

The Adjective Class in Irabu Ryukyuan

SHIMOJI, Michinori

Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/7341545>

出版情報：日本語の研究. 5 (3), pp.33-50, 2009-07-01. The Society for Japanese Linguistics
バージョン：
権利関係：



The Adjective Class in Irabu Ryukyuan

SHIMOJI Michinori

*Research Fellow, Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa,
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies*

Abstract: The aim of this study is to give the definition of the word class adjective in Irabu Ryukyuan (henceforth Irabu), a north-west variety of Miyako Ryukyuan. It is well known among Ryukyuan linguists that Miyako Ryukyuan has a wide range of word forms that encode an ‘adjectival’ meaning, i.e. the compound form with the formal noun *munu*, the reduplicated form, and the inflected form, all of which have been referred to as ‘adjectives’ based on their semantic characteristics. Based on both language-internal criteria (morphosyntactic criteria) and typological criteria (functional criteria, i.e. cross-linguistically recurrent function of adjective), I will show that the reduplicated form is *the only* candidate for the adjective class in Irabu, contrary to the traditional view on ‘adjectives’ in the literature where the reduplicated form has always been treated as a secondary or special kind of adjective.

Keywords: Irabu, Ryukyuan, adjective, linguistic typology

1. Introduction

It is well known among Ryukyuan linguists that there are a wide range of word formation processes involving a given property concept stem (PC stem)¹ in Irabu and other Miyako Ryukyuan varieties (Motonaga 1978; Nakama 1992; Karimata 1992, 2002; Izuyama 2002; Shimoji 2006a, 2006b; Koloskova and Ōhori 2008). A PC stem is a bound stem that encodes an ‘adjectival’ meaning, and requires a further morphological make-up to function as a word. Thus as shown in the Irabu example (1) below, the PC stem *taka-* ‘high’ can serve as the input of five output word forms.²

(1a) Compound 1	(1b) Compound 2	(1c) Reduplication	(1d) Inflection	(1e) Adverbial
<i>taka+jama</i>	<i>taka+munu</i>	<i>takaa+taka</i>	<i>taka-kar-Ø</i>	<i>taka-fi</i>
‘high mountain’	‘high’	‘high’	‘high’	‘in a high state’

Apart from (1a) *taka+jama*, which is a compound noun, and (1e) *taka-fi*, which is an adverb (henceforth PC adverb; Shimoji 2008b), the English translations of the rest of the examples, i.e. (1b-d), leave us with an important question: should all, some, one, or none of these forms be treated as ‘adjectives’ in terms of word class assignment (as opposed to semantic characterisation)? My conclusion in this paper is that the reduplicated form (1c) is the *only* candidate for the adjective class in

Irabu, if we consider both language-internal and cross-linguistic criteria.

The definition of the adjective class suggested in this study is much more restrictive than the traditional definition in the literature, where there has been the tacit assumption that if a word (or even a stem) corresponds to an adjective in Japanese, then it is in some way an adjective. Thus, all previous works on Miyako Ryukyuan treat (1c) and (1d) as adjectives. Motonaga (1978) also treats (1b) as an adjective. I myself have treated (1b) as an adjective in a previous paper (Shimoji 2006). However, we must be cautious about two points here. First, in this traditional view of ‘adjectives’ it is unclear how the adjective class is defined in terms of *the synchronic system of Miyako Ryukyuan*. Second, the setting of the word class adjective in a given language requires a cross-linguistic justification, since the adjective classes in diverse languages show certain common and recurrent syntactic characteristics (Dixon 1982, 2004; Schachter 1985; Croft 2002, 2003; Hengeveld 1992; Stassen 1997; Wetzer 1996; see my discussion below). In other words, it is necessary to reexamine whether the loosely defined ‘adjectives’ (i.e. (1b), (1c), and (1d)) qualify as such in a *typological and cross-linguistic perspective*. By paying attention to these two points that were generally overlooked, I will show that (1c) is the only candidate for the adjective class in Irabu.³

2. A preliminary note on word classes in Irabu

Apart from adjectives, there are two open word classes, i.e. nouns and verbs, and four closed word classes, i.e. adverbs (e.g. *icigu* ‘always’, *ati* ‘very’, etc.), adnominals (*kanu* ‘that’, *kunu* ‘this’, *daizina* ‘quite; very much’, etc.), conjunctions (*ttjaa* ‘then’, *assiba* ‘so’, etc.), and interjections (*hira* ‘hey’, *mmja* ‘well’, etc.). I note nouns, adnominals, and verbs below, as the subsequent discussion presupposes an understanding of these.

2.1. The noun and the adnominal

A noun is defined as a word that only heads an NP, and an NP is independently defined as a constituent that functions as an argument or a copula complement (Shimoji 2008b). In each example below (where an NP is underlined), the word *jarabi* ‘child’ heads an NP with the respective function. NP structure is schematised as **(modifier+) head +case**, where case is obligatory per NP unless an NP functions as a plain (‘be’) copula complement (3). Case ellipsis does occur, but is much less common than case ellipsis in Japanese colloquial speech.

- (2) *uma=nu jarabi=u=du jurav-tar*
 that.place=GEN child=ACC=FOC call-PST
 ‘(I) called the child there.’ [NP as direct object]

- (3) *jamatu=nu jarabi=du a-tar.*
 mainland=GEN child=FOC COP-PST
 ‘(He) was a child from mainland Japan.’ [NP as a plain (‘be’) copula complement]

An important characteristic of NP structure is its recursiveness: an NP may func-

tion as a modifier of a larger NP. Thus (2) *uma* ‘that place’, for example, is an NP (a ‘minimal’ NP consisting of a head alone) that functions as a modifier of the underlined NP. As an NP, *uma* carries genitive case here. See Shimoji (2008b) for a fuller account of the recursiveness of phrase structure.

There is one other word class that is defined in relation to NP structure. That is, the adnominal word class, which is a closed set of words that serve only as a modifier of an NP. Since an adnominal does not head an NP, it never functions as an argument or a copula complement, and it is therefore distinguished from a noun. The difference between a noun and an adnominal is clearly seen in the NP modifier function as well: as shown in (4), the adnominal *daizina* is different from *uma* in (2), in that it does not carry case. This is because an adnominal directly fills the modifier slot of an NP whereas a noun does so only *indirectly*, by first heading an NP which in turn fills the modifier slot of a larger NP.

