

# Root classes from PMP to South Sulawesi

ICAL 12, Bali

Daniel Kaufman  
ELA/Columbia University

July 2, 2012

## 1 Root types and transitivity

- It is nearly impossible to define coherent valency classes for roots in Philippine languages.
- Foley (1998) argues that Tagalog type roots have no argument structure, but rather, argument structure is added by voice morphology.
- While this position cannot extend to property-denoting roots (Kaufman, 2012), it appears roughly correct for event-denoting roots.
- There are few constraints on what can take actor voice <AV>, patient voice *-in*, locative voice *-an* and conveyance voice *i-* in Tagalog.
- (Standard) Indonesian differs here in following the more expected pattern of monovalent predicates projecting intransitive argument structure.

| Root    | Tagalog  | Indonesian |
|---------|----------|------------|
| √PIG    | babúy-in | *di-babi   |
| √HOUSE  | baháy-in | *di-rumah  |
| √RAIN   | ulan-in  | *di-hujan  |
| √ROCK   | batu-hin | *di-batu   |
| √PERSON | taú-hin  | *di-orang  |
| √HAND   | kamay-in | *di-tangan |

Table 1: Entity-denoting roots with PATIENT VOICE *-in/di-*

- Crucially, a priori monovalent predicates can take “transitive” PATIENT VOICE morphology without prior causitivation or applicativization in Tagalog *so long as the event can be conceived of with an affected patient*.
- Affectedness, not predetermined valency, is the key to Tagalog PATIENT VOICE.
- In cases where there is no conceivable affected patient, Tagalog and Indonesian agree with each other in disallowing PATIENT VOICE.

| Root   | Tagalog                           | Indonesian                 |
|--------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| √SIT   | *upu-in (upu-an, pa-upu-in)       | *di-duduk (di-duduk-kan)   |
| √STAND | *tayu-in (pa-tayu-in)             | *di-diri (di-diri-kan)     |
| √LAUGH | *tawa-hin (tawa-nan, pa-tawa-hin) | *di-ketawa (di-ketawa-kan) |

Table 2: Monovalent event-denoting roots with PATIENT VOICE *-in/di-*

- The general picture of voice freedom in Tagalog (and Phil-type languages) can be seen in the following table.

| Root                | ACTOR VOICE                                     | PATIENT VOICE                    | LOCATIVE VOICE                | CONVEYANCE VOICE                  |
|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| √TÚLOG<br>[[sleep]] | t<um>úlog/ma-túlog<br>X to sleep (purposefully) | tulúg-in<br>to knock out X       | tulúg-an<br>to sleep on X     | i-túlog<br>to sleep through/for X |
| √TÁWA<br>[[laugh]]  | t<um>áwa<br>X to laugh                          | *tawá-hin                        | tawá-nan<br>to laugh at X     | i-táwa<br>to laugh about X        |
| √LÁKAD<br>[[walk]]  | l<um>ákad<br>X to walk                          | lakár-in<br>to walk a distance X | lakár-an<br>to walk on X      | i-lákad<br>to walk X (to)         |
| √PATAY<br>[[kill]]  | p<um>atay<br>X to kill                          | patay-in<br>to kill X            | patay-an<br>to kill X of s.t. | i-patay<br>to kill for/with X     |
| √BIGAY<br>[[give]]  | b<um>igay<br>X to give out                      | *bigay-in                        | bigy-an<br>to give to X       | i-bigay<br>to give X              |

Table 3: Tagalog valency

- Kaufman (2009) suggests that this lack of underlying argument structure is a function of underlying nominalism.
- As per Foley, the burden of projecting argument structure is thus largely on the shoulders of voice morphology in Philippine languages.
- Two major morphological cues for nominalism in the Philippines is (i) the total morphological syncretism between non-ACTOR VOICE agents and possessors, (ii) the complete symmetry between ordinary modification and relativization via the “linker”.
  - The ubiquitous Tagalog linker
    - (1) 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 loss of the linker south of Indonesia (sources: Akamine 2005, Clyne 2005, Woolams 2005).

