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Abstract

This article examines the divergent voice systems of a selection of Malay/Indonesian varieties. I will show that the voice systems of the different Malay/Indonesian varieties largely (but not completely) reflect the voice systems in the languages in which that variety is spoken. In this way Malay/Indonesian, in its different varieties, can be seen as a mirror on the development of voice systems in Austronesian languages. While many languages show a syntactically privileged ‘subject’, in many western Austronesian languages (including Malay/Indonesian) some subject properties accrue according to argument structure position, and some other of these properties accrue to the argument that is morphologically marked as ‘special’ in the clause. At the same time, those Austronesian languages belonging to the (eastern) Oceanic branch lack voice alternations, or else show a simple active/passive dichotomy. The change in the presence and nature voice systems follows the migration path of the Austronesians, moving the highly marked diathesis to a more ‘normal’ diathesis. The voice systems of the different Malay varieties vary greatly, encompassing almost all the variation that is found across the Austronesian languages. I propose a model in terms of the speakers’ access to universal grammar in determining the grammar of the new variety of Malay/Indonesian.
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1. Introduction

Austronesian languages have received much attention from linguists, largely connected with issues of subjecthood and voice system typology. To summarise, while many languages familiar to linguists show a convergence of different properties that define a notion of syntactically privileged ‘subject’, in many western Austronesian languages these properties are split between two often distinct arguments in a clause. Some of these properties accrue according to argument structure position (‘Role-related’ properties, in the terminology of Schachter, 1976, 1977), and...
some other of these properties accrue to the argument that is morphologically marked as ‘special’ in the clause (‘Reference-related’, in Schachter’s terms).¹

At the same time, the grammars of those Austronesian languages belonging to the Oceanic branch show very different syntax. Languages such as Manam, Tobati and Ambae have been described as lacking a voice system altogether, which would lead to a very different characterisation of the notion of ‘subject’, since there are no voice alternations (see Foley and Van Valin, 1984, and Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997 for discussion of exactly this point; essentially, the argument structure of the verb determines the syntax of the sentence).² Given the unusual functions of the voice systems in the western Austronesian languages, and their more ‘normal’ appearance in the east, we can describe the change in voice systems as following the migration path of the Austronesians, and largely moving from a system of what is a cross-linguistically highly marked diathesis to a more ‘normal’ diathesis.

This article examines the voice systems of a selection of Malay/Indonesian varieties, stretching from west to east across the Indonesian archipelago, which defines the southern extent of Austronesian linguistic expansion from the north before it began its eastwards movement that ultimately led to the expansion of the Oceanic subgroup to Hawaii, Easter Island, New Zealand, and all of the Pacific (barring the relatively recent migration west to Madagascar). We will see that, while the time period involved in the dispersion of Malay/Indonesian varieties is quite shallow, and while lexical differentiation is minor,³ the voice systems of these different varieties vary considerably, encompassing almost all the variation that is found across the languages of the world. I will show that the voice systems of the different Malay/Indonesian varieties to a large (but not complete) extent reflect the operation of different voice systems in the languages of the region in which that variety is spoken. In this way Malay/Indonesian, in its different varieties, can be seen as a mirror of the development of voice systems in Austronesian languages. In section 10 I shall address the question of the Malay/Indonesian varieties in which the voice system does not match that of the substratal languages, and propose a model in terms of the speakers’ access to universal grammar (ala Bickerton’s, 1981 model of creole genesis) in determining the grammar of the new variety of Malay/Indonesian.

2. Modelling voice

I shall adopt the formalisms of Aissen (1999) to describe and compare the voice systems of the languages considered. This model assumes that the selection of subject is dependent on a number of competing factors, including argument structure and pragmatic structure.⁴

To illustrate this, consider the sentences in (1) and (2). (2) is more ‘marked’ than (1), both morphologically and pragmatically. Any speaker of English will judge (2) to be less natural than (1) (unless they have been well-trained in syntax).

