Preface

These papers on Formosan languages were published between 1974 and 2004. They deal with a range of topics, including general Formosan linguistics, phonology, syntax, reconstruction, language relationships and classification, homeland and migration, sociolinguistics, traditional songs, and four miscellaneous papers; and they are hereunder so arranged. Sometimes the classification of an article proved difficult, as it may have touched upon several categories or have involved interdisciplinary research.

Thirty-five of the papers in this collection were written in English so as to attain the widest, international circulation, while eighteen others were written in Chinese to accommodate a more local audience in Taiwan. Still other of my papers have been excluded from this collection altogether, for several reasons. E.g., “Classification of the sinicized tribes in northern Taiwan, as based on linguistic evidence” (in Chinese) replicated parts of other work that has been included; “On comparative Tsou” and “Classification of Formosan languages: Lexical evidence” are out of date; and “A comparative vocabulary of Saisiyat dialects” was left out due to considerations of space.

Abstracts accompany the articles. A paper written in English will be preceded by an English abstract, but may also be followed by a Chinese abstract. A paper written in Chinese, on the other hand, will be preceded by a Chinese abstract and followed by an English one.

The original articles have been left intact—aside from the correction of minor errors. As such, these papers reflect the various stages of my thinking on these languages, based on my fieldwork over the years. Extensive revision of at least some of the papers would have been required were they to have been brought up to date with the state of the art. Let us now simply say that these works as they are show how my early ideas led to a better understanding reflected in my later studies.

The Formosan languages described in these papers include the following: Atayal, Seediq, Saisiyat, Thao, Pazih, Bunun, Tsou, Rukai, Kavalan, Basay, Siraya, and four west coastal plains languages, although the other Formosan languages are also touched
upon in one paper or another, such as Li (1997). I shall try to cover them in more
detail in future publications.

It was Professor Yu-k’eng Lin at National Taiwan Normal University who
introduced me to linguistics and recommended that I pursue the M.A. at the University
of Michigan; there I took several courses in linguistics (1962-63). In the Ph.D.
program at the University of Hawai’i at Manoa (1967-70), I attended courses by
George Grace, Byron Bender, Stanley Starosta, Gary Parker, and Lawrence Reid—all
specialists in Austronesian languages. I studied the comparative method and
comparative Indo-European with Gordon Fairbanks, and consequently became
fascinated with historical linguistics. Under Fang Kuei Li, I also took up comparative
Tai and Archaic Chinese phonology. Since my student days, I have been interested in
comparative Austronesian, even then having published several papers on comparative
Formosan language studies. At Professor F. K. Li’s urging, I came to the Academia
Sinica, and his guidance and encouragement till his death in 1987 have helped bring
about these studies. To him, my belovèd teacher, I dedicate this collection.

The Formosan languages are crucial in reconstructing all levels of
Proto-Austronesian, including phonology, morphology, and syntax, a fact
acknowledged by the leading Austronesianists—Otto Dahl, Isidore Dyen, John Wolff,
Stanley Starosta, Robert Blust, and Malcolm Ross. Formosan languages are in fact
incredibly diversified and retain many archaic features. After Tsuchida’s (1976)
reconstruction of Proto-Tsouic phonology, I followed up with similar work on
Proto-Rukaic, Proto-Atayalic and Proto-Bunun.

Comparative studies shed light not only on how individual languages change at
each stage of development, but also on the internal relationships of genetically related
languages within the same language family. Over the years, this has been the focus of
my work on Formosan languages. I have studied not only the languages that are still
spoken, but also the written documents of languages that have become extinct. When
we have a clear picture of the internal relationships of the modern languages and their
distribution, then we can know precisely how they split into daughter languages at
different stages and how they dispersed into different areas. Also by collating
information from anthropology, archaeology, history, and geography, I was able to
construct a map showing the dispersal of the Formosan aborigines in Taiwan (Li
2001a).
In the early ’80s, I began applying sociolinguistic principles to my study of the Formosan languages. I discovered that age played an important rôle in linguistic change (Li 1982b, 1986); that there were certain well-defined differences between male and female forms of speech in the Mayrinax dialect of Atayal; and that in fact sex differences in speech was an important mechanism for morphological change in the Atayalic group as a whole (Li 1980b, 1982d, 1983a, c). To Shigeru Tsuchida I owe a note of gratitude for his sharing of valuable information on Formosan languages, especially the Atayalic dialects with me.

