

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

1

In the Dusunic languages of Sabah, Malaysia, there is an alternation in transitive clauses between verbs with the prefixes *po-* and *poN-*. In a series of papers beginning in 1996, Paul Kroeger has claimed that in Kimaragang that alternation marks what he terms *undergoer affectedness*, being conditioned by the thematic role of the undergoer in the transitive clause. Though I do not deny that the undergoer effects Kroeger identifies are real, I argue in this paper that they are epiphenomenal. In the analysis I present, based on both Kroeger's Kimaragang evidence and on data from Bundu Tuhan Dusun, Dusunic *po-* and *poN-* in transitive clauses are not undergoer agreement markers of any sort. I argue that *poN-* marks the profiling of an ACT phase in event structure, a function in all probability inherited from some pre-Dusunic period. The particular function of *po-* that gives rise to Kroeger's undergoer alternations is as a substitute for *conveyance voice*, a function that is probably a Dusunic innovation.<sup>1</sup>

"To understand what something is it is often best to describe how it got to be that way."

Anon

## 1 Dusunic *po-/poN-* as a Non-pivot Undergoer Affectedness Alternation

The best known morphosyntactic characteristic of Philippine-type languages is the set of morphological alternations that are now widely termed *symmetrical voice* alternations, following Foley (1998). The voice alternates are a means of indexing on the verb one designated argument, termed the *pivot*. The terminology used to identify the pivot argument, and to label the voice alternates, is usually (though not exclusively) that of thematic role.

A voice system is *symmetrical* if none of the available alternates can be identified as unmarked. The active-passive or active-antipassive alternations available for transitive verbs in most languages are not symmetrical in this sense because the active is clearly the unmarked alternate. Himmelmann observes (2002:12f) that the label *voice* is itself still misleading, since it suggests a difference in valence or transitivity that the facts do not support. He also proposes (2005:113) that the term *Philippine-type* be further restricted to just those symmetrical voice languages in which at least two of the voices index distinct non-actor arguments, a restriction that excludes languages like Malay.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. I am grateful to Ms. Veronica Atin, a PhD candidate in Linguistics at the University of Western Australia for keeping me supplied with data from Bundu Tuhan Dusun, and for patiently trying to answer my questions about the language.

2. Himmelmann terms these *undergoer voices*. He also adds two additional restrictions, not directly related to voice, to his characterisation of Philippine-type: having at least one non-local nominal case marking proclitic and having 2nd position pronominal clitics. These will be exemplified below.

Students of Philippine-type languages often seem obsessed with matters of terminology; whether the set of

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

2

In a series of papers beginning in 1996, Paul Kroeger claims that in the Dusunic languages of Sabah the Philippine-type symmetrical voice system has been extended, in the case of transitive clauses, to include indexing of a second argument, the *undergoer*, when that argument is itself *not* the pivot. In such cases, in addition to voice morphology, the verb carries one of the prefixes *poN-* or *po-*, the former when the undergoer is patient, recipient, or goal, and the latter when it is instrument or conveyed theme.<sup>3</sup> The membership of these role sets is not accidental in Kroeger's analysis. The undergoer roles indexed by *poN-* are those of arguments at the end of the causal chain in the event structure corresponding to the predication in question; they are *terminal* undergoers ( $U_t$ ). Those indexed by *po-* are intermediate, or *non-terminal* ( $U_n$ ) in their causal chain.

Elsewhere Kroeger defines *undergoer* as "the argument which is viewed as being acted upon or whose affectedness is of primary interest." (2005:186) He relates his *undergoer* to Jackendoff's (1987,1990) account of thematic relations in terms of two tiers, a *thematic* tier of relations of motion and location and an *action* tier of broadly force dynamic actor/patient relations. Like Van Valin and LaPolla (1997:657), Kroeger sees an analogy between the relations on Jackendoff's action tier and the actor/undergoer macro-roles of Role and Reference grammar, and employs the terminology of the latter, substituting Van Valin's *undergoer* for Jackendoff's *patient*. He considers and rejects an alternative analysis of *po-* and *poN-* as a sort of object agreement conditioned by the thematic role of the direct object. The crucial evidence for Kroeger comes from a class of transitive verbs, termed *semitransitive*, that eschew affectedness marking. We review his argument briefly in section 2.2 below.

Most transitive clauses with non-undergoer pivots in Dusunic languages have a verb with either *poN-* or, less frequently, *po-*. In at least two sets of cases, however, the *po-/poN-* alternation provides a coding *choice*. These are actor-pivot transitive clauses with expressed instruments and actor pivot clauses with three-place <AGENT, THEME, GOAL>

---

alternations in question should be termed voice or focus or something else, whether the indexed argument should be termed the pivot or the topic or the subject or something else, and so forth. These scholars are not just being pedantic. Philippine-type languages *are* different in many respects, and it is often not obvious how to apply the terminology of modern linguistic typology or of the various generative theories to the morphosyntax of these languages.

3. Kroeger (1996) treats only one Dusunic language, Kimaragang (henceforth Ki), but from my own work on a related language, Bundu Tuhan dialect (henceforth BT), his observations can be extended to that language. According to Kroeger (2005:397), Kimaragang is spoken by some 10000 people in the Kota Marudu and Pitas districts of Sabah. BT in one of the dialects of Central Kadazan Dusun spoken in Ranau district. The population of Bundu Tuhan municipality is perhaps 8000. Both BT and Ki are classified in the Ethnologue as belonging to the Dusun branch of Dusunic. I have no doubt that the phenomenon described by Kroeger can be generalised throughout that branch, and probably through Dusunic as a whole.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

3

predicates. In the first case, either the patient or the instrument can be selected as undergoer and, in the second, either the theme or the goal. Kroeger's favourite examples are of the latter sort, involving the Kimaragang verbs *ta'ak* 'give' and *suwang* 'enter', as in:

Ki 1a. Ø-pa-ta'ak okuh do siin sid tanak kuh. (= Kroeger 2005: ex. 61)

AV-TR-give 1S.NOM GEN money DAT child 1S.GEN

'I give money to my child.'

b. Mana'ak<sup>4</sup> okuh di tanak kuh do siin.

m.poN.ta'ak okuh di tanak kuh do siin.

AV-TR-give 1S.NOM GEN child 1S.GEN GEN money

'I give my child money.'

2a. Ø-po-suwang okuh ditih sada sid pata'an. (= Kroeger 2005: ex. 63)

AV-TR-enter 1S.NOM PRX fish DAT basket

'I will put this fish in a/the basket.'

b. Monuang okuh do pata'an do sada.

m.poN.suwang okuh do pata'an do sada.

AV-TR-enter 1S.NOM GEN basket GEN fish

'I fill a basket with fish.'

where 1a and 2a involve non-terminal theme undergoers (the money and the fish, respectively) and 1b and 2b terminal recipient and goal undergoers (the child and the basket, respectively). These are akin to the direct object alternations observed in English transitive clauses, and sometimes termed diathesis oppositions. In some cases, as in 2, Kroeger notes that this perspective choice has semantic consequences that are clear in the English glosses. In others, like 1, the difference is more subtle. But he claims that even for the verb *ta'ak*, there can be a semantic difference, manifest in the following:

---

4. In Dusunic languages there are two phonological processes affecting the non-high vowels /o/ and /a/, vowel harmony and antepenultimate raising. The latter raises /a/ to /o/ in an antepenultimate syllable if the penult is high. Vowel harmony is more pervasive. It operates right-to-left, from stem to prefix and, in some cases, from suffix to stem. In case of non-high vowel prefixes like *po-* and *poN-*, if the vowel of the immediately following syllable is /a/, the prefix vowel is /a/; otherwise it is /o/.

The N of *poN-* represents alternations conditioned by the immediately following segment; the cluster NC is realised as /m/, /n/, and /ŋ/ when C is labial, voiceless apical, and voiceless velar respectively. Before vowels, *poŋ-* appears. Before other consonants, Kimaragang has *poŋo-*, while Central Dusun has *pomo-*. The actor voice prefix *m-* gives rise to the same replacement assimilation before /p/ and /w/, so that *m.poN* is realised as *moN*.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

4

Ki 3a. Mana'ak okuh dikau do tana.  
m.poN.ta'ak okuh dikau do tana.  
AV-TR-give 1S.NOM 2S.DAT GEN earth  
'I will give you some land.'

b. Ø-pa-ta'ak okuh dikau do tana. (= Kroeger 2005: ex. 62)  
V-TR-give 1S.NOM 2S.DAT GEN earth  
'I will hand you some dirt (\*land).'

in which the verb *mana'ak* can be used for cases of either transfer of ownership or physical transfer of some concrete object, but *pata'ak* only has the latter interpretation. (I might note that I have not found the same to be true in BT, in which the corresponding forms *manahak* and *patahak* are equally ambiguous according to my native speaker colleague.)

In the discussion to follow, I do not take issue with the *facts* as Kroeger presents them (though in BT, as already noted, the relevant syntactic and semantic facts are not always identical to those reported for Kimaragang). Rather, I take issue with Kroeger's *interpretation* of those facts. For Kroeger, the alternation between *po-* and *poN-* is conditioned by the thematic role of the non-pivot undergoer. For me, *po-* and *poN-* are not really in opposition at all. Rather, the alternation Kroeger identifies is epiphenomenal.

I will argue that the function of *poN-* in transitive clauses is in fact to profile an ACT phase in the event structures realised as transitive clauses. That function is likely to be one of considerable antiquity, having perhaps arisen in some higher order subgroup of the Malayo-Polynesian branch of Austronesian, if not in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) itself, and does not appear to have changed markedly in Dusunic languages. The prefix *po-* is a more complex matter. Kroeger argues that there are two homophonous *po-* prefixes in Kimaragang, one a causative and the other the non-terminal undergoer index at issue here, but offers no convincing account of how that second prefix arose.<sup>5</sup> By contrast, I argue that *po-* in Dusunic languages is fundamentally a causative prefix in all its uses, as it has been reconstructed as far back Proto-Austronesian. (That is not to say that the grammar of *po-* in any Dusunic language is a simple matter; morphological causatives are seldom simple. The range of uses of *po-* in BT is considered briefly in section 5 below.) Yet there is one use of causative *po-* that appears to be an innovation. In Dusunic languages, the patient-voice causative construction came to be used as an alternative to

---

5. Kroeger's attempts to provide an etymology for the affectedness marking *po-* are considered in section 5.1 below.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

5

(and in languages like BT, as a replacement for) the conveyance voice. I will demonstrate that it was precisely this innovation that gave rise to the *po-/poN-* alternations Kroeger identifies. Let me make it clear that I am not just doing what Kroeger fails to do, providing an etymology for the undergoer affectedness marking *po-*. I will demonstrate that *po-* isn't really indexing non-pivot undergoers at all, since it can be used in both Kimaragang and in BT with pivot themes and instruments, as an alternative to the conveyance voice.

For those readers who are unfamiliar with Philippine-type languages in general, and Dusunic languages in particular, a brief overview of those aspects of Dusunic morphosyntax relevant to the arguments presented here is provided in section 2. Section 3 discusses the Proto-Malayo-Polynesian prefix \**paN-*, and section 4 deals with the various uses of its Bundu Tuhan Dusun reflex *poN-*. The Dusunic causative prefix *po-* and its uses in Bundu Tuhan and Kimaragang are discussed in section 5. Against that background, I argue in section 6 that the effects of the alternation between Dusunic *po-* and *poN-* described by Kroeger as undergoer affectedness marking, though real, are in fact epiphenomenal. I propose an alternate analysis by which *po-* and *poN-* have the rather different functions described above, and that it is the interaction of those functions that gives rise to the appearance of undergoer affectedness marking.

## 2 Some Basics of Dusunic Grammar

### 2.1 Verb Morphology and Simple Verbal Clauses

Most of the Kimaragang and BT examples in this paper are instances of what might be termed simple verbal clauses, with the following structure:

3. Predicate<sub>v</sub> Clitic\* (Argument | Adjunct)\*

that is, a clause-initial verbal predicate, some number of pronominal and modal/aspectual clitics and some number of argument or adjunct phrases. Clitics are either pronominal or modal/aspectual. The principles governing relative clitic order remain to be worked out, though that order appears to be largely (though not completely) fixed in the BT data so far available to me. In that data, the longest clitic sequence is three, as in:

BT 4. Nooi'an (n.o.ai.an) toko no moti do silaon.

PST.ST.finish.GV 1PI.PIV already seem NPIV salt

We seem to have run out of salt.

There is some flexibility in the relative order of post-clitic phrases, though actors tend to precede non-actors, arguments tend to precede adjuncts, and non-clausal precede clausal arguments. As in most languages with which I am familiar, clauses with more than one

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

6

non-pronominal argument are rare in unelicited data.

