

琉球大学学術リポジトリ

与論方言（琉球語）の格体系記述に向けて：
主格助詞ga/nuおよび裸格

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: Tohyama, Nana, Seraku, Tohru, 當山, 奈那, 瀬楽, 亨 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/44738

Towards a Description of the Case System of Yoron Ryukyuan: The Nominative Case Particles *Ga/Nu* and the Bare Case

Nana Tohyama*
Tohru Seraku**

1. Objectives

The Yoron dialect of Kunigami (Ryukyuan) is spoken on Yoron Island, Kagoshima, Japan. The vocabulary and grammar of Yoron have been described by Kiku & Takahashi (2005) as well as a series of works by Kiku (2006, 2007, 2009, 2014). The analyses of more specific grammatical phenomena have been provided in Kudo et al. (2007) and Tohyama et al. (2016). Still, the grammatical description of Yoron is far from complete, even for basic grammatical systems. In particular, the case system of Yoron, although it is described in Kiku (2014), needs to be systematically examined based on the independently motivated notions of “case,” “semantic role,” and “grammatical function.” The present article is an attempt to construct such an account of the Yoron case system.

In Yoron (like Japanese and other Ryukyuan languages), case-marking is conducted by a case particle being attached to a noun. There is a wide range of case particles, and a number of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic factors affect the choice of a certain case particle (e.g., whether or not a particle-attached noun is animate). Thus, the case system of Yoron is quite complex, and the target of our enquiry must be properly focused. In this article, we will concentrate on the grammatical properties of nominative case particles.

Yoron displays two nominative particles: *ga* and *nu*. The former is illustrated in (1) and the latter in (2). Each particle is underlined for purposes of emphasis. (See the Appendix for the list of glosses used.)

- (1) *keN-ga cja:-ta-N*
K-NOM1 run-PST-IND
'Ken ran.'

* Research Fellowship for Young Scientists (PD), Okinawa International University 沖縄国際大学、日本学術振興会特別研究員 (PD)

** Assistant Professor, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies 韓国外語大学助教授

- (2) *anu picju-nu sai-NcjaN nu-da-N*
 that person-NOM2 sake-ACC drink-PST-IND
 ‘That person drank sake.’

Although Yoron has two nominative case particles, they are not always interchangeable. For instance, the particle *ga* (not the particle *nu*) is used for proper names denoting human entities, such as *keN* ‘Ken,’ as can be seen in the contrast between (1) and (3).

- (3) **keN-nu cja:-ta-N*
 K-NOM2 run-PST-IND
 Int. ‘Ken ran.’

This article, however, does not address the interchangeability of *ga* and *nu* (see Section 5–1) and focuses on the grammatical description of each case particle.

Further, *ga* and *nu* may be optional, as shown in (4). An issue then arises of whether the optionality of *ga* and *nu* is merely an omission of a case particle or an instantiation of the “bare case.”

- (4) *ami(-nu) pu-ta-N*
 rain(-NOM2) fall-PST-IND
 ‘It rained.’

We will therefore target not only the case particles *ga* and *nu* but explore particleless nouns to consider whether it is descriptively appropriate to set out the bare case in Yoron.

In short, this study aims at contributing to the systematic description of the Yoron case system by presenting an analysis of the nominative particles *ga/nu* as well as the bare case. Section 2 more explicitly clarifies our research object and defines “case,” “semantic role,” and “grammatical function.” Section 3 then describes basic properties of *ga/nu*, and Section 4 turns to the issue of the bare case. Section 5 concludes by mentioning future prospects.

2. Preliminaries

2–1. Target

The particle *ga* in Yoron corresponds to the nominative particle *ga* in Japanese whereas the particle *nu* in Yoron corresponds to the genitive particle *no* in Japanese. In Yoron (as in other Ryukyuan dialects (Karimata, 2008; Shigeno & Shirata, 2016; Shimoji, 2015; Uchima, 2008)), both *ga* and *nu* possess nominative-marking and genitive-marking functions.

(5) *kuNdu-nu je:ga-nu sjujaku-ja aNsjina-nu jutasja-i*
 this.time-GEN1 film-GEN1 principal.role-TOP that.person-NOM2 good-EVD
 ‘As a principal role of the film this time, I recommend that person.’ (Kiku, 2014, p. 107, modified)

(6) *ari-ga jaka-ga sjikama-kara mja:-razji*
 3-GEN2 elder.brother-NOM1 morning-ABL see-NEG
 ‘His elder brother has not shown up since the morning.’

In (5), *nu* with a genitive-marking function is attached to *kuNdu* ‘this time’ and *je:ga* ‘film,’ while *nu* with a nominative-marking function is attached to *aNsjina* ‘that person.’ In (6), *ga* with a genitive-marking function is attached to *ari*, as in *ari-ga* ‘his,’ while *ga* with a nominative-marking function is attached to *jaka* ‘elder brother.’ For the sake of simplicity, we assume that both *nu* and *ga* are lexically ambiguous between a nominative marker and a genitive marker. We then gloss *ga* and *nu* as follows, assuming the “distributional case” approach (Comrie, 1991):

- *ga* (nominative marker): NOM1
- *nu* (nominative marker): NOM2
- *nu* (genitive marker): GEN1
- *ga* (genitive marker): GEN2

In addition to the particles *ga/nu*, Yoron has the topic particle *ja*, which corresponds to the topic particle *wa* in Japanese. Whilst we acknowledge the significance of studying case marking and topic marking in tandem, such comparative work would encounter a number of complicating factors, including the distinction between matrix and subordinate clauses and the presence/absence of negative particles (Kuno, 1973; NKBK, 2009b, pp. 199–200, 213–6; Noda, 1996). We thus leave the topic particle *ja* for future research, taking up *ga* and *nu* that appear in a matrix clause of a declarative sentence.

A case particle is usually attached to a noun (or a nominalised item). In Yoron, however, it may be combined with non-noun elements. In (7), *ga* is attached to *ai-cji*, a sequential form of the verb meaning ‘walk.’

(7) *kuruma-sji-e:kuN ai-cji-ga pe:ku cjik-ju-N*
 car-INST-COMP.ADD walk-SEQ-NOM1 early arrive-NPST-IND
 ‘We get there earlier if we walk than if we go by car.’ (Kiku, 2014, p. 117)

The usage of *ga* in (7) is not observed in Japanese, and it merits a detailed analysis in its own light. But our focus is put on examples where a particle is attached to a noun. (Examples like (7) are also attested in other Ryukyuan languages (Karimata, 2008, p. 52).)

So far, we have mentioned the overt particles *ga/nu*, where “overt” means “phoneti-

cally realised.” In recent studies on Ryukyuan linguistics (Karimata, 2008; Shimoji, 2015), covert (i.e., phonetically unrealised) case particles have also been hypothesised. Moreover, Sasaki (2004) claims that in the Mitsukaido dialect of Japanese, an accusative case for an inanimate noun is not marked with an overt particle. More generally, the “bare case” plays an important role in the grammatical descriptions of the world’s languages (Tsunoda, 2009, p. 34). Against these backgrounds, we will explore whether or not the bare case is an essential category of case in Yoron.

To sum up, our research target is restricted to the following:

- **Case particle:** *ga/nu* (nominative usage alone)
- **Sentence type:** declarative
- **Occurrence position:** matrix clause
- **Particle-attached element:** noun

2–2. Terminology

This work relies on the concepts of “case,” “semantic role,” and “grammatical function.” These terms have been used differently by different scholars in different domains and theories of linguistics. We construe them in line with Comrie (1989), who defines them typologically in a theory-neutral fashion. This construal has also been adopted for a number of grammatical works on Japanese, such as Shibatani (1978) and Tsunoda (2009).

