http://www.jstor.org

Squib

Negation in Saisiyat: Another Perspective

Elizabeth Zeitoun

ACADEMIA SINICA

In a recent paper, Mei-li Yeh compares the distribution and function of eight Saisiyat negators and attempts to resolve the following questions: (1) What is the morphosyntactic relationship that *'oka', 'okay, 'okik, 'amkay,* and *'amkik* bear to one another? (2) Why are certain negators followed by a "ligature" (either *'i* or *'ik*) and others not? (3) Is it the negator or the ligature that determines the marking of the negated verb as dependent or independent? While the first of these questions is well handled, Yeh is unable to answer the last two questions. Based on my own fieldnotes, I suggest answers, showing that together with *'oka', 'izi',* and *'i'ini',* both dynamic and stative verbs occur in their [+dependent] form, and demonstrating that while *'i* is a ligature, *'ik* is not. I also account for the distributional differences between *'oka', 'ʔizi',* and *'i'ini',* on the one hand, and *kayni'* on the other.

1. INTRODUCTION. In a recent paper, Yeh (2000b)[1] compares the distribution and function of eight Saisiyat negators (*'oka', 'okay, 'okik, 'amkay, 'amkik, 'izi', 'in'ini',*[2] and *kayni'*) and attempts to resolve the following questions: what is the morphosyntactic relationship that *'oka', 'okay, 'okik, 'amkay,* and *'amkik* bear to one another?[3] Why are certain negators followed by a "ligature"—two different ligatures are identified, the first is *'i* (1a) and the second is *'ik* (1b)—and others not (1c)?

(1) Based on Yeh (2000b)[4]
    a. yako   'am 'oka' ila **'i**   shebet ka   korkoring
       1SG.NOM will   NEG   ASP LIG beat   ACC child
       'I will not beat the child any longer.'

---

1. Yeh's (2000b) paper presents a slightly revised version of the sixth chapter of her M.A. thesis, Yeh (1991).
2. This negator was recorded as *'i'ini'* by me and by my Saisiyat assistant, Tai-hua Chu (who is learning linguistics through working with me), in all our fieldtrip sessions. There are, in fact, many orthographic and syntactic discrepancies between Yeh's corpus and mine, and because all the examples that appear in this squib have been (re)checked during the two fieldtrips I made to the Saisiyat tribe, I am therefore relying on (and thus have adopted) my (own) transcription. The following orthographic conventions were adopted: e = ə, ae = æ, oe = œ, ng = ŋ, ' = ʔ, sh = ʃ, s = θ, z = ð, b = β (Saisiyat and Atayal), g = γ (Atayal).
3. I even found two other negators, morphologically derived from *'oka' 'i: kai'* and *'oki'*.
4. Abbreviations are as follow: ACC, accusative; AF, Agent focus; ASP, Aspect; CAUS, causative; COMP, complementizer; EXCL, exclusive; GEN, genitive; INCL, inclusive; IF, Instrument focus; LF, Locative focus; LIG, ligature; MOD, modality; NEG, negation; NOM, nominative; PL, plural; PF, Patient focus; PRED, predicate; REC, reciprocal; REL, relativizer; SG, singular; STAT, stative.

> b. t\<in>aw'an   'aehae' ila tinal'omaeh, 'oka' na   **'ik** sizaeh⁵
>   build.house\<PERF>   one   ASP year   NEG still LIG finish
>   'It has been built for one year, but is (still) not finished.'
>
> c. yako   kayni' Ø   s\<om>i'ael ka   'alaw
>   1SG.NOM NEG   Ø   eat\<AF>   ACC fish
>   'I do not want to eat the fish.'

What is the grammatical status of these ligatures? To what degree do they differ
from ligatures occurring in complex sentences (cf. Ø in [2a] and komosha'⁶ in [2b])?

