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Makassarese (basa Mangkasara’)

- Spoken by about two million people in South Sulawesi
- A basilect, but almost essential for daily life in Makassar (pop. 1.3 million)
- Still widely spoken as first (or only) language in rural areas
- Closest relatives: Konjo, Selayarese
- More distantly related to: Bugis, Mandar, Sa’dan
South Sulawesi

- Population 7.8 m, concentrated in southern half
- c.3.5m Bugis
- c.2m Makassarese
- 500,000 Sa’dan
- 250,000 Tae
- 200,000 Mandar
- 150,000 Highland Konjo
- 125,000 Coastal Konjo
- 100,000 Selayarese
- + 21 other languages
Sulawesi – a crossroads for voice systems

- To the north: Formosan and Philippine-type languages (multiple voice)
- To the west: ‘Indonesian-type’ (two-voice with meN- and di-, applicative morphology).
- To the east and south: ‘East Nusantara’-type. Loss of voice system, bound pronouns on the verb mark arguments.

Symmetrical voice

- Symmetrical voice languages have more than one morphologically marked bivalent construction, and it is not clear that one of these is ‘more basic’.
  - Philippine-type multiple voice (actor, patient, locative, conveyance)
  - Indonesian-type (meN- and di-, actor and undergoer, ‘active and passive’)
- Makassarese has an asymmetrical contrast between passive and ‘active’ — but ‘active’ is itself divided into subtypes which are not obviously voice-related
Basic clause structure

• We’ll need to look at some basic clause types before we look in detail at voice.
• Clitic pronouns do the main work of tracking referents
• Clitic pronouns are obligatory for definite arguments while NPs are omissible
• Free pronouns are rare – used for emphasis

Pronominal elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Proclitic (ERG)</th>
<th>Enclitic (ABS)</th>
<th>Possessive suffix (POSS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sing</td>
<td>inakke</td>
<td>ku=</td>
<td>=a’ -ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 fam</td>
<td>ikau</td>
<td>nu=</td>
<td>=ko -nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pol/1pl inc.</td>
<td>ikatte</td>
<td>ki=</td>
<td>=ki’ -ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl exc.</td>
<td>*ikambe</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*=kang *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>na=</td>
<td>=i -na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clitic pronouns (generally) occur in an ergative/absolutive pattern:
• enclitic (absolutive) represents S in intransitive clause or P in transitive clause
• proclitic (ergative) represents A in transitive clause
Intransitive clauses

- Intransitive clauses can be of several major types, depending on the category of the predicate head. Verbs (other than a small set of basic verbs) will be marked with a verb prefix, usually $aC$-
- There will be an ‘absolutive’ (=ABS) enclitic cross-referencing the sole argument S, if S is definite
- The ABS enclitic tends to attach to the first constituent, whatever its category (2P)

(1) $Tinroi\ i\ Ali$
   tinro =i i Ali
   sleep =3ABS PERS Ali
   Ali is sleeping

(2) $A\ jappai\ Balandayya$
   aC– jappa =i balanda =a
   INTR– walk =3ABS Dutch =DEF
   The Dutchman is walking

(3) $Angnganrea’$
   aN(N– kanre =a’
   TR– eat =1ABS
   I’m eating

(4) $A\ varanga’$
   aC– jarang =a’
   INTR– horse =1ABS
   I ride a horse
Transitive clauses

- In fully transitive clauses both proclitic (A) and enclitic (P) are on the verb, and there is no verb prefix.

