

**On the grammaticalization of nominalization marker =ay in Kavalan and Amis:  
a contrastive study**

Haowen Jiang, Rice University

## 1. Introduction

Recently there is a growing interest in nominalization and grammaticalization (Malchukov 2006; López-Couso & Seoane 2008; Yap et al. forthcoming). In light of a functional view on nominalization (Shibatani 2010), the present study investigates the multiple functions of the nominalization marker =ay in Kavalan (ISO *ckv*) and Amis (ISO *ami*), both Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan.

Austronesian languages are famous for the Focus (also called *voice*) system, which is essentially a set of affixes on the verb that are indicative of the participant role of a syntactically privileged argument (called *pivot*). It is widely accepted that in Proto-AN there were four such affixes, reconstructed as \**<um>* for Actor Focus (AF), \**-en* for Patient Focus (PF), \**-an* for Locative Focus (LF), and \**Si-* for Conveyance Focus (CF) (see Ross 2002). Owing to the Focus system, Austronesian languages in general make no morphological distinction between a verb and a nominalized expression based on that verb, a phenomenon which some scholars (see Starosta et al 1982 and Kaufman 2009) believe is the result of the erstwhile NMLZ morphology having been reanalyzed as verbal Focus morphology. The examples from Mayrinax Atayal are illustrative:

- (1) a. **yakaat m<in>uwah**      **cu?hisa?** ku?      naβakis  
NEG AF<PERF>come yesterday NOM.REF old.man  
'The old man **didn't come yesterday.**'  
b. kia?    ?i? m-anik ku?      **yakaat m<in>uwah**      **cu?hisa?**  
PROG LIN AF-eat NOM.REF NEG AF<PERF>come yesterday  
'**The one who didn't come yesterday** is eating (there).' (Shibatani 2009: 170; citing Huang 2002)

However, in Kavalan and Amis, there is a marker =ay that is emerging to take on the marking of nominalization as well as other functions. The presence of =ay in some cases distinguishes a nominalized expression from its base verb, which adds typological significance to the investigation of this particular marker.<sup>1</sup>

- (2) a. matiw sa lazín, mai **m-azas** tu tamun [CKV]  
AF.go to sea NEG AF-take OBL vegetable  
'(They) went to the beach, (and) didn't take any vegetables (with them).' (Ancestors.Ungi.052)  
b. mai tu **m-azas=ay/\*m-azas** timaiku sa-saqay [CKV]  
NEG.EX OBL AF-take=AY 1SG.OBL RED-walk  
'Nobody took me to look around.' (lit. 'One who took me to walk around didn't exist.')(Hsieh 2007: 87)
- (3) a. **ma-tayal** kaku i taypak [AMI]  
AF-work 1S.NOM LOC Taipei  
'I am working in Taipei.' (Wu 2006: 138)

---

<sup>1</sup> All the Kavalan and Amis data presented here are from my field elicitations at Xinshe Village, Hualien, Taiwan, during the summer of 2010, unless otherwise specified.

b. ci panay k-u ma-tayal=**ay**/\*ma-tayal [AMI]

PPN panay NOM-CN AF-work=AY

‘The one who works is Panay.’ (Wu 2006: 73)

## 2. Shared functions of =ay in Kavalan and Amis

It is found that the marker =ay illustrates two major types of functions: entity-denoting and non-entity-denoting. For the entity-denoting function, a verb cliticized by =ay denotes the pivot argument in the argument structure of that verb, whose participant role can be actor/agent or patient/undergoer, depending on verb classes (see 2b and 3b). For the non-entity-denoting function, the marker =ay adds emphatic or anterior/perfective implications to the predication.

(4) a. m-qaRim unglay zau [CKV]

AF-sour pineapple this

b. acicim k-u-ni a talacay [AMI]

AF.sour NOM-CN-this LIG pineapple

‘This pineapple is sour.’

(5) a. m-qaRim=**ay** unglay zau [CKV]

AF-sour=AY pineapple this

b. acicim=**ay** k-u-ni a talacay [AMI]

sour=AY NOM-CN-this LIG pineapple

‘This pineapple is sour (for sure).’ [Non-entity-denoting: emphatic]

(6) a. m-ipil aiku tu sikawman-na [CKV]

AF-listen 1S.NOM OBL words-3S.GEN

b. mi-tengil kaku t-u suwal nira [AMI]

AF-listen 1S.NOM OBL-CN words 3S.GEN

‘I am listening to him/her.’

(7) a. m-ipil=**ay** aiku tu sikawman-na [CKV]

AF-listen=AY 1S.NOM OBL words-3S.GEN

b. mi-tengil=**ay** kaku t-u suwal nira [AMI]

AF-listen=AY 1S.NOM OBL-CN words 3S.GEN

‘I did listen to him/her.’ [Non-entity-denoting: anterior/perfective]

## 3. Evidence for the grammaticalization route from entity-denoting to non-entity-denoting

It is argued that the non-entity-denoting function is related to, or even the grammaticalization of, the entity-denoting function. Supporting pieces of evidence are drawn from typological generalizations, historical reconstructions, and synchronic “bridging contexts”.

