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Although Acehnese has no proper passive, it does have a variety of functional equivalents of the passive. The functional distinctness of these passive-like strategies enables Shibatani's (1985) multi-functional explanation of the characteristic extensional uses of passive morphology to be tested in an interesting way. Although Shibatani's functional correlations are largely confirmed by this investigation, the results suggest that his passive prototype is more a typological summary of extensional properties of passives than an explanation of them.

1 INTRODUCTION

In some recent discussions of the passive from a typological and functional perspective it has been pointed out that there is a three-fold nexus in constructions identified as passives between pragmatic, semantic and syntactic properties. In characterizing passives linguists have distinguished:

1. The pragmatic patient foregrounding and agent backgrounding effects of passives (e.g. Keenan 1986).

2. The semantic correlates involving decreased agency and increased affectedness (e.g. Shibatani 1985).

3. The syntactic consequences of promoting to subject as a syntactic pivot creating process (e.g. Foley and Van Valin 1984, Dixon 1979).

Shibatani (1985) provides an outline of the passive as prototypically a convergence of pragmatic, semantic and syntactic functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERIZATION OF THE PASSIVE Prototype (Shibatani 1985)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Primary pragmatic function: Defocusing of agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Semantic properties:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Semantic valence: Predicate (agent, patient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Subject is affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Syntactic properties:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Syntactic encoding: agent ---&gt; $ (not encoded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient ---&gt; subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Valence of P[redicate]: Active = $^{p}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive = $^{p}_{n-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Morphological property:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active = $^{p}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive = $^{p}_{*\text{passive}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. passive is morphologically marked)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The support which Shibatani provides for this prototype involves an appeal to various non-prototypical, or extensional uses that passive forms
are put to in languages. He argues that the recurring correlations of passives with other construction types can be given a coherent interpretation in terms of the passive prototype; the associated constructions share particular component functions with the passive prototype. The assumption, of course, is that if two grammatical constructions have a functional component in common, then that can be the basis for a similarity in coding.

Shibatani points out the recurrent formal connections of passives with honorific, spontaneous and potential expressions, and with plural and indefinite verb forms. He relates these to the agent defocusing function of the prototypical passive. The passive function of expressing 'subject affectedness' he relates to resultative, stative and perfective applications of passives. Reflexives and reciprocals are doubly linked, he suggests, to the prototypical intransitive status of passives, and to the prototypes 'subject affectedness'. The success Shibatani achieves in establishing these functional connections is intended by him as a measure of the prototype's success in accurately describing the passive, and a weakness of approaches which cannot account for the connections.

One problem with Shibatani's account is that his study is of constructions which, for one reason or another, have been called passives in the descriptive tradition. It is not clear that they have been called passives for the same reasons, i.e. that they are really comparable. A related problem is his notion of 'subject', which is central to the definition of the passive prototype. Here too it is not at all clear that the 'subject' of the various languages he discusses is the same category. Contemporary studies would suggest that it is probably not (see e.g. Foley and Van Valin 1984, Chapter 4).

Another problem is that although the functional connections observed by Shibatani are suggestive, it is not always possible to be sure exactly which functional component is the basis for a formal similarity in coding. This is partly due to the way the prototype is formulated: 'agent defocusing', for example is not really just a pragmatic property. It seems intrinsically semantic making reference to a semantic category. One gets the impression that the prototype was formulated in response to the correlations Shibatani observed: it is a kind of summary of observed correlations, not an independently motivated starting point from which they might be derived.

These difficulties aside, it is undoubtedly true that what descriptivists call a passive verb form may often be used for a range of purposes which would not by themselves merit the term passive. And these other uses of what are called passive fcrms conform to certain types, of which Shibatani provides a comprehensive survey. There is a characteristic clustering (or clusterings) of extensional uses of (so-called) 'passive' morphology, which demands an explanation.

The problem of functional explanation is more manageable for a language in which the suggested prototype passive functions and characteristic extensional uses of passive morphology do not converge on a single morphological voice of the verb, i.e. where there is no passive in the mould of Shibatani's prototype. Acehnese is just such a language. It expresses the pragmatic, semantic and syntactic functions of Shibatani's prototype in ways which keep the pragmatic level relatively distinct from the (semantic and syntactic) level of predicate argument structure. This allows Shibatani's proposed causal relations between prototypical functions and extensional uses to be tested. And indirectly, the notion of a prototypical passive can itself be tested.

