AUSTRONESIAN ERGATIVITY
TRACED THROUGH TWO CYCLES[1]

Joseph C. Finney
Monterey, CA
<*jcfinney@redshift.com*>

0 Introduction

This is a study in the diachronic syntax of the Austronesian (AN) languages. It presents a paradigm of the cycle of ergativity, as seen in that family. We shall be concerned with the syntactic casemarking and the semantic Case relations of the core terms of the verb, in all its voices. Like most in the field, we'll use the accepted definitions from Dixon (1994) that a language is "accusative" (NomAc) if S, the single essential term of intransitive sentences, is marked the same as A, the agent (actor, doer) of the transitive sentences, while O, the object-patient-undergoer bears a different marking, defined as Accusative; and a language is "ergative" (AbErg) if S is marked the same as O, while A bears a different marking, defined as Ergative. Dixon (1994, 183) is to be commended for using the concept "moving a language around the cycle of change", and that concept is basic to our presentation here. Dixon's book defined concepts and basic orientation assumed in the present work.

We'll study how languages move around in cycles. Examine our table (diagram, a short unnumbered page) first and use it as orientation in reading the paper.

As we are specially interested in Polynesian and the complex development within it, let's summarize the successive phases of syntax that come down to it from our theoretically reconstructed PAn.

There are two syntactic states (NomAc and AbErg) in each cycle. Each state lasts for a stage.

There are two phases (A and B) in each syntactic stage (NomAc or AbErg).

That makes four phases in each full cycle (1A, simple NomAc; 1B, NomAc with passive; 2A, simple AbErg; 2B, AbErg with antipassive).

1. The earliest AN we can reconstruct began as NomAc in PAn (easily reconstructable from Basay and other languages considered archaic). Starosta (who died recently) thought Rukai preserves PAn's NomAc (though it might possibly have gone from PAn NomAc through AbErg and back to NomAc).

2. AbErg in many Formosan and Philippine tongues, and through one branch to Padoe's new NomAc. In parallel at greater speed AbErg lasts to about Proto Eastern Oceanic.

---

3. NomAc from roughly Proto Eastern Oceanic through Central Pacific, Fijian, and the earliest reconstructable phase of Proto PN.

4. AbErg by the final phase of Proto PN (through a complex series of changes as proposed by Finney). Staying AbErg in Tongan, Samoan, and largely in the Outliers.

5. Rapanui, Easter Island (parallel to the mainline East PN) staying AbErg but becoming NomAc now, ending cycle 2 and beginning cycle 3 now.

6. NomAc in Proto East PN and persisting as in Hawaiian, Tahitian, Maori. These are 1B of cycle 3.

7. Maori is still within NomAc 1B cycle 3, but its predominant use of passive voice (more often than active) is a sign that it is moving toward AbErg syntax 2A. The passive voice, growing in the present phase, will become the Ergative in the future phase 2A, if the Maori language survives so long.

AN is a good family in which to analyze the diachronic changes of ergativity because for at least one living group, East Polynesian, reconstructions show two complete ancestral cycles (four changes of ergativity state, eight phase-changes), from PAn down: NomAc to AbErg to NomAc to AbErg to NomAc. And because one EPN language is irrevocably headed for AbErg again in a third cycle.

In applying the Dixon test to Stage 2 Ergative AN languages, which construction (voice) shall we use as the transitive? The Agent-Focus, or one of the Non-Agent-Focuses (NAF)? As we shall show in examining Mayrinax, the answer is clearly the Patient Focus. That's the one that is the canonical Non-Agent Focus (and is in English, too). In any AbErg language, the Patient Absolutive term is the only one that will survive and have a descendant as a core term in the NomAcc 1A of the new cycle (where it will be the Accusative Direct Object). Analogously, in English the canonical passive is the Patient Passive "An award was given ([to] the teacher) (by the Board)"; and not, for example, the Dative Passive "The teacher was given an award (by the Board)." A complete cycle, shown in the Table, has four stages. They are: 1A, simple NomAc; 1B, NomAc with a passive voice; 2A, simple AbErg; 2B, AbErg with an antipassive voice [whence we keep repeating]. Could we begin just as well with simple AbErg and end four stages down? I think not. The path 1B to 2A is simple, but 2B to 1A is more complex and variable and is better put at the end.

A complete cycle, shown in the Table, has four stages: 1A, simple NomAc; 1B, NomAc with a passive voice; 2A, simple AbErg; 2B, AbErg with an antipassive voice. Could we begin just as well with simple AbErg and end four stages down: I think not. The path 1B to 2A is simple, but 2B to 1A is more complex and variable, and is better put at the end.

A good recent discussion on the general concepts is Christopher Manning's Ph.D. dissertation, published by Stanford (1996). His research was on Inuit, a West Greenland Eskimo language, but he discusses broader issues well. He considers argument structure (something closer to semantics than to pure syntax) the major determiner of syntax in languages throughout the world. He observes that two paths have been proposed for sliding into ergativity: one, from passive voices; the other, from nominalization (which is not discussed in this present paper).

Some events we'll see are (1) evidence about PAn from Basay, Atayalic and other archaic tongues; (2) dramatic return to NomAc through mixed ergativity ending Cycle 1, in van den Berg's series of villages (and confirmed in Central Pacific); (3) complex changes out of Fiji-like NomAc in the PPN period; (4) many types of syntactic change in Polynesian languages; (5) return to NomAc through mixed ergativity in Rapanui (right now!); and (6) one NomAc East PN language (Maori) taking an irrevocable step toward AbErg syntax early in a third cycle.

The term "Focus" refers to the DetP in Absolutive case, in phase 2A or 2B, which, like all Absolutive DetP, descends from ancestral Nominative case subject of a passive in stage 1B. There are three or more because stage 1B normally has three or more passive constructions. It also refers to the "Focus affixes" on the verb which identify those roles of each Abs term as an Agent, a Patient, or a Locative or some other role. Each corresponds to a type of passive voice. In stage 1B, Agent Focus (AF) Abs DetP had been Nominative subjects of active voice sentences, while Non-Agent Focus (NAF) Abs DetP had been Nominative subjects of passive sentences in the recent stage 1B.

The same basic principles should underlie events in all cycles, but very early in the second detectable cycle of An languages, the Focus affixes in MP had severely eroded, and the term Focus is not used. One could label Tongan's main syntactic (AbErg) type as NAF, or label Fijian's or East Polynesian's NomAc syntax as AF, but nobody does.

Translations of Ergative sentences (stage 2A) into English. If the Ergative agent is translated as the English subject, it shows the new NomAcc syntax that will appear two stages later, 1A, when the old Ergative case is reanalyzed as the new Nominative case. But if the Absolutive patient is translated as the subject, it shows the old passive voice of the NomAc sentence that appeared earlier in stage 1B. English is a language in stage 1B.

1 General characteristics of AN languages

Major words from most ancient forward were CVCCVC > CVCVC > CVCV (in most MP languages and many others now).

The greatly prevailing word order is SVO, and therefore adpositions are prepositions, not postpositions.

All AN languages have Verb Object order, and so they have prepositions, left of the DetP, not postpositions.

In many AN languages, adjectives are not sharply distinguished from verbs. As an example, in Nanumanga, where I did field work, "te tangata fano" translates "the running man", while "te tangata e fano" translates "the man runs or is running", in which "e" is the most neutral tense-aspect marker. In many AN languages "ne" marks past or present perfect tense, and in some "kV" marks future. Many languages in cycle 1 have subject markers and object markers on the verb. They are obviously reduced forms of personal pronouns, reflecting older word order and syntax. If third person we commonly see both the noun and the affix.

The word "focus" means "voice". The focus markers on the verb show its voice. The suffix -un shows that the subject is a patient. The suffix -an showed originally that the subject was a location, but in some languages has come to be used also for a patient subject. Both those markers may be old phrases meaning "at it". Agent subjects in the archaic languages may be shown by prefixes and infixes at the verb.

PAn demonstratives distinguish specific/nonspecific (which Huang calls Rf-Nrf), not definite/indefinite. When English "a" means "a certain" it is specific in AN. In the disagreement between Starosta and Blust, I may occasionally refer to (Austronesian minus Rukai) as Mainline AN.

Some events we'll cover are (1) evidence about PAn from Basay and other archaic tongues; (2) dramatic return to NomAc through mixed ergativity ending Cycle 1, in van den Berg's series of villages; (3) complex changes out of Fiji-like NomAc in the PPN period; (4) many types of syntactic change in Polynesian languages; (5) return to NomAc through mixed ergativity in Rapanui (right now!); and (6) one East PN language's taking an irrevocable step toward AbErg in a third cycle.

We shall see evidence to support a prehistory (1) that the earliest reconstructable PAn had NomAcc syntax; (2) that before moving toward ergativity PAn had to develop passive voice(s) (1B) and developed at least three of them, much like the ones that English has; (3) that through small, identifiable steps, the passive voices became ergative voices in 2A; and (4) by the time the Malayo Polynesian speakers left Formosa, nearly all the AN tongues had changed at least to 1B and some to 2A; and (5) the AbErg, stage 2A was ancestral to all the AN languages but the most highly archaic ones.

2 Basic principles of linguistic change

Lenition (progressive weakening of sounds toward zero) is an inconspicuous process, but it's the great engine of linguistic change. As phonological clues disappear, redundancy falls, and scarcely enough stimuli remain for interpretation, words are inserted. Unstressed words (especially pronouns, and prepositions or casemarkers) become reduced to clitics, which then are reduced to affixes and then to zero.

Space concepts (and space prepositions) are the source of abstract concepts. The prepositions "from [a physical source]" come to mark agents (sources of action): at first in passives (1B) and then in the ergatives to which the 1B passives are reanalyzed in the formation of stage 2A.

As agent subjects are in some sense the source of the action, and accusative object patients are in some sense the destination or goal or theme of the action, it's not surprising that ancestral "from, by" prepositions come to mark agents, and ancestral "at" or "to" prepositions come to mark patients, receivers of the action.

Though we tend to think categorically, in major changes of status many syntactic and phonological changes take place in small steps, which are inconspicuous. A change from AbErg to NomAc syntax, or from NomAc to AbErg, takes place as a series of smaller steps.

This standard way to develop an Ergative syntax is to reanalyze a passive voice (stage 1B) to Ergative (thereby entering stage 2A).

When a syntactic innovation occurs, it may begin as a synchronic transformation, secondarily generated. When the innovation is well established, it may become the one that is generated directly, and then the older syntax, so far as it remains, comes to be generated from the newer one. We shall see in Mayrinax, 2A, that the newer NAF patient-focus construction comes to be the standard, and the older (disappearing) AF sentences are generated secondarily and are not the ones to be used in the Dixon test for ergativity.

Nominalization had been proposed by Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1981) as a source of Ergative syntax in AN. That's not implausible. In some AN languages (notably

Tagalog), "The eat banana got sick" is the way to say, "The one who ate bananas got sick." And the fact that Mayrinax has a voice that some call passive (in NomAc) and others call ergative (in AbErg) is reason to accept that languages drift imperceptibly from one syntax to the other.

Dixon says (p.186): "What is interesting is the ways in which a language moves from accusative to ergative or from ergative to accusative. There are several kinds of diachronic mechanism that may be involved: the reinterpretation of a passive or antipassive as the unmarked transitive construction type; the development of a new periphrastic system of tense and/or aspect marking based on participial forms; the creation of a new case or the extension in meaning of an existing one; generalization from one tense-aspect to another; shift in constituent order and topicalization; and so on. Path (a), from accusative to ergative, is by no means the mirror-image of (b), from ergative to accusative. It is true that one way of achieving (a) is through reinterpretation of a passive, and of (b) by reinterpretation of an antipassive. But I emphasize that although passive and antipassive appear to be syntactically parallel, with A and O interchanged, in fact they are semantically quite different. As a result, the circumstances in which passive reinterpretation can trigger (a) are quite different from those in which antipassive reinterpretation can trigger (b)." [Our observations in this paper confirm that there are differences.] Dixon's list of paths is much longer than Manning's.

He adds (p. 228-229), "These systems are far from being exact complements....We might infer that the S/A links must be stronger and more important from the fact that there are many languages with no trace of ergativity, whereas no language lacks a degree of accusativity."

It's also worth while to examine Dixon's Nominal Hierarchy (p. 85), for which he notes (p. 187), "Accusative marking extends across all types of nominal constituent while ergative is found only on the right-hand side, with inanimates." First-person pronouns are at his far left. He quotes another scholar's finding Hittite with an ergative case used only with neuters or inanimates: "the bindings (Erg) clasp the head (Acc)." I am not the only scholar of Polynesian that has found the opposite: that Ergative case is used mostly for human beings who are held morally responsible for what they do (Duranti, 1981 and later). In PPN the Ergative case is created when human agents come to be allowed in what had been a slot for inanimate causes.

Languages of communities that stay put permanently tend to change only slowly. It seems agreed that the indigenous languages of Formosa are as a whole close to the ancestral PAn. In contrast, those of faraway Polynesia have undergone repeated wrenching changes, and are not the ones from which one would reconstruct PAn. In the 6000 or so years since Formosa was settled, Padoe, far to the South, has undergone a full change of cycle and returned back to NomAcc. And the languages that moved still farther East, as far as East Polynesia, have changed even more rapidly. East Polynesian languages have undergone two full cycles, and Rapanui and Maori, in different ways, are in the third cycle already. The ancestors of Polynesia may have completed the first cycle 3000 years ago, somewhere near Birds Head and Halmahera.

