Book Review: *Pazih Dictionary*

Elizabeth Zeitoun
Academia Sinica

Li, Paul Jen-kuei, and Shigeru Tsuchida. 2001. *Pazih Dictionary*. **391 pp. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series, No. A2. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office), Academia Sinica. NT$700.**[1]

Very few significant dictionaries have ever been published on the Formosan languages, although some are in the works (e.g., Ho and Rau 2000, Zeitoun in preparation, Li and Tsuchida in preparation) or are already in press (e.g., Blust to appear). Until recently, only five major dictionaries were available: Pecoraro (1979) on Taroko Seediq, Egerod (1980) on Squliq Atayal (re-edited and published in 1999), Ferrell (1982) on Paiwan, Fey (1986) on Amis, Cauquelin (1991) on Nanwang Puyuma. The recent publication of the "Pazih[2] Dictionary" (henceforth PD), jointly compiled by Paul Jen-kuei Li and Shigeru Tsuchida and edited in both Chinese and English, represents a welcome contribution to the field of Formosan linguistics.

PD includes: a grammatical sketch (58 pp.); the main body of the dictionary (271 pp.); a finderlist, i.e., an index cross-referencing English glosses (30 pp.); and two appendices (19 pp.), the first containing two Pazih texts and the second listing the major linguistic publications of and about Naoyoshi Ogawa, to whom the dictionary has been dedicated. There are also two pages that have been translated into Chinese regarding the editing of the dictionary (including notes on the lexical arrangement, the adopted orthography, conventions, symbols and abbreviations). PD ends with a three-page postscript written in Chinese. In fact, these three pages should have appeared as a preface and should have been translated into English, because the background

---

[1] I should like to thank Paul Jen-kuei Li, Ying-chin Lin, Robert Blust, and Laurent Sagart for comments on an earlier version of this review, none of whom is responsible for ideas expressed herein.

[2] In earlier publications, Pazih used to be referred to as 'Pazeh'. Why change its orthography? Because in Pazih, which has four vowels, /i, u, a, ə/, [i] and [u] undergo lowering before certain consonants such as /h/ and /r/; as in the orthographic system adopted in this publication, schwa ə is replaced by **e**, the authors thus replaced **e** by **i** to avoid misinterpreting the last vowel of Paz*e*h as a schwa.

concerning the coming into being of the dictionary is provided in detail: Paul Li explains how the dictionary was conceived and revised; concedes its limitations; justifies why it is dedicated to N. Ogawa; acknowledges the help of a number of assistants regarding the Chinese to English translations and the editorial work; expresses his gratitude for the financial support received from a number of institutions; and mentions a prize bestowed upon the two authors in 2001 by the Ministry of Education.

Now I shall review and comment upon the three main parts of the dictionary, i.e., the grammatical sketch, the main body of the dictionary (including the English-Pazih index) and the two texts. My comments are not meant to demean this valuable work but are intended for reference and as guidelines to other authors editing dictionaries on Formosan languages.

1. Sketch of Pazih grammar

This part includes a discussion of the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the Pazih language. It deals also very briefly with the genetic relationships of Pazih with respect to other Formosan languages. It is deliberately descriptive and provides a linguistic background for the dictionary, while complementing previous studies apropos of various aspects of Pazih grammar.

This introduction actually draws on various papers that were published by Paul Li over the past twenty years, namely Li (1978, 1998, 2000, and to appear), but this has an unfortunate consequence. At least two noticeable inconsistencies were overlooked: (i) The use of first person singular pronoun forms (e.g., 'I', 'my informant' on p.30) to refer to the author (in actuality P. Li), while the work was, however, said to have represented "a joint effort by Shigeru Tsuchida and Paul Li" (p.2); in other places, however, corrections were made; (ii) Unwarranted repetitions (e.g., a list of case markers is given both on p.31 and on p.52, without cross-reference; abbreviations are provided in two different places, on pp.x (= xii) and 24).

