

行政院國家科學委員會補助專題研究計畫成果報告

賽夏語語法與認知整合型研究一

賽夏語語法研究(2/2)

計畫類別：整合型研究計畫

計畫編號：NSC 91-2411-H-002-089

執行期間：91年8月1日至92年7月31日

計畫主持人：宋麗梅

執行單位：國立臺灣大學語言學研究所

本成果報告包括以下應繳交之附件：

出席國際學術會議心得報告及發表之論文各一份(因 SARS 而延至 93 年)

中華民國 九十三年 六月

Preface

Language and Cognition in Saisiyat (賽夏語語法與認知) aims to provide a description of Saisiyat in functional terms, that is, in terms of the pragmatic situations in which sentences are used. Nearly all the example sentences used to illustrate grammatical points are based on a corpus of naturally occurring narrative and conversational texts rather than elicited sentences. The narrative data are based on retellings of the well-known Pear films, cited in this grammar as Pear. It is our conviction that grammar emerges from the recurrent patterns in the way speakers track referents, negotiate information flow and determine how to get their points across. What is usually termed grammar is the set of routinized regularities that have achieved stability through repeated use. As Du Bois has put it, "Grammars code best what speakers do most." This process is known as grammaticalization and is the proper object of grammatical investigation. Grammaticalization is manifested in discourse frequency, and so explanations for grammar must be sought in favored strategies for conversation. Grammar is an activity that is embodied in the pragmatics of communication.

Computer corpora are essential to a systematic description of a language within the framework of a functionalist paradigm, but spoken corpora are too expensive in time and effort to build without commercial help. Given the limited size of our corpus, then, *Language and Cognition in Saisiyat* can not claim completeness in its coverage of the grammatical phenomena of the language. It would be foolhardy to do so. In any event we are at least pioneering a new way of looking at the grammatical resources of a language. As a consequence, most of the analyses in this grammar are original.

Morphology in Saisiyat, particularly its affixation pattern, is closely related to other Formosan languages such as Pazeh and Paiwan. However, a number of morphological characteristics seem specific to Saisiyat. A case in point is the combination of the infix *-in-* and the suffix *-an*. Our corpus data appear to violate Blust(1999)'s observation that there is a constraint against co-occurrence of perfective and PF marking, as in (1)

- (1)
- a. hini noka alaw s-in-i'ael-an
this Gen fish eat-Pfv-LF
"This is the remainder of the fish."
- b. hini noka alaw s-in-i'ael-en
this Gen fish eat-Pfv-PF
"This was eaten by the fish."

We have also found that phonological environment plays an important role in selecting the vowel of the AF/PF affix. Transparency of Pharyngeal allows the adjacent vowel to spread to the vowel of the affix whereas oral consonants

will block spreading and the default, or most unmarked vowel remains in the surface form. However, in some cases the adjacent vowel in the base can cross an oral consonant and result in vowel echo. This suggests that feature spreading in vowel echo occurs only across the Vowel Place level under the Consonant Place node in feature geometry. While the concept of a separate node in feature geometry is attractive, it is not able to explain some of the problematic spreading and blocking effect in Saisiyat. In addition to spreading and blocking, we assume that there is certain strategy in choosing the vowel in affix. It requires affixes to be contrastive and to avoid being ambiguous, or to be homophones.