Dual inheritance. Notice that when a passive voice is created, the new agent inherits its identity from the Nominative subject of the active form, but inherits its case and marking from the "from, by" prepositional phrase. At the same time, the new patient subject of passive inherits its identity from the Accusative case of the active voice, but

inherits its case and marking from the Nominative subject of the active voice. The agent in the passive has been demoted from a core term to an oblique adjunct that can be omitted. [Puzzle: in Gault's (1999) account of one Ergative language, any term can be omitted, even the Absolutive patient subject or the Ergative agent.]

3 Sharp and fuzzy changes of syntax

Changes from 2B AbErg to 1A NomAc are sharp, though sometimes murky. There is seldom difficulty in labeling the syntax. The change from 1B passive to 2A ergative is fuzzy, as shown by disputes over the labeling of Mayrinax.

4 Reconstruction of PAn from archaic languages, and especially from Mayrinax (and Rukai?)

The earliest form of hypothetical PAN that we can reconstruct is a NomAc language in stage 1A. That conclusion is required by the persistence of its ghost in Mayrinax's demoted Agent Focus construction. We can't say much about what preceded that stage because 1A is preceded by a murky change involving reanalysis of Ergative to Nominative case. The two examples in which we see the evidence both work through a state of mixed ergativity, but that may not be the only route. It's hard to posit an ergative marking that would be preserved as the essentially zero marking on the Nominative noun phrases reconstructable in PAn, where the identification of the Nominative subject agent is done by the focus-marking morphemes. At the end of this paper we'll suggest some approach to reconstructing an ancestor of PAn by comparison with forms found in families related to Austronesian.

The most obviously archaic AN attested languages (except Basai and Rukai) are languages in stage 2A. As such, they have AbErg syntax; at least in their primary transitive voices, the Non-Agent Focuses, NAF, of which the Patient Focus is the canonical one. But they also show an "Agent Focus" [AF] construction, which has suffered demotion and has become an archaic relic. It no longer counts as a transitive construction, despite the preservation of the apparently transitive wording, including affixes on the verb that identify the focus. Its words (seen most clearly in 2A Mayrinax) preserve the actual wording (including focus marking on the verb) of the earlier stage 1A, which had had transitive NomAc syntax. That's the wording of the basic syntactic structure of Proto-Austronesian's NomAc syntax. Why don't we call Mayrinax NomAc? Because that construction in Mayrinax, though worded the same, no longer functions as the transitive form, nor as the basic syntactic form. It's a derived construction, just as the passive voice is a derived construction in English and other NomAc languages. In the syntactic change from late stage 1B to early stage 2A, what had been the basic form was reanalyzed as a derived form. And what had been a derived form (passive) was reanalyzed as the the basic form. Had the old usage continued, and not been eclipsed by the old passive form (reanalyzed as AbErg construction), Mayrinax would still be NomAc, phase 1B with passive. What the predominating evidence shows is that the immediate ancestor of Mayrinax was in stage 1B, and before that, stage 1A, and that that easily reconstructible NomAcc 1A stage is the earliest form of Proto-Austronesian that can be recovered and perceived, as it was preceded by a sharp, murky change.

Thereafter, the archaic AF form must disappear before the new AbErg construction can develop an antipassive in 2B.

So, the highly archaic voice, from PAn, seems to persist at least in the ancient wording and form and focus markers, but reanalyzed so that it cannot be correctly called

NomAc today, even though it still looks like it. It's a demoted voice. That's why it's not the form to be used in Dixon's test. (That's an issue that Dixon failed to make clear.)

When one looks at the AN languages that are obviously archaic, most seem to show, in general, AbErg syntax. For that reason, most AN linguists (though not Starosta) have mistakenly said that PAn must have had AbErg syntax. The common conclusion does not follow. As in those languages the AF is the demoted form of the of the ancestral syntax from state 1A, it's the one that shows the easily reconstructible earlier ancestral NomAc syntax, and that's what deserves to be called PAn. Those who have called Mayrinax AbErg are basically correct, but it's also basically correct that, following the general principle of the repeating cycle, we can easily reconstruct the earlier phase 1A. And the 1A phase is the appropriate starting point for the diachronic account of the Austronesian languages.

But on the other hand the conventional majority has been correct in the view that (despite what Huang has sometimes said) the canonical unmarked voice in Mayrinax today (and for a substantial part of the past) has been the NAF, and specifically the patient focus. In other words, Mayrinax today is basically AbErg, despite Huang's vacillation about it.

Let's restate the matter, because it's fundamental. By Dixon's definition, the archaic construction in PAn must be called NomAc in Pan. It won't survive into the next 1A phase that the language (if it were to survive) would enter some day, ushered in by the creation of a new Nominative case. In Mayrinax today the NAF construction (specifically the patient voice) is the basic voice and is the one to use in Dixon's test, and its S=O finds Mayrinax to be an AbErg language. What is shown by the S=A agreement in Mayrinax's demoted AF is that Mayrinax's ancestor was PAn NomAc.

Among Western MP languages, from AbErg, some move around the cycle and become NomAc again. Berg's Padoe is striking in being the specific village at which the return to NomAc takes place. The evidence is clear. We are very fortunate that Berg gave so much detail. The languages that pushed farther East changed more rapidly. So, in the present day we see both Padoe completing its first full cycle and Rapanui, Easter Island, completing its second.

Perhaps nobody has said so before, but it seems clear that mixed ergative, no matter whether lexical or fluid, is not a mere curiosity. It is the normal and usual way in which a language changes back from AbErg 2B to NomAc 1A. It does so by reanalysis of the old Ergative case into the new Nominative case. Berg's Padoe is a clear example.

As noted, some Polynesian languages completed a second full cycle in the recent 3000 years and have entered a third. Yes, though the markers have changed, it turns out that the way Rapanui is ending the second full cycle and beginning the third, at this very time is, like Padoe, by creating mixed intransitivity (fluid ergativity, in this case).

At the end of the PPN period a new Ergative was created in an unusual way. The passive that it reanalyzed was not a normal passive but a lexical passive: a set of verbs that had reanalyzed an involuntary cause construction ("The building was hit by a storm") into a passive-like construction that used casemarker "e" for the cause or agent. When this clause was borrowed into the Fiji-like NomAc construction in Proto-Central Pacific, whose verbs had -Cia verbal suffix, it wreaked havoc. We've described some of the complex series of changes that thereupon took place, in various divisions and subdivisions of Polynesian, from that point on. Fischer's discoveries and hypotheses based on Mangareva are of interest. And Maori, NomAc, 1B, has taken the first irreversible step toward a new 2A AbErg syntax, in that third cycle.

5 View of the whole course from basic NomAc PAN onward

In this study of syntactic change we shall see an account of how languages move through each full cycle, from stage 1A simple NomAc, 1B Nom Acc with passive voice, 2A simple AbErg, 2B AbErg with antipassive, thence to 1A again. It's shown in the Table page. Each stage 1A ends one cycle and begins the next cycle. Many languages stay a long time in stage 1A or 1B.

When we look at the AN languages that are obviously archaic, many of them seem show AbErg Syntax, whose unmarked voice is NAF. It is for that reason that most AN linguistists [though not Starosta] have mistakenly said that PAn must have had AbErg syntax. As the AF is the demoted form of the ancestral syntax from stage 1A, it's the one that shows the ancestral NomAc that is to be called PAn. Some scholars have rightly called Mayrinax AbErg, while others have hesitated to say so, for reasons that are easily understandable. When we look at the flow as part of a cycle that inexorably repeats itself, it is clear that Mayrinax in Stage 2B, still in the first cycle, is not far removed from the easily visible proto-language that was NomAc.

There can be little doubt that the canonical ("unmarked") voice in 2A Mayrinax is the NonAgent Focus, and specifically the Patient Focus, which had been the subject of passive voice in stage 1B.

In Mayrinax, as we saw, there is an obviously archaic voice, the AF, which persists and is nowadays derived secondarily, from the NAF. Remember the ancestral 1B, where the passive voice (marked) had been derived from the active. Examination of Mayrinax AF shows that S (subject of intransitive sentence) is marked the same as A (agent of transitive sentence). This demoted archaic construction had been NomAc.

Among AbErg Western MP languages, too, some have moved around the cycle and become NomAc again. Berg's Padoe is striking in being the specific village at which the return in one branch of MP takes place slowly, ending its cycle 1.

With ancestral speeding up, ProtoEastern MP completed its first cycle in perhaps 3000 years, somewhere near Halmahera and the Bird's Head. In a second full cycle. in another 3000 years or so, Rapanui is doing so at this very time. It's interesting that the two that are completing a cycle just about now are doing so in the same way, by mixed intransitivity (fluid ergativity in this case), even though one is ending the first cycle and the other ending the second cycle.

At the end of the PPN period a new Ergative voice was created in an unusual way. The passive that was reanalyzed was not a normal passive but a lexical passive: a set of verbs that had reanalyzed an involuntary cause construction ("the building was hit by a storm") into a full passive marked by casemarker "e". When this agent phrase was borrowed into the Fiji-like Cia NomAc construction that early PAn had inherited, it wreaked havoc. We look at some of the complex series of changes that took place in various divisions and subdivisions of Polynesian from that point on. Fischer's discoveries based on Mangareva are of interest. Rapanui (like Padoe) is at the end of a cycle (the second full cycle in this case), and the beginning of a third. Slightly ahead of it, Maori, NomAcc, 1B, has taken the first irretrievable step toward a new 2A ergative syntax, in a third cycle.

Let's summarize what we have noticed about the sharp differences in the speeds of change. In general, the languages still on Formosa have changed least from PAn, and are

still in the earliest attested cycle. Those that have moved farthest East, notably Polynesian, have changed their syntax most rapidly. At present, some Polynesian languages have completed two full cycles, while Padoe has just completed only one cycle down from PAn.

6 The table of the ergativity cycle in AN 1A > 1B > 2A > 2B > 1A

The Table shows the general path within the single cycles in Austronesian. Each row represents a stage of syntax. In the archaic AN tongues, stage 2, the ergative voices (NAF, non-agennt-focus) resemble passives, of course, because that's what they were in stage 1B before reanalysis; and the simple intransitives are marked the same as the Agent-Focus constructions (thus treating alike what had come down from the S & A of stage 1). So, even if no living archaic language showed precisely a simple Nominative-Accusative (NomAcc) syntax, it still would be easy to reconstruct the ancestor that did, and that's what we'll call PAn (Proto-Austronesian).

This is the canonical cycle of ergativity, somewhat idealized. Each row (or "phase") 1A is simple NomAc syntax; Row 2A, simple Ab Erg. Rows 1B and 2B show the syntaxes of the passive voice of NomAc and the antipassive voice of AbErg. At the end of 2B, the Ergative marking is extended first to subjects of active intransitive sentences (making mixed or fluid ergativity); and then to all intransitive sentences (creating, by definition, a phase 1A in a new NomAc syntax). Padoe has just done this at the end of its first cycle, and Rapanui is in the process of doing it now at the end of its second cycle down from PAn.

Creation of a passive voice does not make movement to AbErg inevitable. A NomAcc language with a passive voice may stay that way a long time. I suggest that change to AbErg becomes inevitable if and when the passive voice comes to be used oftener than the active voice (as it has now in New Zealand Maori).

In the syntactic change to phase 2A, the 1B oblique agent is promoted back to status as a core term, the Ergative case, and its "from, by" preposition nV is reanalyzed as the Ergative casemarker. At the same time, the Nominative patient subject of the former passive is reanalyzed as the Absolutive patient (classed by many as subject) of the new AbErg sentence. This is the "patient focus", which is the most prominent among the NAF (Non-Agent Focus) constructions, for the same reason that English patient passives ("An award was given.") are commoner than dative or locative passives ("John was given an award." and "This house has been lived in."). Both the Ergative agent and the Absolutive patient are core terms.

7 Lack of analogy or symmetry: antipassive in stage 2B

The move to NomAc at the end of stage 2B fails to follow the analogy of the move to AbErg at the end of 1B, in two ways. (1) The demotion of the Nominative agent to an adjunct in formation of the passive is not fully followed in the demotion of the Absolutive patient to an adjunct in formation of the antipassive. In the former, the resultant clause is marked as intransitive and the passive agent is marked as oblique adjunct by a "by" preposition. But in the latter, the demotion may or may not be marked by a preposition. Once Blust complained to me that in somebody's published paper, a sentence is marked as intransitive, but it looks transitive with the patient simple Abs. In such cases, the only way to test whether the antipassive demotion of patient has taken place is to ask a native speaker whether the patient can be omitted or not. If it can, move has been made into stage 2B, and the the construction

is intransitive, antipassive. (2) The subsequent change from 2B to 1A is canonically a reanalysis of old Ergative to new Nominative, going through a condition of mixed ergativity. We'll see two instances.

