

Elizabeth Zeitoun. 2007. *A grammar of Mantauran (Rukai)*. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series A4-2. xviii + 551 pp. ISBN 978-986-01-1219-1. \$50.00, hardcover.

Mantauran is one of the six dialects of the Formosan language Rukai, spoken in the south-central region of Taiwan. It is spoken by only 250–300 people and is highly endangered, with only a few elderly speakers still fluent. This alone is reason enough to document the language that in a generation or so will probably no longer be spoken. But Rukai is unique in that it apparently exhibits an accusative case-marking system, while most other Formosan languages are arguably ergative, and it does not exhibit the widespread “focus” system characteristic of the so-called “Philippine-type” languages of Taiwan, such as Amis, Kavalan, Bunun, Thao, and Atayal. While a substantial grammar exists of one of the other dialects, Tanan Rukai (Li 1973), until Elizabeth Zeitoun (henceforth EZ) began her research on the language, there was very little information available about the morphosyntax of this dialect. With this grammar, we now have extensive coverage of two considerably different dialects of Rukai.

EZ’s goals in writing the grammar in effect match the reasons given above. They were “to provide a description of the most salient characteristics of the grammar of Mantauran in order to reach a better understanding of this language and second, to make available enough empirical data to show in what respect Mantauran differs from the other Rukai dialects and other Formosan languages in general” (13). In these respects it is clear that EZ has succeeded admirably. The grammar is a model of clear prose and elegant argumentation supported by a multitude of carefully chosen examples drawn primarily from over 600 pages of transcribed narrative and folktale texts that the author collected from her primary language consultant.

Chapter 1 discusses the current status of Mantauran Rukai (henceforth MR), providing brief notes on some of the commonly used loanwords, most introduced during the Japanese colonial period, and it is to this language, according to the author, that speakers persistently resort. The possibility that Japanese has also influenced the morphology will be commented on below. This chapter also provides the theoretical orientation of the work, stating that the grammar is a functional and empirically based account of MR, utilizing principles laid out by Dixon (1997) and Noonan (2006). The Conclusion (463) also notes that the grammar is “not circumscribed in any formal theory.” Nevertheless, various syntactic operations used by formalists, such as “raising,” form part of her argumentation to support one analysis over another in later chapters. A succinct outline of the grammar closes the chapter.

Chapter 2 provides a standard structuralist account of the phonology and morphophonemics of MR, and a summary of the sound changes that have occurred in the language from Proto-Rukai as reconstructed by Li (1977). Of particular interest in this chapter is the evidence, rare in Austronesian languages, of a contrast between vowel-initial forms, and glottal stop-initial forms, such as *ʔolipotso* ‘unwrap’ vs. *olipotso* ‘wrap’. Of interest in the morphophonemics section are the various processes labeled by EZ as rightward

and leftward “glottal hopping” associated with the addition of various affixes. Typical of much of the grammar, EZ provides a clear summary of the data, drawing generalizations and providing explanations where possible, and acknowledging problems that she is unable to account for.

Chapter 3, Morphological units and morphological processes, begins as do most chapters with definitional statements and supporting general literature. EZ briefly outlines various approaches to the description of words, including IA and IP Morpheme-based accounts, generative Lexeme-based morphology, Word and Paradigm and Seamless morphology, and makes explicit her claim that, despite recognized difficulties with Morpheme-based accounts, this model allows a transparent treatment of the structure of MR words, helps account for the distribution of some forms, and facilitates a comparison with other Rukai dialects and other Formosan languages (45). She concludes that typologically MR is a synthetic-agglutinative language, with a wide range of “dependent” morphemes, or affixes, bound to roots or stems and forming words. Included among the dependent morphemes are the sets of pronominal clitics. It is perhaps for this reason that EZ decided to mark clitics with a preceding hyphen, rather than the more standard equals sign, thus obscuring the syntactic independence of clitics vis-à-vis affixes. EZ is clearly aware of the distinction between affixes and clitics, making a rather unusual claim that while affixes can bear stress, clitics (even disyllabic ones) never do (289, 293). Nevertheless, on more than one occasion, she refers to a clitic as an affix (e.g., “*ama-* ‘father’ must occur with an affix [cf. . . . *ama-li* ‘my father’]”) (46). This chapter also includes a useful section on reduplicative processes in MR.

