

Some Morphosyntactic Differences between Formosan and Philippine Languages*

Hsiu-chuan Liao

National Tsing Hua University

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.

Key words: Austronesian languages, *Ca-* reduplication, motion verbs, potentive/ abilitative verbs, recent perfective construction

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

* An earlier version of this paper was given as a guest lecture at a course taught by Malcolm Ross (Ling 581200: Topics in the History of Pacific Languages) at the Graduate Institute of Linguistics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, November 12, 2008. I wish to thank Stacy F. Teng for sharing with me her manuscript on “From allative to anticausative: the grammaticalization path of *mu-* in Puyuma” and for bringing to my attention the function of the *paka-* ‘abilitative’ construction in Puyuma. Special thanks go to May Ocampo-Viaje for commenting on the Tagalog examples used in this paper. Last, but not least, I would like to acknowledge Lawrence Reid, Carl Rubino, Elizabeth Zeitoun, and three anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of the paper. All errors and shortcomings are my responsibility alone.

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 Bashiic 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’: *faflhuq* ‘washcloth’; /*iup*/: *miup* ‘to blow’: *aiup* ‘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>ararekep* ‘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’: /*ulalaluan*/ ‘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 cooccured 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,¹ 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. *tatosa?* ‘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.

(1) Nataoran Amis (Chen 1987:218)

tatosa ko ayam i dipong.
two NOM bird LOC nest³
'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 kararuha* (xxv:15) 'the second [servant]', *kataturu ki wäi* (xvi:21) 'the third day', *kapaṗitu ki lbāx ki sulat* (vii:title) 'the seventh chapter', *kamamatuda ki täley* (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. *pukadradrua* or *pukatatelru* 'the second', *pukatatelru* or *pukatelru* '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. *dalawá* '2', *tatló* '3', *ápat* '4', and *ánim* '6') and Ata (e.g. '2'-'9'). The Tagalog forms *ápat* '4' and *ánim* '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 *hatlo* '3', *haṗat* '4', and *haṇem* '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. *ása* '1', *dóá* '2', *tílo* '3', *ápat* '4', *lima* '5', *ánem* '6', *píto* '7', *wáo* '8', and *síam* '9'); (ii) counting human referents (e.g. *ása* '1', *raroá* '2', *tatló* '3', *pápat* '4', *lálíma* '5', *nanem* '6', *pápito* '7', *wawáo* '8', and *sásiam* '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, potensive; REAL, realis; RECT, recent; SPEC, specific; UO, undergoer orientation.

nonhuman referents (e.g. *asa* ‘1’, *adoa* ‘2’, *atlo* ‘3’, *apat* ‘4’, *alima* ‘5’, *anem* ‘6’, *apito* ‘7’, *awao* ‘8’, and *asiam* ‘9’). The set with *Ca*-reduplication appears to be used exclusively for counting human referents in Yami (Rau & Dong 2006:129-131, Tsuchida et al. 1989:103-107).

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 incompleteness and/or unrealized events (e.g. Nanwang Puyuma /*kasu*/ ‘to bring’: *kemakasu* ‘is bringing’: *kakasu* ‘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 *macacengele* ‘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. *anjakakiti* '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': *hahopay* '(be) all very tired'), Kavalan (e.g. *tatɲən* '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. *sasuani* '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. */shannacacaycuy/* 'it's up to them'; */yakin/* 'me' vs. */shannayayakin/* 'it's up to me'; */ihun/* 'you (SG)' vs. */shannaaihun/* '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': *tucacumay* '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', *fafifik* 'gecko', *kakorot* 'bitter cucumber', *tatiniir* '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. *lalipis* '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)

Ting 1978)) ‘a type of grasshopper’, *kakenin* ‘a type of grasshopper’, *zazenga* ‘stink bug, shield bug (Pentatomidae)’ (Nanwang *dradrenga* ‘pentatome’), *vavungetr* ‘a type of gnat’, *ngangalraw* ‘flies (< *ngalaw)’ (Nanwang *ngangalraw* ‘mouche’), *raratru* ‘body louse’, *tratumuh* ‘bedbug’ (Nanwang *tratumug* ‘punaise de corps’), *kakiyas* ‘frog’ (cf. Nanwang *tatikus* ‘grenouille’), *tratuva* ‘toad’ (Nanwang *tratruba* ‘crapaud’), *a’zang* ‘shrimp’, *lralrapitr* ‘bat’, *lalisaw* ‘gills of a fish’ (cf. *lisaw* ‘scrub brush’) (Tsuchida 1980:274-278, Cauquelin 1991).

