alone *koso -e* is a type of linguistic form.

3. Semantic change. In this section, I argue that the second stage of *koso -e* involves semantic change, from literary form to linguistics form.

3.1. SEMANTICS OF CONTRASTIVE TOPIC. Sano (2021) argues that the original use of *koso -e* construction is equivalent to contrastive construction. It involves an abstraction of a proposition and quantification of the emphatic phrase and the value assignment of the focused phrase. The *koso -e* construction involves uniqueness of the semantic value represented by the emphatic phrase.

Rooth (1992) argued that his semantics of focus can derive the semantics of contrastive focus. Here I adopt his concept of focus to represent the meaning of *koso* in the contrastive use. Assuming that *koso* is a focus particle, it forms a focus phrase. Let us further assume that the IZEN ending *-e* marks its focus domain. This is shown as (19):

- (19) [YANAGI-KOSO (KIRE-BA) PAYESUR-E] is translated to
 [[WILLOW will grow again]]^f

The ordinary expressions derived from the focused sentence can be multiplied by the possible semantic values that are contextually assigned to this variable. The ordinary semantic values given by the semantic value of “Willow” to “x will grow again” is represented in (20).

- (20) [[WILLOW will grow again]]^o
 =[willow will grow again]

The proposition expressed in the *koso -e* construction will be true if and only if there is one semantic value among all the possible values of the focus phrase that makes the proposition ϕ true. Let us take α as a semantic value of a variable x , ϕ as a proposition that includes x .

- (21) [α *koso* ϕ -*e*] translates
 ‘ $\alpha \in D$ uniquely satisfies $\lambda x \in D. \llbracket \phi \rrbracket^x$ in the context.’

“Willow” is the value assignments (denotations) of D_e and it is the only value that makes the proposition true in the given context. In another words, the denotation of α in the domain of $x \in D_e$, is *Willow*, and the proposition [a willow will grow again] is true. In addition, it implicates that the alternative value, such as *Man*, does not satisfy the predicate, so [a man will grow again] would be false.

In this use, *koso -e* is a literary form, as its main function was to create a contrast. First, *koso -e* construction was used as an adjunct modifying the main clause. Being introduced by the subordinator *-e*, the construction doesn't have sentence force by itself. Its main function was to juxtapose the main clause with the subordinate clause that has a parallel structure. *Koso* picks out an alternative semantic value to the phrase in the main clause to be contrasted with. The proposition in *koso -e* would be rendered true if the proposition expressed corresponds to truth, but it is followed by the contrastive clause that claims about the alternative semantic value β distinct from α , which does not satisfy the predicate.

3.2. SEMANTICS OF CONTRASTIVE FOCUS. Let us proceed to the examples of stand-alone *koso -e*. In this use, the *koso -e* construction is not followed by a contrastive clause. The typical example of this *koso -e* construction is shown in (22)-(23).

- (22) Ima **koso** naka me tomo ni aperu toki
 Now koso cry CONJ.ECL.EXCL. friend DAT meet.ADN time
(*Manyoshu* 8: 1481)

“(Cuckoo,) Please cry now, while I meet with my friend.”
 “I wish cuckoo would cry now.” (Based on Modern Japanese translation)

- (23) Sikama gapa taye-mu pi ni **koso**, a ga kwopwi yama-me
 Shikama River end-CONJ.ADN day DAT KOSO, I GEN longing cease-CONJ.EXCL
(*MYS* 15: 3605)

‘The Shikama River, it is on the day when it ceases its flow, that my love for you will end.’
(Frellesvig 2010: 250)

In the previous section, This is the type of *koso -e* which expresses “unique identification.” Frellesvig (2010) states that *koso -e* construction has the meaning of “unique identification” and translates [p-*koso* q-*e*] into “It is p (and only p) that is q.”

