

# ACTIVE, PASSIVE AND ANTIPASSIVE IN BUNGKU-TOLAKI LANGUAGES

David Mead

Rice University

As far as is known, all Bungku-Tolaki languages of Sulawesi, Indonesia, have three transitive construction types—that is, three ways of expressing notionally transitive events—encoded with cognate morphology. These construction types are identified here as the passive (marked by the infix *-in-* or one of its allomorphs), the active-direct (marked by the presence of an object indexing pronominal clitic on the verb), and the antipassive (marked by the prefix *poN-*). Passive forms are widely used as nominalizations and in relative clauses and content interrogatives in which the patient is respectively relativized or interrogated. However, in main clauses passive verbs are almost always agent-deleting, and are employed in cases where the agent is unknown or irrelevant. Conversely, antipassives are used in situations where the patient is unknown, irrelevant, non-specific, non-mentioned, etc. (broadly characterized, ‘indefinite’), while active-direct forms are used when the patient is higher on the definiteness scale.

## 1 INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

One way to approach transitivity and voice, popularized by T. Givón (1983, 1994), is to consider voice to be primarily a pragmatic notion, based on the relative topicality of the topic and agent. For any particular language one may further ask, what are the formal resources available for encoding this range of voice? In other words, how many construction types are there which allow the expression of both an agent and a patient? As far as I am aware, the answer for the Bungku-Tolaki languages of southeastern Sulawesi, Indonesia is always three, expressed using cognate morphology.

This paper, then, is concerned with the three transitive construction types of Bungku-Tolaki languages, the inflection which characterizes them, and the discourse situations in which they are appropriately employed. These three types are identified here as the ACTIVE-DIRECT marked by the presence of an object suffix on the verb, the PASSIVE marked by the affix *-in-/in-/ni-* (schematically symbolized hereafter as *<in>*),

and the ANTIPASSIVE marked by the prefix *poN-*. There are of course other issues which touch on transitivity such as cross-referencing a verb for agent or indirect object, derivation of transitive verbs, and so-called detransitive forms. Agent indexing and indirect objects in these languages have both been discussed at length elsewhere (Mead 1998). And since detransitive forms (reciprocal, reflexive, middle, resultative and accidental passive) are syntactically intransitive or stative in Bungku-Tolaki languages, they fall outside the focus of this paper.

As the term antipassive has a number of connotations, it may help the reader to understand at the outset that I employ this term primarily in a pragmatic sense: antipassives are constructions in which the patient has lowered referentiality/topicality. There are, however, morphosyntactic correlates. Syntactically the patient of an antipassive verb can never be realized pronominally, though it may of course be realized as a NP (almost always without oblique marking). In terms of case marking, agents of antipassive verbs are treated in the same manner as subjects of intransitives.

## 2 TRANSITIVE VERB BASES

Before proceeding to a discussion of active-direct, passive and antipassive in Bungku-Tolaki, however, it will be helpful first to define the concept TRANSITIVE VERB BASE. The following are examples of transitive verb bases drawn from a variety of Bungku-Tolaki languages, including here Tolaki, Padoe, Mori Bawah, Bungku, Kulisusu and Moronene (for subgrouping of Bungku-Tolaki languages, see the *Introduction* at the beginning of this volume).

- |     |     |   |
|-----|-----|---|
| TOL | (1) | a. <i>kaa</i> 'eat'                           |
|     |     | b. <i>bindani</i> 'leave behind'              |
| PAD | (2) | a. <i>tamu</i> 'bury'                         |
|     |     | b. <i>kasipapa</i> 'carry under the arm'      |
| MRB | (3) | a. <i>tele</i> 'swallow'                      |
|     |     | b. <i>pepate</i> 'kill'                       |
| BNG | (4) | a. <i>baho</i> 'bathe'                        |
|     |     | b. <i>taepako</i> 'lift'                      |
| KUL | (5) | a. <i>nahu</i> 'cook, boil'                   |
|     |     | b. <i>palingka</i> 'send off, expel'          |
| MRN | (6) | a. <i>ala</i> 'take'                          |
|     |     | b. <i>poko'otolu</i> 'make (something) three' |

A transitive verb base may be simple, composed of a single morpheme as in all the (a) examples, or it may be complex, composed of more than one morpheme<sup>2</sup> as in all the (b) examples. An important aspect of transitivity in Bungku-Tolaki, however, is that whether the transitive base is simple or complex in actual speech it *is nearly always accompanied by some 'extra' bit of morphology*. This accompanying morphology will either be a pronoun which indexes the object, the affix <*in*>, or the prefix *poN-*. For example in Kulisusu:

- KUL (7) a. *Ari-mo to-tongo-ho, to-nahu-o-mo.*  
 finish-PRF 1p-wrap-3s 1p-cook-3s-PRF  
 ‘After we finished wrapping it, we cooked it.’
- b. *Gandu n[in]ahu-no a’iso i-motaha-mo.*  
 corn PASS-cook-3s that 3s-ready-PRF  
 ‘The corn being cooked by him was ready.’
- c. *I-ko’uni-mo: Be-ku-po-nahu gandu.*  
 3s-say-PRF FUT-1s-ANTIPASS-cook corn  
 ‘He said: I will cook corn.’

Or abstracted from context:

- (8) a. *nahuo* ‘cook it’ ACTIVE-DIRECT  
 b. *ninahu* ‘be cooked (by someone)’ PASSIVE  
 c. *ponahu* ‘cook, cook (something)’ ANTIPASSIVE

As the sentences of (7) illustrate, other bits of morphology may also accompany transitive verb bases. However, only object indexing, *<in>* and *poN-* are specific to (and diagnostic of) transitive verbs. One may define a transitive verb base, then, as a stem which has the morphological potential of being indexed for object, passivized with *<in>* or antipassivized with *poN-*.<sup>3</sup> It is also generally true that bases which receive such morphological marking encode notions which are notionally transitive, that is, they involve two distinguishable referents with one acting on or affecting the other.

However as is common throughout Austronesia, bases in and of themselves are not easily classified into different parts of speech, and whether a base should be considered even ‘verbal’ or ‘nominal’ frequently depends on context. Therefore we may conceive of, say, Bungku *baho* as a transitive verb base in that it is possible to create the formations *bahoo* ‘bathe him/her/it’, *binaho* ‘be bathed’, and *pobaho* ‘bathe (someone)’; however, *baho* also combines with *pe-* creating the middle (and syntactically intransitive) verb *pebaho* ‘bathe oneself’, while *baho* alone serves as the Bungku word for ‘water’ (Saro, Rahim, et al. 1982). This caveat notwithstanding, the concept of transitive verb base remains a useful notion for the following discussion.

### 3 PASSIVE

The morpheme *<in>* in Bungku-Tolaki serves as both a marker of passive voice and as a nominalizer which profiles the referent in patient role. This is not surprising as both functions are widely attested in cognates throughout Austronesia, and one or the other or both functions have been attributed to this morpheme in Proto-Austronesian (Pawley & Reid 1980; Startosta, Pawley & Reid 1982; Ross 1995; *inter alia*).<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, even as a passive marker *<in>* probably finds its widest use in

relative clauses and content interrogatives when the patient role is relativized or questioned, where the passive verb may in some cases alternatively be interpreted syntactically as a nominalization (e.g. ‘what are you cooking?’ = literally ‘what is your thing-being-cooked?’).

In Tolaki, the passive marker <*in*> has the following allomorphs: the infix /-in-/ placed before the first stem vowel when the initial consonant is voiceless:<sup>5</sup>

- TOL (9)
- a. *pinaho* ‘planted’ < *paho* ‘plant’
  - b. *tinena* ‘ordered’ < *tena* ‘order’
  - c. *kinulisi* ‘peeled’ < *kulisi* ‘peel (or skin) woody items with a blade’
  - d. *sinolongako* ‘poured out’ < *solongako* ‘pour out’
  - e. *hinunu* ‘burned’ < *humu* ‘burn’

the prefix /in-/ when the stem is vowel initial:<sup>6</sup>

- f. *inalo* ‘taken’ < *alo* ‘take’
- g. *inehe* ‘desired, longed for’ < *ehe* ‘want’
- h. *ininu* ‘drunk’ < *inu* ‘drink’
- i. *inoli* ‘bought’ < *oli* ‘buy’
- j. *inusa* ‘pounded’ < *usa* ‘pound with a pestle’

and the prefix /ni-/ when the initial consonant is voiced:

- k. *nibaho* ‘bathed’ < *baho* ‘bathe’
- l. *nidaga* ‘guarded’ < *daga* ‘guard’
- m. *nigeru* ‘scraped’ < *geru* ‘scrape’
- n. *nimala* ‘trimmed’ < *mala* ‘trim (by shaving off thin pieces)’
- o. *ninahu* ‘cooked’ < *nahu* ‘cook’
- p. *ningangiti* ‘fussed over’ < ‘fuss over’
- q. *niwala* ‘fenced’ < *wala* ‘fence’
- r. *niruru* ‘gathered’ < *ruru* ‘gather’
- s. *niluarako* ‘taken out’ < *luarako* ‘take out, put out’

Because this is also the pattern found in Moronene, it must be attributed a time-depth reaching back at least to Proto-Bungku-Tolaki—even though this pattern has disappeared in Kulisusu, Wawonii, Bungku and Mori Bawah where apparently /-in-/ has everywhere taken over the domain formerly held by /ni-/ (in addition to the numerous examples below, see respectively Asmi 1995:33, 61; Manyambeang, Mahmoed, et al. 1982/1983:32, 37; Hani 1969:32; Esser 1933:352).<sup>7</sup>

### 3.1 Passive as nominalization

Example (10) illustrates a Bungku-Tolaki passive nominalization with <*in*>.

