

Hachijō and South Ryukyuan languages and East-Northeast Japan dialects from the viewpoint of the concentric circle theory of dialect divergence

This paper deals with grammatical forms whose origin can be traced down to *shi ari* and *beshi*. One of the authors (Akihiro Kaneda) is a native speaker of the Yamagata dialect in Northeast Japan (Tōhoku) and has also directly researched the Hachijō language, and the Miyako-Ōgami and Iriomote-Sonai dialects of the Yaeyama language.

Shi ari type forms, which could be observed in *Old Central Japanese language of the Nara period, were almost extinct in Early Middle Japanese of the Heian period. However, they are still encountered in the contemporary Hachijō and South Ryukyuan languages. The Hachijō language displays the form *nomar* (<**nomi ari*), in which the vowel fusion results in the vowel *a*, and is consistent with the forms found in *Man'yōshū*'s *Azuma uta*. For comparison, in Old Central Japanese the corresponding form was *nomeri* (<**nomi ari*), where the vowel fusion resulted in in the vowel *e* (cf. *nomu* 'drink'). The grammatical meaning of *shi ari* type forms varies from dialect to dialect and ranges from tense (past) to aspect (evidentiality), but all these forms are linked to Old and Middle Japanese, and display concentric circle distribution. Forms such as *kagaru* (cf. *kaku* 'write'), which phonetically resemble *shi ari* type forms are also observed in a number of dialects of Northeast Japan, but they are not related to Old Japanese.

Grammatical forms related to *beshi* have long been confirmed in dialects of East Japan (Kantō) and Northeast Japan (Tōhoku), but it has now become clear that they also appear in South Ryukyuan languages. It is thought that they had been present there before the widely used *hazu* type presumptive forms appeared. In South Ryukyuan languages which have both *hazu* type and *beshi* type forms, the former imply a greater degree of certainty, and the latter have the meaning of doubtfulness. In South Ryukyuan languages, like in the dialects of East and Northeast Japan, *beshi* type forms are used in a volitional, hortative or presumptive meaning.

In the light of their current distribution in geographically distant South Ryukyuan languages and dialects of East and Northeast Japan and their grammatical meaning as well as the fact that *beshi* type forms were present in Old Central Japanese and Early Middle Japanese, and that before becoming extinct they were also found in western Japan, it can be said that they, too, display concentric circle distribution.

*Approximate periodization of the Japanese language

Early Old Japanese	before Nara period (before 8 th century)
Old Japanese (Central and Eastern Japanese)	Nara period (8 th century)
Early Middle Japanese	Heian period (9-12 th century)

1. Forms deriving from *shi ari*

Old Japanese

In Old Japanese *shi ari* type forms can predominantly be observed in the strong conjugation (*yodan*) verbs.

3925 新年乃 婆自米尔 豊乃 登之 思流須登 奈良思 雪能 敷礼流波
(新しき 年の 初めに 豊の 年 しるすと ならし 雪の 降れるは)
atarasiki tosino fazimemi toyono tosi sirusuto narasi yukino furerufa
(*futte iru* – resultative: snow has gathered on the ground)

832 烏梅能 波奈 乎利互 加射世留 母呂比得波 家布能 阿比太波 多努斯久 阿流倍斯
(梅の 花 折りて かざせる 諸人は 今日の あいだは 楽しく あるべし)
umeno fana worite kazaseru morofitofa kefuno afidafa tanosiku arubesi
(*kazashite iru* – resultative: *ume* flowers are still there to be admired)

In the forms encountered in *Azuma uta* and *Sakimori uta* the sound appears as *-ar-* rather than *-er-*, which is characteristic of Old Eastern Japanese.

3469 由布氣尔毛 許余比登 乃良路 和賀 西奈波 阿是曾母 許与比 与斯呂 伎麻左奴
(夕占にも 今夜と 告らろ 我が 背なは あぜども 今夜 寄しろ 来まさぬ)
yufukenimo koyofito noraro waga senafa azezomo koyofi yosiro kimasanu
(*otsuge ga dete iru* – resultative: it has been said/conveyed)

On the other hand, *shite ari* (*shitari*) type forms are in principle not restricted to the strong conjugation with the exception of the verbs of existence, which do not have *shite ari* type forms.

