

PRONOUNS AND VERB INFLECTION IN KANAKANAVU*

KUANG MEI

0. INTRODUCTION

The verb structure of the Kanakanavu language⁽¹⁾ may be analysed into three levels, as shown in the following diagram, where D stands for derivational affixes, I for inflectional affixes, ADV for adverbial suffixes, PN for pronominal suffixes, and parentheses for an optional occurrence:

L1: *BASE* + (D)

L2: *STEM* + (I)

L3: *INFLECTED STEM* + (ADV) + (PN)

* Research represented in this work was supported by a grant from the National Science Council, Republic of China (NSC-66H-03-01(05)). I am indebted to Professors Paul Jen-kuei Li and Ting Chih Tang for suggestions for improvement.

(1) Kanakanavu is an Austronesian language spoken by an aboriginal tribe of Taiwan of the same name now living mainly in Min Sheng Ts'un 民生村, one of the three ts'un or villages that make up the mountaineous San Min Hsiang 三民鄉, in the northern part of Kau Hsiung Hsien 高雄縣. The language is related closely to Saaroa to its south and rather distantly to Tsou—the so-called Northern Tsou—to its north, these three being the languages that comprise the Tsouic branch of the Austronesian language group on the island of Taiwan.

There are about three hundred people of Kanakanavu descent in Min Sheng Ts'un; the rest of the population in the village, by far the majority, are Bunun. The two tribes are in close contact with each other, and intertribal marriage is a common practice. As a result, the Kanakanavu people, being the minority group, are slowly but steadily losing their tribal identity. One clear sign is their speech. The Bunun language, almost to the exclusion of Kanakanavu, is the medium of daily communication in the village now.

At present, Kanakanavu, like Saaroa or even more so, is facing extinction. In spite of a twofold increase in population over the past ten years, the number of Kanakanavu speakers is rapidly diminishing. As older members of the community pass away, their knowledge of the language, together with their familiarity with the tradition and folklore of their people, is not likely to be preserved by the younger generations. The transmission of culture in any form has practically come to a halt within the Kanakanavu community owing to impacts from Bunun neighbors and, in a much greater degree, from the 'Plain' culture. During my field trips in Min Sheng, I was not able to find one single person under age forty with a good command of the Kanakanavu language. Even some older people showed deterioration in their ability to speak the language. Finding good informants who did not mix their Kanakanavu with Bunun expressions had been the single major problem during my field trips there.

I did field work in Min Sheng first in the fall of 1977 and again in the spring of 1978, each time for a period of two weeks. My primary informant on the first trip was Weng Ch'e 翁傳 (Anaiana Pa²u-Agai), a highly intelligent man in his early fifties who unfortunately died of a cancerous disease in 1979. Mr. Weng took an active interest in my project. Knowing Mandarin fairly well, he also acted as interpreter when I worked

Thus, the verb form *puacacannnkankiai* "he lets walk around" has the following structural description:

L1: BASE: *ca*, a shortened form for *cann* "road"⁽²⁾.

D:

- (1) Base *ca* is combined with the verbal prefix *u-* signifying locomotion to form *u-ca* "to walk";
- (2) the base part in *u-ca* is reduplicated (i. e., *u-ca* → *u-caca*) to mean "iterative, repetitive action"⁽³⁾;
- (3) finally, the derived form *u-caca* "to walk about" is put in the "permissive" verb form by adding to it the prefix *p-* and the infix *-a-*;

L2: STEM: *p-u-a-caca* "to let walk about".

I: The stem is inflected for object focus (Section 3) and imperfective aspect indicated by the absence of *m* (Section 2) and by the suffix *-nnt* (Section 4.1);

L3: INFLECTED STEM: *p-u-a-caca-nnt*

ADV: The modal suffix *-kan(i)* is added to the inflected stem to mean "indicative"⁽⁴⁾.

PN: *-kiai*, third person unfocused, to indicate the "actor", in accordance with object focus for which the stem is inflected (Section 1).

with other informants. On my second trip there, I had, besides Weng Ch'e, also the invaluable assistance of his mother-in-law K'ung Chiang Ying-hua 孔江櫻花 (Apiana Pi?i) as my informant. Mrs. K'ung, 68 in 1978 and considered the most authoritative person alive on things Kanakanavu, is truly a born storyteller. Her stories all have the stylistic qualities common to the word's best folktales: simple, direct, and economical in expression, qualities which are readily appreciable even to someone who has only begun to learn the language. Several other people, including Weng Ch'e, have also made recordings of Kanakanavu folktales.

For interpretation of the texts, I have relied on the help rendered by Mrs. Chang Chiang Yue 張江月. Mrs. Chang, 48 in 1979 and sister of Mrs. K'ung, has been living away from Min Sheng for the past twenty years or so, though she regularly goes back for a visit. She is married to an elementary school principal, himself a Mainlander, and they are now living with their children in Taipei city.

A brief analysis of the grammatical structure of Kanakanavu, done by a linguist with modern training, can be found in Dr. Shigeru Tsuchida's historical study, *Reconstruction of Proto-Tsouic Phonology* (Tsuchida 1976). The part dealing with Kanakanavu syntax (pp. 36-58), though sketchy, is dependable for statements of facts. In transcribing Kanakanavu words, I have followed roughly Tsuchida's system except that I have left unmarked all stresses, which seem to carry very little functional load. For other studies of Kanakanavu morphology and syntax, the reader is referred to Ogawa & Asai 1935 and Sung 1980.

- (2) Another verb of similar meaning, *u-canu* "to walk", has retained the full form for its base. *u-ca* is a verb of Class 2b, whereas *u-canu* belongs to Class 2a. See Section 2.
- (3) See Tsuchida, p. 55f, for some discussion.
- (4) By virtue of the presence of the infix *-a-*, the verb stem *p-u-a-caca* now belongs to Class 4b. See Section 2.

This study is concerned with Kanakanavu verbal constructions at Levels 2 and 3. Although it deals chiefly with morphological analysis, our aim is to go beyond morphology in an effort to relate forms and functions within the syntactic-semantic framework. Like the other members of the Formosan language group, Kanakanavu is not typically a synthetic language (it would be more appropriately described as an agglutinating language); not only morphological processes, but also syntactic words and, more frequently still, combinations of the two are employed to express grammatical categories. Moreover, as we shall see in Section 3.3, the semantic notion *specificity of reference of noun phrase* has played a key role in our interpreting the functions of case focus, a special feature in the verbal system of Austronesian languages, which has been mistaken by some scholars for a kind of voice.

1. PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Two constituent classes may be set up for Kanakanavu personal pronouns: the Independent and the Suffixal. Independent pronouns occur freely in a sentence as nouns do, whereas suffixal pronouns are bound to a verb or to a noun. An unfocused independent pronoun (See below), however, may be attached to a verb as an enclitic.

The following are the categories of person and number of pronouns:

- 1: first person singular "I";
- 1pe: first person plural exclusive "we";
- 1pi: first person plural inclusive "we";
- 2: second person singular "thou";
- 2p: second person plural "you";
- 3: third person singular or plural "he, she, it, they".

