The Origin and Architecture of Existential Indeterminates in Okinawan
Ken Hiraiwa*

Abstract. In a number of languages, an indeterminate is combined with various particles to yield different indefinite pronouns. This has been called an indeterminate system (Kuroda 1965, Cheng 1991, Haspelmath 1997, Jayaseelan 2001). As Haspelmath (1997) and Jayaseelan (2001) observe, existential indeterminates are often built with disjunction markers. On the other hand, a disjunction particle and a question particle are often morphologically identical cross-linguistically (see Hagstrom 1998, Jayaseelan 2001). Thus, a question that I ask here is whether the alleged homophony between a disjunction marker and a marker that forms an existential quantifier is principled (Jayaseelan 2001, Szabolcsi et al. 2014) or coincidental (Haspelmath 1997, Cable 2010). In this paper, I argue that the observation about homophony is misguided and hence support Haspelmath’s hypothesis, based on the data obtained from my fieldwork on Okinawan, an endangered Ryukyuan language. I propose an analysis where existential indeterminates in Okinawan have a clausal structure of an embedded question and are derived by deletion.
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1. Introduction. In a number of languages, an indeterminate is combined with various particles to yield different indefinite pronouns. This has been called an indeterminate system (Kuroda 1965, Cheng 1991, Haspelmath 1997, Jayaseelan 2001). In Malayalam, Japanese, and Nanay, for example, an indeterminate ‘who’ is interpreted as existential ‘someone’, when combined with a disjunction particle (1b–3b). In Basque and Russian, an indeterminate ‘who’ receives a free choice interpretation when combined with a disjunction particle (4b-5b) (the data are cited from Haspelmath1997).

(1) a. aarə ‘who’ b. aar(ə)-oo ‘someone’ (Malayalam)
(2) a. dare ‘who’ b. dare-ka ‘someone’ (Japanese)
(3) a. uj ‘who’ b. uj-nuu ‘someone’ (Nanay)
(4) a. nor ‘who’ b. edo-nor ‘whoever’ (Basque)
(5) a. kto ‘who’ b. kto-libo ‘whoever’ (Russian)

As Haspelmath (1997) and Jayaseelan (2001) observe, existential indeterminates and free choice indeterminates are often built with disjunction markers. On the other hand, a disjunction particle and a question particle are often morphologically identical cross-linguistically (see Hagstrom 1998, Jayaseelan 2001). Thus, a question that I ask here is whether the alleged homophony between a disjunction marker and a marker that forms an existential quantifier is principled
(Jayaseelan 2001, Szabolcsi et al. 2014) or coincidental (Hauspelm 1997). In this paper, I argue that the observation about homophony is misguided and hence support Hauspelm’s hypothesis, based on the data obtained from my fieldwork on Okinawan, an endangered Ryukyuan language. I propose an analysis where existential indeterminates in Okinawan have a clausal structure of an embedded question and are derived by deletion.

2. Indeterminates in Okinawan. Japanese has an indeterminate system (Kuroda 1965, 2013, Shimoyama 2008, Hiraiwa 2015, 2017). Okinawan also has an indeterminate system, just as Japanese does (see Sugahara 1996 and Hiraiwa 2019; see Miyara 2000, 2019 for a general grammatical description of Okinawan). Each of the five indefinite pronouns in Okinawan combines an indeterminate pronoun and one of the quantificational particles (∅/n/gana/yatin).1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+nominal</th>
<th>+nominal</th>
<th>+nominal</th>
<th>-nominal</th>
<th>-nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td>taa-CASE</td>
<td>taa-CASE</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>taa-n</td>
<td>taa-yatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>nuu-CASE</td>
<td>nuu-CASE</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>nuu-n</td>
<td>nuu-yatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td>maa-CASE</td>
<td>maa-CASE</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>maa-n</td>
<td>maa-yatin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: indeterminate system in Okinawan (partial)

1 Okinawan
a. Taa-ga choo-ta ga?
   who-Nom come-Past Q
   ‘Who came?’
b. Taa-ga-n chuu sa.
   who-Nom-N come Sfp
   ‘Everyone will come.’
c. Taa-gana-ga chan
   who-GANA-Nom come.Past
   ‘Someone came.’
d. Taa-n kuu-n-tan.
   who-N come-Neg-Past
   ‘No one came.’
e. Taa-yatin chuu sa.2
   who-YATIN come Sfp
   ‘Anyone will come.’