According to Tsuta (2011), what is asserted by this type of [p-*koso* q-*e*] cannot be complete without the inference “non-p is non-q” as this is what the speaker intends to convey. However, in the stand-alone *koso -e*, the contrastive clause is not explicitly stated. Ohno reasons that the contrastive clause is omitted or to be stated after a pause, as this might be aesthetically more complex and desirable.

However, Sano (2021) argued against this analysis. Sano argued that the stand-alone *koso -e* is not the same as contrastive *koso -e*. In this analysis, stand-alone *koso -e* is no longer an implied literary form, but it is a linguistic form.

For instance, *it*-cleft construction has very different semantic structure from contrastive top-ic expressed in conjunctions. *It*-cleft cannot be followed by the contrastive clause:

- (24) a. Men do not know it, but pine must know. (= (3))
 b. #It is men who do not know it, but pine must know.
 (25) a. Now I am my own, later I will be yours. (= (10))
 b. #It is now that I am my own, but later I will be yours.

- (26) a. Willow would grow again even if it is cut down, but a person wouldn't. (= (9))
 b. #It is willow that would grow again even if it is cut down, but a person wouldn't.

The contrastive clauses are felt to be redundant in (24-26b). This contrast strongly suggests that contrastive topic *koso -e* and the stand-alone *koso -e* have different semantic structure.

There is another observable difference between the contrastive topic *koso -e* and the stand-alone *koso -e*. It is the meaning of the modal *m(e)* in these uses. Compare the two uses of *-me* in the two uses of *koso -e* in (27) and (28). In the contrastive topic construction in (27), the preja-cent of *koso -e* is entailed. On the other hand, in the stand-alone *koso -e*, the preja-cent of *koso -e* is not entailed as in (28):

- (27) Sinaba **koso** api -mi -zu ara-me,
 Die.COND KOSO recip.-see-NEG AUX.-CONJL.EXCL

iki-te araba sirokami kwora ni opi-zara-me-yamo.
 be.alive-GER. STAT.COND white.hair child.plural DAT. grow-NEG-CONJL.EXCL.-RQ
 (MYS 16: 3792)

'If I died, I wouldn't see my children, but if I were alive, wouldn't I see my children grow gray hair?'
 (Translated based on Modern Japanese translation)

- (28) Sikama gapa taye-mu pi ni **koso**, a ga kwopwi yama-me
 Shikama River end-CONJ.ADN day DAT KOSO, I GEN longing cease-CONJ.EXCL
 (MYS 15: 3605)

'The Shikama River, it is on the day when it ceases its flow, that my love for you will end.'
 (Frellesvig 2010: 250)

'Only on the day Shikama River forebears to flow into the sea of the sea God's realm, will my longing for you likewise end.'
 (Horton 2012: 15)

'My love (for you) will stop only on the day when Shikama river that flows into the sea of the sea dragon will dry up.'
 (Vovin 2009: 62)

In (27) and (28), *koso* is attached to the subordinate clauses and *-e* is attached to the end of the main clause. Ohno among others observe that the intention of the poem in (28) is to express the denial of what is said: since there is no day when the Shikama River stops flowing, the speaker will never end his/her love for the addressee. It is contradictory to say, even if the river does not cease to flow, my feeling for you might stop. However, in (27), the sentence does not assert the strong denial of the consequent, i.e., I will see my children. It is not contradictory to say that even if I do not die, I might still not see my children. The denial of *q* is necessitated in (28), while this is not true in (27).

How can the interlocutors of (28) communicate the intended meaning? Ohno assumed that in stand-alone *koso -e*, the main clause is omitted for aesthetic reasons, since the intended meaning is inferable. However, it is not obvious how the contrasted proposition is reconstructed and interpreted by the speaker. Assume that the contrastive *koso -e* in (27) is uttered without the main clause. It is possible to infer that the speaker is alive, but it is not possible to conclude that the speaker would see his children grow gray hair.