Chapter 4 discusses MR word classes. The author distinguishes eleven word classes: nouns, verbs, pronouns, demonstratives, numerals, adverbs, phrasal elements, clausal elements, interclausal elements, exclamations, and interjections. There is only one recognized adverb (which suggests that it probably belongs to some other class), and EZ notes in discussing the pronouns that they are actually a subclass of nouns, in that they can substitute for a noun as the head of an NP. There are no adjectives. Forms that translate as adjectives are a subclass of verbs in that they carry morphology that also occurs on verbs. Similarly, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, and interrogative words are either nouns or verbs, or are expressed through affixation. The morphosyntactic similarity between nouns and verbs, so often discussed in the literature on Austronesian languages, is also true for MR; however the author provides a very useful discussion outlining with examples a range of formal distinctions between the two categories. She draws attention to the lack of what have been called “case-markers” in descriptions of other Formosan languages, including that of Tanan Rukai. The one form that remains, *i*, can occur before a subject or an object noun, whether common or personal, human or nonhuman, and is optional. The morphological properties of the two major subclasses of verbs, dynamic and stative, are discussed. Both classes can carry imperative as well as other common affixation, and both exhibit the same reduplicative patterns. Both dynamic and stative verbs can occur as heads of transitive as well as intransitive constructions. Each of the other word classes is described with lists of forms and example sentences.

Chapter 5 begins the set of chapters that detail the morphology of nouns and verbs. In this chapter nouns are subcategorized into three major subsets: common, locative and

temporal, and noncommon nouns. These are further subdivided by the derivational processes that each can undergo, as well as by syntactic criteria, for example whether or not they are cross-referenced on the verb when the noun can be interpreted as plural. Non-common nouns include kinship terms, personal and household names, and, interestingly, terms derived from body parts used for insulting people! In common with many other Austronesian languages, only human nouns, whether common or personal (except personal names), carry pluralizing morphology.

Chapter 6 deals with verbal morphology. The most pervasive distinction, as noted earlier, is between dynamic and stative verbs. EZ cites, apparently approvingly, Himmelmann's (2005:362–63) definition of stative verbs as referring to “states of affairs which do not involve any kind of agent,” and all of the examples she provides (141) are verbs of this type, such as ‘be happy’, ‘be good’, ‘be bad’, and the like; but MR also has transitive verbs such as *ma-dhalame* ‘like/love’ (390) that are also marked as stative.

Both dynamic and stative verbs display alternation between finite, non-finite, and subjunctive forms, and both can be marked for active or passive voice. Transitivity, as such, is not overtly marked on the verb. The term “non-finite” is problematic, in that the usual criteria for considering a form to be non-finite are not present in MR. Typically, a non-finite verb does not allow a subject and has restricted marking for tense, aspect, or other inflectional categories, such as mood. Consequently, a non-finite verb generally cannot serve as the main verb of an independent clause, but heads a dependent non-finite clause. In MR these conditions do not apply, bringing into question the appropriateness of the term “non-finite.” Both finite and non-finite verbs can occur at the beginning of sentences and as the heads of independent clauses, and both can be followed by a clitic nominative pronoun or a subject noun. MR verbs are not tensed, but do carry marking for either realis or irrealis mood, the latter distinguishing between an event that will take place in the future, and one that should have, but didn't. Finite verbs carry a reflex of Proto-Austronesian (PAN) **<um>* as MR *om-*, whether referring to a present or past event, or a reflex of Proto-Rukai **o-a-* (explicitly realis) as MR *o-* that is typically also realis. Stative finite verbs carry a reflex of PAN **ma-*. Dynamic non-finite verbs appear in their root forms. Stative non-finite verbs have the root form prefixed with a reflex of PAN **ka-*. MR non-finite verbs are said to be required when occurring with the future prefix *amo-* ‘will’, *ni-* ‘counterfactual’, or *ki-* ‘modal negative (that is, ‘not like’, ‘not want’, and so on)’—typically irrealis events—but they are required as well with *pa-* ‘causative’, or following a conjunction such as *la* ‘and’ and *mani* ‘then’, that could be realis and perfective events. There are in addition, as shown in examples throughout the work, non-finite verbs with a variety of other affixes, including the causative forms *apa'a-* and *apaa-* (discussed in chapter 8), *tako-* ‘while’ (137), and passive verbs prefixed with *i-* (147), any of which could be followed by the aspectual forms *nga* ‘already’ or *na* ‘still’.