3. Absence of a Disjunction Particle in Okinawan. In Japanese, universal/NPI indeterminates and existential indeterminates are built by combining an indeterminate pronoun and the particles

1 The [+nominal]/[-nominal] distinction is based on whether case-marking is possible. * indicates the position of pitch accent. See Hiraiwa (2015, 2017) for a detailed analysis of Japanese indeterminates.
2 Evidently, the morpheme yatin is complex, consisting of the copula yati, and the additive particle n. See Section 4 on its clausal status. A similar decompositional analysis will be proposed for gana, too. See also Hiraiwa and Nakanishi (to appear) for arguments that free choice indeterminates (e.g., dare-demo ‘whoever’) are syntactically an unconditional clause, exactly in the same way as taa-yati-n ‘whoever’ in Okinawan.

(2) Japanese
  a. dare ‘who’
  b. dare-mo ‘any/everyone’
  c. Taro-mo ‘Taro, too’

(3) Japanese
  a. dare ‘who’
  b. dare-ka ‘someone’
  c. Taro-ka Hanako-ka ‘Taro or Hanako’

While it has an additive conjunction particle n (the cognate of mo ‘also’ in Japanese), which is used to build a universal quantifier and an NPI, Okinawan lacks a simple morpheme that expresses nominal disjunction and the morpheme gana used for building existential indeterminates does not have a disjunctive function.

(4) Okinawan
  a. taa ‘who’
  b. taa-n ‘any/everyone’
  c. Taraa-n ‘Taraa, too’

(5) Okinawan
  a. taa ‘who’
  b. taa-gana ‘someone’
  c. *Taraa-gana Maziruu-gana ‘Taraa or Maziruu

On the other hand, the language does have a sentence-final question particle ga (for wh-question) and (m)ji (for yes-no question), as (6a) indicates. This question particle is distinct from the yes-no question particle -mi as shown in (6b). Importantly, however, these particles cannot build an existential indeterminates (or disjoin phrases), either, as shown in (7).

(6) Okinawan
  a. Taa-ga ichu ga?
     who-Nom go Q
     ‘Who will go?’
  b. Jiraa-ga ichu mi?
     Jiraa-Nom go Q
     ‘Does Jiraa go?’

(7) Okinawan
     who-GA-Nom come.Past
     ‘Someone came.’
  b. *Taa-mi-ga chan.
Clausal disjunction in alternative question in Okinawan does not employ any overt marker.

\[(8)\] Okinawan
\[
\text{Shinshi-ya Taraa-nkai [ichu-} \text{mi ikan-i] chichan.}
\]
\[
\text{teacher-Top Taraa-Dat go-Q go.Neg-Q ask.Past .}
\]
\`
\text{The teacher asked Taraa whether he would go or not go.}
\`

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nominal disjunction</th>
<th>clausal disjunction</th>
<th>wh-question</th>
<th>yes-no question</th>
<th>existential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(\varnothing)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
<td>(ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(\varnothing)</td>
<td>(ga)</td>
<td>(mi)</td>
<td>(gana)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: disjunction, question, and existential markers in Japanese and Okinawan

These facts show that (i) Okinawan lacks a disjunction particle and hence that (ii) its question markers cannot build existential indeterminates, contrary to the languages listed in (1).

4. **Existential Indeterminates in Okinawan as Clausal Questions.** As noted in the previous sections, existential indeterminates in Okinawan employ the mysterious morpheme \(gana\), which is not a disjunction particle.

\[(9)\] Okinawan
\[
\text{Taa-} \text{gana-} \text{ga chan.}
\]
\[
\text{who-GANA-Nom come.Past}
\]
\`
\text{‘Someone came.’}
\`

Although the morpheme \(gana\) is likely to be composed of the Q-particle \(ga\) and \(na\), the status of the latter is not immediately clear. Putting aside \(gana\) for a moment, it is interesting to look at another form of existential indeterminate in Okinawan, as shown in (10).

\[(10)\] Okinawan
\[
\text{Taa-} \text{gayara chan.}
\]
\[
\text{who-GAYARA come.Past}
\]
\`
\text{‘Someone came.’}
\`
Importantly, this form is identical to an embedded self-question structure, as shown in (11).\footnote{Iatridou and Von Fintel (2019) discuss particles that make questions “unasked questions”. It is interesting that existential indefinenesses are derived from unasked question forms both in Okinawan and Japanese.} Evidently, \emph{gayara} in (11) is syntactically complex: \emph{ga} is a Q-complementizer, \emph{yara} is a conditional form of copula.