Within the Independent and the Suffixal, a focused form and an unfocused form may be distinguished for pronouns in all categories but the third person independent, which lacks the focused form.

Genitive Pronouns appear only as suffixes, and are identical to the unfocused suffixal pronouns except in the third person.

Figure 1 gives the Kanakanavu personal pronouns.

In Tsuchida, our unfocused independent pronouns are listed under the heading "Enclitic/Suffixal", together with the suffixal pronouns in the third and fourth columns of Fig. 1. The evidence we have clearly shows that these two groups have quite different properties, since the former may freely occur in a variety of positions in a sentence. Consider the following examples:

<i>mia</i>	<i>c-um-a-kupɯ-cu-ku</i>	<i>?inia</i>
at the time	stab:AF;Neut-already-I	him:UFocInd

	Independent		Suffixal		
	Focused	Unfocused	Focused	Unfocused	Genitive
1	iiku iikia	?ikua	-ku ¹⁾ -kia	-(m)aku ²⁾	-(m)aku ²⁾
2	iikasu	kasua	-kasu	-(mu)su ²⁾	-(mu)su ²⁾
1pi	iikita	kitana	-kita	-(mi)ta ²⁾	-(mi)ta ²⁾
1pe	iikimi ¹⁾ iikia	kimia	-kimi ¹⁾ -kia	-mia	-mia
2p	iikamu	kamua	-kamu	-mu	-mu
3(p)	φ	?inia	φ, -ini ³⁾	-kiai	-ini

Fig. 1

Notes:

- 1) "The distinction between *iiku/ku* and *iikia/kia* is as follows: *iikia* and *-kia* are contrastive, whereas *iiku* and *-ku* simply indicate the first person." (Tsuchida: p. 39)
- 2) The *m*-forms are used in cases where the verb stem ends in a vowel; elsewhere the minus-*m*-forms are used. However, there are exceptions to this rule, for reasons I have yet to find out.
- 3) *-ini* is used only in a subordinate clause with *mia* "at the time when" or *nuu* "when". Elsewhere, there is no overt indication for the third person focused. Concerning the various forms of the morpheme /-ini/, Tsuchida states, "m/-ini/ has three allomorphs: *-ini*, *+ini* (enclitic), and *-i*. *-i* occurs immediately after *cania*+ (or *naapa*+)" "barely, at last", and after *+cu* "already", the sequence being realized as a sandhi form *+ci*. *+ini* occurs after other particles, and *-ini* elsewhere." (Tsuchida: p. 39)

ia, *mamacai-cu*

Top (topic marker) dead-already

The moment I stabbed him, he died.

um-a-itaru-ku ?*ai* *kasua*
wait:AF;Imperf-I uncertain you:UFocInd

Let me wait for you, then.

musukuamu *ni-ra?isi* *cacau* ?*ikua*
hurt, suffer from bite:OF;Perf dog me:UFocInd

I ache from a dog bite.

una *tia* *kari* *cau* *kasua*
there is will word person to-you:UFocInd

Someone wishes to have a word with you.

esi *mamia* ?*inia* *cu?u?u*
is keep...ing it:UFocInd think:OF;Neut

(He) keeps thinking about it.

As these sentences show, an unfocused independent pronoun may occur 1) after another pronoun; 2) after the modal particle *?ai*, 3) after a noun not in a genitive construction, and 4) after the adverb *mania* "only; directly; keep...ing". Needless to say, none of these positions may be occupied by a pronominal suffix.

An unfocused independent pronoun may blend into a preceding verb stem and thereby become something of an enclitic. Thus, for example:

<i>pakariekania cine:n</i> , from:	<i>pakari-ai-kani</i>	<i>?inia</i>	<i>cina-ini</i>
	speak:OF2-Indicative	he	mother-his

He spoke to his mother.

<i>vokua kucɯ, Usu, kakicusu...</i> from:	<i>vua-u</i>	<i>?ikua</i>	
	give:OF;Imp	me	
	<i>kucɯ</i>	<i>Usu</i>	<i>kakicu-su</i>
	if you please	p.n.	netbag-your

Please give me your netbag, Usu...

Enclitic formation is a common phonological phenomenon in this language.

The use of pronouns with respect to the focused vs. unfocused distinction is part of the complex mechanism known as 'case focus' in Austronesian linguistics. This is the topic for Section 3. For the present purposes, we are concerned only with those case relations that involve the use of this two sets of pronouns.

We may, then, distinguish between an actor focus situation and two kinds of object focus situation designated as OF1 and OF2. The way pronouns are employed in these situations is as follows:

1. The focused independent always represent the actor (Act), and are used with verb stems in AF or, in the case of the second person, vocatively. It always occurs in marked sentence-initial position;

2. The unfocused independent represent the object (Obj) in AF, or the indirect object (Objind) in OF1. (They are occasionally found to represent the (direct) object in OF1, under circumstances not yet clear to me.) Moreover, the unfocused independent may also represent either the actor or the object in OF2, and it is word order that determines which is which;

3. The focused suffixal represent the actor in AF and the (direct) object or the indirect object in OF1;

(5) *kani* has an independent form *kani* and a suffixal form *-kani*. As a particle, it usually occurs in sentence initial position and is the more emphatic of the two:

kan(i)	tia-kia	m-u-a-kusa	?inia	kavagvag
	will-I	go	there	too

I will certainly go there too.

kani suggests the speaker's commitment to factuality, likelihood, or appropriateness regarding the action or event described in the sentence. It is semantically opposed to the "uncertain" particle *?ai*. I have provisionally put them in the category of mood.

4. The unfocused suffixal always represent the actor, and are used in OF1 or OF2 (the latter in the negative context with *kuu* "never". See Section 3.2).

Figure 2 sums up the above points:

	AF		OF1			OF2	
	Act	Obj	Act	Obj	Obj _{ind}	Act	Obj
Foc Ind	×						
UFoc Ind		×		(×)	×	×	×
Foc Suf	×			×	×		
UFoc Suf			×			×	

Fig. 2

The following sentences illustrate the grammatical features of Kanakanavu pronouns just described:

I. Examples of constructions in AF:

iiku *ni-m-i-a-pacai* *ʔinia*
I:FocInd;Subj kill:AF;Perf it:UfocInd;Obj

I killed it—it is I who killed it.

iiku *ʔai* *m-u-a-canumu*
I:FocInd;Subj uncertain fetch water:AF;Imperf

I'll (go) fetch water (if no one else will)—let me go fetch water.

kaʔan-ku *amanʔŋ* *ʔinia* *t-um-umana*;
not-I:FocSuf;Subj good:OF it:UFocInd;Obj hear:Af;Neut

I don't hear it clearly (lit., well).

Note: *ʔinia* is the object of the verb *tumumana* and may occupy the position after it; *amanʔŋ* is syntactically related to the object; hence, the OF form.

um-a-itaru-ku *ʔai* *kasua*
wait:AF;Perf-I:FocSuf;Subj uncertain you:UFocInd;Obj

I would wait for you—let me wait for you, then.

