

Various types of linking and related constructions in Amis¹

Kazuhiro Imanishi

University of Tokyo, JSPS Research Fellow

Abstract: The present paper describes various types of linking constructions in Amis, an Austronesian language spoken in Taiwan. First, I classify them into three categories: the nominal linkage, the verbal linkage, and the manner/quotation construction. The nominal linkage includes nominal apposition and relative clauses. The verbal linkage includes the serial verb construction, subordination, two types of adverbial clauses, and coordination. The manner/quotation construction is a construction formed by the enclitics =*sa*, =*han*, and their variants. The manner/quotation construction is an important construction in Amis but has been few discussed so far. It describes manner, attended circumstance, quotation, or contrast ('as for').

Key words: Amis, Austronesian language, linking construction, manner and quotation

1. Introduction

The present paper discusses the various types of linking constructions in the Amis language². The major purposes of the present paper are: (a) to propose a classification of linking constructions in Amis (some of which consists of a revision of previous works); and (b) to describe the manner/quotation construction, which has been less described so far.

First, I divide linking constructions in Amis into three large categories: **the nominal linkage, the verbal linkage, and the manner/quotation construction**. The first one includes the nominal apposition and the relative clause construction. The second includes complex clauses which combine two verbs or two clauses. The verbal linkage can be classified according to the following criteria: (a) the use of the linker *a* or *ta*, (b) object raising (raising to object), and (c) word order. With these criteria, I propose a classification of the various patterns of the verbal linkage in Amis: serial verb construction, subordinate clauses, adverbial clause 1 (simultaneity and purpose), adverbial



Figure 1 Map of Taiwan

clauses 2 (condition, time, concession, and reason), and coordination (successive events). These constructions, the verbal linkage, have already been described by Huang (1994) and Wu (1995); the classification in the present paper is a revision of theirs.

Alongside the nominal linkage and the verbal linkage, there is another kind of linkage: manner/quotation construction. It makes use of the quotation enclitic =*sa* or =*han*, and is structurally different from the nominal and the verbal linkage. This type of linkage is few treated in the previous works on linking constructions (“complex sentences”) in Amis, e.g. Huang (1994) and Wu (1995).

Huang (1994) classifies complex sentences in Amis as in Table 1.

Table 1 Huang’s (1994) classification of complex sentences in Amis

Huang (1994)	Relation to my classification
Serial verb	Mixing “serial verb” and part of “adverbial 1” (purpose)
Pivotal	Part of “subordination”
Identifying	“Relative clause” (nominal linkage)
Cognition-utterance	Part of “subordination”
Less-tied	“Coordination” and part of “adverbial 2 (reason and condition)”
Juxtaposed	“Adverbial 2 (time, reason, condition)”

The “serial verb construction” mixes what I refer to as “serial verb” and “purpose adverbial”. I distinguish them because the word order is free with my “serial verb”, but restricted in my “purpose adverbial” (see the discussion below). The distinction between “pivotal construction” and “cognition-utterance” is based on semantics. According to my research, the Amis morphosyntax does not show any remarkable difference between them. Regarding the distinction between “less-tied construction” and “juxtaposed construction”, I focus on the characteristics of the linker *ta*, which distinguishes my “coordination” from other constructions.

Wu’s (1995) classification is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 Wu’s (1995) classification of complex sentences in Amis

Wu (1995)	Relation to my classification
Serial verb	Mixing “serial verb” and “adverbial 1” (purpose and simultaneity)
Pivotal	Part of “subordination”
Cognition	Part of “subordination”
Utterance	Part of “manner/quotation”
Relative	“Relative clause” (nominal)
Temporal	Part of “Adverbial 2” (time)
Contrast	Part of “Adverbial 2” (concession)
Conditional	Part of “Adverbial 2” (condition)
Reason and result	Part of “manner/quotation” and “adverbial 2” (reason)

Wu (1995) classifies complex sentences in Amis into three large categories (relative clauses, adverbial clauses, and four other constructions, which include serial verb, pivotal, cognition, and utterance construction). This classification draws on Givón (1980) and Huang (1993, 1995) (“theoretical framework” in Wu 1995: 6). It seems closely related to Huang (1994), as well. Givón (1980) is a typological framework of complements and Huang (1993, 1995) describes the syntax of the Atayal language, another Formosan language.

Some of the classifications in Huang (1994) and Wu (1995) seem to be based on some pre-determined frameworks; they make some distinctions which cannot be distinguished by the actual morphosyntax of Amis, e.g. the distinction between pivotal and cognition construction. I also suspect that it might also be problematic that they describe *nawhani* (*nawhan*) “because” or *nikawrira* “however” as a marker of clause linkage; they are used rather at the discourse level and seem to be discourse markers³.

In the present paper, I try to posit categories which can be induced from the very fact (i.e. the actual morpho-syntax) in Amis and avoid categories which are made or postulated for other languages.

In the discussion below, not only linking construction proper but also other kinds of constructions are also occasionally discussed because of the (mainly morphological) commonalities which they both share.

2. Nominal clause linkage

The nominal clause linkage in Amis includes the nominal appositional construction and the relative clause. The relative clause in Amis is described in Huang (1994) and Wu (1995); however they do not mention the relation between nominal apposition and the relative

clause.

Wu (1995) treats relative clauses differently from other complex sentences and I agree with her. The relative clause in Amis is a kind of nominal appositional construction. The relative clause in Amis makes use of the linker *a*.

See (1), which is a nominal appositional construction:

- (1) *tapag a kawas* “god, the leader (god as the leader)”
 leader LNK god

In (2a) and (3a) below, both *ma[^]efer* and *ki[^]mer* are verbs. (2b) and (3b) are their corresponding relative clauses. The nominalizing suffix *-ay*, which resembles *-er* (as in “teach-er”) in English, is attached to them in order to attribute a noun (*^ayam* and *tamdaw* respectively).

