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The order of personal pronouns in Formosan and Philippine languages is of great interest to linguists in that it exhibits great variations across languages. In some languages, such as Central Cagayan Agta, the order of personal pronouns is syntactically conditioned. In some languages, such as Tagalog, the order of personal pronouns is phonologically conditioned. In some other languages, such as some Manobo languages, the order of personal pronouns is conditioned by multiple factors (e.g. case, person, etc.). In this study, the relative order of personal pronouns in Atayal is reexamined. It is argued that, contrary to the claims that have been made in previous analyses, semantic factors (e.g. person, number, etc.) alone cannot adequately account for the pronominal order facts in Atayal. Instead, it is the interaction of semantic factors with syntactic and phonological factors that provides us with a fuller and more satisfactory account of the pronominal order facts.
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1. Introduction

The order of personal pronouns in Formosan and Philippine languages is of great interest to linguists in that it exhibits great variations across languages. In some languages, such as Central Cagayan Agta, the relative order of personal pronouns (in transitive clauses) is syntactically conditioned, with agentive genitive pronouns preceding nonagentive nominative pronouns (H. Liao 2004). In some languages, such as Tagalog, however, the relative order of the pronouns is phonologically (rather than syntactically) conditioned, with monosyllabic pronouns always preceding

---

1 This paper is a revised version of a part of Chapter 5 (section 5.2.2) of my doctoral dissertation (H. Liao 2004). I would like to thank the Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange (USA) for providing me with a doctoral dissertation fellowship to conduct my dissertation research. I would also like to thank my committee members, Lawrence Reid (Chairperson), Robert Blust, Byron W. Bender, Sasha Vovin, and Bion Griffin, for their helpful comments on my dissertation. I am also grateful to the reviewers of the journal for comments on an earlier version of this paper. Special thanks go to Lillian Huang for providing me with more Atayal pronominal data to test the constraints proposed in this paper. All errors and shortcomings are my responsibility alone.

2 Even though Atayal is analyzed as ergative, I choose not to use the term “absolutive”, preferring instead the typologically more general term “nominative” for the core arguments S and O in ergative languages (as well as the S and A in accusative languages). Similarly, the case-marking of noun phrases that are the agent of transitive constructions in Atayal is identical to that which marks the possessors of possessed nouns. I choose to use the more general term “genitive” (rather than “ergative”) as the label for the case that marks both of these noun phrases.
disyllabic pronouns, regardless of their case form (Schachter 1973). In some other languages (such as Agusan Manobo, Dibabawon Manobo, and Sarangani Manobo), multiple factors (e.g. case, person) are involved in constraining the relative order of pronouns (Forster 1964, Weaver and Weaver 1964, Reid and Liao 2001, H. Liao 2004).

Very interesting data regarding the order of personal pronouns have been reported in Atayal, an Austronesian language spoken by some 63,000 speakers in the northern mountain area of Taiwan, stretching through eight prefectures (i.e. Taipei, Taoyuan, Hsinchu, Miaoli, Taichung, Nantou, Hualien, and Ilan) (http://www.ethnologue.com). It has been classified as a member of the Atayalic primary subgroup of the Austronesian language family (Blust 1977, 1999). Two major dialects are found in Atayal Proper: Squliq and C?uli?. The dialect variant under study is the Squliq variant, which is more prestigious and innovative than the C?uli? variant.

In this study, the relative order of personal pronouns in Atayal is reexamined. Before considering the relative order of personal pronouns in section 3, a brief discussion of the Atayal personal pronoun system is provided in section 2. Incorporating insights gained from the study of Philippine languages, it is argued that, contrary to the claims that have been made in previous studies, the order of personal pronouns in Atayal is not purely semantically conditioned. Instead, it is constrained by the interaction of semantic factors with syntactic and phonological factors. It is hoped that the present study will show that reference to descriptions of some of the better described western Austronesian languages (such as Tagalog) can sometimes provide us with new insights into the structure of less well-described languages (such as Formosan languages). It is also hoped that the present study can shed new light on the study of Austronesian syntax generally.

