

FOCUS IN MALAGASY AND PROTO-AUSTRONESIAN

Otto Chr. Dahl

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Malagasy verb has a focus system very similar to that found in many Philippine, Minahasan and Formosan languages. We shall here study in detail the morphology and syntax of the Malagasy system, comparing it with the grammar of other languages and with what may be supposed to be Proto-Austronesian.

1.1.1 The phonetic development and the vocabulary of Malagasy are so similar to the languages of the SE Barito subgroup in Kalimantan that it undoubtedly belongs to this subgroup (see Dahl 1977). The ancestors of the Malagasys seem to have migrated to Madagascar about 400 A.D. (Dahl 1951:366-369).

1.1.2 The only Bornean language of this subgroup from which more than wordlists has been published, is Ma'anyan. In this language there is some literature available (see Dahl 1951:24-25) and an outline of a grammar (Sundermann 1913). From this grammar and the texts it is clear, however, that Ma'anyan does not possess the focus structure. It has active forms with affixes that are recognisable in Malagasy, and a passive form less easily comparable.

But the distance between Madagascar and the northern islands of western Austronesia is so great that a separate development of a complicated system with nearly identical forms in each of these widely separated areas must be regarded as impossible. We are therefore forced to assume that SE Barito had the focus system at the time of the emigration towards Madagascar, and that these languages have lost it during the intervening 1600 years.

Such changes are by no means surprising. The Romance and most Germanic languages have lost the old Indo-European case system in the same or even shorter time than is assumed here. The case system is still present in southern German and in Icelandic, that is to say on the fringes of the Germanic area. It should accordingly come as no surprise to find the focus system in the periphery of Austronesia, since this merely illustrates the general tendencies of language families to develop more rapidly in central areas than in their more conservative fringes.

1.1.3 Since phonetically conservative Formosan languages like Paiwan possess the focus system, it is reasonable to assume that this system belonged to PAN grammar.

1.2.1 However, before studying the Malagasy focus system in detail it is necessary to consider some important features in the phonetic development of the language after its arrival in Madagascar. The Barito languages have both consonants and vowels in final position like so many other AN languages. Indeed,

Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds *FOCAL I: papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 21-42. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-93, 1986.

© Otto Chr. Dahl

21

this characteristic is so widespread that it is believed to have existed in PAN. In Malagasy all words have only vocalic finals. Other phonetic changes, similar to the phonetic development of neighbouring Bantu languages, indicate that the immigrants found and absorbed a Bantu population in Madagascar. This Bantu substratum then influenced the Austronesian language of the colonists. The Bantu languages of East Africa have only vocalic finals, and the change is supposed to have occurred because the substratum found it difficult to pronounce final consonants.

In all dialects -l, -s and -h have been apocoped. To -k, -t and -r a final vowel has been added, but -t and -r have merged into an affricate. In Merina the result is -tra, in Sakalava -tse. Final -p has mostly merged with -t, less frequently with -k. These changes are only word finally.

In Merina the final nasals have all merged into -n, which has added a final -a like -ka and -tra. In Sakalava the final nasals have been apocoped, like -l, -s and -h (see Dahl 1954, especially pp.343-344).

When a suffix with initial vowel is added, no changes in the wordbase are required by the structure of the substratum. Before such suffixes the final consonant of the wordbase is therefore often maintained in the shape it now has in intervocalic position. But before the suffixes -ko '1st pers.sg.' and -ny '3rd pers.' the n of -na is also deleted.

1.2.2 Ma'anyan has a non-phonemic penultimate stress. When a final vowel was added in Malagasy, the number of syllables increased by one. But the accent has remained on the syllable that was penult before the lengthening. In words ending in -ka, -tra or -na in Merina it now therefore falls on the antepenult. Like vowels that have come into contact by loss of a consonant, have been contracted. The same has occurred when a suffix with initial vowel has been affixed to a word ending in the same vowel. This reduces the number of syllables. But the accent remains on what was the penultimate vowel before the contraction. Therefore the accent may now also fall on the ultimate syllable.

As a result of these changes Malagasy places a phonemic accent on one of the last three syllables of the word, e.g. Mer¹ tánana *hand, arm* (< PMP *taŋan id.), tanána *village, town* (< *taná-an < PMP *tanaŋ *land* + *-an), manála *to take away, manalá take away!* (imper. < *ma-n-alá-a < PAN *ma-ŋ-ala + -a).

2. ACTOR FOCUS

As a rule languages with focus structure have four different focus forms generally called actor focus (AF), object focus (OF), referent focus (RF), and instrument focus (IF). All these are found in Malagasy.

2.1 Actor focus, which has the performer of the action in focus (mainly as subject), is often formed with the infix -um- in the Philippines and Formosa. In Malagasy dialects there are still some very few cases of this. In Sakalava we have l-om-aŋo² *to swim* < PAN *l-um-aŋui, t-om-áŋy *to cry* < PAN *t₂-um-aŋit, h-om-éhe *to laugh*, cf. Old Javanese kəkəl id., l-om-áy *to run*.³ These forms are present tense. In the past tense the infix is replaced by the prefix no-: no-láŋo, no-táŋy, no-héhe, no-láy.

2.2 In Sakalava we also have h-óm-a *to eat* < PAN *k-um-aʔən. This word is present in Merina too, in the form h-óm-ana, with the regular development of

final *n* into *na*. In this word the crasis of *a + ə* has already taken place in Kalimantan, cf. *Mny kuman id*. The word has thus come to Madagascar in this form, with the stress on the *ú*. The fact that the wordbase was so short explains the abnormal accentuation of the infix. The word has consequently not been regarded as a form with infix, but rather as a wordbase used as verb with no separate form for the past tense.

In Merina, *homana* is the only word of this shape used as a verb. The first three forms above are also considered as wordbases in Merina, and form AF with the prefix *mi-*: *mi-lománo to swim*, *mi-tomány to cry*, *mi-homéhy to laugh*. So does the fourth one, but this has been transformed by popular etymology into *mi-olo-may to run with haste*, lit. *to act as a burning person*.

2.3 The regular formation of AF in Malagasy is with the prefixes *ma-* + nasal substitution or accretion, generally transitive, and *mi-* (probably < PAN **may-*), often intransitive. Besides *lománo to swim* (intr.) mentioned above, Sakalava has *man-dáño to cross swimming* (tr.). Other examples from Merina: *mamábo or mam-bábo to capture, seize as prey*, *mamérina to send back* (tr.), *mi-vérina to come back* (intr.). A few wordbases form AF with *ma-* without nasal substitution or accretion, e.g. *Mlg ma-hita to see* < PAN **kit₁a?* id. Similar verbal forms are found in Philippine languages.

2.4 In the past tense the initial *m* of all these prefixes is replaced by *n*, and in the future tense by *h*, e.g. *na-hita saw*, *ha-hita will see*. The origin of the *n* is probably that the prefix has got the infix *-in-*: *m-in-a-*, as seen in some AN languages. Thereafter the initial syllable has undergone apheresis: *m-in-a- > na-*. In other languages this *-in-* more often seems to indicate perfective aspect than past tense. But a relation between perfective and past is quite understandable.

