

15 *Austronesian typology and the nominalist hypothesis*

DANIEL KAUFMAN

1 Background¹

The idea that a deep connection exists between verbs and nouns in Austronesian languages was already present among early Austronesianist grammarians such as van der Tuuk (1864–67) and Adriani (1893) (Blust 2002). Among twentieth century scholars, this view was echoed by Lopez (1928:51) concerning Tagalog: ‘the quasi verb is not a real verb, for it is treated like a nomen in the sentence and the enlargements, according to their forms, are considered as attributes and not as objects’. More recently, the link between notional verbs and nouns has yet again been underscored by Capell (1964), Naylor (1975, 1980, 1995), Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1982), De Wolf (1988) and Himmelmann (1987, 1991, 2008), among others.

One primary basis for this is the identity in case marking between possessors and agents of non-actor focus verbs. In this article, I argue that there is in fact far more to recommend the nominal view of Austronesian verbs than the simple case syncretism. I extend arguments that several defining features of morphosyntactically conservative Austronesian languages² are intimately connected on the basis of a historical reanalysis of nominalisations to verbal categories as first suggested by Pawley (1977) and Starosta,

¹ This paper represents one side of on-going work that I have presented at the Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, the CUNY Graduate School, and AFLA XV. I am indebted to those audiences and especially to Nikolaus Himmelmann for detailed comments on a previous draft. It is truly an honor to present it to Bob Blust who has been a tremendous source of both inspiration and encouragement to me.

² I am purposefully vague in employing this designation for the following reason. Most of the features I discuss here for ‘(morphosyntactically) conservative languages’ apply throughout the Philippine languages and are found in certain Formosan languages as well, suggesting a reconstruction higher than Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP). Nonetheless, there do appear to be some significant differences in certain other Formosan languages and it is not clear whether these differences should be treated as innovations or retentions. Ross (this volume) argues convincingly that a set of morphosyntactic differences in Puyuma, Rukai and Tsouic represent retentions with the consequence that the features referred to here as conservative may have been post-PAn innovations. Thus, at this stage, I refrain from associating the conservative features discussed here with a particular subgroup.

Pawley and Reid (1982) (henceforth SPR). The contribution of the present paper is to show that many of the synchronic properties of morphosyntactically conservative languages can be explained if we take apparent verbs to still be underlyingly nominal. Moreover, we can explain what appears to be a large scale convergence of typological features among Indonesian languages which do not comprise an exclusive genetic subgroup by understanding these features to be the natural outcome of the reemergence of the verbal category.

The paper is organised as follows: in §2, I discuss the place of Philippine languages within the typology of case syncretisms and alignment types. In §3, I explore the idea of reinterpreting apparent verbal predication as nominal predication showing how this accounts for distributional facts, extraction asymmetries, coordination facts, and a curious asymmetry between two kinds of imperatives. In §4, I show how the primary cues for nominal oriented syntax eroded in Indonesian languages leading to the reemergence of a truly verbal category. In §5, I discuss some problems for the nominalist hypothesis and I conclude in §6 with suggestions for further research.

2 Alignment systems

Austronesian languages are probably best known for their rich voice system, referred to in the earlier literature as the ‘focus system’ (see Blust 2002 for the history of this terminology). Whereas many language families of the world possess rich case systems (Uralic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, to name a few), a similar richness in the voice system, as seen in Austronesian, is exceedingly rare. What makes this type of system even more remarkable is the fact that all voices in Philippine languages tend to be equally marked, morphologically speaking (Ross 1995a:737). In other words, the typologically unusual voices (i.e., the instrumental/conveyance voice and locative voice) do not appear to take one of the ostensibly more basic voices (i.e., patient voice and actor voice) as their base. The modern reflexes of the PAn voice morphemes shown in (1) (following Ross 1995a) typically do not co-occur with each other, and thus appear to form a paradigm of sorts.

(1)	PAn Form	Function
	*<um>	Actor voice
	*-en	Patient voice
	*-an	Locative voice
	*Si-	Instrumental/Conveyance voice

Aldridge (2004) and Ross (2006), however, do argue for an applicative analysis of the locative and conveyance voices. On this view, there are only two true voices, the patient/undergoer voice which forms canonical transitive clauses and the actor voice which is employed for intransitive and antipassive type clauses. The locative and instrumental/conveyance morphemes are analyzed as applicatives which are added to the undergoer voice to promote adjuncts to subject. There are, however, several difficulties with such an analysis which can be noted here.

First, we do not expect that an applicative affix (i.e., PAn *-an, *Si-) would replace a transitive voice affix (i.e., *-en), but this clearly appears to have been the situation from the beginning in Austronesian. Second, the two putative applicatives cannot create new objects, but are rather restricted to creating new subjects. As noted by Ross (this volume, fn.4) and argued for by Aldridge (2004), it may be possible that applicatives in ergative

languages behave differently in promoting applicative objects directly to subject/absolute. Nonetheless, it is odd for there to be a ban on applicatives co-occurring with the actor voice/antipassive, as this is seen to occur in other robustly ergative languages. Third, the two putative applicatives cannot cooccur with each other, a common possibility afforded to applicatives cross-linguistically. Finally, it is not clear that reflexes of **-an* and **Si-* can be considered any more valency-increasing than reflexes of *-en*. Exemplifying with Tagalog, notionally monovalent roots can typically become bivalent simply by the addition of *-in* (< PAn **-en* PV), as shown in (2)–(4). This appears to be problematic for the applicative analysis as increasing valency should be an applicative feature and not a voice feature.

- (2) *lakad* *lakar-in*
 ‘walk’ ‘to walk to x’
- (3) *langoy* *languy-in*
 ‘swim’ ‘swim in x, swim for x duration’
- (4) *init* *init-in3*
 heat ‘to heat x’

In any case, we do not, as of yet, have any clear non-Austronesian functional analogues of the Austronesian morphemes in question. These morphemes, as emphasised by Blust (2002), appear to have features of voice and case, as well as bearing certain resemblances to applicatives. The issue is thus not terminological, but rather can only be resolved by a plausible syntactic scenario which can account for their mixed behaviour, a point to which we return later.

Because of the unusual status of the above paradigm, identifying the alignment system of Philippine-type languages has been at the center of several syntactic and typological debates, most of which have centered on whether Tagalog and other Philippine type languages are best analyzed as ergative or accusative.⁴ Out of languages which morphologically distinguish the two arguments of a transitive clause, there are those which treat intransitive and transitive subjects alike in the accusative pattern, and those which mark intransitive subjects similar to transitive objects in the ergative pattern. This is shown schematically in (5), where A represents the transitive proto-Agent, P the transitive proto-Patient, and S, the sole argument of the intransitive clause. The indices 1 and 2 represent morphological case marking.

- (5) **A-P differentiation:** {A}₁ {P}₂
 Accusative: {A, S}₁ {P}₂
 Ergative: {A}₁ {S, P}₂

³ For many Tagalog property denoting roots, a causative affix is required to obtain the meaning ‘to make x PROPERTY’ but in several cases (e.g., *initin*) this morphology is not obligatory.

⁴ De Guzman (1988), Gerds (1988), Aldridge (2004 et seq), Liao (2004), Reid and Liao (2004) among others, argue that the actor voice is a marked choice for expressing transitives and is identifiable with an anti-passive. In a different camp, Kroeger (1993), Richards (2000), Rackowski (2002) argue for a more accusative type syntax. Himmelmann (1996) and Foley (1998) questions the entire utility of ‘ergative type language’ as a meaningful typological category for Austronesian languages. Because of the primarily typological focus of the present paper, particular syntactic proposals will not be discussed in any detail.

The syntactic and interpretive limitations on actor voice objects in Philippine languages suggest that the patient voice is a canonical transitive and therefore that transitive patients are case marked similarly to intransitive subjects in accordance with the ergative pattern (De Guzman 1988, Gerdts 1988, Aldridge 2004, Liao 2004 among others). But in order to situate the position of these languages more meaningfully within an alignment typology, it is necessary to further articulate our conception of the ergative pattern. Morphological ergativity is defined minimally as a case syncretism between the intransitive subject and the transitive patient, but in the vast majority of ergative languages, there exist other syncretisms among the core and peripheral cases which are not taken into account. These further syncretisms provide important clues as to the historical origins of the pattern with syncretisms between the transitive agent and other cases being particularly revealing (cf. Palancar 2002). In a large number of ergative languages, the ergative argument is marked as an instrumental or ablative. In another group, the ergative argument is marked in the same manner as possessors, i.e., with the genitive case. This is shown schematically in (6), where we identify genitive and instrumental types as subtypes of the ergative alignment.