2. Personal pronouns in Squliq Atayal

Before considering the order of personal pronouns in Squliq Atayal, let us first discuss its personal pronoun system. Like most western Austronesian languages, personal pronouns in Squliq Atayal exhibit formal differences depending on their syntactic functions. The forms and functions of Squliq Atayal personal pronouns are summarized in Table 1. The pronominal forms appearing in the following table are

Table 1. Personal pronouns in Squliq Atayal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLITICS</th>
<th>FREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>=saku?/=ku?</td>
<td>=maku?/=mu/=ku?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>=su?</td>
<td>=su?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=nya?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PI</td>
<td>=ta?</td>
<td>=ta?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PE</td>
<td>=sami</td>
<td>=myan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>=simu</td>
<td>=mamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>=nha?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 1, Squliq Atayal personal pronouns distinguish three persons (first, second, and third) and two numbers (singular and plural). First person plural pronouns make a further distinction between inclusive and exclusive forms. The use of inclusive or exclusive forms is determined by whether the hearer(s) is/are included. Inclusive forms are employed when the hearer(s) is/are included, otherwise exclusive forms are employed.

Four sets of personal pronouns are distinguished: Nominative, Genitive, Core, and Locative. These four sets can be further divided into two groups: clitic pronouns and free form pronouns. Nominative pronouns and genitive pronouns are identified as pronominal clitics (which are indicated by the equals sign ‘=’), whereas core pronouns and locative pronouns are free form pronouns. These two types of pronouns differ in their syntactic distribution. Clitic pronouns are phonologically attached to the main predicate (whether it is an auxiliary or a lexical verb) of a clause, whereas free form pronouns occur after (but not necessarily immediately after) a lexical verb. When the main predicate of a clause is a lexical verb, a clitic pronoun is attached to the lexical predicate, as in (1)-(6).

³ In previous studies, Squliq Atayal has often been described as having a third person singular nominative clitic pronoun hi(y)a? and a third person plural nominative clitic pronoun hga? (see Egerod 1966 and 1978 [1980], Chen and Lin 1985, Rau 1992 for details). However, Huang (1989) has argued convincingly that the forms hiya? and hga? do not behave like clitic pronouns; instead, they behave like other free form pronouns (as well as full noun phrases). My study of Atayal textual data supports Huang’s analysis in treating the third person singular and plural nominative pronouns as phonologically null.
(1) lexical verb as the main predicate: \(V=\text{Nom} \ \ NP \ (\text{Lcv})^4\)

\[\text{baha.mswa} \Rightarrow \text{ta} \Rightarrow \text{hoq} \Rightarrow \text{qani ga}, \ldots\]

because \(\text{cross.over} = \text{NOM.1PI} \ \text{bridge} \ \text{this} \ \text{TP.LK}^5\)

‘Because we (in.) cross over this bridge ....’ (Ata 1–017)

(2) lexical verb as the main predicate: \(V=\text{Gen} \ \ NP \ (\text{Nom})\)

\[\text{galun} = \text{nha} \Rightarrow \text{qu} \Rightarrow \text{sazing qani ru} \Rightarrow \text{hblan} = \text{nha} \Rightarrow \ldots\]

take = \text{GEN.3P} \ \text{QU} \ \text{two} \ this \ \text{and} \ \text{tie} = \text{GEN.3P} \\

‘They brought these two and tied them.’ (Ata 6–026)

(3) lexical verb as the main predicate: \(V=\text{Gen} \ \text{Adv} \ \ NP \ (\text{Nom})\)

\[\ldots \text{syun} = \text{nya} \Rightarrow \text{kya qu} \Rightarrow \text{knerin qasa} \Rightarrow \ldots\]

put = \text{GEN.3S} \ \text{there} \ \text{QU} \ \text{woman} \ \text{that} \\

‘... it put the woman there ....’ (Ata S1–011)

(4) lexical verb as the main predicate: \(V=\text{Gen} (=\text{Nom}) \ \ NP \ (\text{Obl})\)

\[\text{blingan} = \text{nha} \Rightarrow \text{yaqih na} \Rightarrow \text{mlikuy, knerin} \Rightarrow \ldots\]

throw.into = \text{GEN.3P} \ bad \ \text{LIG man woman} \\

‘They threw the bad man and the woman into it....’ (Ata 6–021)