Below, I shall confine myself to mentioning major analytical discrepancies with earlier studies, point out main inconsistencies or flaws, and, whenever possible, propose alternative analyses that may prove of interest to Formosanists.

1.1 Phonology

This section is divided into a discussion of the "synchronic" and "diachronic" phonology of Pazih. In 1999, Blust wrote at length on Pazih phonology, and there are two points of disagreement between him and PD worth mentioning here, regarding

synchronic analysis. The first point has to do with the status of the glottal stop. The second lies in the treatment of final consonants.

Blust (1999:327-328) believes that the glottal stop is phonetically inserted and proposes a rule to account for all citation forms. Li and Tsuchida (2001) actually recognize the fact that the glottal stop is in a "state of changing" (p.3). More specifically, they claim that it is phonemically significant, but that it is phonetically introduced in initial and final positions. They also mention that in initial position, it should be preserved in cases where the <**in**> infix occurs in a lexical item to avoid mistakenly analyzing <**in**> as a prefix. Yet despite these statements, the glottal stop is omitted in many places in the body of the dictionary; e.g., **inaduan** 'were put' (p.61), **inapa** 'have carried' (p.68), etc., which is inconsistent with their prior analysis.

As opposed to earlier studies (e.g., Ferrell 1970, Lin 1999), Blust (1999:326) claims that Pazih distinguishes the places of articulation of /t/ and /d/, while postulating a rule of intervocalic voicing. Li and Tsuchida (2001), on the other hand, propose final devoicing of stop consonants. Whichever analysis is assumed, the data should be consistent with the hypothesis advanced. In many places, spelling discrepancies arise because of the occurrence of a vowel after a lexical item ending in a stop. Compare: **adadumud a dali** 'the very first day of the month' (p.60) vs. **uhuza ka nahada adadumut a saw** 'There was a person in the past' (ibid).

The "historical phonology" discussion is fairly consistent with Blust's (1999) analysis. It goes a small step further in pointing out the obscure origin of the phoneme /g/, remaining, however, clueless as to what the answer might possibly be.

1.2 Morphology

This section consists of a listing of affixes found in Pazih and a discussion of reduplication patterns.

Although the authors did a fairly good job of identifying the semantic function of most of the affixes, some affixal variations are left unaccounted for and might need to be further investigated. For instance, four different types of reciprocal constructions are listed. The first involves **maa-(paa-)**+root, the second **maa-(paa-)**+Red+root, the third **maaka-(paaka-)**+root, and the fourth **maaka-(paaka-)**+Red+root; but the morpho-syntactic distinctions among these different forms are never explicitly stated. In fact, a comparison with other Formosan languages shows the following:

- **maa-** is prefixed to finite dynamic verbs and **paa-** to non-finite dynamic verbs;
- **maaka-** (which I would tend to analyze as **maa-ka-**) occurs with finite

stative verbs and **paaka-** (actually **paa-ka-**) with non-finite stative verbs;
- the reduplication of the base form indicates a plurality of participants (see Zeitoun and Huang 2000 and Zeitoun 2002).

PD lists four major types of reduplication: (i) reduplication of a complete stem minus the coda; (ii) reduplication of the first syllable of the stem; (iii) reduplication of the first syllable of the stem with the vowel replaced by /a/; and (iv) reduplication of the first syllable of the stem with vowel lengthening. In fact, (iii) is nowadays conventionally referred to as *Ca*-reduplication (following Blust 1998), and it is questionable whether (iv) involves vowel lengthening or reduplication of the first syllable plus the vowel of the second syllable, a reduplication pattern attested in at least two Rukai dialects, Budai and Mantauran; e.g., Mt **o-kane** "eat" ~ **okae(-kae)-kaane** 'eat continuously' (cf. Shelley 1979 and Zeitoun to appear).

