INTRODUCTION: We present fieldwork results showing that a process of phonological reduction before the indicative suffix *-n* has led to a partial reanalysis in Yaeyaman of the present tense suffix as an attributive marker. We then suggest that an independent change in Northern Ryukyuan led to a complete reanalysis and the (re-)emergence of verbal attributive marking analogous to but not homologous with the one found in Old Japanese.

ATTRIBUTIVE AND PREDICATIVE MARKING IN JAPANESE

In Old Japanese (OJ), a subset of vowel-final verbs (the so-called *Nidan* verbs) exhibit morphologically distinct attributive and predicative forms. As seen in Table 1, the OJ attributive form of *Nidan* verbs ends with the attributive marker *-ru*. In Modern Standard Japanese (MSJ), the corresponding verbs have collapsed into a form where the final *-ru* marks present tense. The loss of attributive *-ru* stems in part from the partial homophony between it and the present tense suffix, which is spelled out as *-u* following vowels and *-ru* following consonants.

	Attr.	Pred.	
OJ	nu-*ru*	n-u	'sleep'
MSJ	ne-*ru*	ne-*ru*	'sleep'
OK	kach-u-*ru*	kach-u-*n*	'write'
MY	kak-u	kak-u-*n*	'write'

Table 1: Attributive and Predicative Simple Present Tense Verb Forms

ATTRIBUTIVE AND PREDICATIVE MARKING IN RYUKYUAN: In Okinawan (OK), attributive marking is more robust than in OJ. The attributive form of all verb classes ends in *-ru*. The attributive suffix is in complementary distribution with the indicative suffix *-n*, found only in matrix predicative uses. These forms are illustrated for *kak-* 'to write' in Table 1. While the Okinawan pattern is seen in many varieties of Northern Ryukyuan, a different pattern is found in Southern Ryukyuan. As in Okinawan, Yaeyaman (a Southern Ryukyuan language spoken in and around Ishigaki island) has an indicative suffix *-n* restricted to predicative uses of verbs. The simple present attributive, however, has no final *-ru*. This is illustrated in Table 1 for the Miyara variety of Yaeyaman (MY). Superficially, it looks as though Okinawan has completely regularized the Old Japanese *Nidan* attributive pattern in favor of overt attributive marking, while Yaeyaman, like MSJ, lacks any kind of attributive marking at all. Both OK and MY have innovated a final indicative morpheme *-n*, which never appears in attributive positions.

GRAMMATICAL FLUX IN YAEYAMAN: Patterns like those seen above have often led researchers to the conclusion that Southern Ryukyuan lacks any overt attributive marking. Genuardi (2008, p.44), for example, writes: "Miyako and Yaeyama show no distinction between the Attributive and Conclusive [=predicative] outside of the nasal Conclusive form ... Otherwise, the Conclusive and Attributive are indistinct from each other in Miyako and Yaeyama, just as they are in Standard Japanese." Data from our own fieldwork paints a more complex picture. We show that present tense verbs with stative or resultative aspectual morphology have surface forms with Okinawan-style contrasts between a final *-ru* and *-n*. For reasons of space, we focus in this abstract on the stative form in MY. The first row of Table 2 gives the stative present tense verb forms for *kak-* 'to write' in MY. The stative is formed by attaching the suffix *-i* to the verb root, giving *kak-i*. The present tense suffix should be *-ru* after vowels, correctly deriving the 'bare' attributive form *kak-i-ru* shown in the left column of Table 2. Unexpectedly, given the discussion above, the predicative form with final *-n* is *kak-i-n*, not *kak-i-ru-n*.

Given that *-ru* spells out present tense, its absence in the predicative form with final *-n* must result from deletion of the underlying present tense suffix. We call this the *phonological analysis*:

Table 2: Miyaran Stative Verb Forms

	Attr.	Pred.
Present	*kak-i-ru*	*kak-i-n*
Past	*kak-i-da(-ru)*	*kak-i-da*

(1) **Phonological Analysis:** The stative present indicative, whose surface form is [V-*i-n*], is derived from underlying /V-*i-u-n*/, from which the present tense marker *-u* has been

deleted. The final *-ru* in the bare stative present results from epenthesis of *r* before the present tense marker *-u*.