“Case” is a morphological category, typically relating to a noun (or a noun-like item). As stated in Section 2–1, case in Japanese and Ryukyuan languages is designated by a case particle attached to a noun. For example, consider the Japanese sentence (8), where the particle *ga* is attached to *keN* ‘Ken,’ specifying its case as “nominative.”

- (8) *ken-ga hashit-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 K-NOM run-PST
 ‘Ken ran.’

As has been mentioned in Sections 1 and 2, Yoron has two nominative case particles, *ga* and *nu*. Examples (1)–(2) are reproduced here for illustrations.

- (9) *keN-ga cja:-ta-N*
 K-NOM1 run-PST-IND
 ‘Ken ran.’

- (10) *anu picju-nu sai-NcjaN nu-da-N*
 that person-NOM2 sake-ACC drink-PST-IND
 ‘That person drank sake.’

“Semantic role” refers to the role of a noun in the situation (or action, state, etc.)

denoted by the predicate of a sentence to which the noun belongs. In (8), the referent of *keN*, Ken, plays an “actor” role in the action of running denoted by the predicate *hashit* ‘run.’ The terms for semantic roles used in our analysis of Yoron (e.g., “agent,” “object of mental state”) are based on (the English translations of) those adopted in NKBK (2009a, p. 5), except for the semantic roles of “object of permission” and “object of recognition.” See Section 3–1 for the details of semantic roles of nominative-marked nouns in Yoron.

“Grammatical function” refers to a syntactic relation between a noun and the predicate of the sentence to which the noun belongs. Examples include “subject,” “object,” and so on. In (8), *keN* ‘Ken’ functions as the subject of the predicate *hashit* ‘run.’ Grammatical function is an abstract concept; it cannot be determined on the basis of native speakers’ and researchers’ linguistic intuitions. Rather, the grammatical function of a noun with respect to a predicate is determined based on a set of syntactic tests in each language/dialect (Comrie, 1989; Keenan, 1975). In Section 3–2, we will suggest syntactic tests that may be exploited to identify a subject NP and an object NP in Yoron.

In this way, “case,” “semantic role,” and “grammatical function” are different concepts, but they frequently overlap in typical types of sentences. For instance, a nominative-marked NP often bears the semantic role of agent and functions as the subject of a predicate.

(11) nominative (case)—agent (semantic role)—subject (grammatical function)

This has been shown in (8), a typical type of sentence with an intransitive verb, where the verb denotes an intentional action of an animate individual. In (8), *keN* ‘Ken’ is nominative-marked, its semantic role in the event of running is agent, and its grammatical function is a subject of *hashit* ‘run.’ Still, this correspondence is merely a tendency, as illustrated in (12).

(12) *ken-wa tokei-ga hoshii* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 K-TOP watch-NOM want.IND
 ‘Ken wants (to buy) a watch.’

The noun *tokei* ‘watch’ is nominative-marked, as indicated by the particle *ga*, but its semantic role is “object of mental state” and its grammatical function is “object” (see Section 3–2 for details). In examples like (12), case, semantic role, and grammatical function diverge.

Thus, these three concepts, though they are interrelated at least in typical instances, are clearly differentiated from each other. This discrepancy is presupposed in our analysis, to be developed in the subsequent sections.

3. Analysis: *ga* and *nu*

This section reveals the basic properties of *ga/nu* by explicating what semantic role and what grammatical function a *ga/nu*-attached noun may have. As stressed in Section 2–2, the concept of grammatical function is abstract, and it needs to be identified based on syntactic tests. At the present state of our research, however, a sufficient amount of data has not been gathered to establish such tests. Therefore, our analysis of grammatical functions will be a preliminary to more substantive work.

3–1. Semantic role

3–1–1. *Ga*-marked nouns

A *ga*-marked noun in Yoron typically bears the semantic role of “agent” (動作主体).

- (13) *keN-ga cja:-ta-N*
 K-NOM1 run-PST-IND
 ‘Ken ran.’ <*keN*: agent>

There are also examples of different semantic roles. In (14)–(15), where an existential verb is used, we note the semantic roles of “subject of existence” (存在の主体) and “object of possession” (所有の対象). Recall that these terms indicate semantic roles; thus, “subject” and “object” in these terms should not be thought of as grammatical functions.

- (14) *minatu-naN keN-ga hu-ju-i*
 harbour-DAT K-NOM1 exist-NPST-EVD
 ‘Ken is at the harbour.’ <*keN*: subject of existence>
- (15) *keN-naNja de:suki-na uhu-ga hu-ju-i*
 K-DAT.TOP beloved-ADJVS grandfather-NOM1 exist-NPST-EVD
 ‘Ken has a beloved grandfather.’ <*uhu*: object of possession>

As another type of example, (16) involves a verb of perception, and the semantic role of the *ga*-marked noun, *ware:gui* ‘laughter,’ is “object of perception” (知覚の対象).

- (16) *ja:-nu na:-kara ware:gui-ga kik-ar-ju-i*
 house-GEN1 inside-ABL laughter-NOM1 hear-SPT-NPST-EVD
 ‘We hear a laughter coming from the inside of the house.’ <*ware:gui*: object of perception>

Example (17) would be noteworthy because unlike the preceding examples, *uri* ‘that’

may be marked with either the nominative particle *ga* or the accusative particle *NcjaN*. The semantic role of this noun is “object of mental state” (心的状態の対象).

- (17) *nama-kara uri-{ga/NcjaN} sji:-cja*s*-i*
 now-ABL that-{NOM1/ACC} do.SEQ-DES-EVD
 ‘I want to do that from now on.’ (Kiku, 2014, p. 102, modified) <*uri*: object of mental state>

Given that an object NP is typically assigned an accusative case, there is a possibility that *uri* in (17) has the grammatical function of “object” with respect to the verb *shi*: ‘do.’ (In fact, in the Japanese equivalent of (17), the nominative-marked item is an object of the verb ‘do’ (Koizumi, 2008).) A test for objecthood in Yoron will be examined in Section 3–2–2.

As stated above, the Japanese equivalent of (17) allows a nominative-marked NP whose grammatical function is object. In Japanese, in addition to such examples, an object NP may be marked with the nominative particle *ga* when a *ga*-attached noun bears the semantic role of “object of ability” (能力の対象) (NKBK, 2009a).

- (18) *kimi-wa sake-{ga/o} nomeru-noka* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 you-TOP sake-{NOM/ACC} drink.POT-Q
 ‘Can you drink sake?’ <*sake*: object of ability>

In Yoron, however, a noun that bears the semantic role of “object of ability” cannot be nominative-marked. Instead, the accusative particle *NcjaN* must be used.

- (19) *uro: sai-{*ga/NcjaN} num-i na-ju-N-mi:*
 2.TOP sake-{*NOM1/ACC} drink-SEQ become-NPST-IND-YNQ
 ‘Can you drink sake?’ (Kiku, 2014, p. 102, modified) <*sai*: object of ability>

- (20) *uro: keN-{*ga/NcjaN} sjigur-ar-ju-i-ja:*
 2.TOP K-{*NOM1/ACC} hit-POT-NPST-EVD-SFP
 ‘You can hit Ken, can’t you.’ <*keN*: object of ability>

Another difference in case-marking between Japanese and Yoron concerns the semantic role of “object of permission” (許容の対象). In Japanese, such an NP may be nominative-marked or accusative-marked. By contrast, in Yoron, only accusative marking is possible.

