PERSON MARKING AND GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS IN SULAWESI

NIKOLAUS P. HIMMELMANN

1. INTRODUCTION

In Sulawesi a large variety of systems of grammatical relations is said to exist: northern languages (e.g. the Minahassan and Sangiric groups) have a Philippine-type 'focus'[1] marking (see Sneddon 1975); South Sulawesi languages such as Bugis and Makasar exhibit 'ergative'[2] traits (see Friberg 1991); and south-eastern Muna has a very complex subject-inflection on the verb (see van den Berg 1989). Since these different types are all contiguous to each other geographically one might wonder whether there are any transitional types and what the interrelation between the different systems might be.

In this paper I present data from three Central Sulawesi languages, two of which, Totoli and Da'a, may be analysed in terms of a 'focus-system', the third, Uma, showing 'ergative' traits. As for genetic affiliation, Uma and Da'a belong to the Kaili-Pamona group, and Totoli to the Tomini-Tolitoli group. The Kaili-Pamona and the Tomini-Tolitoli groups are definitely related to each other, but it has not yet been established whether they form a higher-order subgroup within Western Malayo-Polynesian (WMP). Data on Uma and Da'a are from Michael Martens and Don Barr, respectively (see references); the presentation also closely follows their analysis. The data on Totoli are my own.

An attempt is made to show how the devices used in establishing grammatical relations found in these three languages are related to each other. Particular attention is given to prefixed pronominal forms, since, as will be seen, so-called 'ergativity' in Sulawesi is intimately linked to these prefixes.

My approach is based on the concepts of grammaticalisation theory (compare, for example, Lehmann (1982), Bybee & Dahl (1989), Traugott & Heine, eds (1991)). This includes the hypothesis that the notion of a *system* of grammatical relations is only of limited use and that it might be preferable to conceive of grammatical relations as being brought about by grammatical formatives (*grams* in the terminology of Bybee and associates) which

---

[1]   For lack of a widely accepted alternative, I continue to use this term despite the fact that it is quite generally agreed upon that the term 'focus' is a misnomer. In general linguistics it is used to refer to the pragmatic phenomenon of highlighting new or contrastive information. 'Focus' affixes in Philippine languages do not have such a highlighting function. For further comments, see Appendix 1.

[2]   I am also somewhat reluctant to use the term 'ergative'. This is due to the fact that in the last decade an inflationary use has been made of this term, so that it can no longer be assumed that it has an unequivocal and specific meaning apart from the technical definition it might be given within a particular framework. I prefer defining 'ergative' as a nominal case-form (i.e. the case-form of the ACTOR in a transitive event). Nevertheless, I will also have to use the term in its broader and vaguer sense in order to discuss the issues addressed in the literature.

---

are relatively independent of each other. The present paper both exemplifies and expands upon this approach, the question of grammatical relations being hitherto neglected within grammaticalisation research.

In §2 the Uma state of affairs (to avoid the term 'system') is presented, with particular emphasis on the fact that Uma exhibits both person marking and vestiges of 'focus' marking. In §3 some of the theoretical issues involved in labelling the Uma state of affairs 'ergative' are addressed and the hypothesis is advanced that 'ergativity' in Uma is a transitional phenomenon caused by the interaction of person marking and 'focus' marking grams. To support this hypothesis, data from Totoli and Da'a, both of which display incipient stages of person marking, is presented in §4. An attempt is made to show that Totoli, Da'a and Uma represent different stages in the rise of person marking in Austronesian languages, and that the Uma state of affairs is best understood from this perspective. To fully corroborate the hypothesis it would be necessary to present a typology and history of person marking in the Austronesian family. This is very briefly hinted at in the last section.

Throughout the paper Aceh and Manam are referred to as prototypical representatives of Austronesian person marking languages. No data is presented from these languages, however, since it is assumed that they are both fairly well known and easily accessible through the excellent grammars by Lichtenberk (1983) and Durie (1985). Furthermore, a basic familiarity with Tagalog is presumed which is referred to as a representative of a 'focus' marking language.

2. 'ERGATIVITY' IN UMA

Let us first take a look at Uma. Table I shows the four series of pronouns found in Uma (see Martens 1988a:169):[3]

TABLE 1: UMA PRONOUNS

	Clitic	Non-topic actor	Possessive	Independent
1SG	-a	ku-	-ku	aku'
2SG	-ko	nu-	-nu/-mu	iko
3SG	-i	na-	-na	hi'a
1PL.INCL	-ta	ta-	-ta	kita'
1PL.EXCL	-kai/kami	ki-	-kai/kami	kai'/kami'
2PL	-koi/komi	ni-	-ni/-mi	koi'/komi'
3PL	-ra	ra-	-ra	hira'

Table 2 shows how the core grammatical relations are marked on the predicate (see Martens 1988a:175):

TABLE 2: UMA BASIC VERB TYPES

INTRANS	mo-/Ø	Stem	clitic pronoun (=S)
TRANS₁	non-topic actor prefix	Stem	clitic pronoun (=P)
TRANS₂	mpo-[4]/N-	Stem	clitic pronoun (=A or P)

As can readily be seen, two of the pronominal series play an essential part in the paradigm. The grammatical function of full noun phrases (NPs) is not marked by any particles

---

3   For list of abbreviations used in this paper see Appendix 2.
4   More precisely, as stated by Martens (1988a:175), this is N- ACTOR-'focus' + po- TRANSITIVE.

whatsoever within the NP (i.e. there are no equivalents to Tagalog *ang/ng* or Samoan case markers), nor is word order used to indicate grammatical relations. Thus, the verbal affixes are the major elements in establishing grammatical relations. Intransitive predicates take a prefix and the single central participant is marked by the (post-)clitic pronoun, as in (1):

(1)   *Mo-keno-a.*
        INT-run-1SG
        I am running.

With transitive predicates, the ACTOR is marked by a pronominal prefix, while the UNDERGOER is marked by the postclitic pronoun, as in (2):

(2)   *Na-weba'-a.*
        3SG-hit-1SG
        He hits me.

The prefixes are person markers, that is, they may cross-reference or index (see Lichtenberk 1983:107) an argument co-occurring in the same clause, while the postclitics do not co-occur with a full NP:

(3)   *Ku-koni' loka'-na.*
        1SG-eat   banana-3SG.POSS
        I eat her/his bananas.

(4)   *Na-manyu   tobine-na   pae toe.*
        3SG-pound woman-3SG.POSS rice DEM
        His wife pounded the rice.

In (4) *na-* is coreferential with *tobinena*, while both *loka'na* in (3) and *pae toe* in (4) are not cross-referenced with the verb. This, by the way, is one major difference between Uma and South Sulawesi 'ergative' languages, which are otherwise very similar. In the following example from Konjo (see Friberg 1991) the postclitic *-i* cross-references *asunna*:

KONJO   (1)   *Kupeppe'i   asunna   Puang   Baco.*
                  ku-peppe'-i   asu-na   Puang   Baco
                  1SG-hit-3SG dog-3SG.POSS title   Baco
                  I hit Mr Baco's dog.

The distribution of postclitic and prefixed pronominal forms is the same as that of absolutive and ergative case-forms in morphologically ergative languages. In terms of the grammatical relations hierarchy (cf. Comrie 1989; Croft 1990), postclitics mark the S and P functions, while the prefixes are used for transitive ACTORs only (A-function). Is Uma then an 'ergative' language?