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, Dupanigan 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]

<i>magdáfung</i>	‘meet’	<i>dádfungan=da</i>	‘they all gather round (someone)’
<i>dumatang</i>	‘arrive’	<i>magdátatang kid</i>	‘they all arrive (e.g. for wedding)’
<i>nagdúma</i>	‘different’	<i>naggadúma kid</i>	‘they are different from each other’
<i>naggitta</i>	‘same’	<i>naggagitta kid</i>	‘they are the same as each other’
<i>magbída</i>	‘talk about’	<i>magbabída kid</i>	‘they are talking together’
<i>magwelwel</i>	‘scold’	<i>magwawelwel kid</i>	‘they are all telling (him) off’

In Dupanigan 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[t]ama* ‘father and son pair’ (cf. *hama* ‘father’) vs. *papat[t]ama* ‘father and children’) (Robinson 2008:111). Second, in other situations,

in Tsuchida (1980) have been changed to *’*, *tr*, *r*, and *lr*, respectively; Nanwang *t*, *d*, and *l* in Cauquelin (1991) have been changed to *tr*, *dr*, and *lr*, respectively. I would like to thank Stacy F. Teng for her help with converting Puyuma forms used in Tsuchida and Cauquelin into the forms presented in the present paper. I would also like to thank one of the reviewers for bringing to my attention this usage of *Ca*-reduplication in Puyuma.

Ca-reduplication can indicate ‘plurality for numbers greater than two’, as in (3) and (4) (cf. (5)).

- (3) Dupanangan Agta (Robinson 2008:178) [Northern Luzon]

Dadapponan=na i hapu=di=a
 MULT.guard=GEN.3SG⁵ DEF boss=GEN.3PL=SPEC
 agom=di hidi=a.
 companion=GEN.3PL PL=SPEC
 ‘Their boss will take care of their companions.’

- (4) Dupanangan Agta (Robinson 2008:179) [Northern Luzon]

nag**ga**ginnakos hidi ngamin.
 PFV.PL.RECP.hug NOM.3PL all
 ‘They all hugged each other.’

- (5) Dupanangan Agta (Robinson 2008:179) [Northern Luzon]

nagginnakos hidi.
 PFV.RECP.hug NOM.3PL
 ‘They (two) hugged each other.’

In Ilokano, *Ca*-reduplication is reported to occur in onomatopoeic forms. Rubino (2001:309) states that a few onomatopoeic roots in Ilokano take a special affix *C*₁*a*- -*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]

<i>bitog</i>	‘thump’	b abtuog	‘thumping sounds’
<i>biset</i>	‘fast sound’	b abseet	‘darting out; spank’
<i>kireb</i>	‘wave crash’	k akreeb	‘sound of crashing waves’
<i>kitol</i>	‘click’	k aktuol	‘clicking sounds (heels)’
<i>dipor</i>	‘crumbling’	d adpuor	‘crumbling or rumbling sound’
<i>dissuor</i>	‘waterfall’	d adsuor	‘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 “absolute,” 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).⁶

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 infix, 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 *mutuqris* ‘blunder into a snare trap’ vs. *tmuqris* ‘catch with a snare trap’). He notes that PAN *mu- ‘motion’ is attested in Formosan languages, where it is highly productive.

Possible reflexes of PAN *mu- ‘motion’ are found in several Formosan languages, including Thao, (Nanwang and Tamalakaw) Puyuma, Siraya, Saaroa, Tsou, Mantauran Rukai, and (Takbanuað and Isbukun) Bunun (Blust 1999a, 2003a, 2003b, 2009, Teng 2008, 2010, Tsuchida 1980, 1990, Adelaar 1997, 2004, Jeng 1977, Li 2009, He, Zeng, Li & Lin 1986, Ismahasan et al. 2001, Zeitoun 2007), as shown in (7)-(11).