KUL (10)      *kinaa-no*      *Wangkinamboro*  
                  <in>:eat-3s      Wangkinamboro

Syntactically this construction has all the earmarks of a noun phrase, compare for example *raha-no Wangkinamboro* ‘W.’s house’, *gandu-no Wangkinamboro* ‘W.’s corn’. But even with this simple data certain ambiguities arise: should *kinaa* be viewed as semantically compositional and hence something to be treated in a syntactic component (suggesting the translation ‘that which Wangkinamboro ate/eats/will eat’), or is *kinaa* its own lexeme and hence something to be derived in a lexical component (suggesting the translation ‘Wangkinamboro’s food’)?

In order to avoid this dichotomous line of questioning, I prefer to adopt a Cognitive Grammar framework for treating and understanding nominalizations.<sup>8</sup> In this view *kinaa*, along with other <in> forms, simply instantiates a broad pattern of <in> affixation which profiles the referent in patient role against the backgrounded event. The cognitive salience of the backgrounded event is a matter of degree, which may even vary from utterance to utterance depending on context. Also the more conventionalized the meaning, the more the backgrounded event may recede. For example Kulisusu *kinaa* is a term for food in general, but often refers more specifically to the main starch (e.g. rice or cassava); in other areas *kinaa* has come to mean exclusively ‘cooked rice’. Tolaki *pinisi* refers to not just anything which is pinched between the fingers (transitive base *pisi*), but specifically to the langsung fruit which is opened in this manner. One could imagine at the far end of this continuum <in> forms with which all reference to the underlying event has become obliterated, e.g. through phonological reshaping of the <in> form so as to be no longer recognized as such, or through the original transitive base falling into disuse. As an example of the former one might cite Padoe *inehu* ‘vegetables’ which is at least two degrees removed phonologically from its original form \**ninahu* ‘be boiled, cooked’. An example of the latter, cited by Adriani (1914:227), is Tolaki *kiniku* ‘carabao’, stem *kiku* unknown.

Although this viewpoint is now associated with modern Cognitive Grammar, similar thoughts were also expressed early this century. The following quote regarding Mori Bawah forms is revealing, even though Esser still desired to divide <in> forms into discrete categories:

Many -in-forms have become regular substantives, such as *inula* ‘cargo, load’; *inule* ‘descendant, progeny’ (from *mo’ule* ‘bring forth’ (of descendants)); *inahu* (from *ninahu*) ‘vegetables, greens, flesh, fish’, but usually ‘greens’, in particular a certain ‘pea’ (namely, the plant, the fruit of which is called *wua inahu* and the leaves *lewe inahu*); *pinotuwu* ‘domesticated animal’; *pinopaho* ‘plantings’ (*mompaho* ‘to plant’; the reduplication could have originated by analogy with *pinotuwu*); *inomba* ‘dried meat’ (*mo’omba* ‘salt meat and dry it in the sun’); *inike* ‘beaten tree bark’; *minama* ‘areca nut’ also referring to the ‘areca palm’ (= *pu’u minama*), from *momama* ‘chew betel nut’. With these forms one no longer

thinks of the action which is expressed by the root word, and the corresponding genitive or possessive pronoun refers then also not to the agent but to the (grammatical) possessor. (Esser 1933:354) (my translation)

Morphologically <in> nominalizations are indexed for agent/possessor in the genitive, and fill the same syntactic slots as do regular nouns. Compare for example:

- KUL (11) a. *Hiina i-da'a doi-ngku.*  
 NEG 3s-NEG.EXT money-1s  
 'I don't have any money (lit. my money does not exist).'
- b. *Hina-mo i-da'a s[in]ikori-nto.*  
 NEG-PRF 3s-NEG.EXT PASS:await-1p.COLL  
 'There's no longer anyone we're waiting for (lit. our awaited one doesn't exist anymore).' (Asmi 1995:86)

Compare further these noun phrase examples:

- TOL (12) **ni-wowai-no Imba**  
 PASS-do-3s Imba  
 'Imba's work' (Sande, Sikki, et al. 1986:88)
- MRB (13) **in-ia-do To Molongkuni**  
 PASS-reside-3p To Molongkuni  
 'a village of the To Molongkuni' (Esser 1927:164)
- (14) **k[in]aa asa n-tongo**  
 PASS:eat one LG-wrap  
 'a wrapper of cooked rice' (Esser 1933:271)
- MRN (15) *yo ni-daga-no simbau-'u*  
 ART PASS-take.care-3s friend-2s  
 'the thing taken care of by your friend' (S. Andersen 1994:48)

and these sentence examples:

- TOL (16) *Mo'ahi ni-nahu-miu.*  
 salty PASS-cook-2p  
 'Your cooking is salty' (Youngman 1991:pers.comm.)
- PAD (17) *Mentee p[in]au-mu sie.*  
 clear PASS:say-2s that  
 'What was said by you is true.' (Karhunen 1994:22)



- KUL (18) *Ndo-riso sabara giu-no k[in]aa,*  
 3p-assemble every kind-3s PASS:eat  
*be-ndo-pom-pili boo apu-no rajaki.*  
 FUT-3p-ANITPASS-choose for lord-3s foodstuff  
 ‘Then every kind of eaten thing gathered together, in order to  
 choose someone to be king of the foods.’ (Asmi 1995:86)
- (19) **C[in]atapi hina-po i-mocu’i.**  
 PASS-wash NEG-INCOMP 3s-dry  
 ‘The wash (washed clothes) isn’t dry yet.’
- MRN (20) *I’aku mehawa-ku mong-kaa k[in]aa.*  
 1s like-1s PART:ANTIPASS-eat PASS:eat  
 ‘I like to eat rice.’ (S. Andersen 1994:17)
- (21) *Nahina t[in]o’ori-no.*  
 NEG:EXT PASS:know-3s  
 ‘There was nothing he knew.’ (S. Andersen 1994:48)
- (22) *Sawali pera in-awa-nto to-pe-tila-orua-’o.*  
 but all PASS-get-1pi 1pi-MM-divide-two-3s  
 ‘But everything we get we’ll divide in two’ (D. Andersen  
 1997:pers.comm.)