1.3 Syntax

The section on syntax is rather long and presents the major syntactic characteristics of the language. However, the authors often make "general" statements, which do not always happen to be true. They mention that "Pazih verbs marked with **m-** appear even in irrealis" and that "such a phenomenon is similar to *most other* Formosan languages" (p.26; reviewer's emphasis). Examples (31) through (34) show that verbs marked by **m-** occur either (i) as embedded verbs, after a verb (31) or a negator (32) and (ii) in sentences that are translated as conditional (33-34), but would be better interpreted as realis: "You do something, then I shall do something else." While it is true that **m-...-ay** is also found in Atayal, still at this stage the simultaneous occurrence of **m-** with **-ay** remains a puzzle.

Regarding existential/possessive constructions, it is noted that, as opposed to most other Formosan languages (e.g., Rukai, Atayal, Bunun), where the theme/possessed is subject of the sentence, in Pazih and Saisiyat it is the locative/possessor that serves as subject. This is certainly true, but other languages, such as Seediq, pattern like Pazih and Saisiyat, and some even exhibit both patterns, as in Bunun or Kavalan (cf. Zeitoun et al. 1999 and Zeitoun 2000).

1.4 Linguistic position of Pazih

This final section on "The position of Pazih" is very disappointing and should have been reduced to a minimum. While comparative linguists usually rely on phonology and lexicon to establish subgrouping hypotheses, the authors provide typological

characteristics that represent scanty and very weak evidence which cannot alone support any kind of analysis.

2. The Pazih dictionary proper

The dictionary includes some 2,700 entries arranged in alphabetic order and lists all forms recorded in the language. Main entries are followed by derived forms (in a slightly smaller point size) and nearly all of these are richly examplified. Affixed forms are also entered separately (but without illustration) and are cross-referenced to the main lexical entry; e.g., **abai** (< **aba**) 'Daddy' (p.59). Lexical items in each entry are in boldface. All the examples (phrases and full sentences) are italicized.

I have a few comments regarding the organization of the lexical entries and their contents.

2.1 Roots

The first has to do with the notion of "root". Roots, which constitute an important part of the lexical entries found in this work, are indicated as bound and as such are never glossed.

This raises three problems, the first two methodological and the third theoretical. In my opinion, these roots should have been glossed in order to facilitate the comprehension of a particular lexical item. Glossing the roots would have avoided much redundancy in the English-Pazih index. E.g., the form **izer-** is given two different (though related) meanings: 'hang oneself to death' and 'hang someone to death' (p.348). The cross-reference to the dictionary (p.134) shows that the second interpretation refers to the causative form **paizer**, i.e., a derived form. A main entry **izer-** 'hang to death' could have been distinguished from subentries, e.g., **mizer** 'hang oneself to death', **paizer** 'hang someone to death' as follows:

hang to death   *izer-*
hang oneself to death   *mizer*
hang someone to death   *paizer*

The authors should also have indicated in more detail which of the roots must appear affixed and which can appear unaffixed. The form **ara-** is marked as 'bound' but appears without any derivative in the following example: **ara la minah, te'eng sen, ini marikazay** 'He took (a branch) again and threw it at it, she still did not move' (p.69).

2.2 Derivational forms

Three discrepancies were noticed with respect to the notion of "derivation".

The first inconsistency concerns the way that examples of PF, LF, imperative, perfective derivations, etc., are arranged under the AF forms (treated implicitly as the "neutral" forms). To mention but one example, under **masu** 'bring someone or something with oneself' (p.73), there occurs **asui!** "Bring it' followed by another one with **masu**, i.e., **masu daran ki wazu** 'The dog leads the way' and three more examples illustrating the occurrence of **asui**.

A different arrangement would have avoided this confusion. Pecoraro (1979) illustrates each derivational form with a number of examples. Blust (to appear) numbers each derivational form (1, 2, 3…) with cross-references to a series of examples.

The second problem has to do with the fact that **ta**-+ root 'Let's ...' is treated as a "derived" form, when in fact it represents the occurrence of a pronoun immediately followed by a verb.

