



Notes on a Possessive Construction in the Formosan Languages

Author(s): Elizabeth Zeitoun

Source: *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications*, No. 29, Grammatical Analysis: Morphology, Syntax, and Semantics (2000), pp. 241-257

Published by: [University of Hawai'i Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20000151>

Accessed: 06/09/2013 04:31

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Hawai'i Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

15: NOTES ON A POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTION IN THE FORMOSAN LANGUAGES

Elizabeth Zeitoun
Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica

1. Introduction¹

Three types of possessive constructions can be distinguished in the Formosan languages, as exemplified in (1–3).²

(1) Tsou (Tfuya)

- a. pan to peisu-si
exist OBL money-his
'He has money.'
- b. pan to peisu ta moʔo
exist OBL money OBL Mo'o
'Mo'o has money.'

(2) Tsou (Tfuya)

- a. ʔe tposi eni zou nu-taini
NOM book this be POSS-his
'This book is his.'
- b. ʔe tposi eni zou nu ta moʔo
NOM book this be POSS OBL Mo'o
'This book is Mo'o's.'

-
1. I would like to acknowledge the financial support of the National Science Council for the three-and-a-half-year project entitled "A Typological Study of Grammatical Relations in Some Formosan languages, I–III," under which this paper was written. This project began in December 1993 and was supervised by Lillian M. Huang. I am indebted to Marie Yeh, Anna Chang, Joy Wu, and Dorinda Liu for providing data on Saisiyat, Paiwan, Amis, and Kavalan, respectively. Data on Tsou, Rukai, Bunun, and Atayal come from my own fieldwork, unless noted otherwise. The source from which examples of other languages are drawn is only mentioned once, where the first example occurs in this study. With the exception of Puyuma and Kavalan, I have personally checked all the sources I drew upon and in so doing was able to elicit additional examples. I am, of course, solely responsible for errors I may have made in reanalyzing the material at hand. I am grateful to Videa De Guzman and Ray Freeze for comments on an earlier version of this paper. Last, but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to Stanley Starosta for his support and constructive criticisms over the years.
2. Abbreviations in the glosses include: ACC, accusative; AF, Agent Focus; ART, article; COP, copula; GEN, genitive; LF, Locative Focus; LIN, linker; LOC, locative; NOM, nominative; OBL, oblique; P, preposition; POSS, possessive; RED, reduplication; s, singular. In some cases, irrelevant glosses that may appear in the original works in which the data are found have been intentionally omitted.

(3) Tfuya Tsou

- a. mo tuyo ʔo ʔo-ʔoko-si
 AF three NOM RED-child-his
 'He has three children.'
- b. mo tuyo ʔo ʔo-ʔoko to moʔo
 AF three NOM RED-child OBL Mo'o
 'Mo'o has three children.'

What makes these examples different from their corresponding nonpossessive counterparts is the fact that the theme has to be "formally" possessed. (1a–b) are structurally identical to existential sentences: these are headed by the existential verb *pan* 'exist', which is followed by a theme NP (possessed entity) and eventually a locative phrase (possessor). (2) and (3) are characterized by the nonoccurrence of the existential *pan*: (2) is an equational/nominal sentence; (3) is, on the other hand, a verbal sentence with the quantifier/numeral *tuyo* 'three' used as the main lexical verb of the sentence.

In the present essay, I deal only with the possessive type of structure found in (1) and compare it in the following Formosan languages (dialects): Central Amis (Changpin), Sqliq Atayal (Wufeng), Bunun (Isbukun), Kavalan (Hsinshe), Northern Paiwan, Puyuma (Nanwang), Rukai (Mantauran and Budai), Saisiyat (Tungho), Seediq (Paran and Truku). Remaining problems in Tsou are outlined in the conclusion. For ease of comparison, I restrict myself to the study of affirmative sentences. Remarks on negative sentences are made just in passing, when relevant to the discussion. Taking Freeze's (1991) study as a starting point (section 2) but departing from him in some respects, I try to show in section 3 that the Formosan languages exhibit either one or two *have*-structures that differ not only semantically but also syntactically. My aim is twofold. On the one hand, I examine the syntactic variation among languages that share the same structure and on the other hand, I analyze the semantic differences yielded by the use of these two structures in languages where they both coexist. In so doing, careful attention is paid to (i) the marking of the verb and (ii) the marking of the nominal arguments.

Though this essay is not framed in any particular formal theory, I hope that the typological analysis provided here will contribute to a better understanding of this type of sentential structure in the Formosan languages.

2. Freeze's (1991) Proposal

Working in GB theory, Freeze (1991; 1992) proposes a cross-linguistic analysis³ that relates existential, possessive, and locative constructions.⁴ While I do not agree with all his assumptions and conclusions, his two articles contain some interesting impli-

3. Freeze's (1991) study is illustrated mainly with examples taken from Austronesian languages other than Formosan, while his 1992 investigation includes languages belonging to different families.