### 3.2 Passive in relative clauses and content interrogatives

Bungku-Tolaki languages follow a pattern common to other languages of Western Indonesia in that they allow a patient to be relativized only when it occurs as surface subject, in other words the verb of the relative clause must occur in passive form.<sup>9</sup> For example:

- KUL (23) *pakea [ w[in]eweu-no ] a’iso*  
 clothing PASS-make-3s that  
 ‘that clothing which had been made by her’

From the discussion of <in> as a nominalizer, it follows that example (23) might have an alternative interpretation, namely that *wineweu-no* is not a clause but rather a noun which stands in apposition to *pakea*, something like ‘that clothing, her made thing’. Although it is possible that relative clauses originated in this way, present-day Bungku-Tolaki languages now generally distinguish relative clauses from nouns in apposition. In Kulisusu for instance it is only non-restrictive relative clauses which may formally resemble appositives. Compare for example the true apposition construction in (24), as well as the non-restrictive relative clause of (25), both of

which are distinguished from the construction of (23) by the position of the deictic (*a'iso*), phonetic pause (indicated by comma), and the article *io*:

KUL (24) *mia a'iso, io [ laki-no lipu ]*  
 person that ART chief-3s settlement  
 'that person, the *Lakino Lipu*'

(25) *ana cina a'iso, io [ t[in]ako-ndo i*  
 child female that ART PASS-hide-3p at  
*tangke-no Wansindoori-dori itonia ]*  
 mountain-3s Wansindori-dori NEAR.PAST  
 'that girl child, the one who had earlier been hidden by them on  
 Mount Wansindori-dori'

Other languages have relative markers which now formally distinguish relative clauses from apposition constructions, for example Padoe *henu*, Mori Bawah and Bungku *amu*, Wawonii *mia* and Moronene *da*.<sup>10</sup> Compare the following examples of relative clauses from across Bungku-Tolaki. In every case it is the patient which has been relativized, and the verb occurs with <*in*>:

TOL (26) *nggiro'o o wine ni-ruru-no*  
 that ART rice PASS-collect-3s  
 'that rice which had been collected by him'

(27) *o gandu s[in]olongako-ro i tonga mbada*  
 ART corn PASS:pour.out-3p at middle LG:field  
 'the corn which had been poured out by them in the middle of the  
 field'

PAD (28) *galu henu tekoni p[in]ompaho-ako*  
 rice.field REL at.the.moment PASS:plant-BEN  
 'the rice field which is being planted' (Karhunen 1994:39)

MRB (29) *kondehora amu h[in]awe-ku hieno*  
 animal REL PASS:encounter-1s near.past  
 'the animal which I just now encountered' (Esser 1927:164)

(30) *kinaa amu n[in]ahu-no*  
 cooked.rice REL PASS:cook-3s  
 'the rice which was cooked by him' (Esser 1927:164)

(31) *punti p[in]aho-do*  
 banana PASS:plant-3p  
 'bananas which were planted by them' (Esser 1927:164)



BNG (32) *susu anu in-oli-no i andi*  
 milk REL PASS-drink-3s PI younger.sibling  
 ‘the milk which was drunk by Younger Brother’  
 (Saro, Rahim, et al. 1982:76)

WAW (33) *lima tongo kinaa mia in-oli-no*  
 five wrap cooked.rice REL PASS-buy-3s  
 ‘five wrappers of cooked rice that were bought by him’  
 (Manyambeang, Mahmoed, et al. 1982/1983:82)

KUL (34) *kapala boo s[in]awiki-ndo*  
 boat FUT PASS:board-3p  
 ‘the boat which was going to be boarded by them’

(35) *ihi-no bawu in-ala-no itonia*  
 flesh-3s pig PASS-take-3s near.past  
 ‘the pig’s flesh which he had taken earlier’

MRN (36) *yo ta’ate-no da ni-ungkaari-no*  
 ART knife-3s REL PASS-hold-3s  
 ‘his knife that he was holding’ (S. Andersen 1994:50)

(37) *luwu doi da p[in]o’ita*  
 all money REL PASS:ask  
 ‘all the money that was asked for’ (S. Andersen 1994:4)

(38) *masina da p[in]ake*  
 machine REL PASS:use  
 ‘a machine which has been used’ (S. Andersen 1994:49)

Apparently a relativizer (*hemu*, *anu*, *mia*, *da*) need not be present, but its absence may signal a more conventionalized meaning. Compare example (38) with the following:

MRN (39) *masina p[in]ake*  
 machine PASS:use  
 ‘a second-hand machine’ (S. Andersen 1994:49)

In a similar way, in these languages headless relative clauses formally and semantically contrast with <*in*> nominalizations, for example Mori Bawah *kinaa-miu* ‘your eaten thing, your cooked rice’ versus *anu kinaa-miu* ‘that which is eaten by you’ (\*‘that which is your cooked rice’), as in:

MRB (40) *Anu-mo k[in]aa-miu onae-mo ngkuda ku-pong-kaa.*  
 thing-PRF PASS:eat-2p 3s-PRF 1s:additive 1s-ANTIPASS-eat  
 ‘That which is eaten by you all, that’s what I’ll eat too.’  
 (Esser 1927:162)

Likewise in Moronene:

- MRN (41) *Lima-no naamo wiri-no simbau-'u da k[in]aa-u.*  
 hand-3s and ear-3s friend-2s REL PASS:eat-2s  
 'What was eaten by you were the hands and ears of your friend.'  
 (S. Andersen 1995a:48)

Just as when the patient is relativized, when one interrogates the patient a passive form of the verb is used. The resulting interrogative sentence has the form of an equative clause with the word for 'who?' or 'what?' standing on one side and a construction with <in> on the other side. In this regard, the <in> form is morphosyntactically indistinguishable from a nominalization. Compare the following two questions:<sup>11</sup>

- KUL (42) *Inaio boo apu-nto?*  
 who FUT lord-1p.COLL  
 'Who will be our king?' (Asmi 1995:86)
- (43) *Inaio boo in-engka-ndo?*  
 who FUT PASS-lift-3p  
 'Who will be elevated by them?' ('Who is to be their elevated one?')

The passive form can also be interpreted in a relative sense, thus 'who is it that will be elevated by them?', but apparently a relativizer (e.g. Padoe *hemu*, Mori Bawah *amu*, Moronene *da*) is not required. Compare further these examples:

- TOL (44) *O hapo laa t[in]ekura'ako-no?*  
 ART what be PASS-distressed.about-3s  
 'What's being distressed about/over by him?'  
 (Sande, Sikki, et al. 1986:111)
- MRB (45) *Isema k[in]ita-mu?*  
 who PASS:see-2s  
 'Who was seen by you?' (Esser 1927:158)
- BNG (46) *Hapa t[in]ewa-mu?*  
 what PASS:carry.in.sarong-2s  
 'What are you carrying in your sarong?' (Adriani 1900:271)
- WAW (47) *Hapao mia b[in]ini-miu?*  
 what REL PASS:carry-2p  
 'What are you carrying?'  
 (Manyambeang, Mahmood, et al. 1982/1983:83)

- KUL (48) *Io hapa k[in]aa-miu?*  
 ART what PASS:eat-2p  
 ‘What are you eating?’
- (49) *Io hapa k[in]eni-miu?*  
 ART what PASS:hold-2p  
 ‘What are you holding?’
- MRN (50) *Hapa nta ni-lagu-to?*  
 what FUT PASS-sing-1pi  
 ‘What are we going to sing?’ (S. Andersen 1995b:60)
- (51) *Hapa ni-weweu-u?*  
 what PASS:do-2s  
 ‘What are you doing?’ (S. Andersen 1995b:62)

### 3.3 Passive in independent clauses

Across Bungku-Tolaki languages, when <in> passives occur as main clause predicates they are agent-deleting, in other words they disallow any overt expression of the agent. Such passive clauses are restricted to discourse contexts where the agent is highly backgrounded or irrelevant. Compare the following examples from Kulisusu, a language in which main verb passives are always agent-deleting:

- KUL (52) *I-p[in]ura-mo.*  
 3s-PASS:finish-PRF  
 ‘It’s used up.’
- (53) *Mewangu mewangu, oloncuduo a’iso i-s[in]ambure.*  
 morning morning yard that 3s-PASS:sweep  
 ‘Every morning that yard is swept.’
- (54) *Gau-ndo be-ndo-k[in]aa pokana-kana.*  
 speech-3p FUT-3p-PASS:eat same  
 ‘They said they will all be eaten the same’ (Asmi 1995:87)
- (55) *E’ehe-o ana-mai b[in]aba.*  
 like-3s child-1p PASS:carry.on.shoulders  
 ‘Our child likes being carried on shoulders.’

Note the morphosyntactic contrast between main clause passives and passives which we have seen used in other contexts. Here as in examples (52) through (54) main verb passives may be indexed for patient—what could hence also be termed the derived subject. This is not possible with <in> forms found in nominalizations, relative clauses and interrogatives, which may only be indexed for the (demoted) agent. Compare further the following examples of main verb passives. Pronominal indexing—when it

occurs as in (58), (60), and (61)—is restricted to the patient/derived subject, with no agent expressed whatsoever.