II. Examples of constructions in OF1:

patikanayū-n-kan-kiai *maʔaŋilisi*
examine by touch:OF1;Perf-Indic-he:UFocSuf plump:AF

ia, *ŋua-kan* *ala-un-kiai*
Top (anaphoric pronoun)-Indic take:OF1;Imperf-he:UFocSuf;Subj

sua mali~~t~~~~n~~~~n~~ ya, kaʔan-kan ala-~~n~~-kiai
 thin:AF Top not-Indic take-he

(Those among the animals that) he felt (with his hand) and were plump, he took; (those that) were thin, he did not take.

tia-kasu itar~~n~~-n
 will-you:FocSuf;Obj wait:OF1;Imperf

I'll wait for you.

Cf. *itar~~n~~-n-kasu*: I wait for you--let me wait for you.

itar(~~n~~)-au-ku
 wait:OF1;Imp-me:FocSuf;Obj

Wait for me!

vua-(a)u-kani-kia piratiʔiji
 give:OF1-Imp-to be sure-to me:FocSuf;Obj_{Ind} a little

tia ka~~n~~-a
 will eat:OF1-(nominalizer) → food

Give me a little of the food!

sua cacau ia, tia vua-~~n~~-kiai
 dog Top will give:OF1;Imperf-he:UFocSuf;Subj

kimia
 us:UFocInd;Obj_{Ind}

As for the dog, he will give it to us—he will give us the dog.

sua nononomani iisa ia, ni-avici-kiai
 thing that Top bring:OF1;Perf-he:UFocSuf;Subj

(mu-vua) ʔiikua
 give:AF;Neut to me:UFocInd;Obj_{Ind}

That thing has been brought to me by him—he has brought me the thing.

Note: The restriction that a verb stem may not take more than one pronominal suffix makes it impossible for a focused suffixal pronoun to co-occur with an unfocused suffixal pronoun.

III. Examples of constructions in OF2:

cak~~n~~(~~n~~)-ai ʔikua ʔinia,
 stab:OF2 I:UFocInd;Subj him:UFocInd;Obj

mamacai-cu
 dead:AF-already

(As soon as) I stabbed him, (he) died.

(ni-malivali-kan sua cau-~~ini~~ mu-vua
 reply:AF;Perf-Indic people-her give:AF;Neut

<i>ʔinia</i>	<i>nanʔnakʔ,</i>)	<i>ali-avic(i)-ai-cu</i>
him:UFocInd;Obj	girl	bring away:OF2-already
<i>ʔinia</i>	<i>nanʔnakʔ</i>	<i>iisa</i>
he:UFocSuf;Subj	girl	that

He took the girl away (after her clansmen had agreed to give her to him).

<i>kuu-kiai</i>	<i>cʔʔur-ai</i>	<i>nononomani</i>
never-he:UFocSuf;Subj	look:OF2	thing

He never watched the thing.

2. CLASSIFICATION OF KANAKANAVU VERB STEMS

There are four major verb classes in Kanakanavu, each with two subclasses. In the following, each subclass is exemplified by one verb stem in various inflectional forms to illustrate the distinctive features of the class.

Ia. *ra-cʔkʔc* "step on"

	AF	OF1
Neutral	<i>r-um-a-cʔkʔcʔ</i> ⁽⁶⁾	
Imperfective	<i>r-um-a-cʔkʔcʔ</i>	<i>ra-cʔkʔc-ʔnʔ</i>
Perfective	<i>ni-r-um-a-cʔkʔcʔ</i>	<i>ni-ra-cʔkʔcʔ</i>

Ib. *ʔanaʔ* "shoot with a bow or gun"

Neut.	<i>mu-ʔanaʔʔ</i>	<i>ʔanaʔʔ</i>
Imperf.	<i>mu-a-ʔanaʔʔ</i>	<i>ʔanaʔ-ʔnʔ</i>
Perf.	<i>ni-mu-ʔanaʔʔ</i>	<i>ni-ʔanaʔʔ</i>

IIa. *ali-sʔʔl* "pull"

Neut.	<i>m-ali-sʔʔlʔ</i>	
Imperf.	<i>m-ali-sʔʔlʔ</i>	<i>ali-sʔʔl-ʔnʔ</i>
Perf.	<i>ni-m-ali-sʔʔlʔ</i>	<i>ni-ali-sʔʔlʔ</i>

IIb. *u-kusa* "go toward"

Neut.	<i>m-u-kusa</i>	<i>u-kusa</i>
Imperf.	<i>m-u-a-kusa</i>	<i>u-kusa-ʔnʔ</i>
Perf.	<i>ni-m-u-kusa</i>	<i>ni-u-kusa</i>

IIIa. *atu-ʔunu* "throw"

Neut.	<i>m-atu-ʔunu</i>	<i>ʔ-atu-ʔunu</i>
Imperf.	<i>m-atu-ʔunu</i>	<i>ʔ-atu-ʔunu-ʔnʔ</i>
Perf.	<i>ni-m-atu-ʔunu</i>	<i>ni-ʔ-atu-ʔunu</i>

IIIb. *a-cina* "wash oneself"

(6) A stem ending in a consonant is realized with an "echo vowel" *i*, *u*, or *ʔ*.

Neut.	<i>ma-cina</i>	
Imperf.	<i>ma-a-cina</i>	<i>pa-cina-un</i>
Perf.	<i>ni-m-a-cina</i>	<i>ni-p-a-cina</i>

IVa. *taku-tavala*² "understand"

Neut.	<i>taku-tavala</i> ² u	
Imperf.	<i>taku-tavala</i> ² u	<i>taku-tavala</i> ² - un u
Perf.	<i>t-in-aku-tavala</i> ² u	<i>t-in-aku-tavala</i> ² u

IVb. *tu-pulu* "sit"

Neut.	<i>tu-pulu</i>	
Imperf.	<i>tu-a-pulu</i>	<i>tu-a-pulu-unu</i>
Perf.	<i>t-in-upulu</i>	<i>t-in-upulu</i>

As is clear from the above, AF and NAF (Non-AF) are formally distinguished for verbs of Classes I-III; specifically:

	AF	NAF
I. UM (um-, mu-, -um-)		∅
II.	m-	∅
III.	m-	p-

It may be pointed out that the marking of AF by *m* is a widespread feature among Formosan languages.

To Class IV belong all irregular verbs for which no distinction between AF and NAF exists except, of course, in the imperfective, where the OF1 suffix *-unu* is present for all classes.

Note also the presence of an infixal *-a-* in the second syllable of a b-subclass verb inflected for the imperfective in AF. Thus the neutral and the imperfective are distinguished from each other in AF for all b-subclasses, but not for the a-subclasses.

By far the most interesting problem has to do with the morpheme UM for Class I verbs. UM has three allomorphs *um-*, *mu-*, and *-um-*, all occurring in the first syllable of the verb stem. Their distribution is phonologically conditioned.

um-: before a stem beginning with a vowel:

<i>ala</i> "take"
<i>um-ala</i> (Neut.)
<i>um-a-ala</i> (Imperf.)
<i>ucan</i> u "rain (v.)"
<i>um-ucan</i> u (Neut.)
<i>um-a-ucan</i> u (Imperf.)

mu-: before a stem beginning with a labial consonant or η ; namely, before
p, v, \eta:

*pana*² "shoot with a bow or gun"

*mu-pana*² $\#$ (Neut.)

