



**HAL**  
open science

# Adversative and experiential applicative constructions in Northern Amis (Austronesian)

Isabelle Brill

► **To cite this version:**

Isabelle Brill. Adversative and experiential applicative constructions in Northern Amis (Austronesian).  
Linguistics, 2023, 10.1515/ling-2021-0181 . hal-04382234

**HAL Id: hal-04382234**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04382234v1>**

Submitted on 9 Jan 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Isabelle Bril\*

# Adversative and experiential applicative constructions in Northern Amis (Austronesian)

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2021-0181>

Received October 9, 2021; accepted December 21, 2022; published online October 13, 2023

**Abstract:** Experiential constructions is an understudied topic in western Austronesian languages. The focus is on Northern Amis (Formosan), with some crosslinguistic comparison. In Amis, experiential constructions are derived by a syncretic suffix *-en*, which is also an Undergoer Voice suffix. In experiential constructions, *-en* is suffixed to stative-intransitive verbs compatible with experiences, and functions as an applicative voice that licenses an extra-thematic experiencer marked as the nominative argument, generally with adverse meaning. Though reminiscent of adversative passives in some Asian languages, experiential constructions in Amis are not passives, nor are they standard Undergoer Voice *-en* constructions for two main reasons: (i) they are restricted to stative and intransitive stems; (ii) their argument structure and case-marking are different. It is argued that the source of Amis experiential constructions is a Proto-Austronesian adversative *\*ka- ... -an/-en* construction (Blust, Robert. 1999. Notes on Pazeh phonology and morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38(2). 321–365) and that Amis innovated by creating a verbal *ma- ... -en* experiential applicative construction from that originally non-finite construction.

**Keywords:** adversative passives; applicative voice; Austronesian; experiential constructions

## 1 Introduction

A number of languages (among which Japanese and Korean) make use of a passive marker with different properties from standard passive constructions; similar constructions are described in Even (Tungusic, Malchukov 1993). In Japanese, these constructions, with extended use of passive morphology, are called adversative, indirect or experiential passives (Ono 2003; Oshima 2003, 2006; Shibatani 1985, 1994). In such constructions, the passive marker *-(r)are-* occurs with intransitive verbs

---

\*Corresponding author: Isabelle Bril, LACITO, CNRS, 7 rue Guy Moquet, 94800 Villejuif, France, E-mail: [isabelle.bril@cnrs.fr](mailto:isabelle.bril@cnrs.fr). <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4582-9755>

with an extra-thematic subject that is not originally part of the verb's argument structure, like *boku* 'I' in (1), and which denotes an indirectly affected experiencer, while the original subject is marked by dative *ni*.

- (1) *Boku wa ame-ni hur-are-ta.*  
 I TOP rain-by<sup>1</sup> fall-PASS-PAST  
 'I was affected (adversely) by rain's falling.'  
 (Shibatani 1985: 842)

Some Austronesian languages discussed in Section 5 have constructions with a similar function; in Amis (Formosan),<sup>2</sup> experiential constructions are marked by a syncretic morpheme *-en*, which is (i) the Undergoer Voice (UV) affix standardly used in constructions with two-argument verbs as in Example (2) below, and (ii) *-en* is also the exponent of applicative experiential constructions, it is suffixed to stative, property-denoting stems, and it licenses an extra-thematic nominative experiencer; these stative verbs belong either to the class of  $\emptyset$ -stem (with  $\emptyset$  voice marker) as in (3b), or to the class of stative *ma-/ka-* stems as in (4b).<sup>3</sup>

UV *-en* and experiential *-en* constructions are distinguished by their argument structure and case-marking pattern, within the bipartite *k-*, *t-* and *k-*, *n-* argument structure of Amis discussed in Section 2.1. Undergoer Voice (UV) *-en* constructions as in Example (2) occur with bivalent verbs with a fully affected nominative patient and a genitive agent (with nominative *k-* and genitive *n-*), while experiential *-en* constructions occur with stative verbs and have a *k-* nominative experiencer reacting to some stimulus marked by *t-* as in (3b) and (4b). Note the distinct argument structure of (3a) and (3b); in the experiential construction (3b), the applied extra-thematic experiencer is the nominative argument, while *hakhak* 'glutinous rice' is case-marked by *t-* as the stimulus; *t-* is the only other available case for low transitive or experiential constructions.

- (2) *Atad-en n-u sikawasay cira.*  
 curse-UV GEN-NM shaman NOM.3SG  
 'The shaman cursed him/her.'

1 Shibatani's original gloss.

2 Amis is a Formosan, Austronesian language spoken along the east coast of Taiwan. Northern Amis is one of four main dialects, with the Tavalang-Fata'an, Central, and Southern varieties. These dialects display significant differences in phonology, lexicon and morphosyntax (Tsuchida 1988) and according to native informants, they are not immediately mutually intelligible.

3 Unless otherwise mentioned, all data and examples originate from my corpus recorded and collected over a period of approximately 14 months of fieldwork in three villages in the outskirts of Hualien and south of Hualien. The corpus mostly contains spontaneous oral productions (i.e., stories, procedural texts), completed by elicitations. I extend my gratitude to all Amis consultants and friends for their precious collaboration, especially to Dawa Lisin, Balah Luo, Li Wen Cen.

- (3) a. *Ø-alsuq k-u hakhak.*  
 tasty NOM-NM glutinous.rice  
 ‘The glutinous rice is tasty.’
- b. *Alsuq-en k-u wawa t-u hakhak.*  
 tasty-EN NOM-NM child STIM-NM glutinous.rice  
 ‘The children find the glutinous rice tasty.’  
 (Turun.056)
- (4) a. *Ma-ciki k-ina babahi.*  
 STAT-dirty NOM-DEIC woman  
 ‘The women are dirty.’
- b. *Ma-ciki-en=tu k-u kawas t-ina babahi.*  
 STAT-dirty-EN=PFV NOM-NM god STIM-DEIC woman  
 ‘The gods felt that the women were dirty.’ (i.e., were repulsed)  
 (Mi-laqdis.056)

The *t*-marked stimulus is not an adjunct, but an essential component of the argument structure of such constructions; its ellipsis is allowed only if it is known and contextually retrievable. On the other hand, an experiential construction without *-en*, such as *\*\*alsuq k-u wawa t-u hakhak* with the intended meaning ‘the children find the glutinous rice tasty’, is ill-formed and ungrammatical.

Another requirement is that monovalent verbs occurring in experiential *-en* constructions have, or at least allow, an implicit or entailed experiencer in their semantic structure, which is encoded as the applied nominative argument. For instance, the standard construction of a stative verb like *alsuq* ‘tasty’ denotes a property related to food as in (3a), while in the experiential construction (3b), the derived verb *alsuq-en* licenses an extra-thematic nominative experiencer marked by *k*, reacting to a stimulus marked by *t*. Similarly, the standard construction of the stative verb *ma-ciki* in (4a) denotes a property, while in the experiential construction (4b), the verb derived by the applicative *-en* licenses an extra-thematic nominative experiencer reacting to a *t*-marked stimulus.

The experiencer is most generally adversely affected by the state or situation at hand, however, some benefactive reading is possible as in (3b), depending on the verb’s lexical semantics. The one common point between canonical UV *-en* and applicative experiential *-en* (glossed *-EN*) constructions is the requirement that their nominative argument be an Undergoer (subsuming experiencer), they otherwise have distinct verbal hosts and distinct case-marking.

These constructions raise questions as to how thematic roles are linked to argument structure and syntactic alignment. It is argued that in experiential constructions, the applicative *-en* suffix licenses an extra-thematic nominative experiencer that is not originally part of the argument structure of the verb.

Section 2 gives some background on the voice system of Amis and on the various functions of UV *-en* in that system. Section 3 focuses on experiential *-en* constructions and their semantics. Section 4 proposes that experiential *-en* constructions are high applicatives and takes a crosslinguistic perspective, pointing out similarities and differences. In Section 5, it is hypothesized that a subset of these constructions, the *ma-* ... *-en* constructions, originate from a reconstructed Proto-Austronesian *\*ka-* ... *-en/-an* form, which have cognate forms and constructions in many other Formosan and Philippine languages. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Some background on the voice system and on the functions of UV *-en* in N.Amis

In Amis, voice affixes are functional categories with derivational and inflectional features. Verbs are derived from roots by voice affixes which also carry aspectual features, expressing for instance (a)telic aspects and resulting states (Bril 2017; Chen 1987; Wu 2006). The voice affixes are different in indicative and non-indicative moods, showing that they are categorized for modal features, except for UV *-en* which occurs in both moods (Bril 2017, 2022).

### 2.1 An outlook of the voice system of Amis

In Amis, voice-affixed verbs select a nominative argument (i.e., the Preferred Syntactic Argument [PSA]) whose thematic macro-role is in accordance with the semantics of the voice affix,<sup>4</sup> e.g., the Actor Voice *mi-* construction has a nominative Actor engaged in some usually atelic activity; the Undergoer Voice *ma-* and the Undergoer Voice *-en* have a nominative patient; the Locative Voice *-an* construction has a nominative location noun or a nominative patient that is superficially affected, etc.

Voice alternations or diathetic constructions are conditioned by various factors: (i) the thematic role of the PSA, (ii) verb classes (such as stative vs. dynamic stems, and other lexical restrictions), (iii) syntactic-semantic features such as (a)telicity, patient affectedness and definiteness, agent intentionality, and mood. For instance, a verb expressing a completed action on a fully affected and definite Patient must be a UV *ma-* stem, while AV *mi-* verbs denote atelic activities with a  $\pm$  definite Theme.

---

<sup>4</sup> Semantic macro-roles or “generalized semantic roles” like Actor, Undergoer, encompass various thematic roles that are treated alike; Undergoer subsumes patient, theme, recipient, experiencer and other roles (Van Valin 2005: 53–67).

**Table 1:** Voices, case-marking and alignment systems.

Voice	Semantic role of nominative subject & verb valency	Argument structure
AV <i>mi-</i> < <i>um</i> > <sup>a</sup>	Actor subject <b>1 or 2 arguments</b> ±Actor subject, experiencer <b>mostly</b> intransitive verbs	NOM & OBLIQUE CASE FRAME
<i>mu-</i>	Non-actor subject, experiencer <b>intransitive</b> verbs	NOM; OBL theme
NAV <i>ma-</i>	Non-actor subject, experiencer, locus of properties <b>1 or 2 arguments</b>	<i>k-</i> , <i>t-</i>
UV <i>ma-</i>	Fully affected patient subject of <b>transitive</b> verbs	ERGATIVE CASE FRAME
UV <i>-en</i>	Patient subject, ± fully affected <b>ALL</b> verbs (including $\emptyset$ -state V)	NOM; GEN agent
LV <i>-an</i>	Superficially affected, patient or experiencer subject, or location subject; <b>1 or 2 arguments</b>	<i>k-</i> , <i>n-</i>
InstV <i>sa-</i>	Instrument subject, <b>transitive</b> verbs allowing instrument	
cv <i>si-</i>	Conveyed entity/beneficiary subject <b>transitive</b> verbs denoting transfer	

<sup>a</sup>The <*um*> and *mu-* affixes are lexically conditioned and occur with two residual verb classes.

Voice-affixed verb stems have a nominative argument and fall into one of two possible argument structures, (i) the low transitive construction with nominative *k-* and the *t-* marked patient/theme (thus *k-*, *t-*), (ii) the transitive, ergative construction with a nominative Undergoer (or argument treated as such) marked by *k-* and a genitive Agent marked by *n-* (thus *k-*, *n-*). The grammatical relations case-marked as *k-*, *t-* are found with (i) AV *mi-* stems denoting atelic activities carried out by an Actor, (ii) with stative NAV *ma-* stems denoting properties, states, cognition, feelings, perception, and whose nominative argument is an experiencer, cognizer, mover, or the locus of properties. The grammatical relations case-marked as *k-*, *n-* occur with the two Undergoer Voices, UV *ma-* and *-en*, with the LV *-an* and the applicative voices. Table 1 summarizes.