The inappropriateness of the term “non-finite” becomes obvious with the prefixes *kama-* ‘continuously’ and *maka-* ‘finish’ (157) that are said to mark a verb as finite, but have a non-finite verb form, such as the verb *kama-ka-ke'eecenge*, in which the prefix *kama-* ‘continuously’ marks the verb as dynamic and finite, while *ka-ke'eecenge* is the non-finite form of the stative verb meaning ‘strong’; and likewise *maka-kane*, in which *maka-* ‘finish’ marks the verb as dynamic and finite, while *kane* is the non-finite (root)

form of the dynamic verb meaning 'eat'. Other uses of the "non-finite" verb form are found in chapter 7, where derivational processes operate on, or result in, such forms.

Since *amo-*, *ni-*, *ki-*, and *tako-* occur at the leftmost edge of the verb, preceding all other derivational affixes including passive, they might better be analyzed as proclitic adverbial forms. EZ considers that *amo-* (and presumably *tako-* and the monosyllabic morphemes that occur at the beginning of a word) are affixes, because they carry stress (primary stress is said to always occur on the first syllable of a word), while clitics do not. But the argument is circular, since it depends on the prior classification of these forms as prefixes rather than as clitics. If *amo-* were a proclitic, it would also presumably carry stress. I would also claim that the aspectual forms *-nga* 'already' and *-na* 'still', that in affirmative sentences always occur at the ends of words and are considered by EZ to be verbal suffixes, are probably enclitics rather than suffixes, even though they precede pronominal clitics. Cognate forms in Philippine languages, such as Tagalog, are enclitics and in some cases precede pronominal clitics. In MR serial verb constructions, the aspectual forms *-nga* 'already' and *-na* 'still' are always attracted to the first verb, and never occur on the second verb even though the second verb can be reduplicated to convey an aspectual meaning (405). The first verb also attracts the shared nominative pronoun, but oblique pronouns can occur on either the first or second verb. In negative sentences, the negative form *-ka* occurs between the aspectual forms and the clitic pronouns (319, 340). It is probably also an enclitic.

Subjunctive verb forms are typically identical to the finite form, and occur in imperative constructions, as well as conditional/hypothetical constructions following *lo* 'if'. They differ from finite verbs, however, in that they require that their actors be genitively rather than nominatively marked. Subjunctive verbs also appear as the second verb in serial verb constructions, discussed in detail in Chapter 15.

Chapter 7 on transcategorial operations discusses the wide variety of derivational affixes that transform nouns into verbs and vice versa. All except gerund formation are considered to be lexical derivation; gerund formation is considered to be a syntactic derivation. Deverbal nominalizations when the source verb is dynamic result in nouns with a non-finite (root) verb form, and with or without some other affix, as *kane* 'food' derived from *o-kane* 'cook', or *velvete* 'wall' derived from *o-velvete* 'pile up', suggesting the possibility that the root form is itself a noun, and that the associated verbs are denominals. Gerunds can also appear unaffixed in their root form, or "marked as non-finite" and have their actor marked by a genitive pronoun like other nouns.

Although MR has no "focus" system, it does have a distinction between subjective nominalizations, with the meaning 'the one who/which. . .', and a range of other nominalizations that correspond to the verbal system of other Formosan languages, such as objective nominals, instrument/manner/result nominals, and reason, locative, and temporal nominals.