- (29) [[I die-KOSO], I would not see my children (grow gray hair)-E]
 ⇒ I am still alive

⇒ I would see my children grow gray hair

By contrast, the use of *koso -e* in (28), the intended part of the meaning is not overtly expressed. It not only implies that Shikama River is still flowing, but also that the speaker's love for the addressee will not end:

- (30) [[Shikama River ceases its flow-KOSO], that my love for you will end-E]
⇒ Shikama River is still flowing.
⇒ My love for you will not end.

There seems to be a difference in entailment, too. If the *koso -e* sentence is taken to be true, is the prejacent entailed? Let us compare contrastive and stand-alone uses of the form [*ima KOSO -me*] exemplified in (10) and (22), repeated here as (31) and (32) respectively. The prejacent is entailed in the contrastive *koso -e*, while the prejacent isn't entailed in the stand-alone *koso -e*:

- (31) Ima koso pa wa-dori ni ara-me,
Now KOSO TOP my-bird COP.INF. be-CONJ.IZ,
noti pa na-dori ni ara-mu wo
later TOP your-bird COP.INF be-CONJ. CONCL ACC
(*Kojiki I: Ohkuninushi no kami 3*)

‘(It is) now (that) I am my own, as opposed to later when I will be yours’
(Frellesvig 2010: 250)

- (32) Ima **koso** naka me tomo ni aperu toki
Now koso cry CONJ.ECL.EXCL. friend DAT meet.ADN time
(*MYS 8: 1481*)

“(Cuckoo,) Please cry now, while I meet with my friend.”
“I wish cuckoo would cry now.”

(Translated based on the Modern Japanese translation)

- (33) a. [[Now-KOSO] I am my own-E], as opposed to later when I will be yours.
⇒ Now I am my own.
b. [[Now-KOSO] cuckoo will cry-E] when I see my friend.
⇒ the cuckoo will cry now.

In (32), the intended meaning is that the speaker is expressing his wish that the cuckoo would cry now. Thus, it shows that the prejacent of the stand-alone *koso -e* construction is being dismissed by the speaker, showing that the prejacent is not an entailment, unlike (31).

These differences strongly suggest that the stand-alone *koso -e* expresses different meanings from the contrastive *koso -e*. The modal *-me* has changed from the epistemic use to the subjunctive/conjectural use. The modal *-me* in the contrastive topic *koso -e* construction expresses the speaker's knowledge and the content of knowledge. This is no longer true with the stand-alone *koso -e*, where *-me* is subjunctive/conjectural modal and does not entail the truth of the prejacent. The crucial difference is, as we have seen above, the stand-alone *koso -e* can implicate or necessitate the negated proposition, whereas the contrastive topic does not necessarily have that implicature. This poses difficulty to Ohno's analysis that the stand-alone *koso -e* is derived from omission of the contrastive clause.

3.3. STRENGTHENING OF *KOSO*. Let us now consider the possible analysis of strengthening of emphatic *koso*. I argue that *koso* is strengthened in the sense that the semantics of this *koso* is most proximate to English *only*.⁸ In the literary use, this *koso -e* can express more than selection: it expresses notions such as exclusion, exhaustivity, exceptions, etc.

Horn (2014) observed that English *only* has the similar effect: there is a pragmatic (implicational) meaning that affects what is asserted. Horn argues that both prejacent and exclusive propositions are entailed, but only the latter is at-issue.

- (34) Only Chris came on time.
 Prejacent: Chris came on time. (INERT)
 Exclusive: No one other than Chris came on time. (AT-ISSUE)

Horn's analysis of meaning of *only* can be directly applicable to the meaning of *koso -e*:

- (35) The Shikama River, it is on the day when it ceases its flow, that my love for you will end.
 Prejacent: My love will end when the Shikama River ceases to flow. (INERT)
 Exclusive: My love will not end as long as the Shikama River flows. (AT-ISSUE)

In this utterance, the prejacent is treated as 'non-at-issue,' and the exclusive meaning represents what is intended by the speaker. This contextual meaning of the stand-alone *koso -e* construction can be stated as follows:

- (36) [α *koso* ψ -*e*] is appropriate in the context where the negation of α (the antecedent) necessitates the negation of ψ (the consequent).