(5) lexical verb as the main predicate: \(V=\text{Gen} \ \ NP \ (\text{Nom})\)

\[\ldots \text{pino} \Rightarrow \text{an} \Rightarrow \text{su} \Rightarrow \text{zyaw na} \Rightarrow \text{mhwh hup} \Rightarrow \text{qsy} \Rightarrow \ldots\]

hear = \text{GEN.2S} \ \text{thing} \ \ \text{LIG flow} \ \text{big water} \\

‘...You (sg.) heard about the big water....’ (Ata 6–002)

(6) lexical verb as the main predicate: \(V=\text{Gen} \ s-V \ \ NP \ (\text{Nom})\)

\[\ldots \text{rasun} = \text{nya} \Rightarrow \text{spqaniq knerin qani} \Rightarrow \ldots\]

carry = \text{GEN.3S} \ \text{CAUS.eat.with woman this} \\

‘... it brought it to feed this woman.’ (Ata S1–013)

---

\(^4\) Labels such as (Lcv), (Obl), etc. shown in parentheses following an NP indicate the case of the preceding NP.

\(^5\) The abbreviations used in this paper are: (A) \(\Rightarrow\) (B), (A) acting upon (B); 1D, first dual; P, plural; 1PI, first person plural inclusive; 1S, first person singular; 1S.G., first person singular genitive; 2S, second person singular; 2S.N., second person singular nominative; 2P, second person plural; 3S, third person singular; 3P, third person plural; Adv, adverb; AG, Agent; ASP, aspectual auxiliary; AUX, Auxiliary; CAUS, causative; DEM, demonstrative; GEN, genitive; in, inclusive; LIG, ligature; LCV, locative; NEG, Negative; NOM, nominative; NP, Noun Phrase; OBL, oblique; PL, plural; PAT, Patient; PRF, perfective; PROX, IMPRF, proximate imperfective; S, singular; sg, singular; TP.LK, topic linker; V, verb.

\(^6\) Unless otherwise indicated, all Atayal data used in this study are taken from the texts presented in Huang (1993). The example reference numbers following the free translation are organized according to the order that they appeared in Huang’s monograph. For example, Ata 1-017 means that the example is the 17th sentence of Atayal Text 1. Ata S1-013 means that the example is the 13th sentence of Atayal Story 1. I would like to thank Lawrence Reid for going through all the Atayal texts with me and helping me determine the syntactic functions and/or discourse functions of the forms in the texts.

\(^7\) In this example, the nominative NP is a phonologically null, third person singular nominative pronoun ‘it’, referring to the location into which the man and woman were thrown. The conjoined noun phrase \(\text{yaqih na} \Rightarrow \text{mlikuy, knerin} \ ‘\text{the bad man and the bad woman}’ \ functions as an oblique NP.
When the main predicate of a clause is an auxiliary verb, a clitic pronoun is attached to the main auxiliary predicate, rather than to the lexical verb, as in (7)–(10).

(7) modal auxiliary as the main predicate: Modal=Nom m-V
... baq=ta?  tminun.
   can=NOM.1PI weave
   ‘... We (in.) can weave.’ (Ata 1–028)

(8) aspectual auxiliary as the main predicate: Asp=Nom V
... nyux=ta?  t?wayay ....
   PROX.IMPRF=NOM.1PI thread
   ‘...We (in.) will thread....’ (Ata 1–028)

(9) aspectual auxiliary as the main predicate: Asp=Nom Modal m-V
... nyux=simu thoyay mqyanux
   PROX.IMPRF=NOM.2P be.able.to live
   ‘... you (pl.) could live well.’ (Ata 6–010)

(10) aspectual auxiliary as the main predicate: Asp=Gen V-un
... yat qani nyux=nya?  pqasun ....
   NEG this PROX.IMPRF=GEN.3S like
   ‘This is not what he likes.’ (Ata 6–023)

Comparing the bound pronouns in (1)–(10) with the free form pronouns in (11)–(12), we observe that bound form pronouns can be attached to either a lexical verb or an auxiliary verb as long as it is the main predicate of a clause, whereas free form pronouns always occur after (but not necessarily immediately after) a lexical verb.

