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proachable. It is densely laid-out with narrow margins and tight leading. To give some idea of its impact, I did a rough word count. In a recent Cambridge University Press book (Cameron and Kulick 2003) there are approximately 460 words per page; GTP has approximately 730 words per page when it is solid text (nearly 160% over Cambridge). In this respect GTP is typical of the Battlebridge series, and I hope that the editors can find some way of getting out future volumes that have a less frantic and cramped appearance. I am sure that the increased readability will allow interesting and important work like Smith’s GTP to shine for more readers.

MIRIAM MEYERHOFF
University of Edinburgh
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This volume is a collection of ten papers focusing on various aspects of nominalization in Formosan languages from different theoretical perspectives. (Two of the languages discussed are not actually Formosan: Yami is spoken on an island to the southeast of Taiwan and subgroups genetically with the Philippines, and Tagalog is, of course, a Philippine language.) The papers are the output of a workshop of the
same name held at Academic Sinica in Taipei, October 21–22, 2000. This is an important contribution to the rapidly growing literature on Formosan (and Philippine) linguistics, not only because of the highly focused nature of the studies, enabling comparisons to be drawn with similar phenomena in other languages of the groups, but also because several of the studies are on highly endangered or nearly extinct languages. Following the papers on nominalization is a careful review by Elizabeth Zeitoun of the recently published *Pazih Dictionary* by Paul Jen-kuei Li and Shigeru Tsuchida. The volume should be on the shelves of any linguist concerned with the analysis and description of these languages. It is in general well edited, although typographical errors appear periodically throughout. The remainder of this review consists of evaluations of each of the papers in the volume.

D. Victoria Rau’s “Nominalization in Yami” (165–196), is a well-written paper providing a succinct account of various nominalization processes in Yami within the context of a brief overview of the syntax of the language, characterized by her as showing morphological ergativity. Rau first outlines the processes involved in the formation of nouns from different lexical categories, by, for example, reduplication of nouns to form plural nouns, or of verbs to form instrumental nouns. She then discusses the use of various so-called focus affixes, to wit, the well-known *mi-/ma-* (AF), *-en* (PF), *-an* (LF), and *i-* (IF) types, as well as the prefix *ka-,* to form participant nominals from verbs. Various other nominalization types, for example, of nouns from numerals and from other nouns, are exemplified. The following section discusses action nominals using *ka-,* which occur following case markers, and compares these forms with similar *ka-* forms that are either marked for recent past, or sequential activity, and an adjectival *ka-* form that indicates degree of strength. Although she is nonspecific about the other functions of *ka-,* Rau treats sequential *ka-* forms explicitly as nominal, because A nominals following them are encoded as genitive, and O nominals are encoded as oblique. Gerundive or clausal nominatives are discussed within the context of content questions, in which such forms occur as the subject, while the question word is the predicate of the sentence, and within the context of relative clauses, in which such forms occur either preceding the modified noun to form a nonrestrictive relative clause, or following it to form a restrictive relative clause.

An interesting feature of Yami syntax is the variable position of genitive pronouns. Typically they occur after a nominal in a modified noun phrase. They likewise occur immediately following a transitive verb to mark the A of that verb, and they occur immediately following a nominalized verb marked by *ka-.* However, in some constructions, the pronoun is fronted to a position immediately preceding an action nominal but following initial elements such as time adverbs, conforming to a second position rule. Finally, in what R describes as “nonnarrative, involved style” (186), the pronoun may occur at the beginning of the sentence. These three positions Rau considers to represent three stages in the development of indicative verbs from nominalizations, and a transition from complete “nouniness” to complete “verbiness,” with the intervening stage being ambiguous as to whether the form is a noun or a verb. She notes that nominative pronouns marking the A of intransitive sentences are following the same trajectory of development, with Yami moving from a head-initial to a head-final language.
Lillian M. Huang’s “Nominalization in Mayrinax Atayal” (197–226) and Paul Jen-kuei Li’s “Nominalization in Pazih” (227–240) in their respective papers both address the familiar problem of how to distinguish verbal forms from nominals. Although Huang discusses a few nonproductive morphological devices for forming lexical nominals, both she and Li conclude that there is no morphological distinction between clausal nominals and verbs in these languages. Most of the verbal morphology appears also on forms whose distribution within noun phrases suggests that they are in fact nouns. Both papers discuss the structure of relative clauses in their respective languages. Huang notes that relative clauses with expressed head nouns appear to function as verbs, but when the head is missing, they appear to function as arguments and are therefore presumably nominal. Li discusses the distribution of forms occurring on either side of the ligature a in Pazih. He notes that both terminals of the construction may be nouns. However, one terminal may by a verb phrase functioning as a relative clause, although its status as a nominalization is unclear, because two verb phrases may also be linked by the same ligature, functioning in this context as a complementizer. He concludes that there is no morphological evidence that subordinate structures such as relative clauses are nominalizations in Pazih.