To avoid debate on matters tangential to the subject of this paper, I will assume that a *verb* is a word used in the predicate slot of instances of 3 above and marked for tense, mood, and voice. The following table, adapted from Kroeger (2005:415), and using his labels, summarises the relevant morphology in Kimaragang:

Voice Category	Non-past	Past	Imperative/ subjunctive	Potentive
Actor	m-/um-	m-in-/in-um-	-∅-	(no)ko-
Objective	-on	-in-__-∅	-o?	(n)o-
Dative	-an	-in-__-an	-ai	(n)o- -an
Instrument	i-	n-i-		(no)ko-
Locative	-on	-in-__-on		

Table 1: Kimaragang Voice Marking

Dusunic languages have a past/non-past tense system. Past is marked by an infix *-in-* or a prefix *n-*, depending on whether the stem is C- or V-initial; non-past is unmarked. Note that locative and objective voices are morphologically distinct only in the past tense; the voice suffix *-on* appears in both past and non-past locatives, but only in non-past objectives. In my BT data, locative voice is rare.

The contrast between potentive/stative and intentive/eventive is widespread in Western Austronesian, and semantically rich. In very general terms, potentive forms are used in describing situations that are non-volitional, unintentional, or unexpected. One might venture that what unifies these functions is the negation of some presupposition regarding what is 'normal' for a particular situation type or for situation types in general. Potentive mood is marked for tense, past forms carrying a prefix *n(o)-*, is defective in voice, formally distinguishing only three of Kroeger's five voices. I will have little more to say about potentive forms here. The imperative/subjunctive sub-paradigm is similarly defective in voice, but is untensed. Its major functions are in imperatives and in narrative sequences, in the manner of the English historic present. Since there is little clearly subjunctive about it, I prefer the label *untensed*.

Though Kroeger's labels for the voice categories in Kimaragang have remained constant since Kroeger (1996), there was some variation in his earlier work, both in the number of voices he recognised and in the labels he used for them. In this paper, for the most part, I

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

7

use Himmelmann's (2005) voice terminology rather than Kroeger's, except in citations from the latter's work.<sup>6</sup> That is, I use ACTOR, PATIENT, and CONVEYANCE for Kroeger's ACTOR, OBJECT, and INSTRUMENT voices, respectively. But I prefer the term GOAL voice for the forms in *-an* that Kroeger labels DATIVE and Himmelmann LOCATIVE, and I retain LOCATIVE for those forms Kroeger describes as such.

The voice marking morphology of BT (and other Central and Coastal KadazanDusun dialects) is identical to that of Kimaragang except in one respect. The INSTRUMENT/ CONVEYANCE voice, with the prefix *i-*, is absent in KadazanDusun, appearing only in a very few fossilised forms. As suggested above, I will demonstrate that there is a relationship between CONVEYANCE voice and those uses of causative *po-* that Kroeger regards as affectedness marking.

## 2.2 Case Marking and Transitivity

Two aspects of case marking in Philippine-type languages have provoked considerable controversy in the literature. One is whether Philippine-type languages should be considered ergative, given their preference for patient voice, near categorical when the patient is specific. For this and other reasons to do with markedness and the distribution of case marked forms, a significant minority of scholars have argued the ergative position. Kroeger is not amongst them, and in this respect I am in broad agreement with him.<sup>7</sup> The facts alluded to above notwithstanding, Dusunic and other Philippine-type languages do not seem to me to be ergative, certainly not in the same sense that most Australian languages are ergative, for example.

A second issue of long-standing controversy is whether the designated argument of verbal clauses in Philippine-type languages, the argument indexed in the voice morphology, should be considered the *subject*. In the view presented in Schachter (1976), and reiterated in the light of subsequent criticism in Schachter (1995), the *ang*-marked argument in Tagalog (and by extension, the designated argument in other Philippine-type languages) does not exhibit enough of the properties associated with canonical subjects in other languages to merit that label. The widespread adoption of the term *pivot* to refer to the designated argument is largely in response to Schachter's arguments. Kroeger (1993)

---

6. Since I do not want to be open to any charge of misrepresentation, I present Kroeger's examples in the form in which they appear in the papers from which they come (spacing and character case aside). An unfortunate consequence of that decision is that it introduces numerous inconsistencies in morpheme glosses and in the spelling of Kimaragang words which I trust the reader will excuse.

7. For a very brief overview of the issues, with some pointers to relevant literature, see Himmelmann (2005:157-9).

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

8

has been amongst Schachter's critics, and argues that the weight of the evidence in Tagalog's favours the identification of the *ang*-phrase as subject.<sup>8</sup> Similar considerations would apply to Dusunic languages. I have no strong views on the matter. The fact that I continue to use the term *pivot* here is not so much because I disagree with Kroeger on this issue as that it permits me to use the complementary term *non-pivot* to refer to the case marking that Kroeger terms *genitive* in recent papers (Kroeger 2005, Kroeger and Johansson 2005) and either *genitive* or *accusative* in Kroeger (1996).

For me, the most interesting aspect of case marking in Philippine-type languages is neither subjecthood nor ergativity but *objecthood*; that is, whether it is possible to distinguish direct from oblique arguments and, thereby, to morphosyntactically distinguish transitive from intransitive clauses in these languages. The issue is not a new one. It has been implicated both in the ergativity debate, with regard to whether actor voice clauses should be considered transitive or intransitive, and with respect to Philippine-type clause structure in general. In an analysis first articulated by Bloomfield (1917), all clauses in Philippine-type languages are essentially equational and transitivity is therefore essentially a semantic matter. Here, I can do no more than give rather cursory attention to these issues underlying the problem of transitivity in Dusunic and other Philippine-type languages, to the extent that the problem bears on Kroeger's affectedness analysis of *po*- and *poN*-.<sup>9</sup>

Case in Dusunic languages is marked in pronouns, in prenominal demonstratives, and in a set of nominal proclitics I refer to as *determiners*.<sup>10</sup> Three distinctions are made in the latter; Table 2 and Table 3 give the Kimaragang and BT forms, respectively:

	NOM	GEN	DAT
PN	i	di	sid+i
CN (Definite)	i(t)	di(t)	sid
CN (Indefinite)	o(t)	do(t)	sid

Table 2: Kimaragang Case-marking Particles  
(adapted from Kroeger 2005:406))

---

8. See Himmelmann (2005:152-7) for some discussion.

9. See Ross (2002) for an assessment of relation of transitivity to the ergative analysis, and Himmelmann (2005:140-1) for a very brief discussion of the equational analysis of Philippine-type clausal syntax.

10. In BT, indefinite predicate NPs do not take a determiner. Determiners are also absent in a number of other cases under conditions that I do not as yet understand.

**The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages**

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

	Pivot	Nonpivot	Locative
Definite	i	di	id
Indefinite	o	do	

Table 3: Bundu Tuhan Prenominal Determiners

The differences in the shape of these two paradigms is largely apparent. The so-called 'moveable -t' of the Kimaragang forms is a feature of vowel-initial common nouns in Dusunic languages (see Kroeger 1996), but with determiners it is often difficult to know whether to assign it to the determiner, as Kroeger does here, or to the following noun, as I prefer. There does not appear to be any BT analog of Ki *sid+i* with personal (as opposed to place) names, since BT *id* is not freely used with human referents.

Prenominal demonstratives show a two-way contrast (nominative/genitive or pivot/nonpivot, depending on the analysis). There are locative demonstratives, but they are not used as determiners. Pronoun case in Dusunic languages is somewhat more complex. The number of contrasts varies from two to four, depending on the language and on the person/number of the form. BT forms are as follows:

	pivot		non-pivot	
	non-clitic	clitic		non-clitic
1s	ioho'	oku	ku	doho
2s	ia'	ko	nu	dia'
3s	iau			dau
3sm	isio			disio
1di	iato	kito	to	dato
1pi	iati'	toko'	toko'	dati
1pe	iahai		da	dahai
2p	iokoyu'	kou	diu	dokoyu'
3p	iolo			diolo

Table 4: Bundu Tuhan Dusun Pronouns

Kroeger labels the last three columns of the corresponding Kimaragang table *nominative*, *genitive*, and *dative*, respectively, and labels the first column *emphatic*. I find that analysis decidedly unrevealing. In BT (and I expect Kimaragang would differ only in

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

10

detail), the non-pivot pronouns can be used as arguments or adjuncts in verbal clauses, and as genitives following a common noun. In verbal clauses, the non-pivot clitics are used only as non-pivot *actors* (agents or experiencers); when expressed, non-pivot undergoers, beneficiaries, and the like are realised as non-clitic non-pivot pronouns. The clitic pronouns are generally used in appropriate functions when they exist, though non-pivot *dahai* 'we.PL.EX' and pivot *ia* 'you.SG' can be used in place of their clitic counterparts. Non-clitic pivot pronouns are used as subjects of non-verbal sentences, as single word utterances, and as preposed topics in the relatively frequent *nopo nga* topicalisation construction:

BT 5. Ioho' nopo nga monokodung (= m.poN.sokodung) do tiim Sabah.

1SG *nopo nga* AV.poN.support NPIV team Sabah

I am a supporter of Team Sabah.

The *nopo nga* construction exemplified in 5 may prove to be just a special type of non-verbal sentence.

The differences between my view of Dusunic case marking and Kroeger's is more than just the choice of labels. I see the system in BT as essentially binary, pivot and non-pivot, and regard the locative *id* as qualitatively quite distinct, and perhaps not a true case marker at all. But it may well be that BT and Ki differ in this respect. Its functions are largely restricted to marking spatial location. Examples like 1a above, in which *sid* marks a human beneficiary, are impossible in BT.<sup>11</sup> It may be that there are restrictions on the use of datives with non-locatives in Ki as well; compare *sid tanak kuh* 'my child (DAT)' in 1a with *dikau* 'you (sg)' in 3a. Kroeger labels the latter *dative* as well, but the same form would be used as a direct object, as in 7a below.

BT *id* does not so much mark a thematic role *location* as an ontological type. Thus:

BT 6a. Panangkus (poN.tangkus) no i Kudingking do hilo id dumo di molohing dii.

poN.run ASP PIV K NPIV there LOC farm NPIV lady that.NPIV

Kudingking ran there to that lady's farm.

---

11. The only instance of non-locative *id* in my BT data is in the following saying, a BT 'golden rule':

Osonong ko nopo id doho om lobi oku po do osonong id dia'.

ST.good 2S.NPIV *nopo* LOC 1S.NPIV and more 1S.PIV yet ST.good LOC 2S.NPIV

If you treat me well, I'll treat you better.

which I am told has a somewhat archaic flavour.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

11

- b. Tindal no i kara do mantad id baang  
emerge already PIV monkey NPIV from LOC river  
om sondiu no do id puhun do kayu do minundorong (m.in.undorong)  
and lean ASP NPIV LOC branch NPIV tree NPIV AV.PST.stop  
When the monkey had got out of the river he learned on a tree branch to rest.

These examples illustrate that *id* marked NPs in BT may carry other more specific role markers (like *mantad* 'from') and may themselves be introduced by another proclitic case marker, as in *do id puhun* 'the branch'. Topicalised *id* phrases and place names do not seem to take other case markers. Apart from those contexts, *do id* NP and *do hilo id* NP are more frequent in unelicited BT text than is *id* NP alone.

The problem of identifying direct objects is essentially that of distinguishing *direct* from *oblique* non-subjects. The term *oblique* itself is open to misunderstanding, since it is sometimes used to refer to non-(subcategorised) arguments (peripherals or adjuncts) and sometimes to non-direct or non-core arguments (that is, arguments realised as other than subject or object). Locative adjuncts flagged by Kimaragang *sid* are oblique in the first sense while, one infers, *sid*-marked recipients and goals (as in 1a and 2a above) are oblique in the second. I will not consider these further here. Nor will I consider the possessor marking functions of *di(t)* and *do(t)* marked NPs (and nonpivot pronouns). What is of interest here is the use of the latter as non-possessor arguments.