*mu-a-pana*² $\#$ (Imperf.)

vua "give"

mu-vua (Neut.)

mu-a-vua (Imperf.)

\eta\#t\#n\# "cut with a polo"

mu-\eta\#t\#n\# (Neut.)

mu-a-\eta\#t\#n\# (Imperf.)

-mu-: elsewhere:

ta\eta "cry"

t-um-a\eta (Neut.)

t-um-a-ta\eta (Imperf.)

sima "play"

s-um-ima $\#$ (Neut.)

s-um-asima $\#$ (Imperf.)

ca-k\#p "pierce"

c-um-a-k\#p $\#$ (Neut.)

c-um-a-ca-k\#p $\#$ (Imperf.)

namar "burn"

n-um-amar $\#$ (Neut.)

n-um-a-namar $\#$ (Imperf.)

ka\#n "eat"

k-um-a\#n $\#$ (Neut.)

k-um-a-ka\#n $\#$ (Imperf.)

2a2a "sharpen on a whetstone"

2-um-a2a (Neut.)

2-um-a-2a2a (Imperf.)

These facts may be recapitulated by the following phonological rules in that order.

1. $UM \rightarrow mu / _ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p, \\ v, \\ \eta, \end{array} \right\}$
2. $UM + C \rightarrow C + UM$
3. $UM \rightarrow um.$

A word about the placement of the infix *-a-* is of help to clarify the imperfective situation found in the third group of examples given above. Unlike the

infixal *-um-*, *-a-* does not occur inside a morpheme. When the verb stem has a derivational prefix one syllable long, it occurs between the prefix and the base. When, however, there is no prefix in the stem, or the prefix is more than one syllable long, then it would be impossible for the infixation to occur. This situation calls for the creation of an extra syllable to fit in the infix, which is accomplished by reduplicating the initial consonant of the stem.

3. CASE FOCUS

All Kanakanavu verb stems are inflected with respect to the basic case-focus distinction /±AF/. Thus a verb is either in actor focus (AF) or in non-actor focus (NAF). Within the latter category, a verb may further be specified according to whether it is in object focus (OF1 or OF2) or in time/location focus (T/LF). Instrument focus, found in some Formosan languages, is non-existent in Kanakanavu. Here Kanakanavu manifests a simplified system.⁽⁷⁾

AF and OF are in contrast with each other mainly in head verbs; a verb in a secondary position in the verb phrase must assume the AF form unless the head verb is a non-inflectible, e.g., *kuu* "never". Because of this, we may consider AF to be syntactically the unmarked member in the basic dichotomized distinction AF/NAF. Pragmatically, however, it is not so. We have found no evidence in our data to show that in general an OF verb is more marked than an AF verb. In at least one case (Section 5) AF may even be considered the marked member of the pair.

Case focus is the syntactic basis on which selection is made of one particular case relation among others in a sentence as the point of interest of the speaker using that sentence. All languages rely on some syntactic devices, such as the active/passive distinction, to express the speaker's perspective in a sentence. Recent studies, largely by Susumu Kuno, in so-called "functional sentence perspective" have further shown that the speaker's empathy and perspective plays a crucial role behind the functioning of syntax. Austronesian languages testify to the importance of this aspect of language in a special way. Here, in the case focus system, we find a mechanically most interesting device for expressing the speaker's perspective occupying the central position of syntax. The case focus

(7) Kanakanavu shows simplicity in another respect. Unlike most Formosan languages, it does not employ different particles to distinguish between Subject (or Actor) and Object. Bunun, for example, has *ka* for the nominative and *ki* for the accusative (Jeng 1977), and Rukai reserves, among its nominal particles, *ku* and *ki* for the same distinction (Li 1973). But Kanakanavu has only one nominal particle *sua* (with *na* as a variant) for both Subject and Object, though Tsuchida (p. 37) has registered a particle, *si*, for the nominative exclusively, a form I have not been able to confirm with my data. Even if he is correct, it is still a significant fact that such a basic function word should be occurring so infrequently in the present-day language. I think that the rigid VSO word order of this language combined with its case focus device would make a case marking system for nominals entirely superfluous. This might very well have been the cause for the latter's disappearance from this language.

system in fact works very much like the familiar lazy Susan on our dinner table: Just as in the one case one turns the revolving tray to get at the desired dish, in the other case, one alternately brings different case relations into prominence by simply changing the verb form.

The functions of AF and OF are discussed in 3.1 and 3.2 respectively. One special function of the Kanakanavu case focus system, particularly of AF and OF, is to serve as the syntactic basis for marking noun phrases for different degrees of referential specificity. This problem is discussed in 3.3. 3.4 deals briefly with T/LF. Finally, 3.5 is devoted to a clarification of the differences between case focus and the more common voice.

3.1 Actor Focus

A declarative sentence may be interpreted in at least four different ways: (1) as a neutral description; (2) as a statement of contrast or comparison; (3) as a statement of comment; and, finally, (4) as a statement of exhaustive listing. (Kuno 1972) Accordingly, the English sentence *John kissed Mary* may be paraphrased as:

- (1) What happened next? John kissed Mary. (neutral description);
- (2) John kissed Mary, but Bill did not. (contrast);
- (3) Speaking of John, he kissed Mary. (comment);
- (4) Among those under discussion, it was John who kissed Mary. (exhaustive listing).

In actor focus, the constituent representing the actor may express: (1) a definite point for future reference (in a neutral description); (2) the individual entity or class to be contrasted or compared (in a statement of contrast or comparison); (3) the topic or theme (in a statement of comment); or (4) the identified entity or entities (in a statement of exhaustive listing). Here are some examples from Kanakanavu:

<i>ni-m-ia-pacai</i>	<i>Avia</i>	<i>tutui</i>		
kill:AF;Perf	p.n.	pig		
Avia has killed a pig. (neutral description)				
<i>Avia</i>	<i>ia,</i>	<i>ni-mina</i>	<i>ʔinia</i>	<i>kavaŋvaŋ</i>
p.n.	Top	drink:AF;Perf	it	also
Avia, too, drank it. (contrast)				
<i>Avia</i>	<i>ia,</i>	<i>ni-m-ia-pacai</i>	<i>tutui</i>	
p.n.	Top	kill:AF;Perf	pig	
Speaking of Avia, he killed a pig. (comment)				
<i>Avia</i>	<i>ni-m-ia-pacai</i>	<i>ʔinia</i>		
p.n.	kill:AF;Perf	it		
Avia killed it—it is Avia who killed it. (exhaustive listing)				

The first sentence appears in the normal VSO word order and is least marked. The other three sentences have marked SVO word order in which the focused

element (the actor in this case) is represented in sentence-initial position. They exemplify the two types of SVO sentences in this language: namely, the two-piece topic/comment type⁽⁸⁾ and the simple one-piece type. The former may be used for comment or contrast, whereas the latter is used exclusively for exhaustive listing.

