Also in Pacific Linguistics

Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, (compiler), 2001, *Sourcebook on Tomini-Tolitoli languages: general information and word lists.*

David E. Mead, 1999, *The Bungku–Tolaki languages of south-eastern Sulawesi, Indonesia.*

Linda A. Barsel, 1994, *The verb morphology of Mori, Sulawesi.*

Naomi Ferreirinho, 1993, *Selected topics in the grammar of Limos Kalinga, the Philipines.*

Sherri Brainard, 1991, *Theme, result, and contrast: a study in expository discourse in Upper Tanudan Kalinga (Philippines).*

Stephen H. Levinsohn, ed., 1991, *Thematic continuity and development in languages of Sabah.*

Charles E. Grimes and Barbara D. Grimes, 1987, *Languages of south Sulawesi.*

The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems

edited by

Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross

Table of contents

crucial to furthering an understanding of the data presented in this paper will be studying eligibility criteria for choosing between the *ni-* and *nong-* transitive verbs (see Quick 1997 for a preliminary view), and whether one is derived from the other or whether they are both basic, as this sketch seems to indicate.

References

Andrews, Avery, 1985, The major functions of the noun phrase. In Timothy Shopen, ed. *Language typology and syntactic description*, 1: *Clause structure*, 62-154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard, 1989, *Language universals and linguistic typology*. (Second edition) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dixon, R.M.W., 1979, Ergativity. *Language*, 55:59-138.

——— 1994, *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 1997, A typology of argument-determined constructions. In John Haiman, Joan Bybee and Sandra Thompson, eds *Essays on language function and language type, dedicated to T. Givón*, 71-113. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Doge, Mesak, Josep Piri, Philip Quick and Rebecca Quick, eds, 1992, *Sompulu Uma-umanong. (Ten Folktales* in Pendau). Manuscript, Palu, Indonesia.

Dryer, Matthew, 1994, The discourse function of the Kutenai inverse. In Talmy Givón, ed. 1994:65-99.

Givón, Talmy, ed., 1983, *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitive cross-language study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

——— 1994, *Voice and inversion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kroeger, Paul, 1993, *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Quick, Philip, 1996, Multilinear discourse analysis software demonstration. In H. Andrew Black, Alan Buseman, David Payne and Gary F. Simons, eds *Proceedings of the 1996 general CARLA conference, November* 14-15, 1996, 291-309. Waxhaw, NC/Dallas: JAARS and Summer Institute of Linguistics.

——— 1997, Active and inverse voice selection criteria in Pendau, a western Austronesian language. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 461-482. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Editions Rodopi B.V.

Voice in two northern Sulawesi languages

NIKOLAUS P. HIMMELMANN

1 Introduction

In this paper, the basic clause structure and some aspects of the verbal morphology of two northern Sulawesi languages, Ratahan and Lauje, are compared with each other and with Tagalog, the language chosen to represent a prototypical Philippine language (which, in fact, it is only with some qualifications). The paper is intended to contribute to the typology of voice-related phenomena in western Austronesian languages by providing primarily descriptive information on two languages for which such information has so far not been available. It should be noted, however, that the grammatical analysis of the two languages is still in its initial stages. Hence, it is almost certain that the information provided here is incomplete, if not erroneous in some respects.

Apart from providing descriptive data, the paper also aims to make some headway in developing a typological grid for western Austronesian languages. Thus, the comparison between the three languages is not limited to the features which come readily to mind when comparing voice-related phenomena in these languages, in particular the basic clause structure (§2), the voice morphology (§3), the paradigms for noun phrase markers (§4) and pronouns (§5), and pronominal prefixes (§6). Instead, it also comprises phenomena which to date have received little attention but may prove to be of major importance for a more elaborate and fine-grained grammatical typology of western Austronesian languages. Among such phenomena are applicative suffixes (§7), the use of voice-marked forms in non-predicative functions, in particular in construction with quantifiers (§8), and voice in stative derivations (§9).

All of these phenomena are further defined and exemplified in the following sections. Their potential typological relevance is discussed in §10, which also provides a summary of the comparison between Tagalog, Ratahan and Lauje.

Ratahan belongs to the Sangiric group of languages and is spoken southwest of the Minahasan area in the province of North Sulawesi. The discussion is based on fieldwork data collected in collaboration with John Wolff in 1996. Lauje belongs to the Tomini-Tolitoli group of languages and is spoken in northern Central Sulawesi. Lauje examples are from my fieldwork data collected in 1988 and 1993. See Himmelmann and Wolff (in prep.) and

Himmelmann (2001) for more background information and full acknowledgments. Tagalog examples are taken from Bloomfield (1917) or my own recordings.

A conscious (and at times quite time consuming) effort has been made to illustrate all grammatical phenomena with examples drawn from realistic spontaneous speech (conversations or narratives). These examples are presented in intonation units, each unit being delimited by a pair of curly brackets (numbers in curly brackets show pause length in seconds, though pause length has not been measured in all instances). In the few instances in which elicited data are given, the available spontaneous data would have required lengthy comments in order to serve as evidence for a given observation.

2 Basic clause structure

In Ratahan, in both transitive as well as intransitive clauses, there is always one core argument (the single core argument in the case of intransitive verbs) which is characterised by three features not shared by any other core argument: (a) its position is variable, i.e. it may occur in pre- or post-verbal position; (b) its semantic role is marked by the voice affix on the verb; (c) it is never marked by any kind of phrase marker.[1] This argument is called the *subject* of a verbal clause. The following two intransitive clauses exemplify these characteristics:[2]

(1) Ratahan uc_tw 121

hairen	*araq*	*kumukuk*	*e*	***manuk***	{}
hairen	araq	um-kukuk	Ce	manuk	
later	if	ACT-cry_out	COMPL	chicken	

'later when the chicken cried out'

(2) Ratahan uf2_tw 127

araq	*isé*	*kumukuk*	*e*	{1.2}
araq	isé	um-kukuk	Ce	
if	3SG	ACT-cry_out	COMPL	

'when he would cry out'

The following two examples, in which the verb is marked for undergoer voice, illustrate the same characteristics for transitive clauses:

(3) Ratahan uc_ew 217

naq	*sawu*	*ntoo*	***Sepus***	*winuno*	*mangasé*	{}
naq	sawu	N-to	Sepus	in-wuno	mangasé	
??	time	LK-NR	Joseph	REAL(UG)-kill	3PL	

