

Chapter 6

Grammatical Relations

As discussed in Chapter 2, RRG approaches the issue of grammatical relations (or syntactic relations) rather differently from other theories. Notions such as subject, direct object, and indirect object are not considered to be basic or universal in languages, nor do they have any theoretical status in RRG. There is only one syntactic relation that is recognized in RRG, namely, the privileged syntactic argument of a grammatical construction (PSA), a term that has been introduced in Chapter 2. There are two types of privileged syntagmatic functions in a construction: controller and pivot. However, only when such privileged functions (i.e. being a controller or being a pivot) involve a restricted neutralization of semantic roles, can we claim that there exists a grammatical relation for that particular construction in the language. In other words, grammatical relations are privileged syntagmatic functions that cannot be defined by semantic or pragmatic grounds. In the following sections, some major constructions that contain a controller, a pivot, or both will be analyzed with regard to how these privileged arguments in the constructions are defined. In particular, I will examine the assumption that is made in quite a few previous studies of Amis that the NP bearing the nominative case is the subject of the sentence (e.g. Chen (1987)). As I will show later, in some constructions, the NPs bearing the genitive case or even the dative case can also have those privileged syntagmatic function(s).

Besides examining whether there are grammatical relations in Amis or not, I will also discuss two major constructions that may affect the semantic status of an NP: applicative constructions and voice operations. Applicative constructions, indicating the

phenomenon of multiple undergoer selection in Amis, play two primary functions in this language: enhancing the status of an adjunct or enhancing the status of a non-macrorole core argument. In other words, they either add an otherwise adjunct to the core, or assign the macrorolehood to a non-macrorole direct core argument. The NP promoted by the applicative constructions will become the undergoer of the sentence, and it will be marked by the nominative case. In other words, the applicative verbs follow the UV pattern by default even without the presence of the UV markers. The default voice choice of the applicative constructions indicates the ergative nature of Amis. The two primary functions performed by the applicative constructions will be further discussed in this chapter. The voice constructions in Amis will also be examined in this chapter with regard to which particular function they perform: PSA modulation or argument modulation, terms that have been introduced in Chapter 2.

This chapter is organized as follows. Section 6.1 examines the following five constructions that may tell us whether “grammatical relations” exist in Amis or not: relative clause, displacement constructions, control constructions, reflexivization, and constructions with consecutive clauses that share a purposive or a sequential relation. Section 6.2 discusses applicative constructions, focusing on their particular functions and the semantics of the applicative markers. Constructional schemas for each applicative construction will be established. Finally, in Section 6.3, I will look into the two voice constructions in Amis and discuss their respective functions. Some constructions that exhibit voice changes without the presence of the voice affixes will also be included in the discussion.

6.1 Major Constructions for the Discussion of Grammatical Relations

There are five constructions investigated in this section. These constructions either contain a controller, a pivot, or both, and for some constructions, there might involve restrictions for a given argument to serve those privileged syntagmatic functions. Nevertheless, not all of the restrictions have to be defined syntactically; some of them are related to the semantic status of an NP. I will begin with the discussion of relative clauses, or RC-like clausal modifiers (Wu 2003) in Amis.

6.1.1 Relative Clause

A relative clause (RC) in Amis is formed by gapping a NP from the modifying clause. The gapped NP is a pivot as it is omitted in the clause (indicated by “__” in the clause). This gapped NP is coreferential with the modified noun that follows the RC, and the linker *a* optionally shows up between the RC and the head noun. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the verb in the RC usually shows up in one of the following two types of structures. AV or plain UV verbs have to be affixed with the factual marker *-ay* or undergo Ca reduplication that manifests the irrealis status of the predicate; in other words, they never appear only with their plain voice forms in an RC. On the contrary, the applied UV verbs appear in the RC with the original applicative forms; they neither show up with *-ay* nor undergo Ca reduplication. The examples are given below. The RC is bold-faced, and the status of the pivot inside the RC is specified for every example.

- (6.1) a. **Mi-kalat k-u wacu ci aki-an**
AV-bite NOM-CN dog PPN Aki-DAT
'The dog is going to bite Aki.' or 'The dog is biting Aki.'

a'. Pivot: Actor of AV verb

Ma-patay tu k-u-ya **mi-kalat-ay** ____i **ci**
 NEUT-dead ASP NOM-CN-that AV-bite-FAC PPN

ak-an a wacu_i.
 Aki-DAT LNK dog
 'That dog that bit Aki is dead'

a''. Pivot: NMR direct core argument of AV verb

*Ma-patay tu k-u-ya **mi-kalat-ay** **k-u**
 NEUT-death ASP NOM-CN-that AV-bite-FAC NOM-CN

wacu ____i a tamdaw_i.
 dog LNK person
 'That person that the dog bit is dead'

b. Ma-ka'en n-i aki k-u-ya tali.
 UV-eat GEN-PPN Aki NOM-CN-that taro.
 'Aki ate that taro.'

b'. Pivot: Undergoer of UV verb

Tati'ih k-u-ya **ma-ka'en-ay** **n-i** **aki** ____i
 bad NOM-CN-that UV-eat-FAC GEN-PPN Aki

a tali_i.
 LNK taro
 'That taro that Aki ate was bad.'

b''. Pivot: (Patient) undergoer of applied UV verb

Tati'ih k-u-ya **mi-ka'en-an** **n-i** **aki** ____i
 bad NOM-CN-that MI-eat-LA GEN-PPN Aki

a tali_i.
 LNK taro.
 'That taro that Aki ate was bad.'

c. Pivot: Actor of UV verb

*Ma-su'su' k-u-ya **ma-ka'en-ay** ____i **k-u** **tali**
 NEUT-fat NOM-CN-that UV-eat-FAC NOM-CN taro

a tamdaw.
 LNK person
 'The person that ate the taro was fat.'

d. Pivot: (Instrument) undergoer of applied UV verb

Ma-pitek	aku	k-u	sa-pi-cikcik	n-i	aki
UV-break	1S.GEN	NOM-CN	InA-PI-cut	GEN-PPN	Aki

t-u	ateng	—i	a	pu'ut _i .
DAT-CN	vegetable		LNK	knife

'I broke the knife with which Aki cuts the vegetable'

i. Pivot: (Locative) undergoer of applied UV verb

Tayra	Ø-ci	panay	mi-ladum	i
go	NOM-PPN	Panay	NEUT-fetch.water	PREP

pi-ladum-an	n-i	aki	—i	a	tefun _i .
PI-fetch.water-LA	GEN-PPN	Aki		LNK	well

'Panay went to fetch water at the well where Aki fetched water.'

As mentioned in Wu (1995, 2000) and Liu (1999), the head of the RC has to be the grammatical subject of the RC. If their observation is correct, the pivot in the RC should involve the restricted neutralization of the semantic roles. This is exactly what one can see in (6.1). To serve as a head for an RC, its co-referential gapped NP has to be the actor of an AV verb, the undergoer of a plain UV verb, or an applied argument of an applied UV verb. If the gapped NP does not belong to any one of the types mentioned above, the sentences will be rendered ungrammatical, as exemplified in (6.1a''), where the pivot is a NMR direct core argument of an AV verb, and in (6.1c), in which the pivot is an actor of a UV verb. Hence, there is a restricted neutralization of semantic roles on the pivot of an RC in Amis.

6.1.2 Displacement Construction and WH-question Construction

Both the displacement construction and the WH-question formation involve a displaced nominal element that is placed at the clause-initial position. There are two types of structures for these constructions. The first type, termed the nominal type, is constructed as an equational sentence in which the displaced NP or the WH-word and the

remaining elements of the clause are juxtaposed together. This remaining clause is preceded by a nominative case marker, and it is structured like a headless relative clause, as the verb in the clause is coded in the same way (e.g. suffixed with *-ay*) as the verbs inside an RC. An example of this type can be found in (6.2a'). The second type, termed the verbal type, is formed simply by placing an NP or a WH-word at the beginning of the clause. The remaining clause of the verbal type stays structurally unchanged; that is, it is neither preceded by a case marker nor is required to change the verb form in it. The WH-word can even appear in-situ in the verbal type though it more often appears clause-initially. This type can be illustrated by an example like (6.4b). Choosing one type over the other crucially depends on the status of the displaced NP. Similar to the condition of forming an RC, the nominal type involves a restricted neutralization of semantic roles; that is, its pivot has to be the PSA of the clause. As for the verbal type, the pivot can be either oblique arguments or adjuncts, but this structure is less preferred or even deemed as ungrammatical if the pivot is a macrorole or a NMR core argument.

Let us first consider the nominal type in (6.2):

- (6.2) a. Ma-ulah kaku t-u fafahian a singsi.
 AV-like 1S.NOM DAT-CN woman LNK teacher
 'I like female teachers.'

a'. Pivot: (Patient) undergoer of -an applied UV verb

U	fafahian	a	singsi _i	k-u	ka-ulah-an
CN	woman	LNK	teacher	NOM-CN	KA-like-LA

aku ____i.

1S.GEN

'It is female teachers that I like better.'

b. Pivot: Actor of AV verb

Ya	wawa _i	k-u	mi-pa-nanum-ay	— _i	t-u
that	child	NOM-CN	AV-CAU-water-FAC		DAT-CN

kulong.

water.buffalo

‘It is that child who feed water to the water buffalos.’

b’. Pivot: Actor of UV verb

*Ya	wawa _i	k-u	ma-pa-nanum-ay	— _i	k-u
that	child	NOM-CN	UV-CAU-water-FAC		NOM-CN

kulong.

water.buffalo

‘It is that child who feed water to the water buffalos.’

c. Pivot: (Patient) undergoer of -an applied UV verb

Ya	nanum _i	k-u	mi-pa-nanum-an	tu	aku
that	water	NOM-CN	MI-CAU-water-LA	ASP	1S.GEN

ci **mama-an** —_i.

PPN father-DAT

‘That water is what I gave father to drink.’

The sentence in (6.2a) shows the sentence that follows the canonical word order of Amis.

In (6.2a’), the undergoer NP in (6.2a) appears at the sentence initial position and there is a gap in the remaining clause that follows the displaced NP. As one can see, there is a case marker *ku* present between the displaced NP and the remaining clause; that is, the clause appears at a nominal position.¹ The same nominal structure is also found when an actor of an AV verb is displaced, as illustrated in (6.2b). But, when the displaced NP is an actor of a UV verb, the nominal structure is not accepted, as seen in (6.2b’). The example in (6.2c) indicates that the nominal type is found when the displaced NP is an undergoer of a UV verb. These examples demonstrate a restricted neutralization of semantic roles, as the pivot in the nominal clause following the displaced element has to be the actor of an AV verb or the undergoer of a UV verb; the latter can be either a plain

¹ This structure is treated as a cleft sentence in Liu (1999).

UV verb or an applied UV verb. In other words, there is a syntactic pivot in the nominal type of displacement construction.

The restricted neutralization exemplified in (6.2) is also observed in the nominal type WH-questions in (6.3):

- (6.3) a. Pivot: Actor of AV verb
 Cima_i k-u **mi-palu-ay** _____i **t-u** **wawa?**
 who.NOM NOM-CN AV-beat-FAC DAT-CN child
 ‘Who is the one that beat the child?’
- a’. Pivot: Actor of UV verb
 *Cima_i k-u **ma-palu-ay** _____i **k-u** **wawa?**
 who.NOM NOM-CN UV-like-FAC NOM-CN child
 ‘Who is the one that beat the child?’

Sentences in (6.3a-a’) exemplify the WH-questions concerning an actor of a predicate. As shown the data, the clause following the interrogative pronoun is preceded by a case marker, which gives the nominal property of the clause. Furthermore, when the interrogative pronoun is coreferential with the actor of the predicate, the verb has to be marked by the AV affix; that is, this pronoun cannot be coreferential with an actor of a UV verb. When the interrogative pronoun refers to a non-actor in the clause, the verb has to be marked by either the plain UV markers (e.g. (6.3b)) or the applicative markers (e.g. (6.3c-f)). Hence, there is a restricted neutralization of semantic roles. Examples follow:

- (6.3) b. Pivot: Undergoer of UV verb
 U maan_i k-u **ma-ka’en-ay** **n-i** **aki** _____i?
 CN what NOM-CN UV-eat-FAC GEN-PPN Aki
 ‘What is it that Aki ate?’
- b’. Pivot: NMR direct core argument of AV verb
 *U maan_i k-u **k-um-a’en-ay** **Ø-ci** **aki** _____i?
 CN what NOM-CN eat<AV>-FAC NOM-PPN Aki
 ‘What did Aki eat?’

- c. Pivot: (Patient) undergoer of applied UV verb

Cima _i	k-u	ka-ulah-an	isu	____i?
who.NOM	NOM-CN	KA-like-LA	2S.GEN	

‘Who is the one you like?’

- d. Pivot: (Instrument) undergoer of applied UV verb

U	maan _i	k-u	sa-pi-cikcik	isu	t-u
CN	what	NOM-CN	InA-PI-cut	2S.GEN	DAT-CN

dateng ____i?

vegetable

‘What did you use to cut the vegetable?’

- e. Pivot: (Locative) undergoer of applied UV verb

Cima _i /Cimanan _i	k-u	pi-caliw-an	isu
who.NOM/who.DAT	NOM-CN	PI-borrow-LA	2S.GEN

t-u **paysu** ____i?

DAT-CN money

‘Whom did you borrow the money from?’

- f. Pivot: (Goal) undergoer of applied UV verb

Cima _i	k-u	pa-aca-an	n-u-ra
who.NOM	NOM-CN	CAU-buy-LA	GEN-CN-that

wawa **t-u** **hana** ____i?

child DAT-CN flower

‘Who did that child sell the flower?’

The verbal type of displacement construction is exemplified in (6.4). In this construction, an NP is displaced, but the structure of the clause is not affected; it can still retain its verbal feature as there is no case marking appearing before the clause, and the verb in the clause does not have to be one of the deverbal forms. The verbal type is well accepted for the displacement of an oblique argument or adjunct, but the acceptability decreases when a macrorole or an NMR direct core argument is displaced. For the latter group of NPs, the nominal type is preferred. Consider the following examples:

- (6.4) a. Ma-pa-nanum tu n-u wawa k-u kulong
 UV-CAU-water ASP GEN-CN child NOM-CN water.buffalo

t-u-ya nanum.
 DAT-CN-that water
 ‘The child has already fed the water buffalo that water.’

- b. Pivot: Oblique argument of three-place UV verb

Ya nanum_i **ma-pa-nanum** **tu** **n-u** **wawa**
 that water UV-CAU-water ASP GEN-CN child

k-u **kulong** _____i.
 NOM-CN water.buffalo
 ‘That water the child has already fed the water buffalo.’

The example (6.4a) exhibits the default word order of a three-place predicate, while in (6.4b), one of the NMR arguments (i.e. the theme participant *nanum* ‘water’) is placed at the beginning of the clause. The only difference between the two sentences is the word order; the clause following the displaced NP in (6.4b) is structurally unaffected, as the verb form remains unchanged and the clause is not preceded by a case marker.

However, the acceptability of such kind of displacement construction varies according to the semantic status of the displaced NP. In general, the more peripheral the NP is, the higher acceptability the verbal type displacement construction can get among the speakers. For example, this structure is not acceptable or less preferred if the displaced NP is the actor (i.e. a macrorole) of the predicate, as seen in (6.4c-c’), or a NMR core argument, as seen in (6.4d):

- (6.4) c. Pivot: Actor of UV verb

*Ya wawa_i **ma-pa-nanum** _____i **k-u** **kulong.**
 that child UV-CAU-water NOM-CN water.buffalo
 ‘That child gave water to the water buffalo.’

- c’. Pivot: Actor of AV verb

??Ya wawa_i **mi-pa-nanum** _____i **t-u** **kulong.**
 that child AV-CAU-water DAT-CN water.buffalo
 ‘That child gave water to the water buffalo.’

d. Pivot: NMR direct core argument of AV verb

??U	kulong _i	mi-pa-nanum	k-u	wawa	____i.
CN	water.buffalo	AV-CAU-water	NOM-CN	DAT-CN	

‘That child gave water to the water buffalo.’

Although both the recipient participant *kulong* ‘water buffalo’ and the theme participant *nanum* ‘water’ are coded as NMR arguments by the dative case in (6.4d) and (6.4a) respectively, they differ from each other regarding the possibility to be selected as the undergoer in the UV construction. For a three-place predicate like *pa-nanum* ‘give water’ or *mi-pa-nanum* ‘go to give water’, only the recipient argument can be the undergoer in the UV construction, as discussed in Chapter 5. Hence, the recipient argument of this predicate enjoys a more important semantic status than the theme argument. The recipient argument *kulong* of *mi-pa-nanum* is analyzed as a NMR direct core argument, while the theme argument *nanum* ‘water’ is analyzed as an NMR oblique core argument.² The verbal type construction is more likely to go with peripheral NPs such as adjunct and oblique core argument but not a macrorole or direct core argument. More examples are given below in (6.4e-g’)

(6.4) e. Pivot: Undergoer of UV verb

?? U	futing _i	ma-ka’en	n-i	sawmah	____i.
CN	fish	UV-eat	GEN-PPN	Sawmah	

‘The fish was eaten by Sawmah.’

f. Ma-laluk kisu mi-padang t-u fafahian a
 NEUT-diligent 2S.NOM AV-help DAT-CN woman LNK

kaka.
 older.sibling
 ‘You are enthusiastic in helping out the elder sister.’

² Another piece of evidence that shows the direct-oblique distinction between the two core arguments is that while the theme argument *nanum* ‘water’ is omissible in the sentence, it is impossible to omit the recipient argument *kulong* ‘water buffalo’.

f'. Pivot: NMR argument of embedded AV verb

U	fafahian	a	kaka _i ,	ma-laluk	kisu
CN	woman	LNK	older.sibling	NEUT-diligent	2S.NOM

mi-padang ____i.

AV-help

‘You are enthusiastic in helping out the elder sister (in contrast with the elder brother).’

g. Pa-si-fanaq Ø-ci ina t-u radiw
CAU-have-knowledge NOM-PPN mother DAT-CN song

i wawa.

PREP child

‘Mother is teaching songs at the child’s place.’

g'. Pivot: Adjunct of three-place AV verb

I	wawa _i	pa-si-fanaq	Ø-ci	ina
PREP	child	CAU-have-knowledge	NOM-CN	mother

t-u **radiw** ____i.