In BT at least, where *id* is more a LOCATION ontological type marker than a case marker, the case marking system is essentially binary. The designated pivot argument is flagged by one set of case markers and everything else, argument or adjunct, irrespective of thematic role (clitic non-pivot pronouns excepted) is marked by the other, non-pivot set. Non-pivot direct objects cannot be distinguished from non-pivot obliques except by stipulation. One might suggest that a direct object is a *di/do* marked nominal that would be pivot in patient voice. But that move might amount to defining direct object notionally or semantically, in terms of particular thematic roles in particular constructions. Kroeger (1996:46) identifies direct objects in Kimaragang as "obligatory arguments which always receive accusative case marking". But "accusative case marking" in Kimaragang is as much a default for non-subjects as it is in BT (*modulo* differences in the distribution of *sid/id* in the respective languages). Since no argument, not even the pivot/subject, is necessarily overt in a Dusunic verbal clause, it is not clear what *obligatory* means. It is thus not at all clear to me how to identify direct objects, and with them, transitive clauses, in any non-arbitrary fashion for Dusunic languages.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

12

Given his definition above, Kroeger regards the accusative pronoun in 7a as a direct object:

Ki 7a. Maya (m-waya) okuh dikaw. (= Kroeger 1996:ex. 22)

AV-follow 1SG.NOM 2SG.ACC

'I will come with you.'

b. Isai ot woyo'on (waya-on) nuh t-um-alob?

who NOM follow.LV 2SG.GEN [-AV-market

'Who will you go to market with?'

The verb *waya* 'follow, accompany' is a member of a class of verbs he terms *semi-transitive*. These are transitive verbs for which, according to Kroeger, the default subject choice is agent, but that do not take an affectedness prefix in actor voice (as is the case in 7a) and . Non-agent subject choice for semitransitive verbs is largely syntactically conditioned, as in 7b, in which the *wh-* form *isay* 'who' must be subject.

The semitransitive verbs are important for Kroeger's analysis of *poN-* because, but for clauses like 7a with semi-transitive predicates, it would have been possible for him to describe *poN-* as a kind of object agreement prefix. But since he regards 7a as a transitive clause, and *dikaw* 'you (sg.)' as its direct object, the actor voice verb *maya* 'accompany, follow' would have been anomalous in not taking *poN-*. In the analysis he adopts, the patient of a transitive verb with *poN-* is projected onto the undergoer of the action tier, while what he terms the *locus* argument of a semi-transitive verb is not, and so those verbs do not take *poN-*.

Kroeger briefly considers an alternative analysis in which an interpretation rule maps affectedness onto either direct objects or subjects, depending on the subcategory of the verb. He rejects this alternative because it "has the effect of removing affectedness entirely from the semantic representation" (Kroeger 1996:49), and as less general than the two-tier account he adopts. Whatever its theoretical status, none of this machinery is necessary for an account of *po-/poN-* alternations Kroeger discusses, as I will now begin to demonstrate.

### 3 Proto-Malayo-Polynesian \*paN-

If Dusunic *poN-* does alternate with *po-* in clauses with non-pivot undergoers, then it is of interest to ask how that function compares with those of reflexes of PMP \*paN- in other languages. If that function differs markedly from those found elsewhere, and from what one would want to reconstruct for PMP, then a historically-minded grammarian might well seek an account of how the Dusunic innovation might have arisen from the PMP source.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

13

Moreover, in evaluating two competing synchronic analyses of any morpheme, one more in concert with the analysis of its cognates and the other at variance with it, then one is I think justified in preferring the former, in the absence of an account of the putative change.

Of course, such diachronic evaluations are only as good as the synchronic descriptions on which they are based, and the descriptions of many Western Austronesian languages are unfortunately still quite sketchy. Reflexes of PMP \*paN- are widespread in Western Austronesian, either alone or with reflexes of the (actor voice) prefix PAN \*m- or both. Its range of functions in those languages, though varied, are largely commensurable. With *m-*, it is associated with actor voice forms, often alternating in that function with reflexes of \*-um- and \*paR-, as is also the case in Dusunic languages. In Philippine (as opposed to Philippine-type languages), there is no particular association of transitivity and \*paN- or \*paR- reflexes. Ross's (2002:49) "quick and dirty" reconstruction of these prefixes as 'distributive' and 'durative', respectively, is limited to languages in the Philippines and reflects a frequent characterisation of their functions in those languages. In Philippine languages, \*paR- is much more common as a stem augment than \*paN- in actor voice. But the semantics of the {∅, pag-, paN-} contrast in actor voice remains poorly understood. Tagalog *pag-* is sometimes contrasted with ∅ as externally vs. internally directed (as in *bumili* 'buy' and *magbili* 'sell'). The label *durative* seems to reflect a view that *pag-* stems are less often used as inchoatives than are ∅ stems with *-um-*. In her 1978 study, De Guzman (1978) refuses to take a stand on the issue, since she regards her study as syntactic, and treats the ∅~*pag-* contrast as lexico-morphological. She analyses Tagalog *paN-* as the *distributive* counterpart of *pag-*, but does not clarify what *distributive* means. Elsewhere the term is characterised as involving a multiplicity of locations, participants, or occasions. Outside the Philippines, reflexes of \*paN- in actor voice are more clearly associated with transitive verbs. In those non-Philippine languages with a reduced voice set, it is often described as as an antipassive or an active transitive prefix. But even in those languages, the correlation between \*m.paN- reflexes and transitivity is far from perfect. Sneddon (1996:65-6) notes a number of Indonesian *meng-* intransitives; some, like *membatu* 'petrify, harden' or *melaut* 'go to sea', are de-nominal, but others, like *menangis* 'weep' or *mengungsi* 'flee' are simply idiosyncratic.

Without *m-*, reflexes of \*paN- are often found with instrument pivots (as, for example, in Tagalog, Sama Bajau, and Buol). In Tagalog, it accompanies the conveyance voice prefix in this function:

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

14

- Tg 8. Ipangpùputol no lang itóng kutsilyo.  
i-pang-RED1-putol ko na lamang itó -ng kutsilyo  
CV-INS-RED1-cut 1.SG.POSS now only PROX-LK knife  
I will just cut it with this knife. (Wolff et al. 1991:367)

In Indonesian and Malay, *peng-* derives agentive and instrument nominals. (In many Philippine languages, including Tagalog, instrumental *paN-* contrasts with distributive *paN-* in not triggering nasal replacement, a fact favouring analyses of these morphemes as homophonous but distinct. This property is not true of all Philippine languages, Cebuano for example.)

In descriptions of many languages, reflexes of \**paN-*, without *m-*, are described variously as gerunds (Tagalog and Ilocano), manner or action nominalisations (Karo Batak), or just as (detransitive) nominalisations (Old Malay, Javanese, and Mori Bawah). For example:

- Tg 9. Ang pagkalunod ng Kastila' ay ikinatakot ng tatlong magkakaibigan.  
ang pag-ka-lunod ng Kastila' ay i- -in- ka-takot ng tatló -ng magkakaibigan  
SPEC GER-ST-drown GEN Spaniard PM CV--RLS(UG)-ST-fear GEN three-LK friends  
The drowning of the Spaniard frightened the three friends.  
(Bloomfield 1917.272/24)

10. Ikinagandá ko ang pagtina' ng buhók ko.  
i-ka-in-gandá ko ang pag-tina' ng buhók ko  
CV-ST-RLS(UG)-beauty 1.SG.POSS SPEC GER-dye GEN hair 1.SG.POSS  
I became beautiful because I dyed my hair (on account of dying my hair).  
(Wolff 1993:230)

In Tagalog, the gerund has one of three forms, predictable from the form of the actor voice: details aside, *-um-* verbs have gerunds in *pag-*, while *pag-* and *paN-* verbs use their respective prefix, together with reduplication of the following syllable. This function is relevant to my account of the development of Dusunic *poN-* and, to the extent that I am correct, of PMP \**paN-* in general.

## 4 Bundu Tuhan *poN-*

We might initially distinguish four functions for the prefix *poN-*. It appears:

- i. on (lexically determined) transitive verbs with actor pivots
- ii. on verbs with instrument pivots
- iii. on de-transitive causatives in actor or patient voice
- iv. with goal voice, as a circumfix *poN-* *-an*, on derived location nouns

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

15

The last of these functions is exemplified by forms like BT *pangakanan* 'plate, thing to eat from' (< *akan* 'eat'), *ponginnan* 'drinking vessel' (< *inum* 'drink'), and *pongongan* 'place to obtain something' (< *anu* 'take'), as in:

BT 11. Amu osodu o pongongan do taakanon.

NEG ST-far PIV poN-take-GV NPIV NOM.ST.eat.PV

There is somewhere to get food from not far away.

Reflexes of PAN goal voice *\*-an* are commonly used with location pivots or to derive locative nouns. In the latter function, *\*-an* reflexes can appear alone or with reflexes of prefixes like *\*paN-*, *\*paR-*, or *\*ka-*. Blust (2003:473) reconstructs both PMP *\*paN-* -an and *\*paR-* -an independently of their components, with the general gloss 'deverbal noun'. Though I feel that this use of *\*paN-* should be reconcilable with its other functions, I will not address that problem further here, and so will ignore the fourth use of Dusunic poN- above in subsequent discussion.

## 4.1 poN- in Actor Voice

With actor voice verbs, BT *poN-* would typically be preceded by the actor voice prefix *m-*, yielding *moN-*, as in:

12. Minamaramai (m.in.poN.ramai) io Jane do kosombulanan di kamanakon dau.<sup>12</sup>

AV.PST.poN.celebrate PIV.PL Jane NPIV ko.one.month.GV NPIV sibling.child 3S.NPIV

Jane and her family celebrated her niece's one month birthday.

13. Mongupu' no do tua' di taadak om mamanan (m.poN.panau) no.

poN.pick yet NPIV fruit NPIV pumpkin and poN.travel yet

[You] pick a pumpkin and travel on.

but can appear in actor voice without *m-*, in untensed (imperative/subjunctive) forms:

14. Ongoi koti pomoli (poN.boli) do silaon.

go CLIT poN.buy NPIV salt.

Would you go buy some salt.

15. Insan tadau pomonsoi (poN.wonsoi) no i Kudingking do gado.

one.time day poN.make yet PIV K NPIV trap

One day Kudingking made a trap.

As is common in Philippine-type languages, the *poN-* forms in the following examples are

---

12. The allomorph *pomo-/pama-* of BT *poN-* was noted in footnote 4. The determiner *io/dio* is used with proper names in the sense '<name> and associates'.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

16

rather more nominal than verbal. In the first case, *momoguno* might be glossed as an agentive noun 'users, ones using' and *papamanau* in the second as a gerund 'travelling, riding':

16. Tuminanud oku di ginumuan do momoguno ngaai' do motosikal.  
AV.PST.follow 1SPIV NPIV PST.many.GV NPIV AV.poN.use all NPIV motorcycle  
I followed all the many people on motorcycles.
17. Lobi no do duo jaam ku do papamanau (R.poN.panau) do motosikal  
more yet NPIV two hour 1SNPIV NPIV R.poN.travel NPIV motorcycle  
om aa' oku po nokorikot id Universiti Malaya.  
and NEG 1SPIV still PST.AVP.arrive LOC U M  
Two more hours of motorcycle riding and I still hadn't reached the University of Malaya.

*poN-* is also used in actor voice forms of derived stems, particularly with *pu-* and *pi-*. The prefix *pu-* is common on denominal verbs in the sense 'produce/yield N': *puraha* 'bleed' (< *raha* 'blood'), *puwaig* 'produce water' (< *waig* 'water'), and sometimes with roots less obviously nominal, as in the case of *minomusorou* (m.in.poN.pu.sorou) 'thinking' in:

18. "Hombo pogihuman ku do taakanon diti", ka di kara' do minomusorou.  
where pog.seek.GV 1SNPIV NPIV food DEM.NPIV say NPIV monkey NPIV PST.poN.pu.think  
"Where am I going to find food?" said the monkey, thinking.

The prefix *pi-* generally derives reciprocals, but not always in any obvious sense when used with *poN-*; for example, *pomisunud* (poN.pi.sunud) 'advice, to advise' (< *sunud* 'tell'), *pomiromos* (poN.pi.romos) 'make a mess' (< *romos* 'mess, rubbish'). Note that these derived stem *poN-* forms are seldom transparently transitive either.

Most intransitive verbs, be they states, processes, or activities, do not take *poN-* in actor voice; for example, *sumakit* 'become sick' ( $\sqrt{\text{sakit}}$ ), *modop* 'sleep' ( $\sqrt{\text{odop}}$ ), *tumunda* 'grow' ( $\sqrt{\text{tunda}}$ ), or *gumuli* 'go home, go back' ( $\sqrt{\text{guli}}$ ). Some verbs have forms both with and without *poN-*; for example, *makan* 'eat, engage in eating' and *mangkan* 'eat something' ( $\sqrt{\text{akan}}$  'eat') or *mubat* 'medicate oneself' and *mongubat* 'give medicine to someone' ( $\sqrt{\text{ubat}}$  'medicine'). In other cases, it is not entirely clear why particular verbs do or do not take *poN-*; for example, *panau* 'walk, travel' takes *poN-* whether a destination is mentioned or not, while *sakai* 'mount, ride in a vehicle' does not.