- (2) a. *ma[^]efer ku=[^]ayam i=kakarayan* “A/The bird is flying in the sky.”
 MA-fly TOP=bird LOC=sky
 b. *ma[^]efer-ay i=kakarayan a [^]ayam* “bird which is flying in the sky”
 MA-fly-AY LOC=sky LNK bird
- (3) a. *ki[^]mer ku=tamdaw* “The person is strong.”
 strong TOP=human
 b. *ki[^]mer-ay a tamdaw* “strong person”
 strong-AY LNK human

In Amis, the verb in the relative clause must be nominalized by the suffix *-ay*. Relative clauses in Amis are a kind of “noun + noun” appositional construction; hence the construction is classified and referred to as the “nominal clause linkage”.

Most of the consultants commented that the linker *a* may not be omitted in this type of linkage (the nominal linkage). Note that, in the verbal linkage (see §3), the linker is always optional (i.e. may be omitted) and more often omitted than retained, as far as I have surveyed.

3. Verbal clause linkage

The linking constructions which are treated in this section broadly cover what Wu (1995) refers to as “serial verb construction”, “pivotal construction”, “cognition construction”, “(a

part of) utterance construction”, and “adverbial clauses”.

In this category, I posit five subcategories: serial verb construction, subordinate clauses, adverbial clauses 1 (simultaneity and purpose), adverbial clauses 2 (condition, time, concession, and reason), and coordination (successive events). They are classified according to the following criteria:

- (a) Whether the linker *a* may be used.
- (b) The existence of the linker *ta*.
- (c) Whether the TOP phrase in the subordinate clause may be raised to become an argument in the main clause (so-called “object raising” or “raising to object”).
- (d) Whether the word order may be changed freely (with the caveat that the second verb follows the first one, whether immediately or not).

The features of the five subcategories are shown in Table 3. The distinction among the first three categories is not an absolute one; there are cases in which the distinction cannot be made clear-cut.

Table 3 Classification of verbal linking constructions in Amis

	Linker <i>a</i>	Linker <i>ta</i>	Object raising	Free word order
SVC	+	–	–	+
Subordination	+	–	+	–
Adverbial 1	+	–	–	–
Adverbial 2	–	–	–	–
Coordination	–	+	–	–

In some constructions in the verbal linkage, the linker *a* is used just like the nominal linkage (see§ 2); however, it is always optional and more often omitted than retained in the verbal linkage. Some consultants mentioned that the presence or absence of the linker does not affect the meaning or the style of the sentence; one consultant commented that the sentence sounds formal and polite if the linker is present.

The condition of presence/absence of the linker *a* in the verbal linkage has not been made clear. It seems that, in some sentences, the linker is less acceptable than others.

3.1. Serial verb construction

Serial verb construction is a construction whereby two or more verbs are combined with

each other to form a kind of unit and serves as the verb of a monoclaus. In the construction which I refer to as “serial verb construction” in Amis, the linker *a* may immediately precede the second verb.

- (4) a. *ma-harek=tu cira (a) mi-negneg tu=uhug*
 MA-finish=PFV 3SG.TOP LNK MI-watch ACC=book
 b. *ma-harek=tu (a) mi-negneg cira tu=uhug*
 MA-finish=PFV LNK MI-watch 3SG.TOP ACC=book
 c. *ma-harek=tu cira tu=uhug (a) mi-negneg*
 MA-finish=PFV 3SG.TOP ACC=book LNK MI-watch
 “He finished reading the book.”

All of the consultants whom I consulted on the matter agree (4a) is the most usual (i.e. unmarked) sentence. According to them, (4c) is less acceptable than the other two, but is still grammatical. As shown in the examples above, the word order can be mixed. This is a piece of evidence that the clauses above are monoclausal.

The voice alternation⁴ of the second verb is allowed, as in (5).

- (5) *ma-harek=tu cira (a) ma-negneg ku=uhug*
 MA-finish=PFV 3SG.TOP LNK MA-watch TOP=book
 “He finished reading the book.” (Lit. “He finished the book has been read”)

In (5), the second verb takes the Undergoer-Voice prefix *ma-*. Compare it with (4a) above.

Manner adverbs are also used in this construction. I refer to them as “the manner adverb construction”. In this case, a manner adverb functions as the first verb, and the second verb denotes the specific action in the clause. See (6).

- (6) a. *fahal (a) ma-keter cigra*
 suddenly LNK MA-angry 3SG.TOP
 b. *fahal cigra (a) ma-keter*
 suddenly 3SG.TOP LNK MA-angry
 c. *fahal cigra (a) ka-keter-an*
 suddenly 3SG.TOP LNK GER-angry-AN
 “Suddenly he got angry.”

Among the sentences in (6), (6b) is the most unmarked construction. (6a) and (6c) are examples which were composed by me and judged to be grammatical by the consultant. As shown in (6), the word order is free. The alternation of *ma-keter* “angry (with someone)” and *ka-keter-an* “Someone is annoyed by ...” is a voice alternation⁵.

Imperative sentences of the manner adverb construction can be formed as in (7). (7a) is a declarative sentence and (7b) and (7c) are its imperative counterparts.

- (7) a. *harakat (a) c<um>ikay* “[Someone] runs fast.”
 fast LNK run<UM⁶>
- b. *harakat (a) cikay-en* “Run fast!”
 fast LNK run-EN⁷
- c. *harakat-en (a) c<um>ikay* “Run fast!”
 fast-EN LNK run<UM>

-en is a voice suffix which is often used with imperative meaning. The suffix *-en* may be attached to either the first verb or the second verb. Because *-en* is a voice suffix, we can conclude that the second verb of the adverbial construction allows its second verb to alternate its voice in this case.