In word order, we have found, based on a careful analysis of the narrative and conversational data, that Saisiyat is a strongly subject-initial language (in AF clauses, SV(O) clauses account for 81.5%; in NAF, agent initial clauses account for 93%); AF clauses are predominantly intransitive, which is not a surprising finding, and that 22.6% of the agents in AF clauses are omitted, as opposed to just 8.3% of the patients. This must be so, since agents are in general much more topical than patients in AF clauses. In NAF clauses, on the other hand, 57.78% of the patients are omitted (vs. 83.3% for agents). This suggests that patients are highly topical in NAF clauses. Again this is a finding expected of a Formosan and Western Austronesian language. In case marking, the following new findings have emerged: (1) locative case markers *kan/kala* are sensitive to interactional structure: *kala* occurs in the first pair part of an adjacency pair, while *kan* is preferred in the second pair part; (2) genitive case markers *no* and *noka* need to be distinguished (*X no Y* means *X* is specially designed for *Y*, and *X noka Y* means *Y* owns *X*.); (3) accusative case markers (*ka/hi*) for lexical NPs are never omitted in our corpus data, whereas the marking for the nominative case is more varied: in preverbal position, most of the subject arguments are zero-marked; in post-verbal position, nearly all of the nominatives are marked.

Like many other Formosan languages, relative clauses in Saisiyat were found to the right or the left of their head noun phrase, although there was a decided preference for right-headed relative clauses. It was also found that the most common grammatical role of the head NP was as O in the main clause, or as S in the relative clause.

We argue that *ka* (perhaps ultimately derived from the nominative case marker) has grammaticized as the relativizer but the relative clause it introduces must be the object of the main clause. We have also found that there is another type of relative clause: PF verbs with the perfective *-in-* often function like a relative clause headed by the patient of the verb itself. Pragmatically this type of relative clause appears to introduce the patient as a new discourse entity into the discourse.

As to the pragmatic functions of agents and patients in AF and NAF clauses in Saisiyat narratives, the Agents in both AF and NAF clauses are consistently more continuous than Patients, and Agents are more topical than Patients in AF and NAF clauses. The topicality values for Agent and Patient in these clauses can be ranked as follows.

A(AF)>A(NAF)>P(NAF)>P(AF)

The result suggests the following clause types:

AF: Agent >>Patient Agent highly topical and often omitted; Patient non-topical and rarely omitted.

NAF: Agent >Patient Agent highly topical and often omitted; Patient moderately topical and more than half of the time omitted.

Based on our analysis, Saisiyat has remained conservative and behaves very like what is known about the Philippine languages, although in Saisiyat, the number of AF clauses far exceeds the number of NAF clauses. Hence, maybe this could explain why grounding is shown to be not a significant factor in the deployment of focus forms.

The preparation of this grammar has been partially supported by the National Science Council. We are grateful to *oemaw a obay* (趙山河) and *baunay a oemaw* (風德輝) and a number of other Saisiyat friends for their native intuitions, to our research assistants Huang Hui-ru (黃惠如), Hsieh Fu-hui (謝富惠), Oda Kenichi (小田賢一), Tsai Pei-shu (蔡佩舒), Emmanuel Tung (董鴻鈞), and Michael Tanangkingsing (洪媽益) for their participation in the preparation of this manuscript, and to many predecessors and contemporaries in the study of Saisiyat. To all of them, we owe our gratitude. *Ma'alo!*

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Morphology	1
Chapter 2	Word Order	21
Chapter 3	Case Marking System	40
Chapter 4	Noun Phrase	57
Chapter 5	Anaphora	66
Chapter 6	Tense and Aspect	89
Chapter 7	Focus	108
Chapter 8	Wh-Words in SaySiyat	128
Chapter 9	Complementation	143
Chapter 10	Serial Verb Construction.	154
Chapter 11	Motion in Space	161
References	184
Glossary		
Texts		

