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Abstract

Atayal, one of the Formosan languages, consists of two major subgroups: Squliq and C'uli?i. The present paper attempts to present a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analysis of the focus system of Mayrinax Atayal, a C'uli?i dialect spoken in Chinshui Village, Taian Hsiang, Miaoli Prefecture.

The term ‘focus system’ used here refers to a kind of agreement system between the subject (i.e. the focused noun phrase) and the verb, though showing no person, gender or number agreement between them. Such an agreement system is one of the characteristics shared by many western Austronesian languages. In Mayrinax Atayal, verbal affixes such as m-, ma-, si-, -um-, -an, -anay, -an, -aw, -ay, -j, -un and ø form the basis of the focus system. In terms of syntactic distribution, i.e. whether sentences are declarative or imperative, affirmative or negative, agent focus (AF) or non-agent focus (NAF), and/or realis or irrealis, different affixes named above are used. For example, AF markers m-, ma-, -um- and ø are used in affirmative declarative sentences while ø is used in imperative and/or negative sentences; m-, ma-, -um-, ø and m-/ma/-um- … -av are used in AF constructions while the others are used in NAF constructions.

Semantically, verbs manifesting events of different degrees of dynamicity (or stativity) are marked with different focus markers. For instance, m- and -um- mark verbs of higher dynamicity whereas ma- and ø designate verbs of lower dynamicity and even of stativity, all of which constitute a dynamic-stative continuum then. Pragmatically, whether the involved agent participant(s) is the addressee alone, the addressee and the addressee, or a third party, and whether the particle quw/qi? is present or not, structures containing projective focus markers may convey varying meanings, such as the addressee’s or the involved participant’s volition, suggestion or obligation, forbiddance or request, as well as the semantics of immediacy.
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Introduction

Atayal is an Austroasiatic language spoken principally in the mountainous area of northern Taiwan. The language has two major dialects, namely, Squliq and C?uli?, with the latter being regarded as more conservative and more useful for historical and comparative studies. The present paper attempts to investigate the focus system of Mayrinax Atayal, a variant of the C?uli? dialect spoken in Chinsui Village, Taian Hsiang, Miaoli Prefecture. The data upon which this paper is based come from the speech of Mr. バヤン, collected from time to time between June 1987 and April 2000.

In this paper, the focus system of Mayrinax Atayal will be examined from a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspective. The basic facts of the Mayrinax focus system have been described in Huang 1995 and 1996. Some of that information will be repeated here, but corrections, refinements and further insight will also be provided. Furthermore, the findings given in this paper may provide some useful information for future research on reconstructing the verbal morphology of PAN (cf. Ross 1995).

Focus system of Mayrinax Atayal

It is widely known that most Formosan languages and many other western Austroasiatic languages have very complex verbal morphology. In each of the named languages, some verbal affixes form its focus system, which has traditionally been understood in terms of the category of subject. As remarked by French (1988:1), the term focus ‘refers to the phenomenon whereby a verbal focus establishes a special relationship between the verb and one of the noun phrases in the sentence’. In other words, a focus system functions to show the ‘role agreement’ between the subject (i.e. the focused noun phrase) and the verb, yet showing no person, gender or number agreement between them. Such an agreement system is one of the characteristics shared by many western Austroasiatic languages, and is peculiar in that not only AGENT and PATIENT participants but semantic roles like LOCATIVE, BENEFICIARY, INSTRUMENT and REASON can also be chosen to be in focus. Thus, a language may not only have agent focus (AF) and patient focus (PF) constructions, but also locative focus (LF) and instrument as well as beneficiary focus (IF/BF). And as expected, there are many more distinct verb forms than can be found in languages like English.

Below we will begin with the discussion of the focus markers in Mayrinax from their syntactic distributions.

Syntactic distributions of Mayrinax focus markers

Like most of the other Formosan languages, Mayrinax Atayal is basically a verb-initial language, and verbs are all affixed with focus markers. Consider the following examples.\(^4\)

(1) a. m-ilis=cu
    [AF-cry=1S.Nom]
    ‘I am crying; I cried’

\(^1\) Different portions of this paper were presented at the Sixth International Conference on Chinese Linguistics in Leiden in 1997. I would like to show my great appreciation to Dr. Elizabeth Zeitoun, Prof. Malcolm Ross and Prof. Robert Van Valin for their suggestions on earlier versions of the paper. Furthermore, I want to show my gratitude to the National Science Council for supporting me to do research in the Department of Linguistics, SUNY at Buffalo, N.Y., between July and November, 2000, during which period this paper was completed. Last, but not the least, I want to thank my informant, Mr. バヤン (Tang Ching-fa in Chinese), who was born in 1917 and is one of very few competent speakers of Mayrinax. Without his constant assistance, I would never have had such an opportunity to appreciate the beauty of the language.

\(^2\) Some linguists prefer to use different terms instead of focus. Schachter (1987:940), for example, prefers to use the term trigger because it ‘reflects the fact that the semantic role of the argument in question triggers the choice of the verbal affix.’ Wouk (1996:369) also chooses the same term because for her, it seems to be a more neutral term. Chang (1997:iv), on the other hand, uses the term ‘voice’ because ‘the so-called focus in Austronesian literature diverges significantly from common focus… (and) should be identified as voice’.

\(^3\) Henceforth, words in small capitals refer to semantic notions.
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b. h<um>akay ku? ?ulaqi?
   [walk<AF>walk Nom.Rf child]
   ‘The child is walking; The child walked’

c. ma-buqa? ku? saraman
   [AF-broken Nom.Rf bowl]
   ‘The bowl is broken’

d. o-kithu? ku? naňakis
   [AF-fat Nom.Rf old:man]
   ‘The old man is fat’

As illustrated above, the sentence initial position is reserved for a verb, and the enclitic pronoun, if there is one, always follows the verb (e.g. cu in [1a]). In addition, note that the verbs in question are affixed with m-, um-, ma-, or without any overt marker (i.e. a zero morpheme ø), which are conventionally treated as alternative forms of AF markers.

These AF markers are not limited to one-argument sentences. Consider the following sentences with more than one pronoun/noun (phrase) manifesting arguments, and with verbs affixed with the named AF markers:

(2a). m-anig-ci? cu? buqa?
   [AF-eat=1S.Nom Acc.Nrf sweet:potato]
   ‘I am eating a sweet potato; I ate a sweet potato’

b. t<um>aqu? ku? naňakis
   [push:down<AF>push:down Acc.Rf old:man]
   ku? ?ulaqi?
   [Nom.Rf child]
   ‘The child pushed the old man down’

c. ma-bahüku ku? situin ?i? sayun
   [AF-wash Acc.Rf clothes Nom Sayun]
   ‘Sayun is washing the clothes; Sayun washed the clothes’

   [AF-swing Acc.Nrf child Nom mother]
   ‘Mother is swinging a child; Mother swung a child’

Note that the agent participant in (2a) is manifested by the pronoun ci?, which is also italicized to the sentential verb, like that in (1a). As for the agent participant in (2b-d), it is either manifested by a common noun (e.g. ?ulaqi? in [2b]) with a preceding Nominative case marker ku?, or designated by a personal proper noun (e.g. sayun in [2c]) or by a kinship term (e.g. yaya? in [2d]) which follows another Nominative case marker ?i?. Notice that these noun phrases manifesting in-focus arguments appear sentence finally. In other words, the language is a subject final language.

