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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 -\textit{in-} or one of its allomorphs), the activ-direct (marked by the presence of an object indexing pronominal clitic on the verb), and the antipassive (marked by the prefix \textit{pN-}). 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-aforementioned, etc. (broadly characterized, ‘indefinite’), while active-direct forms are used when the patient is higher on the definiteness scale.

1 INTRODUCTION

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 \textsc{active-direct} marked by the presence of an object suffix on the verb, the \textsc{passive} marked by the affix -\textit{in-}/\textit{in-}/\textit{ni-} (schematically symbolized hereafter as \texttt{\textasciicircum in\textasciicircum}),
and the antipassive marked by the prefix \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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, Kuliususu and Moronene (for subgrouping of Bungku-Tolaki languages, see the Introduction at the beginning of this volume).

\begin{tabular}{ll}
TOL (1) & a. \textit{kaa} ‘eat’
 & b. \textit{bindani} ‘leave behind’
PAD (2) & a. \textit{tanu} ‘bury’
 & b. \textit{kasipapa} ‘carry under the arm’
MRB (3) & a. \textit{tele} ‘swallow’
 & b. \textit{pepe} ‘kill’
BNG (4) & a. \textit{baho} ‘bathe’
 & b. \textit{taepako} ‘lift’
KUL (5) & a. \textit{nahu} ‘cook, boil’
 & b. \textit{palingka} ‘send off, expel’
MRN (6) & a. \textit{ala} ‘take’
 & b. \textit{poko’otolu} ‘make (something) three’
\end{tabular}

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\textsuperscript{2} 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 \textit{nearly always accompanied by some ‘extra’ bit of morphology}. This accompanying morphology will either be a pronoun which indexes the object, the affix \textless \textit{in} \textgreater , or the prefix \textit{poN}-. For example in Kuliususu:
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-. 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). 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:\(^5\)

**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. *hinumu* ‘burned’ < *humu* ‘burn’

the prefix \(/in-/\) when the stem is vowel initial:\(^6\)

f. *inalo* ‘taken’ < *alo* ‘take’
g. *inehe* ‘desired, longed for’ < *ehe* ‘want’
h. *inimu* ‘drunk’ < *imu* ‘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 Kulisu, Wawanii, Bungku and Mori Bawah where apparently \(/-in-/\) has everywhere taken over the domain formerly held by \(/-i-/\) (in addition to the numerous examples below, see respectively Asmi 1995:33, 61; Manyambeang, Mahmoeo, et al. 1982/1983:32, 37; Hani 1969:32; Esser 1933:352).\(^7\)

3.1 Passive as nominalization

Example (10) illustrates a Bungku-Tolaki passive nominalization with \(<in>\).
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.9 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 Kulisu 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 langsat 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 orginal 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[ini]kori-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[ini]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.)

clear  PASS:say-2s  that  
‘What was said by you is true.’ (Karhunen 1994:22)
3.2 Passive in relative clauses and content interogatives

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. For example:

KUL (23)  
\[ pakea \ [ \ w/injewe-\text{no} \ ] \ a'iso \]
\[ \text{clothing} \ \text{PASS-make-3s} \ \text{that} \]
\[ \text{that clothing which had been made by her} \]

From the discussion of \(<in>\) as a nominalizer, it follows that example (23) might have an alternative interpretation, namely that \(winjewe-\text{no}\) 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 Kulisu 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) \textit{mia a’iso, io [ laki-no lipu ]}  
person that ART chief-3s settlement
‘that person, the Lakino Lipu’

(25) \textit{ana cina a’iso, io [ t[in]/ako-ndo i}  
child female that ART PASS-hide-3p at
\textit{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 \textit{henu}, Mori Bawah and Bungku
\textit{anu}, Wawonii \textit{mia} and Moronene \textit{da}.