The origin of *no-* in the past tense of the above-mentioned Sakalava verbs is probably the same. In some AN languages there is a prefix *mu/mo-* with the same function as the infix *-um-*. I suppose that the prefix has been the original form, and that the infix has come into being by metathesis with the initial consonant of the wordbase: *mu-C ... > C-um-* Sak *no-* is then **m-in-u-* > *nu-* following the same process of development as above.⁴ We shall see that in Malagasy this *no-* has developed a broader function as formative of the past tense, even in forms that do not contain *-um-*.

2.5 To the *h-* of the future tense I have not found any parallel in AN languages. In other verbal forms the morpheme of the future is *ho*. It is possible that this is due to the Bantu substratum. In neighbouring Bantu languages a prefix *ku/hu-* is part of the future morpheme. The substratum, which had a verbal system with tenses, may have felt the necessity of a future tense in the verb, which the language of the AN immigrants lacked (see Dahl 1954:355-360), and it has also transformed the AN perfective aspect into a past tense.

3. OBJECT FOCUS

3.1 The morphemes of object focus in Philippine and Formosan languages are reflexes of PAN **-ən*. In Malagasy too we find the same with regular phonetic reflexes: Mer *-ina*, Sak *-e*. In Sakalava the reflex of PAN **ə* is *e* in all positions. In Merina it is *e* in the accentuated syllable and in the preceding ones,

but in the syllables following the accent it is *i*. Since PAN *-ən was in the ultima, it was not accentuated in Barito, and therefore neither in Malagasy, e.g.:

- (1) tehén -ina ny lákana
push forward OF the canoe
the canoe is pushed forward (with a staff)

< PAN *t₂əkət + -ən, cf. Mer téhina *staff, stick* (cf. 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above).

3.2 But if the wordbase had final *e* in Proto-Malagasy the two vowels in contact are contracted to an accentuated *é*, e.g. Sak teré *to be milked*, Mer teréna *id., to be pressed*, from *teré-en < PMP *təd₁ət' + -ən (with apocope of a final *s*). If, however, the wordbase had final *i* in Proto-Malagasy, Merina shows contraction into *í*, e.g. Mer fidína but Sakalava filí-e *to be chosen* from PAN *piliq + -ən (apocope of *q* already in Barito). The rule of contraction of like vowels has thus had its effect both before and after the change of Pmlg *e > Mer *i* in syllables following the accent.

3.3 In the future tense all dialects have ho- before consonant and h- before vowel, cf. 2.5 above. In the past tense Merina has no/n- in harmony with this. But in Sakalava we often find in the past tense the same as in Philippine languages: the suffix is omitted, and instead we have the infix -in-, e.g. to filí-e *is chosen* we have f-in-íly *was chosen*, and to lanós-e *to be swum in, across* we have l-in-áño *was swum in, across*. This correlation between -ən and -in- seems to be old in AN. But it is also possible in Sakalava to prefix ni- before the whole form with -e, e.g. ni-filí-e *was chosen*.

3.4 This form has in focus the object suffering the action, and this is the subject of the clause, see example (1) above.

4. REFERENT FOCUS

4.1 The morpheme of referent focus in Philippine and Formosan languages is -an in almost all languages where it occurs, and this has also been supposed to be its PAN form. Starosta, Pawley and Reid have, however, reconstructed it as PAN *-ana, based on Oceanic, Malagasy and Tsou (1982a:163, 1982b:104).

4.1.1 It is correct that -ana is the morpheme of RF in Merina and some other Malagasy dialects. But the final *a* in this suffix is an innovation in Malagasy due to the transition from consonantal to vocalic finals, see 1.2.1 above. That this is so appears clearly in Sakalava and some other dialects, where the RF suffix is -a. Here Ø is the regular reflex of final *n*. The development of -ana/a from Pmlg *-an is exactly the same as the development of OF -ina/e from Pmlg *-ən.

If the suffix had been **-ana in Barito, the penultimate *a* would have been accentuated, and would have continued to be stressed in Malagasy. But Mer -ana is unaccentuated, except when there is contraction with a final accentuated *a* in the preceding syllable of the wordbase, see 1.2.2 above, e.g. sorát-ana *is written (on)* < PAN *t'urat₁ + -an, alána *is taken away* < alá-ana < PAN *ala + -an.⁵

Mer -ana can therefore not be used as an argument for PAN **-ana. Comparative linguistics is diachronic linguistics, and a merely synchronic comparison without attention to the historical background may be misleading.

Ma'anyan, which now has no focus forms, has a suffix -an, never *-ana, that is used in derivative forms with different meanings. And as far as I know no other languages in Western Austronesian have the suffix in the form -ana. There is therefore no valid argument from Western Austronesian for a PAN *-ana.

4.1.2 The three authors' argument concerning Tsou depends on Tung 1964:174-175. Under the heading "derivational suffixes" Tung writes:

/-ana/, attached to certain conjoined words (being place and clan names in meaning), is very much like the English suffixes '-place', '-town', '-man', 'smith' and so on in function.

The combination with clan names that may also be derived from names meaning human professions, raises the question as to whether the function of the suffix is really locative. At any rate, it is not a morpheme of RF. In Tsuchida 1976:102-103 we find that "the location focus marker is -i".

Tsou has, like Kanakanabu and Saaroa, vocalic finals. Tsuchida says (p.88): "In word final position a morphophonemic form ending in a consonant or stressed vowel is realized with a supporting vowel".

We cannot therefore discount the possibility that Tsou -ana may have developed from *-an. However, as supporting vowels Tsuchida cites i, u and ə, but not a in modern Tsou. A development -ana < *-an is thus not certain. However, on balance, the argument for PAN *-ana from the derivational suffix -ana is far from convincing.

4.1.3 Starosta, Pawley and Reid do not give any details about -ana in Oceanic, either where it occurs or its function, and I have not had the opportunity to study it closely. If it does occur sufficiently often there, *-ana may be constructed as a Proto-Oceanic innovation, but not as PAN. From the very frequent occurrence of the form -an of the RF suffix in Formosa, the Philippines, and in Proto-Malagasy I consider *-an to be the most likely PAN form.

4.2 Before studying the use of -ana/a in Malagasy we have to note a phonetic feature in Merina. If the final vowel of the wordbase is or has been e, Merina has crasis of e + a into é, but Sakalava has generally not, e.g. omé⁶ *to give* + -a(na) is Mer oména, but Sak omé-a *to be given*.

4.2.1 What is focused with the form with -ana/a in Malagasy is not so uniform as with -ina/e. It may be the place where the action is located, e.g.

- (2) Mer totóf-ana tány ny lávaka
 fill RF *earth the hole*
 The hole (in the ground) is being filled with earth.

Here the direct object of the action is the earth, tany is constructed as such, and the hole is the location of the action and subject of the clause.

