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1. Introduction
1.1 What is nominalization (NMLZ)?

- A process and products of that process: “Creation of constructions that are associated with a denotation comprised of entity concepts characterized in terms of a state-of-affairs in which the relevant concept has crucial relevance. [Nominalizations] are similar to nouns by virtue of their having an entity-concept denotation.” (Shibatani 2010)

- This functional view of NMLZ would subsume constructions traditionally labeled as “headless relative clauses (HI-RC)”, “externally headed relative clauses (EH-RC)”, “genitivization”, “complementation”, among others.

(1) HI-RC in Qiang (LaPolla & Huang 2003: 224)
la-wa-ta-m le-ze
hat-wear-NOM DEF-CL
‘the person wearing a hat’

(2) EH-RC in Qiang (LaPolla & Huang 2003: 226)
qa-fia-xi dz-e-m khuɔ
1sg-DIR-bite-NOM dog
‘the dog which bit me’

(3) Genitivization in Lahu (Lahaussois 2002)
ŋà ve mi-chɔ
I shoulder-bag
my shoulder-bag

(4) Complementation in Lahu (Lahaussois 2002)
a-si ta? la ve thà? nɔ mə γa mə lɔ blood emerge come ACC you NEG get see Q Didn’t you see that blood was coming out?
Recast in this NMLZ-based perspective (Shibatani 2008, 2009), cases in (1) through (4) are then considered different reifications of nominalization, and can be termed “referring use of argument NMLZ”, “restricting use of argument NMLZ”, “relational NMLZ”, and “event NMLZ” respectively.

1.2 Reference vis-à-vis denotation

- Reference is “the name of the act by which a speaker refers to a referent” whereas denotation is “the class of possible objects, situations, etc. to which the word can refer.” (Riemer 2010: 19)
- Reference is about the relationship between an expression and a possible-world referent in a particular context whereas denotation deals with the relationship between an expression and a set of referents to which that expression can successfully refer under all circumstances (Lyons 1995).
- Take -m in Qiang for instance. The morpheme creates expressions that have denotations of their own in both (1) and (2). However, while the created expression in (1) refers to a particular entity (hence “the referring use”), the one in (2) does not. The created expression simply restricts the denotation of a juxtaposed head noun to a subset by its own denotation (hence “the restricting use”), and it is the intersecting denotations of both the created expression and the head noun that help identify a referent.

1.3 Focus system in Austronesian (AN) languages

- Austronesian languages are famous for the Focus (capitalized to be distinguished from pragmatic focus; also called voice) system, which is essentially a set of affixes on the verb that are indicative of the participant role of a syntactically privileged argument (called pivot, see Dixon (1994) for its justification). It is widely accepted that in Proto-AN there were four such affixes, reconstructed as *<um> for Actor Focus, *-en for Patient Focus, *-an for Locative Focus, and *Si- for Conveyance Focus (see Ross 2002). While this four-way contrast of Focus morphology has been lost in numerous descendant languages, it is maintained in many of those spoken in the Philippines and Taiwan, as illustrated in Tagalog below.
(5) Focus system in Tagalog (Kaufman 2009: 3)

a. k⟨um⟩áin nang=dagà sa=pinggan pára sa=ásọ ang=púsa
   〈AV:BEG〉eat gen=rat obl=plate for obl=dog nom=cat
   ‘The cat ate a rat on the plate for the dog.’

b. k⟨in⟩áin-∅ nang=púsa ang=dagà sa=pinggan pára sa=ásọ
   〈BEG〉eat-PV gen=cat nom=rat obl=plate for obl=dog

c. k⟨in⟩áin-an nang=púsa nang=dagà ang=pinggan pára
   〈BEG〉eat-LV gen=cat gen=rat nom=plate for
   sa=ásọ
   obl=dog

d. i-k⟨in⟩áin nang=púsa nang=dagà sa=pinggan ang=ásọ
   cv-〈BEG〉eat gen=cat gen=rat obl=plate nom=dog

1.4 The issue in question

➢ Owing to the Focus system, Austronesian languages in general make no morphological distinction between a verb and a nominalized expression based on that verb, a phenomenon which some scholars (see Starosta et al 1982 and Kaufman 2009) believe is the result of the erstwhile NMLZ morphology having been reanalyzed as verbal Focus morphology.