Chapter One Morphology

1.0 Introduction

Developments in Austronesian linguistics during 1991-2002 have been briefly summarized by Klamer (2002). Compared to other Austronesian languages, Formosan languages are relatively less studied and less understood. Saisiyat, one of the many endangered languages in the world, is not exception. Moreover, the morphology of these languages, although an important domain as phonology and syntax, has been overlooked or less mentioned in literature. Most of previous studies on Formosan languages deal with affixation and its function. We begin this chapter with the classification of prefixes, infixes, suffixes, circumfixes, and reduplications. Blust (1999) compiled a large amount of data from Pazeh-Kahabu. In our discussion below, we will compare Saisiyat with Pazeh, if necessary, to illustrate the similarities and differences between them, since they show closer relationship with each other than with other Formosan languages. In particular, reduplication in Saisiyat shows strong similarities with other Formosan languages such as Paiwan (Tseng 2002) and Pazeh. However, some characteristics violate Blust's assumption on co-occurrence of affixes. Then we will discuss the process of selecting well-formed surface forms among variants in terms of feature geometry. Finally, we will illustrate some examples from nominalization in Saisiyat that will again challenge Blust's assumption on Austronesian languages. In this way, we can shed light on the peculiarity of Saisiyat.

In our data, nine narratives (five Pear Stories and four Frog Stories) and two conversation texts (Life and Elections) were examined, and a total number of 42 affixes (including reduplications) were observed. In the data given below, the name of the story or conversation can be found in parenthesis (P: Pear Story, F: Frog Story, L:

Life, E: Elections), with the number of the story and intonation unit. Otherwise the examples are taken from field notes. Each number in the square bracket corresponds to the number in the Appendix (See page).

1.1 Prefixes

Twenty prefixes were found in the corpus [1-20].

[1] hin-

Although its function is not clear, it is an independent prefix and can be distinguished from the perfective infix *-in-* as in (1a-c).

(1)

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|
| a. | 'az-'azem | 'think' | '-in-az-'azem | 'thought' | (P1: 37) |
| b. | 'az-'azem | | hin-'az-'azem | 'feeling' | (F2: 13) |
| c. | 'az-'azem | | hin-'-in-az-'azem | 'thought, idea' | (E: 174) |

[2] ka-

It is a category-changing prefix meaning 'incomplete action' and derives a noun, which is 'something ready to be done' (2a, b).

(2)

- | | | | | | |
|----|---------|---------|------------|--------------------------|---------|
| a. | pamowa | 'plant' | ka-pamowa | 'seedling' | (L: 16) |
| b. | panabih | 'speak' | ka-panabih | 'things to say, opinion' | (E: 38) |

[3] kama-

It is a category-changing prefix that derives a 'doer' noun from a verb (3a), and also describes a person when prefixed to a stative verb (3b). There is also an unknown derivation (3c).

(3)

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------------------|---------|
| a. | tortoroe | 'teach' | kama-tortoroe | 'teacher' | |
| b. | ma'ngel | 'slow' | kama-ma'ngel | 'one whose motion is slow' | (L: 70) |
| c. | m-anra:an | 'to walk' | kama-m-anra:an | 'man' | |

[4] kas-, [5] kasna-

These are two forms of prefixes meaning 'move, get out' (4a, b).

(4)

- | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| a. | 'oehaz | 'shallow' | kas-'oehaz | 'to get out' | (F1: 48) |
| b. | 'itol | 'go up' | kasna-'itol | 'to move up' | (F1: 10) |

kas- has a fundamental meaning 'toward someone/something' and *kasna-* 'leave the bottommost/depth.' Therefore, *kas-'oehaz* also means 'to come out' and *kasna-'itol* 'to crawl up.'

[6] ki-

When used independently, it means 'with' but in (5), it carries a meaning 'pick, remove' when prefixed to a noun. Only one such case is observed in our data (5a). In Yeh (2000), it is illustrated in more detail (5b, c).

(5)

- | | | | | | |
|----|--------|---------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|
| a. | boway | 'fruit' | ki-boway | 'to pick fruits' | (P1: 11) |
| b. | pazay | 'rice' | ki-pazay | 'to reap rice' | (Yeh) |
| c. | ngepen | 'tooth' | ki-ngepen | 'to pull out a tooth' | (Yeh) |

[7] kom-

It seems to be related to food or meal when prefixed to a verb (6a), but the base verbs are ill-formed in some cases (6b, c).