⁶ Starosta et al. (1982) reconstruct *mu-/*-um- as ‘actor focus’ in Proto-Austronesian. Starosta (1995:698) reconstructs *mu- as ‘actor focus’ in Proto-Formosan. Starosta’s (1995:695, 699) “Proto-Formosan” is equivalent to what has been generally referred to as “Proto-Austronesian”. For further recent discussion of *mu-/*-um-, see Lemaréchal (2010:49-65, 268-270, 272, 274-276, 281-286, 293-298, 316-320, 333, and 337).

- (7) Thao (Blust 2003a:136)
- | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| /Qariwan/ | ‘the city of Pu-li’ | /muqariwan/ | ‘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’ |
| /suhúy/ | ‘there’ | /musuhúy/ | ‘go over there’ |
- (8) Nanwang Puyuma (Teng 2010)
- an **mu**sabak=ku i ruma’ i,...
 when go.inside=NOM.1SG LOC house TOP
 ‘When I went into the house,’
- (9) Siraya (Adelaar 1997:379)
- | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|----------|-----|-------------|
| ka | ni mou koua | 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)
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| mu sala | ‘go; walk’ | mu acekelhe | ‘come’ |
| mu sakesakelalhe | ‘move along the river’ | mu areve | ‘move with’ |
| mu lhungulhungu | ‘move along a brook’ | mu teatealhe | ‘take a shortcut’ |
- (11) Isbukun Bunun (Ismahasan et al. 2001:35-36)
- | | | | |
|-------|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| dan | ‘road’ | mu dan | ‘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. *pi-* ‘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’: ***mu****grahi* ‘go to/toward the garage’; *lawud* ‘sea’: ***mu****lawud* ‘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]

<i>asideg</i>	‘near’	<i>um</i> <i>asideg</i>	‘to approach’
<i>tugaw</i>	‘sit’	<i>tum</i> <i>ugaw</i>	‘to sit down’
<i>seksek</i>	‘interior’	<i>sum</i> <i>eksek</i>	‘to penetrate into’
<i>sirok</i>	‘underneath’	<i>sum</i> <i>irok</i>	‘to go under’
<i>uneg</i>	‘inside’	<i>um</i> <i>uneg</i>	‘to go inside’

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

<i>lom</i> <i>ateng</i>	‘to arrive’	<i>mo</i> <i>wako</i>	‘to walk’ ⁷
<i>pom</i> <i>ahok</i>	‘to enter’	<i>mo</i> <i>wayo</i>	‘to run’

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

Dim*otin* se inay te dagat.
 PFV.go.to SPEC mother OBL beach
 ‘The mother went to the beach.’

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

Nag*alarga*=na=sinda.
 PFV.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.

⁷ 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]
Makabayu=ak.
 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]
Mekegoli se wayeg siyan.
 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**adtu=ku sa inyu human
 if POT.go.there=NOM.1SG LOC 2PL afterwards
 sa paniudtu, **mu**hapit=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**ihi sa diha=ng gilatigu=siya
 almost.happened=NOM.3SG POT.urine LOC there=LIG whip=NOM.3SG
 sa íya=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, potentive verbs are marked by *mapag-* (irrealis) or *mapang-* (irrealis) (or their related aspectual forms) (Quakenbush 2005:461, 475).

- (20) Cebuano (Wolff 1972:661) [Greater Central Philippines]
 Wà=ku **makasakay** (**ka**sakay).
 NEG=NOM.1SG POT.get.a.ride
 ‘I couldn’t get a ride.’
- (21) Sindangan Subanen (Arms 1996:19) [Greater Central Philippines]
 Daʔ=pa **(me)kebaal**.
 NEG.PST=yet POT.do
 ‘He hasn’t been able to do it yet.’

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]
Nakakáin=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]
Nakákain=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)).

- (24) Limos Kalinga (Ferreirinho 1993:46) [Northern Luzon]

Masugat=na sika.

POT.hurt=GEN.3SG NOM.2SG

‘He can hurt you (SG).’

- (25) Limos Kalinga (Ferreirinho 1993:50) [Northern Luzon]

Na?ingina=mi dit bolok.

PFV.POT.sell=GEN.1PL.EXCL SPEC pig

‘We (EXCL) were able to sell the pig.’

- (26) Ilokano (Rubino 2000:lxvi) [Northern Luzon]

Napuóran=na ti baláy.