The case morpheme *t-* is syncretic (i.e., polyfunctional),<sup>5</sup> it marks (i) the core Theme of two argument AV *mi-* verbs as in (6a) and of stative NAV *ma-* verbs (5), (ii) it marks core arguments such as the dative recipient of three-place verbs like ‘give’, as well as cause, associative, instrument NPs, and (iii) time and place adjuncts. Their behavioral properties are distinct; time and place adjuncts marked by *t-* can be topicalized as in *t-u mihmihca-an, ira ku laqdis* ‘every year, there is the fishing festival’;<sup>6</sup> however, core theme and core arguments marked by *t-* cannot be topicalized with their case-marking, showing their distinct status (Bril 2022). In what follows, *t-* marked stimuli of experiential constructions are glossed STIM, theme

5 Chen (1987: 67) analyzes *t-* as marking accusative patients as well as locative locus. Wu (2006: 79) labels *t-* ‘dative’. Chen (2017: 7–8) labels *t-* with the symbol Y referring to “an internal argument [that] is non-Pivot-marked”, and labels it “oblique”.

6 *t-u mih~mihca-an, ira k-u laqdis.*  
ADJC-NM RDP~year-LOC EXS NOM-NM fishing.festival

arguments are glossed THM, while other core arguments such as recipient, associative or cause are glossed OBL (in the sense of Van Valin 2005); adjuncts are glossed ADJC.

If pronominal, patients/themes of stative NAV *ma-* verbs and AV *mi-* verbs are marked by a set of pronouns comprising locative *i*, the oblique case *t-* and an oblique suffix *-an* as in (5b).<sup>7</sup>

- (5) a. *Ma-ngudu k-uhni t-u ma-tu?as-ay.*  
 NAV-respect NOM-3PL THM-NM NAV-be.old-NMZ  
 ‘They respect the elders.’
- b. *Ma-cangal k-aku i-t-isu-an.*  
 NAV-hate NOM-1SG LOC-OBL-2SG-OBL  
 ‘I hate you.’

On the other hand, the grammatical relations case-marked as *k-*, *n-* are those of transitive verbs with a nominative Undergoer and a genitive agent as in (6b)–(6c). Examples (6a)–(6c) illustrate the distinct argument structure and case-marking of verbs with AV *mi-* on the one hand, and of UV *ma-* and UV *-en* voice alternations on the other.

- (6) a. *Mi-tenaq k-uhni a mi-li-tabad t-u tangal*  
 AV-wait.in.ambush NOM-3PL COMP AV-GET-head.hunt THM-NM head  
*n-u ada.*  
 GEN-NM enemy  
 ‘They are waiting (in ambush) to cut off their enemies’ heads.’
- b. *Ma-tenaq k-u Taloko n-u Pangcah i lalan.*  
 UV-ambush NOM-NM Taroko GEN-NM Amis LOC road  
 ‘The Amis ambushed the Taroko on the road.’
- c. *Tenaq-en n-u Taloko k-uhni a mi-li-tangal.*  
 ambush-UV GEN-NM Taroko NOM-3PL COMP AV-GET-head.hunt  
 ‘The Taloko blocked them as they were head-hunting.’  
 (Cikasuan.050)

While AV *mi-* in (6a) denotes an atelic activity, there are only aspectual differences between (6b) and (6c); UV *ma-* denotes an accomplishment with a resulting state; while UV *-en* denotes events irrespective of their accomplishment. The *t-* theme arguments are less affected than the nominative patients of UV constructions.

Amis has a symmetrical voice system,<sup>8</sup> which is defined following Foley (1998, 2008) and Himmelmann (2005) “by the presence of at least two voice alternations,

<sup>7</sup> For instance *i-t-aku-an* (1sg.obl.), *i-t-ami-an* (1pl.excl.obl.), *i-t-uhni-an* (3pl.obl.).

<sup>8</sup> Wu analyzes Central Amis as having an “ergative nature” (2006: 410) and as having two basic voices UV *ma-* and AV *mi-* (2006: 432). Chen T. analyzes Northern Amis as a split-ergative system with

neither of which is the basic form”.<sup>9</sup> The other requirement is that the core status of the other argument be preserved (Arka 2019: 272), which is the case in Amis (Bril 2022).

In Amis, all voices apart from the two applicative voices (instrumental and conveyance/beneficiary) are equally marked, not derived from each other. Actor Voice (AV) *mi-* and Undergoer Voice (UV) *ma-* constructions are basic voice alternations, whose non-nominative arguments retain some core argument status. UV constructions are not the passive derivations of AV constructions, nor are AV constructions derived antipassive constructions, as would be the case in a non-symmetrical voice system. The *k-*, *t-* and *k-*, *n-* case-frames belong to the type defined by Polinsky (2017: 20) as “a case frame of individual lexically specified verbs that alternate with regular transitives”. The AV *mi-* and the stative NAV *ma-* morphemes are also verb class indicators (Bril 2017).

In UV constructions with *k-*, *n-* case-marking, the genitive *n-* Agent retains some core argument properties, as shown by tests like clefted constructions or reflexives (Bril 2022). Thus in (7), the reflexive nominative Undergoer *k-u tireng* is bound by the genitive Agent *n-ira*, suggesting that it is a logical subject, though not the grammatical subject. Besides, reflexive binding is restricted to nominative (S or P) arguments and to genitive Agents in N.Amis, and excludes non-core arguments.

- (7) *Pa-keda han=tu<sup>10</sup> n-ira<sup>11</sup> k-u tireng.*  
 CAUS-allow do.SO=PFV GEN-3SG NOM-NM body.REFL  
 ‘He let himself go.’  
 (Maciwciw.010)

In the case of AV *mi-* and stative NAV *ma-* voice constructions with *k-*, *t-* case-marking, the *t-* core theme is subcategorized by the verb. Evidence comes from the fact that, when clefted, the *t-* marked theme/patient, or the *t-* marked recipient or associative arguments of verbs with such semantic frames, are indexed by UV *-en* or LV *-an*

---

ergative verbs and non-ergative or accusative verbs, and labels *t-* as marking accusative and locative cases (1987: 174). Chen (2017) takes an accusative approach of Central Amis, under a Minimalist Program framework, and analyzes voice alternations as reflecting changes in the information structure of a clause, with obligatory topic-agreement morphology. The present approach is explained in more detail in Bril (2022).

<sup>9</sup> It is also defined as a system that “exhibits at least two formally and semantically distinct UNDERGOER voices, at least one (nonlocal) phrase-marking clitic for nominal expressions, and which allows for pronominal clitics to be positioned in second position” (Himmelman 2005: 113). Amis has all such properties.

<sup>10</sup> *Han=tu* is a UV form (see Bril 2016), *pa-keda han=tu* patterns after a UV construction.

<sup>11</sup> In this position, *n-ira* is the Agent; if it were the possessive determiner of *tireng*, it would occur after it as *k-u tireng n-ira*.



voices, like Undergoer core arguments. On the other hand, clefted *t*-non-core oblique arguments which are not subcategorized for, as well as adjuncts, trigger a complement clause with the linker *a* ([*a* COMP] clause) without voice indexation (Bril 2016).

UV *ma*- constructions with *k*-, *n*- case-marking are transitive, with a definite, fully affected nominative Undergoer and a genitive agent. On the other hand, AV *mi*- and stative NAV *ma*- voice constructions with *k*-, *t*- case-marking are lower on the transitivity scale, yet are not intransitive, the *t*- case encodes the non-fully affected themes of atelic actions or events; the theme may be (but is not necessarily) indefinite. The *t*-marked themes are semi-core arguments (as defined by Arka 2017: 101) of lower transitive constructions that correlate with semantic features such as the theme's lower degree of affectedness and sometimes lower definiteness (see Hemmings 2021 for a similar analysis of Kelabit).

Although the *k*-, *n*- case-marking is reminiscent of an ergative case-marking, it does not entail that Amis is an ergative language; Dryer writes (1986: 828) “ergativity is not really a property of languages, but rather a property of rules”, or following Croft (2001: 170–171), it is a property of constructions (see Bickel 2011; Comrie 1978; Van Valin 2005; Witzlack-Makarevich and Bickel 2019, for a similar approach). To sum up, the semantic roles of the arguments are encoded by grammatical relations within a bipartite case-marking system, (i) the *k*-, *n*-, and (ii) the *k*-, *t*- case-frames.

In this system, the applicative instrumental voice *sa*- and the conveyance/beneficiary voice (CV) *si*- indicating some transfer are secondary derivations which are affixed to non-finite *pi*- and *ka*- stems, respectively the non-finite forms of AV *mi*-activity verbs and of NAV *ma*-stative or intradirective, experiencer verbs (Bril 2022; Chen 1987). Instrumental voice is thus derived as *sa-pi*-, *sa-ka*- stems with a nominative instrument argument. Conveyance voice *si*- is derived for instance as *si-pi*-stems with a nominative conveyed/beneficiary argument. These applicative voices have the *k*-, *n*- case frame, as shown in Table 1.

The discussion now focuses on the various functions of UV *-en*, starting with its standard UV functions in Section 2.2, followed by the applicative function of *-en* in experiential constructions in Section 3. It is argued that the applicative function of *-en* is licensed by (i) the general derivational properties of voice affixes in Amis, (ii) the specific properties and distribution of UV *-en*, and (iii) by diachronic facts. In a system with three other applicative voices with the *k*-, *n*- case-frame, the applicative experiential *-en* constructions have distinctive properties since they license an extra-thematic nominative experiencer with the *k*-, *t*- case-frame.

## 2.2 The functions of UV *-en*

The morpheme *-en* is reconstructed as an Undergoer Voice in Proto-Austronesian (Wolff 1973). In N.Amis, UV *-en* is affixed to all verb types (mono-, bi- or trivalent) with an Undergoer or experiencer subject; it remains unchanged in all tenses and moods, while all other voice affixes have distinct forms in indicative and non-indicative moods.

However, in negative indicative and in prohibitive speech acts, two-argument UV *-en*, UV *ma-* and Locative Voice (LV) *-an* verbs are neutralized as the UV *-i* morpheme (Bril 2022). This property gives evidence for the distinct status of the experiential *-en* which is not neutralized as *-i* under negative scope (see Section 3.4). Experiential *-en* constructions are thus distinct from standard UV *-en* constructions in terms of argument structure, alignment and morphological properties.

### 2.2.1 The standard UV *-en* constructions

Standard two-argument UV *-en* constructions have ergative *k-*, *n-* case-marking pattern, with an animate, intentional genitive agent (Bril 2022; Chen 1987). UV *-en* occurs in present and past contexts as in (8) where the agent is marked by the clitic genitive pronoun *=ita*; UV *-en* also occurs in prospective and future contexts (9), in imperatives and commands (10), and in hortative mood (11).

- (8) *Likat-en=tu=ita*            *k-u*    *lamal*.  
 light-UV=PFV=GEN.1PL.INCL    NOM-NM    fire  
 ‘We lit the fire.’  
 (Turun.033)

- (9) *Tala-en=aku*    (*k-isu*).  
 wait-UV=GEN.1SG    NOM-2SG  
 ‘I’ll be waiting (for you).’

- (10) *Iluh-en*    *k-u*    *lumaq!*  
 burn-UV    NOM-NM    house  
 ‘Burn down the house!’

- (11) *Tangic-en=ita!*  
 cry-UV=GEN.1PL.INCL  
 ‘Let’s implore (him)!’

Amis being a pro-drop language, already referential and easily retrievable arguments are often left unexpressed, for instance, the undergoer in (9, 11), or the agent in (10). This is also true for experiential constructions, a referential stimulus may be ellipted but remains a syntactic constituent of the construction.

UV *-en* is also affixed to stative or property-denoting roots, deriving stems that denote a change of state undergone by its nominative patient, like *get* passives in English. Compare stative (12a) with the change of state *adada-en* in (12b), which is not an experiential construction, since the subject is part of the verb’s argument structure, while experiential constructions license an extra-thematic nominative experiencer that is not part of the verb’s argument structure, as in the case of ‘be tasty’ in (3).

- (12) a. *Adada k-ina wawa.*  
 sick NOM-DEIC child  
 ‘This child is sick/is in pain.’
- b. *Adada-en k-ina wawa.*  
 sick-UV NOM-DEIC child  
 ‘The child has been taken ill/got hurt.’

### 2.2.2 UV *-en* constructions expressing manner of action

UV *-en* occurs in complex verb constructions expressing manner of action or simultaneous actions like (13) where the UV verb *turuq-en* has a clitic third person genitive agent *nira*, coreferent with the unexpressed nominative Actor of the Actor Voice verb *s<em>uwal*.