- (21) *kono heya-de-wa tabako-{ga/o} sueru* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 this room-LOC-TOP tobacco-{NOM/ACC} breathe.POT
 ‘We may smoke in this room.’ <*tabako*: object of permission>

- (22) *kono heja-noNtja: tabako-{*ga/NcjaN} puk-ar-ju-i*
 this room-ALL.TOP tobacco-{*NOM1/ACC} blow-POT-NPST-EVD
 ‘We may smoke in this room.’ <*tabako*: object of permission>

In this way, the nominative particle *ga* in Yoron exhibits a number of similarities to the nominative particle *ga* in Japanese in terms of the semantic role of a nominative-marked noun. As far as the data provided in this subsection are concerned, the domain in which *ga* in Yoron may appear is more restricted than the one in which *ga* in Japanese may appear. More precisely, nominative marking is not possible with *ga* in Yoron if the noun bears the semantic role of “object of ability” or “object of permission.”

3–1–2. *Nu*-marked nouns

A *nu*-marked noun in Yoron typically has the semantic role of “agent.”

- (23) *anu picju-nu sai-NcjaN nu-da-N*
 that person-NOM2 sake-ACC drink-PST-IND
 ‘That person drank sake.’ <*anu picju*: agent>

Examples of other semantic roles are given in (24)–(28) with existential verbs. In these examples, an NP may bear the semantic role of either “subject of existence” or “object of possession” (see (14)–(15) for similar data involving the particle *ga*).

- (24) *minatu-naN puni-nu a-ju-i*
 harbour-DAT ship-NOM2 exist-NPST-EVD
 ‘There is ship in the harbour.’ <*puni*: subject of existence>

- (25) *musuku-naNja jabo:-nu a-ju-i*
 son-DAT.TOP ambition-NOM2 exist-NPST-EVD
 ‘My son is ambitious.’ <*jabo*:: object of possession>

- (26) *Ken-naNja musuko-nu hu-ju-N*
 K-DAT.TOP son-NOM2 exist-NPST-EVD
 ‘Ken has a son.’ <*musuko*: object of possession>

- (27) *naomi-naNja kwa:-nu miccjai hu-ju-N*
 N-DAT.TOP child-NOM2 3.person exist-NPST-EVD
 ‘Naomi has three children.’ <*kwa*:: object of possession>

- (28) *ken-naNja zjisjiN-nu a-ju-N*
 K-DAT.TOP confidence-NOM2 exist-NPST-EVD
 ‘Ken is confident.’ <*zjisjiN*: object of possession>

The term “object of possession” is used here to include an abstract entity like ‘confidence’ denoted by *zjisjiN* in (28).

Data comparable to the *ga*-examples (16)–(17) are also found. (29) involves the verb of perception *kik* ‘hear,’ and the *nu*-marked noun has the semantic role of “object of perception.” (30) involves the psych-predicate *mizjira* ‘funny,’ and the *nu*-marked noun *terebibaNgumi* ‘TV programme’ has the semantic role of “object of mental state.”

- (29) *ja:-nu na:ka-kara ware:gui-nu kik-ar-ju-i*
 house-GEN1 inside-ABL laughter-NOM2 hear-SPT-NPST-EVD
 ‘We hear a laughter coming from the inside of the house.’ <*ware:gui*: object of perception>

- (30) *hunu terebibaNgumi-nu mizjira-sja-i-da:*
 this TV.programme-NOM2 funny-ADJVS-EVD-SFP
 ‘This TV programme is funny, isn’t it.’ <*hunu terebibaNgumi*: object of mental state>

Another example with a noun bearing the semantic role of “object of mental state” is given in (31). In this sentence, code switching appears to occur; that is, the speaker seems to have used Japanese for the angle-bracketed part. As this part is located in a subordinate clause, it is not relevant to our central concern, namely the *nu*-marking of a noun in a matrix clause.

- (31) <*sjukudai-ga owat-ta-ra*> *ge:mu-nu sji:-cjas-a-i*
 <homework-NOM finish-PST-COND> game-NOM2 do.SEQ-DES-EVD
 ‘If I finish my homework, I want to play a game.’ <*ge:mu*: object of mental state>

In (19)–(20), it was stated that *ga* cannot be attached to the nouns that bear the semantic role of “object of ability,” and for such nouns, the accusative particle *NcjaN* must be used. This is true of *nu*, as shown below.

- (32) *uro: sai-{*nu/NcjaN} num-i na-ju-N-mi:*
 2.TOP sake-{*NOM2/ACC} drink-SEQ become-NPST-IND-YNQ
 ‘Can you drink sake?’ (Kiku 2014, p. 102, modified) <*sai*: object of ability>
- (33) *uro: keN-{*nu/NcjaN} sjigur-ar-ju-i-ja:*
 2.TOP K-{*NOM2/ACC} hit-POT-NPST-EVD-SFP
 ‘You can hit Ken, can’t you.’ <*keN*: object of ability>

In the examples considered thus far, the applicability of *ga* and *nu* is quite similar, but

there are environments in which only *nu* is permitted. First, when a noun has the semantic role of “object of recognition” (認識の対象), only *nu* can be used to designate a nominative case. (It is also noted that the accusative particle *NcjaN* is unacceptable in these examples.)

(34) *naomi-nu ja:-nu basjo-{\underline{nu}/*ga/*NcjaN} waka-ta-N*
 N-GEN1 house-GEN1 place-{\NOM2/*NOM1/*ACC} know-PST-IND
 ‘I knew Naomi’s house.’ <*basjo*: object of recognition>

(35) *naomi-ga kimu Nzji-ta-ru waki-{\underline{nu}/*ga/*NcjaN} waka-ta-N*
 N-NOM1 liver go.out-PST-AND reason-{\NOM2/*NOM1/*ACC} know-PST-IND
 ‘I knew the reason why Naomi got angry.’ <*waki*: object of recognition>

Second, whilst a noun bearing the semantic role of “object of ability” cannot be marked with *ga* (see (19)–(20)), such nominative marking is possible with *nu*.

(36) *uro: sai-{\underline{nu}/*ga /NcjaN} uppu:sa num-ari:-ja*
 2.TOP sake-{\NOM2/*NOM1/ACC} much drink-POS-SEP
 ‘You can drink a lot of sake, can’t you.’ <*sai*: object of ability>

Third, whilst a noun bearing the semantic role of “object of permission” resists *ga* (see (22)), such nominative marking is possible with *nu*.

(37) *kono heja-noNtja: tabako-{\underline{nu}/*ga /NcjaN} puk-ar-ju-i*
 this room-ALL.TOP tobacco-{\NOM2/*NOM1/ACC} blow-POT-NPST-EVD
 ‘You may smoke in this room.’ <*tabako*: object of permission>

In a nutshell, the nominative particles *ga/nu* may be attached to nouns with a wide array of semantic roles, but the examination of our data suggests that *nu* is applicable to broader contexts than *ga*, including nouns whose semantic roles are “object of recognition,” “object of ability,” and “object of permission.”

3–2. Grammatical function

The grammatical function of a noun with respect to a predicate must be objectively determined with reference to syntactic tests (Section 2–2). In what follows, we will propose syntactic tests that may be employed to identify subject NPs and object NPs in Yoron. To this end, we first survey some syntactic tests used in Japanese (Section 3–2–1) and then explore whether they are applicable to Yoron (Section 3–2–2). Due to lack of a sufficient amount of data, our proposal of syntactic tests for Yoron is undeniably provisional.

3-2-1. Japanese

Keenan (1975) offers a set of universally available syntactic tests for subjecthood and applies them to diverse languages (including Japanese). In Japanese linguistics, two syntactic tests have been established to identify subject NPs: (i) antecedent of the reflexive pronoun *jibun* and (ii) subject-honorification (Kuno, 1973; Shibatani, 1978; Tsujimura, 2013; Tsunoda, 2009).

The reflexive pronoun *jibun* is “subject-oriented.” Thus, it is held that only a subject NP may be an antecedent of *jibun* (see Mihara, 1994: 105 for a systematic exception involving a psych-verb). To take (38) as an example, the interpretation ‘Naomi_i showed Mari_j her_i photo’ is allowed, but the interpretation ‘Naomi_i showed Mari_j her_j photo’ is disallowed.