- (6) **Ergative:** {A}₁ {S, P}₂
 Instrumental: {A, Instrumental}₁ {S, P}₂
 Genitive: {A, Possessor}₁ {S, P}₂

As discussed by Plank (1979), Garrett (1990) and Dixon (1994), the Instrumental subtype is typically the outcome of a historical reanalysis in which passives or middles are reinterpreted as canonical transitives. Because adjunct agents are generally introduced by the instrumental (or directional cases) a homophony comes into being between the instrumental and the case of transitive agents after reanalysis. The genitive type, on the other hand, comes about from the reanalysis of nominalisations as canonical predicates. The agent of the event predicate is thus expressed as the possessor of the nominalisation.⁵

Reanalysis of nominalisations is precisely the type of event posited by SPR for PAN, which they describe as, ‘a strongly noun-oriented language, with a high percentage of nominalisation strategies’ (SPR:149). Similar scenarios have also been posited for a number of other language families on the basis of the genitive case marking pattern and independent supporting evidence, for example, Gildea (1998) for Cariban, Johns (1992) for Eskimoan, Bricker (1981) for Mayan. Nominalisation is a broad category which can refer to a number of related constructions and Austronesian appears to differ from some of the other language

⁵ Obviously, a historical reanalysis cannot be adduced for all cases of syncretism. The ergative-instrumental syncretism is very widespread in Australian languages, for instance, but no evidence of a historical reanalysis have been found. Either the earlier transitive patterns have been replaced without a trace in such languages or the syncretism did not arise through reanalysis at all but is rather a direct reflex of the semantic similarities between agent and instrument. The ergative-genitive syncretism is more likely to have a purely diachronic source as the semantic similarity between possessors and agents is more obscure. Baerman et al. (2005:52) express a similar opinion:

With the ergative, type 2 syncretism in our sample most typically joins it with the genitive, as in the Tacanan language Araona, the isolate Burushaski, Lak and the Tibeto-Burman language Limbu. It is likely that this is not a random choice, in that there are languages which have cases which inherently combine the functions of ergative and genitive (e.g. the relative case of the Eskimoan languages). Such constructions may have their origin in nominalizations, with the agent expressed by the genitive. However, although diachronic explanations may be found, it is unlikely that a direct, synchronic motivation can be demonstrated for most type 2 pattern.

families with an ostensibly similar history in the type of nominalisations which were relevant in the reanalysis. In Austronesian, the nominalisations must have been of the thematic type (e.g., employer, employee) and not of the event-type (e.g., employment, destruction, cooking)⁶. Accordingly, SPR analyze the voice paradigm shown above in (1) as derivational nominalisation morphology, as in (7).⁷

(7)	PAn Form	Function
	*<um>	Agent nominalisation
	*-en	Patient nominalisation
	*-an	Locative nominalisation
	*Si-	Instrumental nominalisation

Beyond the historical reanalysis, SPR (p.148) further claim that these nominalisers, ‘have in fact retained this function to a previously unrecognised extent even within the Philippine group’. Relatedly, the synchronic consequences of historical change are discussed by Manning (1996:21), who suggests that divergent origins of the ergative pattern can lead to differing varieties of synchronic ergativity:

I believe that historical origin could be a good guide in subdividing the types of ergative languages, although the matter would require much further investigation. Making an initial cut between ergativity arising from a perfective or passive origin (reinterpreting an oblique instrumental or agent as the ergative NP) seems promising. (...) I am suggesting that many languages where ergativity arises from nominalisation are syntactically ergative (whereas the ergativity in the Indic Indo-European languages, for example, seems superficial from the point of view of syntactic behavior).

It is this connection between the putative historical reanalysis of nominalisations and the synchronic syntactic typology of Philippine languages which is the primary point of interest here and it is this topic which we begin to tackle next.

3 Austronesian languages as nominal predicate languages

3.1 The status of aspect morphology

If the genitive-ergative syncretism really has deep roots in nominalisation, we expect to find that event-type predicates, i.e., apparent verbs, display nominal characteristics. This may, at first blush, be a surprising claim considering that one of the most typical hallmarks of verbs cross-linguistically is tense/aspect marking and this is an integral part of event predicates in conservative Austronesian languages. Just as in more familiar languages, event predicates, but not arguments, are the canonical bearers of aspect morphology. As seen in (8), the event predicate *nag-bitaw* ‘resign’ is marked with perfective aspect

⁶ These types are referred to as action nominalisations and argument nominalisations, respectively, in the terminology of Comrie and Thompson (1985:347).

⁷ The forms have been updated to reflect the now commonly accepted reconstructions. The PAn infix *<in>, which SPR analyzed as a voice marker is now generally accepted to have belonged to the aspectual paradigm, indicating the perfective or realis. The instrumental, which was reconstructed by Wolff (1973) as PAn *i- and by SPR as *iSi- was later revised to *Si- by Dahl (1986) and is now the generally agreed upon form.

(compositionally via the *BEGUN* affix and the lack of *INCOMPLETIVE* reduplication) while the subject *pangulo* ‘president’ lacks aspect morphology.

- (8) *nag-bitaw ang=pangulo*
 AV.BEG-resign NOM=president
 ‘The president resigned.’

On the face of it, then, there is nothing radically different in the canonical distribution of tense/aspect marking in such languages when compared to English. Nevertheless, I will argue that in conservative Austronesian languages, event predication, as expressed informally in (9a), is syntactically more analogous to (9b) and (9c) than it is to (9d).⁸

- (9) a. [Fred employs the students]
 b. The students are Fred’s employees (patient nominal predicate)
 c. Fred is an employer of the students (agent nominal predicate)
 d. Fred employs the students (verbal predication)

The fact that these putatively nominal event-denoting predicates are marked with aspect only shows that aspect morphology is promiscuous in its selection of lexical hosts. Aspect appears to have been marked in Proto Austronesian by the use of two morphemes and the combination thereof: **Ca-/CV-* reduplication (*PROGRESSIVE* or *INCOMPLETIVE*), and the infix <in> (*PERFECTIVE* or *BEGUN*, cf. Reid 1992; Ross 2002). That these morphemes also attach to unambiguous lexical nominals in many languages is clear. Both are found abundantly on lexicalised, entity-denoting forms throughout Austronesian. The PAn *<in> affix marked aspect on event-denoting predicates but its reflexes are also very commonly found on lexicalised referent-denoting words, so much so that many have interpreted this affix as a nominaliser in its own right. Reid (1992:68), for instance, echoing an idea proposed earlier in SPR, states that *<in> was used on ‘derived nouns that were the result of the action of the verb’. Some examples of lexicalised formations with <in> in Tagalog are shown in (10). Although (10a-b) can be considered lexicalised, they all have quite transparent event-denoting counterparts (e.g., *harap-in* front-PV ‘to face’). The words in (10c-d), on the other hand, have no event-denoting counterparts in the modern language.

- (10) a. *k<in>a-kapatid-Ø*
 <BEG>INCM~sibling-pv
 ‘relation between the sponsor and sponsored in a baptism, marriage, etc.’
 b. *h<in>a-harap-Ø*
 <BEG>INCM~front-PV

⁸ This idea, too, has a long pedigree in Austronesian studies. Among twentieth century authors, we find it expressed by Bloomfield (1917), Scheerer (1924), Lopez (1937/1977), Capell (1964), Schachter and Otanes (1972), Lemaréchal (1991), Naylor (1995), De Wolf (1988) and Himmelmann (1991), among others. Note, however, that Ross (this volume) offers evidence from Puyuma showing that nominal and verbal predication may not have been symmetrical in PAn. As opposed to verbal predicates, Puyuma requires that nominal predicates are preceded by a determiner.

It is not clear to me at this point whether there exists a significant connection between the reanalysis of nominalisations as canonical predicates and equational type syntax. It seems that, while a symmetric treatment of verbal and nominal predicates may not be a necessary correlate of this reanalysis, it would certainly facilitate it by removing one of the more salient differences between nouns and verbs, the need for a copular element in non-verbal predication.

- ‘future’
- c. *b<in>abae-Ø*
 <BEG>woman-PV
 ‘hermaphrodite’
- d. *s<in>ulid-Ø*
 <BEG>flax-PV
 ‘thread’

At least one referent-denoting etymon with this affix can also be traced to PAn: the word for intestines, PAn **C<in>aqi* ‘intestines’ from PAn **Caqi* ‘feces’. The unpredictable relationship between these aspectual derivations with <in> and their stems in addition to the lack of a productive aspectual paradigm for many of them underscores the fact that they should be treated as lexicalised entity-denoting words, i.e., canonical nouns.⁹ This strongly suggests that aspect marking was never the sole provenance of a particular lexical class in Austronesian. This having been established, aspect marking cannot be taken as evidence for equating event-denoting predicates with the lexical category verb.

3.2 The distribution of voice marked words

We now turn to the syntactic distribution of words marked with voice and aspect, showing that, in addition to playing a canonical ‘verbal role’, they also pattern with nouns cross-linguistically. The most obvious place in which this holds true is in the use of voice marked words as arguments, as exemplified in (11).^{10,11}

- (11) a. *ang=b<um>ili*
 NOM=<AV:BEG>buy
 ‘the one who bought’
- b. *ang=b<in>ili-Ø*
 NOM=<BEG>buy-PV
 ‘the (thing) bought’
- c. *ang=b<in>il-han*
 NOM=<BEG>buy-LV
 ‘the (place) bought at’
- d. *ang=i-b<in>ili*
 NOM=CV-<BEG>-buy

⁹ Discussion of aspectual reduplication is also relevant here but must be postponed until §5. For the moment, we may simply note that it is also well attested in both an apparent nominal and verbal function.

¹⁰ As in so much earlier work, I employ Tagalog to exemplify some typical characteristics of conservative MP languages. It should thus be kept in mind that the features under discussion here apply far more widely than Tagalog.

¹¹ Abbreviations: ABS – absolutive, ACC – accusative, ADJ – adjectival, APPL – applicative, AV – actor voice, BEG – begun, CLASS – classifier, CV – conveyance voice, DEF – definite, DEP – dependent, DER – derivational morphology, ERG – ergative, EXT – existential, GEN – genitive case, INCM - incomplete, LNK – linker, LV – locative voice, NAV – non-actor voice, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, NVL – non-volitional, OBL – oblique case, P – personal, PASS – passive, PL – plural, PREP – preposition, PRT – particle, PST – past, PV – patient voice, RELT – relative marker, RL – realis, STA – stative, TOP – topic marker, TR – transitive.

