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This paper explores morphosyntactic differences between Formosan and Philippine languages. Four of the less widely recognized morphosyntactic features are included in the discussion, including: (a) Ca- reduplication; (b) *mu- ‘motion’ (Blust 2003b); (c) *maka- and/or *paka-: ‘potentive’ vs. ‘abilitative’; (d) the “recent perfective” construction. On the distributional differences of these features, I discuss whether it is necessary to reconstruct certain forms at the PAN level and/or whether some of the formerly proposed reconstructions should be revised.
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1. Introduction

Many of the Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan, the Philippines, Sabah, northern Sarawak, and in northern Sulawesi, as well as Malagasy, Palauan, and Chamorro are often described as having a unique type of grammatical system, known as the “focus system”. The so-called “focus system” is characterized by the use of various verbal affixes to indicate the thematic role of the NP bearing the nominative (or absolutive) case in a sentence (Reid 1975, 2002, Foley 1976, Blust 1998b, 2002, Himmelmann 2002, Ross 2002a, 20002b, Wolff 1973, 2002). The prevalence of the “focus system” in Formosan and Philippine languages leads to the impression that these languages are
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rather similar morphosyntactically. However, a careful survey of morphosyntactic structures in these languages shows that they are in fact quite different in several aspects of their morphosyntax.

The purpose of this paper is to describe some of these morphosyntactic differences and to discuss whether it is necessary to reconstruct certain forms at the PAN level and/or whether some of the formerly proposed reconstructions should be revised. But before discussing them, I shall first define what ‘difference’ means in this study. A difference can be identified if one of the following conditions is met: (i) if a form or construction is associated with a wide range of functions in languages of one group but with only a limited number of functions in the other (e.g. Ca- reduplication, or *maka- and/or *paka-: ‘potentive’ vs. ‘abilitative’); (ii) if a form or construction is found in languages of one group, but not in the other (e.g. the “recent perfective” construction); (iii) if a function is associated with a particular form in languages of one group, but not in the other (e.g. *mu- ‘motion’).

There are a number of features that have already been identified as being different between Formosan and Philippine languages. These include: (a) major morphosyntactic differences in personal pronoun systems (Blust 1977, 1995, Li 1995, Liao 2008a, 2009, and 2010, Reid 2009a, Ross 2006); (b) the non-existence of PMP *maki- ‘social’ construction in Formosan languages (Liao 2011); (c) the formation of benefactive-affect verbs (Liao 2008b); (d) the use of reflexes of PMP *maN- in Philippine languages (Li 1995, Ross 1995, Liao 2004, Wolff 1995, Lemaréchal 2010, etc.); (e) the expansion of functions associated with PAN *maR- in Philippine languages (Li 1995, Ross 1995, Reid & Liao 2004, Lemaréchal 2010, etc.). These five topics are not included in the present study because they are complex and would require a full paper in order to do justice to each topic in question and in any case, these topics have been discussed to some degree or other in the literature and in conference presentations and need not be repeated here. Instead, I shall consider some of the less widely known morphosyntactic differences between these two groups of languages.

It is necessary to first define how the terms “Formosan languages” and “Philippine languages” are used in this paper. Both of these terms are used in a geographic sense, with one exception: Yami, an Austronesian language spoken on Botel Tobago, or Orchid Island (Mandarin Lányǔ) off the southeast coast of Taiwan, is closely related to Ivatan and Itbayat in the northern Philippines and clearly belongs to the Bashic or Batanic subgroup of Philippine languages (Tsuchida et al. 1987, Blust 1991), a first-order subgroup of Malayo-Polynesian. It is therefore included as a Philippine language in this paper.
2. Some less widely recognized morphosyntactic differences between Formosan and Philippine languages

In this section, I discuss four of the less widely recognized morphosyntactic features that are observed to be quite different between Formosan and Philippine languages. Section 2.1 deals with Ca-reduplication, §2.2 *mu- ‘motion’ (Blust 2003b), §2.3 *maka- and/or *paka-: ‘potentive’ vs. ‘abilitative’, and §2.4 the “recent perfective” construction.

2.1 Ca-reduplication

**Ca-reduplication** refers to the repetition of the initial consonant of a base plus a fixed vowel /a/; if the base begins with a vowel, the reduplicating syllable is simply a-, e.g. Thao /flhuq/: flhuq ‘wash’: fflhuq ‘washcloth’; /iu/: miup ‘to blow’: iuup ‘tube used to blow on the fire’ (Blust 1998a). However, if bases contain more than two syllables, variations may occur. For example, in Nanwang Puyuma, if a base is trisyllabic or quadrisyllabic, it is the consonant of the penultimate syllable (rather than the consonant of the initial syllable) that is reduplicated (e.g. /parekep/ ‘to constitute’: p<en>arekep ‘is constituting’: pararekep ‘will constitute’) (Teng 2008:38, 39). Similarly, in Thao, if a base is trisyllabic, it is usually the consonant of the second syllable (which also happens to be the penultimate syllable in this case) that is reduplicated (e.g. /mulalu/ ‘worship the ancestors’: /ulalalu/ ‘ancestral offering basket’). However, one exception is found in Blust’s (2003a) Thao Dictionary. More specifically, the instrumental noun derived from parimrim ‘to drill’ can be either [primary] pararimrim ‘a drill’ or [secondary] paparimrim ‘a drill’. Blust (2003a:190) considers the first variant to be primary but the second variant secondary, and suggests that “Ca-reduplication historically copied the consonant immediately preceding the stressed vowel, or the first consonant of a cluster immediately preceding the stressed vowel”.

Blust (1998a:30) assigns three unrelated functions of Ca-reduplication to PAN: (i) the formation of a derivative set of numerals used in counting humans, (ii) the formation of certain verb forms, and (iii) the formation of instrumental nouns. However, in a later paper (Blust 1999b:169), he considers that only the first and the third functions can be assigned to PAN. Yeh (2009:151) suggests that “Ca-reduplication cooccurred with projective suffixes such as -ay to mark future, and as the original meaning of marking durative aspect got lost through its repeated occurrence with -ay, it took on the meaning of future from the context, and as -ay disappeared in some languages, the function of marking future was assumed by Ca-reduplication alone.” Zeitoun et al. (2010:862) consider the core meaning of Ca-reduplication to be “iteration” and the [+human] feature that Ca-reduplication marks to be epiphenomenon of plural marking. Reid...
(2009b) questions whether the fixed vowel reduplication, Ca-, can be reconstructed at all for PAN, considering that all cases are probably the result of analogical formations developing from CV- reduplication. See Reid (2009b) for possible developmental paths of Ca- reduplication from PAN CV- reduplication.

All three functions discussed in Blust (1998a) are found to be associated with Ca-reduplication in a number of Formosan languages. However, only the first function is found to be associated with Ca- reduplication in a small number of Philippine languages.