There are, however, cases in which the voice alternation of the second verb is not allowed. See (8).

- (8) a. *ma-harek=tu cira k<um>a'en tu=hemay*
 MA-finish=PFV 3SG.TOP eat<UM> ACC=rice
- b. *ma-harek=tu cira ma-ka'en tu=hemay*
 MA-finish=PFV 3SG.TOP MA-eat ACC=rice
 “I finished eating rice.”
- c. **ma-harek=tu cira ka'en-en tu=hemay*
 MA-finish=PFV 3SG.TOP eat-EN ACC=rice

The reason (8c) is ungrammatical is that the EN voice inherently has future time reference or imperative modality; therefore it does not suit the aspectual and time referential meaning of the first verb *ma-harek* “finish”.

As for the manner adverb construction, there are some restrictions which seems to me idiosyncratic in the present stage of investigation. See (9).

- (9) a. *hacikay* (a) *mi-^asip* “[Someone] reads [books] fast.”
 fast LNK MI-read
- b. **hacikay* (a) *ma-^asip* (Intended: “[Someone] has read [the book] fast”)
 fast LNK MA-read
- c. **hacikay* (a) *^asip-en* (Intended: “Read the book fast!”)
 fast LNK read-EN

In (9), the voice alternation of the second verb is not allowed. The contrast between (7b) and (9c) is especially problematic. (7) and (9) are elicited from different consultants, so there is a possibility that this is due to a idiolectic variation.

In summary, the linker *a* optionally precedes the second verb, the word order is free, and the voice alternation is generally allowed with the caveat that the aspectual, time referential, and modal meaning of the voice do not yield a contradiction between the first verb and the second verb. In some manner adverb constructions, there are (seemingly) idiosyncratic restrictions, which need further investigation. At least the voice alternation of the second verb of the manner adverb construction is somewhat more limited than that of other serial verb constructions.

The serial verb construction is not limited to specific verbs such as phasal verbs. See (10):

- (10) a. *mi-sa⁸-facu* *ku=kawas* (a) *mi-saga* *tu=fafahiyān*
 MI-SA-form TOP=god LNK MI-make ACC=woman
- b. *mi-sa-facu* (a) *mi-saga* *ku=kawas* *tu=fafahiyān*
 MI-SA-form LNK MI-make TOP=god ACC=woman
- c. *mi-sa-facu* *ku=kawas* *tu=fafahiyān* (a) *mi-saga*
 MI-SA-form TOP=god ACC=woman LNK MI-make
 “The God created a woman.” (Lit. “The God create-form-made a woman.”)

Aikhenvald (2006: 6) states that “[s]erial verb constructions are monoclausal and allow no markers of syntactic dependency of their components”. The serial verb construction in Amis is monoclausal but allows a marker (the linker *a*). This indicates that we should treat the two criteria separately. I argue that the monoclausality should be the most crucial characteristic of the serial verb construction and the marker of dependency is a secondary factor; if the lack of marker were thought to be the most important, simple juxtaposition of two clauses could be thought to be a serial verb construction.

3.2. Subordination

In subordination, the linker *a* may be used, just like in the serial verb construction. The differences between the subordination and the serial verb construction are the following: the restriction of the word order is stronger (there is clearly a boundary between two clauses), and the so-called “object raising” may occur.

See (11). (11a) and (11b) have almost the same meaning, and both are subordination construction. The difference between them is not known. In (11b), the noun *wacu* “dog” is “raised” to become an argument of the main clause.

- (11) a. *ma-^araw=aku i=lalan (a) {mi-kalat ku=wacu tu=pusi}*
 MA-see=1SG.GEN LOC=road LNK MI-bite TOP=dog ACC=cat
- b. *ma-^araw=aku i=lalan ku=wacu (a) {mi-kalat tu=pusi}*
 MA-see=1SG.GEN LOC=road TOP=dog LNK MI-bite ACC=cat
 “On the street I saw (that) the dog bit a cat.”
- c. **ma-^araw (a) mi-kalat=aku i=lalan ku=wacu tu=pusi*
 MA-see LNK MI-bite=1SG.GEN LOC=road TOP=dog ACC=cat

Other verbs which can be used in this type of construction include: *negneg* “watch” *pasu^lin* “believe”, *fana^* “know”, *tegil* “hear, listen to”, *ulah* “like, love”, *talaw* “afraid”, among others.

As Wu (1995: 61-62) mentions, the verb *ma-fana^* has two meanings, “know” and “can/ be able”, and each takes a different construction. In my classification, the former takes the subordination construction and the latter is used as the serial verb construction.

(12) *mafana^* as subordination

- a. *ma-fana^ kaku {ma-lasag cigra anini}*
 MA-know 1SG.TOP MA-drunk 3SG.TOP today/now
- b. *ma-fana^ kaku cigranan {ma-lasag anini}*
 MA-know 1SG.TOP 3SG.ACC MA-drunk today/now
 “I know that he is drunk today/now.”

(13) *mafana^* as serial verb construction

- a. *ma-fana^ kaku parakat tu=palidig*
 MA-able 1SG.TOP drive ACC=car
- b. *ma-fana^ parakat kaku tu=palidig*
 MA-able drive 1SG.TOP ACC=car

“I can drive a car.”

3.3. Adverbial clauses I (Simultaneity and purpose)

“Adverbial clauses” in Amis can be divided into two categories: (a) simultaneity and purpose, and (b) condition, time, concession, and reason. The two types are distinguished by the use of the linker *a*.

The first type (simultaneity and purpose) may use the linker *a*. There is no verbal morphology which indicates the status as an adverbial clause.

First, I describe adverbial clauses which describe simultaneity. They indicate the simultaneous occurrence of an event in relation to another event (i.e. “While -ing, ...”).