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| (2) <i>Manuk Mangkaw</i><br>lansa heyā<br>boat large<br>'large boat' | (3) <i>Belait</i><br>berejin ma'ang<br>durian red<br>'red durian' | (4) <i>Karo Batak</i><br>telu wari<br>three day<br>'three days' |
|--|---|---|

– Ordinary modification versus “relativization”

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (5) <i>Tagalog</i><br>a. ang malaki=ng aso<br>NOM big=LNK dog<br>'the big dog'<br>b. ang=na-kita=ko=ng aso<br>NOM=NVL.PRF.PV-see=1S.GEN=LNK dog<br>'the dog I see' | (6) <i>Indonesian</i><br>a. anjing besar itu<br>dog big that<br>'that big dog'<br>b. anjing *(yang) ku=lihat<br>dog RELT 1s=see<br>'the dog that I see' |
|--|---|

- Both of these cues become casualties of a more general process of morphological simplification (and occasional re-complexification) south of the Philippines.
- As a result, we find the natural emergence of a canonical verbal category in Indonesian languages.
- Symptoms may include...
  - **Transitive (non-ACTOR VOICE) agents versus possessors:** indistinct in the Philippines, distinguishable in most languages south of the Philippines

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (7) <i>Sa'dan Toraja</i><br>a. na-kita=na'<br>3S.ERG=see=1S.ABS<br>'S/he sees me.'<br>b. banua-ngku<br>house-1S.GEN<br>'my house' | (8) <i>Makassarese</i><br>a. na-cini=ka'<br>3S.ERG-see=1S.ABS<br>'S/he sees me.'<br>b. ballak-ku<br>house-1S.GEN<br>'my house' |
|---|--|

– **Applicativization:** the promotion of an oblique to an ACTOR VOICE object

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (9) <i>Indonesian</i><br>Aku men-ulis-kan kamu sajak<br>1S AV-write-APPL 2 poem<br>'I wrote a poem for you'                            | (10) <i>Taba</i> (Bowden, 2001, p.122)<br>Bib n=pun-ak kolay peda<br>Bib 3s=kill-APPL snake machete<br>'Bib killed the snake with a machete' |
| (11) <i>Balinese</i> (Arka, 2002)<br>Ia meli-ang Nyoman umah Balinese<br>3 AV.buy-APPL name house<br>'(S)he bought a house for Nyoman' |  |

– **Real passives:** Less transitive forms with demoted agents

- (12) *Makassarese* (Jukes, 2005, p.254)  
 Ni-kokko'=a' ri meong=ku  
 PASS-bite=1S.NOM PREP cat=1S.GEN  
 'I was bitten by my cat'
- (13) *Bima* (Arka, 2002)  
 Mbe'e ede ra-nduku ba ompu sia  
 goat that PASS-hit by grandfather 3s  
 'The goat was hit by his/her grandfather'
- (14) *Mualang* (Tjia, 2007, p.152)  
 Tu' da-kerja ulih dua iku' nsia  
 this PASS-work by two CLASS human  
 'This is done (later) by two persons.'
- (15) *Manggarai* (Arka and Kosmas, 2005)  
 Ami onggala le hia  
 1P.EXCL hit by 3s  
 'We were hit by him/her'
- (16) *Acehnese* (Durie, 1985)  
 Lôn ka geu-côm lé-gopnyan  
 1P IN 3-kiss OBL-3S  
 'I was kissed by her.'

- The innovation of a passive has real syntactic consequences. Unlike non-ACTOR VOICE agents, passive agents are introduced via a preposition phrase and PPs can be extracted:

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

- Loss of the general symmetry between bare root predicates and PATIENT VOICE predicates, as seen in Tagalog

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

## 1.1 Is apparent N>V just null conversion?

- Chung (in press) suggests a possible null conversion analysis for words such as *b<um>ahay* <AV>house, which would render the difference between Phil. languages and south of Phil. languages as relatively trivial.

- **Null conversion evidence**

- “verbal” meaning for Tagalog roots is sometimes unavailable in nominal context

(20) a. grabe ang pag-báboy niya sa kwarto ko  
grave NOM GER-pig 3S.GEN OBL room 1S.GEN  
‘His messing up of my room was terrible.’

b. grabe ang báboy niya sa kwarto ko  
grave NOM pig 3S.GEN OBL room 1S.GEN  
‘His pig in my room was terrible.’

- This could also be accounted for by blocking, i.e. the most salient meaning of *báboy* is ‘pig’ with ‘making mess’ an extension which is more easily available in [+ASPECT] contexts. This analysis would be a cop-out w/out counter-evidence.

- **Null conversion counter-evidence**

- In other cases, “verbal” meaning is retained - rendering a null analysis impossible unless the verbalizer can apply in nominal contexts as well(!)