‘the one bought for’

Under analyses which impose a traditional verb/noun distinction on Tagalog and other Philippine languages these are treated as headless relatives. Although headless relatives are attested widely throughout the languages of the world, it is of interest that no morphosyntactically conservative Austronesian language requires constructions as in (11) to be ‘headed’ by an unambiguous entity-denoting word (i.e., as by ‘one’, ‘thing’, ‘place’ in the English translations above).¹²

Relatedly, we typically find no indefinite pronouns in conservative languages. Instead, indefinite unspecified arguments (e.g., ‘something’, ‘someone’, ‘somewhere’, etc.) are expressed by the combination of the existential and the appropriate nominalisation. An indefinite agent must be expressed with the agent nominalisation as in (12); an indefinite patient with the patient nominalisation as in (13); an indefinite locative argument with the locative nominalisation as in (14) and so forth. The nominative case in the existential sentences below is assigned by the existential predicate itself and not the aspect marked predicate. The fact that existential predicates take aspect marked complements is predicted if these complements are in fact nominals. Note that this situation differs markedly from that found in mainland East Asian languages, where *wh*- words typically double as indefinite pronouns.

- (12) *May bi~bili nang=uling*
 EXT INCM~buy GEN=charcoal
 ‘Someone will buy charcoal’
- (13) *May bi~bil-hin si=Obet*
 EXT INCM~buy-PV P.NOM=Obet
 ‘Obet will buy something.’
- (14) *May pu~punta-han si=Liwayway*
 EXT INCM~go-lv P.NOM=Liwayway
 ‘Liwayway has somewhere to go.’

Again related here is the requirement that content questions must be formed as cleft-like constructions in conservative languages. The notional predicate must be preceded by the nominative marker, as shown in (15a). Marking the interrogative phrase rather than the notional predicate with the nominative, as would be expected by a traditional extraction account, is ungrammatical, as shown in (15b). This is expected if all basic sentences,

¹² Note, however, that the same possibilities for such apparently headless nominal phrases are also afforded to prepositional oblique phrases, as seen in (i).

(i) *ang=para sa=bata*
 NOM=for OBL=child
 ‘the one that is for the child.’ (Lemaréchal 1982:21 via Reid 2002:301)

As Reid (2002:301) notes, this is problematic for a theory which treats the complements of the case marking determiners as nominals, as it would require analyzing a prepositional phrase as a nominalisation. Reid (2002) treats the determiners themselves as head nouns and thus derives the productivity of headless relatives from the fact that the apparent case marker is a nominal head with the following complement as something akin to a relative clause. However, this cannot derive the nominal characteristics of verbs even when they are undetermined (e.g., the genitive-ergative syncretism and extraction facts to be discussed below). Nonetheless, this is an important point which unfortunately must be left open here.

including interrogatives, are essentially copular clauses with PRED-SUBJ order. In content questions, then, it is the interrogative element which is in the predicate position and the aspect marked word which is in the subject position (cf. Keenan 1995; Gerassimova and Sells 2008).

- (15) a. *Ano ang=b<in>ili-Ø=mo?*
 wha NOM=<BEG>buy-PV=2S.GEN
 ‘What did you buy?’
- b. **Ang=ano b<in>ili-Ø=mo?*
 NOM=what <BEG>buy-PV=2S.GEN

3.3 Coordination and constituency

Also predicted by the nominalist hypothesis is the fact that the predicate and the transitive agent form a constituent to the exclusion of the nominative argument. As possessor and possessum (genitive agent and predicate, respectively), they must constitute a larger nominal type phrase, represented schematically in (16).

- (16) [[Pred Gen] Nom]

If coordination respects this constituency, we expect that the predicate plus genitive argument can be coordinated under a nominative argument as in (17a) but that the predicate and nominative constituent could not be coordinated under a genitive argument. This turns out to be correct, as shown by Kroeger (1993) who exemplifies with the coordinated constructions in (18) and (19), representing (17a) and (17b), respectively. In (18), the nominative phrase in final position is an argument of both coordinated predicates but in (19), the final genitive phrase can only serve as an argument to both preceding predicates with difficulty because it involves coordination of non-constituents.

- (17) a. [[Pred Gen] and [Pred Gen] Nom]
 b. *[[Pred Nom] and [Pred Nom] Gen]
- (18) *hu~hugas-an=ko at pu~punas-an=mo ang=manga=pinggan*
 INCM~wash-LV=1s.GEN and INCM~wipe-LV=2s.GEN NOM=PL=plate
 ‘I’ll wash and you dry the dishes.’ (Kroeger 1993:34)
- (19) *?*Ni-luto-Ø ang=pagkain a h<in>ugas-an ang=manga=pinggan*
 BEG-cook-PV NOM=food and <BEG>wash-LV NOM=PL=plate
ni=Josie
 P.GEN=Josie
 (For, ‘Josie will cook the food and wash the dishes.’) (Kroeger 1993:34)

3.4 Case and extraction

The feature which has been lavished with the most attention in the syntax literature is the ‘subjects only’ restriction on extraction. Extraction (or apparent extraction) of arguments in question formation, relativisation and topicalisation have been described for many Austronesian languages as being restricted to the subject, i.e., the nominative argument. We can illustrate this with topicalisation, as topicalisation does not require

altering the subject-predicate structure of the sentence. Taking a base sentence such as (20a), the nominative argument can be topicalised, as in (20b), but the genitive argument cannot, as shown in (20c).

- (20) a. *B<in>ili-Ø nang=babae ang=libro kahapon*
 <BEG>buy-PV GEN=woman NOM=book yesterday
 ‘The woman bought a book yesterday.’
- b. *Ang=libro ay b<in>ili-Ø nang=babae kahapon*
 NOM=book TOP <beg>buy-PV GEN=woman yesterday
 ‘The book, the woman bought yesterday.’
- c. **Nang=babae ay b<in>ili-Ø ang=libro kahapon*
 GEN=woman TOP <BEG>buy-PV NOM=book yesterday

The generalisation ‘subjects only’, however, is a misnomer, as many other types of phrases can be extracted. For instance, the dative/oblique argument in (21), the bare temporal adverb in (22), the genitive marked temporal adjunct in (23), and the genitive marked clausal adjunct in (24).

- (21) *Sa=paaralan ay nag-abuloy=sila nang=kotse*
 OBL=school TOP AV.BEG-donate=3p.NOM GEN=car
 ‘To the school, they donated a car.’
- (22) *Kahapon ay b<in>ili-Ø nang=babae ang=libro*
 yesterday TOP <BEG>buy-PV GEN=woman NOM=book
 ‘Yesterday, the woman bought the book.’
- (23) *Nang=ala-una ay <um>alis=sila*
 GEN=o’clock-one TOP <AV.BEG>leave=3p.NOM
 ‘At one o’clock, they left’
- (24) *Nang=hindi=niya na-malay-an ay na-hulog-Ø=siya*
 GEN=NEG=3s.GEN NVL.BEG-conscious-lv TOP NVL.BEG-fall-PV=3s.NOM
 ‘Without noticing it, he fell.’

Note that the case marking on a phrase does not help much in determining its potential for extraction. Although several types of adverbs and adjuncts are introduced with genitive case in Philippine languages, not all of them are unextractable. Instead, the restriction is properly described as applying to direct dependents of the predicate, that is, agents of non-actor voice predicates and objects of actor voice predicates. These types of arguments, in addition to certain ‘inner adverbials’ form a larger constituent with the predicate which cannot be extracted from. Note that these phrases are also dependent in the sense that they cannot stand alone and are unable to function as predicates in typical conservative languages, as exemplified by (25).¹³

¹³ Typically, possessor predicates are expressed in the oblique case. Some languages, like Amis, are exceptional in allowing genitive phrases to fill the predicate position.

Extraction out of the predicate phrase should not be confused with genitive phrases preposed within the predicate phrase, as found in many languages. The difference is typically visible in that preposed genitives, unlike postposed genitives, are connected to the following material with the linker. This can be seen with the first person agent in the Pazeh sentence in (i) (compare the genitive agent of *kinan* without

- (25) **Hindi nang=mundo ang=guro=ng iyon*
 NEG GEN=world NOM=teacher=LNK that
 (For, ‘That teacher is not of the world.’)

This restriction is typically presented as an exotic feature of Austronesian languages, especially in light of independent findings suggesting that subjects are more difficult to extract than objects cross-linguistically. However, given the nominalist hypothesis, the restriction is anything but exotic as the extraction of genitive arguments is equivalent to extraction from NP, a decidedly marked operation cross-linguistically.¹⁴ To exemplify with non-Austronesian languages, we can observe the ungrammaticality of possessor extraction in Semitic and English. In (26), from Modern Hebrew, and (27), from Levantine Arabic, we see that in order to question a possessor, the entire NP within which it is contained must be fronted, as in the (a) sentences. Fronting of just the possessor while stranding the rest of the NP as in the (b) sentences is ungrammatical.

- (26) a. [*et=ha=bayt šel mi*]_i *raita* *t_i*?
 ACC=DEF=house of who see.PST.2s
 ‘Whose house did you see?’
 b. **[šel mi raita]*_i [*et=ha=bayt* *t_i*]?
 Of who saw.PST.2s ACC=DEF=house
- (27) a. [*be:t mi:n*]_i *šuft* *t_i*?
 house who see.PST.2S
 ‘Whose house did you see?’
 b. **mi:n_i šuft* [*be:t* *t_i*]?
 who see.PST.2S house

This can be compared with the similar English facts in (28). In (28a), only a possessor is questioned but the entire containing NP must be fronted. The ungrammaticality of extracting just a possessor from this type of NP is shown in (28b) and (28c).¹⁵

- (28) a. [Whose house] did you see *t_i*?
 b. *[Whose]_i did you see [*t_i* house]?
 c. *[Of whom]_i did you see a house *t_i*

the linker). The alternation between a postposed clitic possessor and a preposed linked possessor is shown for Timugun Murut in (ii) and (iii). See also (39) and (40) below for similar examples.

