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Overview

1. Background of Ryukyuan and Yaeyaman
2. Aspect and Pitch
3. The Miyara and Funauki Stative
4. The Resultative and Perfect
5. Conclusion
Minimally **5 languages** under the “dialect chain” definition (Serafim, 2008)

But boundary between language and dialect unclear

Pellard (2013)
Endangered Status

- Youngest speakers of most languages 70-80
- A few have speakers as young as 40 (Miyara)
- Difficult to make exact count of number of speakers, due to difficulty of division between language and dialect and no surveys of who is a speaker
- **No children are learning the language**
- However, an Okinawan language nest has opened in Naha, the capital of Okinawa Prefecture
# Language Diversity in the Yaeyamas

- **Japanese:**
  - Sentence: `doko=e ik-u=no`
  - Gloss: `where=to(=FOC) go-PRS(=Q)`

- **Ishigaki:**
  - Sentence: `zi=ma=nkai=du har-u`

- **Kabira:**
  - Sentence: `du=ma=he:=du par-u`

- **Miyara:**
  - Sentence: `zi=ma=ge=du har-u`

- **Taketomi:**
  - Sentence: `ma:=i=du har-i=ja`

- **Kuroshima (Miyazato):**
  - Sentence: `ma:=ha=du par-u=ja`

- **Iriomote (Funauki):**
  - Sentence: `zan=tti ngi=rja`

- **Shiraho/Hateruma:**
  - Sentence: `za=go=du ng-o`

**Translation:** Where are you going?

---

1. Alternatively `pa:=ja`
Aspect differentiation via pitch is well-documented in African languages.

According to WALS, 13 languages show this phenomenon (Dryer, 2013):
- 12 in Africa
- 1 in Papua New Guinea (Skou)

However, at least 3 Yaeyaman languages show this phenomenon as well, via pitch accent:
- Miyara and Funauki distinguish stative from a “bare” form
- Shiraho distinguishes stative from resultative
Bare and Stative Forms in Miyara

- Following data summarized from Davis and Lau (in press)
- Yaeyaman bare non-past ending is -u
- Miyaran stative (includes progressive) ending is -í
- It is only pitch that distinguishes the bare forms from the stative forms for -i root verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Non-Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Non-Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>jum-u</td>
<td>jum-u-da²</td>
<td>uki-ru</td>
<td>uki-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>jum-í-ru</td>
<td>jum-í-da</td>
<td>uk-í-ru</td>
<td>uk-í-da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²alternatively jun-da
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Pitch Tracks

‘fell (bare past)’

Funauki has same pattern, but different past tense forms

‘was falling (stative past)’

‘gets up (bare present)’

‘is getting up (stative present)’
Stative and Resultative Forms in Shiraho

- Shiraho shows a vowel quality distinction between bare and stative/perfect forms for both classes.
- However, stative/perfect and resultative forms for both classes differ only by pitch.
- Resultative is commonly used in Yaeyaman to make a conjecture based on indirect evidence (Davis and Lau, in press).

1. \[\text{ami=n=du} \ f\text{-é-ru=rá} \quad \text{Stative}\]
   \[\text{rain=NOM=FOC} \ f\text{all-STA-PRS=PRT}\]
   '(Oh,) it’s raining now.’

2. \[\text{ami=n=du} \ f\text{-e-ru=rá} \quad \text{Resultative}\]
   \[\text{rain=NOM=FOC} \ f\text{all-RES-PRS=PRT}\]
   '(Oh,) it must have rained.’ (ex. it is wet outside)
Stative/Perfect and Resultative Forms in Shiraho

'C is opening (stative present)' | 'was opened (resultative)'
---|---
\( \text{C-root} \)
\( \text{nuff-} \) ‘to sleep’ | \( \text{i-root} \)
\( \text{uti-} \) ‘to fall’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Non-Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Non-Past</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>nuff-o</td>
<td>nuff-u-ta-ro</td>
<td>uti-ro</td>
<td>uti-ta-ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sta./Perf.</td>
<td>nuff-e-ro</td>
<td>nuff-e-ta-ro</td>
<td>ut-á-ro</td>
<td>ut-á-ta-ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Tonic verb accent is initial, atonic on stative morpheme