> (2) a. 'oya' sh\<om>iwa: ka kapinaw Ø   sh\<om>a'ish ka   kayba:en
>   mother agree   ACC lady   Ø   sew\<AF>   ACC clothes
>   'Mother agreed that the lady sew the clothes.' (Yeh 1997)
>
> b. sia   ra:am **k\<om>osha'** yako   kama rae'oe: ka pinobae:h
>   3SG.NOM know   COMP   1SG.NOM REL   drink   ACC wine
>   'He knows that I drink wine.' (Chang 1997)

What are the factors that determine the marking—as dependent (3a) or indepen-
dent (3b)—of the negated verb? The negator or the ligature?

> (3) a. 'izi' **si'ael/*s\<om>i'ael** ka   pazay⁷
>   NEG   eat/*eat\<AF>   ACC   rice
>   'Don't eat (the) rice.' (Yeh 2000b)
>
> b. yako   kayni' **m-ae'rem/*pae'rem**
>   1SG.NOM NEG   AF-sleep/*sleep
>   'I do not want to sleep.' (Yeh 1991:91)

In my opinion, while the first of these questions is well handled, that is, the mor-
phosyntactic relationship *'oka'* and its counterparts bear to one another is correctly
identified and accounted for, Yeh (2000b) is unable to answer the last two ques-
tions, because linguistic phenomena pertaining to verbal morphology (which are
rather transparent in other Formosan languages) have been blurred in Saisiyat. In
the present paper, I suggest answers to these questions, and, in so doing, I show
the analytic contradictions raised by Yeh's (2000b) analysis.

2. REVIEW OF YEH'S (2000) ANALYSIS.

According to Yeh (1991 and sub-
sequent works), focus markers in Saisiyat can be divided into two different sets, as
shown in table 1. The first set corresponds to [–dependent] verbs, that is, verbs that

---

5. While my informants accept the following clauses (cf. [i] and [ii]), they reject the second part
    of (1b) , cf. *'oka'na' 'ik sizaeh* as ungrammatical because of the cooccurrence of *'oka'* 'not'
    with *na* 'still'.

    (i)   **'oka'** 'ik   sizaeh   (ii) **'i'ini'** 'ik   sizaeh
          NEG   LIG finish   NEG   LIG finish
          '(It) was not finished.'   'It is not yet finished.'

6. *komosha'* is a verb meaning 'say' and is treated as a complementizer in Chang (1997). In my
    opinion, the grammaticalization of *komosha'* as a COMP should not be analyzed on the same
    level as the occurrence of the ligature *'i* between a negator and a verb.

7. As will become clear below, the ligature *'i* actually occurs between the negator *'izi'* and the
    verb. Informants thus utter (3a) as (i):

    (i)   'izi' 'i   si'ael ka   pazay
          NEG LIG eat   ACC rice
          'Don't eat (the) rice.'

TABLE 1. FOCUS MARKERS IN SAISIYAT(BASED ON YEH 1991)

	AF	PF	LF	IF
I	m-, -om-, ma-, Ø	-en	-an	si-
II	Ø	-i	—	-ani

occur in affirmative declarative constructions (4a); the second indicates that the verb
is [+ dependent],[8] that is, it occurs in imperative (4b) or negative (4c) constructions.

(4) a. yako   **s<om>i'ael** ka   pazay
         1SG.NOM   eat<AF>   ACC   rice
         'I ate rice.' (Yeh 1991:34)

  b. **si'ael** ka   pazay
        eat   ACC rice
        'Eat rice!'

  c. yako   'oka' 'i   **si'ael** ka   pazay
        1SG.NOM NEG   LIG   eat   ACC   rice
        'I did not eat rice.'

Verbs are also categorized in terms of their being [–stative] (5a) or [+stative]
(5b). A careful examination of Li's (1978) and Yeh's data (1991, 2000a, b) shows
that [–stative] verbs are more frequently marked by <om> and stative verbs by Ø-.