(21) mas malakas ang bato ng bandwidth dun sa mga Net Pro  
more strong NOM rock/throw GEN bandwidth there OBL PL Net Pro  
‘The reach (lit. ‘throw/rock’) of the bandwidth is stronger there at Net Pro.’ (internet)

(22) mas malakas talaga ang bato ng flash ng mga digicam  
more strong really NOM rock/throw GEN flash GEN PL digicam  
‘the reach (lit. ‘throw/rock’) of the flash of digicams is really stronger.’ (internet)

## 2 Mamuju: a perfect ergative language

- Mamuju, a South Sulawesi language, like many other languages of Indonesia, has developed a robust category of N and V. Category can be diagnosed by such phenomenon as the future marker:

(23) a. na menjari=a? guru jao di Udayana  
FUT become=1SG.NOM teacher there PREP Udayana  
‘I will be a teacher there at Udayana.’

b. \*na guru=a? jao di Udayana  
FUT teacher=1SG.NOM there PREP Udayana

- Mamuju can be thought of as the logical “end-point” of (i) morphological simplification and (ii) the maintenance of patient primacy:

1. Transitive verbs have no dedicated voice marker but rather employ the bare stem
2. Applicative morphology increases valency instead of “refocusing” the clause on a different argument

3. The emergence of a genuine ANTIPASSIVE restricted to polyvalent stems

- What ergativists call ANTIPASSIVE in Philippine languages actually shows up on all “intransitive” predicates, including subjectless meteorological verbs.

(24) *Tagalog*  
 <um>ulan  
 <AV>rain  
 ‘It rained.’

(25) *Tagalog*  
 <um>araw  
 <AV>rain  
 ‘It rained.’

- Basic alternations:

(26) UNMARKED TRANSITIVE  
 na-kita=ko  
 3S.ERG-see=2.ABS  
 ‘S/he sees you.’

(27) <UM> MARKED INTRANSITIVE  
 k<um>ande=ko (\*bau)  
 <AV>eat=2.ABS fish  
 ‘You eat’

(28) UNMARKED INTRANSITIVE  
 tama=do=? di songi  
 enter=ALREADY=1S.ABS DIR ROOM  
 ‘I entered the room’

(29) ANTIPASSIVE  
 mang-kande=ko bau  
 ANTIPASS-eat=2.ABS fish  
 ‘You eat fish.’

- One hitch for ergativity: **double absolutes**, as in (30). BUT, these only occur with extraction of agent (similar to definite AV-object ng-phrases in Tagalog).
- As shown in (31), double absolutes without extraction are judged ungrammatical.

(30) *Duri* (Kaufman, 2008, p.23)  
 Inda=ra ng-kita=**ko**?  
 who=QM AV-see=2S.ABS  
 ‘Who saw you?’  
 Iko ng-kita=**na**?  
 2S.INDP AV-see=1S.ABS  
 ‘You saw me.’

(31) *Duri* (Kaufman, 2008, p.23)  
 a. \*?Ng-kita=**na**? iko  
 AV-see=1S.ABS 2S.INDP  
 (For, ‘I see you.’)  
 b. \*Ng-kita=**na**?=ko  
 AV-see=1S.ABS=2S.ABS  
 (For, ‘I see you.’)

- Incidentally, a very odd feature of only Mamuju and Mandar within South Sulawesi is that the absolutive clitics can share a single clause with the “clefted” absolutive. (No apparent relative clause boundary for 2P clitics.)

(32) *Mamuju* (Stromme, 1994, p.98)  
 a. Yaku’=ii man-jampangng-i  
 1S.INDP=3P.ABS AV-care.for-APPL  
 ‘I took care of them.’  
 b. Ia=a’ mang-alli-ang  
 3S.INDP=1S.ABS AV-buy-APPL  
 ‘HE bought it for me.’

- Crucially, Mamuju is rather special among Western Austronesian languages (although not necessarily Sulawesi languages) in having a morphosyntactic detransitivizing process that applies only to bivalent predicates.