- (13) *Turuq-en=n-ira k-iya lalangaw a s<em>uwal.*  
 point-UV=GEN-3SG NOM-DEIC fly COMP <UM>speak<sup>12</sup>  
 ‘Pointing at the fly, he said.’  
 (lalangaw.019-20)

Stative stems, like *kalamkan* ‘hurry, be fast’ in (14) or *salucsuc* ‘fluent’ in (15), are also derived by *-en* and express the manner of the action denoted in the *a* COMP clause, be it in imperative (14) or declarative (15b) mood. The stative verb *kalamkan* can be causativized by *pa-* and marked by UV *-en* as a two-argument verb (14b).

- (14) a. *Kalamkam-en=tu a ta-hekal !*  
 fast-UV=PFV COMP go-out  
 ‘Come/go out quickly !’ (u patay ni Calaw Ilikic.043)
- b. *Pa-kalamkam-en Ø k-u rakat n-uhni.*  
 CAUS-fast-UV Ø NOM-NM walk GEN-3SG  
 ‘(It, (s)he) made them hurry/walk fast !’ (lit. (it, (s)he) made their walk be fast)
- (15) a. *Ø-salucsuc k-u suwal=isu.*  
 fluent NOM-NM speech=GEN.2SG  
 ‘Your (Amis) speech is fluent.’
- b. *Salucsuc-en a s<em>uwal cira.*  
 fluent-UV COMP <UM><sup>13</sup>speak NOM.3SG  
 ‘He speaks fluently.’ (it’s fluently done that he speaks)

<sup>12</sup> The voice infix <um> is generally realized as <em> /əm/ in N.Amis.

<sup>13</sup> The <um ~ em> voice infix has the same argument structure as AV *mi-*.

In complex verb constructions denoting the manner of action, the *V1-en* can be derived from entity-denoting roots (such as artefacts, instruments, implements, body-parts) as in (16–17). The entity-denoting root *cingkur* ‘a stick’ is derived into a verb *-en* heading the verb complex in (16), the subject *k-aku* of the verb ‘walk’ is raised from the COMP clause as the subject of the whole verb complex.

- (16) *Cingkur-en k-aku a r<em>akat.*  
 stick-UV NOM-1SG COMP <UM>walk  
 ‘I walk with a stick.’ (lit. it’s done with a stick that I walk)

In (17) with a two-argument verb *mi-bacaq* ‘wash’, the verb complex headed by *kamay-en* ‘hand-done’ has a shared set of arguments, i.e., a nominative patient *buduy* and a genitive agent *niyam*; in such verb complexes, the dependent verb inside the COMP clause is in default AV.

- (17) *Kamay-en n-iyam [a mi-bacaq] k-u buduy.*  
 hand-UV GEN-1PL.EXCL COMP AV-Wash NOM-NM clothes  
 ‘We wash the clothes by hand.’

Crucially, manner of action is expressed by complex verbs, not by applicative voices; only instruments or tools that are actually used to carry out an action trigger the Instrumental voice as in (18), with a clefted instrument (*kamay*) and a genitive agent.<sup>14</sup>

- (18) *U kamay k-u sa-pi-bacaq n-uniam.*  
 NM hand NOM-NM INST.V-NFIN-Wash GEN-1PL.EXCL  
 ‘We launder by hand.’ (lit. it’s hands that we use to wash)  
 (Chen 1987: 91)

These few cases illustrate the derivational functions of UV *-en*, hosted by all types of roots, including entity-denoting roots as well as stative and intransitive (unaccusative and unergative) verbs.

### 3 The experiential *-en* constructions: syntax and semantics

While UV *-en* constructions have *k-*, *n-* case-marking, applicative experiential *-en* constructions have *k-*, *t-* case-marking and encode different grammatical relations; their one common point is that their nominative argument must be an Undergoer,

<sup>14</sup> Chen (1987: 91) analyses this sentence as equative, but it is actually a clefted construction (see Brill 2016; Brill and Skopeteas 2021).

subsuming an experiencer, but the non-nominative argument is a *t*-marked stimulus in experiential constructions, while it is an *n*-marked genitive agent in UV constructions. Experiential *-en* constructions occur with (i) stative, property-denoting stems, occurring in their base form (noted  $\emptyset$ -) (see Section 3.1), and (ii) with stative or intransitive stems belonging to the *ma-/ka*-class often denoting properties or feelings (Section 3.2). The derived *-en* verbs denote a change of state affecting the nominative experiencer.

### 3.1 Experiential constructions with stative *-en* verbs with an extra-thematic argument

Applicative experiential *-en* constructions derived from stative  $\emptyset$ -stems have one distinct property: they add an extra-thematic argument, a nominative SENTIENT experiencer who is affected by, or reacts to, a *t*-marked stimulus under no animacy restriction. Compare the base form  $\emptyset$ -*suqmet* in (19a) which denotes a property of its inanimate subject *k-ina remi?ad* and the experiential *-en* construction in (19b) with the applied nominative sentient experiencer *k-aku*.

- (19) a.  $\emptyset$ -*suqmet* *k-ina* *remi?ad*.  
 damp NOM-DEIC day  
 'It's a wet day.'
- b.  $\emptyset$ -*suqmet-en* *k-aku* *t-ina* *remi?ad*.  
 damp-EN NOM-1SG STIM-DEIC day  
 'I feel damp on account of the day's (weather).'

In (19b), the *t*-marked cause or stimulus *t-ina remi?ad* retains argument properties, it is not a time adjunct and does not mean \*\*'I felt damp on that day'; nor does it express a cause in a passive construction meaning \*\*'I am made wet by the day'. The experiential *-en* construction licenses an applied extra-thematic nominative experiencer (without *-en*, the sentence \*\* $\emptyset$ -*suqmet k-aku* is ungrammatical, since the subject of *suqmet* must be inanimate).

In (20a)–(20b),  $\emptyset$ -*adidiq* is a stative, size-denoting property verb, while (20c) is an experiential *-en* construction with a nominative experiencer emotionally reacting to a stimulus that is left unexpressed, yet is an underlying argument of this construction; finally (20d) is an Actor Voice construction with a light bound verb *sa* 'do' and a distinct meaning. This also illustrates the derivational properties of voice affixes in Amis, which create distinct stems with distinct properties, different argument structure and meaning.

- (20) a. *Tada Ø-adidiq=tu k-ina buduy.*  
 too small=PFV NOM-DEIC clothes  
 ‘These clothes are too small.’
- b. *Ø-adidiq k-aku.*  
 small NOM-1SG  
 ‘I am small.’ (in size)
- c. *Ø-adidiq-en k-aku.*  
 small-EN NOM-1SG  
 ‘I feel humbled.’
- d. *Mi-sa-adidiq k-uhni.*  
 AV-do-small NOM-3PL  
 ‘They behave modestly.’

In (20c), the stimulus is known and left unmentioned, but would otherwise be marked by *t-*, as in (21b); both arguments, experiencer and stimulus, are licensed by *-en* with the meaning ‘feel humbled’; without *-en*, the stative verb would be monovalent and would have a different meaning as in (20b). Similar non-expression of referential applied arguments are described in Javanese applicative constructions (Vander Klof forthcoming: 11).

The following examples contrast a stative verb construction in (21a) with an applicative experiential *-en* construction in (21b) whose extra-thematic nominative experiencer is adversely affected by the *t-* marked stimulus (i.e., he cannot drink nor use the water). Yet, he is not scalded, that would be expressed by a different verb in a standard UV *ma-* construction given in (22), with a fully affected nominative Patient and a genitive cause/agent. Nor can Example (21b) mean ‘I heated up the water’, which requires a valence increasing, causative derivation given in (21c), deriving a stative verb into a processual verb and allowing the two-argument UV *-en* construction with the *k-*, *n-* case frame.

- (21) a. *Ø-baqdet k-ina nanum.*  
 hot NOM-DEIC water  
 ‘The water is hot.’
- b. *Ø-baqdet-en k-aku t-ina nanum, caay nanum-i=aku.*  
 hot-EN NOM-1SG STIM-DEIC water NEG drink-UV=GEN.1SG  
 ‘I feel the water is too hot, I can’t drink it.’ (not \*\*I’ve heated up the water)
- c. *Pa-baqdet-en=tu=aku k-iya dateng.*  
 CAUS-hot-UV=PFV=GEN.1SG NOM-DEIC vegetables  
 ‘I’ve heated up the vegetables.’
- (22) *Ma-beruh k-aku n-u Ø-baqdet-ay a nanum.*  
 UV-scald NOM-1SG GEN-NM hot-MODF LK water  
 ‘I was scalded by hot water.’

Similarly, the stative verb  $\emptyset$ -*suqsur* ‘adequate, healed’ which denotes a property of an inanimate subject, as in (23a) is derived as an applicative experiential *-en* verb in (23b) licensing an experiencer undergoing a change of state, with an unexpressed stimulus.

- (23) a.  $\emptyset$ -*suqsur*=*tu* *k-iyá* *duka*.  
 heal=PFV NOM-DEIC wound  
 ‘The wound is healed.’  
 (Taruduq.012)
- b.  $\emptyset$ -*suqsur-en*=*tu* *k-aku*.  
 heal-EN=PFV NOM-1sg  
 ‘I have recovered a little/I feel better.’

To summarize, the  $\emptyset$ -stative, intransitive stems that are derived as applicative experiential *-en* constructions must have an implicit sentient experiencer in their semantic structure, which is then licensed as an extra-thematic nominative experiencer or affectee, with the *k*-, *t*-case-frame which is their hallmark, the *t*-marked stimulus is a “semi-core” argument (as defined by Arka 2017).

### 3.2 Distinguishing stative NAV *ma*- verbs from UV *ma*- constructions

Just as the bipartite case-frame distinguishes UV *-en* from experiential *-en* constructions, it also tells apart stative NAV *ma*- verbs with *k*-, *t*-case-marking from UV *ma*- two-argument constructions occurring with dynamic verbs and with *k*-, *n*-case-marking as in (24a). On the other hand, two argument UV *ma*- and UV *-en* constructions (24a)–(24b) share the same argument structure with a nominative patient and a genitive agent. The differences between them are in terms of aspecto-temporal features and agent animacy; UV *-en* profiles the event affecting the Undergoer from a more dynamic angle with some implied change of state, in contrast with UV *ma*-stems which profile accomplishments and resulting states. UV *-en* stems have an animate agent, while UV *ma*-stems have no animacy constraint.

- (24) a. *Wadwad-en*=*tu* *n-uhni* *k-uinian* *u* *budu~buduy-an*.  
 take.apart-UV=PFV GEN-3PL NOM-DEIC NM RDP~clothes-LOC  
 ‘They turned the closet upside down.’ (Frog story.033)
- b. *Ma-wadwad*=*tu* *n-uhni* *k-uinian* *u* *budu~buduy-an*.  
 UV-take.apart=PFV GEN-3PL NOM-DEIC NM RDP~clothes-LOC  
 ‘The closet was (fully) turned upside down.’

UV *ma*- and the experiential *-en* cannot co-occur, while the stative *ma*-verb class can be derived by *-en* in applicative experiential constructions, as shown in Section 3.3.

### 3.3 Applicative experiential constructions with *ma-* ... *-en* verbs

Stative *ma-/ka-* verb stems denoting emotions, perceptions, bodily functions, ailments, natural states, are derived as applicative experiential *-en* constructions with the *k-*, (*t-*) case frame. Monovalent and bivalent verbs are considered in turn.

#### 3.3.1 Adding an extra-thematic nominative experiencer

With monovalent verbs like *ma-ciki* ‘be dirty’ (25a)–(25b), which denotes the property of an (in)animate entity, the experiential *-en* construction adds the extra-thematic nominative experiencer *kawas* (25c) that is adversely affected by the state of dirt described by *ma-ciki*, with a *t-* marked stimulus, the only other case allowed in experiential constructions.

- (25) a. *Ma-ciki k-ina buduy.*  
 STAT-dirty NOM-DEIC clothes  
 ‘The clothes are dirty.’
- b. *Ma-ciki k-ina babahi.*  
 STAT-dirty NOM-DEIC woman  
 ‘The women are dirty.’ (repeated from (4a))
- c. *Ma-ciki-en=tu k-u kawas t-ina babahi.*  
 STAT-dirty-EN=PFV NOM-NM god STIM-DEIC woman  
 ‘The gods felt that the women were dirty.’ (i.e., were repulsed)  
 (Mi-laqdis.056) (repeated from (4b))

Similarly, *ma-canar* ‘be noisy’ in (26a) characterizes the source of the noise; while the experiential *-en* construction in (26b) licenses the extra-thematic and adversely affected nominative experiencer *deku*. Note again that without *-en*, (26b) is ungrammatical.