- (4) *kari=a daizina jarabi=du jar-Ø.*
 3SG=TOP quite child=FOC COP-NPST
 ‘He is quite a kid.’

An adnominal clause is a clause that fills the modifier slot of an NP like an adnominal word. See (5) below, where *asibii=bakaar ur* is an adnominal clause modifying the head noun *jarabi*.

- (5) *asib-i-i=bakaar ur-Ø jarabi=n=du nar-tar.*
 play-THM-MED=only PROG-NPST child=DAT=FOC B.COP-PST
 ‘(He) became a child who is always playing.’ [NP as a ‘become’ copula (B.COP) complement]

The verb form of an adnominal clause (such as *ur-Ø* above) must be a finite unmarked form (or *rentai* form) as opposed to other finite forms such as finite realis form (as shown in (6a-b) below, or *shūshi* form). Verb inflection will be taken up in §3.2 below.

2.2. The verb

A verb is defined as a word that inflects. A verb stem *idi-* ‘exit’, for example, must choose either finite inflection (6a-b), which marks tense and mood, or non-finite inflection (6c-d), which marks either coordination (medial verb) or subordination (converb), to appear as a word (Shimoji 2008a).

- (6) a. *idi-tam* b. *idi-rm* c. *idi-i* d. *idi-tigaa*
 exit-PST.RLS exit-NPST.RLS exit-MED exit-CVB.CND
 ‘exited’ ‘exit’ ‘exit, and’ ‘if exit’

Syntactically, a verb only appears in a VP, which is defined as a constituent that serves as a predicate head of a clause. A VP consists of a main verb + an optional auxiliary verb.

- (7) *ba=ga ffa=a tuz=zu=du tumi-tar.*
 1SG=GEN child=TOP wife=ACC=FOC search-PST
 ‘My child looked for a wife.’ [a minimal VP: a single main verb]

- (8) *ba=ga ffa=a tuz=zu tumi-i=du u-tar.*
1SG=GEN child=TOP wife=ACC search-MED=FOC PROG-PST
'My child was looking for a wife.' [a complex VP: main verb + progressive auxiliary *utar*]
- (9) *ba=ga ffa=a tuz=zu=baa tumi-i njaa-n.*
1SG=GEN child=TOP wife=ACC=TOP search-MED PRF-NPST
'My child has got a wife.' [a complex VP: main verb + perfect auxiliary *njaan*]
- (10) *ba=ga ffa=a tuz=zu tumi-i=du t-tar.*
1SG=GEN child=TOP wife=ACC search-MED=FOC DIR-PST
'My child brought a wife.' [a complex VP: main verb + directional auxiliary *ttar* 'came']

3. Non-adjective word forms

It is possible for most PC stems to serve as the stem of each of the five word forms listed in (1).⁴ As mentioned in §1, among these various word forms I regard the reduplicated form (1c) alone as an adjective. In this section I will show that the other semantically similar forms, specifically (1b) and (1d), should be treated as a subclass of nouns and verbs respectively, in the light of the definition of nouns and verbs given in §2 above. Then I proceed to discuss why the reduplicated form can be regarded as an adjective (in §4).

3.1. Compound form as a noun

The form labelled 'Compound 2' in (1b), where a PC stem and *munu* 'thing; person' are compounded, is a noun, in that it only heads an NP, functioning as an argument, a copula complement, or the modifier of a larger NP (see the examples below). Thus I call such a form a **PC noun** henceforth. The compound head *munu* is originally a lexical noun designating 'thing' or 'person', but is often much less substantive when used in the compound structure, so that it is often unable to be translated as 'thing' or 'person' (and therefore often cannot be used as an argument). In (11) below, it is impossible to translate *sabici-munu* as 'lonely thing' or 'lonely person', but it is appropriate to translate it simply as '(I felt) lonely', where *munu* is semantically not substantive (glossed Ø).

- (11) *ba=a sabici+munu=du a-tar.*
1SG=TOP lonely+Ø=FOC COP-PST
'I was lonely' [not 'I was a lonely person']

One piece of evidence that the semantic content of *munu* is not substantive in (11) is that (11) cannot be the appropriate answer of a question like (a) *vva=a nau=ti=nu pžtu=ga atar?* 'What kind of person were you?'. Rather, (11) would be the appropriate answer of (b) *vva=a nau=si=ga atar?* 'How (i.e. in what state) were you?' On the other hand, the following example, where *munu* retains its semantic content 'person' and is compounded with the PC stem *ujaki* 'rich', can be the proper answer to (a) above:

- (12) *ba=a ujaki+munu=du a-tar.*
 1SG=TOP rich+person=FOC COP-PST
 'I was a rich person.'

It is possible to find other examples where *munu* clearly retains its semantic content, where the full range of nominal function is observed:

- (13) *imi+munu ar-a-da, uku+munu=u tur-i-Ø.*
 small+thing COP-THM-NEG.MED big+thing=ACC take-THM-NPST.IMP
 'Don't take a small one; take a big one.' [copula complement and direct object argument]
- (14) *buuciri+munu=nu uku+gui=ja uturusī-ka-m.*
 mighty+man=GEN big+voice=TOP fearful-VLZ-NPST.RLS
 'The big voice of a mighty person is fearful.' [NP modifier]

Such an example as (13) will be the appropriate answer of a question like *nau=ti=nu munu=u=gā tur-kutu?* 'What kind of thing should I take?'

Thus, it is not appropriate to say that the semantic content of *munu* is completely lost in all examples. Rather, we are looking at an ongoing grammaticalisation process whereby *munu* is gradually undergoing a semantic loss ('thing' > Ø). As shown in (15) below, there are intermediate cases where it is difficult to judge whether *munu* should be either substantively or non-substantively translated:

- (15) *kuma=a=i, kuma=nu kazi=a daizina sīdasi+munu.*
 this.place=TOP=eh this.place=GEN wind=TOP quite cool(+thing?)
 'Here, you know, the wind (blowing) here is very cool (or a very cool one).'

[copula complement]

Even though a PC noun only heads an NP, and therefore is a noun, there is one important difference between an NP headed by a PC noun and an NP headed by an ordinary noun, which distinguishes them within the same word class: a PC noun is able to be modified by an adverb (16a, b) or an adjunct phrase (16c), just like a verb (17a, b, c). This is not the case in an ordinary noun. As a noun, a PC noun may also be modified by an adnominal (18a), just like ordinary nouns (4). Note that, as shown in (18b), a verb cannot be modified by an adnominal.