8 Acquisition of casemarkers from PAN zero

We've seen clues that the NomAc syntax visible in PAn had, like English, zero casemarking for both Nominative and Accusative. I have previously shown that the "kV" marker for Nominative was ancestrally a marker of Topic. The candidate for what became Accusative marker in some languages is "cV" in PAn and Mayrinax and "tV" in PMP. See it partly reanalyzed from preposition to Accusative casemarker in Liao's example. See it also in Finney, 2001b, where a discussion gives many examples showing its evolving from preposition to Accusative casemarker. For Amis, Chen (1987, 127) shows the cu > tu particle (u > o) clearly as having become an Accusative object marker:

Topic	Nominative	Genitive	Accusative	Locative
o	*ko*	*no*	*to*	*i*
ia	*kia*	*nia*	*tia*	*itia*

9 Development

At an early stage, PAn had NomAc syntax, phase 1A. Nominative and Accusative casemarkers were zero. PAn entered phase 1B by developing a passive voice, with the demoted agent marked by preposition nV. As in all such languages, the canonical element raised to Nominative subject was the patient, though, like English, the language allowed other passive voices in which the dative beneficiary or the location or something else could be the one promoted to Nominative subject. AN ("Mainline" if we exclude Rukai) divided into nine branches, as Blust (1999) defined them, on classical principles of lexicon and phonology. Blust (pers.comm.) does not favor using any syntactic changes in the grouping of related languages. One branch (Malayo-Polynesian) spread throughout more than half the world's longitude to Madagascar and to Easter Island and gave rise to countless languages and dialects. Before the MP dispersion, all these branches probably developed not only the canonical passive from patients but also passive subjects from dative, locative, and instrument. The lowest common ancestor of Mayrinax and Tagalog had Agent-Focus markings on the verb that were the same for S and A, and so the syntax still bore signs of ancestral NomAc, stage 1. Focus markers "ma" (more patient-like) and infix "um", both AF markers on the verb, share the consonant, but it's not clear that they have common ancestry. Topics at the left of the sentence had been marked with "kV" at their right, and the topic (later, Nominative) markers "kV" developed from old topic markers. AN casemarkers lie left of their Det Phrases because they are mostly ancestral prepositions in this VO family. In Mayrinax, most of the casemarkers add the syllable "kV" to show specificity ("the" or "a certain"). A reasonable explanation is that this specificity marker comes down from the older topic marker, as topics are inherently specific. That's what established the association between Case 1 (Nom, Abs) and specificity. In Tagalog the Abs casemarker "a-ng" shows specificity, and indeed when the speaker needs to express the specificity, the way to do so is to put the DetP in the "a-ng" case, (Absolutive subject, ancestral Nominative). When a location is put in Tagalog's Abs "a-ng" (subject, specific) case, both the agent and the patient are put in the "n-a-ng" case (Ablative-Genitive-Ergative), making a potential ambiguity. The "-ng" linker on the right end of casemarkers may be an MP innovation, as it is shared by

Tagalog and Old Javanese, but not Mayrinax. Old Javanese uses the vowel "i" (anciently for proper names of persons) left of the linker, while Tagalog uses the "a" vowel (anciently for common nouns). We note Blust's (1999) harsh remarks in the 8-ICAL volume about Starosta's view of Rukai's position in AN.

10 General course of the first full cycle

We've anticipatorily mentioned already and will give full evidence now on the Mayrinax Atayal language which is often regarded as a fully AbErg language, stage 2. The conclusions about its Agent Focus voice may surprise some people. As an MP language, Tagalog agrees with Old Javanese in showing an innovation not found in Mayrinax: the insertion of linker "ng" as a suffix on the casemarkers.

We describe Rene van den Berg's work on the move from AbErg to NomAc in Sulawesi, in which we can identify exactly which village today (Padoe) still preserves the final step ending Cycle 1, still standing on the line between AbErg and the new NomAc.

We compare Berg's Padoe in Sulawesi with Fisher's Rapanui, Easter Island, showing that both of them, today, are reaching state 1A NomAc in the same way (through mixed ergativity, reanalysing final 2B to beginning 1A). But Berg's Padoe is doing so at the end of its first cycle, while Rapanui is doing so at the end of its second cycle. Obviously the ancestors of Oceanic, if they passed near Padoe at all, had done so many centuries earlier. They had ended their first cycle perhaps 3000 years ago, perhaps near the Bird's Head. This is an example that commonly the languages that have move farthest change more rapidly.

11 Concepts of Nom-Ac vs AbErg in regard to Proto-Austronesian and some of the most archaic AN tongues

Stanley Starosta (who died a few weeks after this SEALS meeting) was said to have a predilection for finding ergativity where others don't see it. And yet in regard to PAn, Starosta found it NomAc, while most AN scholars have said it must be AbErg (because Mayrinax and Tagalog and a majority of the AN languages that are credibly archaic show AbErg syntax). Starosta pointed out that the dialects of Rukai are basically NomAc. He thought that the oldest version of PAn that we could reconstruct must be much like Rukai. For this paper I have not reviewed my previous studies of Rukai, which were compatible with that thought. I gave the name Mainline AN to all the other branches of AN, and the name Proto-Mainline AN to the common ancestor of all but Rukai. I don't take a position on the question whether the oldest PAn (ancestor of both Rukai and Mainline AN languages) was more like Proto-Rukai or more like Proto Mainline AN. Either way, PAn was NomAc. But as we'll not discuss Rukai in this paper, the "PAn" that I reconstruct from Mayrinax and other languages is essentially the ancestor of all the (Mainline) AN languages.

We'll examine the relic-structures in the archaic AN languages (adding Basay to those already mentioned) to show how they developed from the NomAc syntax of Proto (Mainline) AN, which for convenience we'll call PAn.

12 What syntax can be seen in the long known AN languages
Exploring this issue, let's compare some AN languages, all known to be conservative: Mayrinax, Old Javanese, Tagalog, and Rukai. I've quoted in an earlier paper Becker and Hunter's (1988) table of "deictic prepositions" (casemarkers) in Old Javanese. Tagalog and Old Javanese are MP languages, and both have suffixed a "linker", "-ng", to the basic forms of the casemarker. Results in Tagalog are a-ng and na-ng (the latter of which is customarily written "ng").

13 Old Javanese
As noted in my earlier reports, this is Becker and Hunter's table of "deictic prepositions" in Old Javanese:

	[Case 1]	[Case 2]	[Case 3]
	[Nominative]	[Genitive]	[Dative-Loc]
	[Absolutive]	[Ergative]	
	direct	oblique	directional
indefinite, nonspecific	*i*	*ni*	*ri [< *di]*
definite	*i-ng*	*ni-ng*	*ri-ng*
definite and specific	*i-ka-ng*	*ni-ka-ng*	*ri-ka-ng*

Old Javanese had lost the kV and cV casemarkers, and Mayrinax had lost the Nom & Loc dV casemarker which shows above as ri in the normal change from PAn *d to r, which becomes a zero consonant in Tongic, as we shall see in the Absolutive marker for common nouns in Niue.

Two key points to notice are these: (1) Old Javanese resembles Tagalog in that it attaches the "linker" -ng to the casemarking particle under certain very common circumstances. (2) Old Javanese agrees with Mayrinax in adding kV to the casemarker to show specificity. (True, it has vowel u in Mayrinax and vowel a in Old Javanese, but that's within the normal variation of the vowel in the PCMs.) The two languages have no history of geographic proximity that could allow borrowing. So, the most reasonable explanation of the occurrence of this marker of specificity is that it was present in Proto Austronesian.

As topics are inherently specific, and PAn "kV" began as a topic marker, it's not surprising to find kV as a marker of specificity in Old Javanese as well as Mayrinax and Rukai.

Those authors' concept of 'definite' differs from the usual; theirs equates to the suffixation of the "ng" linker found also in Central Philippine.

14 Old controversy about Atayal
For good reasons, Mayrinax Atayal is the Formosan language most often cited in efforts to probe back toward PAn. It's clearly a conservative language. It's been described in detail by Lillian M. Huang (1994b with elaboration in 2000). She had previously reported (as her Ph.D. dissertation) a study of Wulai Atayal, a much less conservative dialect, and hence one of less value for reconstructing PAn. The essentials of her dissertation were published (1994a) in Oceanic Linguistics (University of Hawai'i, where Starosta taught). In that work,

she described Atayal as an Ergative language. But her Mayrinax work was done after reestablishing permanent residence in Taiwan, and the word "Ergative" does not appear in her book. People have said that she deleted the concept to please Paul Li,. She published another detailed analysis in Oceanic Linguistics (Huang, 2000). We all owe her a tremendous debt for asking good questions and providing great amounts of valuable data. I couldn't have done the present study had she not gathered the detailed observations and published them.

Wulai Atayal and Mantauran Rukai are not nigh kindred. So when both of them have a particle from PAn *kV (Mantauran ka, Wulai qu) that serves to mark the right edge of a topic, one must believe that that particle was in PAn. In some languages, glottal plus vowel became a topic marker, but glottal stop did not occur in PAn. Glottal often comes from earlier "k".

My rearrangement of the tables of Mayrinax "casemarking" in Huang (1994, 109) shows what seems to represent an early stage not far from PAn:

glottal+V	kV	nV	cV	kV	(zero)+V	
[Abs]	[Abs]	[Erg]	[prepositional]			
Topic	Topic	Gen	Allat	Comit	Loc	(PAn?)
Nom	Nom	Instr	Dat	Allat		
		Ben	Acc			
(glottal) V	kV	nV	cV	kV	zero V	

All the "casemarkers" are ancestrally either topic markers or prepositions, as I have found in earlier reports. The range of their use in Mayrinax is shown in Finney, 2001b, pages 412-413.

Old Javanese has lost the kV and cV. Mayrinax loses the dV casemarker (which becomes rV in Oceanic languages and PPN and, as we shall see, simple V in Tongic).

Where the vowel is 'a' and not 'i' the tables actually show zero and not glottal as the initial consonant of the Topic or Nominative. Has the "I" vowel suffered preglottalization?

Prepositions dV, tV, and sV don't occur in Mayrinax, but were present in PAn. The dV and tV had space meaning; also Nom for dV in some MP tongues. The si particle for proper names of persons occurs in some languages, but is glottal + i in Mayrinax. In some languages, when that person marker occurs it replaces whatever would be the normal preposition or casemarker in a function.

An interesting fact is that kV serves both as an allative-comitative preposition and as a topic marker that can become a Nominative (and later Absolutive) marker. It's not clear that the two uses had ancestry in common.

The word Topic in the table stands for usage either as a topic marker or as a marker of specificity. Topics are always specific, and so many instances can be labeled either way. kV is used after prepositions to mark specificity.

15 More on Mayrinax Atayal

Here are some of Huang's (1994) examples of Agent Focus (AF) and NAF (Non-Agent, i.e., patient or locative):

Agent Focus (AF) (intransitive): p. 40
m - ingilis 'i'   yaya
AF - cry   Nom   mother
Mother is crying (or: Mother cried).

Agent Focus (AF) (transitive): p. 41
c   <um> abu'   cu'   qulih ku'   nabakis
wrap <AF> wrap   Acc.Nrf fish   Nom.Rf old:man
The old man wrapped a fish.

These examples confirm the key point that S and A are case-marked the same, and so the apparent syntax is NomAc. But we note elsewhere in this paper that Cu began as a preposition in PAn. So, PAn accusative objects had no marker and only later took prepositions that became casemarkers. The Nominative marker ku was earlier a marker of topic at the left (better called an afterthought when moved to the right, where it stays in Malagasy). We could translate: "(he) wrapped a fish, the old man." But earlier the kV had occurred at the right edge of the left topic.

Patient (theme) passive or ergative (NAF, PF): p. 45
nubuw -un ni'   yaba' ku   qusia'
drink -PF Gen   father Nom.Rf   water
The water was drunk by father. or: Father drank the water.

Location passive or ergative: (NAF, LF) p. 53
kabax -an   ni'   yumin ku'   kulu'=mu.
borrow-LF   Gen   Yumin Nom.Rf   car   my
Yumin borrowed (at) my car. or: My car was borrowed (at) by Yumin.

For those of us who take the sentences as AbErg (and Mayrinax's basic status as an AbErg language), substitute the label "Ergative" for "Genitive", and substitute the label "Absolutive" for "Nominative". The diachronic point to make is that these sentences were NomAc when the language was in phase 1A & 1B, and they became AbErg in phase 2A. In this voice the change is not obvious. The drastic change in syntax comes in the descendants of the passive voice that arose in phase 2B. It's that agent that becomes the Ergative agent, which thereafter will reanalyzed as the new Nominative agent in the phase 1A of the following cycle, thousands of years later.

These sentences show why Mayrinax Atayal is so often cited on both sides of issues in AN diachronic syntax. Starosta was right in saying that Huang should have stuck to her earlier position that Atayal has ergative syntax. But Mayrinax shows evidence of an older [PAn] syntax in which neither the Nominative Subject Subject nor the Accusative Object had a casemarker. This language's AF sentences can be taken at two levels. On the surface (ignoring their demoted status) they reflect the ancestral NomAc transitive

sentences and thus clarify the nature of PAn. But because they've been demoted, they are not the transitive sentences in Mayrinax that are to be used in the Dixon test for ergativity. Starosta's (1999) objections to Huang's analysis of Mayrinax are well known.

If (correctly) we use Patient Focus to apply Dixon's test to the Mayrinax sentences, the decision is AbErg. The best known observer, Huang, had vacillated on the point.

Here's an interesting sentence (p. 65): [Terms in square brackets are mine, not Huangs's]

kal -un=cu	ni' watan	c=ku sinubilan	cu' kai'
say-PF=1S.BNom	Gen Watan	Acc.Rf legend	Lin language
	[Abs Patient] [Erg]	[Acc Patient]	

Watan told me a legend. Or: (my added translations):
I was told a legend by Watan. A legend was told me by Watan.

An oddity of this (1B dative passive?) sentence is that the Nom/Abs subject (I) of the verb in Patient (Dative?) Focus must be the patient but also the (retained?) Accusative object (legend) must be the patient. English solves it by putting "me" in the dative in active voice; and in dative passive voice having "legend" be a retained accusative object. Huang does not account for the accusative. She gave an active-voice translation into English and I added passive translations. If we regard the construction as dative passive, the solution is the same as in English. It's easy to see why Huang could consider this either a 1B passive or a 2A ergative construction. Generative grammarians like to say that the dative is promoted to accusative before the passive transformation. Hudson's (1992) dissent is persuasive.

The construction still appears to survive today in the AF sentences, though synchronically the generation must be NAF first, then AF. Just look at the AF sentences and treat them as non-derived active voice, which was their ancestry, and you are looking at Proto-AN with its NomAc syntax.