(6) NMLZ in Mayrinax Atayal (Shibatani 2009: 170; citing Huang 2002)

a. yakaat m⟨in⟩uwaḥ cuvhisay kuv naʃakis
   Neg AF⟨PERF⟩come yesterday nom.ref old.man
   ‘The old man didn’t come yesterday.’

b. kiaʁ ʁiʔ m-aniq kuv [yakaat m⟨in⟩uwaḥ cuvhisay]
   PROG LIN AF-eat nom.ref neg AF⟨PERF⟩come yesterday
   ‘The one who didn’t come yesterday is eating (there).’

c. kiaʁ ʁiʔ m-aniq kuʔ cuqliʔ ka’ [yakaat m⟨in⟩uwaḥ cuvhisay]
   PROG LIN AF-eat nom.ref person lin neg AF⟨PERF⟩come yesterday
   ‘The person who didn’t come yesterday is eating (there).’

➢ However, in Kavalan (ISO ckv) and Amis (ISO ami) (both Austronesian spoken in Taiwan) there is a marker =ay that is emerging to take on the marking of nominalization as well as other functions. The presence of =ay in some cases distinguishes a nominalized expression from its base verb, as illustrated below.¹

¹ All the Kavalan and Amis data presented here are from my field elicitations at Xinshe Village, Hualien, Taiwan, during the summer of 2010, unless otherwise specified.
(7) a. matiw sa lazin, mai \textit{m-azas} tu tamun [CKV]
   \begin{align*}
   \text{AF} & \quad \text{go to sea} & \text{NEG} & \quad \text{AF-take} & \text{OBL} & \text{vegetable} \\
   \end{align*}
   ‘(They) went to the beach, (and) didn’t take any vegetables (with them).’
   (Ancestors.Ungi.052)

   b. mai tu \textit{m-azas=ay/m-azas} timaiku sa-saqay [CKV]
   \begin{align*}
   \text{NEG.EX} & \quad \text{OBL} & \text{AF-take}=\text{AY} & \text{1SG.OBL} & \text{RED-walk} \\
   \end{align*}
   ‘Nobody took me to look around.’ (lit. ‘One who took me to walk around didn’t exist.’) (Hsieh 2007: 87)

(8) a. \textit{ma-tayal} kaku i taypak [AMI]
   \begin{align*}
   \text{AF} & \quad \text{work} & \text{1S.NOM} & \text{LOC} & \text{Taipei} \\
   \end{align*}
   ‘I am working in Taipei.’ (Wu 2006: 138)

   b. ci panay k-u \textit{ma-tayal=ay/ma-tayal} [AMI]
   \begin{align*}
   \text{PPN} & \quad \text{panay} & \text{NOM-CN} & \text{AF-work}=\text{AY} \\
   \end{align*}
   ‘The one who works is Panay.’ (Wu 2006: 73)

- Aims of this paper:
  
  (i) To investigate the various functions of $=\text{ay}$ in Kavalan and Amis, whether the morpheme denotes entity concepts or not

  (ii) To argue and give evidence for the shared grammaticalization route that both Kavalan and Amis $=\text{ay}$ might have taken

  (iii) To illustrate the contrastive development that Kavalan and Amis $=\text{ay}$ each undergoes

2. Shared functions of $=\text{ay}$ in Kavalan and Amis

2.1 Entity-denoting functions

2.1.1 Referring vs. restricting use

- In Kavalan and Amis, $=\text{ay}$ is used in both the referring and restricting context. However, in Amis, but not in Kavalan, an extra “attributive ligature” (often called \textit{linker}) is needed in the restricting context, but prohibited in the referring context.

(9) a. p<m>ukun=\textit{ay} (sunis) [CKV]
   \begin{align*}
   <\text{AF}> & \quad \text{hit}=\text{AY} & \text{child} \\
   \end{align*}

   b. mi-palu=\textit{ay} (a wawa) [AMI]
   \begin{align*}
   \text{AF} & \quad \text{hit}=\text{AY} & \text{LIG} & \text{child} \\
   \end{align*}
   ‘one/(child) who hits’
(10) a. Ri-baut=ay (Runanay) [CKV]
    catch-fish=AY man

  b. mi-futing=ay (a fa’inayan) [AMI]
    AF-fish=AY LIG man
    ‘one/(man) who catches fishes’

(11) a. kitut=ay (sizi) [CKV]
    ‘little=AY goat

  b. miming=ay (a siri) [AMI]
    ‘little=AY LIG goat’

    ‘little one/(goat)’

➢ Since the structural difference between the referring and restricting context lies merely in the presence or absence of a head noun following =ay (and of a ligature in the case of Amis), for the sake of simplification only the restricting context will be presented in the following discussions.