We argue in the full paper that this deletion is due to independent constraints on accent placement, but leave discussion aside here for reasons of space. This deletion process results in surface forms in which indicative *-n* sits in apparent opposition to *-ru*. Given that both attributive *-ru* (as argued by Nishiyama 2000) and *-n* (as we argue in the full paper) are C-heads, this opens the way for the following reanalysis:

(2)   **Attributive (Re)Analysis:** The present stative form of verbs consists of the verb root and the marker *-i*, /V-*i*/. The attributive is marked by *-ru*, while the indicative predicative form is marked with *-n*. The two markers are in complementary distribution.

The biggest problem for this analysis is the lack in MY of an overt attributive marker in simple present verb forms. Data from past tense attributive forms, however, shows that this is an area of the grammar that is in flux. As illustrated in the second row of Table 2, forms elicited in our own field work show that past tense stative attributives in MY have an optional, though not mandatory, final *-ru* (the same is true of simple past forms). In the full paper we show that in other varieties of Yaeyaman the attributive marking on past tense forms is mandatory. Given that past and present tense markers are in complementary distribution, the *-ru* in these examples cannot be analyzed as a present tense marker. This is clear evidence that *-ru* is in the process of being reanalyzed as a true attributive marker, bleached of its present tense features.

COMPLETE REANALYSIS IN NORTHERN RYUKYUAN: The Yaeyaman reanalysis of *-ru* does not extend to the simple present forms. Okinawan, by contrast, has the present tense suffix *-(r)u* and the attributive suffix *-ru* co-occuring in the simple present attributive *kach-u-ru*, a pattern seen throughout Northern Ryukyuan. We suggest that this was due to a separate diachronic process know to have taken place in Northern, but not Southern, Ryukyuan. As summarized by Uemura (2003, p.82), the simple present form in Northern Ryukyuan is widely thought to derive from a form corresponding to the Yaeyaman stative present described above. In Northern Ryukyuan, this form was reanalyzed as a simple present, with the stative/continuative function being taken over by another form (this is why the root final *k* is palatalized in the OK examples above). Current-day Yaeyaman suggests that the re-emergence of the attributive in Ryukyuan was triggered by a phonological reduction of present tense before the indicative suffix *-n*. The elimination of the original simple present verb forms altogether in Northern Ryukyuan may then have been the key step in allowing for a full reanalysis of *-ru* as an attributive marker.

CONCLUSION: The comparative data presented above suggests that, rather than being a retention from OJ, the Ryukyuan attributive form is a Ryukyuan-internal innovation. Proto-Ryukyuan, we suggest, lacked an attributive/predicative distinction. The innovation of indicative *-n*, in conjunction with phonological deletion of the present tense suffix, created an area of grammatical ambiguity, attested in present-day Yaeyaman. The Northern Ryukyuan replacement of the simple present with the stative present eliminated the main obstacle to full reanalysis, leading to the current Northern Ryukyuan pattern in which attributive marking is completely general and much more transparent than in Old Japanese. The Ryukyuan data show a reanalysis that goes in the opposite direction from the well-known path in Japanese; while Japanese reanalyzed the attributive as a tense suffix, Northern Ryukyuan reanalyzed, and Yaeyaman is still reanalyzing, the present tense suffix as an attributive.

REFERENCES: Genuardi, Marisa Ann. 2008. *On the Origins of Attributive Verb Forms in the Ryukyuan Languages*. MA Thesis, Cornell. Nishiyama, Kunio. 2000. Predicative and Attributive Forms in Old Japanese. MITWPL 36. 263–275. Uemura, Yukio. 2003. *The Ryukyuan Language* [translated by Wayne Lawrence]. ELPR.