Both Bloomfield (many years ago for Tagalog) and Huang (for Mayrinax) have regarded as passives the constructions that almost everyone today calls ergatives. Both languages show high portions of Agent-Focus sentences that still show clearly the NomAc structure of phase 1B. The high frequency of the (NAF) sentences that could be read as passives invites comparison with Maori's high frequency of passives that we take here as an irrevocable step toward ergativity. For Mayrinax and Tagalog the evidence justifies calling them Ergative languages, despite their clear evidence of NomAc ancestry, which we have called PAn.

We are lucky to have Mayrinax and the detailed work that has been done and published by Huang, as well as by others who have not always agreed with her. Mayrinax is conservative enough to show undeniably (in its archaic AF sentences) the basic NomAc 1A structure of its ancestors. It also shows undeniably the basic 1B passive sentence structure. From reanalysis, Mayrinax itself is AbErg, stage at least 2A. Some might contend that the demoting reanalysis of AF, though not exactly an antipassive, creates stage 2B. If that were so, all four stages or phases of a full cycle could be glimpsed in some sense in Mayrinax.

16 Zero-marked nominative & accusative in Proto-Austronesian

In a paper given in 2002 at the 9th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, H.-ch. Liao shows (in a cu > tu language):

tmuqiq tu	punuz na	paRibunan	tu	bawbi'
pierce Acc.	backside of (the)	watcher	(of, at) (the)	garden

Note that in this sentence the first occurrence of "tu" is best treated as an Accusative object marker (a late development), while its second occurrence can only be a preposition (basically, "at").

This sentence shows a very old PAn locative preposition, glossed "at" in English, whose object here is "garden", but it also shows at the left in the same sentence a later development, in which it is less like a preposition and more like a casemarker for the Accusative Direct Object [backside]. As we can easiy see here, it's an old prepostion "at" that is becoming an Accusative casemarker. We conclude that in its ancestor, PAn, the Accusative case (as in English nouns) bore no marker. And the kV particle that becomes a Nominative marker in some AN languages, and a marker of specificity in others, was ancestrally a topic marker. So in PAn both

Nom and Acc (as in English nouns) bore no marking. This is a new conclusion, no previously made by others.

17 Tagalog

Something like Mayrinax is found in Tagalog and related Philippine languages, though complicated by the fact that the languages suffer from impoverishment of case-marking. With only three case forms and no preposition, some ambiguity and some paradoxical marking is found in Tagalog and some other Philippine languages. When the Absolutive focus (ancestral Nominative) is a location, both agent and patient are marked "nV" (ancestrally "from" or agent). Even when the English sentence has "to" the wording in Tagalog can be "nV", whose basic ancestral meaning was "from".

The Philippines came into American possession as an almost accidental effect of the Spanish-American War (and Hawaii was admitted, too). Leonard Bloomfield took a quick look at Tagalog (the dialect of the capital, and, later, the national language). He called the Ergative voice "passive" (not unreasonably, as its phase 2 grammar descended from the passive of the earlier phase 1B).

The Absolutive case 1, marked by "a-ng", descends from the PAn Nominative, and behaves much like the same case in Mayrinax. Case 3, sa-marked here, is basically locative and general oblique. Case 2, the ancestral Genitive case, Ergative in Mayrinax, has that role here, too. But (because three is a very small number of cases for a language-- we can call Tagalog case-impoverished) that case, marked by "n-a-ng" has come to be used for a broader syntactic and semantic range than it has in most other tongues. See McGinn's (1988) comments.

Most remarkably, when case 1 is used for locative or other oblique function, Ergative "nang" (oddly spelled ["ng"]), case 2, "ni" with a proper name, is used for both the doer agent subject and the undergoer patient object in the same clause, as follows (Schachter & Otanes, 1972, 315):

Hinahaluan   ni Rosa   ng asukal ang kape   sa kapitera
stir   by Rosa   CM sugar Abs coffee loc pot
Rosa stirs sugar into the coffee in the pot. Or literally:
The coffee in pot is stirred sugar into by Rosa.

18 Basay, an extinct Formosan language Nom Ac, stage 1B

In a valuable and outstanding paper, Li (1999, 641) shows Basay's syntax. The Agent Focus markers are used not only in transitive but also in intransitive sentences, showing S marked the same as A, thereby NomAc, as in this sentence:

isu   c-um-aka-cakai.
thou   AF-RED-walk
You (sg) kept walking. (not demoted)

Li's careful study of Basay was based on notes taken by Japanese in 1936. Japanese does not mark word boundaries. The language had been called extinct since 1900 but two old women who could still speak some of it were found. As we'll see, Basay is still in Stage 1, NomAcc. A crucial test is to find sentences that are passive/ergative and see if the agent is deletable passive (stage 1B) or not deletable (Ergative in stage 2A).

Of Li's two examples, # 47 LocFocus "You simply play the flute", has the agent is not deleted. Indeed, the agent "you((sg)" is expressed twice: most archaicly by a "Genitive" pronoun suffixed to the verb, and by an independent "Neu" (Nominative) pronoun:

siamammang   isu   tuLni- an - su. (Tr Text 4)
simply   thou/Neu   play- LF- thou/Gen
You (sg) simply play-the-flute.
[thou simply playest by thee]?

This not truly transitive, as no object is expressed. We see dual contradictory marking of agent, which we'll also see in some Poynesian Outlier tongues. Agents expressed as affixes sometimes are relics of an earlier syntax (RErg?).

The other, # 11, shows the crucial deletion of agent:

vla - vlai - ana   kimu   u   saquL
Red give LF   you/Nom   Obl fruit (Ret.Acc.obj)
You were given fruit [at]. Thou wast (etc).

As the agent is deleted, the syntax is 1B, not 2A. That shows that Basay is 1B passive and is essentially PAn. Both these sentences are Locative Focus, which is commonly used with weaker transitivity. Li also shows some words with MP phonology, probably loans.

19 Seediq

Seediq and Atayal are grouped together within Atayalic. The passive translations with dangling prepositions seen here are the same as those we see for Mayrinax. But we'll see that Seediq is more archaic and closer to PAn than Mayrinax is.

Seediq is described by Chang (1999). First he gives us a sentence in NomAc phase 1 or Agent Focus (Active Voice:

ciga	wadu-ku	m-ekan	ido
yesterday	Past-1sgNom	AV-eat	rice

I ate rice yesterday.

This looks like a normal transitive sentence in NomAc in a Phase1 language; except for the fact that the agent subject is not expressed as an independent word, but only by a so-called agreement marker suffixed to the verb-- because it's a personal pronoun. Is "rice" an incorporated noun? My suggestion is that it's the PAn direct object which has not yet had the "tu" preposition inserted as its casemarker as in Liao's sentence. So this sems to represent a very early form of PAn.

Notice that the AV/AF is not a demoted voice in Seediq. So in that respect Seediq is more conservative and Mayrinax shows later changes. Seediq looks like stage 1B, NomAc with a passive voice, an intransive voice, agent deletable. Or one could call this sentence intransitive because the rice is incorporated into the verb.[This is clearly a simple active voice in a NomAc language, in stage 1. It's a straight retention from the earliest NomAc language, surely must be called PAn, because it is obviously in cycle 1 and not a later cycle. Chang does not give examples of AF with a noun subject.

The patient undergoer "rice" has no preposition nor casemarker. It appears to be a simple direct object, unless it's incorporated into the verb, which it would make intransitive.

More problematic is sentence (5) sais to have bound pronouns undergoing clitic climbing and base generated as agreement afrixes:

kuxun	- su -	mu	q-um-ita	isu
like (PV)	2sgNom	1sg Gen	see (AV)	2sg Acc

I like to see you
[my reanalysis: literally, choice:]

like	thee	I	see	thee
like	thou	by me	see	thee

20 The genitive singular may be a relic of earlier Erg.

The so-called agreement marker on the verb is an old fossilized reduced form of a personal pronoun. For a noun subject the personal pronoun would be in third person. But evidently (from this example) if the subject agent is in first person, it's expressed only as a suffix on the verb, and the equivalent expression by an independent word is suppressed.

Or perhaps there are examples in which (as with third person noun subjects) the first person independent pronoun is expressed, though Chang did not give any examples thereof. How about passive voice and Non-Agent-Focus?

In Seediq as in Mayrinax Atayal, and many Formosan languages, the patient (non-active)-voice verbs have focus-marking -un on the verb.

Chang quotes from Holmer, (1996):

subet- un-   mu   ka   ricahj
hit -   PatVerb   Gen 1 sg   Nom   plum
The plum will be hit by me. (I will hit it)

subet- an-   mu
hit   LocVb   Gen 1sg
The field will be hit plums in by me. (I will there)

biq-   un-   saku (*su-ku)_   pila
give   PatV   2sGen + 1s Nom   Nom money
The money will be given to you by me.
(? I will give you the money.)

Also it's odd to see Genitive (from, by) translated 'to' you. The reason may be that, like Mayrinax, Seediq has impoverishment of number of cases. Finding two non-coreferential Nominative elements (not equational) in the same clause is puzzling. Now see:

biq-   i-   maku (*namu-mu)   pila
give   PV(Imp)   2P.Nom - 1S.Gen   money
The money should be given to you (pl) by me!

Note the English translations with dangling prepositions, as we had to give for Mayrinax. Chang doesn't say whether the agent can be omitted. If they can, the syntax is 1B and NomAc and close to PAn.

All Chang's agents of passives are genitive pronouns. The study raises some interesting questions. More data would help. The crucial question is whether the agents are deletable (passive) or core terms (ergative).

21 Conclusions on archaic languages

Basay is clearly 1B NomAc and close to PAn. Seediq's sentences pose problems, as the analysis hangs on the deletability of its agents, which we are not told.

The important point is that in at least some Formosan languages the set of focus markers on the verb for intransitive sentences is the same as the set of focus markers for transitive Agent-Focus sentences, which had ancestrally been the NomAc sentences in stage1A's active transitive voice. That fact groups the A and S elements powerfully and fundamentally together in contrast to the O element. So, by definition, the ancestral syntax is NomAc. It's the active voice NomAc syntax found in ancestral stage 1A, and the words are still there, though a reanalysis may have taken place.

The whole derivation process we have shown, from stage 1A to 1B to 2A, involves the Nominative cases of 1A and 1B becoming the Absolutive cases of stage 2A and 2B. The Nominative cases from the old active voice become the Absolutive cases in the AF, Agent-focus sentences, and the Nominative cases from the old passive voice become the

Absolutive cases in the NAF, Non-Agent-Focus sentences, the basic voice in Ergative languages.

As noted, the prevailing opinion had been that, because most of the more ancient-appearing languages in most of the primary branches of AN have Ab-Erg syntax (in their NAF voices), Proto-AN must have been AbErg. But, as we see, the syntax preceding those AbErg languages (and still visible there as a dying archaism) was NomAc PAn. The NomAc appearance still survives today in the AF sentences, where the Absolutive element is the Agent. But Marinax Atayal is clearly AbErg, state 2A.

As Dixon has noted, NomAc languages predominate, and are likely to stay NomAc for long periods of time. How far is Mayrinax from the PAn NomAc syntax that shows so clearly in its AF sentences? Unlike Maori, whose ancestry has gone through two full cycles since PAN's Nom Ac syntax and has moved toward late1B near 2A in the third cycle, Mayrinax is still in its first cycle, still so close to its ancestral PAn NomAc that the person who has studied it most can still describe it as NomAc. What has frozen Mayrinax's syntax for six thousand years? Freezing in NomAc is common, but freezing in AbErg is less so. It may bethat the freezing between PAn and Mayrinax occurred in the time when the syntax of early Mayrinax was still NomAc 1B.

There's no reasonable way to avoid calling PAn a Nom-Acc language.

Furthermore, my analysis of the Rukai languages, not given here, is not incompatible with Starosta's view that proto-Rukai, NomAc, was one of two basic branches of PAn, also NomAc. One very ancient feature found in Rukai is a particle ancestrally *ka that was the right boundary of a topic at the left of a sentence, before the particle moved to the left of the phrase. There is a possibility that Rukai's NomAc is a whole cycle earlier than the NomAc ancestor that can be seen in the Basay study. On the other hand, there is cogency in Blust's harsh disagreement with Starosta.

22 Padoe in Van Den Berg's work: an exciting finding

We've mentioned it above, but Berg's work is so important and exciting that we give more details.

This involves a chain of dialects, but not the kind from a group settling on a coast line, along which the newcomers spread. In time, people in adjoining villages still understood one another, but not the ones at the two ends.

In Berg's case, MP AN tribes were migrating South-East from West Central Sulawesi (Celebes) toward where Muna and Wolio are now, leaving a series of villages. The one at the Northwest, at the origin, kept the oldest syntax. The next village changed its syntax slightly, moving from an AbErg syntax toward a NomAc one. Each successive village moved a bit more toward NomAc. (This series is a great place to study the series of small changes that add up to a change in syntactic type of sentence.) Oddly, each village kept its own innovation and made no more, with only the innovators moving farther SouthEast. One village, Padoe, achieved the point of balance between AbErg and NomAc, with mixed ergativity (mixed intransitivity), in which the active intransitive subjects took old-Ergative-new-Nominative marking, while the less dynamic ones kept old Absolutive marking. It's the only place known in the world in which each successive village has fossilized its own step through phase 2B toward NomAc syntax.

Other Western MP languages, including the ancestors of Malaysian and Indonesian, made their own steps into Accusativity in less striking ways.

23 Contributions of the Wouk-Ross 2000 book and the aftermath of the first reanalysis from ergative in 2B to nominative in 1A

None of the three authors reviewed here uses the concept of the diachronic repeated movements of languages around the cycle of Ergativity, the basic concept that Dixon proposes. But their findings support that concept and the approach used in the present study.