'at the time they killed Joseph'

---

(4) Ratahan uc_tw 583

kinambei	*ne*	*yaq*	{}
in-kambei	ne	yaq	
REAL(UG)-embrace	3SG.GEN	1SG	

'he embraced me'

In transitive clauses, the non-subject core argument always follows immediately after the verb. If it is a common noun, it may optionally be marked with the genitive marker *nu* (for proper nouns the marker is *ni*). In examples (3) and (4) the non-subject argument is a pronoun (*mangasé* and *ne*, respectively). Examples with full lexical NPs for both actor and undergoer voices:

(5) Ratahan uf2_tw 113

mamake	***nu***	***babuq***	*mangasé*	{0.9}
maN-pake	nu	babuq	mangasé	
ACT-use	GEN	slave	3PL	

'they had (female) slaves'

(6) Ratahan et_up 013

niraes	*e*	***nu***	***waa***	*wusak.*
ni-raes	Ce	nu	waa	wusak
REAL(UG)-finish	COMPL	GEN	monkey	banana

'The monkey had eaten all the bananas.'

For Lauje essentially the same observations hold. There is, however, one major distinction with regard to the use of NP-markers with core arguments, as discussed in §4.

In both Ratahan and Lauje it is very common for core arguments to follow the verb, which is also the most common order in Tagalog. But there is a crucial difference among the three languages with respect to examples in which the subject precedes the verb. Compare the Ratahan examples (2) and (3) above and the following example from Lauje:

(7) Lauje UF_LM 150

bangkola'	*ngintugome*		*galaa.*	{0.4}
bangkola'	N-intug-O-me		galaa	
monkey	REAL.ACT-look_for-O-COMPL		turtle	

'The monkey looked for the turtle,'

There is no element corresponding to the Tagalog inversion marker *ay* in these examples. There is also no prosodic break between the clause-initial subject and the following verb. Thus these examples show that SV(X) is indeed an alternative basic word order in Ratahan and Lauje.

The examples of SV(X) order should be strictly distinguished from topicalised constituents, i.e. constituents which are separated from the following segment by an intonational boundary, as in:[3]

---

(8)   Lauje UF_LD 029f

too   ntoilapi   injéine { }
too   N-toilapi   injéine
person   LK-married_couple   PROX

na'agaad   *E unga* { }
no-'o-gaad   E unga
STAT.REAL-??-take   E child
'this couple, (they) had a child.'

Such topicalised constituents are probably possible in all western Austronesian languages, with or without special markers such as Tagalog *ay*. Note that even in Tagalog the use of *ay* is not obligatory:

(9)   Tagalog donat 288

yung   Eta namán { }
iyón:LK   Ayta namán
DIST:LK   Ayta truly

takot   na   takot   sa   iyó { }
takot   na   takot   sa   iyo
fear   LK   fear   LOC   2SG.DAT
'those Ayta, (they) were very afraid of you'

A prosodic break is sufficient to separate a topicalised constituent from the remainder of the clause. 'True' SV(X) order, on the other hand, is impossible in Tagalog and many other Philippine-type languages.

3   Basic voice paradigms

In Ratahan, as in Tagalog, the basic voice paradigm in declarative main clauses consists of four voices and two moods. There is, however, a conspicuous difference with regard to the morphological formatives used to express the voice/mood distinctions. While Tagalog has special formatives for each of the three undergoer voices (i.e. the suffixes *-in* and *-an* and the prefix *i-*), Ratahan has only one formative which exclusively occurs in the undergoer voices, i.e. the suffix *-an*. Compare Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Basic voice-mood paradigm in Ratahan

	+REALIS	–REALIS
ACTOR	*-im-/N-*	*-um-/M-*
UNDERGOER	*-in-*	**-an**
UNDERGOER.LOCATIVE	*-in--an*	**-an**
UNDERGOER.THEME	**-in-**	**ø**

Table 2: Basic voice-mood paradigm in Tagalog

	+REALIS	–REALIS
ACTOR	*-um-/N-*	*-um-/M-*
UNDERGOER	*-in-*	*-in*
UNDERGOER.LOCATIVE	*-in--an*	*-an*
UNDERGOER.THEME	*i--in-*	*i-*

The three undergoer voices in Ratahan can only be distinguished based on the paradigmatic interaction with the realis-marking formative *-in-*. Thus, in undergoer voice there is no suffix in realis contexts (see (3) above) but the suffix *-an* is used in non-realis contexts:

(10)   Ratahan uc_tw 762

kau   wunón   masé { }
kau   wuno-an   masé
2.SG   kill-UG   3PL
'they will kill you, no doubt about it'

In locative undergoer voice, on the other hand, the suffix *-an* occurs in both realis and non-realis contexts:

(11)   Ratahan et_ww G16a

laliwuqan   le   yaq   mangewong   buk   tiqí!
laliwuq-an   le   yaq   maN-ewong   buk   tiqí
help-UG.L   IMP   1SG   ACT-carry   book   PROX
'Help me to carry these books!'

(12)   Ratahan et_ww G16b

isé   nilaliwuqan   ku.
isé   ni-laliwuq-an   ku
3SG   REAL(UG)-help-UG.L   1SG.GEN
'I helped him.'

In thematic undergoer voice, there is no formative for voice. In realis contexts, the verb is marked for realis mood by the infix *-in-*:

(13)   Ratahan et_ww G2

sabel   nu   winei   ku   si   tuari   nu
sabel   nu   in-wei   ku   si   tuari   nu
machete   2SG.GEN   REAL(UG)-give   1SG.GEN   PN.LOC   younger_sibling   2SG.GEN
'I gave your machete to your younger sibling'

In non-realis contexts, the verb remains unmarked, i.e. the non-realis form of the thematic undergoer voice is identical with the basic form of the verb:

(14)   Ratahan et_up 067

wias   té   wei   sisé   taawi.
wias   teqé   wei   si =isé   taawi
rice   DIST   give   PN.LOC=3SG   tomorrow
'That rice will be given to him tomorrow.'