4.2.2 In other cases the person profiting from the action, he who receives the direct object of the action, is in focus and constructed as subject, e.g.

- (3) Mer tolór -ana fanomézana ny vahíny
 hand over RF *gift the guest*
 The guest is presented with a gift.

The gift is the direct object. In AF both these verbs may be constructed with two objects:

- (2a) Mer manótotra tány ny lávaka ízy
He fills the hole with earth. OR He fills earth into the hole.
- (3a) Mer manólotra fanomézana ny vahíny ízy
She gives the guest a gift, or
- (3b) Mer manólotra fanomézana ho an'ny vahíny ízy
She presents a gift to the guest, with one object and one complement.

4.3.3 But in many cases a direct object seems to be in focus, e.g.

- (4) Mer mamáfa tokotány ízy
AF sweep courtyard he
He sweeps the courtyard.
- (4b) Mer fafána ny tokotány
sweep RF the courtyard
The courtyard is being swept.

An explanation for the apparent anomaly may be that in this case the courtyard is both object and location of the action. And there are other verbs that allow the same interpretation, e.g.

- (5) Mer sorát-ana ny taratásy
write RF the paper
there is written on the paper or the letter is written

But in

- (6) Mer sorát-ana ny téni-ny
write RF the word his
his words are written down; only a direct object is in focus.

4.3.4 AF of man-omé can take two objects, and both may be focused by RF oména:

- (7) man-omé ny vahíny ny sakáfo ianáó
AF give the guest(s) the food you
You give the guest(s) the food.
- (7b) Mer omén -áo ny vahíny ny sakáfo
give RF you the guest(s) the food
The food is given (to) the guest(s) by you. Or
- (8) Mer manomé sakáfo ny vahíny ianao
You give the guest(s) food.
- (8b) Mer omén-áo sakáfo ny vahíny
The guests are given food by you.

In the latter case the focus is benefactive, but in the former there is no trace of benefactive or locative.

4.3.5 Many forms with -ana/a have only the direct object in focus, e.g.

- (9) arí- ana ny fakofáko
throw away the rubbish
The rubbish is thrown away.

In such cases -ana has the same function as -ina, and it is often impossible to understand why -ana is chosen instead of -ina.

4.4 In Merina forms with -ana have the same tense prefixes as -ina, past tense no/n-, future tense ho/h-. In Sakalava we mostly find ni- and ho- combined with -a, but never the infix -in-. However, Malagasy must earlier have used -in- with forms with -an. The name of a certain town in Betsileo is Am-bato-f-in-andráh-ana *at the stone where things have been chiselled or at the chiselled stone*, from fándraka *chisel*.

5. INSTRUMENT FOCUS

5.1.1 In many Philippine languages there is a form with i- focusing the instrument or the means used to perform the action. In Formosan languages the prefix is generally si-, but in Bunun is-. From these reflexes I have reconstructed the prefix as PAN *Si- (Dahl 1973/76:119).

5.1.2 However, Starosta, Pawley and Reid do not find my reconstruction sufficiently motivated, and prefer to reconstruct it as PAN *iSi- with the following motivation:

Dahl ... reconstructs this form as *Si- for PAN, in spite of the fact that this would be expected to produce hi- in Tagalog, rather than the ?i- that is actually attested In Bunun, there is a similar form, but it is is- rather than si-, and marks future AF as well as IF. ... the reconstruction of *iSi- provides a better explanation of the reflexes in Bunun and Philippine languages than does *Si-. Bunun is- can be accounted for as a result of vowel loss rather than metathesis, whereas Philippine ?i- forms can be assumed to have developed by reduction of the Philippine reflex *ihi- to *?i-. Northern Philippine languages which reflect PAN *S as glottal stop (or zero) would have reduced *i?i- to *?i-. A few Philippine languages still show hi- rather than ?i- as the IF prefix. (Starosta, Pawley and Reid 1982a:165)

5.1.3 But as far as I know no language other than Bunun has the sequence is-, and no language has reflexes of all the three phonemes in **iSi-. If this was the original form, we should expect the form **ihi- in some Philippine language.

In private correspondence R.D.P. Zorc has given me the following survey of the reflexes of the prefix in Philippine languages:

There is no Philippine and no other Formosan evidence for a PAN *iSi-, only *Si-. The only Philippine language that gives clearcut evidence for *Si- is Tausug with a hi- punctual instrument and a hipag- durative instrumental prefix, i.e., some form of hi- (with h < *S) is retained throughout the grammatical system. Samar-Leyte has mahi- and nahi- in the potential instrumental system, but simply ?i- in the punctual and durative; similarly, Aplanon has an accidental instrumental prefix hi- (future, in contrast with a ha- past < PAN *Sa-), but otherwise uses ?i- as the normal instrumental prefix in the durative and punctual

systems. (See Zorc 1977:117-118, for a description of the durative vs punctual systems.) Obviously, the Aklanon and Samar-Leyte evidence is conflicting; Akl seems to indicate a split of PAN *Si- into an irregular (i.e. loss of h < *S) form normally used in the system, with the accidental form (if from the same PAN *Si-) retaining the h. Same problem with S-L.

5.1.4 I know no case of PAN intervocalic *S into Philippine ?. The intermediate form **i?i- is therefore very hypothetical. In initial position, however, some Philippine languages have cases where ? seems to reflect PAN *S (see examples in Dahl 1981:45-46). If we assume that the proto-form of the prefix was *Si-, it thus fits better with the reflexes in Philippine than **iSi.

Zorc mentions Tausug and Aklanon as languages with an uncomposed hi-. And both in these languages and in Samar-Leyte we have hi- in composed prefixes. There are therefore reasons to believe that the Proto-Philippine form of the prefix was *hi-, and that the h was later lost in most Philippine languages. The h has the weakest articulation of all consonants, and a regular or irregular loss of it is therefore frequent in the history of languages. French orthography shows that this language has lost h twice. Malagasy is now losing it for the third time in its history: 1) PMP *h < PAN *S, 2) SEBarito h < Barito s < PAN *t', 3) and now the Merina dialect is losing h < PAN *k. That h is lost in a prefix, even irregularly, is not very surprising. A syllable at some distance before the accentuated one has often a feebler articulation, and its frequent use further weakens it. Pronounced distinctly or not it is always understood from the context.

When this initial h had been dropped, the i- was in initial position. Many Philippine languages have developed glottal onset to initial vowels, and automatically the IF i- must also be articulated in the same way. I therefore assume that the glottal stop here does not directly reflect PAN *S, but has developed secondarily as a normal part of the articulation of initial i.