PFV.POT.burn.down=GEN.3SG SPEC house

‘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 “[I]like *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 1: Romblomanon potentive verb affixes (Newell 2006:39)

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

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]

affix	functions and examples
<i>paka-</i>	nominalizing instrumental affix for potentive <i>maka-</i> verbs <i>makasurat</i> ‘to be able to write’ vs. <i>pakasurat</i> ‘something with which one is able to write’
<i>paka-...-an</i>	nominalizing affix for <i>maka-</i> verbs; reason, source, or place of ability or chance to perform an action (a) <i>makasurat</i> ‘to be able to write’ vs. <i>pakasuratan</i> ‘place where someone can write; reason why someone can write’ (b) <i>makaturog</i> ‘to be able to sleep’ vs. <i>pakaturogan</i> ‘place where someone can sleep; reason why someone is able to sleep’ (c) <i>pakapilian</i> ‘selection’; <i>pakasaritaan</i> ‘history, story’; <i>Ania ti pakasapulam?</i> ‘Why do you (SG) need it?’
<i>pakai-...-an</i>	nominalizing affixation for potentive theme <i>makai-</i> verbs <i>pakairamanan</i> ‘inclusion’

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 *paka-* ‘abilitative’ is one of the several productive processes of verb formation in Amis. Fey (1986:372) considers *paka-* a multifunctional affix with three functions, one of them being ‘abilitative’, as shown in (28). He, Zeng, Citamih & Lin (1986:16-17) describe *paka-* 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 *paka’araw* ‘let the other person see...; is able to see’ Teng (2008:114) states that “[t]he prefix *paka-* 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)

Pakalahci kiso haw?
 ABIL.complete NOM.2SG Q
 ‘Can you (SG) complete it?’

- (29) Amis (Citamih 2005:133)

... kaura awaay ku **pakat**amaay=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 **pakat**enges dra kawi.
 NEG ABIL.bind INDF.OBL timber
 ‘He wanted but was unable to bind the timber.’

- (31) Paiwan (Wolff 1995:567)

makaqati ‘can do something’
su=pakaqati-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 *paka-* (Paiwan also makes use of *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 *p-*initial forms (*paka-*, *peke-*, or *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 *m-*initial forms (*maka-*, *meke-*, or *moko-*) or monosyllabic forms (*ka-* or *ke-/ko-*), and their corresponding *n-*initial forms (*naka-*, *neke-*, or *nook-*) to express the ‘abilitative, accidental, and/or involuntary’ senses in verbal constructions. Although *p-*initial forms are reported to be found in three Philippine languages (Kiangnan Ifugaw, Tagabawa, and Sarangani Manobo), they are either results of avoidance of ambiguous interpretations (as in Kiangnan 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), Kiangnan Ifugaw does not use *maka-* forms (and rarely uses their corresponding transitive *ma-* forms) for potentive verbs because *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).⁹

- (32) Nanwang Puyuma (Teng 2008:114)
 adri=la ***paka***relrep idru na ma'idrang.
 NEG=PFV ABIL.chase that.NOM DEF.NOM old
 ‘The old man wanted to chase (them), but was not able to.’

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 *paʔi(C)-* or *paʔa(C)-* in Batad Ifugao (as shown in (33) and (34), or by the prefix *kapi-* in Ayta Mag-antsi (35) and Halitaq Baytan (36)).

mean ‘very, very much, exceedingly’ and *ma-* forms can mark either stative verbs or passive verbs. To avoid ambiguous interpretations, Kiangnan Ifugaw speakers prefer to use *paka-* forms.