3.2 Object Focus

Kanakanavu has two systems for object focus that are in complementary distribution (See Section 4.1):

	OF1	OF2 ⁽⁹⁾
Neut.	pana [?] ʔ	pana [?] -ai
Imperf.	pana [?] -ʔnʔ	—
Perf.	ni-pana [?] ʔ	—
Imperative	pana [?] -aʔ	—

OF1 appears in all inflectional forms (though OF1 neutrals are rare), whereas OF2 is confined to neutral only. Both OF1 and OF2 require the use of an unfocused pronoun for the object or patient (if ever a pronoun is used), but OF1 takes only suffixals (-*ini* for the neutral and -*kiai* for the imperfective) while OF2 may take either an independent or a suffixal, depending on context. When an OF2 form is used with the negative *kuu* “never”, it requires a suffixal which is attached, not to the OF2 verb stem, but to the preceding negative:

<i>kuu-ʔa-maku</i>	<i>ʔu[?]ai</i>
never-yet-I:UfocSuf	buy:OF2
I have not bought (it) yet.	

Elsewhere, an independent pronoun is required.

A declarative sentence with an OF head verb may also be interpreted in the four different ways mentioned in 3.1. Here, the constituent representing the object of the verb may express (1) a definite point for future reference (in a neutral description); (2) the individual entity or class to be contrasted or compared (in a statement of contrast or comparison); (3) the topic or theme (in a statement of comment); or (4) the identified entity or entities (in a statement of exhaustive listing). For example:

<i>ulu[?]-ai-kani</i>	<i>ʔinia</i>	<i>sua takuis-ini</i>	<i>kava-cumai</i>
take off:OF2-Indic	he	jacket-his	skin-bear
<i>mari-tupuku</i>	<i>ʔuna[?]nai</i>		
throw:AF;Neut	ground		

He took off his bearskin jacket and threw it to the ground. (neutral description)

(8) The topic marker *ia* may optionally drop but a pause must be present between the topic and the comment.

(9) OF2 is called “special focus” by Tsuchida for no other reason than that its function “is not clear”. (p. 49)

p-ia-pacal-ai *cau* *tutui* *na* *ta-u-canum-a*,
 kill:OF2;Neut person pig at place to draw water
una-ava *arakuracu*
 there is- in fact become angry

People got really angry as a pig (of all things!) was killed by someone at the place to draw water. (contrast)

patikanayu-n-kan-kiai *maʔaŋilisi*
 examine by touch:OF1;Perf-Indic he plump:AF
ia, *ɲua-kan* *ala-un-kiai*
 Top (anaphoric pronoun)-Indic take: OF1; Imperf-he
sua malintunɲ ia, *kaʔan-kan* *ala-un-kiai*
 thin:AF not-Indic take-he

(Those among the animals that) he felt (with his hand) and were plump, he took; (those that) were thin, he did not take. (contrast)

Avia ia, *ni-raʔisi* *cacau*
 p.n. Top bite:OF1;Perf dog
 Speaking of Avia, he was bitten by a dog. (comment)

tutui *ni-p-ia-pacai* *Avia*
 pig kill:OF1;Perf p.n.

A pig is what Avia has killed—what Avia has killed is a pig. (exhaustive listing)

Exactly the same three sentence types are found in OF sentences as in AF sentences. The change of case focus from AF to OF (for we make the assumption that AF is syntactically basic) does not affect word order, which remains VSO or, to avoid confusing the logical (deep) subject and the psychological (surface) subject, VAO (Verb-Actor-Object), for sentences of neutral description. In addition, two marked sentence types, in which the focused element—this time the object—is represented in sentence-initial position, are used here for commenting, contrasting, and identification, in exactly the same way as is with AF sentences. Thus the same system of markedness works for both AF and OF (declarative) sentences.

	AF	OF
Unmarked form for neutral description	Verb-Actor-Object	Verb-Actor-Object
Marked forms:		
for contrasting or commenting	Actor-Top, Verb-Object	Object-Top, Verb-Actor
for identification (exhaustive listing)	Actor-Verb-Object	Object-Verb-Actor

Fig. 3

Note that in the second example the object *tutui* “pig” is also marked for contrast, even though the sentence has the basic word order. I have included this sentence to merely show that for any language there is usually more than one way of expressing contrast. For Kanakanavu, topicalization is the principal device but there are auxiliary means, which are more difficult to determine. Thus one may wonder to what extent stress is employed in this language to mark contrast, or what other syntactic devices besides topicalization may be summoned for this purpose.⁽¹⁰⁾ For now these questions must remain unanswered.

3.3 Marking Specificity of Reference

Let us now go beyond the declarative sentence and consider in a wider context what semantic purpose (as opposed to the pragmatic purpose of setting the point of view perspective) may be served by the AF/OF distinction. I shall begin by making a few observations about unmarked OF sentences.

When an OF sentence is used for neutral description, the object necessarily has a definite reference. Thus, in the following sentence, the object NP *tutui* “pig” must be taken to mean “the pig” rather than “a pig” simply because the verb is in OF:

ni-pia-pacai *cau* *tutui*
kill:OF1;Perf person pig
Someone killed the pig.

Cf. the AF sentence: *ni-m-ia-pacai Avia tutui* “Avia killed a pig”. Likewise, the use of OF in the subordinate clause of the sentence below is justified by the fact that the object of the verb, *talisi* “rope”, here refers to something that has previously been mentioned in the story Napalamaci (Mci, Unpublished: p. 39) and it therefore must be marked as a specific noun phrase:

makasua-cu *mucanɬ-cu,* *kili-ai-pa*
walk:AF;Neut-already tie:OF2-yet
ʔinia *talisi* *na* *takiriŋa* *esi* *tanasa-ini*
he rope to kitchen-ware basket is (→in) house-his
He left, after tying the rope to a kitchen-ware basket in his home.

Conversely, with a definite noun phrase or a proper noun as object, a verb can always be put in OF. The following sentence, taken also from the story of Napalamaci, is a case in point:

sua tia *sipapa-ialanasɬ-maku* *cau* *ia,* *tia-maku*
will revenge:OF1-I person Top will-I
panaʔɬɬɬ *taniarɬ*
shoot:OF1;Imperf the sun
So as to take my revenge on (these) people, I shall shoot the sun.

(10) I think the use of the unmarked neutral instead of the marked perfective in this example may very well have been pivotal to the shift of emphasis from “KILLED the pig” to “killed a PIG”. However, I must admit that I have not investigated this problem in any depth.

We find in the story no reference to the sun up to this point and no further mention of it until much later. Naturally one would ask what differences it would make if the verb were put in AF instead. While I cannot give a definite answer to this question, I am inclined to think that the difference would be minimal; that the reason for putting the verb *pana*² in OF may very well be simply that its object is a specific noun phrase.