5.1.5 If the original form of the IF prefix was *Si-, we have to explain how it has become is- in Bunun. Metathesis is frequent in this language, especially in the Isbukun dialect. Compare the following forms in Bunun dialects: Metathesis of consonants: Ttd, Tkb lisáv, Isb sílav *leaf*; Ttd, Tkb qopsíl, Isb xóspil *hair*. Metathesis of vowel and consonant: Ttd, Tkb qalóa?, Isb ?axlóa *ants*; PAN *t₂alíηaH₂, Ttd taiηáh, Tkb taiηa?, Isb taiηía *ear* (metathesis of vowel and consonant or of η with an original l that was later dropped). Metathesis of vowels occurs in all dialects: PAN *at'əη, Ttd is?əη, Tkb is?á:η, Isb ís?əη *breath*; PAN *qaS₁əlu[H₂], Ttd qosáoh, Tkb qosá:o?, Isb xosáo *pestle* (Tsuchida 1971:4,6,9,13, 19). With this frequent occurrence in Bunun the hypothesis of metathesis from *Si- into is- seems very reasonable.

5.1.6 In addition, the morphology of the IF prefix in Bunun gives important information about its history. In its past and perfective forms it is combined with the infix -in-, and in this form is s-in- without the initial i (Ferrell 1972:123). When in is *infix*ed, its place is always *behind the initial consonant*. When it is affixed to a word with *initial vowel*, it is *prefixed*. The composed prefix should thus have been Bun **in-is- if it had initial vowel at the time of the combination of the two morphemes. The affix in is a very old morpheme in Austronesian (cf. Starosta et al. 1982a:163; 1982b:121), and the combination of the two morphemes is therefore likely to have taken place far back in history. The form s-in- reveals that the IF prefix had *initial s* when the combination

took place. In my opinion this proves that the original form of the prefix in Bunun was si-. A metathesis of it has thus taken place later, produced by the trend towards metathesis found in this language.

5.1.7 In Atayal the IF prefix is s- (Egerod 1965:269; Ferrell 1972:124).⁷ In this language the vowel following the initial consonant is very often lost in the non-active focuses (Egerod 1965:255), which explains the reduction of *Si- into s-. That this *S in Atayal has the reflex s and not h, shows that the proto-form of it was PAN *S₁.

5.2.1 I have shown that the modern Malagasy morpheme of this focus is not i, which would be the normal reflex of *S₁i-, but it is a-. Moreover, this form has not only the instrument in focus, but even more frequently a moving object. With the prefix i- the same is seen in some Philippine languages. No prefix cognate to *S₁i- was found in Malagasy when I treated these prefixes, but I assumed that it had existed earlier in the history of this language (Dahl 1978, especially p.389).

5.2.2 One of the Malagasy dialects, Antemoro, has a literary tradition, at least 500 years old, written in Arabic script. No texts exist that can be proved to be so old, because they are written on a locally produced paper which is not sufficiently durable. The oldest texts have therefore been copied several times, and may have been 'modernised' by copyists. But magic texts have a more archaic language than the others. The least change in a magic text may cause the loss of its magic power, and it must therefore be copied more scrupulously. In these texts I have now found instrumental forms with i-, which do not exist in modern Malagasy, e.g.

(10) sóratsy hi- távo- ny áma hinóm-i- ny
writing IF anoint he and drink OF he
Writing with which he shall anoint himself and which he shall drink.

Here h-i-távo-ny is future tense of IF with i- and with third person pronoun suffix, and h-inom-i-ny is future tense of OF with -i(na) and the same pronoun suffix. The written magic text is supposed to be dissolved in water and is the means to be used for anointment and the object to be drunk.

However, the same texts also contain forms with the prefix a-, but these have a moving object in focus, e.g.

(11) ronóno -n' ólon a- íliŋy aŋ- órony
milk gen. human being bring down in nose
Human milk is poured by him into his nose.

(aíliŋy is composed of a-íliŋ + -ny, and aŋ-órony of a locative prefix + óron + -ny, both with assimilation of the nasals) (Dahl 1983:36-38 and 1971).

5.2.3 I proposed in 1978 as a tentative hypothesis that two prefixes, one with an instrument in focus, the other with a moving object in focus, had merged and combined the two functions (Dahl 1978:389). This was a guess, because no form with i- had then been observed in Malagasy. But now this seems to be corroborated by the discovery of the two forms in Malagasy. How far this is valid only for Malagasy, or for old Austronesian in general, is an open question.

Starosta, Pawley and Reid have this objection:

Dahl cites Amis IF *sa-* as one justification for the initial *S, but it turns out that Amis *sa-* is not a regular IF marker in Amis. Instead, Amis *sa-* derives instrumental nominalisations which only rarely occur in a construction which could be analysed as having an Instrumental subject.

It is somewhat puzzling to find this as an objection in a paper which claims that the original function of this and other focus affixes was nominalisation (Starosta et al. 1982a:165; 1982b:131). The authors rely on Teresa Chen 1982: 117:

Although the verbs in these examples ... have instrumental subjects, it would be somewhat misleading to label them "Instrument Focus" in the Philippine sense because they do not form a paradigm, and are not marked by any consistent IF affix.

Ferrell, however, gives a paradigm with *sa-* as morpheme of IF, following Ogawa and Asai 1935:403, although he also gives examples of the same kind as Chen (Ferrell 1972:122-123). It is possible that her investigations and those of Ogawa and Asai have been made in different Amis dialects. But at any rate Amis *sa-* does not seem to indicate a moving object, and is therefore not exactly parallel to Mlg *a-*.

In Saaroa, however, focus forms with the prefix *saa-* (which Tsuchida calls "special focus") may have as subject an instrument/means or an object, e.g. speaking in a fairytale of a bamboo on which a girl was climbing, it is said:

- (12) *Saa- ləvə-a ami muu-capi na ataina isa*
 IF *go by means of is-said AF drop to woman her*
She came down by means of (it) to her mother, it is said.

(The function of the final *-a*, present in some forms but not in all, is not clear.)

- (13) *Saa-tamar-a cu ami ka tapu-tacəŋə*
 IF *burn already is-said the monkey*
(It) was burnt by the monkey, it is said. (Tsuchida 1976:75-77)

In (12) the means for climbing is in focus, in (13) the object burnt. This resembles the double use of *a-* in Malagasy, but the object is not clearly moving.

5.3 When Malagasy verbs in AF have two objects, the direct object is often moving, and the receiver of it is the indirect object. Both these may be focused, the direct one with the *a-* form, the indirect one with the *-ana* form, e.g. Mer

- (14) *manólotra fanomézana an- drai- ny ízy*
hand over gift acc. father his he
He presents his father with a gift.

The same may be said in the following ways:

- (14a) *tolór-a-ny fanomézana (ny) rai-ny*
His father is given a gift by him. Or
 (14b) *a-tólo-ny an-drai-ny ny fanomézana*
The gift is given to his father by him.

Manólotra is AF, tolór-a-ny is RF tolór-ana + third person suffix, a-tólo-ny is IF a-tólotra + third person suffix, from the wordbase tólotra.

5.4 Because the IF forms begin with the vowel a, past tense has only n and future tense only h-, like these tenses in forms with -ina and -ana when the wordbase has initial vowel.