(5) Yeh (1991)
  a. korkoring h<**om**>angih ila
        child   cry<AF>   ASP
        'The child cried.' (p. 66)

  b. sia   **Ø**-sarara' ka   ngiaw
        3SG.NOM   like   ACC cat
        'S/he likes cats.' (p. 55)

Based on the above two parameters (i.e., the categorial nature of verbs as
dynamic or stative and their focus marking), Yeh schematizes the distribution of
Saisiyat negators as follows:

(6) a. 'oka'   + ka   + argument
    b. 'oka'   + 'i   + predicate   [–stative, +dependent]
    c. 'oka'   + 'ik   + predicate   [+stative, –dependent][9]
    d. 'izi'   + Ø   + predicate   [–stative, +dependent]
    e. 'in'ini' + 'i   + predicate   [–stative, +dependent]
    f. kayni'   + Ø   + predicate   [–stative, –dependent]

'i and *'ik* are analyzed on a par with the ligature *ka,* which is found in other For-
mosan languages such as Paiwan and Rukai (7) and is at the same time assimilated
to the prefix *ka-* (and its variants *k-, ku-*), which occur before stative verbs in other
languages such as Seediq (8).

---

8.   This terminology is based on Starosta, Pawley, and Reid (1982), and while I have adopted
     another terminology ("finite" vs. "nonfinite") in two papers (Zeitoun and Huang 2000, and
     Zeitoun 2000), I will keep this distinction here for the sake of clarity. Another thing to be
     aware of, is that only verbs occurring in AF constructions are taken into account in this study.

9.   *'oka' 'ik* also negates nominal arguments, as in *yako 'oka' 'ik/'okik saisyat.*

128 OCEANIC LINGUISTICS, VOL. 40, NO. 1

(7) a. Saisiyat
    'oka' + **'i**   + PRED [–stative]
    'oka' + **'ik** + PRED [+stative]

  b. Mantauran Rukai
    ka   + PRED-ka-GEN
    PRED-ka-GEN + **ka**   (where PRED [± stative])

  c. Paiwan
    ini + **ka** + PRED [±stative]

(8)   Seediq
    ini   + **ku**-PRED [+stative]

The author gives no clue, however, regarding the derivation that accounts for the development from *ka* as a bound morpheme occurring on stative verbs to a free morpheme functioning as a ligature. In a more recent report (2000c), Yeh proposes that such a development results from grammaticalization, as the following schema shows:

(9) Historical development of KA (based on Yeh 2000b:11)
    kaX [inchoative][10] (~ maX [state]), where X is a Verb
    • reanalysis   →   ka-X   (*ka* as an inchoative marker)
    • analogy   →   ka-Y   (Y as zero-marked statives)
    • reanalysis   →   ka X or ka Y (*ka* as a linker)

However, Yeh's (2000a, b) analysis raises both empirical and theoretical questions. First, the inconsistent marking of the negated verb as [±dependent] and the possible occurrence or nonoccurrence of a ligature do not permit a unified treatment of Saisiyat negators, and one is left speculating as to the factors that may be involved. Second, Yeh would seem to be intermixing a syntactic matter—the occurrence of a ligature between the negator and the verb—and a morphological matter—the marking of a verb as dynamic or stative—in an unwarranted way.

3. REINTERPRETATION OF THE DATA. Based on my own fieldnotes, I reach quite different conclusions concerning the distributional patterns of Saisiyat negators, which I give in (10) and (11). These divergences might, of course, result from our eliciting data from different informants. My own fieldwork was done entirely with Southern Saisiyat speakers (Tungho dialect)—from whom I got consistent results pertaining to the occurrence of the ligature *'i* between negators and verbs, as shown in (10b–e) and (11b–e)—while Yeh's work includes examples elicited from informants belonging to both the Taai and Tungho communalects.

(10) a. 'oka' +   [ka + N]OBJ
     b. 'oka' + 'i   +   PRED[–stative, +dependent]
     b'. 'oka' + 'i-k   +   PRED[+stative, + dependent]
     c. 'izi' + 'i   +   PRED[–stative, + dependent]
     c'. 'izi' + 'i-k   +   PRED[+stative, + dependent]

10. I do not intend to discuss in this paper the function of the prefix *ka-* (treated by Yeh 2000 as a marker of "inchoativity"), as this question is already addressed in Zeitoun and Huang 2000.