- (38) *naomi-ga mari-ni jibun-no shashin-o mise-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
N-NOM M-DAT self-GEN photo-ACC show-PST
‘Naomi_i showed Mari_j her_{i/*j} photo.’

That is, only *naomi* can be the antecedent of *jibun* in (38). It is then concluded that the noun standing in “subject” relation to *mise* ‘show’ in this sentence is *naomi*.

Next, verbs in Japanese have an “honorific” form, which is said to elevate the referent of a subject NP (i.e., show respect to the referent of a subject NP).

- (39) *kiku-san-ga jisho-o okakininat-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
K-MS-NOM dictionary-ACC write.HON-PST
‘Ms. Kiku wrote a dictionary.’ (elevating Ms. Kiku)

okakininat is in honorific form of the verb meaning ‘write,’ and this form elevates the referent of *kiku-san* ‘Ms. Kiku.’ It then follows that the subject NP of *okakininat* in (39) is *kiku-san* (not the other NP in this sentence, *jisho* ‘dictionary’).

Two syntactic tests for subjecthood in Japanese have been surveyed, and we now turn to syntactic tests for objecthood (Koizumi, 2008; Shibatani, 1978; Tsunoda, 2009). Some of these tests presuppose other syntactic properties such as the “double-*o* constraint” (Harada, 1971). Since syntactic tests need to be devised through consultation with our informants, simple tests are ideal. We thus discuss only the insertion of the formal noun *koto* (Kishimoto, 2004).

The formal noun *koto* originally means ‘fact,’ but such meaning has been bleached in contemporary Japanese. The formal noun *koto* may be inserted after an object NP (not after a subject NP) together with the genitive particle *no*.

- (40) *naomi-ga mari-o nagut-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
N-NOM M-ACC hit-PST
‘Naomi hit Mari.’

(41) *naomi-ga mari-no-koto-o nagut-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 N-NOM M-GEN-FN-ACC hit-PST
 ‘Naomi hit Mari.’

(42) **naomi-no-koto-ga mari-o nagut-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 N-GEN-FN-NOM M-ACC hit-PST
 Int. ‘Naomi hit Mari.’

In (40), there are two nouns: *naomi* and *mari*. As shown in the marked contrast between (41) and (42), *koto* may be inserted (together with the genitive particle *no*) after *mari* (not after *naomi*). It is then suggested that the object of *nagut* ‘hit’ in (40) is *mari* (not the other NP in this sentence, *naomi*).

Note that *koto* insertion is not possible with all NPs that are regarded as object NPs by other syntactic tests. For instance, *koto* cannot be inserted after an inanimate noun such as *ringo* ‘apple’ even if it is regarded as an object noun by other syntactic tests.

(43) *naomi-ga ringo-o tabe-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 N-NOM apple-ACC eat-PST
 ‘Naomi ate an apple.’

(44) **naomi-ga ringo-no-koto-o tabe-ta* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 N-NOM apple-GEN-FN-ACC eat-PST
 Int. ‘Naomi ate an apple.’

Thus, as also noted by one of the *IJOS* referees, whilst *koto* insertion can indicate that a noun α is an object if *koto* may be inserted after α , it does not indicate that α is not an object even if *koto* cannot be inserted after α (because *koto* insertion may be blocked for other reasons such as the animacy of α). Still, it does not follow that *koto* insertion is not useful for identifying objecthood. That is, if a noun α is treated as an object by other tests, the *koto* insertion test can be profitably used to validate the results of the other tests. In this sense, we assume that *koto* insertion serves as a test for objecthood. In this article, we do not consider the tests for objecthood other than *koto* insertion because they involve

Table 1. Syntactic tests for subjecthood and objecthood in Japanese

subject	antecedent of <i>jibun</i>	Only a subject NP may be an antecedent of the reflexive pronoun <i>jibun</i> .
	honorification	A verb in honorific form elevates the referent of a subject NP alone.
object	insertion of <i>koto</i>	The formal noun <i>koto</i> may be inserted after an NP “only if” (but not “if”) the NP is an object.

complex syntactic argumentation. For these tests, see Kishimoto (2004), Koizumi (2008), Shibatani (1978), and Tsunoda (2009).

3–2–2. Yoron

Now that syntactic tests for subjecthood and objecthood in Japanese have been introduced, it is time to examine whether they are applicable to Yoron.

First, let us start with an antecedent of a reflexive pronoun. Whilst Japanese has the reflexive pronoun *jibun*, Yoron has the reflexive pronoun *du:*. They differ, however, with respect to their orientation towards an antecedent NP. Thus, as has also been pointed out in Tohyama et al. (2016), the Yoron reflexive *du:* is not subject-oriented.

- (45) *naomi-ga mari-kati du:-nu sjasjiN misji-ta-N*
 N-NOM1 M-DAT self-GEN1 photo.ACC show-PST-IND
 ‘Naomi_i showed Mari_j her_{i/j} photo.’

That is, *du:* in (45) may select either *naomi* or *mari* as its antecedent. Of note is that, unlike *jibun* in Japanese, the Yoron reflexive *du:* could be co-referent with the dative-marked NP *mari*. So this test is irrelevant to the discussion of grammatical function in Yoron.

Second, Yoron also displays honorification phenomena. As indicated in (46), a verb in honorific form elevates the referent of a subject NP (not an object NP).

- (46) *sjicjo:-ga kwaNcja:-kati tigami uku-ti wa:-cja-N*
 mayor-NOM1 child.PL-ALL letter.ACC send-SEQ HON-PST-IND
 ‘The mayor sent a letter to children.’ (elevating the mayor over children)

In (46), *uku-ti wa:* is in the polite form of the verb meaning ‘send,’ which elevates the referent of the nominative-marked noun *sjicjo:* ‘mayor,’ not the allative-marked noun *kwaNcja:* ‘children.’ The subject NP of *uku-ti wa:* in (46) is thus regarded as *sjicjo:*.

In (46), the elevated individual is the referent of *sjicjo:* ‘mayor,’ a person who is usually recognised as being socially in high rank. It is, then, expected that if an elevated referent is socially inferior (in terms of social rank) to a non-elevated referent, a sentence with nouns denoting these individuals will be pragmatically awkward. This expectation is born out in (47). (# means that a sentence is pragmatically odd.)

- (47) # *kwaNcja:-ga sjicjo:-kati tigami uku-ti wa:-cja-N*
 child.pl-NOM1 mayor-ALL letter.ACC send-SEQ HON-PST-IND
 ‘Children sent a letter to the mayor.’ (elevating children over the mayor)

The honorific form *uku-ti wa:* elevates the referent of the nominative-marked noun *kwaNcja:* ‘children,’ not the allative-marked noun *sjicjo:* ‘mayor.’ The degraded status

of acceptability in (47) is consistent with our contention that a verb in honorific form elevates the referent of a subject noun. The upshot is that this syntactic test concerning honorification may be utilised to identify a subject NP in Yoron.

Finally, we inspect a syntactic test for objecthood. As argued in Section 3–2–1, one such test in Japanese is the insertion of the formal noun *koto*. Yoron also has such formal noun, *hutu*. A pressing question is whether *hutu* may be inserted after a noun (possibly together with a genitive particle). Consider (48), which involves the nominative-marked noun *naomi* and the accusative-marked noun *mari*. As shown in (49)–(50), *hutu* cannot be inserted after *naomi* or *mari*, regardless of (i) whether it is accompanied with the genitive particle *nu* and (ii) whether *ga* or *NcjaN* is deleted.