### 4.2 *poN-* with Instruments

A non-pivot instrument can be introduced into any semantically appropriate clause as a

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

17

non-pivot argument:

- 19a. Pigison ku i daging do pais.  
cut.PV 1S.NPIV PIV meat NPIV knife
- b. Momigis oku di daging do pais.  
AV.poN.cut 1S.PIV NPIV meat NPIV knife  
I will cut the meat with a knife.

When an instrument is pivot in a transitive clause, the predicate takes the prefix *poN-* in examples like:

20. Nunu pinomigis nu di daging?  
what poN.PST.cut 2S.NPIV NPIV meat  
What did you cut the meat with?
- 21a. Pomigis ku iti pais di daging.  
poN.cut 1S.NPIV DEM.PIV knife NPIV meat  
I will cut the meat with this knife.
- b. Pomigis iti pais di daging.  
poN.cut DEM.PIV knife NPIV meat  
This knife will cut the meat.

In my data, *poN.V* forms are much more frequent as instrument nouns or instrumental nominalisations than as predicates/verbs with instrument pivots. Thus:

22. Kayu o pinomobog ku dilo tasu.  
stick PIV poN.PST.hit 1S.NPIV DEM.NPIV dog  
It was a stick that I used to hit the dog.
23. Pongisas nopo do siliu nga burus.  
poN.scrub *nopo* NPIV floor *nga* brush.  
What is used to scrub floors is a brush.
24. Oniba' iti pamagaris.  
ST.short DEM.PIV poN.draw.line  
This ruler is short.

Examples 22 and 23 are identificational and cleft (or topicalised) NP NP sentences, respectively. Example 24 is a typical sentence with a stative predicate whose pivot, in this case, is the instrumental noun *pamagaris* 'ruler' (< *garis* 'draw.line').

Verbal clauses with instruments, both as pivot and as non-pivot, often take a different construction, with the prefix *po-*. That construction will be considered in section 5.2.3

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

18

below.

## 4.3 Causative poN-

Causatives in BT can be derived from both transitive and intransitive verbs of a range of semantic types. These morphological causatives are typically marked by the prefix *po-*, a construction considered in detail in section 5 below. De-transitive causatives derived from active transitive verbs like *omot* 'to harvest', *lapak* 'to split', or *oit* 'bring, take' can be interpreted either as coercive or permissive, as *make.V* or *let.V* or *get.to.V*.

To establish the base against which derived causatives are formed, consider first a typical transitive verb *omot* 'to harvest' in (non-causative) actor, patient, and goal voice:

25a. Minongomot oku dilo parai.

AV.PST.poN.harvest 1S.PIV DEM.NPIV rice

I harvested that rice.

b. Nokuro tu' omoton nu ino parai?

PST.ST.Q because harvest.PV 2S.NPIV DEM.PIV rice

Why are you harvesting that rice?

c. Amatan oku dau do parai.

harvest.GV 1S.PIV 3S.NPIV NPIV rice

He is going to harvest rice for me.

With the non-causative transitive *omot* 'harvest', the harvester is pivot in actor voice, the crop in patient voice, and a beneficiary in goal voice. In actor voice detransitive causatives, the causer (what Talmy 2000:ch. 7 in his force dynamic account terms the *antagonist*) is pivot. In patient voice, the causee (Talmy's *agonist*), the actor of the transitive source, is pivot. In goal voice, the pivot is the undergoer/patient of the transitive source.<sup>13</sup> But it is only in this last case that the derived causative takes *po-*:

26a. Palapakan ku dau ino piasau.

po.split.GV 1S.NPIV 3S.NPIV DEM.PIV coconut

I am getting him to split those coconuts.

---

13. For a somewhat more detailed account of voice selection in Dusunic causatives see section 4.4 below.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

19

- b. Nokosodia no i parai di maan ku dau paamatai.<sup>14</sup>

PST.POT.ready already PIV rice NPIV do.GV 1S.NPIV 3S.NPIV po.harvest.GV

The rice that i'm getting him to harvest is ready.

In patient voice, these derived causatives take *poN-*, but without the actor voice prefix *m-*:

- 27a. Maai iau pamalapako dino piasau.

do.GV 3S.PIV poN.split.PV DEM.NPIV coconut

Get him to split those coconuts.

I got him to harvest for me.

- b. Pinongomot ku isio doho.

poN.PST.split.PV 1S.NPIV 3S.PIV 1S.NPIV

I got him to harvest for me.

In actor voice, *poN-* is also used, again without *m-*, but must be reduplicated:

- 28a. Pinapamalapak oku dau do piasau.

AV.R.poN.PST.split 1S.NPIV 3S.PIV NPIV coconut

I got him to split coconuts.

- b. Popongomot oku disio di parai doho.

AV.R.poN.PST.harvest 1S.PIV 3S.NPIV NPIV rice 1S.NPIV

I'll get him to harvest the rice for me.

In this actor voice intransitive causatives it is impossible to distinguish between CV reduplication of *poN-* and a sequence *po.poN-* of the prefixes *po-* and *poN-*. I adopt the former analysis because reduplication is also common, though not always obligatory, in actor voice *po-* causatives.

### 4.4 De-transitive Causatives Voice Selection in Kimaragang and Bundu Tuhan

For the purposes of causative formation in Dusunic languages, the voices form a hierarchy, better exemplified by Kimaragang than Bundu Tuhan, since the latter lacks conveyance voice. Using my terminology, rather than that of Kroeger (1988b), the hierarchy is as follows:

ACTOR > PATIENT > CONVEYANCE > GOAL

---

14. The goal voice auxiliary verb BT *maan* (or *mangan*) 'do', followed by a untensed verb in any voice (here, the goal voice causative *paamatai*) is a reasonably high frequency construction whose function is still opaque to me. Note also that the difference between causative and non-causative voice selection is patterned, with pivots corresponding to the same argument. The nature of the pattern is considered in section 4.4.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

20

In derived causatives, actor voice is used when the causer/antagonist argument is pivot. Since actor voice is unavailable, patient voice is used in derived causatives when the pivot is the causee/agonist, which would have used actor pivot in the related non-causative:

Ki 29. Pangalapako yalo dinoh niyuw.

TRANS-split-ACCF he (P) that (NONP) coconut.

Get him to split those coconuts.

(= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 14)

The pattern generalises to the other voices: the voice appropriate to a pivot at position  $n$  in the hierarchy in a non-causative becomes voice  $n+1$  in a derived causative with the same pivot choice. Non-causative patient voice becomes conveyance voice in causative transitives with patient pivots in Kimaragang:<sup>15</sup>

30a. Lapak-on kuh dati inoh tulu nuh!

split-ACCF I (NONP) likely that (P) head your

I'll split your head open if you don't watch out!

(= Kroeger 1988a:ex. 46)

b. N-i-pa-lapak kuh dih ama it niyuw tu, amu l-in-apak-Ø dih iyai.

PST-TF-pa-split I (NONP) NONP.DEF father P.DEF coconut because not \*-PST-split-ACCF

NONP.DEF mother

I got Dad to split the coconut, because Mum wouldn't split it.

(= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 17)

Pivot choice in BT is governed by this same hierarchy, except of course that the conveyance voice is missing. So, causatives with conveyance voice in Kimaragang appear in goal voice in BT:

BT 31. Pinalapakan ku dau ino piasau.

po.PST.split.GV 1S.NPIV 3S.NPIV DEM.PIV coconut

I got him to split those coconuts.

(cf. 29 above)

The hierarchy can give rise to paradigm slot overlap, as in the case of the BT verb *igit* 'to carry a small object, to touch'. The *-on* form of this root has a locative voice interpretation and is usually used as a noun: *igiton* 'railing, place.to.hold.on'. It is the goal voice form that is used when the object held is pivot:

---

15. Kroeger puts locative voice, as described in section 2.1 above, at the same position in the hierarchy as conveyance voice. He also reports an indirect causation construction, involving an additional link in the causal chain, in which voice selection 'skips' a position in the hierarchy. There are no examples of this construction in my BT data to date.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

21

32. Igitai gia doho iti balatak ku.  
hold-gv please 1s.NPIV DEM.PIV bag 1s.NPIV  
Would you please hold my bag.

Because the patient voice of this verb is essentially 'missing', the goal voice derived causative *poigitan* 'to get to hold' is used with either the agonist actor or the theme as pivot:

- 33a. Isai o poigitan nu di surat do kumaa di James?  
who po.hold.GV 2s.NPIV NPIV letter NPIV det AV.direction NPIV James  
Who are you getting to carry the letter to James?
- b. Poigitan ku di tanak iti patung.  
po.hold.GV 2s.NPIV NPIV child PIV doll  
I'm having the child hold this doll.

There is a derived causative *poigiton* 'to let touch' that appears to be derived through the locative sense.

The same *poN-/po-* alternation observed in BT detransitive causatives holds, *mutatis mutandis*, in Kimaragang, though I have not found any examples of actor voice detransitive causatives in any of Kroeger's papers. (Examples 29 and 30b show causee and patient pivots examples in Kimaragang in patient and conveyance voice, respectively.) For obvious reasons, Kroeger does not attempt to account for this *po-/poN-* alternation in terms of undergoer selection. First, he would not regard the causative *po-* as an instance of the same morpheme as that marking non-terminal affectedness. Second, it is probably not clear how the patient undergoer in a *po-* detransitive causative clause could be construed as a non-terminal (instrument or conveyed theme) argument or how the causee in a *poN-* detransitive causative clause could be construed as a terminal (patient or goal) undergoer when there is another patient in the clause. This alternation is not at all problematic under my account, however.

### 4.5 *poN-* as a Degenerate Antipassive

The analysis I propose for Dusunic *poN-* is I think a fairly standard one for reflexes of PMP \**paN-*. It rests on two properties of Philippine-type languages:

- I. Patient voice is the unmarked choice for transitive verbs.
- II. The noun-verb categorial contrast is not sharp.

Neither of these theses is unproblematic, as evidenced by the fact that they continue to be discussed widely in the literature. I will accept them here under the following

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

22

interpretations. Patient voice is literally morphologically unmarked (that is, unaffixed) under the temporal-modal conditions Hopper and Thompson (1980) associate with high transitivity; that is, with a potent volitional actor in realis mood (past tense in Dusunic languages). Patient voice is selected (over actor voice) when the undergoer is highly individuated (specific or definite).

Discussions of the fluid nature of categorial contrasts in Philippine-type languages have been framed in two ways. Some discussions are syntactic in nature, focussing on the difficulties in distinguishing nominal and verbal clauses. The proposal, noted above, that all clauses in Philippine-type languages are essentially equational, is of this sort. The second focus is lexical, and in recent years has taken the form of the *precategoriality* thesis, a proposal that lexical roots in Philippine-type languages have no syntactic category but are only assigned a category in morpho-syntactic context. The precategoriality thesis comes in two flavours, which I will label *weak* and *strong*. Weak precategoriality, as advocated by Foley (1998), following Verhaar, is a claim that lexical roots are precategorial. Strong precategoriality, as attributed to Himmelmann (1991), is a claim that even derived forms like those involved in the voice system are precategorial. In fact, Himmelmann's claim is rather different from this. In Himmelmann (2006) he argues that roots in Tagalog are assigned a *morphological* category. The class of roots he labels the *V-class* are those which take voice affixation, and that are inflected for mood and aspect. He claims that individual voice-mood-aspect forms of a V-class root, V-words, are systematically ambiguous between verbal and nominal interpretations. In the latter use, they are concrete and event-specific, naming the actor, patient, instrument, and so forth of a particular event:

Tg 34. Yung anák ang sumigáw.

iyón.LK anák ang um-sigáw

DIST. LK child SPEC AV-shout

The one who shouted/the shouter is (was) that child.

(= Himmelmann 2006:ex. 64)

Forms like Tagalog *sumigáw* 'one who shouts' (and parallel forms in Dusunic languages) are thus not agentive nominals in the same sense as the English *shouter* since the former are event-specific and not generic. In Himmelmann's analysis, it is this 'systematic ambiguity' that gives Tagalog words the appearance of precategoriality. Nonetheless, that ambiguity remains a fact of the grammar of Tagalog (and of other Philippine-type languages), and one that requires some account. This is not the place for that account,

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

23

however.

It is my contention that PMP \*paN- (and the related, and in some languages more frequent \*paR-) entered the 'verbal' system of Philippine-type languages via the same sort of systematic ambiguity involved in voice-marked forms. In the scenario proposed here, the original function of these prefixes was to derive action nominalisations, gerunds if you will, as they do in languages like Tagalog. These prefixes entered the verbal system in a manner not unlike that by which the English progressive developed from Old English *-ynge* gerunds and *-ende* participles.<sup>16</sup> That these de-gerundive forms should have a special affinity for actor voice is not surprising, by the following reasoning. In patient voice, what is profiled is the terminus or the result, depending on whether the event<sup>17</sup> is simple or complex. Thus:

BT 35a. Linapak dau i piasau.