2.1.2 Types of modification in the restricting context

➢ Numerals

(12) a. u-tulu=ay baut [CKV]
    NHUM-three=AY fish

  b. tulu=ay a futing [AMI]
    three=AY LIG fish
    ‘three fish’

(13) a. kin-tulu=ay sunis [CKV]
    HUM-three=AY child

  b. ta-tulu=ay a wawa [AMI]
    RED-three=AY LIG child
    ‘three children’
Quantifiers

(14) a. mwaza=ay benina [CKV]
   NHUM.many=AY banana
b. adihay=ay a pawli [AMI]
   NHUM.many=AY LIG banana
   ‘many bananas’

(15) a. mazmun=ay sunis [CKV]
   HUM.many=AY child
b. aluman=ay a wawa [AMI]
   HUM.many=AY LIG child
   ‘many children’

Possessive pronouns

(16) a. sunis-ku ‘child-1SG.GEN’ [CKV]
b. wawa aku ‘child 1SG.GEN’ [AMI]
   ‘my child’

(17) a. zaku=ay sunis ‘1SG.POSS=AY child’ [CKV]
b. maku=ay a wawa ‘1SG.POSS=AY LIG child’ [AMI]
   ‘child that is mine’

Underived nouns

(18) a. paRin=ay sazan ‘wood=AY bridge’ [CKV]
b. kilang=ay a kayakay ‘wood=AY LIG bridge’ [AMI]
   ‘wood bridge’

(19) a. betu=ay lazan ‘stone=AY road’ [CKV]
b. vekeloh=ay a lalan ‘stone=AY LIG road’ [AMI]
   ‘stone road’

Stative verbs

(20) a. Rubatang=ay tazungan ‘beautiful=AY woman’ [CKV]
b. salungan=ay a kaying ‘beautiful=AY LIG young.lady [AMI]
   ‘beautiful woman/young lady’

(21) a. ibabaw=ay lepaw ‘high=AY house’ [CKV]
b. takaraw=ay a ruma^ ‘high=AY LIG house’ [AMI]
   ‘high house’

Dynamic verbs

(22) a. [m-Ramaz=ay tu tamun] tazungan unay [CKV]
   AF-cook=AY OBL vegetable woman that
b. [u-ra mi-tangtang=ay t-u dateng] a vavahian [AMI]
   CN-that AF-cook=AY OBL-CN vegetable LIG woman
   ‘that woman cooking vegetables’
2.2 Non-entity-denoting functions

2.2.1 Emphatic pragmatic force

- The marker =ay, when cliticized to a stative predicate, conveys a sense of emphasis on the speaker’s conviction of the state of affairs specified by that predicate.

(23) a. m-qaRim unglay zau [CKV]
   AF-sour pineapple this
   b. acicim k-u-ni a talacay [AMI]
   AF.sour NOM-CN-this LIG pineapple
   ‘This pineapple is sour.’

(24) a. m-qaRim=ay unglay zau [CKV]
   AF-sour=AY pineapple this
   b. acicim=ay k-u-ni a talacay [AMI]
   sour=AY NOM-CN-this LIG pineapple
   ‘This pineapple is sour (for sure).’

(25) a. Rubatang ya tazungan a yau [CKV]
   beautiful NOM woman LIG that
   b. salungan k-u-ra kaying [AMI]
   beautiful NOM-CN-that young.lady
   ‘That woman/young lady is beautiful.’

(26) a. Rubatang=ay ya tazungan a yau [CKV]
   beautiful=AY NOM woman LIG that
   b. salungan=ay k-u-ra kaying [AMI]
   beautiful=AY NOM-CN-that young.lady
   ‘That woman/young lady is beautiful (for sure).’