The second transitive construction (TRANS$_2$ in Table 2) is somewhat difficult to account for with respect to the hypothesis that Uma is an 'ergative' language. In this construction a (non-pronominal) prefix marks the fact that an ACTOR is involved in the event, quite similar to what is called ACTOR-'focus' (ACF) in Philippine languages. Example (5) illustrates this construction along with its alternative which contains a pronominal prefix. Note that in (5a) there is no pronominal marker on the predicate; in (5b) the ACTOR-NP (*Ntinapu*) is optional:

(5) a.   *Ntinapu mpo-wangu tomi-na   hi Bulu'.*
           Ntinapu ACF-build   house-3SG.POSS at Bulu'
           Ntinapu built his house at Bulu'.

     b.   *Na-wangu (Ntinapu) tomi-na   hi Bulu'.*
           3SG-build (Ntinapu) house-3SG.POSS at Bulu'
           Ntinapu built his house at Bulu'.

The ACF construction is used in backgrounding clauses (cf. Martens 1988a:251ff.) as well as in subordinate constituents, for example, relative clauses and verbal complements. Thus, it is both formally and functionally very similar to the Philippine ACF construction.

There is, however, evidence to support the claim that it is no longer a 'true' ACF construction. Postclitics may be used with ACF predicates, but their syntactic role is not fixed. They may denote ACTORs or UNDERGOERs:

(6)   *Hema to   mpo-weba'-ko?*
       who REL   ACF-hit-2SG
       Who hit you?

(7)   *Mpo-hilo-i   romeha' sakaea.*
       ACF-see-3SG   two   boat
       He saw two boats.

In (6) the clitic (*-ko*) marks an UNDERGOER, in (7) the clitic (*-i*) marks an ACTOR. Example (7) is restricted to contexts where the UNDERGOER is specific, but indefinite.[5] Example (6) provides evidence against a 'focus' analysis in that a topic pronoun in a 'true' ACF construction cannot denote anything but an ACTOR (one would expect some oblique form to be used for the UNDERGOER). That the postclitic may refer to an UNDERGOER is probably due to the fact that in Uma postclitics generally denote absolutive. Thus, in (6) two 'systems' seem to be mixed: the prefix belongs to a 'focus' system and the suffix to an ergative-absolutive one.

In Konjo, a 'dialect' of Makasar, the two constructions exemplified in (6) and (7) have been further differentiated (that is, grammaticalised). A Konjo verb may be prefixed with *ang₁-* (triggers nasal substitution) which then optionally takes postclitics for ACTORs, no definite UNDERGOER being allowed. Friberg (1991) calls this 'Actor Focus Transitive':

KONJO   (2)   *Angnganrei   Baco loka.*
              ang-kanre-i   Baco loka
              ACF-eat-3SG   Baco banana
              Baco eats bananas.

Another prefix, *ang₂-* (not triggering nasal substitution), which Friberg calls 'Goal Focus Transitive', takes the postclitic for UNDERGOERs, which are usually definite:

KONJO   (3)   *Nakke angkanrei   lokanna.*
              Nakke ang-kanre-i   loka-na
              1SG   UGF-eat-3SG   banana-3SG.POSS
              I eat his banana.

---

5   Non-specific UNDERGOERs are usually incorporated into the predicate expression, for example:
     Ng-koni' loka'-a.
     ACF-eat   banana-1SG
     I am eating bananas.

Martens (1988a-c) demonstrates that both an 'ergative' analysis and a 'focus' analysis are possible for Uma transitive constructions. According to the 'focus' analysis, TRANS$_1$ is called *transitive goal-focus* and TRANS$_2$ *transitive actor-focus*. In an 'ergative' analysis, TRANS$_2$ constructions would be analysed as antipassives. Both analyses have their drawbacks.

With an 'ergative' analysis, the antipassive solution is problematic, since the UNDERGOER (P) is not marked as an oblique participant (which is especially awkward in examples such as (6) where it is definite and specific).

The 'focus' analysis, on the other hand, remains silent about the important differences to the Philippine-type 'focus' marking. In this type of marking the category of person does not play a role, but 'focus' marking is intimately linked to modal distinctions (REALIS/IRREALIS). In Uma, the category of person is of central importance and modal distinctions do not play a role. Philippine-type NPs are marked by particles, Uma NPs are unmarked. While in Philippine-type languages the non-topic actor clitics[6] are identical to the possessive clitics, in Uma the two series are differentiated by their position. The Uma pronominal prefixes allow us to clearly establish a class of transitive verbs, a category which is difficult, if not impossible, to define in languages such as Tagalog. Nevertheless, there is a certain similarity between these languages, and what we need is an analyis that accounts for both the similarities and the differences.

3. GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS AND GRAMMATICAL FORMATIVES

Many more fundamental issues are involved in trying to account for the Uma facts in terms of *systems* of grammatical relations. To mention just one: in recent years it has been claimed that Philippine-type languages are 'ergative' (both from a discourse point of view as well as within the relational grammar framework (compare the contributions in McGinn (1988)). According to this view, the differences should be considered minor ones of surface forms. Uma could be considered just as much an 'ergative' language as any Philippine language, with some idiosyncracies regarding the position and function of pronominal clitics/affixes. But then, as hinted at above, if the term 'ergative' is used in such a broad fashion one may doubt whether it tells us anything except that a language so characterised is different from English in some way.

To put the question in a more typological perspective: is it useful to call Samoan, Tagalog and Uma 'ergative', when they do not have many surface phenomena in common? I myself cannot detect many similarities between Uma and Samoan, which should be the case if they were both 'ergative'. In Samoan an ergative case marker (*e*) exists, but in Uma there is no trace of case marking for core participants whatsoever. Furthermore, Samoan does not exhibit a single trace of Philippine-type 'focus' marking, but in contrast to Uma does exhibit a very prominent, albeit 'mysterious', transitive suffix (see Mosel 1985:62ff.). No pronominal postclitics exist in Samoan, and the series of pronominal proclitics differs substantially in both form and function from the Uma pronominal prefixes. Thus, to call both Samoan and Uma 'ergative' is to gloss over substantial differences; in particular, the central role played by pronominal prefixes and clitics in Uma would remain unaccounted for.

---

6   Compare the Tagalog *ng*-forms (= possessive/non-topic actor):
     ko, mo, niya, nita, natin, namin, ninyo, nila.

Uma seems to be much more similar to a language such as Aceh in that it does not have NP markers (for core participants) and in its extensive use of pronominal clitics/affixes. For the same reason there is a certain degree of similarity with Melanesian languages, such as Manam. A possible objection to this kind of reasoning might be: the fact that Uma, Aceh and Manam share a lack of NP markers and extensive use of pronominal clitics/affixes is of no particular importance, since the use of the pronouns follows three different 'systems' (Uma is 'ergative', Aceh 'active' (see Durie 1987), and Manam 'accusative'). But such an objection implies a fundamental difference between these languages and obscures the fact that since the three 'systems' are 'realised' in these languages in the same way (i.e. by prenominal affixes/clitics), it is fairly easy to conceive of transitions between them: in order to get from the Uma to the Aceh state of affairs, the use of the pronominal prefixes has to be expanded to cover all ACTORs, which in turn would have repercussions for the use of the clitics and the TRANS$_2$ prefix. The transition from Uma to Manam would consist in expanding the use of the pronominal prefixes to cover intransitive subjects (the S-function), and restricting the use of the clitics to transitive UNDERGOERs (the P-function). It is much more complex to conceive of a possible transition between Uma and Samoan given the differences mentioned above. It is in this sense that I would hold that Uma is much more similar to Aceh and Manam than to an 'ergative' language such as Samoan.