As presented above, Mayrinax seems to have four AF markers, i.e. m-, um-, ma-, and ø. However, note that the sentences discussed so far are all affirmative declaratives; different polarity and varying types of illocutionary force exploit different focus affixes. Polarity, i.e. whether the sentence in question is affirmative or negative, requires certain focus markers to be utilized. Illocutionary force, as stated in Van Valin and LaPolla (1997:41), ‘refers to whether an utterance is an assertion, a question, a command or an expression of a wish,’ and thus, verbs in declarative or imperative sentences are marked with different focus markers in the language.

Moreover, verbs illustrating different tense/aspect/mood require different focus affixes as well. Tense/aspect/mood can be further categorized into realis and irrealis, with the former being classified into ‘neutral’ and ‘perfective’, and the latter ‘future’, ‘projective’ and ‘atemporal’. The term ‘neutral’ used here refers to verbs affixed with focus markers like m- and its alternants alone, without any other overt tense/aspect/mood marking or any co-occurring temporal adverbs or aspectual auxiliaries, seem to be neutral to some extent with respect to indicating tense/aspect; that is, verbs affixed with such focus markers may refer to situations either occurring habitually, having occurred, or actually taking place, though they never refer to unrealized ones (Huang 1995:147-150). Following Ross (1995:742), the term ‘projective’ refers to verbs that express intention, possibility, exhortation and the like. ‘Atemporal’ is defined by Ross (1995:743) as referring to forms that may either function as plain imperatives, occur subordinate to some auxiliaries, or express events in sequence in narrative; Mayrinax seems to have only the
first two functions.

The choice of AF markers being determined by polarity, types of illocutionary force, and by temporal/aspectual/modal systems is also perceived in non-agent focus (NAF) constructions, including patient focus (PF), locative focus (LF) and instrument/ beneficiary focus (IF/BF) constructions. Below are some sentences containing the above-mentioned focus markers.

(3)Affirmative declarative sentences

a. m-a'yal-ci? cu? pila?
   [AF-take=1S.Nom Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘I took money’

b. m-a'yal-ci? cu? pila?
   [AF-take=1S.Nom Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘I’ll take money’ (but not right away)

c. m-a'yal-ay-ci? cu? pila?
   [AF-take-AF2=1S.Nom Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘I want to take money; I’ll (definitely) take money’

d. m-aiq=cu uwe cu? pila?
   [AF-give=1S.Nom too Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘I gave money, too’

e. g-pa-a'yal-ci? cu? pila?
   [AF-Fut-take=1S.Nom Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘I’ll take money’

f. m-a'yal-ci? cu? pila?
   [AF-give=1S.Nom too Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘I gave money, too’ (for donation)

g. a'-a'yal-ci? cu? pila?
   [AF-give=1S.Nom too Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘I took money from Sayun for the old man’

h. m-a'yal-cu uwe cu? pila?
   [AF-take=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money]
   ‘I want to take money; I’ll (definitely) take money’

i. m-aiq-cu uwe cu? pila?
   [AF-take-AF2=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money]
   ‘I want to take money, too’

j. m-aiq-ay-cu uwe cu? pila?
   [AF-take-AF2=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money]
   ‘I want to give money, too; I’ll (definitely) give money, too’

k. a'-a'yal-mu ku? pila?
   [take-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf money]
   ‘I took the money’

l. a'--a'yal-mu ku? pila?
   [Red-take-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf money]
   ‘I’ll take the money’

m. a'-a'yal-ay-mu ku? pila?
   [take-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf money]
   ‘I want to take the money; I’ll (definitely) take the money’

n. a'-a'yal-cu ku? pila?
   [AF-give=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money]
   ‘I gave the child money’

o. m-a'q-an=mi? cu? pila? ku? u'ulaqi?
   [give-LF=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money Nom.Rf child]
   ‘I want to give the child money (now); I’ll (definitely) give the child money’

p. a'-a'q-an-ci? cu? pila? ku? u'ulaqi?
   [AF-give=1S.Gen Acc.Rf child Nom.Rf money]
   ‘I gave the money to the child’

q. a'-a'q-an-cu ku? pila? ku? u'ulaqi?
   [Red-give=1S.Gen Acc.Rf child Nom.Rf money]
   ‘I’ll give the child money’

r. a'-a'q-an-cu ku? pila? ku? i'sayun
   [BF-take=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money Dat Sayun
   ku? nafoakis]
   [Nom.Rf old:man]
   ‘I took money from Sayun for the old man’

s. a'-a'q-an-cu ku? pila? ku? i'sayun
   [Af-take=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money Dat Sayun
   ku? nafoakis]
   [Nom.Rf old:man]
   ‘I’ll take money from Sayun for the old man’

(4)Affirmative imperative sentences

a. a'yal-ay-cu? pila?
   [take-AF Acc.Nrf money]
   ‘Take money!’

b. a'yal-cu? pila?
   [take-PF Nom.Rf money]
   ‘Take the money!’

c. a'q-an=mi? cu? pila? ku? u'ulaqi?
   [give-LF Acc.NRF money Nom.Rf child]
   ‘Give the child money’

d. a'q-an=mi? cu? pila? ku? u'ulaqi?
   [Red-give-LF=1S.Gen Acc.NRF money Nom.Rf
   child]
   ‘Give the money to the child!’
TABLE 1. FOCUS MARKERS OF MAYRINAX ATAYAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Tense/Aspect</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Ilocutionary Force</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Realis</td>
<td>Irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>m-; ma-; -um-; ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>m-/ma-/ -um- ...</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future/Remote</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projective/Immediate</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-aw</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atemporal</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>-ani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future/Remote</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projective/Immediate</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atemporal</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>-ani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future/Remote</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projective/Immediate</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atemporal</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>-ani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future/Remote</td>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projective/Immediate</td>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atemporal</td>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observe that in TABLE 1, there is a set of circumfix AF markers consisting of discontinuous affixes m-/ma-/ -um- and -ay, as exemplified by (3a") and (3b'"). Though this is the only set of discontinuous focus markers found in Mayrinax Atayal, circumfix morphemes are not unique to the language; they are also found in Amis, another Formosan language, as well as in extra-Formosan languages like Tagalog. In addition, while reconstructing PAN verbal morphology, Ross (1995:765) states that ‘Where other scholars have reconstructed *√ -a “AC pivot projective” [equivalent to ‘AF projective’ used in this paper], I reconstruct *<um>√ -a …’6 The above-mentioned AF projective form in Mayrinax thus supports Ross’ reconstruction.

6 The symbol √ in Ross (1995:739) stands for ‘verb root’.
that the named AF marker is a circumfix which consists of realis AF marker and a suffix, though the suffix in Mayrinax (i.e. -vy) is not identical to what Ross proposes (i.e. -ã).

Before we examine the semantic properties of Mayrinax focus markers, one more thing deserves our attention. Compare the Mayrinax focus markers given in TABLE 1 with those shown in TABLE 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus types</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realis</td>
<td>Irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>m-; ma-; um-; ø</td>
<td>pa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>-un; -in</td>
<td>-un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>si-</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that two morphemes here have been treated differently; namely, the infix -in- and the prefix pa-. According to Huang (1995:49 & 151), the infix -in- in a PF construction is analyzed as a portmanteau, designating both a PF marker and a perfective/past marker; whereas the current analysis treats -in- as an aspectual/temporal marker (and so absent from TABLE 1), and when it appears in a PF construction, the co-occurring PF marker is regarded as the zero morpheme ø. Both analyses seem acceptable, yet since the same form -in- also appears in AF and LF constructions marking a perfective/past event only, it is more legitimate and consistent to treat -in- as an aspectual/temporal marker. Besides, that a PF marker is manifested by the zero morpheme is not peculiar in the language; AF and IF/BF constructions also have verbs marked with ø under certain circumstances.

