

琉球大学学術リポジトリ

歴史比較言語学における沖縄の係り結び研究の意義

メタデータ	言語: 出版者: 琉球大学国際沖縄研究所 公開日: 2019-07-24 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Shinzato, Rumiko, Serafim, Leon A., 新里, 瑠美子, セラフィム, レオン・A メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/44730

What Can Studies of Old Okinawan *Kakari Musubi* Contribute to Historical-Comparative Linguistics?

Rumiko Shinzato*
Leon A. Serafim**

1. Introduction

Recent years have seen a growing interest in Ryukyuan linguistics in academic circles outside of Japan. Fast-accumulating research on the one hand is centered on deepening studies of individual languages/dialects of the Ryukyuan lineage. On the other hand, Ryukyuan languages have been highlighted in historical and comparative linguistic research as well. The former orientation includes an excellent collection of papers in Shimoji and Pellard's co-edited volume *An Introduction to Ryukyuan Languages*, Curry's (2004) work on the historical phonology and lexicon of Nakijin dialect, as well as Iwasaki's (2015) analysis of subject marking in Ikema dialect in terms of animacy/addressability. The latter approach includes the most significant reconstruction of Proto-Ryukyuan anywhere, by Thorpe (1983), major comparative studies of Korean, Old Japanese and Ryukyuan languages by Vovin (2005, 2009), and Shimabukuro's accentual history of the Ryukyuan language (2007). Added to these is the *Handbook of the Ryukyuan Languages* (2015) edited by Heinrich, Miyara, and Shimoji, which covers a wide range of topics from linguistic archeology to sociolinguistics, and diverse approaches including generative and functional frameworks, with individual as well as cross-language foci.

In this context, the present paper may be considered a marriage of both approaches. On the one hand, it deals with *kakari musubi* (KM)⁰ phenomena extending over major dialect areas. On the other, it places Okinawan KM in comparative perspective with Old Japanese (OJ) KM in reconstructing Proto-Japonic (PJ) forms, as well as in capturing KM phenomena from the theoretical viewpoint of grammaticalization.

KM is a syntactic agreement construction in which special particles called *kakari* particles (KP) trigger a particular *musubi* 'end form', such as a *rentai* (RT, adnominal) or *izen* (IZ, realis) form, instead of the usual *shūshi* (SS, finite) form to complete a sentence for rhetorical effects such as interrogation, assertion, or emphasis. For instance, example

* Professor, Georgia Institute of Technology ジョージア工科大学教授

** Retired Professor, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa ハワイ大学マノア校元教授

(1) from OOk¹⁾ shows the concord between KP *du* [du] and RT, while example (2) illustrates the agreement between KP *syu/si* [[ʃu/si]²⁾ and IZ. In both cases, SS forms are given for reference.

- (1) しより、ふる、あめや、すでみづど、 ふりよる (ss=ふりより)
siyuryi fur-u ʔami-ya sidi-myiɕi-du fur-y-ur-u (ss=*fur-y-ur-yi*)
 Shuri fall-RT rain-TOP purified-water-KP fall-RY-SE-RT
 ‘The rain falling on Shuri: it is *pure/cleansing* water that falls.’ (OS 7: 386)
- (2) あまみきよが、うざししよ、 この、大しま、 おれたれ、 (ss=おれたり)
ʔamamyikyū-ga ʔu-zasyi-syu kunu da-syima ʔuri-tar-i (ss=*ʔuri-tar-yi*)
 Amamiko-GEN EX-command-KP this great-island descend-PST-IZ
 ともゝすへ、 おぎやかもいす、 ちよわれ (ss=ちよわる)
tu[u]-mumu-sii ʔugyakamii-si cyuwar-i (ss=*cyuwar-u*)
 ten-hundred-endings King.Shō.Shin-KP will.govern-IZ/MR³⁾
 ‘It was by the order of the deity Amamiko himself that he_i descended onto this island. Ogyakamoi (King Shō Shin)_i; and only he_i will govern this island forever. / May it be Ogyakamoi (King Shō Shin)_i; and only he_i; who will govern this island forever!’ (OS 5: 242)

Structurally, KM is compared to clefts. With that in mind, another way of defining KM is as follows. There are (i) a focused element; (ii) a presuppositional clause formed with a nominalizing ending; (iii) the focused element and the presuppositional clause are both marked with a specific marker and a distinct end form, creating a specific concordance pattern.⁴⁾

Within *Japanese*, KM is a historically important construction because the question of its existence separates *Old* and *Middle* Japanese (OJ and MJ) from *Modern* Japanese (NJ). In addition to having such historical significance, this construction came to attract attention from both formal and functional schools of linguistics both, in Japan and abroad, thus proving to be one of the few topics appreciated by such radically different schools of linguistics (Kinsui 2002).⁵⁾ Moreover, the rarity of this construction has been noted, as it is seen only in a few languages⁶⁾ in the world (Whitman 1997), including OJ, Old Okinawan (OOk), and languages of the Indian subcontinent, including Sinhala (Kishimoto 1992, Hagstrom 1998, Watanabe 2002, Wrona 2007).⁷⁾ These facts thus underline the value of studies of this construction.

Needless to say, the study of KM is valuable in its own right, but it is also relevant to studies of other well-known major syntactic constructions. Since KM is a focus construction functionally, where a KP marks a syntactic focus against the presupposition created by a RT/IZ ending clause that comes *after* it, it shares functional similarities to cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions (Whitman 1997, *inter alia*). Just as the origins of the similar English constructions have been investigated at length (cf. Harris 2001 both for an overview and for a specific study), the origin of *kakari musubi* has been a central issue to

kakari musubi researchers in the Japanese scholarly literature.⁸⁾ In addition, KM is also indispensable for understanding nominalization and nominalized constructions, which are omnipresent in the world’s languages, and recognized as key structures in any language (see Yap et al. 2004 on nominalizations in Asian languages). Furthermore, this construction bears relevance to studies of demonstratives since some KPs are held to have originated in demonstratives (Shinzato and Serafim 2011, 2013: 256–258).

Given the high relevance of KM studies to other syntactic structures and other languages, it is not surprising that the studies of Okinawan KM constructions in the *Omorō Sōshi*, in *kumiodori* (early 18th century), and in Modern Shuri/Naha varieties should also have a significant effect on studies of other Ryukyuan varieties as well. In this paper, we will first present the hypotheses and analyses that are to be found in Shinzato and Serafim (2013, henceforth S&S 2013) and then examine their bearing upon three major research fields in historical-comparative linguistics. Section 2 will attempt to resolve KM phenomena in other Ryukyuan varieties seemingly contradictory to the S&S 2013 hypotheses. Section 3 will revisit OJ KM phenomena in light of the S&S 2013 work. Section 4 will place KM in the wider context of grammaticalization and discuss its relevance, especially to the developmental paths of demonstratives. Section 5 will conclude this paper.

2. Testing the S&S hypotheses in other Ryukyuan KM phenomena⁹⁾

2.1. The lgal-type KM hypothesis and the non-existence of lyal-type KM in Ryukyuan¹⁰⁾

In their studies of OOk-lgal type KM, S&S (2013) recognized two subtypes as in (3).¹¹⁾

(3) Two subtypes for OOk lgal-type KM:

Type I: lgal . . . MZ/IA (← IA-RT = *-*am -wo*) self-inquiry

Type II: lgal . . . plain RT (without IA = * -*wo*) other-inquiry

Type I has an inferential auxiliary in the *musubi*, while Type II does not. The naming convention of I and II simply reflects the prevalence of the pattern: Type I is the one surviving into Modern Okinawan in the Okinawan lineage,¹²⁾ and not surprisingly, Type I is by far more prevalent than Type II, amounting to around 70% of the entire lkal-type KM—in the Japanese lineage—in *Man’yō-shū* (Takayama 2015; also see Serafim and Shinzato 2000 and S&S 2013: 35).

