The Evolution of Transitive Constructions in Austronesian*

1. Introduction

Seeking to reconstruct the development of case and voice marking in simple transitive sentences from Proto-Austronesian (PAN) through the major contemporary Austronesian (AN) types, we compare a geographically representative sample of western AN languages with reconstructed Proto-Oceanic (POC).[1] The excellent work of Dahl (1973, Ch. 22) and Wolff (1973) deals with some of the same problems as we do. However, the PAN reconstructions they propose rest on evidence cited from a restricted sample of typologically rather homogeneous western AN languages. Thus, the PAN status of their reconstructions can be questioned, while the problem remains of accounting for the divergent daughter systems.

The AN comparative grammarian is favored by the large number of surviving daughter languages offering comparative testimony but handicapped by the apparently great diversity of case-marking systems among these languages, by problems in characterizing the structure of their case-marking systems, by ig-

---

* Originally published as Pawley, Andrew and Lawrence A. Reid. 1979. The evolution of transitive constructions in Austronesian. In *Austronesian studies: Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, ed. by Paz B. Naylor, 103-130. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 15. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan.

[1] This is the revisited version of a paper read at the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages in Ann Arbor on 4-5 May, 1976. The main ideas presented here developed during seminars on Proto-Oceanic Grammar (Fall 1973) and Proto-Austronesian Grammar (Spring 1974) at the University of Hawai‘i. We are particularly grateful to the other regular participants in the Proto-Austronesian seminar (Paul Geraghty, Robert Gibson, Kay Ikranagara, Renée Siracusa, Kakuko Shoji, and Pila Wilson) for their contributions; each reported on one language from our sample of western Austronesian witnesses (principally Toba Batak, Javanese, Tsou, Merina, Timugon, Wolio, Buli, Bontok, Ivatan, and Tagalog), which were compared with contemporary Oceanic languages and reconstructed Proto-Oceanic. Full details of the comparisons will appear in a monograph in preparation.

By their reactions, positive and negative, to earlier presentations, a considerable number of listeners/readers have aided in the formulation of the arguments. We are particularly indebted to Peter Lincoln for asking some of the questions which sparked off the inquiry and to Ross Clark for critical comments on a draft.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the National Science Foundation whose support (Grant BNS75-19451) enabled Pawley to undertake part of the work reported here.

norance of the first order subgroups of AN, and by the poor state of our knowledge of universals of syntactic change.

Among the various kinds of case-marking systems exhibited by the diverse members of the AN family, at least two types clearly go back a long way. Not only the general structural outlines but the grammatical morphemes of each type can be traced back, yielding reconstructions of two different proto-languages which themselves derive from a single language at some earlier point, the earlier stage presumably being PAN. The main aim of this paper is to characterize the major types of contemporary systems and to account for the differences between them.

An "Oceanic type" is attributable to POC (Pawley 1973; see also Clark 1973, 1976, Pawley 1972, Foley 1976) and in its essentials is exemplified by the languages of Fiji, Solomons, Mota and Tangoa of the New Hebrides-Banks Islands, Ulithian of the West Carolines, and Roviana of the New Georgia Islands, among other widespread members of the Oceanic subgroup. While many Oceanic languages, including the Polynesian group, have departed from the POC system of case marking, many Indonesian languages—e.g., Toba Batak of Sumatra, Malay, Wolio of Southeast Sulawesi, and Buli of Halmahera—share several of its most important features. A "Philippine type" is exemplified by all the languages of the Philippines and better-known Formosan languages, as well as by languages in two regions close to the Philippines—North Borneo and the Minahasa Peninsula, the islands between the Philippines and Sulawesi—and it is closely matched by Merina of Madagascar.[2]

Reconstruction of one or the other type as PAN will have obvious subgrouping consequences. If we assume PAN and Oceanic-type case marking, we must conclude that those languages which show a "Philippine-type" system share many innovations, placing them all in a single (say, Northern Austronesian)

---

[2] In his recent dissertation William Foley (1976) similarly perceives the historical reconciliation of Oceanic- and Philippine-type case and voice marking to be a central problem in AN comparative grammar. We have not had time here to take account of Foley's treatment of the problem, but it should be noted that his reconstructions of PAN are very different from ours—he regards POC as preserving PAN fairly faithfully and attributes the distinctive features of Philippine-type systems to later innovations. It may be an indictment of present methods of syntactic reconstruction that such different conclusions can be drawn from similar data. We think, however, that differences in the data are partly responsible for the divergence between Foley's conclusions and ours and that different subgrouping assumptions are a second factor.

subgroup. Conversely if we attribute to PAN a Philippine-type system, we must subgroup all those languages which possess the Oceanic type. The possibility of evolution from a third, and intermediate, type of system must of course be considered.

2. Oceanic- and Philippine-type Transitive Constructions

The following characterization of transitive constructions in POC and in Philippine-type languages is necessarily somewhat simplified and incomplete. Although POC as described here differs from conventional descriptions of exemplary Oceanic languages, in particular in appearing more like the Philippine type, the differences are artifacts of the descriptive method. The comparative perspective leads us to conclude that exemplary Oceanic languages are in fact closer to the Philippine type rather than the descriptions would indicate and that important structural features have been overlooked in most of the grammars.

2.1 The Oceanic Type

We list here the salient features of POC transitive constructions. (These are reflected in "exemplary" Oceanic languages of several diverse subgroups.)

1. S-V-O as the unmarked word order.[3]
2. A surface constituent "verb phrase" comprising, minimally, the verb system with its flanking affixes and particles of the following types: an embedded ("clitic") subject pronoun (marking person and number of the subject nominal) and a tense-aspect marker, both preceding the verb stem; a transitive suffix and an embedded object pronoun (marking person and number of the object nominal), both following the verb stem. Other particles—e.g., quantifiers and adverbials of direction, manner, and aspect—also occur as satellites of the verb, following the object pronouns.
3. "Transitive verb" is a well-defined category. A transitive verb is any verb which (a) carries a transitive suffix *-i or *-aki(ni) and/or (b) carries a

[3] Note, however, that a good many exemplary Oceanic languages show V-O-S as a frequent variant of S-V-O as the more common order in several, including the Fijian group. This variation applies to full noun phrases; within the "verb phrase" constituent (see (2)) the S-V-O order is invariable for incorporated pronouns, and this is true even for S-O-V languages like Motu of southeastern Papua.

pronominal suffix or clitic determining person and number of direct object. Any construction whose verb is transitive is a transitive construction. Nearly all transitive verbs exhibit both features (a) and (b).[4]

4. Subjects and direct objects are those nominals whose person and number are marked, respectively, by a preverbal and a postverbal pronominal determiner. Direct objects are marked additionally (with all but a few verbs) by the transitive suffix on the verb, which indicates the role (semantic case) relation obtaining between verb and direct object.
5. Subjects and direct objects share certain formal properties apart from oblique cases. They are unmarked, in the sense that the nominal is not introduced by a preposition or other case marker, whereas oblique cases are denoted by prepositional phrases. Subjects and objects are represented inside the verb phrase by embedded pronominal determiners (see (2)), whereas the pronominal determiners of obliques remain inside the prepositional phrase. Probably only subjects and direct objects can lose their quantifiers to the verb phrase (this is the rule in Fijian).[5]
6. There is what might be called "object focus," in a sense roughly parallel to the "(subject) focus system" of Philippine-type languages. In exemplary Oceanic languages, subject selection is restricted to the range of Fillmorean roles or cases at the top of the hierarchy: agents of agentive verbs (i.e., verbs denoting an act which creates, or has perceptible effect on, an entity discrete from the actor), performers of verbs of posture and motion, experiencers of verbs of emotion and perception, etc.,—that is,