d. 'i'ini' + 'i   +   PRED[–stative, + dependent]
d'. 'i'ini' + 'i-k   +   PRED[+stative, + dependent]
e. kayni'+   PRED[±stative, – dependent]

(11) a. yako   **'oka'** ka   rayhil
       1SG.NOM   NEG   ACC   money
       'I do not have money.'

b. yako   **'oka'** 'i   shebet   ka   korkoring
    1SG.NOM   NEG   LIG   beat   ACC   child
    'I did not beat the child.'

b'. **'oka'**   'i-k   sizaeh
     NEG   LIG-STAT   finish
     'It is not finished.'

c. **'izi'**   'i   hangih   ila!
    NEG   LIG   cry   ASP
    'Don't cry!'

c'. **'izi'**   'i-k   ba:'in![11]
     NEG   LIG-STAT   lazy
     'Don't be lazy!'

d. yako   **'i'ini'**   'i   hiba: ka   kayba:en
    1SG.NOM   NEG   LIG   put.on ACC   clothes
    'I have not dressed yet.'

d'. **'i'ini'**   'i-k   sizaeh
     NEG   LIG-STAT   finish
     'It is not finished yet.'

e. yako   **kayni'** rima'
    1SG.NOM   NEG   go
    'I do not want to go.'

e'. yami   **kayni'** makakshiae'
    1PL.EXCL.NOM NEG   REC.happy
    'We do not want to play (together).'

The main divergences between my analysis and Yeh's lie in (1) my distinguishing three groups of negators: (i) *'oka'*, which is followed by a nominal argument (its object), (ii) *'oka'*, *'izi'*, and *'i'ini'*, which can cooccur with a stative or dynamic verb, both marked as [+dependent], and (iii) *kayni'*, which can be followed by either stative or dynamic verbs marked as [–dependent], and (2) my treating the ligature that occurs after *'oka'*, *'izi'*, and *'i'ini'* as the single entity *'i*. As demonstrated in other papers (Zeitoun and Huang 2000 and Zeitoun 2000), *k* marks stativity. This interpretation of the data is further schematized in (12):

(12) a. 'oka'   +   Nominal argument
b. 'oka'   + 'i   + PRED [–stative, +dependent]
    'izi'
    'i'ini'
b'. 'oka'   + 'i-k   + PRED [+stative, +dependent]
     'izi'
     'i'ini'
c. kayni'   + PRED [±stative, –dependent]

---

11. It is difficult to find this type of examples without having the verb first causativized.

My reinterpretation of the data, as depicted in (12), raises some problems that need to be accounted for in order to show that this analysis is well founded. First, because stative verbs are mostly zero-marked in Saisiyat, how can we prove that in cooccurrence with *'oka'*, *'izi'*, and *'i'ini'* (stative) verbs behave like dynamic verbs and occur in their [+dependent] form? Second, what are the types of evidence that can be advanced to support the claim that *'i* is a ligature, and that *'ik* is not? Third, how can the distributional differences between *'oka'*, *'izi'*, and *'i'ini'*, on the one hand, and *kayni'*, on the other, be accounted for?

3.1 DEGREE OF "DEPENDENCY" OF THE NEGATED VERB.

As mentioned above, most stative verbs in Saisiyat are zero-marked. As shown in (13), it is thus rather difficult to determine whether any morphological change has taken place when these verbs are negated.

(13) a. kakaw   'curved'   'okik kakaw   'not curved'
     b. kerpe: 'fat'   'okik kerpe: 'not fat'
     c. mais   'hard'   'okik mais   'not hard'
     d. sarara'   'like, love'   'okik sarara'   'not like, not love'
     e. shiae'   'happy'   'okik shiae   'not happy'

Two types of evidence can be brought to show that stative verbs occurring after *'okik, 'izi'*, and *'i'ini'* are, in fact, dependent verbs. First, for at least two verbs that were elicited, *maskes* 'cold' and *malahan* 'take care of children', a regular morphological change *(ma- ~ ka-)* is observed not only in negative context but also in other types of constructions (e.g., imperative and causative sentences) that (in many Formosan languages) induce a nondependent form.[12]