- (26) a. *Ma-canar k-isu !*  
 STAT-noisy NOM-2SG  
 ‘You’re too noisy !’ (stop it)
- b. *Ma-canar-\*(en) k-iya deku t-u ni-ka-cinglaw.*  
 STAT-disturb.by.noise-EN NOM-DEIC owl STIM-NM PFV.NMZ-STAT-uproar  
 ‘The owl felt/got annoyed by the uproar.’ (Frog story.082)
- b’. *\*\*Ma-canar k-iya deku t-u ni-ka-cinglaw.*  
 [intended meaning] ‘The owl felt/got annoyed by the uproar.’

The experiential construction has different semantic entailments, from ‘be noisy’ in (26a) to ‘be affected by the noise’ in (26b). As pointed out in Section 3.1, referential and contextually retrievable stimuli or experiencers may be left unexpressed, but their existence is presupposed by the *-en* construction.



### 3.3.2 Adding semantic implicatures

- With stative *ma-* verbs of feeling allowing two arguments with the *k-*, *t-* case pattern, and whose lexical structure already contains a sentient experiencer and a semi-core *t-* stimulus, like *ma-libut* ‘worry’ in (27a), the experiential *-en* construction does not modify the argument structure and only carries semantic implicatures, contrasting a state of facts in (27a), with an adverse change of state affecting the experiencer in (27b).

- (27) a. *Ma-libut k-aku t-ina demak-an.*  
 STAT-WORRY NOM-1SG STIM-DEIC action-OBL  
 ‘I am annoyed by (on account of) these things.’
- b. *Ma-libut-en k-uhni t-ina demak-an.*  
 STAT-WORRY-EN NOM-3PL STIM-DEIC action-OBL  
 ‘They got annoyed on account of these things.’

The lack of valence-increasing function in cases like (27b) is restricted to *ma-* verbs of feeling<sup>15</sup> and does not invalidate the applicative analysis of *-en*; applicative constructions that do not increase valence are also described in Bantu languages (Jerro 2023: 24; Pacchiarotti 2017). This is discussed in Section 4.

- With stative *ma-* verbs like *ma-ngeruq* ‘be tired’, *ma-sulep* ‘be hungry’, *ma-becul* ‘be satiated’, a sentient experiencer is already part of the verb’s argument structure; again the main contribution of the experiential *-en* construction is semantic, expressing intensity and an adversative change of state. In (28a), the adverse state has reached such a degree that the participant will inevitably fall, the *t-* stimulus is unmentioned because it is known contextually, the character is hanging by one hand from a tree to be out of reach of an animal. In (28b), the implicature is that the baby’s state of hunger has reached a point that calls for some course of action, namely bring the child to be fed.

- (28) a. *Ma-ngeruq-en=tu, kiyai ma-cait=tu k-u kamay n-ira.*  
 STAT-tired-EN=PFV perhaps NAV-hang=PFV NOM-NM arm GEN-3SG  
 ‘He was feeling tired (from) hanging from his arm.’ (lit. his hand/arm was hanging from a branch)  
 (Kulas.023)

<sup>15</sup> Wu (2006: 178) mentions similar *ma-* ... *-en* constructions occurring with state-denoting stems in Central Amis, with similar semantics called “feel” constructions; the suffix is labelled *-en<sub>2</sub>* to distinguish it from UV *-en<sub>1</sub>* with no further analysis; they are described as “intensifying the emotions denoted by the verbs”.

- b. *Anu t<em>angic k-u luntungay a saba, ma-sulep-en.*  
 if <UM>cry NOM-NM baby LK younger.brother STAT-hungry-EN  
 ‘If (your) baby brother cries, then he must be hungry.’ (so bring him to be fed) (Arikakay\_Dawa.006)

While (29a) is a factual statement, the experiential *-en* construction in (29b) is adversative, the dog’s state of satiety has a ‘contrary to expectation’ implicature, as it was expected to eat more.

- (29) a. *Ma-becul=tu k-ira wacu.*  
 STAT-satiate=PFV NOM-DEIC dog  
 ‘The dog was satiated.’  
 (Pacemut.025)
- b. *Ma-becul-en=tu k-ira wacu.*  
 STAT-satiate-EN=PFV NOM-DEIC dog  
 ‘The dog felt satiated.’ (so it did not want to eat more)

A similar construction with a third-person experiencer was found in the two texts collected by Ogawa and Asai (1935), showing that they are not recent innovations.

- (30) *Ma-patay=tu n-u kemet k-ina wawa, ma-bucul-en.*  
 STAT-die=PFV GEN-NM sleep NOM-DEIC child STAT-satiate-EN  
 ‘The baby felt very sleepy (lit. dying from sleep), it was satiated.’  
 (Arakakai.025)  
 (Ogawa and Asai 1935)

In (31), the father has adversely dozed off (from *ma-tukatuk* ‘be sleepy’) while some other course of action was expected.

- (31) *Ma-tukatuk-en=tu ci ama, isir sa=tu a m-aruq.*  
 STAT-be.sleepy-EN=PFV NOM.PM father sideways do=PFV COMP NAV-sit  
 ‘Father has dozed off, he’s slouching sideways.’

Thus, applicative experiential *-en* constructions may (i) either add an extra-thematic nominative sentient experiencer to an originally stative, property-denoting, one-argument verb, or (ii) may denote a change of state adversely affecting the experiencer of stative *ma-* verbs, or express some counter-expectation.

### 3.4 Restrictions applying to applicative experiential constructions of stative verbs

Applicative experiential constructions in N.Amis are restricted to stative, property-denoting verbs and to verbs implying a nominative sentient experience reacting to some sensorial or affective stimuli. The other restrictions concern mood and types of persons.

### 3.4.1 Indicative mood restriction

Experiential constructions are only used in indicative mood in affirmative, negative or interrogative illocutionary acts. The stative verb *Ø-alsuq* ‘tasty’ in (32a) and the experiential construction in (32b) are respectively negated as (33a)–(33b).

- (32) a. *Ø-alsuq k-ina buting.*  
 tasty NOM-DEIC fish  
 ‘This fish is tasty.’
- b. *Ø-alsuq-en k-aku t-ina buting-an.*  
 tasty-EN NOM-1SG STIM-DEIC fish-OBL  
 ‘I find this fish tasty (to eat).’
- (33) a. *Caay<sup>16</sup> ka-alsuq k-ina buting.*  
 NEG NFIN-tasty NOM-DEIC fish  
 ‘This fish does not taste good/is not tasty.’
- b. *Caay ka-alsuq-en k-aku t-ina buting-an.*  
 NEG NFIN-tasty-EN NOM-1SG STIM-DEIC fish-OBL  
 ‘I find this fish not tasty to eat.’

The fact that the *-en* of experiential constructions is not neutralized as *-i* under negative scope, in contrast with standard UV *-en* forms and constructions, is an additional indication of their distinct status; see another case in Example (37b) below and compare with the *-i* form of a negative UV in (35b).

### 3.4.2 Restriction on pronouns

First and third-person subject pronouns are under no illocutionary restriction, while experiential constructions with second-person nominative pronouns only occur in closed interrogative sentences, inquire about the experiencer’s affectedness, and carry some “contrary to expectation” reading on the speaker’s part. In (34a), the question is addressed to a child, with an implicature that he is eating less than expected, is wasting food, and is thus encouraged to finish his plate. The answer in (34b) is the factual assertion of an undebatable state of affairs; the experiential construction *ma-becul-en* would be pragmatically infelicitous, as it would leave room for personal appreciation of the situation and discussion.

---

16 The negative auxiliary *caay* requires a non-finite verb stem, marked by *ka-* for stative *Ø*-verbs and for stative or assimilated NAV *ma-* verbs.

- (34) a. *Ma-becul-en=tu haw k-isu ?*  
 STAT-satiate-EN=PFV Q NOM-2SG  
 ‘Do you already feel satiated?’
- b. *Hantu ! ma-becul=tu k-aku.*  
 do.SO.PFV STAT-satiate=PFV NOM-1SG  
 ‘Right! I’m satiated/full.’

In (35a), the question expresses the speaker’s counter-expectation to the addressee’s experience. The answer in (35b) was commented on as confirming the experiencer’s adversative reaction to the situation, i.e., his inability to drink it.

- (35) a. *Ø-baqdet-en haw k-isu t-ina nanum ?*  
 hot-EN Q NOM-2SG STIM-DEIC water  
 ‘Do you feel the water is hot?’
- b. *Ø-baqdet-en k-aku t-ina nanum, caay nanum-i=aku.<sup>17</sup>*  
 hot-EN NOM-1SG STIM-DEIC water NEG drink-UV=GEN.1SG  
 ‘I feel the water is (too) hot, I can’t drink it.’

Similarly, in (36b) the question bears on the experiencer’s adverse affectedness and on his potential inability to carry the load *urung*, marked as the stimulus by *t-*.

- (36) a. *Ø-baqket k-ina urung.*  
 heavy NOM-DEIC load  
 ‘The load is heavy.’
- b. *Ø-baqket-en k-isu t-ina (ni-)urung ?*  
 heavy-EN NOM-2SG STIM-DEIC (PFV.NMZ-)load  
 ‘Do you feel that this load is heavy ?/ Is that load (too) heavy for you?’  
 (implied: this is surprising or unexpected)

Questions addressed to the experiencer with an experiential *-en* construction like (35b) and (36b), generally express the speaker’s surprise, concern or counter-expectation to the experiencer’s state.

### 3.5 Some semantic constraints on applicative experiential constructions

The adversative or counter-expectation implicature depends on lexical semantics and context. Compare the neutral statement in (37a) with the experiential construction in (37b).

17 In negative constructions headed by the auxiliary *caay*, two-argument UV *ma-* or standard two-argument UV *-en* verbs have the form *caay* stem-*i*, (*caay nanum-i*) with the same ergative argument structure.

- (37) a. *Caay ka-kapah k-ina demak.*  
 NEG NFIN-good NOM-DEIC work  
 ‘That work is difficult/not good.’
- b. *Caay ka-kapah-en k-aku t-ina demak.*  
 NEG NFIN-good-EN NOM-1SG STIM-DEIC work  
 ‘I feel I’m not suited for that work.’ (in relation to that work)

An experiential *-en* construction is not felicitous if the experiencer is not affected by the situation at hand, or if it has little relevance to him. Thus, it cannot be used to denote an outsider’s perception of a state, as in (38b); a mere assessment of the rice’s state is standardly expressed by a similitive construction like (38c).

- (38) a. *Ma-licang=tu k-u tipus.*  
 STAT-dry=PFV NOM-NM rice  
 ‘The rice is dry now.’
- b. *\*\*Ma-licang-en k-aku t-u tipus.*<sup>18</sup>  
 STAT-dry-EN NOM-1SG OBL-NM rice  
 ‘I think that the rice is dry.’
- c. *Matiya u ma-licang-ay=tu k-iya tipus.*  
 SIMIL NM STAT-dry-NMZ=PFV NOM-DEIC rice  
 ‘It seems that the rice is dry.’

To sum up, the syncretic UV *-en* and applicative experiential *-en* in N.Amis are distinguished by their valency (respectively transitive and low transitive), by their argument structure and case-marking. Experiential *-en* constructions often contain some change of state adversely affecting the experiencer, or denoting some counter-expectation.

## 4 Amis experiential *-en* constructions in typological perspective

Experiential constructions are found in Asian languages, in Bantu and in Amerindian languages under the names of “syncretic passives” (Creissels 2016: 52–53) or syncretic

---

<sup>18</sup> Wu mentions the construction in Central Amis below as having an adversative implicature; however this sentence was rejected by speakers of Northern Amis.

- (i) *Ma-icang-en kaku t-ura kudasing.* (Central Amis)  
 NEUT-dry-EN<sub>2</sub> 1s.NOM DAT-that peanut  
 ‘I feel that those peanuts are over sun-dried’ (and become not tasty)  
 (Wu 2006: 180)

applicatives (Zúñiga and Kittilä 2019: 79–80). N.Amis experiential constructions are now discussed in the light of typologically diverse languages with similar constructions and argued to be high applicatives (Sections 4.2 and 4.3).

#### 4.1 Experiential *-en* constructions crosslinguistically

Experiential constructions in Japanese or Korean (Ono 2003; Oshima 2003; Shibatani 1994) are analyzed under the label passives of experience, indirect passives or adversity passives. Ishizuka (2012) labels them “extra-thematic passive”. These constructions occur with transitive or intransitive verbs.