Let me summarize what has been discussed so far. In the stand-alone *koso -e*, the selection by *koso* is strengthened. It forms a focus construction by which the focused phrase is emphasized as well as its alternatives are excluded at the same time.

3.4. SIMPLE EMPHATIC USES. In this section, I will examine the simple emphatic uses of the *koso -e* construction. The characteristic of this *koso -e* is that there is actuality entailment. In other words, non-at-issue implicature that we have seen in the stand-alone *koso -e* is no longer in effect. The simple emphatic *koso -e* has an illocutionary force, i.e. of exclamatory. First, let me present the examples (37a-b), in which the *koso -e* is used as simple emphatic. In these examples, *koso -e* has the superative-like meaning, and excludes other alternatives that are less optimal or quantitatively less:

- (37) a. Kurai **koso** naho medetaki-mono wa ar-e.
 Status KOSO more nice.ADN thing TOP there.is-EXCL
 (*Pillow Book* 179)

“Nothing is as nice as status.”

(Translated based on Modern Japanese Translation)

- b. Yamazato wa aki **koso** kotoni wabisi-kere
 mountain.village TOP autumn KOSO especially be.sad.EXCL

⁸ There is rich literature on English *only*, though I cannot discuss them here. Rooth (1992) argued that *only* is a focus-sensitive element that associates with focus. Herburger (2000) argued that focused phrase is in the commanding domain of *only*. Chierchia (2004, 2012), Fox (2007) among others argued that *only* is a sentential operator that provides the semantics of exhaustivity to its focus. According to Fox (2007), exhaustivity operator is a silent analogue of *only*, minimally different from the overt *only*.

(*Kokin* 214)

“At the house in the mountain, autumn would be especially sad (among all the seasons).”
(Translated based on Modern Japanese Translation)

In this use, the focus phrase has acquired the emphatic use, in the sense that what is emphasized (i.e. the prejacent of *koso -e*) is a part of entailment. In this use of *koso -e*, the prejacent is presupposed and it asserts that what is selected has the best quality or the best representation.

The semantic change of *koso -e* construction is the transition from the focus *koso -e* construction to the simple emphatic *koso (-e)*. Ohno (1993) pointed out that the predecessor of the emphatic use of *koso -e* in the Middle Japanese is represented by the example like (40) in Old Japanese.

- (38) Puru yuki no tieni tume **koso**, wa ga tati kate-ne.
Fall.ADN snow GEN in layers accumulate.PROV. KOSO, I NOM leave manage-NEG.EXCL
(*MYS* 19: 4234)

Lit: ‘We cannot leave precisely because falling snow has accumulated so much.’
Prejacent: we cannot leave when falling snow is accumulated so much. (AT-ISSUE)

The most evident change from the concessive use of *koso -e* is that the prejacent is a part of the assertion. Thus, this type of *koso -e* is most naturally conceived as simple emphatic. As a preliminary account, I argue that *koso -e* is a simple emphasis when the prejacent is asserted and the original meaning is amplified. This semantics can be expressed as follows:

- (39) [α -*koso* ϕ -*e*] is emphatic when it entails $\exists x. [[\alpha]](x) = [[\phi]](x) = 1$ and the prejacent is at-issue.

In (37)-(38), the speaker’s intention is well represented by the prejacent and this meaning is now at-issue.