817 烏梅能 波奈 佐吉多流 僧能々 阿遠也疑波 可豆良尔 須倍久 奈利尔家良受夜
(梅の 花 咲きたる 園の 青柳は 藪に すべく なりにけらずや)
umeno fana sakitaru sonono awoyagifa kadurani subeku narinikerazuya
(*saito iru* – resultative: is blooming)

3585 和伎母故我 之多尔毛 伎余等 於久理多流 許呂母能 比毛乎 安礼 等可米也母
(我妹子が 下にも 着よと 贈りたる 衣の 紐を 我れ 解かめやも)
wagimokoga sitanimo kiyoto okuritaru koromono fimowo are tokameyamo
(*okutta/okutte kureta* – resultative: has sent me)

3605 和多都美乃 宇美尔 伊弓多流 思可麻河泊 多延無 日尔許曾 安我 故非 夜麻米
(わたつみの 海に 出でたる 飾磨川 絶えむ 日にこそ 我が 恋 やまめ)
watatumino umini idetaru sikamagafa taemu finikoso aga kofi yamame
(*dete iru=nagarete iru*– resultative: [the river] keeps flowing)

834 烏梅能 波奈 伊麻 佐加利奈利 毛々等利能 己恵能 古保志枳 波流 岐多流良斯
(梅の 花 今 盛りなり 百鳥の 声の 恋しき 春 来るらし)
umeno fana ima sakarinari momotorino koweno kofosiki haru kitarurasi
(*kite iru /kita yō da*– resultative: spring has come)

It should be noted that *shi ari* type forms can also be found in the weak conjugation or in irregular verbs although they are rare and the number of examples is very small.

3667 和我 多妣波 比左思久 安良思 許能 安我 家流 伊毛我 許呂母能 阿可 都久 見礼婆
(我が 旅は 久しく あらし この 我が 着る 妹が 衣の 垢 つく 見れば)
waga tabifa fisasiku arasi kono aga keru(<*ki aru) imoga koromono aka tuku mireba
(*kite iru* – resultative: I have worn)

3957 [略]多麻豆左能 使乃 家礼婆 宇礼之美登 安我 麻知 刀敷尔 (略)
([略]玉梓の 使の 来れば 嬉しみと 我が 待ち 問ふに (略))
...tamadusano tukafino kereba(<*ki areba) uresimito aga mati tofuni
(*kita no de* – resultative: because he has come)

4482 保里延 故要 等保伎 佐刀麻豆 於久利 家流 伎美我 許己呂波 和須良由麻之自
(堀江 越え 遠き 里まで 送り 来る 君が 心は 忘らゆましじ)
forie koe tofoki satomade okuri keru(<*ki aru) kimiga kokorofa wasurayumasizi
(*okutte kita* – resultative: has come)

The same can be observed in Old Eastern Japanese where the *-ar-* type (NOT *-er-*) vowel fusion occurred.

4431 佐左賀波乃 佐也久 志毛用尔 奈々弁 加流 去呂毛尔 麻世流 古侶賀 波太波毛
(笹が葉の さやぐ 霜夜に 七重 着る 衣に 増せる 子ろが 肌はも)
sasagafano sayagu simoyoni nanafe karu(<*ki aru) koromoni maseru koroga fadafamo
(*kite iru* – resultative: has put [clothes] on)

3556 思保夫祢能 於可礼婆 可奈之 左宿都礼婆 比登其等 思氣志 那乎 杼可母 思武
(潮船の 置かれば 愛し さ寝つれば 人言 繁し 汝を どころも しむ)

sifobuneno okareba(*<oki areba) kanasi sanetureba fitogoto sigesi nawo dokamo simu
(oite aru no de – resultative: because a boat is left there)

The above examples from *Man'yōshū* indicate that *shi ari* type forms might have appeared in all verbs prior to Old Japanese, and were later simplified from vowel fusion to affixation (**shi ari > seri* : *shite ari > shitari*), which resulted in the appearance forms closer to analytic and, ultimately, the extinction of *shi ari* type forms. However, these forms have survived in the Hachijō language, where the vowel fusion is *-ar-* and is consistent with Old Eastern Japanese of *Azuma uta* and *Sakimori uta*, like in *nomara* (cf. *nonda* 'drank'), that is *-ar-*.

Hachijō language

Past tense verb forms in the Hachijō language display complementary distribution: depending on the type of verb they are either *shi ari* or *shite ari* type forms, and are jointly referred to as *ari* type forms. In the contemporary Hachijō language they are grammaticalized as tense forms. However, because the transition from aspectual to tense forms occurred relatively late, and because there long existed parallel past tense forms of the *-ki* type, which resulted in *ari* type forms retaining their aspectual meaning in the present tense, yet another *ari* was added to clarify the past tense meaning, which resulted in *shi ari ari* and *shite ari ari* type forms. The presence of a double *ari*, makes these forms similar to the Northeast Japan *shitatta*. The difference is that in the Hachijō language the second *ari* is always of the *shi ari* type irrespective of what verb it appears in.

nomu 'drink'

nomara < **nomaro wa* < **nomi aro wa*

nomarara < **nomararo wa* < **nomi ari aro wa*

miru 'see'

mitara < **mitaro wa* < **mite aro wa*

mitarara < **mitararo wa* < **mite ari aro wa*

The verb of existence for both animate (people/animals) and inanimate objects is *aru*, although *woru* can marginally be observed among elderly speakers.