Elizabeth Zeitoun’s “Nominalization in Mantauran (Rukai)” (241–282) provides a highly readable description of the morphological processes that mark nominalizations in this language. She notes that “derived nominals are identified as such based on their identical distribution with other nominals and their sharing the same morphosyntactic properties” (244), and proceeds to describe six tests that serve to distinguish nouns from verbs on the basis of their distribution and their morphology. Using the Comrie and Thompson (1985) typology of distinguishing two types of clausal nominalization, action/state nominals and argument nominals, Zeitoun provides a set of clear tables showing the various morphological processes involved in the nominalization of each verb type, with sets of supporting examples taken from her 600 pages of Mantauran texts. Most of these processes she notes are productive and fairly predictable, although some of them have irregular phonological and morphological developments that she describes and illustrates. In the final section she addresses two issues that are commonly confronted in the literature on nominalization. The first is the apparently nominal nature of what seem to be verbal sentences. Zeitoun notes that in Mantauran, unlike most other Formosan languages, this is not a problem. There is a clear distinction between the verbal morphology and that of its nominalized counterparts. Moreover, there are at least seven different morphological features that serve to distinguish lexical from syntactic nominalization in the language. The second issue is the relationship between syntactic nominalization and relativization. Zeitoun provides examples of six construction types that trigger syntactic nominalization—wh-questions; subordinate, pseudo-cleft, and relative clauses; and negative existential and imperative sentences—and concludes that there is no distinction whatsoever between syntactic nominalization and relativization in Mantauran.

The next six papers discuss nominalization from an explicitly formal theoretical viewpoint. Chih-Chen Jane Tang’s “Nominalization in Paiwan” (283–334), although admittedly a preliminary study, unfortunately provides no clear picture of nominaliza-
tion processes in Paiwan, but instead leads the reader through a thicket of elicited examples into a jungle of involved argumentation in an attempt to show that result nouns stem from two types of nominalization—one taking place at the morphological level and the other at the syntactic level—as against the received wisdom in the theory which stipulates that attaching of nominalizing affixes to predicates cannot take place at the level of S-structure, but only in the lexicon. She further proposes that the nominalization processes that form result nominals are distinct from those that appear in so-called headless relative and internally headed relative clauses. A short note on verbal gerunds suggests that these are also syntactically derived. The various tracks that Tang leads us along on several occasions come to impassable quagmires that require “future research.” At least some of the difficulties of analysis appear to stem from unstated assumptions about the basic nature of Paiwan syntax. Tang’s use of the term “Accusative” to label NPs marked with tua for common nouns and tai for personal nouns, and for the O complements of AF verbs marked with -em-, along with her characterization of such verbs as [+transitive] (319), implies that she considers Paiwan to be either an accusative or a split-ergative language. This results from her perception of transitivity as semantic rather than syntactic, and is further evidenced by her labeling of the root sekau ‘enslave’ as [+transitive] (326) even prior to its affixation or consideration of its syntactic distribution. If she had considered the possibility that her Accusative NPs are actually Obliques, and that the associated AF verbs are not transitive but dyadic intransitives, as has been convincingly argued for tu in Kavalan (Liao 2002), this would have provided her with an explanation as to why nominalized transitive predicates denoting “the X-part” can only derive from verbs affixed with -in- or -n...-an, not with -em- (320), because it is only the former that are syntactically transitive.

