

INTRODUCTION

Barry J. Blake, Peter Austin and Margaret Florey

The papers in this volume all deal with aspects of the grammars of selected Austronesian languages of Indonesia. In Blust's classification the Austronesian family has four branches: Atayalic, Tsouic, Paiwanic and Malayo-Polynesian (Blust 1977). The first three are confined to Taiwan and the fourth is spread from Madagascar to Easter Island. One of the languages included in this volume, Alune, belongs to the Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian group; the others all belong to Western Malayo-Polynesian.

Western Malayo-Polynesian shares with Atayalic, Tsouic and Paiwanic an interesting voice alternation. In one construction, which is typically unmarked, the patient or theme (P) of a two-place verb occupies the privileged grammatical relation, which we will call subject. In the other construction the verb carries a nasal prefix or infix and the agent or actor (A) is subject. The nasal affix also occurs with some one-place predicates, usually showing some correlation with agent. The schema in (1) illustrates the system. We have arbitrarily placed the subject before the verb. This happens to be true for some languages such as modern Balinese, which have subject-verb-complement order. However, in many other languages the identification of the argument of a multi-place verb with the sole argument of an intransitive predicate (S) is by other means of some kind of marking, as illustrated in Tagalog below. The nasal prefix in the schema is indicated by N.

- (1)
- | | | | | |
|----|--------------|-------------------|-----|---|
| a. | intransitive | S _{subj} | V | |
| | | S _{subj} | N-V | |
| b. | transitive | P _{subj} | V | A |
| | Asubj | N-V | P | |

This kind of alternation presents a problem of interpretation, and it has been much discussed in the literature, particularly with respect to Tagalog. In this language the privileged argument is marked by *ang*. Consider the following sentences. In (2) and (3) there is a one-place predicate. In (2) the predicate is unmarked; in (3) the verb bears a nasal infix. In both sentences S is marked by *ang*.

- (2) *Interesante ang libro*
interesting book
'The book is interesting.'
- (3) *T-um-akbo ang propesor*
ran-AGT.VOICE professor
'The professor ran.'

In the next set of examples we have a two-place predicate *bili* 'to buy'. In (4) the patient is marked by *ang* and is thereby aligned with the sole argument of a one-place predicate; in (5) the verb carries a nasal infix and the agent is marked by *ang*. In both constructions the non-subject core argument is marked by *ng*.

- (4) *B-in-ili* *ng* *propesor* *ang* *libro* *sa* *tindahan*
 PERF-PAT.VOICE-buy professor book at shop
 ‘The professor bought the book at a/the shop.’
- (5) *B-um-ili* *ng* *libro* *ang* *propesor* *sa* *tindahan*
 PERF-AGT.VOICE-buy book professor at shop
 ‘The professor bought a book at a/the shop.’

Tagalog differs from the schema in (1) in that the patient-subject construction also bears a nasal infix, at least in the perfective. This infix is not peculiar to the patient-voice, but occurs also with applicatives (see (6) below).

A speaker of a European language faced with a set of constructions like these is likely to see the one in which the patient has subject properties as a passive. A number of earlier analyses of Tagalog adopt that view, including Bloomfield 1917 and F. Blake 1925, as well as some more recent ones, including Wolfenden 1961 and Llamzon 1968. An analogous interpretation of Cebuano was advanced by Bell within the framework of Relational Grammar (Bell 1983). Under this view the construction in which the agent is marked by *ang* is an active transitive construction. Implicit in such an analysis is the view that Tagalog is an accusative language, with A identified with S.

More recently an alternative analysis has emerged which takes the patient-as-subject construction to be transitive and the agent-as-subject construction to be an anti-passive, a derived intransitive. Under this view Tagalog is an ergative language since the patient of a transitive verb is treated the same as the sole argument of a one-place predicate. The ergative interpretation is to be found in Cena (1979), Payne (1982), de Guzman (1983, 1986), Cooreman, Fox and Givón (1984), and Starosta (1986, 1988).