(6) *Pongoro’-dudui anjo taua*

pongôr dudu =i anjo taua =a
mad very =3ABS that person =DEF
That person is really crazy

(7) *Jaranga’*

jarang =a'
horse =1ABS
I am a horse

(11) *Inakkeji*

inakke =ja =i
1PRO =LIM =3ABS
It’s only me

(21) *Nakokkoka’ miongku*

Na= kokko’ =a’ miong =ku
3ERG= bite =1ABS cat =1.POSS
My cat bit me

(42) *Kukanrei untia*

ku= kanre =i unti =a
1ERG= eat =3ABS banana =DEF
I eat the bananas
Transitive clauses

• When both arguments are 3rd person (and definite) the meaning can be ambiguous, and the order of free NPs after the verb does not help to clarify this:

\[ \text{Naciniki tedongku i Ali} \]
\[ \text{na= cini’=i tedong -ku i Ali} \]
\[ 3_{\text{ERG}}=\text{see}=3_{\text{ABS}} \text{ buffalo -1POSS PERS} \text{ Ali} \]
Ali sees my buffalo / my buffalo sees Ali

Passive clauses with \textit{ni-}

• The prefix \textit{ni-} demotes A, leaving P as sole argument S, which is (still) marked with an \textit{=ABS} enclitic.

• The demoted Actor may optionally be expressed in an adjunct preceded by the preposition \textit{ri} — this must follow the verb.

• Passive clauses are marked and in current speech relatively rare (though they were common in literary styles)
Passive clauses

• The contrast between a passive clause and an active transitive clause is shown below:

_Nikokkoca’ (ri meongku)_

ni– kokko’=a’ (ri meong-ku)
PASS– bite =1ABS (PREP cat -1.POSS)
I was bitten (by my cat)

_Nakokkoca’ meongku_

na= kokko’=a’ meong-ku
3ERG= bite =1ABS cat -1.POSS
My cat bit me

---

Passive clauses

(51) _Niroko’mi bulaeng balla’na Puttiri Bida Sari._

ni– roko’ =mo =i bulaeng balla’ =na puttiri Bida Sari
PASS– pack =PRF =3ABS gold house =3.POSS princess Bida Sari
Puttiri Bida Sari’s house was filled with gold (by magic, PT:196).

(52) _areng kalenna. jangku mabassung. nikana. I Mangayoaberang._

areng kale =n na iang =ku ma– bassung ni– kana
name self =3.POSS PROH =1.POSS STV– swollen.belly PASS– word

I Mangayoaberang
PERS Mangayoaberang
His personal name, may I not swell up, was called I Mangayoaberang
(KIT:1:10)
Another type of clause

- So far we have seen intransitive, transitive, and passive clauses. But there is another type:
- These clauses clearly describe events involving two participants, but only include an =ABS enclitic pronoun cross-referencing one of those participants — the Actor.
- the Undergoer (typically indefinite) appears only as an NP and is not cross-referenced.
- The verb is marked with a verb prefix, usually $aN(N)$—

$aN(N)$- clauses

Angnganrea’ taipa
$aN(N)$- kanre =$a'$ taipa
TR- eat =1ABS mango
I eat a mango / mangoes

Ammalia’ ballo’
$aN(N)$- balli =$a'$ ballo’
TR- buy =1ABS palm.wine
I buy palm wine
A brief look at verb prefixes

- The class of verbs in Makassarese is largely defined and subclassified by association with a paradigm of verb prefixes, superficially similar to Indonesian-type voice prefixes *ber-* (active intransitive) and *meN-* (active transitive)

Verbs with *aC-*

- Main function: derive intransitive verb from nominal root

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Derived Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jarang</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>ajarang</td>
<td>ride a horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tedong</td>
<td>buffalo</td>
<td>attedong</td>
<td>keep buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oto</td>
<td>car</td>
<td>a'oto</td>
<td>go by car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buburu’</td>
<td>rice porridge</td>
<td>a'buburu’</td>
<td>make rice porridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayao</td>
<td>egg</td>
<td>a'bayao</td>
<td>lay an egg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jonga</td>
<td>deer</td>
<td>a'jonga</td>
<td>hunt deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juku’</td>
<td>fish</td>
<td>a'juku’</td>
<td>go fishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbs with $aN(N)$-

- Main function: derive a (lexically) bivalent verb – seen in ‘citation’ forms or clauses with indefinite P