24 PAn's ergativity: support from an unexpected source

In January, 2002, four months before this SEALS meeting, I attended and gave a paper at the 9th International Conference on Austronesian Languages (as well as one the following week at the COOL-5 Conference on Oceanic Linguistics), both sponsored by RSPAS at Australian National University. Citing lack of budget, to everyone's surprise, the host group, RSPAS of Australian National University, announced that the papers will not be published. The lack of publication is a disservice to the scientific community. Each of the eight previous ICAL meetings had seen publication of the papers by its sponsoring organization. Those who had submitted papers had done so with an implied promise that at least half the papers given would be published.

In presenting a paper at ICAL9, I mentioned my view that PAn was NomAc. As usual, several members objected because most of the archaic AN languages, including most Formosan ones, are AbErg and therefore it seemed that PAn must have been AbErg. That's not a logical conclusion. It's clear that at some points, between one time phase and the next, a change of syntax takes place. All we can reasonably expect is that the later phase should show traces of the earlier. And it does.

At the meeting, copies were sold of the just-printed 474-page paperback book, The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Systems, edited (and partly written) by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross. On page 34, inconspicuously and without emphasis, the book supports the conclusion that PAn had NomAc syntax. Ross says:

"The Formosan data indicate that intransitive verbs had the same morphology as actor voice [AF] transitives." (and in a footnote remarks that [as I have noted, too], the situation is less clear in Tagalog and other Philippine languages). It follows (though Ross doesn't specifically say so) that by Dixon's rule, the AF sentences of Formosan languages are NomAc. Welcome, Malcolm!

In the present paper we have seen that the AF constructions in Mayrinax Atayalic Formosan (and Basay and other tongues) are descendants of NomAc constructions in the preceding Stage 1A, which must be called PAn. The part of the reasoning that Ross didn't use is what Dixon (op. cit.) called "moving a language around the cycle of change".

Following, in the same 2002 book, is Bob Blust's "Notes on the history of 'focus' in Austronesian languages". Like some others, Blust finds the AN languages odd in having three passives while English and other IE languages are said to have only one. We can only wonder why so many English speakers are unaware the English has multiple passives much like those of AN languages. Our common passive uses the direct Accusative object: "I saw the cat. The cat was seen (by me)". We also have a dative passive: "The board gave John an award. John was given an award (by the board)." In the latter, "an award" is a "retained accusative object" also found in some AN languages. (Mayrinax uses the preposition / casemarker that has been moving toward Acc casemarker.) In English we also have a prepositional passive, which with various prepositions uses the location, the

instrument, etc., as new Nominative subjects: "This house has been lived in." "This knife has been cut with." "This one has been spoken for." English and the AN languages differ slightly in the actual or potential number of passives. A minor difference is that "This house has been given a party in" (with retained accusative object) is acceptable in Tagalog (Dick McGinn, 1988 and pers. comm., and the section on Tagalog in the present paper), but is not accepted in English by many speakers. It's true that English doesn't put focus affixes on the verb. Instead, we have prepositions dangling at the end of some sentences. It has not been determined what ancient phrases have been collapsed into those Focus markers.

25 Note on some forms from Donohue

Also, in the same book, the set of forms shown in Donohue's (2000) report is intriguing. How does it fit into our paradigm of four phases per cycle? P. 85 shows:

Transitive verb without [O] enclitics: [his number 11a]

No-kiki'I	te	iko'o	na	beka
3R-bite	CORE	you	NOM	cat

The cat bit you.
This appears to be:

3s-bite	Acc	you	Nom	cat

Tukang Besi is off the Southeast corner of Sulawesi, near Wolio and Muna and about the point at which Central MP languages begin. We have noted a tV preposition that easily approximates an Accusative casemarker or becomes one. And we have noted that the reanalysis in moving from 2B to 1A (new cycle) that changes the Ergative marker (nV) to a Nominative marker. It seems that the agent "cat" has been reanalyzed from Ergative to Nominative (as typically happened in the move from 2B to 1A) and, of course, keeps the (reanalyzed) nV marker that had anciently been the Ergative agent marker as well as a "from" preposition. So in the second full cycle, the marker "nV" is not primarily an Ergative marker but a Nominative marker. (As we'll see, Reid and his student forgot that and misinterpreted a nominative nV marker in Fijian as Ergative. Forgive them, because the nV preposition "from" persists and can confusingly recreate nV ergative phrases in the second cycle.)

So Tukang Besi seems to be a language in stage 1A early in its second cycle. Not all the sentences that Donohue presents seem fully consistent with expectations. It would be good to see more work on the language within the framework of "moving around the cycle of change".

26 General course of the later full cycles

We don't discuss Central MP nor Eastern MP outside Oceanic, nor Oceanic outside Central Pacific, nor Fijian nor Rotuman, all of which I have written about elsewhere.

We'll see an enormously complex sequence of syntactic changes that took place within the PPN period (from the point when the earliest form of PPN began to diverge from the NomAc syntax of Fijian). I have discussed them in more detail in earlier papers than here.

A new Erg construction arose in PPN from an unusual source and wreaked havoc when it was borrowed into the -Cia NomAc construction, which it reanalyzed to a passive.

We'll review Fischer's promising and interesting proposal, including a new theory of the primary divisions within East PN. Mainline EPN ends Cycle 2 and begins Cycle 3, becoming NomAc 1A by reanalyzing a look-at construction as Accusative. Going farther, Rapanui (Easter Island) has within our lifetime moved to the very border of a new NomAc syntax, 1A, and stands on the border, the end of the line, today. It now has the mixed intransitive construction (in this case fluid ergativity) that is often found when an ergative language in stage 2B is in the process of being reanalyzed as NomAc stage 1A, beginning its third cycle down from PAn. Maori is taking the irrevocable step through the new 1A, 1B, toward ergativity (2A) in the third cycle.

27 Mixed marking after reanalysis into 1A
When the old ergative agent (marked from PAN with "nV", "from" > "of" [genitive], "from" > "by" [agent]) becomes the new Nominative in the new 1A phase, below, we'll note dual contradictory A marking and even S marking in the Polynesian outlier Kapingamarangi. Nouns may use one system of casemarking while pronouns use another.

In a Ph.D. dissertation this past year at the University of Hawai'i Ritsuko Kikusawa (under Lawrence Reid) found some ergative-looking nV agents in Fijian and evidently saw Proto-Fijian as an ergative language. That seems unlikely. We know that the ancestor of Eastern Oceanic had completed cycle 1 by reanalysis of Ergative case to Nominative. If there had been a new Ergative in Fijian earlier than today's NomAc, Fijian would need to have completed Cycle 2, and therefore East PN have completed Cycle 3. That would require an extremely rapid full cycle after Proto Oceanic just before Fiji's NomAc Cia construction. It would mean that the recreation of NomAc in East PN completed not the second but the third full Cycle down (from the level of PAN that is glimpsed through the Agent Focus in Mayrinax). That's not easy to believe. So it's a matter that needs to be investigated skeptically.

Clearly the "nV" particle that Kikusawa and Reid found is a Nominative (not Ergative) marker, as that is what one can expect to find after the reanalysis of old Ergative marker "ne" to new Nominative case marker at the end of Cycle 1 and beginning of Cycle 2. It does not show a whole new ergative phase within Fjian; that's a false impression that could arise from forgetting that Cycle 1 "n" ergative marker had already been reanalyzed as a Nominative marker. And because the old "from" preposition nV persists into Polynesian, there is always the possibility of a new formation of passive agent and then ergative agent marker from it. We shall see that in North Tuvalu (my fieldwork) the ergative agent is marked by "e", from PMP nominative marking, while in South Tuvalu it is marked by "nee" from ancestral ergative marking.

28 The remarkable formation of PPN: fascinatingly complex process
Pawley (1966) discovered the major divisions of PN.

Fijian, Rotuman and Polynesian are the three groups constituting Central Pacific. There can be little doubt that it's basically Fijian that is close to Proto CP. For years a battle raged between those who thought PN began as AbErg and some parts of it drifted to NomAc and those who thought the reverse. Oddly, those who thought PN began with NomAc (including Chung) assumed that PN began with the same NomAc syntax and

marking that East PN languages have today: a NomAc very different from Fijian's. Oddly, nobody tried the obvious approach: to begin PPN with a syntax essentially like Proto-Fijian's and show how all the PN syntaxes can have evolved from it. The solution I developed is as follows.

From a construction with agent marker ni plus personal article a, developed an agent phrase nia > nea > nee. That last is the agent marker in the Southern part of Tuvalu in 1970, some in Funaafuti (Southern) though mostly in Nanumanga (Northern).

Also, early PPN had an involuntary cause construction (ancestrally intransitive) studied by Hooper (1984) showing:

Patient + verb + preposition i + inanimate cause.
She showed remnants of it in current languages.

With passive-appearing marking, she considered it a lexical passive, both semantically and syntactically. Chung (1978) considered it semantically passive, but syntactically active intransitive, a distinction she needed in her work.

When voluntary agents came to be allowed in the inanimate cause slot, followed by the personal article a, the construction became one with a human ergative agent ia > ea > ee > e: the same vowel sequence as for the nV ergative agentmarker in South Tuvalu. Thus PPN acquired an ergative construction, which progressively came to be usable with transitive verbs in general. Then the new ergative construction was borrowed into the major class of verbs, which had kept the Fiji-type active transitive construction, having suffix -Cia [ancestrally "at it"], and it wreaked havoc there, reanalyzing the construction into a passive one with -Cia suffix. (It is not related to the "passive" construction that some students of Fijian recognize and others don't.) Thus late PPN got two constructions with "e" agents: passive with the -Cia suffix and ergative without it. Experts debated whether the suffix was added to the ergative form to create the passive form, or subtracted from the passive form to create the ergative form, but neither of those proposals was true, and neither was even minimally plausible. Ergative became the dominant construction in Tongan and in terminal PPN as a whole, which had also a look-at construction that was almost transitive.

Samoic-Outlier PN languages got all those constructions. Samoan kept all varieties. The outliers had a broad choice of syntaxes to choose among, with various results. In Proto East PN Rapanui may have been the first to break away from the main line, and possibly the only EPN tongue that has not discontinued using the AbErg syntax till now. Mainline EPN let the AbErg costruction fall out of use and reanalyzed the look-at construction as a normal Nom-Ac (with the locative preposition reanalyzed as Accusative casemarker). Mainline EPN divided into a Marquesan-Hawaiian and a Tahitian-Maori, etc., branch.

In summary, some early scholars believed in a drift from (Tongan) AbErg to (EPN) NomAc. Others believed in a drift from (EPN) NomAc to (Tongan) AbErg. Neither side got the point because neither side began with a "PPN" NomAc form much like the Proto-Central Pacific syntax which became the syntax of early Proto-Fijian and early Proto-Polynesian. My proposal of the late PPN ergative arising from the involuntary cause construction is the only one that accounts for all the outcomes and is free of implausibilities.

29 What's remarkable about Niue

pronouns & proper names	common nouns			
a	e	<	*re	Absolutive
e	he	<	*se	Ergative

The "e" Absolutive form descends from PPn "rV" from PAn "dV", which had both Locative and occasional Nominative uses.

Seiter (1982), in his dissertation under Chung, reveals interesting things about the Niue language, which with Tongan constitutes the Tongic primary division of PN. Some of the most fascinating things Seiter never became aware of, because neither he nor anybody else then understood the diachronic phonology. Niuean has two syntactic classes (1) pronouns and proper names, and (2) common nouns. What amazes people is that the form e, which is an Ergative marker in Niue and most PN languages, is the Absolutive marker for common nouns in Niue. The explanation, as we are about to see, is that the two "e" particles came from different ancestries. Pronouns and proper names take "a" to mark absolutives and "e" for ergatives: as is true in other PN languages. The odd forms are those for common nouns: he for ergatives and e for absolutives. What can these be? Knowing that se > he is the singular nonspecific article in PPN, I guessed that "e" (with its ancestor *re) was likely to be the singular specific article. Checking with forms in Tongan and other PN languages, I confirmed it. Samoan has le < *re for singular specific article where most PN languages have forms from *se. PPn had a form *re < PAn, PMP *di. What was PMP *dV became *rV in PPN and in the Tonga-Niue (Tongic) branch of PN the *r zeroed out. In Tagalog's case system (where the basic locative casemarker combines two ancestral cases and appears as both di and sa) shows its three cases as i-an, ni-yan, di-yan: deictic pronouns in Absolutive, Ergative, and Locative cases. So Niue's case forms are not so odd, after all. They all come down regularly from Proto-Malayo-Polynesian.

30 What's remarkable about Tuvalu

When I took a sabbatical leave from the University of Kentucky in 1970-1971 and spent the greater part of it on the island of Nanumanga in what is now Tuvalu, I taught the group of eighteen 11-year-olds who had been selected as potential passers of the British eleven-plus examination. One day near the beginning, I asked the class how to say, "I see you." in their language. Even though I knew that they were taught to answer as a group, it was amazing to hear a chorus:

"Aku e kau matea ngina koe."
Twelve syllables for what was three in English.

Under British administration, with British-trained native teachers, children had been instructed in English but never had any formal instruction about their own language. And the children had not been taught to recite anything in the Polynesian language in a chorus.

It turned out that they gave me what seemed to them the canonical translation, even though in practice the whole thing was almost never said. Nobody had ever analyzed the

matter for them, and they must have acquired intuitively the syntactic analysis and basic theoretical representation (Nom-Ac in this language that is predominantly ergative today). And that's what they gave me (spontaneously, with no time to discuss it among themselves) as the fundamental translation of an English transitive sentence.

It is illuminating that the immediate response of the Polynesian children was to give the basic underlying ancestral NomAc structure in this language in which most sentences today are said with ergative syntax. So in my paper published in the Journal of the Polynesian Society, I gave that remarkable conclusion.