DAT-CN song

‘Mother is teaching songs at the child’s place.’ (An answer to ‘Where is Mother?’)

As shown in the above sentences, the verbal type displacement construction is rendered as marginally acceptable by the speakers for a displaced macrorole in (6.4e).³ But, it is acceptable when the displaced NP is a NMR core argument of an embedded verb as seen in (6.4f’), and it is also grammatical when the NP is a (locative) adjunct of a (three-place) AV verb, as shown in (6.4g’).

The phenomenon discussed above in Amis is reminiscent to the hierarchy of the unmarked topic choice among various NPs discussed in Foley and Van Valin (1984). In this hierarchy, adjuncts (i.e. setting NPs in their term) enjoy the preference over other oblique NPs, which in turn are favored over core NPs to serve as a natural topic. That is to say, “the NPs most central to the clause are the most marked as topics, while the most

³ It seems that for the argument marked by the genitive case (e.g. the actor of a UV verb in (6.4c)), the structure is the least favored. More investigation is needed here.

peripheral NPs are the least marked” (Foley and Van Valin 1994:126). This hierarchy has been found in English and Tagalog. Although the displaced NP in Amis is not necessarily a topic, the various degrees of easiness to be displaced among NPs of different semantic status are also found. Meanwhile, Chang (1997) also reports similar findings regarding the different constraints in the extraction of arguments and adjuncts in two other Formosan languages: Kavalan and Seediq. It is easier to distract adjuncts than arguments.

The verbal type of structure is also found in the formation of WH-questions. In other words, the verb in the clause following the interrogative pronoun does not undergo further affixation or reduplication, and the clause is not preceded by a case marker. This structural type is only limited to the WH-questions of oblique arguments or adjuncts; the WH-questions of macroroles and NMR direct core arguments have to appear in the nominal type exemplified in (6.3). The verbal type of WH-questions is illustrated in (6.5):

(6.5) a. Pivot: NMR oblique argument of AV verb

Cimanan _i	mi-aca	k-u-ra	kaying	t-u	hana
who.DAT	AV-buy	NOM-CN-that	lady	DAT-CN	flower

_____i?

‘Whom is the young lady going to buy flower from?’

b. Pivot: NMR oblique argument of three-place AV verb

Cimanan _i	pa-aca	k-u-ra	wawa	t-u	hana
who.Dat	CAU-buy	NOM-CN-that	child	DAT-CN	flower

_____i?

‘Who did that child sell the flower?’

c. Pivot: adjunct of intransitive verb

I	cuwa _i	kisu	ma-futiq	____ _i ?
PREP	where	2S.NOM	NEUT-sleep	

‘Where are you going to sleep?’

As illustrated in (6.5a-c), the clause following the interrogative pronoun does not undergo the structural changes observed in the nominal type of WH-Question.⁴ Notice that the interrogative pronouns are coreferential with either the NMR oblique argument (e.g. (6.5a-b)) or the adjunct (e.g. (6.5c)). This structure is not acceptable if the interrogative pronoun refers to a macrorole or NMR core argument, as shown in the examples below:

(6.5) d. Pivot: NMR direct core argument of AV verb

*Cima_i/Cimanan_i **ma-ulah** **kisu** _____i?
 who.NOM/who.DAT AV-like 2S.NOM
 ‘Who do you like?’

e. Pivot: Actor of AV verb

*Cima_i **ma-ulah** _____i **t-u** **fafahian a** **singsi?**
 who.NOM AV-like DAT-CN woman LNK teacher
 ‘Who likes female teachers?’

f. Pivot: Actor of UV verb

*Cima_i **ma-palu** _____i **k-u** **wawa?**
 who.NOM UV-beat NOM-CN child
 ‘Who beat the child?’

g. Pivot: Undergoer of UV verb

*U maan_i **ma-ka’en** **n-i** **aki** _____i?
 CN what UV-eat GEN-PPN Aki
 ‘What did Aki eat?’

In the above discussion, I have shown that there are two types of structure for displacement and WH-question constructions in Amis: nominal and verbal. The nominal type, similar to the RC construction discussed in the previous section, involves a syntactic pivot. As for the verbal type, although it is only or preferably found with an oblique argument or an adjunct, there is no neutralization involved. Hence, there is no

⁴ The WH-words can even remain in-situ, and hence, there can be no pivot involved in the WH-questions. For example:

(6.5) h. Pa-fli-en n-i mama k-u wawa **t-u** **maan?**
 CAU-give-UV GEN-PPN father NOM-CN child DAT-CN what
 ‘What will Father give the child?’

evidence for grammatical relations in this type of structure. Table 6.1 below

summarizes the two types of structures for displacement and WH-question formation:

Table 6.1 Summary of the Pivot Types in Displacement and WH-Q Constructions

Structure Type	Grammatical Relations	Pivot
Nominal	Yes	actor of AV undergoer of UV
Verbal	No	oblique NP (oblique argument and adjunct) ??core NP (macrorole and NMR direct core argument)

There is another interesting piece of information revealed in this table. Recall that in Chapter 5, I have shown that in Amis, the NMR direct core argument, oblique core argument, and adjuncts can all be marked by the dative case in an AV sentence.

Although the case marker seems to neutralize their distinctions, their different semantic status is reflected in the structures of displacement and WH-question constructions.

Both macroroles and NMR direct core arguments have to be promoted to become PSAs before being displaced or being the focus of WH-questions, but such a constraint is not found with oblique arguments and adjuncts.

6.1.3 Control Constructions

This section focuses on the exploration of three structural variants of control construction. These variants can be illustrated with the English examples in (6.6):⁵

- (6.6) a. Leslie tried to open the door.
b. Kim persuaded Pat to go to the party.
c. Robin promised Sandy to clean the birdcage.

Both (6.6a) and (6.6c) are referred to as subject control, as the controller of the missing argument in the linked core is the subject of the matrix core. The sentence in (6.6b) exemplifies a case of object control, in which the controller of missing argument in the linked core is the object of the matrix core. As the terms like subject and object play no

⁵ The English examples are taken from VVLP (1997:540)

role in RRG, the types of the controllers (e.g. syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic) of the missing arguments have to be discussed in a different approach. In this section, the Amis equivalents of the control constructions illustrated in (6.6) will be examined. I will show that the controller is not necessarily a syntactic one; in other words, there can be no grammatical relations involved in these constructions. To avoid using terms related to grammatical relation, I will name the three types of control constructions: the try-type, the persuade-type, and the promise-type. Let us begin with the persuade-type:

6.1.3.1 The Persuade-type Control Construction

Consider the following Amis examples containing a jussive verb *mi-lalang* ‘dissuade’:

- (6.7) a. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Mi-lalang	kaku _i	ci	mama-an _j	mi-palu	_____ j/*i.
AV-dissuade	1S.NOM	PPN	father-DAT	AV-beat	

t-u wawa.
 DAT-CN child

‘I am going to dissuade Father from beating the child.’

- a’. ***Mi-lalang** kaku_i ci mama-an_j **mi-palu** cingra j/*i.
 AV-dissuade 1S.NOM PPN father-DAT AV-beat 3S.NOM

t-u wawa.
 DAT-CN child

‘I am going to dissuade Father from beating the child.’

- b. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Ma-lalang	aku _i	Ø-ci	mama _j	mi-palu	_____ j/*i
UV-dissuade	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	father	AV-beat	

t-u wawa
 DAT-CN child

‘I dissuaded Father from beating the child.’

- c. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Lalang-en	aku _i	<i>Ø-ci</i>	mama _j	mi-palu	____j/*i
dissuade-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	father	AV-beat	

t-u wawa.
 DAT-CN child

‘I dissuade Father from beating the child.’

- d. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of intransitive verb

Mi-lalang	kaku _i	<i>ci</i>	mama-an _j	tayra	____j/*i	i
AV-dissuade	1S.NOM	PPN	father-DAT	go.there		PREP

taypak.
 Taipei

‘I am going to dissuade Father from going to Taipei.’

- e. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of intransitive verb

Ma-lalang	aku _i	<i>Ø-ci</i>	mama _j	tayra	____j/*i	i
UV-dissuade	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	father	go.there		PREP

taypak.
 Taipei

‘I dissuaded Father from going to Taipei.’

- f. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of intransitive verb

Lalang-en	aku _i	<i>Ø-ci</i>	mama _j	tayra	____j/*i	i
dissuade-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	father	go.there		PREP

taypak.
 Taipei

‘I dissuade Father from going to Taipei.’

Like the English example with *persuade*, the control construction headed by *mi-lalang* (*ma-lalang*, *lalang-en*) ‘dissuade’ in Amis is also obligatory as there is no way to express the shared argument in the linked core. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of (6.7a’). The data show that the second argument of the matrix core (i.e. the italicized part) is the controller of the missing argument in the linked core regardless as to whether it is realized as an NMR direct core argument in the AV construction in (6.7a) and (6.7d), or an undergoer of a UV verb in (6.7b-c) and (6.7e-f). This observation contradicts to

the previous assumption for an object control construction that the argument bearing the nominative case is the “subject”, and the “object” argument of the matrix core in (6.7a) is the controller for the missing argument. As shown in examples such as (6.7b-c) and (6.7e-f), the controller is not an “object” of the matrix core. Therefore, it is inappropriate to name this type of construction an “object control” construction. However, employing the notions of semantic macrorole and direct core argument, the phenomenon can be explained in a unified way. It is the lowest ranking argument of the matrix verb that can serve as the controller for the missing argument in the linked core (i.e. the “___” part). This argument can be a NMR direct core argument of an AV matrix core or an undergoer of a UV matrix core that controls the interpretation of the missing argument.

Besides a controller, there is a pivot (i.e. the shared argument) in the linked core of the control verb *mi-lalang* (AV) (*ma-lalang* (UV), *lalang-en* (UV)). As shown in the above examples, the pivot can only be an actor of an AV verb, as in (6.7a-c), or an actor of an intransitive verb, as in (6.7d-f). Other possibilities are not allowed. For instance:

- (6.8) a. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb
 ***Mi-lalang** *kaku_i* *ci* *mama-an_j* **ma-palu/palu-en** ___ *j/*i*.
 AV-dissuade 1S.NOM PPN father-DAT UV-beat/beat-UV

k-u *wawa*.
 NOM-CN child
 ‘I am going to dissuade Father from beating the child.’
- b. Controller: NMR core argument AV verb; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb
 ***Mi-lalang** *kaku_i* *ci* *mama-an_j* **mi-palu** *k-u*
 AV-dissuade 1S.NOM PPN father-DAT AV-beat NOM-CN

tao ___ *j/*i*.
 others
 ‘I dissuaded Father from being beaten by others.’

- c. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb

***Mi-lalang** *kaku_i* *ci* *mama-an_j* **ma-palu/palu-en**
 AV-dissuade 1S.NOM PPN father-DAT UV-beat/beat-UV

n-u *tao* ____ *j/*i*.
 GEN-CN others

‘I dissuaded Father from being beaten by others.’

- d. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

***Ma-lalang** *aku_i* *Ø-ci* *mama_j* **ma-palu/palu-en**
 UV-dissuade 1S.GEN NOM-PPN father UV-beat/beat-UV

____ *j/*i* *k-u* *wawa*
 NOM-CN child

‘I dissuaded Father from beating the child.’

- e. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: NMR argument of AV verb

***Ma-lalang** *aku_i* *Ø-ci* *mama_j* **mi-palu** *k-u*
 UV-dissuade 1S.GEN NOM-PPN father AV-beat NOM-CN

tao ____ *j/*i*
 others

‘I dissuaded Father from being beaten by others.’

- f. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb

***Ma-lalang** *aku_i* *Ø-ci* *mama_j* **ma-palu/palu-en**
 UV-dissuade 1S.GEN NOM-PPN father UV-beat/beat-UV

n-u *tao* ____ *j/*i*
 GEN-CN others

‘I dissuaded Father from being beaten by others.’⁶

- g. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

***Lalang-en** *aku_i* *Ø-ci* *mama_j* **ma-palu/palu-en**
 dissuade-UV 1S.GEN NOM-PPN father UV-beat/beat-UV

____ *j/*i* *k-u* *wawa*.
 NOM-CN child

‘I dissuade Father from beating the child.’

⁶ This sentence is acceptable is it is interpreted as the combination of two clauses: “I dissuade Father from going there; otherwise, he will be beaten by others.” The same condition also applies to sentences (6.7d’) and (6.7f’).

- h. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: NMR argument of AV verb
 ***Lalang-en** aku_i Ø-ci mama_j **mi-palu** k-u
 dissuade-UV 1S.GEN NOM-PPN father AV-beat NOM-CN

 tao —j/*i.
 others
 ‘I dissuade Father from being beaten by others.’
- i. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb
 ***Lalang-en** aku_i Ø-ci mama_j **ma-palu/palu-en**
 dissuade-UV 1S.GEN NOM-PPN father UV-beat/beat-UV

 n-u tao —j/*i.
 GEN-CN others
 ‘I dissuade Father from being beaten by others.’

The examples (6.8) are regarded as ungrammatical. In these sentences, the pivot in the linked core may be an actor of a UV verb as in (6.8a) and (6.8g), an NMR core argument of an AV verb as in (6.8b), (6.8e), and (6.8h), or an undergoer of a UV verb as in (6.8c), (6.8f), and (6.8i). Only the actor of an AV verb or an intransitive verb can function as a pivot in the linked core.

The control construction initiated by another verb *mi-ucur* ‘assign’ displays the same condition. In other words, it is always the lowest ranking argument of the matrix verb (i.e. the undergoer of a UV verb or the NMR core argument of an AV verb in the matrix core) that functions as the controller. As for the pivot, it is always the actor of an AV or an intransitive verb. The examples that have the matrix and the linked predicates with different voice forms are given in (6.9).

- (6.9) a. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb
Mi-ucur kaku_i ci aki-an_j **mi-to’or** —j/*i
 AV-assign 1S.NOM PPN Aki-DAT AV-follow

 ci panay-an.
 PPN Panay-DAT
 ‘I am going to assign Aki to follow Panay.’

a'. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

*Mi-ucur	kaku _i	ci	aki-an _j	ma-to'or/to'or-en
AV-assign	1S.NOM	PPN	Aki-DAT	UV-follow/follow-UV

—_{j/*i} Ø-ci panay.
 NOM-PPN Panay

'I am going to assign Aki to follow Panay.'

b. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb

*Mi-ucur	kaku _i	ci	aki-an _j	mi-to'or
AV-assign	1S.NOM	PPN	Aki-DAT	AV-follow

Ø-ci panay —_{j/*i}.
 NOM-PPN Panay

'I am going to assign Aki to be followed by Panay.'

b'. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb

*Mi-ucur	kaku _i	ci	aki-an _j	ma-to'or/to'or-en
AV-assign	1S.NOM	PPN	Aki-DAT	UV-follow/follow-UV

n-i panay —_{j/*i}.
 GEN-PPN Panay

'I am going to assign Aki to be followed by Panay.'

c. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Ma-ucur	aku _i	Ø-ci	aki _j	mi-to'or	— _{j/*i}
UV-assign	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Aki	AV-follow	

ci panay-an.
 PPN Panay-DAT

'I assigned Aki to follow Panay.'

c'. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

*Ma-ucur	aku _i	Ø-ci	aki _j	ma-to'or/to'or-en
UV-assign	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Aki	UV-follow/follow-UV

—_{j/*i} Ø-ci panay.
 NOM-PPN Panay

'I assigned Aki to follow Panay.'

- d. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb

*Ma-ucur	aku _i	Ø-ci	aki _j	mi-to'or
UV-assign	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Aki	AV-follow

Ø-ci panay Ø_{j/*i}.

NOM-PPN Panay

'I assigned Aki to be followed by Panay.'

- d'. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb

*Ma-ucur	aku _i	Ø-ci	aki _j	ma-to'or/to'or-en
UV-assign	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Aki	UV-follow/follow-UV

n-i panay Ø_{j/*i}.

GEN-PPN Panay

'I assigned Aki to be followed by Panay.'

- e. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of intransitive verb

Mi-ucur	kaku _i	ci	aki-an _j	tayra	— _{j/*i}	i
AV-assign	1S.NOM	PPN	Aki-DAT	go.there		PREP

taypak.

Taipei

'I am going to assign Aki to go to Taipei.'

- e'. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of intransitive verb

Ma-ucur	aku _i	Ø-ci	aki _j	tayra	— _{j/*i}
UV-assign	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Aki	go.there	

i taypak.

PREP Taipei

'I assigned Aki to go to Taipei.'

The control constructions examined so far all present the same restriction concerning the semantic status of the controller in the matrix core and the pivot in the linked core; it is always the lowest ranking argument of the matrix core that functions as the controller, and the pivot is limited to the actor of an AV or an intransitive verb. That is to say, both the controller and the pivot are semantically determined, and hence, there is no evidence for a grammatical relation being involved in the above-discussed control constructions.

However, not every control construction exhibits the same condition, especially

regarding the pivot in the linked core. Consider the following sentences beginning with the predicate *pa-tangic* ‘beseech; force’:

- (6.10) a. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of intransitive verb

Pa-tangic	kaku _i	ci	aki-an _j	tayra	— _{j/*i}
CAU-cry	1S.NOM	PPN	Aki-DAT	go	

i pusong.
PREP Taitung.

‘I beseeched Aki to go to Taitung.’ (Causative, AV)

- b. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of an intransitive verb

Pa-tangic	han	n-i	dongi _i	Ø-ci	kacaw _j
CAU-cry	say.so (UV)	GEN-PPN	Dongi	NOM-PPN	Kacaw

tayra —_{j/*i} i kakacawan.
go.there PREP Kakacawan
‘Dongi beseeched Kacaw to go to Kakacawan.’

- c. Controller: U of a UV verb; Pivot: A of an AV verb

Pa-tangic-en	aku _i	Ø-ci	mayaw _j	mi-palu	— _{j/*i}
CAU-cry-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Mayaw	AV-beat	

ci sawmah-an.
PPN Sawmah-DAT

‘I forced Mayaw to go to beat Sawmah.’

- d. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

*Pa-tangic-en	aku _i	Ø-ci	mayaw _j	ma-palu	— _{j/*i}
CAU-cry-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Mayaw	UV-beat	

Ø-ci sawmah.
NOM-PPN Sawmah

‘I forced Mayaw to go to beat Sawmah.’