In Ratahan, then, voice and mood marking are even more intricately intertwined than in Tagalog and other Philippine-type languages. The formal differences between Tagalog and Ratahan are paralleled by semantic ones in that in Ratahan many more verbal roots occur with thematic undergoer voice than in Tagalog. In fact, the thematic undergoer voice in Ratahan appears to be well on its way to becoming not only the formally but also the semantically unmarked undergoer voice (see Himmelmann & Wolff in prep. for more discussion).

The voice-mood paradigm found in Lauje is very different from the one found in Ratahan and Tagalog. To begin with, there are only three basic voices in the Lauje paradigm, as shown by Table 3.

Table 3: Basic voice-mood paradigm in Lauje

	+REALIS	−REALIS
ACTOR	*N-/(-um-)*	*M-/(-um-)*
UNDERGOER	*-in-*	*no-*
UNDERGOER.LOCATIVE	*-in--ang*	*no--i*

Furthermore, locative undergoer voice is marked by two different suffixes, i.e. *-ang* in realis mood and *-i* in non-realis mood:

(15)   Lauje UF_LM 139

    tinambunangonyome   *nu*   *petu* *batanganonye* {0.9}
    in-tambung-ang-O-nye-me   nu   petu batangan-O-nye
    REAL(UG)-pile-UG.L-O-3SG.GEN-COMPL GEN soil body-O-3SG.GEN
    'she covered her body with soil'

(16)   Lauje UF_LD 264

    inyaa *nrape'i*   *a'e* {}
    inyaa no-rape'-i   a'e
    don't IRR(UG)-close_by-UG.L 1SG
    'don't get closer to me'

Finally, possibly the most remarkable feature of the Lauje voice paradigm is the prefix *no-* which occurs in the non-realis forms of the undergoer voices (with the exception of the first person singular, see §6). This feature is remarkable on two counts. First, in typical Philippine-type languages such as Tagalog non-realis mood is always morphologically unmarked. Second, while a prefix marking non-realis mood in undergoer voice occurs in several Sulawesi languages (see van den Berg 1996), Lauje and its closest Tomini relatives (Dondo, Tialo and Ampibabo) are, to my knowledge, unique with regard to the segmental shape of this prefix. In southern Tomini languages (Tajio, Taje, Dampelas and Pendau) the functionally equivalent prefix has the shape *ro-* or *ho-* (which in some of the languages undergoes vowel harmonic alternations) and in Kaili-Pamona languages it generally has the shape *ra-*. Apart from its uniqueness, the Lauje form *no-* is also highly conspicuous and somewhat confusing in that *n*-initial formatives in western Austronesian languages generally signal realis mood (see for example, Tagalog *nag-, na-, naka-, naki-* etc.).

4 NP markers

As in Tagalog, noun phrase markers in Ratahan and Lauje come in two sets, one for common nouns and one for proper nouns. The following discussion pertains primarily to common noun phrase markers. Table 4 lists the forms. Optional markers appear in parentheses.

Table 4: NP-markers

	TAGALOG		RATAHAN		LAUJE	
	common noun	proper noun	common noun	proper noun	common noun	proper noun
ARTICLE	*ang*	*si*	–	*i*	*(nu₁)*	*si*
GEN	*ng*	*ni*	*(nu)*	*ni*	*nu₂*	*ni*
LOC	*sa*	*kay*	*su*	*si*	*li*	–

The most obvious difference between Tagalog and the two Sulawesi languages pertains to the fact that in the Sulawesi languages there is no element corresponding to the specific article *ang* for common nouns. Consequently, common noun phrase subjects in both Ratahan and Lauje may occur without a noun phrase marker, as amply illustrated by the examples in the previous and following sections.

In Ratahan, furthermore, the non-subject argument in both actor- and undergoer-oriented constructions may also remain unmarked. Compare the following two examples with examples (5) and (6) above:

(17)   Ratahan tw 009

    ngo: yaq *mangewong*   *e*   *sinapang* { }
    ngo yaq maN-qewong Ce   sinapang
    like 1SG ACT-carry   COMPL weapon
    'I'll take the gun'

(18)   Ratahan uc_tw 022

    nilaweqan   *burung yaq* {1.3}
    ni-laweq-an   burung yaq
    REAL(UG)-lie_in_wait_for-LOC bird   1SG
    'a bird lay in wait for me'

In this regard, Ratahan differs sharply from Tagalog where the non-subject arguments in these constructions must be marked as genitives.

However, the differences between Ratahan and Tagalog are to a certain degree 'superficial' in that they only pertain to the overt marking of core arguments. The basic distinctions made within the noun phrase marking systems are the same: subjects exhibit coding properties different from all other core arguments; actors in undergoer-oriented constructions are coded as genitives; undergoers in actor-oriented constructions are also coded as genitives (if the undergoer is a proper noun it is marked as oblique); recipients and addressees are coded as obliques in both actor- and undergoer-oriented constructions.

The use of the Lauje noun phrase markers, on the other hand, differs quite distinctly from the one found in Tagalog and Ratahan, despite the fact that essentially the same labels may be used in describing them and that the Lauje formatives are cognate with the Ratahan ones, with the exception of the oblique marker *li*. There are two major differences: first, undergoers

in actor-oriented constructions are not marked as genitives (by the genitive marker nu_2) but rather receive the same marking as subjects (i.e. they may optionally be marked by nu_1, an article-like element). The difference between the two markers of the shape *nu* is further discussed below. Second, recipients and addressees in ditransitive constructions are not marked as obliques but generally remain unmarked.

Evidence for the second difference is relatively straightforward. In Ratahan (and in Tagalog), the additional core argument in ditransitive constructions is marked by the general purpose preposition *su* (unless it is made the subject of the construction):

(19)   Ratahan et_ww G2

tali	*nu*	*winei*		*ku*	*su*	*anak*	*nu*.
tali	nu	in-wei		ku	su	anak	nu
rope	2SG.GEN	REAL(UG)-give		1SG.GEN	LOC	child	2SG.GEN

'I gave your rope to your child'

In Lauje, it remains unmarked:

(20)   Lauje et_mt_g 002

'alolongoome	*binee'e*		*unga'e*.
'alolong-O-Vme	in-bee-'u		unga-'u
rope-O-2SG.GEN	REAL(UG)-give-1SG.GEN		child-1SG.GEN

'I gave your rope to my child'

Whether other morphosyntactic differences correlate with this difference in noun phrase marking requires further investigation.