(14) a. yako   **ma-lahan**   ka korkoring ma'an
        1SG.NOM STAT-take care of ACC child   1SG.GEN
        'I take care of my children.'

     b. yako   'oki' **ka-lahan/*ma-lahan** ka korkoring
        1SG.NOM NEG   STAT-take.care.of   ACC child
        'I do not take care of (the) children.'

     c. 'izi' 'i   **ka-lahan/*ma-lahan** ka korkoring
        NEG   LIG STAT-take.care.of   ACC child
        'Don't take care of (the) children.'

     d. wa-ila   **ta-ka-lahan/*ta-ma-lahan** ka korkoring
        come-ASP   MOD-STAT-take.care.of   ACC child
        'Come take care of (the) children.'

     e. **pa-ka-lahan/*pa-ma-lahan** ni 'oya' ka   korkoring
        CAUS-STAT-take.care.of   GEN mother ACC   child
        'Ask mother to take care of (the) children.'

---

12. There is no one-to-one correspondence between different types of verbs in English and in the Formosan languages, and often one has to rely—as with *malahan* 'take care of'—on the morphological shape of the verb, as well as its morphophonological alternations to determine whether it is stative or dynamic.

(15) a. yako   **ma-skes** a   tomalan
         1SG.NOM   STAT-cold LIG   very
         'I am very cold.'

   b. yako   kayzaeh, kai' **ka-skes/*ma-skes**
         1SG.NOM   good   NEG   STAT-cold
         'I feel fine, I am not cold.'

   c. So'o   **ka-skes-en/*ma-skes-en** ila
         2SG.NOM   STAT-cold-PF   ASP
         'You have caught a cold.'

The second type of evidence lies in the formation of reciprocals. Dynamic verbs undergo C*a*- reduplication, as for example *kita'* 'see' ~ *kakita'* 'see each other, meet', *shombet* 'beat' ~ *shashebet* 'beat each other', *showaw* 'chase' ~ *shashowaw* 'chase each other'. Stative verbs, on the other hand, are prefixed by *maka-k-,* as in *shiae'* 'happy' ~ *maka-k-shiae'* 'play', *sarara'* 'like, love' ~ *maka-k-sarara'* 'like/ love each other', *sekela'* 'know' ~ *maka-k-skela'* 'know each other', etc. While the formation of this prefix is still not well understood, it can be ascertained that it also undergoes a morphological alternation (*m* ~ *p*) in the same environments as above. As an illustration, consider the following examples:

(16) a. yami   'ina   **makakshiae'**
         1PL.EXCL.NOM   ASP   REC.happy
         'We played (together).'

   b. yami   'oka' 'i   **pakakshiae'/*makakshiae'**
         1PL.EXCL.NOM   NEG   LIG   REC.happy
         'We did not play (together).'

   c. 'izi' 'i   **pakakshiae'/*makakshiae'**
         NEG   LIG   REC.happy
         'Don't play.'

   d. yami   'i'ini' 'i   **pakakshiae'/*makakshiae'**
         1PL.EXCL.NOM   NEG   LIG   REC.happy
         'We have not played (together) yet.'

(17) a. yami   **makakskela'**
         1PL.EXCL.NOM   REC.know
         'We know each other.'

   b. ita   **ta-pakakskela'/*ta-makakskela'**
         1PL.INCL.NOM   MOD-REC.know
         'Let's (get to) know each other.'

Note, finally, that the "degree" of dependency of dynamic and stative verbs depends on whether or not they occur just after the negator. When they do not, they appear in their nondependent forms, as the following examples show:

(18) a. ma'an korkoring too 'okay **si'ael/*s<om>i'ael** (ray) ratal
         1SG.GEN child   three NEG   eat/*eat<AF>   (at)   outside
         'My three children are not eating outside.'

   a'. ma'an korkoring too 'okik (ray) ratal   **s<om>i'ael/*si'ael**
         1SG.GEN child   three NEG   (at)   outside eat<AF>/*eat
         'My three children are not outside eating.'

    b. ma'an korkoring too 'okay **pakakshiae'/*makakshiae'**(ray)ratal
        ISG.GEN child   three NEG   REC.happy   (at) outside
        'My three children are not playing outside.'

    b'. ma'an korkoring too 'okik (ray)ratal   **makakshiae'/*pakakshiae'**
        ISG.GEN child   three NEG   (at)   outside REC.happy
        'My three children are not outside playing.'