This notion of (typological) similarity with respect to grammatical relations is, of course, not the standard one. It is based on the following hypothesis: instead of dealing with grammatical relations in terms of overall systems, it seems more useful to treat them in more local and surface oriented terms, that is, to start with the grammatical formatives involved.[7] As for Austronesian languages, at least the following basic classes of grammatical formatives involved in establishing grammatical relations exist:

a)   transitivity related (that is, applicative) suffixes on the predicate expression (*-i, *-aken);

b)   affixes which are 'focus'/voice related ('focus' in turn being closely related to modal distinctions (REALIS/IRREALIS));

c)   pronominal affixes and clitics on the predicate expression, such as the Uma prefixes and clitics;

d)   NP markers (or case-forms, if you prefer to call them that); here one may further differentiate between NP markers clearly denoting semantic roles, such as the various locative and directional markers attested in many Austronesian languages, or the ergative marker e in Samoan and those which are not clearly affiliated with one particular semantic role, such as Tagalog ang and ng;

e)   auxiliaries/particles in pre-predicate position expressing tense-aspect-mood, negation, etc., as widely attested in Oceanic languages.

All but class (c) (pronominal affixes and clitics) have been claimed to reflect features of Proto Austronesian morphosyntax (cf. Dahl 1976; Foley 1976; Wolff 1980; Starosta, Pawley & Reid 1982). Therefore, I think, most researchers will agree that these are the major features with respect to which there is variation in morphosyntax across the Austronesian family.

---

7   Compare van Valin (1981) who already pointed out that languages exhibiting ergative traits have no system of grammatical relations in common.

Instead of assuming that the interaction of these grammatical formatives is governed by some coherent (underlying) system, it seems more appropriate to treat them as relatively independent and meaningful elements and to make it an empirical task to show how these formatives interact in establishing what we are used to calling grammatical relations. Note in particular that the phrase *class of grammatical formatives* has been used here in a rather loose sense. It should also be considered an empirical task to show that a certain number of grammatical formatives having similar forms and functions in fact constitute a class (or paradigm). Recall, for example, that prepositional elements in Oceanic languages are so heterogeneous that they are not treated in any two grammars alike (see Durie 1988; Ross 1988:133ff.). In the same vein, labels such as *case marking language* or *person marking language* are simply used to indicate that in a given language prominent use is made of a class of grammatical formatives of the kind indicated. They do not entail the claim that two languages with the same label are necessarily similar in any other respect (that is, *person marking languages* do not constitute a holistic type). Typologically interesting similarity depends on the degree to which a certain class of formatives is grammaticalised and on the kinds of formatives it interacts with. Whether there is any such interaction on a typologically relevant level at all is also an empirical issue (person marking does not necessarily exclude case marking and vice versa). As an example, note that Uma and South Sulawesi languages are not unique in displaying ergative traits with respect to person marking only (i.e. core NPs are not case marked). Mayan languages are very similar to Sulawesi languages in this regard (see Martens 1988b:270f.). Both groups also exhibit verbal affixes signalling passive[8] – an unusual fact for 'ergative' languages. Whether this is merely accidental or points to some deeper typological similarity remains to be investigated.[9]

Applying this approach to the present investigation of the pronominal prefixes in Uma we may state the following:

1) The series of pronominal prefixes in Uma marks neither Goal-'focus' nor ergative case, but is first and foremost a series marking the category person on the predicate.

2) A person marker provides information about the NP to which a predicate expression is related; it represents the NP on the predicate expression.

3) A 'focus' marker changes a predicate expression in such a way that it (by itself) denotes one of its arguments (for example, it changes *eat* to *eater*, *eatery*, etc.).

4) The difference between person marking and 'focus' marking pertains to the fact that the former marks dependency relations (for example, between a verb and its core arguments), while the latter changes the orientation of an expression and is more similar to certain nominalisation strategies.[10] Thus, the presence of person markers makes Uma similar to other languages with pronominal prefixes and, at the same time, sharply distinguishes it from 'focus' marking languages.

Since, however, there are also vestiges of 'focus' marking in Uma (the TRANS$_2$ prefix), we must raise the following questions: 1) How is it possible that both 'focus' marking and person marking co-occur in the same language? 2) Why are the pronominal prefixes in Uma

---

[8]   This does not occur in Uma; for the South Sulawesi languages, see Friberg (1991).
[9]   There is possibly a substantial difference in that Mayan languages display up to four passive affixes plus an antipassive morpheme, while South Sulawesi languages only have one passive morpheme.
[10] See Appendix 1. For a brief account of the difference between person marking and case marking, see Lehmann (1988:63f.).

restricted to marking person for TRANSITIVE ACTORs only? The answers to these two questions are interconnected.

There is, I hold, a morphological explanation for the supposedly 'ergative' character of the Uma prefixes (and this is also valid for personal prefixes in South Sulawesi languages and in various other WMP languages). That is, the 'ergative' character is due to the interaction with 'focus' prefixes. It is the slot that they occupy in the present prefix paradigm of Uma verbs that 'limits' them to expressing TRANSITIVE ACTORs (more precisely, ACTORs in highly transitive, foregrounded events). And it is the basic make-up of the prefix paradigm in Uma that makes Uma similar to 'focus' marking languages.

How can this claim be corroborated? One piece of evidence would be variation with respect to the pronominal prefixes, which shows that they are not restricted to expressing a TRANSITIVE ACTOR. This is not the case in Uma, but such variation occurs in the otherwise very similar South Sulawesi languages. Friberg (1991, §5) shows that in these languages a pronominal prefix (instead of the expected postclitic) has to be used with *intransitive* verbs, in case they are preceded by a negation marker or temporal/location adverbials. Compare the following example from Bugis:

BUGIS   a.   *Lao-ka'.*
              go-1SG
              I go.

         b.   *De'   u-lao.*
              NEG 1SG-go
              I don't go.

This clearly shows that the so-called 'ergative' prefixes are not restricted to the TRANSITIVE ACTOR function. Rather, a purely formal fact, that is, the occurrence of an element in pre-predicate position, also seems to be relevant. Note, incidentally, that this fact, together with the fact that the pronominal postclitics in South Sulawesi languages may cross-reference NPs (see the Konjo example above), is strong evidence for the claim that person marking in South Sulawesi languages is more grammaticalised than in Uma. This in turn shows that the hypothesised transition from Uma to the Manam state of affairs hinted at above is not purely speculative.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to further corroborate the claim with synchronic data from Uma, since here no variation with respect to the pronominal prefixes occurs. But the dynamics of the Uma 'system' and its transitional character become evident when we compare it with data from Totoli and Da'a. In both languages, 'focus' grams are the most important verbal affixes. Pronominal prefixes also exist, but their overall relevance is marginal due to the fact that the paradigm is not complete. They show, however, similar characteristics to the Uma prefixes. Thus, what I have to show is this:

1) There are closely related languages where pronominal prefixes displaying properties similar to the Uma prefixes occur.

2) The 'ergative' character of these prefixes is due to their interaction with the 'focus'/mood prefixes.

3) It is reasonable to assume that the Uma state of affairs evolved from this or a similar scenario.

When this comparison has been made it will become obvious that there is not much point in discussing whether or not Uma is 'ergative'. Instead one should take the Uma personal prefixes for what they are, that is, person markers that happen to be restricted to marking TRANSITIVE ACTORs.

4. STAGES OF PERSON MARKING IN TOTOLI, DA'A AND UMA

Totoli, a language spoken in northern Central Sulawesi, does not have NP markers for core relations. Word order is basically free, that is, it is governed by discourse considerations.[11] These two features are shared by Da'a and Uma. The verbal morphology can be characterised as rudimentary 'focus' marking, minimal with respect to central grammatical relations (compared to Philippine languages), but quite extensive with regard to phenomena of control, such as intentionality, ability, etc. Only the main affixes are shown in Table 3:

TABLE 3: TOTOLI 'FOCUS'/MOOD PARADIGM[12]

	REALIS	IRREALIS
STAT	nV-[13]	mV-
ACF	nVN-, nVg-/nV-	mVN-, mVg-/mV-[14]
UGF	ni-[15]	—
UGF$_i$	ni--an	-an

The use of the 'focus'/mood affixes (ACF REALIS/IRREALIS, UGF REALIS, and indirect UGF REALIS/IRREALIS) is illustrated by the following examples:

(8)   *I-mponu ia   nen-teleb-mo   dei   bbi bonto...*
        PN-turtle DEM ACF.REAL-smooth-already PREP side lake
        The turtle began to level (the ground) on the shore of the lake...