Similarly, the prefix pa- is also analyzed by Huang (1995:42 & 154) as a portmanteau, indicating both agent focus and future tense. The present analysis, on the other hand, considers that the morpheme pa- is a future tense marker only (and again absent from TABLE 1), and the co-occurring AF marker is represented by the zero morpheme ø. Although the two treatments are plausible, favoring the present analysis is understandable. In Mayrinax NAF constructions, future events are marked by the reduplication of the initial consonant of the verb stem together with the vowel a (Huang 1995:154). Observe that the morpheme pa- also contains a consonant and the vowel a, which seems somewhat similar to the above-mentioned formation in NAF constructions, and which will make the formation of future tense in the language more consistent. Nevertheless, one may then question why the consonant in the AF future marker should always be the bilabial stop p even when the initial consonant of the verb stem is not p. Possible explanations follow.

Ross (1995:750-751) points out that reduplication forms duratives in Formosan languages like Thao, Kanakanavu, Saaroa, Rukai, Puyuma and Paiwan, and

---

7 The reduplication of the initial consonant of the verb stem together with the vowel a is now commonly noted as Ca-

8 One may even move one further step. Note that the vowel a also appears in projective forms (cf. TABLE 1), and thus the semantics of the vowel a may be interpreted as an ‘irrealis’ marker in affirmative declaratives. A similar treatment is also observed in Ross (1995:767): ‘The *-a(-) … emerges as the Pre-PAN irrealis marker.’

9 Huang (1995:148) records that in designating future events, two AF verbs in Mayrinax [i.e. musaʔ ‘go (Fut)’ vs. musaʔ ‘go (Neu)’, and mauwah ‘come (Fut)’ vs. mauwah ‘come (Neu)’] do not take pa- but simply have the vowel a inserted after the AF marker -a.

10 While Ross (1995:752) assumes that ‘the durative pattern has been functionally extended to cover the future’, we suspect that the case is the other way around. However, the issue is beyond the scope of the present paper, and will not be further pursued here.

11 When postulating that PAN may have four major formal classes of verb, Ross (1995:740-741) considers that among the four classes, there are verbs ‘whose root began with *pa- and whose AC pivot forms [equivalent to AF verbs discussed in this paper] began with *ma-, derived historically from *<um>- + *pa-…’. Many of these verbs are complex roots formed with the prefix *pa- ‘causative’.” If his consideration is correct, certain verb roots in PAN might have already had their initial consonant as -p- derived from the causative marker, which seems to confirm Huang’s (2000) observation.
such a reduplicative pattern serves as marking futurity in languages like Sediq and Puyuma; Mayrinax Atayal resembles Sediq and Puyuma in this respect, as illustrated above. Huang (2000), in examining Mayrinax verb classes, states that one way of forming verbs is through the addition of the causative marker *pa*- in other words, certain verb stems in the language begin with the bilabial stop *p*. It is further pointed out that in Mayrinax, AF verbs marked by *m* mostly show *p* → *m* - and *b* → *m* - alternations in their derivatives. Because of the presence of *p* in verb stems and its frequent alternation with *m*, it seems legitimate to hypothesize that the current future marker *pa*- in the language might be an outcome of Mayrinax speakers’ overgeneralization or reanalysis. That is, while reduplicating the initial consonant of the stems in order to form verbs manifesting future events, speakers might utilize the *p* sound since it occurs more often than the others, and thus the future marker *pa*- in the AF construction.

Based on the above analysis and Huang’s (1995), the tense/aspect/mood system of the language can then be schematized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense/Aspect/Mood System of Mayrinax Atayal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tense/Aspect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF/BF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semantic properties of Mayrinax focus markers**

In this section, semantic properties of Mayrinax focus markers will be investigated. First, we will demonstrate that different focus markers mark events of different degrees of dynamicity (or stativity). We will further illustrate the relationship between semantic roles and focus markers.

**Manifestation of different dynamicity**

As presented in TABLE 1, the language has various AF markers in realis affirmative declarative sentences; namely, *m*, *ma*, *-um*, *ø*. Apparently the choice of these variants is not syntactically conditioned. Huang (1995:39) remarks that such a choice is lexically determined, yet she later (2000) considers that the named AF affixes indeed have different semantic functions; they mark verbs designating events of different dynamicity (or stativity). That is, verbs marked by *m*/*-um* designate greater action than those marked by *ma/*-ø*; and among verbs marked with *ma/*-ø*, though superficially identical, these verbs can be further divided into different verb classes: *ma*-/*ø*- and *ma*-/*ø*- with the former manifesting more dynamic events and the latter designating events of less action and more stativity. Such a categorization is supported by semantic and morpho-syntactical evidence. Now consider the semantic differences in the following examples (Huang 2000):

7a. *m*-hahapuy=cu nku? ?ulaqi? (p. 374)

[AF-cook=1S.Nom Ben.Rf child]

‘I am cooking for the child’

b. *γ<um>* hahapuy= cu nku? ?ulaqi?

[cook<AF>cook=1S.Nom Ben.Rf child]

‘I am cooking for the child’


[lose<AF>lose=1S.Nom Acc.Nrf money]

‘I lost money’

Such a postulation may help explain the strangeness Ross (1995:751) observes in Kanakanavu, Saaroa and Puyuma in which the expected reduplicative duratives of some AF verbs are replaced by the insertion of the vowel -*γ* between the verbalizing prefix and the root.

Most of the discussion given in this section is based on Huang 2000. For a more detailed discussion on Mayrinax verbs illustrating different degrees of dynamicity/stativity, and the dynamic-static continuum, please refer to Huang 2000.
a. ma-yaʔan ku? pilaʔ=mu
   [AF-lost Nom.Rf money=1S.Gen]
   ‘My money is gone/lost’

b. m-qaʔ cuʔ saraman ku? ulaqiʔ
   [AF-break Acc.Nrf bowl Nom.Rf child kariariax (p. 372)
   [every:day]
   ‘The child breaks bowls every day’

b’. ma-ʔuqal ay ku? ulaqiʔ (p. 373)
   [AF-broken Nom.Rf bowl]
   ‘The bowl is broken’ (not knowing why or when it broke)

c. m-aynaʔalay ku? ulaqiʔ
   [AF-fat Nom.Rf child]
   ‘The child is fat’ (because of his eating a lot)

c’. ma-kithu ku? ulaqiʔ
   [AF-fat Nom.Rf child]
   ‘The child is fat’ (an inborn characteristic; without eating a lot)

While semantic differences between the focus markers m- and -um- as exemplified in (7a-b) is not apparent, the semantic distinctions between -um- and ma- in (8a-a’), between m- and ma- in (8b-b’), and between m- and a- in (8c-c’) are noticeable. For example, the two events yumaʔan in (8a) and mayaʔan in (8a’) seem to present different degrees of dynamicity; that is, while (8a) designates a more dynamic event ‘losing money’, (8a’) stresses more on the state of ‘money’s being gone/lost’. A similar contrast is also observed in (8b-b’), (8c-c’) illustrate a similar but not exactly identical case. Though the verbs in (8c-c’) both refer to someone’s being fat, maynaʔalay in (8c) implies that the child’s fatness is due to his eating a lot, whereas kithu in (8c’) shows that the child’s fatness is an inborn characteristic, having nothing to do with the action of ‘eating’. Therefore, it is plausible to postulate that the language manifests such a dynamic-stative contrast by utilizing different focus affixes; i.e. verbs marked by m-/-um- designate greater dynamicity than those marked by ma-/-a-.