6. IMPERATIVE

6.1 The only mood different from the forms treated above is the imperative. The AF imperative is formed with the suffix -a to AF present tense, e.g. mi-sótro *to drink*, mi-sotró-a *drink!* Because a syllable is added, the accent is moved to the new penult. If the wordbase has final -ka or -tra, the suffixation of the imperative morpheme follows the same diachronic rules as that of -ina and -ana (cf. 1.2.1-1.2.2), e.g. mi-pétraka *to sit*, mi-petráh-a *sit down!*, manóratra *to write*, manorát-a *write!* When a wordbase with antepenultimate accent has final -na, the same rule leads to the following consequence: the imperative morpheme replaces the secondary final a, and this displaces the stress to the penult, e.g. manátona *to approach*, manaton + the imperative suffix -a = manatón-a *draw near!* The only audible and visible difference between AF present tense and imperative is then the place of the accent.

If a wordbase accentuated on the penult has a in final position, the -a of the suffix contracts with the preceding a, e.g. mi-ála *to go away*, *mi-alá-a > mialá *get out!* Here too the shift of the accent, now to the ultima, is the only difference between the two forms.

6.2 All the non-active focuses have the same imperative suffixes. In Merina the regular suffix is -o, but when there is an o in the wordbase, -y [i] is used instead of -o by a rule of euphony. Before the suffixation of -o or -y the suffixes -ina and -ana are deleted. OF and RF have thus the same form in imperative, e.g. tapáh-ina *to be cut*, tapáh-o ny tady *cut the rope!*, sorát-ana *to be written*, sorát-y ny taratásy *write the letter!*, a-tólotra *to be handed over*, a-tolór-y azy ny vóla *give him the money!* The "thing" in focus is subject of the verb in the imperative too, and must be in a definite form, here as in non-imperative clauses. The subject is not always pronounced, but nevertheless implicit, because it is "old information". If the object of the action is indefinite, active imperative must be used, e.g. mambóly váry *to plant rice*, mambolé váry *plant rice!* We see that if the wordbase had an original final e, Merina has crasis between this and the -a, as has been observed with -ana, while Sakalava has mambolé-a (cf. 4.2 above).

In Sakalava the suffix of the non-active focuses is always -o, e.g. sorát-o zao *write this!* When the wordbase has final o, the two o's are contracted, e.g. vonó-e *to be killed*, vonó *kill!* from vonó-o.

6.3 The suffix -i is the morpheme of RF imperative in Atayal too (Egerod 1965: 269), and also imperative in Sedek (Asai 1953:56). It is used in RF or locative forms in several Philippine languages. Mlg -o may be cognate to Atayal -au, which is OF subjunctive morpheme in this language (Egerod 1965:269), and has similar use in other Formosan languages, e.g. Paiwan.

7. VERB OR NOUN?

7.1 Since Dempwolff, it has been discussed whether the non-active focus forms are verbal or nominal. Dempwolff always spoke of *das nominale Denken der Austronesier* 'the nominal thinking of the Austronesians'. This is endorsed by Erin Asai (1936:37; 1953:62-63) and Cecilio Lopez (1941) who were among his students. The reason given by Dempwolff was that these forms construct the actor in the same way as the owner to his possession, and should accordingly be considered as nouns.

With my background in Malagasy I could not accept this. I had the feeling that the forms of non-actor focus were as verbal as AF, expressing actions and states to the same degree. But feelings are not scientific arguments, and for a foreigner semantics is too often influenced by translation to his mother-tongue.

In Indo-European languages we have verbal nouns expressing actions, but syntactically their function is nominal, even when they, as infinitive, have no nominal inflection. The decisive criteria must therefore be found in syntax. Is it possible to find such criteria in Malagasy syntax?

7.2.1 In a simple clause where no member is emphasised more than others, the word order in Malagasy is predicate (new information)-subject (old information). Both predicate and subject may be either noun or verb, e.g.

- (15) mpam-bóly ny mp-ónina éto
farmer the inhabitant here
The inhabitants (P) here are farmers (S).
- (16) mam-bóly vóry ny mp-ónina
cultivate rice the inhabitant
The inhabitants (S) cultivate rice (P).
- (17) mpam-bóly daholo ny m-ónina éto
farmer all the AF live here
They who live (S) here are all farmers (P).
- (18) mam-bóly vóry ny m-ónina éto
AF cultivate rice the AF live here
They who live (S) here cultivate (P) rice.

In clauses of this type the subject, whether noun or verb, must be in a definite form in Merina, whether preceded by the article *ny*, or preceded and followed by a demonstrative pronoun. (Proper nouns and pronouns are definite by nature and do not require these determiners.) In the examples above the AF verb *monina* is nominalised by the article, and functions like a participle, but without any formal change of the finite verb.

- (19) mamonjy aina ny man-dósitra
AF save life the AF flee, run away

This may be understood in two ways, whether: *to flee (S) saves (P) life*, or: *they who flee save their lives*. The nominalised verb may thus function like an infinitive or like a participle in Indo-European. In these clauses the predicate, noun or verb, cannot be in a definite form with *ny*.

In the examples above I have used AF because this form bears no morphological resemblance to nouns. It takes objects and complements in the same way as active verbs generally do. It should therefore be possible to agree on their

verbal nature. As subject with *ny* we must consider them as nominalised verbs, deverbatives, but their form is exactly the same as the finite verb.

7.2.2 In the descriptions above of the three non-active focuses there are several examples of these forms used as predicate (no.1, 2, 3, 4b, 5, 6, 7b, 8b, 9, 11, 14a, 14b). But they may also be used as subject, e.g.

- (20) *tsy ázo-* ko ny laza-in-ao
not understood I the say OF you
I do not understand what you say. (lit. the said (S) by you (is) not understood (P) by me.)
- (21) *mba vakí-o* ny no- sorát-an-ao
please read imper. the past write RF you
Please read (P) what you wrote (S).
- (22) *rátsy tokóa* ny a-fíndra ho amin' ío lásy ío
bad very the IF move to that camp that
To be moved (S) to that camp is very bad (P).

7.2.3 When the predicate is strongly emphasised, to the virtual exclusion of all else, the clause has a special structure. The subject (old information) is in Merina preceded by *no* (in other dialects by *ro*), particles resembling the case markers in Formosan and Philippine languages. It is very often natural to translate it in our languages as *it is X that/who is/does Y*. In Malagasy *X* is predicate and *Y* is subject. After *no* the article *ny* cannot be used (and only rarely after *ro*). Both predicate and subject may be noun or verb, and a noun as predicate may be in an indefinite or definite form, e.g.

- (23) *mpampianatra no tómpo-n'* ny tráno
teacher owner gen. the house
It is a teacher (P) who is (the) owner (S) of the house.
- (24) *ny mpampianatra no tómpo-ny* tráno
It is the teacher (P) who is (the) owner of the house.
- (25) (*ny*) *vazáha no mampianatra tény frantsay*
(the) stranger AF teach word French
It is a/the stranger (P) who teaches (S) French.