• koko=N aro=wa. '[It] is here'

Accordingly, the auxiliary verb, too, is *aru* in the progressive aspect. It corresponds to the standard Japanese *shite iru*. Therefore, all standard Japanese *shite iru* forms appear as *shite aru*. (In the past *woru*, too, was used as an auxiliary verb.)

- ui=mo noNde aro=wa. ‘That guy, too, is drinking.’
- ui=mo mite aro=wa. ‘That guy, too, is watching.’

The *shi ari* type forms which are described in this paper are observed in all strong conjugation verbs except those whose stem consonant *s*, whereas *shite ari* type forms occur in weak conjugation verbs, irregular verbs and in strong conjugation verbs with the stem consonant *s*.

- ui=mo nomara. (<*nomi aro=wa) ‘That guy, too, drank it.’
- ui=mo mitara. (<*mite aro=wa) ‘That guy, too, saw it.’

(In the past *wori* type forms like *noNdoro=ga*<**nomite woro=ga* or *nomattoro=ga*<**nomi arite woro=ga* were also used, but they are almost extinct now. It should be noted that they all represented the *shite wori* type, and that the *shi wori* did never exist.)

As stated above, both *ari* type forms and aspectual progressive forms consist of the main verb and *aru* as their components. (The resultative aspect comprises the main verb, the *aru* constituent and the auxiliary *aru* as in *kakete aro=wa* or *kakarete aro=wa* (cf. *kaite aru*). The fact that the structure [main verb + *aru* constituent] appears as *e* (cf. *kakete*) as is the case in Old and Middle Central Japanese may indicate its late development.) Therefore, in weak conjugation verbs such as *miru* the past form follows the *mitari* pattern, and the analytic aspectual form follows the *mite aru* pattern, both having the same constituents, but different forms and meaning. (In the Iriomote-Sonai dialect, too, the analytic aspectual form is *numi bu*, whereas the resultative aspect is expressed by the fusion form *numiru*, both having the same constituents employing the main verb and *wori*.)

Ari type forms primarily express the past tense, which in this point resembles the transition from the perfective (aspect) to past (tense) meaning in Old Central Japanese. There are two past tense forms in the Hachijō language: *nomara* and *nomarara*. (It resembles the situation in Northeast Japan dialects, where both *noNda* and *noNdatta* are used.) The meaning of *nomara* type forms ranges from expressing present result to distant past.

nomara

- nja:=ni tanei makara wara: . ‘I have sown seeds in the garden.’
- wara kinei terebjo mitara. ‘I saw it on the TV yesterday’
- mi=ga narara. ‘The fruits have ripened.’ (present result)

Nomarara type forms refer to ‘detached’ past with no present relevance, which make them different from *nomara*. On rare occasions forms with yet another *ari*, i.e. *nomararara* are encountered.

nomarara

- kjoneN=wa sikkai mi=ga nararara. ‘Last year lot of fruit grew.’
- kinei sakei nomarara. ‘I drank sake yesterday.’
- wara kinei terebjo mitarara. ‘I watched the TV yesterday.’

The fact that non-*ari* type forms express present progressiveness and *shi ari* type forms are used in a present resultative meaning, and that *ki* type past forms still marginally exist in this dialect makes its tense-and-aspect system very similar to that observed in Old and Early Middle Japanese.

- mada nomou!(<*nomo=wo) (wo= exclamatory sentence-end particle) ‘He is still drinking!’
- kogoN nomarou!<*nomi aro=wo) ‘He is drinking so much!’ (wo = exclamatory sentence-end particle)
- ui=to noNzi=ga (<*nomi-si=ga) no:. ‘I can recall my having drunk with that guy.’

Old-Early Middle Japanese and Hachijō tense-and-aspect system (exclamatory predicates shown as shaded)

	Present progressive	Present resultative	Past (adnominal)
Old-Early Middle Japanese	nomu · miru	nomeri · mitari	nomisi · misi
Hachijō language	nomou · mirou	nomarou · mitarou	noNzi · mici

Considering all the factors we can say that, while having partly retained the Old and Early Middle Japanese aspectual meaning *ari* type forms in the Hachijō language have generally shifted towards tense.

Miyako-Ōgami dialect

In the 2009 UNESCO report the Ōgami dialect was classified as one of the dialects of the Miyako language. The verbs of existence in this dialect corresponding to the standard Japanese *iru* and *aru* are *uɿ* and *aɿ*, respectively. All verbs in this dialect, including the verbs of existence, have *shi ari* type forms. Here we disregard the fact that the ‘*shi* part’ of the main verb itself includes *ari* (*numi* <**nomi ari*) and want to emphasize that the preceding constituent which combines with the auxiliary *ari* should be in the ‘*shi* form’.