(14) Simultaneity

a. {*kala-caciyaw ku=fafahi=aku*} (a) {*ma-futi*[^]}
 (frequent)-speak TOP=wife=1SG.GEN LNK MA-sleep

“My wife talks frequently in her sleep (while sleeping).”

b. {*r<um>akat cigra i=lalan*} (a) {*r<um>adiw*}
 walk<UM> 3SG.TOP LOC=road LNK sing<UM>

“Walking on the road, he was singing. He was singing while walking on the road.”

c. {*mi-negneg cigra tu=tilifi*} (a) {*k<um>a'en tu=epah*}
 MI-watch 3SG.TOP ACC=TV LNK eat<UM> ACC=alcohol

“Watching TV, he was drinking alcoholic drink.”

All of the examples above depict the simultaneous occurrence of two events. The linker *a* is optional. The main-subordinate relation of the two clauses is not clear.

Next, we will look at purpose clauses. See (15):

(15) Purpose

a. {*pafeli-en=aku kisu tu=paysu*}
 give-EN=1SG.GEN 2SG.TOP ACC=money

(a) {*tala-pusug*} (a) {*mi-aca tu=uhug*}

LNK (motion)-(place name) LNK MI-buy ACC=book

“I will give you money so that you go to Pusug and buy books.”

b. {*mi-nukay kaku*} (a) {*ma-lahuk*}

MI-return 1SG.TOP LNK MA-eat.lunch

“I will return in order to eat lunch.”

c.*{*mi-nukay=tu kaku*} (a) {*ma-lahuk=tu*}
 MI-return=PFV 1SG.TOP LNK MA-eat.lunch=PFV
 Intended: ‘I returned and ate lunch.’

In the sentences above, the first clause is the main clause and the clause(s) that follow(s) expresses the purpose of the first one. (15c) is ungrammatical because the enclitic =*tu*, which designates the perfective aspect, attaches to the verb in the second clause and this yields the interpretation that the actor (*kaku* “I”) has already eaten lunch; this is incompatible with the property of the purpose clause (i.e. a purpose is to be fulfilled in the future). The intended meaning of (15c) is realized by another construction: coordination (see 3.5).

Examples such as (14) and (15) are treated as “serial verb construction” in Huang (1994) and Wu (1995). Note that the word order in (14c) and (15a) cannot be mixed crossing the border of the clauses. As for (14a), (14b), and (15b), the meaning does not change greatly even if the noun phrases, such as *ku=fafahi=aku* “my wife” in (14a), move to the second clause. I think that the adverbial 1 and the serial verb construction comprise a cline; if two verbs share their arguments, the serial verb construction is likely to appear; if they do not, the adverbial construction tends to appear.

The subordination construction is also not very different from SVC and adverbial 1. If the patient/them argument of the first clause is the actor of the second, the subordination construction appears. That is to say, the first three constructions are not very different from one another: the distinction depends on what kind of arguments verbs have.

3.4. Adverbial clauses 2 (condition, time, concession, and reason)

The second type of adverbial clauses expresses condition, time, concession, or reason. In this case, the linker *a* is usually avoided⁹. As Huang (1994: 84) and Wu (1995: 115) states, in order to express condition, time, etc., two clauses are simply juxtaposed in most cases. There are, however, specific verbal morphologies which express condition, time, or concession. In order to express reason, the enclitics such as *saka*, *sanaw*, or *hanaw* (all of them can be translated to “therefore”) may optionally be used (See§ 4).

One highly literate consultant tends to avoid the simple juxtaposition; he makes it clear what kind of logical relation two clauses have. Others usually use the simple juxtaposition, though they understand the specific morphology or elements which indicate the logical relation between two clauses. In written material, i.e. the Bible, the clear logical relation is usually indicated; in oral communications, it is usually not.

[1] Condition (*anu-*)

The prefix *anu-* may precede the verb in order to express a conditional adverbial clause (Wu 1995: 130). The overt distinction between simple conditional and counter-factual conditional has not been attested. Wu (1995: 130-135) states that the suffix *-ay* indicates the counter-factual condition in the adverbial clause of this type; however, this is denied by the consultant to whom I asked the problem. According to the data obtained from her, the presence or absence of *-ay* has nothing to do with the distinction between simple condition and counter-factual condition. In (16), the linker *a* is not allowed.

- (16) a. $\{(anu-)ma-urad\} (*a) \{i=luma^{\wedge} \quad kaku\}$
 ANU-MA-rain tomorrow LNK LOC=house 1SG.TOP
 “If it rains tomorrow, I will stay at home.”
- b. $\{(anu-)ira=hu \quad ku=limaw\} (*a) \{nanay \quad matenes=hu \quad kaku \quad itini\}$
 ANU-exist=IMPF TOP=time LNK hope long=IMPF 1SG.TOP here
 “If I had more time, I would like to stay here longer.”

[2] Time (*yu-*)

The prefix *yu-* may be used to express a time adverbial clause. The prefix *yu-* seems to be used only when referring to an event in the past. The linker *a* is prohibited.

- (17) a. $\{(yu-)ka^{\wedge}mag=hu \quad kaku\} (*a) \{awa \quad ku=cukap\}$
 YU-young=IMPF 1SG.TOP LNK not.exist TOP=shoes
 “When I was young, there were no shoes.”
- b. $\{(yu-)ma-tayal \quad kaku\} \{mi-^{\wedge}aw^{\wedge}aw \quad ku=wacu\}$
 YU-MA-work 1SG.TOP MI-bark TOP=dog
 “When I was working, a dog barked [to me].”

[3] Concession (reduplication)

In many cases, the mere juxtaposition of two clauses can express concession. As Wu (1995: 128) mentions, the partial reduplication of a verb is used¹⁰ in order to express concession. This is done if one wants to emphasize the concessive tone (especially if one wants to accuse someone).