(9)   *...ma-kko   mag-ala   anak sagin.*
        ACF.IRR-go ACF.IRR-take child banana
        (They agreed) to go and get banana seedlings.

(10)   *Laus   ni-tedang-na   batang sagin   itu.*
        CONJ   REAL-climb-3SG.POSS stem   banana DEM
        At once he climbed the banana shrub.

(11)   *Laus   ni-tonga-an-na   i-mponu...*
        CONJ   REAL-ask-UGF$_i$-3SG.POSS PN-turtle
        Then he asked the turtle...

---

[11] The clause-initial position is the topic position. In verb-initial clauses, when there are two full lexical NPs following the verb (rare!), the ACTOR precedes a specific UNDERGOER. If the UNDERGOER is non-specific/generic, it follows immediately after the verb.

[12] I use the terms REALIS/IRREALIS since they are established for Philippine languages and languages in Sulawesi. Barr (1988a:78) characterises the factors involved for Da'a in the following way:
    REALIS: "Past, completed action, a state or action already existing or occurring, a characteristic which is real, existing, fact, fully actualised."
    IRREALIS: "Non-past action, hypothetical, not yet realised action or state, a characteristic not yet real, not fully actualised. In this respect irrealis shares some features of subjunctive."

[13] The basic quality of the vowel is /o/ and there is vowel harmony with non-high vowels (i.e. /e/ and /a/).

[14] mVg- is used with vowel-initial stems, while mV- is used with consonant-initial stems.

[15] The infix -*in*- as allomorph of *ni*- is extremely rare.

(12)   ...*lambot-an   anu ni-loba-ku!*
        remember-UGF$_i$ that REAL-inform-1SG.POSS
        ...remember what I told (you)!

Strictly speaking, there is no affix for UGF IRREALIS. Note that this slot in the paradigm given in Table 3 is empty. In the most common contexts for IRREALIS mood, such as imperative and embedded predicates involving an UNDERGOER as a central participant, the suffix -*i* is used:

(13)   *Mponu, turung-i (ai) aku, engan!*
        turtle help-IMP DIR 1SG buddy
        Turtle, help me, buddy!

(14)   ...*kumali ma-laus   jampang-i-ta.*
        so.that STAT-easy take.care.of-SUBJ.TR-1PL.INCL.POSS
        ...so that it (the garden) is easy for us to take care of.

But this suffix -*i* does not signal UGF IRREALIS, because:

– it is generally used in imperatives, that is, it is not limited to transitive predicates:

(15)   *Olat-i-mo   pomoo!*
        wait-IMP-already first
        Wait first (here)!

– it is also compatible with the ACF prefixes:

(16)   *Maala   kamú monurung-i   aku?*
        possible 2PL ACF.REAL.help-SUBJ.TR 1SG
        Can you help me?

– it does not signal IRREALIS, since it is compatible with the /n/-variants of the ACF prefixes:

(17)   ...*sabab na-nga-jampang-i-mo   gauan sisia itu.*
        cause ACF.REAL-PL-take.care.of-SUBJ.TR-TAM garden 3PL DEM
        ...because they took care of their gardens.

Thus, -*i* is not part of the 'focus' system and, as the last example shows, only partially fits into the REALIS/IRREALIS distinction.[16] Therefore, UGF IRREALIS is not signalled by an affix. It remains to be investigated whether it can be shown that the bare stem of a transitive predicate has an inherent UNDERGOER orientation.

Turning now to the pronouns, there are two series of pronouns, as shown in Table 4. One series consists of suffixes/postclitics marking the POSSESSOR and the ACTOR in UGF constructions, and the other consists of free forms which are used elsewhere. The examples given above illustrate their use.

---

[16] Note, incidentally, that the interaction between the 'focus' affixes and this suffix could have been taken as another example for the claim that grammatical relation marking arises from the interaction of basically independent grams.

TABLE 4: TOTOLI PRONOUNS[17]

	FREE	POSSESSOR/ACTOR
1SG	*aku/yaku*	*-ku*
2SG	*kau*	*-mu*
3SG	*isia*	*-na*
1PL.INCL	*kita*	*-ta*
1PL.EXCL	*kami*	*kami*
2PL	*kamú*	*kamú*
3PL	*sisia*	*sisia*

This should suffice as background information for our main point, namely that, in some contexts, the first person singular ACTOR is marked by the prefix *ku-* rather than by the free form or the suffix; compare example (18) with example (12):

(18)   ...*kode ingga ku-loba-an   ngalan-na.*
        only   NEG 1SG-inform-UGF$_i$ name-3SG.POSS
        ...but I won't tell (you) his name.

The relevance of this form for Totoli grammar is not central,[18] since its use is obviously limited to propositions which include a reference to the speaker. Furthermore, *ku-* is not a polite form for first person singular (*kami* or *botuon iya* 'this slave' are used instead). Thus it occurs only in informal, familiar conversations and direct speech sequences of narratives. Though this is the main characteristic of this form, there are several other properties which are of interest in the present context:

a)   being limited to first person singular it occurs in a sort of 'paradigmatic' relation with constructions involving an unprefixed form + person suffix/postclitic:

(19)   *Ingga ku-koto-i.*
        NEG 1SG-know-SUBJ.TR
        I don't know.

        Ingga koto-i-mu?
        NEG   know-SUBJ.TR-2SG.POSS
        You (singular) don't know?

---

[17]   Some of the possessive pronouns are suffixes (indicated by a hyphen), the others are identical to the free forms. The suffixes (all of which are monosyllables) cause the stress to move to the final syllable of the stem, i.e. suffixed forms receive regular penultimate stress.

[18]   Note that this construction does not seem to be simply due to interference with Indonesian, where we find a similar construction. I have the following reasons for making this claim:
   a)   it is used by speakers who do not know Indonesian;
   b)   in some of the more prominent contexts, such as negation, I have never come across a construction with a suffixed first person singular (and I have elicited the clause 'I don't know' close to 100 times all over the Tomini-Tolitoli area);
   c)   if the construction was 'borrowed' from Indonesian (or Buginese) one would expect that the second person would have been 'borrowed' too;
   d)   the Indonesian construction is not very polite and is confined to familiar conversation. Since Indonesian in the area is primarily used as the language of formal, official interaction, it is not reasonable to assume that the *ku*-construction is often used (I, at least, did not hear it - usually *kita ini* was used for referring to oneself).

> *Ingga koto-i-na.*
> NEG know-SUBJ.TR-3SG.POSS
> He doesn't know.

> *Ingga koto-i   kami.*
> NEG know-SUBJ.TR 1PL.EXCL
> We don't know.

> *Ingga koto-i   kamú?*
> NEG know-SUBJ.TR 2PL
> You don't know?

b) it is in complementary distribution with the ACF prefixes and the REALIS prefix *ni-*;

c) it is limited to transitive constructions;

d) it is compatible with both the *-an* and the *-i* suffix; compare examples (18), (19) and (20):

(20)   *...mau boko-na   ingga ku-been-an   kau.*
        though peel-3SG.POSS NEG 1SG-give-UGF$_i$ 2SG
        ...even its (the banana's) peel I won't give you.