Melody Ya-yin Chang’s “Nominalization in Tsou” (335–348), is a short, clear presentation of the difference between lexical and syntactic nominalization in Tsou. Chang provides a set of syntactic tests, which show that the former cannot occur with aspect markers, may not be modified by adverbials, and do not take oblique arguments. The latter, however, all do, implying that they are clausal in nature. The presence of an overt nominalizer hia in the latter provides further support for her analysis. There is a third construction type that also contains an (optional) form hia, which is different from the syntactic nominalizations she has already described, because these structures allow tense/mood/voice auxiliaries, and nominatively marked subjects. She concludes that such structures are not nominalizations at all, and that hia in these cases is not a nominalizer, but the head of what she considers to be an internally headed relative clause. The only problem I find in her analysis is her ambivalent stand regarding the nature of oblique NPs in Tsou. Although in all her examples she carefully labels to phrases as obl., within her text she refers to the phrases as accusative, and refers to nominalizations with these NPs as retaining the ability to “assign accusative case” (340) to them. On only one occasion, where the form is translated into English with a prepositional phrase (341), does she feel confident in referring to it in the text as oblique.

Henry Yung-li Chang and Amy Pei-jung Lee, “Nominalization in Kavalan” (349–368), argue on the basis of various types of evidence that in this language it is necessary to distinguish nominalizations from so-called headless relative clause construc-
tions. The former are considered to be nouns with argument status, the latter to be verbal structures functioning as modifiers. A distinction is drawn between nominalization of action predicates and of state predicates, with the latter requiring affixation not required of the former. This paper relies heavily on the claim that verbal modifiers of relative clauses allow tu NPs, analyzed by Chang and Lee as accusative, and that therefore the structures must be verbal and not nominal. They claim, on the other hand, that nominalizations with -an do not allow such NPs. This claim is made first in the abstract (349) and repeated several times (354, 355, 356, 364), but is invalidated by example (29a), which shows just such a nominalized verb with -an followed by a tu NP, glossed by the authors as Accusative. A more careful analysis of Kavalan syntax might have revealed that, in fact, tu NPs are not accusative, but obliques with a wide range of functions in the language, including not only an indefinite theme of a dyadic m- clause, but also a temporal phrase, a location noun, a comitative noun, a possessor, and an actor of a dyadic -an clause (Liao 2002), and therefore their appearance following -an nominalizations is not at all unexpected or surprising.

Cheng-Fu Chen’s “Nominalization of Interrogatives in Kucapungan Rukai” (369-392), provides an interesting discussion of the development of a set of interrogative verbs in Rukai and the various nominalization processes they can undergo. The author demonstrates that the verbal base of all but one of the verbal interrogatives, -tumane, developed historically from the verbalization of a nominal base mane, no longer occurring independently in the language but found in reduplicated form as a nominal interrogative meaning “what.” The form tu- occurs elsewhere in the language to derive nouns into verbs. Chen concludes that mane was originally an incorporated object, but that now the full form is frozen as an interrogative verbal base. As such, it may be reduplicated and take a variety of tense and voice morphemes, which result in a set of transitive verbs (“do what”) and their passive counterparts, a set of intransitive verbs querying the state of an action or event (“how—state”) and a further set of transitive verbs querying the manner of an action or state (“how—manner”). In his discussion of the nominalization of each of these forms, Chen notes that tense and aspect morphology are retained, although sometimes manifested with different forms from the corresponding verbal form. Reduplication also occurs as part of the nominalizations. Considering the syntax of the nominalized forms, he concludes that transitivity has no effect on the nominalization of interrogatives. They may occur both as sentential arguments and as nominal predicates. Nominalized transitive interrogatives still allow obliquely marked objects, just as their verbal counterparts do. Chen concludes that nominalized interrogatives in this language are “mixed nominals” (390), carrying verbal as well as nominal characteristics.