- (48) *naomi-ga mari-NcjaN sjigu-ta-N*
 N-NOM1 M-ACC hit-PST-IND
 ‘Naomi hit Mary.’
- (49) **naomi-ga Mari(-nu)-hutu(-NcjaN) sjigu-ta-N*
 N-NOM1 M(-GEN1)-FN(-ACC) hit-PST-IND
 Int. ‘Naomi hit Mary.’
- (50) **naomi(-nu)-hutu(-ga) mari-NcjaN sjigu-ta-N*
 N(-GEN1)-FN(-NOM1) M-ACC hit-PST-IND
 Int. ‘Naomi hit Mary.’

These data appear to show that the *hutu*-insertion test cannot serve to specify the grammatical function of a noun. But the consideration of further examples demonstrates that the insertion of *hutu* is possible if a predicate other than *sjigu* ‘hit’ is used, such as *humi* ‘praise.’ (Note that unlike Japanese, where the formal noun *koto* must accompany the genitive particle *no* as in *no-koto*, the formal noun *hutu* in Yoron can be used without the genitive particle *nu*.)

- (51) *naomi-ga mari-NcjaN humi-ta-N*
 N-NOM1 M-ACC praise-PST-IND
 ‘Naomi praised Mary.’
- (52) *naomi-ga mari(-nu)-hutu(-NcjaN) humi-ta-N*
 N-NOM1 M(-GEN1)-FN(-ACC) praise-PST-IND
 ‘Naomi praised Mary.’
- (53) **naomi(-nu)-hutu(-ga) mari-NcjaN humi-ta-N*
 N(-GEN1)-FN(-NOM1) M-ACC praise-PST-IND
 Int. ‘Naomi praised Mary.’

In (51), there are two nouns: the nominative-marked *naomi* and the accusative-marked *mari*. As shown in (52)–(53), *hutu* may be inserted after *mari* (not *naomi*). This grammatical pattern may be taken to mean that the object of *humi* ‘praise’ in (51) is *mari* (not *naomi*).

A residual issue is why *hutu* insertion is not possible with the predicate *sjigu* ‘hit.’ More generally, it is not obvious what syntactic and semantic conditions are imposed upon *hutu* insertion. A possible factor may be the semantic nature of the predicate. *Sjigu* ‘hit’ denotes an action where an individual directly affects another individual, while *humi* ‘praise’ does not denote an action involving such a physical contact. As pointed out by one of the *IJOS* referees, we may suspect that *hutu* functions as a marker for object NPs that are not typical in terms of semantic roles. It is generally maintained (e.g., Tsunoda, 2009) that typical object NPs bear the “patient” role (see (48)), whereas non-typical object NPs bear the non-patient roles such as “theme” (see (51)). As *hutu* insertion is possible in (51) and not in (48), one might assume that *hutu* is a marker for non-typical object NPs. A comprehensive analysis of *hutu* insertion, however, is beyond the scope of the present article.

Section 3–2 has been devoted to the discussion of syntactic tests that may identify subject and object NPs in Yoron. Although our data size is not large enough to establish such tests, we have argued that both subjecthood and objecthood in Yoron are informed by the tests summarised in Table 2. Concomitantly, we have also pointed out syntactic differences between Japanese and Yoron with regard to the interpretation of reflexives and the lexical idiosyncrasies relating to the insertion of a formal noun after an object NP.

Table 2. Syntactic tests for subjecthood and objecthood in Yoron

subject	antecedent of <i>du</i> :	The reflexive pronoun <i>du</i> : is not subject-oriented, and this syntactic test is inapplicable to Yoron.
	honorification	A verb in honorific form elevates the referent of a subject NP alone.
object	insertion of <i>hutu</i>	The formal noun <i>hutu</i> may be inserted after an NP “only if” (but not “if”) the NP is an object

4. Analysis: bare case

4–1. Concept of bare case

In previous studies on Ryukyuan languages, the “bare case” has been hypothesised in the grammatical descriptions of the Kikaijima dialect (Matsumoto, 1982), the Nakijin dialect (Shimabukuro, 2006), the Nago-Kouki dialect (Karimata, 2008), and the Yonaguni dialect (Shimoji, 2014, 2015). In particular, Karimata (2008) and Shimoji (2014, 2015) explicitly set out the bare case as a category in parallel with overt case markers.

In Yoron, the particles *ga/nu* are sometimes absent, especially in spontaneous speech.

An issue, then, arises of whether this caseless phenomenon is just the omission of a case particle or the realisation of bare case. In what follows, we will discuss two guidelines for bare case by taking into account Shimoji's (2014, 2015) remarks and then propose a heuristic procedure to identify bare case.

Shimoji argues that when a noun α lacks a case particle, it may be viewed as the instantiation of bare case if this absence of a case particle has distinct semantic effects from those observed when α is marked by an overt case particle. Shimoji (2014, p. 89) refers to the case-marking patterns in Manipuri, where the argument NP of an intransitive verb is marked by an overt case particle when the verb denotes a volitional action, while the argument NP is marked by a zero marker (i.e. instantiation of bare case) when the same verb denotes a non-volitional action. In this example, the distinction between the use of an overt case marker and that of a zero marker engenders the distinct semantic effects in terms of volitionality. Shimoji also shows that in the Yonaguni dialect, nouns with low "agentivity" are marked by a zero marker. In this dialect, the relevant semantic effect pertains to "agentivity."

In addition to the above guideline for bare case, it would also be reasonable to assume that when a noun α lacks a case particle, it may be conceived of as the instantiation of bare case if the attachment of a case particle to α is not possible (or at least lessens acceptability significantly). This second guideline, however, does not entail that when the attachment of a case particle to a noun α is possible, one cannot postulate bare case for α . This is because even when a case particle may be attached to a noun α , one may still postulate bare case if the presence of a case particle leads to different semantic effects from those observed when α lacks a case particle.

Based on these considerations, we propose that the two guidelines can be integrated to identify bare case in the following fashion:

(54) Heuristic procedure for identifying bare case

- a. For a sentence S, examine whether a noun α in S obligatorily lacks a case particle. If α resists any case particles, we may posit bare case for α .
- b. If α accommodates at least one case particle, examine whether the attachment of a case particle to α engenders any semantic effects distinct from those observed when a case particle is absent. If such effects are detected, we may posit bare case for α .

As for (54)b, if such semantic effects are absent, the rationale for positing bare case is not strong with respect to (54). But it does not necessarily mean that one cannot hypothesise bare case since future work may reveal additional criteria for bare case.

Once a reasonable ground on which to argue for bare case is presented, we also need to clarify the syntactic environments in which bare case can be postulated. For the Yonaguni dialect, Shimoji (2015) argues that a subject NP with low agentivity tends to resist a case particle in the syntactic environments in which an intransitive action verb appears in

a matrix clause under a “sentence focus” environment (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 223).

In the following subsections, we present some preliminary case studies concerning bare case by restricting our attention to the task (54)a. We also leave it for future work to explore in detail the issue of “syntactic environments” mentioned in the previous paragraph.

4–2. Absence of *ga* and *nu*

A useful resource for the task (54)a is Kiku (1985), a written collection of oral traditions featuring various aspects of Yoron Island (e.g., culture, myth). Ms. Kiku is a co-author of Kiku & Takahashi (2005) *Yoron Hougen Jiten* [The dictionary of the Yoron dialect]. Since the written materials included in Kiku (1985) are notated in Japanese *kana* characters, we asked our informants to read some narratives aloud and then wrote them down.