(11) Okinawan
\begin{enumerate}
  \item [a.] \{Ta\} \text{ ga } \text{ ya-ra} \text{ wakara-n.}
  \begin{enumerate}
    \item who \text{ Q Cop-RA} \text{ know.Neg}
      \begin{enumerate}
        \item ‘I don’t know who it is.’
      \end{enumerate}
  \end{enumerate}
  \item [b.] \{Ta\} \text{ ga } \text{ ya-ra.}
  \begin{enumerate}
    \item who \text{ Q Cop-RA}
      \begin{enumerate}
        \item ‘(I wonder/I don’t know) Who it is.’
      \end{enumerate}
  \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

As described in detail in Miyara (2000, 2007), Karimata and Shimabukuro (2007), Shinzato and Serafim (2013), Van der Lubbe (2017), self-question in Okinawan takes a form of focus-concord construction (called \emph{kakari-musubi}).\footnote{While the sentence-final Q-complementizer \emph{ga} in Okinawan in (12a) requires a wh-phrase, the Q-particle \emph{ga} in (12b) does not.}

(12) Okinawan
\begin{enumerate}
  \item [a.] \{Ta\} \{Taara\} \text{ ga } \text{ choo-ta } \text{ ga?}
  \begin{enumerate}
    \item who/Tara-Nom \text{ come-Past} \text{ Q}
      \begin{enumerate}
        \item ‘Who came? / *Did Tara come?’ \hspace{1cm} \text{(Wh-question)}
      \end{enumerate}
  \end{enumerate}
  \item [b.] \{Ta\} \{Taara\} \text{ ga-ga } \text{ choo-ta-ra?}
  \begin{enumerate}
    \item who/Tara-Nom-\text{Q} \text{ come-Past-RA}
      \begin{enumerate}
        \item ‘I wonder who came. / I wonder if Tara came.’ \hspace{1cm} \text{(Focus-concord self-question)}
      \end{enumerate}
  \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Wh-question in (12a) is information-seeking. The \text{Q-particle} appears at the end of the clause as a Q-complementizer and requires a wh-phrase. In contrast, focus-concord question in (12b) is a self-question and hence not information-seeking. The \text{Q-particle} \text{ga} necessarily attaches to the focus of the sentence and the predicate takes the focus-concord suffix -\text{ra} (see Miyara 2000, 2007 for a detailed description). Thus, the existential indeterminate in (10) and the self-question in (11) are both derived from the focus-concord question construction in (12b).

Interestingly, Okinawan employs this self-question structure in (11) and (12b) to build the existential indeterminate in (10). More specifically, I propose that what looks like an existential indeterminate in (10) is derived from an embedded self-question ‘I wonder / don’t know wh- it is’ by \text{dunno}-deletion and question-internal ellipsis (or pseudo-sluicing) inside the embedded question (Ross 1969; see, Inamine 2005, Miyara 2007, and Kurafuji 2009 on sluicing in Okinawan, and Saito 2007 and Hiraia and Ishihara 2010 on (pseudo)-sluicing in Japanese), as illustrated in (13)–(14).\footnote{\textit{gayara}, \textit{yarawan}, and \textit{yatin} are not always interchangeable, as the latter two are unconditional/free choice forms.}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Okinawan
    \begin{align*}
      &\text{Koohii-}\{yatin/\*gayara\} \text{ ucha-}\{yatin/\*gayara\} \text{ kwimisooree.} \\
      &\text{coffee-YATIN/GAYARA} \text{ tea-YATIN/GAYARA} \text{ give.me.please}
    \end{align*}
    \begin{enumerate}
      \item ‘Please give me some coffee or tea.’
    \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
(13) Okinawan
[Uree Taa ga ya-ra] wakara-n shiga, chuu ndi doo.
it.Top who Q Cop-RA know-Neg but come C.say Sfp
‘I heard that someone would come.’ (lit.) I don’t know who it is, (I heard) (he/she) will come.’