As for the differences between the focus markers m-/-um- and ma-/-a-, Huang (2000:370) remarks that among the 237 verbs being collected, there are 177 dynamic verbs (including m-/-um- verbs and ma-/-a- verbs), as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4. DYNAMIC VS. STATIVE VERBS IN MAYRINAX ATAYAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that ma- and a- marked verbs (9 and 20, respectively) are relatively few, when compared with verbs containing m- and -um- (76 and 72). Huang (2000:370) further points out that most of the ma-/-a- verbs are intransitive (see FIGURE 1 below), without requiring a co-present noun that designates the second (i.e. patient) argument, especially the a- marked verbs. In other words, within the dynamic verbs, varying degrees of dynamicity are observed.

Similarly, among stative verbs marked by ma- and a-, different degrees of stativity are noticed, as exemplified by the following sentences:

(9)a. ma-hiqaʔ ?iʔ yayaʔ
   [AF-slender Nom mother]
   ‘Mother is slender’ (because of her illness)

b. a-ʔiqaʔ? ?iʔ yayaʔ
   [AF-slender Nom mother]
   ‘Mother is slender’ (an inborn characteristic)

As illustrated by the additional English gloss, the state of one’s being slender expressed by the verb mahigaʔ in (9a) seems to designate a transitory one, implying a cause/history of one’s illness; whereas the state represented by the verb iqaʔ in (9b) tends to describe one’s inherent and permanent characteristic, with no implication of history. In other words, those marked by ma- seem to designate more temporary properties or less stative events (and hence more action-like), whereas those affixed with a- tend to
manifest states, or inherent or permanent properties.

FIGURE 1 presents some of the Mayrinax verbs that belong to different classes (Huang 2000:375):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamic Verbs</th>
<th>Stative Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m-; -um-</td>
<td>ma-; -ø-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-astatail 'jump'</td>
<td>ma-τuβainay 'sell'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-qa' 'break'</td>
<td>ma-βainay 'buy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-hahapuy 'cook'</td>
<td>ma-βahuq 'wash (clothes)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-itaal 'watch'</td>
<td>ma-qilaap 'sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-aynaxalay 'fat (eating)'</td>
<td>ma-γianax 'live (not die)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-anaquh 'frightened'</td>
<td>o-βuina 'graduate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-um-utiq 'beat'</td>
<td>o-kaβaux 'borrow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-um-hahapuy 'cook'</td>
<td>o-paγaip 'fish'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-um-itaal 'watch'</td>
<td>o-tuliqi 'hide (Vt)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-um-akay 'walk'</td>
<td>o-aruwa 'leave'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q-um-aluap 'hunt'</td>
<td>o-tayhok 'arrive'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-itaal 'watch'</td>
<td>ma-qilaap 'sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-qa' 'break'</td>
<td>ma-βainay 'buy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-hahapuy 'cook'</td>
<td>ma-βahuq 'wash (clothes)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-itaal 'watch'</td>
<td>ma-qilaap 'sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-astatail 'jump'</td>
<td>ma-τuβainay 'sell'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-qa' 'break'</td>
<td>ma-βainay 'buy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-hahapuy 'cook'</td>
<td>ma-βahuq 'wash (clothes)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-itaal 'watch'</td>
<td>ma-qilaap 'sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-aynaxalay 'fat (eating)'</td>
<td>ma-γianax 'live (not die)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-anaquh 'frightened'</td>
<td>o-βuina 'graduate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-um-utiq 'beat'</td>
<td>o-kaβaux 'borrow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ-um-hahapuy 'cook'</td>
<td>o-paγaip 'fish'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-um-itaal 'watch'</td>
<td>o-tuliqi 'hide (Vt)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-um-akay 'walk'</td>
<td>o-aruwa 'leave'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q-um-aluap 'hunt'</td>
<td>o-tayhok 'arrive'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up the above discussion, different AF focus markers can be used to mark different degrees of dynamicity (or stativity). In other words, verbs affixed with m-, -um-, ma- or o- designate dynamic events, while verbs marked by ma- or o- manifest stative ones. Such a dynamic-stative division is further supported by some morphological and syntactic manifestations, such as negative constructions, tense/aspect/mood system, imperative constructions and causative constructions (cf. Huang 2000:384-385), which will not be discussed here.

Correlation between semantic roles and focus markers

It is often pointed out (e.g. Kess 1976, French 1988, Yeh 1991, Tan 1997) that in Austronesian languages, focus markers and semantic roles of the in-focus argument do not often show one-to-one correspondences: either the same focus marker may signal different semantic roles, or more than one focus marker can designate the same semantic role. Such an imperfect mapping is also observed in Mayrinax (cf. Huang 1995), and will be further examined shortly.

The semantic roles referred to in this paper are used in the following senses:14

14 Different linguists may use different terms, or interpret the above terms in different ways. For example, while Andrews (1985:70) treats THEME as a participant being in a state/position or changing its state/position, Van Valin and LaPolla (1997:85) regard PATIENT as ‘things that are in a state or condition, or undergo a change of state or condition’ and THEME as ‘things which are located or are undergoing a change of location (motion)’.
In Section 2.2.1, it is noticed that different AF affixes mark different degrees of dynamicity (or stativity). In spite of their marking different verb classes, variants like \texttt{ma-}, \texttt{\textasciitilde{ma}-}, \texttt{ma-} and \texttt{\textasciitilde{g}-} are all named agent focus (AF) markers. The term ‘agent’ is merely a cover term, which allows different argument-types, such as \textsc{agent, executor} and \textsc{experiencer}, depending primarily upon the semantics of the co-occurring verb.\footnote{We share the view with Van Valin and LaPolla (1997:86) that ‘the role an entity plays is crucially a function of the type of state of affairs [i.e. event types] in which it is involved. Put simply, it is possible to derive participant roles by analyzing states of affairs, but the converse is not possible, since participant roles cannot be defined without reference to states of affairs.’}

As expected, \textsc{agent} is the prototypical in-focus agent participant in the AF construction. Below are some examples with the focused argument being an \textsc{agent} (e.g. [10a-b]), an \textsc{executor} (11a-b), or an \textsc{experiencer} (e.g. [12a-b]):

(10) a. \texttt{m-hahapuy=cu} \texttt{nku? \textasciitilde{?}ulaqi?}
    \hspace{1em} [AF-cook=1S.Nom Ben.Rf \texttt{child}]
    \hspace{1em} ‘I am cooking for the child’

b. \texttt{t<\textasciitilde{um}>uti\textasciitilde{ji}} \texttt{cu? \textasciitilde{?}ulaqi? \textasciitilde{?}i? yaya?}
    \hspace{1em} [beat<AF\textasciitilde{ }>beat Acc.Rf \texttt{child Nom mother}]
    \hspace{1em} ‘Mother is beating the child’