For the past several years I have been actively engaged in salvage linguistics, working as much as possible with languages on the verge of extinction: Pazih, Thao, Kavalan, Kanakanavu, and Saaroa. The type of language data that I have gathered is quite diverse: vocabularies, sentence studies, texts, and folksongs. An ethnomusicologist and I collaborated on the production of pamphlets with CDs, as well as journal articles (Li & Wu 2000, 2002, 2003). With Tsuchida I published the two monographs Pazih Dictionary (2001) and Pazih Texts and Songs (2002); our Kavalan Dictionary should appear shortly, with similar projected works on Kanakanavu and Saaroa. (It seemed inappropriate to include such monographic materials in this collection.)

Formosan languages were first written down during the Dutch period (1624-1662), when missionaries devised alphabets for Siraya and Favorlang (a dialect of Babuza), two now-extinct plains languages. For these two languages then, some valuable documents have survived. For the fourteen extant Formosan languages, I developed orthographic systems in a pamphlet for the Ministry of Education (Li 1991); this has also been included hereunder, in hopes that it can still serve as a useful pædogogical reference.

A list of my relevant publications and a comparative basic vocabulary of Formosan languages and dialects (some 200 lexical items) have been attached as appendices.

Over the past three decades, I have been greatly encouraged by the foremost senior comparative Austronesian scholars, Otto Dahl, Isidore Dyen, and Paul Benedict; greatly aided by my colleagues, John Wolff, Shigeru Tsuchida, Robert Blust, Pang-hsin Ting, and Hwang-cherng Gong; and taught a great deal about Formosan languages.
from Ogawa’s publications and unpublished manuscripts. And to all my informants, too numerous to name, for various Formosan languages and dialects, I shall remain forever indebted.

Since June of 1970, I have been most fortunate in being able to work at the Academia Sinica, which has provided me with the facilities and funding to work not only on the Austronesian languages of Formosa, but also on a few languages in the Philippines as well. I should now like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the generous financial support for my research projects provided by the Academia Sinica, the National Science Council, the Harvard Yenching Institute, and the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange.

Finally, I would like to thank Dah-an Ho for instigating this monograph and goading it to publication. Over the years, my manuscripts have greatly benefited from his valuable suggestions for improvement. Each paper has been proofread at least thrice by my research assistants: Celine Shu-ling Hsu, Hsiu-min Huang, Yi-chun Lu, Chin-yu Lin, Hsiao-ling You, Snow Hsiao-ping Wu, Iris Shu-mei Li, and Amy Ming-luan Chen. Yung-li Chang, Amy Peijung Li, and Dorinda Tsai-hsiu Liu have also read some of the papers, finding further corrigenda. And last but not least, I should like to thank Joyce Chunyu Kuo, whose meticulous editorial assistance spared me the embarrassment of missing figures and maps, and De-wen Wei for providing an old map of Taiwan as the cover design of this monograph.

Paul Jen-kuei Li
Institute of Linguistics
Academia Sinica

Nankang, Taipei, Taiwan
June 2004
這些是過去三十年（1974-2004）來，我在學術期刊或學術研討會論文集上發表過的有關台灣南島語言研究論文的選集。這些論文涵蓋語言的各種層面，包括通論、音韻、句法、古語重建、語言關係、族群起源與遷徙、社會語言學、傳統歌謠等等，並且按照以上的類別依序編排。有些論文的歸類有困難，因為內容並不只限於單一的層面，此外，有一些論文可以算是跨學科的研究。


除了更正錯字或刪除嚴重的錯誤之外，我大致都保持論文的內容而沒有修改。這些論文反映了我在不同階段對台灣南島語言的理解，主要都是根據我從田野蒐集到的語言資料。如果要更正確地代表我現階段對這些語言的理解和看法，有些論文必須重寫才行。但我當時的見解，對於我日後在南島語的研究，卻有不可完全抹滅的影響。

從目錄可以看出，我所描述的台灣南島語言包括泰雅、賽德克、賽夏、布農、邵、巴宰、鄒、魯凱、噶瑪蘭、巴賽、西拉雅，以及西部沿海的四種平埔族語言，其他幾種台灣南島語言（阿美、卑南、排灣）雖然還沒有以單篇論文來專門討論，在有些論文中也已提及這些語言的一些現象。