⁹ Ferreira (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 **paʔ**idyamama.
 TOP.this house SPEC RECT.PFV.construct
 ‘As for this house, it was recently constructed.’
- (34) Batad Ifugao (Newell 1993:52) [Northern Luzon]
Paʔakkak hi Oʔʔolwang.
 RECT.PFV.leave PERS.NOM Olwang
 ‘Olwang just left.’
- (35) Ayta Mag-antsi (Storck & Storck 2005:145) [Central Luzon]
Kapiyari=la=n nangan.
 RECT.PFV.finish=GEN/NOM.3PL=LIG eating
 ‘They just finished eating.’
- (36) Halitaq Baytan (Malicsi 1974:66) [Central Luzon]
Kapipakan nin ʔaho 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]
Kawára namen pa asdawa
 RECT.PFV.arrive GEN.1PL.EXCL already that.is.why
kapanútung 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]
Kadadatang(=na) ning mestra.
 RECT.PFV.come(=GEN.3SG) GEN teacher
 ‘The teacher just came.’
- (40) Kapampangan (Gonzalez 1981:75, 184) [Central Luzon]
Kalákadlákad=na=pá mu=ŋ Pédru.
 RECT.PFV.walk=GEN.3SG=still/yet just=PERS.GEN Pedro
 ‘Pedro has just now walked.’
- (41) Brook’s Point Palawano (Loevstaf & Young 1994:14) [Greater Central Philippines]
Kepepatey=ye lang.
 RECT.PFV.die=GEN.3SG just
 ‘He just died.’
- (42) Agutaynen (Quakenbush 2005:463) [Kalamian]
Kakaolik=ko lamang.
 RECT.PFV.go.home=GEN.1SG only
 ‘I just go home.’

If it is a dyadic (or triadic) recent perfective construction, NONE of the two (or three) arguments of the sentence will be in the NOMINATIVE (or ABSOLUTIVE) case form, as shown in (36) and (43).

- (43) Tagalog (Schachter 1995:7) [Greater Central Philippines]
Kabibigay=lang ng maestra ng libro sa bata.
 RECT.PFV.give=just GEN teacher GEN book 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.¹⁰ That is, in a monadic construction, the sole NP of the sentence will still be in the NOMINATIVE (or ABSOLUTIVE) form, as shown in (34) and (44), see also Seidenadel (1909:112-113) for more examples.

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 ABSOLUTE) 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 ABSOLUTE), as shown in (47) and (48).

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

Kapidyag 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]

Kapibita=*la*.¹¹

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]
Kopupuu=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]
kakapanaw=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.

References

- Adelaar, K. Alexander. 1997. Grammar notes on Siraya, an extinct Formosan language. *Oceanic Linguistics* 36.2:362-397.
- Adelaar, K. Alexander. 2000. Siraya reduplication. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39.1:33-52.
- Adelaar, K. Alexander. 2004. The coming and going of 'lexical prefixes' in Siraya. *Language and Linguistics* 5.2:333-361.
- Antworth, Evan L. 1979. *Grammatical Sketch of Botolan Sambal*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Arms, D. G. 1996. Categories of the Sindangan Subanen verb. *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics*, No. 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 1-32. Pacific Linguistics A-84. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Blust, Robert A. 1977. The Proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgrouping: a preliminary report. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in Linguistics* 9.2: 1-15.
- Blust, Robert A. 1991. The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30.2:73-129.
- Blust, Robert A. 1995. The position of the Formosan languages: method and theory in Austronesian comparative linguistics. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 585-650. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Blust, Robert A. 1998a. *Ca-* reduplication and Proto-Austronesian grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37.1:29-64.
- Blust, Robert A. 1998b. Squib: A note on the Thao patient focus perfective. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37.2:346-353.
- Blust, Robert A. 1999a. Subgrouping, circularity and extinction: some issues in Austronesian comparative linguistics. *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Elizabeth Zeitoun & Paul Jen-kuei Li, 31-94. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Blust, Robert A. 1999b. Squib: A note on covert structure: *Ca-* reduplication in Amis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38.1:168-174.
- Blust, Robert A. 2002. Notes on the history of 'focus' in Austronesian languages. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 63-78. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Blust, Robert A. 2003a. *Thao Dictionary*. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.