2 A BRIEF OUTLINE OF RELEVANT ACEHNENE GRAMMAR

Acehnese is neither ergative nor accusative in its syntactic type. It is systematically and consistently an active language (or 'split-S' in the terminology of Dixon 1979: see also Dahlstrom 1983). The active pattern is illustrated in (1), where the intransitive argument in (1b) is coded like the transitive 'object'; in (1c) like the transitive 'subject'.
(1) a. geu-poh-keuh
   3-hit-2
   'He hits you.'

b. sakét-keuh
   hurt-3
   'You are hurt/sick.'

c. geu-jak
   3-go
   'He goes.'

The clitic pronominals in (1) are phonologically reduced forms of independent pronouns, and they code what I will call the Actor, cross-referenced by proclitics, and the Undergoer, cross-referenced by (optionally present) enclitics. Thus (1a,b) both have Undergoer arguments, and (1a,c) both have Actor arguments.

Verbal arguments in Acehnese may be realized as full NP's, with certain constraints, which include:

1. Only one direct argument NP (Actor or Undergoer) can precede the verb. This is termed fronting.
2. When a transitive Actor is placed after the verb, and there is no Undergoer enclitic, the Actor must be marked by the proclitic lé, an ergative case marker, as in (2a). Note that in (2b), with an Undergoer enclitic, lé is not required.

(2) a. lôn h'an geu-patéh lé gopnyan
    I not 3-believe ERG he
    'He doesn't believe me.'

b. kah h'an geu-patéh-keuh gopnyan
   you not 3-believc-2 he
   'He doesn't believe you.'

Otherwise word order is constrained by discourse context, and argument expressions may be omitted, according to the context. Acehnese word order is not configurationally linked to argument structure: in this sense it is 'free'. Any order of the verb and its two argument NP's is in principle possible, subject to the above constraints. Moreover, any argument may be omitted, if discourse context makes the identity of the argument recoverable (or irrelevant). The two intransitive orders with overt argument NPs are illustrated in (3), for Undergoers and Actors. In (4) various transitive orders are illustrated, with both NPs present (4a, b, c), just one omitted (4d, e, f, g) and no overt argument NP (4h).

(3) a. gopnyan sakét
    she hurt

b. sakét gopnyan
    hurt she

   'She is hurting/sick.'

c. gopnyan geu-jak
    he 3-go

d. geu-jak gopnyan
    3-go he

   'He is going.'

(4) a. kèè ku-poh jih
    I 1-hit he

b. jih ku-poh-ih lé kèè
    he 1-hit-3 ERG I

   21
c. ku-poh jih lé këe
   1-hit he ERG I

d. këe ku-poh-(ih)
   I 1-hit-(3)
e. ku-poh-(ih) lé këe
   1-hit-(3) ERG I

f. jih ku-poh-(ih)
   he 1-hit-(3)
g. ku-poh jih
   1-hit he
h. ku-poh-(ih)

"I will hit him."

The Acehnese Actor - the argument cross-referenced by a proclitic - is a volitional, controlling participant in the event or state described. This semantic status is particularly clear for those intransitive verbs which take either an Actor or an Undergoer, for example meureumpök 'greet, meet' in (5):

(5) a. jih ji-meureumpök sabé
    they 3-greet always
    ACTOR
    'They always meet: they always greet each other when they happen to come across each other.'

b. jih meureumpök sabé
    they meet always
    UNDERGOER
    'They always meet: they always are running into each other.'

Actors are necessarily (with some metaphorical exceptions: see Durie 1985: 67ff) animate, for they are volitional. When an Undergoer is inanimate it (almost always) is not cross-referenced.

An extensive investigation of Acehnese grammar (reported in detail in Durie MSb) reveals no reason for identifying a subject for Acehnese distinct from the Actor, and the Actor is a subject only in a very weak sense. Many syntactic properties, including the ability to undergo zero anaphora and the ability to be relativized or raised apply equally well to the Actor or Undergoer of transitive and intransitive clauses. Other syntactic properties such as the availability to be controlled in Equi constructions and to be the addressee of the imperative, are restricted to the Actor, and distinguish it from the Undergoer. These are 'semantic-role-related' properties (Schachter 1977, Dixon 1979), and as such are characteristic of agents or 'logical subjects', rather than of syntactic pivots, or 'surface' subjects.