PST.split.PV 3S.NP<sub>IV</sub> PIV coconut

He split the coconut.

[a ACT ] CAUSE [ b RESULT<split>]

.....

b. Binobog ku i tasu.

PST.strike.PV 1S.NP<sub>IV</sub> PIV dog

I hit the dog.

[a ACT<hit> b] (or perhaps [a ACT<hit> b])

...

.....

Croft's account of event structure profiling (1998:34ff) identifies the event profile as that portion of the event structure that delimits the core arguments of the corresponding syntactic structure. The profile thus spans at least one complete phase of the event structure. In no case does that span cover only an argument in Croft's account. For the moment at least, I leave open the possibility that the best analysis of Philippine-type voice, in terms of event structure profiling, might be one that permits arguments, and not just event phases, to be profiled.

In actor voice, it is of course the actor that is profiled (along with the associated act phase, in an account in which event phases are profiled):

---

16. For an interesting recent account of that development, see Ziegeler (1999).

17. In what follows, I take a rather eclectic and generic approach to event structure, informed particularly by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) and Croft (1998). As my point is not to argue for or against any particular view of event structure, I hope my lack of theoretical purity here will be excused.

The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages  
Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

24

BT 36a. Sumakai oku do baas.

AV.ride 1S.PIV NPIV bus

I take (ride [on]) a bus.

[a ACT<ride> ] ^ [a BE\_AT b]]

.....

b. Minamalapak iau di piasau (do dangol).

AV.PST.poN.split 3S.PIV NPIV coconut

He split the coconut (with a machete).

[a ACT ] CAUSE ([b ACT ] CAUSE) [ C RESULT<split>]

.....

c. Minomobog oku di tasu.

AV.PST.poN.strike 1S.PIV NPIV dog

I hit the dog.

[a ACT<hit> b]]

.....

Clauses with instrument pivots would be analysed with a similar ACT profile in sentences with instrument pivots. Compare:

37a. Linapak dau i piasau do dangol.

PST.split.PV 3S.NPIV PIV coconut NPIV machete

He split the coconut with a machete.

[a ACT ] CAUSE [b ACT ] CAUSE [ C RESULT<split>]

.....

b. Pinamalapak dau di piasau i dangol.

PST.poN.split 3S.NPIV NPIV coconut PIV machete

He split the coconut with the machete.

[a ACT ] CAUSE [b ACT ] CAUSE [ C RESULT<split>]

.....

It is possible, perhaps even likely, that these instrument pivot clauses originally used conveyance voice, as is the case in Tagalog--see example 8 above. Kroeger in fact postulates a  $\emptyset$  allomorph of the conveyance voice prefix for instrument pivot clauses with poN- in Kimaragang, as we consider in more detail in section 6 below. Of course, an instrument is not a *volitional* actor, but act event structure phases are not necessarily volitional.

The circumstances in which poN- forms are used in Dusunic languages like BT (and Ki)

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

25

are just those in which an ACT phase is profiled in a transitive clause. This same analysis can be extended to transitive causatives:

38a. Papamalapak oku dau dino piasau.

AV.R.poN.split 1S.PIV 3S.PIV DEM.NPIV COCONUT

[a ACT ] CAUSE [b ACT ] CAUSE [ c RESULT<split>]

.....

b. Pamalapakon ku iau dino piasau.

AV.R.poN.split 1S.NPIV 3S.PIV DEM.NPIV COCONUT

[a ACT ] CAUSE [b ACT ] CAUSE [ c RESULT<split>]

.....

c. Palapakan ku dau ino piasau.

po.split.GV 1S.NPIV 3S.NPIV DEM.PIV COCONUT

I am getting him to split those coconuts.

[a ACT ] CAUSE [b ACT ] CAUSE [ c RESULT<split>]

.....

*poN-* forms, rather than the expected *po-*, are used (without the actor voice prefix *m-*, as noted earlier) in just those de-transitive causative clauses in which what is profiled is an act phase involving either the antagonist (35a) or the agonist (35c) of the causative situation. *po-* forms are used when it is the result that is profiled.

When the actor of a clause is profiled, it should not be surprising that a verb form profiling the action itself, in this case an action nominalisation (or gerund), should come to be used in that clause. From a diachronic viewpoint, this is what I claim took place at some early period in the history of Malayo-Polynesian languages. The pattern observed in Dusunic languages is simply the synchronic consequence of that early move, though its extension to actor profile causatives is, so far as I am aware, a Dusunic innovation. It is not clear to me whether the use of \**paN-* reflexes in actor profile clauses was originally confined largely to transitive verbs, as is the case for Malayo-Polynesian languages outside the Philippines, or whether languages like Tagalog are more conservative in this respect. Those who have ventured reconstructions, like Ross (2002), have tended not to look outside the Philippines, though there is no reason to believe that Philippine languages are more conservative in this respect than are languages to the south.

It should now be clear why I have labelled Dusunic *poN-* a degenerative antipassive. If Dusunic languages were ergative in the conventional sense, one would expect the predicate of clauses with the marked (that is, non-patient) pivot choice to reflect that

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

26

choice in some morphosyntactic fashion. Dusunic languages are *not* ergative, yet the patient is still the unmarked pivot choice in a transitive clause. In those cases in which the pivot choice was one that profiled an ACT phase in the event structure of a transitive clause, a verb form that was originally an action nominalisation was the one that came to be used.

## 5 The Causative Prefix *po-*

### 5.1 The Etymology of Dusunic *po-*

Kroeger's analysis of Kimaragang *po-/poN-* as undergoer agreement prefixes required him to postulate two homophonous *po-* prefixes, one alternating with *poN-* and marking undergoers intermediate in the event structure and the other a causative prefix. The causative prefix *po-* reflects the PMP causative \**pa-* (< PAN \**pa-* 'dynamic non-motion/location causative' in Blust's (2003) reconstruction). Kroeger's undergoer-marking *po-* has no obvious etymology, nor is it obvious by what path it might have emerged, either as a specialisation of the causative *po-* or from some other source. Kroeger makes two attempts at etymologising undergoer-marking *po-*. The first (Kroeger 1996:ft. 2), which he attributes to David Zorc, is the suggestion that it reflects a PAN \**paG-*. I have never encountered that reconstruction, and can only think that it is equivalent to PMP \**paR-*. If that is the case, then it cannot be the source of Kroeger's affectedness-marking *po-*, since the Dusunic reflex of \**paR-* is *pog-*. His second attempt at etymologising *po-* is a rather opaque reference to the effect that: "[i]n some closely related languages, it appears that both of these prefixes [the transitive and the causative *po-* -- SPH] can co-occur in the same word." (Kroeger 2005:420) Since he does not identify these closely related languages, this claim is difficult to assess. The only such cases of which I am aware come from discussions of two languages in Northern Sulawesi, Ratahan (Himmelmann and Wolff 1999) and Buol (Zobel 2005). In both those languages, the causative (Buol *po-*, Ratahan *pa-*) appears to require a stem-forming prefix to carry tense and voice. Ratahan has three such stem forming prefixes: *paN-*, *pu-*, and *pa-*. The last of these, homophonous with the causative *pa-*, is also the stem formative that typically precedes *pa*, yielding *papa-*. For Buol, Zobel notes only *poN-* and *pog-*, and observes that it is the latter, in the shape of the allomorph *po-*, that typically precedes causative *po-*. For example:

Bu 39. Pinopo-lundu=nio=lono                      taa utato. (= Zobel 2005: ex. 69)  
IV.PST.CAU-embark=3S.GEN=CPL NR sibling  
'She made [her] brother embark.'

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

27

If Zobel is correct in analysing the Buol stem formant *po-* as an allomorph of *pog-* (and therefore a reflex of PAN \**paR-*), and if that analysis can be extended to Ratahan stem-forming *pa-*, then these forms do not provide any external parallels to Kroeger's claim that there are homophonous *po*<sub>-TR</sub> and *po*<sub>-CA</sub> prefixes in Kimaragang because, if nothing else, there is no reason to believe that Dusunic *pog-* has an allomorph *po-*, except by stipulation. Himmelmann suggests that "what is described as polysemy of causative *pa-* for a number of transitional and preposed possessor languages is actually a case of homophony, due to a merger of \**pa-*, \**paR-* and \**paN-*". (Himmelmann 2005:171) A corollary to those cautionary remarks is that before one postulates a *new* morpheme homophonous with the reflex of some well-established etymon, one must take care to consider the history of the entire system.

## 5.2 *Bundu Tuhan po-*

As we did with BT *poN-*, we might begin by distinguishing a number of constructions in which lexemes derived via *po-* appear in BT. These include:

- i. prototypical causation, of both the *cause* and *let* variety
- ii. persistence of stance, state, and, occasionally, motion
- iii. situations involving instruments
- iv. situations involving conveyed themes

In function ii, *po-* is typically prefixed to stems already derived via other prefixes, the most common being *iN-* (see further below). In the form *poki-*, it is used productively with verb and noun roots with the prefix *ki-* 'to have an object, to manifest a property' in verbs meaning 'to ask someone to V' or 'to go to get N'. It is also prefixed to forms derived via *piN-* 'repetitive action, persistent state' with causative interpretations. These uses are readily subsumed under the functions of *po-* alone, and will not be considered further here.

### 5.2.1 *Prototypical Causation*

With a range of transitive and intransitive stems, *po-* is a valency increasing device, adding an {[X ACT] CAUSE} phase (with a typically sentient causer) to the event structure associated with the root. As already described in some detail above, with transitive roots *po-* appears only in forms in which an ACT phrase is not profiled. With intransitive roots like *odop* 'sleep', however, *po-* appears in all (available) voices:

BT 40a. Irikau po do hino, poodop oku po diti tanak.

sit yet NP<sub>IV</sub> here, po.sleep.AV 1S.P<sub>IV</sub> yet DEM.NP<sub>IV</sub> child

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

28

- b. Irikau po do hino, poodopo' ku po iti tanak.  
sit yet NPIV here, po.drink.PV 1S.NPIV yet DEM.PIV child  
Just have a seat while I put the baby to sleep.

With stative roots like *tobono* 'shut' and *naru* 'wide' in the following examples, *po-* derives transitive accomplishments, as in:

- 41a. ...om panangkus no iolo do kinumaa do hiri id walai om potobono' no i totobon.  
& poN.run now 3P.PIV NPIV PST.AV.dir NPIV here LOC house & po.shut.PV now PIV door  
...and they ran towards the house and shut the door.
- b. Panaru iolo di talun-alun.  
po.wide.AV 3P.PIV NPIV road  
They are widening the road.

*po-* is not the only construction available in BT to derive de-stative causatives however and, in the data available to me so far, is not particularly frequent in that function.

Roots naming acts of ingestion like *akan* 'eat' and *inum* 'drink' can be used both intransitively (42) and transitively (43):

42. Kosorou iolo do makan tu' louson nodi gia.  
ST.think 3P.PIV NPIV AV.eat because hunger.PV already rather  
It occurs to them to eat because they are already rather hungry.
- 43a. Ogumu po kaagu tua-ua' do norubat tu' aa' diolo naai' do mangakan.  
ST.many yet again fruit NPIV PST.ST.waste since not 3P.NPIV PST.finish NPIV AV.poN.eat  
Much fruit was wasted too because they didn't finish eating (them).
- b. Inumo' ino waig nu.  
drink.PV that water 2S.NPIV  
Drink that water you've got.

Voice selection for causatives derived from verbs of ingestion is parallel to that of detransitive causatives, except that *po-* is used in all voices:

- 44a. Poinum oku po diti tanak.  
po.drink.AV 1S.PIV yet DEM.NPIV child  
I'm still giving this child something drink.
- b. Poinumo' i tanak nu diti tubat.  
po.drink.PV PIV child 2S.NPIV DEM.NPIV medicine  
Have your child drink this medicine.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

29

- c. Nunu o paakanan do tanak do sumusu po?  
what PIV po.eat.GV NPIV child NPIV AV.nurse yet  
What do you feed a child who is still nursing?

The fact that these ingestion verb causatives do not take *poN-* with actor pivots, as do other transitive causatives, is perhaps explained if there are derived from intransitive, rather than transitive forms. Along with other de-intransitive causatives, *po.V* forms of ingestion verbs are also used as object nominals; for example: *paakan* 'food, what is eaten', *poinum* 'drink, what is drunk', *posuang* 'contents, that which is put in' (< *posuang* 'put in, make/let enter').