- Blust, Robert A. 2003b. Three notes on early Austronesian morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42.2:438-478.
- Blust, Robert A. 2009. *The Austronesian Languages*. Pacific Linguistics 602. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Cauquelin, Josiane. 1991. *Dictionnaire puyuma-français*. Paris & Jakarta: Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Chen, Teresa M. 1987. *Verbal Constructions and Verbal Classification in Nataoran-Amis*. Pacific Linguistics C-85. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Citami. (comp.) 2005. *A Collection of Amis Texts*. Beijing: Nationalities Press.
- DuBois, Carl D. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo: An Introductory Guide*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- DuBois, Lauretta J., and Carl D. DuBois. (comps.) 2005. *Tagabawa Texts*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL.
- Ferreirinho, Naomi. 1993. *Selected Topics in the Grammar of Limos Kalinga, the Philippines*. Pacific Linguistics B-109. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Fey, Virginia. 1986. *Amis-Dictionary*. Taipei: The Bible Society in the Republic of China.
- Foley, William A. 1976. *Comparative Syntax in Austronesian*. Berkeley: University of California dissertation.
- Gonzalez, Andrew. 1981. *Pampangan: Towards a Meaning-based Description*. Pacific Linguistics C-48. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- He, Rufen, Siqi Zeng, Citami, and Dengxian Lin. 1986. *A Grammatical Sketch of the Language of the Mountain Tribes (Amis)*. Beijing: Nationalities Press. (In Chinese)
- He, Rufen, Siqi Zeng, Wensu Li, and Qingchun Lin. 1986. *A Grammatical Sketch of the Language of the Mountain Tribes (Bunun)*. Beijing: Nationalities Press. (In Chinese)
- Healey, Phyllis M. 1960. *An Agta Grammar*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Hidalgo, Cesar A., and Araceli C. Hidalgo. 1971. *A Tagmemic Grammar of Ivatan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2002. Voice in western Austronesian: an update. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 7-16. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Hurlbut, Hope M. 1988. *Verb Morphology in Eastern Kadazan*. Pacific Linguistics B-97. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Ismahasan, Dahu, Bukun Ismahasan, Siqi Zeng, and Wensu Li. 2001. *A Study of Isbukun Bunun Morphology*. Taipei: Duce Wenhua. (In Chinese)
- Jeng, Heng-hsiung. 1977. *Topic and Focus in Bunun*. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.

- Kaufman, Daniel. 2009. On the scope and function of PAN *⟨R⟩ and *⟨ŋ⟩. Paper presented at the 11th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (11-ICAL), June 22-25, 2009. Aussois, France.
- Kitano, Hiroaki, and Michael Raymon Manaloto Pangilinan. 2003. Overview of Aita Mag-anchi in Central Luzon, Philippines: a preliminary grammatical analysis. *Descriptive and Theoretical Studies in Minority Languages of East and Southeast Asia*, ed. by Hiroaki Kitano, 169-223. Osaka: ELPR, Osaka Gakuin University.
- Lambrecht, Frans Hubert, C.I.C.M. 1978. *Ifugaw-English Dictionary*. Baguio City: The Catholic Vicar Apostolic of the Mountain Province.
- Lee, Amy Pei-jung. 2009. Kavalan reduplication. *Oceanic Linguistics* 48.1:130-147.
- Lemaréchal, Alain. 2010. *Comparative Grammar and Typology: Essays on the Historical Grammar of the Austronesian Languages*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Li, Chao-lin. 2009. The syntax of prefix concord in Saaroa: restructuring and multiple agreement. *Oceanic Linguistics* 48.1:172-212.
- Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 1973. *Rukai Structure*. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 1995. Formosan vs. non-Formosan features in some Austronesian languages in Taiwan. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 651-681. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2004. *Transitivity and Ergativity in Formosan and Philippine Languages*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa dissertation.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2008a. A typology of first person dual pronouns and their reconstructibility in Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 47.1:1-29.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2008b. The development of benefactive affect verbs in Philippine languages: some implications for comparative Austronesian linguistics. Paper presented at the 18th International Congress of Linguists (CIL 18), July 21-26, 2008. Seoul: Korea University.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2009. When a first person participant meets a second person participant: irregularities in personal pronoun systems in Philippine languages. Paper presented at the 11th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (11-ICAL), June 22-25, 2009. Aussois, France.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2010. Morphosyntactic irregularities in local pronouns in some western Austronesian languages. Paper presented at the Workshop on Between You and Me: Local Pronouns across Modalities, June 7-8, 2010. Nijmegen: Radboud University.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2011. On the development of comitative verbs in Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 12.1:205-237.