- (i) *naki a t<in>alek-Ø a alaw ka k<in>an-Ø ni=Asilu*
 1S.GEN LNK <PRF>cook-PV LNK fish TOP <PRF>eat-PV P.GEN=Asilu
 ‘the fish that I cooked was eaten by Asilu.’ (Blust 1999a:351)

- (ii) *baloy=min* (iii) *akaw ra baloy*
 house=2S.GEN 2s LNK house
 ‘your house’ (Prentice 1971:181) ‘YOUR house’ (Prentice 1971:205)

¹⁴ As far as I am aware, Naylor (1980:42) is the only one to have made the connection between the unextractability of the *nang* phrase in Tagalog and its modifier/attribute status, although the basis is not made entirely clear: ‘Obviously, structures that are bound retrogressively to the preceding constituent cannot precede the constituent. Thus, *nang*-NPs never occur initially in the clause (nor in the phrase).’

¹⁵ The conditions on extraction from NP in English are notoriously difficult. Unlike the more categorial case of Semitic, the specificity of the containing NP and the nature of the predicate *y* play a large role (Erteschik-Shir 1973; Horn 1974).

The restriction on the extraction of non-actor voice agents and actor voice objects can now be reduced to whatever it is which blocks extraction of possessors from NP cross-linguistically (see Kaufman 2008 for some ideas on a formal implementation of this).¹⁶ This general approach has the advantage of putting the famous Austronesian restriction on extraction on more universal grounds rather than treating it as an exotic case of a ‘subjects-only’ constraint on syntactic movement.

3.5 The syntax of independent and dependent imperatives

The final feature to be mentioned in this section relates to the syntax of imperatives. The imperative, as a speech act category, belongs entirely to the verbal realm. Accordingly, illocutionary/speech act categories are observed to be the last types of functional elements to be included in clausal nominalisation (Malchukov 2004). One of the defining syntactic features of imperatives cross-linguistically is the omission of the imperative addressee. Interestingly, imperative addressees are rarely omitted with the ‘voice’ derivations in (7). It is in fact, ungrammatical to omit the addressee in many contexts, as in the simple Tagalog imperative in (29).¹⁷

- (29) *Sige, kain-in(*=mo)!*
 alright eat-PV=2S.GEN
 ‘Alright, eat (it)!’

However, if these forms are nominalisations, we may expect that predicates such as those in (29), which are often treated as imperatives, are not imperatives at all. In fact, the forms used for imperatives are not dedicated for this purpose but rather have a more general non-aspectual function also found in infinitive contexts. This helps account for the fact that these apparent imperatives cannot license omission of the addressee as imperatives in other languages typically do.¹⁸ The most convincing evidence for this however comes from the behaviour of the forms in the so-called dependent paradigm, which we turn to next.

¹⁶ This incidentally resolves a difficulty noted for Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) Accessibility Hierarchy, shown in (i), in which relations further to the left were posited to be easier to extract.

(i) Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977)
 SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

Aldridge (2005) points out that the positioning of subjects as more extractable than objects is problematically based on data from Austronesian languages in which Keenan and Comrie equated transitive patients with subjects. Accepting the nominalist hypothesis, we can still maintain the cross-linguistic generalisation that objects may be easier to extract than subjects cross-linguistically (Rizzi 1990 and the references therein). What appears to be a preference for extracting SU in (i) is in fact a ban on the extraction of GEN. Asymmetries between SU and DO are thus essentially irrelevant here.

¹⁷ Were the person marking in question to be understood as subject agreement, this would not be so surprising as imperatives can be marked for agreement with a null second person subject. But in light of the fact that the person markers in question are second position clitics, such an analysis is ruled out under the assumption that subject agreement must be marked on a verbal category (V or AUX) and can cooccur with full NP arguments. Neither of these criteria hold true in Tagalog nor in the majority of conservative Austronesian languages.

¹⁸ Note that the indication of aspect in nominalisations, while not very widespread, is attested (see for instance Noonan 1992:213 for Lango).

Alongside the voice forms discussed above, Wolff (1973) also reconstructs another set which he terms the dependent forms, shown in (30).¹⁹ As Wolff shows, the independent voice paradigm appears to have been used in matrix declarative clauses while the dependent paradigm was used in special contexts such as imperatives and negated clauses, a situation which is still maintained in many Austronesian languages today. SPR argue that the reanalyzed nominalisations represented by the independent forms supplanted the dependent forms, which were the original verbs of PAn.

(30)		Independent	Dependent
	Agent	*<um>	Ø
	Patient	*-en	*-a
	Locative	*-an	*-i
	Conveyance	*Si-	*-an

Ross (2002a:46) makes the important observation that the interchangeability between notional nouns and verbs in Austronesian only applies to the independent forms. The similarity in distribution breaks down when we examine the dependent forms, which are restricted in appearing only in predicate and not in argument position. Although Ross (1995a:758 fn.24) correctly states that this difference is not visible in standard Tagalog, which has lost the dependent forms, we can see the distinction clearly in certain provincial dialects of Tagalog, such as that of Batangas, which preserve the dependent forms in imperatives.²⁰ In (31a) and (b) we see the imperative use of the independent and dependent forms in predicate position in Batangas Tagalog. In (32), we see the same imperatives in argument position with the patient in predicate position. But here, only the independent form is grammatical.

(31) a. *Buks-an=mo ang=pintuan!*
 open=LV=2S.GEN NOM=door
 ‘Open the door!’

b. *Buks-i ang=pintuan!*
 open=LV.DEP NOM=door
 ‘Open the door!’

(32) a. *Pintuan ang=buks-an=mo!*
 door NOM=open-LV=2S.GEN
 ‘Open the WINDOW! Not the door’ (‘Window is your one to open!’)

¹⁹ Ross (2002) reconstructs the dependent form (his ‘non-indicative’) of the conveyance voice as alternatively *án-i* V or V+*án-i*. He also reconstructs projective forms which include a suffix *-a* preceding the dependent suffixes in 0. Because these differences are not directly relevant here they will not be discussed further.

²⁰ Note that, as with most generalisations, exceptions can be found. The Ilonggo sentence in (i) shows the use of the locative dependent form embedded under a nominative case marker. This is highly unusual, however, if at all really permissible. Out of some 490 hits on the Google search engine of ‘hatagi’ (give-LV.DEP in several Bisayan languages), only two attestations of ‘ang hatagi’ could be found. Compare this to the 70 hits of the embedded independent form ‘ang hatagan’ (NOM=give-LV) out of 464 hits for ‘hatagan’ (give-LV) more generally.

(i) *Ako ang=hatag-i sang=pabo=mo!*
 1s.NOM NOM=give=LV.DEP GEN=turkey=2s.GEN
 ‘Just give your turkey to ME!’

<www.sabong.com.ph/forum/showthread.php?t=10889&page=208?>

- b. **Pintuan ang=buks-i!*
 door NOM=open-DEP.LV

This shows that the noun-like nature of the aspect marked lexemes in Tagalog and other Philippine languages is not necessarily an across the board phenomenon which is basic to the syntax (*pace* Gil 1993). Rather, the syntax is capable of distinguishing nouns and verbs but nominals have simply subsumed verbs for the expression of most event-type predicates. The verbal nature of the dependent forms is further supported by their behaviour in imperatives. Although dependent forms license agents in negation and other auxiliary contexts, they require omission of the imperative addressee in all languages for which they are attested, as exemplified again by Batangas Tagalog in (33).²¹ The contrast between the obligatory omission of the addressee of dependent form imperatives and their near obligatory inclusion in independent form imperatives underscores the verb like nature of the former set and the non-verbal nature of the latter.

- (33) *Buks-i(*=mo) ang=pintuan!*
 open=LV.DEP=2S.GEN NOM=door
 ‘Open the door!’

The rest of this paper will focus on the disintegration of nominalism in Indonesian languages and the consequent reemergence of a robust verb-noun distinction in the morphosyntax of these languages. It is argued that many of the diverse changes which characterise the MP languages outside of the Philippines may be traced to the redeployment of true verbs as event-type predicates.

4 The disintegration of nominalism in Indonesia

The breakdown of the complex voice/nominalisation system in Indonesian languages has long been a topic of some interest among Austronesianists (see the papers in Wouk and Ross 2002 among others).²² As emphasised in the recent literature (Blust 1985; Pawley and Ross 1993; Ross 1995b; Blust 1999b), there is no good comparative evidence suggesting that the MP languages outside of Central-East-Malayo-Polynesian form a single subgroup. Furthermore, there appears to be no large scale subgroup that includes a majority of extra-Philippine MP languages while excluding the Philippine languages. It is somewhat unexpected then that the MP languages outside of the Philippines show recurring morphosyntactic characteristics which set them apart from the more conservative Austronesian languages. Blust (2002:68) remarks on the rather uniform attrition of the voice system outside the Philippine area: ‘...[W]ith a few notable exceptions, languages closer to the probable Austronesian homeland in Taiwan have preserved more of the original focus system than languages at a greater distance from it. It is an intriguing question why this should be the case.’ If there was no exclusively shared common ancestor for the relevant languages, then there are only two alternatives left, as identified by Ross

²¹ Some languages only disallow inclusion of the imperative addressee when the addressee is singular, e.g., **Buksi=mo!* ‘Open it!’ but *Buks-i=ninyo!* ‘(You pl.) open it!’.

²² It has only been relatively recently that we can identify with certainty the features of Indonesian voice systems as historical simplifications and not retentions. This is due to the distribution of the more complex systems across Formosan languages, which comprise several primary subgroups of Austronesian and thus demand reconstruction to PAN.