(11) aspectual auxiliary as the main predicate: Asp V NP (core)
... nyux  pcbaq  hiya?.
   PROX.IMPRF teach 3S(CORE)
   ‘... It seems to instruct (us).’ (Ata 1–003)

(12) aspectual auxiliary as the main predicate: Asp m-V NP (core)
... wan mhuqin misuw balay hiya?  uzi.
   PRF die just true 3S(CORE) too
   ‘... he himself just died (recently).’ (Ata 5–023)

3. The order of personal pronouns

In previous studies of Squiliq Atayal, person has often been considered to be the
sole factor that conditions the relative order of personal pronouns. For example, Rau (1992:146, 1997:502) proposes that the order of pronominal forms in Atayal follows Silverstein’s (1976) Agency Hierarchy; that is, the order is 1<sup>ST</sup> PERSON > 2<sup>ND</sup> PERSON > 3<sup>RD</sup> PERSON. Huang (1989:124, 1993:19), however, suggests a different kind of hierarchy: 2<sup>ND</sup> PERSON > 1<sup>ST</sup> PERSON > 3<sup>RD</sup> PERSON, although she notes that “the exact relationship between the 1<sup>ST</sup> and 2<sup>ND</sup> person is not completely clear to us yet…”

Notice that Rau (1992, 1997) and Huang (1989, 1993) agree with each other in predicting that first person and second person pronouns precede third person pronouns. However, they disagree with each other in their predictions of the relative order between first person pronouns and second person pronouns. The disagreement between Rau’s and Huang’s proposals arises because of the type of data that they examined. Observing the existence of sentences like (13), Rau claims that first person pronouns precede second person pronouns. Noticing the data presented in (14), Huang proposes that second person pronouns precede first person pronouns.

(13) dyadic –<i>un</i> clause with two pronominal clitics: ⁸ Neg=Nom.1s=Gen.2p

ini?=ku?=momu bay suwali musa? qalaŋ lepa. ¹⁰
NEG= NOM.1S=GEN.2P very permit go village Lepa
‘You (pl.) did not permit me to go to the village of Lepa.’ (data from Y. Liao 1990:90, cited in Rau 1992:147)

(14) relative order between a first person pronoun and a second person pronoun in a dyadic –<i>un</i> clause (data from Huang 1989:124):

a. dyadic –<i>un</i> clause with two pronominal clitics: V-<i>un</i>=Gen.2s=Nom.1s(rare)

bhiyun=su?=saku?.
beat=GEN.2S= NOM.1S
‘You (sg.) are going to beat me.’

b. dyadic –<i>un</i> clause with two pronominal clitics: *V-<i>un</i>=Nom.1s=Gen.2s

*bhiyun=saku?=su?.
beat=NOM.1S=GEN.2S
‘You (sg.) are going to beat me.’

---

⁸ Huang (1995:35-36, 2000:72-74) suggests that the order of personal pronouns in Mayrinax Atayal is somewhat more complex than that in Squiliq Atayal. She considers that the pronominal order in Squiliq Atayal is solely conditioned by person; however, pronominal order in Mayrinax Atayal is conditioned by the interaction of three semantic factors (i.e. person, number, and semantic role).

⁹ The form -<i>i</i> is the infinitive form of a dyadic –<i>un</i> verb.

¹⁰ Rau (1992:126, footnote 8) notes that <i>momu</i> alternates with <i>mamu</i> in the Taichung dialect of Atayal.
c. dyadic –un clause with one pronominal clitic: \textbf{V-un=Nom.1s} (frequent)

\begin{align*}
\text{bhiy}=\text{saku} & \Rightarrow \text{beat=NOM.1S} \\
\text{‘You (sg.) are going to beat me.’}
\end{align*}

Simply looking at the data in (13), we find that a first person nominative pronoun does precede a second person genitive pronoun. However, simply looking at the data in (14), we find that a second person genitive pronoun does precede a first person nominative pronoun. It seems that both Rau’s and Huang’s proposals can account for some, but not all, of the pronominal order facts in Atayal. If neither Rau’s proposal nor Huang’s proposal can fully account for the pronominal order facts, what can be used to explain the relative order of pronouns in Atayal?

In this study, I argue that person alone cannot adequately account for the pronominal order facts in Atayal. Instead, it should be used in conjunction with other constraints. I propose that two constraints are required to account for the order of clitic pronouns in Atayal.