2.2.2 Anterior/perfective overtone

- A dynamic predicate cliticized by the marker =ay is oftentimes associated with an anterior/perfective interpretation.
(27) a. m-ipil aiku tu sikawman-na [CKV]  
   AF-listen 1S.NOM OBL words-3S.GEN  
   b. mi-tengil kaku t-u suwal nira [AMI]  
   AF-listen 1S.NOM OBL-CN words 3S.GEN  
   ‘I am listening to him/her.’

(28) a. m-ipil=ay aiku tu sikawman-na [CKV]  
   AF-listen=AY 1S.NOM OBL words-3S.GEN  
   b. mi-tengil=ay kaku t-u suwal nira [AMI]  
   AF-listen=AY 1S.NOM OBL-CN words 3S.GEN  
   ‘I did listen to him/her.’

➢ The anterior/perfective overtone is arrived at through pragmatic inference rather than coded in the marker =ay itself since this “default” interpretation can be overridden by some future adverbials.

(29) a. napawan-ku [m-Ramaz=ay tu tamun amawaR] [CKV]  
   spouse-1SG.GEN AF-cook=AY OBL vegetable tomorrow  
   b. fafahi aku k-u-ra [mi-tangtang=ay t-u dateng anudafak] [AMI]  
   wife 1SG.GEN NOM-CN-that AF-cook=AY OBL-CN vegetable tomorrow  
   ‘The one who will cook vegetables tomorrow is my wife.’

3. Evidence for the GRMLZ route from entity-denoting to non-entity-denoting

3.1 Typological generalizations

➢ From dependent to independent structures

“[I]n many Tibeto-Burman languages the finite construction of the verb reflects an earlier construction in which the sentence or verb phrase is nominalized. The construction often includes a copula, of which the nominalized sentence is then an argument, but the copula may be dropped over time, and sometimes nominalizations are simply used as finite clauses.” (DeLancey forthcoming)

(30) Nominalization in Magar (Yap & Grunow-Hårsta 2010: 10)

   (a) barhamanya aŋ-ke pa-a  
       Bariamanya go-NMZ seek-PST  
       ‘(I) wanted to go to Barhamanya.’
   (b) barhamanya aŋ-ke(=le)10  
       Bariamanya go-NMZ=COP  
       ‘(I) wanted to go to Barhamanya.’
   (c) pikiŋ barhamanya aŋ-ke(=le)  
       tomorrow Bariamanya go-NMZ=COP  
       ‘Tomorrow, (I) will go to Barhamanya.’
From entity-denoting to stance-taking

“In a number of East and Southeast Asian languages, grammatical markers in the referential domain are in some cases recruited to also serve in the evidential domain.” (Yap et al. 2004: 137)

(31) Nominalization in Cantonese (Yap et al. 2004: 150)

a. gaaze maai ge
   sister buy NMLZ
   ‘one that Sister bought’

b. gaaze maai ge je
   sister buy NMLZ thing
   ‘thing(s) that Sister bought’

c. gaaze wui maai ge
   sister will buy STN
   ‘Sister will buy it (for sure).’

3.2 Historical reconstructions

According to Reid (forthcoming), the “attributive ligature” in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) was *na/*=n after vowels and *=a after consonants. In Ivatan and the other Bashiic languages, the reflex of this PMP ligature has been generalized to =a, regardless of the phonological environment where it occurs. In addition, the ligature is typically fused with any demonstrative that follows it, giving rise to forms like those in (32).

(32) a. Ivantan: N=aya (< a+ya) ‘this N’;
   N=awri (< a+uri) ‘that N’

b. Dupaningan Agta: N=aye (< a+ye) ‘this (proximal) N’;
   N=aya (< a+ya) ‘that (medial) N’;
   N=ayo (< a+yo) ‘that (distal) N’

In Dupaningan Agta, the fusion of the ligature =a and a demonstrative is encliticized to a nominal and a verbal alike, as in (33).