Thus, morphologically it looks like a 'focus'/mood prefix for UGF IRREALIS. Note, however, that its distribution is not identical to that of the UGF REALIS prefix *ni-*, since it may co-occur with the suffix *-i*, a property it shares with the ACTOR prefixes.

The contexts it appears in also closely match the semantics of a UGF IRREALIS prefix. It occurs most commonly after negation (see example (19)) and modal auxiliaries:

(21)   *Kodoong ku-takol-i   buki•*[19]   *iya.*
        want   1SG-climb-SUBJ.TR mountain DEM
        I want to climb this mountain.

The UNDERGOER orientation is more difficult to show. A case in point may be the fact that it occurs after topicalised constituents:

(22)   *...dumudu ku-benji...*
        sprout   1SG-tear
        ...the sprouts I have torn out...

Note that in the example just given the action referred to has definitely taken place at the time of speaking and would thus be expected to be marked for REALIS (as in example (12)).

In the overwhelming majority of cases the *ku*-prefixed form occurs after a clause-initial element, but it may also occur in clause-initial position:

(23)   *Ku-kaan sagin-na.*
        1SG-eat   banana-3SG.POSS
        I eat his bananas.

Thus, although the ku-prefix closely matches a UGF IRREALIS prefix both formally and semantically, the correspondence is still only partial.

---

[19]   [•] marks an overlong, high-pitched vowel, overlength and pitch being an allophonic realisation of /l/ in word-final position. For a brief sketch of Totoli phonology, see Himmelmann (1991b).

The fact that there is no complete match is not surprising, if you recall that this prefix has a meaning and category of its own, that is, informal first person singular. First person singular pronouns are not inherently designated to signal either UGF IRREALIS or TRANSITIVE ACTOR.[20] Thus, the association with these meanings must be due either to the position which the prefix occupies in the 'focus'/mood paradigm or to the construction which provided the original context for preposing a first person singular pronoun.

The factors that gave rise to the prefixing of *ku-* are not yet fully understood, but the following scenario does not seem improbable. The basis for becoming part of the system at all is the fact that *ku-* occupies a formal slot that is generally unoccupied in Philippine-type 'focus'/mood paradigms. Remember that for UGF IRREALIS forms there is no prefix. Most likely, the occurrence of another element in pre-predicate position, for example, a negation marker, has been instrumental, prior postclitics then being reanalysed as preclitics (see Martens 1988a:230, fnn.4, 32). In Philippine languages clitics occur immediately after the first (full) word in the constituent they belong to (Wackernagel's position). Thus the negation marker, various auxiliaries, and adverbials which occur in pre-predicate position cause pronominal clitics to also move into pre-predicate position. Compare the following Tagalog example with (18) above:

TAGALOG   *Hindi ko   sasabi-hin   ang   pangalan niya.*
          NEG   1SG.POSS   IRR.IMPF.tell-UGF   SPEC name   3SG.POSS
          I will not tell (you) his name.

But this cannot be the only cause, since we would then expect to find prefixes for all persons and not just for first person singular. Thus, we also have to take into account other factors that might make first person singular especially prone to reanalysis. There is, on the one hand, its form, which is monosyllabic and lacks the nasal so characteristic of the other forms in the possessive series.[21] And, on the other hand, there is the special pragmatics of first person singular as a speech act participant, and one would have to investigate whether this favours a preposed position.[22] But it is not necessary to pursue this further now, since for the present discussion the important point is that there is a language where only one pronominal form is prefixed. This allows us to make the following point: although the prefix *ku-* does not totally fit the unoccupied UGF IRREALIS slot in the 'focus'/mood paradigm in Totoli, it is so closely linked to it that it cannot be analysed as totally unrelated to the

---

[20]   The association with UGF and TRANSITIVE ACTOR is a somewhat more complex issue, because in many Austronesian languages the possessive series of pronouns is also associated with the transitive actor function. Since many series of preposed pronominal forms in Sulawesi are formally closely related to the possessive/agentive series, one might argue that they are preposed possessive/agentive pronouns. In this case, the association with UGF and TRANSITIVE ACTOR would have 'existed before'. What is still important in any case is the fact that with *ku -* there is a grammatical formative exclusively associated with a transitive actor function, i.e. it no longer has the possessive function.

[21]   We do not know what the possessive series looked like at the time this reanalysis occurred. Recall that in Tagalog (cf. fn.6) and many other Philippine languages, all possessive forms except the first person singular involve a nasal. If the possessive series was similar to the one found today in Totoli, one would expect to find first person plural inclusive *-ta* to have been simultaneously reanalysed (given the assumption that the segmental make-up was instrumental in the reanalysis).

      Furthermore, since we do not know when the reanalysis occurred and what Tomini-Tolitoli languages looked like at that time we cannot exclude the possibility that *ku -* instead of being a reanalysed possessive form is a shortened form of the free form *aku*, since these also shift in Philippine languages.

[22]   To this end, one would have to make a detailed study of informal conversation, which is obviously quite difficult. The use in narratives is probably not very telling in that it is only an imitation of informal conversation.

'focus'/mood system. In this sense, the prefix occupies a slot in the 'focus'/mood paradigm. This in turn has consequences for the prefix itself, as well as for the 'focus'/mood paradigm:

(a) As for *ku-*, the place in the paradigm strengthens the association with the functions UGF IRREALIS/TRANSITIVE ACTOR, whatever the original reason may have been for putting it in pre-predicate position. Since there are prefixes for UGF REALIS and ACF, it appears to be 'morphologically' limited to the UGF IRREALIS slot.[23]

(b) The category person is generally not a part of a 'focus'/mood paradigm. To the degree a pronominal prefix becomes incorporated into the paradigm it also changes the basic make-up of the predicate expression. Person markers may cross-reference NPs, something which cannot be done by 'focus' markers (see above). Further changes may be correlated with this, for example, in the present case the fact that – as distinct from the 'true' 'focus'/mood prefixes – *ku-* is compatible with both suffixes (*-an* and *-i*).

In Totoli these consequences only appear in outline form. They are not of great importance to the overall 'system', since here the series of preposed pronominal forms is restricted to *ku-*, which in turn is severely restrained pragmatically (informal first person singular). But this only strengthens my main claim: It would be very awkward to attribute the prefixing of *ku-* to an underlying 'ergative' system, since this would considerably complicate the statement of Totoli morphosyntax which otherwise may be analysed straightforwardly in terms of 'focus' marking. It seems more reasonable to explain it in 'local' terms (i.e. factors related to its form and its pragmatic status as a device of informal reference to the speaker). Nevertheless, the TRANSITIVE ACTOR function associated with the pronominal prefixes in Uma is already present at this incipient stage. It is therefore not very difficult to see how the series of pronominal prefixes in Uma may have developed from such an initial state by completing the paradigm and specializing on one of the associated functions mentioned. That is, Totoli and Uma represent different stages in the process of the 'intrusion' of person markers into the 'focus'/mood paradigm.[24] And the presence of the other prefixes 'restricts' them to expressing TRANSITIVE ACTORs.[25]

Further evidence for the proposed development comes from Da'a, which is genetically closely linked to Uma but, with regard to the inventory of grammatical formatives, much closer to Totoli.

---

[23] This entails the hypothesis that a major factor in the association of *ku-* with the IRREALIS slot is the fact that in Totoli the principal allomorph for UGF REALIS is the prefix (*ni-*) rather than the infix (*-in-*), the latter being prevalent in the Philippine languages. In Paiwan (see §5), where the infix is the single allomorph for REALIS, the pronominal prefixes are equally common both in REALIS and IRREALIS contexts.