- e. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

Pa-tangic-en	aku _i	Ø-ci	mayaw _j	palu-en	— _{j/*i}
CAU-cry-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Mayaw	beat-UV	

Ø-ci sawmah.
NOM-PPN Sawmah

‘I forced Mayaw to go to beat Sawmah.’

- f. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb

*Pa-tangic-en	aku _i	Ø-ci	mayaw _j	pa-nengneng-en/
CAU-cry-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	Mayaw	CAU-watch-UV

ma-pa-nengneng	n-u	ising	— _{j/*i} .
UV-CAU-watch	GEN-CN	doctor	

‘I forced Mayaw to be seen by the doctor.’

The control construction initiated by *pa-tangic* ‘beseech; force’ presents a very intriguing case regarding the pivot of the linked core. As indicated in the data, the controller in the matrix core is still the lowest ranking argument (i.e. undergoer of a UV verb or NMR direct core argument of an AV verb) of the core. Nevertheless, in addition to the actor of an AV verb or an intransitive verb, the pivot can also be the actor of an *-en* UV verb (e.g. (6.10e)), but not a *ma-* UV verb (e.g. (6.10d)). I have no good explanation for this contrast here.⁷ In fact, the undergoer of a UV verb can also be a pivot of in the linked core, as shown in (6.11c):

- (6.11) a. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Sa-pi-pa-tangic-an	kaku _i	ci	sawmah-an _j
InA-PI-CAU-cry-MOOD	1S.NOM	PPN	Sawmah-DAT

mi-palu	— _{j/*i}	t-u	wawa.
AV-beat		DAT-CN	child

‘I want to force Sawmah to beat the child.’ (Optative, AV)

- b. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

Sa-pi-pa-tangic-an	kaku _i	ci	sawmah-an _j
InA-PI-CAU-cry-MOOD.AV	1S.NOM	PPN	Sawmah-DAT

ma-ka-ulah	— _{j/*i}	kaku.
UV-KA-like		1S.NOM

‘I want to force Sawmah to like me.’ (Optative, AV)

⁷ A possible reason may be the different degrees of agentivity inherent in the two UV markers. While *-en* is an agentive marker, *ma-* does not carry such a feature. As the pivot has to be an actor of the linked core, the strong agentivity of *-en* may contribute to its acceptability in such a construction.

- c. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb
?Sa-pi-pa-tangic-an *kaku_i* *ci* *sawmah-an_j*
 InA-PI-CAU-cry-MOOD 1S.NOM PPN Sawmah-DAT
- ma-pa-nengneng** n-u ising ____j/*i.
 UV-CAU-watch GEN-CN doctor
- ‘I want to force Sawmah to be seen by the doctor.’ (Optative, AV)
- c’. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: NMR of AV verb
***Sa-pi-pa-tangic-an** *kaku_i* *ci* *sawmah-an_j*
 InA-PI-CAU-cry-MOOD 1S.NOM PPN Sawmah-DAT
- pa-nengneng** k-u ising ____j/*i.
 CAU-watch NOM-CN child
- ‘I want to force Sawmah to be seen by the doctor.’ (Optative, AV)

As illustrated in the data, when the predicate in the matrix core is a *sa-* applicative verb in the optative mood,⁸ the pivot of the linked core can be an actor of an AV verb (e.g. (6.11a) or a UV verb (e.g. (6.11b)), or an undergoer of a UV verb (e.g. in (6.11c)), though the last structure is less favored by the informants. It is possible that the forms of the matrix core (e.g. in the mood form or not) indicate different linkage types between the two cores, and these linkage types can in turn influence the pivot types in the control construction. I will leave this issue for further research.

Before I move on to the discussion of the promise-type of control construction, I would like to comment on one issue based on the work by Chang and Tsai (2001). According them, there is an actor-sensitivity constraint in the persuade-type control construction⁹ in Kavalan and other Formosan languages. They report that verbs in the linked core have to be causativized, and in this way, the actor of the matrix core, not the undergoer, will also be the actor of the causative predicate in the linked core. In other words, the actor of the matrix core has to be the controller of the pivot in the linked core.

⁸ Please refer to Chapter 3 for the discussion of this mood form.

⁹ This construction is discussed under the term obligatory control in their paper.

The following Kavalan sentences are taken from their paper (Chang and Tsai 2001: 3, original transcription and glosses):

- (6.12)a. pawRat a tina-na tu sunis pa-qaynəp.
force Nom mother-3S.Gen Acc child Cau(AV)-sleep
lit. 'His mother forces her child such that she causes him/her to sleep.'
- b. ??pawRat a tina-na tu sunis m-qaynəp.
force Nom mother-3S.Gen Acc child AV-sleep
for 'His mother forces her child to sleep.'
- c. mərinana=iku tu sunis pa-rusit.
persuade=1S.Nom Acc child Cau(AV)-leave
lit. 'I persuade my child such that I cause him/her to leave.'
- d. ??mərinana=iku tu sunis m-rusit.
persuade=1S.Nom Acc child AV-leave
for 'I persuade my child to leave.'
- e. pawRat-an-na_i ni abas_i aiku pa-ʔtuŋ tu tuquq.
force-PV-3S.Gen Gen Abas 1S.Nom Cau-kill Acc chicken
lit. 'I was forced by Abas such that she caused me to kill a chicken.'
- f. ??pawRat-an-na_i ni abas_i aiku mə-ʔtuŋ tu tuquq.
force-PV-3S.Gen Gen Abas 1S.Nom AV-kill Acc chicken
for. 'I was forced by Abas to kill a chicken.'

In the Kavalan sentences in (6.12), no matter how the matrix control predicate is inflected, the predicate in the linked core is always a causativized AV verb, and the actor in the matrix is the controller of the pivot of the causative predicate in the linked core. Chang and Tsai (2001) refer to such obligatory causativization of the predicate in the linked core as the actor-sensitivity constraint, which refers to the fact the actor in the matrix core has to be the controller in this control construction.¹⁰ This constraint is obligatory in

¹⁰ Chang and Tsai (2001) only focus on the controlling property from the actor in the matrix core. However, as pointed out in the discussion, there is more than one controller from the matrix core, as there is more than one missing argument for the causative predicate in the linked core. Hence, calling this structure an example of "actor-sensitivity" phenomenon might be over-simplified.

Kavalan, but may be optional in some other Formosan languages such as Puyuma.¹¹ In other words, it is not unique to a single Formosan language.

With a closer observation of the sentences with a causative non-initial predicate in (6.12), they seem more like purposive constructions, and this is also implied in the English translation. Moreover, in such constructions, not only the actor but also the undergoer or the NMR core argument of the matrix core are controllers, as now there are actually two missing arguments in the causative verbs in the linked core. Such constructions are very different from the English examples and the Amis examples that have been discussed so far in this dissertation. Although the actor-sensitivity constraint has also been found in Formosan languages other than Kavalan, it does not exist in Amis. Nonetheless, I do find examples that have a causativized predicate in the linked core of a control construction, but the causativization is not obligatory, and it is not commonly found in the data. An example is given in (6.13b):

(6.13)a. Controller: U of UV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Lalang-en	aku _i	Ø-ci	mama _j	tayra	___j.
dissuade-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	father	go.there	

‘I dissuade Father from going.’

b. Controller: A and U of UV verb; Pivot: A and NMR core argument of causative AV verb

Lalang-en	aku _i	Ø-ci	mama _j	pa-tayra	___i ___j.
dissuade-UV	1S.GEN	NOM-PPN	father	CAU-go	

‘I dissuade Father from going there.’ (more emphatic than (6.13a))
‘I dissuade Father from doing something in order to cause him to go.’

As seen in (6.13), both the plain form and the causative form of the verb can appear in the linked core, but the interpretations of the two control constructions are somewhat different. There are two possible readings for the causative one, as provided by

¹¹ This observation leads Chang and Tsai (2001) to conclude that “control dependency should be thematically determined rather than grammatically determined” (Chang and Tsai 2001:1), which similar to the proposal made in RRG.

different informants; one involves a more emphatic reading of the jussive tone, while the other involves a reversal of the causing event, as now the whole sentence is rendered as ‘persuade to go’ instead of ‘dissuade from going’. With the lack of consensus in the reading of such kind of structure, it is highly possible that this structure is rarely used. That is why I conclude that the actor-sensitivity constraint does not exist in Amis.

The discussion of the persuade-type of control construction shows that there is no evidence for grammatical relations being involved to define the privileged arguments in this construction, as there is no restricted neutralization. Both the controller and the pivot in this construction are semantically determined. The controller is always the undergoer or the NMR core argument of the matrix core, namely, the lower ranking of the two primary arguments of the matrix predicate.¹² As for the pivot of the linked core, it is the actor of an AV verb or an intransitive verb for the majority of the examples; in other words, it is the highest ranking argument in the linked core. Nonetheless, we do see examples with an actor pivot of a UV verb, or even an undergoer pivot of a UV verb.

6.1.3.2 The Promise-type Control Construction

The promise-type control verb discussed here is *mi-hai* ‘agree (to let); promise’. The linked core following this verb can be structured in two ways in terms of whether the linked core is normalized or not. The first structural type is exemplified in (6.14) in which the linked core is not normalized. This structure has two readings. If there is an undergoer or a NMR direct core argument showing up in the matrix core, the undergoer

¹² The semantic account of control construction is not something unique in Amis, nor is it a proposal exclusively made in the RRG framework. Jackendoff and Culicover (2003) also propose a semantic analysis for the control constructions in English. In their review of the rather extensive literature that deals with control constructions, they mention that there are two traditions of analyzing control; one is primarily based on syntactic factors, and the other, semantic factors. The second tradition can actually be dated back to works as early as Jackendoff (1969).

or the NMR direct core argument will be the controller of the pivot in the linked core, as shown in (6.14a-d). If only the actor shows up in the matrix core, then the actor will be the controller, as seen in (6.14e):

(6.14) a. Controller: U of UV; Pivot: A of AV verb

Ma-hai	n-i	mama _i	kaku _j	mi-aca	_____j/*i
UV-agree	GEN-PPN	father	1S.NOM	AV-buy	

t-u waneng.
 DAT-CN candy
 ‘Father agreed to let me buy candy.’
 *‘Father agreed to buy me candy.’

a’. Controller: U of UV; Pivot: A of UV verb

* Ma-hai	n-i	mama _i	kaku _j	ma-aca	_____j/*i
UV-agree	GEN-PPN	father	1S.NOM	UV-buy	

k-u waneng
 NOM-CN candy
 ‘Father agreed to let me buy candy.’
 *‘Father agreed to buy me candy.’

b. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Mi-hai	tu	Ø-ci	mama _i	takuwanan _j	mi-aca	_____j/*i
AV-agree	ASP	NOM-PPN	father	1S.DAT	AV-buy	

t-u waneng
 DAT-CN candy
 ‘Father will agree to let me buy candy.’
 *‘Father will agree to buy me candy.’

b’. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

* Mi-hai	tu	Ø-ci	mama _i	takuwanan _j	ma-aca	_____j/*i
AV-agree	ASP	NOM-PPN	father	1S.DAT	UV-buy	

k-u waneng.
 NOM-CN candy
 ‘Father will agree to let me buy candy.’
 *‘Father will agree to buy me candy.’

- c. Controller: U of UV; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb

Ma-hai	n-i	mama _i	kaku _j	mi-lisuq
UV-promise	GEN-PPN	father	1S.NOM	AV-visit

k-u singsi ____ j/*i.
NOM-CN teacher

‘Father promised me that the teacher will visit me.’

* ‘Father_i promised with me that teacher will visit him_i.’

- c’. Controller: U of UV; Pivot: U of UV verb

Ma-hai	n-i	mama _i	kaku _j	ma-lisuq/lisuq-en
UV-agree	GEN-PPN	father	1S.NOM	UV-visit/visit-UV

n-u singsi ____ j/*i.
GEN-CN teacher

‘Father promised me that the teacher will visit me.’

* ‘Father_i promised me that teacher will visit him_i.’

- d. Controller: NMR core argument of AV verb; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb

Mi-hai	tu	Ø-ci	mama _i	takuwanan _j	mi-lisuq
AV-agree ASP		NOM-PPN	father	1S.DAT	AV-visit

k-u singsi ____ j/*i.
NOM-CN teacher

‘Father will promise me that teacher will visit me.’

* ‘Father_i will promise me that teacher will visit him_i.’

- e. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Mi-hai	tu	Ø-ci	mama _i	mi-aca	____ _{i/??j}	t-u
AV-promise	ASP	NOM-CN	father	AV-buy		DAT-CN

waneng.

candy

‘Father agreed to buy candy.’

?? ‘Father agreed to let someone buy candy.’

The predicate *ma-hai* (*mi-hai*) ‘agree (to let); promise’ in the examples form (6.14a) to (6.14d) behaves like the persuade-type control predicate discussed in the previous section.

Similar to those persuade-type predicates, the controller in the matrix core is the lowest ranking argument of the core; hence, it is a semantic controller. However, the pivot in the linked core exhibits more possibilities than the persuade-type predicates; it can be an

actor of an AV verb, as seen in (6.14a-b), an undergoer of a UV verb, as seen in (6.14c'), and a NMR core argument of an AV verb, as seen in (6.14c) and (6.14d), but it cannot be an actor of a UV verb. There is no neutralization of semantic roles involved in the pivot in the linked core. The example given in (6.14e) illustrates a different sub-type of control construction, the promise-type, though it is also initiated by the same predicate *mi-hai*. There is only core argument (i.e. the actor) showing up in the matrix core, and this argument is the controller for the linked core; hence, this is an example of actor control.¹³ The two readings of *mi-hai* (*ma-hai*, UV) 'agree (to let); promise' both involve semantic controllers and pivots; there is no grammatical relation indicated in these sentences.

In the second structural variation of the promise-type control construction, the linked core is a nominal structure, as it is preceded by a case maker and the verb form in the linked core is changed into the *sa-* applicative form with an optional mood marker. This structure has only one reading: the promise-type reading. That is, the actor of the matrix core will be the only possible controller of the missing argument in the linked core. The examples are provided in (6.15):

(6.15)a. Controller: A of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

Ma-hai	<i>n-i</i>	<i>dongi_i</i>	Ø-ci	kacaw _j	t-u
UV-promise	GEN-PPN	Dongi	NOM-PPN	Kacaw	DAT-CN
sa-pi-kadafu-(aw)		— _{i/*j}	i	cingraan _{j/*i}	
InA-PI-spouse-(MOOD)			PREP	3S.DAT	
'Dongi _i promised Kacaw _j that she _i would marry him _j .'					

¹³ This behavior of *mi-hai* (*ma-hai*) 'agree (to let); promise' is similar to the English verb *ask* as in the sentence "Larry asked Sally to leave." discussed in VVLP (1997:545). This sentence can have a jussive reading and a non-jussive reading; the former is a case of undergoer control, while the latter, an actor control.

- b. Controller: A of UV verb; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb
 ***Ma-hai** n-i dongi_i Ø-ci kacaw_j t-u
 UV-promise GEN-PPN Dongi NOM-PPN Kacaw DAT-CN

sa-pi-kadafu-an cingra_i Ø_j
 InA-PI-spouse-MOOD 3S.NOM
 ‘Dongi promised Kacaw that she would marry him.’

The sentences in (6.15) again show that the clause linkage might affect the interpretation of the control construction. As the second core in (6.15) is constructed like an argument of the matrix core, this whole sentence exemplifies a juncture-nexus type of core subordination (VVLP 1997:453), which is different from the linkage type found in (6.14). Notice that the predicate in the linked core has to be in UV form (e.g. *sa-pi-kadaf(-aw)* in (6.15a)) but not the AV form (e.g. *sa-pi-kadafu-an* in (6.15b)), and the pivot can only be the actor of the UV verb in the linked core.

6.1.3.3 The Try-type Control Construction

The verbs discussed for this type include *mi-tanam* ‘(go to) try’ and *ma-na’ay* ‘not want’. As there is only one argument in the matrix core, it will be the only choice of the controller for the pivot in the linked core. Notice that this controller does not have to be marked by the nominative case, as illustrated in (6.16b):

- (6.16)a. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb
Mi-tanam kaku_i **pa-rakat** _____i t-u tusiya.
 AV-try 1S.NOM CAU-walk DAT-CN car
 ‘I am going to try to drive the car.’
- b. Controller: A of UV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb
Tanam-en aku_i a **pa-rakat** _____i k-u-ra
 try-UV 1S.GEN LNK CAU-walk NOM-CN-that

 tusiya.
 car
 ‘I will try to drive that car.’

As for the pivot in the linked core, it has to be the actor of an AV verb like those in (6.16).

The sentence is rendered ungrammatical if the predicate in the linked core appears in the UV form (e.g. (6.17a-b) and (6.17d)):

(6.17) a. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

*Mi-tanam	<i>kaku_i</i>	ma-pa-rakak/pa-rakat-en	_____i
AV-try	1S.NOM	UV-CAU-walk/CAU-walk-UV	
t-u	tusiya.		
DAT-CN	car		
'I am going to try to drive cars.'			

a'. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

*Mi-tanam	<i>kaku_i</i>	ma-pa-rakak/pa-rakat-en	_____i
AV-try	1S.NOM	UV-CAU-walk/CAU-walk-UV	
k-u	tusiya.		
NOM-CN	car		
'I am going to try to drive the car.'			

b. Controller: A of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

*Tanam-en	<i>aku_i</i>	ma-pa-rakak/pa-rakat-en	_____i
try-UV	1S.GEN	UV-CAU-walk/CAU-walk-UV	
t-u	tusiya.		
DAT-CN	car		
'I am going to try to drive cars.'			

b'. Controller: A of UV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb

*Tanam-en	<i>aku_i</i>	ma-pa-rakak/pa-rakat-en	_____i.
try-UV	1S.GEN	UV-CAU-walk/CAU-walk-UV	
k-u	tusiya.		
NOM-CN	car		
'I am going to try to drive the car.'			

c. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb

Sa-pi-tanam-an	<i>kaku_i</i>	ma-ulah	_____i	ci	panay-an.
InA-PI-try-MOOD	1S.NOM	AV-like		PPN	Panay-DAT
'I want to try to like Panay.' (Optative, AV)					

d. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb

*Sa-pi-tanam-an	<i>kaku_i</i>	ma-ka-ulah	n-i	panay	_____i.
InA-PI-try-MOOD	1S.NOM	UV-KA-like	GEN-PPN	Panay	
'I want to try to be liked by Panay.' (Optative, AV)					

The examples in (6.16) and (6.17) indicate the control construction beginning with *mi-nanam* (AV) (or *nanam-en* (UV)) ‘try’ has a semantic controller, which is the actor of the matrix core, and also a semantic pivot, which is the actor of an AV verb.