(2002:52): ‘...[T]heir similarities are at least in part the results of independent parallel developments and of language contact.’ Here, I suggest that the cues for the nominal organisation of the syntax were lost by natural erosion and that this led to the re-emergence of a true verbal category as canonical event-denoting predicates. This is best seen as a consequence of the universal tendency towards treating event-denoting predicates as a separate lexical category with a privileged link to Tense-Aspect-Mood marking.²³

Two of the most salient morphological cues to the nominal-based predication of conservative Austronesian languages are the nasal linker and the distribution of genitive case on both possessors and the agents. We review below how both of these cues eroded in Indonesian languages thereby setting the stage for the re-emergence of canonical verbs.

4.1 The loss of the linker

The linker connects all elements within a domain of modification. This can be seen by the position of the linkers in the Tagalog determiner phrase in (34).

- (34) *Ito=ng dalawa=ng ma-laki=ng aso=ng ito*
 NOM.this=LNK two=LNK ADJ-big=LNK dog=LNK NOM.this
 ‘These two big dogs’

The linker is a ubiquitous feature of Philippine languages and is also present in Formosan languages.²⁴ Observe its obligatory presence in a simple adjective-noun constituent in Itbayat, Ilokano, Ibanag, Kapampangan, Tagalog, Waray (from Yamada and Tsuchida 1975:1) Maranao, Western Bukidnon and Amis as seen in (35a-i), respectively.

- (35) a. *mahilid a raraxan* b. *akikid na dalan* c. *atazzi’ nga dalan*
 narrow LNK road narrow LNK road narrow LNK road
 d. *makitid a dalan* e. *makitid na daan* f. *haligot nga dalan*
 narrow LNK road narrow LNK road narrow LNK road
 g. *maroni a wata’* h. *madagway ha bulat* i. *miming-ay a siri*
 small LNK child beautiful LNK flower small-FAC LNK goat
 (Post and Gardner 1992:64) (Wu 2006:72)

The linker is nearly invisible in Indonesian languages, as can be gleaned from the sample in (36a-f), from Manuk Mangkaw Sama, Belait, Karo Batak, Makassarese, Mori Bawah and Kambara, respectively (Adelaar and Himmelmann 2005).

- (36) a. *lansa heya* b. *berejin ma’ang* c. *telu wari*
 boat large durian red three day
 ‘large boat’ ‘red durian’ ‘three days’

²³ Ultimately, I believe, the trigger for morphological erosion in the Indonesian languages was contact, as already suggested by Ross. Note that it was not only the linker, but a substantial part of the derivational morphology which was jettisoned in the Austronesian migration out of the Philippines. The complex derivational morphologies found in certain Indonesian languages (e.g., Tukang Besi, [Donohue 1999], Kambara [Klamer 2005], Acehnese [Durie 1985]) have been in large part reinnovated, although this deserves more in-depth research.

²⁴ The function and reconstruction of the linker is discussed by Blust (1974), Dempwolff (1934-38) and Ross (2006).

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (Akamine 2005) | (Clyne 2005:436) | (Woolams 2005:549) |
| d. <i>tau rua=yya</i>
person two=DET
'those two people'
(Jukes 2005:669) | e. <i>ambau opaa</i>
carabao four
'four carabao'
(Mead 2005:687) | f. <i>tau wàu</i>
personto.smell
'smelly person'
(Klamer 2005:714) |

The correspondence between reduction in the voice system and the absence of linkers is not perfect. Philippine languages like Sarangani Manobo and Central Subanen have lost the linker, as seen in (37a-b), but preserved the voice system. Conversely, Indonesian languages like Toba Batak have made certain simplifications to the voice system but retain the linker, as seen in (38):

- (37) a. *mepiya otaw*
good person
(Dubois 1976:97)
- b. *lima basu*
five glass

- (38) *dalan na soppit*
road LNK narrow
(Blust 1974:10)

Nonetheless, I believe the connection between loss of the linker and simplification of the voice system is highly significant. It is very plausible that the basis of this connection is that the domain of linking also includes genitive marked dependents of the predicate. The positioning of genitive phrases in PAN was probably much like it is today in modern Tagalog and Paiwan, as seen in (39) and (40). When postposed as in the (a) sentences, the genitive phrase was introduced by a simple case marker (or case marked clitic). However, when preposed, it was followed by the linker.

- (39) a. *bahay=niya*
house=2s.GEN
'His/her house'
- b. *kanya=ng bahay*
1s.GEN=LNK house
'His/her house'
- (40) a. *umaq ni=maju*
house GEN=3s
'his/her house'
- b. *ni=maju a umaq*
GEN=3s LNK house
'his/her house'
- (Egli 1990:155; Himmelmann 2005:164)

In languages which retain the linker, good evidence that genitive agents are a type of possessor within the modificational domain is always available: preposed genitive agents are overtly linked to their predicates just like adjectives and other types of modifiers, as shown in (41).

- (41) a. *P<in>unta-han=niya ang=bahay*
<BEG>go-LV=3s.GEN NOM=house
'He went to the house.'
- b. *Kanya=ng p<in>unta-han ang=bahay*
3s.GEN=LNK <BEG>go-LV NOM=house
'He went to the house.'

The loss of the linker leads to the creation of a real (i.e. category particular) relative marker in many Indonesian languages. This can be illustrated by the comparison between

Tagalog and Indonesian. In (42a) and (43a), we see that determiner phrase internal modification requires the linker in Tagalog but not in Indonesian. As seen by (42b), Tagalog treats modification of a noun by an event predicate just as it treats determiner phrase internal modification, that is, with the intermediation of the linker. On the other hand, the example in (43b), shows that Indonesian displays an asymmetry between determiner phrase modification and relativisation, requiring the marker *yang* for the latter.

(42) a. *ang=malaki=ng aso=ng iyon* b. *ang=na-kita=ko=ng aso*
 NOM=big=LNK dog=LNK that NOM=NVL.BEG-see:PV=1S.GEN=LNK dog
 ‘that big dog’ ‘the dog I see’

(43) a. *anjing besar itu*
 dog big that
 ‘that big dog’
 b. *anjing *(yang) ku=lihat*
 dog RELT 1s=see
 ‘the dog that I see’

The loss of the linker thus leads to a categorial difference in the treatment of modification by canonical determiner phrase internal elements (e.g., adjectives, numerals, determiners) and modification by verbs. This obviously underscores the status of the verb as a *syntactically* distinct category in Indonesian languages and shows how the natural morphological erosion of the linker in Indonesian languages could have led to a significant reorganisation of the grammar.²⁵

4.2 The loss of ergative-genitive syncretism

The other pervasive cue for nominalism mentioned above is the syncretism between non-actor voice agents and possessors. Alieva (1980) claims that the similarity is still significant for languages like Indonesian, offering the examples in (44) and (45) to demonstrate the similar marking of patient voice agents and possessors.

(44) *buku ini sudah di-baca anak-anak*
 book this already PV-read child-child
 ‘the children already read this book.’

(45) *ini buku-buku anak kami*
 this book-book child 1P.EXCL
 ‘these are our children’s books.’

Alieva (1980:421) further suggests that differences between possessors and agents in Indonesian are perhaps due to foreign influence. This is, however, incorrect, as several significant differences can already be seen in the earliest attestations of Malay. Firstly, agents, but not possessors, could already be introduced by the preposition *oleh* in early Classical Malay texts. Secondly, possessors were regularly doubled by genitive pronouns in early Classical Malay, as shown in (46), a situation which probably obtained even in Old

²⁵ Interestingly, we can see the development of the relative marker in Indonesian from the earliest attestations in Old Malay (but see Ross 2004 for a different view of the relationship of Old Malay to Malayic.). Mahdi (2005:195) notes that the marker *yam* in Old Malay (Classical Malay *yang*) was often omitted where it was obligatory in later Classical Malay. For instance, in introducing the relative clause in (i).

(i) *ni-vunuḥ ka□mu sumpaḥ ni-minu[m]=ma□mu*
 PV-kill 2p curse PV-drink=2P.GEN
 ‘you will be killed by the curse which is drunk by you.’

Malay, as suggested by (47). A genitive pronoun following a patient voice verb in Classical Malay was never co-referent with a following (unmarked) agent. A following NP is always interpreted as the patient, as shown by the interpretation of (48).²⁶

- (46) *Apakah dosa-nya anak-ku, maka engkau bunuh-kan dia?*
 what sin-3S.GEN child-1S.GEN thus 2s kill-APPL 3s
 ‘What was my child’s sin that you killed him?’
 (Hikayat Bayan Budiman 202:16, from the Malay Concordance Project
<http://mcp.anu.edu.au/>)

- (47) *stha□na-ña satru-ñku*
 residence-3S.GEN enemy-1S.GEN
 ‘the position/residence of my enemy’ (SKN 12, Mahdi 2005:194)

- (48) *Ia men-cari damar, di-pasang-nya di-suluh-nya di-lihat-nya*
 3s AV-search resin PV-put-3S.GEN PV-torch-3S.GEN PV-see-3S.GEN

anak-nya

child-3S.GEN

‘He searched for resin, he put it (in its place), he lit it, and **he saw his child**’

(Hikayat Bayan Budiman 132:23, from the Malay Concordance Project

<http://mcp.anu.edu.au/>)

Once the noun-verb distinction took on this new syntactic significance, the verbal category was free to develop along cross-linguistically familiar lines. In particular, it developed person agreement and a true passive, lacking in earlier stages. Person agreement on verbs, first documented systematically by Haaksma (1933), is a feature which sharply distinguishes Indonesian languages from Philippine and Formosan ones (Wolff 1996; Zobel 2002; Kikusawa 2003; Himmelmann 2005:149–151). Crucially, it cleaves apart the two functions of the inherited genitive pronouns as it treats non-actor voice agents differently from possessors.²⁷ We can see how this typically works from the sample of Sulawesi languages discussed by Noorduynd (1991:148–149) and shown in Table 1. In all the languages shown, the agent marker attaches to the verb as an agreement prefix while the possessor is a phrase final pronominal clitic. Note that, as may be gleaned from the largely unrelated basic lexemes, not all of these languages are closely related to each other and the development in question was quite clearly not inherited from a common ancestor, even on the single island of Sulawesi (Mead 2002).