A clear case in which an AF form and an OF form are shown to be in free variation may be obtained by comparing the following two sentences (Section 2):

mia *c-um-a-kup#-cu-ku* *?inia* *ia,* *mamacai-cu*
 at the time stab:AF;Neut-already-I him Top dead-already
 The moment I stabbed him, he died.

ca-kup(#)-ai *?ikua* *?inia,* *mamacai-cu*
 stab:OF2 I him dead-already

(As soon as) I stabbed him, he died.

In view of the fact that the object of the subordinate clause is also the subject of the main clause, we would expect an OF verb for the subordinate clause, such as in the second sentence. However, both sentences are well-formed, and they also mean the same thing.

In any case, it is clear that one major role—though not, of course, the only role—played by OF in Kananavu is to register specificity of reference in a noun phrase in object position. In this light, we also see that AF plays a complementary role to OF. Figure 4 below shows the differences in degree of specificity accorded to the noun phrase *cau* “man” as Actor or Object in AF and OF situations:

<i>cau</i> “man”	AF	OF
Actor	specific: the man	less specific: a man or someone
Object	least specific: a man	specific: the man

Fig. 4

The actor in the OF situation and the object in the AF situation are both reduced in specificity by contrast with their respective marked counterpart; the former less so because the actor position is inherently referential.

Thus in marking noun phrases for different degrees of referential specificity AF and OF are found to work in cooperation. The result is the creation of a four-way contrast, which lies at the base of nominal reference in sentence. The principle of binary opposition, as previously seen (Sections 3.1., 3.2.), operates inside each case-focus situation, but it is the principle of complementarity that we find at work between AF and OF. This is the first thing to keep in mind for a

valid comparison of the verbal system between Austronesian languages and those languages that make a distinction between active and passive. See Section 3.5.

3.4 Time/Location Focus

T/LF is marked by the suffix *-a(n)*, which occurs only in a perfective verb. The T/LF sentence in its basic form appears in the marked word order of the second marked sentence type; namely, T (or L) VAO. But a combination of the first and second sentence types may result if either A or O in the sentence is topicalized:

A *ia*, T(or L) V O;

O *ia*, T(or L) V A.

The following examples serve to illustrate these features. Note that in the last two sentences the focused element is *-cu* "already", which cannot but appears as a suffix.

na ta-u-canum-a ni-p-ia-pacal-an-aku tutui
 at place to draw water kill:T/LF;Perf-I pig
 It is at the place to draw water that I have killed the pig.

sua tutui ia, na ta-u-canum-a ni-p-ia-pacal-an-aku
 pig Top at place to draw water kill:T/F;Perf-I
 As for the pig, it is at the place to draw water that I have killed it.

miaura ni-p-ia-pacal-an-aku tutui
 yesterday kill:T/F;Perf-I pig
 It was yesterday that I killed the pig.

sua tutui ia, miaura ni-p-ia-pacal-an-aku
 pig Top yesterday kill:T/LF;Perf-I
 As for the pig, it was yesterday that I killed it.

ni-p-ia-pacal-anu-cu
 kill: T/LF; Perf-already
 (The pig) has already been killed.

sua tutui ia, ni-p-ia-pacal-anu-cu
 pig Top kill:T/LF;Perf-already
 As for the pig, it has already been killed.

T/LF marker *-an* has three allomorphs: *an*, *-anu*, and *-a*: *-an* occurs before a suffixal pronoun beginning with a vowel; *-anu* before a suffix beginning with a consonant; and *-a*, with the final nasal segment dropped, occurs in word-final position:

na ta-u-canum-a ni-p-ia-pacal-a tutui
 at place to draw water kill:T/LF;Perf pig
 It is at the place to draw water that the pig has been killed.

3.5 Case Focus or Voice?

I shall now take up the issue whether or not case focus as is found in Philippine and Formosan languages may be interpreted as voice. Those linguists who preferred such an interpretation⁽¹¹⁾ have come across languages that show a tendency to underscore, at least syntactically, the AF/NAF distinction. But this cannot be said to be a general characteristic of these two groups of languages. In its essential aspect, the case focus system is a non-binary system whose elements consist of all case relations marked morphologically in the verb stem; the unmarked/ marked distinction may exist within the system of sentences in AF or OF, but not between AF and OF, which are only two among the three or more case relations. On the other hand, voice is a binary system with passive set in opposition to active as the [marked form in both the syntactic and semantic senses.⁽¹²⁾ While voice contributes to semantics only in a limited way, the central position of case focus in the grammatical system is indicated by the use it is put to, as we have found in Kananavu, in the determination of different degrees of referential specificity in noun phrases occupying subject or object position.

Some members of these language groups may have in the course of history simplified the case focus system to the point that only AF and NAF are formally distinguished.⁽¹³⁾ In such cases the NAF may, as a further development, assume a more specialized role and become marked. It is also possible that some have developed a special kind of OF sentences marked by negative emotional coloring that may be compared to one type of passive in, say, Indo-European languages. I would not be surprised if Kananavu turns out to be one such case, though the evidence I have is scanty. In any case, such developments, some of which may be called aberrations, should best be viewed against the background of case focus for a proper understanding.

The case for the passive interpretation has been made in Formosan linguistics on the basis of highly questionable evidence. It happens in a large number of Formosan languages that personal suffixes for NAF verbs are identical to the set of genitives. This fact, then, is interpreted in two steps:

Step One: By assuming identity of the two sets of suffixes, this fact is taken to be an indication that all NAF sentences are nominalized;

Step Two: By assuming, on the basis of the preceding interpretation, that the NAF verb is marked, this is compared to passive.

The assumption in Step One is unwarranted; the assumption in Step Two is invalidated by an unproved premise, and the conclusion there is a non sequitur.

(11) Bloomfield (1917) was the first linguist to employ the terms active and passive in his study of Tagalog.

(12) See Lyons 1977: 9.7. for a discussion of markedness in these two senses.

(13) Some such cases are described in Li 1978.

Let us, first of all, put the pronouns situation with these languages in perspective by considering for a moment the case of Kanakanavu. As we have seen in Section 1, Kanakanavu pronominal suffixes fall into three categories: focused, unfocused, and genitive. Moreover, unfocused and genitive are distinguished in the third person only. Now, suppose a further development within this pronominal system results in the obliteration of this minor distinction. There could be two alternative descriptions of the pronominal system after the change.

D1: There are two sets of pronominal suffixes for Kanakanavu verbs, the focused or marked on the one hand and the unfocused or unmarked on the other; in addition, the pronominal suffixes for nouns, i.e., genitives, are identical in this language to the unmarked forms;

D2: There are two sets of pronominal suffixes in this language, one set for verbs, another set for nouns (i.e., genitives); genitives may be added to a verb stem for nominalization.

Clearly, D1 is to be preferred to D2 because it makes no assumption about changes in the grammatical system of this language.

