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Overview

This is a study in diachronic syntax of the Austronesian (AN) languages. We shall be concerned with the casemarking (syntactic case) and the semantic Case relations of the core terms of the verb, in all its voices.

We begin by reviewing my comparative study of Atayal (in the North Formosan group) and Malagasy (in the Western Malayo-Polynesian group of AN). The conclusion is that forms -an/-un/-in, verbal focus affixes, are underlyingly ANA/UNA/INA, i.e., locative preposition A/U/I followed by the demonstrative NA ("that"). The focus affix is a grammaticalization of a phrase, "at that". This conclusion, if true, has profound consequences on our understanding of the diachronic development of the AN system.

In a few languages, the allative preposition KA/KU/KI is grammaticalized in another form of the phrase. In a few others, demonstratives of other distances (NI "this" and DA "that, remote, out of sight"), grammaticalize in the same way.

In AN as in Indo-European (IE), both third-person pronouns and Determiners, including articles, typically arise from demonstrative pronouns.

Here’s an example of a simple use of the phrase (not grammaticalized) from Ross (1997); it’s in Tigak, a Meso-Melanesian Western Oceanic language of New Ireland.

pikoi ina iai
bark PREP tree
"tree bark, bark of a tree"

Even here, the fusion of preposition i and article (determiner) na into a single word is a slight grammaticalization. The optional use of the i “at” preposition for “of” is found in what I call Greater Central-Eastern MP, i.e., Central and Eastern MP languages plus adjacent Wolio.

The thrust of this paper is to examine some of the Rukai languages of Formosa for cognate forms and their place in AN’s diachronic syntax. Rukai
has come to be of special interest because of Starosta's (1994) proposal that Rukai was the first to break off from the main line of AN.

The present study finds that both Tanan Rukai and Mantauran Rukai indeed have casemarked pronouns (or verbal suffixes descended from casemarked pronouns) which obviously descend from phrases consisting of a locative preposition (a/u/i) plus pronouns. These have rather limited applicative functions in Rukai and they do not serve as makers of voice change. Nevertheless, Tanan Rukai has such a formation with some passive uses, even though an unrelated construction is the passive voice. Rukai languages show some elements of the focus affixes found in the other major branches of AN. These facts raise the question: did Rukai have the focus voice-changing system and lose the essential part of it? Or did the other AN languages develop the system from a common ancestor not shared by Rukai? I make a judgment on the issue.

Now let's look at the facts: and begin with examining the prepositions, casemarkers, and demonstratives of AN languages in general, and PAN, that can form the relevant PPs and then grammaticalize. We note that casemarkers commonly arise from prepositions, and that in diachronic studies it is convenient to speak of PCMs (prepositions-casemarkers).

**Prepositional phrase: a-na = “at that”, “there”**

The table below (based on evidence that may be given in another paper) shows the composition of prepositions and casemarkers (henceforth PCM) and Demonstratives (Dem) / Determiners (Det) in Proto-Austronesian (henceforth PAN) and Austronesian (AN) languages generally. Choose any consonant from column 1 plus any vowel from column 2 to make a PCM, and add a Dem/Det from column 3, which may be fused with the PCM to form a casemarked Dem/Det. Each Dem/Det refers to a distance (from this- to that-there). Glosses show the likely PAN semantics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zero (at,in)</td>
<td>i (person, proper name)</td>
<td>ni (this, near me)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottal (topic)</td>
<td>u (unmarked, neutral)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (from,of,by)</td>
<td>s (not Gen/Erg)</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k (to,toward)</td>
<td>a (nonspec, common noun)</td>
<td>na (that)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s (not Gen/Erg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>da (that, out of sight)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t (not Gen/Erg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the disappearance of the initial glottals in most AN languages, the glottal case (Topic > Nominative/Absolutive) becomes indistinguishable from the zero case, which is locative but comes to take accusative uses in
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some languages. We’ll call the zero-form locative and the k-form allative. In AN as in other language families, the allative form can get dative use, and the locative and allative forms can get accusative use. AN allatives also (perhaps through “turn into”) acquire use as predicate nouns or presentatives; and from that use k- can come to acquire nominative use.

In some Formosan languages, such as Li’s Tanan Rukai (1973) an element -a is added, said to be an accusative marker, forming object pronouns inia and idaa (p 83).

The forms from the table that we’ll deal mostly with in this study are ana (< zero + a + na), una (< zero + u + na), and ina (< zero + i + na); all of which have the basic locative meaning “at that” or “there” in the hypothetical PAN and in some languages today. Those are the forms most often grammaticalized, though in a few languages forms beginning k- (allative “to”) or ending -Da (remote) come to be grammaticalized in the same way.

In Li’s table of feature classification of determiners in Tanan Rukai (1973, 87) one portion shows:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
-NM & +NM \\
-pers & ka & ka \\
+pers & ki & ku \\
\end{array}
\]

The table is interesting in grouping vowels i and u together against a, and it does so without invoking a schwa vowel. Locatives are more likely to be non-persons, and patients are more likely to be persons. I suggest that this is the reason why, of the grammaticalized constructions that arose in AN from “at that”, the ina / una passive voices (with non-low vowel) promoted accusative patients to subjects, and the ana passive/circumstantial voices (with the low vowel a) promoted mostly locatives. Another way to say this is that in the voice-changing affixes of verbs in such languages as Atayal, Tagalog, and Malagasy, the -pers PCMs with vowel a were used mainly for semantic locatives and circumstantials, and the +pers PCMs with vowels i and u came to be used for most person-like semantic patients. Tanan’s distinction between ku marking Nominatives and ki marking non-Nominatives raises questions I don’t wish to discuss in this paper. Let’s only note that in Polynesian tongues ko < *ku has nominative-like functions (marking presentative and predicate noun), while ki keeps its normal use as preposition “to”.

In Li’s -NM, -pers slot, sa substitutes for ka if it is +spec. That doesn’t affect what we have said about the vowels.
Here are a few examples of the basic phrase, without grammaticalization, in attested languages.

The word ina occurs in some Polynesian languages without grammaticalization, with the meaning, "in or at that place" or (by extension) "in or at that time". Carroll & Soulis's Nukuoro dictionary, 1973, defines it as "to it". It is interesting that "in or at that (place)" is exactly the most ancient PAN meaning that is reconstructable from Rukai and from Amis, as we shall see. For Hawaiian, Puku'i and Elbert (1957/1965,94) define ina] as "Here, now, then" (i.e., in or at that place or time):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ina} & \text{ iho ke ala} \\
& \text{Here is the road.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ina} & \text{ aku ka hale.} \\
& \text{Yonder's the house.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ina} & \text{ aku a ho'l'eha mai} \\
& \text{[He will] soon be back.}
\end{align*}
\]

From *Tanan Rukai, Li (op. cit., 88)*

iakai bilinj inia anatu  
exist high that tree  
\([-\text{NM}] = \text{Acc/Loc}\)  
"(It) is high up on that tree."


\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Misy lehilahy any } & \text{ an-} \text{ trano} \\
& \text{(A-NI)} \\
\text{exist man Deic Obl-} & \text{ house} \\
& \text{"There is a man in the house."}
\end{align*}
\]

When the function of the demonstrative is to serve as a Determiner, one of its effects may be to make the NP definite, specific, and referential.

In (perhaps) all languages, time locatives arise from place locatives. So it's no surprise to find ana and ina forms referring to time. Rukai languages have (Zeitoun, pers. comm.) adverb ana "still". Nuclear Polynesian languages have e VERB ana for continuative aspect. Both of those a-na could easily arise from "at that time".