Under a third view Tagalog is neither accusative nor ergative. In this view Tagalog has no subject since the properties associated with subject in European languages are divided between the *ang*-marked constituent and agent or actor. This is the view espoused by Schacter in his much-quoted 1976 paper. Mallinson and Blake characterise Tagalog and other ‘Philippines-type’ languages as ones in which both A and P have equal status as subject (Mallinson and Blake 1981: 54, 79). In Foley 1991, and Kroeger 1993 two transitive constructions are recognised. In the patient-subject construction the actor is still part of the core; in the agent-subject construction the patient is still part of the core. Neither A nor P is exclusively aligned with S (see also Himmelmann 1991, 2001).

The fact that the distribution of the nasal prefix splits intransitive predicates into two classes in many of these languages means that with respect to verb marking at least, these languages have an active system (Klimov 1973) or a split-S system (Dixon 1994). It also raises the possibility that this morphological split might allow an analysis into unaccusative predicates that take an underlying object and unergatives that have an underlying subject (Perlmutter and Postal 1984), or an LFG analysis in which unaccusatives are treated as [-r] and unergatives as [-o] (Bresnan 2000: 312-13).

Another consistent characteristic of the Austronesian languages of Taiwan and the WMP branch is the use of what were called advancements in Relational Grammar and more

generally applicative constructions, i.e. constructions in which a benefactive, locative or instrumental can be promoted into the core where, if the predicate is a transitive verb, the promoted argument displaces the patient-theme. In the following Tagalog example the locative *tindahan* has been advanced to subject, as indicated by the substitution of *ang* for *sa* (compare (4) and (5) above), a change of valency that is registered on the verb by *-(h)an* in addition to *-in-*.

- (6) *B-in-il-han ng propesor ang tindahan ng libro*
 buy-LOC.VOICE professor shop book
 ‘A/the professor bought a book at the shop.’

A number of these characteristic features of WMP are to be found in the languages illustrated in this volume.

Balinese provides a good example of an alternation between an unmarked construction with the patient as subject and a construction marked with a nasal prefix in which the agent is subject. An interesting feature noted by Artawa, Artini and Blake is the way third person agents are treated. In clauses with the patient as subject and a third person agent, the agent can be expressed by an enclitic *=(n)a* or by an indefinite noun. If the agent is to be expressed as a definite noun, then it must be expressed in a prepositional phrase along with the enclitic. In (7) the agent appears to be represented both by *=(n)a* and by *meme*.

- (7) *Tigtig=a lantas I Bawang taken meme-ne*
 beat=3erg then Bawang by mother-3poss
 ‘Then Bawang was beaten by her mother.’

Sasak, spoken on the next island to the immediate east of Balinese, shows an interesting split in coding described in the paper by Austin. One of its dialects, *Ngenó-Ngené*, is like Balinese in having nasal intransitive verbs and a nasal transitive construction where the Actor is Subject (the alternative zero-marked construction has the Patient as Subject). There is also a productive passive marked by the prefix *te-*, and a rich system of applicatives marked by *-ang* on the transitive verb to introduce an array of oblique semantic roles as a Patient Subject of the zero construction. The syntax of *Ngenó-Ngené* thus resembles Balinese. Other dialects of Sasak, however, differ in their syntactic orientation. In the *Menó-Mené* dialect semantic roles in transitive clauses are coded differently according to animacy of the actants:

third person Agent acting on third person Patient is coded as a prepositional phrase marked by the preposition *isiq* (which also marks the Agent of a passive);

third person Agent acting on first or second person Patients are coded by a passive construction in which the Patient is an intransitive Subject, the verbs take the prefix *te-* and the Agent appears in a prepositional phrase marked by *isiq*; first or second person Agent acting on any Patient is coded by a zero-marked transitive construction where the usual word order is Agent Verb Patient.

The nasal transitive construction exists as an alternative to the zero-marked transitive; however, the Patient must be non-referential in *Menó-Mené* nasal transitives, and is typically

left unexpressed. Menó-Mené has only a restricted benefactive applicative that codes the person of the beneficiary along with the applicative sense.