The first major difference in noun phrase marking between Ratahan and Lauje mentioned above is in need of a somewhat more elaborate discussion. To begin with, note that the two markers of the shape *nu* are not only distinguished with regard to their use but also differ on a purely morphological level.[4] Thus, genitive *nu* is regularly reduced to *u* after consonant-final words, as in:

(21)   Lauje PF_DJ 022

li	*lalong*	*u*	*ogo*
li	lalong	nu	ogo
LOC	inside	GEN	water

'in the water'

No such regular alternation occurs with article-like *nu*. Furthermore, there is a special emphatic form *'onu* for article-like *nu* which is found most commonly in clause-initial position:

(22)   Lauje UF_LM 020

'onu bangkola'	*pogombo'onya*		*nu* (0.4)	*tatambuang*	*E*
'onu bangkola'	po-gombo'-O-nye:A		nu	tatambuang	E
DET monkey	GER-word-O-3SG.GEN:A		DET	bee	E

'as for the monkeys, they talked to the bees'

No such emphatic form exists for genitive *nu*.

Article-like *nu* may be used to mark subjects (and topicalised constituents), as in:

(23)   Lauje UF_LM 122

'uminangma		*nu:: galaa* {0.6}
um-'inang-O-me:A		nu galaa
ACT-eat-O-COMPL:A		DET turtle

'the turtle already started eating'

(24)   Lauje UF_LM 059

ame	*goong A*	*nu*	*tatambuang E* {0.3}
ame	goong A	nu	tatambuang E
like	gong A	DET	bee E

'the bees were (arranged) like a gong,'

This use of article-like *nu* is optional,[5] as shown by (7) above and:

(25)   Lauje PF_DJ 017

nomeelu	*A*	*tuping*: { }
noN-peelu	A	tuping
REAL.ACT-inform	A	eel

'the eel said:'

Article-like *nu* is used not only with subjects but also with undergoers in actor-oriented constructions, as in:

(26)   Lauje et_kl_e 006

tuái'e	*nonobong*	*E*	*nu*	*kopi*
tuai-'u	noN-tobong	E	nu	kopi
younger_sibling-1SG.GEN	REAL.ACT-cut	E	DET	coffee

'My younger sibling chopped down the coffee tree (that I had planted).'

Again, this usage is optional and, in fact, rather infrequent in spontaneous discourse. Typically, undergoers in actor-oriented constructions remain unmarked, as in (7) above and:

(27)   Lauje UF_LM 078

li'ó	*mogutu*	*manisanonya*	*o'e*
li'oe	M-po-gutu	manisan-O-nye:A	o'e
you	ACT-??-make	honey-O-3.SG.GEN:A	DIST

'You make that honey'

Actors in undergoer-oriented constructions, on the other hand, are marked as genitives:

(28)   Lauje UF_LM 089

'ininang	*u*	*pani'i goot*	*E* {0.5}
in-'inang	nu	pani'i goot	E
REAL(UG)-eat	GEN	bat many	E

'(these bananas) had been eaten by many bats,'

To sum up the presentation so far, there are two important morphosyntactic differences between Lauje and Ratahan which are related to article-like *nu*. First, common noun phrase subjects in Ratahan are never accompanied by a noun phrase marker while common noun phrase subjects in Lauje may optionally be preceded by article-like *nu*. Second, and more importantly, common noun phrase undergoers in actor-oriented constructions may optionally be marked as genitives in Ratahan, but in Lauje they may optionally receive the same kind of marking as subjects, i.e. article-like *nu*.

Note that this difference in noun phrase marking is not mirrored by differences with regard to other aspects of the morphosyntax of core arguments in the two languages. As mentioned in §2 above, subjects in both Lauje and Ratahan are characterised by the fact that their position with respect to the verb is variable and that their semantic role is marked by the voice affix on the verb. Non-subject core arguments in both languages, including undergoers in actor-oriented constructions, have to occur immediately after the verb.

Still, the different noun phrase marking in Lauje is highly significant in that it leads to a change in the markedness relation between actor- and undergoer-oriented constructions. In Ratahan (and in Tagalog) actor- and undergoer-oriented constructions are almost perfect mirror-images of each other, as indicated by the following structural patterns:

(29)   actor-oriented construction: NP_{ACT} ACT-Verb $\text{GEN-NP}_{\text{UG}}$
       undergoer-oriented construction: NP_{UG} UG-Verb $\text{GEN-NP}_{\text{ACT}}$

There is no direct evidence for deriving one construction from the other. (Note that this state of affairs only holds for clauses in which the non-subject argument is a common noun. If the non-subject argument in an actor-oriented construction is a pronoun or a proper noun, it is marked as oblique rather than as genitive. Pronouns are further discussed in the following section.)

For Lauje, on the other hand, it may be argued that the actor-oriented construction is slightly less marked than the undergoer-oriented construction (in terms of morphosyntactic marking). In any event, the two constructions are no longer perfect mirror-images of each other:

(30)   actor-oriented construction: $(\text{DET=})\text{NP}_{\text{ACT}}$ ACT-Verb   **$(\text{DET=})\text{NP}_{\text{UG}}$**
       undergoer-oriented construction: $(\text{DET=})\text{NP}_{\text{UG}}$ UG-Verb   **$\text{GEN-NP}_{\text{ACT}}$**

That is, in Lauje the morphosyntactic properties of the two major types of non-subject core arguments (undergoers in actor-oriented constructions and actors in undergoer-oriented constructions) are not identical. They share the fixed post-verbal position, but they differ with regard to noun phrase marking (in a rather subtle way, since the marker in both cases has the basic shape *nu*).

5   Pronoun sets

Compared to Tagalog, there are fewer pronoun sets in Ratahan and Lauje, namely two instead of three (for Ratahan plural pronouns there is, in fact, only one set). The distribution of one of the two sets is adequately covered by the label *genitive* (it is used for actors in undergoer-oriented constructions and for possessors). The other set appears in a broad variety of syntactic functions. Since the use of any case label such as *absolutive* or *nominative* as a label for this set is prone to lead to misconceptions, the rather nondescript label *free* is chosen here to refer to this set.

