

Problems in reviving Siraya

Alexander Adelaar
Asia Institute
University of Melbourne

Paper 3rd International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation,
Honolulu, 3 March 2013

O INTRODUCTION

Two dialects: Gospel of St. Matthew dialect (G) and Utrecht manuscript dialect (UM)

Choices to be made:

1. Follow original orthography or re-establish underlying phonemic distinction?
2. Maintain a morphological opposition which has become unproductive and is phonologically inadequately expressed? Or run ahead of the trend and ignore the opposition?
3. When reconstituting a vocabulary from the evidence of two dialects:
 - a. mix all words together?
 - b. adapt words of one dialect to phonology of the other dialect?
 - c. trace the words of both dialects to their common ancestral form and use the resulting proto-words instead?
4. Maintain a rather salient (but somewhat unstable) morphological category if it is represented in only one of the two available dialects?

1. SIRAYA SCHWA IS PHONEMIC BUT IGNORED IN THE SPELLING

(1) u and i both denote short vowels. They are sometimes in free variation, and when they are, they often historically reflect schwa. Compare:

original spelling	comparative evidence	phonological spelling
<u>'addim addum</u> 'thorn'	--	<i>ădəm</i>
<u>ninnim, nnum</u> 'six'	PAn * <i>nəm(nəm)</i>	<i>nənəm, nəm</i>
<u>'tdarim, 'td-darum</u> 'to go down'	PAn * <i>daləm</i>	<i>t-darəm</i>
<u>voukugh, voukig</u> (UM) 'hair'	PAn * <i>bukəS</i> 'head hair'	<i>vukəx</i>

(2) Some phonotactically odd heterorganic consonant clusters imply the presence of a schwa. This schwa is often supported by comparative evidence. Examples:

original spelling	comparative evidence	phonological spelling
<u>tbung</u> 'spouse'	PAN *Cəbung 'to meet'	<i>təbŭŋ</i>
<u>matmoei</u> 'full'	PAN *təməy 'many; full'	<i>ma-təməy</i>
<u>pchag</u> 'pounded rice'	PAn *bəRas ¹	<i>pəxax</i>
<u>rbo</u> 'inside'	PAn *ləbu 'interior'	<i>rəbo</i>

(3) Orthographic variety in undergoer suffixes involving final n:

a. The endings en, -in, -un and -n all reflect the object suffix *-ən*.

original spelling	phonological spelling
<u>ni-tnamsing-enhou</u> (PST-believe-OV=2S.GEN) 'was believed by you'	<i>ni-tna-m'sing-ən=hu</i>
<u>kannin</u> (eat-OV) 'to be eaten'	<i>kan-ən</i>
<u>pa-kan-nun</u> (CAUS-eat-OV) 'to be fed'	<i>pa-kan-ən</i>
<u>ni-lpogh-un</u> (xxi:35) (PST-kill-OV) 'was killed'	<i>ni-l'pux-ən</i>
<u>æillingigh-noumi</u> (RDP-hear-OV=2P.GEN) 'heard by you'	<i>ä-ilingix-[ə]n=umi</i>

b. The ending -an often reflects the locative suffix *-an* but can also be the result of contraction of root-final -a and following *-ən*, e.g.

<u>ni-æuloug han</u> (iii:6) (PST-baptise-OV) '(they) were baptised'	<i>ni-äwlux-an</i>
<u>ka-kytt'an-oumi</u> (RDP-look-OV=2P.GEN) 'seen by you'	<i>ka-kīta-[ə]n=umi</i>

(*kīta-n* occurs 75 times, but there is also one instance of *kīta-ən-hu*)

2. THE VOICE SYSTEM: ONE OR TWO NON-AGENT VOICES?

1. Proto Austronesian (simplified)

	indicative	subjunctive
AV	*<m>	*<m> + -a
OV	*-ən	*-aw
LV	*-an	*-ay
IV	*Si-	*-anay

According to Tsuchida (2000): Siraya had actor -, object - and locative voice:

¹ *b- > p is irregular.