- (16) a. *ati kuu+munu* b. *maadaa kuu+mumu ar-a-n* c. *ui=jarruu kuu+munu*
 very stressed+Ø not.very stressed+Ø COP-THM-NEG.NPST 3SG=than stressed+Ø
 'feel very stressed' 'not feel very stressed' 'feel more stressed than s/he'
- (17) a. *ati patarafi-tar.* b. *maadaa patarak-a-n.* c. *ui=jarruu patarafi-tar*
 very work-PST not.very work-THM-NEG.NPST 3SG=than work-PST
 'worked much' 'do not work much' 'worked more than s/he did'
- (18) a. *daizina kuu+munu* *b. *daizina patarafi-tar.*
 very.much stressed+Ø very.much work-PST
 'very stressed'

The adverbial modification is possible even if the semantic content of *munu* is clearly retained. Thus we have such an expression as *mmjahi mcīkasi+munu=u=mai asirair* '(He) can do a more difficult thing' where the underlined PC noun is a direct object NP that is modified by the adverb *mmjahi* 'more'. In fact, the adver-

bial modification is possible even in Compound 1 as in (1a), where the head is always fully lexical. Thus it is possible to get *mmjahi taka+jama* ‘higher mountain’, *ati taka+gii* ‘very tall tree’ (see also Karimata 2002: 63), and so on.⁵

3.2. Inflected form as a verb

An inflected form (1d) consists of a verb stem derived from a PC stem by the verbaliser suffix *-ka(r)* and an inflectional affix identical to one for an ordinary verb (Shimoji 2008a). Thus it is uncontroversial to analyse the word form as a verb. I call this word form a **PC verb** henceforth. The morphophonemic pattern of the stem-final (r) is identical to that for the state verb stem *a(r)*- ‘be’, since the verbaliser *-ka(r)* was historically composed of **-ku* and **ari* (state verb) (Nakama 1992). TABLE 1 below demonstrates the analysis that a PC verb is a verb, with the same inflectional morphology as ordinary verbs.

TABLE 1. PC verb in terms of inflection (Inflectional affix underlined)⁶

Stem form	<i>tur</i> - ‘take’	<i>a(r)</i> - ‘be’	<i>taka-ka(r)</i> - ‘be high’
Finite verb: past realis	<i>tur-tam</i>	<i>a-tam</i>	<i>taka-ka-tam</i>
Finite verb: past unmarked	<i>tur-tar</i>	<i>a-tar</i>	<i>taka-ka-tar</i>
Finite verb: non-past realis	<i>tur-m</i>	<i>a(r)-m</i>	<i>taka-ka(r)-m</i>
Finite verb: non-past unmarked	<i>tur-Ø</i>	<i>ar-Ø</i>	<i>taka-kar-Ø</i>
Finite verb: non-past irrealis intentional	<i>tur-a-di</i>	<i>ar-a-di</i>	<i>taka-kar-a-di</i>
Finite verb: non-past irrealis optative	<i>tur-a-baa</i>	<i>ar-a-baa</i>	<i>taka-kar-a-baa</i>
Finite verb: non-past irrealis imperative	<i>tur-i-Ø</i>	<i>ar-i-Ø</i>	<i>taka-kar-i-Ø</i>
Finite verb: past realis negative	<i>tur-a-ttam</i>	<i>njaa-ttam</i>	<i>taka-kar-a-ttam</i>
Finite verb: past unmarked negative	<i>tur-a-ttar</i>	<i>njaa-ttar</i>	<i>taka-kar-a-ttar</i>
Finite verb: non-past unmarked negative	<i>tur-a-n</i>	<i>njaa-n</i>	<i>taka-kar-a-n</i>
Converb: causal ‘because’	<i>tu(r)-i-ba</i>	<i>a(r)-i-ba</i>	<i>taka-ka(r)-i-ba</i>
Converb: conditional ‘if/when’	<i>tur-tigaa</i>	<i>a-tigaa</i>	<i>taka-ka-tigaa</i>
Converb: negative conditional	<i>tur-a-dakaa</i>	<i>ar-a-dakaa</i>	<i>taka-kar-a-dakaa</i>
Converb: simultaneous ‘while’	<i>tur-ccjaaki</i>	N/A	N/A
Converb: purposive ‘in order to’	<i>tur-ga</i>	N/A	N/A
Converb: immediate anterior ‘as soon as’	<i>tur-tuu</i>	N/A	N/A
Medial verb: coordination ‘and’	<i>tur-i-i</i>	<i>ar-i-i</i>	<i>taka-kar-i-i</i>
Medial verb: negative ‘not doing’	<i>tur-a-da</i>	<i>ar-a-da</i>	<i>taka-kar-a-da</i>

In the table, I list two underived verb stems, i.e. the verb stem *tur*- ‘take’ and the state verb stem *a(r)*- for comparison. The stem *tur*- can be taken to be a typical consonant-final verb stem, with no peculiar inflectional pattern. ‘N/A’ indicates that the inflection in question is semantically impossible. Note that there is a single set of inflectional affixes that applies to *tur*-, *a(r)*-, and *taka-ka(r)*-, with some morphophonemic adjustment on the part of the stem (which is identical in *a(r)*- and *taka-ka(r)*-). Thus, unlike Japanese, where an adjective and a verb have different sets of inflectional affixes (e.g. non-past inflection *-i* vs. *-(r)u*; Backhouse

1984), there is no ground on which to distinguish between a verb and a PC verb in terms of inflectional morphology. Even though some inflectional possibilities are unavailable for a PC verb (e.g. simultaneous converbal inflection *-ccjaaki* ‘while -ing’), this is also true for the state verb *ar* and other stative verbs (e.g. *cigav* ‘differ’), thus such a gap is semantically explained.

Syntactically, a PC verb only appears in a VP, functioning exclusively as a predicate head, exactly like an ordinary verb (§2.2). Due to this exclusively predicative function, a PC verb cannot directly modify a noun; when modifying a noun, a PC verb serves as a predicate of an adnominal clause, then the adnominal clause serves as a modifier of a noun, just as in the case of an ordinary verb (cf. §2.1, (5)). Thus when appearing in the modifier slot of an NP, a PC verb must inflect for a finite unmarked form, which is obligatory when a verb serves as the predicate of an adnominal clause (e.g. *taka-kar-Ø pžtu* ‘a man who is tall’, but **taka-ka-m pžtu*, where the PC verb is a finite realis form *-m*).