- TOL (56) *Koa oleo hopulo kiniku ni-gere.*  
 every day ten carabao PASS-slaughter  
 ‘Every day, ten carabao are slaughtered.’  
 (Muthalib, Alimuddin, Chalik, et al. 1985:34)
- (57) *Ina-inae me-alo meohai t[in]ondu*  
 whoever PART:MM-take PART:be.siblings PASS-submerge  
*i iwoi.*  
 at water  
 ‘Whoever marries with their sibling is drowned in water.’  
 (Sande, Sikki, et al. 1986:89)
- (58) *Saa ari-no k[in]aputi, laulau-no in-ulu.*  
 when finish-3s PASS:lash directly-3s PASS-lower  
 ‘When it was finished being lashed, immediately it was lowered.’
- PAD (59) *Ono t[in]anu owundu-olo.*  
 3s.IRR PASS-bury short-day  
 ‘He will be buried in the afternoon.’ (Vuorinen 1995:104)
- (60) *H[in]emu-komiu-to kee ai sala?*  
 PASS:hit-2p-PRF INTERROG at road  
 ‘Were you hit on the road?’ (Vuorinen 1995:105)
- MRN (61) *T[in]arima-a moico-si langa-ku.*  
 PASS:receive-3s good-CTR brideprice-1s  
 ‘My brideprice was well accepted.’ (S. Andersen 1995b:35)

Although these languages certainly have the apparatus to express the agent when the verb is passive, apparently this rarely happens in main clauses. Moronene is one language which allows non-topical agents to be introduced following the preposition *hai* ‘at’ (S. Andersen 1995b:35), but even this strategy appears to be uncommon in Moronene and similar strategies are not known to me in other Bungku-Tolaki languages:

- MRN (62) *Daa-ko nta ni-rako hai polisi.*  
 be-2s FUT PASS-catch at police  
 ‘You may be caught by the police.’

Instead, when the agent is expressed usually an active-direct clause must be employed, even when a new agent is presented against a highly topical patient. Compare for example this Moronene sentence in which the verb *onto* ‘see’ in its second occurrence

is active-direct, ‘they (people) saw him’, not passive ‘he was seen by people’ (S. Andersen 1995b:28):

MRN (63)	<i>Saba</i>	<i>nta</i>	<i>mo-rako</i>	<i>kadadi</i>	<i>da</i>
	emerge	FUT	PART:ANTIPASS-catch	animal	REL
	<i>[in]onto-no,</i>	<i>ka-ndo</i>	<i>me-’onto-o</i>	<i>miano.</i>	
	PASS:see-3s	and-3p	PL-see-3s	person	
	‘(the tiger) emerged in order to catch any animal it saw and then people saw it.’				

The same is also found in Tolaki. For example in response to the question ‘What happened to this wooden spoon?’, only the following active-direct clause is acceptable, not its passive counterpart, even though the rat introduced in agent role is neither topical nor specific (S. Youngman 1990:pers.comm.):

TOL (64)	a.	<i>No-kaa-’i</i>	<i>doeke.</i>
		3SG <sub>i</sub> -eat-3SG <sub>j</sub>	rat <sub>i</sub>
		‘A rat ate it.’	

In a similar vein, Esser (1933:352) gives the following Mori Bawah translation for ‘ten lepers were healed by Jesus’:<sup>12</sup>

MRB (65)	<i>Hopulu</i>	<i>ira</i>	<i>mia</i>	<i>melowe</i>	<i>do-poko-madoo-ira</i>
	ten	3p	person <sub>i</sub>	leprous	3p <sub>j</sub> -CAUS-healthy-3p <sub>i</sub>
	<i>Ue</i>	<i>Isa.</i>			
	Lord	Jesus <sub>j</sub>			

Apparently the prominence achieved by using passive voice as in the English translation can only be approximated by word order in these languages, so that (65) translates literally ‘the ten lepers, he healed them Jesus’. When a passive construction is attempted, namely:

MRB (66)	<i>Hopulu</i>	<i>ira</i>	<i>mia</i>	<i>melowe</i>	<i>p[in]oko-madoo-do</i>
	ten	3p	person	leprous	PASS:CAUS-healthy-3p <sub>j</sub>
	<i>Ue</i>	<i>Isa.</i>			
	Lord	Jesus <sub>j</sub>			

the passive verb with agent indexing can only be interpreted as belonging to a relative clause, hence ‘ten lepers *who* were healed by Jesus’ (Esser 1933:352).

In general, then, passive main verbs do not allow expression of an agent. Exceptions (besides the Moronene strategy using *hai*) are rare, but I do have one example each from Tolaki, Padoe and Moronene. The Tolaki example is taken from a

discourse context in which the agent is highly topical and the patient is introduced into the discourse, and the same apparently also holds true for the Moronene example:

- TOL (67) *Opitu o'osu ni-lomba-no, a-no luarao-kee*  
seven mountain PASS-perforate-3s and-3s expel-3s  
*i tahi...*  
at sea  
‘Seven mountains were punched through by him, and he deposited them in the sea...’
- PAD (68) *n[in]ahu-nggu inehu la'a*  
PASS-cook-1s vegetable that  
‘those vegetables were cooked by me’ (Vuorinen 1995:106)
- MRN (69) *Ko'ira yo wembe ni-pakani-no-mo koie i Ali.*  
those ART goat PASS-feed-3s-PRF that PI Ali  
‘Those goats were pastured by Ali.’ (S. Andersen 1995b:36)

However a syntactic interpretation in which these <in> forms are considered to be nominalizations—that is ‘seven mountians were what was punched through by him...’, ‘what I cooked are thsoe vegetables’, ‘those goats were what were pastured by Ali’—cannot immediately be ruled out. I have also come across one example from Mori Bawah; in this case an interpretation of *l[in]alo-do* as a nominalization seems less likely:

- MRB (70) *umari-no t[um]ele-o kimbohu nana'ote andio,*  
finish-3s PART:swallow-3s iguana youth this  
*ka-i amba l[um]ako-ako-ira, osio inia*  
and-3s next PART:go-CONF-3p nine village  
*l[in]alo-do, ka-i amba tetoro-ako-ira a*  
PASS:pass.by-3p and-3s next sit-CONF-3p at  
*n-toto si'e-do Datu*  
LG-below rice.barn-3p Datu  
‘After the iguana had swallowed the youth, then he walked for them on the way (the iguana walked, but they were both on the move), nine villages they passed through, then he sat for them underneath the rice barn of Datu.’ (Esser 1933:376)

Because of their rarity, these constructions have resisted further investigation.



#### 4 ACTIVE-DIRECT AND ANTIPASSIVE

Wherever one goes in the Bungku-Tolaki area, there are two ways to invite someone to eat. For example in Kulisusu:

- KUL (71) a. *Pong-kaa!* ‘Eat!’  
 ANTIPASS-eat
- b. *Kaa-ho!* ‘Eat it!’  
 eat-3s

The verb of (71a), which is an antipassive form, is the standard way to invite someone to eat, to ‘dig in!’ as it were, to help oneself to whatever food has been set out. The active-direct verb of (71b) has a much more specific intent and would only be used when some certain food is under consideration; maybe the hostess has prepared a special dish and wants you to eat it. On a microcosmic scale these two verbs, *pongkaa* and *kaaho*, illustrate the difference between active-direct and antipassive in Bungku-Tolaki. Whatever the associated morphosyntactic properties, the difference semantically lies in the definiteness of the referent in patient role, namely: active-direct for patients on the high end of the definiteness scale, and antipassive for patients lower down.

Although traditional grammar recognizes the categories ‘definite’ and ‘indefinite’, degree of definiteness actually represents an interplay of different vectors, including whether or not the referent is referential, a specific entity, aforementioned in the discourse, and present in long-term or focal memory. Accordingly, how ‘definite’ and ‘indefinite’ get defined may be played out differently from one language to the next. However the correlation between active-direct forms (with indexing for object) and ‘definite’ versus antipassive forms (with *poN-*) and ‘indefinite’, is found so many times over in present-day languages that it must be very old.