[24] Note that I do not claim that Totoli has preserved certain aspects of a protolanguage from which both Uma and Totoli are derived. The claim is that they represent different stages in the development of a series of pronominal prefixes which may have independently occurred in their respective ancestors.

[25] Of course, one possible objection against this account is to claim (see van den Berg, this volume) that the *ku-*prefix in Totoli, rather than presenting an incipient stage, is a leftover of a 'complete' paradigm of person markers for UGF IRREALIS. But then, the Totoli state of affairs would hold for all Tomini-Tolitoli languages investigated to date. Thus the 'leftover-scenario' would have to be defended at the subgroup level. Since, however, nobody so far has proposed to reconstruct a series of pronominal prefixes for Proto Austronesian or for WMP, I can not see how one could substantiate such a claim. On the contrary, the fact that a large amount of variation occurs with respect to pronominal prefixes in WMP (both with regard to the completeness of the paradigm and the actual forms used) makes it more probable to view pronominal prefixation as a (recent) innovation.

Table 5 presents the 'focus'/mood paradigm of Da'a (see Barr 1988a:13,19):

TABLE 5: DA'A 'FOCUS'/MOOD PARADIGM

	REALIS	IRREALIS
INT/STAT	*na-/no-/ne-*	*ma-/mo-/me-*
ACF	*naN-/noN-/neN-*	*maN-/moN-/meN-*
UGF	*ni-*	*ra-*

Examples (24) - (27) illustrate their use (see Barr 1988a:19ff.):

(24) *Na-lau-mo   ira   mpakari potomu.*
      INT.REAL-go-PERF 3PL   to   market
      They went to the market.

(25) *Aku mang-goni   loka.*
      1SG ACF.IRR-eat banana
      I eat bananas.

(26) *Ni-oli-ku   ose etu.*
      UGF.REAL-buy-1SG rice DEM
      The rice was bought by me.

(27) *Loka   etu   ma-tasa   kana ra-koni.*
      banana DEM STAT.IRR-ripe must UGF.IRR-eat
      (When) that banana is ripe it must be eaten.

As Table 6 shows, pronominal prefixes, called proclitics by Barr (1988a:39), exist in Da'a for first *and* second singular. In the related Moma dialect there are also prefixes for first and second plural (in parentheses in Table 6).[26]

TABLE 6: DA'A PRONOUNS

	Focused Phrase	Actor Proclitics	Possessive/ Actor Enclitics
1SG	*aku*	*ku-*	*-ku*
2SG	*iko*	*mu-*	*-mu*
3SG	*i'a*	--	*-na*
1PL.INCL	*kita*	*(ta-)*	*-ta*
1PL.EXCL	*kami*	-	*kami*
2PL	*komi*	*(koi-)*	*-mu/-mi*
3PL	*ira*		*ira/-ra*

The use of the proclitics is, of course, again limited to highly informal conversation and direct speech within narratives and, as the following example (see Barr 1988a:40) shows, is common in IRREALIS contexts:

(28) *Da'a ma-mala   aku mu-raga.*
      not STAT.IRR-able 1SG 2SG-chase
      You can't chase me.

---

26 According to van den Berg (this volume), Moma (Kulawi) has a complete set of pronominal prefixes.

Ma-mala   ku-raga.
STAT.IRR-able 1SG-chase
I can chase (you).

Ane da'a iko ku-raga   ma-gese   mompe we'i.
if   not 2SG 1SG-chase ACF.IRR-rub medicine like.this
If (you claim) I can't chase you rub this medicine on like this.

Thus, Da'a shows that the paradigm of personal prefixes may be completed step by step. Without being able to spell out the details,[27] I hope the data presented are sufficient to support my claim that the transition from Da'a to Uma requires expansion of the use of pronominal prefixes, rather than alteration of the system of grammatical relations, the 'ergative' trait of Uma pronominal prefixes therefore being nothing but an 'accident'. It is the position of the pronominal prefixes and, linked to their position, the interaction with the 'focus'/mood prefixes that accounts for their 'ergative' character.

'Ergativity' in Uma, then, is primarily a morphological phenomenon. Note, however, that it is not 'merely' morphological, since the 'intrusion' of pronominal affixes into the 'focus'/mood paradigm also changes the make-up of verbal expressions in these languages. The main differences between 'focus' markers and person markers have been briefly hinted at above. We may here add that the occurrence of pronominal affixes, depending on the degree to which they become obligatory, makes it necessary to distinguish between transitive and intransitive classes of verbs. There is no need to do this in a language such as Tagalog where it is hardly possible to morphosyntactically define the class of verbs (see Appendix 1). Of course, there are also many other factors that distinguish languages such as Tagalog and Uma, for example the presence of NP-markers and the REALIS/IRREALIS distinction in Tagalog. Another important difference pertains to the clitic pronouns ('Topic' in Tagalog, S/P-function in Uma) and the possessive pronouns (identical to non-topic ACTORs in Tagalog, in Uma never expressing non-topic ACTORs, but in some constructions expressing UNDERGOERs (see Martens 1988a:224ff.)). In order to fully understand the transition between Tagalog and the various person marking languages dealt with in this paper, investigations similar to the one presented here for pronominal prefixes would be required for the other grammatical formatives mentioned.

Although the interaction of pronominal prefixes with other prefixes has been at the centre of the present account, the fact should not be overlooked that there is a dynamics to the development of the pronominal prefixes that is basically independent of the other grams in pre-predicate position. There is, for example, no need to fill the empty UGF IRREALIS slot in a Philippine-type 'focus'/mood paradigm. Instead of prefixing *ku-* in Totoli, a first person singular postclitic could be used, as with the other persons. There is also no necessity to complete the pronominal prefix paradigm. If it happens in the step-by-step fashion suggested by the data from Totoli, Da'a and Uma, it must involve the pragmatics of person, a category

---

[27]   Note that in Da'a a UGF IRREALIS prefix occurs which seems to be an innovation. On the one hand, this complicates an account of the historical development in that the occurrence of this prefix has to be explained. On the other hand, however, it simplifies it, since the fact that there is a special prefix for UGF IRREALIS makes the association between pronominal prefixes and IRREALIS less strong than in Totoli, which in turn underscores their function as ACTOR prefixes.

   Note that the UGF IRREALIS marker in Da'a is identical to the third person plural prefix in Uma. In Uma this is also used as a prefix for non-specific actors; cf. Martens (1988a:182, example 73).

which is fundamentally independent of 'focus', voice, transitivity, etc.[28] The completion of the paradigm, furthermore, does not necessarily have to be done with forms from the possessive series. A prefixed *ku-* could also be interpreted as a shortened form of *aku*, and in this case the paradigm would be completed from the independent series (as exemplified by Indonesian *kau-baca*).

To sum up the discussion of Uma: Uma is a person marking language where the person markers are still squeezed into a skeleton 'focus' marking paradigm (note that mood has been lost in the process). It represents a certain stage in the grammaticalisation of person markers in an Austronesian language and it does not seem improbable to suppose that they will be further grammaticalised into subject prefixes (as in Melanesian languages) or into 'active' prefixes (as in Aceh). That is, in the same way that it was possible to link Totoli, Da'a and Uma as representatives of different stages of the intrusion of person marking into a 'focus' marking paradigm it will, I assume, be possible to find other languages which represent intermediate steps in the process of further expansion of person marking, which would then provide a grammaticalisational link of Uma with Manam or Aceh. Muna, for example, could well represent an intermediary stage between Uma and Manam (see van den Berg 1989, and this volume).