Besides these major morphological and syntactic commonalities, there are a number of phenomena in which an ordinary verb and a PC verb behave in the same way, all of which can be explained by the fact that the verbaliser *-ka(r)* etymologically contains the state verb *ar*. One such phenomenon is clitic attachment. As shown in (19) and (20) below, a PC verb and an ordinary verb can directly carry a conjunction clitic such as *=suga* (or *=ruga*) ‘but’. On the other hand, as shown in (21), if a conjunction clitic attaches to a predicate consisting only of a copula complement NP, a copula becomes necessary.

- (19) *kari=a aparagi-kar-Ø=ruga, jana+pžtu=dooi.*
 3sg=TOP beautiful-VLZ-NPST=but bad.hearted+man=EMP
 ‘She is beautiful, but (she) is evil-hearted.’ [PC verb]
- (20) *uri=u=baa cifi-tar=ruga, mmja, bassi-i njaa-n.*
 3SG=ACC=TOP hear-PST=but INTJ forget-MED PRF-NPST
 ‘(I) heard about that, but, well, (I) have forgot (that).’ [ordinary verb]
- (21) a. *kari=a midum.* b. *kari=a midum jar-Ø=ruga, taka+pžtu=dooi.*
 3SG=TOP woman 3SG=TOP woman COP-NPST=but high+man=EMP
 ‘She is a woman’ ‘She is a woman, but (she) is a tall woman.’

On the other hand, there are two syntactic differences between an ordinary verb and a PC verb, which require us to distinguish between the two within the same word class: (a) negation and (b) verbal focus. With respect to (a), there are both morphological and syntactic ways to negate a PC verb, whereas an ordinary verb only has the former option. Compare the two rows in (22) below:

- | (22) PC verb and its negation | Ordinary verb and its negation |
|--|---|
| a. <i>ssu-kar-Ø.</i>
white-VLZ-NPST
‘(That) is white.’ [affirmative: stative] | a’. <i>par-Ø</i>
leave-NPST
‘(I) leave.’ [affirmative: dynamic] |
| b. <i>ssu-kar-a-n.</i>
white-VLZ-THM-NEG.NPST
‘(That) does not become whitened’. [negative: dynamic] | b’. <i>par-a-n.</i>
leave-THM-NEG.NPST
‘(I) do not leave’ [negative: dynamic] |

- c. *ssu-f=fa* *njaa-n.* c'. No syntactic negation
white-AVLZ=TOP NEG-NPST
'(That) is not white. [negative: stative]

As is shown in (22b) above, when a PC verb is morphologically negated (with the same negative affix that is used for an ordinary verb), the negative form designates dynamic negation rather than stative negation. If one wants to negative the PC verb (22a) with no stative-to-dynamic semantic change, the syntactic expression (22c) must be used. The syntactic expression (22c) consists of an adverbialised PC stem, i.e. a PC adverb (as in (1e)), and the negative form of the state verb *ar*.

With respect to verbal focus, if an ordinary verb is to be focused, then its stem and inflection are separated, and the undocked inflectional suffix attaches to the newly introduced light verb *sī* 'do' (23). On the other hand, a PC verb involves a stative verb construction, as in (24), where a PC stem is adverbialised to become a complement of the state verb, and the undocked inflectional suffix is attached to the state verb.

- (23) Ordinary verb: light verb construction (24) PC verb: stative verb construction
- | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------|---------------|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| <i>mii-tar</i> | > | <i>mii=du</i> | <i>sī-tar</i> | <i>taka-ka-tar</i> | > | <i>taka-fi=du</i> | <i>a-tar</i> |
| look-PST | | look=FOC | do-PST | high-VLZ-PST | | high-AVLZ=FOC | be-PST |
| 'looked' | | 'did looking' | | 'was high' | | 'was in a high state' | |

3.3. Summary

A PC noun is a compound noun. It only heads an NP, satisfying the definition of the noun in Irabu (§2.1). However, its syntactic function may be restricted if the compound head *munu* is semantically empty ($\emptyset$). Thus as summarised in TABLE 2, the syntactic function of an NP headed by a PC noun is varied (+ or –, collectively shown as $\pm$) depending on the semantic content of *munu*. We also noted that a PC noun can be modified by an adverb, a characteristic that is not found in ordinary nouns. Thus a PC noun is distinguished from an ordinary noun within the same word class.

TABLE 2. The functions of an NP headed by an ordinary noun or by a PC noun

Head of an NP	Argument	Copula complement	NP modifier	Modified by an adnominal	Modified by an adverb
Ordinary noun	+	+	+	+	–
PC noun	$\pm$	+	$\pm$	+	+

A PC verb is a verb, since it inflects in the same way as ordinary verbs, satisfying the definition of the verb in Irabu (§2.2). Syntactically, a PC verb and an ordinary verb exclusively appear in a VP, serving as a predicate in a clause. Also they share a number of characteristics such as an ability to carry a conjunction clitic. On the other hand, a PC verb does show two syntactic differences that require us to distinguish between PC verbs and ordinary verbs within the same word class:

negation and verbal focus.

TABLE 3. Morphosyntactic commonalities and differences between ordinary verbs and PC verbs

	Inflection	Syntactic distribution	Clitic attachment	Negation	Verbal focus
Ordinary verb	+	VP only	direct	suffix	light verb construction
PC verb	+	VP only	direct	suffix or <i>njaan</i>	state verb construction

4. The adjective class

Having excluded PC nouns and PC verbs from the candidate list of the adjective class, we now need to verify the claim that the reduplicated form as shown in (1c) should be called an adjective. This requires two independent arguments. First, we need to provide **language-internal (formal) criteria**: we have to show that what we want to call an adjective is morphosyntactically different both from nouns and from verbs. Second, we must consider **cross-linguistic (functional) criteria**, paying attention to the typological findings regarding what function is likely to be, or should be, expected in the adjective class in diverse languages.