- (18) a. $\{(anu-)ma-raru(<raru>)m \quad kaku\} (*a) \{ma-tawa \quad kaku\}$
 ANU-MA-sad<RED> 1SG.TOP LNK MA-laugh 1SG.TOP

“Though I am/was very sad, I laugh/laughed.”

- b. {*mi-tili*(<*tili*>)*d=hu* *ku=kaka*}
 MI-study<RED>=IMPF TOP=elder.sibling
 {*mi-negneg* *ku=safa* *tu=tilifi*}
 MI-watch TOP=younger.sibling ACC=TV

“Though the elder sibling is studying, the younger sibling is watching TV.”

In (18a), *anu-* may be added to the verb, which means that *anu-* covers broad meanings including condition and concession.

[4] Reason

The mere juxtaposition of two clauses is the most unmarked construction to describe a reason; however a kind of manner/quotation construction can also express reason, using the elements such as *saka*, *sanaw*, or *hanaw* “therefore”. They are discussed in §4 as well.

- (19) a. {*ga^{ay}* *ku=rumi^{ad}* *anini*} (*saka*) {*r<um>uad* *kita*}
 good TOP=day now/today therefore go.out<UM> 1PLI.TOP

“Because it is sunny today, let’s go out.” (Lit. “The day is good today, so we go out.”)

- b. {*ira* *mi-nukay* *ku=kaka=aku*} (*sanaw*)
 exist MI-return TOP=elder.sibling=1SG.GEN therefore
 {*mi-sa-turun* *ci-ina* *tu=sakalafi*}¹¹
 MI-SA-rice.cake TOP-mother ACC=dinner

“Because the elder sibling has returned, the mother is making rice to serve them for dinner”

- c. {*mi-sa-^{efit}* *cigra*} (*hanaw*) {*ma-ka-keter=aku*}
 MI-SA-tell.lie 3SG.TOP therefore MA-GER-angry=1SG.GEN

“He told a lie, so I got angry¹².”

3.5. Coordination (Successive events)

In order to describe two successive events, the linker *ta* is used. See (20).

- (20) a. {*r<um>akat* *cigra* *i=lalan*} *ta* {*r<um>adiw*}
 walk<UM> 3SG.TOP LOC=road LNK sing<UM>

“He walked, and then sung.”

- b. {*ma-futi*[^] *ku=wawa* } *ta* {*mi-salama kita*}
 MA-sleep TOP=child LNK MI-play 1PLI.TOP

“Let’s go out and play after the child sleeps.” (Lit. “The child sleeps, and then we play.”)

The linker *ta* combines two clauses which describe two events which occur successively, whether there is an interval or not. For example, *cigra* “he” in (20a) may begin to sing immediately after he stops walking; or he may stop walking, do other things, and then start to sing. The two events must not overlap when the linker *ta* is used. In order to express successive events, *ta* is indispensable; *ta* is different from *saka*, *sanaw*, and *hanaw* because of this indispensability to express a certain meaning. If *ta* is absent, the sentences have other interpretations, i.e. simultaneity, time, etc.

4. Manner/quotation construction

Amis has two types of enclitics which express manner and quotation. Those in the first type are =*sa* and its variants =*sa’an*, =*sanay*, =*satu* and =*sakira*; those of the second type are =*han*, =*hananay*, etc. The first type has the property as an actor voice, and the second type owns the properties of an undergoer voice. Most of them are second position enclitics, which attaches to a root or a clause in the first position.

4.1. =*sa*

The enclitic =*sa* attaches to a root or a clause; it describes manner or background information (attended circumstance). A root or a clause is put in the initial position of a clause, and the enclitic =*sa* attaches to it.

- (21) a. {*rakat*}=*sa* *tayra i=pitilidan*
 walk=SA go LOC=school
 “[I] walked to school.” (Lit. “[I] went walking to school.”)
- b. {*ma-kalat nu=wacu*} =*sa* *ma-talaw kaku tu=wacu*
 MA-bite GEN=dog =SA MA-afraid 1SG.TOP ACC=dog
 “Bitten by the dog, I am afraid of it.”
- c. {*r<um>akat cigra i=lalan*} =*sa* *r<um>adiw*
 walk<UM> 3SG.TOP LOC=road =SA sing<UM>
 “Walking along the road, he is singing.”
- d. {*mi-^aca kaku tu=sapaiyu*} =*sa* *tayra kaku i=pusug*
 MI-buy 1SG.TOP ACC=medicine =SA go 1SG.TOP LOC=(place name)
 “I go to Taitung (*pusug*) to buy medicine.”

In (21a), =*sa* attaches to the root *rakat* “walk”, and is phonologically dependent, i.e. it does not have its own accent¹³ (*rakát=sa*) and no interval between the first element and =*sa* is allowed. In other examples, it attaches to a clause. When =*sa* attaches to a clause, it may have its own accent, but the accent usually does not fall on it.

In any case, the elements which =*sa* attaches describe the manner, background information, or an attended circumstance of the clause that follows them. Wu (2004) calls the construction such as (21a) “ideophone”.

4.2. =*sa’an* (=san), =*sanay*, =*sakira*

=*sa’an* (=san), =*sanay*, and =*sakira* are the quotation markers in Amis. These can also function as the hear-say evidential marker, as in (22b). Of these three, =*sa’an* is by far the most popular one. See (22).

- (22) a. {*tayra kaku i=taypak anudafak*} =*sa’an*/=*sakira* *cigra*
 go 1SG.TOP LOC=Taipei tomorrow =SAAN/=SAKIRA 3SG.TOP
 “‘I will go to Taipei tomorrow,’ he said.”
- b. {*ma-^urad anudafak*} =*sa’an*/=*sanay*
 MA-rain tomorrow =SAAN/=SANAY
 “[It is] said that it will rain tomorrow.”