4. This hypothesis is not new. It is also found in Lyons 1967, Kuno 1971, Clark 1978, and Huumo 1996, among others.

cations concerning language universals. To me, they shed light on syntactic and semantic variation that can be observed in the Formosan languages but that has never been systematically compared and accounted for. In this section, I briefly summarize his study, indicate those respects in which I disagree with him, and present the line of reasoning I will pursue in section 3.

Freeze's main purpose is to demonstrate that existential, possessive, and locative constructions are all derived from the same D-structure, a structure that involves a preposition at the head of the predicate phrase, a theme, and a locative. For him, variation among languages is "very restricted" and "highly predictable."⁵ He argues that

5. There are two cross-linguistic generalizations to be found in the Formosan languages that I will not develop further in the course of this study. One concerns the fact that there is no restriction concerning the nature of the possessed NP: it may refer to a [\pm human] or [\pm animate] entity, as shown in (i. a–c):

(i) Truku Seediq (Tsukida 1999:626)

- a. niqan bubu-na ka laqi nii
exist mother-3S.GEN NOM child this
'This child has a mother.'
- b. niqan kiŋal katin-na ka senaw nii
exist one cow-3S.GEN NOM man this
'This man has a cow.'
- c. niqan patas-na ka laqi nii
exist book-3S.GEN NOM child this
'This child has a book.'

On the other hand, as pointed out by Freeze (1991, 1992), the possessor is usually [\pm human]. In examples of this sort, there is no restriction concerning the relation of possession. That is, it may refer to an inalienable or to an alienable relationship. If the possessor is [\pm human], the possessed entity must bear some kind of inherent relationship with it. Hence, while (ii. a–b) are grammatical examples, only (iii. a) but not (iii. b) is acceptable. The use of the locative preposition *i* in (iii. c) gives back the example its grammaticality but prevents it from getting a possessive interpretation.

(ii) Central Amis

- a. ira ku kahəŋəŋay a ŋosoŋ ni aki
exist NOM red LIN nose GEN Aki
'Aki has a red nose.'
- b. ira ku pusi ni aki
exist NOM cat GEN Aki
'Aki has a cat.'

(iii) Central Amis

- a. ira ku kahəŋəŋay a papah nu kilan
exist NOM red LIN leave GEN tree
'The tree has red leaves.'
- b. *ira ku pusi nu kilan
exist NOM cat GEN tree
- c. ira ku pusi i kilan
exist NOM cat LOC tree
'There is a cat on the tree.'

the difference between existential and locative constructions can be reduced to a simple movement in the Spec IP (left empty at D-structure) of one of the two NPs as a result of definiteness: if the theme is definite, it moves into the subject position, and the sentence turns into a locative construction. If, on the other hand, the theme is indefinite, the locative phrase moves into the subject position, and the sentence is given an existential interpretation. In this context, Freeze shows that two *have*-structures can be distinguished in the Austronesian languages. The first (denoted by H_1) is locative in nature and thus shares the same structure as the existential. That is, the locative phrase, usually introduced by a preposition, is the subject of the sentence. The second (denoted by H_2) is not locative and differs from the former in that (i) it has a DP predicate instead of a PP predicate, (ii) the theme is the subject of the sentence, and (iii) the copula may agree with the theme argument. Despite these differences, Freeze posits that the second structure shares many properties with the first, because of the presence of a locative copula—usually the same as the one occurring in existential sentences—and the fact that the possessor is semantically interpreted as a location. The following two pairs of examples illustrate the parallelism between existential (a) and possessive (b) sentences in Kiribati and Palawan. Kiribati exemplifies the first possessive structure and Palawan, the second. The subject in each sentence is enclosed in brackets for the sake of clarity.

- (4) Kiribati (adapted from Freeze 1991:5)
- a. iai booki [iaon te taibora]
COP book on ART table
'There are some books on the table.'
 - b. iai tabeua boki [irou-n te m^wm^aaane]
COP some book to-him the man
'The man has (some) books.'
- (5) Palawan
- a. ŋ-ŋar-ŋii a bilis [er a sers-ek]
3s-be-it dog P garden-my
'There is a dog in my garden.' (Freeze 1992:563)
 - b. ŋ-ŋar [a berrul aʔad]
3s-be raft-his man
'The man has a raft.' (lit. the man's raft is) (from Freeze 1991:8)

Some languages, such as Palawan, exhibit only one of these two structures, while others, like Kiribati, may display both. Compare (6a) and (6b).