5. A BRIEF LOOK AT PREPOSED PERSON MARKING IN AUSTRONESIAN

To further support this 'prediction' and clarify the status of pronominal affixation, I am presently preparing a survey of pronominal prefixes and proclitics throughout the Austronesian family (*preposed pronominal forms* will be used hereafter to cover both prefixes and proclitics). This survey is intended to expand and revise the two major works on pronominal prefixes published thus far (Jonker 1911; Haaksma 1933), both of which concentrate on the languages of Indonesia. In the following I will briefly report some of the observations made so far. Supporting as well as contradicting evidence is more than welcome.

As is well known, there is large variation with regard to the number of preposed pronominal forms throughout the family. Central Eastern Malayo-Polynesian languages often have complete paradigms of preposed pronominal forms, though two types may be further distinguished: Central Malayo-Polynesian, South Halmahera West New Guinea and Melanesian languages usually have prefixes or even highly fused verb-initial conjugations, while Eastern Oceanic languages generally have a series of proclitics. In Formosan and Philippine languages (including Malagasy and the Philippine-type languages of Sabah and Sarawak), preposed pronominal forms do not seem to exist, an exception being Paiwanic. We find the following partial paradigm of pronominal prefixes (data from Egli 1990):

PAIWAN		after Negation/*sa*
1SG	*ku-*	*ke-*
2SG	*su-*	*su-*
1PL.INCL	*nia-*	*ne-*
1PL.EXCL	*tja-*	*tje-*
2PL	*nu-*	*nu-*

---

[28] It is for this reason that I have listed pronominal affixes as one of the basic classes of grammatical formatives in Austronesian in §3.

These prefixes may also be used for marking the possessor:

> PAIWAN   *ku-kama*   my father

Paiwan also shows that there is no intrinsic reason for the fact that pronominal prefixes may not be combined with the REALIS marker in Totoli:

> PAIWAN   *Su-k-in-an   a   vaqu.*
> 2SG-REAL-eat SPEC millet
> You have eaten millet.

Instead, this has to be due to the fact that the REALIS prefix is the main allomorph in Totoli (see fn.23).

Although complete paradigms of prefixes also occur in WMP 'border' languages such as the South and South-Eastern Sulawesi languages, the Barrier Island languages, and Aceh, the remaining WMP languages usually do not have complete paradigms of *prefixes*, but rather forms for first person singular, or first person singular and plural, or first and second person only.

The completeness of the paradigm clearly follows the *person hierarchy*, with first person ranked highest. That is, the presence of third person preposed pronominal forms implies the presence of first and second person forms, the presence of second person implies the presence of a first person.

Despite this vast amount of variation,[29] at least three generalisations seem possible:

1) Preposed pronominal forms usually denote ACTORs or NOMINATIVEs (S/A function in terms of the grammatical relations hierarchy), but never exclusively denote UNDERGOERs or ABSOLUTIVEs. Furthermore, preposed pronominal forms may express/cross-reference the POSSESSOR. This is found, for example, in Paiwanic (see above) and the languages of the Molucca and Lesser Sunda Islands.

2) The presence of a complete paradigm of pronominal *prefixes* correlates with the absence of a Philippine-type 'focus'/mood system.

3) Preposed pronominal forms are sometimes linked with modal distinctions. For example, Manam has REALIS and IRREALIS forms for subject prefixes, Muna has REALIS and IRREALIS conjugations, and the prefixed pronominal series in Palauan is called hypothetical by Josephs (1975). (DeWolf (1976) argues that they exclusively occur in subordinate constructions.)

None of these observations pertains to properties that may be considered universal characteristics of pronominal forms in general or preposed pronominal forms in particular. That is, though there are many languages where subjects are marked by prefixes, there are also many languages where they are marked by suffixes.[30] There are also some languages where personal prefixes mark objects or UNDERGOERs. Thus, the properties just mentioned represent empirical facts about Austronesian preposed pronominal forms, and it is

---

[29]   This, incidentally, points to the fact that preposed pronominal forms are relatively new innovations within the Austronesian family. As mentioned above, so far no preposed pronominal forms have been reconstructed for Proto Austronesian.

[30]   Statistically, there is a strong tendency for suffixing or postposing grams in the languages of the world (cf. Hawkins & Gilligan 1988; Hall 1988; Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1990). With regard to person marking, however, the data are still unclear (cf. Hawkins & Gilligan 1988:225, fn.4).

tempting to look for a unified account which explains both these general characteristics and the enormous variation that is encountered.

If you look at the data from Totoli again, many of the features just mentioned are associated with the prefix *ku-*. Note in particular the association with IRREALIS which we have not pursued further in this paper. Though I suspect that a similar scenario for the development of preposed pronominal forms may be adequate for other parts of the family, it does not seem reasonable to claim that it holds for the whole Austronesian family. Given the Paiwan case and present assumptions on subgrouping (see Blust 1990), it seems more likely that the prefixing of pronouns started at the subgroup level, and that different factors triggered and controlled the development.

APPENDIX 1: A NOTE ON THE SEMANTICS OF 'FOCUS'

The so-called 'focus' affixes in Philippine languages do not have a pragmatic highlighting function. Instead they are functionally similar to nominalising affixes in other languages (compare, among many others, Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1982:147f.)). To call them nominalising affixes, however, is not very revealing as long as it is not explained why in a language such as Tagalog practically all predicates appear in a 'nominalised' form. Furthermore, it is necessary to delimit more precisely the derivational process involved, since many different nominalisation strategies are found in the languages of the world. In particular, it is necessary to make a difference between the morphosyntactic and the semantic aspects pertaining to nominalisations.

As for morphosyntax, the term nominalisation implies a change with regard to the part of speech of a given item: a verb is turned into a noun and this means that the morphosyntactic properties of the word (its distribution, affixation, etc.) change. In Tagalog it is difficult to show that anything of this sort happens in 'focus' affixation, since it is not clear how nouns and verbs can be defined morphosyntactically. Is the base-form a verb? How can this be shown if it is hardly ever used without affixation? Is there any morphosyntactic slot that can be filled by verbs (or nouns) only? So far I have not been able to find a satisfactory definition for nouns and verbs in Tagalog and it seems preferable to follow Bloomfield and to call both of them full words. Thus, to call 'focus' affixes nominalising affixes seems misleading, since it cannot be shown that there are any verbs to begin with (for details, see Himmelmann (1987:72ff., 1991a)).

There is, however, a similarity to the semantic side of certain nominalising strategies. What 'focus' affixes do is to change the orientation of a given word in such a way that it may be used to refer to one of the participants involved in the state of affairs denoted by the base-form of the word. This also holds for those nominalising affixes in Indo-European languages that derive *nomina agentis*, *nomina acti* (*patientis*), *nomina loci*, *nomina instrumenti* from verbs.

Lehmann (1984:151f.), who introduced the term 'orientation' ("Ausrichtung") for this process, characterises it in the following way: There are different types of nominalisation strategies in Indo-European languages. In one of these types, resulting in *nomina actionis*, the core arguments of the former verb may still be added as adnominal modifiers, as in *Peter's employing of my brother*. Here the nominalised verb (*employing*) simply refers to a state of affairs, no orientation being implied. In another nominalisation strategy, the expression for the state of affairs is oriented towards one of the participants involved in the

process of employing and then actually denotes that participant, for example, *employer* which involves orientation towards the ACTOR (*nomina agentis*). As a result, the ACTOR-argument of the verb *employ* can no longer be added as an adnominal modifier, that is, *Peter's employer* can not mean that Peter was the agent of the employing. In order to express this (with the nominalised form), one would have to use an equational construction such as *Peter is the employer of my brother*. Note that the same construction is impossible with *nomina actionis* (*Peter is the employing of my brother*). Thus, the two nominalisation strategies differ in the way they deal with the argument slots of the underlying verb. The former basically leaves them untouched, while in the latter strategy one of the argument slots is filled by the orientational affix and can thus no longer be filled by a nominal expression.[31] Note that this difference pertains to the semantic relationality of the items involved: morphosyntactically – and this pertains to both strategies – the nominalised forms no longer have argument slots that have to be filled obligatorily. *Baking is not one of my favourite activities* is a well-formed expression, while *bakes that banana cake* is not.