But if a verb is predicate, it is hardly ever possible to use it in an indefinite form. It must generally be preceded by the article *ny*. Compare the following examples:

- (26) (*ny*) *mpampianatra tény frantsay no fántatr-o*
(the) teacher word French known I
It is a/the teacher (P) of French whom I know (S).

As *mpampianatra* is a noun, it may be in indefinite or definite form. But here it is possible to use the verb *mampianatra* *teach* instead of *mpampianatra* *teacher*, and then it must be preceded by the article:

- (26a) *ny mampianatra tény frantsay no fántatr-o*
the AF teach word French known I
lit. It is the teaching (P) French whom I know (S).

Here the verb expresses the actor. But to say:

- (26b) **mampianatra teny frantsay no fantatro
It is a teaching French whom I know.

would not be grammatical. To have an indefinite predicate we must introduce a noun to which mampianatra is an attribute:

- (26c) ólona mampianatra teny frantsay no fantatr-o
person teach word French known I
It is somebody (lit. a person) teaching French whom I know.

If, however, the verb expresses the action and not an actor (cf. example (19)), it may be without article, e.g.

- (27) (ny) mampianatra teny frantsay no raharáha-ny
It is to teach (P) French that is his/her/their occupation (S).

With or without an article the meaning is the same.

With verbs in the non-actor focuses the syntax is the same, e.g.

- (28) ny n- irí- ko no éfa ázo-ko
the past desire OF I finished got I
It is what I desired (P) that I have got (S).

- (29) ny éfa no- sorát-ana no ho- vakína
the perfective past write RF fut. read OF
It is what has been written (P) that shall be read (S).

- (30) ny h- a- éli- ko no lazá-i-ko amin-ao
the fut. IF diffuse I say OF I to you
It is what I shall diffuse (P) that I tell (S) you.

In these cases the verb must be preceded by the article, because it is used like a participle expressing, e.g., the object of the action. But the non-actor focuses too may express the action itself, and then ny is facultative, e.g.

- (31) (ny) arí- ana no antónona ázy
(the) throw away RF suitable it
It is to be thrown away (P) that is suitable (S) for it.

We may say that the most nominal use of the verb expresses the action itself (like an infinitive or a gerund) and is treated syntactically as a noun. Where it expresses actor or object (like a participle), it retains more of its verbal character and is treated unlike a noun. Actor focus and non-actor focuses are treated in the same way, as verbs, not as nouns.

7.2.4 Malagasy has yet another construction which clearly shows that in this language, at any rate, Dempwolff's argument is not valid as proof of nominal character. Non-active imperative forms may have the short-forms of the second person pronoun suffixed to them, like nouns and the ordinary non-active focus forms. The appeal is then emphasised. And imperative is incontestably a verbal, not a nominal form. Compare the following examples:

- (32) trano-n- ao ity
house poss. you(sg.) this
this is your house

- (33) tafó- an- ao ny trano
thatch RF you the house
you are thatching the house
- (34) hevér-o- n- ao ny toétra- ny
think imper.poss. you the situation his
Do think (P) of his/her/their situation (S).
- (35) Fidi- o- n- areo aníó izay ho- tompo-in-areo
choose imper.pos. you(pl.) today who fut. serve OF you(pl.)
Do choose (P) today whom you(pl.) will serve (S).

7.2.5 Morphologically noun and verb have owner and actor constructed in the same way, but syntactically nominal and verbal forms have different constructions. The limit between the two categories is, however, not the same as in Indo-European languages. Used about the action (like an infinitive) the verb has nominal character, but used like a participle it is verbal. The participle is an adjectival form, and in Malagasy the adjective belongs to the verbal category. It is often formed with the verbal prefix *ma-* and has the same tense inflection as the verb, past *na-*, future *ha-*. It has also an imperative form with *-a* like AF, e.g. *ma-dio clean*, *na-dio was clean*, *ha-dio will be clean*, *ma-diov-a be clean!*

7.2.6 In Malagasy it thus seems clear that the non-active focus forms are verbal. Only a syntactic examination of other languages can show whether this is the case in these languages too. The criteria have to be chosen according to the syntactic rules of each language. A comparison of the results may inform us about the character of these forms in modern languages.

7.3.1 What are we able to say today about the situation in Proto-Austronesian? Starosta, Pawley and Reid argue that:

*-ən, *ni-/in-, *-ana, *iSi-, and possibly *mu-/um- were all noun-deriving affixes in PAN, as they still are to a large extent in the modern languages outside the Philippine area, and that they have in fact retained this function to a previously unrecognised extent even within the Philippine language group. We argue further that Austronesian nominalisations in *-ən, *ni-/in-, *-ana, *iSi- and possibly *mu-/um- did not develop from original passive constructions, as concluded by Dahl (1973), Wolff (1979), and Pawley and Reid (1979), but rather that the nominalising function was the original one, and that the passive and verbal focus uses of these affixes in Philippine languages are a secondary development. That is, verbal focus in Proto-Austronesian was at most an incipient mechanism that was later elaborated and developed by the languages of Borneo and the Celebes.

(Starosta et al. 1982a:148)

We shall see that development from nominal into verbal forms has probably taken place in Malagasy (see 8.3 below), and such changes are certainly possible.

7.3.2 However, if we consider as PAN only the nominal forms with the affixes of the focus system, the focus system itself must have developed later. In my opinion this is not possible. The focus system is found both in some Formosan and in some western languages from the Philippines to Madagascar with similar

forms and in similar constructions. But the languages where it is found belong to different primary subgroups of Austronesian. The Formosan languages have so many archaic features which they do not have in common with languages outside Formosa, that they must represent the first offshoots from the PAN centre (Dahl 1973:124-125; 1976:125; 1981:153; Blust 1980:13). Till now I have not been able to find innovations common to all Formosan languages. For the time being they must therefore be considered as belonging to several first-order subgroups of Austronesian.

But all the languages outside Formosa have innovations in common, e.g. PAN *S₁, S₂, H₁, H₂ into PMP *h, and after this PAN *t' generally into s (Dahl 1981: 45-62). In the Formosan languages which have had PAN *t' > s, this s has merged with s < PAN *S₁ (1981:84). If s from both these PAN phonemes had existed simultaneously in the proto-language of the languages outside Formosa, we should have expected the same merger in at least some of these languages, but this is found nowhere outside Formosa. The change of PAN *t' into s outside Formosa must therefore have taken place after the change PAN *S₁ > h (Dahl 1981:87).

The nasalisation of the first consonant of the wordbase, which has led to nasal accretion in Oceanic and nasal substitution in Western Austronesian, is also confined to the non-Formosan languages. We must therefore consider all languages outside Formosa as one primary subgroup, which Blust has called Malayo-Polynesian (see e.g. Blust 1980:13).