Ca- reduplication can be used to form numerals that only count human beings in several Formosan languages, including at least Siraya, Thao, Bunun, Kanakanabu, Amis, and the Tamalakaw dialect of Puyuma (Tsuchida 1980:287, Adelaar 2000:48, Blust 1998a:31, Zeitoun & Wu 2006). Special qualification is required for Amis Ca-reduplication. Both Wu (2000:59) and Lu (2003:92) describe Ca- reduplication as a process that can be used to form numerals that count not only human beings, but also animals (e.g. taitosa‘two (persons, pigs, cows, etc.)’ in Central Amis (Lu 2003:92)). A similar observation has also been made for Nataoran Amis (Chen 1987:218), as shown in (1).²

---

¹ Adelaar (2000:49) notes “The use of Ca- reduplication for human referents is not limited strictly to count words. Compare, for instance, ra-ruma (v:43) ‘other, some’, which always has a human referent, with ruma, which usually has a nonhuman referent (as in xiii:4, although it occasionally does qualify a human referent, as in xvi:14).” This might also be true for other Formosan languages (Elizabeth Zeitoun p.c.).

² Data cited from published materials reflect the actual spelling conventions of the original with the following exceptions. First, clitics are indicated with an equals sign whether or not they are written with a space between them or joined to their host in the original. Second, the representation of glottal stop /ʔ/ in Philippine languages is treated in the following ways. When glottal stop is represented by “q” or “ ’ ” in the original, these symbols are replaced by the glottal stop symbol “ʔ”. However, when glottal stop is represented by a hyphen “-” in the original, it is retained as such because the orthography of Filipino, the Tagalog-based national language of the Philippines (as well as a number of other Philippine languages that base their orthographic conventions on Filipino), uses a hyphen “-” to represent glottal stop in a consonant cluster. Although Filipino (or Tagalog) does not represent glottal stop between vowels (or word initially), the hyphen “-” will be retained for intervocalic glottal stop in (Central) Bontok data because this is a common local orthographic convention for this language (see http://htq.minpaku.ac.jp/databases/bontok/ for details). Third, the Saaroa voiceless lateral fricative /ɬ/, written as “hl” in Li (2009), has been changed to “lh” in order to be consistent with the writing systems used in other Formosan languages. Literal and free translations reflect, wherever possible, that of the original, although these have also been changed at times to more accurately reflect the syntax of the example. Grammatical labels are changed in accordance with my theoretical assumptions/beliefs.
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(1) Nataoran Amis (Chen 1987:218)

\[ \text{tata} \text{osa ko ayam i dipong.} \]

Two NOM bird LOC nest

‘There are two birds in the nest.’

In addition to the above usage, Ca- reduplication can also combine with a numeral base and a prefix to form ordinal numerals in Siraya and Nanwang Puyuma. In Siraya, ordinal numerals are formed by prefixing ka- and Ca- reduplication to a numeral base, e.g. ta \[ \text{kara} \text{ruha} \] \( \text{xxv:15} \) ‘the second [servant]’, \[ \text{kata} \text{tur} \text{u ki wäi} \] \( \text{xvi:21} \) ‘the third day’, \[ \text{kapa} \text{pi} \text{t} \text{u ki s} \text{l} \text{ut} \] \( \text{vii:} \text{title} \) ‘the seventh chapter’, \[ \text{kama} \text{mat} \text{u} \text{da} \text{ki täley} \] \( \text{xx:5} \) ‘the ninth hour’ (Adelaar 2000:49). In Nanwang Puyuma, ordinal numerals are formed by prefixing puka- and an optional Ca- reduplication to a numeral base, e.g. pukadra \text{rua} \ ‘the second’, puka \text{tel} \text{ru} \ ‘the third’ (Teng 2008:40-41).

Ca- reduplication is also found to occur with numeral bases in some Philippine languages, but their use and distribution is not the same as that in Formosan languages.

First, Ca- reduplication only occurs in some numerals in Tagalog (e.g. \[ \text{dalaw} \text{á} \text{2} \], \[ \text{tat} \text{lo} \text{3} \], \[ \text{áp} \text{at} \text{4} \], and \[ \text{án} \text{im} \text{6} \]) and Ata (e.g. ‘2’-‘9’). The Tagalog forms \[ \text{áp} \text{at} \text{4} \] and \[ \text{án} \text{im} \text{6} \] are considered to have been historically developed from PAN Set B numerals *Sa-Sepat ‘four’ and *a-enem ‘six’ with subsequent contraction of the sequence *a-e to simply a- (Blust 1998a:30-31). However, these numerals (like the numerals without Ca-reduplication in these two languages) can be used for counting both human and nonhuman referents (Blust 1998a:32).

Second, Ca- reduplication also occurs in some numerals in Bashiic languages (e.g. Ivatan (Ivasay and Isamorong), Babuyan (or Ibatan), Itbayat, and Yami (Tsuchida et al. 1989:103-107, Yamada 2002:308-309, Rau & Dong 2006:129-132, Maree 2007:91-96, Reid 1966:97-107). Like Tagalog and Ata, numerals with Ca- reduplication in Ivatan, Babuyan, and Itbayat can also be used for counting both human and nonhuman referents. In Itbayat, numerals with an initial \( h \), which include only the numerals \[ \text{ha} \text{t} \text{lo} \text{3} \], \[ \text{ha} \text{p} \text{at} \text{4} \], and \[ \text{ha} \text{ð} \text{n} \text{em} \text{6} \], are solely for counting ‘persons’ (Yamada 2002:309). Yami appears to be the only Philippine language that distinguishes three sets of numerals: (i) serial counting (e.g. \[ \text{asa} \text{1} \], \[ \text{dó} \text{a} \text{2} \], \[ \text{tí} \text{lo} \text{3} \], \[ \text{áp} \text{at} \text{4} \], \[ \text{l} \text{í} \text{ma} \text{5} \], \[ \text{án} \text{em} \text{6} \], \[ \text{p} \text{i} \text{to} \text{7} \], \[ \text{w} \text{á} \text{o} \text{8} \], and \[ \text{s} \text{i} \text{a} \text{m} \text{9} \]); (ii) counting human referents (e.g. \[ \text{asa} \text{1} \], \[ \text{r} \text{a} \text{ro} \text{a} \text{2} \], \[ \text{t} \text{at} \text{lo} \text{3} \], \[ \text{p} \text{a} \text{p} \text{at} \text{4} \], \[ \text{l} \text{á} \text{í} \text{ma} \text{5} \], \[ \text{n} \text{a} \text{n} \text{e} \text{m} \text{6} \], \[ \text{p} \text{á} \text{p} \text{i} \text{to} \text{7} \], \[ \text{w} \text{a} \text{w} \text{a} \text{o} \text{8} \], and \[ \text{s} \text{a} \text{s} \text{i} \text{a} \text{m} \text{9} \]); (iii) counting

---

\[ ^{3} \] Abbreviations used in this paper that are not included in the Leipzig Glossing Rules (see http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php for details) are: PAN, Proto-Austronesian; PMP, Proto-Malayo-Polynesian; ABIL, abilitative; AO, actor orientation; EXIST, existential; HAB, habitual; LIG, ligature; MED, medial; MULT, multiplicative; NAF, non-Actor Focus; NPST, non-past; NS, nominal specifier; PERS, personal; PLT, polite; POT, potentiive; REAL, realis; RECT, recent; SPEC, specific; UO, undergoer orientation.