Of course, there are many differences between such nominalising affixes in Indo-European languages and the Tagalog 'focus' affixes with regard to productivity and the specific semantics involved. But apart from the fundamental difference that Tagalog 'focus' affixes are not nominalising in terms of morphosyntax, the overall similarity in the function of these affixes is conspicuous. This is also shown by the fact that Tagalog clause structure can be imitated fairly well by translations involving nominalisations such as EATER, EATERY/EATING-PLACE, or 'EATEE'/THAT-EATEN (see DeWolf 1988:156ff.). For a detailed analysis of Tagalog 'focus' affixation along these lines, see Himmelmann (1987:92ff., 1991a). A similar, somewhat more formal approach to 'focus' has been proposed by Foley (1991).

APPENDIX 2: ABBREVIATIONS

ABS	absolutive	PERF	perfective
ACF	actor-'focus'	PL	plural
CONJ	conjunction	PN	proper noun
DEM	demonstrative	POSS	possessor
DIR	directional	PREP	preposition
ERG	ergative	REAL	realis
EXCL	exclusive	REL	relative
FOC	focus marker	SG	singular
IMP	imperative	SPEC	specific article
IMPF	imperfective	STAT	stative
INCL	inclusive	SUBJ	subjunctive
INT	intransitive	TAM	tense-aspect-mood
IRR	irrealis	TR	transitive
NP	noun phrase	UGF	undergoer-'focus'
NEG	negation		

---

[31]   DiSciullo and Williams (1987:40f.) call this "control of an argument by an affix".

i   indirect

S   single argument of intransitive predicate

A   ACTOR of transitive predicate

P   UNDERGOER of transitive predicate

v•   overlong vowel

REFERENCES

Baldi, Phillip, ed., 1990, *Linguistic change and reconstruction methodology*. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 45. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barlow, M. and C.A. Ferguson, eds, 1988, *Agreement in natural language: approaches, theories, descriptions*. Stanford: Center for the study of language and information.

Barr, D.F., 1988a, Da'a verbal affixes and clitics. In Steinhauer, ed. 1988:11-49.

1988b, Focus and mood in Da'a discourse. In Steinhauer, ed. 1988:77-129.

Blust, R., 1990, Summary report: linguistic change and reconstruction methodology in the Austronesian language family. In Baldi, ed. 1990:133-153.

Bybee, J.L. and Ö.C. Dahl, 1989, The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13:51-103.

Bybee, J.L., W. Pagliuca and R.D. Perkins, 1990, On the asymmetries in the affixation of grammatical material. In Croft, Denning and Kemmer, eds 1990:1-42.

Comrie, B., 1989, *Language universals and linguistic typology: syntax and morphology* (2nd edn). Oxford: Blackwell.

Croft, William, 1990, *Typology and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William, Keith Denning and Suzanne Kemmer, eds, 1990, *Studies in typology and diachrony: papers presented to Joseph H. Greenberg on his 75th birthday*. Typological Studies in Language 20. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dahl, O.C., 1976, *Proto-Austronesian* (2nd rev. edn). Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No.15. London: Curzon Press.

DeWolf, C.M., 1976, A syntactic analysis of the pronoun system of Palauan. *Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii* 8/2:101-110.

1988, Voice in Austronesian languages of Philippine type: passive, ergative, or neither? In Shibatani, ed. 1988:143-193.

DiSciullo, Anna-Maria and Edwin Williams, 1987, *On the definition of word*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Durie, M., 1985, *A grammar of Acehnese on the basis of a dialect of north Aceh. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 112. Dordrecht: Foris.

1987, Grammatical relations in Acehnese. *Studies in Language* 11:365-399.

1988, Verb serialization and 'verbal-prepositions' in Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 27:1-23.

Egli, H., 1990, *Paiwangrammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Foley, W.A., 1976, *Comparative syntax in Austronesian*. PhD dissertation, University of California (Berkeley).

1991, The lexical basis of argument structure in Western Austronesian languages. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (6ICAL), Honolulu.

Friberg, B., 1991, Ergativity, focus and verb morphology in several South Sulawesi languages. In Ray Harlow and Ross Clark, eds *VICAL 2: Western Austronesian and contact languages: papers from the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 103-130. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

Haaksma, R., 1933, *Inleiding tot de studie der vervoegde vormen in de Indonesische talen*. Leiden: Boekhandel en Drukkerij.

Halim, A., L. Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds, 1983, *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol.2: *Tracking the travellers. PL*, C-75.

Hall, C.J., 1988, Integrating diachronic and processing principles in explaining the suffixing preference. In Hawkins, ed. 1988:321-349.

Hawkins, J.A., ed., 1988, *Explaining language universals*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hawkins, J.A. and G. Gilligan, 1988, Prefixing and suffixing universals in relation to basic word order. *Lingua* 74:219-259.

Himmelmann, N.P., 1987, *Morphosyntax und Morphologie - Die Ausrichtungsaffixe im Tagalog*. München: Fink.

1991a, *The Philippine challenge to universal grammar*. Arbeitspapier Nr 15 (NF). Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

1991b, Tomini-Tolitoli sound structures. In J.N. Sneddon, ed. *Studies in Sulawesi linguistics*, Part 2. *NUSA* 33:49-70.

Jonker, J.C.G., 1911, Over de 'vervoegde' werkwoordsvormen in de Maleisch-Polynesische talen. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 65:266-333.

Josephs, L., 1975, *Palauan reference grammar*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Lehmann, C., 1982, *Thoughts on grammaticalization: a programmatic sketch*, vol.I. Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien Projekts 48. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

1984, *Der Relativsatz*. Tübingen: G. Narr.

1988, On the function of agreement. In Barlow and Ferguson, eds. 1988:55-65.

Lichtenberk, F., 1983, *A grammar of Manam*. *Oceanic Linguistics* Special Publication No.18.

Martens, M., 1988a, Focus and discourse in Uma. In Steinhauer, ed. 1988:239-256.

1988b, Focus or ergativity? Pronoun sets in Uma. In Steinhauer, ed. 1988:263-277.

1988c, Notes on Uma verbs. In Steinhauer, ed. 1988:167-237.

McGinn, Richard, ed., 1988, *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*. Athens, Ohio: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Ohio University.

Mosel, U., 1985, *Ergativity in Samoan*. Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien Projekts 61. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Naylor, P.B., ed., 1980, *Austronesian studies: papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia 15. Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Ross, M.D., 1988, *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia. PL*, C-98.

Shibatani, M., ed., 1988, *Passive and voice*. Typological Studies in Language 16. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sneddon, J.N., 1975, *Tondano phonology and grammar. PL*, B-38.

Starosta, S., A. Pawley and L.A. Reid, 1982, The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In Halim, Carrington and Wurm, eds 1982:145-170.

Steinhauer, H., ed., 1988, *Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics* No.4. *PL*, A-79.

Traugott, E.C. and B. Heine, eds, 1991, *Approaches to grammaticalization*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

van den Berg, R., 1989, *A grammar of the Muna language*. Dordrecht: Foris.

van Valin, R., 1981, Grammatical relations in ergative languages. *Studies in Language* 5:361-394.

Wolff, J.U., 1980, Verbal morphology and verbal sentences in Proto-Austronesian. In Naylor, ed. 1980:153-167.