	Indicative	Imperative	Future
AV	{ <u>m</u> }-	{ <u>m</u> }- + - <u>a/ä</u>	{ <u>m</u> }- + - <u>ah/-äh</u>
OV	- <u>en</u>	- <u>au/</u> - <u>äu</u>	- <u>auh/äuh</u>
LV	- <u>an</u>	- <u>ei</u>	- <u>eih</u> , - <u>aneih</u>

According to Adelaar (2011) OV and LV voices were in the process of merging; I would now reconstruct the following system:

	Indicative	Imperative	Subjunctive
AV	{ <i>m</i> }-	{ <i>m</i> }- + - <i>a</i>	{ <i>m</i> }- + - <i>a</i>
OV	Ø, - <i>ən</i> , - <i>an</i>	- <i>ey</i> , - <i>aw</i> ² , - <i>i</i> , - <i>u</i>	- <i>ey</i> , - <i>aw</i>
RV			- <i>aney</i>

- Tsuchida: OV and LV markers have an unclear distribution and there is ‘no serious difference’ between them
- Adelaar: distribution not entirely random: system is in transition and undergoing a re-alignment

Examples:

- (1) *ni-paki-valey nein ta rawey lam ki Rarenan tñn*
PST-seek-fnd 3P.GEN NOM child with DF Mother 3S.GEN
‘they found the child with its Mother’ (ii:11)
- (2) *ǎsi nein ni-paki-valey-ən ki mamang*
NEG 3P.GEN PST-seek-fnd-OV DF whatever
‘they did not find anything’ (xxvi:60)
- (3) *Päx-s’hūt-a äpak, ǎtaral-ən=kaw ki varaw*
think-trust-SJ son forgive-OV=2S.NOM DF sin
‘have faith, Son, your sins are forgiven to you’ (ix:2)
- (4) *ka-ilx-ən tu ǎtaral-an ki varaw tu Näy=ra*
V1-strong-OV LOC forgive-OV DF sin LOC earth=ADV
‘the power...to forgive sins on earth’ (ix:6)
- (5) *ka mamang ka väut-aw=mumi tu Näy,*
LK whatever LK bind-SJ.UO=2P.GEN LOC earth
- väut-ey ta ǎna tu tunun ki vülüm*
bind.SJ.UO NOM DIST LOC heaven
‘whatever you will bind on earth, will be bound in Heaven’ (xviii:18)

² No instances of $\sqrt{-aney}$ with imperative meaning are found in the Gospel text.

- (6) *pää-tunun-aw* *ta* *Alak* *ki* *kaäwlung*
 give-pass.on-SJ.UO NOM child DF human.being
- tu* *rima* *ki* *tama-ka-varaw*.
 LOC hand DF sinner
 ‘the Son of Man shall be betrayed into the hands of sinners’ (xxvi:45)
- (7) *pää-tunun-ey* *ta* *Alak* *ki* *kaäwlung*
 give-pass.on-SJ.UO NOM offspring DF human.being
- tu* *rima* *ki* *kaäwlung*.
 LOC hand DF human.being
 ‘the Son of Man shall be betrayed into the hands of men’ (xvii:22)
- (8) *ni-hawat-ən* *tĩn* *ta* *kidi* *ka* *ma-riang*,
 PST-look.out-OV 3S.GEN NOM time LK AV1-good
- ka* *mǎno-no* *ka* *pää-tunun-aney* *tĩn* *tĩni-än*.
 LK RDP-when LK give-pass.on-SJ.UO 3S.GEN 3S-OBL
 ‘he looked for the right moment to deliver him’ (xxvi:16)

My re-alignment theory is based on the following considerations:

- no *-ən* and *-an* alternation in:

The collective suffix *-an* with nouns, e.g. *asu-asu-an* ‘dogs’ *vato-to-an* ‘stony places’.

The final syllable of nominal roots ending in *-an* or *-än*.

