

Preface

The International Symposium on Austronesian Cultures: Issues Relating to Taiwan took place at the Academia Sinica in Taipei from December 8 through 11, 2001. It followed up on the success of a symposium held there nine years prior.¹ This later conference focused on Taiwan and Taiwan's relationship with the rest of Austronesia; and as such, it provided the opportunity to evaluate anthropological, archaeological, and linguistic studies in the Austronesian field coming to light in the intervening decade.

Among the thirty papers presented, eight dealt with Austronesian and Formosan languages, including discussions of historical linguistics, morphology, and syntax. Lillian M. Huang, in addition, led a workshop on the typology of Austronesian languages, where three papers were presented.

It was I, Elizabeth Zeitoun, who organized the Linguistic session and took charge of editing the present volume.² Of eleven papers presented at the *Symposium*, only six actually appear here. While some authors decided to publish their articles elsewhere (e.g., R. Blust and yours truly),³ still others, for whatever reasons, decided not to submit their articles to *Language and Linguistics*. This, however, should in no wise be construed as a detraction from the remarkable quality of the papers appearing in this volume.

These six papers can be put into three categories. (1) Historical linguistics: K.A. Adelaar reassesses the functions of three types of prefixes (anticipating prefixes, lexical prefixes, and orientation prefixes) and shows that they represent different stages of grammaticalization into the Siraya verbal system; Paul Li re-examines the origins of the East Formosan Peoples. (2) The morpho-syntax of Formosan and extra-Formosan languages: Chih-Chen J. Tang re-evaluates the morphological, syntactic, and semantic criteria for distinguishing poor classifier languages and rich classifier languages, based

¹ The proceedings of that first *Symposium* were published in 1995 as: Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho, and Chiu-yu Tseng (eds.), *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, No.3, Taipei: Academia Sinica.

² New publication regulations and constraints make it more difficult now to publish collective volumes, especially Proceedings.

³ See: R. Blust (2003), Three Notes on Early Austronesian Morphology, *Oceanic Linguistics*, 42.2:438-478; and E. Zeitoun (2004), Typologie des langues austronésiennes de Taiwan, *Faits de Langues* 23 (ed. by E. Zeitoun), Gap: Ophrys.

mostly on a study of classification markers in Paiwan; Charles Randriamasimanana compares two Formosan languages (Tsou and Atayal) with Malagasy from a Chomskyan point of view. (3) The morphosyntactic typology of Philippine languages and of Oceanic languages: Lawrence A. Reid and Hsiu-chuan Liao provide a short outline of the major syntactic characteristics of the Philippine languages, focusing on three main issues: word order, verb phrase structure, and noun phrase structure; M. Ross describes some morphosyntactic characteristics (pertaining to verb classification and verb subcategorization, marking of possession and interclausal relationships) that are common to a majority of Oceanic Languages, by defining a canonical language type.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the anonymous referees for their careful reviews and valuable suggestions and Chun-yu Kuo, our copy-editor, for carefully formatting all the manuscripts published in the present volume.

Elizabeth Zeitoun
Taipei, Taiwan
March 2004