4.1. Language-internal criteria

In this paper I define the adjective word class as an open class of words created by the reduplication of a PC stem where the final phoneme of the input stem is lengthened by one mora, as shown in (25a). In addition, a few noun stems such as (25b) can be input stems (Motonaga 1978; Karimata 2002).⁷

(25)	Input stem		Output word
a.	PC stem	>	Adjective
	<i>taka-</i> 'high'		<i>takaa+taka</i> 'high'
	<i>kiban-</i> 'poor'		<i>kibann+kiban</i> 'poor'
	<i>pjaa-</i> 'fast'		<i>pjaaa+pjaa</i> 'fast'
b.	Noun stem	>	Adjective
	<i>avva</i> 'oil'		<i>avvaa+avva</i> 'oily'
	<i>jarabi</i> 'child'		<i>jarabii+jarabi</i> 'childish'

The morphological definition here is iron-clad and we can identify an adjective without ambiguity.

In terms of syntax, the adjective class does not have its own phrase structure. Rather, as shown in TABLE 4, an adjective is 'parasitic' on NP structure and on VP structure, with a flexible ability to appear in either structure. As will be shown in the sections below, when appearing in an NP, an adjective only heads it, just like a noun; when appearing in a VP, an adjective only fills the main verb slot of a complex VP, and never fills the auxiliary slot or the only available slot of a minimal VP (i.e. a single main verb).

TABLE 4. Adjective in phrase structure

	As head of an NP (sorted by function)			In VP structure (sorted by slot)		
	Argument	Copula complement	NP modifier ⁸	A complex VP main verb	aux	A minimal VP main verb
Noun	+	+	+	–	–	–
Adjective	–	+	+	+	–	–
Verb	–	–	–	+	+	+

It is clear at this stage, then, that in terms of syntax, too, it is easy to identify an adjective as opposed to a noun or a verb, since a noun *only* appears in an NP (§2.1), and a verb *only* appears in a VP (§2.2).

4.1.1. Adjective in NP structure

An adjective may head an NP, functioning as a copula complement or a modifier of a larger NP. Since it heads an NP, it carries case unless in the plain ('be') copula function. In the examples below, the (a) exemplifies an adjective as the head of an NP, while the (b) exemplifies a noun as the head of an NP. Note the recursive nature of NP structure (discussed in §2.1), whereby the adjective in (26a) and the noun in (26b) head NPs, which then serve as modifiers of larger NPs, carrying genitive case.

- (26) a. *takaa+taka=nu pžtu* b. *imsja=nu fini*
 RED+high=GEN man fisherman=GEN boat
 'tall man' 'a fisherman's boat'
- (27) a. *takaa+taka=n=du nar-tar.* b. *imsja=n=du nar-tar.*
 RED+high=DAT=FOC B.COP-PST fisherman=DAT=FOC B.COP-PST
 '(He) became tall.' '(He) became a fisherman.'
- (28) a. *uri=a takaa+taka=du a-tar.* b. *uri=a imsja=du a-tar.*
 3SG=TOP RED+high=FOC COP-PST 3SG=TOP fisherman=FOC COP-PST
 'He was tall.' 'He was a fisherman.'

An NP headed by an adjective is nevertheless different from an NP headed by a noun in a number of respects. There are two points that distinguish an NP headed by an adjective from an NP headed by an ordinary noun: (A) the inability to serve as an argument (TABLE 4 above), and (B) the biased preference for the NP modifier function.

(A) Inability to serve as an argument: An NP headed by an adjective cannot function as an argument (i.e. subject, direct object, indirect object or peripheral arguments such as locative, source, and so on).

(B) Biased preference for the NP modifier function: An NP headed by an adjective in most cases functions as a modifier of a larger NP (in a recursive manner).

- (29) *imii+imi=nu* *mii-gama=nu* *nar-Ø=ri.* (30) *nagaa+naga=nu* *bau=sii* *tur-Ø.*
 RED+small=GEN fruit-DIM=NOM grow-NPST=eh RED+long=GEN stick=INST take-NPST
 'A small fruit grows, eh?' '(I would) catch (guavas) by a long stick.'

TABLE 5 below summarises a text-count in which I collected tokens of nouns and adjectives from thirty two text materials (46,960 words) and sorted them out according to their syntactic functions.⁹

TABLE 5. Nouns and adjectives in terms of syntactic function

	Argument	Copula complement	NP modifier	Others	Total
Ordinary noun	8206 (73.8%)	802 (7.2%)	1049 (9.4%)	1059 (9.5%)	11116 (apprx.100%)
PC noun	32 (15.7%)	160 (78.4%)	12 (5.9%)	0 (0%)	204 (100%)
Adjective	0 (0%)	16 (4.9%)	288 (87.8%)	24 (7.3%)	328 (100%)

As is clear from the figures in the table, the overwhelming majority of adjectives (87.8%) function as an NP modifier. Interestingly, the overwhelming majority of PC nouns function as a copula complement (78.4%), and the NP modifier function is almost absent. That is, roughly speaking, there is a complementary distribution between adjectives and PC nouns. This issue will be taken up in §4.2.

The 'Others' category of adjectives includes two less common functions of adjectives: the main verb function within a complex VP (N = 8) and the adverbial function (N = 12). These are noted in the sections below. Also, in just four examples, an adjective was used as the complement of the light verb *sī* 'do', as shown in (31) below.

- (31) *kanu midum=ma kibann+kiban s-i-i=du u-tar=ca.*
 that woman=TOP RED+poor do-THM-MED=FOC PROG-PST=HS
 'That woman was said to be poor.'

4.1.2. Adjective in VP structure

An adjective may appear in a VP, even though this is much less common than the situation in which an adjective occurs in NP structure as discussed above. Moreover, when an adjective appears in a VP, there emerge two severe restrictions. First, an adjective only fills the main verb slot of a complex VP. Second, the auxiliary must be the progressive auxiliary (cf. (8)).

- (32) *hira, kama=a imii+imi=du ur-Ø=ri.*
 INTJ that.place=TOP RED+small=FOC PROG-NPST=eh
 'You see, that place is small, eh?' [lit. you see, that place is small-ing.]
- (33) *cīnuu=ja cīcī=nu akaa+aka=du u-tar=iba...*
 yesterday=TOP moon=NOM RED+bright=FOC PROG-PST=so

‘Yesterday, the moon was bright, so...’ [lit. yesterday, the moon was bright-ing, so...]