(a) Nominative pronouns precede genitive pronouns except in situations where first person clitic pronouns and second person clitic pronouns differ in phonological length (e.g. one is monosyllabic, and the other is disyllabic).

(b) If first person clitic pronouns and second person clitic pronouns differ in phonological length (e.g. one is monosyllabic, and the other is disyllabic), the relative order between them is phonologically conditioned, with monosyllabic pronouns preceding disyllabic pronouns. [Exception: The “portmanteau pronoun” misu?, which represents the combination of a first person singular genitive and a second person singular nominative, must be used in place of the nonoccurring sequences *maku? su? and *su? maku?.]

First, let us consider Constraint (a): Nominative pronouns precede genitive pronouns except in cases where first person clitic pronouns and second person clitic pronouns differ in phonological length (e.g. one is monosyllabic, and the other is disyllabic).

Huang (1989, 1993) and Rau (1992, 1997) both consider person as the only factor that conditions the relative order of pronouns in Squiliq Atayal. However, a closer look at the Squiliq Atayal data suggests that person interacts with either
syntactic factors (such as case and/or grammatical relations) or with phonological factors (such as syllable weight) in conditioning the relative order between first/second person pronouns and third person pronouns, and the relative order between first person pronouns and second person pronouns.

In this study, I consider that the order of clitic pronouns, depending on which persons are involved, is conditioned by two different factors, either syntactic or phonological. In general, the relative order between genitive and nominative clitic pronouns is syntactically conditioned, with a nominative clitic pronoun preceding a genitive clitic pronoun. For example, when a first/second person clitic pronoun cooccurs with a third person clitic pronoun, the nominative clitic pronoun always precedes the genitive clitic pronoun. However, the relative order between first person pronouns and second person pronouns is not always syntactically conditioned. Instead, it is phonologically conditioned if the first person and second person pronouns differ in phonological length. Specifically, a monosyllabic clitic pronoun must precede a disyllabic clitic pronoun. These two constraints are crucial in determining the relative order between first/second person pronouns and third person pronouns and the relative order between first person pronouns and second person pronouns in Squiliq Atayal.

Let us first consider the relative order between nominative clitic pronouns and genitive clitic pronouns.

When a first person pronoun (e.g. taʔ ‘NOM.1PI’, kuʔ ‘NOM.1S’) cooccurs with a third person pronoun (e.g. nyaʔ ‘GEN.3S’), the nominative clitic pronoun must precede the genitive pronoun, as shown in (15)–(17). If the order between the nominative clitic pronoun and the genitive clitic pronoun is reversed, the resulting sentence is unacceptable, as in (18).

(15) first person vs. third person: nominative clitic pronoun precedes genitive clitic pronoun:

```
... tmokun=taʔ=nyaʔ  ruʔ phoqin=taʔ  kwaraʔ ....
cover=NOM.1PI=GEN.3S and die=NOM.1PI all
‘... it will cover us (in.) and we (in.) will all die.’ (Ata 6–016)
```

(16) first person vs. third person: nominative clitic pronoun precedes genitive clitic pronoun:

```
qsinuw  sʔaras=kuʔ=nyaʔ pqaniq.
wild.animal bring.with=NOM.1S=GEN.3S CAUS.eat
‘Wild animals are what it brought me to feed (me).’ (Ata S1–044)
```
(17) first person vs. third person: nominative clitic pronoun precedes genitive clitic pronoun:
nyux=saku?=nya? pm\textsc{a}n.
PROX.IMPRF=NOM.1S=GEN.3S wash
‘He is washing me.’ (data from Huang 1989:125)

(18) first person vs. third person: *genitive clitic pronoun precedes nominative clitic pronoun:
*nyux=nya?=saku? pm\textsc{a}n.
PROX.IMPRF=GEN.3S=NOM.1S wash
‘He is washing me.’ (data from Huang 1989:125)

Likewise, when a second person pronoun (e.g. su? ‘NOM.2S’) cooccurs with a third person pronoun (e.g. nya? ‘GEN.3S’), the nominative clitic pronoun must precede the genitive clitic pronoun, as in (19). If the order between the nominative clitic pronoun and the genitive clitic pronoun is reversed, the resulting sentence is unacceptable, as in (20).