In terms of cross-clausal syntax and determination of pivots, Menó-Mené shows a contrast between core arguments and non-core elements only, with no evidence for a syntactic subject. This orientation is thus quite different from Ngenó-Ngené and Balinese; however, it is identical to the pattern found in Sumbawan, spoken on the next island to the east of Sasak.

As Austin's discussion shows, Sumbawan shows nasal marked verbs; however, they are always intransitive and can never have a Patient expressed. Sumbawan lacks a passive construction and has only limited valence changing mechanisms; its cross-clausal syntax resembles Menó-Mené Sasak in contrasting core NP function with non-core. There is thus a cline of decreasing importance of transitivity from Balinese, through the dialects of Sasak, to Sumbawan.

In Alune (as appears to be the case with other CEMP languages such as Buru), arguments are marked as subject and object solely by word order rather than by morphological case marking. The grammatical role of subject is the pre-verbal core argument which is optionally cross-referenced with a proclitic on the verb. Object is a post-verbal core argument which is required by the predicator and which may occur as an enclitic on the verb. Semantically, subject and object may be either Actor or Undergoer, as indicated in the examples below.

- (8) *Latlakea-ru si=asu-ru uwele apale*
 Laturake-PL 3p.poss.al=dog-PL hold.at.bay pig
 'Some people from Laturake, their dogs were holding a pig at bay.' (YM: 20)

- (9) *Apale sui au bei ndi lo-mei*
 pig follow 1S from DIR ALL-LOC
 'The pig followed me from there over to here.' (YM: 26)

- (10) *I=daba lo-pe yo, sala, ele'i apale naia ne*
 3S=stab ALL=DIR DM wrong then pig run.away DM
 'He stabbed at it, missed, then the pig ran away.' (YM: 45-7)

- (11) *Apale 'ane=le ele'i apale mata*
 pig eat=3SNH then pig die
 'The pig ate it then died.' (ATK: 54)

In Sundanese the actor-subject construction with a nasal-prefixed verb is the dominant construction for most two-place verbs. In general the patient can be the subject only via the passive, but the passive has an unusual feature. Sundanese has number agreement on the verb. In the actor-subject construction, the active construction, the actor-subject controls the agreement, but, as Hanafi shows, in the passive the actor or agent still controls the agreement.

- (12) a. *B-ar-udak n-ar-akol-an bedug éta? [N-(t)-ar-akol-an]*
 PL-child ACT-PL-beat-it large drum DEF
 'Children kept on beating the large drum.'

- b. *Bedug éta? di-t-ar-akol-an ku b-ar-udak*
 large drum DEF PASS-PL-beat-it by PL.child
 ‘The large drum was repeatedly beaten by the children.’

In the passive in most languages it is the subject rather than the agent that controls the agreement. This agent-controlled agreement is unusual for a passive, but if the passive developed from a patient-subject construction, then one can see this agreement as a vestige of a construction in which the agent was part of the core. A comparison with Balinese examples like (7) above is instructive.

Bugis is interesting in regard to the debate about the interpretation of Western Malayo-Polynesian languages in that there is an ergative-absolutive system of clitics. In this language, as in other South Sulawesi languages, core arguments are expressed by clitics, with the option of free nominals in cross-reference. A set of enclitics marks S and P, and a set of proclitics marks A.

- (13) *Jokka-I Ali*
 go-3ABS Ali
 ‘Ali went.’
- (14) *U-nasu-i nanre-e*
 1ERG-cook-3ABS rice-Art
 ‘I cook the rice.’

This system of marking also provides a good test for transitivity, and, as Hanson notes in his paper, the patient is not cross-referenced in the nasal construction, which suggests the construction is formally intransitive. This is not surprising when we consider that the nasal construction is used when the patient is indefinite (cf. Menó-Mené Sasak). Compare (15a), where the patient is definite and the unmarked verb is used, and (15b), where the patient is indefinite and the nasal verb is used. The enclitic in (15b) encodes the agent, not the patient.