Verbs in the Miyako-Ōgami dialect display the same change (fusion) of vowels as in Old Japanese, which is $\varepsilon : /e (num\epsilon : \dot{\gamma} < *nomi aru) < ia$, as in *nomeri* <**nomi ari*. Apart from that, the Ōgami dialect partly displays analytic forms when the emphatic *tu* (cf. *zo*) is used like in **nomi=zo aru > numi=tu aɿ/numita : \dot{\gamma}*. This point makes it different from the Iriomote-Sonai dialect, which has only synthetic

(fusion) forms and lacks analytic forms.

Verbs forms whose *-shi* form ends with a short *i* after a consonant are subject to the *-i aɲ > -ε:ɲ* fusion irrespective of the type of verb, even in the weak conjugation. The exception is the short *-ri* sound after which the vowel fusion results in *-(j)aɲ* (with a glide) provided there is a long vowel before *-ri* as in *kε:ri jaɲ* (*kieru* ‘go out’). In verbs which end with two subsequent vowels (or diphthongs) *ai* and *εi* or the the long vowel *i*; *aɲ* is not subject to fusion. It becomes *jaɲ* (often with a preceding glide) as in *mi: jaɲ/mi: aɲ* (cf. *miru* ‘see’) or *fai jaɲ* (cf. *taberu* ‘eat’), *itεi jaɲ* (cf. *au* ‘meet’).

If the emphatic particle *tu* is used, the analytic *-tu aɲ* may be encountered, but very often it is subject to fusion, which results in *-ta:ɲ*.

Result

- ja[tu:=pa: ffi]ta:ɲ. ‘The door is closed.’ (cf. To o shimete aru. To ga shimatte iru. Human subject.)
- u[sakana:=tu] kai jaɲ. ‘I have bought a lot.’ (cf. Takusan katte aru. Katte kita mono ga aru.)
- a[ka=tu] uskε:ɲ. ‘I put it [there]’ (cf. Watashi ga oite aru. <Dare ga oita ka?)
- mme] s[k]rita:ɲ. ‘It already is/has been cut’ (cf. Mō kitte aru.)

Evidence

- taukara:=ka=[tu nu:]re:ɲ. ‘Someone has climbed up=there is evidence of someone’s climbing up.’
(cf. Dareka ga nobotte aru. Nobotta konseki ga aru.)
- kɲnu=tu] taukara:=ka aɲ]kε:taɲ. ‘Someone walked [here] yesterday (having seen footprints in the field)’ (cf. Kinō dareka ga aruite atta.)
- jupi=tu ami=nu] ffε:ɲ. ‘It seems it rained last night.’ (judging from wet patches on the ground)
- ta:ka=tu fai ja]re:ɲ? ‘Did someone eat [here]?’ (having seen the evidence)

Shi ari type forms are also used in counterfactual (unreal) hypothetical utterances.

- mmakatika: aN=mai fai]ta:ɲ. ‘Had I known [it] was tasty, [I] would have eaten, too.’ or
‘Had it been tasty, I would have eaten [it].’
- kari:] fai u[ka: sɲ]nita:ɲ. ‘Had I eaten [it], [I] would have died’

Shi ori type forms (*numi iɲ*, *numi:ɲ* / *numi=tu uɲ*) in this dialect express progressiveness, whereas *shi ari* type forms (*numε:ɲ* / *numita:ɲ*) express present result or evidence. The difference between these forms and the standard Japanese *shite aru* is in that the agent remains the subject of a sentence in this dialect.

Aspectual (progressive) use—analytic forms

- kanu ps]ta: [kɿma:]iti=tu uɿ. ‘That guy is (being) angry.’
- ami=nu=te:N=tu ffi iɿ. ‘It is raining and raining.’
- tukei=nu=[tu] tumari iɿ. ‘The clock has stopped.’
- mma=Nsi niti iɿ. ‘She looks like her mother.’
- iks=mai] umaN=tu tati iɿ. ‘He is always standing here.’
- a[N=mai pɿ]ri=tu uɿ. ‘I am sitting, too.’
- pɿri]=tu utaɿ. ‘[I] was sitting.’

Iriomote-Sonai dialect

In the 2009 UNESCO report the Iriomote-Sonai dialect was classified as one of the Yaeyama language dialects.

The verbs of existence (cf. *iru*, *aru*) in the Iriomote-Sonai dialect are *buN* and *aN*, and derive from *wori* and *ari*, respectively. In this dialect all verbs including the verbs of existence have *shi ari* type forms. (Unlike in the Miyako-Ōgami dialect the Sonai dialect does not include *ari* in the main verb.) The vowel fusion in this dialect is *ia>e/e* and is similar to the Old Japanese **nomi ari > nomeri*. All verbs in this dialect display the same type of fusion: **nomi aru > numeru*.