(19) second person vs. third person: nominative clitic pronoun precedes genitive clitic pronoun:
bhiyun=su?=nya?.
beat=NOM.2S=GEN.3S
‘He is going to beat you (sg.).’ (data from Huang 1989:123)

(20) second person vs. third person: *genitive clitic pronoun precedes nominative clitic pronoun:
*bhiyun=nya?=su?.
beat=GEN.3S=NOM.2S
‘He is going to beat you (sg.).’ (data from Huang 1989:123)

Based on examples (15)–(20), one might be tempted to conclude that nominative pronouns always precede genitive pronouns. However, things are not that simple. There are situations (such as (14b)) where nominative pronouns cannot precede genitive pronouns. These cases can be explained using Constraint (b).

Second, let us consider Constraint (b): If first person clitic pronouns and second person clitic pronouns differ in phonological length (e.g. one is monosyllabic, and the other is disyllabic), the relative order between them is phonologically conditioned, with monosyllabic pronouns preceding disyllabic pronouns.

As discussed earlier, the relative order between first person pronouns and second person pronouns is not always syntactically conditioned. In cases where the first
person and the second person clitic pronouns differ in phonological length, it is the phonological factor (rather than the syntactic factor) that conditions their relative order. More specifically, a monosyllabic clitic pronoun must precede a disyllabic clitic pronoun. Such an explanation has been proposed by Schachter (1973) to account for the order of clitics in Tagalog, but until now has not been considered in the study of Formosan languages. In this study, I explore the role of phonological factors (specifically, syllable weight) in the determination of pronominal order in Squliq Atayal.

In the study of Tagalog clitic order, Schachter (1973:220) proposes that monosyllabic clitics (including monosyllabic pronouns and monosyllabic adverbials) always precede disyllabic clitics in Tagalog. Schachter’s proposal can easily account for the following pairs of Tagalog data. Comparing (21a) with (21b), we find that the monosyllabic pronoun *mo ‘GEN.2S’ can only precede the disyllabic pronoun *ako ‘NOM.1S’. Comparing (22a) with (22b), we find that the monosyllabic question word *ba can only precede the disyllabic pronoun *ako ‘NOM.1S’.

(21) Tagalog (Schachter 1973:217)
   a. a monosyllabic pronoun precedes a disyllabic pronoun:
      Hindi=mo=ako kapatid.
      NEG=GEN.2S=NOM.1S brother/sister
      ‘You (sg.) are not my brother/sister.’
   b. *a disyllabic pronoun precedes a monosyllabic pronoun:
      *Hindi=ako=mo kapatid.
      NEG=NOM.1S=GEN.2S brother/sister
      ‘You (sg.) are not my brother/sister.’

(22) Tagalog (Schachter 1973:219)
   a. a monosyllabic adverb precedes a disyllabic pronoun:
      Nakita=ba=ako ni Juan.
      see=Q=NOM.1S GEN Juan
      ‘Has Juan seen me?’
   b. *a disyllabic pronoun precedes a monosyllabic adverb:
      *Nakita=ako=ba ni Juan.
      see=NOM.1S=Q GEN Juan
      ‘Has Juan seen me?’

If we apply the same phonological constraint to the Squliq Atayal data presented in (13) and (14), repeated below in (23) and (24), we can account for the relative order between first person pronouns and second person pronouns.
In (23), the first person singular nominative pronoun *ku* is required to precede the second person plural genitive pronoun *momu* because *ku* is monosyllabic and *momu* is disyllabic (but not because *ku* is first person and *momu* is second person, as Rau (1992) claimed).

(23) a monosyllabic pronoun precedes a disyllabic pronoun:

\[
\text{ini}=\text{ku}=\text{momu} \quad \text{bay suwali musa qalao lepa.}
\]

NEG=NOM.1S=GEN.2P very permit go village Lepa

‘You (pl.) did not permit me to go to the village of Lepa.’ (data from Y. Liao 1990:90, cited in Rau 1992:147)

In (24), the second person singular genitive pronoun *su* is required to precede the first person singular nominative pronoun *saku* because *su* is monosyllabic and *saku* is disyllabic (but not because *su* is second person and *saku* is first person, as Huang (1989, 1993) claimed). In (24b), the disyllabic pronoun *saku* precedes the monosyllabic pronoun *su*. This violates the constraint that monosyllabic pronouns must precede disyllabic pronouns. Therefore, the resulting sentence is unacceptable.