We know as a literate person how much nominal style differs from verbal style: it is more static, less vivid and forceful. Although there always exist stylistic circumstances that call for its employment, one would not expect it to be used frequently, as OF sentences are, in narrations or for command.⁽¹⁴⁾ Moreover, we also know that nominalization usually involves more than just the addition of a genitive suffix to a verb stem, particularly in languages with a relatively rich morphology like Formosan languages.⁽⁶⁾ It would, therefore, take a great amount of syntactic and pragmatic evidence to substantiate a claim like the one made in D2.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that NAF sentences indeed were nominalized and therefore marked, it still does not follow that they are passive sentences. In his criticism of the theory of case focus, Li (1978) argues in this way:

"This traditional view has certain advantages over the active/passive dichotomy. Nevertheless, it has certain disadvantages as well. One problem is that it cannot satisfactorily account for the fact that all the various non-Agent (our Actor, KM)-focused verbs are modified by genitives. In other words, we would miss a great generality by the focus system." (p. 609)

(14) For a discussion of some of the reasons behind choosing nominal style over verbal style in Modern English and the two Classical languages Sanskrit and Greek, see Wells 1960.

(15) In Kanakanavu, for instance, there are three nominalizing affixes: the instrumental *si-*, the locative *ta*, and the objective *-an*:

ula "cut": *si-ula* "something to cut with;

vua "give": *ta-vua-anu-su* "the person you give (something) to; lit., where you give (something) to" (*-su* "you").

kaun "eat": *kaun-an* (phonetically, *kauna*) "that which is eaten, —food"

In other words, Li claims that the active/passive dichotomy would capture the generality that NAF verbs, as against AF verbs, are modified by genitives. One wonders, however, what is actually to be gained by using the active/passive dichotomy when other terms of dichotomy could capture the generality just as well. Moreover, the case focus system is established on morphological grounds independent of pronominal suffixes. No matter how much the pronominal system may have changed in a Formosan language, it alone cannot affect the other system.

Case focus is a well-defined concept whereas passive is still in search for a universally valid definition. I believe that Austronesian linguistics has much to contribute to the better understanding of the passive phenomenon, not vice versa.

4. ASPECT

Six verbal aspects may be distinguished for Kanakanavu. They are: neutral, imperfective, progressive, future, perfective, and stative. Of these six, three are basic: neutral, imperfective and perfective. The neutral is the unmarked aspect; the non-neutrals (imperfective and perfective) are marked. The progressive aspect is formed with *esi* "is" and the imperfective; the future aspect, with *tia* "will" and the imperfective; and the stative, with *esi* "is" and the perfective:

esi-pa-ku k-um-a-kaʔnu

is-yet-I eat:AF;Imperf

I am still eating. (progressive)

kan manasu esi tavalapʔu kavayvay

to be sure perhaps is know:AF;Imperf all

paasakasakan

surreptitiously

(He) probably knew all (that had happened) surreptitiously. (progressive)

tia-ku kipapa si tia-kia c-um-a-cuʔura

will-I follow:AF;Imperf for will-I watch:AF;Imperf

I shall follow (you) because I want to watch. (future)

esi-kan t-in-upulu (→timʔulu) na tanarau sua cau

is-Indic sit:AF;Perf at cool place person

ni-matikuru kanasiaʔ ni-marumanʔ

wear:AF;Perf suit handsome

Sitting in the cool place is a handsome (young) man wearing a (red) suit. (stative)

esi ni-muciri

is stand:AF;Perf

(He) is standing. (stative)

4.1 Neutral and Imperfective

Neutral aspect is defined negatively as denoting no particular mode of action in relation to the passage of time. Syntactically, it is the verb form to occur in a subordinate clause beginning with *mia* "when (in the past)" or *nuu* "if, when"; it is also the form (AF neutral, to be precise) for the verb of an embedded sentence to assume in surface structure: for instance, it is the verb form to co-occur with *kuu* "never", which may be considered as a predicate taking a sentence for subject. Neutral aspect occurs frequently as the predicate in narrations when no particular mode of action need be specified. On the other hand, imperfective aspect in Kanakanavu "expresses an incomplete action or event whether it is momentary or durative, past, present, or future." (Tsuchida, 1976: p. 52) An imperfective verb may act as the main verb, or occur with *tia* and *esi* to express future and progressive respectively. Figure 5 sums up the contexts of use for both neutral and imperfective:

		Main Verb		Secondary Positions		
		main clause etc.	subord clause with <i>nuu</i> 'if', <i>mia</i> 'when'	with <i>tia</i> or <i>esi</i>	with <i>kuu</i> 'never'	elsewhere
Neut.	AF	+	+	-	+	+
	OF1	--	+	-	-	-
	OF2	+	--	-	+	-
Imperf.		+	--	+	-	--

Fig. 5

Except in the first column, the items are distributed admirably well. The first column represents situations of head verbs in main clauses or in subordinate clauses exclusive of those beginning with *nuu* or *mia*. Only in these situations is imperfective set in direct contrast with neutral. However, the distinction between these two aspects may not always be maintained. For instance, the following two sentences, one with an OF1 head verb in the imperfective and the other with an OF2 head verb in the neutral, are found in our texts (Mei, Unpublished: p. 3) side by side with each other; they are in free variation in that context:

<i>p-asi-kuc-unu-kan</i>	<i>Usu manu-ini</i>
pinch between fingers: OF1;Imperf-Indic	child-her
<i>p-asi-kukuc-a-kan</i>	<i>sua Usu manu-ini</i>
pinch between fingers: OF2;Neut-Indic	child-her
Usu pinched her child between fingers.	

OF1 and OF2 neutrals are in complementary distribution. OF1 neutral occurs only as the head verb in subordinate clauses beginning with *nuu* or *mia*:

una *taʔnrnm* *esi* *ʔinia* *ia,* *ɣuai* *kan*
 there is black is there Top that to be sure
na(or sua) *nimuluʔu* *mia* *ʔanaʔn-ini*
 blood when shoot:OF1; Neut.-he

There is a black spot in there, which was (his) blood at the time of his being shot.

ʔpacuai-nuu *macic-ini* *ia,* *tavalaʔn-kia* *sumuʔin*
 even if hot:AF;Neut.-it Top can-we bear
 We can bear it even if it is hot.

Elsewhere OF2 is used whenever an OF neutral form is called for.

AF and OF1 neutrals appear in stem forms. An OF2 neutral is formed by adding the suffix *-a* to an NAF verb stem.

In imperfective aspect, an AF verb stem has zero suffix while an OF verb stem is marked by the suffix *-unu*. *-unu* has three allomorphs: *-ini*, *-unu*, and *-nnt*. *-ini* occurs when the verb stem ends in *i*; *-unu* occurs when the verb stem ends in *u*; and *-nnt*, elsewhere. In addition, the infix *-a-* appears in all AF verb stems of b-subclasses and also in OF verb stems of Subclass IVb. Cf. Section 2.

4.2 Perfective

Perfective aspect is marked by *ni-*, which has two allomorphs: *ni-* and *-in-*. The infix *-in-* occurs when the verb stem begins with a voiceless dental/alveolar consonant, i. e., *t*, *c*, or *s*:

taku-navuyu "head-hunt"
t-in-aku-navuya (Perf.);
caknp "pierce"
c-in-aknp (Perf.)
simaʔn "play"
s-in-um-imaʔn (Perf.)