Table 5: Ratahan pronouns

	SG		PL
	FREE	GEN	FREE
1INCL	*yaq*	*ku*	*(i) kite*
EXCL			*(i) kami*
2	*(i) kau*	*nu*	*(i) kumú*
3	*isé*	*ne*	*(i) mangasé*

Table 6: Lauje pronouns

	SG		PL	
	FREE	GEN	FREE	GEN
1INCL	*(li)a'e*	*-'u*	*(li)'ite*	*-te*
EXCL			*(li)'ame*	*mame*
2	*(li)'oe*	*-Vme*	*(li)'eme*	*mie*
3	*(li)io*	*-nye*	*jimo*	*(nu jimo)*

The differences between Tagalog and the two Sulawesi languages are not restricted to the inventory of forms. A much more important difference pertains to the fact that Ratahan and Lauje pronouns, unlike Tagalog subject and genitive pronouns, are *not* second-position clitics. The genitive pronouns in Ratahan and Lauje are either suffixes or enclitics, occurring always immediately after their heads (the verb when they are used to express actors in undergoer-oriented constructions, the possessed noun when they express possessors).

Free pronouns in Ratahan and Lauje occur in almost exactly the same positions as full lexical NPs. In particular, they may be used in preverbal position (see, for example, (2) and (49)) and they follow the non-subject argument in postverbal position:

(31)   Ratahan uc_tw 022
nilaweqan   *burung* **yaq** {1.3}
ni-laweq-an   burung yaq
REAL(UG)-intercept-UG.L bird   1SG
'a bird lay in wait for me'

(32)   Lauje UF_LD 179
nongkoni   *bisa* *io* *juniaa ine* { }
noN-'oni   bisa   io   juniaa ine
REAL.ACT-carry poison 3SG world PROX
'she poisoned this world (lit. she brought poison to this world)'

In Lauje, free pronouns may also be used as non-subject arguments in actor-oriented constructions:

(33)   Lauje PF_DJ 038
li'ó bela jeiang E { } *monyampuat* *a'e* *baoanomá'* { }
li'oe bela jeiang E   moN-sampuat a'e   báoan-O-ma'e
you buddy friend E   ACT-save   1SG   land-O-AND
'you my friend, will rescue me by getting me ashore.'

In Ratahan, however, free pronouns cannot be used as non-subject arguments in actor-oriented constructions. Instead, free pronouns must be marked with the locative proper noun marker *si* when referring to the non-subject argument of an actor-oriented construction:

(34) Ratahan et_ww N22
 apa to namatakuq   *si* *kau?*
 apa to naN-pa-takuq   si kau
 what NR REAL.ACT-CAUS-afraid PN.LOC 2SG
 'what frightened you?'

(35) Ratahan uc_tw 077
 nunongkoliwu   *si* *yaq* { }
 nu-nongko-liwu   si yaq
 REAL.ACT-??-crowd_around PN.LOC 1SG
 '(they) crowded around me'

Note that this is the only way in which pronominal undergoers in actor-oriented constructions may be expressed in Ratahan. In this regard, pronominal undergoers differ from common noun phrase undergoers. As mentioned in the preceding section, if the undergoer in an actor-oriented construction is a common noun phrase, it may optionally be marked as genitive. But genitive pronouns in Ratahan can never be used to express the undergoer of an actor-oriented construction.

6   Pronominal prefix

In addition to the pronouns shown in Table 6, Lauje has a single pronominal prefix *'u-* for first person singular actors in transitive events. This prefix only occurs in the non-realis undergoer voices:

(36) Lauje PF_DJ 072
 moopus *E* *'u'inang* { }
 mo-opus E 'u-'inang
 STAT-done E 1SG.ACT-eat
 'since I will devour it completely'

(37) Lauje UF_LM 187
 'udendenima   *ine* {0.5}
 'u-dendeng-i-me:A   ine
 1SG.ACT-hit-UG.L-COMPL:A PROX
 'I will bang it.'

This is the standard form for non-realis undergoer-oriented constructions involving a 1SG actor. That is, there are no derivations involving a prefix *no-* and a suffix *-'u*. Furthermore, *'u-* is in complementary distribution with the prefix *no-* which occurs in all the other non-realis forms of the undergoer voices. Thus, strictly speaking, *'u-* is also part of the basic voice-mood paradigm in Lauje and should be added as an alternative prefix to the two cells containing *no-* in Table 3.

7   Applicative suffixes

There is one more feature with regard to which Lauje verbal morphology sharply diverges from Tagalog and Ratahan. Lauje has at least one applicative suffix, i.e. the suffix *-a'e*. This suffix occurs in both actor- and undergoer-oriented constructions as illustrated by the following two examples:

(38) Lauje UF_LD 209
 setela pinogutuá'   *balung* *E* *e'e* { }
 setela in-po-gutu-a'e   balung E o'e
 after REAL(UG)-GER-make-APPL provisions E DIST
 'when those provisions had been made (for him)'

(39) Lauje et_ml_g 017
 tuai'e   *mongkonia'e* *lia'e.*
 tuai-'u   moN-'oni-a'e lia'e
 younger_sibling-1SG.GEN ACT-carry-APPL 1SG
 'my brother is going to carry (it) for me.'

This applicative suffix is used consistently with verbs denoting an event which involves a beneficiary (as in the two preceding examples). No alternative non-applicative construction exists for such events because there is no preposition for beneficiaries which would allow the beneficiary to be introduced in a grammatically oblique role (in elicitation, the Indonesian *untuk* is occasionally used in this function).

The applicative suffix is in complementary distribution with the locative undergoer voice suffixes *-ang* and *-i* (there are no formatives of the shape *-ana'e*, *-ia'e*, etc.). That is, in applicative constructions the basic three voice system is reduced to a two voice system.

It is possible that there is a second applicative suffix *-i* in Lauje, which would be homophonous with the non-realis locative undergoer voice suffix *-i* (see Table 3 above). So far, however, possible examples for an applicative *-i* have only appeared in elicitation and thus could be calques from Indonesian.[6] If there is such a suffix, its distribution would be limited due to the homophony with the voice marking suffix *-i*. For example, the form *mo-linjo'-i* 'to leave, go away from' was given as a possible non-realis actor voice plus applicative suffix derivation from the root < *linjo'* 'run' (corresponding to Indonesian *meninggalkan*). However, there is no realis counterpart to this derivation. The form *no-linjo'-i* which would be the formally correct realis derivation is, in fact, the regular non-realis locative undergoer voice form (corresponding to realis *ilinjo'ang*). Note that *nolinjo'i* is not ambiguous. It is consistently translated by Indonesian *ditinggalkan* 'be left behind'.