With help from an adult I got the parsing: [I added the numbering later]

1	2		3	4	5	6
aku	e		kau	matea	ngina	koe
I	[tense-aspect]		I	see	Cia	thee

The more genuine form of "ngina" was "ngi-a", which is used in the neighboring island of Niutao. Nanumanga's odd form contaminates it with another suffix, ina, used in Samoan, which we need not discuss. The "ngi-a" seems to be something like "at that", "at it" or "at him", in which (as often happens in languages) a grammaticalized form takes the old 3d person singular form (a < PAn *ia.).

Indeed, the Nanumanga agent could also occur in one other slot, elements 7 and 8, at the right, as "e aku" (North Tuvalu) or "nee au" (South) [by me]. So the agent "I" or "by me" could appear in any one or two of the three slots but not in all three.

Whenever the maximum sentence was shortened to

2	4	5	6	7	8
e	matea	(ngina)	koe	(n)e(e)	aku

it was an AbErg sentence.

Whenever it was shortened to
(aku) e (kau) matea koe
[with at least one of the (aku, kau) pair]

it was NomAc.

Whenever it was shortened to
e matea koe

it was passive.

The flexibility of choice of syntax was amazing.

Element 3 is e in north Tuvau and nee in south Tuvalu. The governor's grammar (Kennedy, 1945) wrote ne, as Kennedy was unable to distinguish long vowels (which have shortened to one-and-a-half length).

Elements 3 and 5 are well-preserved ancestral pronouns for nominative and accusative cases. Examination of Fijian (not done here) shows much the same with slightly earlier appearance in some ways, and less so in others.

Nobody had ever taught the children how to answer a question such as the one I asked. But evidently the reply they gave me was so deeply imbedded unconsciously in their linguistic competence that it came out simultaneously in all eighteen children.

The 3-4-5 sequence (agent, verb, patient; or if you like, SVO) is what I have called the inner clause. It's a fossilized version of the subject-verb-object expression which appears (not fossilized) in some of Berg's Sulawesi languages (as terms in main clauses), and in Yap and other Oceanic languages. I was the first to propose (orally, at the ICAL at Leiden) that Yap is an Oceanic language. Somebody who heard me rushed to make that proposal in a publication without citing me as the source. Eventually, as in Samoan today, the subject and object pronouns (elements 3 and 5) become clitics. Synchronic linguists ignore clitics as nonexistent, but diachronically the clitics, as former words, deserve close attention from linguists, as they are the remnants of core words of an earlier phase, and thus show the ancestral syntax. In Samoan, deletable element 3 is the last remnant of the ancient Nominative element, but a Samoan expert misleadingly calls it "Ergative clitic" because it's co-referent with the 78 ergative phrase.

The British sub-governor for the Ellice Islands (the traditional name Tuvalu was restored on independence) had chosen Nanumanga Island for me because it had not been much studied by anthropologists or linguists, and because he admired its local government. By good luck, it turned out to be the one in which the "I see you" question revealed, better than Samoan, the whole range of NomAc and AbErg constructions that were in use at the breakup of PPN.

I was also lucky in the verb that I happened to use in my question. Only a small class of verbs in Nanumanga keeps the full use of the PPN syntax. Most transitive verbs there (and all verbs in most of Tuvalu) use an almost pure AbErg syntax without keeping the older NomAc options that are still used, in one set of verbs, in Nanumanga.

Niko Besnier, in oral communication a few years later, minimized the value of my finding and interpretation. He pointed out that the verb "matea" belongs to a small class (most verbs and nouns are CVCV). Although small or large parts of what I found in Nanumanga are also found in two islands of Tuvalu near Nanumanga, and in some islands of the Outlier group, he was not moved from his feeling that the only important fact of Nanumanga is that most of its verbs use ergative syntax with only a few signs of the ancestral NomAc syntax that may have developed soon after the ProtoPolynesian period.

I didn't deny Besnier's facts and he didn't deny mine. Is it only a matter of taste about which set of facts is more worth trumpeting?

My suggestion is that the final stage of ProtoPN, the beginning stage of Proto-Mainline PN, and the beginning stage of the Samoic and Outlier group (to which Naumanga belongs), kept a state that had both the AbErg syntax (prevailing in the final stage of Proto-Polynesian and in the Tongic group) and the almost transitive look-at construction that in the earliest ancestral phase of East Polynesian was developing toward a new NomAc syntax.

31 What's remarkable about Samoan

From terminal PPN Samoan inherited a look-at construction that was potentially transitive. Samoan is also a language in which the syntax with ergative casemarker "e" for agents is used in speeches in the fono (local council) to attribute moral praise or blame (Duranti, 1981and later). Nearly always taking a human subject, it can also be used for storms and other causes of disaster, in a personification.

When the missionaries translated the Bible, they mistakenly tended to mark all agents with e and all patients with the locative and look-at marker, the ninth letter of the alphabet. The combination was an innovation and must have puzzled the native Samoans at first. A normal Samoan clause, (like Rapanui's) might have either the quasi-accusative look-at patient, marked with i, or the ergative agent marked with e, but not both. But because of the high prestige of the London Missionary Society's translation of the Bible in Samoan, such sentences have been gaining use in Samoan. The change is consistent with the general diachronic linguistic tendency to lose cues through lenition and then lessen ambiguity by insertion of words.

Studies of look-at in English today have also shown acquisition of some Accusative Object qualities, thus beginning a syntactic change.

32 Dual contradictory agent marking in Polynesian

Elsewhere I have discussed the dual contradictory casemarking seen in Marian Klamer's work on a Central MP language. Here are examples of it, from my teacher Sam Elbert, in Outlier Polynesian languages among those noted in Finney, 1998b (in Kapingamarangi):

au	e	moinaa	e	au	koe	
I	TA	cherish	by	me	thee	

au	ku	kite	e	au	a	mee (Elbert)
I	TA	see	by	me	ART	him

au	te	iloo	e	au	
I	not	know	by	me	

Dual marking (like mixed intransitivity) is a process occurring when Ergativity is changing. The Outlier language cited here is one coping with the excessive number of alternate syntaxes left available at the end of the PPN period.

33 What's remarkable about Rapanui

Often regarded as the first branch off Proto-East PN, Rapanui is the only East PN language proven to preserve the PPN glottal stop. Found in Tongan, that stop seems to have zeroed out in the Samoic-Outlier group. It must have been preserved in Proto-East PN to reach Rapanui. In recent years Rapanui requires either marking the agent with e or marking the patient with (former "at" preposition) i but seldom both. Finney & Alexander (1999) called Rapanui "a language at the end of the line" in two senses. In a good sense, as one that fascinates linguists, an opportunity to observe Rapanui moving through fluid ergativity to become NomAc. In a bad sense, as disappearing because all under 25 now have been reared to speak Chilean Spanish.

As we have noticed, the phenomenon of "mixed intransitive" or "mixed ergative" is a situation in which the more active intransitive verbs have AbErg syntax and the less active ones have NomAc syntax. In some languages the mixture is lexically determined; in other cases it's "fluid" ergativity, i.e., casemarking and syntax are determined by the degree of activity implied in the particular sentence. The mixed situation (no matter whether fluid or lexical) had been described only as a curiosity. But our present paper asserts that it is a transient state found only when the syntax is changing from 2B AbErg to 1A NomAc. And on the Table page, the reader can easily see how it develops and why.

From Alexander (1981:142) here is an example of split ergativity in Rapanui:

He	tahuti	e	te	poki
present	run	TAM	the	child

The child runs.

It is mixed and fluid because when "tahuti" is used for less active running, the subject is not marked with the Ergative "e" marker [new Nominative], nor any other casemarker.

34 An original proposal

I propose that mixed intransitivy (mixed ergativity), no matter whether lexical or fluid, occurs ONLY when a language is changing from AbErg (stage 2B) to NomAc (stage 1A). Of course, it does not occur in languages when they are changing from NomAc to AbErg. Dixon is right in seeing the cycle as moving around in only one direction. It doesn't reverse course.

We catch the syntactic change and the phase and cycle change (2B to 1A) both in Padoe and in Rapanui (Easter Island). Nobody else has discovered the relation between mixed ergativity and the process of changing from NomAc to AbErg.

35 Steven Fischer's discoveries in Rapanui and Southeast Polynesian

Mainline EPN is the main group of EPN which divides into two: the Hawaiian-Marquesan and the Tahitian-Maori group. Because of shared phonology, Mangareva and the smaller islands around it had been thought to have branched off from Marquesan (even though Mangareva is on the obvious path to Rapanui from anywhere else in Polynesia.) The traditional view, held by Pawley and others, was that Rapanui was the first branch off protoEPN.

Steven Fischer is the most creative person working on Polynesian today. He knows linguistics from Sanskrit and Greek onward. His books on the history of language are classics. He (2001a,b) made an important discovery in East Polynesian. Comparison of Mangarevan wordlists from different dates show that Marquesan changes appeared only later. So the Marquesans must have invaded Mangareva and partly settled it. He calls it "a dominant intrusive language subjugating a vulnerable indigenous language". The settlers of Rapanui must have passed through Mangareva before it was invaded by Marquesans. Rapanui's preserved glottal stop came down from PPN, but was lost independently in most other PN lines.

So Fischer proposes that Rapanui and the Mangarevan group together separated from Mainline EPN as the first separation from Mainline EPN. A possible objection is that

in the EPN group, Rapanui alone keeps the ancestral glottal stops. But glottal stops are easily lost independently; nor is it sure that Mangareva does not have the glottals, unwritten.

Fisher advances the concept of (proto)SouthEast Polynesian, to consist of Mangareva and smaller islands nearby. In his view it's a slightly earlier Protolanguage consisting of the Mangareva group plus Rapanui that first separated from Mainline EPN. He includes Rapanui in SEPN.

One interesting point is that in Fischer's reconstruction of early development of SouthEast PN phonology is a lenition from "h" to glottal stop, one that I have not encountered elsewhere. Rapanui differs from many PN tongues both in keeping the PPN glottal stops and in refraining from lenition of other sounds (k) to glottal stops. Not all would call "h" a fricative. If a fricative it must be a laryngeal (glottal) fricative. Both sounds are about the end of the line in lenition: both of them weaken directly to zero. Normally a stop weakens to a fricative, not the reverse. I'd like to hear from anybody who knows of a change from glottal stop to "h".

It has been noticed that Rapanui preserves two features from terminal PPN that are lost in Mainline EPN: the ergative case and the glottal stop. Fischer's theory, that Rapanui and Mangarevan formed a group that left Mainline EPN together, poses a question. In separating from Rapanui, did Mangarevan (known from dictionaries not written by linguists) lose both the ancestral glottal stop and the ergative case? Will Fischer's theory be stronger if it turns out that Mangarevan keeps the ergative case? Fischer notes that Mangarevan had a particle "e" (with or without glottal?) used before nouns, but in the absence of sentences it is not known whether the particle marked a passive agent (as in Mainline EPN), which would not have a glottal, or an ergative agent (as in Rapanui) which would. Somebody could do a good masters or doctoral thesis by sailing to Mangareva, resolving these issues, and clarifying its phonology and syntax.

36 What's remarkable in Mainline EPN: entering the third full cycle
Mainline EPN, which includes all of East PN except Rapanui and the Mangareva group, divides into two branches, one that includes Marquesas and Hawai'i and another that includes Tahitian, Maori and much of Tuamotu.

One early and excellent study was done by Patrick Hohepa (1967a,b), who was a native speaker of Maori, and one of the first scholars of Polynesian to use generative grammar. Caught in the argument whether early Polynesian languages began as AbErg and drifted into NomAc, or began as NomAc and drifted into AbErg, Hohepa chose drift from East PN NomAc to Tongan AbErg. Neither scenario was precisely true, but Tongan must have come close to its present form (AbErg) before the East PN languages came close to theirs (reinventing NomAc by replacing the simple direct object with a new structure, inserting a locative preposition). This may have been facilitated by the fact that, like Samoan, Proto East PN may have inherited the incipiently transitive look-at preposition which used the same marker, i.

Hohepa correctly concluded that Maori was a NomAc tongue that showed a characteristic that seemed to point to a change toward AbErg. That was, the use of passive voice more often than the active. He was right in principle. Maori has begun that path. But he was mistaken in thinking that Tongan was ahead of Maori in the same movement. In fact, Tongan reached ergativity in phase 2A of the second full cycle. Maori's ancestor,

Proto-Mainline PN, at the end of the PPN period, must have had an AbErg voice in common with Tongan and all PN. But it dropped out of use long ago in Proto-Mainline EPN and the ergativity that Maori is headed toward now will be the phase 2A of the third full cycle down from PAn.

As we have seen, the phenomenon of "mixed intransitive" or "mixed ergative" is a situation in which the more dynamic intransitive verbs have AbErg syntax and the less active ones have NomAc syntax. In our survey, the only two examples thereof occurred when a change was taking place from AbErg to NomAc syntax to begin a new full cycle. Like Padoe, a whole cycle earlier, Rapanui is at that point today. The S had been marked the same as the O, with AbErg syntax, but when the former AbErg marking comes to be used with all the intransitive sentences, by definition the old Ergative case in Rapanui has just become a Nominative (just as Padoe has done).

It is impressive that Padoe and Rapanui are the only examples we found of mixed intransitive (mixed ergative) syntax; and that in both cases, just now though a full cycle apart, it occurred only in the reanalysis of old Ergative to new Nominative case that creates now the new state 1A, ending one full cycle (of thousands of years) and beginning another.

37 Construction rejected for English passive but fully acceptable as Tagalog ergative (or passive)

English accepts "This house has been lived in" but not with a retained Accusative object, as in: "This house has been given a party in."