---

[4] We might formulate (3) more tightly and assert that a transitive verb MUST carry a pronominal suffix or clitic determining definiteness and person-and-number of the direct object. Such a formulation would exclude "reciprocal verbs" (e.g., Fijian *vei-loma-ni* 'love one another'), passives (Fijian *loma-ni* in *Au sā loma-ni* 'I am loved'), and so-called "incorporated object" constructions (Fijian *Era kumu-ni ilavo* 'They are money-collecting') from the class of transitive constructions. While the latter are probably best regarded as intransitive, they are fairly good arguments for treating reciprocal and passive verbs as transitive in languages like Fijian.

[5] The rules in standard Fijian are rather complex, but, essentially, the situation is that a quantifier like *kece* 'all, every', which quantifies a subject or direct object nominal, normally occurs after the verb rather than after the nominal. Direct object outranks subject in the Quantifier shift rule, such that when both contain a quantifier the one modifying the direct object is moved into the verb phrase. Quantifiers cannot be moved off the oblique NP, however.

the cluster of roles for which the term "actor" seems appropriate because performance of the action or process is attributed to the nominal.[6] In contrast, direct object selection is freer. The direct object can be a patient, product, target, location, goal, instrument, cause, concomitant, etc. Direct objects divide into two types according to the transitive suffix which they select. The suffix *-i marks a cluster of roles of the sort typically associated with direct objects—patients and products of agentive verbs, stimuli/targets of psychological verbs—and it also marks location/goal of verbs of motion and posture. The suffix *-aki(ni), on the other hand, marks a cluster of roles which are of the "accessory" or "indirect" sort: instrument (with agentive verbs), concomitant (with posture and motion verbs), cause or concomitant (e.g., with psychological verbs), etc. The opposition might be labeled "close" vs. "remote," "direct" vs. "indirect," or "goal" vs. "accessory." Not all verbs can select either suffix, but among those that can the semantic contrast marked by *-i and *-aki(ni) is (with few exceptions) consistent. Further, given the choice of suffix, the semantic role of its direct object will be predictable from a knowledge of the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the subject and object nominals; that is, roles such as "patient," "product," "stimulus/target" and "location" are noncontrastive; similarly, there is no contrast between "cause," "instrument," "concomitant," and "beneficiary."

7. The morphemes *i and *aki (ni) also occur as prepositions introducing oblique objects. Thus, speakers had the choice of making a particular nonactor nominal a direct object or an oblique object, roughly as in English *I shot the man with a gun. / I shot the gun at a man; He stabbed the pig with his knife. / He stabbed his knife into the pig;* or *He sailed his boat over the ocean. / He sailed the ocean. / He sailed the ocean with/in his boat.* The

---

[6] We are aware that this is a problematic claim. To say, for Tagalog or English, that "performance of the action or process IS ATTRIBUTED TO" the subject nominal (which therefore denotes "actor") is, of course, to claim that speakers generalize the interpretation of the large body of clear-cut actor-action sentences (*John killed Bill*, etc.) to other sentences which have the same superficial grammatical structure (*John felt the blow, the man heard the singing, she hates jazz*). Various sorts of evidence suggest that such a generalization does occur, but here we will do no more than note the grammatical association of agents, actors, and experiencers, and suggest "actor" as a cover term.

process is more productive than in English, however, and so we can speak of "(direct) object selection" as a central feature of POC grammar.

8. Verb roots fall into two major classes: stative and active. Active verbs are derived from statives (or nouns) either by adding *-i or *-aki(ni) or by adding the causative prefix *paka- plus *-i or *-aki. These derivations are associated with a rule: SUBJECT → DIRECT OBJECT, i.e., the set of nominals which stand as subject of a stative verb is just the set which can stand as the direct object of the transitive verb derived form it, (cf. English *The door slammed. / John slammed the door*).
9. It is uncertain whether POC had a passive. Some of the exemplary Oceanic languages have a passive in which direct objects (both *-i and *-aki(ni) types) can become subjects, others do not (see Clark 1973b, who provides evidence that a reduced passive [no explicit agent allowed] is reconstructible at least as far back as Proto-Eastern Oceanic, a stage not far removed from POC and just possibly identical with it).

2.2.1 The Philippine Type

There has been considerable dispute as to the best way of describing transitive constructions in Philippine languages, these being the best-known representatives of the "Philippine-type." The following characterization is close to the currently favored descriptive mode:

1. Verb-initial word order, with V-S-O probably the most common order, but V-O-S also occurring, especially in languages like Tagalog where the object marker (Tag. *ng* [naŋ]) is identical with the genitive marker, thus causing frequent ambiguity when the V-S-O order is used.[7] However, there is a question as to whether Philippine languages have "subjects" and "direct objects" as surface grammar relations. Generally, the NP which is the primary topic, the "focused" NP in simple transitive sentences, is equated with "subject," although nontopic actor nominals

[7] Note the ambiguity in the following Tagalog sentences where subject immediately follows verb. (1) *kumagát ang áso ng bátà.* 'The dog bit the child', or 'The dog of the child bit'; (2) *Nakáin ang áso ng bátà.* 'The dog was able to be eaten by the child', or 'The dog of the child was eaten.' Although this is a possible order in Tagalog, V-O-S is preferred and removes the ambiguity with sentences having a genitive NP.

display some of the properties which we usually associate with subjects (Schachter 1976).

2. Subjects differ from other constituents in several ways. They are unmarked for case.[8] The verb, however, carries an affix, marking its role relation to the topic; this affix is usually called the "focus marker," a verb carrying such an affix is a "focused verb," the nominal whose role is marked thus is the "focused" NP, and the rules for using these affixes are the "focus system." This term is perhaps unfortunate in that it may be confused with the much broader use of "focus" to denote highlighting, foregrounding, or emphasis of a nominal, which is typically a function of secondary topicalization. In most Philippine languages all transitive verbs carry a focus or role-marking affix. The subject or focused nominal is the least dispensable NP, an obligatory (but sometimes deletable Reid 1970:129 constituent in transitive sentences.
3. "Transitive verb" is not a clearly defined category in Philippine languages, and there has been disagreement among Philippinists on this matter (Reid 1967). However, it is arguable that a transitive verb is any verb which (a) carries nonactor focus affixation, or (b) has an actor topic and an oblique nominal marked for goal case (see (6) below).
4. If we equate topic and subject, Philippine languages allow a wide array of subject. Not only actors but location, instrument, beneficiary, concomitant, etc.,—that is, virtually any role relation—can be selected as (syntactic) subject. Typically, at least four different focus affixes are distinguished, each marking a cluster of role types. Actor focus is usually marked by one of a set of affixes, the principal form being reconstructible as *-um- 'nonperfective', or *-umin- 'perfective', also combining with *paŋ- or *paR- to produce *mŋa - and maR- 'nonperfective', and *(mi)naŋ- and *(mi)naR- 'perfective'. As in Oceanic languages, actor roles include agent, actor, and experiencer. The three main nonactor focus affixes are *-an, *i-, and *-ən, the last having a variant *-ø occurring