8   Use of voice-marked forms in non-predicative functions

Voice-marked forms in Tagalog freely occur in non-predicative functions. For example, they occur after the NP-markers *ang, ng* and *sa,* as in:

---

6 Note that an applicative suffix *-i* has been found to occur in non-elicited material in other Tomini-Tolitoli languages, including Totoli, Pendau, and Tialo (the latter being the immediate neighbour of Lauje).

(40)   Tagalog Bloomfield (1917:30/14)

at   ang   pare   at   siyá   ay   nag-hintáy
and   SPEC   priest   and   3SG   PM   REAL.ACT-wait

ng   sà-sabih-in   ng   sundalo.
GEN   RED1-statement-UG   GEN   soldier
'and the priest and he waited for what the soldier would say.'

(41)   Tagalog Bloomfield (1917:72/6)

na-kà-tanaw   siyá   ng   bahay   na   ma-ilaw
REAL.STAT-??-in_sight   3SG   GEN   house   LK   STAT-light

sa   p-in-a-tù-tunguh-an   ng   kalabáw
LOC   ??-REAL(UG)-RED1-direction-UG.L   GEN   water_buffalo
'he saw a lighted house in the direction toward which the caribou was going.'

They may also be used in construction with the existential quantifier *may* (and other quantifiers):

(42)   Tagalog pep 094

ay   mayroon   palang   nagàalaga   {0.1}
ay   may-doón   palá-ng   nag-RED1-alaga'
PM   EXIST-DIST.LOC   so!-LK   REAL.ACT-RED1-cared_for

doón   sa   ibun   {1.3}
doón   sa   ibon
DIST.LOC   LOC   bird
'there was already someone looking after those birds.'

(43)   Tagalog ahas 096

may   ipàpakíta   ako   sa   iyo   {0.6}
may   i-RED1-pa-kita   akó   sa   iyo
EXIST   UG.T-RED1-CAUS-visible   1SG   LOC   2SG.DAT
'Come here, I have something to show you.'

In Ratahan and Lauje, voice-marked forms are used primarily in predicative function. They must not be used in construction with the existential quantifier (i.e. there are no examples parallel to the Tagalog examples (42) and (43)). They may be used in argument positions of verbal predicates but such use requires nominalisation by a particle which also functions as a relative clause marker (in Ratahan this is the particle *to*, in Lauje the particle *sau*):

(44)   Ratahan uc_tw 415

waktu   itu   siningkapen   ku   e   to: (0.3)
waktu   itu   in-singkap-an   ku   Ce   to
time   DIST   REAL(UG)-answer-UG.L   1SG.GEN   COMPL   NR

pinakinak   nge   si   yaq { }
in-pakinak   ne   si   yaq
REAL(UG)-ask   3SG.GEN   PN.LOC   1SG
'at the time I answered what he asked me'

(45)   Ratahan uf_tw 088f

tapi   to   napók   tee { } *nangule   taa* { }
tapi   to   N-pa-pok   teqé   naN-qule   ta-ná
but   NR   REAL.ACT-??-cut   DIST   REAL.ACT-return   AND-DOWN
'But those who split them (the stones) returned'

(46)   Lauje UF_LM 040

ma'o   mongintug   E   sau   no'inang   E {0.5}
ma'o   moN-intug   E   sau   no-'inang   E
go_out   ACT-look_for   E   NR   IRR(UG)-eat   E
'(they went to the river) to look for food,'

In Ratahan, a voice-marked form nominalised by *to* may then also co-occur with the NP-markers *su* or *nu*:

(47)   Ratahan uf_tw 049

nayuma   na   sto   kunaq   (0.2)   *pinangaren   Pinatén* {0.9}
na-yuma   na   su-to   kunaq   in-paN-aren   Pinaten
REAL.STAT-arrive   ??   LOC-NR   like?   REAL(UG)-GER-name   Pinaten
'they arrived at the place called Pinaten'

9   Voice in statives

Philippine-type languages make a basic distinction between two event types, i.e. dynamic and stative. There is no special morphological marking for dynamic events, which are characterised by the fact that they involve actors who are in full control of the event. Statives are morphologically marked by a prefix (in Tagalog *ma-* and/or *ka-*) and comprise a broad range of event classes, ranging from events in which the actor is not fully in control but just manages or happens to do something, to events which do not involve actors.

Statives allow for up to four basic voice-mood derivations, involving at least in part the same morphology as the basic voice-mood derivations for dynamic events. The details of these derivations vary quite substantially, depending on the meaning of the root (for roots denoting perceptions there are different derivational possibilities than for roots denoting emotional states, etc.).

In Ratahan, statives may be marked for voice and mood in essentially the same way as in Tagalog (there are differences with regard to many details and in particular the overall productivity and generality of these formations). For example, with roots denoting emotional states the prefix *ma-* (realis *na-*) marks the theme, i.e. the entity that is or was undergoing a given emotion:

(48)   Ratahan uf_kera 034

tomponú   na-awuq   e   rapa {1.3}
tomponú   na-awuq   Ce   rapa
turtle   REAL.STAT-annoyed   COMPL   RPRT
'the turtle got angry'

When the same root is marked for stative locative undergoer voice (affix combination *ka--an*), the subject is the cause of the emotion (the place at, and because of, which the emotion is felt), while the theme occurs in the genitive slot:

(49) Ratahan et_ww N23b
    yaq   ***kinaawuqan***   *e*
    yaq   in-ka-awuq-an   ne
    1SG   REAL(UG)-STAT-annoyed-UG.L 3SG.GEN
    'he got mad at me (I became the reason/object of his anger)'

A similar contrast is expressed by these derivations with roots denoting physical states. Here, however, the subject of the stative locative undergoer derivation is an experiencer:

(50) Ratahan et_lw 24_4
    nakawus   *e*   *susu.*
    na-kawus   Ce   susu
    REAL.STAT-used_up COMPL milk
    'The milk is finished/used up.'

(51) Ratahan et_lw 24_2
    kinakawusan   *nu*   *susu kami*
    in-ka-kawus-an   nu   susu kami
    REAL(UG)-STAT-used_up-UG.L GEN milk 1PL.EX
    'We ran out of milk/the milk ran out on us.'