³The non-past forms are actually elicited as \( \text{nuff-e-ru}=\text{rá} \) and \( \text{ut-a-ru}=\text{rá} \)
Summary Thus Far

- Miyara and Funauki distinguish bare and stative forms for *i*-stem verbs by presence or absence of pitch accent on *i*.
- Shirahō distinguishes stative and resultative forms:
  - *C*-stem verbs by presence or absence of pitch accent on *-e*
  - *i*-stem verbs by presence or absence of pitch accent on *-a*
- We will now explore the origins of these forms.
The Miyara Stative

- In Davis and Lau (in press), we argue that the Miyara stative derives from the continuative (*renyou*) form in combination with the existential *úr-*
- Due to a phonological ban on the sequence *i(w)u*, Miyara solves by deleting the *u*, but preserving the pitch accent
- In fact, Miyara preserves the longer -*i úr-* form for verbs
  
  \[ \text{kak-i úr-u > kak-í-ru} \text{ ‘is writing’} \]
  
  \[ \text{uk-i úr-u > uk-í-ru} \text{ ‘is getting up’} \]

- Also morpheme \( =duru < =du \ ur-u \ (=\text{FOC exist-PRS}) \)

(3) nā: ubingani tum-i=duru Taketomi
now ring find-STA=FOC.exist
‘I’m looking for the ring now.’

- This morpheme exists across all Yaeyaman varieties
The Funauki Stative

- Does the Funauki stative have the same origin as in Miyara?
- Considering the distance between Funauki and Miyara, it would be difficult to say that the Funauki stative came about via borrowing.
- Whether the two languages share this grammaticalized retention or underwent parallel development, the accentual data points to both their statives originating in the connective + existential verb.
- However, outside of the varieties on Ishigaki island (Ishigaki, Miyara, Kabira), the animate existential verb is *búr-* and not *úr-*.
Funauki data suggests strongly that, *w underwent fortition to b in Yaeyaman and probably across Southern Ryukyuan (*wor- ‘to exist’ > *wur- > bur-)

Contrary to theories about *b lenition to w across Japono-Ryukyuan except in Southern Ryukyuan (Martin, 1966; Whitman, 1985; Vovin, 2010)

If Yaeyaman b is original, it would have to be argued
- Funauki borrowed from Miyara, despite distance
- OR *b underwent lenition to *w and fortition back to b and that grammaticalization occurred in the *w period

More parsimonious to assume that grammaticalization happened in both varieties before fortition occurred
Across most varieties of Yaeyaman, the resultative morpheme is -e(e)

Likely derived from *-i a(r)- (-CON exist-)

A focused form -i=daru across Yaeyama supports this derivation (example from Kuroshima)

(4) ko:ne=e fuk-i=daru=waja
eldest.son=TOP awake-CON=FOC.exist=PRT
‘(It appears) my eldest son has awoken.’
The SH stative/perfect, -já/-é, remains a mystery

- C-root verbs have -já instead of -é (so the stative of ‘to rain’ is f-já-ro instead of f-é-ro)
- i-root verbs in H conjugate the same as in S

Because ar- ‘to exist’ does not have an accent in Yaeyaman, we should not expect this morpheme to derive from -i ar-, although the vowel correspondence works out
More Hints from Funauki

- Funauki has a perfect aspect marker -já that functions separately from its stative -í
  
  (5)  
  ki: to:r-já-n  
  tree fall-PRF-IND  
  ‘The tree has fallen!’

- Also has a resultative marker -e, used as well in the analytic resultative
  
  (6)  
  ta=kka=du a:r-e-ru=sa  
  who=INDEF=FOC wash-RES-PRS=PRT  
  ‘It’s been washed by someone.’