台灣師範大學英語教學中心副主任林瑜鏗教授是我的語言學的啟蒙老師。她推薦我到密西根大學就讀英語語言和文學研究所時，當時我已偏重語言學方面的若干課程。爾後，1967年我到夏威夷大學語言學系攻讀博士學位時，有好幾位教授的專長是南島語言學，包括George Grace, Byron Bender, Stanley Starosta, Lawrence Reid, Gary Parker等諸位教授。我不僅修他們的課，還從他們身上學到許多做學問的方法和處世之道。那一年我也跟Gordon Fairbanks教授修習印歐比較語言學，這門學問深深吸引了我；同年，語言學泰斗李方桂院士剛好也到夏威夷大學客座，
我從他所講授的「比較傣語」和「漢語上古音」學到比較研究方法的精髓。從此我對南島語言比較研究產生了濃厚的興趣，因此我寫了好幾篇論文都跟歷史語言學有密切的關聯。李先生視他的學生如同自己的子女一般，提攜晚輩更是不遺餘力。因為他的極力推薦，我才很順利的進入了中央研究院歷史語言研究所任職。那時也在中研院的丁邦新先生，承他大力促成此事。從 1970 年起，我就在中研院安身立命。李先生不幸於 1987 年去世之後，我失去精神上的支柱，深以不能在他生前有所回饋為憾。我今天只能以這些年來所寫的、還不太成熟的著作敬獻給他。

台灣南島語言在整個南島民族中佔有極為關鍵的地位，因為這些語言各層次的現象不但非常紛歧，而且保存了古南島語的許多特徵，因此國際上知名的南島語言比較學者，如 Otto Dahl, Isidore Dyen, John Wolff, Stanley Starosta, Robert Blust, Malcolm Ross 等，在重建南島語言的音韻或句法系統時，必須大量引用各種台灣南島語言的資料。台灣南島語言幾個重要支群(subgroup)，除了土田教授(Tsuchida 1976)的大作「鄒語群音韻系統的構擬」之外，本人在這一方面陸續提供了一些不可或缺的資料，包括魯凱語群(Li 1977a)、泰雅語群(Li 1981)、布農語(Li 1988)的古語重建。

比較研究一方面是要重建語言的演變史，另一方面也是要釐清各種語言之間的關係。這也是我一直所關注的研究課題，不僅是現存的十多種台灣南島語言，同時也積極進行已消失或即將消失的語言的研究。從十多年前所發表的泰雅語的地位(Li 1985)，到各種平埔族語言的地位(Li 2001b, c)及其相互關係(Li 1992b)，一直到最近兩年所發表的兩篇論文(Li 2003b, 2004)，都是環繞著語言關係這個重要課題而寫的。以這些比較研究的成果作為基礎，同時也結合了人類學、考古學、歷史、地理、資訊等各學門的知識，我才能順利的繪製出台灣各南島族群的遷移和擴散圖(Li 2001a)來。

大約在 1980 年初，我就開始嘗試做台灣南島語言的社會語言學調查研究，我(Li 1982b)發現了年齡的差異是語言演變的重要機制。同時，我(Li 1980b, 1982d)發現泰雅語汶水方言男女有不同的語言形式，在構詞上呈現出系統性的差異，這些差異普遍存在於泰雅語群的各種方言中，可見性別差異也是語言演變的重要機制。像這種重要的發現可說是可遇不可求的。我要特別感謝土田滋教授先做了地毯式的泰雅語群方言調查，而且與我分享有哪些方言保存重要現象，我才有可能及時去做進一步的調查研究。

最近幾年來，我都在積極搶救瀕臨消失的語言：巴宰、邵、噶瑪蘭、卡那卡那富、沙阿魯阿等五種語言的情況較有急迫性，尤其巴宰語最危急。除了儘量多...
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蒐集詞彙和文本之外，我也採錄他們的傳統歌謠，並跟音樂學者合作發表期刊論文，有的也發行 CD 跟小冊子，我要感謝他們容許我把這幾篇論文收進本論文集裡。同時我也要感謝好友土田滋教授願意跟我密切合作，共同推出了《巴宰語詞典》（Li and Tsuchida 2001）跟《巴宰族傳說歌謠集》（Li and Tsuchida 2002）這兩部專書。近期內我們還會推出另一部新書《噶瑪蘭語詞典》。希望不久的將來也能為南鄒的兩種語言出版類似的著作。專書的篇幅過大，大都不適合把相關的資料收進論文集裡。

多數的台灣南島語言過去都沒有文字記錄，也沒有書寫系統。一直到十七世紀中葉荷蘭傳教士才開始使用羅馬拼音來拼寫西拉雅跟法佛朗兩種平埔族語言（如今都已消失）。本人於 1991 年才為現存的十五種語言制訂了書寫系統，並且作了通盤的考慮；本來是在教育部以手冊的形式出版，今也收入本論文集中，希冀它有一些實用和參考的價值，可以協助日後台灣南島語言的教育與傳承。