- (6) Kiribati (adapted from Freeze 1991:5)
- a. iai tabeua boki [irou-n te m^wm^aaane]
COP some book to-him the man
'The man has (some) books.'
 - b. iai [am boki]
COP your book
'Do you have a book?'

To account for the coexistence of the two different *have*-structures in the same language, Freeze (1991:12) suggests that H_2 be interpreted as “an assertion of ownership by the ‘possessor’”. The locative H_1 does coexist with such a structure: the H_2 for inalienable possession and the H_1 for alienable possession.”

In my opinion, one of the main contributions of Freeze’s (1991) study lies in the distinction he makes between these two *have*-structures, which exhibit not only syntactic variation but may also yield a different interpretation (alienable vs. inalienable relation) in languages where they coexist. Below, I will also argue that the Formosan languages exhibit two different *have*-structures. Though we seem to reach the same conclusion, my own interpretation of the data differs from Freeze’s in at least three fundamental respects, however.

Concerning the marking of nominal arguments, Freeze makes the following assumptions: (i) in H_1 , the locative phrase is the subject of the sentence, as a result of the “definiteness effect”; (ii) the locative phrase/possessor is usually preceded by a preposition, as in Kiribati; (iii) there are languages such as Tagalog where a preposition occurs in existential but not in possessive sentences, because they make a distinction between [+human] vs. [–human] subjects. Compare for instance (7a) and (7b).

(7) Tagalog (from Freeze 1992:585)

- a. may gera sa ewropa
COP war in Europe
‘There is a war in Europe.’
- b. may relos ang naanai
COP watch ART mom
‘Mom has a watch.’

Contrary to what Freeze demonstrates, in most, if not all, Formosan languages, the “definiteness effect” does not play any role in the selection of the theme or the locative phrase as subject in existential vs. locative constructions. (For details, see Zeitoun et al. 1999.) This claim is mainly supported by case assignment properties. That is, it is the theme that is usually marked as nominative.⁶ On the other hand, there are languages where the locative phrase is the subject of the sentence, but in this case, no preposition precedes the possessor, because it is marked as nominative. Finally, in many languages, existential sentences are, to some extent, parallel to possessive sentences, but while the locative phrase is preceded by a locative preposition in the former, it is marked by the genitive in the latter. In such constructions, the theme is the subject of the sentence, as the following examples taken from Central Amis reveal.

(8) Central Amis

- a. ira [ku wawa] i paputal
exist NOM child LOC outside
‘There are children outside.’

6. This analysis also departs from what has been commonly assumed regarding the Formosan languages, for example, that existential/possessive sentences are subjectless (cf. Li 1973:178ff).

- b. ira [paysu ni panay]
 exist money GEN Panay
 'Panay has money.'

Regarding the marking of the copula, Freeze establishes a distinction between 'have' (H_1) and 'be' (H_2): while the first is unmarked, the second is said to usually agree with the theme. Though I am not at all familiar with the languages Freeze deals with, it seems clear, looking at the data provided to support his analysis, that (i) in many languages (e.g., Kiribati as in [6b], K'ekchi', etc.), there is no such agreement on the copula and (ii) in languages (e.g., Palawan, Tongan) where agreement is found, it also occurs in existential sentences. Compare for instance (5a) and (5b). This may lead us to wonder about the well-foundedness of the distinction established between 'have' and 'be'. In the Formosan languages, there seems to be no such pronominal agreement in this type of possessive construction. What we do find, on the other hand, is that in possessive sentences where the locative phrase is the subject, the verb may be marked by the *-an* suffix, whereas in sentences where the theme is subject, the occurrence of *-an* is prohibited. Thus while (9a) is correct, (9b) is totally ungrammatical.

- (9) Isbukun Bunun
 a. ?aið(a)-an-ik ?uvað
 exist-*an*-IS.NOM child
 'I have a child.'
 b. *?aið(a)-an ?inak ?uvað
 exist-*an* my child

Freeze emphasizes that the variation between the two structures is reflected at D-structure: H_1 involves a prepositional phrase as the head of the predicate, H_2 a noun. I have several comments regarding this claim: (i) based on a fair amount of evidence, I have shown (Zeitoun et al. 1999) that, in most Formosan languages, the existential morpheme heading existential, possessive, and locative constructions should be treated as a (full lexical) verb;⁷ (ii) if the distinction established between these two structures is made in terms of "transitivity," there is no need to posit different structures of this sort at D-structure; and (iii) in most Formosan languages, the two *have*-structures exhibit exactly the same syntactic characteristics as those found in existential constructions.