Verbs of perception and cognition like *intong* 'see', *ilo* 'know', and *kito* 'see, observe' have derived causatives that behave like causatives of ingestion verbs. Note that *ilo* and *kito* have no non-causative eventive forms. Though *intong* 'see' has actor and goal voice forms, it is defective in having no patient voice form. The goal voice is used when the stimulus is pivot.

## 5.2.2 Maintenance of State, Stance, and Motion

From the perspective of accounts of the semantics of causation restricted to causatives paraphrasable by the English *make* or *let* constructions, like those just discussed, derived causatives like the following BT forms appear unusual, even anomalous:

45. Pokukuro i tanak di nokorikot ko?

po.R.Q.AV PIV child NPIV PST.POT.arrive.AV 2S.PIV

What was the child's position when you arrived? (expected answer: a stance)

- 46a. Nokokito iau do sumandak do tolumis no kopio do poingkakat id tolitudan dau.

PST.POT.see 3S.PIV NPIV girl NPIV N.ST.beautiful yet very NPIV.det. po.iN.AV.stand LOC  
N.ST.back.GV 3S.PIV

He saw a very beautiful young lady standing behind him.

- cf. b. Ingkakatan nopo diolo i karaja do mooj pomoruba' di montiri.

leave.GV *nopo* 3P.NPIV PIV work NPIV AV.go poN.meet NPIV minister

They leave their work to welcome the minister.

47. Tanak bo di Sigam ii poinsikul do hilo id Labuan?

child Q NPIV Sigam DEM.PIV po.iN.AV.school NPIV there LOC Labuan?

Is it Sigam's child that is going to school in Labuan?

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

30

48. Dii poimpasi po iau, opuhaang tomod i taki ku.

DEM.NPIV po.iN.AV.alive yet 3S.PIV ST.generous very PIV grandfather 1S.NPIV

When he was alive, my grandfather was very generous.

In Talmy's (2000:ch. 7) generalised force dynamic account of causation, the BT *poiN-* construction just exemplified is an instance of *steady state*, as opposed to *onset* causation. In steady state causation, the antagonist applies force, actual or metaphoric, to keep the agonist at rest or in motion in contrast to the onset causation exemplified in the previous section, in which the antagonist affects some change. Note also that in Talmy's account, the antagonist need not be a separate individual, nor an agent. Individuals can act on themselves, and the force can be more metaphoric than actual, as in 48 above. Steady state causatives are generally paraphrasable as English *keep/stay/continue V'ing* constructions.

The following sentences exemplify a construction in which a *po.V.GV* form is used in an apparently pivotless clause to mark maintenance of direction or orientation:

49. Patakadan di tanak.

po.uphill.GV NPIV child

The child is going uphill.

50. Poguliai ku no kaagu.

po.return.GV 1S.NPIV yet again

I retraced my route.

51. Pasakaian ku di korita.

po.ride.GV 1S.NPIV NPIV car

I'm going to get in the car.

The same construction is used with the auxiliary verb *tilombus* 'continue':

52. Potilombusai ku nopo do mamananau.

po.continue.GV 1S.NPIV *nopo* NPIV AV.poN.travel

I kept on riding.

The aspectual auxiliaries *timpuun* 'start' and *tingkod* 'stop', which do not involve persistence of a steady state, can appear in the same construction:

53. Timpuunai no diolo do mamatuh gisom do naai' om powonsoio no do walai.

start.GV yet 3P.NPIV NPIV AV.poN.weave till NPIV PST.ST.end and po.build.PV NPIV house

They started weaving until they had finished and they built a house of it.

but do not take *po-*. Since subordinate clauses introduced by the otherwise non-pivot

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

31

determiner *do* can function as clausal pivots in BT, one might suggest that this is the case in examples like 49. That account is not available for other instances of the *po.V.GV* direction maintenance construction, whose apparently pivotless nature remains a mystery to me.

### 5.2.3 Conveyed Themes, Instruments, and Conveyance Voice

Perhaps the most singular use of the causative in BT and other Dusunic languages is in patient voice with conveyed theme pivots, as in:

54. Potokonon ku i tandus do hilo id gouton.

*po.throw.PV 1S.NPIV PIV spear NPIV there LOC bush*

I will throw your spear into the bush.

55. Pinotungu dau di bunga i waig di pinogonsok do takano.

*po.pour.PV 3S.NPIV NPIV flower PIV water NPIV AV.PST.pog.cook NPIV rice*

He poured the water the rice was cooked in onto the flowers.

56.

*Iti sada o pinaatod diolo.*

*DEM.PIV fish PIV PST.po.transport.PV 3P.NPIV*

These fish are what they transported.

57. Intangai daa num notuuh no i kain di pinosidang ku dii.

*see.GV please if PST.ST.dry yet PIV clothes NPIV PST.po.dry.in.sun.PV 3P.NPIV DEM.NPIV*

See if the clothes I put out to dry are dried yet.

The notion *conveyed theme* appears to extend to the content of speech verbs, as in:

58a. ...om posunudo' no disio i naantakan ngaai do koposion dau.

*and po.advise.PV yet 3S.NPIV PIV PST.ST.OCCUR.GV all NPIV ko.alive.PV 3S.NPIV*

...and he told her all that had happened in his life.

b. Haro poboroson ku dau.<sup>18</sup>

*exist po.speak.PV 1S.NPIV 3S.NPIV*

I have something to say to him.

The use of the causative *po-* in these conveyed theme constructions is of particular interest because it appears to be an innovation that may be unique to Dusunic languages. In other Philippine-type languages, the predicate of a verbal clause whose pivot is a theme that undergoes movement would typically be expressed in what is variously termed the instrumental (Kroeger 1996), translative (Kroeger 1988), circumstantial (Ross 2002), or

---

18. In this example, the causative *poboroson* 'what is said' is used as a noun naming the content of the speech event.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

32

conveyance (Himmelmann 2005) voice, marked by reflexes of PAN \*Si-/PMP \*i-. In those Dusunic languages that retain it, like Kimaragang, the conveyance voice is also used in such circumstances:<sup>19</sup>

- Ki 59. I-tokon kuh itih tandus nuh sid gowuton.  
IV-hurl 1SG.GEN this.NOM spear your DAT jungle  
I will throw your spear into the bush. (= Kroeger 1996:ex.19a)
60. N-i-tungtug dialo i p[in]oN-woog-an do wagas sid bunga.  
PAST-IV-pour 3SG NOM [PAST]U<sub>i</sub>-wash-DV ACC rice DAT flower  
He poured the (water) that the uncooked rice was washed in onto the flowers.  
(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 33b)
61. N-i-atod dih Jaiwan itih sada ditih.  
PAST-TF-bring NONP/DEF Jaiwan this (P) fish this  
These fish Jaiwan brought over. (= Kroeger 1988a:ex. 87)
62. Intang-an tinoo it kumut dit n-i-sidang.  
watch-DATF soon P/DEF cloth REL PAST-TF-dry  
Check on the clothes (I) put out to dry. (= Kroeger 1988a:ex. 89)

In Kimaragang, however, these conveyance voice forms alternate with po.V.PV forms, as in:

- Ki 63a. Kobobos nopoh yalo mongimpuros dit roo dit kanas .  
satisfied only he (P) examine NONP/DEF jaw of wild.pig  
posowito (po-sawit-o) noh dialo sid tayup.  
CAUS-pour-ACCF already he (NONP) on post  
When he was tired of examining the jawbone of the pig, he hung it on the post of his trap. (= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 93)
- b. Jadi, pamanau noh dirih mogintong dit tulang dit roo dit kanas  
so walked already this look.at NONP/DEF jaw of wild.pig  
it n-i-sawit dih kusai sid tayup yoh.  
REL.DEF PAST-TF-hang NONP/DEF man on post his  
So they went to look at the jawbone of the wild pig, which the man had hung on the post of his trap. (= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 94)

---

19. It is not uncommon in recent literature to find the pivot of conveyance voice forms labelled displaced themes. This usage seems to have begun in Kroeger (1996:35f), and has been adopted by Himmelmann (for example, 2006:5). Kroeger acknowledges its origin in Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1988), but doesn't seem to notice that 'displaced' refers not to the referent of the theme argument but to its syntactic realisation, a NP displaced from direct to oblique status.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

33

64a. Po-suwang-on kuh it wogok sid tinsod.

CAUS-enter-ACCF I (NONP) P.DEF pig to pig.pen

b. I-suwang kuh it wogok sid tinsod.

I'll put the pig into his pen.

(= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 91)

65a. Pa-taak-on dogo itih siin sid dih Maralin.

CAUS-give-ACCF me (NONP) this (P).DEF money to NONP.DEF Maralin

Give this money to Maralin for me.

(= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 102)

b. Itih siin i-taak nuh sid dih Maralin.

this (P).DEF money TF-give you (NONP.SG) to NONP.DEF Maralin

Give this money to Maralin for me.

(= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 103)

Compare:

BT 66. Potonomon di odu i bunga.

po.plant.PV NPIV grandmother PIV flower

Grandmother is planting the flower.

67. Posuargon iti sada do tid balatak.

po.enter.PV PIV fish NPIV LOC basket

Put this fish in a basket.

68. Patahakon di turang tua ilo panahak.

po.enter.PV NPIV headman DEM.PIV contribution

Give that contribution to the headman.

Conveyance voice is also common with instrument pivots in Philippine-type languages, and it is for that reason that the voice is often labelled *instrument voice*. The following sentences exemplify instrument pivot clauses in conveyance voice in Kimaragang:

Ki 69a. Nokuroh.tu' n-i-ansap nuh do poring inoh dangol kuh?

why PST-IV-scrape 2S.GEN bamboo that.NOM bush.knife my

Why did you use my bush knife to scrape bamboo?

b. Sagai bala amu noh a-tarom iti pisou n-i-gamas nu boh.

PRTCL PRTCL not COMPL STAT-sharp this(NOM) knife PST-IV-cut.grass 2S.GEN PRTCL

No wonder this knife isn't sharp any more, you used it to cut grass!

(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005: ex. 37a,b)

Kroeger suggests that the use of conveyance voice with instruments implies that the instrument is damaged or otherwise affected. In a more general sense, perhaps instrument pivots in conveyance voice clauses are just a type of conveyed theme; that is, the instrument is construed as an object that is moved in the course of carrying out some

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

34

other action or bringing about some result.

It should come as no great surprise that patient voice verbs can also be used with instrument pivots in *po-* in both Bundu Tuhan and Kimaragang:

BT 70a. Popigison ku i pais di daging.

*po.cut.pv* 1S.NPIV PIV knife NPIV meat

I will use the knife to cut the meat.

b. Nokotogod oku dau do pinotibas dau i dangol ku do id watu. cf. Kr 96-9

*PST.ST.angry* 1S.PIV 3S.NPIV NPIV *po.PST.slash.pv* 3S.NPIV PIV machete 1S.NPIV NPIV LOC  
rock

I got angry at him for slashing my knife on a rock.

c. Palapakon ku iti pais di lugus.

*po.split.pv* 1S.NPIV DEM.PIV knife NPIV betelnut

I'm using this knife to split the betelnut.Ki

71a. Ong koo-titip do dangol, kada'ai pa-lapak-o dot niyuw.

*if IMM-forge* NONP.INDEF bush.knife don't *CAUS-split-ACCF.IMPER* NONP.INDEF COCONUT

Don't try to split coconuts with a newly forged bush knife.

(= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 87)

b. Po-omot-on kuh petih (poh itih) linggaman nuh ditih, ong atarom ko amu.

*CAUS-harvest-ACCF* I(NONP) yet this(P) harvest.knife your this if sharp or not

I will try harvesting with your knife to see whether it is sharp.

(= Kroeger 1988b:ex. 88)

The equivalence of conveyance voice and *po.V.pv* forms is a noteworthy feature of Kimaragang grammar (and, I would speculate, of other Dusunic languages in which the conveyance voice survives). Kroeger points it out explicitly in an early paper, observing that:

"there is a general tendency for Translative Focus (= conveyance voice--SPH) forms and affected Causee forms to be equivalent. For intransitive stems, this means that Translative Focus forms take on causative meanings. For ditransitive verbs, the instrumental causative form can be substituted for the simple Translative Focus form, both forms conveying non-causative senses. For transitive verbs not involving an instrument, both Translative Focus and affected Causee (= *po-* causative in patient voice --SPH) forms convey non-causative senses involving change of position. In all these cases, the object whose location is affected is in focus." (Kroeger 1988b.:266f)

Bundu Tuhan, and other central and coastal dialects that agree with it in this respect, differ

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

35

from Kimaragang (and similar languages) in that while the latter have *two* constructions for profiling a conveyed theme, the former, having lost the conveyance voice, have only the *po.V.PV* construction.