➤ According to Reid (forthcoming), the “attributive ligature” in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) was \*na/\*=n after vowels and \*=a after consonants. In Ivatan and the other Bashiic languages, the reflex of this

PMP ligature has been generalized to =*a*, regardless of the phonological environment where it occurs. In addition, the ligature is typically fused with any demonstrative that follows it.

- In Dupanangan Agta, for instance, the fusion of the ligature =*a* and a demonstrative is encliticized to a nominal and a verbal alike:

- (8) a. ni-sabit            ni    Manet i    **sulu=ayo**  
 CMPL.TV-hang PERS Manet DEF light=DIST.SPC  
 ‘Manet hung up **that light**.’  
 b. ma-singat i    **na-lutu=ayo**            im    ma-kata=*a*  
 ADJ-tasty    DEF ADJ-ripe=DIST.SPC than ADJ-unripe=SPC  
 ‘**That ripe one** is tastier than an unripe one.’ (Robinson 2008: 78)

- Kavalan and Amis might have undergone a similar development, whereby the fusion of the ligature =*a* and a following element gave rise to the nominalization function of =*ay*, probably in a context like (8b), i.e. from “that V-ing one” to “the one who Vs”.
- Amis still uses the ligature *a* productively in various attributive constructions. The case in Kavalan, though, is less straightforward since the ligature is no longer present in almost all cases. However, Kavalan does preserve the ligature =*a* (as an enclitics) in one particular attributive construction, where the modifier is a demonstrative and the modifiee a noun, as in *sunis=a zau* ‘child=LIG this’ meaning “this child”.
- The link between entity-denoting and non-entity-denoting functions of =*ay* can be found in so-called “bridging contexts”, where two (or more) meaning construals are equally plausible. The bridging context in this case is typically one where the predicate consists of only one single verb, which when cliticized by =*ay* may be interpreted as a nominal predicate with a denotation characterized by the verb, or as a verbal predicate associated with anterior/perfective overtone.

- (9) a. Ri-baut    aiku    [CKV]  
 catch-fish 1S.NOM  
 b. mi-futing kaku    [AMI]  
 AF-fish 1S.NOM  
 ‘I am catching fish.’
- (10) a. Ri-baut=**ay**    aiku    [CKV]  
 catch-fish=AY 1S.NOM  
 b. mi-futing=**ay** kaku    [AMI]  
 AF-fish=AY 1S.NOM  
 ‘I am the one who catches/caught fish.’ [Nominal predicate]  
 ‘I (already) caught fish.’ [Verbal predicate]

#### 4. Contrastive development of =*ay* in Kavalan and Amis

- In terms of entity-denoting functions, Kavalan =*ay* seems to be more grammaticalized than Amis =*ay*

because the former is permitted to (i) collocate with more verbal classes and (ii) cliticize on constituents of larger unit.

- In terms of non-entity-denoting functions, Amis =*ay* seems to be more grammaticalized than Kavalan =*ay* because the former has wider applications than the latter. There are many cases where Amis =*ay* introduces either emphatic or anterior/perfective implications to the predicate while Kavalan =*ay* does not.

## 5. Conclusion

- Although Austronesian languages in general do not require overt NMLZ marking save for Focus morphology, the marker =*ay* in both Kavalan and Amis is emerging to function like an NMLZ marker, in the referring and restricting use of argument NMLZ. However, it is not yet a full-fledged nominalizer since not all verbal classes (i.e. Focus types) require it for argument NMLZ.
- The marker =*ay* illustrates two major types of functions: entity-denoting and non-entity-denoting. It is argued that the non-entity-denoting function is the grammaticalization of the entity-denoting function. Supporting pieces of evidence are drawn from typological generalizations, historical reconstructions, and synchronic overlapping of the two types of functions.
- Once the link between the two types of functions is established, we might as well think of non-entity-denoting =*ay* as an epistemic modality maker that conveys the speaker's strong commitment to a proposition. Its emphatic reading is then a natural result of higher degree of speaker's commitment. And its anterior/perfective reading is most likely arrived at through pragmatic inferences based on presuppositions that are often associated with nominalizations. Thus, we have the advantage of conceptualizing =*ay* as the nexus of nominalization and evidentiality/epistemicity, the connection of which is crosslinguistically attested (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004).
- Finally, while Kavalan =*ay* is more grammaticalized in terms of nominalization (or the entity-denoting function), Amis =*ay* is more grammaticalized in terms of evidentiality/epistemicity (or the non-entity-denoting function). This suggests languages that share the same source and target domain in a grammaticalization process may end up developing different degrees of grammaticalization in either domain.

## Partial References

- López-Couso, María José & Elena Seoane (eds.), in collaboration with Teresa Fanego. 2008. *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Reid, Lawrence A. Forthcoming. Palauan velar nasals and the diachronic development of PMP noun phrases: A response to Blust. *Oceanic Linguistics* 49(2).
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2009. Elements of complex structures, where recursion isn't: The case of relativization. *Syntactic Complexity: Diachrony, Acquisition, Neuro-cognition, Evolution (Typological Studies in Language 85)*, eds. by T. Givón & Masayoshi Shibatani, 163-198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2010. Chasing nominalization particles—theory, field and history. Presented at Linguistics Colloquium of Rice University, Houston, Texas, October 14, 2010.
- Yap, F. H., K. Grunow-Hårsta & J. Wrona. Forthcoming. *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives (Typological Studies in Language 96)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.