Huang (1989) comments that when expressing an event involving a second person singular participant acting upon a first person singular participant, (24a) is acceptable but rarely used. Instead, a pattern like (24c), in which the monosyllabic second person singular pronoun is elided, is often used. It is not yet clear to me why a pattern like (24a) is acceptable, but less preferable than a pattern like (24c).¹¹

(24) dyadic –*un* clauses with two pronominal clitics (data from Huang 1989:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{124):} \\
\text{a.} & \quad \text{a monosyllabic pronoun precedes a disyllabic pronoun: (rare)} \\
& \text{bhiyun=\text{su}=\text{saku}.} \\
& \text{beat=GEN.2S=NOM.1S} \\
& \text{‘You (sg.) are going to beat me.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad *a disyllabic pronoun precedes a monosyllabic pronoun:} \\
& *\text{bhiyun=\text{saku}=\text{su}.} \\
& \text{beat=NOM.1S=GEN.2S} \\
& \text{‘You (sg.) are going to beat me.’}
\end{align*}
\]

¹¹ Reid (pers. comm.) suggests that the agent here is probably nonspecific and that it probably means ‘(Someone) will beat me’, or ‘I’m going to get beaten’. If the agent is there holding a stick, he certainly does not need to be encoded in the speech signal! It is interesting that a similar phenomenon also occurs in Bontok (a Central Cordilleran language spoken in northern Luzon, the Philippines) with the same verb, *faikhen chaka*. ‘You will get beaten’, without an explicit agent.
c. dyadic –un clause with one pronominal clitic: V-un=Nom (dysyllabic)  
(frequent)  
bhiyun=saku?.  
beat=Nom.1S  
‘(You) are going to beat me.’

An alternative analysis for (24c) is to consider the form saku? as a “portmanteau pronoun” with the meaning ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1S’, just like misu? ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2S’. Such an analysis can be supported by evidence from Seediq, another Atayalic language. Holmer (1996:32) states that Seediq has three “portmanteau pronouns”: misu ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2S’, saku ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1S’, and maku ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2P’. He considers that misu is derived historically from the combination of mu ‘GEN.1S’ and su ‘NOM/GEN.2S’, and saku is derived historically from the combination of su ‘GEN/NOM.2S’ and ku ‘NOM.1S’. If Holmer’s analysis of the Seediq forms misu and saku is correct, it might offer us an explanation why (24a) is acceptable, but rarely used.12

Alternatively, one might consider that the use of a pattern like (24c) is preferred because it is modeled on the existing form misu? ‘GEN.1S+NOM.2S’. In Squilq Atayal, when one wants to express an event involving a first person singular genitive pronoun and a second person singular nominative pronoun, the “portmanteau pronoun” misu? ‘GEN.1S+NOM.2S’ must be used in place of the nonoccurring sequences *maku? su? and *su? maku? (Egerod 1966, 1978[1980], Huang 1989, 1993, Rau 1992, 1997), as shown in (25a)–(25c).

(25) dyadic –un clause with first person genitive and second person nominative  
(data from Huang 1989:124):  
a. V-un=misu?  
bhiyun=misu?.  
beat=GEN.1S+NOM.2S  
‘I am going to beat you (sg.).’

12 One major difference between Seediq and Atayal that needs to be pointed out is that Seediq does not have a first person singular nominative pronoun form saku, nor a first person genitive form maku. Even if Holmer’s analysis of Seediq saku is correct, one still cannot be sure whether the Squilq Atayal form saku? in (24c) is simply a first person singular nominative pronoun or a portmanteau pronoun with the meaning ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1S’.
b. *V-un=Gen (disyllabic)=Nom (monosyllabic)
   
   *bihyun=maku?=su?.
   
   beat=GEN.1S=NOM.2S
   
   ‘I am going to beat you (sg.).’

c. *V-un=Nom (monosyllabic)=Gen (disyllabic)
   
   *bihyun=su?=maku?.
   
   beat=NOM.2S=GEN.1S
   
   ‘I am going to beat you (sg.).’