3.2 THE STATUS OF '*I* AND *K*-. Having shown that stative verbs (like dynamic verbs) occur in their dependent forms when they are positioned (just) after the negators *'oka', 'izi',* and *'i'ini',* let us now examine the status of *'i* and *k*-.

One major argument that can be advanced, at this stage, to prove that there is one (and only one) ligature occurring after the negators *'oka','izi',* and *'i'ini* (i.e., *'i*) and that *-k* is, in fact, a marker of stativity (that usually shows up on [–dependent] stative verbs) is that if a (stative) verb is (properly) marked for stativity—that is, if the morphological change *ma- ~ ka-* takes place, or if a verbal prefix (e.g., *maka-k-* 'reciprocal', *pa-k-* 'causative') contains *k*-, then only *'i* is heard after the negator, as in (19). If the (stative) verb undergoes no such morphological alternation, then *k*- is attached to the ligature *'i-k* (instead of being attached to the verb), as a result of phonological blending, as in (20).

(19) a. yako   'oki/kai'/*'okik *ka-skes*
        ISG.NOM NEG   STAT-cold
        'I am not cold.'

    b. yako   'i'ini' 'i/*'ik *ka-lahan*   ka   korkoring
        ISG.NOM NEG   LIG   STAT-take.care.of   ACC   child
        'I do not take care of children yet.'

    c. 'izi'   'i/*'ik   *paka-k-shiae'*
        NEG   LIG   REC-STAT-happy
        'Don't play (together).'

    d. 'izi'   'i/*'ik   *pa-k-mais*
        NEG   LIG   CAUS-STAT-hard
        'Don't make it hard.'

(20) a. yako   'okik   *Ø-sarara'* hisia
    a'. yako   'oka' 'i-k-/*'i   *Ø-sarara'* hisia
        ISG.NOM NEG   LIG-STAT/*LIG   like   3SG.ACC
        'I do not like him.'

    b. 'i'ini' 'i-k-/*'i   *Ø-sizaeh*
        NEG   LIG-STAT/*LIG   finish
        'It is not finished yet.'

As a matter of fact, the same phonological contrast is found in causative constructions. Compare *pa-ka-lahan* 'make s.o. take care of' vs. **pa-k-kalahan* and *pa-k-kerpe:* 'make s.o. fat' vs. **pa-kerpe:*.

3.3 'OKA', 'IZI', AND 'I'INI' VS. KAYNI'. It has been shown that verbs occurring after *'oka', 'izi',* and *'i'ini'* differ from those occurring after *kayni'* in their degree of dependency. One reason that can be advanced to account for this discrepancy lies in the fact that *kayni'* is a verb, usually glossed by Saisiyat speak-

ers in Chinese as the equivalent of 'not want', as in (21), while in (22) it has been grammaticalized as a negator. It behaves like other (lexical) verbs in that the embedded verb occurs in its nondependent form, and no ligature occurs between the two verbs (23)–(24).

(21)   yako   **kayni'**   hisia
        1SG.NOM   not:want   3SG.ACC
        'I do not want him.'

(22)   yako   **kayni'**   *(*'i)*   rima'
        1SG.NOM   NEG   (*LIG)   go
        'I do not want to go.'

(23) a. yako   **kayni'**   *s\<om\>i'ael*
            1SG.NOM   NEG   eat\<AF\>
            'I do not want to eat.'

      b. yako   **kayni'**   ma-lahan   ka   korkoring
            1SG.NOM   NEG   STAT-take.care.of   ACC   child
            'I do not want to take care of (the) children.'