[8] It is commonly assumed that the particle preceding primary topics in Philippine languages, e.g., Tagalog *ang,* is a (nominative) case marker, whereas the basic function of Tagalog *ang* and its counterparts is to mark definiteness. The misinterpretation stems from the fact that subjects/primary topics are usually definite.

in conjunction with the *-in- marker of perfective aspect. *-an typically marks subjects as denoting location, the place where the action takes place or the place (or person) to which it is directed or from which it emanates, and while it sometimes appears to subsume patient and dative, the term locative or directional focus covers the range fairly well. *i- typically refers to an accessory, something which is an instrument, concomitant, beneficiary, or otherwise indirectly associated with an act. Traditionally, it is called associated or instrument focus marker, but accessory focus is a convenient label for this cluster of roles. *-ən is generally called the goal focus or object focus marker. It marks the typical "direct object" type roles: patient, product, etc. (that is, entities directly affected by an act) and stimulus/target of psychological verbs.

5. If we equate nonactor-subject sentences with passives, Philippine languages generally have at least three passives, as indicated in (4). Some writers simply prefer to speak of four different kinds of focused nominals, while others distinguish "true" or "direct" passive (the *-ən or goal subject kind) from "indirect" (*-an) and "circumstantial" (*i-) passives. It is agreed that Philippine-type "actives" and "passives" are not to be related as in English, where underlying structures are assumed to have actor subjects, and nonactor nominals are promoted to subject by a transformational rule which is optional). In Philippine languages, subject selection is, first, strictly discourse-determined (Naylor 1974; Reid 1970, 1976). The general principle is that the nominal which is presupposed (or, relatively, the MOST presupposed nominal) is made the topic or subject. Second, if both an actor and a goal NP are presupposed, the goal NP is made subject. Thus, goal subjects are in this sense more basic than actor subjects.
6. When a nominal is not the subject, it is generally marked, i.e., it falls into an oblique case. Generally, there is a contrast between at least two kinds of oblique cases. Tagalog, for example, has *sa* marking location and accessory role types, and *ng* [naŋ] *(ni* before personal names) marking both goal and actor. In other languages the last two are distinguished also, e.g., Ivatan *nu* marks actor and instrument, *su* marks goal, and *du* marks location. Some writers refer to goal nominals as di-

rect objects when they are not the subject, but the category "direct object," like "transitive verb," is less clearly set off than is the case in Oceanic-type languages. A goal nominal when not subject is normally indefinite. On the other hand, an actor when not subject is normally definite. Other nonsubject NPs are interpretable as definite or indefinite.

7. Passive constructions with agents closely resemble nominalizations. ("Agent" here refers to actor when not the subject.) The same preposition marks both agent and possessor; *ni is widely reflected as a personal agent and possessive marker, with many languages having a historically complex form (e.g., Tagalog *na-ng*) or some other form (e.g., Ivatan *nu*, Ibanag *na*) before common nominals. The same distinctive set of pronouns—the so-called "genitive set"—marks both agent and possessor, in contrast to the sets for subject (actor, goal, etc.). Verb stems with focus affixes are used with great frequency as nominals, often with a tense-aspect marker retained. In some cases the "focused" form of a verb occurs only in nominalizations.
8. Stative constructions occur, paralleling the passive constructions (which are nonstative). The stative prefix is reconstructible as *ma- 'nonperfective' and *(mi)na- 'perfective'. The stative prefix combines with the nonactor focus affixes so that marking of the role of the subject is maintained. The nonperfective combinations are as follows: *ma--ø 'goal focus', *ma-i- 'associate focus', and *ma--an 'locative focus'.

3. Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian and Later Developments

3.1 Features Common to Oceanic and Philippine Types

Although the major case-marking morphemes of the Oceanic and Philippine types are not cognate, there are certain obvious likenesses suggesting a historical connection. But before attributing all the commonalities to the earlier PAN stage, we need to ask whether these are of the general kind that might easily develop independently in different languages.

Verb-object order, for example, is found in many families. Similarly, the clusterings of semantic roles into marked case forms—clusterings which are rather similar in the two types—are, with some qualifications, common enough in languages of the world. For instance, the cluster associated with the category

actor in both types is probably a near universal, while instruments, concomitants, and causes are frequently given a single case marker. More remarkable is the WAY case marking is done in the two sets of AN languages. The use of a transitive marker on the verb is not especially rare, but the use of a variety of different verbal affixes to signal contrasting role relations holding between verb and unmarked nominal is highly distinctive. Thus, we can assume that PAN had a "focus system" of this general sort, in which any one of several different non-actor roles could become an unmarked nominal (topic or subject in one type, direct object in the other), with case marking carried by the verb.

3.2 Accounting for the Differences

Our central problems, then, are in accounting for the several differences between the two types: (1) the non-cognation of the verbal and other case marking morphemes, (2) differences in the number of surface contrasts signaled by case markers, (3) differences in the details of role clusterings associated with particular case markers, (4) the fact that the focused nominal is subject or topic in the Philippine type but direct object in the Oceanic type, (5) the difference in word order, namely, position of the subject, (6) the obligatory use of pronouns to determine person and number of NP in one type (Oceanic), and (7) differences with respect to number and formation of passive constructions.

These are interrelated problems, of course. The first is critically related to most of the others. Which of the case markers, particularly the verbal affixes, are PAN and which are not? If one type has innovated, why and how? Where did the raw material come from, and how was it reshaped?

Our argument will be that most of the innovating has been done by the Oceanic type, i.e., in the period leading up to the development of POC, and that the innovations involved the creation of new structures rather than new morphemes. The major case-marking morphemes of BOTH types are of PAN age; it is their use which has changed.

3.2.1 Case marking and voice

We find in Oceanic languages cognates of all the focus affixes of Philippine languages. In Oceanic these affixes are noun-deriving. *-an and *i- are quite

widely reflected and still productive.[9] *-ən has traces only, and must have ceased to be productive by POC times. *-in- is fully or semi-productive in several subgroups and must have been productive in POC.[10] *-um-, *maR- and *maŋ- had probably ceased to be productive in POC (except for a specialized use of *paRi- reflecting the earlier *paR-), though apparent traces remain.[11] In Oceanic languages which retain the affixes, *-an derives nouns denoting the place of an action, an object which is characteristically the place or goal of a posture, movement, etc. (POC *nopo 'stay', *nopoan 'place of staying'; PPN *nofoa 'seat'). In Nguna, derived nouns with *-ana* combine with a copula verb to form passive-like constructions (Schütz 1969). Also, *i- derives nouns denoting instrument or product of a verb of manufacture—in general, objects associated with the act named by the verb and *-in- derives abstract nouns and nouns of result in some of the languages which reflect it, a function which it also has in some Philippine languages.