As far as I can currently ascertain, Lauje does not have voice-marked stative derivations. This assessment, however, needs further investigation and testing.

10   Summary and discussion

This section presents a brief summary of the (possibly) voice-related morphosyntactic features discussed in the preceding sections, focussing on the distribution of these features among the three languages under review and putting them into a wider typological perspective. To begin with, let us briefly note some voice-related features which are shared by Tagalog, Ratahan, and Lauje:

- the voice system consists of more than two basic voices.
- all voices involve some kind of morphological marking (with one exception in Ratahan, see Table 9).
- non-subject core arguments regularly occur in immediate postverbal position.
- actors in undergoer-oriented constructions are marked as genitives.

These features have not been discussed at length in the preceding sections since the focus there was on morphosyntactic features which differ among the three languages. Still, these shared features are of major typological import because they are among those features which render the voice system in (some) western Austronesian languages remarkable when compared to the voice systems found in other linguistic areas and language families. Note, however, that though they are widely shared among western Austronesian languages, it is far from clear whether they are shared by all of them.

As for the features which are not shared by Tagalog, Ratahan, and Lauje, there are altogether eleven features which have been reviewed in the preceding sections. For six of these, Tagalog groups with Ratahan, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Features shared by Tagalog and Ratahan

	Tagalog	Ratahan	Lauje
second core argument in ditransitive construction marked oblique	yes	yes	no
undergoer core argument in actor-oriented constructions marked as genitive (common noun phrases only)	yes	yes	no
voice derivations for statives	yes	yes	no
applicative suffix(es)	no	no	yes
pronominal prefixes in basic voice-mood paradigm	no	no	yes
non-realis prefix	no	no	yes

From a typological point of view, the interesting question is, of course, whether some of the features in Table 7 (and in the following tables) correlate with each other in such a way that the presence of one implies the presence of another. More than just three languages would have to be considered in order to make the search for correlations a typologically interesting one. Nevertheless, some very preliminary observations and suggestions can be derived from the data presented here and the (rather scarce) comparative literature on western Austronesian languages.

For two features, i.e. the presence of pronominal prefixes and applicative suffixes, it has been suggested repeatedly that they correlate with each other. More precisely, the presence of both pronominal prefixes and applicative suffixes is held to be the crucial characteristic that distinguishes Philippine-type languages from Indonesian-type languages.[7] And while it appears to be true that none of the generally recognised Philippine-type languages[8] exhibits both these features, it is not true that the languages of western Indonesia all exhibit both of them. Thus, for example, there are no pronominal prefixes or proclitics in Balinese, a language which otherwise appears to share many characteristics with neighbouring languages such as Javanese and Sasak, including applicative suffixes.[9] Still, the co-occurrence of

---

[7] To date, the distinction between Philippine-type and Indonesian-type languages (these are the terms used by Wolff (1996)) has been discussed exclusively in historical terms, i.e. as innovations found in Indonesian-type languages with respect to an older, possibly Proto Austronesian or Proto Malayo-Polynesian system which is hypothesised to have been inherited more or less intact by Philippine-type languages (Wolff 1996; Zobel). Note that the historical and the typological perspectives, though overlapping to a considerable degree, differ with regard to the inferences which may be drawn from the same set of data. A particular set of features may not qualify as an innovation from a historical point of view but may still provide a useful typological grid. Here, we are only concerned with typological groupings and generalisations.

[8] That is, in addition to all the Austronesian languages spoken in the Philippines, the languages of Sabah and Sarawak and northern Sulawesi, and Yami.

[9] The typological (and historical) relevance of pronominal prefixes is also somewhat questionable because of the fact that there appear to be pronominal prefixes in several Formosan languages, including Paiwan and Puyuma. But then, the typological position of Formosan languages, though often subsumed without much discussion under the Philippine type, is far from clear.

applicative suffixes with pronominal prefixes is so pervasive in western Indonesia that it surely constitutes a strong typological tendency.

A correlation of similar strength exists, I suspect, between the presence of applicative suffixes and the lack of voice derivations for statives. Rather than having two partially separate voice paradigms (one for dynamic predicates and one for stative predicates), it appears to be the case that in some languages of western Indonesia at least, stative morphology (such as Indonesian *ter-* and Balinese *ka-*) is in complementary distribution with voice marking morphology. However, this topic is hardly ever addressed in the literature dealing with the voice morphology in languages of western Indonesia, and thus certainly needs further study before any serious typological claims can be advanced.

The search for further correlations for two of the remaining features mentioned in Table 7 will be limited by the fact that the morphological category in question does not exist in many languages of western Indonesia. Most of these languages do not mark modal and/or aspectual distinctions on the verb. Thus, the question of whether or not there is a non-realis prefix in the basic voice paradigm does not arise. Similarly, there is no genitive marker in many of these languages. Thus, again, the question of whether or not the undergoer in actor-oriented construction is marked as a genitive does not arise. But in the latter instance it is still possible and useful to investigate the fundamental issue, i.e. whether actors in undergoer-oriented constructions exhibit essentially the same morphosyntactic features as undergoers in actor-oriented constructions (see (29) and (30) above).

Finally, it may be noteworthy that of the six features mentioned in Table 7 four pertain to verbal morphology. This is in contrast with the four features shown in Table 8, three of which pertain to the morphosyntax of nominal expressions. These features are shared between the two Sulawesi languages and distinguish them from Tagalog and other Philippine-type languages which resemble Tagalog.

Table 8: Features shared by Ratahan and Lauje

	Tagalog	Ratahan	Lauje
no (or optional) NP-marker for subject	no	yes	yes
subject may occur in immediate preverbal position	no	yes	yes
pronouns are second position clitics	yes	no	no
voice-mood marked derivations can be used with quantifiers	yes	no	no

If Ratahan is taken to be a Philippine-type language – and the features relating to verbal morphology in Table 7 strongly suggest that – then the distribution of the features in Table 8 shows that certain very typical features of nominal and pronominal expressions in Tagalog and most other languages spoken in the Philippines are not necessary correlates of Philippine-type voice morphology. Or, perhaps more productively, it suggests a division of Philippine-type languages into two subtypes: those which are similar to Tagalog in that all noun phrases are marked with some kind of marker, pronouns typically occur in clitic positions, and some kind of prosodic break or inversion marker has to be used when a subject precedes the predicate; and those which are similar to Ratahan in that subjects freely occur in pre-predicate position, pronouns are not second position clitics, and noun phrase marking is either

optional or non-existent. From Clayre's (1996) survey of the languages of Sabah and Sarawak it appears that these languages pattern with Ratahan with regard to these features.

