

A very preliminary analysis of verb classification in the two Central Bunun dialects

Rik De Busser

rdbusser@nccu.edu.tw



政大
NATIONAL CHENGCHI UNIVERSITY

NATIONAL CHENGCHI UNIVERSITY

Bunun



Research questions

- What are the formal criteria to identify verbal subcategories in the two Central dialects (Takivatan and Takbanuaz)?
 - Especially, are verbal subcategories marked by verbal affixes?
 - Which verbal affixes are critical in marking verbal subcategories?
- How similar or different are the two dialects in their verbal morphology and the effect this morphology has on verb subcategorization?
 - Are there any differences between the two closely related dialects?
 - If so, do they lead to differences in subcategorization?

Data

- Takivatan
 - A corpus largely consisting of narrative text
 - ... and some elicited example sentences
- Takbanuaz
 - A collection of example sentences that are the result of targeted elicitation
 - A set of associated judgements about the validity of affix-verb combinations
 - Tapha 'roast': see *examples 1-6*

Tapha 'roast'

- (1) ma-tapha titi
DYN-roast meat
Roast meat.
- (2) ma-baliv tataphaʔan
DYN-buy oven
Buy an oven
- (3) ni asu ma-tapha
NEG 2S.TOP DYN-roast
Don't you want to roast something?
- (4) na tapha-un a titi di
IRR roast-UV LNK meat here
Do you want to roast this meat here?

Tapha 'roast'

- (5) * ta-tapha-an ludun titi
CV-roast-LV mountain meat
- (6) in<in>han sak ludun di ma-tapha titi
<PST>inhabit 1S.TOP.AG mountain here DYN-roast meat
I roasted meat on this mountain here
- (7) madia t<in>apha titi
many <PST>roast meat
There is a lot of meat that already finished cooking.

Sample: *sihal* 'good'

			TBZ	TVN
		Form	Acceptable	Attested
ROOT		sihal	yes	yes
VOICE	AV	masihal	yes	yes
	UV	sihalun	yes	yes
	LV	sihalan	yes	no
	PST	sinihal	no	no
	PST+UV	sinihalun	no	no
	PST+LV	sinihalan	no	no
INCH	BASE	minsihal	yes	yes
	BASE+LV			
	CAUS	pinsihal	yes	no
	CAUS+PST	pinisihal	yes	yes
	CAUS+UV	pinsihalun	yes	yes
	CAUS+LV			
	ASSOC	kinsihal	no	no
RECIP		pakasihal		yes
DYN	AV	masihalan	yes	yes
	AV+UV			
	AV+LV			
	AV+PST			

			TBZ	TVN
	CAUS	pasihal	no	yes
	CAUS+UV	pasihalun	possibly	yes
	CAUS+LV	pasihalan		no
	ASSOC	kasihal		no
	ASSOC+UV	kasihalun		yes
	ASSOC+LV	kasihalan		yes
STAT	CAUS	pisihal	yes	yes
	CAUS+UV	pisihalun	yes	yes
	CAUS+LV	pisihalan	no	no
	ASSOC	kisihal	no	no
	ASSOC+UV	kisihalun	no	yes
INSTR	BASE			
SUDDEN		tinsihal	yes	no
VARIOUS		palsihalav	yes	no
		palsisihalav	yes	no
		pinsihalav	yes	no
		ispinsihal	yes	no
		ispisihal	?	yes
		ispinsihalun	no	no
		ispalsihalav	no	no
		sinihalan	no	no
		tasihalan	yes	no

General observations

- 35 forms tested / 18 acceptable in TBZ / 16 attested in TVN
- General:
 - Relatively few differences
 - Existing differences might be due to a lack of data
 - Especially the absence of forms in the Takivatan spontaneous corpus
 - ... or due to biased / personal interpretations of data
 - Rejection of certain less common or contextually dependent forms in Takbanuaz
- This suggests that for an accurate assessment of possible form we need
 - A combination of spontaneous and elicited data
 - A lot of data for each verbal root

Specific observations

- Voice alternations
 - Similar across dialects
 - Similar across major verb categories

(8) ma-sihal kaun-un
STAT-good eat-UV
It is very nice to eat

(9) sihal-un aipa saipuk-saipuk
good-UV DEM.S.DIST.VIS RED-take.care.of
(You/we) have to help him well

(10) sihal-an sak laihli di
good-LV 1S.TOP.AG car here
I really like this car here

Specific observations

- Voice alternations
 - Possibly different functional spread for LV forms

(11) sihal-an sak babu di
good-LV 1S.TOP.AG pig here
I really like this pig here

(12) ma-sihal-an dalaq-un-a
MA-good-LV ground-UN-LNK
The land there was very good (Takivatan)

Sample: *daqvas* 'tall'

			TBZ	TVN
		Form	Acceptable	Attested
ROOT		daqvas	yes	no
VOICE	AV	madaqvas	yes	yes
	UV	daqvasun	dubious	no
	LV	daqvasan	no	no
	PST			
INCH	BASE	mindaqvas	yes	no
	BASE+LV	mindaqvasan	no	no
	CAUS	pindaqvas	dubious	no
	CAUS+LV	pindaqvasan	yes	no
	ASSOC			

			TBZ	TVN
DYN	AV			
	AV+UV			
	AV+LV	madaqvasan	yes	?
	CAUS			
	ASSOC			
STAT	CAUS			
	CAUS+UV			
	CAUS+LV	pidaqvasan	yes	no
	ASSOC			
INSTR	BASE	isdaqvas	no	no
	CAUS			
SUDDEN	BASE	tindaqvas	yes	no
TIMESPAN	BASE	taldaqvas	yes	no
	CAUS	paldaqvas	no	no
VARIOUS		pindadaqvas	yes	no
		mundaqvas	no	no
		daldaqvasan	yes	no
		ispindaqvas	yes	no
		istaldaqvas	no	no

General observations

- Low frequency of use relative to *sihal*
 - In Takivatan, only the form *madaqvas* has been attested
- Less variation
 - I.e. less morphological variants
 - But it is not clear whether this is because of the smaller set of examples

Specific observations

- Voice alternations (in Takbanuaz)

- AV and UV are acceptable

(13) ma-daɣvas daiŋʔað-a Tiaŋ-un
STAT-high extremely-LNK PersName.M-UN
Tiang is especially tall

(14) daɣvas-un makaiha
high-UV hang.over
Put it higher to hang over a line (e.g. of clothes).

- But LV is not
- Both *sihal* and *daɣvas* are traditionally considered stative verbs
- Semantic motivation for difference?

Specific observations

- *Sihal* and *daqvas* both allow the prefix *tin-* ‘sudden change into’

(18) tin-sihal-in nak tian
SUDDEN-good-PRV 1S.N belly
My belly is suddenly better.

(19) tin-daqvas-in-a uvaðʔað di
SUDDEN-high-PRV-LNK child here
This child has grown tall (suddenly).

- Are low-frequency, non-prototypical affixes more reliable indicators of subclassification?

Discussion

- Methodological difficulties
 - Non-equivalent data: naturalistic text vs elicitation
 - Problem of scaling: how much data is feasible?
 - Consistency of elicitation across target verb roots
- Analysis
 - Relatively little differences
 - Affixes such as voice markers are not good indicators of verb subcategorization
 - Possible to rely on peripheral affixes?