Apart from Yami, which may have retained Ca- reduplication in its use on numerals referring to humans because of its contact with neighboring Formosan languages, Philippine languages generally do not use Ca- reduplication, and those that do are probably the result of analogical change of CV- reduplication to Ca- reduplication (Lawrence Reid, p.c., Reid 2009b). By contrast, Ca- reduplication has developed with a wide range of functions in Formosan languages (Zeitoun & Wu 2006). Because other functions of Ca- reduplication do not overlap at all in Formosan and Philippine languages, I will only mention them without detailed discussion.

In addition to forming numerals for counting human referents, Ca- reduplication is commonly used in the following three situations in Formosan languages. First, Ca- reduplication (either alone or in conjunction with a reflex of PAN *-an ‘locative’) can be used to form instrumental nouns (e.g. Pazeh /luzuk/: muluzuk ‘to comb’: [canonical instrument] laluzuk ‘a comb’; /bizu/: mubizu ‘write, draw’: [non-canonical instrument] babizu ‘letter’; /gigeh/: mugigeh ‘tickle’: [non-canonical instrument] gagigehan ‘armpit’) in Saisiyat, Pazeh, Thao, Puyuma, and Siraya (Blust 1998a, Adelaar 2000, Zeitoun & Wu 2006). According to Blust (1998a:37-38), Canonical Instruments have the following properties: (i) they tend to be cultural artifacts manufactured for a preconceived purpose, rather than natural objects that may serve a contingent purpose as the need arises; (ii) they are often implicitly “active” or “dynamic”. By contrast, Non-Canonical Instruments may be passive or static, but they also may be body parts rather than cultural artifacts.

Second, Ca- reduplication can be used to indicate incompleted and/or unrealized events (e.g. Nanwang Puyuma /kasu/ ‘to bring’: kemākasu ‘is bringing’: kākasu ‘will bring’; /parekep/ ‘to constitute’: p<en>ararekep ‘is constituting’: pararekep ‘will constitute’), including continuous/repetitive aspect (in Amis, Siraya, and Thao), progressive aspect (in Tanan Rukai, Nanwang Puyuma (Ca- reduplication with a voice affix), and Siraya), and future/irrealis mood (in Central Amis, Nanwang Puyuma (Ca- reduplication without a voice affix), Saisiyat, and Mayrinax Atayal (for NAF verbs only)) (Li 1973:281, Zeitoun et al. 1996:37, 43, Zeitoun & Wu 2006, Wu 2000, Teng 2008:39).

Third, Ca- reduplication (usually cooccurring with the prefix ma-) can be used to mark reciprocity (typically for dynamic verbs) (e.g. Mantauran Rukai makaćengele ‘see each other’) in Southern Paiwan, Nanwang Puyuma, Saisiyat, Rukai (Mantauran and Maga), Mayrinax Atayal, Seediq, and Amis (Zeitoun 2002, 2007, 2010, Zeitoun & Wu 2006).
In addition to the above commonly found functions, Ca- reduplication is also found to be associated with the following functions in Formosan languages.

First, (when co-occurring with a prefix,) it can express reflexivity in Mantauran Rukai (e.g. *inikake’ete ‘cut oneself’) and Maga Rukai (e.g. *ajakakiti ‘cut oneself’) (Zeitoun & Wu 2006).

Second, it can express intensification and/or add the notion of ‘inchoativity’ to stative verbs in Saisiyat (e.g. hopay ‘(be) tired’: bahopay ‘(be) all very tired’), Kavalan (e.g. tatyon ‘is getting darker and darker’), and Nanwang Puyuma (e.g. ma-’idrang ‘old’: ma’a’idrang ‘become older’) (Zeitoun & Wu 2006, Lee 2009:134, Teng 2008:40).

Third, it can signal plurality or collectivity in Nanwang Puyuma, e.g. trau ‘person(s)’ vs. tratrau ‘everybody’ vs. tratrauan/trauan ‘human being’; wadi ‘younger sibling(s)’ vs. wawadian ‘brothers and sisters’ (Teng 2008:40).

Fourth, when added to a kin term, it can express ‘the most’ in Kavalan, e.g. qaqa ‘elder siblings’ vs. qaqaqa ‘the eldest sibling’; suani ‘younger siblings’ vs. sasuan ‘the youngest sibling’ (Lee 2009:135).

Fifth, it can be used to form nouns that “seem to correspond to the categories of agent, instrument, undergoer, abstract noun, or (if suffixed with -an/-ən) location” in Siraya, e.g. dilux ‘to lead’: da-dilo (< *da-dilux) ‘priest’; piha, ni-phā-n ‘to give’: pā-pāpā ‘gifts’; pa-paril ‘wings’; pāx-dəmdəm ‘to think’: da-rəmdəm, na da-rəmdəm ‘thoughts’, etc. (Adelaar 2000:47).

Sixth, it can occur as part of the template /shan-na-Ca-X/ to mean ‘it’s up to X (“X” stands for a personal pronoun (e.g. /caycuy/ ‘them’ vs. /shannaca/caycuy/ ‘it’s up to them’; /yakin/ ‘me’ vs. /shannayakin/ ‘it’s up to me’; /ihun/ ‘you (SG)’ vs. /shannaai/hun/ ‘It’s up to you (SG).’) in Thao (Blust 2003a:172, 193).

Seventh, it can occur as part of the template tu-Ca-X to mean ‘smell of an X’ in Thao (e.g. cumay ‘bear’: tucumay ‘smell of a bear’) (Blust 2003a:193).

Eighth, it can occur as part of the template CaCVCV(C), which is commonly associated with names of flora and fauna, including the shells of mollusks (e.g. cacido? ‘dragonfly’, fafikfik ‘gecko’, kakorot ‘bitter cucumber’, tainiir ‘fish species’, etc.), in Amis (Blust 1999b). Similarly, Ca- reduplication also occurs in Tamalakaw (and Nanwang) Puyuma insect names and in names for a frog, shrimp, bat, etc., e.g. la lipis ‘water beetle’, 4 a’dul ‘house cricket (Cryllidae)’, kakras (or kakeras (according to

---

4 Tamalakaw Puyuma forms are not enclosed in parentheses; Nanwang Puyuma forms are enclosed in parentheses. Tamalakaw data are from Tsuchida (1980) and Nanwang data are from Cauquelin (1991) and have French glosses. To avoid the use of three different writing systems for Puyuma, I have modified the symbols used in Tsuchida (1980) and Cauquelin (1991) to make them compatible with the symbols used in Teng (2008). More specifically, Tamalakaw H (voiceless pharyngeal fricative), T (retroflex stop), R (trill), and r (retroflex flap)

As already shown above, Ca- reduplication can be associated with a wide range of functions in Formosan languages. By contrast, Ca- reduplication is associated with a limited number of functions in a few Philippine languages. In the great majority of Philippine languages, it is totally unattested. As far as I am aware, only three Philippine languages (all belong to the Northern Luzon subgroup of Malayo-Polynesian languages) are reported to have Ca- reduplication in non-numeral forms: Central Cagayan Agta, Dupaningan Agta, and Ilokano.