Table 1: Ergative agents versus possessors in Sulawesi languages

Transitive clause	Noun phrase	Language
-------------------	-------------	----------

²⁶ Full NP agents could be doubled by a genitive pronoun but only when introduced by the agent marker *oleh*, and even then, typically only when dislocated, as in (i).

(i) *Maka oleh Bedawi itu pun di-beri-kan-nya air kepada Hasanah*
 so by B. that even PV-give-APPL-3S.GEN water to H.

‘So that Bedawi, he gave water to Hasanah.’ (Hikayat Bayan 198:7)

²⁷ In what at first appears to be a parallel development, genitive proclitics were also innovated in Paiwan and Puyuma. A major difference exists, however, between the Formosan proclitics and their Indonesian counterparts. In both Paiwan and Puyuma these proclitics mark both non-actor voice agents and possessors whereas in Indonesian languages they only have an agent marking function.

<i>na-hilo=a</i> <i>na-cini=ka'</i> <i>na-kita=na'</i> <i>la-longa-aku</i> <i>a-kamata-aku</i> <i>no-toa-aku</i> 3S.ERG-see=1S.ABS 'S/he sees me'	<i>tomi=ku</i> <i>ballak=ku</i> <i>banua=ngku</i> <i>sapo=ku</i> <i>banua=ku</i> <i>laika-nggu</i> house=1S.GEN 'my house'	Uma Makassarese Sad'an Toraja Barang-barang Wolio Tolaki
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------

4.3 The development of a passive

The development of a true passive voice is another widespread innovation among Indonesian languages that is unknown in Philippine languages.²⁸ One of the correlates of the passive is the introduction of the agent as an oblique prepositional phrase rather than a genitive phrase. This can be seen in the diverse group of Indonesian languages in (49)-(53).²⁹

- (49) *Ni-kokko'=a' ri meong=ku* Makassarese
 PASS-bite=1s.NOM PREP cat=1s.GEN
 'I was bitten by my cat' (Jukes 2006:254)
- (50) *Mbe'e ede ra-nduku ba ompu sia* Bima
 goat that PASS-hit by grandfather 3s
 'The goat was hit by his/her grandfather' (Arka 2002)
- (51) *Tu' da-kerja ulih dua iku' nsia* Mualang
 this PASS-work by two CLASS human
 'This is done (later) by two persons.' (Tjia 2007:152)
- (52) *Ami onggga le hia* Manggarai
 1p.EXCL hit by 3s
 'We were hit by him/her' (Arka and Kosmas 2005)
- (53) *Lôn ka geu-côm lé-gopnyan* Acehnese
 1p IN 3-kiss OBL-she

²⁸ Some authors treat stative forms in conservative Austronesian languages as passives due to the fact their undergoers are typically mapped to the nominative argument and their agents are freely omitted (see Reid and Liao 2004:462). In Central Philippine languages like Tagalog there is no evidence for this, as stative agents also display genitive marking and show similar syntactic behaviour to dynamic non-actor voice agents, the only interpretative difference being in the realm of volitionality and ability. In certain other Northern Philippine and Formosan languages, however, stative forms appear to resist licensing a genitive agent. If Ross (1995a:741) is correct in reconstructing the PAn stative **ma-* as derived by the combination of **ka-* STATIVE and **<um>* ACTOR VOICE (i.e. **k<um>a-* \rightarrow **ma-* via loss of the first syllable) then statives may be best treated as a variety of actor voice predicate rather than a variety of passive, unlike Indonesian passives which have no connection at all to the actor voice.

²⁹ There is additional evidence for the independent but parallel nature of this development in the fact that several widespread languages appear to have made an early borrowing of the agent introducing preposition *oleh* from Malay in some form. Among others, a form *le* introduces passive agents in Manggarai, Acehnese and various Sama languages, a rather motley distribution which does not subgroup closely.

‘I was kissed by her.’ (Durie 1988)

We predict that when agents are introduced obliquely as in the above languages they should not be bound by the restrictions on possessor extraction discussed earlier, as they are no longer contained within a predicate noun phrase. This is confirmed by Mualang and Sundanese below (see also the Classical Malay example in fn.25) which both allow topicalisation of passive agents.

- (54) *Ulih dua iku’ nsia tu’ da-kerja* Mualang
 by two CLASS human this PASS-work
 ‘This is done (later) by two persons.’ (Tjia 2007:152)
- (55) *Ku bapa=na bade di-pang-meser-keun motor* Sundanese
 By father=3S.GEN will PASS-DER-buy-TR motorbike
 ‘His father will buy him a motorbike’ (Müller-Gotama 2001:33)

4.4 The development of canonical applicatives

Another consequence of the development of canonical verbs in Indonesian languages is the licensing of true applicatives. Recall that the various nominal ‘voices’ in more conservative languages do not exactly serve to increase the valency of the predicate. In these languages, when a benefactee is selected by the conveyance morphology on the predicate, all other arguments are typically expressed in the genitive case. It is a much discussed fact that similar morphology in Indonesian languages has the ability to create new objects on actor voice verbs, as seen in (56)–(58).

- (56) *Aku men-ulis-kan kamu sajak* Indonesian
 1s AV-write-APPL 2 poem
 ‘I wrote a poem for you’
- (57) *Bib n=pun-ak kolay peda* Taba
 Bib 3s=kill-APPL snake machete
 ‘Bib killed the snake with a machete’ (Bowden 2001:122)
- (58) *Ia meli-ang Nyoman umah* Balinese
 3 AV.buy-APPL name house
 ‘(S)he bought a house for Nyoman’ (Arka 2002)

Note that applicatives are a nearly uniquely verbal category, rarely attested in the nominal domain (Malchukov 2004). It is thus unsurprising that with the loss of the cues for nominal predicates and the consequent development of a true verbal category, we should also find the parallel development of applicatives, a morphological category which is virtually unknown in the more conservative languages.³⁰

4.5 The status of the imperative addressee

Finally, we can note that verbs are naturally suited for a wider variety of illocutionary acts than are nominals, whose proto-typical functions are referential in nature. We expect

³⁰ Recall from above, however, that Aldridge (2004) and Ross (2006), among others, do argue for an interpretation of CV and LV morphology as applicatives.

that the new verbal category of Indonesian languages should be similar to the old dependent forms examined earlier in requiring null imperative addressees. That this is generally correct can be seen from the representative examples in (59), from Malay and Selayarese, respectively. The imperative addressee is obligatorily omitted in Selayarese and typically omitted in Malay.

- (59) a. *Masak sayur=nya!*
 cook vegetable=3S.GEN
 ‘Cook the vegetables!’
- b. *Keo=a!*
 call=1s.NOM
 ‘Call me!’

We have seen in this section how several typological traits shared among Indonesian languages of various MP subgroups can be related to the redevelopment of canonical verbs. We also saw how this development could have been aided by morphological attrition, as this has removed some of the most salient morphological clues for the nominal oriented syntax so characteristic of the more conservative languages. In the next two sections we review three problems for the nominalist hypothesis and offer directions for further research.

5 Residue

5.1 *Ca- reduplication and the noun-verb distinction

Blust (1998) brings to light an intriguing problem for SPR’s nominalist hypothesis. He shows that PAn appears to have had an independent method for forming instrumental nominalisations, *Ca- reduplication, which was unrelated to the voice system. Words with *Ca- reduplication form unambiguous entity-denoting words and appear not to take aspect marking. Problematically, this appears to be nearly identical to the function of *Si- according to SPR, except that the latter clearly formed event-denoting predicates, typically taking aspect morphology. If the voice forms were indeed nominalisations, it is difficult to explain why these two forms share the same basic semantics but differ syntactically in modern languages along apparent noun-verb lines.

A plausible reanalysis of the facts involves taking the reduplication in question not as a marker of instrumental formation per se, but rather as an instantiation of the very same morpheme which has been reconstructed for the durative aspect (Ross 1995a:750–751, Blust 1998:34–35). As is common cross-linguistically, the durative would have also been used to denote habitual action. In the case of instrumentals, then, the reduplication would indicate the habitual use of the root but not the instrumental semantics itself, which must consequently be considered as the product of a zero-derivation. This would explain why *Ca- instrumental forms could not take additional aspectual morphology, as they would have already been marked for aspect. Doubtlessly, lexicalisation has occurred in a large number of these forms as their interpretations are not always transparently derivable from the roots (see Blust 1998 for extensive discussion), but the reanalysis suggests that there is no deep categorical difference between such instrumentals and their aspectually productive counterparts with *Si-.

Although defending this proposal properly requires far more space than is available here, some pieces of supporting evidence can be briefly brought to bear on the problem. If *Ca- reduplication indicated habitual aspect we would expect to find it not only on instrumentals but also on agentive and locative nominalisations, among others types. As

Blust notes, many forms which can be interpreted as instrumentals take the PAN locative suffix **-an*. Evidence from several languages further confirms this prediction. As discussed by Huang (2002), Mayrinax Atayal employs *Ca-* reduplication for both what she describes as non-actor irrealis forms and nominalisations.³¹ In the actor voice, both of these functions happen to be subsumed by *pa-* instead of *Ca-* (see Huang 2001:56–57 for an analysis of this). Crucially, however, the same form functions as an aspectual marker and as an apparent nominalisation marker, as can be seen from (60) and (61), respectively.