Type I: -*ga* . . . MZ/IA

(4) たが とりよら たが うちよら
taa-ga tur-y-ur-a taa-ga ūuc-y-ur-a
 who-KP hold-RY-SE-IA who-KP beat-RY-SE-IA

‘I wonder who could be holding [the drum]. I wonder who could be beating it.’
 (OS 12: 1157)

Type II: -ga . . . RT

(5) のう	みちへが	おひきよる
<i>nuu</i>	<i>myii-cyee-ga</i>	<i>ʔuu-yi-k-y-uur-u</i>
what	see-RSLT-KP	chase-RY-come-RY-SE-RT
いきや	みちへが	おひきよる
<i>ʔyikya</i>	<i>myii-cyee-ga</i>	<i>ʔuu-yi-k-y-uur-u</i>
how	see-RSLT-KP	chase-RY-come-RY-SE-RT
きみ	みちへす	おひきよれ
<i>kyimyi</i>	<i>myii-cyee-si</i>	<i>ʔuu-yi-k-y-uur-i</i>
priestess	see-RSLT-KP	chase-RY-come-RY-SE-IZ
ぬし	みちへす	おひきよれ
<i>nusyi</i>	<i>myii-cyee-si</i>	<i>ʔuu-yi-k-y-uur-i</i>
priestess	see-RSLT-KP	chase-RY-come-RY-SE-IZ

‘(The long-billed bird:) What has it seen that it is chasing (it) down? How has it seen (it), that it is chasing it down? It is precisely because it has seen the *kyimyi*-priestess that it is chasing it down. It is precisely because it has seen the *nusyi*-priestess that it is chasing it down.’ (OS 12: 731)

Type I lgal KM has what looks like a *mizen* (MZ, irrealis)¹³ as its *musubi*, which was actually historically an elided form of the inferential auxiliary’s RT (= IA-RT, *-am-wo > *-a); thus we give it the notation “MZ/IA”. The change IA-RT → MZ/IA is a grammaticalization of a sequence of two morphemes into just one morpheme. Type II has a plain RT without the inferential auxiliary as its *musubi*. These two subtypes are functionally different: Type I forms a self-inquiry—wondering, and doubt—as in (4), while Type II makes an other-inquiry as in (5), where *nuu myii-cyee-ga ʔuu-yi-k-y-uur-u* ‘What has it seen that it is chasing (it) down?’ in the first line is replied to in the succeeding verse with *kyimyi myii-cyee-si ʔuu-yi-k-y-uur-i* ‘It is precisely because it has seen the *kyimyi*-priestess that it is chasing it down.’

These subtypes have been recognized in Japanese scholarship (Nomura 1996, Takayama 2015), but they become more explicit if OOk KM subtypes are taken into consideration. S&S (2013) argue that these subtypes existed in Proto-Japonic (PJ). Their rationale is that KM syntactic constructions are complex and idiosyncratic, and highly unlikely to develop independently in both branches of Japonic. The reconstructed PJ forms and their derivations to OOk are given below:

(6) PJ Type I		>	Old Okinawan
* . . . -ka _i . . . [Y	X-am _Y]-wor _i		. . . -ga _i . . . X-((y)ur)a _i
* -KP	Root-IA -RT		
PJ Type II:			
* . . . -ka _i	. . . Y-wor _i		. . . -ga _i . . . Y- -u _i
-KP	-RT		

They also note that KP *-ga* started to move to sentence-final position in the *Omoro Sōshi* and had almost completely shifted by the time of the *kumiodori*. Not surprisingly, this positional change is consistent with a general shift that also occurred in Middle Japanese language history.

In the following subsections, three Ryukyuan cases that at first glance may seem to present challenges to the S&S hypothesis presented above will be discussed.

2.2. The Torishima¹⁴⁾ case

One potential difficulty for the S&S 2013 hypothesis comes from Torishima (Kume) dialect, whose lgal-type KM looks like Type II structurally but semantically aligns with Type I. To be more specific, Nohara (1986) interprets the *musubi* of KP *-ga* of the examples in (7) as being the plain RT *ru*: “Since the *i* at the end of Torishima-dialect (*h*)*attfui*, *tfuwasai*, and *ɽwajui* is something equivalent to other dialects’ — e.g., Naha dialect’s — *-ru*, the *musubi* ending for the KP *-ga* is the *i* form of the conjugated word.” [English translation by S&S]¹⁵⁾

- | | |
|---|---|
| (7) a. <i>ɽyui-ga (h)accyui</i>
‘I wonder if he’s writing a character’ | 字を書いているのだろうか
Ji o kaite-iru no darō ka. |
| b. <i>kangeeti-ga ɽwayui</i>
‘I wonder if he’s thinking.’ | 考えておられるのだろうか
Kangaete-orareru no darō ka. |
| c. <i>taiga-ga cyuwasai</i>
‘I wonder which one is beautiful’ | 誰かが美しいだろうか
Dare ga ga [<i>sic</i>] utsukushii darō ka.
(Nohara 1986: 130) |

If Nohara’s analysis on *musubi* is correct, this KM belongs to Type II in the S&S 2013 typology, which is expected to form an other-inquiry. However, as Nohara’s Japanese translations clearly indicate, this construction is taken as self-inquiry, that is, Type I. Thus, this case appears at first glance to serve as counterevidence to the S&S 2013 hypothesis.

However, *i* does not in this case correspond to the NOK RT ending . . . *r-u*, as Nohara claims, but rather, to the NOK inferential (IA) . . . *r-a*. For this argument, we posit the following derivation:

- (8) **kaccyura* > **kaccyuya* > **haccyuyi* > (*h*)*accyui*.

It should also be noted that the IA/MZ form here is with the stative extension, that is, *-(y) -u-i* < **-y-ur-a*, just as expected from the hypothesis. Thus, structurally as well, this particular KM belongs to Type I, and the S&S hypothesis is sustained.

The posited change **ra* > *i* is abundantly evidenced in Tshako’s work and examples on Torishima, e.g.:

- (9) *kai₁kai₂* < **karakara* ‘liquor-pouring vessel’ (cf. NOK *karakaraa*, OGJ 310a)¹⁶⁾

In fact, it is not only the **r* of **ra* that lenites: most original **r* has either become a glide *y/w* or \emptyset , and concomitantly, in many instances, **d* has lenited to *r* to take its place. Any remaining word-initial **r* has tended to become *d*, much as in NOK and indeed throughout Japonic. Tsuchiko gives various examples of the lenition of *r* to glide-initial moras (e.g., *ro/ru* > *yu* (> *i*), and offglides of diphthongs (*yu/ya* > *i*), **...ara* (> **...aya*) > *...ai*, while **...ora* or **...ura* become *...uwa*. Sometimes the change stops before the collapse of the *yV* mora to a front offglide. Other examples of *i* specifically from **ya* are:

- (10) *kai_izyi* ‘hair’ < **kar_azyi* (cf. NOK *kar_azyi*, ‘(head-)hair’ OGI 311a); *yawai_san* ‘soft’ < **jawa_rasan* (cf. NOK *yafa_rasan*, ‘soft; (body) is weak’ OGI 274a); *waibi* ‘child’ < **war_abe* (cf. NOK *war_abi*, ‘child’ OGI 591b) (Tsuchiko 2003: 132–135)

Tsuchiko mentions a correspondence between Torishima *yu* and J *ro, ru* and in addition notes that some examples go on to *i*, such as *yui* ‘night’ [cf. J *yoru*], *dui* ‘mud’ [cf. J *doro*], *kuima* ‘cart’ [cf. J *kuruma*], *fukui* ‘bag’ [cf. J *fukuro*]. Examples of **aru* and **aro* lenitions to *au* are:

- (11) Tr *hau* ‘farmland’ :: Sr *haru* ‘(id.)’ < **paru*
 (12) Tr *mau* ‘circle’ :: Sr *maru* ‘(id.)’ < **maru*

Nohara (1986) gives one phonological stretch, a sentence, that has two different meanings, presumably requiring context to be disambiguated. The first meaning is a strong assertion of the truth of the content of the sentence. The second meaning is a hedge, suggesting that something may be so, but not laying claim to the proposition. The reason that these two meanings exist for the same phonological stretch is that the final syllables, having once been different, and having once carried the difference in meaning, have collapsed into one: **Vru* ↔ **Vra* > *Vi*. The reconstructions are ours.

- (13) *na-i-ru s-u-i* (‘deki-zo s-ur-u’ [*sic*]; ‘s/he will indeed be able to do it’)
 [< **nar-yi-do s-y-or-u*] (346)
 (14) *na-i-ru s-u-i* (‘deki-ru dar-ō’; ‘s/he should be able to do it’)
 [**nar-y-o-do s-y-or-a*; cf. NOK *na-i/ru-ru haz_yi*] (352)

In §2.1, it was pointed out that **-ga* eventually moved to the sentence-final position. Unexpectedly, however, in Torishima, what appears in that position are *-ya/-wa* and *-syee*, which resemble Proto-Japonic yes/no question particle **-ya*, rather than the expected *-ga* as in (15). Note that (15c) might also, and perhaps more literally, be translated by どうして子供泣かすのか ‘Why is it that you make the children cry?’, with an extended predicate construction to fit its sentence-final nominalizer plus question particle.