- (34) *kantja=a jarabii+jarabi=du ur-Ø=dara.*
3PL=TOP RED+child=FOC PROG-NPST=EMP

‘They are childish, you see.’ [lit. they are childish-ing, you see.]

Note that the verb *ur* (or *utar*) after the adjective cannot be regarded as the existential verb *ur* ‘(animate subject) exists’: the existential verb *ur* only co-occurs with an animate subject (e.g. *pžtu=nu=du ur* ‘there is a man’, *waa=nu=du ur* ‘there is a pig’, but **jama=nu=du ur* ‘there is a mountain’), whereas the auxiliary verb *ur* has no such restriction (Shimoji 2006: 91). Thus, we can find such an example as *tida=nu tirii=du ur* ‘the sun is shining’ and *ami=nu ffii=du ur*. ‘rain is falling’. Examples (32) and (33) then clearly show that the *ur* is an auxiliary, and therefore we can say that the adjective fills the main verb slot of a VP.¹⁰

4.1.3. Adverbial function

An adjective can directly modify a verb like an adverb. Thus in each of the examples below, an adjective directly modifies a verb without carrying case or any other grammatical marking on it.

- (35) *ngjamasii+ngjamasii nak-i-ba=du, gui, taru=mai mii-ttam=mu=ti.*
RED+noisy cry-THM-CVB.CSL=FOC INTJ who=even take.care-NEG.PST.RLS=Q=QT
‘Because (she) cried noisily, (I said) “No one took care (of you)?”.’

- (36) *kuma=nu mci=kara pjaaa+pjaa ngi-i, mmja, naugara=ca.*
this.place=GEN road=ABL RED+fast=FOC leave-MED INTJ whatever=HS
‘(The evil spirit) left from this road quickly, and , you know.’

- (37) *naa=ga jaa=mai surumiciĩ+surumiciĩ sauc-cas-i-i=du ur-Ø=pazi.*
REF=GEN house=too RED+clean cleaning-VLZ-THM-MED=FOC PROG-NPST=maybe
‘(She) is cleaning her house cleanly, perhaps.’

4.1.4. Summary

An adjective is a word form that is morphologically distinct from a noun or from a verb, in that an adjective is a reduplicated form of a PC stem (or a noun stem as listed in (25b)), with the reduplicated stem being lengthened. An adjective can also be syntactically distinguished from a noun and a verb, in that an adjective is parasitic on both an NP and a VP. It was also noted that adjectives may function adverbially, and in more restricted cases as a complement of the light verb.

TABLE 6. Nouns, verbs, and adjectives: summary

	Morphology	Syntax
Noun (incl. PC noun)	N/A	Exclusively in an NP
Verb (incl. PC verb)	Inflection	Exclusively in a VP
Adjective	Reduplication +lengthening	Either in an NP or a VP; adverbial; LV comp

4.2. Cross-linguistic criteria

The discussion above revealed that there is a third word class in Irabu, which I defined as adjective, in addition to noun and verb. Now our question is this: is it *cross-linguistically* plausible to call this third word class an adjective?

There is typological agreement that for a particular word class to be called an ‘adjective’, the word class must satisfy either or both of the following two major functions (Givón 1979; Dixon 1982, 2004; Schachter 1985; Thompson 1988; Wetzer 1996): **(a) attributive modification** (i.e. an ability to modify a noun in NP structure) and **(b) predicative modification** (i.e. an ability to serve as a predicate to modify (describe) a subject NP). In addition, there may be a sub-function **(c) adverbial modification** (Dixon 2004: 11). In particular, it is very often claimed that the cross-linguistically most typical function of the adjective class is (a) (Hengeveld 1992; Bhat 1994; Lichtenberk 2005; Croft 2002; 2003). If we claim that reduplicated forms (1c) are adjectives, *and* if such a claim is to make much sense in a typological perspective, reduplicated forms should demonstrate (a) and/or (b), and possibly (c). Also, such a claim will be most persuasive if reduplicated forms demonstrate (a) as a typical function.

Given these typological considerations, reduplicated forms are actually a perfect example of the adjective class. Note that a reduplicated form may function either (a) attributively as an NP modifier (26a, 29, 30, etc.) or (b) predicatively as a copula complement (27a, 28a, etc.) or as a component of a main verb (32, 33, 34, etc.), and in addition (c) it may function adverbially (35, 36, 37). Furthermore, the examination of the actual occurrences of reduplicated forms in texts (TABLE 5) revealed that the most typical function of the reduplicated form is (a), as an NP modifier. This usage-based fact did not receive much attention in the literature (except for Motonaga 1978), which obscured the important fact that it is the reduplicated form that demonstrates a cross-linguistically recurrent function of the adjective class. Koloskova and Ōhori (2008), which is an important work of ‘adjectives’ in Miyako, mostly focused on the predicative function of what they call ‘adjectives’ (1b, 1c, and 1d). However, what is no less important in examining the adjective class in a typological perspective is to pay attention to the attributive function.

This finding is also important in interpreting the ongoing diachronic change in PC nouns as noted in §3.1, where we observed that the head noun *munu* is undergoing a semantic change (‘thing’ > Ø). If, as the typological literature suggests, (a) attributive modification and (b) predicative modification are two basic functions of the adjective class, then it turns out that the synchronic Irabu system lacks an adjective form that regularly takes over the job of (b), since the existing adjective mostly functions attributively. There are three word forms that are likely to fill this functional gap in Irabu: PC nouns, PC verbs, and PC adverbs that are used in stative verb constructions (24). In particular, it is interesting to note that a PC noun mostly functions predicatively as a copula complement (TABLE 5). Now, the semantic change of *munu* can be seen as resulting from diachronic pressure to cre-

ate the adjective specialised for predicative modification, which will emerge when the semantic content of *munu* has completely been lost and *munu* has been reanalysed as an ‘adjectivalising suffix’ that derives a predicative adjective. A PC noun is in the transitional stage, becoming less and less likely to serve as an argument and more and more likely to serve as a predicative modifier.

5. Conclusion

This study has shown that the adjective class in Irabu is the reduplicated form as in (1c). In addition to its morphological peculiarity, an adjective is syntactically distinct both from a noun and from a verb, with its parasitic nature, whereby an adjective demonstrates a wide range of syntactic functions (i.e. attributive, predicative, and adverbial modification). Among these, it turned out that the attributive function is the most pervasive, a fact generally overlooked in the literature. Thus, the adjective class in Irabu is a cross-linguistically standard example, contrary to the traditional view on ‘adjectives’ in the literature where the reduplicated form has always been treated as a secondary or special kind of adjective.