(11) a. \texttt{ma-\textasciitilde{qilaap} ku’ na\textasciitilde{fakakis}}
    \hspace{1em} [AF-sleep Nom.Rf \texttt{old:man}]
    \hspace{1em} ‘The old man is sleeping’

b. \texttt{\textasciitilde{g}-\textasciitilde{tayhok}} \textasciitilde{?}i? yaya? \textasciitilde{la}
    \hspace{1em} [AF-arrive Nom mother Part]
    \hspace{1em} ‘Mother has arrived’

(12) a. \texttt{\textasciitilde{g}-\textasciitilde{baq} \textasciitilde{?}i? \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{h}um>\textasciitilde{anuy} ku?}
    \hspace{1em} [AF-know Lin swim<AF\textasciitilde{ }>swim Nom.Rf
    \hspace{1em} \textasciitilde{?}ulaqi?]
    \hspace{1em} [child]
    \hspace{1em} ‘The child knows how to swim’

b. \texttt{\textasciitilde{g}-\textasciitilde{kith\textasciitilde{ti}} ku? \textasciitilde{?}ulaqi?}
    \hspace{1em} [AF-fat Nom.Rf \texttt{child}]
    \hspace{1em} ‘The child is fat’

As illustrated above, verbs appearing close to the dynamic end in \textsc{figure} 1 tend to have \textsc{agent} or \textsc{executor} arguments to be in focus, whereas verbs occurring near the staticive extreme seem more likely to have \textsc{experiencer} as the focused argument.

Like an AF construction, a PF construction allows not only a \textsc{patient} argument (e.g. [13a-b]) but also a \textsc{recipient}\footnote{PF verbs with a \textsc{recipient} participant in focus are not many; we have only found one verb \texttt{kahan} ‘tell (PF)’. There is another verb, however, glossed similarly but affixed with the LF marker, as exemplified below: \texttt{panakako-an nji watan cu? hisa? \textasciitilde{?}i? \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{h}a\textasciitilde{u}nay cu? sin\textasciitilde{u}\textasciitilde{fi\textasciitilde{l}an cu? kai?}
    [tell-LF Gen Watan Part yesterday Nom \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{h}a\textasciitilde{u}nay Acc.Rf legend Lin language]}
    ‘Yesterday Watan told \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{h}a\textasciitilde{u}nay the legend’
    \hspace{1em} Verbal semantics which may account for such discrepancy deserves further research.} (e.g. [14]) to be in focus, with the former being the unmarked in-focus patient argument:

(13) a. \texttt{tut\textasciitilde{ip}-un=\textasciitilde{mu} ku? \textasciitilde{xuil}}
    \hspace{1em} [beat-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf \texttt{dog}]
    \hspace{1em} ‘I beat the dog’

b. \texttt{naya?-un=\textasciitilde{mi} yumin}
    \hspace{1em} [wait-PF=1S.Gen \texttt{Yumin}]
    \hspace{1em} ‘I am waiting for Yumin’ (I have an appointment with him)

(14) \texttt{kal-un=\textasciitilde{cu} \textasciitilde{n}i? watan cu? sin\textasciitilde{u}\textasciitilde{fi\textasciitilde{l}an}
    [tell-PF=1S.Gen Nom Watan Acc.Rf legend cu? \textasciitilde{kai?}
    [Lin language]
    ‘Watan told me the legend’

In an LF construction, the \textsc{locative} role is usually expected to serve as the in-focus participant. However, Huang (1995:50-51) points out that only very few verbs affixed with the LF marker designating locations can appear in verbal constructions (e.g. [15a-b]), while words formed in a similar way very often function as nouns manifesting locations and appear in equational sentences (e.g. [16]):

(15) a. \texttt{qilap-an nji yaya? ku? \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{p}a\textasciitilde{y}a?=\textasciitilde{su}}}
    \hspace{1em} [sleep-LF Gen mother Nom.Rf \texttt{bed=2S.Gen}]
    \hspace{1em} ‘Mother slept on your bed’

b. \texttt{\textasciitilde{?}<\textasciitilde{in}>usal-an=\textasciitilde{mu} ku? \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{b}a\textasciitilde{li}? \textasciitilde{la}}
    \hspace{1em} [go<\textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{p}erf}-go-LF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf \texttt{Miao\textasciitilde{li}} Part]
    \hspace{1em} ‘I have (already) been to Miao\textasciitilde{li}’

(16) \texttt{\textasciitilde{na}-\textasciitilde{niq-an} cu? \textasciitilde{\textasciitilde{b}u\textasciitilde{na}? \textasciitilde{nku}?}
    [Red-eat-LF Acc.Nrf \texttt{sweet:potato Gen.Rf \textasciitilde{?}ulaqi?}]
    \hspace{1em} [\textasciitilde{ku}? \textasciitilde{yu-yapuuy-an}]
    \hspace{1em} [child Nom.Rf Red-cook-LF]
    \hspace{1em} ‘The place where the child (always) eats sweet potatoes is the kitchen’
In addition to the LOCATIVE role, the focused argument in an LF construction can be a RECIPIENT (e.g. [17a-b]), a GOAL (e.g. [18]), or a SOURCE (e.g. [19a-b]):

(17) a. ƙaiq-an=mi? cu? pila? ku?
[give-LF=1S.Gen Acc.Nrf money Nom.Rf ?ulaqi?]
[child ]
‘I gave the child money’

‘The child pointed at you’

[Nom father]
‘The child requested money from Father’

[Nom mother]
‘The man robbed money of Mother’

Whereas a RECIPIENT often refers to an animate participant, a GOAL or SOURCE argument usually designates a real location. However, such a function may get extended metaphorically, as shown in (18-19), where an animate participant may designate a GOAL or SOURCE role.

Besides the above-mentioned semantic roles, a PATIENT participant may serve as the in-focus argument in an LF construction as well. Consider (Huang 1995:52-53):

(20) a. kaƙax-an ni? yumin ku? yoloy=mu [borrow-LF Gen Yumin Nom.Rf car=1S.Gen]
‘Yumin borrowed my car’

b. uŋi?-an=mu ku? waaw ka? yani [forget-LF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf thing Lin that]
‘I forgot that thing’

c. s?wa?-an=mi? limuy cu? ƙalay [like-LF=1S.Gen Limuy very ]
‘I like Limuy very much’
‘The old man saw the child’
‘Mother kissed the child’

While one may perceive the semantic connection between a LOCATIVE participant and a RECIPIENT, GOAL or SOURCE participant, it appears puzzling that the seeming PATIENT arguments in (20a-e) should be the focused participants in events manifested by LF verbs instead of PF ones. One possible interpretation is that the events in question do not actually place any effects on the named arguments; in other words, these in-focus arguments are not totally affected like full-fledged PATIENTS, and thus appear in LF constructions instead of PF ones.¹⁷

The last semantic roles to be discussed are those in the IF/BF constructions. As exemplified below, the arguments in focus can be either an INSTRUMENT (e.g. [21a-b]) or a BENEFICIARY (e.g. [22a-b]), with the two roles being distinguishable by the semantics of animacy; that is, an INSTRUMENT being inanimate and a BENEFICIARY animate:

[bƙatah [charcoal]
‘I roasted pork with the charcoal’

[Nom.Rf leaf]
‘The old man wrapped a fish with the leaf’

[Nom Yumin]
‘The old man wrapped a fish for Yumin’

