

Nonfinites in Southern Paiwan: Verbal vs. Nominal

Chunming Wu Henry Y. Chang
Academia Sinica Academia Sinica

Given the lack of clear-cut tense marking, it remains unclear how nonfinites are grammatically identified in Formosan languages. What have been categorized as infinitive verbs in Indo-European languages are subject to a morphological constraint dubbed as the AV-only restriction (Tang 1999, among many others). However, it is suggested that the AV-only restriction be not equated to non-finiteness. Recent findings have indicated that in some Formosan languages nonfinites do not necessarily respect the AV-only restriction (Chang 2010). This study explores nonfinite constructions in Southern Paiwan, with a special focus on their grammatical categorization and representation. It is shown that in Southern Paiwan nonfinites are structurally diverse, and can be primarily divided into two types: verbal type and nominal type. In the verbal type, an embedded verb must occur with a set of special verbal morphology (i.e., bare verb form (intransitive) in (1a), *-i* (transitive marker/locative applicative) in (1b) and *-an* (instrumental/beneficiary applicative) in (1c)). In contrast, an embedded verb in the nominal type occurs with **, *-en (-in)*, *-an* and *si-*, the verbal morphology pervasively utilized both in nominalizations and declarative sentences, as in (2).

- (1) a. 'u-p<in>angul a kasiw sa 'a-pungdjuq
1S.ERG-hit<PERF.TR> ABS wood LNK STA-broken.INTR.V
/*ma-pungdjuq/*na-ma-pungdjuq
/*INTR-broken/*PERF-INTR-broken
'I hit the wood broken.' (Resultative)
- b. na-m-alap=a'en ta tjakit sa 'u-sekas-i a kasiw
PERF-INTR-take=1S.ABS OBL knife LNK 1S.ERG-cut-TR.V ABS tree
'I took a knife to cut the tree.' (Purposive)
- c. uRi='u-alap-en a tjakit sa 'u-sekas-an ta kasiw timadju
IRR=1S.ERG-take-TR ABS knife LNK 1S.ERG-cut-BA.V OBL tree 3S.ABS
'I will take a knife to cut a tree for him.' (Purposive)
- (2) a. na-'isalu=a'en tu kan ta qavay
PERF-agree.INTR=1S.ABS OBL eat<NMLZ.INTR> OBL taro.cake
'I agreed to eat taro cakes.' (Control)
- b. na-kesa=a'en ta ciqaw tu 'u-kan-en
PERF-cook<INTR>=1S.ABS OBL fish OBL 1S.GEN-eat-NMLZ.TR
'I cooked fish to eat.' (Purposive)
- c. uRi='u-alap-en a aicu a tjakit tu 'u-si-sekas ta kasiw
1S.ERG-take-TR ABS this LNK knife OBL 1S.GEN-NMLZ.IA-cut OBL tree
'I will take the knife to cut a tree.' (Purposive)

The nominal and verbal embedded verbs can be either intransitive or transitive and these constructions share two major nonfinite properties: morphological defectiveness and syntactic dependency (Chang 2014). As opposed to matrix verbs, embedded verbs are morphologically defective and cannot be fully inflected for TAM (*uRi=* and *<in>*), as in (3).

- (3) a. *uRi='u-alap-en a tjakit sa uRi='u-sekas-an ta kasiw **timadju**
 IRR=1S.ERG-take-TR ABS knife LNK IRR=1S.ERG-cut-BA.V OBL tree 3S.ABS (Verbal nonfinite)
- b. *na-kesa=a'en ta ciqaw tu 'u-k<in>an
 PERF-cook<INTR>=1S.ABS OBL fish OBL 1S.GEN-eat<PERF.NMLZ.TR> (Nominal nonfinite)

Syntactically, verbal and nominal nonfinites must both depend on their matrix clauses and cannot stand alone as independent clauses. In spite of these similarities, two types of nonfinite construction are different in several syntactic properties. First, the verbal nonfinite allows the occurrence of the grammatical trigger but the nominal nonfinite does not, as shown by the contrast in (1b-c) and (2b-c). Second, two nonfinite constructions differ in their syntactic constituency. A verbal nonfinite maximally occurs as an infinitival CP which may accommodate wh-phrases, as in (4a), while a nominal nonfinite as a vP where wh-phrases are prohibited, as in (4b).

- (4) a. na-m-alap=esun ta tjakit sa anema a su-sekas-en
 PERF-INTR-take=2S.ABS OBL knife LNK what ABS 2S.ERG-cut-TR
 Lit. 'You took a knife to cut what?'
- b. *uRi=su-alap-en a aicu a tjakit tu anema a su-sekas-en
 1S.ERG-take-TR ABS this LNK knife OBL what ABS 2S.GEN-cut-NMLZ.TR
 Intended: 'You took a knife to cut what?'

Third, the verbal type allows its DP constituent (*qayam*) to be placed in the matrix clause, as in (5a), but the nominal type does not, as in (5b).

- (5) a. uRi='u-si-alap ta tjakit a aicu a qayam_i
 IRR=1S.ERG-IA-take OBL knife ABS this LNK pork
 [OP_i sa 'u-sekas-i t_i]
 LNK 1S.ERG-cut-TR.V
 'I will take a knife to cut this pork.'
- b. *uRi='u-si-alap ta aicu a tjakit a kasiw_i tu ['u-si-sekas t_i]
 IRR=1S.ERG-IA-take OBL this LNK knife ABS tree OBL 1S.GEN-NMLZ.IA-cut

These findings not only shed light on the complex structures and operations in Austronesian nonfinite constructions but also draw out important theoretical implications from two aspects. For one thing, the verbal nonfinite morphology has its unique grammatical status and function and cannot be treated on a par with the so-called 'non-indicative' morphology. A verbal nonfinite intransitive verb occurs as a bare verb while an intransitive imperative verb must be affixed by *-u/-i*. The verbal nonfinite *-i* is specialized as a transitive marker but the imperative *-i* can be both intransitive and transitive. For another, in Southern Paiwan there are at least two types of transitive *v* in non-finite clauses (cf. Aldridge 2004). The verbal transitive *v* is able to license an overt DP trigger but the nominal transitive *v* is not. We shall further explore how this distinction is tackled in the generative grammar. **Selected References:** Aldridge, Edith. 2004. Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages. PhD Dissertation, Cornell University. Chang, Henry Yungli. 2014. Finiteness in Formosan Complementation: A Preliminary Inquiry. Paper presented at Workshop on A Typological Study of Austronesian Languages in Taiwan and their Revitalization III. Academia Sinica. Chang, Henry Yungli. 2010. On the syntax of adverbial verbs in Formosan languages. *Austronesian Contribution to Theoretical Linguistics*, by Lisa Travis et al., Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Tang, Chih-Chen Jane, 1999. On clausal complements in Paiwan. *Selected papers from the 8 ICAL*: 529-578.