- Loevstaf, Annika, and Catherine Young. 1994. Palawano: Brooke's Point Grammar Essentials. Manuscript.
- Lu, Shun-chieh. 2003. *An Optimality Theory Approach to Reduplication in Formosan Languages*. Taipei: National Chengchi University MA thesis.
- Malicsi, Jonathan C. 1974. *A Structural Sketch of Halitaq Baytan (a Sambal Aeta Dialect)*. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines MA thesis.
- Maree, Rundell D. 2007. *Ibatan: A Grammatical Sketch of the Language of Babuyan Claro Island*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Mirikitani, Leatrice T. 1972. *Kapampangan Syntax*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.
- Newell, Leonard E. (comp.) 1993. *Batad Ifugao Dictionary with Ethnographic Notes*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Newell, Leonard E. (comp.) 2006. *Romblomanon Dictionary*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Quakenbush, John Stephen. 2005. Some Agutaynen grammatical details: personal pronouns, nominal markers, and tense/aspect/mode. *Linguistics and Language Education in the Philippines and Beyond: A Festschrift in Honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista*, ed. by Danilo T. Dayag & John Stephen Quakenbush, 437-477. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Ramos, Teresita V. 1971. *Tagalog Structures*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Rau, D. Victoria, and Maa-Neu Dong. 2006. *Yami Texts with Reference Grammar and Dictionary*. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1966. *An Ivatan Syntax*. Honolulu: Pacific and Asian Linguistics Institute, University of Hawai'i.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1975. Philippine type systems. Manuscript.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2002. Philippine languages in focus and out of focus. Guest Lecture: Linguistics 640X(2): The Syntax of Ergative Languages, September 17, 2002. Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2009a. The reconstruction of a dual pronoun to Proto Malayo-Polynesian. *Discovering History through Language: Papers in Honour of Malcolm Ross*, ed. by Bethwyn Evans, 461-477. Pacific Linguistics 605. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2009b. On the diachronic development of C₁V₁- reduplication in some Austronesian languages. *Morphology* 19.2:239-261.
- Reid, Lawrence A., and Hsiu-chuan Liao. 2004. A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5.2:433-490.
- Robinson, Laura C. 2005. A sketch grammar of Tindal Dusun. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in Linguistics* 36.5:1-31.

- Robinson, Laura C. 2008. *Dupaningan Agta: Grammar, Vocabulary, and Texts*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa dissertation.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 1995. Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian verbal morphology: evidence from Taiwan. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 727-791. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2002a. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 17-62. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2002b. Final words: research themes in the history and typology of western Austronesian languages. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 451-474. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2006. Reconstructing the case-marking and personal pronoun systems of Proto Austronesian. *Streams Converging into an Ocean: Festschrift in Honor of Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on His 70th Birthday*, ed. by Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang & Dah-an Ho, 521-563. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Rubino, Carl R. Galvez. 1997. *A Reference Grammar of Ilocano*. Santa Barbara: University of California dissertation.
- Rubino, Carl R. Galvez. 2000. *Ilocano Dictionary and Grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Rubino, Carl R. Galvez. 2001. Iconic morphology and word formation in Ilocano. *Ideophones*, ed. by F. K. Erhard Voeltz & Christa Kilian-Hatz, 303-320. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schachter, Paul. 1995. The subject in Tagalog: still none of the above. *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 15:1-61.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Scott, William Henry. 1957. *A Vocabulary of the Sagada Igorot Dialect*. Chicago: Philippine Studies Program, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.
- Seidenadel, Carl Wilhelm. 1909. *The First Grammar of the Language Spoken by the Bontoc Igorot with Vocabulary and Texts*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1974. Causative verbs in Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13.1-2:279-369.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1986. Focus as recentralisation. *FOCAL I: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Paul Geraghty, Lois