Although the underlying form of the antipassive marker is *poN-*, it coalesces with the so-called active participle marker *-um-* to appear in surface form as *moN-*. As may be observed below, a participle form may not directly follow a subject pronoun. For a fuller discussion regarding the meaning and distribution of *-um-* see Mead (in preparation). In Proto-Bungku-Tolaki the nasal coda of *\*poN-* had a prenasalizing effect on a following voiceless stop or sibilant, but otherwise was realized as zero (a glottal appeared between the prefix and a vowel-initial stem). This pattern is found unchanged for example in Mori Bawah (data from Esser 1927, 1933; Tapehe 1984):

- MRB (72) a. *moN-paho* → *mompaho* ‘plant’  
 b. *moN-tia* → *montia* ‘divide’  
 c. *moN-kaa* → *mongkaa* ‘eat’  
 d. *moN-saru* → *monsaru* ‘borrow’

e.	<i>moN-basa</i>	→	<i>mobasa</i>	‘read’
f.	<i>moN-dagai</i>	→	<i>modagai</i>	‘guard’
g.	<i>moN-gonti</i>	→	<i>mogonti</i>	‘cut with scissors’
h.	<i>moN-maru</i>	→	<i>momaru</i>	‘climb’
i.	<i>moN-nahu</i>	→	<i>monahu</i>	‘cook, boil’
j.	<i>moN-wawa</i>	→	<i>mowawa</i>	‘carry’
k.	<i>moN-hola</i>	→	<i>mohola</i>	‘mix’
l.	<i>moN-rako</i>	→	<i>morako</i>	‘capture, catch’
m.	<i>moN-lulu</i>	→	<i>mohulu</i>	‘chase’
n.	<i>moN-aha</i>	→	<i>mo’aha</i>	‘whet’
o.	<i>moN-eu</i>	→	<i>mo’eu</i>	‘change, exchange’
p.	<i>moN-isa</i>	→	<i>mo’isa</i>	‘pound (rice)’
q.	<i>moN-oli</i>	→	<i>mo’oli</i>	‘buy’
r.	<i>moN-ungke</i>	→	<i>mo’ungke</i>	‘seek’

and is repeated again and again throughout the Bungku-Tolaki family, with only slightly different manifestations depending on historical sound change.<sup>13</sup>

#### 4.1 Mori Bawah

In Mori Bawah, specific patients take an active-direct form of the verb, but non-specific patients (especially in a partitive sense) require the antipassive:

Any object, namely, whether singular or plural, which is not human, individual, definite, but serves as part (without being further specified) of a whole, a group, a collective, is taken as indefinite and thus constructed with one of the above [*poN-*] forms. Thus in a sentence such as ‘Today we shall eat the cow which was slaughtered yesterday’, in Mori only a form with definite object can be used, if one’s intention is to refer to the entire animal. If one intends however to say that today one shall eat a portion of the flesh, and the rest keep until later (e.g. ‘we shall eat *of* the cow...’), then in Mori one can only use an indefinite object form, because in that case which part of the cow shall be eaten at the specified time, and which part not, is not indicated. (Esser 1933:182–183) (my translation)

Examples of the antipassive in Mori Bawah are (Esser 1933:183):

MRB (73)	<i>Onae-mo</i>	<i>ka-i</i>	<b>pon-tena</b>	<i>i</i>	<i>Numunuo</i>
	3s-PRF	and-3s	ANTIPASS-order	PI	Numunuo
	<i>otolu-’ira</i>	<i>mia</i>	<i>mota’u.</i>		
	three-3p	person	old		
	‘Then Numunuo sent out three <i>of</i> the old people’				

- (74) *Nahi tehine i-hawe-o-mo umbele-do bonti,*  
 NEG long.time 3s-encounter-3s-PRF mudhole-3p wild.pig  
*onae-mo i-po-'imu.*  
 3s-PRF 3s-ANTIPASS-drink  
 ‘Not long after, she came to a mudhole used by wild pigs, and she drank thereof.’

If Esser’s analysis is correct then active-direct forms are used so long as the patient is a specific (whole) entity, even if such a referent is new to the discourse and unknown to one’s audience—as for example the twigs, banyan tree and rice mortar in the following examples, which even at first mention receive pronominal indexing on a transitive verb (this also holds true for the ‘mudhole’ of the example immediately above) (Esser 1933:184):

- MRB (75) *I-ala-o rani andio p[Ø]udu-o ranka*  
 3s-take-3s gnome this PART:break.off-3s twig  
*opaa, ka-i wee-ako-no i Rintago.*  
 four and-3s give-INST-3s PI Rintago  
 ‘The gnome took and broke off four twigs and gave them to Rintago.’
- (76) *[m]elulu i Oleo b[Ø]uta-o apali, ka-i lako*  
 PART:leap PI Sun PART:extract-3s banyan and-3s go  
*paho-ako-no i Wula a n-toro ulu-no;*  
 plant-BEN-3s PI moon at LG-crown head-3s  
*[m]ombalo i Wula l[um]ako um-ala-o*  
 PART:take.revenge PI Moon PART:go PART-take-3s  
*nohu langkai, [m]elulu p[Ø]aho-ako-no i*  
 rice.mortar large PART:leap PART:plant-BEN-3s PI  
*Oleo a n-toro ulu-no.*  
 Sun at LG-crown head-3s  
 ‘Sun leapt hard, pulled a banyan tree out of the ground, and planted it for Moon on the crown of her head; responding, Moon took a large rice mortar, leapt hard and planted it for Sun on her crown.’

## 4.2 Tolaki

What we have seen in Mori Bawah does not necessarily hold for other Bungku-Tolaki languages. In Tolaki for example specific referents which are new to the discourse generally require an antipassive form of the verb when first mentioned (assuming of course they are introduced in patient role). Compare for example the

two occurrences of the verb *piara* ‘take care of’ (the first antipassive, the second active-direct) in the following stretch of narrative discourse. The only difference between the object of *piara* in the two clauses is its knownness:

- TOL (77) *Laa-i-to mo'ia i Abunawas, a-no*  
 be-3s-PRF live PI Abunawas and-3s  
*pom-biara o bee, o'aso-ikaa.*  
 ANTIPASS-care.for ART goat one-precisely  
*Laa-i-to-kaa p[Ø]iara-i, a-no laa nggoo mate.*  
 be-3s-PRF-just PART:care.for-3s and-3s be FUT die  
 ‘There used to live a man called Abunawas (lit., Abunawas was living), and he cared for a goat, a single one. He was just taking care of it, and it was going to die.’

Note also the following pairs, each of which contrasts a verb in antipassive and active-direct form. Although antipassives allow an object to be expressed in nominal form (it of course cannot be expressed pronominally), in general modification by deictic, possessor, or relative clause is eschewed, as this further specification would increase the definiteness of the referent in patient role to where an active-direct form would be required (data from S. Youngman 1990:pers.comm.):

- TOL (78) a. ...*lako mo-lolaha o ambo*  
 go PART:ANTIPASS-search ART goodness  
 ‘...go look for goodness’
- b. ...*lako l[um]olaha-'i ina-no i Dapi*  
 go PART:search-3s mother-3s PI David  
 ‘...go look for David’s mother’
- (79) a. *Ku-onggo mo-inu iwoi.*  
 1s-want PART:ANTIPASS-drink water  
 ‘I want to drink some water’ (water in general, not any specific water)
- b. *Ku-onggo um-inu-'i iwoi ni'ino.*  
 1s-want PART-drink-3s water this  
 ‘I want to drink this (particular glass of) water’
- (80) a. ...*a-no po-wohiki dadio ana dalo.*  
 and-3s ANTIPASS-wash many child baby  
 ‘...and he washed many baby children’ (unspecified group)

- b. ...*a-no*      *wohiki-'i*      *ana-nto.*  
          and-3s      wash-3s      child-1pi  
          ‘...and he washed our child’ (a specific child)

When making a request, a Tolaki speaker may consciously employ a form implying that the object is indefinite, even when it is specific and known to both the speaker and his audience (S. Youngman 1990:pers.comm.). Sentence (81b) is thus considered more polite:

- TOL (81) a. *Tewali-i-ki*                      *ku-onggo*      *s[um]aru-'i*      *la'usa-miu?*  
          be.possible-3s-CERT      1s-want      PART:borrow-3s      ladder-2p  
          ‘May I certainly borrow your ladder?’
- b. *Tewali-i-ki*                      *ku-onggo*      **mo-saru**  
          be.possible-3s-CERT      1s-want      PART:ANTIPASS-borrow  
          *la'usa-miu?*  
          ladder-2p  
          ‘May I certainly borrow a ladder of yours?’