- (15) a. *maa-ya*, *nuu-wa*, *tai-ya*, *ʔiku-cyi-ya*, *ʔicyi-ya*
 どこか 何か 誰か いくつか いつか
 where-QP what-QP who-QP how.many-QP when-QP
 Where? What? Who? How many? When?
- b. *cyassa-bikee-ya*
 いくらぐらいか
 how.much-about-QP
 ‘How much is it?’
- c. *nuuwa k’wa nak-as-u-sye-e*
 why child cry-CAUS-ART-NOM-QP
 どうして 子供 泣かす[の]か (「の」 added by S&S)
 ‘Why do you make the children cry?’ (Nohara 1986: 130)

These *-ya/-wa* were surely derived historically from *lkal* by **k/*g* lenition as in (16).

(16) Allomorphic derivation

- *-ga* > **-ya* / V____
**-ya* > *-wa* / [+back]____
 > *-ya* / [-back]____
-si^{NOM}-ya > *-sye-e*

The velar lenitions are supported by evidence from liquid lenitions such as (10) and (11) above.

2.3. Why is the sentence-final *-ga* voiced in the case of *wh*-questions?

In some varieties of Ryukyuan, the sentence-final question particle originating from PR **-ka* has split into two phonemically different forms, the voiceless *-ka* and the voiced *-ga*. This was not mentioned in the S&S hypothesis, as it was based on Shuri/Naha Okinawan. Such varieties include Inokawa, Asama, Benoki, and Kanna.¹⁷⁾ In Inokawa, spoken in eastern Tokunoshima island, yes/no questions utilize voiceless *-ka*, as in *ʔa-mu-ka* (17a), while *wh*-questions utilize voiced *-ga*, as in *s-y-u-N-ga* (17b).

- (17) a. *wunagu ʔatima s-aar-u-N-mun yinga-nu s-aar-an kutu-nu ʔa-mu-ka*
 女 さえ 出来るのに 男が 出来ないことが あるか
 ‘If even women can do it, is it (the case) that men can’t do it?’
- b. *ku-N ʔyuu-ya ʔyikya-sa s-y-u-N-ga*
 この 魚は いくら するか
 ‘How much does this fish cost?’ (Inokawa, Nohara 1986: 208)

This distinction has been noted in previous studies, but to our knowledge no explanation for this phonological contrast has been offered.

In the S&S hypothesis, the sentence-final particle (**ka*) was viewed as having shifted from the sentence-medial KP (**ka*). Thus, the PJ form of this particle was hypothesized to be **ka*. With the starting point as this voiceless *ka*, we offer the following account to explain the *ka/ga* split on phonological grounds: in the case of yes/no questions, no nasal reduction occurred to the nasal segment of the reconstructed RT form #ʔar-wo#mō[nō]# ‘exist-RT#object#’ as in (18a),¹⁸⁾ while in *wh*-questions, nasal reduction did occur, losing the vowel of the morpheme, *no*, and subsequently, the nasal *ŋ* (< **nu* < **no*) voiced the following velar *k*, yielding *ga*.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(18) (a) yes/no Q:
 *#ʔar_{·exist-1'}-wo_{RT}#mō[nō]_{thing}#ka#
 *#ʔar-wo#mō#ka
 *#ʔar-u#mo#ka#
 *#ʔan-mu_{RT1}#ka#
 #ʔa-mu#ka#
 [same]</p> | <p>(b) <i>wh</i>-Q:
 *#s_{do'}-yi_{RY}#wor_{·exist-2'}-wo_{RT}#nō_{NOM}#ka#
 *#s-yi#wor-wo#nō#ka#
 *#s-y-ur-u#no#ka#
 *#s-y-u-nu_{RT2}#ka#
 *#s-y-u-N#ka#
 #s-y-u-N#ga#</p> |
|---|---|

In *this* dialect, at least, the most straightforward hypothesis is to reconstruct the same **no* that underlies the normal RT (not the RT that is used in KM constructions). This is what one would expect in the case of a *wh*-question. RT inflection is suitable for *wh*-questions or lkal-type KM because it is presuppositional, referential, and established. The focus that these questions place is only possible against a backdrop of presupposition. This point has been succinctly stated by Quinn (2001: 309) as below:

. . . when asking *ta(re)* ‘who’, *idure* ‘which’, *iduko* ‘where’ and the like, one presupposes a background against which each of these requests for identification makes sense. Asking ‘Who goes there?’ entails the assumption that someone ‘goes there’, . . .

In Inokawa, obviously, both endings before *ka* had a nominal element: (a) has *lmonol* and (b) has *lnol*. Therefore, at first glance, they do both seem to form nominalized clauses. However, the grammaticalized verb form (a) is now SS, and (b) is RT2 (RT1 corresponds to KP lkal-forming KM). Thus, the form (a) is no longer felt to be a nominalized form. Probably due to that fact, RT2 was chosen for the *wh*-questions.

Although the allomorphy of the sentence-final **ka* was not part of the S&S hypothesis, by including the additional morpheme in the case of *wh*-questions, the puzzle of the Inokawa case is thus accounted for, and the S&S hypothesis is sustained. Phonologically, it is much more plausible to posit a change **ka* > **ga*, than the other way around.

2.4. Nakijin *k'usyee*

Another challenge to the S&S hypothesis comes from the particle *k'usyee* [k^hɥ_hʃe:] of Nakijin dialect of northern Okinawa as in (19), since it has been considered by some scholars as a cognate to the OJ KP *kösö* (i.e., lkosol). The S&S hypothesis states that the

OOK cognate to OJ KP *l*kosol is *-si ~ -syu* (i.e., *lsul*; Shinzato and Serafim 2013: 129–133), and it has gone out of use in the present-day Ryukyuan dialects. Some scholars (e.g. Hirayama et al., vol. 3 (1992: 1913)) cast doubt on the cognation of *k'usyee* to *l*kosol, while others (Nakasone 1983, Uchima 1994) see a link. For the latter, the association is probably based on its phonetic similarity and its functional similarity of forming a KM-like agreement pattern where *k'usyee* obligatorily calls for the ending to be other than a finite form, in this case, MZ as below.

- (19) *ʔuyaa-nu-k'usyee wahaar-ur-aa*
 parent(s)-SUB-KP know-SE-IA
 ‘oya-no-koso waku de arō’ [Uchima’s Jp translation]
 ‘Surely the parents must know.’ (Uchima 1994, citing *Nakijin Hōgen Jiten*)

However, as argued in detail in S&S (2013: 129–133), we dispute the cognation of *Nakijin k'usyee* with *l*kosol. First, the form *k'usyee* does not agree with IZ, unlike its alleged counterpart, OJ *l*kosol. Uchima attempts to save the *k'usyee* cognate hypothesis as follows: he hypothesizes that the inferential auxiliary ending in *-a* once had the IZ form, that is, **am-e*, but that **. . . m-e* was dropped, reconfiguring the IZ *musubi* into a new MZ *musubi*, as below:

- (20) **-am_{IA}-e_{IZ} > -a_{MZ}*

However, we find no independent evidence for such a change. It certainly is true that **me* **[mɛ]* ought to yield **mi* **[mɪ]* through raising, as shown in (21); but that vowel, **i* **[ɪ]*, is lax, ie, not **yi* **[ji]*, a strongly fronted and palatal one, and this fact prevents the absorption of **i* **[ɪ]* by the preceding **m*.

- (21) **mey* **[mɛɪ]* (type-B vowel in PJ) > **me* **[mɛ]* > **mi* **[mɪ]* (*not* **myi* **[mʲi]*) > *mi* *[mʲi]*

OS data corroborate this view, showing *lsul* KM frequently correlating with the inferential in IZ: *am-i* < **ame*. There is only one example of *lsul* correlating with a bare MZ, out of around 269 examples of *lsul*-type KM in the OS (Uchima 1994: 101). Thus, there is no convincing argument available as to why *k'usyee* all of a sudden abandoned the agreement with regular IZ. In addition, there is also a syntactic difference between OOK *lsul* and *Nakijin k'usyee*. Unlike *lsul*, *k'usyee* does not *replace* a subject/object-marking case particle, but rather *appends* to it. Thus the likelihood that the *. . . m-* of the IA and IZ *-i*—i.e., *. . . m-i*—were dropped is quite low.

The *Nakijin* KP *k'usyee* is not a reflex of PJ **kō#swo*, but rather, probably, of **ko* ‘this’ + **saye* ‘at least, even’.¹⁹ Then how did the *Nakijin* KP *k'usyee* establish itself as a KP? Our best guess is that it was introduced into the existing *l*gal KM environment as an

alternative to express strong assertion, just as usages with OJ *lyal* spread into the former territory of OJ *lkal* (Nomura 2002: 32–5). Consistent with the division of labor seen between OJ *lyal*, expressing the speaker’s certainty, as opposed to *lkal*, which indicates his uncertainty (Ohno 1993), Nakijin KP *k’usyee* and KP *ga* show a similar epistemic division: with the new KP *k’usyee* expressing certainty, while the pre-existing KP *ga* continues to indicate uncertainty.