The same constraint is also observed in the Mayrinax dialect of C?uli? Atayal (Huang 1995), but not in another Ataylic language Seediq.13 A similar kind of constraint is also reported in Tagalog (Schachter and Otanes 1972, Schachter 1973), Central Cagayan Agta (Healey 1960, H. Liao 2004), Pangasinan (Benton 1971), Mamanwa (Miller and Miller 1976), and other Philippine languages (Reid and Liao 2001, 2004).14 It is not yet clear to me why a “portmanteau pronoun” is preferred in situations that involve a first person genitive pronoun and a second person nominative pronoun.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, the order of personal pronouns in Squilq Atayal has been reexamined. Incorporating insights gained from the study of Philippine languages, two major constraints on the order of clitic pronouns in Squilq Atayal have been proposed. First, nominative pronouns precede genitive pronouns except in situations where first person clitic pronouns and second person clitic pronouns differ in phonological length. Second, in cases where first person clitic pronouns and second

---

13 Holmer (1996:70) states that “Portmanteau clitics exist only for a couple of combinations of arguments, and their use is gradually diminishing. For instance, misu (1SAG ⇒ 2SPAT) does occur, but it is usually considered archaic and speakers tend to prefer su mu (2S.N.—1S.G.) in normal conversation ....” One of the reviewers points out to me that Holmer’s finding is also echoed in Y. Liao’s (1990:140) data.

14 There are variations regarding the occurrence of “portmanteau pronouns”. In some languages (such as Tagalog/Filipino), the “portmanteau pronoun” (kita ‘GEN.1S+NOM.2S’ in Tagalog/Filipino) is used only in situations that involves a first person singular genitive pronoun acting upon a second person singular nominative pronoun. In some languages (such as Central Cagayan Agta), “portmanteau pronouns” are used if one wishes to express an event involving a first person singular genitive pronoun acting upon a second person singular or plural nominative pronoun. For example, in Central Cagayan Agta, the special combining form taka ‘GEN.1S+NOM.2S’ (< ta ‘GEN.1D’ + ka ‘NOM.2S’) is used to express an event involving a first person singular genitive pronoun acting upon a second person singular nominative pronoun, whereas the special combining form takam ‘GEN.1S+NOM.2P’ (< ta ‘GEN.1D’ + kam ‘NOM.2P’) is used to express an event involving a first person singular genitive pronoun acting upon a second person plural nominative pronoun.
person clitic pronouns differ in phonological length (e.g. one is monosyllabic, and the other is disyllabic), the relative order between them is phonologically conditioned, with monosyllabic pronouns preceding disyllabic pronouns. However, if one wishes to express an event involving a first person singular genitive pronoun and a second person singular nominative pronoun, the “portmanteau pronoun” misu? ‘GEN.1S+NOM.2S’, must be used in place of the nonoccurring sequences *maku? su? and *su? maku?.

Based on a cursory look at the Mayrinax Atayal data presented in Huang (2000:72-74), it seems that the same set of constraints also can account for the pronominal order facts in Mayrinax Atayal.

The present study explores the possible role that phonological factors may play in constraining the order of personal pronouns in Formosan languages. It is hoped that this study can shed new light on the study of word order variations in Formosan languages as well as in other Austronesian languages.
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烏來泰雅語中附著式人稱代名詞之詞序

廖秀娟
德拉薩大學

在台灣南島語及菲律賓南島語中，附著式人稱代名詞之間的相對詞序呈現極大的差異性。在某些語言中，人稱代名詞之間的相對詞序是由句法因素（如：格位）來決定的；在某些語言中，人稱代名詞之間的相對詞序則是由音韻因素（如：代名詞的音節數量）來決定的；在其他語言中，則由多種因素（如：格位與人稱等）共同來決定的。

本文重新檢視烏來泰雅語中附著式人稱代名詞之間的相對詞序。本文主張烏來泰雅語中附著式人稱代名詞的相對詞序是由語意因素（即人稱）與句法因素（即格位）及音韻因素（即音節數量）共同來決定的，而非僅由語意因素（人稱與單複數等）來決定的。

關鍵詞：烏來泰雅語、台灣南島語、附著式人稱代名詞、詞序、音韻因素、句法因素