We focus on the following three oral traditions:

- *icjumaN kibai* ‘work in Itoman’ (*Itoman* is a place name in Okinawa.) [pp. 55–59]
- *mununu picjunu tamasji: tutaru munugattai* ‘the story where a ghost took the spirit of a human’ [pp. 251–62]
- *pamatai mazju:matu pukurubinu munu* ‘Pamatai Mazju:ma and the monster of Pukurubi’ (*Pamatai Mazju:ma* is a person name, and *Pukurubi* is a place name.) [pp. 263–73]

In these oral traditions, we collected five particleless nouns that, we suspect, might be marked by *ga* or *nu*, given the range of semantic roles compatible with *ga* and *nu* (Section 3). Some of these data are cited below:

(55) *wa:cjiki-gawai sji:-gisa-ru baN-ja iccjiN akaja:*
 weather-change do.SEQ-ADJVS-ADN case-TOP always INTJ
wata ja-di kju-i-cji
 stomach ach-SEQ come-EVD-QUOT
 ‘When the weather is likely to change, always (they say) “Oh, my stomach starts to hurt”.’ (Kiku, 1985, p. 55)

(56) *huiga-nu idu unu pukuru-gamo: wanu mu-ta-Ncji cja-kuta:*
 man-NOM 2 well that bag-DIM.TOP 1.SG hold-PST-QUOT say.PST-COND
 ‘If a man says “Well, I’ll hold this small bag,” . . .’ (Kiku 1985, p. 254)

(57) *huigo: nama dis-sami-cji cji me:rabi-nu*
 man-NOM1.TOP now intj-SFP-QUOT say.SEQ girl-GEN1
tamasi: ic-cju-ru pukuru-gamo: picjikuru-kati iri-ti-kara:
 spirit enter-DUR-AND bag-DIM.TOP inside.breast.pocket-ALL put.into-SEQ-COND
 ‘The man says “I should do this right now” and put into his inside breast pocket a small bag containing the girl’s spirit . . .’ (Kiku, 1985, p. 255)

In (55)–(57), the boldfaced nouns come without a particle. The absence of a particle, however, does not immediately validate the postulation of bare case since they may turn out to be the omission of a particle. To resolve this issue, we asked our informants to read these examples in the context of each narrative, and they confirmed that *ga* or *nu* can be inserted after all of these boldfaced nouns.

Karimata (2008) and Shimoji (2015) report that the omission of a nominative particle is observed mainly (i) when a noun at a nominative-marking position denotes inanimate entities (including natural phenomena) or (ii) a predicate is a verb of change (i.e., non-agentive, telic intransitive verb) or (iii) a sentence is produced in a “sentence focus” environment. We thus created sentences satisfying these points and asked our informants whether a nominative particle may be inserted after a noun in each sentence. (Each sentence is preceded by the question sentence *nu:gutunu ataNga* ‘what happened?’, which contextualises a reply under a “sentence focus” environment.)

(58) *ami(-nu)* *pu-ta-N*
rain(-NOM2) fall-PST-IND
‘It rained.’

(59) *u:hadi(-nu)* *pu-ta-N*
typhoon(-NOM2) blow-PST-IND
‘A typhoon occurred/came to our village.’

(60) *miNtama(-nu)* *Nzji-ta-N*
sprout(-NOM2) come.out-PST-IND
‘A sprout came out.’

As can be seen in (58)–(60), a nominative particle could be present. That is, these examples do not allow the obligatory absence of a case particle.

Based on the analysis of narrative data (55)–(57) and the elicited judgments about (58)–(60), it seems that the obligatory absence of a nominative particle is quite limited in Yoron, at least in comparison with other Ryukyuan languages (Karimata, 2008; Shimoji, 2015). It might then appear that the postulation of bare case as a category analogous to nominative case is not appropriate in Yoron given our available data. This view, however, is far from conclusive since we have only tackled the task (54)a (not the task (54)b). The examination of bare case in Yoron thus requires the collection of more data and a more thorough analysis of them.

4–3. Further considerations

The last subsection suggested that the absence of a nominative particle does not count as an instance of bare case. This does not mean, however, that the category of bare case is not to be posited in the grammar of Yoron. This subsection thus considers, albeit briefly,

parts of grammar other than nominative-case marking.

4–3–1. Inchoatives and genitive constructions

To begin with, let us consider inchoatives and genitive constructions. First, a noun selected as an internal argument by an inchoative verb such as *na* ‘become’ is necessarily free of any case particles. For instance, (61) is acceptable only if *seNse:* is not marked with any particle. The same remark applies to (62) as well.

(61) *keN-ja seNse:(*-naN/*-kati/*-NcjaN) na-ta-N*
 K-TOP teacher(*-DAT/*-ALL/*-ACC) become-PST-IND
 ‘Ken became a teacher.’

(62) *naomja: keN-nu jumi(*-naN/*-kati/*-NcjaN) na-ta-N*
 N-TOP K-GEN1 wife(*-DAT/*-ALL/*-ACC) become-PST-IND
 ‘Naomi became a wife of Ken.’

It might then be reasonable (at least with respect to (54)a) to assume that *seNse:* ‘teacher’ and *jumi* ‘wife’ in these examples are assigned the bare case.

Second, consider genitive constructions. As shown in (63)–(65), the first noun cannot be marked with a case particle. In (63), for example, only the string *wa: ti:* is acceptable.

(63) *wa:(-*nu/*-ga) ti:*
 1.SG(*-GEN1/*-GEN2) hand
 ‘my hand’

(64) *ta:(-*nu/*-ga) ti:*
 who(*-GEN1/*-GEN2) hand
 ‘whose hand’

(65) *ari(*-nu/*-ga) ti:*
 3.SG(*-GEN1/*-GEN2) hand
 ‘his hand’

When a noun denoting a family member is located at the initial position, it could be, but does not need to be, marked with *nu*. For this example, too, the use of *ga* is illegitimate.

(66) *pa:pa:(-nu/*-ga) ti:*
 grandmother(-GEN1/*-GEN2) hand
 ‘grandmother’s hand’

The bare case is thus motivated for the initial nouns in (63)–(65) (at least with respect to

(54)a), while it is not obvious whether (66) involves bare case. Similar distributions of bare case are attested in the genitive constructions of several Amami dialects, where the Animacy Hierarchy (Silverstein, 1976; Tsunoda, 2009) plays a role in the selection of overt and covert case-marking (Shigeno & Shirata, 2016).

4–3–2. The copula

In connection with the discussion of bare case, the copula may be noteworthy. In Yoron, as in many other languages such as Japanese, the combination of a common noun and the copula constitutes predicate nominals. Thus, as noted by one of the *IJOS* referees, if the copula may be omitted, the copula-stripped predicate nominals cannot be morphologically distinguished from bare nouns. Consider the following paradigm of examples, which were composed based on the examples cited in Kiku (2014, p. 116):

- (67) A: *ida-ga* *ura* *ja:-ga*
 where-NOM1 2.GEN house-WHQ
 ‘Where is your house?’
 B: *ama-ga* *wa:* *ja:* (*e-N*)
 that-NOM1 1.GEN house (COP-IND)
 ‘That is my house.’
- (68) A: *ida-ga* *ura* *ja:* *e:-bju-N-ga*
 where-NOM1 2.GEN house COP-POL-IND-WHQ
 ‘Where is your house?’
 B: *ama-ga* *wa:* *ja:* (*e:-bju-N*)
 that-NOM1 1.GEN house (COP-POL-IND)
 ‘That is my house.’

As shown in (67)B, the copula *e* may be omitted. This is true of the polite form of the copula, as illustrated in (68)B.

At present, it is unclear whether these data are indicative of the postulation of bare case. In future work, it is essential to investigate the syntactic and semantic properties of nominal predicates in Yoron in a systematic manner. For instance, several classifications of copular sentences have been proposed in the literature (Declerck, 1988; Nishiyama, 2003). It remains to be seen how nominal predicates in Yoron are linguistically characterised and how these characterisations are related to the discussion of bare case.