Chapter 8 discusses valence adjusting operations, primarily dealing with causativization, but with short sections on anticausativization, reflexivization, and reciprocity.

Chapter 9 examines numerals and other quantifiers. MR has developed four sets of sortal classifiers used for counting humans, the number of referents caught or taken, the number of referents contained in a recipient, and the number of floors in a building.

Chapter 10 covers pronouns, personal, impersonal and demonstrative, their forms and functions. It also discusses adnominal demonstratives that have similar forms to demonstrative pronouns, but that only occur as modifiers of nouns. There are four sets of personal pronouns: topic, nominative, oblique, and genitive. Nominative pronouns are not case-marked, oblique pronouns are. MR personal pronouns exhibit the usual exclusive/inclusive distinction in first person found in nearly all Austronesian languages. In the topic and nominative sets there are no third person personal pronouns, the gap being filled by demonstrative pronouns. The genitive and oblique sets maintain a distinction between third person pronouns that are visible and those that are not, in both the singular and plural forms. All except topic pronouns are enclitics, although each of the first person pronouns (singular, inclusive, and exclusive plural forms) has a proclitic variant, carrying modal information, suggesting that they were once enclitics to an initial modal verb that has since been lost, with the pronoun being captured by the main lexical verb as a proclitic.

Despite EZ's claim that pronouns are not affixes on the verb but syntactically independent clitic forms, she claims that first and second person topic pronouns must by cross-referenced "on the verb" with a nominative pronoun if the sentence is affirmative, and by a genitive pronoun if the sentence is negative (297). Cross-referencing does occur, but not "on the verb" since the pronouns are not part of the verb.

Chapter 11 moves from the discussion of word categories to the structure of noun and verb phrases. A single noun (with or without a preceding adnominal demonstrative) or a pronoun constitutes a simple noun phrase. A complex noun phrase consists of a head noun and one or more modifying verbal or nominal elements. No ligature exists between the head and its modifier. A verbal modifier is actually a nominalized constituent and forms an attributive (or relative clause) construction with the head noun, with which it maintains obligatory semantic role concord, reminiscent of the structure of verbal relative clauses in other Austronesian languages that allow relativization of only the grammatical subject of the clause. The order of the head and its modifier is relatively free, although when a part-whole relationship is involved and the phrase marker 'i occurs between them, as in *dha'ane 'i velvete* (house PM wall) 'wall of the house, lit. house's wall', this order is obligatory. Since this is the reverse of what one would expect in an Austronesian language, the possibility that the order reflects the influence of Japanese might be considered: note Japanese *ie=no kabe* (house=GEN wall) 'house's wall'. Compounding and coordination also produce complex noun phrases.

A simple verb phrase is said to consist of a verb, with or without pronominal complements, and its object complement, if any. A complex verb phrase contains verbs that are modified by the adverb *toramora* 'very', that is linked by *ka* to the verb that it modifies. Although EZ claims that the ligature only occurs when the adverb precedes the verb, but not when the adverb follows the verb (324), a counterexample occurs in the immediately preceding example (11.54c). Complex verb phrases can also be formed by coordination.

Chapter 12 gives an overview of clause structures in MR. There are two basic clause types, one headed by a verb, the other by a nominal predicate. Typically, the clauses are predicate-initial. MR distinguishes between ambient, intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive clause types. Gerundive constructions used, for example, in interrogative constructions are very similar to verbal constructions, with the same morphology, but requiring a

genitively marked argument to express the agent, rather than a nominative argument as in the corresponding affirmative construction. There is no copula in MR, so nominal clauses are constructed by juxtaposing two NPs (350) and form pseudo-cleft as well as interrogative constructions.

Topicalization of subject NPs is allowed (with obligatory cross-referencing “on the verb,” that is, by a pronominal clitic), but only definite objects can be topicalized. Ordering of nominal arguments after the verb is free, but pronominal ordering is fixed. This chapter also covers existential, possessive (two types), and locative clauses.