The last concern is with the identification of a derived word as belonging (or not belonging) to the same paradigm as the major lexical entry or subentry. On the one hand, it is rather difficult to see the semantic relationship between: **ada** "other" and **ada buxuan** 'mainland Chinese' (p.60) < **ada** 'other' + **buxuan** further listed as 'seed' (?). On the other hand, it would have been more appropriate to have **maapuhinis** 'fall in love with each other' mentioned under **puhinis** 'fall in love' (p.124).

2.3 Other inconsistencies and typos

Other inconsistencies and typos were spotted here and there, but were not listed in the errata. Below, I will only refer to those relating to the Pazih data.

1. <u>Variants</u>: It is questionable whether **aku** should be analyzed as having the variant **ku** (p.63) since this form usually follows a word ending with /a/. Besides, the form **ku** is not given as a variant of **aku** in the grammatical sketch (cf. the pronominal system depicted in Table 2), and examples are found in the introduction where a word ending with /a/ is followed by **aku**, e.g., **mausay li*a* <u>aku</u>** 'I shall go. I am about to leave' (p.39).

2. <u>References</u> <u>to</u> <u>Ogawa</u>: I find it very puzzling that the authors sometimes provide Ogawa's data as a separate entry (e.g., two entries for **maa**-+Red(uplication)+Root 'reciprocally', p.172), while at others combining his lexical items and examples with their own (e.g., **kaxa** 'iron, nail' (Ogawa **kaxxa**), p.145).

3. <u>Spelling</u> <u>variations</u>: It is not entirely clear to me why different spellings are given for the same form, sometimes cross-referenced to a different lexical entry. For example:

- alternation between vowels and glides:
    asai vs. **asay** (p.71)
- bound vs. free forms:
    masu <u>liaku</u> 'I brought it' (p.73) vs. **lia ku** or **lia aku** elsewhere (cf. also my comment in the precedent paragraph concerning **aku** ~ **ku**)
- consonantal variants:
    huhul ~ **huhun** 'carefully' (p.125): the l ~ n variation is not only pointed out on p.5 of the introduction, but also after each one's lexical entry!

4. <u>Lexical</u> <u>classes</u>: The indication of lexical classes should have been left out entirely, due to limitations in our understanding of the data, yet, nevertheless, it appears here and there for no apparent reason; e.g., p.222.

5. <u>Semantic</u> <u>distinctions</u>: Semantic distinctions between lexical items that seem to be synonymous or nearly synonymous are never fully explained. Compare for instance: **pungu-tatudu** 'thumb' (Ogawa) vs. **tapupu** 'thumb' (p.237). In this very example, the reader is left to ponder over different possibilities: (i) Is the form proposed by Ogawa incorrect? But if erroneous, how does it merit mentioning? (ii) Are the two forms synonyms? (iii) Has **tapapu** actually replaced **pungu-tatudu**?

6. <u>Typos</u>: Other typos and discrepancies detract from our enjoyment of the dictionary. To cite but a few:

- **abal** (p.64) > **aba** 'father';
- **papaapaitadu** (p.223) > **tapaapaitadu** 'let's put into order';
- **nita** is glossed as 'our, ours (1st pers. pl. inc. Gen[itive]/poss[essive])', but it is mentioned nowhere in the introduction that genitive pronouns can also function as possessive pronouns (p.237);
- **pungu-** is not mentioned as a root on p.237;
- **maxapabaret** (p.368) > **maxapaabaret** (?) 'reply to each other, say hello to each other': the expected form should contain a long vowel; cf. **maa-** ~ **paa-** 'reciprocal'.

3. Pazih texts

The two stories are glossed and translated into Chinese and English. It is not really clear why abbreviations are repeated on p.369 since they correspond to those given on page x. But the more important problem concerns the three levels of translation.

There are flagrant discrepancies in (i) the English and Chinese glosses—English glosses are much more detailed, indicating, for example, verbal derivations (AF/PF, Prf/Prg, Imp, etc.), while Chinese glosses do not; (ii) the Chinese glosses (e.g., p.369.1: **d<a>u-du-ay**「要講」 'will tell' vs. p.369.2: **m<a>aka-kawas-ay**「講」 'tell'); and (iii) the lexical entries of the dictionary and the glosses provided in the stories, as, for example, **abasan** is glossed as 'elder brother' on p.375:15, but as 'elder sibling' on p.60.