In conclusion, I believe, like Freeze but for different reasons, that two *have*-structures can be distinguished in the Formosan languages and that this distinction should be based on subject selection. In the first structure, the existential/locative verb behaves as a two-place predicate with the theme/possessed entity marked as accusative or oblique and the locative phrase/possessor as nominative. This construction can be glossed as 'Y has X'.⁸ In the second, the existential/locative verb is (in most cases) a one-place predicate. The theme/possessed entity is, in any case, marked as nominative, while the syntactic role of the possessor varies among languages. This second

7. In a recent paper, Yeh (1998) has provided additional data on Saisiyat supporting this claim.

8. The distinction established in the glosses 'have' vs. 'exist' is made only for the sake of convenience.

construction corresponds to ‘Y’s X exists’. In the next section, I present a typological study of these two structures in the Formosan languages.

3. Two *have*-Structures in the Formosan Languages

The main purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the possessive construction by highlighting the major characteristics and idiosyncracies of each language and showing in what respects they differ from one another.

My presentation of the data requires a few explanations. First, in order to be able to compare the data at hand, I have been careful to choose the same kind of examples in each language (e.g., “he has money” or “John has a child”). Second, in the linguistic networks/families (e.g., Rukai or Seediq) where two or more dialects display interesting divergences, I have included the two most representative ones for comparative purposes. Third, only semantic alternations will be discussed in section 3 when comparing languages that display the two *have*-structures.

I first consider languages where the structure ‘Y has X’ is found. I then turn to languages where the structure ‘Y’s X exists’ occurs, before dealing with a set of languages where the two structures coexist. I pay particular attention to the variation that exists among these languages in the marking of the verb and its nominal arguments.

3.1 Y Has X

In Paran Seediq, Bunun Isbukun, Saisiyat, and Kavalan, the first structure ‘Y has X’ is found. The verb is a two-place predicate, with the possessor marked as nominative and the theme as oblique/accusative.⁹

- (10) a. Paran Seediq (from Chang 1997a)
 niqan-ku laqi
 exist-IS.NOM child
 ‘I have a child.’
- b. Isbukun Bunun
 ʔaið(a)-an-ik ʔuvað
 exist-LF-IS.NOM child
 ‘I have a child.’
- (11) a. Tungho Saisiyat (Marie Yeh, pers. comm.)
 yako hayðæh ka rayhil
 IS.NOM have ACC money
 ‘I have money.’
- b. Hsinshe Kavalan (from Lee 1997:125)
 yau-iku tu kerisiw
 exist-IS.NOM ACC money
 ‘I have money.’

9. Some languages do not make any distinction between accusative, locative, and genitive, but exhibit an oblique case marker that takes over these functions.

The most striking difference between these two sets of languages concerns the marking of the verb. In Bunun and Seediq, the verb is marked with the suffix *-an*,¹⁰ whereas in Saisiyat and Kavalan, the verb is unmarked. Chang (1997a) claims that in Paran Seediq, the verb has been grammaticalized and that the suffix *-an* is already fossilized, and thus that it has nothing to do with focus/voice. Chang's analysis is based, in fact, on what I believe to be a wrong assumption, that the theme should be analyzed as the subject of the sentence, and thus bear the nominative case. Because the theme NP is (usually) unmarked for case in such a structure, he argues in support of his point of view that if *niqan* were really a verb marked as LF, the pronoun occurring on the verb should be in the genitive case. However, it is not, as the ungrammaticality of (12) reveals.

(12) Paran Seediq (from Chang 1997a)

**niqan-mu* *kiqan laqi*
 exist-1S.GEN one child

Lin (1996), on the other hand, was the first to call attention to the occurrence of the LF *-an* suffix in Bunun possessive sentences. Like him, I believe that in Bunun and Paran Seediq, the verb is marked as LF. This analysis is supported by (i) subject selection and (ii) coreference restrictions. The grammatical variation exemplified in Bunun in (13a, b) shows that the verb suffixed by *-an* can only select a locative phrase (i.e., the possessor) as subject of the sentence, as is the case in Paran Seediq. On the other hand, if it remains unmarked, as in (13c), it cannot take the locative phrase as its subject. In Paran Seediq, the nominative pronoun *yaku*, preceded by the nominative marker *ka*, is coreferent with the pronominal suffix *-ku* attached to the verb, and thus the theme cannot be marked simultaneously as nominative.

(13) Isbukun Bunun

- a. *?aið(a)-an-ik* *?uvað*
 exist-LF-1S.NOM child
 'I have a child.'
- b. **?aið(a)-an ?inak* *?uvað*
 exist-LF my child

10. In negative sentences, Isbukun Bunun differs from Paran Seediq, in that the former, but not the latter, exhibits a negator marked by the suffix *-an* in this type of construction. Compare the grammaticality of (i) and (ii):

(i) Isbukun Bunun

?uka-an-ik *?uvað*
 not.exist-LF-1S.NOM child
 'My child does not exist.'