Now let us consider another control predicate *ma-na’ay* ‘not want’ in (6.18):

- (6.18)a. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb
Ma-na’ay *kaku_i* **mi-nanum** _____i t-u sayta.
 AV-not.want 1S.NOM AV-water DAT-CN soda
 ‘I don’t want to drink soda.’
- b. Controller: A of UV verb; Pivot: A of AV verb
Na’ay-en *aku_i* **mi-naunm** _____i k-u sayta.
 not.want-UV 1S.GEN AV-water NOM-CN soda
 ‘I don’t want to drink the soda.’
- c. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb
 ***Ma-na’ay** *kaku_i* **ma-nanum** _____i t-u sayta.
 AV-not.want 1S.NOM UV-water DAT-CN soda
 ‘I don’t want to drink soda.’
- c’. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: A of UV verb
 ***Ma-na’ay** *kaku_i* **ma-nanum** _____i k-u sayta.
 AV-not.want 1S.NOM UV-water NOM-CN soda
 ‘I don’t want to drink the soda.’

Similar to *ma-tanam* ‘try’, *ma-na’ay* ‘not want’ also has an actor controller from the matrix core. Nevertheless, the pivot in the linked core of *ma-na’ay* shows different property from the pivot of *ma-tanam* ‘try’. Consider:

- (6.19)a. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb
Ma-na’ay *kaku_i* **ma-palu** n-u tao _____{i/*j}.
 AV-not.want 1S.NOM UV-beat GEN-CN other
 ‘I don’t want to be hit by others.’
- b. Controller: A of AV verb; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb
 ***Ma-na’ay** *kaku_i* **mi-palu** k-u tao _____{i/*j}.
 AV-not.want 1S.NOM AV-beat NOM-CN other
 ‘I don’t want to be hit by others.’

b'. **Ma-na'ay** kaku_i **mi-palu** k-u tao takuwanan.
 NEUT-not.want 1S.NOM AV-beat NOM-CN other 1S.DAT
 'I don't want to be hit by others.'

The example in (6.19a) shows that the missing argument in the linked core can also be an undergoer of a UV predicate, in addition to an actor of an AV verb, as we have seen in (6.18a-b). However, this pivot cannot be an actor of a UV verb, as indicated in (6.18c-c'), nor can it be a NMR core argument of an AV verb, as seen in (6.19b). In other words, the pivot of *ma-na'ay* has to be either an actor of AV verb or an undergoer of a UV verb, which presents a case of restricted neutralization. Thus, for the control construction beginning with *ma-na'ay* 'not want', there is a semantic controller and a syntactic pivot.

The table below summarizes the discussion of the control constructions:

Table 6.2 Controllers and Pivots in the Control Constructions

Types	Matrix Predicate	Controller	Pivot
persuade-type	<i>mi-lalang/ma-lalang/lalang-en</i> 'dissuade'	Semantic: U and NMR core argument	Semantic: A of AV or intransitive V
	<i>mi-ucur/ma-ucur</i> 'assign'	Semantic: U and NMR core argument	Semantic: A of AV or intransitive V
	<i>mi-hai/ma-hai</i> 'agree (to let)'	Semantic: U and NMR core argument	Semantic: A of AV; U of UV; NMR core argument of AV
	<i>pa-tangic/pa-tangic-en</i> 'beseech; force'	Semantic: U and NMR core argument	?Semantic: A of AV or intransitive V; U of -en V
	<i>sa-pi-patangic-an</i> 'want to force'	Semantic: U and NMR core argument	Semantic: A of AV or UV; U of UV (i.e. macroroles)
promise-type	<i>mi-hai</i> 'promise'	Semantic: A	Semantic: A of AV or UV
try-type	<i>mi-tanam</i> 'try'	Semantic: A	Semantic: A of AV Verb
	<i>ma-na'ay/na'ay-en</i> 'not want'	Semantic: A	Syntactic: A of AV or U of UV

As illustrated in Table 6.2, only the pivot of *ma-na'ay* 'not want' is a syntactic pivot.

For other control verbs examined in this section, there is no need to resort to grammatical relations; most of the phenomena can be explained by employing semantic roles if there is any restriction imposed by these constructions regarding controller or pivot types.

6.1.4 Reflexivization

In RRG, the analysis of reflexivization adheres to the following two principles: Role Hierarchy Condition and Logical Structure Superiority (VVLP 1997 398; 400), both of which make crucial reference to the PSA selection hierarchy repeated in (6.20)

(6.20) Privileged Syntactic Argument Selection Hierarchy

Arg of DO > 1st arg of **do'** > 1st arg of **pred'** (x, y) > 2nd arg of **pred'** (x, y) > Arg of **pred'** (x)

The Role Hierarchy Condition and Logical Structure Superiority Condition are given in (6.21) and (6.22):

(6.21) Role Hierarchy Condition on Reflexivization

The reflexive pronoun must not be higher on the PSA selection hierarchy in (6.20) than its antecedent.

(6.22)a. Logical Structure Superiority (LS Superiority)

A constituent P in logical structure is LS-superior to a constituent Q iff there is a constituent R in logical structure such that

- (i) Q is a constituent of R, and
- (ii) P and R are primary arguments of the same logical structures.

b. Superiority Condition on Reflexivization

A bound variable may not be LS-superior to its binder.

Now let us take a look at the data form Amis. Reflexivization in this language is formed by placing a marker *tu*¹⁴ after the pronoun to form a reflexive expression:

- (6.23)a. Mi-palu Ø-ci aki_i cingraan_{i/j}.
 AV-beat NOM-PPN Aki 3S.DAT
 'Aki is beating himself/him.'
- b. Mi-palu Ø-ci aki_i cingraan_{i/*j} **tu**.
 AV-beat NOM-PPN Aki 3S.DAT REFL
 'Aki is beating himself.'
- c. *Mi-palu cingra_i **tu** ci aki-an_i.
 AV-beat 3S.NOM REFL NOM Aki-DAT
 'Himself_i is beating Aki_i.'

¹⁴ The function of this marker is not clear to me at this moment. Tentatively, I will gloss it as "REFL", which stands for "reflexive marker". However, further investigation is needed for better understanding of the nature and distribution of this marker.

As illustrated in (6.23a), when there is no *tu* following *cingraan*, the reference of this pronoun is ambiguous. However, once *tu* is added, as seen in (6.23b), *cingraan* can only refer to *Aki*. Moreover, the example in (6.12c) shows that the reflexive cannot show up before its binder. The UV version of (6.23) is given in (6.24):

- (6.24)a. Palu-en n-i dongi_i cingra_i **tu**.
 beat-UV GEN-PPN Dongi 3S.NOM REFL
 'Dongi beat herself.'
- b. Ma-palu nira_i cingra_i **tu**.
 UV-beat 3S.GEN 3S.NOM REFL
 'He beat himself.'
- c. Palu-en nira_i cingra_i **tu**.
 beat-UV 3S.GEN 3S.NOM REFL
 'He will beat himself/herself.'
- d. *Palu-en nira_i **tu** k-u wawa_i.
 beat-UV 3S.GEN REFL NOM-CN child
 'Himself_i will beat the child_i.'

Sentences in (6.24) demonstrates the same phenomenon in which when the pronoun is followed by *tu*, it can only receive a reflexive reading. The same word order constraint between the reflexive and the binder is also observed in (6.24d).

The interpretation of a reflexive form always requires a controller. In (6.23) and (6.24), we can see that it is the actor of the predicate that acts as the controller for the reflexive form. Notice that this actor can be an actor of an AV verb (e.g. *mi-palu* in (6.23)) or a UV verb (e.g. *palu-en* in (6.24)). In other words, the grammatical status of the actor has nothing to do with its being controller in the reflexive construction. Furthermore, as illustrated in (6.23c) and (6.24d), the undergoer cannot function as the controller of the reflexive expression. This observation follows the role hierarchy condition stated in (6.21), as the binder has to be higher on the PSA selection hierarchy

than the reflexive expression.

Nevertheless, the following data in (6.25) seem to present some counterexamples to the role hierarchy:

- (6.25)a. Mi-palu cingra_i **tu** cingraan_i.
 AV-beat 3S.NOM REFL 3S.DAT
 'He is beating himself.'
- b. Palu-en nira_i **tu** cingra_i
 beat-UV 3S.GEN REFL 3S.NOM
 'He will beat himself.'

As seen in (6.25), now the reflexive form seems to appear before the non-reflexive form, assuming the pronoun preceding *tu* is the reflexive expression. Judging from the case marking pattern of (6.25b), the pronoun preceding *tu* has to be the actor while the one following *tu* has to be the undergoer. Hence, it looks like an example against the role hierarchy condition, as now the undergoer is the binder for the actor. However, such an exceptional word order is only found when the binder and the reflexive form are both pronominal. For non-pronominal forms, the order in (6.23) and (6.24) is the only possibility, as shown in the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (6.26):

- (6.26)a. *Mi-palu Ø-ci aki_i **tu** cingraan_i.
 AV-beat NOM-PPN Aki REFL 3S.DAT
 'Aki is beating himself.'
- b. *Palu-en n-i aki_i **tu** cingra_i
 beat-UV GEN-PPN Aki REFL 3S.NOM
 'Aki will beat himself.'

Compare the sentences in (6.26) with (6.23b) and (6.24a), and we can see that the marker *tu* has to show up after the pronominal form.

There are two possible analyses that can account for the sentences like (6.25). The first one is to analyze these sentences as the violation of the role hierarchy condition; that

is, when both of the binder and the reflexive form are pronouns, they do not have to obey the role hierarchy condition, but if the binder is non-pronominal, then the role hierarchy condition is strictly observed. The other analysis is simply saying that the reflexive marker *tu* can float to the position before the reflexive pronoun, and hence, *cingra* in (6.25a) and *nira* in (6.25b) are still the antecedents of *cingraan* and *cingra* respectively; that is, the actor is still the binder for the undergoer. However, the position after a non-pronominal antecedent is not an acceptable floating site, and that is why sentences like (6.26) are ungrammatical. This restriction might be due to the avoidance of ambiguity. The second analysis is adopted here for two reasons. First, it seems quite unnatural to say that non-pronominal antecedents follow one condition, while pronominal antecedents can break it or follow the other condition. The second reason is provided by the examples in (6.27), where the *tu* marker moves to a position following an NP (i.e. *sasing* ‘photo’) that is not likely to be an antecedent or a reflexive form. That is to say, the NP preceding *tu* is not necessarily the reflexive form; it can be something else.

- (6.27)a. Pa-nengneng-en nira_i t-u sasing nira_i **tu**.
 CAU-watch-UV 3S.GEN DAT-CN photo 3S.GEN REFL
 ‘He showed the photo of himself to others.’
- b. Pa-nengneng-en nira_i t-u sasing **tu** nira_i.
 CAU-watch-UV 3S.GEN DAT-CN photo REFL 3S.GEN
 ‘He will show the photo of himself to others.’
- c. Pa-nengneng-en nira_i **tu** t-u sasing nira_i.
 CAU-watch-UV 3S.GEN REFL DAT-CN photo 3S.GEN
 ‘He will show the photo of himself to others.’
- d. Pa-nengneng-en n-i aki_i t-u sasing nira_i **tu**
 CAU-watch-UV GEN-PPN Aki DAT-CN photo 3S.GEN REFL
 ‘Aki will show the photo of himself to others.’

- e. Pa-nengneng-en n-i aki_i t-u sasing **tu** nira_i.
 CAU-watch-UV GEN-PPN Aki DAT-CN photo REFL 3S.GEN
 ‘Aki showed the photo of himself to others.’
- f. *Pa-nengneng-en n-i aki_i **tu** t-u sassing nira_i.
 CAU-watch-UV GEN-PPN Aki REFL DAT-CN photo 3S.GEN
 ‘Aki showed the photo of himself to others.’

As illustrated in (6.27b) and (6.27e), the marker *tu* now floats to the position after the noun *sasing* ‘photo’, which is neither an antecedent nor a reflexive expression. These examples also show that *tu* can also appear before the reflexive expressions (i.e. the second *nira* in (6.27b) and *nira* in (6.27e)). The sentence in (6.27f) indicates that *tu* can never move to the position following the non-pronominal antecedent (i.e. *Aki* in this sentence). Based on the two reasons stated above, the floating reflexive marker analysis is adopted, and the role hierarchy condition is still observed in Amis. In fact, as remarked by the informant, the word order that an actor-binder precedes an undergoer reflexive form, as exhibited in (6.23) and (6.24), is more common and preferred than the word order in (6.25).

As for the condition of LS-superiority, it is postulated to account for the behavior of their reflexive forms embedded under another NPs, like those in (6.27a) and (6.27d). To illustrate how this condition works, let us examine the logical structures of (6.27d) and (6.27a) below:

- (6.28)a. Pa-nengneng-en n-i aki_i t-u sasing **nira_i** **tu**
 CAU-watch-UV GEN-PPN Aki DAT-CN photo 3S.GEN REFL
 ‘Aki will show the photo of himself to others.’
- a’. [**do**’ (aki_i, ∅)] CAUSE [BECOME **see**’ (∅, [**have**’ (nira_i, sasing)))]
- b. *Pa-nengneng-en **nira_i** **tu** t-u sasing n-i aki_i.
 CAU-watch-UV 3S.GEN REFL DAT-CN photo GEN-PPN Aki
 ‘Himself_i will show Aki_i’s photo’

b'. [**do'** (*nira_i*, \emptyset)] CAUSE [BECOME **see'** (\emptyset , [**have'** (*aki_i*, *sasing*)])]

c. Pa-nengneng-en *nira_i* t-u sasing **nira_i** **tu**
 CAU-watch-UV 3S.GEN DAT-CN photo 3S.GEN REFL
 'He will show the photo of himself to others.'

c'. [**do'** (*nira_i*, \emptyset)] CAUSE [BECOME **see'** (\emptyset , [**have'** (*nira_i*, *sasing*)])]

As exemplified in (6.28a) (= (6.27d)) and (6.28c) (= (6.27a)), the reflexive form (i.e. *nira tu*) and the antecedent (i.e. *aki* and *nira*) are not the arguments of the same predicate; *nira (tu)* is in the embedded predicate **have'**, while *aki* and *nira* the first argument of **do'**.

Hence, the grammaticality or ungrammaticality of (6.28) cannot be explained by the role hierarchy condition stated in (6.21); the acceptability of these sentences is subject to the LS superiority condition stated in (6.22). These principles account for the grammaticality of (6.28a), as the antecedent *aki* is LS-superior than the reflexive from *nira tu*. As seen in the LS in (6.28a'), *aki* is a primary argument (i.e. heads of the fillers of the variable positions in logical structure) of an LS, while *nira (tu)* is not, as it is in the embedded predicate **have'** (*nira*, *sasing*). On the contrary, in (6.28b), the reflexive form is LS-superior than its binder, which is indicated in the LS in (6.28b'), in which *nira (tu)* is the head, while *aki* is not. (6.28b) violates the principles in (6.22).

The reflexivization of Amis analyzed above demonstrates another construction in this language that does not involve grammatical relations.

6.1.5 Consecutive Clauses

Finally, in this section, some constructions that consist of two or more consecutive clauses sharing a purposive or a sequential relation are examined. The second clause may contain a missing argument co-referential with one of the arguments in the first clause. The focus of the discussion is to find out which argument in the first clause can serve as the controller for the missing argument in the consecutive clauses. Let us begin

with consecutive clauses that share a purposive relationship.

The first clause in the following examples all begin with a verb suffixed with the agentive UV marker *-en*, and the second clause indicates the purpose of the first clause.

- (6.29) a. Controller in the first core: A of UV verb; Pivot: NMR core argument of AV verb
 Tireng-en **aku**_i pa-kimad _____i, ta paka-nengneng
 stand-UV 1S.GEN CAU-speech so.that ABLT-watch

kamu _____i.

2P.NOM

‘I want to stand up when making a speech so that you can see (me) clearly.’

- b. Controller in the first core: A of UV verb; Pivot: U of UV verb
 Tireng-en **aku**_i pa-kimad _____i, ta ma-nengneng
 stand-UV 1S.GEN CAU-speech so.that UV-watch

namu _____i.

2P.GEN

‘I want to stand up when making a speech so that you can see me clearly.’

- c. Controller in the first core: A of UV verb; Pivot in the second core: A of AV verb/*A of UV verb; Pivot in the third core: A of an intransitive verb
 Cahiw-en ho _____i k-u tiyadj, nga’ay hali-ka’en/
 hungry-UV ASP NOM-CN tummy fine love.to-eat

*hali-ka’en-en¹⁵ _____i ma-lafi _____i.
 love.to-eat-UV NEUT-dinner

‘Keep your stomach hungry first (so that) you can eat a lot when having dinner.’

In the sentences provided in (6.29), there is at least one missing argument in the non-initial core(s), and the interpretation of this argument is controlled by one of the arguments in the first core. The following table summarizes the controllers and the pivots in (6.29):

¹⁵ *Hali-ka’en* means ‘love to eat; eat a lot habitually’. This verb has a UV *-en* form, but it cannot be prefixed by the UV marker *ma-*.

Table 6.3 Controllers and Pivots for the Sentences in (6.29)

Sentence Number	Controller in the 1 st Core	Controller and Pivot in the 2 nd Core	Controller and Pivot in the 3 rd Core
6.29a	A of <i>-en</i> intransitive verb	pivot: NMR direct core argument in an AV verb	---
6.29b	A of <i>-en</i> intransitive verb	pivot: U of a UV verb	---
6.29c	A of <i>-en</i> UV verb	pivot: A of an AV verb	pivot: A of an intransitive verb

As shown in the table, these sentences behave similar to the try-type control construction in that they all have the actor¹⁶ in the first core as the controller for the missing argument in non-initial core(s), though the controller actor does not have to bear the nominative case. As for the pivots, they exhibit many varieties, including macroroles as well as NMR direct core arguments. This construction thus has a semantic controller, and it seems that any core argument can serve as a pivot.