(7)  
  kazi=du jadu fu-i cik-e-ru  
  wind=FOC door close-CON put-RES-PRS  
  ‘The door has been shut by the wind.’
Comparison with Hateruma

The Hateruma perfect -já takes the function of the stative as well when used with the “present” marker -o but retains a perfect meaning when used with the indicative marker -n.

\[(8) \quad \text{mana kapi ss-já-ro /ss-já-n}
\]
\[\text{now paper cut-PRF-PRS cut-PRF-IND}
\]
\[\text{‘I am cutting/have cut the paper now.’}\]

Like Funauki and unlike Shiraho, the Hateruma perfect -já has not undergone criasis to -e.

However, the Hateruma resultative is also -ja.

\[(9) \quad \text{kapi sïts-ah-e sik-ja-n}
\]
\[\text{paper cut-TRS-CON put-RES-IND}
\]
\[\text{‘The paper has been cut up.’}\]
A Caveat

- Due to the pitch accent on -ja here, it is possible that \textit{sikjan} is actually the perfect.
- However, other Yaeyaman varieties consistently use \(-e(e)\) with the analytic resultative, and not a perfect or past.

\begin{equation}
\text{unu } <\text{uekibace}> = e \quad \text{no:h-i } \text{sik-e:-ru}
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\text{this } <\text{flower.pot}> = \text{TOP fix-CON put-RES-PRS}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{‘I had this flower pot fixed.’ (Miyara)}
\end{equation}

- Must explore Hateruma resultative in more detail as pitch accent on sik-já-n may be phonological and not lexical.
- \textit{cf.} Shiraho has initial pitch accent on tonic words, which shifts if the first syllable is voiceless.
- Furthermore, moraic \textit{n} causes a falling tone in many Yaeyaman varieties.
Considering that the resultative and perfect forms of Funauki have separate vowel qualities, it seems that the Shiraho (and likely Hateruma as well) perfect/stative and resultative may have different origins.

The resultative derives from the connective form in conjunction with the inanimate existential: *-e a(r)- → -ja

This in turn underwent criasis to become -e(e) in the remaining Yaeyaman varieties (that I am aware of).

Funauki shows -jà for the perfect but -e for the resultative. Possible that the pitch accent prevented criasis.

But, possibility that resultative is borrowed from neighboring varieties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stative in Miyara/Funauki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*-e wó(r)- → *-i(w)ú(r)- → -í(r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resultative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resultative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>-e a(r)- → (</em>)-ia(r) → (*)-ja(r) → -e(e) (Retained in Hateruma)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Western Yaeyama Perfect(/Stative)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Yaeyama Perfect(/Stative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-já(r) Hateruma/Funauki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development of ‘to exist’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of ‘to exist’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>úr- Mainland Ishigaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*wór- → *wúr-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>búr- Outer Yaeyama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Summary Chart**

- |-e wó(r)- → *i(w)ú(r)- → -í(r) |
- **Resultative**
  - |-e a(r)- → (*)-ia(r) → (*)-ja(r) → -e(e) (Retained in Hateruma) |
  - **Western Yaeyama Perfect(/Stative)**
    - |-já(r) Hateruma/Funauki |
    - **Development of ‘to exist’**
      - úr- Mainland Ishigaki
      - *wór- → *wúr- 
      - búr- Outer Yaeyama
Conclusion

- Pitch accent distinguishes aspect for at least three Yaeyaman languages
- Provides insight into historical development
- Chart above also provides possible evidence for subgrouping
  - Western Yaeyama characterized by existence of perfect morpheme
  - Mainland Ishigaki varieties characterized by lack of fortition for úr-
- Uncertain origin of perfect (> stative) -já/-é, but possible that the resultative and perfect simply grammaticalized at different times (i.e. a(r)- had an accent at some prior time)
- More research should be done into pitch accent and its relation to aspect in Yaeyama
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