7.3.3 The four-focus grammatical system exists both in Formosan and MP languages, that is to say in more primary subgroups. If this system did not belong to PAN but developed later from nominal PAN forms, parallel development must have taken place in several subgroups after their separation. However, not only are the morphemes identical, but also the syntactical use of the forms. The choice of focus form permits placement as subject words with different relations to the action or state expressed in the clause. A parallel development of this sophisticated system in different subgroups of AN from nominal forms with the same affixes does not seem possible to me. There are too many similarities. For instance, in Atayal and Malagasy the fundamental features of the four-focus system are virtually the same in spite of the long separate development of the languages. The only significant difference is that the more differentiated modal categories in Atayal are reduced to two in Malagasy.

To me the possibility of parallel development from verbal into nominal forms seems much greater. The uses of the non-verbal forms are not so similar in the different languages. In Malagasy these forms are generally not nouns but adjectives, and thus nearer the quality of the verb. The Malagasy focus forms are not only used as subject and predicate, but also as qualifiers of nouns, like adjectives, e.g. *závatra oména a thing given*, in constructions like *závatra mavésatra a heavy thing*. From such constructions to the use of the same affixes to create adjectives the way is short, e.g. *ráno lomór-ina water overgrown with moss* from *lómotra moss*, *tány vató-ana stony earth* from *váto stone*. (Neither *lomotra* nor *vato* have verbal forms.) If the noun is omitted in such constructions, the adjective is nominalised. The next step in the evolution may then be a real noun.

We have seen (7.2.5 above) that in an AN language the difference between noun and verb is not the same and not so sharp as in IE languages. For that reason, the possibility that the same affixes as those forming focus may have been used to produce nominal forms in PAN itself cannot be excluded (cf. Saaroa saa- in 5.2.3 above).

7.3.4 If the focus system belonged to PAN, some Formosan and many MP languages have lost it, among others Malagasy's nearest relatives, the Barito languages. Here about 1600 years of separation has been sufficient to produce the difference. PAN was probably spoken around 5000 B.C. (Blust 1980:13), and a loss of fundamental grammatical features during these 7000 years is not extraordinary. Modern European languages have lost the fundamental case structure of Proto-Indo-European in a much shorter time, replacing it with a set of prepositions formed from old material. In languages which have lost the focus system, there may be new forms replacing categories in the focus system, here also using old material. It may be worth examining modern grammatical systems with this in mind.

8. CIRCUMSTANTIAL FOCUS

8.1 Malagasy has also a fifth focus which is formed by a circumfix where the suffix is always Mer *-ana*, Sak *-a*, and the prefix is any AF prefix deprived of its initial *m-*. The form has thus initial vowel and therefore *n-* and *h-* in past and future tenses like IF. In most dialects it forms its imperative according to the same rules as the other non-active focuses. But in Tesaka the imperative of this focus always has the suffix *-y* (Deschamps 1938:20). We have already seen that *-i* forms the imperative of RF in Atayal (6.3 above), and in other languages it is a locative suffix. Because CF has the suffix *-ana*, it has some resemblance to RF. This may be the reason why *-y* is the imperative suffix here, and this may be the origin of the alternative *-y* in Merina too.

This focus was called relative voice by the old grammarians (Cousins 1894: 48) because it has in focus any relation to the action. However, since this form has no similarity to the accustomed use of relative in grammars (relative pronoun, relative clause), I prefer another term: circumstantial focus (CF).

8.2 Any circumstance having a relation to the action or state expressed by the verb may be focused by this form: place, time, cause, intention, reason, means, instrument, beneficent, e.g.

- (32) *i-petráh-a-ny ny séza* (petraka to sit)
sit CF he the chair
The chair (S) is where he is sitting (P).
- (33) *i-angón-ana ny alahády* (ángona to assemble, go to church)
assemble CF the Sunday
Sunday (S) is when going to church (P).

When CF is used, there is often so great an emphasis on the circumstance that the construction with *no* is preferred:

- (34) *táhotra no n- an-dosír-a-ny* (lósitra flight)
fear past flee CF he
It was for fear (P) that he fled (S).
- (35) *mba h- amotsí-ana ny tráno no ilá- ko sokay*
conj. fut. white CF the house want I lime
It is in order to whitewash (P) the house that I want (S) lime.

(The wordbase of *hamotsiana* is *fótsy white*, AF *mamótsy*, and of *ilako íla*, AF *m-íla to want*. Because the AF prefix is only *m-*, which must be deleted, CF of this verb has no prefix.)

- (36) sokay no h-amotsí-a-ko ny trano
It is with lime (P) that I shall whitewash (S) the house.
- (37) ny ántsi- n- ao no anapáh- o ny tády
the knife gen. you cut CF imp. the rope
Cut (S) the rope with your knife (P).
- (38) ny ray aman- drény no h- anolór- an- ao ny vóla
the father and mother fut. present CF you the money
It is to the parents (P) that you shall give (S) the money.

The CF may also express an action on only a part of the subject. Compare the following clauses:

- (39) vono- y ny akóho- ko
kill OF imper. the chicken my
kill my chickens (all of them)
- (40) amono-y ny akóho-ko
kill some of my chickens
- (41) amono-y róa ny akóho-ko
kill two of my chickens

Ny akohoko is the subject of all the three clauses, róa in the last one is object of amonoy. The command in the last one may also be expressed in AF, but in a less elegant manner:

- (41a) mamonó- a róa ámin' ny akóho- ko
AF kill imp. two among the chicken my

The fact that the part in AF is expressed with a complement (amin'ny a-), and accordingly as a circumstance in relation to the verb, explains the use of CF with the same meaning.

Preceded by the article the CF may also mean the action itself nominalised, e.g. ny i-petráh-ana *the sitting, the action to sit.*

The CF form makes the language very flexible in that it allows any part of a statement to be emphasised. This is necessary because more than ordinary stress cannot be used to emphasise single words. Focus thus offers a suitable means of achieving emphasis.

8.3 I have found no clear parallel to CF in any other AN language. It therefore seems to be a Malagasy innovation. Looking for material from which it has been created, I have found some forms in Ma'anyan. This language has some abstract nouns formed with the circumfix pa- with nasal substitution or accretion + -an or with pi- + -an. The meanings of these forms are the following: the action itself, the place, time, instrument (Sundermann 1913:219-221).

Ma'anyan p has become Mlg f, and in Malagasy we have the same forms with f-: fa- with nasal substitution or accretion + Mer -ana, Sak -a, and fi- + -ana/a. The meanings of the Mlg forms are the same as in Ma'anyan plus most of the meanings of the CF. But the Mlg forms with f- and the Mny forms with p- add to these meanings the notion of habitual. Compare the following:

- (42) ny fanaov-ana ázy (from tao to do, make)
the doing it
The habitual, general way of doing it (always).

- (42a) ny anaov-ana ázy
the way of doing it (in the actual situation).

There are also forms without -ana which have the same habitual meaning, e.g. f-ómba *custom, habit* from ómba *to accompany*.

It is therefore possible that the old forms with p/f + -an/ana and habitual meaning have eliminated the f-, and thereby removed the connotation of habitude. What is left is the form of CF, and to this still other meanings have been added. For the time being I consider this to be the most likely hypothesis.