In Japanese, Example (39a) is a standard passive, while (39b) is an adversative, extra-thematic passive. Both are marked by *-(r)are*, but the adversative passive construction in (39b) has an extra-thematic argument, defined by Shibatani (1994: 465) as “an argument that is not part of the case frame of the verb, or that does not bear a theta role specified by the verbal head”. This extra-thematic argument is the affected experiencer promoted to subject function, while the nominative patient (the child) of the standard passive is marked as the accusative object of the verb (39b); affectees must be animate.

- (39) a. *Kodomo-ga sensei-ni sikar-are-ta.*  
 child-NOM teacher-DAT scold-PASS-PAST  
 ‘The child was scolded by the teacher.’  
 (Kroeger 2004: 57)
- b. *Ziroo-ga sensei-ni kodomo-o sikar-are-ta.*  
 Ziroo-NOM teacher-DAT child-ACC scold-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Ziroo was affected by the teacher’s scolding his child.’  
 (Kroeger 2004: 57)

Passives of experience also occur with intransitive unergative verbs as in (40b) ‘cry’, or with unaccusative verbs such as ‘rain’ (40c) or ‘die’ (42a) and an extra-thematic argument (40b), (40c).

- (40) a. *Kodomo-ga nai-ta.*  
 child-NOM cry-PAST  
 ‘The child cried.’  
 (Ono 2003: 28)
- b. *Taroo-ga kodomo-ni nak-are-ta.*  
 Taro-NOM child-by cry-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Taroo was affected by the child’s crying.’  
 (Ono 2003: 28)

- c. *Taroo-ga ame-ni hur-are-ta.*  
 Taroo-NOM rain-by fall-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Taroo was rained on.’  
 (Ono 2003: 34)

Among the necessary features allowing an adversative passive is the presence of some “intimate connection between the referent of the subject/topic and that of the person responsible for bringing about the adverse effect” (Shibatani 1994: 467), as in (41).

- (41) *Taroo-wa Hanako-ni piano-o hik-are-ta.*  
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-DAT piano-ACC play-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Taro was adversely affected by Hanako’s playing the piano.’  
 (Shibatani 1994: 464)

Similarly, the adversative passive in (42a) with an extra-thematic subject is only felicitous if the protagonists are closely related, while no such semantic implication is implied or required with a standard passive like (42b) in which both NPs are part of the verb’s argument structure.

- (42) a. *Taroo-wa Hanako-ni sin-are-ta.*  
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-DAT die-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Taro had Hanako die on him.’  
 (Shibatani 1994: 467)
- b. *Taroo-wa Hanako-ni nagur-are-ta.*  
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-DAT hit-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Taro was hit by Hanako.’  
 (Shibatani 1994: 467)

Similarly for (43) to be felicitous, the implicature is that Taro was expecting some part of that meal and is adversely affected by the situation.

- (43) *Taroo-wa Hanako-ni gohan-o zenbu tabe-rare-ta.*  
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-DAT meal-ACC meal eat-PASS-PAST  
 ‘Taro was adversely affected by Hanako’s eating all the meal.’  
 (Shibatani 1994: 469)

On the other hand, verbs of feelings with an experiencer subject like (44) do not have indirect passives.

- (44) *Taroo-wa Hanako-ga suki-da.*  
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM like-COP  
 ‘Taro likes Hanako.’  
 (Shibatani 1994: 467)

Shibatani (1985: 839–842) thus argues that the extra-thematic experiencer subject of adversative passives is indirectly affected by the event and that the adversative reading is a semantic extension of such constructions. According to Shibatani, *-(r)are* originally occurred in spontaneous expressions and its use as a passive marker “developed later, taking advantage of the agent-defocusing effect of the suffix” (1985: 846).

In N.Amis, the agent-defocusing effect is expressed via case-marking, i.e., by the *t*-marked stimulus of applicative *-en* constructions, in contrast with the standard genitive agent/cause of UV *-en* constructions.

In Even (Tungusic), Malchukov discusses a special verbal category, “the adversative, which combines semantic features of the prototypical passive, on the one hand, and the non-volitional permissive-causative, on the other hand” (1993: 369, 382).

- (45) a. (*imanra-Ø*) *iman-ra-n*.  
 SNOW-NOM SNOW-NFUT-3SG  
 ‘It is snowing.’
- b. *Etiken-Ø* (*imanra-du*) *imana-v-ra-n*.  
 old.man-NOM SNOW-DAT SNOW-ADVS-NFUT-3SG  
 ‘The old man is caught by the snowfall.’  
 (Malchukov 1993: 369)

In Japanese and in Even, the same morphemes are used for standard passives and “in constructions expressing other kinds of valency operations or involving no valency change”, they are called “syncretic passives” by Creissels (2016: 52–53). Zúñiga and Kittilä (2019: 79–80) also discuss syncretic applicative morphemes promoting an extra-thematic participant as subject of the verb form in Mapudungunor in Yupik.<sup>19</sup>

Taking a different perspective, Aoyagi (2010) analyzes Japanese *-(r)are-* as the exponent of either passive Voice or adversative High Applicative as defined by Pylkkänen (2000, 2002). In Korean, Kim (2011) argues for a high applicative analysis of a syncretic morpheme *-i* marking non-volitional causatives (i.e., with a non-agentive dative causee) and adversity clauses with a nominative affectee and a dative cause/instrument of some event; these constructions occur with dynamic and stative verbs (Kim 2011: 488–489, 498, 508).

By contrast, N.Amis experiential *-en* constructions are strictly restricted to stative verbs, they do not occur with unaccusative verbs like ‘rain’, those are NAV *ma*-verbs, as shown by Example (56b), nor with intransitive unergative verbs, nor with dynamic verbs. The strict restriction to stative verbs in N.Amis has three main correlates: (i) the applied nominative experiencer can only be an affectee; (ii) the *t*-stimulus may not be an unintentional causee (i.e., one unintentionally caused to do

<sup>19</sup> Mapudungun is unclassified and is spoken in Chile and Argentina.



something); (iii) consequently, it disallows the causative syncretism; applicative experiential *-en* constructions and causative constructions are distinct.

Causative constructions are valency-increasing constructions marked by the prefix *pa-*, the causee's volition depends on its animacy and on whether the verb stem is lexically dynamic or stative. Once causativized, stative verbs have increased valency and may host voice affixes like UV *-en* with the *k-*, *n-* case frame, i.e., a nominative patient-causee that has no cause or instrument role in relation to the event and a genitive agent-causer as in (46a)–(46c).

- (46) a. *Pa-ta-hekal-en n-ira k-u bekeloh namaka kabang.*  
 CAUS-go-outside-UV GEN-3SG NOM-NM stone from bag  
 'She took the stones out of her bag.' (lit. she caused the stones to go out)  
 (Babalic.010)
- b. *Pa-kalamkam-en Ø k-u rakat nuhni.*  
 CAUS-fast-UV Ø NOM-NM walk GEN.3SG  
 '(It, (s)he) made them hurry/walk fast !' (lit. (it, (s)he) made their walk be fast) (repeated from 14b)
- c. *Pa-baqdet-en=tu=aku k-iya dateng.*  
 CAUS-hot-UV=PFV=GEN.1SG NOM-DEIC vegetables  
 'I heated up the vegetables.'  
 (repeated from 21c)

On the other hand, in applicative experiential *-en* constructions, the applied, extra-thematic nominative experiencer is an affectee and the *t-* marked argument, the 'women' in (47), is a stimulus, not a causer, nor an instrument.

- (47) *Ma-ciki-en=tu k-u kawas t-ina babahi.*  
 STAT-dirty-EN=PFV NOM-NM god STIM-DEIC woman  
 'The gods felt that the women were dirty.' (i.e., were repulsed by the dirt)  
 (Mi-laqdis.056) (repeated from (4a))

Experiential *-en* constructions in N.Amis thus do not show any syncretism with non-volitional permissive-causatives as in Even or Korean. The *t-* marked stimulus does not have any instrument reading; instrument usually occurs as the nominative argument of applicative constructions marked by the prefix *sa-*, which are transitive constructions, see Example (18) Section 2.2.2.

## 4.2 N.Amis experiential *-en* constructions as high applicatives

Applicatives standardly license a peripheral participant in a core argument function, usually the object in accusative languages. In a voice system like the one in

Amis, it is argued that the applied participant is licensed as the nominative PSA argument (see Himmelmann and Riesberg [2013: 408–409],<sup>20</sup> for a similar approach in Totoli).

The other applicative voices of N.Amis, the locative voice (LV) *-an*, the instrumental voice (InstV) *sa-*, and the conveyance/beneficiary voice (CV) *si-*, also license the applied participant as the nominative PSA; however, they have a *n-* marked genitive agent, while experiential *-en* constructions have a *t-* marked stimulus, and are thus an altogether different type of applicative; it is argued that they are high applicatives.

Applicative *-en* constructions in N.Amis show some analogy with “ethical dative” constructions found in accusative languages, for instance in colloquial French *il me l’a plié n’importe comment* (lit. he folded it anyhow on me), in which the extra-thematic dative pronoun ‘*me*’ adds an adversely affected experiencer that is not part of the verb’s argument structure. English adversative constructions like *the car broke down on me in the middle of nowhere* are similar in function and meaning. “Ethical dative” constructions and extra-thematic adversative constructions in Japanese are analyzed as high applicatives in Pykkänen’s approach (2002: 61–63), and defined as denoting “a relation between an event and an individual”, while low applicatives “denote a relation between two individuals” (participants),<sup>21</sup> one of which is the object, the other being the applied argument. Low applicatives consequently “require transitivity from their base predicate (Pykkänen 2002: 12), while high applicatives are compatible with intransitive (unergative, unaccusative) and stative verbs.

Experiential constructions in N.Amis have some of the hallmarks of high applicatives, they do not remap thematic roles or arguments onto syntactic functions as canonical applicatives do (Zúñiga and Kittilä 2019), rather (i) they occur with stative verbs denoting properties, perceptual and emotional experience, (ii) they add an extra-thematic nominative experiencer, (iii) the construed relation is one between an event and this applied nominative experiencer; (iv) as in Japanese, the meaning is generally detrimental or denotes some counter-expectation.

---

<sup>20</sup> Himmelmann and Riesberg (2013: 409) state “To date, there has been no detailed investigation into which grammatical function is the default target of applicative alternations in symmetrical voice systems (the subject or the non-subject core position, the latter roughly corresponding to the object function in nominative-accusative systems). Hence, it cannot be presumed that an alternation that targets the subject function is *not* applicative.”

<sup>21</sup> The terms high and low refer to the level at which “an applicative head” occurs, i.e., above the verb for high applicatives, but in the VP in the case of low applicatives, i.e., where the applied argument bears a relation to the direct object (Pykkänen 2000: 198).

### 4.3 The semantic implicatures of non-canonical experiential –*en* constructions

Section 3.3 has shown that some experiential –*en* constructions in N.Amis are non-canonical applicatives, since they do not add an extra-thematic argument, do not increase valence, nor modify the verb's argument structure. Their contribution is mostly semantic and the suffix –*en* carries semantic implicatures contrasting a state of facts with an adverse change of state affecting the nominative experiencer (see the case of *ma-libut* 'worry' and *ma-libut-en* 'got annoyed' in Examples (27a)–(27b).

Non-canonical applicative constructions with semantic functions and without valence-increasing functions are attested crosslinguistically. They may denote a high degree of affectedness of the applied participant, they also have pragmatic, focalizing functions in Bantu languages (Jerro 2023: 24, 34; Pacchiarotti 2017), in Huasteca Nahuatl (Peregrina Llanes et al. 2017: 89). In some western Indonesian languages, non-canonical applicatives do not increase valence nor assign a role to an applied argument, but they have discourse effects, expressing degree, intensity of affectedness of the applied argument, habitual and/or iterative aspect, pluractionality (Truong and McDonnell 2020; Vander Klok forthcoming), see also Peterson (2007) and Pacchiarotti (2017).

Jerro (2023: 1) proposes three possible outputs of applicativization across the Bantu family: “one in which the applicative adds a new argument and associated thematic role, one in which the applicative has the effect of giving license to an unrealized participant entailed by the meaning of the verb, and one in which the applicative does not increase valence but rather modifies the thematic role of an existing internal argument”. Jerro adds that the “lexical semantic analysis of verb meanings in relation to applicative morphology provides insight into the nature of argument realization” (Jerro 2023: 32).