And *ni-* occurs elsewhere.

Perfective aspect expresses a completed action or event:

mialanau-ku *um-itar* *kasua*
 for a long time:AF;Perf.-I wait:AF;Neut. you
 I waited for you for a long time.
ni-mali-sukuamu *ʔikua* *mali-vulanʔ*
 beat-painful:AF;Perf. me beat:AF;Neut.
 He has beaten me hurtfully.

Perfective is also used to underscore the sequential nature of two events:

<i>ni-malivali-kan</i>	<i>sua cau-ini</i>	<i>mu-vua</i>
reply:AF;Perf.-Indic	people-her	give:AF;Neut.
<i>ʔinia nanʔnakʔ</i> ,	<i>ali-avic(i)-ai-cu</i>	<i>ʔinia</i>
him girl	bring away:OF2-already	he
<i>nanʔnakʔ iisa</i>		
girl that		

He took the girl away after her clansmen had agreed to give her to him.

The first part of the sentence, in which the perfective occurs, is a subordinate clause of time. No conjunction is needed here to connect the two clauses.

5. IMPERATIVE

Kanakanavu verbs are inflected for the imperative by adding the suffix *-a* to an AF verb stem and the suffix *-au* to an NAF verb stem:

matiʔʔ!ʔc(ʔ)-a
get hold:AF;Imp.
Hold (it)!

sua tikuru-mu ia, uluy-au kavayvay
clothes-your Top take off:OF;Imp. all
Take off all your clothes

avayvay-au um-ala kamsya
all:OF1;Imp. take:AF;Neut. candies
Take all the candies!

The first example is taken from the folktale Navungu (The story of a head, Mei, Unpublished: p.10). The sentence was spoken by the wife to her husband, who was a head. As is the case with Atayal (Egerod, 1965) and perhaps other Austronesian languages on Taiwan as well, when an AF form is used instead of an OF form, the command is less emphatic and more polite. Here we find that the contrast between AF and OF is made to function in a special way. Since the AF form is not used unless politeness is intended, it should be considered as semantically marked.

Other milder forms of mands (Lyons, 1977: Ch 16) may also be expressed by way of imperative. When an imperative form takes the suffix *-cu* (*ci* before *kia* "I" and *kita* "we") "already", it expresses a mild urge:

k-um-aʔn-a-cu
eat:AF;Imp-already
Eat now (i.e., it's time *already* to eat)!

macin-a-cu, si tia-cu-kia k-um-a-kaʔnʔ
wash up:AF;Imp-already for will-already-we eat:AF;Imperf.

Wash now (i.e., it's time *already* to wash up), for we will be eating (soon);

ta-a-cu

go:AF;Imp-already

Go now (i. e., it's time *already* to go).

Otherwise, *-pa* "yet" may be added to an imperative to express a request:

ta-a-pa

kuc#

ʔumaʔuma,

lavai

go:AF;Imp-yet if you please rice field relative by marriage

Please go to the rice field (i. e., you have *yet* to do me a favor by going to the rice field), lavai!

The particle *kuc#* is used, as in the above sentence, to indicate polite intention. Other examples are:

siʔic#p(ʔ)-a-cu

kuc#

lavai

sleep:AF;Imp-already if you please relative

Please sleep now, lavai (i. e., it's time *already* to sleep, lavai).

mu-canum(u)-a-pa

kuc#

fetch water:AF;Imp-yet if you please

Please (go) fetch water (i. e., you have *yet* to do me a favor by fetching water).

The 'uncertainty' particle *ʔai* may be added to an imperative to suggest tentativeness. Compare:

tikirim(i)-au-pa

look for:OF1;Imp-yet

Look for (it).

tikirim(i)-au-pa ʔai

Try to look for (it).

In the following instances *ʔai* has very much the same force as the 'advisative particle' *ba* 吧 in Mandarin Chinese:

p-ati-rupaŋ-au-pa

iisua

mim(a)-a-cu

ʔai

finish doing:OF;Imp-yet that drink:AF;Imp-already uncertain

paʔici

rice wine

Finish doing (your work) (before) you drink wine.

Cf. Mandarin Chinese 做完再喝酒吧;

nuu m-ati-rupaŋ-cu-kasu

ia,

if finish doing:AF;Neut-already-you Top

siʔuc#p(ʔ)-a-cu

ʔai

sleep:AF;Imp-already uncertain

If you are already finished, go to bed.

Cf. Mandarin Chinese 做完了就去睡吧.

REFERENCES

- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Egerod, Søren. 1965. "Verb inflexion in Atayal". *Lingua* 15:251-82.
- Jeng, Heng-hsiung. 1977. *Topic and Focus in Bunun*. Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Special Publications No. 72.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1972. "Functional sentence perspective—a case study for Japanese and English", *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, No. 3:269-320.
- Li, Paul Jen-kuei. 1973. *Rukai Structure*. Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Special Publications No. 64.
- _____. 1978. "The case-marking systems of the four less-known Formosan languages". Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Fascicle 1: Western Austronesian, 569-615.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mei, Kuang. Unpublished. *Kanakanavu Texts*.
- Ogawa, Naoyoshi and Evin Asai. 1935. *Myths and Traditions of the Formosan Native Tribes* (in Japanese). Taipei: Taihoku Imperial University.
- Sung, Margaret M. Y. 1980. "Morphology of the Kanakanavu language, Formosa" (in Chinese), 書目季刊 *Bibliography Quarterly* 14, No. 2: 89-112.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru. 1976. *Reconstruction of Proto-Tsouic Phonology*. Studies of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series 5. Tokyo.
- Wells, Rulon. 1960. "Nominal and verbal styles", in Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., *Style in Language*, 213-220. The MIT Press.

卡那卡那布語的稱代詞系統和動詞變化

梅 廣

卡那卡那布語（簡稱卡語）是臺灣山地南島語系鄒語的一種。這個語言具有南島語言的特徵，句子以動詞居首，動詞和句中名詞成分的語法關係（即格的關係）用一套特別的方式表現在動詞結構中。形式上卡語的格的系統大別為主格和非主格，非主格又分賓格和副格（包括時間副語和處所副語）。相對於主格、非主格的劃分，卡語的動詞皆具有兩種形式：M式和非M式。M式是標出主格的動詞形式；非M式則用來標出賓格或副格。在句子里一種語法關係在動詞結構中標出，此語法關係即成為該句的陳述重點。因此根據動詞的形式我們可以確定一句的陳述重點是主語、賓語，還是副語。本文的主要部分是研究這種陳述重點表示方式的用法和語意的問題。因稱代詞的使用和重點陳述有密切關係，故兼及之。

本文對這種南島語言所特有的重點陳述方式有兩點結論：

一、這個系統除了用來表示句子的那一部分是陳述重點外，還用來表示句中名詞成分的特指和非特指的語意性質；

二、在這系統中，由於主語和賓語都可以成為陳述的重點因而產生兩種不同的陳述方式，但二者的關係和其他語言的主動、被動關係並不相同。

此外，本文還討論了卡語的動貌系統和命令式。這些都是涉及動詞變化的問題。