The use of verb stems plus nonactor focus affixes as NOUNS is clearly PAN. The nominal uses are found throughout Philippine-type subgroups as well as in Oceanic and Toba Batak of Sumatra, and their PAN status can hardly be questioned. What is asserted here, as a more debatable proposition, is that PAN used such forms as verbs and that, in fact, they were basically verbs.[12] Given the distribution of nominal uses and given that Philippine passive constructions are suspiciously like nominalizations, differing only in that they lack a nominal article before the focused verb stem where the nominalization requires such, we might argue that the passives derive from nominalizations and that construc-

---

9 See Pawley (1972:83-84) for a partial list of languages retaining productive *-an and *i-.

10 In the languages of eastern Melanesia and Polynesia *-in- remains only as a fossil, as in PPN *tinaqe 'guts' beside *taqe 'excrement'. But it remains productive in a number of western Melanesian languages, such as Nakanai, Kuanua, and Roviana. Thus, in Kuanua we find hundreds of pairs like *mate* 'to die', *minat* 'a corpse', *mait* 'be sick', *minait* 'sickness', *ka* 'to scrape', *kina* 'any shellfish used for scraping', *kao* 'to climb', *kinao* 'climbing (n.)', *burut* 'fear', *bunurut* 'fear (n.)'.

11 See Pawley (1973:150-154) for discussion of *paRi-, a productive prefix marking a collective plural of nouns and a unified plurality of actors (usually the subject nominals) or actions, hence the misleading label "reciprocal prefix." Certain sporadic instances of *m-* for PAN *p-, *b- in Oceanic stems probably reflect a PAN morphological process in which *-um- appeared as *m-, replacing the initial labial consonant of root forms.

12 Editors' note: A different analysis of these forms is provided in Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1982)

tions corresponding to, say, ‘the sitting-place of John’ were ancestral to verbal constructions translating ‘the place sat on by John’—there being, of course, no distinction between ‘of’ and ‘by’ in Philippine languages.

In arguing the contrary case, we would suggest, first, that passive-to-nominal is the more natural direction of change. Passive verbs typically have a “nounier” syntax than active verbs (Ross 1973), presumably for semantic reasons. When nominalizations are used predicatively in passive constructions, they are generally supported by a verb “to be”; and while this is the case in, say, Nguna (and Latin), it is not so in Philippine-type languages. This is not to say that the agent marker (PAN *ni, at least before proper nouns) was not necessarily connected with the other and more central parts of the passive, namely, the use of a nonactor nominal as subject and the marking of the verb to show this.

Second, and this may turn out to be the crucial criterion, there is the matter of subgrouping. The use of *-an, *i-, and *-in-/*-ən as case markers on passive verbs, and the use of *ni as agent marker, is not confined to pure Philippine-type languages. These uses are widespread in West Indonesian languages. For example, Toba Batak of Sumatra and Merina of Madagascar (originally, no doubt, a South Borneo language), exhibits passives with most of these features (Toba Batak lacks *i-). Toba Batak, if not Merina, probably subgroups with Malay and perhaps other West Indonesian languages such as Madurese, Sundanese, and Javanese (Dyen 1965a); certainly there is no independent evidence for assigning it to a subgroup with Philippine-type languages. The protolanguage common to Toba Batak and Philippine and Formosan languages must have been PAN itself or a stage very close to it. In this connection we may note arguments by Dyen (1965b) and Dahl (1973) that Formosan languages diverged very early from the rest of AN (even including the Philippine languages). If these scholars are right in isolating Formosan as a first-order subgroup of AN, we can hardly avoid attributing a Philippine-type system of case and voice marking to PAN.

If PAN had a focus system with the full array of Philippine type verbal affixes marking actor, goal, location and accessory focus, where did POC *-i and *-aki(ni) come from, along with the associated direct object focus? There are no definite cognates in Philippine languages, though there are possible candi-

dates, such as the *-i* form for verbs marked with locative focus in some Philippine and Formosan languages.[13] On the other hand, Indonesian languages from Sumatra in the west to Halmahera in the east frequently show verbal suffixes and/or prepositions that are almost certainly cognate with POC *-i and *-aki(ni), though, *akən rather than *akin is suggested by the non-Oceanic evidence. For example, both Toba Batak and Wolio show verbal suffixes *-i* and *-hon* (TB) and *-aka* (Wolio) whose uses closely match those of POC.[14] The suffixes function, first, to derive transitive verbs from other parts of speech and, second, to indicate the role relation of the verb and its direct object. The role clusterings are similar to POC, but one difference is that Toba Batak (and, on lesser evidence, Wolio also) distinguishes three kinds of direct object role-clusters against two in POC. Crudely, the Toba Batak equations are: those roles which in Philippine-type languages cluster as goal are marked by the verb stem with no suffix (ø-marking); those which cluster as location are marked by *-i* and accessory-type roles are marked by *-hon* (van der Tuuk 1971). Thus, POC appears to have merged two earlier cases, ø and *-i*, marking both by *-i*. Wolio appears to have drifted part of the way along this path also, but the precise semantic basis of the -ø vs. *-i* contrast in Wolio is not clear from Anceaux's (1952) description.

It was noted that *i and *aki (ni) occur both as verb suffixes and as prepositions introducing oblique case nominals in POC. This double use is also found in some Indonesian languages, where *i is reflected as a (basically) locative preposition and *akən as an instrumental preposition. Thus, we can establish not only that *-i and *-aki (ni) (or *akən) is older than POC but that the double

---

[13] Wolff (1973:86-88) reconstructs *-i and *-a for PAN, as the "dependent" forms of *-an and *-ən, respectively, on the basis of their occurrence in Samar-Leyte and Atayal. In the Philippines a fair number of other languages, including Maranao, Western Bukidnon Manobo, and Inibaloi have retained reflexes of *-i and *-a. The forms are required in each of these languages in imperative sentences, e.g., Maranao *Tabasi ngka sa dinis so lamesa'an*. 'It is on the table you must cut the cloth.' (McKaughan 1958:25-26); Western Bukidnon Manobo *Ewa'i nu.* 'Get away from it.' (Elkins 1970:51-57); Inibaloi *Jet bedbechim i sedik ya ingesto.* 'And bind up my feet the same way.' (Ballard and Ballard n.d:10). Each of these languages has other constructions in which these forms must also be used. In Maranao and Western Bukidnon Manobo, the forms imply conditional, contingent, or potential activity. In Inibaloi they are used to indicate progressive aspect.

[14] Toba Batak *-hon* and Wolio *-aka* regularly reflect PAN *-kən and *-akən, respectively. The correspondences and uses are detailed in Pawley (1973:122-26, and note 18), based on van der Tuuk (1971) and Anceaux (1952).

use of these forms is also old. Just how old is uncertain, for the subgrouping relation of Oceanic and various Indonesian groups is not established.