### 4.3 Moronene

Moronene presents many of the same features of active-direct and antipassive seen back in Tolaki and Mori Bawah. Some contexts in which typically an antipassive form is called for are when the patient is non-referential or non-specific:

- MRN (82)      *I*      *Samidi*      *merare-ho*      **mo-benuti**                      *ni'i.*  
          PI      Sanudi      fast-3s                      PART:ANTIPASS-husk      coconut  
          ‘Sanudi is very fast at husking coconuts.’ (S. Andersen 1995b:29)
- (83)      *Ari-aku*      **mong-kaa**                      *nangka.*  
          finish-1s      PART:ANTIPASS-eat      jackfruit  
          ‘I have eaten jackfruit’ (S. Andersen 1995a:17)
- (84)      *Na-ndo*      *paisa*      **mo-'awa**                      *ihi*      *e'e.*  
          NEG-3p      never      PART:ANTIPASS-find      meat      water  
          ‘They never found any snakehead fish’ (S. Andersen 1995a:17)

A closely related use of antipassive forms is what may be termed ‘action-focus’. In such cases any overt reference to a highly backgrounded patient may simply be missing:

- MRN (85)      *Ari-aku-mo*                      **mon-totapi.**  
          finish-1s-PRF                      PART:ANTIPASS-wash  
          ‘I’ve washed (clothes)’ (S. Andersen 1995a:16)

Active-direct forms on the other hand usually imply an action carried out on a specific, known entity:

- MRN (86) *Me'asa tempo koie koe leu titia-ho dahu.*  
 one time that stork come invite-3s dog  
 'Once upon a time the stork came and invited the dog'  
 (S. Andersen 1995a:12)
- (87) *Tampo-'o-mo yo kaumba; mokora-ho ngalu.*  
 close-3s-PRF ART window strong-3s wind  
 'Please close the window; the wind is strong.'  
 (S. Andersen 1995a:13)
- (88) *Aha-'akita-'o pali, nta lako-kita mom-popodo*  
 sharpen-BEN:1pi-3s axe FUT go-1pi ANTIPASS-cut  
*keu.*  
 wood  
 'Please sharpen the axe for us, we are going to cut wood'  
 (S. Andersen 1995a:13)
- (89) *Ka-u ala-a die doi ka-u lako mo-'oli*  
 and-2s take-3s this money and-3s go ANTIPASS-buy  
*depa.*  
 biscuit  
 'Then you take this money and buy some biscuits.'  
 (S. Andersen 1995a:13)

When an unknown referent is introduced into the discourse, whether it is specific or non-specific plays a role in the choice of verb form. For example I assume in the following examples that because the well and the hut are individual and specific (there was only one well, and only one hut in the orchard), they appear as the surface object of an active-direct verb—even though the most natural translation in English is with the indefinite article *a*:

- MRN (90) *Ka-i onto-o nangkua pinewuwu, koie*  
 and-3s see-3s indeed well that  
*po-'ala-a-no-mo miano e'e.*  
 ANTIPASS-get-LOC-3s-PRF person water  
 'Then indeed he saw a well, the place where people drew water.'  
 (S. Andersen 1995a:12)



- (91) *Ka-i lako koie me-raro-m-punti ka-i*  
 and-3s go that PART:MM-inside-LG-banana and-3s  
*awa-a olumpu-'ute.*  
 find-3s hut-small

‘Then he went into the banana orchard and found a small hut.’  
 (S. Andersen 1995a:12)

On the other hand, the bananas and the stake in the following examples are introduced as objects of antipassive verbs, not only because they are unknown but also non-specific (there were several bananas, of which some were picked, and—presumably, as neither the context nor Andersen’s free translation indicates this—several stakes of which one was sharpened). Once introduced, however, their definiteness is established and in subsequent mention the bananas and stake appear as objects of active-direct verb forms:<sup>14</sup>

- MRN (92) *Nilako-no-mo ndoke momone; sa-teleu-no*  
 immediately-3s-PRF monkey PART:climb when-arrive-3s  
*hai otu m-punti laulau-no-mo totoro naamo*  
 at top LG-banana go.directly-3s-PRF sit and  
*mo-'upu ka-i kulisi-o ronga kaa-ho.*  
 PART:ANTIPASS-pick and-3s peel-3s with eat-3s

‘Immediately the monkey climbed; when he arrived at the top of the banana (tree), immediately he sat down, picked (some fruit), then peeled and ate it.’ (S. Andersen 1995a:21)

- (93) *Nilako-no-mo kolopua lako mo-sembi*  
 immediately-3s-PRF turtle go PART:ANTIPASS-sharpen  
*ampa, naamo ta'o-o hai raro ng-kapu.*  
 stake, and set-3s at inside LG-grass

‘Immediately the turtle went and sharpened a stake and set it in a clump of grass.’ (S. Andersen 1995a:15)

To summarize what we have seen in Moronene thus far, antipassive constructions are used when the patient is non-referential, non-specific, or simply backgrounded to the point of receiving no overt mention, while active-direct forms are used when the patient is specific, even albeit newly introduced into the discourse. Nevertheless, there remain other uses of antipassive verb forms which cannot be brought under this analysis. Compare for example the following sentence, where even though the English gloss indicates that the object is to be considered specific, nevertheless the verb appears in its antipassive form:

MRN (94) a. *Daa-ko mo-wawa sica- 'u?*  
 be-2s PART:antipass-bring brush-2s  
 'Have you brought your brush?' (S. Andersen 1995a:19)

Furthermore even in subsequent discourse this brush failed to rise to the point where it became indexed by object pronoun, compare for example the following two sentences which occurred subsequently to that of (94a) (S. Andersen 1995a:19):

- b. *Nde 'e nta mo- 'ala-ko?*  
 INTERROG FUT PART:ANTIPASS-take-2s  
 'Will you take (it)?'
- c. *Po-wee-haku ka-ku po-saru isala.*  
 ANTIPASS-give-1s and-1s ANTIPASS-borrow first  
 'Give me so I can borrow (it) first.'

Another wrinkle yet in the analysis of antipassive and active-direct forms in Moronene is that with certain transitive verb bases, the difference between the two constructions appears to have become lexicalized. Compare *mo-lesa* 'step on (accidentally)' versus *lesa- 'o* 'tread on, step on (on purpose)'; *mo- 'ulea* 'serve (food)' versus *ulea-ho* 'load on'; and *mo-dio* 'keep' versus *dio-ho* 'put away' (S. Andersen 1999:pers.comm.). From even these few examples it emerges that—apparently unique to Moronene—the meaning of prefix *poN-* has been extended in certain semantic directions not yet described in other Bungku-Tolaki languages.

Clearly further investigation is needed, especially regarding the extent to which such lexical differences are found. It may turn out that 'antipassive' will be an inappropriate label for the prefix *poN-* in Moronene, at least in some of its uses.

#### 4.4 Kulisusu

As the following examples illustrate, the usual correlation between antipassive marking and indefiniteness of the referent in patient role is also to be found in Kulisusu:

- KUL (95) *Sa-bucu-no i-po-wole-mo empe daida-no.*  
 when-only-3s 3s-ANTIPASS-stretch.out-3s mat father-3s  
 'Then her father stretched out a mat.'
- (96) *Ndo-pom-pewoo woo-no manusia.*  
 3p-ANTIPASS-smell scent-3s human  
 'They smelled human scent.'

- (97) *Ungkude ku-po-wawa kabaku.*  
 1s 1s-ANTIPASS-bring gift  
 ‘(As for) me, I’ve brought a gift.’
- (98) *Sa-ari-no a’iko, i-po-moni-mo raha...*  
 when-finish-3s that 3s-ANTIPASS-request-PRF house  
 ‘After that, she asked for a house...’
- (99) *Mo-hapai inggomiu? Mo-wuu*  
 PART:ANTIPASS-do.what 2p PART:ANTIPASS-husk  
*ni’i.*  
 coconut  
 ‘What are you doing?’ – ‘Husking coconuts.’

A major difference between Kulisusu and the other languages looked at here is that when the verb is active-direct, pronominal indexing sometimes lapses. First are some examples which follow the ‘standard’ active-direct pattern with full pronominal indexing for the patient. Even unknown referents as in (101) may be introduced into the discourse as patient of an active-direct clause provided they are specific:

- KUL (100) *Mbalo c[in]udapako-no itonia*  
 bamboo.container PASS:throw-3s near.past  
*i-’ala-o-mo tama-no, ka-i wungkahi-o.*  
 3s-take-3s-PRF father-3s and-3s open-3s  
 ‘Her father took the bamboo container which she had just thrown and he opened it.’
- (101) *Ari-no ka-i lingka, i-awa-’inda-mo mia,*  
 finish-3s and-3s go 3s-meet-3p-PRF person  
*indade kototoro i koro-no bawu.*  
 3p sit.around at trail-3s wild.pig  
 ‘Afterwards he set off, and he met some people, they were sitting around along a wild pig trail.’
- (102) *I-parinta-’o-mo duka kincah-no*  
 3s-command-3s-PRF again kincah.bird-3s  
*be-i-ko’uni-’ako “Kincāh”...*  
 FUT-3s-say-COMM kincah  
 ‘Again he commanded his kincah bird to say “kincah”...’

The conditions under which the pronoun suffix may be omitted are not yet understood, especially as the same speaker under nearly identical circumstances may sometimes

enunciate, sometimes not, the expected suffix. Compare especially (101) with (103) and (102) with (104).