(6)

a.	si'ael	'eat'	kom-si'ael	'to eat lunch'	(L: 229)
b.	*hama		kom-hama	'to eat breakfast'	
c.	*sao		kom-sao	'to eat dinner'	

[8] m-, [9] ma-, [12] mo-, [14] moe-

Four forms of the Agent Focus (AF) prefix are observed (7a-d). Phonological environment plays a crucial role in the selection of the variant, or its vowel. We will return to discuss this issue later.

(7)

a.	pahrahrang	'discuss'	m-ahrahrang	'to discuss'	(E: 101)
b.	'az-'azem	'think'	ma-'az-'azem	'to think'	(P1: 116)
c.	bay	'give'	mo-bay	'to give'	(P5: 75)
d.	ha'oe	'come down'	moe-ha'oe	'to come down'	(P4: 11)

[10] makak-

It is only prefixed to stative verbs and adds a reciprocal meaning 'together, each other' (8a, b). If the base is a dynamic verb, *Ca-* reduplication marks reciprocal constructions with optional AF marker *ma-* (8c, d).

(8)

a.	siyae'	'happy'	makak-siyae'	'to play'	(P5: 81)
b.	sarara'	'like'	makak-sarara'	'to love each other'	
c.	sebet	'beat'	*makak-sebet		
			(ma-)sa-sebet	'to beat each other'	
d.	tortoroe	'teach'	*makak-tortoroe		
			ta-tortoroe	'to teach each other'	

[11] min-

It seems to make a verb intransitive or involuntary (9a, b).

(9)

- | | | | | | |
|----|-------|---------|-----------|-------------|----------|
| a. | 'itol | 'go up' | min-'itol | 'to get up' | (F1: 2) |
| b. | rakay | 'break' | min-rakay | 'to break' | (F1: 29) |

min- is not a combination of the AF prefix *ma-* and perfective aspectual infix *-in-*, since *rakay* chooses *-om-* as its AF marker to form *r-om-akay* and the combination of the AF and perfective aspectual markers would derive *r-om-in-akay*, and both forms are observed. In this form, it is interpreted as a transitive verb and has a voluntary action.

[13] mon-

This is prefixed to numerals and multiplies the number by ten (10a, b).

(10)

- | | | | | | |
|----|---------|--------|-------------|---------|---------|
| a. | haseb | 'five' | mon-aseb | 'fifty' | (L: 55) |
| b. | saibuSi | 'six' | mon-saibuSi | 'sixty' | (L: 61) |

[15] pa-, [16] pak-

Two forms of the causative prefix are observed. Pazez causative prefix, which has also two variants (*pa-* and *paka-*), are reflexes of Proto-Austronesian **pa-* and **paka-* and they are grammatically conditioned variants (Blust). The former forms the causative of dynamic verbs and the latter the causative of stative verbs. It is obvious, in Saisiyat too, that *pa-* forms the causative of dynamic verb as in (11a) and *pak-* the causative of stative verb in (11b).

(11)

- | | | | | | |
|----|--------|------------|------------|-------------------------|----------|
| a. | kalben | 'lay down' | pa-kalben | 'to lay something down' | (P3: 18) |
| b. | hoepay | 'tired' | pak-hoepay | 'to make someone tired' | (L: 145) |

[17] pas-

Basically it carries a meaning related to producing something (12a, b). It also has the meaning of ‘attitude’ or ‘treatment’ as in (12b).

(12)

- | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------------------|----------|
| a. | kilkilo’ | ‘child (animal) | pas-kilkilo’ | ‘to bear child’ | (E: 73) |
| b. | kayzaeh | ‘good’ | pas-kayzaeh | ‘to treat nicely, make, repair’ | (E: 208) |

[18] si-, [19] sik-

There are two variations of the Referential Focus (RF) prefix, *si-* and *sik-*, but the former is dominant in frequency (13a). Only one case was observed for the latter (13b).