(60) *pa-∅-paquwas kuʔ=irawin=mu*
IRR-AF-sing NOM=friend=1S.GEN
'My friend will sing' (Huang 2002:211)

(61) *βaq-un=mu kuʔ=papaquwas kaʔ=hacaʔ*
know-PF=1S.GEN NOM=singer LNK=that
'I know that singer (who will sing there)' (Huang 2002:211)

The same pattern is found not only with agents but with patients, locatives and instruments, as well. What are translated as canonical nominalisations consistently take *Ca-* reduplication in Mayrinax Atayal. Note that this is also the case with many lexicalised nominalisations in Philippine languages. In Tagalog, for instance, we find reduplication (of the *CV-* variety) regularly in forms such as those in (62), just as we find it in the aspectual paradigm.³²

(62) a. *la~lamun-an* b. *mang~ang-awit*
INCM~swallow-LV AV.DIST~INCM-sing
'throat' 'singer'

Intriguingly, although Mayrinax Atayal possesses a reflex of PAN **Si-* in the form of *si-*, used for the instrumental/benefactive voice, it does not employ this prefix either for the irrealis verb or for instrumental nominalisations (Huang 2002:219–220). Thus, the *Ca-* reduplicant forms the instrumental *pa~patiq* 'pen' from the root *patiq* 'write' but is also used without overt indication of voice in the aspectually productive paradigm of the instrumental/benefactive voice, as can be seen from the difference between realis (63) and irrealis (64).

(63) *si-ʔa ʔal=miʔ cuʔ=pilaʔ kiʔ=sayun kuʔ=naβakis*
BF-take=1S.GEN ACC.NRF=money OBLsayun NOM.RF=old.man
'I took money from Sayun for the old man.' (Huang 2001:54)

(64) *ʔa~ʔa ʔal-∅=miʔ cuʔ=pilaʔ kiʔ=sayun kuʔ=naβakis*
IRR-take-BF=1s.GEN ACC.NRF=money OBL=sayun NOM.RF=old.man
'I'll take money from Sayun for the old man.' (Huang 2001:54)

Note that in (64), Huang marks the benefactive voice as being zero-derived in the irrealis. If this irregularity is a retention from PAN, then it follows that what appear to be

³¹ Although the gloss irrealis is not congruent with a habitual interpretation, the function of aspectual reduplication has clearly undergone major changes in many languages. On the shifting aspectual semantics of **Ca-/CV-* reduplication see Reid (1992) and Ross (1995a:750–752, 2002).

³² Lexicalised nominalisations are often further distinguished from aspectually productive ones in Tagalog by a process of length flip (more commonly referred to as 'stress shift' in the literature) by which vowel length is removed from roots with a long penult and added to those without one.

instrumental nominalisations with **Ca-* in various Austronesian languages are better described as lexicalised etymons marked with proto-durative aspect (to indicate the habitual) and a null morpheme indicating instrumental voice.

5.2 The case of dependent form agents

A perhaps more serious problem for the SPR analysis which appears to have gone generally undiscussed is the case frame of the dependent forms. Recall that one of the primary motivations for the nominalisation hypothesis was that genitive case was used both to mark possessors and non-actor voice agents. Nominalisation explains this pattern as arguments of nominalisations are typically expressed as possessors. However, if the dependent forms were the original verbs—having been ousted from matrix clauses by nominalisations—we should certainly not expect that they would also mark agents with the genitive, but this is in fact what we find throughout. Observe the marking of the agents in Samarenyo (65)–(66) and Atayal (67).

(65) *Wara'*=**ku** *balik-a* *a=sirbisa*
 NEG=1s.GEN return-PV NOM=beer
 ‘I didn’t return for the beer.’ (Wolff 1973:76)

(66) *Wara'*=**ku** *hingalimt-i* *a=isturya*
 NEG=1s.GEN forget-LV.DEP NOM=story
 ‘I didn’t forget the story.’ (Wolff 1973:78)

(67) *nanu' kina ini' gngi'-i na' Asang pi qu' pqziuan*
 and perhaps NEG forget-LV.DEP GEN A. PRT NOM legend
mrhuurara *ga'*
 forefather PRT
 ‘Maybe Asang has not forgotten the legends of our forefathers.’ (Wolff 1973:78)

In both languages, as in every other language for which the dependent forms are attested, the non-actor voice forms require the genitive case on the agent. Thus, the spread of nominalisation meant to explain the distribution of the genitive case has to apply before nominalisation even enters the scene. I take this to be the most daunting challenge facing the nominalist hypothesis at present.³³

5.3 The syntax of roots

Another puzzle concerning the nominalist hypothesis comes to light when we examine the syntax of bare roots in certain Philippine languages. Just as we unexpectedly find genitive agents with dependent forms where we do not expect them, we also commonly find genitive agents of bare roots in languages like Tagalog. Observe the sentences in (68) where no voice or aspect marking is found on the predicates. In both cases the agent is obligatorily assigned genitive case and the patient is assigned nominative case. It is not plausible to derive such bare root predicates by simply taking them to be reductions of

³³ Ross (this volume) argues on the basis of data from Puyuma, Rukai and Tsouic that this state of affairs characterises what he terms Proto Nuclear-Austronesian but not PAn proper, which did not show this syncretism.

their corresponding voice and aspect inflected counterparts (e.g. *d<in>a~dala-Ø* <BEG>INCM~carry-PV for (68a) and *na-ki~kita-Ø* NVL.BEG-INCM~see-PV for (68b)) because they do not have the same aspectual interpretation. Aspect inflected forms describe events while bare root forms describe states as indicated by the stative translations below. Thus, the sentence in (68a) is an infelicitous answer to the question ‘What is he doing?’ unlike its voice and aspect inflected counterpart. Note also that the patient oriented nature of bare roots in Tagalog is present even without the presence of a genitive agent, as shown by (69) where the nominative argument can only be interpreted as the patient of ‘see’ (see also Himmelmann 2008).

- (68) a. *dala=niya ang=niyog*
 carry=3S.GEN NOM=coconut
 ‘The coconut is his carried thing.’ (i.e. ‘He carries the coconut.’)
- b. *kita=niya ang=bangka*
 see=3S.GEN NOM=boat
 ‘The boat is his visible thing.’ (i.e. ‘He sees the boat.’)
- (69) *kita=ka*
 see=2S.NOM
 ‘You’re visible’ (not, ‘You see’)

Again we are faced with the embarrassment of nominal characteristics without the presence of nominalizing morphology (i.e. the independent voice forms). If event-denoting roots in PAn were inherently nominal to begin with then the independent voice forms could not be understood as nominalisers. However, it is not at all clear that the nominal properties of roots seen in Tagalog can be reconstructed all the way to PAn although the work required to ascertain this one way or the other has yet to be carried out systematically.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that several morphosyntactic features broadly associated with conservative Austronesian languages result from their nominal syntax and that the features characteristic of many MP subgroups outside of the Philippines result from the re-emergence of a canonical verb. The side of the story which can be told through ordinary genetic inheritance is summarised in Table 2. The function of the dependent paradigm was presumably purely predicational in PAn (or pre-PAn) but was marginalised in PMP to imperative, negative and narrative contexts. Presumably, the independent paradigm was primarily used for arguments in PAn (or pre-PAn) but came to be used for canonical event-denoting predicates in PMP.

Table 2: Ordinary genetic inheritance

	(Pre-)Pan functions	PMP functions
Dependent paradigm	canonical predicate	(imperative, negative, narrative)
Independent	canonical argument	canonical

paradigm		predicate
-----------------	--	-----------

Subsequent developments appear to have been the result of convergence and parallel change among those groups which migrated further south. In these languages, the dependent and independent paradigms were merged to a large extent to create a robustly verbal category which often allowed applicatives and person agreement. This helps to explain certain puzzling typological similarities between disparate genetic subgroups of Indonesian languages. The erosion of the cues for nominality—perhaps due to simplification via heavier contact with speakers of non-Austronesian languages south of the Philippines—led to the redevelopment of verbs as a morphosyntactic category. The redevelopment of verbs gives way to a constellation of properties commonly found in Indonesian language, among which we find unique relative markers, verbal agreement and object creating applicatives. Further work on the PAn dependent paradigm and on the syntax and semantics of bare roots should ultimately help elucidate the validity of the nominalist hypothesis.

References

- Adelaar, Alexander and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, eds. 2005. *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge.
- Adriani, Nicolaus. 1893. *Sangireesche spraakkunst*. Leiden: Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap.
- Akamine, Jun. 2005. Sama (Bajau). In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds 2005:377–392.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2004. Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages. PhD thesis, Cornell University.
- . 2005. Two fallacies relating to the accessibility hierarchy. Paper presented at the LSA conference, Oakland.
- Alieva, Natalia. 1980. The possessive syntactical type and the Malay language. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 136.4:417–425.
- Arka, I Wayan and Jeladu Kosmas. 2005. Passive without passive morphology? Evidence from Mangarai. In I Wayan Arka and Malcolm Ross, eds *The many voice of Austronesian systems: some new empirical studies*, 87–117. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2002. Voice and being core: evidence from (Eastern) Indonesian Languages. Paper presented at Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association 7.
- Baermann, Matthew, Dunstan Brown and Greville G. Corbett. 2005. *The syntax-morphology interface: a study of syncretism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*. 3 vols. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois.
- Blust, Robert. 1974. Proto-Austronesian: the first step. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13.1/2:1–15.
- . 1985. The Austronesian homeland: a linguistic perspective. *Asian Perspectives* 26.1:45–67.