- KUL (103) *Ari-no* *a'iso,* *ka-i-lingka,* *i-awa-Ø-mo* *mia,*  
 finish-3s that and-3s-go 3s-meet-3p-PRF person  
*indade* *mo-'ala* *bake-no* *jampaka.*  
 3p PART:ANTIPASS-get fruit-3s plumeria  
 ‘After that he set off, and he met some people, they were collecting plumeria fruit.’
- (104) *Maka* *Buragil* *i-tena-Ø-mo* *kincah-no*  
 then Buragil 3s-order-3s-PRF kincah.bird-3s  
*be-i-ko'uni-'ako* “Kincah”...  
 FUT-3s-say-COMM kincah  
 ‘Then Buragil ordered his kincah bird to say “kincah”...’
- (105) *Sa-tewancu-no* *numu* *a'iso,* *tena-'o-mo* *tama-no*  
 when-leaning-3s banyan that order-3s-PRF father-3s  
*“Sapu-Ø, Bintausu.”* *Lako-mo* *ka-i* *sapu-'o* *keu* *a'iso.*  
 catch-3s Bintausu go-3s and-3s catch-3s tree that  
 ‘When that banyan tree was about to fall, his father ordered him,  
 “Catch, Bintausu.” He went and he caught the tree.’

Another point of difference between Kulisusu and the other Bungku-Tolaki languages investigated above is that while in general the patient of an antipassive verb (when expressed) shows up without any oblique marking, in Kulisusu the noun in patient role has come to be preceded by an oblique marker with some verbs, such as *kuani* ‘inform’. Compare the active-direct construction of (106a) with the antipassive-cum-oblique-patient of (106b):

- KUL (106) a. *Sabucu-no* *mia* *a'iso* *i-kuani-o-mo* *potae...*  
 after-3s person that 3s-inform-3s-PRF that  
 ‘Then that person informed him that...’
- b. *Ndo-bansule-mo* *ka-ndo* *pong-kuani* *i* *tama-no*  
 3p-return-PRF and-3p ANTIPASS-inform at father-3s  
*tae-no...*  
 say-3s  
 ‘They returned and they informed her father saying...’

This other use of the antipassive in Kulisusu corresponds to what Cooreman (1988) described in Chamorro as DEMOTING antipassives—in which the patient is coded with

an oblique marker—versus the more usual INDEFINITE antipassive (corresponding to all other antipassive examples given above). Compare for example this active versus demoting antipassive pair in Chamorro:

- CHM (107) a. *Un-hongge i lahi.*  
 2s-believe the man  
 ‘you believe the man’
- b. *Man-hongge hao nu i lahi.*  
 ANTIPASS-believe 2s OBLIQUE the man  
 ‘you believe/have faith in the man’ (Cooreman 1988:575)

Chamorro demoting antipassives are used in contexts where (a) the patient is less affected (similar to English ‘he hacked the tree’ versus ‘he hacked at the tree’), (b) the given agent was not wholly responsible for the action, but rather “was involved in, took part in, or was one of those who performed the act described by the verb with respect to the definite object” (Cooreman 1988:580), or (c) the action is iterative or distributive. Whether corresponding Kulisusu constructions are employed in similar contexts has yet to be verified.

## ABBREVIATIONS

### languages cited

BNG	Bungku	PAD	Padoe
CHM	Chamorro	PAI	Paiwan
KUL	Kulisusu	TAG	Tagalog
MRB	Mori Bawah	TOL	Tolaki
MRN	Moronene	WAW	Wawonii

### grammatical terms

1s	first singular	EXT	existential
1p	first plural	FUT	future
1pi	first plural inclusive	INCOMP	incomplete
1pe	first plural exclusive	INSTR	instrumental
2s	second singular	INTERROG	interrogative
2p	second plural	IRR	irrealis
3s	third singular	LOC	locative
3p	third plural	MM	middle marker
ANTIPASS	antipassive	NEG	negative
ART	article	LG	(nasal) ligature
CAUS	causative	PART	(active) participle
CERT	certainty	PASS	passive
COLL	collective	PI	person indicator
COMM	communicative	PL	plural (subject)
CONF	confective	PRF	perfective
CTR	contraexpectation	REL	relative clause marker
BEN	benefactive		



## REFERENCES

- ADRIANI, N. (with Alb. C. KRUYT)  
 1914 *De Bare 'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden Celebes*, volume 3: *Taal- en Letterkundige Schets der Bare 'e-taal en Overzicht van het Taalgebied Celebes–Zuid-Halmahera*. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.
- ANDERSEN, Suree  
 1994 'Moronene Noun Phrases'. Unpublished typescript, 63 pp.  
 1995a 'Moronene Person Marking: a Nominative Absolutive System'. Unpublished typescript, 90 pp.  
 1995b 'Moronene Simple (Well, not so Simple) Clauses'. Unpublished typescript, 72 pp.
- ASMI  
 1995 Sistem Afiksasi Bahasa Kulisusu. B.A. thesis. FKIP Universitas Haluoleo, Kendari.
- COOREMAN, Ann  
 1988 'The Antipassive in Chamorro: Variations on the Theme of Transitivity'. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed), *Passive and Voice* (Typological Studies in Language, 16), 561–593. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- ESSER, S. J.  
 1927 *Klank- en Vormleer van het Morisch*, part 1. (Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, 67/3.) Leiden: Vros.  
 1933 *Klank- en Vormleer van het Morisch*, part 2. (Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, 67/4.) Bandoeng: Nix.
- FERRELL, Raleigh J.  
 1982 *Paiwan Dictionary*. (Pacific Linguistics, C-73.) Canberra: Australian National University.
- GIVÓN, T. (ed.)  
 1983 *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantified Text-based Study*. (Typological Studies in Language, 3.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.  
 1994 *Voice and Inversion*. (Typological Studies in Language, 28.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HANI, Almi  
 1969 Morfologi Bahasa Bungku. B.A. thesis. FKSS-IKIP, Manado.

- KARHUNEN, Marjo  
 1994 'The noun phrase in Padoe'. In René van den Berg (ed), *Studies in Sulawesi Linguistics*, part 3 (NUSA Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and Other Languages in Indonesia, 36), 17–47. Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya.
- LANGACKER, Ronald W.  
 1988 'A Usage-based Model'. In Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (ed), *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 50), 127–161. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1991a 'Cognitive Grammar'. In Flip G. Droste and John E. Joseph (eds), *Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Description* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 75), 275–306. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1991b *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, volume 2: *Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- LARA, Tahe, Sipantu LAROBUR, Paula VUORINEN and Marjo KARHUNEN  
 1991 'Pau Mpu'uno: Pau Padoe—Indonesia—Inggris'. Unpublished typescript, 87 pp.
- MANYAMBEANG, A. Kadir, Hamzah MAHMOED, Rabiana S. BADUDU, Tajuddin MAKNU, A. Kadir MULYA and Ambo GANI  
 1982/1983 *Struktur Bahasa Wawonii*. Ujung Pandang: Proyek Penelitian Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah Sulawesi Selatan.
- MEAD, David  
 1998 Proto-Bungku-Tolaki: Reconstruction of its Phonology and Aspects of its Morphosyntax. Ph.D. dissertation. Rice University, Houston, TX.
- MUTHALIB, Abdul, ALIMUDDIN D. P., Husen CHALIK and ARSAMID  
 1985 *Kamus Tolaki-Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- MUTHALIB, Abdul, ALIMUDDIN D. P., J. F. PATTIASINA, Haloma BALAKA and Amir KADIR  
 1985 *Kata Tugas Dalam Bahasa Tolaki*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- PATTIASINA, J. F., Abdul MUTHALIB, Haloma BALAKA and Abdurrauf TARIMANA  
 1979/1980 *Morfologi dan Sintaksis Bahasa Tolaki*. Ujung Pandang: Proyek Penelitian Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah Sulawesi Selatan.