In Central Cagayan Agta, Ca- reduplication is used to indicate ‘plural actors’. As shown in (2), the use of Ca- reduplication implies that “both or all of the actors are actually involved in the action” (Healey 1960:9).

(2) Central Cagayan Agta (Healey 1960:9) [Northern Luzon]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{magdáfung} & \quad \text{‘meet’} & \text{dádáfungan} = \text{da} & \quad \text{‘they all gather round (someone)’} \\
\text{dumatang} & \quad \text{‘arrive’} & \text{magdádatang kid} & \quad \text{‘they all arrive (e.g. for wedding)’} \\
\text{nagdúma} & \quad \text{‘different’} & \text{nagdúma kid} & \quad \text{‘they are different from each other’} \\
\text{naggitta} & \quad \text{‘same’} & \text{naggagitta kid} & \quad \text{‘they are the same as each other’} \\
\text{magbida} & \quad \text{‘talk about’} & \text{magbida kid} & \quad \text{‘they are talking together’} \\
\text{magwelwel} & \quad \text{‘scold’} & \text{magwawelwel kid} & \quad \text{‘they are all telling (him) off’}
\end{align*}
\]

In Dupaningan Agta, Ca- reduplication is associated with a function related to the one in Central Cagayan Agta. Robinson (2008) considers Ca- reduplication a ‘multiplicative’ marker that can be used with various parts of speech. First, when Ca-reduplication occurs in a kin term prefixed with pat-, it can be used to create a multiple, e.g. patwadi ‘pair of siblings’ (cf. wadi ‘younger sibling (either sex)’) vs. papatwadi ‘sibling set (more than two)’; pat[tf]ama ‘father and son pair’ (cf. hama ‘father’) vs. papat[tf]ama ‘father and children’) (Robinson 2008:111). Second, in other situations,
Ca- reduplication can indicate ‘plurality for numbers greater than two’, as in (3) and (4) (cf. (5)).

(3) Dupaningan Agta (Robinson 2008:178) [Northern Luzon]
\[
\text{Dadapponan}=\text{na} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{hapu}=\text{di}=\text{a} \\
\text{MULT.guard}=\text{GEN.3SG}^5 \quad \text{DEF} \quad \text{boss}=\text{GEN.3PL}=\text{SPEC} \\
\text{agom}=\text{di} \quad \text{hidi}=\text{a}.
\]
\text{companion}=\text{GEN.3PL} \quad \text{PL}=\text{SPEC}

‘Their boss will take care of their companions.’

(4) Dupaningan Agta (Robinson 2008:179) [Northern Luzon]
\[
\text{nagga}\text{ginnakos} \quad \text{hidi} \quad \text{ngamin}. \\
\text{PFV.PL.RECP.hug} \quad \text{NOM.3PL} \quad \text{all}
\]

‘They all hugged each other.’

(5) Dupaningan Agta (Robinson 2008:179) [Northern Luzon]
\[
\text{nagga}\text{ginnakos} \quad \text{hidi}. \\
\text{PFV.RECP.hug} \quad \text{NOM.3PL}
\]

‘They (two) hugged each other.’

In Ilokano, Ca- reduplication is reported to occur in onomatopoetic forms. Rubino (2001:309) states that a few onomatopoetic roots in Ilokano take a special affix C_1a-V_2-. He notes that “most of the sounds expressed by these words are loud and prolonged or iterative”, as shown in (6).

(6) Ilokano (Rubino 2001:309) [Northern Luzon]
\[
\text{bitog} \quad ‘\text{thump}’ \quad \text{babtiog} \quad ‘\text{thumping sounds}’ \\
\text{biset} \quad ‘\text{fast sound}’ \quad \text{babseet} \quad ‘\text{darting out; spank}’ \\
\text{kireb} \quad ‘\text{wave crash}’ \quad \text{kakreeb} \quad ‘\text{sound of crashing waves}’ \\
\text{kitol} \quad ‘\text{click}’ \quad \text{kaktuol} \quad ‘\text{clicking sounds (heels)}’ \\
\text{dipor} \quad ‘\text{crumbling}’ \quad \text{dadjuor} \quad ‘\text{crumbling or rumbling sound}’ \\
\text{dissuor} \quad ‘\text{waterfall}’ \quad \text{dadjuor} \quad ‘\text{fall down with a thump}’
\]

5 Following Starosta (1986, 1988), even though I analyze (most, if not all) Formosan and Philippine languages as ergative, I choose not to use the term “absolutive,” preferring instead the typologically more general term “nominative” for the core arguments S and O in ergative languages (as well as the S and A in accusative languages). Moreover, the case-marking of noun phrases that are the agent of transitive constructions in most, if not all, Formosan and Philippine languages is identical to that which marks the possessors of possessed nouns. I choose to use the more general term “genitive” (rather than “ergative”) as the label for the case that marks both of these noun phrases.
2.2 *mu- ‘motion’

In discussing the grammatical subgrouping of Formosan languages, Starosta notes that “[t]here are possible instances of PF [Proto-Formosan] *mu- used as a motion-verb prefix, but it is hard to separate them from other uses of the prefix mu-” (Starosta 1995: 716).

In response to Starosta’s comments on *mu-, Blust (1999a:64, footnote 13) uses data from Thao to argue for the non-identity of *mu- and -um- in Formosan languages. He comments that “… these two affixes are distinct in several Formosan languages, including Thao, where /mu/- is always prefixed and applies almost exclusively to motion verbs, whereas -/um/- is infixed, and applies to a semantically much less restricted verb class: /mu-apaw/ ‘emerge from concealment, as a snake from its hole’, but /m-apa/ ‘carry on the back’, /mu-sazum/ ‘enter the water’, but /s-m-apuk/ ‘catch, seize’, /mu-fafaw/ ‘go up, climb up’, but /fanuz/ ‘wake up’ (with zero marking of the actor focus -/um/- in verb bases that begin with /f/)” (Blust 1999a:64, footnote 13).

In discussing the morphological expression of causation, Blust (2003b:451-453) uses primarily data from Thao and Puyuma to reconstruct PAN *mu- ‘motion’ and its corresponding causative form PAN *pu- ‘the causative of motion’. Blust (2009:366) further stresses the distinction between PAN *mu- ‘motion’ and PAN *-um- ‘actor focus’ (e.g. Thao *muqris ‘blunder into a snare trap’ vs. *muqris ‘catch with a snare trap’). He notes that PAN *mu- ‘motion’ is attested in Formosan languages, where it is highly productive.


