

PREFACE

This special issue consists, for the most part, of papers that were presented at the Workshop on “Nominalization in Formosan Languages”, held at the Academia Sinica on October 21-22, 2000. This workshop, organized by the Field research group of the Institute of Linguistics, was the second in a series of such meetings, which aim at stimulating scholarly discussions concerning a specific linguistic area (Tibetan languages, Formosan languages, Chinese dialects, Mongolic languages).

This volume contains ten papers covering eight Formosan languages/dialects (Atayal, Seediq, Tsou, Rukai, Paiwan, Pazih, Kavalan and Yami). The first four deal with nominalization within a functional approach, the last six examine related issues within formal frameworks.

The first paper, by D. Victoria Rau, deals with Yami spoken on Orchid Island; and although closely related to the Batanic languages of the Philippines, it is nevertheless subsumed under “Formosan”. This first paper provides an introductory overview of nominalization in the Formosan languages with all the analytical and theoretical problems related to the morphological marking of derived nominals in terms of synchrony and diachrony and the differentiation between different types of nominals and their verbal counterparts.

The second paper, authored by Lillian Huang, presents a preliminary study of nominalization in Atayal. It shows that no productive morphological device is found in that language that allows the formation of derived nominals.

The third paper, by Paul Jen-kuei Li, discusses nominalization in a moribund plains-tribe language, Pazih, and shows that in that language morphology alone does not permit establishment of a formal distinction between nouns and verbs, though a number of nominalizing affixes have been identified.

The fourth paper, written by Elizabeth Zeitoun, provides a descriptive analysis of the various nominalization processes found in Mantauran (Rukai). While morpho-syntactic tests are proposed that permit to identify derived nominals (as opposed to verbs) and to distinguish lexical nominalization from syntactic nominalization, the array of constructions that trigger syntactic nominalization shows that there is *a priori* no distinction between nominalization and relativization in this dialect.

The fifth paper, by Chih-Chen Jane Tang, demonstrates that Paiwan exhibits two kinds of nominalization yielding result nouns—the first takes place at the morphological level and the second occurs at the syntactic level—and that both types of derived nominals should be distinguished from headless relatives and internally-headed relatives in Paiwan.

The sixth paper, by Melody Ya-yin Chang, explores the status of two types of nominals in Tsou and attempts to distinguish them in terms of their displaying or not nominal or verbal properties. Nominalization is further contrasted to internal headed relativization.

In the same vein, the seventh paper, co-authored by Henry Yungli Chang and Amy Peijung Lee shows that in Kavalan, nominalization and headless relativization, which are both subsumed under nominalization in the literature, are morphologically, syntactically, and semantically/pragmatically distinct. It also argues that there is no formal distinction between lexical nominalization and syntactic nominalization in Kavalan.

The eighth and ninth papers deal with the word formation and the internal structure of interrogative words/sentences.

The eighth paper, by Cheng-Fu Chen aims at investigating the nominalization of verbal interrogatives in Kucapungan, a dialectal variant of Budai (Rukai). It shows that these verbal interrogatives have undergone a morphological process incorporating an underlying argument into the verbal base *-tumane* and that through this common base, a complex set of interrogatives is derived, in which the members exhibit distinct grammatical functions and differ in morphology, syntax and semantics. The data adduced in the discussion regarding their morpho-syntax suggest that these verbal interrogatives undertake nominalization as do other verbs in general.

The ninth paper, by Edith Aldridge, proposes to account for different types of wh-question formation in Seediq and Tagalog. It shows that argument wh-questions are formed on pseudo-clefts, which involve relativization while adjunct wh-questions are formed via more traditional wh-movement.

The tenth paper concludes this volume by arguing that “focus inflection” involves actually “lexical derivation”, as evidenced by nominalization in Formosan and Western Austronesian languages.

All the papers were sent to at least two anonymous reviewers and I worked with each author to further revise their contributions. I would like to thank the editor in chief of the journal *Language and Linguistics*, Dah-an Ho, for allowing the publication of this special issue, Joyce Kuo for editing these papers, and Warren Brewer for polishing them. I would also like to express my gratitude to all the reviewers for their fruitful comments and the contributors for kindly agreeing to take part in this enterprise.

Elizabeth Zeitoun
Taipei
1/3/2002