¹⁷ Foley and Van Valin (1984:74) have a similar observation: ‘The focus affix associated with patients … is used to mark more thoroughly affected NPs in contrast to less affected NPs which are marked by -an, the locative focus suffix.’ Anderson (1971) also proposes that the semantic object of events manifested by the following verbs should be treated as locative: ‘know’, ‘like’ and ‘want’, verbs of transfer like ‘buy/sell’, ‘lend/borrow’, ‘teach/learn’, verbs of non-physical transfer, and verbs of perception.


b. *si*-hahapuy=mu *ku? cuquliq
[BF-cook=1S.Gen Nom.Rf person]
‘I cooked for the guests’

Besides the two roles named above, the in-focus argument in such constructions can be a PATIENT (e.g. [23a-b]), a THEME (e.g. [24a-b]), as well as a peripheral argument like REASON (e.g. [25a-c]):

[BF-swing Gen mother Nom.Rf child ]
‘Mother swang the child’
b. *si*-pa *a ni yaya? *ku? *ulaqi?
[BF-carry:on:back Gen mother Nom.Rf child ]
‘Mother is carrying the child on her back’

(24) a. *si*-iaq=mu *cuquliq
[IF-give=1S.Gen Acc.Rf child Nom.Rf pila? [money]
‘I gave the money to the child’
b. *si*-cu *u nku *ulaqi i *luliyu
[IF-throw Gen.Rf child Prep river *ku? *betaunux
[Nom.Rf stone ]
‘The child threw the stone into a river’

[IF-take=1S.Gen Acc.Nrf money Nom.Rf situi=mu
[clothes=1S.Gen]
‘I took money because of my clothes’ (someone took them)
b. *si?-na=q=mu *yumin
[IF-wait=1S.Gen Yumin]
‘I am waiting for Yumin’ (to come because I have something to share with him)
c. *si?-naquh=mu *ku? *ulaqi?
[IF-frightened=1S.Gen Nom.Rf child ]
‘I am frightened by the child’ (because he almost fell down)

Like the PATIENT argument in LF constructions discussed above, the seeming PATIENT *ulaqi? in (23a-b) are not really acted upon by anything and do not undergo any consequent change of state or condition either; here they can be treated as benefactee (Huang 1995:57). As for the argument pila? and betaunux in (24a-b), they are merely transferred from one place to another, and are THEME arguments. Finally in (25a), situi manifests the in-focus REASON argument because of which the event ‘taking’ is performed, whereas in (25b-c), yumin and *ulaqi? are not true in-focus arguments; something related to them are, again peripheral REASON participants.

To sum up the above discussion, the correlation between focus markers and semantic roles of the focused arguments can be schematized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Focus</th>
<th>AGT</th>
<th>EXE</th>
<th>EXP</th>
<th>INS</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>THM</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>GOL</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF/BF</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed above, different from languages like English that have only active-passive dichotomous voice system, Mayrinax has a quartet focus system, with the AF construction similar to the English active construction, and the three NAF constructions (i.e. PF, LF and IF/BF) allowing a wide range of non-agent roles (instead of just the PATIENT role) to be in focus. These non-agent roles seem to have their own desired NAF structures in which they serve as focused arguments: PATIENT and sometimes RECIPIENT as well are best candidates for the in-focus participant in the PF structure, LOCATIVE, SOURCE, GOAL, RECIPIENT and PATIENT for the LF structure, and INSTRUMENT, BENEFICIARY, REASON, THEME and PATIENT for the IF/BF structure.

To conclude the above discussion, the following generalizations are presented:

(i) AGENT, EXECUTOR and EXPERIENCER function as focused participants in AF constructions; they do not serve as focused arguments in any NAF...
constructions. Similarly, the other roles cannot be in-focus arguments in the AF construction, either.

(ii) Except for the PATIENT argument, almost all the other non-agent roles\(^{18}\) do not overlap with each other when being in focus in different NAF constructions. In other words, each role seems to have its own functional load and does not overlap with the others.

(iii) When serving as an in-focus argument in the LF and IF/BF sentences, the PATIENT participant is not a true PATIENT, because nothing has actually acted upon it. This seeming PATIENT can be re-interpreted either as a LOCATIVE or BENEFICIARY argument in an LF or IF/BF construction, respectively.\(^{19}\) Consequently, we may either postulate that the scope of the LF and IF/BF expands and enters the PF domain, or that only full-fledged PATIENT can be in focus in the PF structure while the seeming PATIENT has to be in other NAF constructions.\(^{20}\)

**Pragmatic functions of Mayrinax projective focus markers**\(^{21}\)

In this section, the pragmatic functions of the projective focus markers in Mayrinax (i.e. \/-um-/ma- ... -ay [AF], -aw [PF], -ay [LF] and -anay [IF/BF]) will be investigated. As stated earlier, the term ‘projective’ refers to verbs that express intention, possibility, exhortation and the like. Below we will begin examining the pragmatic functions of the circumfix projective AF markers.

**Pragmatic functions of the projective AF markers**

First, consider the following sets of sentences (repeated from [3a-b]), with the pronoun ciʔ/cu ‘1st person singular’ manifesting the addresser ‘I’ and serving as the in-focus argument:

(26) a. \(\text{m-ayal}=ciʔ \quad \text{cu}\) \quad \text{pila?} \\
    \quad [\text{AF-take}=\text{1S.Nom} \quad \text{Acc.Nrf money}] \\
    ‘I took money’

b. \(\text{g-pa-}\text{ayal}=ciʔ \quad \text{cu}\) \quad \text{pila?} \\
    [\text{AF-give}=\text{1S.Nom} \quad \text{too Acc.Nrf money}] \\
    ‘I gave money, too’

(27) a. \(\text{m-aiq}=cu \quad \text{uwe cu}\) \quad \text{pila?} \\
    [\text{AF-give}=\text{1S.Nom} \quad \text{too Acc.Nrf money}] \\
    ‘I gave money, too’

b. \(\text{g-pa-}\text{aiq}=cu \quad \text{uwe cu}\) \quad \text{pila?} \\
    [\text{AF-give}=\text{1S.Nom} \quad \text{too Acc.Nrf money}] \\
    ‘I will give money, too’

c. \(\text{m-aiq-ay}=cu \quad \text{uwe cu}\) \quad \text{pila?} \\
    [\text{AF-give}=\text{1S.Nom} \quad \text{too Acc.Nrf money}] \\
    ‘I want to give money, too’

As indicated by the English gloss in each set of sentences above, different meanings are perceived:

(i) While verbs affixed with AF markers like \text{m-} indicate realized (either on-going or perfective/past) events, verbs affixed with either \text{g-pa-} or \text{m-/}u\text{m-}ma- ... -ay designate future/unrealized events;

(ii) Between verbs with affixes indicating future/unrealized events, verbs affixed with \text{m-/}u\text{m-}ma- ... -ay seem to designate the addressee’s greater volition and assurance, and thus the translation ‘want to’ and ‘definitely’, whereas verbs prefixed with \text{g-pa-} do not provide such readings.