The numeral *kĩtiän* occurs 53 times with *-än* and only once with *-ən*.

Oblique marker *-an*, e.g. *ĩau-an* ‘me (+oblique)’; *Isaac-an* ‘Isaac (+oblique)’.

The final syllable of roots ending in *-an/-än*, e.g. *k<m>an* ‘to eat’, *ĩmiän* 1PE, *than* ‘profit’.

- feature nouns (belonging to class 1) tend to show *-an*, e.g.

ka-tiktik-an ‘righteousness’; *ka-patey-an* ‘death’; *ka-tukul-an* ‘iniquity, injustice’,

kä-wäx-an, *kä-wax-an* ‘life’.

But there are still counterexamples, e.g.

ka-irang-ən ‘goodness’; *kaläwhäw-an* (6x) vs *ka-läwhäw-ən* (5x) ‘hell’;

ka-harum-an (occurring 3x), *ka-harum-‘n-* (2x) and *ka-harum-ən* (4x) ‘mercy’

- Verbs tend to select the same set of undergoer suffixes:

1. *-ən* and *-ay*: the most frequent combination, e.g. *pa-susu* ‘to say’, *pa-nanang* ‘to give a name’, *vana-vana* ‘to tell’, *ĩnang* ‘to refuse’, *tna-m’sing* ‘to believe’
2. *-ən* and *-aw*: Various verbs combine these, e.g. *kan* ‘to eat’, *ĩt* ‘to drink’, *kalang* ‘to know’, *ma-i-alak* ‘to give birth’ and *pa-darang* ‘to send (someone) away’
3. *-an* and *-ey*: Only one verb, *äwlux* ‘to baptise’, always combines with *-an* and *-ey*.

4. -an and -aw: There are no verbs with this combination (except for *xilingix* ‘to hear’, which combines with any of the four suffixes (although its OV form is usually *ilingix-an*).³

The instability shown between -an and -ən and between -ey and -aw, as well as the fact that there are many verbs regularly combining (indicative) -ən with (subjunctive) -ey, indicate that there was a re-alignment in progress.

If the pairing of -ən and -ey was really gaining ground, it clearly demonstrates that the Siraya voice system was not a simple continuation of the Proto Austronesian one.

Historical process:

PAn	indic.	subj.	-->	Siraya	indic.	subj.	-->	Siraya	indic.	subj.
AV	-ø	-a		AV	-ø	-a		AV	-ø	-a
OV	-ən	-aw		OV	-ən	(-aw)		OV	-ən	-ey
LV	-an	-ay		LV	(-an)	-ey				
IV	Si-	-anay		RV	--	-aney		RV	--	-aney

- Proto Austronesian voice system with multiple undergoer-oriented voices broken down
 - New alignment: -ən and -ey become increasingly normal as OV markers
 - -ən/-aw and an/-ey alignments still exist but are becoming less usual, and forms like *äwlux-an* and (less so) *kan-aw* are becoming anomalies. The opposition between OV and LV is becoming lexicalised: it is becoming formal, not semantic.
- Instrument voice survives (as a Recipient voice) but only in subjunctive verbs.

IS -AN HIGHLIGHTING A NON-CORE ARGUMENT?

Verbs sometimes have -an or (subjunctive) -aney highlighting a location or another non-core argument. When this highlighting occurs, the patient is still subject. Examples:

- (9) *ni-padipax-an* *nein tu* *vlung tñ*
PST-spit-OV 3P-GEN in face 3S.GEN
they spat him in the face' (xxvi:67)

- (10) *ru* *i-rua* *paki-valey-ən* *tñ* *ta* *kuko* *ka* *ni-uap-an*
when LOC-arrive seek-find-OV 3S-OBL NOM empty LK PST-sweep-OV
- ki* *uap* *tmura* *pa-ka-tabung ta* *ăna*
DF broom and also CAUS-V1-beautiful NOM DIST
‘when he came he found it [=the house] empty, swept with a broom and decorated’ (xii44)

- (11) *aley ka* *ni-ärax-an* *ki* *vato=ra*
reason LK PST-found-OV DF rock=ADV
‘because [the house] was founded upon a rock’ (vii:25)

³ The occurrences are as follows: 21 x with -ən, 3x with -ey, 3x with -aw, 1x with -an.