(24) a. yako   **shomiwa:** ka korkoring *s\<om\>i'ael* ka pazay
            1SG.NOM   agree   ACC child   eat\<AF\>   ACC rice
            'I agreed that the child eat rice.'

      b. yako   **shomiwa:** hi 'oya'   *ma-halan*   ka korkoring
            1SG.NOM   agree   ACC mother   STAT-take.care.of ACC child
            'I agreed that mother take care of (the) children.'

The grammaticalization of *kayni'* in Saisiyat is reminiscent of that of *malax* 'give up' in Mayrinax Atayal, where the LF (imperative) form *laxi* is now used as one of the two imperative negators (see Huang 1995:168ff).

(25) Mayrinax Atayal (based on Huang 1995)
      a. **m-alax**-ci'   cu' quwaw
          AF-give.up-1SG.NOM   ACC wine
          'I do not want wine.' (p. 168)

      b. **lax-i**   ku' xuil
          give.up-LF   NOM dog
          'Give up the dog.'

      c. **laxi** ku' m-nubuwag cu' quwaw
          NEG NOM AF-drink   ACC wine
          'Don't drink wine!'

4. CONCLUSION. In this squib, I have demonstrated that both dynamic and stative verbs cooccur with *'oka', 'iði',* and *'i'ini'* in their [+dependent] forms, and *'i* is indeed a ligature but *'ik* is not. I have also accounted for the distributional differences between *'oka', 'iði',* and *'i'ini',* on the one hand, and *kayni'* on the other. This squib also helps confirm one hypothesis of Zeitoun and Huang (2000), that Saisiyat has undergone (or may still be undergoing) a process termed "phonological blending" in that earlier paper, whereby a syllable is attracted to the one preceding and thus makes it more difficult to identify the function of *k* (< -*ka*) as a marker of stativity.

REFERENCES

Chang, Anna. 1997. Cognition and utterance constructions in some Formosan lan-
    guages. In *Papers for the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguis-
    tics,* 109–130. Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office), Academia Sinica.
Huang, Lillian M. 1995. *The study of Mayrinax syntax.* Taipei: Crane Publishing.
Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 1978. A comparative vocabulary of Saisiyat dialects. Bulletin of the
    Institute of History and Philology, 49.2: 133–199.
Starosta, Stanley, Andrew Pawley, and Lawrence Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in
    Austronesian. In *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian
    Linguistics,* vol. 2, *Tracking the travellers,* ed. by Amran Halim, Lois Carrington,
    and S. A. Wurm, 145–170. Series C-75. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
Yeh, Mei-li. 1991. Saisiyat structure. M.A. thesis, National Tsing-hua University (Hsinchu).
———. 1997. Pivotal constructions in some Formosan languages. In *Papers for the
    Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics,* 85–108. Institute of
    Linguistics (Preparatory Office), Academia Sinica.
———. 2000a. *A reference grammar of Saisiyat* (in Chinese). Series on Formosan Lan-
    guages, 2. Taipei: Yuanliou Publishing.
———. 2000b. The syntax and semantics of Saisiyat negators. In *Grammatical analy-
    sis: Morphology, syntax and semantics: Studies in honor of Stanley Starosta,* ed. by
    Videa DeGuzman and Byron W. Bender, 325–347. Honolulu: University of
    Hawai'i Press.
———. 2000c. The uses and functions of KA in Formosan languages. Paper presented
    at the Ninth International Conference on Chinese Linguistics, Singapore, June
    25–27.
Yeh, Marie M., Lillian M. Huang, Elizabeth Zeitoun, Anna H. Chang, and Joy J. Wu.
    1998. A Preliminary Study on Negative Constructions in Some Formosan Lan-
    guages. In *Papers from the Second International Symposium on Languages in Tai-
    wan,* ed. by Shuan-fan Huang, 79–110. Taipei: Crane Publishing.
Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 2000. Dynamic and stative verbs in Mantauran (Rukai). *Oceanic
    Linguistics* 39:415–427.
Zeitoun, Elizabeth, and Lillian M. Huang. 200. Concerning *ka-,* a marker of verbal der-
    ivation in Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39:391–414.

Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office),
    Academia Sinica
11529 Nankang, Taipei
Taiwan, ROC
hsez@ccvax.sinica.edu.tw