3. Contributions of OOk KM studies to Japanese KM studies

3.1. Two OJ KM groups emerge from a comparison with OOk KM constructions

OJ has 5 KPs: *lzol*, *lnamul*, *lyal*, *lkal*, and *lkosol*. OOk has 3 KPs. When they are compared, an interesting division emerges as in (14).

(22) Two groups:²⁰⁾

	OJ	OOk	
Group I:	<i>lkosol</i>	<i>lsul</i>	(< * <i>kö#swo</i>) ²¹⁾ ← Proximal
	<i>lzol</i>	<i>ldol</i>	(< * <i>työ</i>) ← Mesial
	<i>lkal</i>	<i>lgal</i>	(< * <i>ka</i>) ← Distal
Group II:	<i>lyal</i>	∅	
	<i>lnamul</i>	∅	

Group I KPs have realizations in both lineages, while Group II KPs do not. For instance, OJ *lkosol* has its counterpart *lsul* in OOk, while OJ *lnamul* has no corresponding KP in OOk. Furthermore, horizontally aligned KPs in Group I are derived from the same etymon, namely the proximal, mesial, and distal demonstratives (e.g., the OJ *lkal* and OOk *lgal* pair originating in the distal demonstrative PJ **ka*—cf. S&S 2013). This division is in line with the view that Group I has a narrow focus, while Group II has a broad (sentence) focus.

This division is useful in corroborating the different developmental paths of OJ *lyal* and *lkal*, both of which are question-forming KPs. For instance, OJ KP *lyal* started in the sentence-final position and moved its way into the sentence-medial position by analogy with *lkal* (Nomura 2002: 32–5; see also Omodaka 1941).²²⁾ The different group membership of *lkal* and *lyal* (Group I vs. Group II) and the existence of *lyal* in OOk not as a sentence-medial KP, but as a sentence-final particle (pre-OOk **-ye*) support a generally held view in the Japanese scholarship that OJ *lkal* and *lyal* might have come about from/through different developmental paths, only one of them deictic. As for the lack of an OJ *lnamul* counterpart in OOk, it is also in accord with the general observation that *lnamul* has a collocational affinity with the nominalizer *lakul*, i.e., . . . *-namu* . . . *-aku*. As it turns out, and not surprisingly, OOk lacks not only *lnamul*, but *lakul* as well.

3.2. New etymology of Ikosol postulated based on a comparison with equivalent OOk KM

In Ryukyuan linguistics, the cognation of OJ Ikosol and OOk Isul as in (23) and (24) are assumed for their agreement patterns with IZ and their semantic parallel of forming a strong assertion (Uchima 1994, Mamiya 2005). However, the challenge was how to resolve phonological incongruities between the two KPs. In S&S 2013, a full treatment of phonological incongruities of OJ and OOk forms is offered, in turn making it possible to view OJ Ikosol in new light.

- (23) 和礼許曾 末加米
 ware-**kösö** mak-am-ey
 I-KP use.as.a.pillow-IA-IZ
 ‘It is I who will use (it) as a pillow.’ (MYS 5: 857)
- (24) はつにしやす まちよたれ
 faci-nyisya-**si** mac-y-u-tar-**i**
 first-north.wind-KP await-RY-SE-PS-IZ
 おきとはす まちよたれ
 ?ukyi.tuba-**si** mac-y-u-tar-**i**
 north.wind-KP await-RY-SE-PST-IZ
 ‘It was the first north wind itself that we awaited. It was the north wind itself that we awaited.’ (OS 13: 899)

In *kokugogaku*, the consensus is that OJ *kösö* is the combination of the proximal deictic *kö* + the mesial deictic *sö* (Ohno 1993, *inter alia*). Given the OJ data (*Man’yō-shū*) alone, this conclusion would seem valid, as *man’yō-gana* clearly point to both vowels as Type B (*otsu*) vowels. However, when OJ Ikosol is placed in a comparative perspective with OOk Isul as in (25a), it casts doubt on the OJ-based etymon and necessitates its revision as in (25b), that is, the proximal deictic *kö* + noun ‘thing’.²³ Furthermore, OOk data show that the PJ vowel coloring of Ikosol must be **kö#swo*, with the second-syllable vowel as Type A (甲), not the heretofore supposed Type B (乙).

- (25) a. Hypothesis of origin of OOk Isul:
 Isul ← **kö#swo* < PJ **kö#swo* = ‘proximal deictic’ + Noun ‘thing’ (S&S 2013: 158)
- b. Two hypotheses of origin of OJ Ikosol:
 OJ Ikosol = *-kösö* ← **kö#swo* ‘proximal deictic’ + ‘thing_{Noun}’ (S&S 2013: 163)
 = proximal *kö* + mesial *sö* (Ohno 1993: 120–121, Sakakura 1993)

S&S (2013: 158) hypothesized as in (26) that the Japanese lineage fused the compound by deleting the internal word boundary, causing Arisaka’s First Law (1963 [1934];

“Ari1” below), a constraint that prohibits type-A (*)*wo* and type-B (*)*ö* in the same morpheme, to change **kö#swo* instantaneously into the attested OJ *-kösö*, i.e., B#A > BA^{Ari1} → BB. The loss of the boundary is due to a lexicalization of the two morphs into one new morpheme, where the two-morpheme sequence has already acquired a new, *kakari*, function; the lexicalization comes after the grammaticalization creating this particular * . . . *-kö#swo* . . . *-ëiz* KM construction.

- (26) a. **kö* ‘(proximal deictic)’ + **swo* ‘(nominalizer)’ →
 **kö#swo* ‘this (very) one’ →
 kösö ‘(KP)’

Here as well, the data from OOk KM prove to be indispensable for seeing the holistic picture of the Proto-Japonic (PJ) progenitor of this KP.

3.3. Functional continuity from KM to *-no-da* in the Japanese lineage reinforced by a comparison with OOk KM constructions

It is generally assumed that OJ KM has been functionally transferred to NJ *-no-da* (Funaki 1987: 302; Kushima 1989: 43; Shinzato 1998: 213; Schaffar 2002: 328; Oki 2010). In KM constructions, KP may attach to a sentence-medial word or phrase, or it may append to a predicate at the end. In the former case, KP takes a narrow focus, while in the latter case, it makes a wide focus placing the entire sentence in its scope. Regarding the latter case, Sakakura (1993: 226) sees that *lzol* and *lnamul*, especially in the collocations . . . *-namu* . . . *-keru* ‘PERFECT’ or . . . *-namu* . . . *-taru* ‘PERFECT’, are used in comment-/explanation-making, for which *-no-da* is suited as a translation, as in (27b).

- (27) a. この いまの 妻は 富たつ
 kono ima-no me-fa tom-i-tat-u
 this now-GEN wife-TOP be.wealthy-RY-(intensifier)-RT
 女になむ ありける
 wonna-n-i-namu ar-i-ker-u
 woman-COP-RY-KP SE-RY-PRFT-RT
 ‘This new wife, she was indeed a very wealthy woman.’ (*Yamato Monogatari* 149, in Sakakura 1957: 320)
- b. この新しい妻というのは、 金持ちの 女だったのだ
 kono atarasyii cuma to iu-no-wa, kanemocyi-no onna-dat-ta-no-da.
 this new wife QT say-NOM-TOP rich-APP woman-COP-PST-NOM-COP
 ‘This new wife, she was a wealthy woman.’ (Sakakura 1993: 226)

The close relationship of KM and *-no-da* can also be reinforced if Ok KM data are brought into the picture. Examples (28) and (29) show mutual translatability of Jp *-no-da* and Ok KM.

- (28) J: ik-u-N-**da!**
 go-SS-NOM-COP
 ‘Hey, go out, you!’ / ‘So, go, already!’ / ‘(It’s better) you go.’
 Ok: ʔic-yi-**du** s-u-**ru**
 go-RY-KP DV-SE-RT
- (29) J: kawaii de.wa nee. kawaiiso da to itta-N-**da**
 cute COP not pitiful be QT said-NOM-COP
 ‘It’s not ‘cute’. It’s that I said ‘pitiful’.’ (*Shunshoku Ume Goyomi*, in Nakamura 1962: 56)
 Ok: cyimuganasan-ya ʔar-an, cyimugurisan di-**du** ʔi-cyar-**u**.
 be.cute-COP SE-NEG be.pitiful QT-KP say-PST-RT

(29J) is an excerpt from *Shunshoku Ume Goyomi*, a novel in the Edo-period vernacular, during which the use of *-no-da* sees a robust increase (Uji’ie 1992: 562). “Ok” is the Okinawan-language equivalent. Note the use of KM in Okinawan where the Japanese uses *-N-da*. Okinawan has no *lno-dal* construction.