Irrespective of the type of verb, that is in strong conjugation, weak conjugation and irregular verbs, *shi ari* type verbs in this dialect all become *-eru*. If the emphatic *du* is used *-du aru* becomes *-daru* as a result of vowel fusion. The fusion of subsequent vowels *ia* in this dialect results in *e*, which in that respect makes the situation in South Ryukyuan languages similar to that in Old Central Japanese (central=western pattern), and different from that in Old Eastern Japanese and in the Hachijō language (eastern pattern), where the fusion results in *a*.

Shi ari type forms (*numeru*) in the Iriomote-Sonai dialect mainly express evidentiality. They are different from the standard Japanese *shite aru* in that the agent remains the subject of a sentence (the object of action does not become the subject of a sentence).

- tak]ka=du [mana] a[s.ipe]ru. ‘Someone must has played [there].’ (there is some evidence of it)
- inu=[du] a[ruhe]ru. ‘A dog has walked/passed [through here].’ (having seen dog footprints)
- kabiN=[du] a[re]ru. ‘There must have been a vase [here].’ (having seen some marks/traces)
- tak]ka na[re:daru]. ‘Someone has practiced here.’ (there is some evidence of it)
- inu=[miN] a[ruhida]da. ‘A dog, too, had walked/passed [through here].’ (having seen some evidence)

Shi ari type forms are also used in counterfactual (unreal) hypothetical utterances.

- taro:=[miN] i[hida]ru. ‘Tarō would have gone, too [for an excursion, if his best friend had].’
- ti:da=nu i[di] bure[ra] ka:re[da]ru. ‘[It] would have dried if the weather had been sunny.’
- u[ra a]si ja[nakka]ra [ba:] numi=[du] bu[re]ru. ‘I would have drunk if you had not told me not to.’

There are two types of *shi wori* forms in the Iriomote-Sonai dialect: synthetic (resulting from fusion) and analytic. The analytic form is *numi bu*, and expresses progressive action, change, or lasting result of change. The analytic form does not take the starting point of an ongoing action into account. The synthetic form is *numiru*. It expresses the lasting result of change. Unlike the analytic form, the synthetic progressive form takes the starting point into account. Therefore, whenever the starting point is in question, the synthetic form is used.

Progressive forms (analytic)

- unu maja: na[hi=doNna] a[rihi] bu. ‘That cat is walking and mewling.’ (progressive action)
- s. a[ki] bu. ‘[Flowers] are blooming.’ (progressive change)
- ta[ro=me iciheN [as. i=tu i] bu. ‘Tarō is always saying that.’ (habitual action)

Progressive-resultative forms (synthetic)

- taro:=[du] nu[ru]. ‘Tarō (NOT Jirō) is sewing [it].’ (progress)
- taro:=[miN] k. a[kidu]ru. ‘Tarō, too, is writing.’ (I know it because I saw him start writing)
(beginning and progress)
- inu=[du] s. i[ni]ru. ‘The dog is dead/has died.’ (having confirmed the situation/result - resultative)

Other Ryukyuan languages

Apart from South Ryukyuan languages *shi ari* type forms expressing past are also observed in the Amami-Kikaijima dialect (Matsumoto 2017), which in that respect makes them look closer *shi ari* type forms used in the Hachijō language. It indicates that at some stage these forms might have existed in all Ryukyuan languages and later disappeared from ‘central’ Ryukyuan languages leading to a secondary concentric circle dialect distribution.

The fact that *shi ari* type forms which are observed in South Ryukyuan languages and partly in Amami languages occur in all verbs, but are almost only found in strong conjugation (*yodan*) verbs of Old Japanese (having disappeared from other verbs) may imply that in regard to *shi ari* Ryukyuan languages have retained an older language layer (Early Old Japanese) than that of the Nara period.

East and Northeast Japan dialects

East and Northeast Japan dialects are diverse. In this paper we will focus on the Nan'yō dialect of southern Yamagata Prefecture (the native language of A. Kaneda). *Shi ari* type forms which are observed in Old Japanese are already extinct in this dialect. However, certain types of potential verbs which can be linked to the category of voice such as *kagaru* and forms like the resultative *kagatteru* (<**kag-atte iru*, cf. *kagu* 'write'), which structurally look similar to the progressive form, morphologically resemble the *shi ari* (*kak*+*-ar*+*iru*) form. This phenomenon is normally dealt with as the opposition between intransitive and transitive verbs, however, their morphological resemblance of the two forms suggest that they may be related.

Unlike standard Japanese potential verbs, which are the result of contraction (*kakeru*<*kakareru*), potential verbs in this dialect have an intransitive-passive morpheme *-ar-* (as opposed to the transitive-causative *-as-*) added to the stem. If we assume that *kagaru* is the result of fusion of the non-conclusive form (*chūshikei=ren'yōkei*) *kagi* and *-aru*, the fusion would follow the pattern similar to the one observed in Old Eastern Japanese and in the Hachijō language, that is *-i aru* would become *-aru* rather than *-eru*.