(33) a. ni-sabit ni Manet i sulu=ayo
   CMPL.TV-hang PERS Manet DEF light=DIST.SPC
   ‘Manet hung up that light.’

b. ma-singgat i na-lutu=ayo im ma-kata=a
   ADJ-tasty DEF ADJ-ripe=DIST.SPC than ADJ-unripe=SPC
   ‘That ripe one is tastier than an unripe one.’ (Robinson 2008: 78)
In light of the development in the Philippine languages, Kavalan and Amis might have undergone a similar development, whereby the fusion of the ligature \( =a \) and a following element gave rise to the nominalization function of \( =ay \), probably in a context like (33b), that is, from “that V-ing one” to “the one who Vs”.

Amis still uses the ligature \( a \) productively in various attributive constructions. The case in Kavalan, though, is less straightforward since the ligature is no longer present in almost all cases. However, Kavalan does preserve the ligature \( =a \) (as an enclitics) in one particular attributive construction, where the modifier is a demonstrative and the modificie a noun, as in sunis\( =a \) zu/yau ‘child=LIG this/that’ meaning “this/that child”.

### 3.3 Synchronic bridging contexts

The link between entity-denoting and non-entity-denoting functions of \( =ay \) can be found in so-called “bridging contexts” (see Heine 2002), where two (or more) meaning construals are equally plausible. The bridging context in this case is typically one where the predicate consists of only one single verb, which when cliticized by \( =ay \) may be interpreted as a nominal predicate with a denotation characterized by the verb, or as a verbal predicate associated with anterior/perfective overtone.

(34) a. Ri-baut aiku [CKV]
    catch-fish 1S.NOM

b. mi-futing kaku [AMI]
    AF-fish 1S.NOM

    ‘I am catching fish.’

(35) a. Ri-baut=ay aiku [CKV]
    catch-fish=AY 1S.NOM

b. mi-futing=ay kaku [AMI]
    AF-fish=AY 1S.NOM

    ‘I am the one who catches/caught fish.’ [Nominal predicate]
    ‘I (already) caught fish.’ [Verbal predicate]

### 4 Contrastive development of \( =ay \) in Kavalan and Amis

#### 4.1 Entity-denoting functions

In terms of entity-denoting functions, Kavalan \( =ay \) seems to be more grammaticalized than Amis \( =ay \) because the former is permitted to (i) collocate with more verbal classes and (ii) cliticize on constituents of larger unit (more on this below).
Both Kavalan and Amis =ay can nominalize Actor Focus (AF) verbs and ma-verbs, and a verb cliticized by =ay denotes the pivot argument in the argument structure of the verb, be it actor/agent or patient/undergoer.

(36) a. s<rm><n>ipay=ay lazat [CKV]
   <AF>sweep=AY person
   ‘person who sweeps’ [actor/agent]
b. ma-bedung=ay-ku peRasku [CKV]
   MA-break=AY-1SG.GEN bottle
   ‘bottle that I broke’ [patient/undergoer]

(37) a. k<um>aen=ay a tamdaw [AMI]
   <AF>eat=AY LIG person
   ‘person who eats’ [actor/agent]
b. ma-tayal=ay a tamdaw [AMI]
   MA-work=AY LIG person
   ‘person who works’ [actor]
c. ma-kaen=ay aku a tali [AMI]
   MA-eat=AY 1SG.GEN LIG taro
   ‘taro that I ate’ [patient/undergoer]

Non-Actor Focus (NAF) verbs, which include all the Focus types other than AF, do not require extra marking for NMLZ save for the Focus morphology, as is the case in most Austronesian languages.

(38) a. ni-temaq-an-ku baut [CKV]
   ANT-roast-LF-1SG.GEN fish
   ‘fish that I roasted’ [patient/undergoer]
b. palu-en aku a tamdaw [AMI]
   hit-PF 1SG.GEN LIG person
   ‘person that I will hit’ [patient/undergoer]

---

2 In both Kavalan and Amis, ma-verbs are not a homogenous set since some of them pattern like AF verbs while the others behave like NAF verbs. Thus, they are distinguished from AF and NAF verbs.
However, Kavalan does allow the presence of =ay with NAF verbs whereas Amis prohibits it.

(39)  
a. ni-temaq-an-ku=ay baut [CKV]  
ANTI-roast-LF-1SG.GEN=AY fish  
‘fish that I roasted’ [patient/undergoer]

b. palu-en=ay aku a tamdaw [AMI]  
hit-PF=AY 1SG.GEN LIG person  
Intended: ‘the person that I (will) hit’ [patient/undergoer]

Turning to the host constituent of =ay, Kavalan =ay cliticizes not only on the verb, but sometimes also on the verbal phrase. Amis =ay, however, does not have the alternative to cliticize on the verbal phrase.