---

Some Morphosyntactic Differences between Formosan and Philippine Languages

(7) Thao (Blust 2003a:136)

/qariwan/ ‘the city of Pu-li’  /mqariwan/ ‘go to Pu-li’
/taipak/ ‘Taipei’  /mutaipak/ ‘go to Taipei’
/fafaw/ ‘top’  /mufafaw/ ‘go to the top’
/pruq/ ‘earth; down’  /mupruq/ ‘go down, descend’
/qualh/ ‘near’  /muqualh/ ‘come near, move closer’
/suhiy/ ‘there’  /musuhiy/ ‘go over there’

(8) Nanwang Puyuma (Teng 2010)

an musabak=ku i ruma’ i,…
when go.inside=NOM.1SG LOC house TOP
‘When I went into the house, …’

(9) Siraya (Adelaar 1997:379)

ka nimoukoua ki Si-bavau ka Tama-p’hik.
ka ni-m-u-kua ki Si-bavaw ka tama-pixik
and PST-AO-go.toward-move LOC chief LIG priest
‘[Judas Iscariot] went unto the chief priest.’ (xxvi:14)

(10) Saaroa (Li 2009:209)

musala ‘go; walk’  muacekelhe ‘come’
musakesakelhe ‘move along the river’  muareve ‘move with’
muhungulhungu ‘move along a brook’  muteatealhe ‘take a shortcut’

(11) Isbukun Bunun (Ismahasan et al. 2001:35-36)

dan ‘road’  mudan ‘walk’
aisku ‘near’  mu?aisku ‘go somewhere near; come near’
apav ‘outside’  mu?apav ‘go outside; emerge, appear’

Both Teng (2008:181-182) and Li (2009:208) suggest that the form mu- is better analyzed as a bimorphemic m-u- (< m- ‘intransitive/actor focus’ and u- ‘motion or move’) in Puyuma and Saaroa. Adelaar (2004:336, 348-349) also considers mu- to be bimorphemic m-u-, in which u- ‘motion’ stands for one of the three verbal ‘orientation prefixes’ (a- ‘comitative’, i- ‘location’, and u- ‘motion’) in Siraya. The bimorphemic analysis of Siraya mu- is supported by the fact that m-u- is in a paradigmatic relationship with u- and p-u-, and this set is mirrored by the location-oriented derivational set i-, m-i-, and p-i-. A similar contrast (more specifically, i- ‘be at’ vs. p-i- ‘put at (locative causative)’; m-o- ‘go to’ (< o- ‘motion’) vs. po- ‘bring (back) (movement causative)’) is also observed in Mantauran Rukai (Zeitoun 2007:225-226).

Although possible reflexes of PAN *mu- ‘motion’ are found in at least seven Formosan languages, its attestation in Philippine languages can barely be found. Blust
(2009:366-367) considers that the affixation of *mu- to nouns referring to a place (e.g. *grahi *garage*; *mugrai* *go to/toward the garage*; *lawud* *sea*; *mulawud* *go to/toward the sea*) in Cebuano might be the only known reflex of PAN *mu-* ‘motion’ outside Taiwan. However, Liao (2004:104) notes that in Cebuano and some other Central Philippine languages (e.g. Surigaonon and Naturalis), PAN *-um- developed into the prefix form *mu- probably from a metathesis of the initial root consonant with the nasal of the infix. This historical fact undermines the argument that PAN *mu-* ‘motion’ is distinct from PAN *-um- ‘actor focus’.

In most, if not all, Philippine languages, motion verbs are expressed by either reflexes of PAN/PMP *-um- ‘actor focus’ (as in (12)-(14)) or reflexes of PMP *maR-* ‘actor focus’ (as in (15)).

(12) Ilokano (Rubino 1997:201-202) [Northern Luzon]

- asideg ‘near’
- tugaw ‘sit’
- seksek ‘interior’
- sirok ‘underneath’
- uneg ‘inside’

(13) Botolan Sambal (Antworth 1979:15) [Central Luzon]

- lomateng ‘to arrive’
- pomahok ‘to enter’

(14) Sarangani Manobo (DuBois 1976:25) [Greater Central Philippines]

-Dimotin se inay te dagat.

-Prv.go.to SPEC mother OBL beach

-‘The mother went to the beach.’

(15) Masbatenyo (Wolfenden 2001:307) [Greater Central Philippines]

-Nagalarga=na=sinda.

-Prv.leave=now/already=NOM.3PL

-‘They are leaving now.’

To sum up, although motion verbs are found to be marked by possible reflexes of PAN *mu-* ‘motion’ in at least seven Formosan languages, they are marked by either reflexes of PAN/PMP *-um- ‘actor focus’ or reflexes of PMP *maR-* ‘actor focus’ in most, if not all, Philippine languages. Unlike Formosan languages, Philippine languages do not employ an affix distinct from ‘actor focus’ markers to express motion events.

---

According to Antworth (1979:15), “-om- undergoes a morphophonemic change to become the prefix mo- with bases beginning with ow (phonemically /w/)” in Botolan Sambal.
2.3 *maka- and/or *paka-: ‘potentive’ vs. ‘abilitative’

In many Philippine languages, a construction known as the “potentive” (or “abilitative”, “aptative”, “potential”, “accidental”, or “opportunity”) construction is commonly used to express the following meanings: (i) the internal, innate ability of an actor to perform a certain action (as shown in (16) and (17)); (ii) an actor has the opportunity to perform an action, i.e. that external circumstances (not innate ability) permitted the actor to perform the action (as shown in (18)); (iii) an actor involuntarily, unintentionally, or accidentally performs an action (as shown in (19)) (Antworth 1979:20). Following Rubino (1997), I will refer to this construction as the “potentive” construction.

(16) Limos Kalinga (Ferreirinho 1993:44, 52) [Northern Luzon]
Maka
POT.pound=NOM.1SG
‘I am able to pound.’ or ‘I will be able to pound.’

(17) Sarangani Manobo (DuBois 1976:111) [Greater Central Philippine]
Meke
POT.get.well SPEC water that.NOM.MED
‘That water can make one well again.’

(18) Cebuano (Wolff 1972:661) [Greater Central Philippine]
Ug maka
POT.go.there=NOM.1SG LOC 2PL afterwards
sa paniudtu, muhapit=ku.
LOC lunch drop.in=NOM.1SG
‘If I get a chance to go to your (PL) place after lunch, I will drop in.’

(19) Cebuano (Wolff 1972:661-662) [Greater Central Philippine]
Diriyut=siya maka
POT.urine LOC there=LIG whip=NOM.3SG
sa iya=ng inahan.
GEN 3SG=LIG mother
‘Her mother whipped her so hard that she nearly wet her pants.’

In the great majority of Philippine languages, verbs in this construction are marked with the form maka- (or its related m-forms) (as in (16)-(21)) or simply ka- (as in (20) and (21)). In Agutaynen, potentiive verbs are marked by mapag- (irrealis) or mapang- (irrealis) (or their related aspectual forms) (Quakenbush 2005:461, 475).
Strictly speaking, two groups of *maka-* “potentive” verbs should be distinguished: (i) *maka-* (or *ka*)- verbs (with no stress on the affix) that are used to express an actor’s ability to perform an action [i.e. the first sense discussed above]; (ii) *maká-* (or *ká*)- verbs (with a stress on the last vowel (and/or lengthening of the last vowel) of the affix) that are used to express either (a) an actor has the opportunity to perform an action [i.e. the second sense discussed above] or (b) an actor involuntarily, unintentionally, or accidentally performs an action [i.e. the third sense discussed above]. Such a distinction has been reported in at least two Philippine languages, i.e. Botolan Sambal and Tagalog (Antworth 1979, Ramos 1971, Wolff et al. 1991). As shown in (22), when the perfective aspect form of *maka-* is attached to the base *kain* ‘eat’, the sentence receives an “abilitative” reading. By contrast, when the perfective aspect form of *maká-* is attached to the base *kain* ‘eat’, the sentence receives an “unintentional” reading, as shown in (23).