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 \textit{<in>}:

TOL (26) \textit{nggiro’o o wine ni-ruru-no}  
that ART rice PASS-collect-3s
‘that rice which had been collected by him’

(27) \textit{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) \textit{galu henu tekonai 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) \textit{kondehora anu h/in/awe-ku hieno}  
animal REL PASS:encounter-1s near.past
‘the animal which I just now encountered’ (Esser 1927:164)

(30) \textit{kinaa anu n/in/ahu-no}  
cooked.rice REL PASS:cook-3s
‘the rice which was cooked by him’ (Esser 1927:164)

(31) \textit{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-n do
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:

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)  
\[
\text{Lima-no naamo wiri-no simbau-’u da k[in/aa-u.} \\
\text{hand-3s and ear-3s friend-2s REL PASS:eat-2s} \\
\text{‘What was eaten by you were the hands and ears of your friend.’} \\
\text{(S. Andersen 1995a:48)}
\]

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.\(^{11}\)

KUL (42)  
\[
\text{Inaio boo apu-ndo?} \\
\text{who FUT lord-1p.COLL} \\
\text{‘Who will be our king?’ (Asmi 1995:86)}
\]

(43)  
\[
\text{Inaio boo in-engka-ndo?} \\
\text{who FUT PASS-lift-3p} \\
\text{‘Who will be elevated by them?’ (‘Who is to be their elevated one?’)}
\]

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)  
\[
\text{O hapo laa t[in/ekura’ako-no?} \\
\text{ART what be PASS-distressed.about-3s} \\
\text{‘What’s being distressed about/over by him?’} \\
\text{(Sande, Sikki, et al. 1986:111)}
\]

MRB (45)  
\[
\text{Isema k[in/ita-mu?} \\
\text{who PASS:see-2s} \\
\text{‘Who was seen by you?’ (Esser 1927:158)}
\]

BNG (46)  
\[
\text{Hapa t[in/ewa-mu?} \\
\text{what PASS:carry.in sarong-2s} \\
\text{‘What are you carrying in your sarong?’ (Adriani 1900:271)}
\]

WAW (47)  
\[
\text{Hapao mia b[in/ini-mu?} \\
\text{what REL PASS:carry-2p} \\
\text{‘What are you carrying?’} \\
\text{(Manyambeang, Mahmoed, et al. 1982/1983:83)}
\]
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-wewe-u-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 Kulisu, a
language in which main verb passives are always agent-deleting:

KUL (52)  1-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) \textit{Koa oleo hopulo kiniku ni-gere.}  
every day ten carabao PASS-slaughter  
‘Every day, ten carabao are slaughtered.’  
(Muthalib, Alimuiddin, Chalik, et al. 1985:34)

(57) \textit{Ina-inae me-alo meohai tf/injondu}  
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) \textit{Saa ari-no k/fin/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) \textit{Ono tf/injamo owundu-olo.}  
3s.IRR PASS-bury short-day  
‘He will be buried in the afternoon.’ (Vuorinen 1995:104)

(60) \textit{H/finjemu-komiu-to kee ai sala?}  
PASS:hit-2p-PRF INTERROG at road  
‘Were you hit on the road?’ (Vuorinen 1995:105)

MRN (61) \textit{T/finjarima-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 \textit{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) \textit{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 \textit{onto} ‘see’ in its second occurence
is active-direct, ‘they (people) saw him’, not passive ‘he was seen by people’ (S. Andersen 1995b:28):

MRN (63) Saba mta mo-rako kadadi da
emerge FUT PART:ANTIPASS-catch animal REL

[injonto-no, ka-ndo me-’onto-o miano.
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. No-kaa-’i dooke.
3SGi-eat-3SGj ratj
‘A rat ate it.’

In a similar vein, Esser (1933:352) gives the following Mori Bawah translation for ‘ten lepers were healed by Jesus’:\textsuperscript{12}

MRB (65) Hopulu ira mia melowe do-poko-madoo-ira
ten 3p personi leprous 3pj-CAUS-healthy-3pi

Ue Isa.
Lord Jesusj

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) Hopulu ira mia melowe p/[inf]oko-madoo-do
ten 3p person leprous PASS:CAUS-healthy-3pj

Ue Isa.
Lord Jesusj

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)  

\[ O\text{pitu} \ o'\text{osu} \ ni-lomba-no, \ a-no \ luarao-kee \]
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)  

\[ n/\text{in}jahu-nggu \ inehu \ la'a \]
PASS-cook-1s vegetable that

'those vegetables were cooked by me' (Vuorinen 1995:106)