- PATTIASINA, J. F., Abdul MUTHALIB, Haloma BALAKA, Abdurrauf  
TARIMANA, M. Arief MATTALITTI and Abd. Kadir MULYA  
1983        *Sistem Morfologi Kata Kerja Bahasa Tolaki*. Jakarta: Pusat  
Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- PAWLEY, Andrew, and Lawrence A. REID  
1980        'The Evolution of Transitive Constructions in Austronesian'. In Paz  
Buenaventura Naylor (ed), *Austronesian Studies: Papers from the  
Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian languages* (Michigan  
Papers on South and Southeast Asia, 15), 103–130. Ann Arbor:  
University of Michigan.
- REID, Lawrence A  
1992        'On the Development of the Aspect System in some Philippine  
Languages'. *Oceanic Linguistics* 31:65–91.
- ROSS, Malcolm D.  
1995        'Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian Verbal Morphology: Evidence  
from Taiwan'. In Paul Jen-kuei Li, Dah-an Ho, Ying-Kuei Huang and  
Cheng-hwa Tsang (eds), *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*  
(Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology, 4),  
727–791. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- SANDE, J. S., Muhammad SIKKI, M. Arief MATTALITTI and ARSAMID  
1986        *Struktur Sastra Lisan Tolaki*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan  
Pengembangan Bahasa.
- SARO, Ahmad; Abdillah A. RAHIM, Indra B. WUMBU and Abd. KADIR  
1982        *Struktur Bahasa Bungku*. Palu: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan  
Bahasa.
- STAROSTA, Stanley, Andrew K. PAWLEY and Lawrence A. REID  
1982        'The Evolution of Focus in Austronesian'. In Amran Halim, Lois  
Carrington and S. A. Wurm (eds), *Papers from the Third  
International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, volume 2:  
*Tracking the Travellers* (Pacific Linguistics, C-75), 145–170.  
Canberra: Australian National University.
- TAPEHE, Magnes  
1984        Proses Perangkaian Prefiks *mo-* dengan Bentuk Dasar dalam Bahasa  
Mori. M.A. thesis. FPBS-IKIP, Manado.
- VUORINEN, Paula  
1995        'Person marking in Padoe'. In René van den Berg (ed), *Studies in  
Sulawesi Linguistics*, part 4 (NUSA: Linguistic Studies of Indonesian  
and Other Languages in Indonesia, 37), 97–121. Jakarta: Universitas  
Atma Jaya.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Scott Youngman and Dr. Suzanne Kemmer for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Sponsorship by the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) in 1996 allowed me to collect the Kulisusu data presented herein.

<sup>2</sup> Compare respectively Tolaki *binda* ‘depart’, Padoe *kasi* ‘pinch’, Mori Bawah *mate* ‘die’, Bungku *toe* ‘lift’ Kulisusu *lingka* ‘go, set off’ and Moronene *otolu* ‘three’, which constitute the respective roots of the derived forms listed here.

<sup>3</sup> This same constellation of morphological marking occurs over and over, and nearly any root which has the possibility of being, say, cross-referenced for object may also be passivized or antipassivized and conversely. Some notable exceptions exist, most of which involve the applicative suffix *-ako*. This topic unfortunately does not have a simple treatment; for a complete analysis of this phenomenon in Kulisusu and Mori Bawah, see Mead (1998:212–244).

<sup>4</sup> Two undergoer pivot morphemes have been reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian, the perfective (or past) infix *\*<in>* and the neutral (or non-past) suffix *\*-ən*. Both apparently also functioned as nominalizers, and the difference between them may be illustrated by examples from present-day languages. The following pairs are from respectively Paiwan (Ferrell 1982, cited in Ross 1995:752) and Tagalog (Reid 1992:68):

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| PAI | a. <i>k/in/an</i> ‘consumed food, something eaten’ |
|     | b. <i>kan-ən</i> ‘food, something to be eaten’     |
| TAG | a. <i>b/in/jili</i> ‘something that was bought’    |
|     | b. <i>bilihin</i> ‘something to be bought’         |

However in the prehistory of the languages under study here Proto-Austronesian *\*-ən* merged phonologically with the locative pivot morpheme *\*-an* (Mead 1998). Consequently by Proto-Bungku-Tolaki *\*<in>* had expanded in productivity and application, and was no longer restricted to perfective contexts (a point which is abundantly illustrated by the examples to be found in this paper); on the other hand the present-day suffix *-a*, where it continues the older meaning of Proto-Austronesian *\*-ən*, exists only in certain frozen nominalizations. Compare for example these forms originally meaning ‘that which will be X-ed’:

- |     |                              |   |
|-----|------------------------------|---|
| PAD | <i>kaanga</i> ‘food’         | cf. <i>kaa</i> ‘to eat’ (Lara, Larobu, et al. 1991:22)  |
| PAD | <i>asa’a</i> ‘merchandise’   | cf. <i>asa</i> ‘to sell’ (Lara, Larobu, et al. 1991:5)  |
| MRB | <i>tunua</i> ‘firewood’      | cf. <i>tunu</i> ‘to burn’ (Adriani 1914:234)            |
| MRB | <i>anggaa</i> ‘work’         | cf. <i>angga</i> ‘to pick up, work on’ (Esser 1933:370) |
| MRB | <i>pae pahoa</i> ‘seed rice’ | cf. <i>paho</i> ‘to plant’                              |

Interestingly, Esser (1933:370) gives Mori Bawah *asa-a* ‘that which is to be sold’ and *kaa-nga* ‘that which is to be eaten’, but also notes *in-asa* and *k/in/aa* in the very same meanings—a pair of present-day examples which illustrates the old yet continuing take-over of the function of \*-ən by \*<in>.

<sup>5</sup> The Tolaki data has been drawn from various sources, including Pattiasina, Muthalib, et al. (1979/1980), Muthalib, Alimuddin, Pattiasina, et al. (1985), Scott Youngman (1997:pers.comm.) and my own field notes. Pattiasina, Muthalib, et al. (1983:23) provide certain forms which fail to conform to the stated pattern—*nihoto* ‘cut’, *ginogo* ‘embraced’—but such data have not been confirmed by any of my other sources.

<sup>6</sup> Rarely one also hears *ni-* before vowel initial stems (Scott Youngman 1997:pers.comm.).

<sup>7</sup> Regarding other languages, there is no firm data. David Andersen (1997:pers.comm.) has informed me that Moronene stems which normally take the infix *-in-* can also take the prefix as a minor variant (e.g. *hinole* ‘fried, roasted’ var. *nihole*), but not vice versa. This may indicate that in Moronene—unlike elsewhere—it is the prefixed form which is becoming the more dominant pattern.

<sup>8</sup> Regarding nominalizations, see especially Langacker (1991b:13 ff.). For more general and succinct introductions to cognitive grammar, see Langacker (1988, 1991a).

<sup>9</sup> With certain exceptions, including the restriction in Mori Bawah that the verb of a relative clause containing the negative *nahi* or one of its variants cannot be passive (Esser 1927:164):

MRB    *mia*            *amu*    *nahi*    *ku-to'ori-o*  
          person    REL    NEG    1s-know-3s  
          ‘someone whom I do not know’

Also in at least Mori Bawah and Tolaki a relative clause cannot be made passive when a beneficiary is cross-referenced on the verb, even though it is the patient that is relativized. Compare particularly the Tolaki noun phrase below with example (27) in the main text.

MRB    *kinaa*                    *amu*    *i-binta-ako-ira*  
          cooked.rice    REL    3s-leave-BEN-3p  
          ‘the cooked rice which she had left for them’ (Esser 1927:164)

‘the basket of corn that had been poured out for him in the middle of the field’

<sup>10</sup> Padoe *hemu* and Mori Bawah *anu* are from an earlier form \*anu meaning ‘thing, what’sit, what’s-his-name’, compare Bahasa Indonesia *anu*. Wawonii *mia* originally meant ‘person’. The Moronene form *da* is found in other Bungku-Tolaki languages as an existential and/or progressive marker (roughly translatable as ‘be, still’), compare the final syllable of Bahasa Indonesia *sedang*.

KUL    *Boo*        *inai*        *u-po-'oli*        *pakuli?*  
 for        who        2s-ANTIPASS-buy        medicine  
 'Who did you buy medicine for?'

<sup>13</sup> For example in Kulisusu where Proto-Bungku-Tolaki \*t, \*nt became *c*, *nc* before high vowels, then this morphophonemic process naturally has a prenasalizing effect on *c* as well as *p*, *t*, *k* and *s*, compare for example Kulisusu *moncia* ‘give’ (from *moN-cia* < PBT \*moN-tia).

TOL	<i>moN-paho</i>	→	<i>mombaho</i>	‘plant’
	<i>moN-tia</i>	→	<i>mondia</i>	‘divide’
	<i>moN-kaa</i>	→	<i>monggaa</i>	‘eat’
	<i>moN-saru</i>	→	<i>mosaru</i>	‘borrow’



<sup>14</sup> However, note also this sentence. Perhaps the gloss ‘...and ate thereof’ would be appropriate; compare also example (74) in the main text.

MRN    ...*ka-i*            *ala-a*            **mong-kaa**            *tuai-no*.  
         and-3s        take-3s        PART:ANTIPASS-eat    younger.sibling-3s  
         ‘...then his sister took it and ate.’ (S. Andersen 1995b:29)