(22) Tagalog (Ramos 1971:59) [Greater Central Philippines]

\[Naka\k̄ain=ako ng balut.\]
\[Pfv.POT.eat=NOM.1SG GEN balut\]
‘I was able to eat *balut* (i.e. duck’s egg with developed embryo).’

(23) Tagalog (Ramos 1971:59) [Greater Central Philippines]

\[Nakākāin=ako ng balut.\]
\[Pfv.POT.eat=NOM.1SG GEN balut\]
‘I (unintentionally) ate *balut* (i.e. duck’s egg with developed embryo).’

In general, *maka-* forms are considered to be “actor focus” (intransitive) verbs in the potentive mood. Typically, they have transitive counterparts with the forms *ma-* (“goal focus”/”patient focus”) (as shown in (24)), *maʔi-* (or *ʔika*) (“accessory focus/instrumental focus/theme focus”) (as shown in (25)), and *ma-* -an (or *ka*- -an) (“locative focus”) (as shown in (26)).
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(24) Limos Kalinga (Ferreirinho 1993:46) [Northern Luzon]
\begin{verbatim}
Masugat=na  sika.
POT.hurt=GEN.3SG NOM.2SG
\end{verbatim}
‘He can hurt you (SG).’

(25) Limos Kalinga (Ferreirinho 1993:50) [Northern Luzon]
\begin{verbatim}
Na?ningina=mi  dit  bolok.
P FV.POT.sell=GEN.1PL.EXCL SPEC pig
\end{verbatim}
‘We (EXCL) were able to sell the pig.’

(26) Ilokano (Rubino 2000:lxvi) [Northern Luzon]
\begin{verbatim}
Napu?ran=na  ti  baláy.
P FV.POT.burn.down=GEN.3SG SPEC house
\end{verbatim}
‘He accidentally burned down the house.’

Table 1 illustrates potentive verb affixes in various tense/aspect/mood in Romblomanon, a Greater Central Philippine language. Most Philippine languages with potentive verbs have similar formal distinctions as in Romblomanon. In most Philippine languages, potentive verbs do not have p-initial forms corresponding to m-initial forms. This fact has led Blust (2009:364) to state that “[l]ike *ma-, *maka- does NOT appear to participate in p/m pairing, since the only p-initial correspondent is *pa-ka- ‘causative of stative verbs’”. Although Blust’s claim is too strong, it is generally true that potentive verbs do not participate in p/m pairing in most Philippine languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agent (nag- class)</th>
<th>Goal (-un class)</th>
<th>Accessory (?i- class)</th>
<th>Location (-an class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPST POT</td>
<td>maka-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ma?i-, ?ika-</td>
<td>ma- -an, ka- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG NPST POT</td>
<td>maka-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ma?i-</td>
<td>ma--i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST POT</td>
<td>naka-</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>na?i-</td>
<td>na--an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG PST POT</td>
<td>naka-</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>na?i-</td>
<td>na--i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL POT</td>
<td>magka-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG NEUTRAL POT</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Philippine facts discussed above appear to support Blust’s (2009:364) reconstruction of *maka- ‘abilitative/aptative’ rather than Kaufman’s (2009) reconstruction of PMP *paka- ‘abilitative/aptative’. Kaufman’s reconstruction is based on a common misconception that all m-initial verbs in Malayo-Polynesian languages historically developed from infixation of *-um- to p-initial verbs. Although *maR- is supposed to
have developed historically from *-um- + *paR- and *maN- from *-um- + *paN-, not all m-initial (“actor focus”) verbs in Philippine languages developed historically in the same way, as discussed in Liao (2011).

Sometimes the alternation between m-initial forms and p-initial forms is related to an alternation between verbal and nominal functions, rather than an alternation between “actor focus” verbs and “non-actor focus” verbs. Potentive forms in Ilokano support this statement. In Ilokano, no potentive verbs take p-initial forms. However, p-initial forms are found to be nominalizations of m-initial forms, as shown in (27).

(27) Ilokano (Rubino 2000:415) [Northern Luzon]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>affix</th>
<th>functions and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paka-</td>
<td>nominalizing instrumental affix for potentive maka- verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>makaSurat ‘to be able to write’ vs. pakaSurat ‘something with which one is able to write’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paka-…-an</td>
<td>nominalizing affix for maka- verbs; reason, source, or place of ability or chance to perform an action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) makaSurat ‘to be able to write’ vs. makaSurat-an ‘place where someone can write; reason why someone can write’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) makaTurog ‘to be able to sleep’ vs. makaTurogan ‘place where someone can sleep; reason why someone is able to sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) makaPili ‘selection’; makaSarita ‘history, story’; Ania ti makaSapul ‘Why do you (SG) need it?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pakai-…-an</td>
<td>nominalizing affixation for potentive theme makai- verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pakaiRamanan ‘inclusion’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar construction has been reported to occur in at least three Formosan languages: Amis, Puyuma, and Paiwan (Starosta 1974, Fey 1986, Citamih 2005, He, Zeng, Citamih & Lin 1986, Zeng 2008, Tsukida 1993, Teng 2008, Wolff 1995). Starosta (1974:307) states that maka- ‘abilitative’ is one of the several productive processes of verb formation in Amis. Fey (1986:372) considers maka- a multifunctional affix with three functions, one of them being ‘abilitative’, as shown in (28). He, Zeng, Citamih & Lin (1986:16-17) describe maka- as a prefix that expresses ‘… is able to perform the action indicated by a verb root’, as shown in (29). Zeng (2008:395) gives the example maka’araw ‘let the other person see…; is able to see ….’ Teng (2008:114) states that “[t]he prefix maka- attaches to dynamic verbs, and only appears in the negative construction, indicating that the actor has a strong intention to do something but is unable to accomplish the action”, as shown in (30). Wolff (1995:565) reports that there is a prefix maka- that is used to form “potential active verbs” in Paiwan. He analyzes
the Paiwan “active potential affix maka-” as consisting of -um- plus paka-, as shown in (31) (Wolff 1995:567).

(28) Central Amis (Fey 1986:372)
   \textit{Paka}lahci kiso haw?
   ABIL.complete NOM.2SG Q
   ‘Can you (S G) complete it?’

(29) Amis (Citamih 2005:133)
   … kaura awaay ku \textit{paka}tamaay=naira.
   but NEG.EXIST NOM ABIL.hit.the.target=GEN.3PL
   ‘… but none of them were able to hit the target.’

(30) Nanwang Puyuma (Teng 2008:114)
   adri \textit{paka}tenges dra kawi.
   NEG ABIL.bind INDF.OBL timber
   ‘He wanted but was unable to bind the timber.’

(31) Paiwan (Wolff 1995:567)
   \textit{maka}qati ‘can do something’
   \textit{su=}\textit{paka}qati-n ‘You (SG) can do it.’