- Carrington & Stephen A. Wurm, 73-95. Pacific Linguistics C-93. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1988. A grammatical typology of Formosan languages. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica* 59.2:541-576.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1995. A grammatical subgrouping of Formosan languages. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 683-726. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew Pawley, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, Vol. 2: *Tracking the Travellers*, ed. by Amran Halim, Lois Carrington & Stephen A. Wurm, 145-170. Pacific Linguistics C-75. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Storck, Kurt, and Margaret Storck. (comps.) 2005. *Ayta Mag-antsi-English Dictionary*. Manila: SIL.
- Teng, Stacy Fang-ching. 2008. *A Reference Grammar of Puyuma: An Austronesian Language of Taiwan*. Pacific Linguistics 595. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Teng, Stacy Fang-ching. 2010. From allative to anticausative: the grammaticalization path of *mu-* in Puyuma. Paper presented at the 8th International Symposium on Taiwanese Languages and Teaching, October 15-16, 2010. Miaoli: National United University.
- Ting, Pang-Hsin. 1978. Reconstruction of Proto-Puyuma phonology. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica* 49.3:321-392. (In Chinese)
- Tsuchida, Shigeru. 1980. Puyuma (Tamalakaw dialect) vocabulary, with grammatical notes and texts. *Kuroshio no Minzoku, Bunka, Gengo* [*Ethnology, Cultures and Languages Along the Black Current*], ed. by Kuroshio Bunka no Kai (Black Current Cultures Committee), 183-307. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten. (In Japanese)
- Tsuchida, Shigeru. 1990. Classificatory prefixes of Tsou verbs. *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers* '89:17-52.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru, Ernesto Constantino, Yukihiro Yamada, and Tsunekazu Moriguchi. 1989. *Batanic Languages: Lists of Sentences for Grammatical Features*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru, Yukihiro Yamada, and Tsunekazu Moriguchi. 1987. *Lists of Selected Words of Batanic Languages*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo.
- Tsukida, Naomi. 1993. A brief sketch of the Sakizaya dialect of Amis. *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers (TULIP)* 13:375-413.
- Vanoverbergh, Morice. 1933. *A Dictionary of Lepanto Igorot as it is Spoken at Bauco*. St.

- Gabriel, Mödling bei Wien, Österreich: Verlag der Internationalen zeitschrift “Anthropos”.
- Waterman, Margaret A. 1932. *A Study of the Igorot Language as Spoken by the Bontoc Igorots*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Wolfenden, Elmer P. (comp.) 2001. *A Masbatenyo-English Dictionary*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U. 1972. *A Dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian. *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in Honor of Cecilio Lopez on His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, 71-91. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U. 1995. The position of the Austronesian languages of Taiwan within the Austronesian group. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 521-583. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Wolff, John U. 2002. Final words: the development of the focus system. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 437-449. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Wolff, John U., Ma. Theresa C. Centeno, and D. Victoria Rau. 1991. *Pilipino through Self-instruction*. Ithaca: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University.
- Wu, Joy. 2000. *A Reference Grammar of Amis*. Taipei: Yuan-Liou. (In Chinese)
- Yamada, Yukihiro. (comp.) 2002. *Itbayat-English Dictionary*. Osaka: ELPR, Osaka Gakuin University.
- Yeh, Marie Meili. 2009. Ca- reduplication in Formosan languages. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 71:135-156.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2002. Reciprocals in Formosan languages. Paper presented at the 9th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (9-ICAL), January 8-11, 2002. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2007. *A Grammar of Mantauran (Rukai)*. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2010. On the reconstruction of reciprocal prefixes in PAN based on Formosan data. Guest Lecture: LING581500: Comparative Austronesian Morphosyntax, November 24, 2010. Hsinchu: Graduate Institute of Linguistics, National Tsing Hua University.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth, Lillian M. Huang, Marie M. Yeh, Anna H. Chang, and Joy J. Wu. 1996. The temporal, aspectual, and modal systems of some Formosan languages: a typological perspective. *Oceanic Linguistics* 35.1:21-56.

- Zeitoun, Elizabeth, Stacy Fang-ching Teng, and Raleigh Ferrell. 2010. Reconstruction of '2' in PAN and related issues. *Language and Linguistics* 11.4:853-884.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth, and Chen-huei Wu. 2006. An overview of reduplication in Formosan languages. *Streams Converging into an Ocean: Festschrift in Honor of Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on His 70th Birthday*, ed. by Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang & Dah-an Ho, 97-142. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Zeng, Siqu. (comp.) 2008. *Taiwan Amis Yu Changyong Cizhui yu Dongci Cigen Shouce* [*Handbook of Frequently-used Affixes and Verb Roots in Amis*]. Beijing: Nationalities Press. (In Chinese)

[Received 11 April 2011; revised 19 May 2011; accepted 29 July 2011]

Institute of Linguistics
National Tsing Hua University
101, Sec. 2, Kuang-fu Road
Hsinchu 300, Taiwan
hcliao@mx.nthu.edu.tw

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/或 **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