MRN (69)  

\[ Ko'ira \ yo \ wembe \ ni-pakani-no-mo \ koie \ i \ Al\text{i}. \]
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 mountains were what was punched through by him…’, ‘what I cooked are those 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 \(l/\text{in}jalo-do\) as a nominalization seems less likely:

MRB (70)  

\[ umari-no \ t/\text{um}jle-o \ kimbohu \ nana'ote \ andio, \]
finish-3s PART:swallow-3s iguana youth this

\[ ka-i \ amb\text{a} \ l/\text{um}jako-ako-ira, \ osio \ inia \]
and-3s next PART:go-CONF-3p nine village

\[ l/\text{in}jalo-do, \ ka-i \ amb\text{a} \ tetoro-ako-ira \ a \]
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 Kulisu:

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

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

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):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRB (73)</th>
<th>Onae-mo</th>
<th>ka-i</th>
<th>pon-tena</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>Numunuo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3s-PRF</td>
<td>and-3s</td>
<td>ANTIORDER</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Numunuo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otolu-‘ira</td>
<td>mia</td>
<td>mota’u.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three-3p</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Then Numunuo sent out three of 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) l-ala-o rani andio p(∅)ulu-o ranka
   3s-take-3s gnome this PART:break.off-3s twig
   opaa, ka-i wee-ako-no i Rintago.
   four and-3s give-INSTR-3s PI Rintago

   ‘The gnome took and broke off four twigs and gave them to Rintago.’

(76) /m/elulu i Oleo h(∅)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(∅)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) \[La-\text{-}i\text{-}to \quad mo\text{-}ia \quad i \quad \text{Abunawas}, \quad a\text{-}no\]
be-3s-PRF live PI Abunawas and-3s

\[\text{pom-biara} \quad o \quad \text{bee}, \quad o\text{'aso-ikaa.}\]
ANTIPASS-care.for ART goat one-precisely

\[La-\text{-}i\text{-}to\text{-}kaa \quad p\{O\}jara\text{-}i, \quad a\text{-}no \quad laa \quad nggoo \quad mate.\]
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. \[\ldots lako \quad mo\text{-}lolaha \quad o \quad \text{ambo}\]
go PART:ANTIPASS-search ART goodness
‘...go look for goodness’

b. \[\ldots lako \quad l\{um\}olah\text{-}i \quad \text{ina-no} \quad i \quad \text{Dapi}\]
go PART:search-3s mother-3s PI David
‘...go look for David’s mother’

(79) a. \[\text{Ku-onggo} \quad \text{mo-inu} \quad i\text{woi}.\]
1s-want PART:ANTIPASS-drink water
‘I want to drink some water’ (water in general, not any specific water)

b. \[\text{Ku-onggo} \quad \text{um-inu\text{-}i} \quad i\text{woi} \quad ni\text{'ino}.\]
1s-want PART-drink-3s water this
‘I want to drink this (particular glass of) water’

(80) a. \[\ldots a\text{-}no \quad \text{po-wohiki} \quad dadio \quad \text{ana} \quad dalo.\]
and-3s ANTIPASS-wash many child baby
‘...and he washed many baby children’ (unspecified group)
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) Tempo-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 pinewinwu, koie
and-3s see-3s indeed well that
po-’ala-a-no-mo mi ano 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
*a-wa-a o-lumpu-‘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.¹⁴

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:
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. *Ndé’e nta mo-’ala-ko?*  
   INTERROG FUT PART:ANTIPASS-take-2s  
   ‘Will you take (it)/authentication?’

   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-leşa* ‘step on (accidentally)’ versus *leşa-’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 Kulisu

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 Kulisu:

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.’

KUL (96)  
*Ndo-pom-pewoo woo-no manusia.*  
3p-ANTIPASS-smell scent-3s human  
‘They smelled human scent.’
(97) *Ungkude ku-powawa 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 inggomi? Mo-wuu**
PART:ANTIPASS-do what 2p PART:ANTIPASS-husk

*ni’i.*
coconut

‘What are you doing?’ – ‘Husking coconuts.’