- (15) a. *Na-baca-i boq-e*
 3erg-read-3ABS book-Art
 ‘He is reading the book.’
- b. *Mab-baca-i boq*
 N-read-3ABS book
 ‘He is reading a book.’

There is also a passive construction marked by a prefix *ri-*.

Karo Batak has the alternation between unmarked verbs with the patient/theme as subject and nasal verbs with the agent as subject. In the unmarked voice there is a series of clitics for A.

- (16) *Baba=na beras*
 bring=3ERG rice
 ‘They brought rice.’

Norwood’s paper is mainly concerned with the discourse factors that influence the choice of voice. This is a challenge for anyone describing a language with such an alternation.

In Javanese there is an active construction for transitive verbs marked by a nasal prefix (17a), and a passive marked by *di-*. However, with a first or second person agent there is an unmarked construction with the patient as subject and the agent as an obligatory argument expressed as a proclitic (17b).

- (17) a. *Aku m-(w)aca buku iku*
1SG N-read book DEF
'I read the book'
- b. *Buku iku dak-waca*
book DEF 1SG-read
'I read the book.' (lit. 'The book I read')

An analogous construction is found in Bahasa Indonesia and Chung (1976) analyses it as a non-canonical passive. Sofwan points out that this construction is unmarked and that the agent is obligatory. He takes it to be an ergative construction, and his argument would apply to Indonesian as much as to Javanese.

REFERENCES

- Bell, S.J. 1983. Advancements and ascensions in Cebuano. In Perlmutter, D.M. (ed.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 143-218.
- Blake, F.R. 1925. *A grammar of the Tagalog language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bloomfield, L. 1917. Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis. *University of Illinois, Studies in Language and Literature* 3.2-4, Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Blust, R. 1977. The proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgrouping. *Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii* 9 (2): 1-15.
- Bresnan, J. 2000. *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cena, R.M. 1979. Patient primary in Tagalog. Paper read at LSA Winter Meeting, Chicago.

- Cooreman, A., Fox, B. and Givón, T. 1984. The discourse definition of ergativity. *Studies in language* 8: 1-34.
- Chung, S. 1976. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. In C. Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 57-98.
- de Guzman, V. 1983. Ergative analysis for Philippine languages. Paper presented at the Third Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages. Ohio University.
- de Guzman, V. 1986. Some consequences of causative clause union in Tagalog. In Geraghty, G., Carrington, L. & Wurm, S. A. (eds.), *FOCAL I : Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. 59-72.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, W.A. 1991. The lexical basis of argument structure in Western Austronesian. Paper presented to the 6th International Conference on Austronesian Languages.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1991. *The Philippine Challenge to Universal Grammar*. Arbeitspapier Nr. 15. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 2001. Lexical categories and voice in Tagalog. To appear in Peter Austin and Simon Musgrave (eds), *Voice and Grammatical Relations in Austronesian Languages*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Klimov, G.A. 1973. *O•erk Obš•ej Teorii ergativnosti* (Outline of a general theory of ergativity. [Reviewed by B. Comrie, *Lingua* 39: 252-60].
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Llamzon, T. 1968. Modern Tagalog. PhD dissertation. Georgetown University.
- Mallinson, G. & Blake, B. 1981. *Language typology*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Payne, T.E. 1982. Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik Eskimo and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 6.75-106.
- Perlmutter, D. & Postal, P. 1984. The 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law. In Perlmutter D. & Rosen, C. (eds.), *Studies in Relational Grammar 2*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 81-125.
- Schachter, P. 1976. The subject in Philippines languages: topic, actor actor-topic, or none of the above. In Li, C. (ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press, 491-518.
- Starosta, S. 1986. Focus as recentralisation. In Geraghty, P., Carrington, L. & Wurm, S.A. (eds.), *FOCAL 1: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. 73-95.
- Starosta, S. 1988. *The case for lexicase*. London: Pinter.
- Wolfenden, E. 1961. *A re-statement of Tagalog grammar*. Manila: SIL and Institute of National Language.