Ok also has a line in a theatrical text, *Oka no Ipponmatsu* (30 below), which structurally resembles (29J). Prior to (30), the speaker is accused of using a disrespectful word, *fun* ‘hmp!’ , with “what do you mean by ‘*fun*’?” to which the speaker responds with the statement below. In both (29J) and (30) the first sentence negates the addressee’s expectation, and then offers an alternative as explanation. Although more research will be needed, this type of contrastive context (i.e., ~A, but B) may have been a trigger for the development of *-no-da*.

- (30) nuu-N ʔar-an. hana-nkayi²⁴ haabeeruu-nu tuma-too-ta-gutu,
 anything-TOP COP-NEG nose-on butterfly-SUB alight-IMPV-PST-because
 fun ri²⁵ ʔyi-cyi, ʔwii-hoo-yi-**ru** s-ar-**u**.
 hmp! QT say-ing chase-repel-RY-KP DV-PST-RT
 ‘It’s nothing. It’s that I repelled a butterfly, because it had alighted on my nose, saying “hmp!”’ (*Oka no Ipponmatsu*, in Hateruma, et al. 2003: 106)

The above examples show rough functional equivalency of *-no-da* and KM as predicted from the cited *kokugogaku* studies. To push such similarity further, there is the fact that NOk has not yet developed a structural parallel to *-no-da* (Shinzato 2011). The Ok morphological counterpart of *-no-da* is *-syi yan* ‘-*syi*_{nom} + cop’, but *-syi* and *yan* are not quite yet grammaticalized, and *-syi* still has only a referential meaning ‘one’ as in (31) (S&S 2013: 220–221). Here the referential meaning of *-syi* is more and more bleached from (a) to (d), and (31d) comes closest to *-no-da*, but only with the help of the sentence-final particle *doo*, and more likely with the omission of *yan*. S&S (2013: 221) report that in their recorded data of spoken natural conversation of 52 minutes, there was not a single instance of *-syi yan*, though *-syi* itself appeared 106 times either as a pronominal or a

nominalizer. They also add that the same result was obtained in their examination of the conversation transcription done by Izuyama (2006). This also vouches for the underdevelopment of *-syi yan* as a *-no-da* type construction. According to S&S (2013), the complementary distribution of KM and *-no-da* is seen with other dialects as well.

- (31) a. *ʔuree cyuu cyika-yi-syi yan.*
 that.TOP today use-APO-NOM COP
 ‘That’s the one that I’ll use today’
- b. *kunu zyinoo cyuu cyika-yi-syi yan.*
 this money.TOP today use-APO-NOM COP
 ‘This money is the one for me to use today (vis-à-vis the one not to use) / This money is to be used today.’
- c. *zyin di-syee (← -syi+ya) cyika-yi-syiyan, tami-(y)i-syee ʔar-an.*
 money QT-NOM.TOP use-APO-NOMCOP save-APO-NOM.COP STAT-NEG
 ‘Money is something that we should use, not something we should save.’
- d. *nama zyin cyika-yi-syi (yan) doo.*
 now money use-APO-NOM(cop) SKP
 ‘(The situation) is that the money is to be used now, I tell you. → It’s that you should use the money now!’

To recapitulate, the foregoing discussion points out the complementary distribution of KM and *-no-da*, which in turn, also strengthen the view of functional transfer from OJ KM to NJ *-no-da*, as has been argued in Japanese scholarship.

4. Contribution of OOk KM studies to theories of grammaticalization

Building on §3.1, this section places the development of demonstratives into focus particles in the larger context of grammaticalization. The term *grammaticalization* is generally defined as follows:

“Grammaticalization . . . is the process whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions.” (Hopper and Traugott, 1993, p. xv)

With such a definition as a backdrop, Diessel (1999: 8–9) states that demonstratives form a *special* class because they are not *derived* from *lexical* items, but rather *started* as *grammatical* items, which exist in the basic vocabulary of every language. Further, demonstratives also grammaticalize and develop new functions. Heine and Kuteva (2002) and Diessel (1999) recognize a common path of grammaticalization as shown in (32):

- (32) a. DEMONSTRATIVE > PERSONAL-PRONOUN > COPULA > FOCUS . . .
 (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 111)

b. IDENT DEM²⁶⁾ > (COPULA)²⁷⁾ > FOCUS MARKER (Diessel 1999: 148)

Such a path can be exemplified from the world languages as below (Heine and Kuteva (2002: 95–96):

- (33) a. French *c'est* 'it is' > Haitian French-based creole *se*, focus marker
 b. Paiamentu Spanish-based creole *ta*, copula > focus marker
 c. Chinese *shi* (是): demonstrative > copula > focus marker

Going back to the OOk and OJ KM cases, what is unique about them is that multiple demonstratives in one language, Proto-Japonic, developed into focus particles.²⁸⁾ What is more, they grammaticalized in a way that preserved and faithfully transferred their source spatial relationships as demonstratives into the newly grammaticalized forms, as in (34).

- | | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|
| (34) proximal | lkosol/lsul | assertion (certainty) |
| ⋮ | ⋮ | ⋮ |
| distal | lkal/lgal | question/doubt (uncertainty) |

For instance, a short spatial distance (e.g., proximal) was conceptually transferred as a short psychological distance. This short psychological distance can be translated into the speaker's certainty, in accord with the cognitive principles in (35). If one feels close to a perceived event/situation emotionally, it is easier for one to vouch for its validity. It is of note that both of these distances are measured from the same deictic center (Büler, K. (1982 [1934])).

- (35) a. What is near the scene is considered subjectively more certain than what is away from the scene. (Givón 1982: 44)
 b. We are cognitively committed to what is proximal and physically verifiable and we conceptualize these entities and events as constituting our actuality; we are much less committed to the actuality of that which is distant and not physically verifiable. In view of the foregoing we suggest that actuality is elaborated at the conceptual level in terms of content pertaining to that which is physically proximal to the experiencer. (Tyler and Evans (2001: 85).

The correspondences in (34) also show that the selection of demonstrative-based KPs is not random, but rather, iconicity-based. In *kokugogaku* scholarship, research has been devoted mostly to the origins of KM (cf. endnote 8), but very little attention has been paid to the particular combinations of KPs and *musubi* and to the illocution (assertion or question) that they express. The iconicity involved in such combinations becomes possible to see when OJ and OOk KMs are examined in a comparative perspective.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented how studies of OOk KM have far-reaching impact on comparative/historical linguistics, not only with Ryukyuan varieties but also with OJ and ultimately PJ. We also touched upon their potential benefits in providing useful data for generative studies of KM, especially with regard to Q-movement (endnote 7).

In regard to Ryukyuan linguistics, we have illustrated how the S&S hypotheses could be tested against the existing data in other Ryukyuan varieties. At the same time, we have also shown the merit of the S&S hypotheses in tackling issues not yet fully explained or resolved previously. We have dealt with lkal-type KMs in Torishima, the allomorphy of the sentence-final lkal particle in Inokawa, and Nakijin KP *k'usyee*. With regard to OJ KM, we discussed the usefulness of OOk KM in identifying two basic groups in the OJ KM system, in revising the OJ etymon for KP lkosol, and in providing additional support for the functional transfer from OJ KM to NJ *-no-da*. In the bigger context of grammaticalization, we have pointed out that OOk KM constructions are significant for deepening understanding of the development of demonstratives into focus particles.

The KM constructions died out in Japanese, but one of them is still preserved in its sister language, Okinawan. Studies of Okinawan *kakari musubi* have been undertaken mostly at a descriptive level and have seldom been an object of serious contrastive analyses in mainstream Japanese linguistics, with the important exceptions of Shimoji (2011) and Davis (2015). It is hoped that this paper will stimulate future comparative KM studies within Ryukyuan varieties, and with Japanese and other languages, and subsequently advance this field with new findings and hypotheses, which in turn would make further contribution to other languages.