Experiential –*en* constructions in N.Amis have very similar properties: (i) they occur with stative verbs and add an extra-thematic nominative experiencer or affectee that is entailed by the verb's semantic structure; (ii) the *t*-marked stimulus is a “semi-core” argument; (iii) experiential –*en* constructions contain semantic implicatures, generally expressing an adverse change of state or some counter-expectation. Experiential –*en* constructions used in direct questions addressed to the experiencer marked as a second person pronoun, express the speaker's surprise, concern or counter-expectation towards the addressee's state. In any case, an experiential –*en* construction may only be used if the situation at hand is relevant to the experiencer's state or the speaker's.

## 5 Experiential constructions in other Austronesian languages: some historical hypothesis

Other Austronesian languages with similar constructions, which are rarely analyzed in depth in the literature, are now discussed.

It is argued that stative NAV *ma-* prefixes in N.Amis are voice markers and verb class indicators and that in *ma- ... -en* constructions, *-en* is the exponent of applicative experiential constructions licensing an applied nominative experiencer or affectee. It is hypothesized that experiential *ma- ... -en* constructions originate from the reconstructed Proto-Austronesian (PAN) *\*ka- ... -an/-en* adversative ‘passive’ constructions (Blust 2003a: 450) attested in various Western Austronesian languages,<sup>22</sup> as expressing adverse situations affecting a nominative experiencer. Examples in Formosan languages are: Paiwan *ka-sulem-an* ‘be caught by darkness’ (*sulem* ‘darkness’) (Ferrell 1982); Pazeh, *ka-bari-en* ‘be blown by the wind’ (*bari* ‘wind’), *ka-udan-an* ‘be rained on’ (*udan* ‘rain’) (Blust 2003a: 449–450).

### 5.1 The hypothesis

It is hypothesized that the PAN *\*ka- ... -an/-en* adversative passive has been retained in N.Amis as non-finite, nominalized stative *ka- ... -an* stems, and that the verbal experiential *ma- ... -en* constructions are innovations. *Ka- ... -an/-en* stems in N.Amis denote place or time nouns, e.g., *ka-bali-an* ‘the windy season’ (*bali* ‘wind’), *ka-urad-an* ‘rainy season or day’ (*urad* ‘rain’); these derived forms which may also be used as modifiers, as in *ka-tuqman-an a remi?ad* ‘a dark day/time’ (*tuqman* ‘dark’), however, they do not have adversative experiential reading. To obtain a reading such as ‘they were blown away by the wind’, a causative construction is used in N.Amis, like *pa-bali* in (48).

- (48) *Caay=tu ka-pa-bali k-uhni.*  
 NEG=PFV NFIN.STAT-CAUS-WIND NOM-3PL  
 ‘They weren’t blown by the wind.’

Derived *ka- ... -an* stems in N.Amis also serve as non-finite stative predicates denoting a general property as in (49a) where *ka-canar-an* is derived from a stative verb *ma-canar* ‘be noisy’. In (49b), the property-denoting verb *ka-canar-an* has a nominative experiencer *k-aku*, and a *t-* marked stimulus the ‘noise’, yet it is not an

<sup>22</sup> As pointed out by a reviewer, this term is an areal label (Himmelmann 2002: 7, Fn.1).

applicative experiential construction. The experiential construction is the finite *ma- ... -en* construction in (49c), which has an extra-thematic, applied nominative Affectee undergoing a change of state, see Examples (26) above.

- (49) a. *Ka-canar-an*                      *k-u*    *sunī*    *n-u*    *karireng*.  
 NFIN.STAT-disturb.by.noise-AN    NOM-NM    sound    GEN-NM    car  
 ‘The noise of the cars is disturbing.’
- b. *Ka-canar-an*                      *k-aku*    *t-u*        *sunī*    *n-u*    *karireng*.  
 NFIN.STAT-disturb.by.noise-LV    NOM-1SG    STIM-NM    sound    GEN-NM    car  
 ‘I am (generally) disturbed by/due to the noise of the cars.’
- c. *Ma-canar-en*    *k-aku*    *t-u*        *sunī*    *n-u*    *karireng*.  
 STAT-noisy-EN    NOM-1SG    STIM-NM    sound    GEN-NM    car  
 ‘I feel/get annoyed by the noise of the cars.’ (on account of the noise)

N.Amis stative, non-finite *ka- ... -an* stems, like *ka-tawa-an* ‘laughing stock’ in (50) may be used predicatively, with a nominative undergoer (Kamata). However, these are characterizing constructions, not experiential constructions with *k-*, *t-* case-marking.

- (50) *Ka-tawa-an*    *n-u*    *cabay*        *n-ira*    *ci*        *Kamata*.<sup>23</sup>  
 NFIN.STAT-laugh-LV    GEN-NM    companion    GEN-3SG    NOM.PM    Kamata  
 ‘Kamata was the laughing stock of his companions.’  
 (Kamata.017)

The non-finite *ka- ... -an* forms and the finite verbal *ma- ... -en* forms have thus specialized with distinct functions and semantics in N.Amis. The former are predications of general properties, while the latter occur in experiential constructions. Some division of labor is at work between *-an* and *-en*: *-an* occurs in non-finite stative *ka- ... -an* stems, while *-en* occurs in finite experiential *ma- ... -en* stems (*ma- ... -an* stems are extremely rare).

It is also proposed that the finite experiential *ma- ... -en* constructions reflect one morphological evolution initially proposed by Ross (1995), followed by Himmelmann and Wolff (1999), and by Blust (2003a: 467), according to which the stative *\*ma-* is a surface realization resulting from infixing the *\*ka-* stative affix with the actor voice *\*<um>*, yielding a derived *\*k<um>a-* form later clipped as *\*ma-*.

In this vein, I propose that the finite *ma- ... -en* verb forms in N.Amis result from an infixed *\*k<um>a- ... -an/-en* stems, clipped as *ma- ... -en* stems and occurring in the restricted context of experiential constructions. These finite verbal *ma- ... -en* constructions have taken on the experiential/adversative function and semantics in

<sup>23</sup> *ka-tawan-an* is a participial construction meaning ‘the one made fun of by his companion was Kamata’.

relation to specific events and situations, while the non-finite *ka- ... -an/-en* forms occur in stative constructions denoting general properties like (50), or are nominalized time and place constructions.

This hypothesized evolution also explains why the co-occurrence of *ma- ... -en* is non-conflictual: it does not result from the independent, synchronic affixation of two distinct voice affixes NAV *ma-* and UV *-en*, rather it originates from a PAN *\*ka- ... -an/-en* adversative passive circumfix.

## 5.2 Adversative and experiential constructions in other Austronesian languages

Blust (2003a) mentions that *\*ka- ... -an* is well represented in the Philippines and in Western Indonesia, occurring (i) as nouns, often of location, and (ii) as adversative (agentless) passives. Blust (2003a: 447–451) also states that “cognate forms in both senses are found in several Formosan languages, but the comparison has never been clearly pointed out.”

### 5.2.1 Languages with reflexes of *\*ka- ... -an/-en*

Blust (1999) cites various *ka- ... -an* forms in other Formosan languages, derived from entity- or property-denoting stems; they occur as *ke- ... -an* stems in Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia *ke-hujan-an* (*hujan* ‘rain’) (Vamarasi 1999: 93), and in Javanese *k-odan-an* (*udan* ‘rain’), both meaning ‘to be caught in the rain’ (Blust 1999: 352).

- (51) *Ali ke-mati-an anak.*  
 Ali AFFECT-die-AN child  
 ‘Ali had a child die on him.’ (Ali was adversely affected by the child dying)  
 (Vamarasi 1999: 99)

Among Formosan languages, Pazehe has adversative constructions such as *ka-akux-an* ‘get a heatstroke’ (*akux* ‘heat’); *ka-lamik-an* ‘suffer from a cold’ (*lamik* ‘cold’); *ka-rizax-an/ka-rizax-en* ‘burned or darkened by the sun’ (*rizax* ‘sun’); *ka-kelem-an* ‘too salty, over-salted’ (*ma-kelem* ‘salty’); *ka-payak-an* ‘get wet’ (*ma-payak* ‘wet’); *ka-rinu-an* ‘suffer from acute pains’ (*ma-rinu* ‘sour, sharp pain’) (Blust 1999: 352; Li and Tsuchida 2001).

In Pazehe, Blust (1999: 353) also mentions *si-* N ‘have N’ forms derived as *si- ... -an/-en* stems which are affixed to insect or pest nouns, meaning ‘infested with, overrun with’: e.g., *si-adus-an* ‘infested with mice or rats’ (*adus* ‘mouse, rat’); *si-babulay-en* ‘infested with fleas/lice’ (*babulay* ‘flea, louse’); *si-rangaw-an* ‘infested with flies, covered with flies’ (*rangaw* ‘housefly’); *si-tibaun-en* ‘infested with

mosquitos' (*tibaun* 'mosquito'); *si-wili-an* 'infested with leeches' (*wili* 'leech'). They are also affixed to nouns of bodily conditions, meaning 'afflicted with': *si-hais-en* 'having armpit odor' (*hais* 'armpit odor'); *si-kuhih-an* 'to have scabies' (*kuhih* 'scabies'); *si-langa-an* 'to have pus, be full of pus (of a boil or wound)' (*langa* 'pus').<sup>24</sup>

In Thao (Formosan), \*ka- ... -an forms are reflected by *ka-p-acay-an* 'be bereaved' (*p-acay* 'kill'); *ka-cawa-n* 'be laughed at' (*cawa* 'laugh') (Blust 2003b). Interestingly, LV -an also occurs in finite verbal adversative constructions such as (52), with an unergative verb 'escape' and with an applied nominative affectee.

- (52) *Yaku shuari-an binanau'az.*  
 1sg.NOM escape-LV wife  
 'My wife ran off with someone.' (lit. I was adversely affected by my wife's running off with someone else)  
 (Blust 2003b: 95)

In Thao, other constructions with adversative meaning involve *ki- ... -an* forms derived from body-parts and denoting afflictions, like *ki-punuq-an* 'get/be afflicted by headaches' (*punuq* 'head'); *ki-rikus-an* 'get backaches' (*rikus* 'back'); *ki-tiaz-an* 'get stomach-aches' (*tiaz* 'abdomen, stomach'), as well as *kit- ... -in* forms (with UV -in) for pest infestation or afflictions, generally meaning 'be full of, fully infested with' (Blust 2003b: 104–105, 475).

- (53) a. *Haya wa qrus (kit)-ayaz-in=iza.*  
 that LIG post KIT-termite-UV=already  
 'That post is termite-eaten.'  
 (Blust 2003b: 309)
- b. *Haya wazish (kit)-kukulay-in=iza.*  
 that pork KIT-bug-UV=already  
 'That pork is infested with bugs.'  
 (Blust 2003b: 490)
- c. *Cicu ma-cuaw kit-lhulhuk-in.*  
 3SG STAT-many KIT-pimple-UV  
 'He has lots of pimples.'  
 (Blust 2003b: 553)

As shown by (53a), these constructions are not restricted to sentient experiencers as they are in N.Amis, but they generally denote a situation judged detrimental by the speaker. In N.Amis however, similar meanings involving an inanimate patient are expressed by stative NAV *ma-* verbs derived from an entity noun as in (56a) below.

<sup>24</sup> These forms are given in lists, their syntactic analysis is restricted by the lack of sentences.

### 5.2.2 Languages with reflexes of \*-an/\*-en

Some Formosan languages like Siraya (Adelaar 1997, 2011) or Isbukun Bunun (Li 2017) have experiential constructions with reflexes of \*-en. In Siraya, they occur with names of diseases, ailments and body-parts suffixed with *-ən* ~ *-ing* (dialectal variants), exceptionally with *-an* (see 54b): for instance, *aingit-ing* ‘to have a fever’ (*aingit* ‘fever’); *vuil-ing* ‘(have) diarrhoea’ (*vuil* ‘belly’); *ka-kias-ing* ‘to be kicked’; *u-taüm-ən* ‘to be leprosy’ (*u-taüm* ‘leprosy’) (Adelaar 1997: 381, 386). In (54a) to (54c), they occur in relative clauses modifying an afflicted experiencer.