When the involved agent participants are the addressee and the addressee, and are manifested by the pronoun ʔuʔ/ʔa ‘1st person plural inclusive’, the addressee’s volition mentioned above becomes a polite suggestion, and the event in question is anticipated to take place immediately, as exemplified by the following sentences and their English gloss: \text{‘Let’s ... now’}:

(28) a. \(\text{m-aniq-ay}=\text{ʔu}\) \quad \text{la} \\
    [\text{AF1-eat-}\text{AF2}=\text{1PI.Nom Part}] \\
    ‘Let’s eat (now)!’

b. \(\text{t-}\text{um-}u\text{ti0-ay}=\text{ʔa}\) \quad \text{cu}\) \quad \text{ʔulaqi?} \\
    [\text{beat}=\text{AF}, \text{beat-}\text{AF2}=\text{1PI.Nom Acc.Rf child}] \\
    ‘Let’s beat the child (now)!’

\(^{18}\) We are aware that there is still another troublesome case with the in-focus RECIPIENT argument in both PF and LF constructions.

\(^{19}\) That an LF marker may function as a PF one under certain circumstances is also observed in Wulai Atayal (Huang 1993) and Puyuma (Tan 1997). Moreover, in Kavalan, the conventional LF marker -an has completely lost its LF function; it serves as a PF marker now (Chang 2000:108).

\(^{20}\) Ross (1995:68) hypothesizes that the semantic distinction between PF -aw and LF -ay became blurred around the time that PAN broke up.

\(^{21}\) The discussion presented in this section is mostly based on Huang 1996.
Moreover, when the agent argument is someone other than the addressee, the addresser’s volition or suggestion surfaces as an anticipation, and thus the named participant’s obligation, which is indicated by the translation ‘should’. For instance:

(29a) m-aq-av cu? pila? ?i? watan uwe
   [AF1-give-AF2 Acc.Nrf money Nom Watan too]
   ‘Watan should give money, too’ (he also went to
   the movies, so he should pay his share)

b. m-aq-av cu? pila? ?i?
   [AF1-give-AF2 Acc.Nrf money Nom
   nha? uwe]
   [3P.Neu too]
   ‘They should give money, too’

To sum up the above discussion, we consider that the circumfix AF markers function to indicate a semantic scale of addresser’s volition-suggestion-anticipation which corresponds to the change of the involved agent participant(s) from (i) the addresser alone, to (ii) the addresser and the addressee, and to (iii) a third party. The following figure illustrates such a correspondence:

---

**FIGURE 3. PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF THE PROJECTIVE AF MARKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involved agent(s):</th>
<th>[+ addresser]</th>
<th>[+ addresser] &amp; [+ addressee]</th>
<th>[- addresser] &amp; [- addressee]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addresser’s view:</td>
<td>volition</td>
<td>suggestion</td>
<td>anticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(immediate event)</td>
<td>(3rd party’s obligation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Pragmatic functions of the projective NAF markers

Next, compare the following three sets of NAF sentences:

(30)a. niq-aw=mu ku? siyam
   [eat-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf pork]
   ‘I will eat the pork (now); I want to eat the pork (now)’ (I already have chopsticks on it)

a’.na-niq-un=mu ku? siyam
   [Red-eat-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf pork]
   ‘I will eat the pork’ (but not immediately)

a”.niq-un=mu ku? siyam
   [eat-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf pork]
   ‘I ate the pork’

(31)a. baq-av=mi? cu? pila? ku?
   [give-LF=1S.Gen Acc.Nrf money Nom.Rf]
   ‘I will (definitely) give the child money’ (I am already taking money out of my pocket)

a’.ba-baq-am=mi? cu? pila?
   [Red-give-LF=1S.Gen Acc.Nrf money Nom.Rf]
   ‘I will catch fish for the child’ (I may still be home now)

   [take-BF=1S.Gen Acc.Nrf fish Nom.Rf]
   ‘I want to catch fish for the child; I will (definitely) catch fish for the child’
   (I am already in the water)

a’.?a-yaq-al=mi? cu? qulih ku?
   [Red-take-BF=1S.Gen Acc.Nrf fish Nom.Rf]
   ‘I will catch fish for the child’ (I may still be home now)

a”.si-yaq-al=mi? cu? qulih ku?

---

22 I owe this term to Professor Chauncey Chu.
to be lexically determined (or to be conditioned by verbal semantics); that is, verbs taking PF -aw are those taking -un; verbs taking LF -ay are those taking -an; and verbs taking IF/BF -anay are those taking si/-ø.\(^{23}\) respectively. In other words, the three projective affixes -aw, -ay and -anay are counterparts of PF -un, LF -an and IF/BF si/-ø. Yet these two sets are not interchangeable; they differ semantically and pragmatically. As indicated in the above English gloss and additional information, verbs affixed with -aw, -ay and -anay, in contrast with verbs taking -un, -an and si/-ø, seem to manifest more immediate events, events which may take place right away or may have already been in progress. Besides, the addresser’s volition/assurance is greater. In other words, some of the functions the projective AF markers designate (i.e. the addresser’s volition/assurance and the sense of immediacy as discussed in Section 2.3.1) are also observed here. But note that the addresser (i.e. the agent participant) is no longer the focused argument in the above NAF sentences, unlike the one given in AF constructions, as exemplified in (26-27).

Moreover, like the circumfix AF markers, the three projective NAF affixes when appearing in sentences with the pronoun ti or ta ‘1st person plural inclusive’ manifesting the involved agent participant (again not the in-focus argument) may indicate the addresser’s polite suggestion and an immediate event. Examples follow:

(33) a. tuti-aw=ti? yumin
[beat-PF=1PI.Gen Yumin]
‘Let’s beat Yumin (now)!’

b. kalaha-ay=ni? yaya=su?
[take:care-LF=1PI.Gen mother=2S.Gen]
‘Let’s take care of your mother (now)!’

c. yapu-ay=ti? sayun
[cook-BF=1PI.Gen Sayun]
‘Let’s cook for Sayun (now)!’

However, when the involved agent participant is expressed by a third person pronoun, the addresser’s volition becomes the third party’s volition (instead of his obligation as designated by the circumfix AF markers discussed in Section 2.3.1). Consider:

[eat-PF=3S.Gen Nom.Rf fish Lin this]
‘He wants to eat this fish (now); He will (definitely) eat this fish’

b. tal-ay=nia? ku? ruwas ka? hani
[see-LF=3S.Gen Nom.Rf book Lin this]
‘He wants to read this book (now); He will (definitely) read this book’

c. ?al-anay=nia? cu? quilih ku?
[child]
‘He wants to catch fish for the child (now); He will (definitely) catch fish for the child’

The following diagram sums up the pragmatic functions of the three NAF affixes examined above:

![FIGURE 4. PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF THE PROJECTIVE NAF MARKERS](image)

Pragmatic functions of the projective markers with cooccurring particles quw/qi?

Another thing worth mentioning is that when the above-mentioned sentences appear with the question particle quw, the addresser’s or the third party’s volition becomes the addresser’s request, asking for the addressee’s permission. For instance:

[eat-PF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf fish Lin this Part]
‘Let me eat this fish, will you?’

sentences if the particle

(38) a.*niq-

b. tal-\textit{ay}=\textit{ni}a? \textit{ku}? \textit{ruwas} \textit{ka}? \textit{hani quw}

[see-LF=3S.Gen Nom.Rf book Lin this Part]

‘Let him read this book, will you?’

(37) a. ?al-\textit{anay}=?\textit{mi}? \textit{cu}? qulih \textit{ku}?


‘Let me catch fish for the child, will you?’

b. yhapuy-\textit{anay} ni? sayun ?i? yumin quw

[cook-BF Gen Sayun Nom Yumin Part]

‘Let Sayun cook for Yumin, will you?’