The second construction is initiated by a predicate followed by the quotation verb *han* ‘say so (UV)’, which we have seen in the discussion of the ideophone-forming construction in Chapter 4. In addition to introducing a quote (Wu 1995), *han* usually denotes a disposal manner for the predicate preceding it (Liu 2003), and it is followed by another clause indicating the subsequent event after the disposal event. This disposal construction is exemplified in (6.30). Notice that the predicate preceding *han* appears in the bear root form, and the voice marking of the sentence is determined *han*:

- (6.30)a. Tanam han n-i kacaw_i k-u dateng_j,
taste say.so GEN-PPN Kacaw NOM-CN vegetable
- anger ———_j
bitter
- ‘Kacaw (then) tasted the vegetable and (found that) it was bitter.’

¹⁶ More specifically, this actor is an agentive actor, as the verb in the first core is marked by the agentive UV marker *-en*.

- b. Palu han n-i kacaw_i Ø-ci dongi_i,
 beat say.so GEN-PPN Kacaw NOM-PPN Dongi

t-um-angic tu _____j/??i.
 cry<NEUT> ASP
 ‘Kacaw_i beat Dongi_j, (and then she_j/??he_i) cried.’

- c. Palu han n-i kacaw_i Ø-ci dongi_j,
 beat say.so GEN-PPN Kacaw NOM-PPN Dongi

mi-laliw tu _____j/*i.
 AV-run.away ASP
 ‘Kacaw_i then beat Dongi_j, (and then she_j) ran away.’

The *han* sentences in (6.30a-c) indicate that only the undergoer of *V + han* can serve as the controller for the pivot in the following core; if the event in the second clause is about the actor of *V + han*, a full NP or a pronoun has to show up, as illustrated in (6.30d-e):

- (6.30)d. Palu han n-i kacaw_i Ø-ci dongi_j,
 beat say.so GEN-PPN Kacaw NOM-PPN Dongi

mi-laliw tu cingra_i/*j/Ø-ci Kacaw.
 AV-run.away ASP 3S.NOM NOM-MCM Kacaw
 ‘Kacaw then beat Dongi, (and then) he_i/Kacaw ran away.’

- e. Tanam han aku_i k-u nanum_j, ma-piyas
 taste say.so 1S.GEN NOM-CN water NEUT-have.a.diarrhea

kaku/*____i.
 1S.NOM
 ‘I then tasted the water, (and then) I had a diarrhea.’

The above examples show that in the *V+ han* construction, there is a restricted semantic controller: U of the UV construction.

The construction beginning with *ma-herek + V* ‘after V’¹⁷ exhibits a situation different from *V + han*:

¹⁷ Although the predicate *ma-herek* is glossed as ‘finish’, the derived interpretation of *ma-herek + V* is ‘after doing something’ (Wu 1995), especially when this complex predicate is followed by another clause. *Ma-herek* can also be used independently.

- (6.31)a. Ma-herek mi-palu Ø-ci kacaw_i ci dongi-an_j,
 NEUT-finish AV-beat NOM-PPN Kacaw PPN Dongi-DAT
- mi-laliw _____{i/*j}.
 AV-run.away
 ‘After Kacaw_i beats Dongi, (he_i then) will run away.’
- b. Ma-herek ma-palu n-i kacaw_i Ø-ci dongi_j,
 NEUT-finish UV-beat GEN-PPN Kacaw NOM-PPN Dongi
- mi-laliw tu _____{i/*j}.
 AV-run.away ASP
 ‘After Kacaw_i beat Dongi, (he_i) then ran away.’
- c. Ma-herek ma-palu n-i kacaw_i Ø-ci dongi_j,
 NEUT-finish UV-beat GEN-PPN Kacaw NOM-PPN Dongi
- ma-laliw tu _____{i/*j}.
 UV-run.away ASP
 ‘After Kacaw_i Dongi, he_i/Dongi ran away.’

Unlike the examples of *V + han*, in the consecutive clauses beginning with *ma-herek + V* ‘after V’, the actor of the first clause (an AV verb or UV verb) is the controller.

Based on the examples discussed so far, it seems that most of the time, only macroroles can serve as controllers and pivots, though we do find one example with NMR direct core argument serving as a pivot (e.g. (6.29a)).¹⁸ In fact, it seems less likely for NMR direct core argument to function as a privileged argument, especially controllers. Consider:

- (6.32)a. ??Mi-palal tu Ø-ci dongi_i ci kacaw-an_j,
 AV-wake ASP NOM-PPN Dongi PPN Kacaw-DAT
- ca’ay ka-l-um-uwad _____i.
 NEG KA-get.up<NEUT>
 ‘Dongi has gone to wake up Kacaw, (but he_j) did not get up.’

¹⁸ Here I limit the discussion to macrorole and non-macrorole direct core arguments. As for the behavioral non-macrorole oblique arguments and adjuncts in these constructions, I will leave them for future research.

- a'. Ma-palal tu aku_i Ø-ci kacaw_j, ca'ay
 UV-wake ASP 1S.GEN NOM-PPN Kacaw NEG

 ka-l-um-uwad ______{j/*i}.
 KA-get.up<NEUT>
 'I woke Kacaw_j up, (but he_j) didn't get up.'
- b. *Aka pa-fli ci dongi-an_i t-u waneng,
 NEG.IMP CAU-give PPN Dongi-DAT DAT-CN candy

 ma-liyang _____i.
 NEUT-disobedient
 'Don't give Dongi candy; (she) is disobedient.'
- b'. Aka pa-fli-en k-u-ra wawa_i t-u
 NEG.IMP CAU-give-UV NOM-CN-that child DAT-CN

 waneng, ma-liyang _____i.
 candy NEUT-disobedient
 'Don't give that child candy; (he/she) is disobedient.'

As illustrated in (6.32), for an undergoer to function as a controller, it has to show up in a UV construction; it cannot be a controller if it shows up as NMR direct core argument of an AV verb such as *ci kacaw-an* in (6.32a).

The above discussion shows that the notion macrorole plays an important part in defining the privileged functions of being a controller or a pivot in these consecutive sentences. Such functions are not defined by grammatical relations in these sentences, as we have seen from the examples that an actor can function as a controller regardless as to whether it is an actor of an AV verb (e.g. (6.31a) or an actor of a UV verb (e.g. (6.31b)). In the following discussion of two texts, we will see that the pivot is not necessarily the NP marked by the nominative case, either. Nevertheless, based on the data I have collected, there seems to be some idiosyncratic preference in maintaining the nominative status of the pivot in a text. The two passages in (6.33) and (6.34) are excerpts from two texts, of which the complete versions are provided in the appendix. The one in (6.33) is

from a text in which the informant talked about the chores that she had to do when she was a child, and the hardship she experienced at that time. The excerpted part talks about feeding and driving the cattle:

- (6.33)a. Ma-ra'od sa tu k-u ka-lahok-an,
 NEUT-come.near say.so ASP NOM-CN KA-lunch-LA
- ci-roma cacay a **ma-lahok** ____i **aroq** ____i
 have-some.times alone LNK NEUT-lunch sit
- sa itira.
 say.so there
 'When the lunch time came, sometimes (I) sat there along eating lunch.'
- b. **Araw** **han** ____i awa tu k-u maan-maan
 see say.so (UV) not.exist ASP NOM-CN what-RED
- awa k-u dateng.
 not.exist NOM-CN vegetable
 '(I then) took a look, (and found that) there was nothing (in the lunchbox), no side dishes.'
- c. Ci-roma ta'enu adiyam sa **k-um-a'en** ____i.
 have-some.times only hot.peppers say.so eat<NEUT>
- 'Sometimes (I) only (had) hot peppers to eat.'
- d. Ha-tira k-u roray n-u orip niyam
 like.that NOM-CN hardship GEN-CN life 1P.EXCL.GEN
- i tiya i ho.¹⁹
 PREP then I ASP
 'The hardship of our life in the past was just like that.'
- e. Ma-'edeng tu ha-ka-kerem n-u cidal,
 NEUT-enough ASP HA-KA-sun.set GEN-CN sun
- mi-sa-tapang** tu ____j a **mi-ala** ____j t-u
 AV-SA-start ASP LNK NEUT-take DAT-CN
- a'orongen a **mi-nukay** ____j.
 things.to.carry.on.shoulders LNK NEUT-return
 'When it was about the sunset, (we) started to get the things to carry on the shoulders and go home.'

¹⁹ "I-tiya i ho" is a fixed expression, meaning 'long time ago'.

missing arguments will be marked by the genitive case. For other positions, they will all be marked by the nominative case, as an actor of an AV verb or an S of an intransitive predicate.

Now consider another piece of text, which is about how a mother cooks a kind of spice vegetable (i.e. *tanaq* in the story) so that her children would not refuse to eat the dishes that are cooked with this kind of vegetable.

(6.34)a. Ya wawa_i n-i-ya Lao3-man3-niang2_j aku ira
that child GEN-CN-that wife.of.the.owner 1S.GEN exist

i katayalan aku i kakacawan, anu **pa-camul**
PREP work.place 1S.GEN PREP Kakacawan if CAU-add

han —_j i dateng_i k-u tanaq_k,
say.so (UV) PREP vegetable NOM-CN tanaq

ca'ay ka-ulah k-um-a'en —_i —_i.
NEG KA-like eat<NEUT>

'The children of the wife of the boss in my workplace in Kakacawan do not like to eat the dishes if she puts "tanaq" into dishes.'

b. **Sa-maan-maan-en** —_j k-u pi-sanga, ta ma-nga'ay
InA-what-RED-UV NOM-CN PI-make then NEUT-good

k-um-a'en cangra_i t-u tanaq sa kaku.²¹
eat<NEUT> 3P.NOM DAT-CN tanaq say.so 1S.NOM

'What should I do to make the dish, and then they are willing to eat tanaq?' so I asked.'

c. U-ni-ni u tanaq **letek** **han** —_j **mi-letek** —_j
CN-this-RED CN tanaq chop say.so (UV) NEUT-chop

—_k, u-ni halu-akaway han nira_j **mi-tangtang** —_j
CN-this HALU-straw say.so (UV) 3S.GEN NEUT-cook

—_k.

'She then chopped the leaves of "tanaq" along with the straws, and then cooked them.'

²¹ The first person pronoun here refers to the wife. In Amis narratives, direct quote is a very common strategy during narration.

- d. **Tenes** **han** _____j **mi-tangtang** _____j k-u-ya tanaq.
 long.time say.so (UV) NEUT-cook NOM-CN-that tanaq
 ‘Then (she) cooked the *tanaq* for a long time.’

In this text, the discussion will focus on the two pivots that refer to the lady owner of the speaker’s workplace (i.e. _____j) and a special kind of spice vegetable *tanaq* (i.e. _____k). In these examples, the positions for _____j, if filled up, will all be the genitive case (i.e. actor for a UV verb). Notice that even this pivot sometimes shows up after an apparent AV verb prefixed by *mi-* (e.g. *mi-letek* ‘chop into pieces’ in (6.34c), this position is not a position for a nominative actor, as the sentence is a UV construction introduced by *V + han*. In other words, the *mi-* prefix has no voice function there; only its derivational function is retained. As for the pivot _____k, the nominative case will be used if the positions are filled up as it is the undergoer of the *V + han* construction.

The analysis of the consecutive sentences and the two texts show that pivots tend to be macroroles. We do find NMR core arguments serving as pivots (e.g. _____j in (6.34a)), but it is rather uncommon, as the majority of pivots are macroroles.

The discussion of the major constructions is summarized in Table 6.4:

Table 6.4 The Analysis of Controllers and Pivots in Some Grammatical Constructions in Amis

Grammatical Phenomenon	Controller	Pivot	GR
Relative Clause	---	Syntactic	Yes
Displacement and Wh-Q (Nominal)	---	Syntactic	Yes
Displacement and Wh-Q (Verbal)	---	Semantic (NMR oblique argument and adjunct) ²²	No
Control: persuade-type	Semantic U or NMR core argument	Semantic (roles varies among verbs)	No
Control: promise-type	Semantic: A	Semantic: A	No
Control: try-type	Semantic: A	Semantic mostly (roles varies among verbs)	No
Reflexivization	Semantic: A	---	No
V1+ <i>han</i> +V2	Semantic: U of V1+ <i>han</i> (UV)	---	No
<i>ma-herek</i> + V	Semantic: A		No
Texts	---	Semantic: A or U mostly	No

²² This condition is strictly observed in WH-questions, but for displacement constructions, macroroles and NMR direct core arguments are sometimes allowed.

As shown in Table 6.4, the argument exhibiting the behavioral properties of a “subject” (i.e. as a controller or a pivot) does not necessarily always involve restricted neutralization of semantic roles; it may also be defined by semantic notions such as macroroles and direct core arguments, depending on the construction in which the argument(s) appear. We have only found grammatical relations in relative clause and the nominal type of displacement constructions and WH-question constructions;²³ for other grammatical phenomena, the relevant privileged arguments can be defined semantically. In other words, “subject” may not be a term that is always adequate in describing the grammar of Amis; whether or not there is a subject-like grammatical relation depends on the construction.

As for another two grammatical relations: direct object and indirect object, RRG also approaches them in a different way; many grammatical phenomena (e.g. passive, dative shift, and applicative) that are assumed to involve so-called objects (and indirect object) can be more appropriately discussed under the notions of macrorole and direct core argument as well.

In fact, it is difficult to define a direct object or an indirect object in Amis. As I have shown in the discussion of three-place predicates, Amis exhibits a mixed type of direct-indirect object (DO/IO) and primary-second object (PO/SO) languages, which complicates a grammatical-relation based analysis. However, within the RRG framework, these mixed patterns can be simply explained through multiple undergoer selection patterns in terms of different principles; the DO/IO pattern follows Principle A and has the default choice of undergoer based on the AUH, while the PO/SO pattern

²³ Cleft sentences (Liu 1999) also have syntactic pivots. In fact, they can be regarded as type of headless relative clause.

follows Principle B and has the marked choice of undergoer in terms of the AUH.

Hence, there is no need to employ the GR terms in the discussion here.

Starting from the following section, constructions that are crucially related to the status of an argument will be discussed, namely, the applicative constructions and the voice operations.

6.2 The Applicative Constructions

Recall that in Chapter 3, a new analysis for the Amis voice/focus system has been proposed. I have argued that the so-called instrumental voice (or focus) and locative voice (or focus) are applicative makers that either promote non-arguments such as instrument and location NPs to become core arguments and subsequently to become an undergoer, or enhance the status of a NMR core argument to become an undergoer. I have also shown that the undergoer of the applied verb will be marked by nominative case by default with or without the presence of a UV marker in the sentence. In other words, the applicative constructions follow the UV case marking pattern by default, and this indicates the ergative nature of Amis.

The new analysis of the voice system explains why we can have sentences like (6.35), in which we can find the co-occurrence of the UV marker and the instrumental applicative marker *sa-*, but only the instrument NP surfaces as the undergoer instead the patient NP, which would be the undergoer following the AUH.

- (6.35)a. Aka sa-pi-litek-en *k-u-ra* *caklis*
 NEG.IMP InA-PI-chop.tree-UV NOM-CN-that ax

 t-u-ra kilang!
 DAT-CN-that tree
 ‘Don’t use that ax to chop down the tree!’

- b. Ma-sa-pi-sanga n-i aki t-u takid
 UV-InA-PI-make GEN-PPN Aki DAT-CN bottle
- k-u-ya* *aol.*
 NOM-CN-that bamboo
 ‘Aki used use that bamboo to make the bottle.

Following the new analysis, the co-occurrence of the applicative marker and the voice marker can be accounted for, as these markers show different operations at the two phases of linking in the RRG linking algorithm. That is to say, the applicative marker affects the linking from the argument positions to macroroles, while the voice marker operates at the linking from macroroles to syntactic functions.

As mentioned, at the phase of linking from argument positions to macroroles, applicative constructions perform two functions. First, they may enhance the status of a non-argument such as instrument or location to become an argument. Second, they can also promote a non-macrorole core argument (e.g. patient) to become a macrorole. The instrumental applicative construction serves the first function, while the locative applicative construction can perform both functions. An interesting feature of these applicative forms is that they can all be used as a noun designating the argument that is affected by them, and some may even be lexicalized. For example, the *sa-* applicative form usually can refer to an instrument or a reason, while *-an* applicative form can designate an object that is acted upon (e.g. *mi-tilid-an* ‘something written’ > *mi-tilid* ‘write; study’) or a location (e.g. *pi-tilid-an* ‘school’). In the following discussion, although I will focus on the predicative function of these applicative forms, I will utilize this nominal feature to discuss the different types of participants of which the semantic status is enhanced by the applicative constructions. Furthermore, a decompositional analysis for the applied verbs will be proposed and the constructional schema that records

the specific properties of each applicative construction will be postulated. Let us begin with the instrumental applicative construction.

6.2.1 The Instrumental Applicative Constructions

The applicative construction marked by *sa-* has been discussed under the label “instrumental focus” or “instrumental voice” in many of the previous works (e.g. Yan 1992; Wu 1995; Liu 1999; Liu 2003), as this construction usually introduces an instrument to the LS of the verb it attaches to, and the added instrument is chosen to be the undergoer of the derived verb. As exemplified in (6.36), repeated from Chapter 3, the instrument is marked by the preposition in the non-applied verb, which indicates its peripheral status. To make the instrument a core argument, the applicative construction has to be employed.

- (6.36)a. **Mi**-dohdoh kaku t-u titi *i* *falah.*
 AV-smoke 1S.NOM DAT-CN meat PREP coal
 ‘I am going to smoke the meat over the coal.’
- b. **Sa**-pi-dohdoh aku t-u titi *k-u* *falah.*
 InA-PI-smoke 1S.GEN DAT-CN meat NOM-CN coal
 ‘I am going to smoke the meat with the coal.’

The applicative function of *sa-* is well-demonstrated in (6.36), in which the oblique NP in (6.36a) becomes a core argument in (6.36b) when the applied verb is used.