From a functional perspective a rule that 'promoted an object to subject' in Acehnese would be superfluous, since both Actors and Undergoers are already available to crucial syntactic processes such as zero anaphora, and relativization. They can both act in several respects like what are called subjects in other languages. Moreover there is nothing to promote an object to: to turn an Undergoer into an Actor would be to radically alter the semantic structure of the verb, since Actors are volitional, Undergoers not. There is the fronting strategy, for topicalizing argument expressions before their predicate - this is discussed below - but it is hardly a syntactic promotion.

3. FUNCTIONAL CORRELATES OF THE PASSIVE IN ACEHNESEx

Although Acehnese has no proper passive (of the sort that promotes an object to subject without changing the underlying semantic relational structure of the clause) it does have a variety of ways of expressing what
one might say with a passive in another language. And these expressive strategies have revealing interactions with the correlations discussed by Shibatani.

3.1 Pragmatic strategies

3.1.1 Zero anaphora

It is possible in Acehnese to drop argument NP's. This enables one to achieve some of the functional effects of the English passive, for example. Consider three of the reasons for using the English passive, identified by Jespersen (1924:167-8) and cited by Shibatani:

a. The active subject is unknown or cannot be easily stated.
b. The active subject is self-evident from the context.
c. There may be a special reason (tact or delicacy of sentiment) for not mentioning the active subject.

These reasons apply in contexts where one cannot or would not want to mention the active subject overtly. These pragmatic needs can be met in Acehnese by the simple strategy of having no overt Actor NP, and just retaining the proclitic pronominal to reference the Actor. The Undergoer NP need not be topicalized before the verb. The following two examples are illustrative:

(6) a. ureueng sakét geu-ba u rumoh sakét
   person sick 3-take to house sick
   'The sick person was taken to hospital.'

   b. ban ji-peugót jaian nyoe
      just 3-make road this
      'This road has just been built.'

Note that the Acehnese speaker must at least make a decision about the Actor, whether the Actor will be referred to formally, as in (6a) with geu- 'he/she/they, polite', or informally, as in (6b) with ji- 'he/she/they, familiar'. This decision depends on many factors, including the formality of the discourse context itself. The speaker must also commit him or herself to saying that the unspecified Actor is not the speaker or addressee, since the proclitic cannot be so unspecific as to allow for first or second, as well as third person reference. So the unspecified Actor of this Acehnese construction type is not quite as unspecified as in the English passive, where the active subject could be anyone at all, including first and second person.

The Acehnese strategy of speaking without identifying the Actor overtly is formally identical with the possibility of omitting overt reference to an Actor whose identity has been established in the discourse, or is otherwise inferable: Clauses like those of (6) could also have a 'recoverable Actor' interpretation.

When the Actor in Acehnese could be anyone, speaker or addressee included, and one is making a generic statement, then the first person inclusive pronominal clitic ta- 'we' can be used:

(7) a. ta-peugót bruek . keu aueuk
    lincl-make coconut shell to ladle
    'Coconut shells are made into ladles.'

   b. nyang patót aduen       bek ta-kheun adoe
      COMP polite elder brother don't lincl-call younger brother
      'It is polite for an elder brother not to be called younger brother.'
Here we see a correlation between plural and defocusing: a plural pronominal clitic is used for generic Actors. However it is clear that this is not a passive, and the defocusing is purely pragmatic, not semantic. The Actor relation and its agentive meaning is not suppressed. Indeed a plural enclitic may be used for a generic Undergoer (8a) or possessor (8b), so the use of a plural form is not related to the agency of the Actor in any way.

(8) a. sayang-teuh
    feel sympathy-lincl
    'One feels sympathy (about that).'

    b. wah ulèe-teuh
    split head-lincl
    'One gets confused. (lit: one's head is burst open)'

3.1.2 Fronting

In Acehnese the expression of predication is achieved by the fronting of the appropriate NP before the verb. Thus in a folk story when the mouse-deer (kancil) wants to tell of himself that he has been elevated to official rank, he says:

(9) kèè ka geu-bôh keu waki lè raja
    I already 3-appoint to lord assistant ERG king
    'I have been appointed to Lord Assistant by the king.'

At the pragmatic level it seems right to relate this fronting to the English subject-predicate construction. In a very clear sense, kèè 'I' in (9) is the pragmatic peak of its clause. Kèè is named, and then a statement is made about kèè. This two-part structure is directly reflected in the intonation.