In all the sentences discussed so far, there are no examples with the second person, singular or plural, serving as the agent participant. Such examples, with or without the particle quw, are in fact ungrammatical:

(38) a.*niq-\textit{aw}=?\textit{su}? \textit{ku}? qulih (quw)

[see-LF=2S.Gen Nom.Rf fish Part]

b.*kalahan-\textit{ay}=?\textit{i}i? yumin (quw)

[take:care-LF=2S.Gen Yumin Part]

c.*?al-\textit{anay}=?\textit{i}i? \textit{cu}? qulih \textit{ku}?

[take-BF=2S.Gen Acc.Nrf fish Nom.Rf ?ulaqi? (quw)]

[child Part]

However, (38a-c) will become grammatical sentences if the particle qi? cooccurs, as shown below:

(38) a’.*m-\textit{aras-ay}=?\textit{i}i? \textit{cu}? quisia? qi?

[AF\textsubscript{1}-bring-\textit{AF}\textsubscript{2}=2S.Gen Acc.Nrf water (quw)]

b. m-\textit{aqi-ay}=?\textit{i}i? \textit{cu}? pila? qi?

[AF\textsubscript{1}-give-\textit{AF}\textsubscript{2}=2S.Gen Acc.Nrf money Part]

‘Don’t you give money!’

(39) a. m-\textit{aras-ay}=?\textit{i}i? \textit{cu}? quisia? qi?

[AF\textsubscript{1}-bring-\textit{AF}\textsubscript{2}=2S.Gen Acc.Nrf water Part]

‘Let me eat this fish, will you?’

b. m-\textit{aqi-ay}=?\textit{i}i? \textit{cu}? pila? quw

[AF\textsubscript{1}-give-\textit{AF}\textsubscript{2}=2S.Gen Acc.Nrf money Part]

Nevertheless, the actual semantics of the particle qi? is rather puzzling. Note that it may also appear in sentences with 1st or 3rd person pronouns, singular or plural. Yet, in such constructions, the sense of strong forbiddance shown in (38-39) does not appear. Instead, the constructions under study become questions and the reading of \textit{request} is present:

(40) a. niq-\textit{aw}=?\textit{su}? \textit{ku}? qulih \textit{ka}? hani qi?

[see-LF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf fish Lin this Part]

‘Let me eat this fish, will you?’

b. tuti-\textit{aw} ni? bai\textit{cu}? ?i? yumin qi?

[see-LF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf book Lin this Part]

‘Let him read this book, will you?’

(35) a. tal-\textit{ay}=?\textit{su}? \textit{ku}? ruwas \textit{ka}? hani quw

[see-LF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf book Lin this Part]

‘Let me read this book, will you?’

b. *\textit{niq-aw}=?\textit{su}? \textit{ku}? qulih \textit{ku}?


‘Don’t you take care of Yumin?’

(36) a. tal-\textit{ay}=?\textit{mu}? \textit{ku}? ruwas \textit{ka}? hani quw

[see-LF=1S.Gen Nom.Rf book Lin this Part]

‘Let me read this book, will you?’

(37) a. ?al-\textit{anay}=?\textit{mi}? \textit{cu}? qulih \textit{ku}?


[AF\textsubscript{1}-bring-\textit{AF}\textsubscript{2}=2S.Gen Acc.Nrf water Part]

‘Don’t you bring water!’
-ay and -anay, the functions of volition and suggestion (but not obligation) are conveyed, again determined by the agent participant(s). That is, when the agent participant(s) (not the in-focus argument) is either the addresser alone or a third party, the sentences containing the projective NAF affixes manifest the agent participant’s volition; and when the agent participants are the addresser and the addressee, a reading of suggestion is presented. Moreover, the presence of the particle quw or qiʔ may contribute a reading of request or forbiddance. TABLE 6 sums up the above discussion on the pragmatic functions of projective focus markers in Mayrinax:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>No particle</th>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Forbiddance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quw</td>
<td>qiʔ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Volition</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-/um-</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ma...-ay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aw</td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-anay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note] +: presence of the named function -: absence of the named function *: ungrammatical sentences ---: no examples available

Concluding remarks

The present paper has attempted to provide a comprehensive study of the focus system of Mayrinax Atayal, from a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspective:

(i) Syntactically, different focus markers are chosen, depending on different polarity (affirmative or negative), types of illocutionary force (declarative or imperative), tense/aspect/mood systems (neutral, perfective, future, projective, or atemporal), and focus types (AF, PF, LF, or IF/BF).

(ii) Semantically, different AF affixes designate varying semantic functions and mark verbs manifesting events of different dynamicity (or stativity). Also, focus markers and semantic roles of the in-focus arguments do not show one-to-one correspondence: while only AGENT, EXECUTOR or EXPERIENCER can serve as the focused participant in AF constructions, the PATIENT participant can serve that function in all the NAF (i.e. PF, LF and IF/BF) constructions, and the other non-agent roles can only function as in-focus arguments in either LF or IF/BF constructions and do not overlap with each other.

(iii) Pragmatically, whether the involved agent participant(s) is the addresser alone, the addresser and the addressee, or a third party, and whether the particle quw/qiʔ is present or not, structures containing projective focus markers may convey different meanings, such as the addresser’s or the involved participant’s volition, suggestion or obligation, forbiddance or request, as well as the semantics of immediacy.

Although the present paper does not intend to reconstruct the verbal morphology of PAN, it is hoped that the findings given here may provide some useful information for future researchers when doing historical reconstructions.
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汶水泰雅語焦點系統：
語法、語意及語用研究

黃美金

泰雅語是台灣南島語言的一支，包括兩個主要方言 Squilq 和 C’ulic’，苗栗泰安鄉汶水泰雅語即屬 C’ulic’方言。本篇論文在探討該方言的焦點系統。

「焦點系統」乃指句子中的文法主詞（亦即焦點名詞片語）和動詞間所呈現的呼應系統，是大多數西部南島語言共通特性之一。這系統不會因人稱、性別或數目而有形式上的差異。在汶水泰雅語中，動詞詞綴 m-, ma-, si-, um-, an-, anay, ami, aw, av, i-, un 及 ø 組成這焦點系統的基礎。就語法分佈而言，隨著一個句子為陳述句或祈使句、肯定句或否定句、主事焦點句或非主事焦點句、實現句或非實現句等，上述不同的詞綴即會被使用。例如：肯定陳述句會利用 m-, ma-, um- 及 ø, 祈使句及否定句會用 ø; 又主事焦點句會用 m-, ma-, um-, ø and m-/ma-/um- ... -av, 而非主事焦點句則會用到其餘的詞綴。

在語意上，不同動詞焦點詞綴標示不同程度的及物性（或靜態性）。例如 m- 和 um- 標示高及物性的動詞，ma- 和 ø 則用來標示較低及物性、甚或靜態性動詞。因此，構成一「及物性—靜態性」的 Continuum。另外，在語用功能上，當主事參與者是說話者本身時，不管聽話者或第三人稱個體是否參與，也不論句中是否有助詞 guw/qi’出現，含 projective 焦點標記的結構即可能表徵不同意涵，包括說話者或事件參與者的意願、建議或責任，禁止或要求，及「臨近」等語意。

關鍵詞：泰雅語、南島語言、焦點系統、語法、語意、語用