Notice that although the *sa-* applicative construction is labeled as an instrumental applicative, the enhanced argument in this construction can sometimes be interpreted as a reason or a motivation, depending on the semantics of the applied verb and the co-occurring context. Consider the following examples:

- (6.37) a. **Sa-pi-diput**²⁴ n-i dongi t-u wawa
 InA-PI-look.after GEN-PPN Dongi DAT-CN child

k-u-ni *paysu.*
 NOM-CN-this money
 ‘The money is for Dongi to look after the child.’
- b. **Sa-ka-sadak** aku *k-u-ni* *ra’ic.*
 InA-KA-appear 1S.GEN NOM-CN-this rope
 ‘I used the rope to go out (e.g. escaped).’
 ‘The rope is the tool with which I got out (e.g. escaped).’
- c. U maan k-u **sa-ka-sadak** nira?
 CN what NOM-CN InA-KA-appear 3S.GEN
 ‘What is the reason that he came out?’
- d. **Sa-pi-to’or** aku t-u tao *k-u*
 InA-PI-follow 1S.GEN DAT-CN others NOM-CN

mi-tayal-an.
 MI-work-LA
 ‘The reason why I have done such things is to catch up with others.’
- e. **Sa-pa-kungal** t-u titi *k-u-ni* *a*
 InA-CAU-tender DAT-CN meat NOM-CN-this LNK

kuwaq.
 papaya
 ‘This papaya is for tendering the meat.’

As seen in (6.37), the interpretations of the argument added by *sa-* can be an instrument (6.37a-b), a reason (6.37c), a motivation (6.37d), or an indirect cause (6.37e); the reading of the enhanced NP definitely involves more than just instrument. Further consider the example in (6.38):

- (6.38) **Sa-pi-diput** n-i dongi t-u wawa, ca’ay
 InA-PI-adopt GEN-PPN Dongi DAT-CN child NEG

 ka-ci-wawa cangra.
 KA-have-child 3P.NOM
 ‘The reason why Dongi adopted the kid (is that) they don’t have children.’

²⁴ The root *diput* has two meanings; one is ‘look after’, and the other one is ‘adopt’, as seen in (6.38).

In (6.38), the argument added by the instrumental applicative construction (i.e. a reason) does not show up in the first clause. Semantically speaking, this reason equals to the second clause in (6.38), and the relation between the two clauses is bridged by the prefix *sa-*.

In general, there are two types of interpretations presented in the instrumental applicative constructions in (6.37) and (6.38). The *sa-* form in the first type manifesting a kind of means by which the event denoted by the applied verb is carried out. The instrument reading belongs to this type. As for the *sa-* form in the second type, it designates a motivation or a reason for the event or action denoted by the applied verb. This type subsumes indirect cause, motivation, and reason. The first type of instrumental applicative often co-occurs with an NP denoting the instrument, while the second type shows up with a reason/cause/motivation denoted by either an NP or a clause. For the semantic representations of these two sub-types of instrumental applicatives, I would like to utilize the semantic structures postulated in RRG originally for signaling two inter-clausal semantic relations: modifying sub-events and reason. According to VV (2005:206), there are four types of modifying sub-events: manner, motion, position, and means. In particular, I will use the semantic structure of “means” to represent one of the readings generated by the instrumental applicative construction. These two semantic representations are given in (6.39), based on VV (2005:206-207):

(6.39) The Semantic Representations of Instrumental Applicative Construction

a. Modifying sub-event (“means”): **do'** (x, [...] ^ [**pred₂'** (x, y)])

b. Reason: [LS₁] **BECAUSE'** [LS₂]

In the above semantic representations, the first part (i.e. **pred₁'** in [...] in (6.39a) and LS₁

in (6.39b)) is supplied by the stem predicate. The part in **pred₂**' and LS₂ and are left unspecified; their contents and interpretations depend on the semantics of **pred₁**' and LS₁ and other contextual information. The semantic representations of the *sa*- applicative verbs in (6.37) and (6.38) are given as (6.40):

- (6.40)a. Sa-pi-dohdoh aku t-u titi k-u falah.
 InA-PI-smoke 1S.GEN DAT-CN meat NOM-CN coal
 'I am going to smoke the meat with the coal.'

a'. **do'** (aku, [**smoke'** (aku, titi) ^ **use'** (aku, falah)])

- b. Sa-ka-sadak aku k-u-ni ra'ic.
 InA-KA-appear 1S.GEN NOM-CN-this rope
 'I used the rope to go out (e.g. escape).'
 'The rope is the tool with which I got out (e.g. escaped).'

b'. **do'** (aku, [**appear'** (aku) ^ **use'** (aku, ra'ic)])

- c. Sa-pa-kungal t-u titi k-u-ni a
 InA-CAU-tender DAT-CN meat NOM-CN-this LNK
 kuwaq.
 papaya
 'This papaya is for tendering the meat.'

c'. [**do'** (x, [**use'** (x, kauwq)])] CAUSE [BECOME **tender'** (titi)]

- d. Sa-pi-to'or aku t-u tao k-u mi-tayal-an.
 InA-PI-follow 1S.GEN DAT-CN others NOM-CN MI-work-LA
 'I use the things that I have done to catch up with others.'

d'. **do'** (aku, [**follow'** (aku, tao) ^ **use'** (aku, mitayalan)])

- e. Sa-pi-diput n-i dongi t-u wawa k-u-ni
 InA-PI-look.after GEN-PPN Dongi DAT-CN child NOM-CN-this
 paysu.
 money
 'The money is for Dongi to look after the child.'

e'. **do'** (dongi, [**look.after'** (dongi, wawa) ^ **use'** (dongi, money)])

- f. Sa-pi-diput n-i dongi t-u wawa, ca'ay
 InA-PI-adopt GEN-PPN Dongi DAT-CN child NEG
- ka-ci-wawa cangra.
 KA-have-child 3P.NOM
 'The reason why Doing adopted the kid is that they don't have children.'
- f'. [**do'** (dongi, [**adopt'** (dongi, wawa)))] **BECAUSE'** [NOT.**have'** (cangra, wawa)]
- g. U maan k-u sa-ka-sadak nira?
 CN what NOM-CN InA-KA-appear 3S.GEN
 'What is the reason that he came out?'
- g'. [**do'** (nira, [**appear'** (nira)])] **BECAUSE'** [LS₂]

Although two semantic representations have to be stipulated for the instrumental applicative verb instead of postulating a unified one, these representations help us better capture the syntactic properties of this applicative construction. To begin with, as the two semantic representations suggest a subordination relationship between the two parts in the logical structures, they actually reflect the original adjunct status of the argument introduced by the instrumental applicative construction. Moreover, postulating one of the functions of *sa-* as signaling **BECAUSE'** LS₂ leaves the possibility that this applied verb might introduce a full-fledged clause, and that is what we have seen in (6.40g). Finally, employing the term **BECAUSE'** for this applied verb has an important consequence in explaining related structures such as the optative mood constructions *sa-....-aw* and *sa-...-an*. As I argued in Chapter 3, the *sa-* in the two mood forms is exactly the same as the applicative marker *sa-*, and this *sa-* has the semantic representation of (6.39b). This analysis explains the Genitive-Dative pattern that *sa-...-aw* always takes and the inquiry of reason reading that these optative constructions may get in their WH-Questions.

Now that we have two semantic representations for the instrumental applicative construction, how do we know which one a particular *sa-* applied verb takes? Although it is not yet possible to build up a set of rules to regulate the choices, there are some tendencies for the selectional restrictions. To begin with, the modifying sub-event LS can only go with a predicate with an activity component, while the reason LS is applicable to the *sa-* predicates with or without an activity component, but the latter is found more commonly. In other words, for predicates with an activity component, their *sa-* applicative forms may have ambiguous readings, as seen in *sa-pi-diput* in (6.40e) and (6.40g). The more dynamic the activity is, the more likely its *sa-* form will get the modifying sub-event reading. This preference can be observed from the following examples:²⁵

(6.41)a. *sa-pi-sadak* ‘tool for getting things out’

b. *sa-ka-sadak* ‘reason for going out or appearing’ or ‘tool for getting out’

Compare the two *sa-* applicative forms derived from the root, and we can see that the activity in *sa-pi-sadak* (i.e. ‘get something out’) is more dynamic than that in *sa-ka-sadak* (i.e. ‘appear’ or ‘come out’), and thus, the unmarked reading for (6.41a) is the modifying sub-event, while for (6.41b), both are acceptable. Consider another pair of examples:

- (6.42)a. **Sa-pi-fanaq** aku t-u caciyaw n-u amis
 InA-PI-know 1S.GEN DAT-CN language GEN-CN Amis
 k-u-ni a laciyo.
 NOM-CN-this LNK radio
 ‘I use this radio to learn the language of Amis.’
- b. **Sa-ka-fanaq** aku t-u-ni a dmak....
 InA-KA-know 1S.GEN NOM-CN-this LNK matter
 ‘The reason why I know about this matter....’

²⁵ The two predicates are actually derived from *sa-* + *mi-sadak* ‘get something out’ and *sa-* + *ma-sadak* ‘appear; come/go out’.

Both predicates in (6.42) are derived from the same root *fanaq* ‘know’. For the derived activity verb in (6.42a), the modifying sub-event is the preferred reading, if not the only reading.²⁶ However, for the state predicate in (6.42b), only the reason reading is possible. Another clue that helps disambiguate the readings of a *sa-* applicative form lies in the context. The *sa-* verb with the modifying sub-event LS only co-occurs with NPs denoting the instrument or means, but the *sa-* verb with the reason LS can show up with an NP or a full-fledged clause denoting the reason. This is illustrated in the contrast between (6.40e) and (6.40g). Finally, when the *sa-* applicative form is affixed with the optative mood markers *-aw* and *-an*, only the reason LS is allowed, but not the modifying sub-event. This can be observed from the following WH-questions:

- (6.43)a. U maan k-u **sa-pi-nanum-aw** isu?
 CN what NOM-CN InA-PI-water-MOOD 2S.GEN
 ‘Why did you want to drink it?’
- b. U maan k-u **sa-ka-fanaq-aw** isu
 CN what NOM-CN InA-PI-know-MOOD 2S.GEN
- ci sawmah-an?
 PPN Sawmah-DAT
 ‘Why did you want to know about Sawmah?’

As illustrated in the data, both WH-questions are about the inquiry for “reason”, not a tool or means denoted by a modifying sub-event.

In the two semantic representations, it is either the lowest ranking argument of **pred₂**’ or LS₂ that is chosen to be the undergoer, or the whole LS₂ when it is constructed like a nominal clause (e.g. (6.40f)). This undergoer will be marked by the nominative case as the applicative form is a UV predicate by default. In other words, it has its own construction-specific properties regarding undergoer assignment, though it follows the

²⁶ The two *sa-* predicates are respectively derived from *sa-* + *mi-fanaq* ‘learn’ and *sa-* + *ma-fanaq* ‘know’.

UV case marking pattern. These properties are recorded in the constructional schema in

Table 6.5:

Table 6.5 Constructional Schema for Amis Instrumental Applicative

Construction: Amis instrumental applicative	
Syntax:	
Template: default	
Linking:	
Undergoer: the lowest ranking argument in pred₂' , or LS ₂ after BECAUSE' , or the whole LS ₂	
Morphology:	
<i>sa-</i> (<i>ka-/pi-</i>) root	
Semantics:	
(6.39)	
PSA is an instrument, reason, motivation, or indirect cause	
Pragmatics:	
Illocutionary force: unspecified	
Focus Structure: PSA = unspecified	

The specific undergoer assignment of the instrumental applicative construction is specified in the linking part in the schema. In addition, the schema also records the morphological information and the semantic representations that are specific to this construction.

6.2.2 The Locative Applicative Constructions

Although both *sa-* and *-an* are analyzed as applicative markers, they behave rather differently regarding the following syntactic structures. First, while *sa-* can co-occur with the UV markers *ma-* and *-en*, these two voice markers may not occur with *-an*. This co-occurrence restriction suggests that the UV markers and *-an* applicative might overlap to a certain extent regarding their functions. Second, while *sa-* can appear on the main predicate in the imperative construction, *-an* is never found on an imperative predicate: Compare:

- (6.44)a. Aka **sa-pi-litek-en** k-u-ra caklis
 NEG.IMP InA-PI-chop.tree-UV NOM-CN-that ax

 t-u-ra kilang!
 DAT-CN-that tree
 ‘Don’t use that ax to chop down the tree!’
- b. **Ka-i** **tira** mi-litek t-u-ra kilang!
 KA-PREP there NEUT-chop DAT-CN-that tree
 ‘Chop that tree **there!**’
- c. **Ka-i** **demiq** mi-tangtang t-u hemay!
 KA-PREP kitchen NEUT-cook DAT-CN rice
 ‘Cook the meal **in the kitchen!**’
- d. *Pi-tangtang-an t-u hemay k-u demiq.
 PI-cook-LA DAT-CN rice NOM-CN kitchen
 ‘Cook the meal in the kitchen!’
- e. *Mi-adup-an k-u fafuy n-u lutuk!
 MI-hunt-LA NOM-CN pig GEN-CN mountain
 ‘Go to hunt the mountain pig!’

As shown in (6.44a), the *sa-* applied verb can be imperativized. However, in an imperative sentence concerning a particular location, a serial verb construction is used with the prepositional phrase functioning as the main imperativized predicate, as shown in (6.44b-c), but the *-an* verb is not used in this context as shown in (6.44d-e). The purposive applicative *mi-...-an* has never been found in the imperative form, either. The different behavioral properties of *sa-* and *-an* suggest that there are finer distinctions among these applicative markers.

As mentioned at a couple of places in earlier discussion, there are three possible interpretations that go with the locative applicative constructions, depending on the affixes co-occurring with *-an*. To facilitate the discussion, let us term them purposive-locative applicative, patient-locative applicative, and location-locative

applicative²⁷ respectively. The comparison among the three interpretations is summarized in Table 6.6:

Table 6.6 The Co-occurring Affixes and the Readings of the Locative Applicative Constructions

Form \ Reading	purposive-locative	patient-locative	location-locative
<i>mi-...-an</i>	✓	✓	x
<i>-um-...-an</i>	x	✓	x
<i>ka-...-an</i>	x	✓	✓
<i>ka-...-um-...an</i>	x	x	✓
<i>pi-...-an</i>	x	x	✓

As shown in Table 6.6, the readings of purposive and patient seem to be almost in complementary distribution with the reading of location; that is, it is quite unlikely for the form that gets the purposive/patient reading to also get the location reading. The only exception is found with *ka-...-an*, of which both readings are found in the data. The distinction between the patient-locative *ka-...-an* and the location-locative *ka-...-an* lies in the semantics of the verb that *-an* attaches to. For two-place *ma-* predicates (e.g. *ma-ulah* ‘like’(AV)), their *ka-...-an* forms (e.g. *ka-ulah-an* ‘the one liked’) usually affect the status of the patient, while for one-place predicates (e.g. *ma-lahok* ‘have lunch’), their *ka-...-an* forms tend to add a location or time to the core (e.g. *ka-lahok-an* ‘time or place for having lunch’). Another way of telling which reading between the two that a *ka-...-an* form is likely to get is to check whether the verb can also have a *mi-...-an* applicative form. If the same verb also has a *mi-...-an* locative applicative form, then its *ka-...-an* form tends to be the location-locative applicative. For instance, from the root *tayal* ‘work’, one can derive both *mi-tayal-an* and *ka-tayal-an*; with the former, it is the work that is done gets the nominative case, while with the latter, it is the location where the work is carried out gets the nominative case, not the work.

²⁷ The locative applicative construction can also add a temporal NP to the core of the verb. such examples will be treated as a type of location-locative applicative.

As shown in Table 6.6, the purposive-locative reading is only associated with *mi-...-an*. This exclusiveness is definitely attributed to the purposive component inherent in *mi-*. Furthermore, while a *mi-...-an* verb can be either a purposive-locative applicative or a patient-locative applicative, it is the former usually goes with the *mi-...-an* form of one-place predicates (e.g. *mi-cikay-an* ‘something got by running’ from *cikay* ‘run’). The three sub-types of locative applicative constructions will be discussed in the following sections.

6.2.2.1 The Location-Locative Applicative Construction

Consider the following examples repeated from Chapter 3:

- (6.45)a.

Mi-adup	Ø-ci	mama	t-u	fafuy	i
AV-hunt	NOM-PPN	father	DAT-CN	pig	PREP

lutuk.
mountain
‘Father is going to hunt the (mountain) pig in the mountain.’
- b.

Pi-adup-an	n-i	mama	t-u	fafuy	<i>k-u-ni</i>
PI-hunt-LA	GEN-PPN	father	DAT-CN	pig	NOM-CN-this

lutuk.
mountain
‘This mountain is where Father hunted the boar.’

As illustrated in (6.45), the locative form *pi-adup-an* makes a non-argument (i.e. *lutuk* ‘mountain’ marked by the preposition *i* in (6.45a)) a core argument and an undergoer (marked by the nominative case in (6.45b)). As there is always a location participant or temporal participant in the location-locative construction, the semantic structures of *pi-...-an*, *ka-...-an*, *ka-...-um-...-an* predicates can be represented as (6.46) (VV 2005:194, 207).

(6.46) The LS of the *pi-...-an*, *ka-...-an*, *ka-...-um-...-an* location-locative applicative:

be-LOC'/TEMP' (z, [LS₁])

Following (6.46), the LS of (6.45b) is given in (6.47b):

(6.47) a. Pi-adup-an n-i mama t-u fafuy
 PI-hunt-LA GEN-PPN father DAT-CN pig

k-u-ni **lutuk.**
 NOM-CN-this mountain
 'This mountain is where Father hunted the boar.'

b. **be-LOC'** (lutuk, [**do'** (mama, [**hunt'** (mama, fafuy))])

As mentioned earlier, with the location-locative applicative, it is always the location element or the temporal element (i.e. the *z* argument in (6.46)) that is chosen to be the undergoer; as for the actor, it is the highest ranking argument in the embedded LS. This constructional-specific property is recorded in the following constructional schema:

Table 6.7 Constructional Schema for Amis Location-Locative Applicative

Construction: Amis location-locative applicative
Syntax:
Template: default
Linking:
Undergoer: the first argument of be-LOC'/TEMP'
Morphology:
<i>ka-/pi</i> - root- <i>an</i> , <i>ka-root-<um>...-an</i>
Semantics:
(6.46)
PSA is a place or time
Pragmatics:
Illocutionary force: unspecified
Focus Structure: PSA = unspecified

6.2.2.2 The Purposive-Locative Applicative Construction

As for the purpose applicative construction, it is only found with *mi-...-an*, as illustrated in (6.48):

- (6.48)a. **Mi-cikay-an**/?**c-um-ikay-an** aku i pitilidan
 MI-run-LA run<UM>-LA 1S.GEN PREP school

k-u-ni *a* *cudad.*
 NOM-CN-this LNK book
 ‘This is the book that I ran to school to get.’ (i.e. I ran to school for this book.)
- b. **Mi-radiw-an** aku *k-u-ni.*
 MI-song-LA 1S.GEN NOM-CN-this
 ‘This is what I sing.’
 ‘This is what I got by singing.’ (i.e. ‘I sang for (getting) this.’)