3 THE VOCABULARY BELONGS TO TWO DIFFERENT DIALECTS.

How to solve this: a. just combine sources (and cause dialect mixing)? or
b. adapt words of one dialect to phonology of the other? or
c. reconstruct ancestral form?

d/r, s or ḏ?

Utrecht Manuscript	Gospel	proto Siraya
<i>sosoa</i>	<i>ruha, ru-ruha, du-ruha</i>	*ḏu-ḏuha
<i>salom</i>	<i>ralum, -d'lūm</i>	*ḏalum
<i>xmisiong</i>	<i>m-irūng</i> 'to labour'	*x<m>iḏung
**tama-isung?	<i>tama-irūng</i> 'worker'	*tama-iḏung
<i>masimdim</i>	<i>ma-rimdim</i>	*ma-ḏəmdəḡ
**na sa-simdim?	<i>na da-rimdim</i> 'thoughts'	*ḏa-ḏəmdəḡ
<i>ma-sarey</i> 'wicked, angry'	---	*ma-ḏarey
**sarey?	<i>rarey</i> 'anger'	*ḏarey
**sarey-rey-ing?	<i>rarey-rey-ing</i> 'lamentation'	*ḏarey-rey-ing
**ka-sarey-ang?	<i>ka-rarey-an</i> 'scolding, dispute'	*ka-ḏarey-an

x or ø?

Palatalisation of *a* (--> ä) or *u* (--> äw) often happens in the G dialect but not in the UM dialect. Palatalisation also happens across morpheme boundaries. It is not totally predictable and is most likely to occur in three environments:

1) *a* or *u* are in the vicinity of a velar fricative (x). Examples:

<i>pasānax</i> (UM) 'tree'	<i>päränäx</i> id.
<i>pulax</i> (UM) 'barren country, desert'	<i>puläx</i> id.
<i>xiltax</i> (UM) 'thunder'	'Itäx 'thunder'
<i>ma-xanix</i> (UM) 'it's good'	<i>mä-änix</i> 'beautiful'
<i>rīx</i> 'mind' + <i>-uhu</i> '2S.GEN'	<i>rīx-äwhu</i> 'your mind'
<i>pa-ka-rämäx</i> 'let shine' + <i>-aw</i> '(SJ, UV)'	<i>pa-ka-rämäx-äw</i> 'let shine!'

2) *a* or *u* are in the vicinity of a palatalised ä. Examples:

<i>ma-</i> (stative prefix) + <i>-uax-</i> , <i>-uäx-</i> 'living'	-->	<i>mä-uäx</i> 'to live'
<i>pihä</i> (xiv:7) 'to give' + <i>-a</i> (+ SJ)		<i>piä-ä</i> 'give!'
<i>pasānax</i> (UM) 'tree'		<i>päränäx</i> id.
<i>pa-ka-rämäx</i> 'let shine' + <i>-u</i> '(SJ, UV)'		<i>pa-ka-rämäx-äw</i> 'let shine!'
<i>puläx</i> 'barren country, desert'		<i>päwlä-päwläx</i> id.
<i>m-u-</i> (AV-MOT-) + <i>pänäx</i> 'outward'		<i>m-äw-pänäx</i> , <i>m-u-pänäx</i> 'to appear in the open'

3) *a* or *u* were historically in the vicinity of **x*, which is still extant in UM. The effect of this palatalisation is fairly regular.