We suggest that both *i and *akən were present in PAN, at least as prepositions. Their function as prepositions was to mark location and accessory cases, respectively, when these were not subject. Now, prepositions are often "captured" by the verb to become a suffix or clitic, the necessary precondition being that the prepositional phrase immediately follow the verb. These conditions were probably met in PAN, as they are in contemporary Philippine languages and in Toba Batak. Such a capturing need not mean the end of their life as separable prepositions—the double use of *i and *akən has persisted widely in both Oceanic and Indonesian languages—though it frequently means a split into two distinct syntactic functions. The hypothesis is that in PAN itself, or in a slightly later stage ancestral to Oceanic and West Indonesian languages, there was an alternation between active sentences with structure:

(1) V S $\begin{bmatrix} i & \text{LOCATION} \\ akən & \text{ACCESSORY} \end{bmatrix}$

and (originally) synonymous counterparts with the structures:

(2) V $\begin{bmatrix} i & \text{LOCATION} \\ akən & \text{ACCESSORY} \end{bmatrix}$ S

and (3) $\begin{bmatrix} \text{V-} & i \\ & akən \end{bmatrix}$ S $\begin{bmatrix} \text{LOCATION} \\ \text{ACCESSORY} \end{bmatrix}$

In (1) the location and accessory nominals are clearly part of prepositional phrases, the subject being the only unmarked nominal. In (2) the situation is less clear, while in (3) *i* and *akən* clearly group with the verb. In (3) there are thus two unmarked nominals, the location and accessory nominals having at least that property of direct objecthood. (We leave open the question of how goal nominals were marked at this stage. When not selected as direct object they are apparently sometimes assigned, in Toba Batak as in Oceanic, to a prepositional phrase introduced by the goal case marker, and this may have been the case in PAN or the early post-PAN stage.) A clear-cut direct object category

may have developed from these beginnings. Alternations rather similar to (1)-(3) exist in Tongan (Churchward 1953) and Niuean (William Seiter, pers. comm.).[15]

At this point it is relevant to consider the origins of the final vowel in POC *akini, which alternated with *aki or *akin.[16] This final *-i* is unexpected, having no counterpart in non-Oceanic forms of the suffix. The distribution of the alternants, however, provides the clue. The form *akini is reconstructible as occurring before pronominal objects and proper objects—in effect, whenever an overt direct object was present (since common nominals also required a pronominal determiner). The form *aki(n) occurred when the direct object was not overt, e.g., in "reciprocal" constructions, where object was combined with subject, and in passives (at least in exemplary Oceanic languages that have passives), where the object is promoted to subject position. Note that in Philippine languages there is a personal article *si which occurs before pronouns standing

---

[15] See, for example, Churchward's (1953:119-20) discussion of the uses of Tongan *'aki*. He says that the "fundamental meaning of *'aki*, when prepositional, is 'with' in an instrumental sense" (p. 120) and gives examples such as:

> *'Oku ngaohi eni 'aki 'a e mohuku.*
> ASP make this with NOM DEF grass
> 'This is made of grass.'

Then he notes that "in native usage this *'aki* is often placed immediately after a verb when its logical position appears to be after the object of the verb." For example:

> *Fō 'aki ho'ū kofú ha vai mafana mo ha koa.*
> wash with your clothes INDEF water warm and INDEF soap
> 'Wash your clothes with warm water and soap.' (alternating with placement of *'aki* after *kofú*).

> *'Oku 'ikai ngofua ke nau ui 'aki ha pōpula hano hingoa pau'u.*
> ASP not permitted that they call by INDEF prisoner a his nickname
> 'It is not permissible for them to call a prisoner by his nickname.' (alternating with placement of *'aki* after *pōpula*).

[16] The basic form of the suffix should probably be reconstructed as POC *akin. It now appears that PAN *n was retained in absolute final position in POC. PAN finals are, however, regularly lost in so-called "Eastern Oceanic" and many Western Melanesian languages giving *-aki, except when the suffix is nonfinal, as before an object pronoun. It can hardly be doubted that POC *-akin is cognate with *-aken as reflected in Toba Batak, Malay, Javanese, Wolio, etc. The irregular appearance of *-i- instead of *-o- as the reflex of the PAN central vowel *-e- in *akin can be explained simply. Pre-Oceanic developed obligatory pronominal suffixes in transitive constructions, giving the series *ákon-(i)áu, *-ákon-íko, *-ákon-ía, *-ákon-ikámi, *-ákon-ída, etc., with stresses on the penult and alternate preceding syllables. The high frequency of third singular and third plural endings *-ákonía and *-ákonída was the precondition for an assimilation of unstressed *o to *i before stressed *i, yielding *-akinia, *-akinida, *-akiniko, etc. This, the most frequent variant, was then generalized to all positions.

as subject—the so-called nominative pronouns *siyakən, *siqikaw, *siya, etc. (Reid 1979). It is probably no coincidence that it is just these pronouns which appear as objects in Oceanic languages, and which also appear as independent (not embedded) subject and topic pronouns in these languages. The Oceanic personal article is *i, and it is this which yields the final *-i* in *akini, after reanalysis of *akin-iau, *akin-iko, *akin-ia, etc. (Some Oceanic languages have gone a step further, with the resulting forms *aki-nau, *aki-niko, *aki-nia, and so forth yielding a new set of independent pronouns.)

The alignment of PAN nominative pronouns with POC direct object is matched by a similar switch with PAN nonsubject agent pronouns. The agent pronouns which occur in oblique phrases in Philippine languages are the same as possessive pronouns: *-ku, *-mu, *-ña, etc. In POC this set of pronouns marks possessor on the one hand and SUBJECT on the other (with the exception that *mu is replaced by *ko as subject). These alignments presumably reflect the reworking of the grammatical system. The focused nominal in POC was no longer the subject, but the DIRECT OBJECT; therefore the topic pronouns appear in direct object position. The use of *ku, etc., for agent continued, the distinction between subject and nonsubject agent now possibly having disappeared (if POC had passives it is likely that they were agentless passives).

To recapitulate, we postulate an early stage of AN in which *-ø, *-i, and *-akən appear as case markers suffixed to the verb in ACTIVE sentences, while *-ən, *-an, and *i- appear in the corresponding roles in PASSIVE sentences. This is not a hypothetical system; it is essentially the situation which persists in Toba Batak. Toba Batak has passives in which the verbal suffix is *-i,* and passives in *ni-/-in-*, corresponding to actives in which the suffix is zero. Toba Batak has lost *-i*, and apparently uses *-hon* for accessory focus in both active and passive, there being another device to mark the voice difference.

The next stage in the development of the Oceanic type is the loss of the PAN passives. Passive verbs survive only as nominalizations and after *ø merges with *-i; *-i and *aki(ni) remain as the only focus affixes. The way is clear for the development of new types of passives. We find passives in a good many Indonesian and Oceanic languages, and they are quite differently constructed from Philippine-type passives. Both Indonesian (Dardjowidjojo 1974) and some Oceanic languages (Clark 1973b) have a pair of passives constructed

by promoting *-i (or -ø in Indonesian) and *-akən marked direct objects to subject. More clearly than in Philippine-type systems, these passives can be derived from underlying constructions in which the subject is actor and the focused nominal is direct object. In Indonesian passive the actor may overtly occur as a prepositional phrase, but in exemplary Oceanic languages the passive is normally reduced, i.e., agentless. Some Oceanic languages lack a passive while others have a single passive, e.g., in several Micronesian languages there is a passive in which the verb is marked by a reflex of *-aki(ni); in Polynesian languages there is a passive in which the verb is marked by a reflex of *-i plus a following *-a* which probably comes from the POC stative-deriving suffix *-a; an agent is permitted in both Polynesian and Micronesian passives, but the agent markers of the two groups are not cognate.