- 1998. Ca- reduplication and Proto-Austronesian grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37.1:29–64.
- 1999a. Notes on Pazeh phonology and morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38/2:321–365.
- 1999b. Subgrouping, circularity and extinction: some issues in Austronesian comparative linguistics. In E. Zeitoun and P.J.-K. Li, eds *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 31–94. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- 2002. Notes on the history of ‘focus’ in Austronesian languages. In Wouk and Ross, eds 2002:63–78.
- Bowden, John. 2001. *Taba: description of a South Halmaheran language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Bricker, Victoria. 1981. The source of the ergative split in Yucatec Maya. *Journal of Mayan Linguistics* 2.2:83–127.
- Capell, Arthur. 1964. Verbal systems in Philippine languages. *Philippine Journal of Science* 93:231–249.
- Clynes, Adrian. 2005. Belait. In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds 2005:429–455.
- Comrie, Bernard and Sandra A. Thompson. 1985. Lexical nominalization. In Timothy Shopen, ed. *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. III: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 349–398. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Otto Christian. 1986. Focus in Malagasy and Proto-Austronesian. In P. Geraghty, L. Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds *FOCAL II: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 21–42. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- De Guzman, Videia. 1988. Ergative analysis for Philippine languages: an analysis. In R. McGinn, ed. *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*, 323–45. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Monographs in International Studies.
- De Wolf, Charles. 1988. Voice in Austronesian languages of Philippine type: passive, ergative, or neither? In Shibatani, ed. *Passive and voice*, 143–193. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
- Dempwolff, Otto. 1934–38. *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes* (3 vols), Beihefte Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen Sprachen 15,17,19. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Dixon, Robert. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A grammar of Tukang Besi*. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DuBois, Carl D. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Durie, Mark. 1988. *A grammar of Acehnese on the Basis of a dialect of North Aceh*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Egli, Hans. 1990. *Paiwangrammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1973. On the nature of island constraints. PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

- Foley, William A. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in Philippine languages. Paper presented at the 3rd LFG conference, Brisbane.
- Garrett, Andrew. 1990. The origin of split NP ergativity. *Language* 66:2.261–296.
- Gerassimova, Veronica and Peter Sells. 2008. Long-distance dependencies in Tagalog: the case for raising. In Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, eds *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 190–198. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Gerdts, Donna. 1988. Antipassives and causatives in Ilokano: evidence for an ergative analysis. In Richard McGinn, ed. *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University.
- Gil, David. 1993. Tagalog semantics. *Proceedings of BLS 19*, 390–403.
- Gildea, Spike. 1998. *On reconstructing grammar: comparative Cariban morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haaksma, Rémy. 1933. *Inleiding tot de Studie der Vervoegde Vormen in de Indonesische Talen*. Leiden: Brill.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 1987. *Morphosyntax und morphologie – Die Ausrichtungsauffixe im Tagalog*. München: Fink.
- 1991. The Philippine challenge to universal grammar, *Arbeitspapier 15*. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- 1996. Person marking and grammatical relations in Sulawesi. In H. Steinhauer, ed. *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics No.3*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- 2005. Typological characteristics. In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds.
- 2008. Lexical categories and voice in Tagalog. In Peter K. Austin and Simon Musgrave, eds *Voice and grammatical functions in Austronesian languages*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Horn, G.M. 1974. The noun phrase constraint. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Huang, Lillian, M. 2001. Focus system of Mayrinax Atayal: a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspective. *Journal of Taiwan Normal University: Humanities and Social Science* 46 (1-2):51–69.
- 2002. Nominalization in Mayrinax Atayal. *Language and Linguistics* 3 (2):197–225.
- Johns, Alana. 1992. Deriving ergativity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23.1:58-87.
- Jukes, Anthony. 2006. Makassar. In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds 2006:649-682.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2008. Austronesian voice as thematic nominalization. Paper presented at the 15th meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association, Sydney. July 1, 2008.
- Keenan, Edward and Comrie, Bernard. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63–69.
- Keenan, Edward. 1995. Predicate-argument structure in Malagasy. In C.S. Burgess, ed. *Grammatical relations: theoretical approaches to Empirical questions*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Kikusawa, Ritsuko. 2003. The development of some Indonesian pronominal systems. In Barry J. Blake and Kate Burridge (eds, with Jo Taylor) *Historical linguistics 2001: selected papers from the 15th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Melbourne, 13-17 August 2001*. Current Issues in Linguistics Theory, 237–268. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Klamer, Marian. 2005. Kambara. In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds 2005:709–727.
- Kroeger, Paul R. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lemaréchal, Alain. 1991. Dérivation et orientation dans les langues des Philippines, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 86:317–358.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2004. Transitivity and ergativity in Formosan and Philippine languages. PhD thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Lopez, Cecilio. 1928. Comparison of Tagalog and Iloko. PhD thesis, University of Hamburg.
- Lopez, Cecilio. 1937/1977. Preliminary Study of Affixes in Tagalog. In Ernesto Constatino, ed. *Selected writings in Philippine linguistics*, 28–104. Diliman: University of the Philippines Press.
- Mahdi, Waruno. 2005. Old Malay. In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds, 2005:182–201.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2004. *Nominalization/Verbalization*. LINCOM Studies in Language Typology. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Manning, Christopher. 1996. *Ergativity: argument structure and grammatical relations*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Mead, David. 2002. Proto-Celebic focus revisited. In Wouk and Ross, eds 2002:143–177.
- 2005. Mori Bawah. In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds 2005:683–708.
- Müller-Gotama, Franz. 2001. *Sundanese*. Languages of the World/Materials 369. München: Lincolnm
- Naylor, Paz B. 1975. Topic, focus, and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause. *Oceanic Linguistics*. 14:1.
- 1980. Linking, relation-marking, and Tagalog syntax. In Paz B. Naylor, ed. *Austronesian Studies, papers from the 2. Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, 33–49. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.
- 1995. Subject, Topic, and Tagalog syntax. In: David Benett, Theodora Bynon and George B. Hewitt, eds *Subject, voice and ergativity*, 161–201. London: SOAS.
- Noonan, Michael. 1992. *A grammar of Lango*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Noorduyn, J. 1991. The languages of Sulawesi. In H. Steinhauer, ed. *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics* No.1. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Palancar, Enrique L. 2002. *The origin of Agent Markers*. Studia Typologica 5. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Pawley, Andrew. 1977. Lecture given at the Linguistic Society of America's Summer Institute.

- Pawley, Andrew and Malcolm Ross. 1993. Austronesian historical linguistics and culture history. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22. 425–459.
- Plank, Frans. 1979. Ergativity, syntactic typology and universal grammar: some past and present viewpoints. In: Frans Plank, ed. *Ergativity: towards a theory of grammatical relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Prentice, D.J. 1971. *The Murut languages of Sabah*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Post, Ursula and Mary Jane Gardner (compilers). 1992. *Binukid dictionary*. Studies in Philippine Linguistics, 9:2. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Rackowski, Andrea. 2002. The structure of Tagalog: specificity, voice, and the distribution of arguments. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Reid, Lawrence. 1992. On the development of the aspect system in some Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 31.1:65–91.
- 2002. Determiners, nouns, or what? Problems in the analysis of some commonly occurring forms in Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41.2:295–309.
- Reid, Lawrence and Hsiu-Chuan Liao. 2004. A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5.2:433–490.
- Richards, Norvin. 2000. Another look at Tagalog subjects. In Ileana Paul, Vivianne Phillips and Lisa Travis, eds *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*, 105–116. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Ross, Malcolm. 1995a. Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian verbal morphology: evidence from Taiwan. In Paul Jen-kuei Li, Dah-an Ho, Ying-kuei Huang, Cheng-hwa Tsang and Chiu-yu Tseng, eds *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*. Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 4, 727–791. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- 1995b. Some current issues in Austronesian linguistics. In Darrell Tryon, ed. *Comparative Austronesian dictionary: an introduction to Austronesian studies. Part 1: Fascicle 1*, 45–120. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice marking. In Wouk and Ross, eds 2002:63–78.
- 2004. Notes on the prehistory and internal subgrouping of Malayic. In John Bowden and Nikolaus Himmelmann, eds *Papers in Austronesian subgrouping and dialectology*, 97–109. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- 2006. The argument structure of undergoer voice clauses in Formosan and other Philippine type languages. MS. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies and Centre for Research on Language Change, The Australian National University.
- Schachter, Paul and Fe T. Otnes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Scheerer, Otto. 1924. On the essential difference between the verbs of the European and the Philippine languages. *Philippine Journal of Education* 7:1–10.

- Starosta, S. Pawley, A. and Reid L. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In Amran Halim, Lois Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds *Papers from TICAL*, vol.2, 201–216. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Tjia, Johnny. 2007. A grammar of Mualang, an Ibanic Language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia. PhD thesis, University of Leiden. LOT Publications.
- Tuuk, H. N. van der. 1864-1867. *Tobasche Sprachkunst*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Muller.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal Inflection in Proto-Austronesian. In A.B. Gonzalez, ed. *Parangal Kay Cecilio Lopez*, 71–91. Quezon City: Philippine Journal of Linguistics (Special monograph 4).
- 1996. The development of the passive verb with pronominal prefix in Western Austronesian languages. In Bernd Nothofer, ed. *Reconstruction, classification, description – festschrift in honor of Isidore Dyen*, (Asia-Pacific 3), 15–40. Hamburg: Abera.
- Woollams, Geoff. 2005. Karo Batak. In Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds 2005:534–561.
- Wouk, Faye and Malcolm Ross, eds. 2002. *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Wu, Jing-lan Joy. 2006. Verb classification, case marking, and grammatical relations in Amis. PhD thesis, University of Buffalo, New York.
- Yamada, Yukihiro and Shigeru Tsuchida. 1975. *Philippine languages, Asian and African grammatical manual No. 15b*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Zobel, Erik. 2002. The position of Chamorro and Palauan in the Austronesian family tree: evidence from verb morphosyntax. In Wouk and Ross, eds 2002:405–436.