For such predicative judgements, Acehnese NP preposing often achieves a similar effect to the English active-passive distinction. Native speakers of Acehnese who speak English well will translate the English subject with a fronted NP in Acehnese. However in many respects Acehnese is very different from English. Most strikingly there is no verbal morphology to reflect the NP fronting. And for non-predicative statements (most clauses in actual discourse are of this type), which merely express an event without a predication, Acehnese typically has predicate first order, and no argument expression need occupy the pre-predicate position. This is illustrated in (10):

(10) ji-ku'uek manok
    3-crow fowl
    'A cock crowed.'

In English a clause is generally required to have a subject, whether or not it is to be regarded as the pragmatic subject of the statement, the thing about which one is saying something. One could say A cock crowed without the cock having any particular salience in the discourse, and without intending to convey any particular knowledge about the cock: one might just be indicating what time it was. However in Acehnese the fronted position seems to be used when one wants to indicate that the fronted NP is a subject of an assertion. For example, (11a) is the usual way of saying that it is raining. However in a narrative about heavy rains and the resulting floods, the order of (11b), with fronting, was consistently used, since the rain was a global topic or theme of the discourse: (11b) is a statement about the rain.

(11) a. ji-tôh ujeuen
    3-excrete rain
    'It is raining.'
b. ujeuen ji-tôh
rain 3-excrete
'The rain came down.'

In imperative or hortative expression in Acehnese pragmatic defocusing through the use of a non-fronted position is used for an honorific affect. An addressee Actor is 'backgrounded' by placing its NP after the verb:

(12) a. neu-jak droeneuh dilè
3-go you now
'You go now.'

b. neu-cok bacut treuk lé droeneuh
2-take little more Erg you
'Take a little more.'

Such word orders are very common with polite imperatives, for example when the addressee is droeneuh 'you, polite'.

The predicative status of clauses with fronting in Acehnese is reflected in significant discourse patterns. Verbal clauses are overwhelming predicate-initial in Acehnese discourse, and this is understandable, since verbs commonly describe events and states which fit into a flow of described situations. However, non-verbal clauses with PP or NP predicates are much more likely to have a fronted subject NP, and the highest frequency of fronting is with equational predications, like 'His father is Judge Marwan.' These predicate types are characteristically used to make truly predicative statements which are true across time, not temporally ordered components of a sequence of events or situations.

So in Acehnese it is possible to strictly distinguish the pragmatic strategy of predicative fronting from the issue of syntactic subjecthood. There is no direct linking of predication to argument structure. Pragmatic defocusing can be completely distinguished from operations on verbal argument structure.

In this section I have discussed some pragmatic strategies for focusing and defocusing the Actor in Acehnese, some involving omission of an overt Actor NP, and others involving ordering the Actor NP before or after the verb. It has been observed that these strategies are not passives, but they nevertheless show correlations with indefinite, plural and honorific usage. The use of an indefinite third person proclitic pronominal for an unspecified Actor, and of a first person plural inclusive clitic for a generic Actor provide natural translational equivalents of some uses of the English passive. And NPs may be defocused after the verb for the sake of politeness. This indicates that the correlations observed by Shibatani between passive morphology and indefinite, plural and honorific expression in many languages may be attributed to the pragmatic defocusing of the agent inherent to such constructions, for in Acehnese purely pragmatic strategies show the correlations in question.

3.2 Strategies involving operations on argument structure

Acehnese has a deverbal derivative strategy for suppressing an Actor's volitional status by forming a non-volitional verb, one without a proper volitional argument, from a volitional verb. The prefix teu- is attached to a verb to form the derivative. If the root is an intransitive verb, the derivative is also intransitive, but has an Undergoer argument instead of an Actor. Thus jak 'go' gives teujak 'walk aimlessly, without intent or purpose'; batôk 'cough' gives teubatôk 'cough without control'; and duek 'sit' gives teudemek 'be seated, be placed'. (13) provides an illustration of the semantic distinction with teu-:

(13) a. ka-dong bak pageue
2-stand at fence
'Stand at the fence.'
b. batèe'ulèe nyan teudöng bak pageue
   stone head that TEU-stand at fence
   'That headstone is standing by the fence.'

From a transitive verb teu- derives an intransitive verb, with the
same Undergoer argument as the root. The Actor is no longer a direct argu-
ment of the verb, and is typically unexpressed and unexpressible. Thus
grak 'move something, tr.' gives teugrak 'moved, movable'; kap 'bite, tr.'
gives teukap 'bitten, bitten accidentally'. Teukap is illustrated in
(14b), and two other teu- formations in (15).