It is noteworthy that the nominalizations of POC and many of its descendants show a contrast between actor-possessor and patient-possessor. Further, the particle marking actor-possessor (POC *na Pawley 1973, sec. 3) is probably a reflex of PAN *na, a common noun marker corresponding to the personal noun marker PAN *ni 'actor/owner'.[17] These developments are presumably related in some way (not at present understood) to changes in the marking of case and voice in transitive sentences.

We have touched on most of the discrepancies between the Oceanic- and Philippine-type systems and offered proposals concerning the sequence of innovations leading from a Philippine-like ancestral system to the Oceanic type: PAN nonactor focus ("passive") verbals persist only as nouns and the original SUBJECT-focus series of transitive constructions is lost; subject became basically equated with actor, and the original focus system continued as DIRECT OBJECT focus in active transitive sentences; new passives based on these active constructions appeared (possibly independently) in certain Indonesian and Oceanic languages; POC merges the case markers for the two role clusters location and

---

[17] Evidence for PAN *na 'common actor/owner' as distinct from PAN *ni 'personal actor/owner' comes from Philippine and Formosan languages. These particles (*na and *ni) with these meanings are reconstructible for Proto-Cordilleran in the Philippines on the basis of *na / ni* forms in Agta, Atta, Isneg, Ibanag, and Casiguran Dumagat. Gaddang has *na / i*, Inibaloi *ni / ni* and its close relative, Pangasinan *na / nen*, provide added support. Outside of Cordilleran, Tagalog *na-ng / ni*, Hiligaynon *sa-ng / ni*, and Kapampangan *ni-ng / na-ng* (with reversed meanings) are also supportive. In Formosa *na /*ni is reconstructible for Proto-Atayalic, while Kavalan of the Paiwanic subgroup also retains *na / ni*.

goal, using the location marker for *-i for both. All these developments are interrelated.

3.2.2 Pronominal determiners

The obligatory use of pronominal determiners in POC (and the emergence of a surface constituent "verb phrase," containing subject and direct object pronouns) presumably developed from an earlier situation in which prenominal determiners were optional, or obligatory only in certain contexts. One syntactic context in which many AN languages require a pronoun along with a coreferential nominal is when a basically postverbal NP is moved into preverbal position, as in relative clauses, secondary topicalization, and *wh*-questions. A pronominal "trace" must be left behind (Keenan 1972; Pawley 1975b). In POC this pronoun came to be present even in basic constructions, acting as a determiner marking definiteness, person, and number of the associated NP. Pronominal determiners may be related to the focus system in at least the following way. In Philippine-type systems the focused nominal (the topic or subject) is always presupposed and is marked as such by a definite article (e.g., Tagalog *ang*), while out-of-focus nominals other than actors are generally indefinite. In the Oceanic type, the focused nominal (direct object) must be specific, if not definite. POC had a nominal marker *na but evidently had no definite article pure-and-simple. Instead, it used pronouns to determine certain features of the noun, like definiteness, person, and number. The better-known exemplary Oceanic languages show a contrast between constructions containing a specific direct object (marked by a pronoun plus *na) and those containing a nonspecific object (unmarked and incorporated as a verb modifier into the verb phrase) (cf., Clark 1973a,b; Sugita 1973; Milner 1956). As some languages of eastern Indonesia resemble Oceanic in the use of pronominal determiners, their obligatory use, along with their incorporation in a "verb phrase," probably occurred at least a stage earlier than POC.

3.2.3 Word-order-change

Shifts in preferred position of the subject nominal appear to have happened quite often in the history of different branches of the AN family, without necessarily having any great consequences for the rest of the grammatical sys-

tem. Verb-initial word order is found in Toba Batak and Merina as well as in Philippine and Formosan languages, and we assume that it was the preferred order in PAN. However, verb-initial languages allow or require subjects to be clause-initial in some contexts, e.g., in relative clauses and secondary topicalization, so that the precondition for a change to S-V-O, namely synchronic variation between V-S and S-V order was no doubt always present. A more important (but probably related) development than the shift of subject position was the emergence, in the branch of AN leading to POC, of "subject," "direct object," and "transitive verb" as clear-cut grammatical categories. This followed the loss of subject-topic focus transitive sentences, the new equation of subject with actor in basic sentence structure, and the restriction of focus-marking to direct object. In this system the direct object nominal carries more information than the subject nominal (i.e., the range of roles which can occupy direct object position is wider), and it is therefore more important to identify it clearly. The critical word order relation, then, is that of verb to direct object. The strongly preferred position for direct object in Oceanic-type languages—e.g., in spoken Fijian S-V-O is a frequent alternant of V-O-S (Paul Geraghty, pers. comm.)—and variation in subject position appears to be common in Bugotu and Roviana. In languages of the world where subject is basically equated with actor, S-V-O is more likely to be the preferred order than V-O-S; when we understand the reasons for this tendency, we may be able to explain better the change to subject initial word in POC. It may be the result of ambiguity where actor is interpretable as possessor of the object nominal. A similar kind of ambiguity is probably the reason for the preference in Tagalog for V-O-S order over V-S-O, which was possibly the earlier order in Philippine languages.

On the matter of change in Philippine-type languages we have little to say—largely because under our hypothesis there have been few major changes. In this we are in agreement with Dahl and Wolff. One change is the replacement of *akən by some other preposition. Similarly, the PAN reconstructions allow for little change in Toba Batak, which preserves the subject focus constructions fairly completely. Just how much change has occurred in Toba Batak is uncertain, because we are unsure whether the special resemblances which Toba Batak shows to POC (e.g., in the use of *i- and *-akən) are due to common heritage from PAN, convergence (this seems likely in the case of subject focus

affixes retained only in derived nouns), or a period of common development after the break-up of PAN. At least in the case of certain eastern Indonesian languages (e.g., Buli of Halmahera), the special grammatical and lexical resemblances with Oceanic are sufficient to strongly suggest a period of common evolution continuing after PAN (see Blust 1974 for a discussion of the lexical isoglosses).

4. Generalities

The main object of this paper has been to build an evolutionary bridge between two major grammatical types, each of considerable antiquity within the AN family. While some of the planks are still missing and others are shaky, the connection has been made. At least with the major problems identified we know what kind of solution to look for.

The Austronesian material has certain interesting general implications. A full investigation of these will have to wait for another time, but we wish to mention three sorts of implications very briefly.