Abbreviations

*A (A is a reconstruction);	A → B (A is transformed into B by means other than phonological or morphophonemic);	MZ (<i>mizen</i> , irrealis);
-GEN (genitive);	B < A (B comes from A by regular phonological or morphophonemic change);	MZ/IA (<i>mizen</i> /inferential.auxiliary);
-IZ (<i>izen(-kei)</i> ; realis);	DV- (dummy verb);	NJ (Modern Japanese);
-IZ/MR (an identical form, indeterminate between <i>realis</i> and imperative function);	EX- (exalting prefix);	NOM (nominalizer);
-PST- (past; <i>-tar-</i>);	IDENT DEM (identificational demonstratives);	NOK (Modern Okinawan);
-RSLT (resultative; <i>-cyee</i>);	KM (<i>kakari musubi</i>);	OGJ (<i>Okinawa-go Jiten</i>);
-RT (<i>rentai(kei)</i> , adnominal);	KP (<i>kakari</i> particles);	OJ (Old Japanese);
-RY (<i>ren'yō(kei)</i> , adverbial);	MJ (Middle Japanese);	OOK (Old Okinawan);
-SE- (stative extension; <i>-u-</i>);	MR (<i>meirei</i> , imperative);	OS (<i>Omoro Sōshi</i>);
-TOP (topic);	MYS (<i>Man'yō-shū</i>);	PJ (Proto-Japonic);
A > B (A changes to B by regular phonological or morphophonemic change);		PR (Proto-Ryukyuan);
		Q (question morpheme <i>də</i> of Sinhala);
		RT (<i>rentai</i> , adnominal);

RT1, RT2 (RT subtypes in some varieties of Ryukyuan);	yes/no Q (yes/no Question);	-APP (appositive; NJ <i>-no</i>);
SE (stative extension, <i>-ur-</i> or <i>-ar-</i>);	lAl (“A” is given as a cover term for many variant morphs in different dialects or periods);	-ART (abbreviated <i>rentai</i>);
SKP (sentence KP; NOK <i>doo</i>);	~A (“not A”);	-COP- (copula; MJ <i>-n-</i> ; NJ <i>-da(t-), de.wa</i>);
SS (<i>shūshi(-kei)</i> ; sentence-ending form);	-GEN- (genitive; J <i>-no</i>);	-IA- (inferential auxiliary);
Sr (Shuri);	-PS- (past; <i>-tar-</i>);	-IMPFV- (imperfective; NOK <i>-too-</i>);
Tr (Torishima);	ö (Type-B “oh” in earlier Japonic, including, most famously, OJ; either [ə] or [o], contrasting with Type-A “oh”, which is either [o] or [ʊo], respectively);	-NOM- (nominalizer; NJ <i>-no(-, -N-)</i>);
V (vowel);	[ʔ] (glottal stop);	-PST (past; <i>-cya(r)-</i>);
[sic] (exactly copied from a quoted text);	[ʃ] (voiceless post-alveolar sibilant);	-QT (quotative; J <i>to</i> ; NOK <i>-di- ~ -ri</i>);
[kʰ] (aspirated [k]);	[:] (indicates lengthening of preceding vowel);	-SE- (stative extension);
[ʉ] (devoiced [u]);	-APO- (apocopated form; NOK <i>-yi- ← -yu-</i>);	-SUB (subject enclitic; NOK <i>-mu</i>);
<i>wh</i> -Q (<i>wh</i> -Question);		-TOP (topic; NOK <i>-N</i> ; cf. NJ <i>-mo</i> ; MJ <i>-fa</i>);
<i>wh</i> -question (a question utilizing an information-question word, such as <i>why</i> or <i>naze</i>);		‘(id.)’ (meaning identical to the preceding);
^x A (A is not in evidence or is not allowed);		

Notes

- 0) A complete list of abbreviations is given just above this note.
- 1) “Old Okinawan” refers to the language of, e.g., the *Omorō Sōshi*. It was compiled between 1531 and 1623, but is said to represent language as far back as the 12th century (Hokama & Saigō 1972: 527).
- 2) KP *-syu* [ʃu] is a progressively palatalized allomorph of *-si* [si]. Progressive Palatalization is triggered by a preceding *yi* [ʲi] vowel, like the *yi* in *ʔu-zasyi* [ʔuzaʃʲi] in (2). Readers may notice that this did not happen with <o gi ya ka mo i su>, although it appears also to have *yi*. This is due to the fact that the preceding vowel is not a monophthong *yi* but actually part of a diphthong (*uyi* → *wii*, monophthongized to *ii* after a labial: *ʔu-gyaka-mii-si*, thus preventing the progressive palatalization. A full discussion of the interaction of this particle with PP is available in S&S 2013: 136–137, 150–155.
- 3) Due to the merger of *izen* (IZ, realis) and *meirei* (MR, imperative) by the time of the promulgation of the first volume of the *Omorō Sōshi*, some *omoro* songs allow two interpretations as shown here. These two interpretations are semantically similar as they denote the certainty that the described state (i.e., King Shō Shin’s lasting reign) will come to pass. See Uchima (1994: 100–101).
- 4) In the framework of generative grammar, Whitman (1997: 162) interprets the agreement patterns of *kakari musubi* in terms of scope relationship as follows:
 - a. The KM particle designates the scope-bearing constituent (the K-marked element) in a SCOPED (focus, interrogative) construction.
 - b. The K-marked element is contained in a clause whose predicate (the M-marked predicate) takes a nominalizing ending.
 - c. The M-marked predicate indicates the scope of the K-marked element.
 - d. There are locality restrictions on the relationship between the K-marked element and the M-marked predicate.
- 5) Indeed, in September 2015 an international workshop was convened at the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL, 国立国語研究所) by Kinsui Satoshi, John Whitman, Edith Aldridge, and Nagasaki Iku, representing a broad spectrum of linguistic theoretical stance and interest, to present and discuss papers on all aspects of KM and KM-like constructions.
- 6) At the same workshop (cf. footnote 5), more languages with KM or KM-like structures were presented, including Kolyma Yukaghir, spoken in Northeast Siberia, Silammon, spoken on the Northwest Coast of

North America, and Turkish.

- 7) For instance, according to Hagstrom (1998: 20), Sinhala has the following syntactic phenomena, which are comparable to Old Japanese and Okinawan KM:

(i) *gunəpaalə sinduvak kivva.*
 Gunapala a.song sang
 ‘Gunapala sang a song.’ (Sumangala 1991: 230)

(ii) *Siri mokak də keruwe?*
 Siri what Q did-E
 ‘What did Siri do?’ (Gair & Sumangala 1991: 93)

He states that declarative sentences regularly end with a verb-final *a* as in (i), but when the ‘Q’ morpheme *də* is attached to a *wh*-word, as in *mokak də* ‘what Q’, the verb takes the *e*-ending instead. In a generative framework, he analyzes this phenomenon as a movement of Q. Similarly, Watanabe (2002), based on word order data in Old Japanese, hypothesizes movement to explain the facts of KM. Wrona (2010) criticizes Watanabe’s arguments because his data are not based solely on phonographically written examples but include logographically written ones as well. If only phonographic examples are included, Wrona claims that there is no statistically significant basis to sustain Watanabe’s hypothesis. Indeed, he goes so far as to assert that KM does not involve any movement. Miyara (2001) is also a study addressing movement issues, in that case by including examples of Shuri Okinawa KM. The interested reader may follow up by reading the cited studies.

- 8) Currently, there are four major hypotheses: the inversion hypothesis (Ohno 1993); the insertion hypothesis (Sakakura 1993); the *chūshaku-gata* “commentary” biclausal hypothesis (Nomura 1995); and the afterthought biclausal hypothesis (Quinn 1997). It is no coincidence that the biclausal hypotheses bear much similarity to Harris (2001)’s hypothesis on the origin of clefts.
- 9) This section comes from our unpublished presentation entitled “An Overview of *Kakari Musubi* Constructions in Ryukyuan,” given at the UCLA Workshop on Ryukyuan Languages and Linguistic Research on October 23–5, 2009.
- 10) This hypothesis and the discussion in 2.4 also appeared in Japanese as Shinzato and Serafim (2012).
- 11) Uchima (1994: 181–194) also recognizes two agreement patterns as shown here. However, he treats Type II here as “the norm” (*seikaku* 正格) and Type I as “irregular, ie, contrary to the norm” (*hakaku* 破格). According to Uchima (1994: 188), there are 12 examples of lgal-type KM in *Omoro sōshi*, seven of which are Type I and five of which are Type II.
- 12) Consistent with a general shift that also occurred in Middle Japanese language history, KP *-ga* of Type II had shifted to the sentence-final position almost completely by the time of the *kumiodori*. For KP *-ga* in Modern Okinawan, see Handa (1999: 141–142).
- 13) There are two MZ forms in OOk: one with the stative extension, *-ur-* (*?uc-y-ur-a* ‘is probably striking it’), and one without it (*?ut-a* ‘let me/us strike it’). The one that agrees with KP lgal is the former. For more discussion of this, see S&S 2013: 57–58.
- 14) Torishima is a dialect spoken in a village on Kume Island, west of Okinawa proper. However, it is known that the residents of Iō Torishima (of the Amami region, north of Okinawa proper) emigrated to the new Torishima on Kume between 1903 and 1959. It is thus classified as a dialect of the Amami group.
- 15) All examples taken from other sources have been adapted to our own romanization scheme.
- 16) Both probably originally from *kara-kara*, a Kagoshima regionalism equivalent to the submeaning of standard *chōshi*, referring to a one- or two-spouted vessel with a long handle for pouring sake. It must have been borrowed into Ryukyuan after 1609, the date of the Satsuma invasion, so the change happened no more than 400 years ago and surely much more recently than that.
- 17) The Inokawa and Asama dialects are spoken in the Amami islands. The Benoki and Kanna dialects are spoken in the Northern and Middle regions of the Okinawa main island.
- 18) Elsewhere, reduction of **mōnō* always left the first vowel intact, as *u*, so the influence from other **mōnō* grammaticalizations where the first mora turned out to be *mu* . . . , while admittedly not a phonological process, nevertheless must have helped the vowel not to disappear. Such an explanation, however, will not work for most dialects, and indeed, even in the case of Inokawa, this case with following *-ka* is

exceptional.