=*sa’an*, =*sanay*, and =*sakira* often have their own accent, but no interval is allowed between them and the clause they attach to. They are a little closer to independent words than =*sa*, but are treated as enclitics in the present paper.

=*sa’an* can be analyzed as “=*sa* (see 4.1) + *-an* (patientive/locative nominalization)”. =*san* is the reduced form of =*sa’an*. The difference between them has not been found; one consultant commented that there is no difference at all.

=*sanay* can be analyzed as the amalgamated form of “=*sa* + *-an* + *-ay* (agentive nominalization, see §2)”. The form =*sa’an-ay*, too, is also attested. One consultant commented that =*sa’an-ay* is the emphasized version of =*sa’an*.

=*sakira* can be analyzed as =*sa* + *kira*. *kira* seems to be the northern dialectal variant of *ku-ra* “TOP-that” (Inaida 2002: 5). *ku-ra* is used as in the following example.

- (23) *mi-daguy ku-ra wawa*
 MI-swim TOP-that child
 “That child is swimming.”

ra is a distal demonstrative which denotes a visible entity; therefore, *sa-kira* might be analyzed as “say-that” or “say-so”.

4.3. =*satu*

The enclitic =*satu* can be analyzed as “=*sa* + =*tu* (perfective aspect marker)”; however, =*satu* cannot be accounted for if we analyze it as a simple combination of =*sa* and =*tu*. The enclitic =*satu* has two uses: the manner marker and the contrast/topic marker.

First, =*satu* expresses a manner or a circumstance, as in the following examples.

(24) a. {*tefad*}=*satu* “[someone] fell”

fall=SATU

b. {*lasa*<*lasa*>*g*}=*satu* *malasag*=*tu* *ma*-[^]*emin* *ku*=*tamdaw*
 drunk<RED>=SATU drunk=PFV MA-all TOP=people
 “People are all drunk.”

In (24b), *ma-lasag*=*tu* *ma*-[^]*emin* *ku*=*tamdaw* “People are all drunk” is enough to express the meaning of the clause; but *lasa-lasa-g*=*satu* “drunk” is added in order to emphasize the drunken manner of the people. The reduplication, too, is used to emphasize the meaning.

Second, =*satu* can be used as a contrast/topic marker which can be translated to “as for ...” in English, i.e. it is used when a narrator wants to focus on something which is not the main theme of the previous sentence.

The following sentences are excerpts from a discourse which describes a person (*kafu*[^]*uk*) who is fighting the Chinese army (*kuapig*).

(25) The Chinese army shot *Kafu*[^]*uk*, but ...

ca *ka-tama* *nu*=*kuapig* *ku-ra* *ci-kafu*[^]*uk*
 NEG GER-hit GEN-Chinese.army TOP-that TOP-(personal.name)
 “[The shot of] the Chinese army did not hit (that) *Kafu*[^]*uk*.”

{*u-ra* *ci-kafu*[^]*uk*}=*satu* *c*<*um*>*ikay*=*tu* *mi-tu*[^]*ur*
 PRE-that TOP-(personal.name)=SATU run<UM>=PFV MI-follow
 “As for (that) *Kafu*[^]*uk*, he ran (and) followed [the army].”

The following sentences describe the situation in which the Chinese army gave the Amis people alcoholic drink and made them drunk.

- (26) *pa-ka'en=han nigra tu=^epah*
 CAU-eat=HAN 3SG.GEN ACC=alcohol
 “He (a soldier in the Chinese army) made [the Amis people] drink alcoholic drink.”
{matu^asay}=satu kina-ulah=sa k<um>a'en tu=^epah
 old.people=SATU (joy)-like=SA eat<UM> ACC=alcohol
 “As for the old people, they were very pleased to drink the alcoholic drink.”

The word *kina-ulah* means “be pleased to do something”. The enclitic *=han* expresses a manner which is realized by someone’s will (see 4.4).

=satu may also have its own accent, but there is no interval between it and the element it attaches to; so it is treated as an enclitic.

4.4. =han

=han is a manner/quotation marker and similar to *=sa*. Just like *=sa*, *=han* does not have its own accent and hence treated as an enclitic. The main differences between *=sa* and *=han* are the following: (a) Roughly speaking, *=han* is used when someone’s will is clearly present. (b) *=han* usually refers to an event in the future, or the change of a situation by someone’s will; on the contrary, *=sa* simply refers to a state or a situation in the present time or in the past. (c) *=sa* is an actor voice, *=han* is an undergoer voice. That is to say, the instigator of the quoted part is indicated by TOP with *=sa*, and GEN with *=han*. (d) *=han* can be used a contrast/topic marker, just like *=satu*. *=sa* itself cannot function as a contrast/topic marker.

- (27) a. *{ka'en}=han=ita*
 eat=HAN=1PLI.GEN
 “Let’s eat.”
- b. *na=itini {rakat}=han tahira i=kakacawan*
 ABL=here walk=HAN arrive LOC=(place name)
 “From here, [I] walk to [arrive at] Kakacawan.”
- c. *{cufus}=han=aku kisu*
 pour=HAN-1SG.GEN 2SG.TOP
 “I will pour [water on] you.”
- d. *{ka-likat i=kakarayan a pa^edil tu=hekal}=han nu=kawas*
 IMP-light LOC=sky LNK CAU-radiance ACC=earth=HAN GEN=god
 “‘The light should glow and light the earth’, said the God.”

In every sentence in (27), there is someone's will. When =*han* is used to describe a manner, it attaches to a root which describes the manner that someone is going to perform, as *ka'en* in (27a), *rakat* in (27b), and *cufus* in (27c). When used as a quotation marker, it usually attaches to an imperative clause, as in (27d)¹⁴.

The following pair clearly shows the contrast between =*sa* and =*han*.