在國際南島語言學界，我受到不少前輩學者的鼓勵和同輩學者的協助，前輩學者包括 Otto Dahl, Isidore Dyen 和 Paul Benedict，同輩學者包括 John Wolff, Shigeru Tsuchida, Robert Blust, 丁邦新、龔煌城等人。我雖無緣拜識台灣語言學先驅—小川尚義教授，卻從他的相關著作中，學到許多有關台灣南島語言的知識。最近幾年，我更從他的未發表稿件和田野筆記中，得到很多不為外界所知的珍貴的學術資料。我們有時不免訝異，他何以對學術研究工作如此認真和執著？前輩的風範，可說為後世的人樹立了最佳的典範。我的朋友土田滋教授，給我在學術方面的各種協助，更非「誌謝」所能表達於萬分之一的。

有的學術研究工作是孤獨的。三十多年來我絕大部分的時間都在孤軍奮鬥。當我揹著旅行袋，單獨一個人在山上行走時，我的心境、我的感覺有如楚留香連續劇主題曲中的一句話，「千山我獨行！」 每當我到一個部落去蒐集語言資料，常常有人好奇地問我：「你為什麼要學我們的話？學它有什麼用？離開這個村子，就沒有人聽得懂我們的話了。」 我的回答是，「你們的語言很有學術價值。年輕人知道的愈來愈少了。我要把它記錄下來，免得後代的子孫沒有人知道我們曾經有過這麼有特色有價值的語言存在世界上，存在台灣這個地方！」 一般人都懷疑研究少數民族語言會有什麼前途？寫出來的研究成果又沒有什麼人要看，何必自討苦吃？三十多年來是什麼力量在支撐著我，使我從未中斷這一方面的研究工作呢？這就是使命感。我不做，誰做？何況，這是很有意義的工作。令人欣慰的是，近年來也有一些較年輕的學者投入台灣南島語言的調查研究工作，他們所累積的研究成果也已遠超出我當初的期望，這就是孔子所說的「德不孤，必有鄰。」
回想過去三十多年來，中央研究院提供了我極佳的研究環境，使我能專心調查研究這些語言。在研究經費方面，我得到不少學術機構的資助，除了中央研究院以外，還包括行政院國家科學委員會、哈佛燕京學社、蔣經國學術交流基金會等的大力支持。在許多原住民族村莊或部落調查時，受到許多人士的熱心協助和無私的奉獻，確實令我感激不盡，銘感於心，可惜我無法在此一一把他們的大名都寫出來。有好幾位耆老在我訪問之後都先後過世了，我在整理從他們蒐集到的珍貴的語言資料的同時，常使我想起他們的音容笑容，內心激動，久久不能自已。

此外，我的父母李訓練先生（已故）和王紅菜女士（已故）及胞兄李坤焰先生（已故），為協助我的求學和研究而付出、奉獻許多，在此向他們表達我內心最誠摯的感激。更要感謝我的妻子王心玲女士及兒女夏新和凱萍，這些年來我因研究工作需要，常外出去做田野調查，佔據了諸多與他們相伴的歲月，內人和幼小的子女卻只能在家擔心害怕，默默地承受等待之苦，我深感內疚並感激他們的體諒。同時也要感謝我的岳父母王天義先生和馬秋榮女士，協助我們照顧年幼的子女，前後好幾年。近二十年來，何大安教授對我的論文提供不少寶貴的意見，幾年前他就已提出出版論文集的構想，並敦促我積極進行這件工作。沒有他的積極鼓勵，我這部論文集恐怕不可能有問世的一天。最近八年來所撰寫的中文稿大都由許淑鈴小姐輸入。所有的論文因為重新排版，都必須重新校對至少在三次以上，除了許小姐之外，黃秀敏、呂憶君、林晉瑜、吴小玲、巫筱萍、李淑梅、陳鳴鸞、賴晁慧等幾位小姐都協助這個繁重的校對工作。此外，張永利教授、李佩容小姐（英國 University of Essex 博士候選人）、劉彩秀小姐（夏威夷大學博士生）也都幫我校對了一部分或大部分的論文，指出不少錯誤，我才能及時訂正。編輯助理郭君瑜小姐為了整理這些論文稿件，使她本就繁重的編輯業務更是忙上加忙，也因為她的細心，論文的插圖和圖版才沒有遺漏。南天書局魏德文先生提供十八世紀的台灣古地圖圖版作為本書封面圖案。我在此一併向他們表示由衷的謝意。

李壬癸
2004 年 7 月
於南港中央研究院