The verbs of existence in the Yamagata-Nan'yō dialect are *iru* and *aru*, but *iru* is the only auxiliary verb used in aspectual forms.

- ko=sa=mo nani=ga kagatteda. 'Something is written here, too.' (cf. *koko ni mo nani ka kaite aru*)

Kagaru (**kaki* + *aru* > *kagaru*) type forms are principally used to express present potentiality.

- ore=mo zi: kagu. 'I, too, will write letters.' (future perfective) (*kagane*, cf. *kakanai*, human subject)
- kono bo:rupeN ma~da kagaru. 'This ball-point pen will still write.' (present) (cf. *kagaNne*, *kakenai*, inanimate subject)

In displaying the same vowel type of vowel fusion verb forms (*kagaru=shi aru* type) in this dialect look similar to Old Eastern Japanese and the Hachijō language rather than to Old Central Japanese or South Ryukyuan languages. In the Nan'yō dialect potential verbs used with human subjects are of the *kagareru* (*-areru*) type and are similar to passive verbs. It should be noted that there are no *kakeru* (*-eru*) type potential forms in this dialect.

2. Forms deriving from *beshi*

Next we shall look at grammatical forms which derive from the Old and Early Middle Japanese *beshi*, which are typical of East and Northeast Japan, and will compare them with similar forms encountered in South Ryukyuan languages. These forms are used in three meanings: volitional, hortative and presumptive. These forms were long thought to be endemic to East and Northeast Japan, but it has become clear that they are also present in Miyako and other South Ryukyuan languages—they have been confirmed in all Miyako dialects, and in the Iriomote dialect of Yaeyama (but not in other Yaeyama dialects or in the Yonaguni language). The presence of *beshi* type forms in South Ryukyuan languages implies that they might have been used even before the currently wide spread formal noun *hazu* appeared.

In the Miyako-Ōgami dialect, Iriomote-Sonai dialect, and in other dialects where grammatical forms employing *hazu* and forms deriving from *beshi* coexist, the former express a greater degree, and the latter express a lesser degree of certainty or doubtfulness if used in the presumptive meaning. It should be noted that forms deriving from *beshi* which are used in East-Northeast Japan express a greater degree of certainty than their South Ryukyuan counterparts. In both East-Northeast Japan dialects and in South Ryukyuan languages these forms also express a volitional or hortative meaning, in which case their use is restricted to verbs in the same way as in the standard Japanese. There is no such restriction when used in a presumptive meaning.

Beshi type forms existed in Old Central Japanese, and it is thought that they were once present in western Japan (Funaki 1999). Their use and meaning in South Ryukyuan languages and in East and Northeast Japan are very similar, which implies that they would have remained in both distant areas after disappearing from the center (now dialects of western Japan). Their current distribution can be treated as concentric circle distribution.

It should be noted that the volitional and presumptive *beshi* is used in soliloquy type utterances even if the listener is present.

The use of *beshi*

	Ōgami dialect	Kurima dialect	Tarama dialect	Iriomote dialect	Yamagata Nan'yō dialect
Indicative-declarative	×	×	×	×	×
Indicative-presumptive	○	○	○	○	○no[mu]be:
Interrogative (with no question word)	○	○	○	△	○no[mube]ga
Interrogative (with <i>wh</i> - question word)	×	×	○	○	○nomu]be
Dubitative (with no question word)	○	○	○	○	○no[mu]bega na:
Dubitative (with <i>wh</i> - question word)	×	×	○	○	○nomu]be na:
Volitional	○	○	×	○	○[nomube
Hortative	○	×	×	×	○nomu]be:
Suffix deriving from <i>beshi</i>	pe:m	bjɑ:/pja:	be:m	be:	be:

Northeast Japan dialects

The relevant form in the Yamagata-Nan'yō dialect and in other dialects of southern Northeast Japan is *be:*. It is used in volitional, hortative and presumptive utterances, and the difference in meaning is indicated by intonation, subject to individual differences (even within the same speaker). Presumptive utterances display the opposition of tense (non-past:past). In Kaneda's native environment (yet still individual) the differences are as follows : *no[mube* (volitional), *no[mu]be:* (hortative), *no[mu]be:* (presumptive). It is worth noticing that in northern Northeast Japan dialects, e.g. in Aomori, the presumptive form and the volitional-hortative form are morphologically different: the former is *be:*, whereas the latter is *beshi*.