It is worth noting that the nominal form with f- has an object, just like the verbal CF form without f-. This shows that in Malagasy the difference between noun and verb is not so sharp as in Indo-European. It would be interesting to know if this is true of other AN languages.

9. CONCLUSIONS

Malagasy has the four-focus grammatical system which is also found in Formosan, Philippine and Minahasan languages, and with affixes that are present in other focus languages too. It is found here that the PAN forms of these affixes are AF *-um-, OF *-ən and -in-, RF *-an and IF *S₁i- (perhaps also *Sa-). Malagasy shows regular reflexes of all these. The imperative suffixes present in Malagasy are AF -a < PAN *-a, in the non-active focuses -i < PAN *-i and -o < PAN *-au. Instead of PAN *-um- Malagasy mostly uses reflexes of *ma- + nasal accretion or substitution, or of *may-.

Since Dempwolff the question of whether the non-active focuses are verbal or nominal has been a moot point. Malagasy syntax shows that in this language they are verbs - in spite of the construction of the actor being in the same form as the owner of the noun expressing his possession. The non-active imperatives may suffix the second person short form, like nouns. But imperatives are incontestably verbal forms. This shows that such construction is no proof of nominal character. To settle this question for the focus languages in general a syntactical examination of the function of focus in these languages is needed.

Today the focus system is found in several first-order subgroups of Austronesian (see 7.3.2 above). The similarities are so great that a parallel development of the system in these languages must be excluded. Focus must therefore have belonged to the PAN grammatical system. Malagasy has, however, developed a fifth focus which must be a local innovation.

The languages without the focus system today must have lost it. Instead there are sometimes found new forms replacing categories in this system, formed at least partly with old material. A further study of this in Austronesian languages is needed.

NOTES

1. The following abbreviations are used: AN = Austronesian, Isb = Isbukun, Mer = Merina, Mlg = Malagasy, Mny = Ma'anyan, MP = Malayo-Polynesian, P = predicate, PAN = Proto-Austronesian, PMLg = Proto-Malagasy, PMP = Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, S = subject, Sak = Sakalava, Tkb = Takbanuad, Ttd = Takitu?duh.

2. In Malagasy orthography o is the symbol for the vowel [u], and y is written for final [i]. I mostly take my examples from Merina, which is the base of the official literary Malagasy, but also from Sakalava, and only occasionally from other dialects, when they give us information about the historical development of the language.
3. There are two possible proto-forms for this wordbase: PAN *layiu and *laiat', both meaning *to run*, and both with irregular development of the last vowel. The two have probably merged, because in imperative we have both l-om-ai-a and l-om-ais-a, cf. 6.1.
4. That there has been a prefixed form with mu- is corroborated by the causative form of these verbs. The ordinary causative prefixes in Malagasy are mampa- + nasal accretion or substitution, or mampi-, corresponding with the AF prefixes ma- + nasal accretion or substitution or with mi-. But in Sakalava the causative prefix of the verbs with -om- is mampo-, e.g. mampo-lay *to cause to run*. See also mu- in Formosan languages (Dahl 1973/76:119).
5. For the development of final nasals, contraction of vowels and accent in Malagasy, see Dahl 1951:62-65 and 84-91.
6. omé < PAN *bəyai with fossilised -um-: *b-um-əyai > *wumée > omé. Only the loss of w before u is irregular.
7. Ferrell has misunderstood two forms in Egerod's paradigm. In private correspondence Egerod has informed me that perfective OF should be q-n-alup and RF q-nalup-an. In perfective IF the form Egerod has written (i)nsqalup is so rare in his material that he does not consider it as certain. Ogawa and Asai do not have this form in their paradigm (1935:30).

REFERENCES

ASAI, Erin

1936 *A study of the Yami language, an Indonesian language spoken on Botel Tobago Island*. Leiden: J. Ginsberg.

1953 *The Sedik language of Formosa*. Kanazawa: Cercle Linguistique de Kanazawa.

BLUST, Robert A.

1980 Austronesian etymologies. *Oceanic Linguistics* 19:1-189.

CHEN, Teresa M.

1985 *Verbal constructions and verbal classification in Nataoran-Amis*. (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii, 1982.) PL, C-85.

COUSINS, W.E.

1894 *A concise introduction to the study of the Malagasy language as spoken in Imerina*. Antananarivo: The Press of the L.M.S.

DAHL, Otto Chr.

1951 *Malgache et maanjan. Une comparaison linguistique*. Oslo: Egede-Instituttet.

- 1954 Le substrat bantou en malgache. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 17:325-362.
- 1971 La forme locative du nom malgache. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 24:154-162.
- 1973 *Proto-Austronesian*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, Monograph Series No.15. Lund: Studentlitteratur. 2nd revised edn, 1976.
- 1977 La subdivision de la famille Barito et la place du malgache. *Acta Orientalia* 38:77-134.
- 1978 The fourth focus. In S.A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, eds *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: proceedings*, 383-393. PL, C-61.
- 1981 *Early phonetic and phonemic changes in Austronesian*. Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture B 63. Universitetsforlaget.
- 1983 *Sorabe révélant l'évolution du dialecte antemoro*. Antananarivo: T.P.F.L.M.
- DESCHAMPS, Hubert
- 1936 *Le dialecte Antaisaka*. Tananarive: Pitot de la Beaujardière.
- EGEROD, Søren
- 1965 Verb inflection in Atayal. *Lingua* 15:251-282.
- FERRELL, Raleigh
- 1972 Verb systems in Formosan languages. In Jaqueline M.C. Thomas and Lucien Bernot, eds *Langues et techniques, nature et société*, vol.1, 121-128. Paris: Klincksieck.
- LOPEZ, Cecilio
- 1941 *A manual of the Philippine national language*. 3rd edn. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- OGAWA, Naoyoshi and Erin ASAI
- 1935 *The myths and traditions of the Formosan native tribes*. Taihoku: Taihoku Imperial University.
- SNEDDON, J.N.
- 1978 *Proto-Minahasan: phonology, morphology and wordlist*. PL, B-54.
- STAROSTA, Stanley, Andrew K. PAWLEY and Lawrence A. REID
- 1982a The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In Amran Halim, Lois Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol.2: *Tracking the travellers*, 145-170. PL, C-75.
- 1982b The evolution of focus in Austronesian. MS. An expanded version of 1982a.
- SUNDERMANN, Hermann
- 1913 Der Dialekt der "Olon Maanjan" (Dajak) in Süd-ost-Borneo. *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 66:203-236.

TSUCHIDA, Shigeru

1976 *Reconstruction of Proto-Tsouic phonology*. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series No.5. Tokyo.

TUNG, T'ung-ho

1964 *A descriptive study of the Tsou language, Formosa*. Institute of History and Philology special publication No.48. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

ZORC, David Paul

1977 *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: subgrouping and reconstruction*. PL, C-44.