But in Tagalog, as Dick McGinn (1988 and pers.comm.) points out, that construction with retained object is fully acceptable.

The following examples of locative focus (LF) are given by Schachter & Otanes (1972:317). My translation keeps the Abs focus as subject. Schachter's (in parens here) makes the Tagalog ergative phrase the English subject. [These are sentences in which Tagalog puts both agent and patient in the ergative case.] English "in" or "on" is needed to translate the locative focus marker on the verb.

> Pinagbayuhan nila   ng   palay   ang   lusong.
> pounded (LF)   Erg-them   Erg   rice   the   mortar'
> *The mortar was pounded rice in by them.*
> (They pounded rice in the mortar.)

> Pinaglalaruan namin   ng   tses   ang   mesang   maliit.
> played (LF)   Erg-us   Erg   chess   the   small   table
> *The small table is played chess on by us.*
> (We play chess on the small table.)

> Pinaglutuan   ni Helen   ng   karne   ang   kawali.
> cooked (LF)   Erg Helen   Erg   meat   the   frying PAn
> *The frying pan was cooked meat in by Helen.*
> (Helen cooked some meat in the frying pan.)

All these sentences show retained direct objects marked in Ergative case in this language with too few cases.

Note also in Chang's (1999) Seediq, p. 361, in an AbErg sentence with a retained Accusative object for which no case is named (in this Ab-Erg language):

subet - an -   mu   ricah   ka   neepahah
hit loc vb mrkr 1SGGen   plum   Nom field
The field will be hit plums in by me.

We could say (as we say of Maori later in this paper) that this is stage 1B with passive becoming more common than active voice, and thus moving toward reanalysis into stage 2A. Or we could say that (like Mayrinax's AF) this is an archaic remnant of 1B syntax in a 2A language. If the latter, it is comparable to the occurrence of the obviously archaic AF construction in Mayrinax.

Typical conservative Formosan and Philippine AN languages have ergative / passive voices much like those three basic types. The patient passive has the verb suffixed with -un or -in, presumably from the PAn obscure vowel. The locative passive has the verb suffixed -an. The element 'an' also occurs as an independent locative word; and as a noun-forming suffix that ancestrally formed locational nouns (where the activity takes place) but in some languages has come to form general verbal nouns. In some languages the dative focus takes the locative focus form. In others, the locative focus noun represents a patient (theme), with little or no implication of location, but with (perhaps) a lesser degree of transitivity than is conveyed by the patient focus suffix. My tentative hypothesis is that the -un, -in, and -an elements were ancestrally phrases Vna meaning something like 'at that' or 'at it' [coindexed with the (Focus) (Nominative) (Absolutive) NP].

38 Preposition nV from PAn to Polynesian

The ablative directional preposition nV "from" (a concrete location) came to be used abstractly with objects that were sources in any sense, causes in general.

When an ablative 'from' preposition acquires both genitive (possessive and 'of') uses and agent uses (in passive or ergative) it often loses ablative 'from' uses. But 'from' usage persists in some tongues all the way down to East Polynesian. In Maori, for instance, nV translates 'from', though not used with verbs of motion (Williams and Williams, 1956).

Partial survival of 'from' meaning amid changes is also seen in Southeast Ambryn in Vanuatu, an Oceanic language (Parker, 1970). Preposition ni is glossed 'with, by means of, for (in acquiring), than', while raNi is 'from'. So we see that PAn nV (taking mostly i vowel, as other prepositions do in CEMP) has lasted in the AN family many thousands of years, even when branches of it have diverged into Ergative, whose descendants can be reanalyzed into Nominative cases that keep the "nV" marking that meant "from" in earliest PAn and still does in many AN languages to this day.

Languages that lost the ablative 'from' meaning of the nV particle were left with two usages thereof: Genitive and Ergative (i.e., agent not in the unmarked case).

The result of all this is that even after the casemarker "nV" has been reanalyzed from an Ergative marker to a Nominative marker, the "from" meaning often remains and in the next cycle can be used to create a new marker of passive agents and then a new Ergative case marker.

39 Incidental sidelight

There is an interesting sidelight to the canonical method of creation of ergative case by reanalysis of passive agents. One AN language was reported (in a masters' thesis) to be at least weakly ergative with no evidence of derivation from a passive. The same demonstrative marks S and O, while for A, the marker is zero. For specifics, contact my source, David Ross Clark, a born Canadian who, after getting his Ph.D. in California, moved to Auckland Universiy in New Zealand.

40 Starosta's statement of position

For our purposes, the best account by Starosta of his view is Starosta (1995).

As we have seen, Dixon, like most linguists, takes NomAc as the unmarked form for languages in general, but Starosta's position seems to differ. Dixon says that NomAc seems intrinsically favored. Is Starosta contradicting that when he classifies all intransitive subjects as semantic patients? Note, however, that he labels those subjects (syntactically) as "actor", not as "undergoer".

In response to a question, Starosta wrote to me (pers. comm., July 24, 2000, two years before his death which occurred about the time of this 2002 SEALS meeting). I have not checked his references, and so they are not given at the end of this paper.

"Here are some answers to your question. Starosta, 1988, 126-128. Patient (formerly also Object or Theme): The perceived central participant in a state or event. Patient centrality. Lexicase assumes there is a Patient in the case frame of every verb, where "Patient" corresponds to Halliday's MEDIUM.

"Every process has associated with it one participant that is the key figure in that process; that is the one through which the process is actualized, and without which there would be no process at all. Let us call this element the MEDIUM, since it is the entity through which the process comes into existence...in a material transitive clause...the medium is obligatory in all processes; and it is the only element that is. [1985, 146]. The idea of requiring every verb to have a Patient...is partly a lexicase internal development (Taylor 1972, 37) but was strongly influenced by Gruber's (1965) work which I first encountered in Jackendoff's Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar (Jackendoff 1972; esp. pp. 29-31), by John Anderson's analogous use of nom as an obligatory term in every case frame (1961:37), and by Halliday's (1967-1968) transitivity and theme analysis..."

Though my 1998 paper on Chamorro refuted Starosta's inclusion of that language in his controversial "treetop" set, a great deal of Starosta's work is fundamentally sound. Blust once looked with me at a phase 2B antipassive sentence marked intransitive, and objected that the sentence was obviously transitive with Ergative subject and Absolutive object. The problem was that it was one of the languages in which the preposition for the demoted antipassive can be zero. I told Blust that the only way to make the distinction is to ask a native speaker whether the presumably demoted Abs patient could be deleted. If so, the construction is antipassive and hence intransitive (as passives are), and the phase has moved from 2A to 2B.

41 Conclusions

1. Languages that have a passive or ergative voice vary in the number of such voices. They always have the canonical one that puts the Accusative patient undergoer into the Nominative slot while demoting the active Nominative subject to an adjunct. English passive voices differ somewhat, but not fundamentally, from the ancestral passive voices (stage 1B) that underlie the ergative voices found in stages 2A and 2B in Austronesian languages.

2. By Dixon's definition, languages such as Mayrinax Atayal and Tagalog are ergative, stage at least 2A and often 2B. To reach that conclusion we must first decide which voice is the basic one for applying the definition: the AF or an NAF. In stage 1B the Nominative subject of the Active is the basic grammar, the one generated first, and Dixon's rule confirms the syntax as NomAc. The passive is secondarily derived. But in stage 2A and 2B, the decendant of that old construction, the AF (Agent Focus), which still looks like NomAc, with identical marking for intransitive subject and for agent, is a demoted and a derived construction. So what the marking shows is not that Mayrinax is NomAc, but that Mayrinax's ancestor (PAn) had NomAcc syntax.

3. Evidence from Li's brilliant study of the dead Basay language clearly shows it to be 1B NomAc with deletable passive agents, very close to NomAc PAN as argued by Starosta.

4. Despite its obvious strong ergativity, Mayrinax Atayal also clearly shows ancestral PAn NomAc in its archaic dead-end AF (Agent-Focus) construction, in which intransitive S and the transitive Agent are marked alike, fulfilling the definition we all follow from Dixon. We call Mayrinax AbErg because of what holds true in its basic voice, the NAF, Non-Agent Focus (and specifically the patient-focus). The NomAcc appearance shown in Mayrinax's Agent Focus is a demoted relic of the ancestral PAn NomAc syntax. Some of this can be seen in other languages such as Basay and Tagalog. The demoted AF construction must fall into disuse before the next 1A.

5. From a generative point of view, today's AbErg patient-focus construction (in AbErg languages such as Mayrinax) must be generated first and the NomAc appearing Agent Focus construction be derived from it synchronically. This is true even though historically the Ergative arose as a reanalysis of a passive voice which, of course, was secondary, synchronically derived at the time from the ancestral active voice NomAc construction that survives as the AF.

6. What we show as the normal route to ergativity is not the only route. One AN language created a (weakly) ergative construction with no sign that it developed from a passive. Dixon was right. There is more than path.

7. Return to NomAc syntax (typically after creation of an antipassive) differs sharply from return to AbErg syntax after creation of a passive voice.

8. Stage 1A shows no obvious trace of its immediately preceding 2B syntax. That was wiped out in passing through mixed ergativity, reanalyzing Erg case to Nom. The Reanalysis of Ergative agent as Nominative is the sharp change that conceals it. That is one reason that it makes sense to define that each new full cycle begins at the point of restoration of NomAc in stage 1A, not at the fuzzy restoration of AbErg in stage 2A. Mayrinax and other 2A tongues keep sentences looking like the

passive clauses in their recent ancestor 1B. Mayrinax also keepa archaic demoted Agent Focus clauses that keep the wording that had been NomAc in stage 1.

9. Change back to NomAc, ending the first full cycle, is most obvious in van den Berg's work. His showing of five villages is the only case I know of anywhere in the world where a dialect chain remains geographically in order from the most archaic syntax to the most changed. It is made even more remarkable because it clearly identifies one village, Padoe, in the middle, having mixed ergativity, at the point where AbErg changes to NomAcc. That author is one of the most sophisticated linguistic experts working on Austronesian languages today.

10. Proto-Polynesian acquired a new AbErg 2A system in a complex way, but still kept other syntaxes as the common ancestor lost the old Fijian-like NomAc. It became neither an exclusively AbErg nor a fully NomAc language before it split up.

11. It's not easy to summarize briefly the complex sequence of changes that took place within the Proto-Polynesian period. Its ergative does arise from a passive, but it's a lexical passive, not one with an active voice. It seems fair to say that at the end of the PPN period Ergative was the predominant syntax, though PPN kept the optional use of Fijian NomAc syntax that we see in Nanumanga, and had a look-at construction that could become accusative.

12. One sub-branch of PEPn, Rapanui, at the end of cycle 2, has reached the point of return to NomAc by acquiring mixed ergativity (specifically, fluid ergativity), and then reanalyzing the old Ergative as the new Nominative to begin cycle 3. This is exactly what Padoe has done in ending its slow-moving first full cycle to begin its cycle 2.

13. Perhaps the major discovery reported in this paper is that only two instances of mixed ergativity were found (Padoe and Rapanui) and both occur at the point of a major change in syntax, and specifically at the end of a full cycle and beginning of the next, as 2B changes to the new 1A.

14. Mainline EastPn returned to NomAc by letting the ergative syntax drop out of use. and by letting a locative construction be reanalyzed as a NomAc transitive.

15. It's by a different mechanism that Maori is interesting in that it is just at the point in 1B when passive voice comes to be used more often than active voice. That may be the normal event that is to be followed by the reanalysis of the passive term (a mere adjunct) into Ergative (a core term), the reanalysis that changed the phase from 1B to 2A, the path of inevitably moving toward a new Nominative. The fact that we don't see other languages in Maori's late 1B state may mean that languages pass rapidly through it by entering the reanalysis of passive to ergative that changes the state from 1B to 2A.

16. Steven Fischer is on firm ground in his discovery that Mangareva's language was severely impacted in the phonology of its vocabulary. He worked with dictionaries and not with elicited sentences. His view is plausible that Rapanui belongs in the group with Mangareva (and not in the mainline EPN group which includes the Marquesas-Hawaiian and the Tahitian-Maori groups). He denies that Rapanui and Mainline East PN formed a group in opposition to Mangarevan.

17. Both in Nanumanga, Tuvalu, where I did fieldwork, and in Rapanui, for which I wrote a review of DuFeu's (1996) grammar, we find confirmations that after a syntactic change, the remnants of use of the old syntax have come to be generated

from the new syntax (a reversal of the direction of the generating process). This may be a rule of diachronic generative grammar.

42 Degrees of confidence about the conclusions

Conclusions vary in the degree to which they are backed up by evidence.

When the antipassive transformation uses an "at" preposition, that's certainty. In languages that make that development (demoting the patient to an adjunct) without inserting a preposition, we can only confirm that it has taken place by asking a native speaker whether the patient DP can be deleted in the sentence.

There is more direct evidence in deciding whether a construction has developed from 1B passive to 2A ergative. The agent in a passive is oblique and deletable, while the Ergative agent in an ergative construction is not. In Huang (1944b) I didn't find any complete sentence that was passive without an agent expressed. (Page 79 has a patient focus expression glossed "the person was beaten by someone" but it was one in a set of five incomplete sentences all of which [the others active] were filled in with "the person" or "someone" or "something" to replace missing parts of the sentence.) That carries some weight toward calling "AbErg" the NAF sentences, which she translates active voice in English.