(ii) Paran Seediq

- a. *uka-ku* *laqi*
 not.exist-1S.NOM child
 'I have no child.'
- b. **uka-an-ku* *laqi*
 not.exist-LF-1S.NOM child

- c. *ʔaið(a)-ik ʔuvað
exist -IS.NOM child

- (14) Paran Seediq (based on Chang 1997a)
niq-an-ku laqi (ka yaku)
exist-LF-IS.NOM child NOM IS
'I have a child.'

Other variation among these four languages can be observed, most notably the position of sentential arguments—Saisiyat is turning into an SVO language—and the use of bound/free pronouns. Abstracting word order and pronominal variation, these two pairs of examples can be schematized as in (15).

- (15) a. Paran Seediq and Isbukun Bunun
exist-*an* [Y]_{NOM} [X]_{ACC} (lit. 'Y is the place where X exists')
b. Saisiyat and Kavalan
exist/has [Y]_{NOM} [X]_{ACC} (lit. 'Y has X')

A word should be said about Puyuma, where, for reasons still unaccounted for, this structure is found only in negative and not in affirmative sentences.

- (16) Nanwang Puyuma (from Tan, 1997:86ff)
a. *ulaya-ku qa paisu
exist-IS.NOM OBL money
b. unian-ku qa paisu
NEG-IS.NOM OBL money
'I have no money.'

3.2 Y's X Exists

The second and most prominent structure 'Y's X exists' is found in various languages, including some of those mentioned above. However, the variation among these languages, as well as among dialects belonging to the same language, is extensive.

What characterizes these languages mostly is that the possessive construction is headed by an existential verb unmarked for focus that introduces a single (nominative) NP. The theme (or possessed entity) is the head of this constituent; the possessor may be expressed by means of a pronoun or a noun as an attribute. Variation among these languages includes the following:

- (a) VERB FORMATION. In Amis and Paiwan, the existential verb can be analyzed as the fusion of the locative preposition *i* and the demonstrative 'that'. In Budai,¹¹ the existential verb is made almost exactly on the same pattern,

11. While the verb formation of *yakai* is quite transparent in Budai, it is rather opaque in Mantauran Rukai. For one thing, I am quite unable to account for the occurrence of *om-* (> *om-iki*) in Mantauran Rukai, a language that, like the other Rukai dialects, is characterized by the absence of focus marking. Besides, the root *iki* has nothing to do with the demonstratives found in this language (cf. *ʔina* 'this', *ana* 'that', *ðona* 'that').

except that *i-* is, in this language, used as a verbalizer; *kai* means ‘this’ and the verb is inflected for tense/aspect (cf. realis *a-*; for details, see Zeitoun et al. 1999). In Kavalan, *yau* also means ‘that’.

(b) NOMINAL CASE MARKING OF THE THEME. The Wufeng dialect of Atayal is part of the Suliq branch, where nominative NPs have become unmarked for case. In Paiwan, no case marker seems to occur before the noun phrase. This is due to the elision of one of the two juxtaposed identical vowels (*izua* *a* > *izua*).¹² In Puyuma, Tan (1997) has shown that the nominative case does not occur before a possessed noun. In Mantauran Rukai, nominative NPs are usually unmarked for case.

(c) MARKING AND POSITION OF THE POSSESSOR INDICATED THROUGH PRONOMINAL MEANS. In some languages, the bound pronoun may precede the head noun, as in Paiwan and Puyuma; in others (e.g., Amis, Atayal, Kavalan, Bunun, and Rukai) it can only follow.

(d) MARKING AND POSITION OF THE POSSESSOR INDICATED THROUGH NOMINAL MEANS. The possessor may be preceded by (i) a genitive case marker, as in Amis, Atayal, Paiwan, and Kavalan, or (ii) by an oblique case marker, as in Puyuma and Budai Rukai. In both instances, word order variation is rather restricted, with the possessor usually following the head noun. In Mantauran Rukai, the possessor is unmarked and may either precede or follow the head noun. In Nichols’s (1986) terms, most languages (except Puyuma and Mantauran Rukai) behave like “dependent-marking” languages, that is, the possessive relation is marked on the modifier by means of nominal case marking. Puyuma exhibits a double marking: the two nominal arguments are marked. Mantauran Rukai displays, on the other hand, a head-marking pattern in which the possessive relation is marked on the modifiee/theme.

Variation of these types can be seen in the following examples.

(17) Central Amis

- a. ira ku wawa-aku
exist NOM child-my
‘I have (a) child.’
- b. ira ku wawa ni panay
exist NOM child GEN Panay
‘Panay has a child.’

12. The case marker *a* is not elided if the existential verb is followed by a morpheme ending in a consonant (e.g., *izua-anan a*), as (i) shows:

(i) Northern Paiwan (Anna Chang, pers. comm.)
izua-anan a su-paysu
exist-still NOM your-money
‘Do you still have money?’