Superficially, the “abilitative” construction reported in Formosan languages appears to be quite similar to the “potentive” construction found in Philippine languages, but they are, in fact, quite different from each other in terms of form, function, and distribution.

First, in terms of form, the three Formosan languages all use \textit{paka-} (Paiwan also makes use of \textit{maka-}) verbs to express ‘be able to/can do …’, as shown in (28)-(31). By contrast, the great majority of Philippine languages do not use \textit{p-} initial forms (\textit{paka-}, \textit{peke-}, or \textit{poko-}) to express ‘abilitative, accidental, and/or involuntary’ events at all (although they can use these forms to express meanings unrelated to abilitative/accidental/involuntary, such as causative). They use only \textit{m-} initial forms (\textit{maka-}, \textit{meke-}, or \textit{moko-}) or monosyllabic forms (\textit{ka-} or \textit{ke/-ko-}), and their corresponding \textit{n-} initial forms (\textit{naka-}, \textit{neke-}, or \textit{nook-}) to express the ‘abilitative, accidental, and/or involuntary’ senses in verbal constructions. Although \textit{p-} initial forms are reported to be found in three Philippine languages (Kiangan Ifugaw, Tagabawa, and Sarangani Manobo), they are either results of avoidance of ambiguous interpretations (as in Kiangan Ifugaw) or results of restructuring of morphological systems (as in Tagabawa and Sarangani Manobo) (Lambrecht 1978, DuBois 1976, DuBois & DuBois 2005).8

8 According to Lambrecht (1978:344, 397), Kiangan Ifugaw does not use \textit{maka-} forms (and rarely uses their corresponding transitive \textit{ma-} forms) for potentive verbs because \textit{maka-} forms
Second, in terms of function, *maka-* (or occasionally *paka-*) forms are commonly associated with three functions in Philippine languages, as already discussed in the earlier part of this section. However, only the first function (i.e. the “abilitative” sense) is reported to be associated with *paka-* (and/or *maka-*) in the three Formosan languages. Due to the above difference in function, *maka-* (or *paka-*) forms are referred to as “potentive” forms in Philippine languages, but *paka-* (or *maka-*) forms are referred to as “abilitative” forms in Formosan languages.

Moreover, according to Teng (2008:114), “[t]he prefix *paka-* attaches to dynamic verbs … indicating that the actor has a strong intention to do something but is unable to accomplish the action”, as shown in (32). By contrast, in Philippine languages, potentive verbs typically “lack volitionality and include the following semantic areas: states of being, ability, need, and involuntary and accidental activity” (Ferreirinho 1993:43).

(32) Nanwang Puyuma (Teng 2008:114)
\[
\text{adri=la paka=relrep idru na ma’idrang.}
\]
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{NEG=PFV ABIL.chase that.NOM DEF.NOM old} \\
\text{‘The old man wanted to chase (them), but was not able to.’}
\end{tabular}

Third, in terms of distribution, in most, if not all, Philippine languages, *maka-* (or its related forms) can occur in both affirmative and negative constructions. However, in at least one Formosan language, i.e. (Nanwang) Puyuma, *paka-* forms can only occur in negative constructions, as shown in (32).

2.4 The “recent perfective” construction

In many Philippine languages, events completed just prior to the speech event are expressed by a special construction referred to in the literature as either the ‘RECENT PERFECTIVE construction’, ‘RECENT PAST construction’, ‘RECENT COMPLETIVE construction’, or ‘RECENT construction’.

The predicate in a recent perfective construction can be marked by the prefix *pa’i(C)-* or *pa’a(C)-* in Batad Ifugao (as shown in (33) and (34), or by the prefix *kap*- in AytA Mag-antsi (35) and Halitaq Baytan (36)).

\[\text{mean ‘very, very much, exceedingly’ and } ma\text{- forms can mark either stative verbs or passive verbs. To avoid ambiguous interpretations, Kiangan Ifugaw speakers prefer to use *paka-* forms.}
\]

\[9\text{ Ferreirinho (1993:43) uses the term ‘inactive’ as opposed to ‘active’ to describe these verbs.}\]
(33) Batad Ifugao (Newell 1993:446) [Northern Luzon]
Heten baluy ya pa?i?iyamama.
TOP.this house SPEC RECT.PFV.construct
‘As for this house, it was recently constructed.’

(34) Batad Ifugao (Newell 1993:52) [Northern Luzon]
Pa?akkak hi O??iolwang.
RECT.PFV.leave PERS.NOM Olwang
‘Olwang just left.’

(35) Ayta Mag-antsi (Storck & Storck 2005:145) [Central Luzon]
Kapi?yari=la=n nangan.
RECT.PFV.finish=GEN/NOM.3PL=LIG eating
‘They just finished eating.’

(36) Halitaq Baytan (Malicsi 1974:66) [Central Luzon]
Kapi?akan nin ’aho nin dalaga.
RECT.PFV.CAUS.eat GEN dog GEN maiden
‘The maiden has just made the dog eat.’

Most commonly, the predicate in a recent perfective construction is marked by the prefix ka-, which may occur alone, as in (37), or be followed by some form of reduplication (usually CV-, CVC-, C-, or full reduplication), as shown in (38)-(42).

In most Philippine languages with a recent perfective construction, this construction does not take any nominative (or absolutive) phrase. More specifically, if it is a monadic recent perfective construction, the sole argument of the sentence will be in the GENITIVE (or ERGATIVE) case form, as shown in (37)-(42).

(37) Ivatan (Hidalgo & Hidalgo 1971:160) [Bashiic]
Káwára namen pa asdawa
RECT.PFV.arrive GEN.1PL.EXCL already that.is.why
kapumútung namen pa.
RECT.PFV.cook GEN.1PL.EXCL already
‘We (EXCL) have just arrived, that is why we (EXCL) have just started cooking.’

(38) Ilokano (Rubino 2000:lxvii) [Northern Luzon]
Kasasangpét=ko.
RECT.PFV.arrive=GEN.1SG
‘I just arrived.’
(39) Kapampangan (Mirikitani 1972:65) [Central Luzon]
   \textit{Kada}datang(=na) ning mestra.
   \textsc{rect.pfv.come}(=\textsc{gen.3sg}) \textsc{gen} \textsc{teacher}
   ‘The teacher just came.’

(40) Kapampangan (Gonzalez 1981:75, 184) [Central Luzon]
   \textit{Kalákad}lákad=na=pá mu=ŋ Pédru.
   \textsc{rect.pfv.walk}=(\textsc{gen.3sg}=\text{still/yet just=\textsc{pers.gen}} Pédro
   ‘Pedro has just now walked.’

(41) Brook’s Point Palawano (Loevstaf & Young 1994:14) [Greater Central Philippines]
   \textit{Kepe}patey=ye lang.
   \textsc{rect.pfv.die}=(\textsc{gen.3sg} just
   ‘He just died.’

(42) Agutaynen (Quakenbush 2005:463) [Kalamian]
   \textit{Kaka}olik=ko lamang.
   \textsc{rect.pfv.go.home}=\textsc{gen.1sg} only
   ‘I just go home.’

