Coordination and Comitativity in Austronesian Languages

All the papers included in this Special Issue were presented at the workshop on “Coordination and Comitativity in Austronesian Languages” which was co-organized by Stacy F. Teng and Elizabeth Zeitoun and was held on November 7-8, 2009 at the Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica. This workshop was arranged at the end of a three-year (2006-2009) NSC project headed by Prof. Lillian M. Huang on “Coordination and comitativity in French, English and some Formosan languages”, in which various scholars and students took part (Marie-Claude Paris, Elizabeth Zeitoun, Stephen Y. Chuang, Stacy F. Teng and Joy Wu—see references for publications that were produced in relation to this three-year project).

The workshop was intended to provide a platform for discussion on any aspects related to coordination and comitativity from both functional and theoretical perspectives in Austronesian languages, with a special emphasis on Formosan languages. Fifteen papers were presented. Ten papers dealt with specific Formosan languages: Atayal (Yeh 2009), Seediq (Lee 2009), Tungho Saisiyat (Hsieh 2009 and Zeitoun et al. 2009), Amis (Wei 2009, Wu 2009 and Zeng 2009), Kavalan (Li 2009), Takivatan Bunun (De Busser 2009), Puyuma (Teng 2009). Three papers compared at least two (or more) Formosan languages: Atayal and Seediq (Huang 2009), Atayal and Paiwan (Tsai & Wu 2009), Paiwan, Puyuma, Amis, Kavalan and Atayal (Tang 2009). One focused on Philippine languages (Liao 2009) and another one discussed coordination and comitativity from a typological perspective in Austronesian languages, with a special focus on Oceanic languages (Bril 2009). Most studies dealt with one specific type of coordination, viz. conjunction (or conjunctive coordination in Haspelmath’s (2004:5) terms) and most specifically NP conjunction, as opposed to strategies encoding comitativity.

Out of these fifteen papers, eight have been included in this Special Issue. They cover a number of issues on coordination and comitativity in Formosan (Atayal, Seediq, Saisiyat, Amis, Puyuma and Paiwan) and non-Formosan languages (Philippine languages and Oceanic languages). Lillian M. Huang examines the morphosyntactic and semantic similarities and differences between coordinative and comitative strategies in Squiliq Atayal, by discussing the status of the conjoined elements, the readings obtained and the type of constructions that allow one or the other strategy. Amy P. Lee also contrasts the coordinative and comitative strategy in Truku Seediq. She shows, in particular, that the preposition deha (from the numeral ‘two’) should be treated as a comitative marker, along with the comitative case marker ka. Elizabeth Zeitoun et al. investigate coordinative and comitative marking in Tungho Saisiyat by contrasting the two morphemes =o ‘and, as well’ and ki ‘and, with’. They show that while a new set of case marking and
pronominal system should be recognized, viz. the “comitative” ki-set, ki can actually function as coordinator and/or a case marker, two distinct functions that only syntactic tests can distinguish. Joy Wu examines the composition of the two conjunctors atu and aci, and in particular the types of NP constructions they coordinate in the framework of Role and Reference Grammar (RRG). She argues that both atu and aci function as single conjunctors but reflect two nexus types at the NP-juncture: NP cosubordination vs. NP coordination. C.-C. Jane Tang investigates the three synchronic strategies Paiwan exhibits comitativity (the comitative preposition ka, the comitative case markers kati/katua and the distributive/collective coordinators kati/katua, whereby ti and tua behave as noun class markers) and accounts for their (dis)similarities from a formal perspective. Stacy F. Teng investigates noun phrase conjunction in three Puyuma dialects (Nanwang, Katripul and Tamalakaw) and shows that different coordinative/comitative strategies are found. She suggests that in view of the reported dialectal variations, kay in Nanwang and za+i/na in Katripul originally encoded comitativity but are being grammaticalized as coordinators, while aw and zi, which originally conjoined clauses, have developed as NP coordinators. Hsiu-chuan Liao deals with comitative verbal forms in the Philippine languages from both a synchronic and diachronic perspective, in particular with the reflexes and the semantic development path of the sociative prefix *maki- (and its variants). Isabelle Bril’s paper, which concludes this volume, analyzes different (pro)nominal coordinative and comitative conjunctions from a typological perspective based on an array of Austronesian languages (Atayal, Puyuma, Tagalog, Palawano, Toqabaqita, Nēlēmwa, Zuanga and Tuvaluan).
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