- (18) Wufeng Atayal
 a. cyux laqi?-mu
 exist child-my
 'I have a child.'
 b. cyux laqi? na? pilay
 exist child GEN Pilay
 'Pilay has a child.'
- (19) Northern Paiwan (from Anna Chang, pers. comm.)
 a. izua ku-paysu
 exist my-money
 'I have money.'
 b. izua paysu ni palanj
 exist money GEN Palang
 'Palang has money.'
- (20) Isbukun Bunun
 a. ?aiða? ?inak ?uvað
 exist my child
 'I have a child.'
 b. ?aiða? ?alanj tu? ?uvað
 exist Alang LIN child
 'Alang has a child.'
- (21) Hsinshe Kavalan
 a. yau sunis-ku
 exist child-my
 'I have children.' (based on Chang 1997:46)
 b. yau kerisiw ni abas
 exist money GEN Abas
 'Abas has money.' (from Dorinda Liu, pers. comm.)
- (22) Nanwang Puyuma
 a. ulaya ku-paisu
 exist my-money
 'I have money.' (from Tan, pers. comm.)
 b. ulaya tu-tiļil kan sigimulj
 exist his-book OBL Sigimuli
 'Sigimuli has a book.' (from Tan 1997:85)
- (23) Budai Rukai
 a. yakai ku paisu-li
 exist NOM money-my
 b. yakai ku paisu ki takanaw
 exist NOM money OBL Takanaw
 'Takanaw has money.'

- (24) Mantauran Rukai
- a. omiki paiso-li
exist money-my
'I have money.'
 - b. omiki paiso-ni taotao
exist money-his Taotao
'Taotao has money.'
 - c. omiki taotao paiso-ni
exist Taotao money-his
'Taotao has money.'

Mantauran Rukai exhibits another structure, one that is exemplified in (25), where the possessor is marked by the oblique case.¹³ Though unmarked for case, the theme must be treated as the subject of the sentence. This claim is based on coreference restrictions illustrated in (25b) and (25d, e), which show that the oblique pronoun occurring on the verb does not corefer with the possessed entity.

- (25) Mantauran Rukai
- a. omik-iaə [paiso]_{NOM}
exist-1S.OBL money
'I have money.'
 - b. *omik-iaə paiso-li
exist-1S.OBL money-my
 - c. omik-inə paiso
exist-3S.OBL money
'He has money.'
 - d. omik-inə_i [paiso-ni taotao]_j
exist-3S.OBL money-his Taotao
'He has Taotao's money.'

13. While the first structure 'Y's X exists' is existential in nature, the second parallels the locative construction. Compare Mantauran Rukai (i) and (ii).

- (i) a. omiki paiso ana
exist money there
'There is money there.'
- b. omiki paiso-li
exist money-my
'I have money.' (lit. 'My money exists.')
- (ii) a. omik-iaə paiso
exist-1S.OBL money
'I have money.' (lit. 'The money exists to me.')
- b. omik-iaə varəŋə-li [olai ʔapəcə
exist-1S.OBL belly-my child sleep
'The child is sleeping on my belly.'

- e. omik-inə_i ðipolo_i [paiso-ni taotao]_j
 exist-3S.OBL Dipolo money-his Taotao
 'Dipolo has Taotao's money.'

At this stage, a word should be said about Truku Seediq, which behaves a bit differently from Paran Seediq. I have attempted to show in section 3.1. that in Paran Seediq, the verb *niqan* should be analyzed as *niq-an*, a verb marked as LF that takes two nominal arguments. It is quite clear that in Truku Seediq a process of grammaticalization is under way: (i) the verb is a one-place predicate; (ii) if the possessor is indicated by means of a noun, it is marked as nominative and corefers with the suffix attached on the theme NP. This grammaticalization process is thoroughly discussed in Tsukida (1999), and I follow her analysis in this study.

(26) Truku Seediq (adapted from Tsukida, 1999)

- a. niqan laqi-mu
 exist child-my
 'I have a child.'
- b. *?niqan-ku laqi¹⁴
 [exist-IS.NOM child]
- c. niqan laqi-na ka awi
 exist child-his NOM Awi
 'Awi has a child.'

Abstracting all the variation pointed out above, we can schematize the second structure as (27a, b).

- (27) a. Amis, Atayal, Bunun, Kavalan, Paiwan, Puyuma, Rukai, Truku Seediq
 exists [X Y]_{NOM} (lit. Y's X exists)
- b. Mantauran Rukai
 exists [Y]_{OBL} [X]_{NOM} (lit. X exists to Y)

3.3 Y Has X vs. Y's X Exists

In this section, I attempt to determine the semantic variation associated with the two structures 'Y has X' and 'Y's X exists' in the three languages (Bunun, Kavalan, and Puyuma) where they are both found, and finally, to compare them with Mantauran Rukai.