Edith Aldridge’s “Nominalization and WH-movement in Seediq and Tagalog” (393-426) is a carefully argued paper within the context of minimalist syntactic theory. Its main purpose is to compare the nature of wh-questions in Seediq and Tagalog, both treated as ergative languages, and to draw general theoretical conclusions from this. A notes that there are two main types of wh-questions in these languages, those that are formed on arguments and those formed on adjuncts. With reference to the first type, A discusses the well-known restriction in many Austronesian languages on absolutive
extraction in the formation of relative clauses and pseudo-cleft constructions, and consid-
ers that argument WH-questions are biclausal, with the WH-word forming a matrix
predicate and the rest of the clause being composed of a headless relative clause. The
restriction on absolutive movement, she claims, is related to the same restriction in rel-
ative clause formation by a requirement that an absolutive Case feature must be
checked in the C domain, or, as she says, "the null operator in the headless relative
must check an absolutive Case feature in its landing site in the C domain" (421). In this
respect the two languages function in precisely the same way. The same cannot, how-
ever, be said of adjunct WH-questions, where the two languages behave differently,
although in both languages, unlike WH-argument questions, adjunct WH-questions are
monoclausal and are formed through WH-movement. The difference between the two
languages, A claims, is related to the different processes of determining word order in
the two languages. Whereas in Seediq an absolutive NP occurs at the end of a sen-
tence, in Tagalog, word order "adheres to the thematic hierarchy of agent, theme/
patient, goal, and so on" (407). In Seediq, basic word order is generated by an XP pred-
icate-fronting process that leaves only the absolutive NP eligible for fronting. All other
material is contained in the fronted predicate and ineligible for extraction to predicate-
initial position. In Tagalog, however, basic word-order generation is much simpler and
does not leave adjuncts confined in an XP island. They therefore remain eligible for
extraction by WH-movement to predicate initial position. Aldridge provides useful ref-
ences to related literature in other Austronesian languages, including mention of
work done on Chamorro and Palauan, which she characterizes as Oceanic languages.
Although they are located geographically within Oceania, they do not form a part of
the Oceanic subgroup. Both are Western Malayo-Polynesian languages.

Stanley Starosta's "Austronesian 'Focus' as Derivation: Evidence from Nominal-
ization" (427-479) has appeared posthumously, and thus serves as an excellent sum-
mary of much of his life's work with reference to the syntax of Philippine and
Formosan languages. The paper contains useful summaries of several of the key
concepts that distinguish his theory (lexicase dependency grammar and in recent
years seamless morphology) from other current theories, in particular his under-
standing of the nature of case relations as not being situational, as are Fillmorean
case relations, Chomskyan theta-roles, Relational Grammar initial Grammatical
Relations, but perceptual (465-466). In many ways, Starosta was a voice crying in
the wilderness, his theory and many of the claims that he made were not widely
accepted by mainstream linguists working in the field. But it might be good to
remember that sometimes such voices can be prophetic, and the messages they send
can have deep influence on future generations. From this point of view, the paper is
worthy of careful reading and serious reflection.

The major theme of this paper is that the so-called 'focus' systems of Austrone-
sian languages are not inflectional, as has been claimed by many linguists working
in the field (fully documented by Starosta in footnotes), but are derivational. This
turns out to be not simply a terminological squabble, but to have far-reaching impli-
cations for the syntactic analyses of these languages, involving the determination of
the transitivity of verbal constructions, and ultimately of determining whether the
languages are ergative, accusative, or something in between. Starosta concludes that so-called AF (actor focus) constructions are all syntactically intransitive, whether they are monadic or dyadic, and that all NAF (nonactor focus) constructions are transitive, and that almost all Formosan languages are consequently ergative.