- (28) a. {*taladaw*}=**sa** *ku=suwal nu=pagcah tu-rira a ^alu*
 (place name)=**SA** TOP=word GEN=Amis ACC-that LNK river
 "That river **is called** 'Taladaw' in Amis."
 b. {*taladaw*}=**han** *ku=suwal nu=pagcah tu-rira a ^alu*
 (place name)=**HAN** TOP=word GEN=Amis ACC-that LNK river
 "Amis **named** that river 'Taladaw'."

(28a) simply describes the state that a certain river is called *taladaw*; on the contrary, (28b) describes the action of naming; it implies a person who named the river *taladaw*.

=*han* sometimes functions as a contrast marker, too. In this respect, it is similar to =*satu* (see 4.3). In (29) below, the narrator first talks about the people who are made drunk by the Chinese army; then he focuses on the army.

- (29) *k<um>a'en [cagra] tu-ra ^epah nu=kuapig*
 eat<UM> 3PL.TOP ACC-that alcohol GEN=Chinese.army
 "[They] drunk that alcoholic drink of the Chinese army."

*itiya {u-ra kuapig}=**han** ma-fana^ itiya=tu*
 then PRE-that Chinese.army=**HAN** MA-able then=PFV
 "Then, **as for** the Chinese army, they were able [to kill them]."

mi-patay tu=^aluman-ay a tamdaw nu=cepu^
 MI-kill ACC=many-AY LNK people GEN-(place name)
 "[They] killed many people of Cepu^ then."

=*han=tu* is the combination of =*han* and =*tu* (PFV).

- (30) a. *pa-tireg=han ku-ra* b. *pa-tireg=han=tu ku-ra*
 CAU-stand=HAN TOP-that CAU-stand=HAN=PFV TOP-that

Both: “Stand that!” (Lit. “That should be handled so that it will be in a standing manner.”)

In Amis, =*tu* is used in order to emphasize imperative modality; (30b) is an emphasized version of (30a).

The form *han-en* is also attested. *-en* is a marker of undergoer voice, i.e. a voice affix can attach to =*han*.

- (31) *han-en=tu* “Leave [that] as it is.” (Lit. “[That] should be so.”)
 HAN-EN=TU

4.5. *hananay* (*hanan*)

hananay can be analyzed as =*han-an-ay* and has three meanings: (a) “this way”, “such”, or “so”; and (b) “called” or “so-called”; and (c) contrast/topic marker “as for ...” (just like =*satu* and =*han*). With the first two meanings, =*hananay* is an enclitic, because it immediately follows the first element in a clause and no interval is allowed. (32a) is an example in which =*hananay* means “called”, and (32b) is an example in which it is used with meaning of the contrast marker “as for”:

- (32) a. {*ci-kafu^uk*}=*hananay* *ku=gagan=nira*
 PRE-(personal name)=HANANAY TOP=name=3SG.GEN
 “His name is called ‘Kafu^uk’.”
 b. {*u-ra ci-kafu^uk*}=*hananay* *mi=simsim=tu tu=falucu^*
 PRE-that PRE-kafu^uk=HANANAY MI-thoughts=PFV ACC=heart
 “As for (that) Kafu^uk, [he] thought [that ...]”

With the third meaning of *hananay*, i.e. “this way, such, so”, *hananay* is not an enclitic. In (33), *ki^mer ku=amis hananay* “Amis is so strong” is a clause, and *hananay* is at the third position of the clause and a short pause may be put before it.

- (33) *ma-^urad ma-fali ma-tayal ki^mer ku=amis hananay*
 MA-rain MA-wind MA-work strong TOP=Amis such/so
 “[No matter though it] rains [and/or] blows, [Amis] works. Amis is so strong.”

One consultant mentioned that *hanan* has the same meaning as *hananay*; however, it seems to be rarely used. I have no example in which it is used.

4.6. *saka, sanaw, hanaw*

saka, sanaw, and hanaw seem to include =*sa* or =*han*, and might be able to be analyzed as *sa-ka, san-aw, and han-aw*; however, they have their own accent when used in a sentence (*saká, sánaw/sanáw, and hánaw/hanáw*) and a short pause is often put before them; therefore, they are treated as independent words. All of them can be translated to “therefore” in English. See (19) in 3.4-[4].

5. Concluding remarks

In the present paper, we have looked at various types of linking constructions in Amis and have proposed classifications based on the morpho-syntax of Amis. The following two points are especially interesting results: (a) the so-called “adverbial clauses” can be divided into two categories and one of them, i.e. adverbial clauses 1 (simultaneity and purpose) is more tightly attached to the main clause; (b) the manner/quotation markers seem to indicate the close relationships between manner description, quotation, and topic/contrast indication.

I hope that the present paper will contribute to the better understanding of the language and various types of linking construction in general.

Notes

1. The first version of the present paper is presented at the 16th meeting of the Linguistic Circle for the Study of Eastern Eurasian Languages, held in Tokyo, Japan, on December 5th, 2009. I would like to express my gratitude to the consultants who helped me in the field. I also thank Shigeru Tsuchida and two anonymous reviewers, who gave me valuable comments on the draft of the present paper.
2. Amis is an Austronesian language spoken in Taiwan. The Amis people, who are one of the indigenous groups in Taiwan, have a population of around 160,000; I estimate that approximately half of them speak the language fluently. There are four dialects: Northern, Tavalog-Fataan, Central, and Southern (Tsuchida 1988). In the present paper, the Central dialect is treated. Examples are cited in a notation which is basically based on IPA, except for the following cases: <e> = [ə]; <u> = [u ~ ʊ ~ o]; <i> = [i ~ e]; <y> = [j]; <s> = [ɕ] before /i/, [s] in other environments; <c> = [tɕ] before /i/, [ts] in other environments; <d> = [t ~ ʈ]; <g> = [ŋ]; <^> = [ʔh] when in the word final position, otherwise [ʔ]. The following abbreviations are used: TOP: topicative, PRE: predicative, ACC: accusative, GEN: genitive, LOC: locative,

ABL: ablative, PFV: perfective, GER: gerund, IMP: imperative, NEG: negation, LNK: linker, 1SG: first person singular, 2SG: second person singular, 3SG: third person singular, 1PLI: first person plural inclusive, 1PLE: first person plural exclusive, 2PL: second person plural, 3PL: third person plural. Affixes and clitics are indicated with ‘-’ and ‘=’, respectively. { } is used in two ways: (a) to indicate a clause, and (b) to indicate a root to which an enclitic attaches.