(13)

- | | | | | | |
|----|--------|---------|-----------|------------|----------|
| a. | ‘oe’oe | ‘call’ | si-‘oe’oe | ‘to call’ | (F1: 76) |
| b. | ra:iw | ‘leave’ | sik-ra:iw | ‘to leave’ | (P3: 21) |

[20] ta-

It has the meaning ‘climb’ (14a). Similar to Pazeh *ta-*, it has a hortative function in some cases (14b).

(14)

- | | | | | | |
|----|-------|---------|----------|---------------|-----------|
| a. | ‘itol | ‘go up’ | ta-‘itol | ‘to climb up’ | (P1: 29) |
| b. | ‘ila | ‘go’ | ta-‘ila | ‘let’s go’ | (F1: 117) |

1.2 Infixes

Only three infixes were found in the corpus [21-23].

[21] -in-

It marks perfective aspect, either in verbs (15a) or in nouns (15b). A noun

derived by this infix is a result of the action.

(15)

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------|----------|
| a. | kita | 'see' | k-in-ita | 'saw' | (E: 108) |
| b. | 'az-'azem | 'think' | '-in-az-'azem | 'idea, thought' | (F2: 9) |

[22] -om-, [23] -oem-

Two more variants of the AF prefix are observed (16a, b). In addition to the AF prefixes, vowel echo occurs between the infix and base.

(16)

- | | | | | | |
|----|--------|--------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| a. | rokrok | 'pick' | r-om-okrok | 'to pick' | (P1: 12) |
| b. | 'oe'oe | 'call' | '-oem-oe'oe | 'to call' | (F4: 53) |

1.3 Suffixes

Eight suffixes were found in the corpus [24-31].

[24] -an

It is a multifunctional suffix. Basically it marks the Locative Focus (LF) as in (17a). In some cases, it adds emphasis to the base (17b). Lexical extension also results in derivation of a noun modifier (or nominal) from an adverb (17c).

(17)

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------|
| a. | 'iyok | 'orange' | 'iyok-an | 'orange orchard' | (L: 51) |
| b. | 'at-'atas | 'small cliff' | 'at-'atas-an | 'big cliff' | (F1: 89) |
| c. | nakhini | 'like this' | nakhini-an | 'something like this' | (E: 132) |

[25] -aw

The function of this suffix is not clear. In other languages, it is a projective marker on the verb corresponding to the Patient Focus (PF) in Proto-Austronesian

(Ross, 1995), and the irrealis of the PF in Pazeh (Blust). There is only one case in the corpus co-occurring with the hortative *ta-*, not with PF, as in (18).

(18)

si'ael	'eat'	ta-si'ael-aw	'let someone eat' (P1: 117)
--------	-------	--------------	-----------------------------

[26] -en, [29] -in, [30] -on, [31] -oen

Four allomorphs of the PF are observed (19a-d). The adjacent vowel determines the vowel of the suffix and some constraints are observed. We will discuss this with the vowel echo of the AF markers later.

(19)

a.	aras	'bring'	aras-en	'be brought' (P1: 21)
b.	mari	'take'	mari-in	'be taken' (P3: 28)
c.	paiho	'stick'	paiho-on	'be stuck' (F1: 23)
d.	ra'oe'	'drink'	ra'oe'-oen	'be drunk' (E: 52)

[27] -han

It is possibly a variant of the LF *-an*. Glottal stop is somehow represented as [h]. The function is not clearly understood. There is only one case observed in the corpus.

(20)

kala (?)	?	k-in-ala-han	?	(L: 24)
----------	---	--------------	---	---------

[28] -i

This suffix only co-occurs with negative '*okay* (21a), *kik* (21b), or *oka*' (21c). It can be prefixed as in (21c).

(21)

a.	pamowa	'plant'	'okay pamowa-i	'not plant' (L: 46)
b.	raam	'know'	kik raam-i	'not know' (L: 32)
c.	panra:an	'walk'	oka' ila i'-panra:an	'not walk' (E: 130)