He summarizes the various ways many linguists have analyzed focus, either as voice (which implies inflection), or as subject-verb agreement (which has also been characterized by some as inflection). It has also been claimed that focus is inflectional because it is productive and forms paradigms (442–443). Starosta shows that focus systems are far from being productive, with typically very few roots in a language being capable of appearing in all focus forms, thus making it necessary for each possible form of a verb to be listed in dictionaries, rather than being derived by rule (456).

One of the major arguments Starosta produces is the following. He reminds us that inflection is expected to operate on forms within the same syntactic category and to be paradigmatic, with all the resultant forms remaining within that same category. Derivation on the other hand may relate forms from the same, or from different categories. Yet focus affixation does not produce paradigmatic alternation, because some of the affixes affect the valency of their verbs: AF forms are intransitive, while the NAF forms are transitive. They therefore do not alternate in the same syntactic position in a sentence (456). He further shows that the ubiquitous mag- and mang-AF prefixes in Philippine languages are the result of a process that relates them with their corresponding gerundival forms prefixed with pag- and pang-, respectively, by the addition of an AF verbalizing prefix m-, a process that must be derivational, not inflectional (445). An additional piece of evidence is that some focus forms exhibit semantic specialization, expected in derivation, but not in inflection (445).

The appearance of what are thought of as focus affixes between widely accepted derivational affixes and their bases in some of the languages further argues that the focus affixes cannot be inflectional. Thus in Tagalog the supposed IF inflectional prefix i- appears inside the ablitative/involuntary/accidental derivational prefix ma-, in examples such as ma-itapon ‘able to throw s.t.’, ma-ipangluto? ‘able to be used to cook with’, etc. (445).

Not only does Starosta claim that verbal forms marked with focus affixes are formed by derivation, but that nominal forms carrying precisely the same affixation are also formed by derivation, and are derivationally related to their corresponding verbal forms. They cannot be related to inflectional categories, because these categories are not carried across to new forms in derivation. The presence of precisely the same set of ‘focus’ morphology occurring on both nouns and verbs (a fact illustrated in a number of papers in this volume) is evidence, according to Starosta, that the forms must result from derivation, not inflection. Thus in Paiwan, k’m/an ‘eat (AF)’ and k’m/an ‘eater, one who eats’, or kan-en ‘eat (OF)’ and kan-en ‘food’, and so forth, provide clear evidence that they are derivationally related (457–463).

Starosta asks, if Austronesian focus morphology is derivational, what does it derive? His answer is that AF morphology encodes intransitive verbs, and NAF morphology encodes transitive verbs. But then what do the various NAF affixes derive. Here he refers to his work on what he terms “recentralization,” a process resulting in
what in other frameworks is referred to as “applicatives.” The different NAF constructions are, in effect, different semantic subclasses of transitive verbs, each imposing a characteristic semantic interpretation on its Patient (the required perceptual, not situational, role), expressed as a Nominative noun phrase in these languages.

Lawrence A. Reid
University of Hawai‘i
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This volume contains a dozen papers dealing with morphological topics in Austronesian, preceded by three chapters that summarize Byron W. Bender’s research interests and professional activities. The volume opens with a short reminiscence by Alfred Capelle that recounts his experience working with Bender on the Marshallese-English dictionary project, and details Bender’s extensive administrative work in the Marshall Islands. George W. Grace provides a brief biographical sketch that emphasizes Bender’s long and distinguished record of professional service. The third chapter lists Bender’s publications up to 2000.

The twelve papers that follow are organized alphabetically by author rather than thematically, though a number of papers address common issues, and some general themes run through many of the papers in the volume. One intriguing group of papers reconsiders alternations in Oceanic between reflexes of transitive forms in *-i or *-aki(ni) and their intransitive counterparts. In the first of these papers, “The Gilbertese -i intransitives, high-vowel erasure, and related phenomena,” Harrison articulates the descriptive issue raised by the thematic consonants that precede transitive markers. He notes that “if the verb root was one that was consonant-final in Proto Oceanic, then the transitive form will typically reflect the historical root-final consonant as a so-called thematic consonant, which is lost in the unsuffixed intransitives” (106). Yet the loss of thematic consonants in intransitives entails that the transitive