Were we justified in calling Mayrinax's AF construction a demoted and dying one, and thereby using patient NAF as the essential transitive construction for applying Dixon's test and thereby classifying Mayrinax as AbErg? We do so because in each move we observe from 2B AbErg to 1A NomAc, the new NomAc is not a survival of the earlier NomAc but is a new formation (the reanalysis of something else). Languages drift around the circle in one direction only. Both in Padoe and in Rapanui an earlier 2B Ergative case is being reanalyzed into a new Nominative case, moving through mixed intransitivity. In Mainline East PN (after PPN developed more constructions than any language needs, and the Fiji-like NomAc was bombed out) the new active NomAc was a reanalysis of a look-at construction into an Accusative object, while the ergative construction simply dropped out of use.

There is something intrinsically elusive about the definition of antipassive as the demotion of the Absolutive patient from a core term to an oblique adjunct that is deletable. One problem is that the Absolutive is in some sense the Subject of the sentence and as such can't be zero. Gault's (1999, 398) examples of antipassive show preposition ma (OBL) inserted to demote the Abs subject DP that had come down from 1A's Accusative object. Gault says, "It [the antipassive construction] significantly reduces the transitivity of the underlying transitive clause. In many instances the resulting construction is clearly an intransitive with the patient in an oblique phrase; in other instances the patient does not receive oblique case marking, but its topicality has been significantly reduced. It may be possible to argue that because of the reduced topicality of the patient, the antipassive is a true intransitive even when the patient does not receive oblique case marking. ...[I]t is clear that the antipassive significantly reduces the topicality of the patient and so for the purposes of this paper it will be considered a type of intransitive."

Mayrinax is clearly beyond phase 1B and Ergative because the passive agent adjunct of 1B has been promoted to a term. That's enough to show that it is not NomAc, though its ancestral NomAc [PAn] has been so and the ancestral PAn NomAc still shows through. Huang (sometimes) labels the Abs as Nominative and the Ergative as Genitive (as

indeed they had been in phase 1B). From Mayrinax's present state demoting change of the Abs patient to an adjunct would make it 2B. Thereafter, loss of the AF (with reanalysis of Ergative case to Nominative) could move it into 1A in a new cycle. But we don't see evidence moving Mayrinax beyond 2A. Huang translates her presumably AbErg NAF sentences into both active and passive English sentences. So, AbErg stage 2A is the label that fits Huang's evidence best. Having been burnt in controversy for changing her position on Atayal's NomAc or AbErg status, Huang has cautiously protected herself in recent years with important new data but chosen not to use the words that would assert or deny the ergativity of the constructions.

43 For comparison: relics of ancestral ergativity in English & Latin

Notice that in English as well as Latin, neuter nouns and pronouns have the same forms for Nominatives as for Accusatives. As we know, the former Nominative of a passive becomes Absolutive in phase 2A. Latin neuter nouns and PIE had -m (Greek -n) and -d for Latin pronouns (id, quid, quod, istud, illud, aliquid) whose cognate in English is -t for neuter pronouns (it, that, what). I suggest that that's an old IE Absolutive case ending (d). In some Latin neuter nouns (declensions 2, 3, 4) it's zero after the stem vowel. English nouns are invariant but for genitive, and so not helpful here. Perhaps those mark more than one period in prehistory when Proto IndoEuropean marked Absolutive case (S=O) with zero or -d or -m.

Begin with the thought that (from the reanalysis of old Ergative as new Nominative in Austronesian) the use of the same casemarking for Nominative as for Genitive (Ergative) is a sign that in some ancestral period the Ergative case was reanalyzed as the new Nominative. We find that in Latin the ending is -s for both nominative and genitive in non-neuters in the third declension singular nouns. That may mark a period when Ergative cases, phase 2B, in an ancestor of Latin, were being reanalyzed to Nominative making phase 1A, to begin a whole new cycle, as happened in Padoe and Rapanui. In Classical Latin times, writers Cicero, Caesar, and Vergil, with intentional archaism, used SOV order.

The suffix -s must have been the ergative casemarker in IE as the prefix nV was in AN, and both became Nominative by reanalysis as 2B gave way to 1A. English and Latin's decaying casemarkers at the ends of words are old postpositions from a phase of IE that had OV word order, and the modern prepositions arose in a later period along with VO word order. Essentially all AN is VO.

Note that when English and Latin show relics of ancestral ergativity, they are in certain case conditions and in ergative-looking clause structure. That's because the ancestral ergativity is wiped out in the mixed ergativity and reanalysis at the end of phase 2B.

44 Connection with related language families?

At the age of 76 I have retired from the field and must leave the broader question to others, notably those who have identified which families are related to AN. One thought is that if another family uses the same marking, such as "nV" for "from", that represents what was true of a common ancestral language. But if the other family shows "nV" for a non-subject agent, that may more likely show a similar development that has taken place in parallel with AN's. Reid (1999) is worth reading. In the future, of course, the AN languages that survive will keep diverging from one another in phonology and syntax and more full cycles will follow.

Postscript

In lenition, stops are commonly weakened to fricatives, and then to h, which if it is a fricative, is a glottal or uvular one. Both /h/ and glottal stop are virtual dead ends of lenition; the next step is to zero. English has only three words with phonemic glottal stops, and they all have marginal status as words: (1) uh-uh ("no"); (2) uh-oh ("something bad has just happened"); and (3) "ah-ah-ah" [pitch rising from syllable to syllable and topping and falling in the final syllable] ("Don't do what I think you are about to do"). A 7 PM weekly radio program, about the year 1940, began: "Ah-ah-ah! Don't touch that dial. Stay tuned for [name of program]." It's interesting to find Steven Fischer proposing a phonological change from "h" (a fricative at most, if not a breathing) to glottal stop in Southeast Polynesian. In lenitions, a stop can easily change to a fricative, but not the reverse.

SEALS (number) means Papers from the (Fifth, etc.). Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistic Society. OL is Oceanic Linguistics, University of Hawai'i Pr.. PL is Pacific Linguistics, RSPAS, Australian National University. JPS is Journal of the Polynesian Society.

References

Alexander, James D. 1981. Case-marking and Passivity in Easter Island Polynesian. *OL* 20: 131-149.

Becker, Alton L. & Thomas Hunter. 1988. Cohesion in Old Javanese prose. Pp. 475-488 in Richard McGinn (Ed.), *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*. Ohio University Press, with distributor Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berg, Rene van den. 2002, discussion with this writer at the International Confereence on Austronesian Linguistics, elaborating his earlier published papers. .

Blust, Robert. 1999. Subgrouping, Circularity and Extinction: Some Issues in Austronesian Comparative Linguistics. Pp. 31-94 in Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li (Eds.), *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Taipei:Academia Sinica.

Blust, Robert. 2002. Notes on the history of 'focus' in Austronesian languages. Pp. 63-78 in Wouk & Ross (Eds.).

Carroll, Vern & Topias Soulik. 1973. *Nukuoro Lexicon*. Honolulu, Univ. Press of Hawaii.

Chang, Yung-Li. 1999. Seediq bound pronouns: pronominal clitics or agreement affixes? Pp. 355-370 in Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li (Eds.), *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Chen, Teresa. 1987. *Verbal constructins and verbal classification in Nataroan Amis*. Canberra, Pacific Linguistics C-85.

Chung, Sandra. 1978. *Case Relations and Grammatical Relations in Polynesian*. Austin and London: University of Texas.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge, New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Donohue, Mark. 2002. Voice in Tukang Besi and the Austronesian focus system. in Wouk & Ross (Eds.)

DuFeu, Veronica. 1996. *Rapanui*. London & New York: Routledge.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1981. *The Samoan Fono: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Canberra, Pacific Linguistics.

Finney, Joseph C. 1983. Nanumanga verbal syntax: a study in variation, with implications for Proto-Polynesian. *JPS* 92(1): 107-115.

Finney, Joseph C. 1994. Casemarking and the *ia demonstratives. Pp. 551-574 in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Cecilia Ode & Wim Stokhof, Eds., Leiden, Netherlands.

Finney, Joseph C. 1997. The Yap language: whence and how? *SEALS 5*, pp.97-114.

Finney, Joseph C. 1998a. Fiji's 'o' and 'ko' in context-- some points in the diachronic syntax of Fijian. *SEALS 6*, pp.149-170.

Finney, Joseph C. 1998b. Dual contradictory agent-marking: solutions to Proto-Polynesian mysteries. Pp. 103-114 in Matthew Pearson, Ed., Recent *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings of the Third and Fourth Meetings of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)*. Los Angeles: UCLA Department of Linguistics.

Finney, Joseph C. 1998c. Chamorro: Whence and How? ibidem.

Finney, Joseph C. 2000a. Two "e" studies in Polynesian. Pp. 405-416 in: *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Oceanic Linguistics*. Wolfgang Sterling & Steven R. Fischer, Eds. Auckland: Leo Pacifica.

Finney, Joseph C. 2000b. The True Prepositions/ Casemarkers in Proto-Oceanic. (Given at the Second International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics.) Pacific Linguistics. (Bill Palmer and Paul Geraghty, Eds.)

Finney, Joseph C. 2000c. A language at the end of the Line. in Stevenson, Lee. & Morin, 20001.

Finney, Joseph C. 2001a. General Diachronic Course of Proto-Austronesian Casemarkers-- Prepositions and Topic Markers: Sources of Austronesian Casemarkers. *SEALS 9*.

Finney, Joseph C. 2001b. A Language at the End of the Line. *Pacific 2000*: Pp. 405-416 In: Stevenson, Lee, Morin.

Finney, Joseph C. (forthcoming). An applicative process persisting through Austronesian. *SEALS 7*.

Finney, Joseph C. (forthcoming). Toward reconstruction of demonstratives in Proto-Austronesian. *SEALS 8*.

Finney, Joseph C. (forthcoming) Will the real Proto-Austronesian please stand up? *SEALS 10*.

Finney, Joseph C. and James D. Alexander. 1998.*The Rapanui language of Easter Island: Where does it fit in the Polynesian family tree?* Easter Island Foundation, Los Osos, CA.

Fischer, Steven Roger. 2001a. Mangarevan doublets: preliminary evidence for Proto-Southeastern Polynesian. Pp. 417-424 in Stevenson, Lee, Morin.

Fischer, Steven Roger. 2001b. Mangarevan doublets: preliminary evidence for Proto-Southeastern Polynesian. *OL* 40(1), 112-124.

Gault, JoAnn. 1999. Ergativity, Subject and Focus in Sama Bangingi'. Pp. 393-422 in Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li (Eds.), *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Hohepa, Patrick. 1967a. A profile generative grammar of Maori. Indiana U. Pub. in *Anthropology & Linguistics*, M20.

Hohepa, Patrick. 1967b. The accusative-to-ergative drift in Polynesian languages. *JPS* 78:295-329.

Hooper, Robin. 1984. Neuter verbs, stative aspect and the expression of agency in Polynesian. *JPS* 93:39-70.

Huang, Lillian M. 1994a. Ergativity in [Wulai]Atayal. *OL* 33, 1:129-143.

Huang, Lillian M. 1994b, *A Study of Mayrinax Syntax*. Taipei: Crane.

Huang, Lillian M. 2000. Verb classification in Mayrinax Atayal. *OL* 39: 364-390.

Kennedy, Donald Gilbert. 1945. *Te Ngangana a te Tuvalu* [The language of the group of eight]. Suva: Government Printer.

Kikusawa, Ritsuko. 2002, unpublished thesis, U, Hawai'i.

Li, Paul J.-k. 1999. Some problems in the Basay language. Pp. 637-665 in *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. (Elizabeth Zeitoun & Paul J.-k. Li, Eds.) Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Manning, Christopher D. 1996. *Ergativity*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications (Dissertations in Linguistics series).

McGinn, Richard. 1988. Government and Case in Tagalog. Chapter 9 in Athens, OH: *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*. Ohio University Center for International Studies.

Pawley, Andrew. 1966. Polynesian languages: a subgrouping based on shared innovations in morphology. *JPS* 75:39-64.

Pawley, Andrew and Lawrence A. Reid. 1979. The evolution of transitive constructions in Austronesian. Pp. 103-130 in *Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asiia. University of Michigan.

Rau, Der-Hwa Victoria. 1992. *A Grammar of Atayal*. Taipei: Crane.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1999. New linguistic evidence for the Austric hypothesis. Pp. 5-30 in Zeitoun and Li (Eds), *Selected Papers from the Eighth Interenationall Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Academia Sinica, Taipei.

Ross, Malcolm D. 1995. Reconstructing PAn Verbal Morphology: Evidence from Taiwan. Pp. 727-791 in Paul J.-k. Li et al. (Eds), *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Ross, Malcolm D. 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. Pp. 17-62 in Wouk & Ross (Eds.).

Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley, University of California Pr.

Seiter, William J. 1980. Studies in Niuean Syntax. in *Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics*. Jorge Hankamer, Ed. New York: Garland. 1-348.

Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley & Lawrence A. Reid. 1981. *The evolution of focus in Austronesian*. in Pacific Linguistics C-75 (Eds. Amran Halim, Lois Carrington & S. A. Wurm).

Starosta, Stanley. 1995. A grammatical subgrouping of Formosan Languages. Pp. 683-726 in *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan* (Eds: Paul J-k Li, C-h Tsang, Y-k. Huang, D-a. Ho, and C-y. Tseng). #3 in Symposium Series of the Institute of History & Philology, Academic Sinica, Taipei.

Starosta, Stanley. 1999. Transitivity, ergativity, and the best analysis of Atayal case marking. Pp. 371-392 in: *Selected Papers from the 8ICAL*. Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul J.-K. Li, Eds.

Stevenson, Christopher M., Georgia Lee, and F. J. Morin. 2001. *Pacific 2000: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Easter Island and the Pacific*. Easter Island Foundation: Los Osos.

Williams, W. L. & H. W. Williams. 1956. *First Lessons in Maori*. (First published 1862, later editions revised by W. W. Bird). Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs.

Wouk, Fay and Malcolm Ross. 2000 (Eds.). *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*. Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.