4–3–3. The accusative case particle

Let us close Section 4 by considering the accusative case particle *NcjaN*. Although there is no strict correspondence between case particles and grammatical functions (Section 2–2), object NPs are typically marked with an accusative case particle. As pointed out in Shimoji (2015), there is a tendency that object NPs in North Ryukyuan languages are

not marked with overt particles. Thus, it is descriptively important to examine *NcjaN* in Yoron.

As has been observed in Kiku (2007), the omission of *NcjaN* is conditioned by the “adjacency” restriction:

- (69) The accusative case particle *NcjaN* may be omitted only if the *NcjaN*-marked noun is adjacent to the predicate.

Let us illustrate (69) with the examples discussed in Tohyama et al. (2016). Consider (70)–(71) below.

- (70) *keN-ga* *cjina(-NcjaN)* *ki-cja-N*
 K-NOM1 rope(-ACC) cut-PST-IND
 ‘Ken cut the rope.’

- (71) *cjina-NcjaN* *keN-ga* *ki-cja-N*
 rope-ACC K-NOM1 cut-PST-IND
 ‘Ken cut the rope.’

In (70), the *NcjaN*-marked noun *cjina* ‘rope’ is adjacent to the predicate *ki* ‘cut.’ Thus, the particle *NcjaN* may be omitted, as shown by the parentheses. In (71), since the *NcjaN*-marked noun *cjina* is not adjacent to the predicate *ki*, *NcjaN* cannot be omitted. An attempt to omit *NcjaN* in (71) results in an ungrammatical sentence, as shown in (72).

- (72) **cjina* *keN-ga* *ki-cja-N*
 rope K-NOM1 cut-PST-IND
 Int. ‘Ken cut the rope.’

The above facts may shed light on the discussion of bare case in Yoron. When an *NcjaN*-marked noun is adjacent to the predicate, the use of *NcjaN* is optional. On the other hand, when an *NcjaN*-marked noun is not adjacent to the predicate, the use of *NcjaN* is obligatory. Neither of these patterns indicates that the postulation of bare case is appropriate for the data (70)–(72), at least with respect to (54)a. It is thus necessary to analyse in more detail data such as (70) where the use of *NcjaN* is optional (see (54)b).

In Section 4, we have touched on the issues of bare case. The upshot of our preliminary discussion is summarised as follows:

- The study of bare case has been largely untouched in Ryukyuan linguistics. Against this situation, and based on relevant previous studies (e.g., Karimata, 2008; Shimoji, 2015), we have presented some provisional criteria for identifying bare case (see (54)).
- We have also mentioned several specific constructions and expressions in Yoron that

might be analysed in terms of bare case such as inchoatives and genitive constructions.

5. Prospects

This article has described the basic properties of the nominative particles *ga* and *nu* in Yoron with special reference to semantic roles and grammatical functions. We have also addressed several issues concerning bare case. By way of conclusion, some residual questions for future studies are mentioned.

5–1. Distribution of *ga* and *nu*

The nominative particles *ga* and *nu* are not always interchangeable. At present, it is not clear under which conditions *ga* is preferred over *nu* (and vice versa). We hope to settle this issue on other occasions, for which purpose we here point out potentially relevant factors affecting the choice of *ga* or *nu* (see also Uchima, 2008):

- Reference type of noun: Shigeno & Shirata (2016) apply Tsunoda’s (2009) “Animacy Hierarchy” (cf., Silverstein, 1976) to the selection of nominative and genitive particles in the Ura, Kamikatetsu, and Onozu dialects of Amami.
- Syntactic type of predicate: Predicates are divided into verbs (e.g., intransitive), adjectives, and nominal predicates. See Section 4.1 for Shimoji’s (2015) remark on this issue.
- Semantic type of predicate: Predicates are classified in terms of aspect, such as predicates of change (e.g., *ochiru* ‘drop’) and stative predicates (e.g., *itamu* ‘hurt’). See Section 4.1 for Karimata’s (2008) and Shimoji’s (2015) remarks on this issue.
- Information structure: Kuno (1973) notes that in Japanese, the nominative particle *ga* tends to mark a noun conveying a focus, and the topic particle *wa* a noun conveying a topic.
- Style: the speaker may be reluctant to use the same case particle if it has already occurred in the same clause.

5–2. Case compounding

Noonan (2008) mentions several types of case compounding in Bodic languages. Karimata (2008, p. 60, fn. 58) points out case-compounding phenomena in the Miyako dialect. Case compounding is limited in Japanese (but see Kaneda (1993) for the “double marking” data in the Hachijo dialect); as peripheral examples, *kara* ‘from’ or *made* ‘to’ is sometimes combined with the nominative particle *ga* (NKBK, 2009a).

(73) *sono-omise-wa ken-no ie-kara-ga chikai* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]
 that-store-TOP K-GEN house-ABL-NOM close
 ‘That store is close to Ken’s house.’

(74) *koko-made-ga* [[*kinou hanashita*] *koto*] *desu* [Japanese (Tokyo dialect)]

this-LMT-NOM [[yesterday talked] thing] COP
 ‘We talked about the story up to this point yesterday.’

Case compounding seems to be more abundant in Yoron. First, *ga/nu* may be combined with a different particle (including a citation marker) (Kiku, 2014, pp. 119–24). In (75), *naN* and *ga* co-occur in this order, a phenomenon disallowed in Japanese.

(75) *hunu puku-ja mari:-e:kuN naomi:-naN-ga nie:-gisa-i*
 this cloth-TOP M-COMP.ADD N-DAT-NOM1 go.well.with-look-EVD
 ‘This cloth looks better on Naomi than Mari.’ (Kiku, 2014, p. 119, modified)

Second, *ga* and *nu* can be combined as in *ga-ga* and *nu-ga*, though the sequences of **nu-nu* and **nu-ga* are banned. Third, *ga/nu* can be combined (though not always) with the topic particle *ja*. As also noted by one of the *IJOS* referees, however, it is premature to conclude that these data involve case compounding. For instance, a possibility remains that *ga* in (75) might be a particle irrelevant to case marking, such as a focus marker. Although the details are unknown, Yoron data like (75) pose intriguing and challenging problems for the study of case compounding.

Appendix

This article draws examples from Yoron and Japanese (Tokyo dialect). Yoron examples are transcribed in a phonological (not phonetic) notation, while Japanese examples are romanised in the Hepburn system. Yoron data presented without a citation source were collected through our fieldworks (17–19/02/2016,

ABL	ablative
ACC	accusatives
ADD	additive
ADJVS	adjectivaliser
ADN	adnominal
ALL	allative
COMP	comparative
COND	conditional
COP	copula
DAT	dative
DES	desiderative
DIM	diminutive
DUR	durative
EVD	evidential
FN	formal noun
GEN	genitive (for <i>no</i> in Japanese)
GEN1	genitive (for <i>nu</i> in Yoron)
GEN2	genitive (for <i>ga</i> in Yoron)
HON	honorific
IND	indicative
INST	instrumental
INTJ	interjection
LMT	limitative

LOC	locative
NEG	negation
NOM	nominative (for <i>ga</i> in Japanese)
NOM1	nominative (for <i>ga</i> in Yoron)
NOM2	nominative (for <i>nu</i> in Yoron)
NPST	non-past
PL	plural
POL	polite
POT	potential
PST	past
Q	question
QUOT	quotative
SEQ	sequential
SFP	sentence-final particle
SG	singular
SPT	spontaneous
TOP	topic
WHQ	<i>wh</i> -question
YNQ	<i>yes-no</i> question
1	first person
2	second person
3	third person

30–31/05/2016, 1/06/2016) with our informants, CK (female, born in 1927) and HK (male, born in 1958). The list of glosses is provided in the table in the Appendix.