1. Comparative typological studies too often use terms like “subject”, “object”, “indirect object”, “S-V-O word order”, and the like, in a loose manner, uncritically assuming cross-linguistic equivalence of these terms, whereas there are obviously important differences between different languages in respect of these grammatical concepts. In some languages, “subject” and “direct object” are well-marked entities, in others only “subject”, and in still others, e.g., Philippine languages, neither subject nor direct object is a clear-cut category; rather, (as Schachter has shown for Tagalog and its congeners) the usual properties associated with subjects are distributed over two types of nominal—in this instance, the topic and the nontopic agent. In some languages, in basic sentence structure, subject-selection is restricted to actors; in ergative languages, actors are never subject, while in others a wide range of roles may become subject or enjoy subject-like treatment. In some languages, subjects are strictly discourse-determined; in others they are not. In some languages, the passive (nonactor subject transitive construction) is clearly directly related to or derivable from a corresponding active; in

others there is a passive (or a construction showing certain properties associated with passives), but it is not readily derivable from the active structure—Philippine languages again illustrate the last type, and so on. Obviously, then, a study of syntactic change which assumes the cross-linguistic equivalence of these terms is likely to oversimplify; by overlooking important structural differences, it is likely to produce illusory generalizations and miss real solutions to historical problems. In a study of change in transitive sentences, we need to look closely at the variations which individual languages play on supposedly universal or familiar themes.

2. The AN comparisons suggest that, for this family at least, we may be able to make do with fewer than the eight or ten case relations or roles posited as universals in Fillmorean case grammar. In "The Case for Case", Fillmore (1968) saw as a major goal the elucidation of the way these putative semantic-psychological primes are correlated with surface structures in different languages. With a few exceptions, linguists have hardly taken up the challenge. Austronesianists, among others, have generally avoided certain steps necessary to test the Fillmorean model. Fillmore's approach calls for a grammar to provide an explicit hypothesis about the underlying structure of sentences in the language and about the syntactic operations which map underlying structures onto surface structures. Austronesianists have usually not attempted an explicit account of underlying structure incorporating Fillmorean roles but instead have focused on the surface marking of roles, noting the range of different roles associated with each case marker. But this is only a first step. In Philippine and Oceanic languages, for example, as in many other groups, the same case form may mark a variety of different Fillmorean roles, and what is apparently the same role may in various contexts be marked by a variety of different case forms (or other case-marking devices).[18] What we need to know is the precise syntactic semantic conditions surrounding these variations.

---

[18] Some work, however, has been done in recent years on the elucidation of the relationship between case relations and case forms in various Austronesian languages utilizing Staros-

The imperfect materials now at hand on Austronesian languages indicate that certain sets of roles are noncontrastive, standing in syntactic complementary distribution or free variation. Two roles are in complementary distribution when each occurs in different grammatical environments, e.g., in Fijian, agents occur as subject of agentive verbs and experiencers occur as subjects of psychological verbs; again, instruments occur as direct objects of instrumental verbs, while concomitants and causes occur as direct objects of psychological verbs. There is no overlap; the variation is predictable, and thus one basic category (actor in one case, accessory in the other) will suffice instead of two. The differences can be "read off" the wider syntactic context, the association of particular nominals, verbs, and case markers, rather than representing an ambiguity in the role structure of particular case markers.

Or so the argument might run. Of course, role differences are still there, in the sense that speakers are still able to perceive objective differences between the functions of different entities, such as instruments and causes. What is in question is the special grammatical/semantic status of the eight or ten Fillmorean roles, as opposed to some smaller set or some larger set, in a given language. On the one hand, a smaller number of roles is formally contrasted in Philippine- and Oceanic-type grammars. On the other hand, a much larger set of roles may be postulated as universal percepts, potential perceptual discriminations, in order to account for the full range of objective functions which speakers are capable of associating with particular nominals in various contexts. Just think of the variety of "causal relations" that may be distinguished, or the many senses in which something may be a "location" or a "goal". The number of perceptually distinguishable roles or functions may be, for all practical purposes, infinitely extendable. But do perceptual categories equal categories of a language? Our problem, then, is to justify isolating a particular set (such as Fillmore's) as basic grammati-

---

ta's Lexicase model. See, for example, Li (1973), Starosta (1974), Ramos (1974), Ikranagara (1975), and de Guzman (1978).

cal/semantic categories in a particular language.[19] This problem is especially evident in those contexts where two (or more) Fillmorean cases seem to be in free variation—i.e., contexts in which two different readings can be made of the role played by a given nominal in a sentence, where the two readings are not in fact discrete but are either the extremes of a continuum or blur of types of functions—or are interpretable as referring to different situations because of our knowledge of the world rather than because of a difference in linguistic meaning. For example, *John laughed at the man* shows a blur between goal and cause in respect of the role played by *the man*, while *the net* in *The fish was caught in the net* (or *na lawa* in the Fijian equivalent *Sā coko na ika e na lawa*) is both location and instrument, and *Harry* in *John sat on Harry* is both location and experiencer (or patient). In these examples there seems to be no point in saying that there are really two sentences which happen to have the same surface form (an analysis which does make sense for, say,

---

[19] As a first principle, it seems reasonable to assume that the number of semantic distinctions in the case grammar of a particular language equals the number of grammatical categories that are formally distinguished. Thus, if a language never overtly signals a difference between two putatively universal cases, how do we know that speakers distinguish two basic semantic/grammatical categories? We need to keep apart claims about human perceptual capacities and claims about language-particular semantics. It is not to be doubted that children are born able to learn to distinguish between causes and instruments, just as they are born with the potential to learn to distinguish nasal and oral vowels or blue and green. But if the language they learn never makes use of such potential contrasts, that potential is suppressed. The child learns to attend only to the linguistically significant differences, and in his maturity he may have trouble learning to perceive distinctions not present in his language.

Of course, there is a problem in defining "formally distinct categories". The work done in transformational grammar suggests that we should not limit ourselves to distinctions in the surface grammar of basic clause structure. Selectional restrictions and behavior under transformations reveal covert grammatical distinctions. The trouble is that once we take these last factors into account, there is virtually no end to the number of role contrasts that can be justified. Thus, using selectional restrictions we can show that speakers of English distinguish immediate from ultimate cause, deliberate vs. accidental instigator, accomplice vs. principal actor, animate vs. inanimate concomitant, intended vs. accidental result, etc. And, of course, English overtly distinguishes many kinds of locative roles, marked by prepositions such as at, in, on, under, over, beside, inside, around, through, etc.

Case grammar as developed by Fillmore and others remains a promising and intuitively appealing approach. But those in the business of describing languages must test it as it was intended to be tested, instead of using the set of putatively universal cases as a Procrustean bed and fitting their data onto it.

He was crushed by the door where the locative and instrumental uses for *by* are truly discrete).

What is needed, then, is a detailed analysis of the role structures of particular verbs and of the way these structures interact with particular nominals or collocations of nominals, with pragmatic considerations, and so forth. For Austronesian the information we have is limited, even for the best-described members of the family.