- sorosoro neN=[be]. 'I am going to bed.' (volitional)
- doNzjotori=sa ae]=~be. 'Let's go-and-catch loaches.' (hortative)
- eppugu suN]=be. 'Let's rest a while.' (hortative)
- asogora=sa ette asuNdeda N[ne]=be=ga. 'He's probably gone there to play.' (presumptive)
- ano ero=no s. isjoe=na dogo=no dare=da]=be [na:]. 'Whose may be that white one.' (presumptive)
- anos. ito=mo ku:=~be=gara oedoge. 'He will probably eat it. Leave it [there].' (presumptive)
- taeheNda=be=geNto nae. 'It must be hard to take [it] there.' (presumptive)

Miyako-Ōgami dialect

The form used in the Miyako-Ōgami dialect is *-pe:m*. It is common for both volitional-hortative and presumptive use, but the verb form is different. In the volitional-hortative use it is *numati=pe:m*, while in the presumptive use the verb takes the emphatic form *num=tu s=pe:m*. Verbs in the presumptive use display the opposition between non-past and past tense. The dubitative *ira:* (cf. *kanaa*) can appear after *-pe:m*. *Beshi* type forms display large differences from dialect to dialect: in other Miyako dialects they include *be:m*, *bjə:ŋ*, *biraN*, and other particles.

- pi:ru:] numa[ti]=pe:m. [saki:] numa[ti]=pe:m. ‘Shall I have beer or sake?’ (volitional)
- mmɛ] jusara[pi] nari uri[pa] ika[ti]=pe:m. ‘It’s already evening. I’m going home.’ (volitional)
- ki:=ja] numa[ti]=pe:m. nu[matɛ:N]=pe:m. ‘Shall we [possibly] drink today or not?’ (hortative)
- kare: ki:=ja saki:=[pa:] num=tu s]=pe:m. ‘Is he likely to drink today?’ (presumptive)
- kare:] kanu saki:=[pa:] num=tu staɪ]=pe:m. ‘Did he possibly drink that sake?’ (presumptive)
- o:saka=mai] ame: ffi=tu u=pe:m. ‘Isn’t it raining in Osaka, too?’ (presumptive)
- umaN=tu] geNno:=[ja] ari u]=pe:m. ‘Would there be a hammer [here]?’ (presumptive)
- unu] ka:ssa [mmakam]=pe:m. ‘Would those biscuits be tasty?’ (presumptive)
- u[ri]=pe:m. ‘It must have been this one (=I think it was the one I saw the other day).’ (presumptive)
- u[pu:sa=tu kai]=pe:m [i]ra:. ‘Did I buy a lot? Too much, perhaps? Anyway, I did.’ (presumptive)

In order to express a higher degree of certainty either the formal noun *pakɿ* (deriving from *hazu*) or *hazu* is used. *Hazu* as such may be observed when the speaker ‘thinks’ he/she is using the standard Japanese (its grammatical meaning will then be the same as in the local language, not standard Japanese).

- uri=ka=tu] mmakaɿ] pakɿ. ‘I think it is tasty.’
- ftacucigai=hazu. ‘I think this guy is two years older/younger(=different) than me.’
(looking at a photograph).

Iriomote-Sonai dialect

Iriomote-Sonai dialect the relevant particle is *-be:*. As was the case in the Miyako-Ōgami dialect, the same particle appears in volitional and presumptive utterances, but the verb form is different. The form in the volitional use it is *numu=be:*, and in the presumptive use it is *numi su=be:* (analytic). In the presumptive use it displays the opposition of tense (non-past : past).

- nu[du] kareri[ki nuk]ka nu[mu=be:]. ‘I am so thirsty. I am going to have something to drink.’
(volitional)

- bi:ru nu[mu=be]: s. aki=du nu[mu=be]: ‘Shall I have beer or, perhaps, *awamori*?’ (volitional)
- ak[ka]ra a[ca taro: [ki:] su=[be]: ‘And Tarō is probably coming tomorrow.’ (presumptive)
- aca=[nu] maru ta[ro: kuN=be]: ‘Tarō may not be coming tomorrow.’ (presumptive)
- k. inu] taro: [ki s. i]=tu bu[re=be]: ‘If that is the case, Tarō would have come (=I am sure he did).’
(presumptive)
- ta[ro:] ja[na=na] buraN=[be]: ‘Tarō may not be at home.’ (presumptive)
- k. asi=nu hoN be:=na mjaN=be]: ‘I don’t think I have this book at home.’ (presumptive)
- ici=N] naruk[ka]ra p. ari[ru=be]: ‘When is it possibly going to clear.’ (presumptive)

In order to express a higher degree of certainty either the formal noun *hazi* or *hazu* is used. *Hazu* appears to be ‘woven’ into the dialect with no ‘standard Japanese’ use similar to the Miyako-Ōgami dialect.

- dak]ka=[na at]turu hazu. ‘I think [it] is/must be somewhere.’ (presumptive).