In (6.48), the argument bearing the nominative case indicates the purpose of the action, and only the *mi-...-an* form can be used if one wants to refer to this participant, as seen in (6.48a), in which the *-um-...-an* form is rendered problematic. It is not surprising, as *mi-* contains a purposive element in its logical structure, which has been shown in Chapter 4. Adopting the format that Jolly (1993:302) postulates to represent the purposive function of the preposition *for* in English, we may represent the LS of the purposive-locative applicative *mi-...-an* as (6.49):

(6.49) **The LS of *mi-...-an* purposive-locative applicative:**

[**do'** (x, [...]) PURP [BECOME **have'** (x, y)]

The unspecified **pred'** following **do'** (i.e. [...] in the LS) is supplied by the predicate that *-an* attaches to. The LS in (6.49) is illustrated in (6.50):

- (6.50) a. **Mi-cikay-an** **aku** i pitilidan *k-u-ni* a
 MI-run-LA 1S.GEN PREP school NOM-CN-this LNK

 cudad
 book
 ‘This is the book that I ran to school to get.’
 (i.e. I ran to school for this book.)
- a'. [**do'** (aku, [**run'** (aku)]) & INGR **be-at'** (pitilidan, aku)] PURP [BECOME **have'** (aku, cudad)]

- b. **Mi-radiw-an** aku k-u-ni.
 MI-song-LA 1S.GEN NOM-CN-this
 ‘This is what I got by singing.’ (i.e. ‘I sang for (getting) this.’)

b’. [**do’** (aku, [**sing’** (aku)])] PURP [BECOME **have’** (aku, kuni)]

For the purposive applicative, the undergoer will always be the lowest ranking argument of BECOME **have’**, while the actor is the highest ranking argument in the LS. Its constructional schema is provided below:

Table 6.8 Constructional Schema for Amis Purposive-Locative Applicative Construction

Construction: Amis purposive-locative applicative

Syntax:

Template: default

Linking:

Undergoer: the lowest ranking of BECOME **have’**

Morphology:

mi- root *-an*

Semantics:

(6.49)

PSA is the goal of a purpose

Pragmatics:

Illocutionary force: unspecified

Focus Structure: PSA = unspecified

6.2.2.3 The Patient-Locative Applicative Construction

Unlike the above-discussed applicative constructions that add a non-argument to the verb, the patient applicative *-an* does not necessarily involve any addition of an argument.

Compare the following examples:

- (6.51) a. **Mi-adup** Ø-ci aki **t-u-ra** **fafuy** **n-u** **lutuk.**
 AV-hunt NOM-PPN Aki DAT-CN-that pig GEN-CN mountain
 ‘Aki is going to hunt/is hunting that mountain pig.’

- a’. **Mi-adup-an** n-i aki *k-u-ra* *fafuy* *n-u*
 MI-hunt-LA GEN-PPN Aki NOM-CN-that pig GEN-CN

mountain.

‘Aki hunted that mountain pig.’

‘That mountain pig is what Aki hunted.’

a". **Ma-adup** n-i aki *k-u-ra* *fafuy* *n-u*
 UV-hunt GEN-PPN Aki NOM-CN-that pig GEN-CN

lutuk.

mountain

‘Aki hunted the mountain pig.’

b. **R-um-akat** kaku *t-u* *lalan* *n-u*
 walk<AV> 1S.NOM DAT-CN road GEN-CN

sa-ka-tayra

InA-KA-go.there

i

PREP

wuciya.

Wuciya

‘I am walking on the road that is going to Wuciya.’

b'. **Mi-rakat-an** tu n-i aki *k-u-ni* *a*
 MI-walk-LA ASP GEN-PPN Aki NOM-CN-this LNK

lalan.

road

‘Aki has already walked on this load.’

b". **Ma-rakat** tu aku *k-u-ni* *a* *lalan.*
 UV-walk ASP 1S.GEN NOM-CN-this LNK road

‘This road has been walked on by me.’

The above two sets of examples display the AV, patient-locative applicative UV, and the plain UV versions of two verbs. As seen in (6.51a') and (6.51b'), the argument that bears the nominative case in the patient-locative applicative construction is the same as the argument that is marked by the nominative case in the plain UV constructions in (6.51a'') and (6.51b''). These plain UV sentences indicate that the patient argument is in the core already. Hence, the *mi-...-an* applicative form does not add a core argument to the verb it attaches to; instead, it performs a different function by making an NMR argument a macrorole. As one may compare the (plain) AV verbs in (6.51a) and (6.51b) and the applied versions in (6.51a') and (6.51b), the same argument is a non-macrorole in the AV verb, as it is marked by the dative case, but it becomes a macrorole in the patient-locative applicative construction, as it is marked by the nominative case in the UV

constructions in (5.51a') and (5.51b'). In other words, for two-place predicates, their patient-locative applicative involves no addition of the core arguments, and it follows the default macrorole assignment rules discussed in Chapter 5 (Figure 5.1 and Principle A of the undergoer selection) and case marking rules of UV verbs stated in (5.54). The function of the patient-locative applicative construction is quite different from the other two locative applicatives discussed earlier; the patient-locative primarily makes a non-undergoer core argument become an undergoer, while the purposive-locative and the location-locative make a non-argument a core argument, which then also becomes the undergoer.

Now let us consider the functions performed by the locative applicatives of three-place predicates. To begin with, consider the three-place predicates marked by *mi-* exemplified in (6.52):

- (6.52)a. Cimanan kisu mi-caliw t-u paysu?
 who.DAT 2S.NOM AV-borrow DAT-CN money
 'From whom are you going to borrow the money?'
- b. U maan k-u **mi-caliw-an** isu i widang?
 CN what NOM-CN MI-borrow-LA 2S.GEN PREP friend
 'What is that that you borrowed from the friend?'
- c. Cima k-u **pi-caliw-an/*mi-caliwa-an** isu
 who.NOM NOM-CN PI-borrow-LA/MI-borrow-LA 2S.GEN
- t-u paysu?
 DAT-CN money
 'Who is the one you borrow the money from?'
- d. *Cima k-u **mi-aca-an** n-u-ra kaying
 who.NOM NOM-CN MI-buy-LA GEN-CN-that young.lady
- t-u hana?
 DAT-CN flower
 'Who is the one that young lady bought the flowers from?'

For the *mi-* verb exemplified above, the patient-locative applicative *mi-...-an* only promotes a NMR core argument to become a macrorole, but not adding a non-argument into the core. That is why only the lowest ranking core argument (e.g. the theme NP in (6.52b)) can co-occur with the patient-locative applicative *mi-...-an* and gets promoted to become a macrorole. As for an adjunct-like source NP in (6.52a),²⁸ it can only co-occur with the location-locative applicative *pi-...-an* for the enhancement of its status but not the patient-locative applicative *mi-...-an*, as illustrated in (6.52c) and (6.52d).

With *pa-* three-place predicates, the patient-locative applicative is allowed to be associated with either the second highest ranking argument (e.g. the recipient NPs in (6.53a) and (6.54a)) or the lowest ranking argument in the LS (e.g. the theme NPs in (6.53b) and (6.54b)). Consider:

- (6.53)a. Ci panay k-u **pa-fli-an** aku t-u
 PPN Panay NOM-CN CAU-give-LA 1S.GEN DAT-CN
- paysu, ca'ay-ay ka Ø-ci aki.
 money NEG-FAC KA NOM-PPN Aki
 'It is Panay that I gave the money to, not Aki.'
- b. U paysu k-u **pa-fli-an** aku ci aki-an,
 CN money NOM-CN CAU-give-LA 1S.GEN PPN Aki-DAT
- ca'ay-ay k-u ucya.²⁹
 NEG-FAC NOM-CN tea
 'It is money that I gave Aki, not tea.'
- (6.54)a. Cima k-u **pa-nanum-an** nira t-u-ni
 who.NOM NOM-CN CAU-water-LA 3S.GEN DAT-CN-this
- sayta?
 soda
 'Who is the one that he gave this soda to drink?'

²⁸ The adjunct-like properties of this NP have been discussed in Chapter 5. To begin with, it can be marked by the preposition. Furthermore, it is never chosen to be the undergoer in the plain UV construction.

²⁹ I don't know why the structure after *ca'ay-ay* is not *ka ku ucya*.

- b. U maan k-u **pa-nanum-an** nira ci
 CN what NOM-CN CAU-water-LA 3S.GEN PPN
 aki-an?
 Aki-DAT
 ‘What is that he gave Aki to drink?’

As illustrated in (6.53) and (6.54), the two non-actor participants of *pa-* three-place predicates can both co-occur with the applicative marker *pa-...-an*, regardless whether the predicate has a default undergoer choice or not. For example, as discussed in Chapter 5, the verb *pa-nanum* ‘give water’ selects the second highest ranking argument (i.e. the recipient or the beneficiary) in the LS as the undergoer in the plain UV construction, which indicates the relative importance of this second highest ranking argument over the lowest ranking argument (i.e. the theme or the patient). However, with the *-an* applicative construction, their different degrees of importance have been neutralized. The same neutralization is also found with *pa-fli* ‘give’, which favors the second highest ranking argument as the undergoer in the UV constructions, though the lowest ranking argument is also possible.

Now consider the examples with *pa-pi-* verbs:

- (6.55)a. ??Cima k-u **pa-pi-nanum-an** nira
 who.NOM NOM-CN CAU-PI-water-LA 3S.GEN
 t-u-ra soda
 DAT-CN-that sayta?
 ‘Who is the one that he asked to go to drink that soda?’

- a’. U maan k-u **pa-pi-nanum-an** nira ci aki-an?
 CN what NOM-CN CAU-PI-water-LA 3S.GEN PPN Aki-DAT
 ‘What is that he asked Aki to go to drink?’

- b. **Pa-pi-ka’en-an** n-i ina kaku t-u futing.
 CAU-PI-eat-LA GEN-PPN mother 1S.NOM DAT-CN fish
 ‘Mother asked me to go to eat fish.’

It seems that applicative form *pa-pi-...-an* is favored to be used to promote the status of the lowest ranking argument (e.g. the theme NP in (6.55a')), as the co-occurrence of *pa-pi-...-an* with the second highest ranking argument is rendered marginal with some *pa-pi-* verbs (e.g. *pa-pi-nanum* in (6.55a)), though it is perfectly acceptable for other *pa-pi-* verbs (e.g. *pa-pi-ka'en* in (6.55b)). This inconsistency is not surprising, as the second highest ranking argument is the only undergoer choice in the plain UV structures of *pa-pi-* verbs, as pointed out in Chapter 5. The prominent status of this argument may make its co-occurrence with the applicative form a bit unnatural.

Judging from all the three-place predicates discussed above, it seems that the unmarked target choice of the patient-locative applicative form is the lowest ranking argument, though the second highest ranking argument is also possible. The macrorole assignment rules for patient applicative verbs are recorded in the constructional schema in Table 6.9:

Table 6.9 Constructional Schema for Amis Patient-Locative Applicative

Construction: Amis patient-locative applicative

Syntax:

Template: default

Linking:

Undergoer: the lowest ranking argument in LS (default) or
the second highest ranking argument in LS

Morphology:

mi- root-*an*; *ka-* root -*an*; -*um-* root -*an*; *pa-* root -*an*

Semantics:

LS same as the unapplied verbs

PSA is the patient, theme, or recipient

Pragmatics:

Illocutionary force: unspecified

Focus Structure: PSA = unspecified

Based on the constructional schemas proposed above for the applicative constructions, we can see that all of these applicative forms will affect the choice of the undergoer; in other words, with the affixation of the applicative markers, there will be a

specified choice of undergoer, either from an added core argument or from an NMR direct core argument. Although these applicative constructions differ among themselves regarding the choice of the undergoer, they all follow the same case assignment rules and have the case marking patterns for UV verbs, as one can see from the schemas.

Before ending the discussion in this section, there are a few additional comments I would like to make regarding these applicative constructions, especially the patient-locative applicative construction. To begin with, as exemplified in (6.51), this construction overlaps with the plain UV verbs for having the same PSA argument. In spite of this similarity, these two constructions differ from each other pragmatically. One of such pragmatic differences is that the applicative form can also be used as a nominal structure, but it is rare, if not impossible, to find the plain UV form being used nominally without any additional affixes such as the factual marker *-ay*. This difference has been mentioned in the discussion of the relative clause. Another distinction lies in the different information focus provided by the two forms. As remarked by the informants, the plain UV form is used when the focus is on the completion of the event, while the applicative is used when the focus is on the relation between arguments. This is illustrated in the following examples:

(6.56)a. Q: **Anu hakuwa** kisu mi-adup t-u fafuy?
 when what.time 2S.NOM AV-hunt DAT-CN pig
 ‘When will you go to hunt (mountain) pigs?’

A: **Ma-adup** aku k-u fafuy.
 UV-hunt 1S.GEN NOM-CN pig
 ‘I have already hunted the (mountain) pigs.’

b. Q: **Nima** k-u-ni a fafuy?
 who.GEN NOM-CN-this LNK pig
 ‘Whose is this (mountain) pig?’

A: **Mi-adup-an** aku k-u-ni fafuy.
 MI-hunt-LA 1S.GEN NOM-CN-this pig
 ‘This pig is that I hunted.’

The answer denoted by the plain UV form in (6.56a) emphasizes the completion of the event, as a response to a question relevant to the event time. On the contrary, the question in (6.56b) focuses on the ownership of a certain object, and thus an appropriate answer for this question will be the patient-locative applicative form, which shows the relation between the actor and the undergoer.

Besides the applicative constructions, there is another mechanism that can affect the status of an argument in a sentence, namely, the voice constructions. They will be examined in the following section.

6.3 Voice Constructions

RRG approaches the issue of voice constructions by discussing the two functions that voice constructions may play cross-linguistically. These two functions are referred to as PSA modulation and argument modulation. PSA modulation voice permits an argument other than the default argument in terms of the selection hierarchy stated in (6.20) to function as the PSA. As for the argument modulation voice, it gives a non-canonical realization to a macrorole argument by either realizing the macrorole as an oblique element (e.g. the passive construction of English.) or stripping a macrorole argument of its macrorolehood (e.g. the antipassive construction of Kalkatungu as discussed in VV 2005:98 and 117 (Footnote 16))

There are two voice constructions in Amis: the actor and the undergoer voice constructions. The two voice constructions will be discussed in the following sections. In particular, I will argue that the AV constructions perform both PSA modulation and

argument modulation functions. Furthermore, I will show that the UV construction might appear to be the marked voice choice for some predicates that usually appear with the AV pattern by default, though presumably the UV construction should be treated as the basic pattern of Amis, judging from the case marking pattern and default voice choice of the applicative constructions. Therefore, I argue that Amis, in spite of displaying ergative features in the case marking system and in some grammatical constructions such as relative clauses, exhibits a split system in verbal morphology; both the actor voice and undergoer voice are two basic voice forms.³⁰ Besides discussing the characterizations of the voice constructions, I will also examine two constructions exhibiting the voice changes without the affixation of the voice markers.

6.3.1 The Actor Voice Constructions

In Chapter 5, a set of case marking rules (i.e. (5.52)) has been postulated and the application of the rules to verbs with different voice morphology has been demonstrated. AV verbs always have a nominative-dative case marking pattern, as they only have one macrorole, which is assigned the nominative case, and the NMR argument is marked by the dative case. The voice marking function of the AV affixes is demonstrated in their co-occurrence with the volitative mood marker *-aw*. This mood construction has been discussed in Chapter 3. Some of the examples are repeated below:

- (6.57)a. Nanum-aw ho aku.
 water-MOOD ASP 1S.GEN
 ‘I will go drink water first.’ (Volitative mood, UV)
- a’. **Mi**-nanum-aw ho kaku.
 AV-water-MOOD ASP 1S.NOM
 ‘I will go drink water first.’ (The water is further away than #a.)

³⁰ Based on this proposal, I have maintained the terminology of actor voice and undergoer voice in the discussion, instead of using undergoer voice and antipassive voice, or actor voice and passive voice.

As shown in (6.57a), the suffix *-aw* manifests an optative reading for the derived verb. Notice that the case marking pattern is the UV pattern, as the actor is marked by the genitive case. However, when the *V-aw* form is affixed with *mi-*, the case marking pattern becomes the AV pattern, as the actor is marked by the nominative case. This contrast shows the voice marking function of *mi-*. By the same token, the following two pairs of examples in (6.57b-b') and (6.57c-c') indicate the voice operation function of *-um-* and *ma-*, as they both can change the case marking pattern when they attach to the verbs.³¹

(6.57)b. Ka'en-aw aku k-u dateng.
eat-MOOD 1S.GEN NOM-CN vegetable
'I will try that vegetable.' (Volitative mood, UV)

b'. K-**um**-a'en-aw k-u wawa t-u sapaiyu.
eat<AV>-MOOD NOM-CN child DAT-CN medicine
'(I am) afraid that the child will take the medicine.'

c. Ulah-aw aku kisu?
like-MOOD 1S.GEN 2S.NOM
'May I go to love you?' (Volitative mood, UV)

c'. **Ma**-ulah-aw kaku tisunan.
AV-like-MOOD 1S.NOM 2S.DAT
'I am afraid that I will like you.'

The volitative mood constructions in (6.57) demonstrate the voice marking function of the three AV affixes. But, what kind of functions do the AV constructions perform?

Clearly, the AV constructions have a PSA modulation function, as it makes a marked choice of PSA in terms of the PSA selection hierarchy. Given the fact that Amis displays strong ergative features in at least the case marking system and some contractions that involve a PSA such as the relative clause and the nominal type of

³¹ Notice that the interpretation of the mood may become the timerative reading when the actor is not the first person, as seen in (6.57b') and (6.57c').

WH-question, one would expect the lowest ranking argument to be the unmarked PSA choice. But, in the AV construction, it is the highest ranking direct core argument that is chosen to be the PSA.