3. The Austronesian material suggests that present grammatical models of the structuralist and generative types are handicapped in their ability to account for syntactic change by virtue of their treatment of grammatical units and processes as invariably well-defined and discrete from each other. We refer in particular to the distinction between "lexical derivation" and "syntactic transformation". Although both are structure-changing processes, they are represented as doing quite different, unconnected jobs in the grammar. Thus, a particular affix may be regarded as derivational—e.g., Fijian *-i* derives transitive verbs from stative verbs so that the class of nominals which were subjects of the stative verbs become direct objects in the case structure of the derived transitive verb—and this is considered a purely lexical matter. On the other hand, the affix is sometimes regarded as purely inflectional, e.g., *-en* in the English passive transformation. Although suffixing *-en* changes the case structure of a verb so that former direct objects become subjects, this change is conventionally regarded as purely syntactic, part of a transformational operation on a sentence structure.[20] There is no disputing that the distinction in question is often useful. Transformations supposedly refer to changes that are regular and fully productive for a class of sentence structures which are independently definable, while derivational processes are generally less regular, not fully productive for any independently definable class of sentences. But in Austronesian languages some processes do not fall neatly or exclusively into one or the other

---

[20] The English passive transformation has long been the paradigmatic syntactic transformation. In recent years, however, several writers have argued that the English passive is derivational. See, for example, Starosta (1971); Freidin (1975); and Langacker and Munro (1975).

ideal type. For example, the transitivizing suffix *-i* in Fijian performs syntactic functions which may be considered inflectional and at the same time as introduced by a syntactic transformation. Thus, a location nominal with a given verb may be made either into a prepositional phrase or a direct object in Fijian discourse, just as actor in English may be made either into a subject or an agent-of-passive. The Fijian pair:

(a) *au davo e na ibe*
I lie LOC the mat

and

(b) *au davo-r-a na ibe*
I lie-TR-it the mat

Both mean 'I lay on the mat', but the latter might be regarded as resulting from a direct-object-creating transformation (cf. Chung's 1976 discussion of Indonesian *–kan*). A good many Oceanic languages are like Fijian in using *-i (and *-aki) in ways that seem to be derivational but also transformational. However, the direct-object-creating processes are not as completely productive as the ideal transformational process. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the proto-language was any more perfect. This process has evidently persisted as a semi-productive transformation from pre-Oceanic times. As van der Tuuk once said, "All languages are something of a ruin". The extreme neatness of structuralist and transformational generative formalizations is an illusion; we suspect the analyses of being more rigorous, more well-defined, than the reality which they represent. This is not an argument against striving for precision. The claim is merely that sometimes reality is two-faced and sometimes it is fuzzy. A model which views language structure solely in terms of absolutes, which sees a process as one thing or another, never something in between, or which sees a rule either as present and productive or as completely absent—such a model must picture language change as always involving abrupt jumps, distinct stages resulting from sudden reanalysis in which black becomes white without passing through gray. A model which accepts a certain amount of synchronic variation (of the kind allowed for in Labov's approach) and which accepts varying degrees of productivity and a continuum between certain kinds of categories and processes, such as between lexical derivation and

syntactic transformations—such a model may be aesthetically inferior, but so long as it gives an explicit account of the "ruinous state" of the language, it is in a better position to explain how language change occurs.

References

Anceaux, J. C. 1952. The Wolio language. The Hague: H. L. Smits.

Ballard, D. Lee, and Arlene S. Ballard. n.d. Inibaloi III: Word analysis. Unpublished paper in the files of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Philippines.

Blust, Robert. 1974. Eastern Austronesian: A note. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in Linguistics* 6(4):101-108.

Chung, Sandra. 1976. An object-creating rule in Bahasa Indonesia. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(1):41-87.

Churchward, C. Maxwell. 1953. *Tongan grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, D. Ross. 1973. Transitivity and case in Eastern Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:559-606.

Clark, D. Ross. 1976. *Aspects of Proto-Polynesian syntax*. Te Reo Monograph Series No. 5. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

Dahl, Otto Christian. 1973. *Proto-Austronesian*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 15. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1974. The role of overt markers in some Indonesian and Javanese passive sentences. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:371-89.

De Guzman, Videa P. 1978. *Syntactic derivation of Tagalog verbs*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication no. 16. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.

Dyen, Isidore. 1965a. A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 31(1). International Journal of American Linguistics Memoir 19. Baltimore: Waverly Press.

Dyen, Isidore. 1965b. Formosan evidence for some new Proto-Austronesian phonemes. *Lingua* 14:285-305.

Elkins, Richard E. 1970. *Major grammatical patterns of Western Bukidnon Manobo*. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields 26. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In *Universals in linguistic theory*, ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms, 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Foley, William A. 1976. Comparative syntax in Austronesian. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Freidin, Robert. 1975. The analysis of passives. *Language* 51(2):384-405.

Ikranagara, Kay. 1975. Melayu Betawi grammar. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai‘i.

Keenan, Edward. 1972. Relative clause formation in Malagasy. In *The Chicago which hunt*, ed. by Paul Peranteau, Judith Levi, and Gloria Phares, 169-189. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Langacker, Ronald. W., and Pamela. Munro. 1975. Passives and their meaning. *Language* 51(4):789-830.

Li, Paul Jen-Kuei. 1973. *Rukai Structure*. Honolulu: The University of Hawai‘i Press.

McKaughan, Howard. 1958. *The inflection and syntax of Maranao verbs*. Publications of the Institute of National Language. Manila: Bureau of Printing.

Milner, George. B. 1956. *Fijian grammar*. Suva, Fiji: Government Printer.

Naylor, Paz B. 1974. On contextual aspects of topicalization. Paper presented to the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu, January 1974.

Pawley, Andrew. 1972. On the internal relationships of Eastern Oceanic languages. *Studies in Oceanic culture history*, vol. 3, ed. by Roger C. Green and M. Kelly, 1-142. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

Pawley, Andrew. 1973. Some problems in Proto-Oceanic grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:103-188.

Pawley, Andrew. 1975a. A reanalysis of Fijian transitive sentences, or, why change a structure that has lasted 5,000 years? Typescript.

Pawley, Andrew. 1975b. On the development of relative clauses in Oceanic languages. Paper read to the Oceanic Linguistics Festival, University of Hawai‘i, Honolulu, December 6.

Ramos, Teresita V. 1974. *The case system of Tagalog verbs*. Pacific Linguistics B-27. Canberra: The Australian National University.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1967. On redefining transitivity for Philippine languages. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching* 5:15-28.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1970. *Central Bontoc: Sentence, paragraph, and discourse*. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, No. 27. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1976. Philippine type systems. Typescript.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1979. Towards a reconstruction of the pronominal systems of Proto-Cordilleran, Philippines. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies* 3, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 259-275. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Ross, John R. 1973. Nouniness. In *Three dimensions of linguistic theory*, ed. by Osamu Fujimura, 137-257. Tokyo: The TEC Company.

Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above? In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles Li, 491-581. New York: Academic Press.

Schütz, Albert J. 1969. *Nguna grammar*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 5. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Starosta, Stanley. 1971. Lexical derivation in a case grammar. *University of Hawai‘i Working Papers in Linguistics* 3(8):83-102.

Starosta, Stanley. 1974. Causative verbs in Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:279-369.

Sugita, H. 1973. Semitransitive verbs and object incorporation in Micronesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:393-406.

Van der Tuuk, Herman N. 1971. A grammar of Toba Batak. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. (Translations of Tobasche Spraackunst, Amsterdam 1864.)

Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, 71-91. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph 4. Quezon City: Linguistics Society of the Philippines.