- (54) a. *Pa-ka-kuptix-ä ki Leproos ka u-ta-taüm-ən.*  
 CAUS-V1-clean-SBJV DC leper LK MOT-RDP~leprosy-AFFL  
 ‘Cleanse lepers.’ (lit. clean the lepers who suffer from leprosy)  
 (Adelaar 2011: 269)
- b. *Ka kit'-ey ta ina ka täw-ämax-an ...*  
 LK see-SBJV.UV NOM woman LK come.out-blood-AFFL  
 ‘And behold, a woman who had been suffering from a hemorrhage...’  
 (Adelaar 2011: 258)
- c. *Ni-k<m>ita ki Rarenan ki k-äyä-n tïn ka ma-la~liko,*  
 PAST-(AV)see DC mother DC v1-be.with-UV 3S.GEN LK AV-RDP~lie.down  
*ka aingit-ing.*  
 LK fever-AFFL  
 ‘He saw his mother-in-law and wife lying sick with a fever.’  
 (Adelaar 2011: 241)

In Isbukun Bunun (Li 2017: 252–260), similar constructions occur with stative verbs denoting experiences, such as *haizu* ‘sour’, *husbu* ‘heavy’, *hansu* ‘smell bad’; they are suffixed by the locative voice *-an* and have an applied nominative experiencer.

- (55) a. *Haizu-an saikin maun bunuaz-ka-busul-un.*<sup>25</sup>  
 sour-LV NOM.1SG AV.eat plum-make-hunting.gun-OBJ.NMZ  
 ‘I feel/felt sour eating plums.’  
 (Li 2017: 256)
- b. *Husbu-an saikin mama simintu tu tasa.*  
 heavy-LV NOM.1SG AV.carry.on.back cement LK one  
 ‘I feel/felt heavy carrying one (pack of) cement on my shoulder.’  
 (Li 2017: 256)

<sup>25</sup> The Bunun people use some type of plum trees to make hunting guns, *bunuaz-ka-busul-un* refers to that type of plum-(tree) (梅子), while *bunuaz* is another kind of ‘plum’ (李子) (Li, p.c.).



- c. *Hansu-an saikin sa<i>puk-as<sup>26</sup> babu tu lu~lum-an.*  
 smell-LV NOM.1SG raise<PFV>-LV.OBL pig LK RED~jail-LV  
 ‘I feel/felt stinky (when) raising pigs in a pigsty.’  
 (Li 2017: 260)

This pattern is also reconstructed for Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP), for which various stem *-en* forms are attested, involving nouns for diseases, body-parts, insects, weather condition, and meaning ‘be afflicted by’ that derived property: e.g., \*quban ‘grey hair’, \*quban-en ‘get grey hair’; \*anay ‘termite’, \*anay-en ‘damaged by termites, eaten by termites’; \*quzan ‘rain’, \*quzan-en ‘get caught in the rain’ (Blust 2009: 456).

However, in N.Amis, stems denoting infestation by pests or ailments are generally derived as stative NAV *ma-* stems, not as UV *-en*, nor as experiential *-en* constructions: e.g., *ubad* ‘white hair’, *ma-ubad* ‘have white hair’; *lalunah* ‘ant’, *ma-lalunah* ‘infested with ants’ in (56). No *ka- ... -an* forms nor stem-*en* forms are derived with such meanings, nor with similar lexical roots in N.Amis (*\*\*ka-lalunah-an kina bacal* with the intended meaning ‘this room is infested with ants’ is infelicitous).

- (56) a. *Ma-lalunah k-ina bacal.*  
 STAT-ant NOM-DEIC room  
 ‘This room is infested with ants.’  
 b. *Ma-urad k-u niyaruq.*  
 STAT-rain NOM-NM village  
 ‘The villages were under heavy rain.’  
 (Lalangawan.0005)

Places infested by pests are derived by *si- ... -an* in N.Amis, like *si-widiq-an* ‘infested by leeches’ (similarly to Pazeh above), but these are derived locative nouns in N.Amis with the bound verb *si-* ‘have, get’; they are not experiential constructions, nor are the constructions in (56a)–(56b). Even temporary ailments such as having hiccups or burping, having a cold, are also expressed by stative intransitive NAV *ma-* stems, as in (57), (58a) or by the locative voice *-an* in (58b). These constructions are not experiential constructions since the subject *cira* is part of the verb’s argument structure; on the other hand, the experiential *-en* construction on the Ø-stative verb in (59) licenses an extra-thematic nominative experiencer *wawa*.

- (57) *Ma-lalisan cira.*  
 STAT-catch.cold NOM.3sg  
 ‘He caught a cold.’

26 Suffix *-as* conflates LV *-an* and the OBL marker *mas* (Li, p.c.).

- (58) a. *Ma-seruuk cira.*  
 STAT-hiccups NOM.3sg  
 ‘He (often) has hiccups.’
- b. *Seruuk-an cira.*  
 hiccups-LV NOM.3sg  
 ‘He burped/he’s having hiccups.’
- (59) *Ø-alsuq-en k-u wawa t-ina buting-an.*  
 tasty-EN NOM-NM child STIM-DEIC fish-OBL  
 ‘The children find the fish tasty.’

In Cebuano (Philippine), derived *gi-* verbs also denote insect or pest infestation: *gi-anay* ‘be infested with termites’, *gi-kagaw* ‘be infected with germs’, *gi-kuto* ‘be infected with lice’, *gi-ulod* ‘be infested with worms’. UV *gi-* is also affixed to intransitive, stative verbs derived into verbs with an oblique stimulus as in (60), much like Amis stative NAV *ma-* constructions.

- (60) *Gi-luod=siya ni Pedro // Gi-luod=siya sa dugo.*  
 GI-be.nauseous=NOM.3SG OBL Pedro GI-be.nauseous=NOM.3SG OBL blood  
 ‘She felt disgusted with Pedro // She felt nauseous because of the blood.’  
 (Tanangkingsing and Huang 2007: 574)

In experiential *gi- ... -an* constructions derived from stative verbs like (61), the applicative suffix *-an* adds an extra-thematic nominative experiencer (clitic =*ko* ‘I’), who is affected by the woman’s ugly appearance (Tanangkingsing and Huang 2007: 573).

- (61) *Gi-maot-an=ko sa babayi.*  
 GI-ugly-LV=NOM.1sg OBL woman  
 ‘I am consciously aware of the ugliness of the woman.’ [authors’ comment: the subject is biased against the woman and exerts an effort to emphasize her ugly appearance].  
 (Tanangkingsing and Huang 2007: 574)

Cebuano *gi- ... -an* constructions are very similar to N.Amis experiential *ma- ... -en* constructions: (i) they have a nominative experiencer and an oblique stimulus, with a different pattern from the nominative patient and genitive agent of their LV or UV constructions; (ii) these constructions have similar verbal hosts (i.e., property-denoting or experiential, perceptual verbs). In both cases, a syncretic LV or UV morpheme is used with an applicative function deriving a stative property or a perceptual verb into a two-argument verb with an extra-thematic nominative experiencer.

In Tagalog, roots denoting pests, natural phenomena or inanimate entities are derived as UV *-in* verbs, meaning ‘be infested/afflicted by/with N’ (De Guzman 1978:

273). These derived verbs are intransitive, e.g., *anay* > *anay-in* ‘infested by termites’ (De Guzman 1978: 167).

- (62) *La~langgam-in diyan ang tinapay.*  
 RDP.FUT~ant-UV there NOM bread  
 ‘The bread will be ant-infested there.’  
 (De Guzman 1978: 274)

UV *-in* and LV *-an* are also affixed to stative verbs as in (63b), suffix *-in* denotes a change-of-state. With verbs in perfective <in> aspect, UV *-in* has a zero allomorph,  $\emptyset$  as in (63a). These constructions have a nominative experiencer and an oblique stimulus, as in (63b). The roots are *sipon* ‘cold’, *malat* ‘hoarse(ness)’, *kabag* ‘gas pain’.

- (63) a. *S<in>ipon- $\emptyset$  siya at m<in>alat- $\emptyset$  noong isang linggo.*  
 <PFV>cold-UV NOM.3SG and <PFV>hoarse-UV last one week  
 ‘He suffered from cold and hoarseness last week.’ (lit.: he was stricken with cold and hoarseness last week.)  
 (De Guzman 1978: 274)
- b. *K<in>abag-an ang bata? sa ka?tiyak.*  
 <PFV>gas.pain-LV NOM child OBL crying  
 ‘The child suffered gas pain from crying too much.’  
 (De Guzman 1978: 274)

Other cases of experiential voice in Tagalog, occurring with quality- and property-denoting roots are discussed by Klimenko and Endriga (2016). In (64a), the applied nominative experiencer is licensed by LV *-an*, to be compared with the AV construction in (64b).

- (64) a. *Nagandahan ako sakaniya.*  
 m<in>a-ganda-an  
 <PFV>MOD-beauty-LV NOM.1SG 3SG.NACT  
 ‘I found her beautiful.’  
 (Klimenko and Endriga 2016: 488)
- b. *G<um>anda siya.*  
 <AV>beauty NOM.3SG  
 ‘She became beautiful.’  
 (Klimenko and Endriga 2016: 490)

Wolff et al. (1991) also discuss such constructions in Tagalog with stative and unaccusative verbs derived by LV *-an* and meaning ‘be affected by (root), have (root) happen to one’. Compare the standard declarative construction in (65a) with the experiential construction in (65b) with an extra-thematic nominative experiencer.

- (65) a. *Na-matay ang aso nila.*  
 RL-die NOM dog GEN.3PL  
 ‘Their dog died.’  
 (Wolff et al. 1991: 486)

- b. *Na-matay-an sila ng aso.*  
 RL-die-LV            NOM.3PL    NPIV    dog  
 ‘Their dog died on them.’  
 (Wolff et al. 1991: 486)

Other cases of applied nominative experiencers licensed by stem *-an* derivations are illustrated below.

- (66) *Na-ulan-an ako. (ulan ‘rain’)*  
 RL-rain-LV    NOM.1SG  
 ‘I was caught in the rain.’  
 (Wolff et al. 1991: 288)
- (67) a. *Na-ubus-an sila ng inumin. (ubus ‘used up’)*  
 RL-used.up-LV    NOM.3PL    NPIV    drink  
 ‘Their drinks ran out on them.’  
 (Wolff et al. 1991: 486)
- b. *Na-ubus-an na kami ng pagkain.*  
 RL-used.up-LV    NOM.1PL            NPIV    food  
 ‘We have run out of food.’  
 (Wolff et al. 1991: 288)
- (68) a. *Ma-wa~wala-(a)n sila ng lupa. (wala ‘lose’)*  
 STAT-RED~lose-LV    NOM.3PL    NPIV    land  
 ‘They will be deprived of their lands.’  
 (Wolff et al. 1991: 486)
- b. *Na-wa~wala-(a)n ako ng gana.*  
 RL-RED~lose-LV    NOM.1SG    NPIV    appetite  
 ‘I’m losing my appetite.’ (lit. I suffer a loss of appetite)  
 (Wolff et al. 1991: 288)

In Ilokano (Philippine), Liao (2004: 31) mentions similar constructions derived from intransitive verbs, or from entity-denoting roots referring to insects, natural phenomena, perceptual states like cold, moldy, drowsy, body functions, health conditions (hiccups, aches, itching) meaning ‘be afflicted with’. The afflicted nominative argument has no animacy restriction.

- (69) a. *Tili-én ti ubing.*  
 hiccups-UV    NOM    child  
 ‘The child has hiccups.’  
 (Vanoverbergh 1955: 147, in Liao 2004: 31)

b. *Kuton-én ti inapui.*

ant-UV        NOM    rice

‘The rice is full of ants.’

(Vanoverbergh 1955: 147, in Liao 2004: 31)

These Austronesian languages display applicative experiential constructions using similar morphemes, (*ka-*) ... *-an/-en* stems, and *ke-* ... *-an* stems in Malay and Javanese, with a suffix that is syncretic with UV or LV voice affixes, and whose arguments – typically a nominative experiencer and an oblique stimulus – are encoded with a different case-marking from the original UV or LV constructions. The suffix *-an* is usually stative, while *-en* occurs in situations involving a change of state. These constructions generally have adverse meanings, such as ‘be afflicted by the derived stem’, be it a detrimental atmospheric situation (wind, rain, cold), ailments, medical condition, or pest infestation, and they occur with stative, unaccusative or unergative intransitive verbs, as in Thao (52), Bahasa Indonesia (51) and Tagalog (65b), (66) to (67).