If it is a dyadic (or triadic) recent perfective construction, \textbf{none} of the two (or
three) arguments of the sentence will be in the \textsc{nominative} (or \textsc{absolutive}) case form, as shown in (36) and (43).

(43) Tagalog (Schachter 1995:7) [Greater Central Philippines]
   \textit{Kabi}bigay=lang ng maestra ng libro sa bata.
   \textsc{rect.pfv.give}=\textsc{just gen} \textsc{teacher gen} book \textsc{loc} child
   ‘The teacher just gave a book to the child.’

However, not all languages exhibit special case-marking for arguments in the recent
perfective construction. In Batad Ifugao and Central Bontok (both belong to the Central
Cordilleran branch of Northern Luzon languages), the case-marking for arguments in the
recent perfective construction is not different from that in other aspectual constructions.\textsuperscript{10}
That is, in a monadic construction, the sole NP of the sentence will still be in the
\textsc{nominative} (or \textsc{absolutive}) form, as shown in (34) and (44), see also Seidenadel
(1909:112-113) for more examples.

\textsuperscript{10} I would like to thank Lawrence Reid for bringing to my attention the unique behavior of
Central Bontok recent perfective constructions and also for looking for Bontok examples from
Scott (1957), Vanoverbergh (1933), and Waterman (1932).
(44) Central Bontok (Waterman 1932:133) [Northern Luzon]

**Ka-al-ali=yak.**

RECT.PFV.come=NOM.1SG

‘I just came.’

In a dyadic (or triadic) recent perfective construction, the two (or three) arguments of the sentence do NOT receive special marking either. That is, the patient argument will be in the NOMINATIVE (or ABSOLUTIVE) case form, as shown in (45) (cf. (46)).

(45) Central Bontok (Lawrence Reid, p.c.) [Northern Luzon]

**Ka-il-ila=k nan aso=cha.**

RECT.PFV.see=GEN.1SG SPEC[NOM] dog=GEN.3PL

‘I just saw their dogs.’

(46) Central Bontok (Lawrence Reid, p.c.) [Northern Luzon]

**Inila=k nan aso=cha.**

PFV.see=GEN.1SG SPEC[NOM] dog=GEN.3PL

‘I saw their dogs.’

Similarly, Ayta Mag-antsi, a Central Luzon language, also exhibits a regular case-marking pattern. More specifically, the sole argument in an intransitive clause is encoded as NOMINATIVE (or ABSOLUTIVE), as shown in (47) and (48).

(47) Ayta Mag-antsi (Storck & Storck 2005:145) [Central Luzon]

**Kapi dyag ya bali ni Kiko.**

RECT.PFV.built SPEC[NOM] house GEN Kiko

‘Kiko’s house was just built.’

(48) Ayta Mag-antsi (Storck & Storck 2005:145) [Central Luzon]

**Kapi bita=la.**

RECT.PFV.leave=GEN/NOM.3PL

‘They just left.’

---

11 The interpretation of the pronoun =la here is controversial. According to Storck & Storck (2005:xv), =la is ‘GEN.3PL’. However, Kitano & Pangilinan (2003:173-175, 180) treat =la as either ‘GEN.3PL’ or ‘NOM.3PL’. If =la is interpreted as ‘GEN.3PL’, then Ayta Mag-antsi exhibits a mixture of the above two types of case-marking properties in the recent perfective construction.
A similar situation is also reported in Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken outside the Philippines, including Eastern Kadazan and Tindal Dusun (both are Dusunic languages spoken in Sabah, East Malaysia), as shown in (49) and (50).

(49) Eastern Kadazan (Hurlbut 1988:34) [Dusunic]
Kopu puu=ku ilo pijak.
RECT.PFV.move=GEN.1SG NOM.that baby.chicks
‘I have just moved those baby chicks.’

(50) Tindal Dusun (Robinson 2005:24) [Dusunic]
kaka panaw=yolo.
RECT.PFV.walk=NOM.3PL
‘They just left.’

Although the recent perfective construction is found in at least five subgroups of Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in the Philippines (and at least two Dusunic languages in Sabah), it has never been reported to occur in any Formosan language. Moreover, Blust (2003b, 2009) reconstructs a number of homophonous affixes with the shape *ka- in PAN and in PMP, but the recent perfective aspect function is NOT one of them. Whether this suggests that the recent perfective construction has simply been overlooked in previous studies on Formosan languages or is a construction that developed after Austronesian language speakers left Taiwan proper, is not clear at the present time. Future research on the use of different aspectual constructions in Austronesian languages (especially Formosan languages) may help clarify the point.

3. Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed four morphosyntactic differences between Formosan and Philippine languages.

First, although Ca- reduplication appears to be a fairly commonly used process in Formosan languages, it is not so in Philippine languages.

Second, although a number of Formosan languages appear to reflect what has been reconstructed as PAN *mu- ‘motion’ and use it in the formation of intransitive verbs, plausible reflexes of the reconstruction in Philippine languages are difficult to find. This leads to the question of whether it is necessary to reconstruct *mu- ‘motion’ in PAN.

Third, although two forms have been reconstructed for PMP ‘abilitative/aptative’: *maka- (Blust 2009) and *paka- (Kaufman 2009) in previous studies, the present study shows that only the first form, i.e. *maka- ‘potentive’, can be reconstructed for PMP.
However, the presence of *paka- (and/or *maka-) forms in Amis, Puyuma, and Paiwan leads us to wonder whether one can reconstruct *maka- and/or *paka- ‘abilitative’ for PAN. Due to the lack of sufficient grammatical descriptions in Formosan languages, I was not able to determine whether an affix encoding ‘abilitative’ can be reconstructed for PAN.

Fourth, many Philippine languages have developed a special construction, i.e. the ‘recent perfective construction’, to encode events completed just prior to the speech event. Such a construction has never been reported in any Formosan languages.

In addition to the four topics discussed here, a number of other morphosyntactic features could have been included but are not covered because of space limitations.

Based on the data available to date, I have concluded that Formosan languages and Philippine languages are quite different from each other in terms of the four morphosyntactic features discussed in this paper. However, due to the fact that very few Formosan languages have as detailed a grammatical description as can be found for some Philippine languages, such as Tagalog (Schachter & Otanes 1972, Wolff et al. 1991, etc.), one can only consider the findings presented in this paper as tentative.
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台灣南島語與菲律賓南島語
在形態句法上的一些差異

廖秀娟
國立清華大學

本文旨在探討台灣南島語與菲律賓南島語在形態句法上的一些較不常被探討的差異。筆者針對台灣南島語與菲律賓南島語在以下四點形態句法上的差異做簡短的探討：

(1) 固定元音重疊構詞 (Ca- reduplication);
(2) *mu- 「趨向動詞」;
(3) *maka- 和 *paka-: 「潛在動詞」 vs. 「能力動詞」;
(4) 表「剛剛完成的事件」專用的結構 (“recent perfective construction”)。筆者並且根據這些特徵在這兩群語言分布上的差異來探討是否需要將某些形式重建至原始南島語 (Proto-Austronesian) 或是否需要修正某些目前已被重建的形式。

關鍵詞：南島語，固定元音重疊構詞，趨向動詞，潛在動詞，能力動詞