Abbreviations

ABL:	ablative	EMP:	emphatic	NOM:	nominative
ACC:	accusative	FOC:	focus	(N)PST:	(non-)past
AVLZ:	adverbializer	GEN:	genitive	PROG:	progressive
B.COP	‘become’ copula	HS:	hearsay	PRF:	perfect
CND:	conditional	IMP:	imperative	RED:	reduplication
COP:	copula	INST:	instrumental	Q:	question
CSL:	causal	INT:	intentional	QT:	quotative
CVB:	converb	INTJ:	interjection	RLS:	realis
DAT:	dative	MED:	medial verb	SG:	singular
DIM:	diminutive	NEG:	negative	THM:	thematic vowel
DIR:	directional verb	NLZ:	nominalizer	TOP:	topic
				VLZ:	verbalizer

Notes

¹ I use the term ‘property concept stem’ (PC stem) rather than ‘adjective stem’, to avoid terminological confusion: we will discuss in this paper whether a given form containing a PC stem is regarded as an adjective or not. Thus, it is wise to distinguish between a label for a stem and a label for a word form. Property concept (Thompson 1988) is a semantic concept that expresses such semantic types as dimension (e.g. *high*), age (e.g. *old*), value (e.g. *good*), colour (e.g. *red*), physical property (e.g. *strong*), human propensity (e.g. *happy*), and speed (e.g. *fast*), defined by Dixon (1982, 2004).

² This study does *not* address how these forms differ in semantic-pragmatic terms, simply because of the limited length of the paper. This is in fact one important research topic. It suffices in this study to note the following discourse-pragmatic characteristics of (1a) to (1d). (1b) is mostly used as a predicate in an unmarked topic-comment structure (i.e. the predicate (1b) is asserted and focused, as in ‘that mountain is high’). Conversely, (1d) is

mostly used as a predicate in that pragmatic structure in which the predicate is presupposed (either because the predicate is in a subordinate clause or because the argument is in focus, as in '(it is) that mountain (which) is high(er).'). See Koloskova and Ōhori (2008) for these accounts. Finally, (1c) is mostly used as an attributive modifier of a noun which is newly introduced into discourse, as in 'there is a high mountain there'; in (1a) the PC stem is also an attributive modifier of the head noun of a compound, but the difference between (1a) and (1c) is that in the former the head noun is typically non-referential and the compound noun is typically used as a copula complement of proper inclusion (as in *uri=a taka+jama* 'this is a high mountain.'). and in the latter the head noun is typically referential (see the above example). See Shimoji (2006b) for a fuller account of the discourse functions of (1a) and (1c).

³ The present study is based on three spells of fieldwork (2005, 2006, and 2007) conducted by the present author. For the present study I used both free text data and elicitation data, taken from eight consultants (S(peakers) 1 to 8 henceforth) all of whom were born and raised on Irabu Island (five females and three males). All were over sixty five years old (S1: 76, S2: 78, S3: 84, S4: 67, S5: 77, S6: 102, S7: 92, S8: 94). The texts consist of twenty four narratives (eight personal histories, fourteen folktales, two procedural texts) and eight dialogues (all spontaneous conversations), and were recorded and transcribed by the present author with the help of four consultants (S1 to S4, mostly S4).

⁴ Some PC stems are unable to form one or more of (1c), (1d), and (1e) (e.g. *tuu-* 'distant' > **tuuu+tuu*). Conversely, some noun stems are able to form one or more of (1c), (1d), and (1e). In this point, Motonaga (1978: 352–354) provides us with a careful and insightful discussion. He notes that such nouns as *jarabi* 'child', *javva* 'wild person', *maifiga* 'wise person', etc., show both nominal and PC-stem-like features: for example, *jarabi* can form (1c) and (1d), even though it can also function as a noun (see §2.1). Thus in a strict sense, there seems to be a continuum between a typical PC stem and a typical noun stem, between which some overlap cases exist, as Motonaga rightly pointed out.

⁵ Adverbial modification of PC noun and Compound 1 is noteworthy since it is a compound noun rather than a two-word phrase. Let us take Japanese *takai#ki* 'tall tree' (tall#tree, where # is a word boundary) for comparison. This Japanese example is a two-word NP consisting of the modifier filled by an adjective and the head filled by a noun, both of which are free forms. The modifier *takai* can be further modified by an adverb like *totemo* 'very', with the structure [[[*totemo*] *takai*] *ki*] 'very tall tree'. Note here that the adverb does not modify the head *ki*, but only the modifier *takai*. By contrast, in Irabu such an example as *taka+gii* 'tall tree' is a single compound word where both stems are bound, and it is still able to be modified by an adverb like *ati* 'very'. That is, the head of an NP (i.e. the compound noun) is modified by an adverb, a situation substantially different from that in Japanese. With this modificational characteristic, a number of studies (e.g. Motonaga 1978, Karimata 1992, 2002) seem to be reluctant to regard PC nouns and Compound 1 as compounds. However, there are at least two reasons for which they cannot be regarded as phrases, even if these show a rather 'phrasal' character in terms of their ability to be modified by an adverb. First, a compound like (1a) may undergo sequential voicing (e.g. *taka+gii* 'tall+tree', where the head noun stem is underlyingly *kii* 'tree'), which is one strong indication for compound structure in Irabu and is never found in phrases. Second, if a constituent A+B is an NP, it is possible for an adnominal word to be inserted between A and B, as in *niwaa=nu kii* (a tree in the garden) > *niwaa=nu unu kii* (that tree in the garden); if A+B constitutes a single compound word, then the insertion

is disallowed, as in *taka+gii* > **taka- unu -gii*, or *taka+munu* > **taka- unu -munu*. Here, if the PC stem is turned into a separate word, the insertion becomes possible: *takaa+taka=nu unu kii*.

⁶ The state verb has suppletive negation (i.e. its stem alternates between *a(r)-* and *njaa-*), but the inflectional affixes are identical with those for *tur-* and *taka-ka(r)-*. This table excludes the adverbial form such as (1a) *taka-fi* 'in a high state', since this table lists verb inflection. The adverbial form is an adverb derived from a PC stem (Shimoji 2008b).