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$aN(N)$-p</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>ROOT GLOSS</th>
<th>VERB FORM</th>
<th>DERIVED VERB MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aN(N)-p</td>
<td>peckang</td>
<td>hook</td>
<td>ammekang</td>
<td>fish with a hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aN(N)-b</td>
<td>balli</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>ammalli</td>
<td>buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aN(N)-t</td>
<td>tunrunung</td>
<td>*hit</td>
<td>ammrunung</td>
<td>hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aN(N)-s</td>
<td>sanggara’</td>
<td>fried</td>
<td>amnyanggara’/ammangara’</td>
<td>fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aN(N)-c</td>
<td>kokko</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>annyokko</td>
<td>hide (something)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aN(N)-k</td>
<td>kanre</td>
<td>rice/food</td>
<td>anganganre</td>
<td>cat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs with either $aC$- and $aN(N)$-

- $banyyang$ *stretch* → $a'banyyang$ stretch (self)
- $kanuku$ nail, claw → $akkanuku$ have nails/claws
- $kanyame$ taste → $akkanyame$ have a flavour
- $kokkoro’$ crumbling → $akkokkoro’$ tumble down
- $kokko$ secret → $accokko$ hide (self)
- $jari$ so → $ajari$ become something
- $kanre$ food → $akkanre$ be consumed (e.g. by fire)
- $lesang$ *move* → $a'lesang$ move (self)

What are these $aN(N)$- clauses?

- Are they ‘formally intransitive’?
  - Are they ‘extended intransitives’? (intransitive +)
  - Are they antipassives? (transitive -)
- Is $aN(N)$- a marker of Actor voice?

Formally intransitive

- This is the analysis used by Friberg for Konjo (1996), and Basri for Selayarese (1999).
- Based on an equivalency between cross-referencing and argument status. No clitic pronoun = not an argument.
- BUT this analysis doesn’t really help us work out what an indefinite Undergoer is, and there are problems with the clitic = core analysis.
‘Extended intransitive’

- This is the analysis used by Lee for similar constructions in Mandar (2006)
- It relies on the analysis of indefinite P as ‘a non-core obligatory extended argument’
- ‘I have identified core arguments in Mandar by two forms of morphosyntactic coding. The first form of coding is the marking on the verb by pronominal clitics. That is, the pronominal clitics are core arguments. The second form of coding is position in the clause as a fronted NP. This fronted NP is also a core argument... Others might make a case that the obligatory status of the NP makes it a candidate for core status, but I do not.’

Extended intransitive

- ‘There may also be a subset of the intransitive class, which we can call 'extended intransitive', that involves two core roles - one is mapped onto S relation and the other is marked in some other way, e.g. by dative case... An important point to note here is that these 'extended' subclasses are always relatively minor... most intransitive verbs will be canonically intransitive, with one core role; the extended intransitives, with an extra role, are always relatively few in number.’ (Dixon 1994:123)
Antipassive

• This is (for example) Mead’s analysis of the function of a similar prefix *poN* in Mori Bawah (Mead 2005).
• It is also Kaufman’s analysis of similar constructions in Mamuju, and (by extension) across South Sulawesi languages

Canonical antipassive derivation
(Dixon 2012:208)

a) Applies to an underlying transitive clause and forms a derived intransitive
b) The underlying A becomes S of the antipassive
c) The underlying O goes into a peripheral function, being marked by a non-core case, adposition, etc.; this argument can be omitted, although there is always the option of including it.
d) There is some explicit formal marking of an antipassive construction
Antipassive may be used to satisfy some syntactic constraint (pivot feeding), or to focus on what the A argument is doing, or to avoid stating the O argument’. (Dixon 2012:220)

\[aN(N)\] - as a voice marker

Friberg (1996) and Hanson (2001) have analysed the contrast between constructions with two clitics (fully transitive clauses) and those with a verb prefix and an absolutive (\(aC\)- or \(aN()N\)- clauses) as being a contrast of ‘focus’ (i.e. voice)