### 6 The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Just how a causative could come to alternate with, and in some languages replace the conveyance voice with caused movement verbs is an interesting problem of historical grammar about which I will entertain some speculation below. What is of more immediate interest is to show that this change was in fact the origin of the *po-/poN-* alternations that Kroeger describes as undergoer affectedness marking. To do this, we begin by reviewing Kroeger's proposal. He makes the following four claims:

- I. The undergoer affectedness prefixes *po-* and *poN-* appear only on verbs in transitive clauses with a non-pivot undergoer.
- II. The choice of prefix is determined by the thematic role of the undergoer argument, which in turn is constrained by the semantics of the predicate. If the undergoer is the end point of the predicate's event structure, the corresponding verb takes *poN-*: if the undergoer is some intermediate point, the verb takes *po-*. Undergoers of the former sort are deemed *terminal*, and are usually patients or goals/recipients. Those of the latter sort are deemed *non-terminal*, and are usually conveyed themes or instruments.
- III. In some cases, the event structure affords no choice of undergoer. For simple act or result transitives without instruments for example, the undergoer is always the patient and so the verb must carry *poN-* when the undergoer is non-pivot.
- IV. In at least two cases,<sup>20</sup> a three-argument event structure does offer a choice of undergoer:

---

20. A third case that one might initially expect would be parallel to that of patient/instrument clauses is that of transitive clauses with benefactives. If the benefactive is the undergoer, in what he terms the *benefactive applicative construction* (Kroeger 1996:42-4), Kroeger asserts that the benefactive undergoer must be selected as pivot. As a consequence, the verb carries no affectiveness prefix by condition I) above. By the same reasoning no affectiveness prefix appears if the patient is selected as pivot, since the benefactive cannot be undergoer. Kroeger attempts to justify this analysis of benefactives as a *morphological blocking* constraint. He argues that in patient/benefactive clauses, both these arguments are *terminal* in his sense, and as potential undergoers, both therefore "compete" for the same *poN-* prefix. In that case, he asserts that patient undergoers "win" because they are obligatory. The existence of a *poN.V* patient undergoer construction "blocks" the same form from use with benefactive undergoers. I find Kroeger's account rather stipulative and not particularly convincing, though others of course may not. In my account of the function of *poN-*, one would not expect it to be used in any of the constructions in question, since they do not involve ACT profiling.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

36

- a. In caused motion situations, the undergoer might be either the conveyed theme or the goal/recipient.
- b. In transitive clauses with an explicit instrument, the undergoer might be either the patient or the instrument.

As observed in the preceding section for instrument pivots in conveyance voice, it is possible to interpret these two cases as effectively the same, if an instrument undergoer is viewed as a conveyed theme, an object manipulated and affected in bringing about a result or effect on some other entity.

Kroeger and Johansson characterise the choices in IVa-b above as *undergoer perspective alternations*. With respect to caused motion predications they observe that "[f]rom one perspective, the speaker's primary interest is the effect of the action on the displaced theme. From the other perspective, the speaker's primary interest is the effect on the goal." (2005:185f) For caused motion verbs, including imparted motion verbs like Ki *suwang* 'put/go in', ditransitives like *ta'ak* 'give', and transitive verbs like *tokon* 'spear, hurl' or *tanom* 'plant' that can be construed as involving imparted motion, Kroeger and Johansson describe the Theme-Goal undergoer alternation as akin to the *spray/load* diathesis alternations of English. They tabulate the Kimaragang verb forms corresponding to each perspective choice as follows:

		A	B
VOICE/PIVOT		U=THEME	U=GOAL
1	AV/Actor	∅- <i>po</i> -Root (72a)	<i>m-poN</i> -Root (72b)
2	CV/Theme	<i>i</i> -Root (73a)	∅- <i>poN</i> -Root (73b)
3	GV/Goal	<i>po</i> -Root- <i>an</i> (74a)	Root- <i>an</i> (74b)

Table 5: *po-poN-* with Theme-Goal Verbs (= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(31))

In some cases, as for *suwang* 'go/put in, fill' (72-74) and *tokon* 'hurl, spear' (75-76) the semantic contrast between theme and goal undergoer clauses is sharp:

- Ki 72a. ∅-*po*-*suwang* *okuh* *ditih* *sada* *sid* *pata'an*.  
 AV-U<sub>n</sub>-enter 1SG.NOM this(ACC) fish DAT basket  
 I will put this fish in a/the basket.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

37

- b. Monuang okuh do pata'an do sada.  
m.poN.suwang okuh do pata'an do sada.  
AV-U<sub>t</sub>-enter 1SG.NOM ACC basket ACC fish  
I give fill a basket with fish.  
(= 2 above and Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(28))
- 73a. Subai.ko i-suwang inoh parai sid kadut.  
should IV-enter that(NOM) rice DAT gunnysack  
You should/must put that rice into a gunnysack.
- b. Amu kosukup ilo weeg dot Ø-poN-(s)uwang do botung.  
NEG enough that(NOM) water COMP IV-U<sub>t</sub>-enter ACC paddy.field  
There is not enough water to fill up the paddy field.  
(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(29a), (30b))
- 74a. Nunuh ot po-suwang-an nu dit togilai nu?  
what NOM U<sub>n</sub>-enter-DV 2SG.GEN ACC corn 2SG.GEN  
What will you put your corn into? (to store or carry)
- b. S[in]uwang-an dialo dot togilai ilo bakul yoh.  
[PAST]enter-DV 3SG.GEN corn that(NOM) basket 3SG.GEN  
He filled his basket with corn. (= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(29b), (30a))
- 75a. Ø-po-tokon okuh do tandus.  
AV-U<sub>n</sub>-hurl 1SG.NOM ACC spear  
I will throw a spear. (= Kroeger 1996:ex. 18a)
- b. Monokon okuh do kanas.  
AV-U<sub>t</sub>-hurl 1SG.NOM ACC wild.pig  
I will spear a wild pig. (not \*I will hurl a wild pig.) (= Kroeger 1996:ex. 20a)
- 76a. I-tokon kuh itih tandus nuh sid gowuton.  
IV-hurl 1SG.GEN this.NOM spear your DAT jungle  
I will throw your spear into the bush. (= 59 above)
- b. Tokon-on kuh i kanas do poring.  
hurl-OV 1SG.GEN NOM wild.pig ACC bamboo  
I will spear the wild pig with bamboo. (= Kroeger 1996:ex. 21a)

For verbs like *ta'ak* 'hand over, give' (77-78) and *tanom* 'plant, stick in the ground' (79-80) the contrast is rather more subtle:

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

38

- 77a. Ø-pa-ta'ak oku dikau do tana.  
AV-U<sub>n</sub>-give 1SG.NOM 2SG.DAT ACC earth  
I will hand you some dirt. (= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(32b))
- b. Mana'ak(m-poN-ta'ak) oku dikau do tana.  
AV-U<sub>t</sub>-give 1SG.NOM 2SG.DAT ACC earth  
I will give you some land/dirt. (= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(32a))
- 78a. Itih pe'es n-i-taak dih kamaman kuh sid dogon.  
this(P) knife PAST-TF-give 1SG.NONP/DEF ACC basket my to me  
This knife was given to me by my uncle.  
(= Kroeger 1988a:ex. 3, cf. 65b above)
- b. Isai ot pa-taak-an do siin?  
who U<sub>n</sub>-give-PV ACC money  
To whom should contributions be given? (= Kroeger 1996:ex. 4c)
- 79a. Ø-pa-tanom ino tatangan ki.<sup>21</sup>  
AV-U<sub>n</sub>-plant that(NOM) softwood.specied PRTCL  
Stick those *tatangan* poles in the ground (for fenceposts), okay?  
(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 47a)
- b. Subai i-tanom babanar ino torigi...  
PRTCL IV-plant truly that(NOM) house.post  
You must plant those house posts firmly in the ground.  
(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 47b)
- b. M[in]ananom okoi dit tinorodok sid botung yah.  
AV-[PAST]-U<sub>t</sub>-plant 1PL.EX.NOM ACC rice.seedling DAT field 1PL.EX.GEN  
We planted the rice seedlings in our paddy field.  
(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(46a))
- 80a. Subai i-tanom babanar ino torigi...  
PRTCL IV-plant truly that(NOM) house.post  
You must plant those house posts firmly in the ground. (= 63b above)
- b. Tonom-on nu poh i bibit di sayur sid batas.  
plant-OV 2SG.GEN yet ACC seedling GEN veggie DAT bund  
Plant the vegetable seedlings on the bund/bank. (= Kroeger and Johansson

---

21. Kroeger and Johansson gloss this example as actor voice, but its pivot is the theme *ino tatangan* 'those *tatangan* poles'. Either Kimaragang imperatives behave differently from the corresponding forms in BT, or there is some problem with this example. I include it nonetheless, because it is the only example I have been able to find for *tanom* 'plant, stick in the ground' with affectedness marking *po-*.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

39

2005:(46c))

As already noted in section 1, Kroeger claims that with *ta'ak* 'give' the theme undergoer clauses necessarily involve physical transfer, while the recipient undergoer clauses are ambiguous between physical transfer and change of ownership.

Kroeger and Johansson describe a similar Instrument/Patient undergoer alternation for Kimaragang transitive clauses with instruments. The relevant verbs forms are:

		A	B
VOICE/PIVOT		U = Patient	U = Instrument
1	AV/Actor	<i>m-poN-Root</i>	$\emptyset$ - <i>po-Root</i>
2	PV/Patient	<i>Root-on</i>	??
3	CV/Instrument	$\emptyset$ - <i>poN-Root</i>	<i>i-Root</i>

Table 6: Patient-Undergoer and Instrument-Undergoer Paradigms  
(adapted from Kroeger and Johansson 2005:(36))

as in:

Ki 81a. Mangalapak(*m-poN-lapak*) oku do niyuw.<sup>22</sup>

AV-U<sub>f</sub>-split 1SG.NOM ACC COCONUT

I will split a coconut / some coconuts.

(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 34a)

b. *Lapak-on* ku do kapak ilo' niyuw ku.

split-OV 1SG.GEN ACC AXE that(NOM) COCONUT 1SG.GEN

I will split my coconuts with an axe.

(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 34b)

c. Tongoh ot pangalapak( $\emptyset$ -*poN-lapak*) nu dilo' niyuw?

what REL IV-U<sub>f</sub>-split 2SG.GEN that(ACC) COCONUT

What will you split those coconuts with?

(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 34c)

22. I have found no parallel example of an actor voice form with an expressed instrument in the Kimaragang material available to me, though there is no reason I am aware of that such forms should not be possible.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

40

82a. Ø-pa-lapak oku poh diti kapak nu do niyuw.

AV-U<sub>n</sub>-split 1SG.NOM yet this(ACC) axe your ACC coconut

I will (or 'Let me') split some coconuts with your axe.

(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 35a)

b. Nokuroh.tu n-i-lapak nu do niyuw inoh dangol ku?

why PAST-IV-split 2SG.GEN ACC coconut that(NOM) bush.knife 1SG.GEN

Why did you use my bush knife to split coconuts?

(= Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ex. 35b)

As already noted, what are undergoer instruments in Kroeger and Johansson's analysis (82) are construed as more affected than are the non-undergoer instruments of 81. And as also observed above, these instrument undergoer constructions that Kroeger (1996) terms *instrumental applicatives* may just be a special case of conveyed themes.

There are two empirical problems with Kroeger's undergoer affectedness analysis of the *po-/poN-* alternations in Dusunic languages. First, though Kroeger asserts that the undergoer affectedness prefixes appear only on transitive verbs with non-pivot undergoers, the *po.V.PV* construction exemplified in Kimaragang examples like 64a, 65a, and 71a-b and BT examples 66-68 and 70 above are cases of *pivot* conveyed theme or instrument undergoers in clauses with a *po-* prefixed verb. In Kimaragang, this construction is an alternative to the conveyance voice construction of cell A2 in Table 5 and B3 in Table 6.

The second problem is the fact that some instances of the perspective alternations Kroeger attributes to undergoer choice involve clauses that are not differentiated by the presence of a *po-* rather than a *poN-* prefixed verb form. The same alternation is observed in Kimaragang in the contrast between conveyance voice and *poN.V* forms in row 2 of Table 5 and row 3 of Table 6 above. And once again, conveyance voice is implicated.

Kroeger is aware of both these issues. As already observed in section 5.2.3 above, he comments at length on the equivalence of conveyance voice and *po.V.PV* constructions in Kroeger (1988:266f), and provides numerous examples in early papers, though these are overlooked in later work. By Kroeger and Johansson (2005) he has become aware of undergoer affectedness alternations holding between conveyance voice and *poN.V* forms. In that paper, Kroeger and Johansson are careful *not* to attribute what they now term these *object alternations* specifically to the presence of *po-* and *poN-*. "[T]he alternation is not triggered by the presence of an affix.", they state (2005:178-9). Instead, they now attribute the undergoer affectedness constraints to the choice between undergoer

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

41

selection paradigms: the Theme-Undergoer or Goal-Undergoer paradigms of Table 5 and the Patient-Undergoer or Instrument-Undergoer paradigms of Table 6.