UM

xamax (gamach) 'blood'
xiltax 'thunder'
xapit 'get up'
raxang 'rib'
nixaha 'sister'
maxanix 'it's good'
waxi 'day; sun'
vaxiox 'stormwind'
vaxo (vacho) 'new'
tataxof 'blanket'
taxo 'shoulder'
xuma 'village, town'
vuxox 'enemy'
uxla 'snow'
uxing 'candle'
muxo (moucho) 'whale'
muxax (mougag) 'to live'

Gospel

ämax id.
ʼltäx id.
äpit id.
rääng id.
niähä id.
mä-änix 'beautiful'
wäi id.
bäyux 'thunderstorm'
vahäw id.
ta-taäwf 'to reveal'
pa-ka-taäw-ən 'laid on the shoulders'
äwma id.
väux id.
äwla id.
äwing id.
mäwäw id.
m-äwäx id.

What to do in the following cases? Mix dialects or reconstruct?

UM

x<m>a-xirax 'to sell, trade'
 ***xa-xirax-ang*?
waxi ki ka-xa-xangal-ang
 'festive day'
 ***ma-xangal*?
 ***ina ka axukax-ən(g)*?
x<m>imix 'to value, appraise'
 ***tama-ximəx*?
xaap --> ***gahap*?

Gospel

a-iräx-an 'market place'

m-angal 'worthy, valuable'
ina ka aäwkax-ən 'm.-in-law'

tama-imix, tama-imüx
 'tax collector'
**ähäp, ääp* 'seed'

Proto Siraya

**x<m>a-xirax*
 **xa-xirax-an*
 **ka-xa-gangal-an*
 **ina ka axukax-ən*
 **x<m>imix*
 **tama* + **ximəx*
 **gahap* (PAn **Rəhap*)

4 Anticipating sequences

Anticipating sequence: a formal part (first one or two syllables, first consonant) of a lexical verb, which is prefixed to preceding auxiliaries in a complex verb phrase. The prefixed element can also be semantically or iconically related to the lexical verb. Examples:

The anticipating sequence is a formal element of the lexical verb: *kmi-*, *mu-*

- 12) *Raraman-uhu ka kmi-dung k<m>ita*
 Father-2sGEN LNK AS-do in secret <AV>look, watch
 'your Father Who sees in secret...' (vi:18)
- 13) *mu-ìməd-kamu kawa m-umxa ki àta*
 AS-all-2sNOM maybe AV-understand DF this
 'do you understand all this?' (xiii:51)

The anticipating sequence is semantically related to the lexical verb (*pää-* is also a lexical prefix denoting 'to give' or 'to pass on'):

- 14) *pää-ìməd-ey-(m)au-kaw p-u-daäux*
 AS-all-UV.SJ-1sGEN-2sNOM CAUS-MOT-pay
 'I will pay you everything' (xviii:26)

The anticipating sequence is iconically related to the lexical verb:

- 15) *ää-la-likux s<m>ulat*
 AS-RDP-do again <AV>to write
 "it is written again"

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1S, 2S, 3S	1st, 2nd, 3rd person sing.	INV	inversive
1PE	1st person plural exclusive	LK	linker
1PI	1st person plural inclusive	LOC	locative
2P, 3P	2nd, 3rd person plural	MOT	motion
ADD	additive ('and', 'also')	NEG	negator
ADV	adversative ('but')	NOM	nominative
AV	actor voice affix	OBL	oblique
AV1, AV3, AV4	AV affix belonging to class 1/3/4 verbs	PA	personal article
AS	anticipating sequence	PAn	Proto Austronesian
CAUS	causative	PRF	perfective
COM	comitative	PRX	proximal
DF	default case marker	PST	past
DST	distal	RDP	reduplication
GEN	genitive	ST	stative
IMP	imperative	SJ	subjunctive
INCH	inchoative	SJ.UV	portemanteau suffix combining SJ and UV
INCL	inclusive	UV	undergoer voice
INDEP	independent	V1, v4	prefixes forming resp. class 1 and 4 verbs

Reference

Adelaar, Alexander, 2011, *Siraya. Retrieving the phonology, grammar and lexicon of a dormant Formosan language*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.