(14) a. ji-kap bibi
   3-bite lip
   'She bit her lip (intentionally).'

b. teukap bibi
   TEU-bite lip
   'She bit her lip (accidentally).'

(15) a. neu-peulingkôngng beuso nyan
   2-bend iron that
   'Bend that iron.'

b. teupeulingkong beuso nyan
   TEU-bend iron that
   'That iron is bendable, is bent.'

c. lôn teungöh lôn-crûh pisang
   I middle 1-fry banana
   'I am frying bananas.'

d. pisang nyan ka teucrôh
   banana that already TEU-fry
   'Those bananas have been fried.'

Only for accidental uses of teu- can the understood initiator - one might
say the 'infelicitous' agent - be realized as a NP in an oblique-like con-
text, as in (16b). The initiator NP is syntactically inert, since it can-
not be fronted before the verb (16c):

(16) a. kamoe meu-koh bak kayèe nyan
    we, exclusive 2excl-cut tree that
    'We cut down that tree.'

b. bak kayèe nyan teukoh lé kamoe
    tree that TEU-cut we, exclusive
    'That tree accidentally got cut down by us.'

c. (*kamoe) teukoh bak kayèe nyan
    (we) TEU-cut tree that
    'That tree got cut down.'

The initiator NP is also unavailable for syntactic processes which usually
target Actors and Undergoers, with one exception: if the initiator is ad-
versely affected, then by virtue of that, and not of any volition, it can
be syntactically available; it can, for example, be fronted:

(17) lôn teu'uet tuleueng
    I TEU-swallow bone
    'I swallowed a bone.'

The status of teu- as a word deriving affix is demonstrated by the fac-
that a number of verbs only come in teu- form: no independent attes-
tion of the root is possible. Furthermore, certain meanings have
become lexicalized, thus bûh 'discard, throw away' gives teubûh 'wasted'.
Derivatives with teu express a number of related meanings, all involving the lack of volition: accidental, spontaneous, potential, resultative and stative. What all these have in common is that they make no assertion of volition. For example in the potential reading of (15b) no reference is made to an agent, since the flexibility of the iron is asserted quite apart from the issue of who might bend it. Likewise in the resultative reading of (15d) the bananas are reported as fried, with nothing said about who did it, or even whether anyone did it. (They could have fallen accidentally into the hot oil.)

Teu- is not a marker of a simple syntactic demotion. Its application effectively erases the volitional semantic component of the verb, and its argument restructuring properties are the result of the semantic operation.

Teu- may be termed a demotional semantic passive. It operates on argument structure and in suppressing the agent role changes the meaning of a verb it applies to. No promotion is involved. Thus in (14) the thing bitten, bibi 'lip' is syntactically an Undergoer for both koh 'bite, tr.' of (14a) and teukoh 'bitten, intr.' of (14b). Its semantic and syntactic status remains unchanged. The derivative verb simply has no proper volitional argument, and hence no Actor. The semantic suppression of the Actor occurs without a concomitant syntactic advancement. It is clear that the suppression of volition is not a pragmatic defocusing: it is an erasure of lexical semantic content, since teu- verbs explicitly preclude a volitional argument from the event or state described.

In Acehnese the connection between spontaneous, accidental, potential, resultative and stative uses of teu- is a semantic one. The common factor is semantic suppression of volition as a component of verbal meaning. We can thus observe a clear contrast in Acehnese between pragmatic defocusing of the Actor with the associated indefinite, plural and honorific effects, and semantic suppression of volition with the associated spontaneous, accidental, potential, resultative and stative effects.

This suggests that where what are termed passives in other languages show the latter set of associations, the functional motivation is the semantic suppression of agentivity which is possible in passives, rather than any pragmatic defocusing.

It would appear that in this respect the correlations suggested by Shibatani are in need of some revision, or further empirical support, since the Acehnese data are not all what one would expect. Potential and spontaneous expressions in Acehnese do not directly show the predicted correlation with pragmatic defocusing of the Actor, rather these, along with resultative and stative expressions, show a particularly clear correlation with semantic (and syntactic) suppression of the Actor, a factor not regarded as significant by Shibatani for spontaneous and potential usages.

3.2.1 Reflexives and reciprocals

One further passive correlation which Shibatani discusses is with reflexive and reciprocal constructions. He links these with two proto-typical passive properties: subject affectedness and detransitivization.