- (33) a. \*man-langi  
ANTIPASS-swim  
b. mo-langi  
AV-swim  
'to swim'

|                    | √LANGOY 'swim' | √PATAY 'kill' | √ITIM 'black' |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| <um> ACTOR VOICE   | l<um>angoy     | p<um>atay     | <um>itim      |
| ma- STATIVE        | #ma-langoy     | *ma-patay     | ma-itim       |
| -in PATIENT VOICE  | languy-in      | patay-in      | *itim-in      |
| -an LOCATIVE VOICE | languy-an      | patay-an      | ?itim-an      |
| =ko 1SG.GEN        | langoy=ko      | patay-ko      | #itim=ko      |

Table 4: Tagalog word classes

|                   | √LANGI 'swim' | √PATEI 'kill' | √LOTONG 'black' |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| mo- ACTIVE        | mo-langi      | *mo-patei     | *mo-lotong      |
| ma- STATIVE       | *ma-langi     | *ma-patei     | ma-lotong       |
| mang- ANTIPASSIVE | *man-langi    | mam-patei     | *man-lotong     |
| ku- 1SG.ERG       | *ku-langi     | ku-patei      | *ku-lotong      |
| -ku 1SG.GEN       | ?langi-ku     | ?patei-ku     | *lotong-ku      |

Table 5: Mamuju word classes

## 2.1 How did *mang-* come to be ANTIPASSIVE?

- There is good evidence for the historical derivation in (34):

- (34) p<um>a<ŋ>-  
<ACTORVOICE>CAUSATIVE<DISTRIBUTIVE>-

- The proposed step in (35) is not surprising given that the object of distributive predicates in Philippine languages are never definite.

- (35) PAN/PMP \*maŋ- PLURACTIONAL AV → SSul \*maŋ- ANTIPASSIVE

- By definition, the undergoer must be dispersed in some sense.

(36) *Tagalog*  
 nang-isda ako ng tambakol  
 AV.DIST.PRF-fish 1S.NOM GEN tambakol  
 ‘I fished some tambakol.’

(37) *Tagalog*  
 \*?p<in>ang-isda ko ang tambakol  
 <PRF>PV.DIST-fish 1S.GEN NOM tambakol  
 ‘I fished the tambakol.’

## 2.2 Motivation for the development of an antipassive

- The South Sulawesi languages are strongly verb-initial and have all lost all traces of case marking (on phrasal arguments).
- Fully transitive clauses are indexed for the ergative agent, but consider what happens then in a simple intransitive clause without case marking:

(38) When eat (GEN) fish?

- The relation of the post verbal argument cannot be retrieved without additional cues.
- The textual example in (39) shows the Mamuju solution:

(39) mangapa bongi itte ampe' k<um>ande bau?  
 why/when night DEM CONJ <AV>eat fish  
 ‘What time did the fish bite last night?’

## 3 Conclusion

- This is one example of the general trend from a mixed head-marking/dependent-marking system as in Philippine and Formosan languages to a purely head-marking system as found south of the Philippines. (With exceptions of course, i.e. *Tukang Besi*, *Nias*...)
- Loss of nominal cues led to the development of canonical verbal and nominal categories.
- The loss of phrasal case marking shifted the burden of indicating grammatical categories to the verbal head.
- More than simply indicating what role ultimately maps to the subject position, this morphology gives additional information about the AV object relation.

## References

- Arka, I Wayan, and Jeladu Kosmas. 2005. Passive without passive morphology? evidence from Mangarai. In *The many voice of Austronesian systems: some new empirical studies*, ed. Wayan Arka and Malcolm Ross, 87–117. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Arka, Wayan. 2002. Voice and being core: evidence from (eastern) Indonesian languages. Paper presented at Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association 7.



- Bowden, John. 2001. *Taba: Description of a South Halmahera Language*, volume 521. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Asian Studies, ANU.
- Durie, Mark. 1985. *A Grammar of Acehnese on the basis of a dialect of North Aceh*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.
- Foley, William A. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in philippine languages. Paper presented at the 3rd LFG conference, Brisbane.
- Jukes, Anthony. 2005. Makassar. In *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus Himmelmann, 649–682. London: Routledge.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2008. South sulawesi pronominal clitics: form, function and position. *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures* 10-ICAL Pronoun Papers:13–65.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2009. Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: A tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35:1–49.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2012. Pan \*ka- and predicate classes. Presentation made at AFLA 19, Academia Sinica, Taiwan.
- Madjid, Abdul et al. 1991. *Percakapan Sehari-hari Bahasa Mamuju*. SIL + UNHAS.
- Müller-Gotama, Franz. 2001. *Sundanese*. Number 369 in Languages of the World. Muenchen: Lincom-Europa.
- Stromme, Kari. 1994. Person marking in the mamuju language. *NUSA* 91–113.
- Tjia, Johnny. 2007. A grammar of Mualang, an Ibanic language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Leiden, LOT Publications.