4. Semantic change and Linguistic form. Sano (2021) argues that the semantics of *koso -e* in stand-alone uses is distinct from the semantics of contrastive uses. The semantic restriction of *p* by *koso* is stronger in the former than the latter. To summarize the above argument, the *koso -e* construction has undergone semantic changes and its meaning is shifted in the following order:

- (40) Contrastive Topic: [α *koso* ψ -*e*] is true if ψ follows from α (the antecedent).
(41) Focus construction: [α *koso* ψ -*e*] is appropriate in the context where the negation of α necessitates the negation of ψ .
(42) Simple emphasis: [α *koso* ψ -*e*] is true if and only if α necessitates ψ .

In the contrastive use, *koso -e* is a literary form. It forms a subordinate clause that parallels the main clause and makes a contrast with the main clause. In the focus construction, *koso -e* is not followed by a main clause. This shift has been perceived as a case of implied literary form, with the main clause simply omitted or a pause being placed. However, as we have seen, this shift involves a linguistic form. Since *koso* retains the function of making “contrast” with other alternatives in both (40) and (41), literary forms make the linguistic difference between (40) and (41) less obvious.

5. Conclusion. The purpose of the present article is to show that linguistic forms and literary forms interact with each other, and sometimes they are hard to be differentiated. Though it is true that *koso -e* construction initially served to form a contrast for aesthetic reasons, it did not simp-

ly remain to be a literary form. The focus *koso* –*e* might have opened a new path to a linguistic form. Literary forms interfere with linguistic forms, making less obvious of the linguistic form of *koso* –*e* in the focus construction. Much more research is needed to explore literary uses of KM as well as their interaction with linguistic forms.

References

- Fabb, Nigel. 2004. *Language and Literary Structure: The linguistic analysis of form in verse and narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, Daniel. 2007. Free choice and the theory of scalar implicatures. In Uli Sauerland & Penka Stateva (eds.), *Presupposition and implicature in compositional semantics*, 71–120. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Speech acts*, 41–58. London: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003.
- Hando, Hideaki, 1993. Kotengo “koso” no hataraki. *Kokugakuin Zasshi* 94(6). 30–39.
- Honda, Heihachiro. 1967. *The Manyōshū: A new and complete translation*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2000. From if to iff: Conditional perfection as pragmatic strengthening. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(3). 289–326. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00053-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00053-3).
- Horn, Laurence R.. 2014. Information structure and the landscape of (non-)at-issue meaning. In Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horton, H. Mack. 2012. *Traversing the frontier: the Man'yōshū account of a Japanese mission to Silla in 736–737*. London: Brill.
- Levy, H. Ian 1981. *The ten thousand leaves: A translation of the Man'yōshū, Japan's premier anthology of classical poetry* (Volume one). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- McCullough, Helen C. 1985. *Brocade by night: 'Kokin WakaShū' and the court style in Japanese classical poetry*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ohno, Susumu. 1993. *Kakarimusubi no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Iwanami Syoten.
- Quinn, Charles J. 2015. Why izenkei in koso-focused kakarimusubi? – some considerations. A handout from International Workshop Kakarimusubi from a Comparative Perspective.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1. 75–116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02342617>.
- Sano, Kyoko. 2021. Koso ni yoru kakarimusubi no imihenka. Japanese Linguistics Conference in Spring.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suga, Teruo 1991. *The Man'yo-shū: A complete English translation in 5-7 rhythm*. Chiba, JP: Kanda University of Institutional Studies.
- Tsuta, Kiyoyuki, 2011. Koso, izenkei kenkyū-shi shō. *Nihongo, Nihon Bunka* 37. 35–57.
- Whitman, John, 1997. Kakarimusubi from a comparative perspective. In Ho-Min Sohn & John Haig (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* (Volume 6). Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Vovin, Alexander. 2009. *Man'yōshū (Book 15): A new translation containing the original text, Kana transliteration, Romanization, glossing and commentary*. London: Brill.
- <Old Japanese texts>
- Shinpen Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshu. 1994-2004. Shōgakkan.
- The Nippon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai Translation 1965. *The Manyōshū. Records of civilization: Sources & studies*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.