In the former three languages, the same kind of semantic variation is found where both *have*-structures occur: the first structure 'Y has X' indicates inalienable or inherent possession; the second structure 'Y's X exists' refers to the existence of the possessed entity. Compare (28–29).

14. Tsukida (1999) indicates that this example is totally ungrammatical. One Seediq informant in his early sixties whom I consulted believes that it is grammatically correct when it yields the following interpretation(s): 'I am pregnant' or 'I belong to a(nother) man' (implied: having born his child). Similar examples with inanimate themes are, on the other hand, rejected.

(28) 'Y has X'

- a. Isbukun Bunun
 ?aiða-an-ik ?uvað
 exist-LF-IS.NOM child
 'I have a child.' (implied: of my own)
- b. Hsinshe Kavalan
 yau-iku tu sunis
 exist-IS.NOM ACC child
 'I have a child.' (implied: of my own)
- c. Nanwang Puyuma
 unian-ku qa paisu
 not exist-IS.NOM OBL money
 'I have no money.' (implied: of my own)

(29) 'Y's X exists'

- a. Isbukun Bunun
 ?aiða? ?inak ?uvað
 exist my child
 'I have a child.' (lit. 'My child exists.')
- b. Hsinshe Kavalan
 yau sunis-ku
 exist child-my
 'I have a child.' (lit. 'My children exist.' [may not be my own child])
- c. Nanwang Puyuma
 ulaya ku-paisu
 exist my-money
 'I have money.' (lit. 'My money exists.')

Interestingly enough, the syntactic variation found in Mantauran Rukai (cf. 'Y's X exists' vs. 'X exists at Y's place') yields the same semantic difference as that found in languages that display the two *have*-structures 'Y has X' and 'Y's X exists'. As in the other languages, 'Y's X exists' refers to the existence of the possessed entity and usually implies its presence at speech time. As for the second structure 'X exists at Y's place', it can be regarded as semantically equivalent to 'Y has X' because it indicates inalienable or inherent possession.

(30) Mantauran Rukai

- a. omiki paiso-li
 exist money-my
 'I have money.' (implied: 'My money exists.')
- b. omik-iaə paiso
 exist-IS.OBL money
 'I have money.' (implied: 'My money is here in my pocket.')

4. Conclusion

I have tried to show in this essay that the Formosan languages display either one or two *have*-structures. This has been achieved by a thorough investigation of the marking of the verb and of the nominal arguments, and in that respect, Table 1—based in part on Yeh et al. (1998) and Lin (1996)—may aid in visualizing the main syntactic variation that divides these languages.

Table 1. Verbal Marking and Case Realization of Nominal Arguments in the Two *have*-structures Found in Formosan Languages*

LANGUAGE	DIALECT	STRUCTURE	MARKING OF THE VERB	MARKING OF THE TWO NPS	
				THEME	LOCATIVE PHRASE
Seediq	Truku	Y's X exists	unmarked	GEN	NOM
Seediq	Paran	Y has X	marked by LF - <i>an</i>	NOM	ACC
Bunun	Isbukun	Y has X	marked by LF - <i>an</i>	OBL	NOM
		Y's X exists	unmarked	NOM	GEN
Saisiyat	Tungho	Y has X	unmarked	ACC	NOM
Kavalan	Hsinshe	Y has X	unmarked	ACC	NOM
		Y's X exists	unmarked	NOM	GEN or OBL
Puyuma	Nanwang	Y's X exists	unmarked	NOM	OBL
Amis	Central	Y's X exists	unmarked	NOM	GEN
Atayal	Wufeng	Y's X exists	unmarked	NOM	GEN
Paiwan	Northern	Y's X exists	unmarked	NOM	GEN
Rukai	Budai	Y's X exists	unmarked	NOM	OBL
Rukai	Mantauran	X exists to Y	marked by <i>om</i> -	NOM	OBL
		Y's X exists	marked by <i>om</i> -	NOM	GEN

* Table 1 also appears in a slightly different form in Zeitoun et al. 1999:29.

I have said nothing about Tsou, because in many respects, it does not fit into the typological picture provided above. In the early sixties, Tung (1964) pointed out the difficulty in accounting for the existential/possessive construction, and this problem, to my knowledge, has not been resolved. To conclude this essay, I would like to repeat the two of the examples given in the introduction, to call attention now in retrospect to the ways in which Tsou departs from what is found in the Formosan languages as a whole.

- (31) Tfuya Tsou
 a. pan to peisu-si
 exist OBL money-his
 'I have money.'

- b. *pan to peisu ta moʔo*
 exist OBL money OBL Mo'o
 'Mo'o has money.'