The last feature mentioned in Table 8 — that voice-mood marked derivations can be used with quantifiers — is of interest in that it provides some indication of the degree to which a systematic distinction can be made between nouns and verbs in a given language. The noun–verb distinction in western Austronesian languages is, in general, less clearly developed than in the more familiar European languages. However, these languages certainly differ to the extent to which semantically nominal and semantically verbal expressions may occur in the same morphosyntactic contexts and hence can be more or less sharply distinguished from each other.

For Tagalog, it has been argued that there are actually no morphosyntactic contexts which provide a basis for distinguishing between nouns and verbs (understood as primary morphosyntactic form classes).[10] The fact that in Tagalog putative verbs (i.e. words which express actions and are marked for voice, aspect and mood) may be used with quantifiers without undergoing further derivation (see examples (42) and (43) above) is perhaps the strongest argument for this view. Indonesian-type languages, on the other hand, appear to be much more restrictive with regard to the possibility of directly quantifying voice-marked derivations. Thus, in (standard) Indonesian it is not possible to say *ada menjaga anak-anak* for 'someone is looking after the children'. Instead, the phrase *menjaga anak-anak* has to be nominalised with *yang* when it is to be used as the argument of the existential operator *ada* (thus *ada yang menjaga anak-anak* is fine). Unfortunately, for most western Austronesian languages no reliable information is available for this potentially very important typological parameter.

To conclude this discussion of the morphosyntactic features not shared between Tagalog, Ratahan, and Lauje, we may note that there is one feature which is found only in Ratahan (Table 9).

Table 9: Feature unique to Ratahan

	Tagalog	Ratahan	Lauje
morphologically unmarked form as part of the basic voice paradigm	no	yes	no

For Philippine-type languages, the occurrence of a morphologically unmarked form as part of the basic voice paradigm may appear to be unusual. Ratahan, however, is not the only Philippine-type language in which this phenomenon is found. According to Table 14 in Clayre (1996:75), it is also widespread among the Philippine-type languages of Sarawak and Arms (1996) reports it for Sindangan Subanen, a language spoken in Western Mindanao. Note also that the thematic undergoer prefix *i-* is quite often dropped in Tagalog spontaneous discourse (and probably in many other Philippine-type languages as well):

---

10   See Himmelmann (1991) and Gil (1993) for further discussion and references.

(52)   Tagalog donat 273

làlatag   mo   doón
i-RED1-latag   mo   doón
UG.T-RED1-spread_out 2SG.GEN   DIST.LOC
'you'd spread it (the sack) out there'

Thus, I would surmise that the occurrence of a morphologically unmarked form as part of the basic voice paradigm is not a feature of particular typological import. This does not preclude the possibility that it is of major historical import (the occurrence of a morphologically unmarked form may lead to a restructuring of the whole paradigm, possibly with further consequences for the overall system of grammatical relations.

References

Arms, D.G., 1996, Categories of the Sindangan Subanen verb. In Steinhauer, ed. 1996: 89-114.

Berg, René, van den, 1996, The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi. In Steinhauer, ed. 1996:89-114.

Bloomfield, Leonard, 1917, *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*. Urbana: The University of Illinois.

Clayre, Beatrice, 1996, The changing face of focus in the languages of Borneo. In Steinhauer, ed. 1996:51-88.

Gil, David, 1993, Tagalog Semantics. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 19:390-403.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., 1991, *The Philippine challenge to universal grammar*. Arbeitspapier Nr. 15, Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

   1996, Person Marking and Grammatical Relations in Sulawesi. In Steinhauer, ed., 1996:115-136.

   1997, The paragogic vowel in Lauje (Tomini-Tolitoli): phonology or morphosyntax? In Cecilia Odé and Wim Stokhof, eds *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 81-103. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., compiler, 2001, *Sourcebook on Tomini-Tolitoli languages*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. and John U. Wolff, in prep., *Ratahan morphosyntax*. München: Lincom Europa.

Steinhauer, Hein, ed., 1996, *Papers in Austronesian linguistics No.3*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Wolff, John U., 1996, The development of the passive verb with pronominal prefix in Western Austronesian languages. In Bernd Nothofer, ed. *Reconstruction, classification, description: festschrift in honor of Isidore Dyen*, 15–40. Hamburg: Abera-Verlag.

Yoshimura, Chikao, in prep., A descriptive grammar of Tialo. Manuscript, The Australian National University, Canberra.

Proto Celebic focus revisited

DAVID MEAD

1 Introduction[1]

The title of this paper is aptly appended with the word 'revisited', because throughout the following discussion I am indebted to René van den Berg and his pioneering investigation of focus in languages of central and south-eastern Sulawesi. In his paper, 'The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi' (originally presented 1991, published 1996) van den Berg both set forth arguments for recognising a Celebic macrogroup — comprising the Kaili-Pamona, Bungku-Tolaki and (the then) Muna-Buton language families — and within that framework discussed the nature of the Proto Celebic focus system and, by way of illustration, its development in seven daughter languages. As the title of his paper indicates, conjugated verbs — verbs with agent prefixes historically related to possessive enclitics — played a crucial role. They originally appeared as irrealis counterparts to realis goal focus verbs with *‹in›*, and later spread to other (non-goal focus) verb forms.

The results of my own investigations, however, which have primarily been in the Bungku-Tolaki languages of southeastern Sulawesi, have led me to question some of van den Berg's conclusions. There is, for example, little doubt in my mind that his Proto Celebic focus system accurately represents the source from which Kaili-Pamona languages sprang. However the basis of languages further to the south-east — namely Bungku-Tolaki and Muna-Buton — is significantly different. Not only have these languages preserved a living distinction between Proto Malayo-Polynesian **maN-* and **‹um›*, but the role of conjugated verbs within the system of verb inflection is so disparate when compared to Kaili-Pamona — conjugated verbs are anything **but** goal focus forms in these languages — that one must question: what innovations exactly do all these languages share that they should be subgrouped together?