- 19) As pointed out by Alexander Vovin (pc, 9/18/2012), extremely limited geographic distribution of *k'usyee* even in the Ryukyuan dialects serves to bolster our hypothesis that *k'usyee* is not a cognate either of OOK *lsul* or of OJ *lkosol*.
- 20) At an individual KP level (Fujitani 1960 [1778], Ōno 1978, Ohno 1993, Sakakura 1993), their etyma have been suggested sporadically but never presented as a structurally significant dichotomy.
- 21) There is *lil* KM which does not have a cognate in OJ but is also hypothesized to be demonstrative-based. For more on this, see Serafim (2015).
- 22) This exists as a sentence-final question particle but not as a KP throughout the Ryukyus, as far as we know (thus PR *-*ye*). This fact lends support to Nomura's movement hypothesis.
- 23) This etymology for OJ was first mentioned in Thorpe (1983: 242–243), but he did not connect OOK *lsul* to OJ *lkosol*; instead he cited Hokama's linkage with OJ *lsol* (151). A fuller treatment of OOK *lsul* as a cognate to OJ *lkosol* was presented in Serafim and Shinzato (2005). They have substantiated this etymon on various grounds, such as a) the spelling in *Omorō Sōshi*; b) the *Konkō Kenshū* account pointing to the etymon of *lsul* as a nominalizer (Hokama 1970); c) evidence from the grammaticalization patterns of demonstratives from the world languages; and d) the psycholinguistic concept of "joint attention" (Diessel 2006).
- 24) Both in Ok and in Jp, *hana* can mean either 'nose' or 'flower'.
- 25) In Ok, the phonemes /d/ and /r/ have merged in some dialects, and [r] is also a common variant of [d] in rapid or careless speech in most dialects.
- 26) Diessel (1999: 147) distinguishes demonstrative pronouns from identificational demonstratives: the former is a complex free form while the latter is a monosyllabic enclitic.
- 27) Diessel (1999: 148) notes that the intermediate stage of copula is not obligatory.
- 28) Besides these two languages, to our knowledge, *Ambulas*, one of the Ndu languages, which in turn are a subset of the Sepik languages spoken in northern Papua New Guinea, is the only other language in which multiple demonstratives are grammaticalized as focus markers. For details, see Wilson (1980) and Serafim and Shinzato (2011).

References

- Arisaka, H. (1957 [1934]). *Kodai Nihongo ni okeru onsetsu ketsugō no hōsoku* [Syllable-combination rules in Old Japanese]. In H. Arisaka, *Kokugo On'in-shi no Kenkyū*, revised and enlarged edition, 103–117. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- Büler, K. (1982 [1934]). The deictic field of language and deictic words. In R. Jarvella & W. Klein (Eds.), *Speech, place and action: Studies in deixis and related topics*. New York: John Wiley.
- Curry, S. (2004). *Small linguistics—Phonological history and lexical loans in Okinawa-Nakijin dialect*. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Davis, C. (2015). Focus, mood, and interrogatives in Yaeyaman. A paper presented at *Kakarimusubi* from a Comparative Perspective, NINJAL, Tokyo, Japan.
- Diessel, H. (1999). *Form, function, and grammaticalization* (Typological studies in language 42). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Diessel, H. (2006). Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17.4: 463–489.
- Fujitani, N. (1960 [1778]). *Ayui-shō* [The *Ayui-shō*]. In N. Nakada & M. Takeoka (Eds.), *Ayui-shō Shinchū* [New interpretation of the *Ayui-shō*]. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō.
- Funaki, S. (1987). *Kakari musubi*. In A. Yamaguchi (Ed.), *Kokubunpō Kōza* 3: 278–358. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Gair, J. W., & Sumangala, L. (1991). What to focus in Sinhala. In G. F. Westphal, B. Ao & H-R. Chae (Eds.), *ESCOL '91: Proceedings of the eighth Eastern states conference on linguistics*, 93–108. Columbus: Ohio State University Working Papers.
- Givón, T. (1982). Evidentiality and epistemic space. *Studies in Language* 6.1: 23–49.
- Hagstrom, P. (1998). *Decomposing questions*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

What Can Studies of Old Okinawan *Kakari Musubi* Contribute to Historical-Comparative Linguistics?

- Handa, I. (1999). *Ryūkyū-go jiten* [Dictionary of Ryukyuan]. Tokyo: Daigaku Shorin.
- Harris, A. (2001). Focus and universal principles governing simplification of cleft structures. In J. T. Faarlund (Ed.), *Grammatical relations in change*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hateruma, E. (Ed.). (2003). *Shin-pen Okinawa no bungaku*: Onsei shiryō CD [Sound CD for *Okinawan Literature, New Edition*]. Naha: Okinawa Jiji Shuppan.
- Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2002). *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Heinrich, P., Miyara, S., & Shimoji, M. (2015). *Handbook of Ryukyuan languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hirayama, T. (Ed.). (1992). *Gendai Nihon-go hōgen dai-jiten* [Comprehensive dictionary of contemporary Japanese dialects], 5. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Hokama, S. (1970). *Konkōkeshū: Kōhon to kenkyū* [The *Konkōkeshū*: Redaction and interpretation]. Tokyo: Kadokawa.
- Hokama, S. & Saigō, N. (1972). *Omoro sōshi* [Book of omoros], Nihon Shisō Taikai [Series on Japanese Thought] 18. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Hopper, P., & Traugott, E. C. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iwasaki, S. (2015). Animacy and differential subject marking in the Ikema dialect of Miyako. *Studies in Language* 39.3: 754–778.
- Izuyama, A. (2006). *Luchuan dialogues (Shuri Dialect): A Posthumous collection of Shirō Hattori's radio Recordings*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- JDB = Jōdai-go Jiten Henshū Iin-kai (Eds.). (1967). *Jidai-betsu kokugo dai-jiten, jōdai-hen* [A periodized comprehensive dictionary of the Japanese language: Old Japanese]. Tokyo: Sansaidō.
- Kinsui, S. (2002). Nihongo bunpō no rekishi-teki kenkyū ni okeru riron to kijutsu [Theory and description in historical studies of Japanese grammar]. *Nihongo Bunpō* 2.2: 81–94.
- Kishimoto, H. (1992). LF pied piping: Evidence from Sinhala. *Gengo Kenkyū* 102: 46–87.
- Kushima, S. (1989). Rentaikai shūshi-hō no imi-suru mono: Kakari musubi no imi kōzō to sono hōkai [What it means to conclude a sentence with an adnominal: The semantic structure of *kakari musubi* and its collapse]. *Shizu-Dai Kokubun*, 34: 36–47.
- Mamiya, A. (2005). *Omoro Sōshi no gengo* [The language of the *Omoro Sōshi*]. Tokyo: Kasama.
- Miyara, S. (2001). Wh-questions in Okinawan. *Linguistic Analysis* 30: 25–66.
- Nakasone, S. (1983). *Nakijin hōgen jiten* [Dictionary of the Nakijin dialect]. Tokyo: Kadokawa.
- Nohara, M. (1986). *Ryūkyū hōgen joshi no kenkyū* [A study of the particles of the Ryukyuan dialects]. Tokyo: Musashino.
- Nomura T. (1995). Ka ni yoru kakari musubi shiron [Prolegomena to a theory of *kakari musubi* with the particle *ka*]. *Kokugo Kokubun*, 64.9: 1–27.
- Nomura, T. (2002). Rentaikai ni yoru kakari musubi no tenkai [Development of *kakari musubi* from adnominal forms]. In H. Ueda (Ed.), *Nihongogaku to Gengo Kyōiku* [Japanese linguistics and language education] 11–37. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- OGJ = Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyū-jo (Eds.). (1998 [1963]). *Okinawa-go Jiten* [A dictionary of the Okinawan Language]. 8th printing. Tokyo: Ōkura-shō Insatsu-kyoku.
- Ohno, S. (1993). *Kakari musubi no kenkyū* [A study of *kakari musubi*]. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Oki, K. (2010). Kodai Nihongo rentaikei no kinō to sono hensen: Kakari musubi–bun, rentai-kei shūshi–bun o shiza to shite [The function and the changes in function of the adnominal form of Ancient Japanese, from the point of view of *kakari musubi* sentences and sentences ending in adnominal forms (without KM)]. Grant-in-aid research report.
- Omodaka, H. (1941). *Ka yori ya e no sui'i* [The shift from *ka* to *ya*]. In id, *Man'yō no Sakuhin to Jidai*. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Ōno, T. (1978). *Nihongo no sogenteki kenkyū* [An etymological study of the Japanese language]. Tokyo: Takayama Honten.
- Quinn, C. J. (1997). On the origins of Japanese sentence particles *ka* and *zo*. In J. Haig & H-M. Sohn (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 6: 61–89. Stanford: CSLI.
- Quinn, C. J. (2001). Why early Japanese *rentaikei* sentences didn't mean “. . . koto”. In K. Horie & S. Sato