The alternative analysis I propose here confronts both these issues directly. I would argue that the membership of Kroeger and Johansson's undergoer selection paradigms is not accidental, nor are the two pairs of paradigms particularly distinct. One set comprises the conveyance voice in *i-* and those forms in *po-* that are alternatives to the conveyance voice, in an extended sense I will make explicit below. The other set is just the remaining three voices, as appropriate to particular verb classes and with or without *poN-* depending upon whether the voice chosen does or does not profile an ACT phase in event structure.

The easiest way to describe these patterns is to describe the processes by which I believe they arose. Let us begin at a period prior to that in which *po.V.PV* began to be used in Dusunic languages as alternatives to the simple conveyance voice in *i-*. At that stage the languages had the standard four voices and employed the prefix *poN-* (and its competitor *pog-*) in the ACT profiling function it still retains under my analysis. Ignoring the *poN.V.an* forms as we have done here throughout, only one the alternations considered above was present in the language at this point, the alternation between clauses with conveyance voice forms and with *poN.V* (row 2 and row 3 of Table 5 and Table 6, respectively), as exemplified in Kimaragang in 73a-b and 81c/82b above.

Let me stress again that for me these two cases are essentially the same, the contrast between a conveyed theme and an instrument. As Kroeger and Johansson (2005:187) observe, instrument pivot forms with *poN-* are more frequent than those with the simple conveyance voice. The latter construction is restricted to cases in which the instrument is not just used but is also affected. In my analysis, these are cases in which the instrument is being construed as a conveyed theme. The converse is probably the case for examples like 73a-b. In 73b, the referent of *ilo weeg* 'that water' is being construed as an instrument, rather than as a conveyed theme, so a *poN-* prefixed verb form is used.

As observed in section 4.5, Kroeger and Johansson analyse both these constructions in Kimaragang as conveyance voice, the latter involving a  $\emptyset$  allomorph of the conveyance voice prefix *i-* (Kroeger and Johansson 2005:ft. 2). They note that in Labuk Kadazan, another Dusunic language, the corresponding form is in fact *ipoN-* (Hurlbut 1988:61).<sup>23</sup> I

---

23. Compare the Tagalog instrumental *ipaN-* in example 8 above. For examples of *poN-* with instrument pivots in BT, see 20-24 above.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

42

am not particularly fond of  $\emptyset$  morphemes, but have no reason to dispute Kroeger and Johansson's analysis, at least as a possible account of the history of the Dusunic instrumental *poN-*. And their proposal does not affect my view of the nature of the contrast; the conveyance voice with *poN-* was used with an instrument pivot when the instrument was being construed *qua* instrument, as involved in an act phrase in event structure rather than (or perhaps in addition to) being itself a conveyed theme. The *relevant* portions of the voice system at this point, as I view it, might be tabulated as follows:

			A	B	
		VOICE	PIVOT	caused motion events	other events
<b>1</b>	AV	Actor			<i>m-(poN-)Root</i>
<b>2</b>	PV	Patient			<i>Root-on</i>
<b>3</b>	CV	Theme/ Instrument		<i>i-Root</i>	<i>i-poN-Root</i>
<b>4</b>	GV	Goal, etc.			<i>Root-an</i>

Table 7: Voice and Event Semantics in Pre-Dusunic

Crucial to this account is the fact that conveyance voice forms were (and continue to be) associated with a very particular caused motion event structure (as evidenced in examples like 73a, 76a, 78a, 80a, and 82b above). That is not to say that each voice in Dusunic (and other Philippine-type) languages is not associated with its own semantics, at least at the level of profile selection. But the contrast between the conveyance voice and other voices used with transitive predicates is particularly marked, and is the basis for the undergoer perspective alternations Kroeger and Johansson (2005) discuss.

At this historical juncture, the patient voice causative came to be used as an alternative to conveyance voice in Dusunic languages. There is one important difference between conveyance voice and the *po.V.PV* construction that came to alternate with it, however. The former is just one member of a four-member voice paradigm (ignoring the various ACT profiling functions of *poN-*), but *po-* causative derivatives are *lexemes*. As lexemes, they potentially come with a complete voice paradigm, of which the *po.V.PV* construction is but one member. Once that construction is in place as an alternative to conveyance voice with theme pivots of caused motion verbs, the other members of the causative paradigm

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

43

become available to profile other arguments.<sup>24</sup> The result is that two paradigms are now available for caused motion predicates:

		A		B	
	PIVOT	VOICE	Basic Paradigm	VOICE	Innovative Paradigm
1	Actor	AV	<i>m-poN-Root</i>	AV	$\emptyset$ - <i>po-Root</i>
2	Theme	CV	<i>i-Root</i>	CV	<i>po-Root-on</i>
3	Goal	GV	<i>Root-an</i>	GV	<i>po-Root-an</i>

Table 8: Two Paradigms for Caused Motion Verbs

Cell B2 is a formal alternative to the corresponding cell A2; the semantics of the two forms are not different. The forms in cells B1 and B3 represent real *semantic* innovations in Dusunic languages. As evidenced in examples like 63a, 72a (but see ft. 21), 74a, 75a, 77a, and 78b in Kimaragang, these actor voice and goal voice *po-* forms have the same semantics as the corresponding conveyance voice forms, and contrast with the actor and goal voice forms of the same roots *without po-*.

The final stage of this process is represented by BT, in which the *po.V.PV* replaced the conveyance voice, so that the only forms that remain with caused motion semantics are those of the innovative paradigm of column B in Table 8. The following are instances of this construction in actor voice in BT, to complement the patient voice forms given above:

BT 83a. Papatanom do bunga' i odu'.

po.R.AV.plant NPIV flower PIV grandmother

Grandmother is planting (a) flower(s).

b. Patahak oku di odu do rasuk.

(cf. Ki 1a above)

po.AV.give 1S.PIV NPIV grandmother NPIV clothes

I am giving grandmother a blouse.

c. Posuang oku do sada id balatak.

(cf. Ki 2a above)

po.AV.inside 1S.PIV NPIV fish LOC basket

I will put a fish in the basket.

---

24. I assume that the conveyance voice causative *i-po-Root* did not have a place in this paradigm because its function would have been identical to that of simple conveyance voice and its *po-V-on* alternative. A third form with that same function would have been guiding the lily. In Kimaragang, of course, the conveyance voice *i-po-Root* continues to be used in derived transitive causative clauses with patient pivots, as described in section 4.4 above.

## The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

44

There are no examples of *po*-prefixed verbs in goal voice with goal or recipient pivots in my BT data so far.

The class of *po*-marked undergoers in Kroeger's analysis are thus just those arguments that are pivots of conveyance voice clauses, and the *po.V.AV* and *po.V.GV* in Table 8 are just the forms that alternate with *poN.V.AV* and *V.GV* in rows 1 and 3 of both Tables 5 and 6 above. That is, they *are* the undergoer affectedness alternations. Though Kroeger's undergoer affectedness alternations are real, they are epiphenomenal. Dusunic *poN*- does not mark patient and goal undergoers. It signals act phrase profiling, as it has done since prior to the time the *po*- prefixed construction with which it now contrasts first arose. That construction arose as an alternative to conveyance voice, initially in patient voice with theme pivots and then by analogy in actor and goal voice as well. These latter forms retained the caused motion semantics of conveyance voice, even those cases in which the theme is not pivot. It is the caused motion semantics appropriate to clauses with conveyed theme or instrument pivots in conveyance voice, and maintained in those innovative constructions with actor and goal pivots, that gives the appearance of theme or instrument undergoers in clauses with *po*- verb forms.

At least two questions remain, one historical and one synchronic. The first is how to describe the semantics associated with conveyance voice, as contrasted with that of other voices for the same root. A possible direction is to think of conveyance voice semantics as involving an event structure like the following:

80a. [a cause [b be/move<loc> c]]

b. [a ACT<manner>] CAUSE [b BE/MOVE<loc> c]

in which the resulting motion/location is profiled. The instrumental interpretation of conveyance voice might be represented by structure in which the argument *c* is a result event phase:

c. [a ACT ] CAUSE [b BE/MOVE<loc> [C RESULT<vt>]]

It seems to me that the other voices should involve related event structures, but constrained so that the *b* argument is unavailable as pivot. The sort of structure I have in mind is one in which event structures like 80a and b are mapped onto more typical accomplishment event structures. The details escape me at the moment however.

The second question is why and how the patient voice causative construction came to be used as an alternative to conveyance voice. The answers to such *how possible* questions are often elusive. In this case, it might be as simple as the fact that the semantics of

# **The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages**

**Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)**

**Draft Only (v. January 2007)**

**(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)**

45

conveyance voice is a causative semantics. But so, of course, are the semantics of ordinary accomplishment verbs, and they do not seem to have developed morphological causative alternatives. Historical semantics is can usually only answer *how possible*, and not *why necessary* questions.

# The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages

Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)

Draft Only (v. January 2007)

(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)

46

## References

- Adelaar, Alexander and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2005. *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Austin, Peter, and Simon Musgrave, eds. 2006. *Voice and grammatical functions in Austronesian languages*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*. Urbana: The University of Illinois.
- Blust, Robert. 2003. Three notes on early austronesian morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42(2):438-78.
- Butt, M., and W. Geuder, eds. 1998. *The projection of arguments*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Croft, William. 1998. Event structure in argument linking. in Butt and Geuder, eds., pp. 21-63.
- De Guzman, Videa. 1978. *Syntactic derivation of tagalog verbs*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Foley, Bill. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in philippine languages. *LFG98: Workshop on Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian Languages*
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 2006. Lexical categories and voice in tagalog. in Austin and Musgrave, eds.
2002. Voice in Western Austronesian: an update. in Wouk and Ross, eds. pp. 7-16.
2005. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. in Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds. pp. 110-81.
1991. *The Philippine challenge to universal grammar*. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- and John U. Wolff. 1999. *Toratán (Ratahan)*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Hopper, P.J., and S.A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56 (2).251-99.
- Hurlbut, Hope. 1988. *Verb morphology in eastern kadazan*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1987. The status of thematic relations in linguistic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.369-411.
1990. *Semantic structures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1988a. Verbal focus in Kimaragang. in Steinhauer, H., ed., pp. 217-40.
- 1988b. Case marking in Kimaragang causative constructions. in Steinhauer, H., ed., pp. 241-76.

# **The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages**

**Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)**

**Draft Only (v. January 2007)**

**(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)**

47

1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in tagalog*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

1996. The morphology of affectedness in Kimaragang Dusun. in Steinhauer, H., ed. pp. 33-50.

2005. Kimaragang. in Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds. pp. 397-428.

and Jim Johansson. 2005. Object alternations in Kimaragang. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)* 177-93.

Li, Charles, ed. 1976. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Rappaport Hovav, M., and B. Levin. 1988. What to do with theta-roles. in Wilkins, W., ed. pp. 7-36.

1998. Building verb meanings. in Butt, M. and Geuder, eds. pp. 97-134.

Reesink, Ger P., ed. 1993. *Topics in descriptive Austronesian linguistics*. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië.

Ross, Malcolm. 2002. The history and transitivity of Western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. in Wouk and Ross, eds. pp. 17-62.

Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic or none of the above. in Li, Charles, ed. pp. 491-518.

1995. *The subject in tagalog: Still none of the above*. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, UCLA.

Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Steinhauer, H., ed. 1988. *Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics*, no. 3. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

1996. *Papers in Austronesian linguistics*, no. 3. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, A-84 .

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr., and Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, W., ed. 1998. *Thematic relations*. *Syntax and semantics* 21. New York: Academic Press.

Wolff, John U. 1993. Why roots add the affixes with which they occur. in Reesink, Ger P., ed. pp. 217-44.

Wolff, John U., Maria Theresa C. Centeno, and Der-Hwa V. Rau. 1991. *Pilipino through self-instruction*. Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program.

Wouk, Fay, and Malcolm Ross, eds. 2002. *The history and typology of Western*

**The Epiphenominal Nature of Affectedness Marking in Dusunic Languages**

**Shelly Harrison (Linguistics, University of Western Australia)**

**Draft Only (v. January 2007)**

**(comments welcome, but please do not quote or circulate without permission)**

48

Austronesian voice systems. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Ziegeler, Debra. 1999. Agentivity and the history of the English progressive. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 97 (1).51-101.

Zobel, Erik. 2005. Buol. in Adelaar and Himmelmann, eds. pp. 397-428.