3. *nawhani* can be analyzed as *naw-han-i* (why-HAN-topic/contrast.marker) and is roughly translated to “(To explain) why it is so, ...”. For *han*, see 4.4. *nikawrira* can be analyzed as *nika-u-rira* (despite-PRE-that), which means “Despite that, ...”. I doubt whether they can be treated as a linker or a conjunction. As far as I surveyed, they are used with a clear long interval before them; they are better treated as discourse markers, which resemble “therefore” or “however” in English.
4. The voice system in Amis includes two large categories: Actor Voice, which is similar to the active voice in languages such as English, and Undergoer Voice, which resembles the passive voice in languages such as English. Examples of the voices in Amis are: (i) MI voice: an Actor Voice which has no specific aspectual, time referential, and modal meaning. Roughly speaking, it takes the topicative (TOP) of actor or experiencer. This is the most unmarked voice in Amis. (ii) MA voice: an Undergoer Voice which has perfect or stative aspect. It takes the topicative of undergoer or experiencer of state; it is also sometimes used with ambient verbs such as “rain”, or verbs such as “work” or “eat lunch”, which describe a routine. Other voices are introduced when they are used in examples.
5. “*ma-keter* TOP ACC” means “TOP is angry with ACC”, and “*ka-keter-an* GEN TOP” means “GEN is very angry with TOP”. *ka-* of *ka-keter-an* is a stem-forming prefix.
6. *-um-* is a voice infix which designates an affected agent (or middle voice).
7. *-en* is a suffix indicating “Irrealis Undergoer Voice”. It designates future time reference or imperative modality. In the example, it has the imperative modality.
8. The prefix *sa-* designates “creation” or “performance”. In these examples, it refers to the creation of the form of a woman.
9. Of the three consultants with whom I discussed the matter, one reluctantly allowed the use of *a* in some cases. The other two totally rejected the use of *a* in this construction.
10. The partial reduplication in Amis is achieved by the following process: CVCV => CVCV-CVCV, CVCVC => CVCV-CVCV-C. See Yeh (2003) for detail.
11. *ira* is an existential verb and means “exist / there is”, but in the example it is used as a marker of the perfect aspect (“have already returned”). Compare it with Japanese perfect/progressive *te-iru*, which also contains the existential *iru* “exist / there is”. For the prefix *sa-* in *mi-saturun*, see Footnote 7. *sa-ka-lafi* (instrumental voice prefix *sa-* + stem-forming prefix *ka-* + *lafi*

“dinner”) literally means “an instrument/mean which is used as dinner”. The accusative marker *tu=* here expresses a purpose; the latter clause literally means: “The mother makes rice cakes in order to let them be an instrument which is used as dinner”).

12. *ma-keter* describes a state “be angry”, and *ma-ka-keter* describes a change of state “get angry”. Another similar pair has been found: *ma-fana*^ “know (state)” *ma-ka-fana*^ “come to know (change of state)”.
13. Amis has stress accent and the accent falls on the ultimate syllable.
14. The sentence (27d) is taken from the Bible in Amis. Examples in which =*han* attaches to an imperative clause is very frequently found in the Bible, but rarely found in other situations, such as elicitation or oral narratives. It is possible that =*han* is not usually used in a way as in (27d) in oral communication; it is possible that it was first utilized when Amis began to be written. In written materials, speech-act verbs are more necessary than in oral communication. When Amis began to be written, I assume, people intuitively felt that they need more speech-act verbs, which Amis lacked when it was solely used as a spoken language, and they used =*han* as one of them. See Olson and Astington (1990) for a similar development in English.

References

- Aikhenvald, Y. Alexandra. (2006) ‘Serial verb construction in typological perspective.’ In: A. Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial verb construction: a cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. (1980) ‘The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements’ *Studies in language* 4, 333-377.
- Huang, Lilian Mei-jin. (1993) *A study of Atayal syntax*. Taipei: Crane Publishing Co.
- _____. (1994) *A preliminary study of Amis syntax*. Taipei: National Science Council Report NSC 81-0301-H033-504.
- _____. (1995) *A study of Mayrinax syntax*. Taipei: Crane Publishing Co.
- Inaida, Yuki. (2002) *Amigo no shiekikoubun <Causative construction in Amis>*. M.A. Thesis. The University of Tokyo.
- Olson, D. R. and J. W. Astington. (1990) ‘Talking about text: how literacy contributes to thought.’ *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(15), 557-573.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru. (1988) ‘Amigo <Amis>.’ In: T. Kamei, R. Kono, and E. Chino (eds.), *Gengogaku Daijiten <Linguistic encyclopedia> vol.1*, 447-449. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Wu, Joy Jing-lan. (1995) *Complex Sentences in Amis*. M.A. Thesis. National Taiwan Normal University.
- _____. (2004) ‘The ideophone-forming construction...sa and lexical categories in Amis.’

Taiwan-Japan Joint Workshop on Austronesian Languages. Taipei: National Taiwan University.

Yeh, Shih-chi. (2003) *Syllabification and reduplication in Amis*. MA Thesis. National Tsinghua University.