- (Eds.), *Cognitive-Functional Linguistics in an East Asian Context*. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Sakakura, A., et al. (Eds.). (1957). *Nihon koten bungaku taikai, Taketori Monogatari, Ise Monogatari, Yamato Monogatari* [Collected works of Classical Japanese literature, *Tale of the Bamboo Cutter, Tales of Ise, Tales of Yamato*]. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Sakakura, A. (1993). *Nihongo hyōgen no nagare* [The flow of Japanese expression through time]. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Schaffar, W. (2002). *Kakari musubi, noda*-construction, and how grammaticalization theory meets formal grammar. In N. Akatsuka, S. Strauss, & B. Comrie (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10: 320–333.
- Serafim, L. A. (2015). (Old) Okinawan and Old Japanese KM in functional and diachronic perspective, Part II, A paper presented at: *Kakarimusubi* from a Comparative Perspective, NINJAL, Tokyo.
- Serafim, L. A., & Shinzato, R. (2000). Reconstructing the proto-Japonic *kakari musubi*, *ka . . . (a)m-wo. *Gengo Kenkyū* 118: 81–118.
- Serafim, L. A., & Shinzato, R. (2005). On the Old Japanese *kakari* (focus) particle *koso*: Its origin and structure. *Gengo Kenkyū* 127: 1–49.
- Serafim, L. A., & Shinzato, R. (2011). On the origin of the Old Japanese *kakari* particles *ka*, *zō*, and *kōsō*, and their Okinawan counterparts: An iconicity-based hypothesis. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 19: 449–464.
- Shimabukuro, M. (2007). *The accentual history of the Japanese and Ryukyuan languages*. Leiden, Netherlands: Global Oriental/Brill.
- Shimabukuro, M. (2007). *The accentual history of the Japanese and Ryukyuan languages: A reconstruction*. Kent, UK: Global Oriental.
- Shimoji, M. (2011). Quasi-*kakarimusubi* in Irabu. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 18: 114–125.
- Shinzato, R. (1998). *Kakari musubi*: Its functions and development. *Japanese/Korean linguistics* 8: 203–216.
- Shinzato, R. (2011). Nominalization in Okinawan: From a diachronic and comparative perspective. In F. H. Yap, K. Grunow-Hårsta, & J. Wrona (Eds.), *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives, II: Asia Pacific Languages. Typological Studies in Language*, pp. 445–472. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Shinzato, R., & Serafim, L. A. (2003). *Kakari musubi* in comparative perspective: Old Japanese *ka/ya* and Okinawan *gali*. In P. Clancy (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 11: 189–202.
- Shinzato, R., & Serafim, L. A. (2009). An Overview of *Kakari Musubi* constructions in Ryukyuan. At the UCLA Workshop on Ryukyuan Languages and Linguistic Research, October 23–25.
- Shinzato, R., & Serafim, L. A. (2011). *lgal no kakari musubi no kasetu to kenshō: Ryūkyū-ko no hōgen no kijutsu-teki kenkyū ni motozuite* [The *lgal*-type *kakari musubi* hypotheses and their verification based on descriptive studies of Ryūkyū-archipelago dialects]. *Nihongo no Kenkyū* 7.4: 83–98.
- Shinzato, R., & Serafim, L. A. (2013). *Synchrony and diachrony of Okinawan Kakari Musubi in comparative perspective with premodern Japanese*. Leiden, Netherlands: Global Oriental/Brill.
- Sumangala, L. (1991). Inner and outer subjects in Sinhala. In *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 9: 229–257. Cornell University.
- Takahashi, T. (1991). *Omoro Sōshi no dōshi no kenkyū* [A study of the verbs of the *Omoro Sōshi*]. Tokyo: Musashino Shoin.
- Takayama, Y. (2015). *Gimon-bun to modaritii keishiki no kankei* [Question sentences and their relation to the form of modality]. In *Nihongo gimonbun no tsūjiteki/taishōgakuteki kenkyū* [A diachronic and comparative study of Japanese interrogative sentence {sic}]. <http://j-int.info/report/>.
- Tamenaga, S., author; Nakamura Y., comp. (1962 [1832–1833]), *Shunshoku uumegoyomi* [Spring Colors: The Plum Calendar], (Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikai [Collected works of Classical Japanese literature]). Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Thorpe, M. L. (1983). *Ryūkyūan language history*. Dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Tsuhako, T. (2003). Kume-jima Iō-Torishima hōgen no onsetsu-betsu goi shiryō [Vocabulary materials of Kume-Island Iō-Torishima dialect, arranged according to syllable]. Tsuhako T. & Uemura Y., (Eds.), *Kiki ni hin-shita Okinawa Shotō hōgen no kinkū chōsa kenkyū* [A survey study of critically endangered Okinawa-islands dialects], 131–149. Kyoto: Nakanishi Shuppan.
- Tyler, A., & Evans, V. (2001). The relation between experience, conceptual structure and meaning: Non-

- temporal uses of tense and language teaching. In M. Pütz, S. Niemeier, & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Applied cognitive linguistics I: Theory and language acquisition*, 63–108. Berlin: Mouton.
- Uchima, C. (1994). *Ryūkyū hōgen joshi to hyōgen no kenkyū* [Studies in Ryukyuan-dialect particles and expression]. Tokyo: Musashino Shoin.
- Uji'ie, Y. (1992). *No desu bun no seiritsu to sono haikai: Nihon-go-shi to no taiwa* [The establishment of the *no desu* sentence and its background: A dialogue with Japanese language history]. In T. Tsujimura Kyōju Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankō I'inkai (Ed.), *Tsujimura Toshiki Kyōju Koki Kinen: Nihon-go-shi no Shomondai*, 554–572. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Vovin, A. (2005). *A Descriptive and comparative grammar of Western Old Japanese, part 1: Introduction, writing system and phonology, lexicon, nominals*. Folkestone: Global Oriental.
- Vovin, A. (2009). *A Descriptive and comparative grammar of Western Old Japanese. part 2: Adjectives, verbs, adverbs, conjunctions, particles, postpositions, and indices*. Folkestone: Global Oriental.
- Watanabe, A. (2002). Loss of overt *wh*-movement in Old Japanese. In D. Lightfoot (Ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, 179–195. Oxford: OUP.
- Whitman, J. (1997). *Kakarimusubi* from a comparative perspective. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 6: 161–178.
- Wilson, P. R. (1980). *Ambulas grammar*. Ukarumpa, PNG: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Yap, F. H., Matthews, S., & Horie, K. (2004). From nominalizer to pragmatic marker: Implications for unidirectionality from a crosslinguistic perspective. In O. Fischer, M. Norde, & H. Perridon (Eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization 2: Unidirectionality in grammaticalization* [Typological Studies in Language], 137–168. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

歴史比較言語学における沖縄の係り結び研究の意義

新里瑠美子、レオン・A・セラフィム

係り結びは、世界の言語においても稀な構文であるだけでなく、生成・機能主義の両学派に注目される構文でもある。本稿は、『おもしろさうし』、組踊、現代首里・那覇方言を基に構築された係り結びの仮説 (Shinzato and Serafim 2013) の妥当性を、先学による琉球諸方言係り結びの記述的研究を通して検証するものである。その過程で、一見仮説への反例と見られる事象、不可解と思われる事象について、詳細に検討し、新たな見解を提示する。また、古代日本語の係り結び構文についても、沖縄語の係り結びとの比較研究により得られる知見を指摘する。特に、日本本土の言語の歴史において、係り結びの延長線上にノダ構文を据える見解が沖縄の係り結びの歴史的流れに合致するものと述べる。更に、昨今欧米にて脚光を浴びてきた文法化理論の枠内において、係り結びの成立・発展がどのように捉えられるかについても言及する。これら一連の議論を通し、沖縄語の係り結び研究の意義を明らかにする。