What about the argument modulation function? For a two-place predicate, the lowest ranking direct core argument in the AV sentences should be assigned an undergoer based on the macrorole assignment principles discussed in Chapter 5, as such verbs can at most take two macroroles. However, this argument does not surface as a macrorole syntactically, as revealed by its case marking and the fact that its semantic status can be promoted by the patient-locative applicative construction. This argument is realized as an NMR core argument in the AV constructions. Its core argument status is indicated by its behavioral property in serving as a semantic controller in the persuade-type control construction. In other words, the lowest ranking argument of a two-place predicate has been stripped of its macrorole status by the AV operation. Hence, the AV constructions also perform an argument modulation function. This function is even more salient for three-place predicates, as a possible undergoer can also be marked by the preposition in the AV construction in addition to the dative case. Consider the following examples:

- (6.58)a. **Pa-caliw** Ø-ci kacaw *t-u* *singsi* t-u
CAU-borrow NOM-PPN Kacaw DAT-CN teacher DAT-CN

paysu.
money
'Kacaw lent the teacher money.' (Causative, AV)

- b. **Pa-caliw** Ø-ci kacaw t-u paysu *i*
CAU-borrow NOM-PPN Kacaw DAT-CN teacher PREP

singsi.
teacher
'Kacaw lent the money to the teacher.'

- c. Aka **pa-caliw-en** *k-u* *singsi* t-u
 NEG.IMP CAU-borrow-UV NOM-CN teacher DAT-CN
- paysu!
 money
 ‘Don’t lend the teacher money!’

As shown in the above examples, the recipient NP *singsi* can be marked either by the dative case or the preposition in the AV constructions. This NP is the second highest ranking argument in the LS of *pa-caliw* ‘lend’, and it is also a possible undergoer, as indicated in the UV sentence in (6.58c). The presumable undergoer NP is realized as non-macrorole in the AV construction in (6.58a), but it is realized as an adjunct in (6.58c), as the preposition *i* typically marks a locative NP in the periphery. From the above discussion, one can thus conclude that the actor voice not only modulates the PSA choice but also modulates the semantic status of a core argument by either stripping a macrorole argument of its macrorolehood, or realizing a core argument as an oblique element.

6.3.2 The Undergoer Voice Constructions

As mentioned, the UV pattern is deemed as the default pattern in Amis. The default, unmarked nature of the UV construction is proven by the fact that this voice is the unmarked voice of the applicative constructions even when the UV markers do not show up. Although the UV pattern enjoys an unmarked status in Amis, there are some predicates that seem to take the AV pattern by default, and for such predicates, UV appears to be a marked pattern.

Such predicates can be illustrated by the *pa-* verbs. Consider the following examples of a *pa-* verb plus the volitive mood suffix *-aw*:

- (6.59)a. **Pa-nanum** *kaku* t-u *kulong*.
 CAU-water 1S.NOM DAT-NCM water.buffalo
 ‘I feed water buffalo water.’ (Causative, AV)

- b. **Pa-nanum-aw** ho aku *k-u* *kulong*.
 CAU-water-AW ASP 1S.GEN NOM-CN water.buffalo
 ‘I will feed the water buffalo water first.’ (Volitative, UV)
- c. **Mi-pa-nanum-aw** ho *kaku* t-u *kulong*
 AV-CAU-water-AW ASP 1S.NOM DAT-CN water.buffalo
 ‘I will go to feed water buffalo water first.’

Recall that in the previous section, I have shown that when a root form is attached with *-aw*, it takes the UV pattern. As shown in (6.59a), the *pa-* predicates appear with the AV case marking pattern (i.e. Nominative-Dative). However, when they are suffixed with *-aw*, the case marking pattern becomes the UV pattern. In other words, the *pa-* predicates behave like a bare root form in the volitative mood construction, as one can compare (6.59b) with (6.57a). When the volitative form is affixed with *mi-*, the case pattern becomes the AV pattern again. These examples show that unlike *mi-*, *pa-* does not have a voice marking function. However, *pa-* verbs follow the AV pattern by default. To make *pa-* verbs appear in the UV pattern, the plain UV markers or the applicative forms have to be used. Morphologically, the AV pattern appears to be the default pattern of *pa-* verb, while the UV pattern is a marked one. However, syntactically, the UV forms actually turn a marked pattern (i.e. AV) into an unmarked one. This may explain why the UV form *pa-...-en* is found much more frequently than the plain *pa-* forms in Amis, as pointed out by Starosta (1974) and my investigation also confirms this finding.

Another example for verbs taking the AV pattern by default is found with two-place AV *ma-* verbs, especially psych-predicates such as *ma-ulah* ‘like’ and *ma-fanaq* ‘know’. Some of these predicates have an undergoer form *ma-ka-*, as illustrated below:

- (6.60)a. Ma-ulah kaku ci panay-an
 AV-like 1S.NOM PPN Panay-DAT
 ‘I like Panay.’

- a'. Ma-ka-ulah aku Ø-ci panay.
 UV-KA-like 1S.GEN NOM-PPN Panay
 'Panay is liked by me.'
 'I like Panay.'
- b. Ma-fanaq kaku t-u-ra tamdaw.
 AV-know 1S.NOM DAT-CN-that person
 'I know that person.'
- b'. Ma-ka-fanaq n-u tao k-u-ra demak.
 UV-KA-know GEN-CN other NOM-CN-that thing
 'That matter was discovered by others.'

We have shown that the prefix *ma-* has a voice marking function in the discussion of the *-aw* examples in (6.57c) and (6.57c'). The examples in (6.60) show that an UV marker (i.e. *ma-* in *ma-ka-*) is required to make these verbs appear in the UV pattern.

Morphologically, the UV form appears to be the marked one. Notice that, however, the situation of these AV *ma-* verbs differs from the *pa-* verbs in terms of the following features. First, unlike *pa-* verbs, the *ma-* verbs still keep their AV pattern when appearing with the volitive suffix *-aw*, as seen in (6.57c'). Second, unlike *pa-...-en* or *ma-pa-* verbs, these *ma-ka-* UV forms are not found as frequently in the data, and as remarked by the informants, some of them seem innovative. This implies a pragmatically more marked status of these *ma-ka-* forms, though they actually follow the default case marking pattern of this language.

A possible account for the infrequency of the UV from of these *ma-* verbs may be due to the fact that the majority of these verbs do not have **do'** in their logical structures, as these verbs are mostly state predicates. In other words, the highest ranking core argument of these *ma-* verbs is not very actor-like, and according to the macrorole assignment rules, this argument would have been assigned an undergoer macrorole, not an actor. Although the actor status of the highest ranking core argument of such verbs

has been discussed in the section of psych-predicates in Chapter 4, these verbs are not typical examples of AV verbs, as they are cases of violation of macrorole assignment principles. This atypical property of such AV verbs might account for why their UV version is less frequently found.

These two sets of verbs, *pa-* verbs and *ma-* psych-predicates (mostly), indicate that UV is a morphologically more marked form for them. As for other types of verbs, there is no such indication for which voice is a marked one in terms of morphological marking. This observation leads us to conclude that Amis presents a split system in the verbal morphology. Nevertheless, based on the varieties of UV marking (e.g. *ma-*, *-en*, and two applicative markers) and the case marking patterns discussed in Chapter 5, the undergoer voice still display more features to be the unmarked one.

6.3.3 Other Constructions Exhibiting Voice Changes

In addition to the sentences marked by the voice affixes, there are some constructions that also exhibit voice oppositions without the affixation of any voice markers. Two of them have been mentioned in Chapters 3 and 4: the ideophone-forming construction and the optative mood constructions.

The voice differences in the ideophone-forming construction are signaled by the choice of the predicates that introduce the ideophones. As mentioned in Chapter 4, there are two such predicates: *sa/saan* and *han*, both of which are rendered as ‘say so’ and both of which can introduce a direct quote during narration. The structure following *sa* or *saan* appears with the AV pattern, while the one following *han* shows up with the UV pattern. Examples follow:

- (6.61) a. Sa/Saan Ø-ci sawmah cingraan.
 say.so/said.so NOM-PPN Sawmah 3S.DAT
 ‘I want to say/said so to him.’ (AV)
- b. Han n-i sawmah cingra.
 say.so GEN-PPN Sawmah 3S.NOM
 ‘Sawmah said so to him.’ (UV)
- c. Sa-rayaray sa kita pa-sasuluy t-u-ni
 form-row say.so 1P.INCL.NOM CAU-pass DAT-CN-this

 a anengang i tiya alamkam.
 LNK chair PREP there fast
 ‘Let’s line up (and in this way) and we can pass this quickly.’ (AV)
- d. Sa-rayaray han ita pa-sasuluy k-u-ni
 form-row say.so 1P.INCL.GEN CAU-pass NOM-CN-this

 a anengang itiya kalamkam.
 LNK chair ITIYA fast
 ‘Let’s line up (and in this way) and we can pass this quickly.’ (UV)

As shown in (6.61a-b), when the two quotative verbs *sa/saan* and *han* are used independently, they also exhibit voice oppositions, and such oppositions are also found in their respective ideophone-forming constructions in (6.61c-d). Moreover, as seen in the forms of the quotative verb, there is no special marker that particularly indicates the voice operation; these two verbs seem to be individual verbs with their own default choice of voice patterns and, again, exemplify a case of a morphological split in Amis.

The other construction is the optative mood construction *sa-...-aw* and *sa-...-an* mentioned in Chapter 3. The examples are given again in (6.62):

- (6.62) a. Sa-pi-nanum-aw n-u wawa t-u-ni/
 InA-PI-water-MOOD GEN-CN child DAT-CN-this/

 *k-u-ni sayta.
 NOM-CN-this soda
 ‘The child wants to drink this soda.’ (UV)
 (indicating stronger desire and a more specific and remote desired object)

- a'. Sa-pi-nanum-an k-u wawa t-u-ni sayta.
 InA-PI-water-MOOD NOM-CN child DAT-CN-this soda
 'The child wants to drink this soda.' (AV)
- b. Sa-ka-fanaq-aw aku (i) kisuwannan/*kisu.
 InA-KA-know-MOOD 1S.GEN PREP 2S.DAT 2S.NOM
 'I want to know you.' (UV)
- b'. Sa-ka-fanaq-an kaku (i) kisuwannan.
 InA-KA-know-MOOD 1S.NOM PREP 2S.DAT
 'I want to know you.' (AV)
- c. Sa-ka-orad-aw n-u kakarayan/romi'ad.
 InA-KA-rain-MOOD GEN-CN sky/day
 'It looks like rain.' (UV) (indicating an unexpected weather change)
- c'. Sa-ka-orad-an k-u kakarayan/romi'ad.
 InA-KA-rain-MOOD NOM-CN sky/day
 'It looks like rain.' (AV)

While the *sa-...-an* clearly shows an AV pattern, the UV counterpart *sa-...-aw* exhibits a rather interesting pattern of genitive-dative, instead of the genitive-nominative pattern that one would expect to find in a UV construction. As proposed in Chapter 3, this modal expression is composed of the applicative marker *sa-* and the mood markers *-aw* or *-an*. The *sa-* applicative gives a natural account for the genitive-dative pattern that *sa-...-aw* verbs have, as in an instrumental applicative UV construction, the lowest ranking argument in the LS is marked by the dative case but not the nominative case. The nouns or pronouns in (6.62a) and (6.62b) both denote the lowest ranking argument in the LS of the verb. Interestingly, the argument that is supposed to be marked by the nominative does not show up in the sentence. However, it surfaces in the WH-questions in (6.63):

- (6.63)a. U maan k-u **sa-pi-ala-aw** isu?
 CN what NOM-CN InA-PI-take-MOOD 2S.GEN
 'Why did you want to take it?'
 *'What do you want to take?'

- b. U maan k-u **sa-ka-fanaq-aw** isu
 CN what NOM-CN InA-PI-know-MOOD 2S.GEN
- ci sawmah-an?
 PPN Sawmah-DAT
 ‘Why did you want to know about Sawmah?’

The data in (6.63) show that the covert argument in (6.62) can be displaced to form the WH-question, and this argument denotes a kind of reason. It is impossible to interpret this displaced argument as the lowest ranking argument of *ala* ‘take’ or *fanaq* ‘know’. If one wants to form a question for this lowest ranking argument, the verbal type of WH-question will be used but not the nominal type. This feature indicates that the lowest ranking argument is now an oblique argument in the sentence.

- (6.64)a. Sa-ka-fanaq-an kisu t-u maan?
 InA-KA-know-MOOD 2S.NOM DAT-CN what
 ‘What do you want to know?’
- a’. *U maan k-u sa-ka-fanaq-an kisu?
 CN what NOM-CN InA-KA-know-MOOD 2S.NOM
 ‘What do you want to know?’
- b. Sa-ka-fanaq-aw isu t-u maan?³²
 InA-KA-know-MOOD 2S.GEN DAT-CN what
 ‘What do you want to know?’
- c. Sa-pi-palu-an cimanan Ø-ci panay?
 InA-PI-beat-MOOD who.DAT NOM-PPN Panay
 ‘Who does Panay want to beat?’

Like the AV and UV constructions discussed earlier, *sa-...-an* and *sa-...-aw* also perform PSA modulation function. This PSA modulation function of *sa-...-aw* is illustrated in (6.63) in which only the undergoer can be the pivot in this nominal type

³² Notice that this sentence is not acceptable if the one that is questioned is human (i.e. who), as seen below. I have no explanation for this.

- (6.65) b’. *Sa-ka-fanaq-aw isu cimanan?
 InA-KA-know-MOOD 2S.GEN who.DAT
 ‘Who do you want to know?’

WH-question. The PSA modulation function of *sa...-an* is illustrated in (6.65):

- (6.65) a. Ma-liyang-ay k-u sa-pi-nanum-an
NEUT-disobedient-FAC NOM-CN InA-PI-water-MOOD
- t-u 'epah a wawa.
DAT-CN wine LNK child
'The child who wanted to drink alcohol is disobedient.'
- a'. *Ma-liyang-ay k-u sa-pi-nanum-aw
NEUT-disobedient-FAC NOM-CN InA-PI-water-MOOD
- t-u 'epah a wawa
DAT-CN wine LNK child
'The child who wanted to drink alcohol is disobedient.'
- b. Cima k-u sa-ka-sadak-an?
who.NOM NOM-CN InA-KA-appear-MOOD
'Who wants to go out?'
- b'. *Cima k-u sa-ka-sadak-aw?
who.NOM NOM-CN InA-KA-appear-MOOD
'Who wants to go out?'

As illustrated in the RC and WH-questions in (6.65), only the actor of *sa-...-an* can be the pivot in the two grammatical constructions.

Since both *sa-...-aw* and *sa-...-aw* are related to the instrumental applicative construction *sa-*, it is quite natural to find the function of argument modulation of these two forms, as now the lowest ranking argument (i.e. the patient) is marked by the dative case and treated as an oblique argument, as shown in the verbal type of WH-questions in (6.64). However, unlike the argument modulation that has been discussed for the AV verbs such as *mi-* and *pa-*, the undergoer (i.e. the reason NP) in the AV form *sa-...-an* is not stripped of its undergoer status. Consider the following sentences:

(6.66)a. U maan k-u sa-pi-nanum-an isu t-u-ni
CN what NOM-CN InA-PI-water-MOOD 2S.GEN DAT-CN-this

a 'epah?
LNK wine
'Why do you want to drink this wine?'

b. Tati'ih-ay k-u sa-pi-palu-an isu t-u
bad-FAC NOM-CN InA-PI-beat-MOOD 2S.GEN DAT-CN

wawa (a dmak).
child LNK matter
'The fact that you want to beat the child is bad.'

c. Fangcal-ay k-u sa-ka-fanaq-an isu t-u
good-FAC NOM-CN InA-KA-know-MOOD 2S.GEN DAT-CN

caciyaw n-u pangcah.
language GEN-CN Amis
'It is a good thing that you want to know the language of Amis.'

Although the form *sa-...-an* is used in the sentences in (6.65), the WH-question and the relative clauses are not about the actor; rather, they are all about the covert instrumental undergoer NP of *sa-...-an*. In other words, this covert undergoer can serve as a pivot in the *sa-...-an* sentences. Notice that the actor NP of *sa-...-an* is marked by the genitive case rather than the nominative case, and this case marking makes *sa-...-an* appear like a UV form. It seems that the form *sa-...-an* allows variable linking to the PSA; that is, it can be an AV verb that follows the nominative-dative pattern, or a UV verb that has the genitive-dative pattern with a covert nominative NP. The actor PSA is exemplified in (6.65a) and (6.65b), and the undergoer PSA is illustrated in (6.66). Unfortunately, I do not have a good explanation for this peculiar property of *sa-...-an* and the factors that may affect the variable linking. Nevertheless, my data shows that the AV pattern is found more commonly with *sa-...-an*. I will leave these issues for further research.

6.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have examined whether grammatical relations exist in Amis and other related phenomena such as applicative constructions and voice operations. The following claims and analyses have been made in the discussion. First, regarding the existence of grammatical relations in Amis, it is subject to different constructions. For constructions like the relative clause and the nominal type of displacement and WH-question, there are syntactic pivots involved in these constructions, and hence, one may claim that there is a subject-like grammatical relation in these constructions. However, there are constructions such as control constructions and reflexivization that cannot be adequately accounted for by a grammatical-relation based analysis; these constructions may involve controllers or pivots that are not defined syntactically. Second, the semantic representations of the applicative constructions have been worked out, and the constructional schemas that record the properties specific to these constructions have been established in our discussion. In particular, I have proposed two logical structures for the instrumental applicative: the modifying sub-event and the reason, and the choice between the two depends on the semantics of the source predicates and other contextual factors. As for the locative construction marked by *-an*, I have shown that there are three sub-types of this applicative constructions: locative, purposive, and patient, depending on the co-occurring affix with *-an*, and their differences can be found in their respective constructional schema. Finally, regarding the voice operations, I have claimed that the AV construction performs both functions of PSA modulation and argument modulation. I have also shown that, although Amis presents ergative features in the case marking pattern and in the two grammatical constructions that involve a PSA,

it exhibits a split system in verbal morphology, since some predicates such *pa-* verbs and some *ma-* psych-predicates appear with AV by default, not UV. Finally, I have discussed two constructions that display voice changes without the affixation of voice affixes: the *sa* and *han* constructions and the optative mood expressions *sa-...-aw* and *sa-...-an*. The discussion of *sa* and *han* sentences provides another piece of evidence for a morphologically split system in Amis, as there is no evidence indicating which voice is the basic one for the two predicates. As for *sa-...-aw* and *sa-...-an*, though they display voice oppositions between UV and AV, the AV form *sa-...-an* seems to allow variable linking to the PSA and may function like a UV construction sometimes. For this pair of predicates, UV seems to be the basic pattern.