(14) Okinawan
[Uree Taa ga ya-ra] wakara-n shiga, chuu ndi doo.
it.Top who Q Cop-RA know-Neg but come C.say Sfp
‘I heard that someone would come.’ (lit.) I don’t know who it is, (I heard) (he/she) will come.’

The predicate wakara-n (shiga) ‘I don’t know’, which takes the embedded self-question, is deleted. The embedded question has the following structure in (15). The topicalized nominal demonstrative, which refers to the antecedent clause, undergoes ellipsis. The Q-particle attaches to the wh-phrase taa ‘who’ and agrees with the sentence-final focus-suffix -ra (focus concord).

(15) I don’t know who it is, but …

Haspelmath makes an important observation that existential quantifiers in some European languages have a sentential structure ‘I don’t know who’, as their source. This is illustrated in (16).

(16) Haspelmath (1997, 131)⁶
a. neizwer ‘somebody’ <ne weiz wer ‘(I) don’t know who’ (Middle High German)

---

⁶ Another way to build an existential indeterminate is reduplication.
(i) a. Taa-taa-ya kuu-n-tan.
   who-who-Top come-Neg-Past
   ‘(I don’t know their name, but) a certain person/certain people didn’t come.’
b. nāhwa ‘somebody’ <newāt hwā ‘(I) don’t know who’ (Old English)
c. nekkver ‘somebody’ <*ne wait ik hwarīr ‘I don’t know who’ (Old Norse)
d. nesține ‘some’ <Latin: nescio quis ‘I don’t know who’ (Romanian (dialectal))
e. na(m)koj ‘somebody’ <ne znam koj ‘I don’t know who’ (Bulgarian (dialectal))
f. někūtō ‘somebody’ <ne vě kūtō ‘I don’t know who’ (Old Church Slavonic)
g. je ne saiz quel ‘some kind of’ <cf. je ne saiz (pas) quel ‘I don’t know which’ (French)

Hasephamath refers to this type of grammaticalization path of existential quantifiers as *dunno-type* and observes that it is restricted to the European languages, but our analysis in (13)–(14) demonstrates that it is a general mechanism, observed outside the particular language family (see also Section 5 on Japanese).

I argue that the lack of a disjunction particle and the question-based existential indeterminates provide strong evidence against the homophony between a disjunction particle and a particle that forms existential indeterminates. Rather, it must be the Q-complementizer that plays a crucial role in deriving existential indeterminates in Okinawan.7

Finally, let us return to gana. As mentioned at the beginning of this section, ga should be a Q-particle of a focus-concord question. I propose that gana is derived from ga ya-ra in (17).

(17) Okinawan
    ga ya -ra
    Q Cop-RA

Suppose that the underlying structure of taa-gana ‘someone’ is taa ga ya-ra in (14). If deletion applies to the copula ya alone, leaving the focus-concord suffix intact, then we obtain the form *taa-gara in (17b). Assuming that /r/ undergoes phonological change to /n/, we obtain the form taa-gana in (17c).

(18) a. taa ga ya-ra ‘(I wonder) who it is’
    b. taa ga ya-ra copula deletion
    c. taa ga yana /r/ → /n/

   who-GANA who-GANA-Top come-Neg-Past
   ‘(I don’t know their name, but) a certain person/certain people didn’t come.’

As the translations indicate, it seems that reduplicated indeterminates is specific-unknown. Reduplicated indeterminates are also possible with universal indeterminates and NPIs. (e.g., taa-ga-n ta-ga-n ‘everyone’, taa-n taa-n ‘anyone’).

7 Shimoji (2008) observes similar data, wh-gagara (or wh-gara), from Irabu, a southern Ryukyuan language. If my analysis of Okinawan and Japanese is on the right track, then question-based existential indeterminates may well be a wide-spread feature of the languages across Japan. I suspect that the doubling ga in Irabu is due to non-complementary distribution of the Q-particle ga and the Q-complementizer ga in wh-focus-concord question in Irabu (see Shimoji 2008, 447–448).

(i) Irabu (Shimoji 2008, 242–243)
    Tau-gagara-nu-du sîn-tar-ca.
    who-GAGARA-Nom-Foc die-Past-HS
    ‘Someone has died, they say.’
The phonological fortition rule in (18c) is common cross-linguistically (see Proctor 2009). Van der Lubbe (2017) observes that the form *gara* in (18b) is indeed employed in an embedded (self)-question in Okinoerabu Ryukyuan.