- ERG and ABS clitics = ‘object’, ‘goal’ (Friberg) or ‘patient’ (Hanson) focus
- Prefix and ABS clitic = ‘subject’ (Friberg) or ‘agent’ (Hanson) focus
Intransitive as ‘subject focus’ (or Actor voice)

- Konjo: ‘Subject Focus implies that there is no object or that the object is not relevant to the action at hand’ (Friberg 1996:143)
- ‘Regardless of the inherent transitivity of the verb, (these) clauses are viewed as intransitive constructions since there is either no object or the object is indefinite’ (*ibid* 144)

Konjo ‘subject focus’ (Actor voice) examples

- *Angngitte*a  *jangang-jangang*
  VRt.see.1ABS  bird
  ‘I see some birds’

- *Langnginranga*   *berangta*
  FUT-VRt.borrow.1ABS knife.2(H)POSS
  ‘I want to borrow (one of) your knives’

(Friberg 1996:143-4)
Problems with $aN(N)$- as a voice marker

- Speakers can’t choose between $aC$-, $aN(N)$- or their absence to realign grammatical relations
- Definiteness of P is the determining factor
- Sensitive to discourse and pragmatic/real world constraints rather than speaker’s choice of grammatical relation alignment or realignment.

What is the status of indefinite P?

- Is it core?

- It’s tempting to analyse (as Lee 2006 did) core arguments in Makassarese as those marked on the verb by pronominal clitics
- But this is not unproblematic
Problems with ‘core argument = clitic’

• It is not only indefinite P which lacks a cross-referencing clitic. Indefinite S is also not doubled:
  • Battu jai toana
    come many guest
  ‘Many guests are coming’ (c.f battui jai toanayya)
  • Nia’ sikayu tedong
    be   one-CLASS buffalo
  ‘There’s a buffalo’

Problems with ‘core argument = clitic’

• There is a focus construction in which NPs (any of S, A or P) are fronted and then not cross-referenced.
• This pre–predicate slot performs a variety of pragmatic functions associated with focus, such as disambiguating, emphasizing, adding certainty or uncertainty.
• i Ali tinro can express such meanings as:
  – ‘Are you sure it’s Ali who is asleep?’,
  – ‘I tell you that Ali is asleep’,
  – ‘I’ve heard that Ali is asleep’.
Problems with ‘core = clitic’

• There is often a mismatch between the form of the clitic and its presumed grammatical function
  – S is often marked with an ERG proclitic (in complement clauses, negated clauses, etc)
    Ten a na=tinro
    NEG 3=sleep
    ‘He doesn’t sleep’ (cf. tinro=i ‘he sleeps’)
  – Even P is sometimes marked by an ERG proclitic
    Ten a nu=ku=cini’
    NEG 2f= 1= see
    ‘I don’t see you’

What about indefinite S and P?

• They are clearly important, as can be shown by the fact that they can not be omitted (unlike NPs coreferent with clitics denoting S, A or P).
• They are not oblique.
• They are not incorporated.
• Indefinite P shares the qualities of indefinite S.
• "Core arguments are those arguments which are part of the semantic representation of the verb." (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:26)
What to call $aN(N)$- clauses

• Intransitive
• Antipassive
• Extended intransitive
• Semi-transitive?

Semi-transitive

• ‘In many languages... there are some clauses that... behave in some ways like intransitive clauses, but in other ways like intransitive clauses.’
• ‘nothing is intended beyond observing that they exhibit properties that fall in between those of normal intransitive and transitive clauses... the best analysis will vary from language to language’. (Dryer 2007:270-4)
To sum up

- Makassarese has an asymmetrical voice system, with several ‘active’ constructions and a passive construction.
- The ‘active’ constructions are marked differently according to levels of transitivity but not according to voice.
- When clitic pronouns are present, they constitute core arguments. Coreferent NPs are in apposition, only present for disambiguation or emphasis.
- When clitic pronouns are not present, NPs themselves are core arguments. These include focused (fronted) NPs and indefinite arguments.
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