(40)  
a. m-RaRiw=ti sunis [q<m>an=ay tu biabas-ku] [CKV]  
AF-run=PFV child <AF>eat=AY OBL guava-1SG.GEN  
‘The child who ate my guava ran away.’ (Hsieh forthcoming)

b. m-RaRiw=ti sunis [q<m>an tu biabas-ku]=ay  
‘The child who ate my guava ran away.’ (Hsieh forthcoming)

(41)  
a. [u-ra mi-tangtang=ay t-u dateng] a fafahian, u fafahi aku [AMI]  
CN-that AF-cook=AY OBL-CN vegetable LIG young.lady CN wife 1SG.GEN  
‘That young lady cooking vegetables is my wife.’

b. [u-ra mi-tangtang t-u dateng]=ay a fafahian, u fafahi aku

4.2 Non-entity-denoting functions

In terms of non-entity-denoting functions, Amis =ay seems to be more grammaticalized than Kavalan =ay because the former has wider applications than the latter. There are many cases where Amis =ay introduces either emphatic or anterior/perfective implications to the predicate while Kavalan =ay does not.

(42)  
a. m-patay=ti aizipna [CKV]  
AF-die=PFV 3S.NOM  
‘He has died.’

b. m-patay=ay(=ti) aizipna  
Intended: ‘He has died (for sure).’

(43)  
a. ma-patay tu cingra [AMI]  
MA-die PFV 3S.NOM  
‘He has died.’

b. ma-patay=ay tu cingra  
‘He has died (for sure).’

³ Nevertheless, that Kavalan =ay can cliticize on the verbal phrase is probably a recent development since my consultants in their sixties readily reject this alternative but those in their forties accept it just fine.
(44) a. t<mg>ayta aiku tu sunis a yau [CKV]  
    *<AF>see 1S.NOM OBL child LIG that  
      ‘I am watching that child.’  
    * b. t<mg>ay=ay aiku tu sunis a yau  
      Intended: ‘I (already) watched that child.’

(45) a. mi-nengneng kaku t-u-ra wawa [AMI]  
    *AF-see 1S.NOM OBL-CN-that child  
      ‘I am watching that child.’  
    b. mi-nengneng=ay kaku t-u-ra wawa  
      ‘I (already) watched that child.’

5 Conclusion

- Although Austronesian languages in general do not require overt NMLZ marking save for Focus morphology, the marker =ay in both Kavalan and Amis is emerging to function like an NMLZ marker, in the referring and restricting use of argument NMLZ. However, it is not yet a full-fledged nominalizer since not all verbal classes (i.e. Focus types) require it for argument NMLZ.

- The marker =ay illustrates two major types of functions: entity-denoting and non-entity-denoting. For the entity-denoting function, a verb cliticized by =ay denotes the pivot argument in the argument structure of that verb, whose participant role can be actor/agent or patient/undergoer, depending on verb classes. For the non-entity-denoting function, the marker =ay adds emphatic or anterior/perfective implications to the predication.

- It is argued that the non-entity-denoting function is related to, or even the grammaticalization of, the entity-denoting function. Supporting pieces of evidence are drawn from typological generalizations, historical reconstructions, and synchronic overlapping of the two functions.

- Once the link between the two types of functions is established, we might as well think of non-entity-denoting =ay as an epistemic modality marker that conveys the speaker’s strong commitment to a proposition. Its emphatic reading is then a natural result of higher degree of speaker’s commitment. And its anterior/perfective reading is most likely arrived at through pragmatic inferences based on presuppositions that are often associated with nominalizations. Thus, we have the advantage of conceptualizing =ay as the nexus of nominalization and evidentiality/epistemicity, the connection of which is crosslinguistically attested (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004).

- Finally, while Kavalan =ay is more grammaticalized in terms of nominalization (or the entity-denoting function), Amis =ay is more grammaticalized in terms of evidentiality/epistemicity (or the non-entity-denoting function). This suggests languages
that share the same source and target domain in a grammaticalization process may end up developing different degrees of grammaticalization in different domains.
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