4. Concluding remarks

On the whole, PD represents a very valuable resource, providing an exhaustive record of a moribund language, and as such will serve as a reference tool for Formosanists and comparativists. Had the authors been in less of a hurry to publish their work, the avoidable mistakes would not have distracted us from considering this dictionary one of the best ever published on a Formosan language.

References

Blust, Robert. 1998. *Ca-* reduplication and Proto-Austronesian grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37.1:29-64.

Blust, Robert. 1999. Notes on Pazeh phonology and morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38.2:321-365.

Blust, Robert. (to appear). *Thao Dictionary*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. (in press)

Cauquelin, Josiane. 1991. *Dictionnaire Puyuma-Français*. Paris/Jakarta: Ecole Française d'Etrême-Orient.

Egerod, Søren. 1980. *Atayal-English Dictionary*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series, No.35. London: Curzon Press. Second edition (1999), ed. by Jens Ostergaard Peterson. Copenhagen: Kongelige danske vedenskabernes Selskab.

Ferrell, Raleigh. 1982. *Paiwan Dictionary*. Pacific Linguistics C-73. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University

Fey, Virginia (ed). 1986. *Amis Dictionary*. Taipei: The Bible Society.

Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 1978. The case-marking systems of the four less known Formosan languages. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, fasc. 1., 569-615. Pacific Linguistics C-61. Canberra: Australian National University.

Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 1998. The case marking system of the Pazeh language. Papers from the International Symposium on the Languages and Language Teaching in Taiwan, 1:57-81. Hsinchu: Hsinchu Normal College.

Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 2000. Some aspects of Pazeh syntax. *Grammatical Analysis: Morphology, Syntax and Semantics: Studies in Honor of Stanley Starosta*, ed. by Videa De Guzman and Byron Bender, 89-108. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication, No.29. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Li, Paul Jen-kuei. (to appear). Nominalization in Pazih. *Language and Linguistics* 3.2.

Li, Paul Jen-kuei, and Shigeru Tsuchida. 2001. *Pazih Dictionary*. Language and Linguistic Monograph Series No.A2. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.

Li, Paul Jen-kuei, and Shigeru Tsuchida. (in preparation). *Kavalan Dictionary*. Manuscript.

Lin, Ying-chin. 2000. *The Pazeh Language*. Series on the Formosan languages, 4. Taipei: Yuanliou Publishing Co. (in Chinese)

Pecoraro, Ferdinando. 1979. *Essai de Dictionnaire Taroko-Français*. Cahier d'Archipel 7. Paris: S.E.C.M.I. (Société pour l'Etude de la Connaissance du Monde

Insulindien).

Shelley, George. 1979. *Vudai Dukai: The Language, its Context, and its Relationship.* Hartford, Connecticut: The Hartford Seminary Foundation dissertation.

Tung, Ma-nyu, and Der-Hwa V. Rau. 2000. *Yami-Chinese Dictionary*. Manuscript.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2000. Notes on a possessive construction in the Formosan languages. *Grammatical Analysis: Morphology, Syntax and Semantics: Studies in Honor of Stanley Starosta*, ed, by Videa De Guzman and Byron Bender, 241-257. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications, No.29. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2002. Reciprocals in Formosan languages. Paper presented at the 9th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (9ICAL). Canberra: Australian National University.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth. (to appear). *A Grammar of Mantauran (Rukai)*. Manuscript.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth. (in preparation). *A Dictionary of Mantauran (Rukai)*. Manuscript.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth, Lillian M. Huang, Marie M. Yeh, and Anna H. Chang. 1999. Existential, possessive and locative constructions in the Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38.1:1-42.

Institute of Linguistics, Preparatory Office
Academia Sinica
130, Sec. 2, Academia Road
Nankang, Taipei 115, Taiwan
hsez@ccvax.sinica.edu.tw