⁷ Reijirou Shibasaki (p.c.) pointed out that the fact that certain nominal stems can serve as an input stem of an adjective should not be accidental. For example, 'child' is actually a property concept, in the sense that it can be metonymically construed as a physical property in terms of Dixon's semantic typology of property concept (see Note 1).

⁸ A verb that directly precedes a noun (e.g. *jumtar hon* 'the book (I) read'), thus ostensibly filling the modifier slot of an NP, is not actually filling the modifier slot of an NP: the verb is the predicate of an adnominal clause, and it is this adnominal clause that fills the modifier slot of an NP. The only function of the verb is, then, to serve as predicate (i.e. head of a VP) of a clause, whether it is an adnominal clause or other kind of clause.

⁹ See Note 3 for the detail of the text data. The per cent was rounded to one decimal place. The 'argument function' includes both core (S, A, O) and peripheral (locative, instrument, etc.) argument functions. Most of the tokens of ordinary nouns in 'Others' involved (a) direct quotation, (b) topicalisation, as in *bancikira, ui=ga=du juu atar=dara* 'Guavas, there were a plenty of them.', (c) vocative, and (d) restatement.

¹⁰ This main verb function of adjectives is also reported in Motonaga (1978), Izuyama (2002), and Karimata (2002).

References

- Backhouse, A.E. 1984. Have all the adjectives gone? *Lingua* 62: 169–186.
- Backhouse, A.E. 2004. Inflected and uninflected adjectives in Japanese. In Dixon and Aikhenvald, eds., 50–73.
- Bhat, D.N.S. 1994. *The adjectival category*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Croft, William. 2002. *Radical construction grammar: syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: OUP.
- Croft, William. 2003. *Typology and Universals* (2nd edition). Cambridge: CUP.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1982. *Where have all the adjectives gone? and other essays in semantics and syntax*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2004. Adjective classes in typological perspective. In Dixon and Aikhenvald, eds., 1–49.
- Dixon, R.M.W., and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. eds. 2004. *Adjective classes*. Oxford: OUP.
- Givón, T. 1979. *On understanding grammar*, Academic Press, New York.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal predication: theory, typology, diachrony*. Berlin and New York: Mouton.
- Huddleston, Rodney. 1984. *Introduction to the grammar of English*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Izuyama, Atsuko. 2002. A study on the grammar of Miyako Hirara dialect of Luchuan. In Sanada, Shinji, ed., *Grammatical Aspects of Endangered Dialects in Japan* (1), 35–97, Tokyo: ELPR.

- Karimata, Shigehisa. 1992 (reprinted in 1997) Miyakohōgen. In Kamei, Takashi, Rokurō Kōno, and Eiichi Chino, eds. *Nipponrettō no gengo (Gengogakudaijiten selection)*, 388–402, Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- Karimata, Shigehisa. 2002. Notes on adjectives in Miyako dialects of the Ryukyuan language. In Shigehisa Karimata, Toshiko Tsuchiko, Shinichi Kajiku, and Toshizō Takahashi, eds., *Preliminary research on endangered Ryukyuan language*, 44–69, Tokyo: ELPR.
- Koloskova, Yulia, and Toshio Ōhori. 2008. Pragmatic factors in the development of a switch-adjective language: A case study of the Miyako-Hirara dialect of Ryukyuan. *Studies in Language* 32 (3): 610–636.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 2005. On the notion “adjective” in Toqabaqita. *Oceanic Linguistics* 44 (1): 113–144.
- Motonaga, Moriyasu. 1978 (reprinted in 2001). Miyako Hirarahōgen no keiyōsi. In Inoue, Fumio, Kōichi Shinozaki, Takashi Kobayashi, and Takuichirō Ōnishi, eds., *Ryūkyūhōgen kō* 7, 351–359. Tokyo: Yumani Shobō.
- Nakama, Mitsunari. 1992. *Ryūkyūhōgen no kosō*. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō.
- Shimoji, Michinori. 2006a. Minami Ryūkyūgo Miyako Irabujimahōgen. In Nakayama, Toshihide, and Fuyuki Ebata, eds., *Bumpō o egaku* 1, 85–117, Tokyo: ILCAA.
- Shimoji, Michinori. 2006b. Adjectives in Irabu Ryukyuan. Paper read at Japan Centre Seminar, Canberra, ANU.
- Shimoji, Michinori. 2008a. Irabujima hōgen no dōshi kussetsu keitairon. *Ryūkyū no hōgen* 32: 69–114.
- Shimoji, Michinori. 2008b. Descriptive units and categories in Irabu. *Shigen* 4: 21–55.
- Schachter, Paul. 1985. Parts-of-speech systems. In Shopen, Timothy, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description* (1), 3–61, Cambridge: CUP.
- Stassen, Leon. 1997. *Intransitive predication*. Oxford: OUP.
- Thompson, S. A. 1988. A discourse approach to the category “adjective”. In Hawkins, John, ed. *Explaining language universals*, 167–210, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wetzer, Harrie. 1996. *The typology of adjectival predication*. Berlin and New York: Mouton.

[Received 15 October 2008]

[Revision received 2 April 2009]

【要 旨】

南琉球宮古伊良部島方言の形容詞

下 地 理 則

キーワード：伊良部島方言，琉球語，形容詞，言語類型論

本稿の目的は、南琉球宮古伊良部島方言（以下伊良部島方言）の形容詞を定義することである。これまで、伊良部島方言を含めた宮古方言全体の研究史において、形容詞という用語は複数の形式（*munu*「もの」を主要部とした複合，疊語，活用など）に対して広く用いられ，当該方言の共時的な品詞体系を重視して形容詞を定義した論考はほとんど存在しない。さらに，ある形式を「形容詞」と呼ぶことが一般言語学的に見て適切かどうかという通言語的・類型論的な視点からの考察がなかった。したがって本稿では，共時体系における他品詞（名詞と動詞）との張り合いの中で形容詞を定義し，さらに通言語的な観点から，形容詞と呼ぶにふさわしい形式を考察する。その結果，形容詞としてはむしろ二次的に考えられてきた疊語形式のみが形容詞と呼ぶにふさわしく，複合形式と活用形式は名詞と動詞の下位クラスとして考えられることを示す。