A major difference between Kulisu 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 “Kincah”...*
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
ennunciate, 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-kouni-’ako  ”Kincah”...
FUT-3s-say-COMM  kincah

‘Then Buragil ordered his kincah bird to say “kincah”…’

(105)  

Sa-tcwancu-no  mumu  a’iso,  tena-’o-mo  tama-no  
when-lean-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 Kulisu 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 Kulisu the noun in patient role has come to be preceded by an oblique marker with some verbs, such as "kuam ‘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-n’do  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 Kulisu 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNG</td>
<td>Bungku</td>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>Padoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM</td>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>PAI</td>
<td>Paiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUL</td>
<td>Kulisusu</td>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRB</td>
<td>Mori Bawah</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>Tolaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>Moronene</td>
<td>WAW</td>
<td>Wawonii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### grammatical terms

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

1 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 Kulisu data presented herein.

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

3 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 Kulisu and Mori Bawah, see Mead (1998:212–244).

4 Two undergoer pivot morphemes have been reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian, the perfective (or past) infix *<in> and the neutral (or non-past) suffix *-on. 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 (Ferrall 1982, cited in Ross 1995:752) and Tagalog (Reid 1992:68):

PAI a. k/in/an ‘consumed food, something eaten’
b. kan-on ‘food, something to be eaten’

TAG a. b/in/jili ‘something that was bought’
b. bilihan ‘something to be bought’

However in the prehistory of the languages under study here Proto-Austronesian *-on 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 *-on, exists only in certain frozen nominalizations. Compare for example these forms originally meaning ‘that which will be X-ed’:

PAD kaanga ‘food’
PAD as’a ‘merchandise’
MRB tuma ‘firewood’
MRB anggaa ‘work’
MRB pa pe paho ‘seed rice’

PAD cf. kaa ‘to eat’ (Lara, Larobu, et al. 1991:22)
PAD cf. asa ‘to sell’ (Lara, Larobu, et al. 1991:5)
MRB cf. tumu ‘to burn’ (Adriani 1914:234)
MRB cf. angga ‘to pick up, work on’ (Esser 1933:370)
MRB cf. paho ‘to plant’
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Interestingly, Esser (1933:370) gives Mori Bawah asa-‘a ‘that which is to be sold’ and kaa-ngा ‘that which is to be eaten’, but also notes in-asə and k/in/ə 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>.

5 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.

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

7 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.

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

9 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 anu 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 anu i-hinta-ako-ira
   cooked rice REL 3s-leave-BEN-3p
   ‘the cooked rice which she had left for them’ (Esser 1927:164)
TOL  o  gandu  aso  lepa  s/fum/olonggee-kee
    ART corn one  basket  PART: pour. out: 3s-BEN: 3s

i  tonga  mbada
    at  middle  LG: field

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

See Esser (1927: 164) for certain further exceptions found in Mori Bawah.

10 Padoe henu and Mori Bawah anu are from an earlier form *anu meaning ‘thing, whatsit, 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.

11 The form inaio ‘who?’ (historically *inai + the third person singular pronoun *io) is used only in equative sentences, further evidence that in-engka-ndo of example (41) is being treated as a nominalization. The form used to interrogate oblique cases is inai, as in:

KUL  Boo  inai  u-po-’oli  pakuli?
      for  who  2s-ANTIPASS-buy  medicine

‘Who did you buy medicine for?’

12 In this example, Jesus is deferentially indexed using a third person plural pronoun.

13 For example in Kulisu 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 Kulisu moncia ‘give’ (from moN-cia < PBT *moN-tia).

Because in Tolaki ns merged with s, and the other voiceless prenasalized stops merged with their voiced counterparts, the effect of N- on a following p, t, k or s has changed correspondingly (with other consonants and vowel-initial stems the pattern remains the same as in Mori Bawah):

TOL  moN-paho  →  momba ho  ‘plant’
     moN-tia    →  mondia  ‘divide’
     moN-kaa    →  mongga a  ‘eat’
     moN-saru   →  mosaru  ‘borrow’
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 a-la-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)