(19) Okinoerabu Ryukyuan (Van der Lubbe 2017, 303)

Ichi ki-n gara waka-ra-n.

when come-Ind GARA know-Neg-Ind

‘I don’t know when he will come.’

Furthermore, the analysis in (18) is also independently supported by the fact that the counterpart of *gana* in Irabu is *gagara* (see footnote 7).

5. Japanese Existential Indeterminates as Embedded Question. The analysis of existential indeterminates as hidden embedded question is corroborated by Japanese. Nakanishi and Hiraiwa (2019) and Hiraiwa and Nakanishi (to appear) argue that there is indeed evidence that they are clausal in its origin and the particle *ka* is a Q-complementizer. The existential indeterminate *dare-ka* in example (20a) has long been considered to be an indeterminate combined with a nominal disjunction particle *ka*. However, we also find a semantically equivalent clausal expression (20b) in Japanese, just like in Okinawan. If we apply *dunno*-deletion, we obtain (20). If the copula is further deleted, we obtain the form (20d), which is identical to (20a).

(20) Japanese (Hiraiwa and Nakanishi to appear)

a. [Dare-ka]-ga kit-ta.

who-KA-Nom come-Past

‘Someone came.’

b. [Dare dat-ta *ka*] shira.nai-ga ki-ta.

who Cop-Past Q know.Neg-but come-Past

‘Someone (lit. I don’t know who it was) came.’

8 Thanks to Feng-Fan Hsieh for bringing this to my attention. The existence of glide-nasal alternation is also observed in Irabu (see Shimoji 2008, 448).

9 Thanks to Chris Davis for bringing my attention to the dialectal data.

10 Incidentally, this form, *ga ya-ra* can also convey disjunction.

(i) Kunu sumuchee, [Taraa mun *ga ya-ra*], [Jiraa mun ga ya-ra], ya sa.

this book Taraa thing Q Cop-RA Jiraa thing Q Cop-RA Cop Sfp

‘This book is Taraa’s or Jiraa’s.’ (lit.) This book is, I wonder if it is Taraa’s or if it is Jiraa’s.’

Two other forms *yarawan* and *yatin* can also be used for expressing what amounts to disjunction. They are also concessive conditional (or unconditional) clauses and the latter is also used as free choice expression (see table 1). 10

(ii) Okinawan

a. Pan *ya-ra-wa-n* kume *ya-ra-wa-n* masiyasi kara irabee.

bread Cop-RA-Cond also rice- Cop-RA-Cond also better from choose.Imp

‘Choose what you like better, whether bread or rice.’

b. Pan *yati-n* kume *yati-n* masiyasi kara irabee.

bread Cop.Cond-also rice Cop.Cond-also better from choose.Imp

‘Choose what you like better, whether bread or rice.’
c. [Dare dat-ta ka] shiranaigaki-ta.
   who Cop-Past Q know.Neg-Nom come-Past
   ‘Someone (lit. I don’t know who it was) came.’

d. [Dare dat-ta ka] shiranaigaki-ta.
   who Cop-Past Q know.Neg-Nom come-Past
   ‘Someone (lit. I don’t know who it was) came.’

Crucially, Japanese has another existential indeterminate expression (21), where only the sentential negation is elided from (20b) (with optional copula deletion).

(21) Japanese
   a. [Dare dat-ta ka] shiranaigaki-ta.
      who Cop-Past Q know.Neg-Nom came
      ‘Someone (lit. I don’t know who) came.’
   b. [Dare dat-ta ka] shiranaigaki-ta.
      who Cop-Past Q know.Neg-Nom came
      ‘Someone (lit. I don’t know who) came.’

The forms in (21) cannot be explained if ka were a nominal disjunction particle, because then it would not be able to be selected by the verb ‘know’.

From the perspective of the proposed analysis of existential indeterminates in Okinawan, the closest Japanese counterpart of the Okinawan example in (14) is (22).

(22) Japanese
   a. [Dare yara] ki-ta.
      who YARA come-Past
      ‘Someone came.’
   b. [Nani yara] ki-ta.
      what YARA come.Past
      ‘Something came.’
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