It is striking that in Acehnese the prefix meu-, used to form derivational reflexives and reciprocals, characteristically gives an intransitive result. Some examples of reciprocal and reflexive uses are: som 'hide tr.' -- meu som 'hide oneself, intr.'; poh 'hit, kill' -- mupoh6 'fight, reciprocal, intr.'.

This prefix derives intransitive verbs in a great variety of ways, from a variety of parts of speech. The common denominator is that the result must be intransitive. Meu- is used to form non-volitional intransitives from volitional verbs, just like teu-. It is used to derive volitional intransitives from non-volitional verbs, thus seunang 'happy' takes an Undergoer argument, but meu seunang 'celebrate, have a good time' takes an Actor. Meu- is also used to derive intransitive verbs, both volitional and non-volitional, from nouns, thus lampoh 'garden' -- meu lampoh, which with an Actor means 'work in a garden' and with an Undergoer means 'have a
garden'. Yet another use of meu- is to derive intransitive group activity verbs, for example competitive activity verbs like muplueng-plueng 'race, compete in running' ← plueng 'run, intr.' Meu- is also used as a detransitivizer, where the Actor is in some sense affected, as for example in persistent asking for something. Thus lakee 'ask, tr.' — meulakee 'ask on and on'.

Meu- in all its uses always gives an intransitive derivative, and its derivatives have a high degree of 'argument affectedness'. In this latter respect meu- contrasts with the detransitivizing infixed -eum-, which gets rid of a transitive verb's Undergoer argument, producing a volitional intransitive without any sense of argument affectedness. Thus som 'hide, tr.' gives seumeusom 'hide (things) intr.' (but cf. meusom 'hide (oneself) intr.'). Likewise sadeue 'lean, tr.' gives seumadeue 'lean (things) intr.' (but cf. meusadeue 'lean (one self) intr.').

It is clear that the reciprocal and reflexive uses of meu- have no connection with anything like a proto-typical passive in Acehnese. However the connections suggested by Shibatani may be observed: meu- derivatives are characteristically intransitive and there is a clear sense of argument affectedness in certain uses which are not reciprocal or reflexive. It seems plausible that there is a connection between reciprocal and reflexive uses of meu- and its more general functions as a detransitivizer and encoder of affectedness. The infixed -eum-, in contrast, derives intransitives but has an unaffected Actor argument, and is not used to express reciprocals or reflexives.

4 CONCLUSION

In Acehnese, which does not have a prototypical passive of the sort Shibatani defines, some 'passive' correlations he pointed out may still be observed if one considers the functional components of his passive prototype in isolation from each other. Particular functional strategies show very particular correlations, roughly confirming the connections he suggested. However in Acehnese there is a very clear distinction between pragmatic and semantic-syntactic coding strategies, with a corresponding distinction between types of correlation.

It is unnecessary to appeal to a prototype to explain the 'passive' correlations Shibatani discusses. They may still be observed when passive functions do not converge on a prototype. One must conclude that indeed certain coherent functional effects universally tend to receive appropriately coherent coding, but whether a single coding strategy, for example a passive, is the locus of several functional strategies is a matter of variation from language to language. It is a matter of interest that several rather different functions tend to converge in what are often termed passives. This needs explaining, but Shibatani's prototype is more a summary of properties than an explanation, since the 'prototype' functions do not necessarily converge on a single construction type.

NOTES

1. I do not attempt to deal here with Lawler's (1977) arguments that Acehnese is a language with a preverbal subject position and a passive. Elsewhere (Durie MSa) I have prepared a rebuttal of his claims.

2. The orthography used here is an adapted version of that recommended in Hasil. Note that Acehnese does not code tense on the verb, nor gender or number of pronouns. Appropriate, but by no means unique English translations are provided.

3. There are some other, more complex constraints, which do not concern us here.
4. Formality or politeness is one of the systematic distinctions made between Acehnese pronouns.

5. This difference between Acehnese and English is perhaps characteristic of a difference between Southeast Asia and the west, since in Indonesian cultures distinctions of personal reference are so much more elaborated and less dispensable.

6. Meu- has an allomorph mu- before labials.

7. Somewhat exceptionally a small number of non-volitional verbs take -eum- with a non-volitional result. Thus gadoh 'lost' gives geumadoh 'having lost something'.

8. Role and Reference Grammar (Foley and Van Valin 1984) provides a fairly elaborate and careful attempt at explaining this and related problems of universal grammar.

9. Shibatani's passive prototype thus differs from the prototype of transitivity postulated by Hopper and Thompson (1980), in that the convergence of transitive properties they describe does seem to be universal.
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