Acknowledgements

First of all, we are truly grateful to our informants for their valuable inputs to our research. The present article largely benefitted from the comments made by the two anonymous *IJOS* referees. Earlier versions of the article were presented at Busan University of Foreign Studies and Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in 2016, where we received constructive comments and questions from the audience and the discussants. Our special thanks go to Shigehisa Karimata, with whom we discussed several grammatical phenomena in Yoron and other Ryukyuan languages. Needless to say, any remaining errors are entirely our own. The first author's part of this work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows 16J05135. The second author's part of this work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2016.

References

- Comrie, B. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, 2nd edn. The University of Chicago Press, IL, Chicago.
- Comrie, B. 1991. Form and function in identifying cases. In Plank, F. (ed.) *Paradigms*, pp. 41–55. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Declerck, R. 1988. *Studies on Copular Sentences, Clefts and Pseudo-Clefts*. Leuven University Press, Leuven.
- Harada, S.-I. 1971. *Ga-no* conversion and idiolectal variations in Japanese. *Gengo Kenkyu* 60, 25–38.
- Kaneda, A. 1993. “Nnijyuu” hyouji genshou-o megutte. [On the “double” marking phenomena] In Nitta, Y. (ed.) *Nihongo-no kaku-o megutte*, pp. 163–89. Kuroshio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Karimata, S. 2008. Okinawa-ken Nago-shi Kouki hougen-no meishi-no kaku = toritate. [Case particles and kakari (focus) particles in Okinawan dialects] *Nihon Touyou Bunka Ronshuu* 14, 1–80.
- Keenan, E. L. 1975. Towards a universal definition of “subject.” In Li, C. N. (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, pp. 303–33. Academic Press, New York.
- Kiku, C. 1985. *Yoron-no Shimagatari*. [Oral traditions of Yoron Island] Haru Shobo, Tokyo.
- Kiku, C. & Takahashi, T. 2005. *Yoron Hougen Jiten*. [The dictionary of the Yoron dialect] Musashino Shoin Publisher, Tokyo.
- Kiku, H. 2006. *Yoron-no Kotoba-de Hanasou*, vol. 1, 2nd edn. [Let's speak in the language of Yoron] Yoron Minzoku-mura, Yoron.
- Kiku, H. 2007. *Yoron-no Kotoba-de Hanasou*, vol. 2. [Let's speak in the language of Yoron] Yoron Minzoku-mura, Yoron.
- Kiku, H. 2009. *Yoron-no Kotoba-de Hanasou*, vol. 3. [Let's speak in the language of Yoron] Yoron Minzoku-mura, Yoron.
- Kiku, H. 2014. *Yoron-no Kotoba-de Hanasou*, vol. 4. [Let's speak in the language of Yoron] Yoron Minzoku-mura, Yoron.
- Kishimoto, H. 2004. Transitivity of ergative case-marking predicates in Japanese. *Studies in Language* 28 (1), pp. 105–36.
- Koizumi, M. 2008. Nominative object. In Miyagawa, S. & Saito, M. (eds.) *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, pp. 141–64. OUP, Oxford.
- Kudo, M., Nakama, K., Yakame, H. 2007. Yoron hougen doushi-no asupekuto, tensu, ebidensharitii. [Aspect-tense-mood of verbs in the Yoron dialect] *Kokugo-to Kokubungaku* 84 (3), 53–67.
- Kuno, S. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press, MA, Cambridge.
- Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. CUP, Cambridge.
- Matsumoto, H. 1982. Kitaryukyuu hougen-no syukaku-hyougen-no mondaiten. [Issues in the nominative expressions of North-Ryukyuan dialects] *Kokubungaku Kaishaku-to Kansho* 47 (9), 178–85.
- Mihara, K. 1994. *Nihongo-no Tougo Kouzou*. [The syntactic structure of Japanese] Shohakusha, Tokyo.

- Nishiyama, Y. 2003. *Nihongo Meishiku-no Imiron-to Goyouron*. [The semantics and pragmatics of noun phrases in Japanese] Hituzi Publishing, Tokyo.
- NKBB (Nihongo Kijutsu Bunpou Kenkyukai) (ed.) 2009a. *Gendai Nihongo Bunpou 2*. [Contemporary Japanese grammar, Vol. 2] Kuroshio Publishers, Tokyo.
- NKBB (Nihongo Kijutsu Bunpou Kenkyukai) (ed.) 2009b. *Gendai Nihongo Bunpou 5*. [Contemporary Japanese grammar, Vol. 5] Kuroshio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Noda, H. 1996. *Wa-to Ga*. [“Wa” and “ga”] Kuroshio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Noonan, M. 2008. Case compounding in the Bodic languages. In Corbett, G. & Noonan, M. (eds.) *Case and Grammatical Relations*, pp. 127–47. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Sasaki, K. 2004. *Mitsukaidou Hougen-niokeru Kaku-to Bunpou Kankei*. [Case and grammatical function in the Mitsukaido dialect] Kuroshio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Shibatani, M. 1978. *Nihongo-no Bunseki*. (The analysis of Japanese) Taishukan Publishing Company, Tokyo.
- Shigeno, H. & Sirata, R. 2016. Kitaryukyū Amami hougen-niokeru yuuseisei kaisou. [The animacy hierarchy in Amami daialects] *Hiroshima Keizai Daigaku Kenkyū Ronsou* 38 (4), 111–33.
- Shimabukuro, Y. 2006. Yanbaru hougen-no joshi. [Particles in the Yanbaru dialect] In Nago-shi-shi hensan iinkai (ed.) *Gengo* (Nago-shi-shi Hon-hen 10), pp. 111–30. Nago City Hall, Nago.
- Shimoji, M. 2014. Syntactic description of Yonaguni Ryukyuan. *Shigen* 10, 81–106.
- Shimoji, M. 2015. Ryukyū shohougen-niokeru yuhyō shukaku-to bunretsu jidousei. [Marked nominative case and split intransitivity in Ryukyuan dialects] *Hougen-no Kenkyū* 1, 1–26.
- Silverstein, M. 1976. Hierarchies of features and ergativity. In Dixon, R. M. W. (ed.), *Grammatical Categories in Australian languages*, pp. 112–71. Humanities Press, New Jersey.
- Tohyama, N., Seraku, T., & Karimata, S. 2016. The affective construction with the passive morpheme *a:ri* in Yoron, a Ryukyuan language. Paper read at *Documentary Linguistics: Asian Perspectives 2016*. The University of Hong Kong.
- Tsujimura, N. 2013. *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics*, 3rd edn. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Tsunoda, T. 2009. *Sekai-no Gengo-to Nihongo*, 2nd edn. [The world’s languages and Japanese] Kuroshio Publishers, Tokyo.
- Uchima, C. 2008. Ryukyū hougen-niokeru joshi “ga” “no”-no youhou. [On the usage of *ga* and *no* in Ryukyuan dialects] *Ryukyū Daigaku Gengo Bunka Ronsou* 5, 1–14.

与論方言（琉球語）の格体系記述に向けて： 主格助詞 *ga/nu* および裸格

當山奈那・瀬楽亭

国頭語と与論方言は鹿児島県と与論島で話されており、広くは琉球語に分類される。本稿は主格助詞 *ga/nu* の基本的な文法的性質を探ることで、同方言における格体系の包括的記述への一助となることを目的とする。主格助詞 *ga/nu* の統語的性質は先行研究で既に取りあげられているが、これらの研究では関連する概念である〈格〉・〈意味役割〉・〈文法機能〉について一貫した定義がなされていない。本論文はこれらの術語を類型論的な視点から区別することで、*ga/nu* の統語的性質に関する体系的な分析を提示する。また、*ga/nu* などの助詞が生じていない場合を調査し、それらは単なる〈助詞の省略〉か〈裸格の具現〉であるかという点も考察する。