Chapter 13 examines interrogative and exclamatory sentences. Polar “yes-no” questions, most commonly used in greetings, are of particular interest because the predication being questioned, whether nominal or verbal, is marked as interrogative by the morpheme *-ka* (glossed as ‘negative’ by EZ) occurring at the end of the predicate (following any aspectual forms), and a genitive pronoun. Alternatively, the structure begins with a nominalized form of the verb meaning ‘exist’ followed by a genitive pronoun, a free morpheme *ka* that EZ glosses as ‘negative’, and the questioned predicate, either a noun or a non-finite (root) form of a verb. The free morpheme *ka* can also appear as the negative response to a question. Again, the possibility arises that the structure is influenced by Japanese interrogative constructions, that (at least in formal constructions) require the interrogative morpheme *ka* to appear immediately following a questioned predication, as in *Ogenki desu ka?* ‘Are you well?’.

Chapter 14 is a short chapter on the coding of grammatical relations, short because there is very little overt case-marking in the language, verbal agreement is restricted, and word order is relatively free. This chapter contains a section justifying MR as an accusative language and giving evidence for the syntactic status of “subject.” If in fact MR is an accusative language, the question arises as to why the objects of transitive verbs are marked as oblique, and why there are no accusatively marked NPs in the language.

Chapter 15 is a substantial chapter detailing serialization and other complementation strategies in MR. Serial verb constructions are one of the most productive complementation strategies and are defined as two or more verbs sharing the same grammatical subject and juxtaposed in a single clause. Tense, aspect, and modality, as well as negative polarity, are only marked on one of the verbs (403). Clitic pronouns, aspectual forms *-nga* and *-na*, and the negative *-ka* only appear on the first verb, suggesting the clitic status of the latter three forms. No temporal adjunct can appear between the two verbs. EZ discusses the types of verbs that can appear as the initial verb in a serial construction. They are grouped as phasal (those that indicate whether the verb is inceptive, continuative, or terminal), modal (marking ability, or know-how), adverbial (including manner, temporal, and numeral expressions), directional, and purposive verbs. The second verb is always in its subjunctive form.

Various other complementation strategies and the kinds of verbs that take them are described, including zero or paratactic complements, nominalization, and causativization.

Finally, chapter 16 examines subordination—in particular, the structure of adverbial clauses, juxtaposed clauses, and other coordinated constructions. The adverbial clauses described are temporal, conditional/hypothetical, counterfactual, and concessive clauses.

Juxtaposition is one method of coordinating two clauses, although specific conjunctions, verbs, or other devices can indicate the logical succession of two (or more) clauses (462).

The grammar concludes with two appendices: a detailed list of 147 affixes in MR, their meanings, and a few carefully chosen examples of their use, cross-referenced to the section of the grammar where they are described; and four MR texts, with interlinear and free translations. A list of references and an index complete the work.

This handsomely bound volume provides a very accessible description of MR structures, with carefully prepared summary statements and charts appearing in every chapter. All analyses are well-described and illustrated with numerous examples, providing a rich resource for comparative studies of Formosan languages, and enough unresolved analytical problems to keep Formosanists busy for a long time hunting for adequate solutions. It is a pleasure to read a grammar that has been carefully edited and proofread. There are very few typographical errors, and only one wrong cross-reference that I identified (6.1.3.2 for 6.3.1.2 at the bottom of page 466). The reversal of ‘east’ and ‘west’ in the very first paragraph of the introduction is certainly not indicative of the general level of careful editing that is found throughout the rest of the work.

We can look forward to the appearance of a volume being prepared by EZ comparing Mantauran Rukai with other Formosan languages, confident that it will meet, like the grammar, the high academic standards for which the author is justly recognized.

LAWRENCE A. REID
University of Hawai‘i

REFERENCES

- Dixon, R. M. W. 1997. *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. Chapter 12: Tagalog. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman, 350–76. New York: Routledge.
- Li, Paul Jen-Kuei. 1973. *Rukai structure*. Taipei: Academia Sinica. Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Special Publication No. 64.
- . 1977. The internal relationships of Rukai. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 48(1):1–92.
- Noonan, Michael. 2006. Grammar writing for a grammar reading audience. *Studies in Language* 30(2):351–65.