Possessive sentences differ from other types of verbal/nominal sentences in this language in at least two respects. (i) Verbal sentences are (nearly) always introduced by an auxiliary verb, whereas possessive sentences are headed by *pan* 'exist', which does not belong to the class of auxiliary verbs¹⁵ reported in this language. (ii) Verbal and nominal clauses usually include a predicate followed by at least one NP, marked as nominative, but in possessive sentences, *pan* is followed by an oblique NP. That is, the existential sentence is subjectless. Thus, we find quite a different pattern from that found in the two types of languages described above, where either the locative phrase/possessor or the theme/possessed entity is marked as nominative and thus behaves as the subject of the sentence.

Though I am leaving the question open as to how these examples should be integrated into the typological perspective presented here, an increasing number of linguists are now working on Tsou—Stanley Starosta was among the first to get interested in this language—and I am sure that no one will remain insensitive to this question.

15. Auxiliary verbs include *mo*, *mi-*, *moso*, *moh-*, *i-*, *α(h)-*, *te*, *nte*, *ta*, *tena*, *ntena*, *da*, and *ntα(h)-*, and usually carry not only focus but also temporal/aspectual distinctions. For a detailed analysis, see Tung et al. (1964), Szakos (1994), and Zeitoun (1996). Joseph Szakos (pers. comm.) believes that *pan* should be treated as a verb, because it can, for instance, be causativized, e.g., *poa-pan* . . . 'make (it) exist (come into existence) . . .'.

REFERENCES

- Bresnan, Joan, and J. Kanerva. 1989. Locative inversion in Chichewa: A case study of factorization in grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:1–50.
- Chang, Yung-li. 1997a. An outline of Seediq grammar [In Chinese]. Ms.
- . 1997b. An outline of Kavalan grammar [In Chinese]. Ms.
- . 1997c. Voice, case, and agreement in Seediq and Kavalan. Ph.D. dissertation, National Tsing-hua University.
- Clark, Eve. 1978. Locational: Existential, locative, and possessive constructions. In *Universals of human language*, vol. 4, *Syntax*, ed. by Joseph Greenberg, 85–126. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Freeze, Ray. 1991. Existentials in Austronesian. Paper read at the Sixth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. Honolulu, May 21–24.
- . 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68:553–595.
- Kuno, Susumo. 1971. The position of locatives in existential sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 333–378.
- Huang, Lillian M. 1993. *A study of Atayal syntax*. Taipei: Crane Publishing.
- Huumo, T. 1996. Bound spaces and the semantic interpretation of existentials. *Linguistics* 34:295–328.
- Lee, Pei-jung. 1997. The case marking and focus systems in Kavalan. M.A. thesis, National Tsing-hua University.
- Li, Paul. 1973. *Rukai structure*. Special Publications No. 64. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- . 1997. *The Formosan tribes and languages of I-lan county* (In Chinese). I-lan Historical Series, 1. I-lan: I-lan county government.
- Lin, Hsiu-hsu. 1996. Isbukun syntax. Ms.
- Lyons, John. 1967. A note on possessive, existential, and locative sentences. *Foundations of language* 3:390–396.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1986. Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar. *Language* 62:56–119.
- Szagos, Joseph. 1994. Die Sprache der Cou: Untersuchungen zur Synchronie einer austronesischen Sprache auf Taiwan. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Bonn.
- Tan, Cindy R. 1997. Simple sentences in Puyuma. M.A. thesis, National Normal Taiwan University.
- Tsukida, Naomi. 1999. Locative, existential, and possessive clauses in Seediq. In *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li, 599–636. Symposium Series of the Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, No. 1. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office), Academia Sinica.
- Tung, T'ung-ho, S. H. Wang, T. K. Kuan, T. F. Cheng, and Margaret M. Yan. 1964. *A descriptive study of the Tsou language, Formosa*. Institute of History and Philology, Special Publications No. 48. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Yeh, Marie M. 1998. The relationship between existential and possessive sentences in Saisiyat. Paper read at the First International Conference on Languages in Taiwan and Language Acquisition, National Hsinchu University, Hsinchu, May 31–June 1.
- Yeh, Marie M., Lillian M. Huang, Elizabeth Zeitoun, Anna H. Chang, and Joy J. Wu. 1998. A preliminary study on the negative constructions in some Formosan languages. In *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Languages in Taiwan*, ed. by Huang Shuan-fan, 79–110. Taipei: Crane Publishing.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth. 1996. The Tsou temporal, aspectual, and modal system revisited. *Bulletin of History and Philology* 67.3:503–532. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth, Lillian M. Huang, Marie M. Yeh, and Anna H. Chang. 1999. Existential, possessive, and locative constructions in the Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38:1–42.