However, in N.Amis, experiential *-en* constructions are restricted (i) to stative NAV *ma-* verbs generally denoting detrimental properties or perceptual states, and (ii) to sentient experiencers; otherwise stative NAV *ma-* verbs or LV *-an* verbs are used. Pest infestation of persons or places are also derived as stative NAV *ma-* verbs.

## 6 Conclusion

It has been proposed that N.Amis *ma-* ... *-en* stems were innovated as finite forms originating from the reconstructed PAN non-finite *\*ka-* ... *-an/-en* adversative passives; this innovation resulted from infixing *\*ka* with AV *\*<um>*, as *\*k<um>a-* ... *-an/-en* stems, later clipped as *ma-* ... *-an/-en* verb stems; it also occurred on  $\emptyset$ -stative verbs as  $\emptyset$ - ... *-en* stems with an implicit experiencer-affectee.

The syncretism between UV *-en* and the applicative experiential *-en* is licensed by its compatibility with all verb types, and by their having a nominative Undergoer or Experiencer-Affectee. However these constructions diverge in relation to the other argument’s encoding, i.e., a genitive agent for UV *-en* constructions and a *t*-stimulus for experiential *-en* constructions. Moreover, under negative scope, UV *-en* changes to UV *-i*, while experiential *-en* does not, evidencing their homophony. Thus, while UV *-en* is a voice affix mapping the patient to nominative and the agent to genitive case, experiential *-en* is an applicative affix licensing an extra-thematic nominative experiencer/affectee.

In N.Amis, the bipartite case-frame, (i) *k-*, *n-* for all Undergoer Voices, for the applicative Locative, Instrumental, Conveyance/Beneficiary constructions, and (ii) *k-*, *t-* for AV *mi-*, stative NAV *ma-* constructions and for the applicative experiential *-en* constructions also signal differences of transitivity, the *k-*, *t-* pattern denoting lower affectation and lower transitivity.

In contrast with more canonical applicatives, experiential applicatives in N.Amis and in the other Austronesian languages where they are attested, do not re-map arguments onto grammatical relations, they license an extra-thematic nominative experiencer and are thus characterized as high applicatives encoding a relation between that applied argument and an event.

**Acknowledgments:** This research was financed by research strand 3 “Typology and dynamics of linguistic systems” of the LABEX EFL (Empirical Foundations of Linguistics) (Investissements d’Avenir, ANR-10-LABX-0083/CGI). It is part of IdEx Paris University (ANR-18-IDEX-0001). I wish to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their thought-provoking questions and remarks.

## Abbreviations

*	Proto-form
**	Ungrammatical
ACC	accusative
ADVS	adversative
AFF	afflicted
AFFECT	affectee
AV	actor voice
CA.RDP	Ca-reduplication
CAUS	causative
COMP	complementizer
COP	copula
CV	conveyance voice
DAT	dative
DC	default case marker
DEIC	deictic marker
EXCL	exclusive
EXS	existential
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
INCL	inclusive
INST	instrumental
IRR	irrealis
LA	locative applicative
LK	linker
LOC	locative
LV	locative voice
MOD	modal
MODF	modifier
MOT	motion
NACT	non-actor
NAV	non-actor voice
NEG	negation

NFIN	non-finite
NOM	nominative
NM	noun marker
NMZ	nominalizer
NPIV	non-pivot
OBL	oblique
PASS	passive
PM	personal marker
PFV	perfective
PM	person marker
POSS	possessive
PREP	preposition
Q	question marker
RDP	reduplication
RL	realis
STAT	stative
STIM	stimulus
SBJV	subjunctive
STAT	stative
THM	theme argument
TOP	topic
UV	undergoer voice

## References

- Adelaar, Alexander K. 1997. Grammar notes on Siraya, an extinct Formosan language. *Oceanic Linguistics* 36(2). 362–397.
- Adelaar, Alexander K. 2011. *Siraya retrieving the phonology, grammar and lexicon of a dormant Formosan language*. (Trends in Linguistics Documentation 30). Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Aoyagi, Hiroshi. 2010. On the causative and passive morphology in Japanese and Korean. *Open Linguistics* 7. 87–110.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2017. The core-oblique distinction in some Austronesian languages of Indonesia and beyond. *Linguistik Indonesia* 35(2). 101–144.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2019. Grammatical relations in Balinese. In Alena Witzlack-Makarevich & Balthasar Bickel (eds.), *Argument selectors. A new perspective on grammatical relations*, 257–299. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2011. Grammatical relations typology. In Jae Jun Song (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of language typology*, 399–444. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blust, Robert. 1999. Notes on Pazeh phonology and morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38(2). 321–365.
- Blust, Robert. 2003a. Three notes on early Austronesian morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42(2). 438–478.
- Blust, Robert. 2003b. *Thao dictionary*. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series A5. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Blust, Robert. 2009. *The Austronesian languages*. (Pacific Linguistics, 602.). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2016. Information structure in Northern Amis (Formosan): A morphosyntactic analysis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 55(2). 451–481.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2017. Roots and stems: Lexical and functional flexibility in Amis and Nêlêmwa. [Special issue on lexical flexibility in Oceanic languages]. *Studies in Language* 41(1). 358–407.

- Bril, Isabelle. 2022. Lexical restrictions on grammatical relations in voice constructions (Northern Amis). In *Lexical restrictions on grammatical relations in voice and valency constructions*. STUF, *Language Typology and Universals* 75(1). 21–71.
- Bril, Isabelle & Stavros Skopeteas. 2021. The syntax and prosody of focus in Northern Amis (Formosan). *Faits de Langue* 51(2). 61–87.
- Chen, Teresa. 1987. *Verbal constructions and verbal classifications in Nataoran-Amis* (Pacific linguistics Series C). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Chen, Victoria. 2017. *A reexamination of the Philippine-type voice system and its implications for Austronesian primary-level subgrouping*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i dissertation.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In Winfred P. Lehmann (ed.), *Syntactic typology: Studies in the phenomenology of language*, 329–394. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Creissels, Denis. 2016. Transitivity, valency, and voice. European Summer School in Linguistic Typology, Porquerolles, September 2016, European Summer School in Linguistic Typology, 1–157. Available at: <http://www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-ESSLT.pdf>.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical construction grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1978. *Syntactic derivation of Tagalog verbs*. (Oceanic Linguistics special publication 16). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antipassive. *Language* 62(4). 808–845.
- Ferrell, Raleigh. 1982. *Paiwan dictionary*. (Pacific Linguistics C 73). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Foley, William A. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in Philippine languages. Paper presented at The Third Lexical Functional Grammar Conference, Brisbane, 30 June–2 July 1998.
- Foley, William A. 2008. The place of Philippine languages in a typology of voice systems. In Peter K. Austin & Simon Musgrave (eds.), *Voice and grammatical relations in Austronesian languages*, 22–44. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Hemmings, Charlotte. 2021. When an antipassive isn't an antipassive anymore: The actor voice construction in Kelabit. In Katarzyna Janic & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (eds.), *Antipassive.: Typology, diachrony, and related constructions*. (Typological Studies in Language 130), 580–620. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2002. Voice in western Austronesian: An update. In Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*, 7–16 (Pacific Linguistics 518). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 110–181. London: Routledge.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & John Wolff. 1999. *Toratán (Ratahan)*. (Languages of the World/Materials 130). Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & Sonja Riesberg. 2013. Symmetrical voice and applicative alternations: Evidence from Totoli. *Oceanic Linguistics* 52(2). 396–422.
- Ishizuka, Tomoko. 2012. *The passive in Japanese: A cartographic minimalist approach*. (Linguistics Today 192). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jerro, Kyle. 2023. The semantics of applicativization in Kinyarwanda. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13(2). 181–254.
- Kim, Kyumin. 2011. High applicatives in Korean causatives and passives. *Lingua* 121. 487–551.
- Klimenko, Sergei B. & Divine Angeli P. Endriga. 2016. Semantic verb classes and regularity of voice paradigms in Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 55(2). 483–502.



- Kroeger, Paul. 2004. *Analyzing syntax: A lexical-functional approach*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2004. *Transitivity and ergativity in Formosan and Philippine languages*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i dissertation.
- Li, Lillian Li-ying. 2017. *A grammar of Isbukun Bunun*. Taipei: Academia Sinica dissertation.
- Li, Paul Jen-kuei & Shigeru Tsuchida. 2001. *Pazih dictionary*. Language and linguistics Monograph Series A2. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Malchukov, Andrey. 1993. Adversative constructions in Even in relation to passive and permissive. In Bernard Comrie & Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and transitivity*, 369–384. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ogawa, Naoyoshi & Erin Asai. 1935. *Gengo ni yoru Taiwan Takasago-zoku densutsu-shū* [The myths and traditions of the Formosan native tribes (Texts and notes)]. Taihoku: Teikoku Daigaku Gengo-gaku Kenkyu-shitsu.
- Ono, Naoyuki. 2003. On the event structure of indirect passive in Japanese. In Dong Hong Ji & Kim Teng Lua (eds.), *Proceedings of the 17th Pacific Asia conference on language, information and computation*, 28–37. Singapore: Colips publications.
- Oshima, David Y. 2003. Out of control: A unified analysis of Japanese passive constructions. In Jong-Bok Kim & Stephen Wechsler (eds.), *The proceedings of the 9th international conference on HPSG*, 245–265. Stanford: CA Stanford University.
- Oshima, David Y. 2006. Adversity and Korean/Japanese passives: Constructional analogy. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15. 137–166.
- Pacchiarotti, Sara. 2017. *Bantu applicative construction types involving \*-id: Form, functions and diachrony*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon dissertation.
- Peregrina Llanes, Manuel, Albert Álvares González & Zarina Estrada-Fernández. 2017. Transitivity and valency-changing operations in Huasteca Nahuatl. In Albert Álvares González & Ía Navarro (eds.), *Verb valency changes: Theoretical and typological perspectives*. (Typological Studies in Language 120), 82–105. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Peterson, David. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2017. Antipassive. In Jessica Coon, Diane Massam & Lisa deMena Travis (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of ergativity*, 308–331. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2000. What applicative heads apply to. In *Proceedings of the 24th annual Penn linguistics colloquium*. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 7. Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/bitstreams/ab856177-5152-4645-a46d-69a89c460d7f/download>.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. *Introducing argument*. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Ross, Malcolm. 1995. Reconstructing proto Austronesian verbal morphology; evidence from Taiwan. In Paul Jen-kuei Li, Dah-an Ho, Ying-kuei Huang & Cheng-hwa Tsang (eds.), *Austronesian studies relating to Taiwan, 727–791*. (Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 3). Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and related constructions: A prototype analysis. *Language* 61(4). 821–848.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1994. An integrational approach to possessor raising, ethical datives, and adversative passives. *Proceedings of the twentieth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General session dedicated to the contributions of Charles J. Fillmore*, BLS 20, 461–486. Berkeley: BLS.
- Tanangkingsing, Michael & Shuanfan Huang. 2007. Cebuano passives revisited. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46(2). 554–584.

- Truong, Christina L. & Bradley J. McDonnell. 2020. Semantic and syntactic functions of western Indonesian applicative morphology. Paper presented at the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, 26–29 August 2020, University of Bucharest.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru. 1988. Amis. In Kamei Takashi, Rokuro Kono & Eiichi Chino (eds.), *Gengo gaku dai jiten* [Encyclopedia of linguistics], vol. 1, 447–449. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Vamarasi, Marit K. 1999. *Grammatical relations in Bahasa Indonesia*. (Pacific linguistics D 93). Canberra: Australian National University.
- Vanoverbergh, Morice. 1995. *Iloko grammar*. Baguio City: Catholic School Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vander Klok, Jozina. Forthcoming. The role of prominence in post-verbal word order alternation in Javanese applicatives. In Bethwyn Evans, Åshild Næss & Jozina Vander Klok (eds.), *Prominence in Austronesian* (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Typology 66). Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena & Balthazar Bickel. 2019. *Argument selectors. A new perspective on grammatical relations*. (Typological Studies in Language 123). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian. In Andrew B. Gonzalez (ed.), *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday* (Special monograph Issue 4), 71–91. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U., Maria Theresa C. Centeno & Der-Hwa V. Rau. 1991. *Pilipino through self-instruction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program.
- Wu, Joy. 2006. *Verb classification, case marking, and grammatical relations in Amis*. Buffalo: State University of New York PhD Dissertation.
- Zúñiga, Fernando & Seppo Kittilä. 2019. *Grammatical voice*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.