As pointed to above, South Ryukyuan languages employ different verb forms to express the volitional-hortative and the presumptive meaning. Interestingly, the same distinction can be observed in northern Northeast Japan dialects (cf. *be:* : *beshi*). There was no such a distinction in Old and Middle Japanese.

Hachijō language

The relevant volitional form deriving from *beshi* in the Hachijō language is *nomou=bei*. However, it is largely redundant and very seldom used because there exist three specialized forms which separately express all the three grammatical meanings. They are: *nomu=nou=wa* (presumptive), *nomou* (volitional), and *nomo=goN* (hortative). Apart from these there is also a form expressing obligation or duty, which is *-beki=dara*. It is used with weak conjugation verbs like *mi=beki=dara* (cf. *miru*) or *de=beki=dara* (cf. *deru*) being added to the old conclusive form (=stem) as was the case in Old Japanese.

3951 日晩之乃 奈吉奴流 登吉波 乎美奈敵之 佐伎多流 野邊乎 遊吉追都 見倍之
(ひぐらしの 鳴きぬる 時は をみなへし 咲きたる 野邊を 行きつつ 見べし)
figurasino nakinuru tokifa wominafesi sakitaru nobewo yukitutu mibesi

(mirubeki ‘it’s good to see’)

The form *-nou=wa*, which is used in the Hachijō language, derives from Old Eastern Japanese *namu*, which is thought to even be older than Old Central Japanese *ramu* used in the Nara period (=Early Old Japanese). Should that be true, it would mean that the contemporary Hachijō language has

retained the oldest layer of the Japanese language regarding *-nou=wa* < *namu* presumptive forms.

We have presented the concentric circle distribution of grammatical forms in Northeast Japan, the Hachijō language and South Ryukyuan languages. As far as *shi ari* type forms are concerned, South Ryukyuan languages, where these forms are used in all verbs, form the outermost circle. On the other hand, the use of presumptive forms which can be traced back to *namu* in the the Hachijō language and the fact that *beshi* type forms are marginal in this language place it on the outermost circle of presumptive forms.

Other linguistic phenomena which are not discussed in this paper include the well-known *kakarimusubi* forms, which conclude sentences, and the adnominal verb forms with the *-o* ending, which are encountered in the Hachijō language (*nomo sake*, cf. *nomu sake*). The latter resemble Old Eastern Japanese of *Man'yōshū* (3423 布路与伎能 *furo joki no*, cf. *furu yuki no*), but are also confirmed in *Omorosōshi*, and are thought to appear in the contemporary Ishigaki dialect of the Yaeyama language (Karimata 2014). This would place the adnominal *-o* ending, which was typical of Old Eastern Japanese, on the easternmost distribution circle on the Hachijō Island and on the southernmost circle on the South Ryukyu Islands. The *-o* ending which is confirmed to have occurred in the language spoken in Shuri about 500 years ago would then have disappeared from the center (Shuri) and remained on the southern periphery (Yaeyama). These facts imply that *-o* might have been the adnominal ending even before *-u* ending documented in *Man'yōshū* appeared in Old Central Japanese.

Yanagita's concentric circle theory of dialect divergence, which was based on vocabulary distribution, has not gained much support, but it looks much more convincing if we apply it to grammatical phenomena, in which case it may even prove indispensable for the study of 'peripheral' languages or dialects.

★Bibliography

Akihiro Kaneda(2012), *Hachijō hōgen ni okeru arata na henka to jōdaigo*, in: *Gengo Kenkyū*, no. 142, pp. 119-142

Akihiro Kaneda, Kayoko Shimoji(2015), *Miyako shohōgen ni okeru beshi yuraikei no shiyō jittai*, in: *Ryukyu no hōgen*, no. 39, Hosei University Institute of Okinawan Studies, pp. 141-164

Hirotake Matsumoto (2017), *Amami kikajima hōgen ni arawareru shiarikei no gokei kanken*, in: *Suzuki Tai koki kinen ronbunshū*, Kokusai rengoron gakkai (ed.) , pp.33-43

Reiko Funaki(1999), *Ishi-suiryō keishiki be: no taishō —yōhō henka no suiron—*, in: *Machikaneyama Rōnsō*(33), pp.17-31

Shigehisa Karimata(2014), *Rentaikai gobi kara mita Omorosōshi no -o dan to -u dan no kana no*

tsukaiwake, in: *Okinawa Bunka*, vol. 48 nr. 2, pp.187-198

Shigehisa Karimata(2016),*Ryūkyū shogo no asupekuto-tensu taikei o kōsei suru keishiki*,
in:Yukinori Takubo, John Whitman, Tatsuya Hirako (ed.),*Ryūkyū shogo to kodai nihongo —nichi-ryū sogo no saiken ni mukete*, pp.125-147