¹ Cole et al. (1980) discuss the gradual accrual of these properties into the constellation that justifies the label ‘subject’.
² Further east the Polynesian languages have, in many instances, reinvented passive constructions. See Chung (1978a) for a comprehensive overview of the syntax of these languages.
³ There are, of course, other differences: it is well-known that, while most basic vocabulary is cognate across the different varieties, pronouns, aspect markers and negators differ, rendering intelligibility difficult in many cases.
⁴ The model assumes the background and many of the formal mechanisms that have been introduced in work such as Legendre et al. (1993). Sells (2001) extends the work of Aissen (1999), but the evidence from the Malay languages is not enough to justify his more complex model.
(1) Matilda poked Flynn.
(2) Flynn was poked by Matilda.

Given a suitable pragmatic context, however, (2) is more felicitous than (1). Given the preceding discourse shown in (3), which clearly establishes Flynn as a contrastive topic by the end of the text, a clause analogous to (2) is a more felicitous conclusion than it would have been without the prior establishment of Flynn as topical.

(3) A. Matilda was interacting with all of the children today.
   B. Really? What was going on?
   A. Well, she tickled Evelyn, and admired Josie, and . . .
   B: . . . and Flynn?
   A: Oh, he was poked by Matilda.

Aissen captures the relationship between the active and passive coding choices, and between ‘prominent’ and ‘non-prominent’ information (where ‘prominent’ is approximately equal to ‘topical’ or ‘focussed’ or ‘contrastive’—see Aissen, 1999:684. Following Aissen, ‘prominent’ will be represented as ‘X’, while ‘non-prominent’ will be shown as ‘x’) by assuming the following pair of constraint rankings. The constraint ranking in (4) specifies that an Agt is preferred as the argument to be coded as subject, rather than a Pat. (5) specifies that a prominent argument should be coded as subject in preference to a non-prominent argument.

(4) $$^*_{\text{SUBJ/Pat}} \gg ^*_{\text{SUBJ/Agt}}$$
The ban on subjects that occupy the highest position in argument structure (‘Agt’) is outranked by a ban on subjects that are not the highest argument (‘Pat’).

(5) $$^*_{\text{SUBJ/x}} \gg ^*_{\text{SUBJ/X}}$$
The ban on having a non-prominent (‘x’) subject outranks a ban on having a prominent (‘X’) subject.

These constraints are ordered as in (6); this predicts that clauses in English will be coded with active voice unless the Pat is more prominent than the Agt, as in (2). Only in that instance will a Pat be selected as the subject of the clause; and these are exactly the discourse circumstances that were achieved at the end of the mini-discourse in (3). The tableau showing the selection of subject leading to the passive clause at the end of (3) is shown as (7).

(6) $$^*_{\text{SUBJ/x}} \gg ^*_{\text{SUBJ/Pat}} \gg \text{GF/Pers}$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V(Agt/3/x, Pat/3/X)</th>
<th>*SUBJ/x</th>
<th>*SUBJ/Pat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other languages require different rankings of these constraints, or different constraints altogether in addition to these. To illustrate a simple parameter of variation, a language that
reversed the ranking of the two constraints in (8) would require all clauses to be active; the fact that there are many languages without voice oppositions affirms this as part of a factorial typology.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
V(Agt/3/x, Pat/3/X) & *SUBJ/Pat & *SUBJ/x \\
\hline
\Rightarrow & \text{Active A/SUBJ} > \text{P/OBJ} & \text{*!} \\
& \text{Passive A/OBL} > \text{P/SUBJ} & \text{*} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Particularly noteworthy are those languages that restrict the assignment of grammatical functions according to the type of argument under consideration, particularly depending on whether the argument is local (first or second person) or third person (based on Aissen, 1999, in turn drawing on Jelinek and Demers, 1983). At its most extreme, these person-hierarchy based restrictions might be manifested in the form of a constraint such as (9)

\[(9) \quad *\text{SUBJ}/3 \\
\text{Do not permit third person subjects} \]

In languages for which such a constraint holds, the translation equivalents of (10) and (12) will be grammatical, while the translation equivalents of (11) and (13) are ungrammatical. (14)–(16) present the tableaux that model of such a language; in (14) we model sentence (10), showing that the passive is not selected because that would result in a third person subject. (15) shows that passive will be selected when the Agt is third person, in order to avoid coding that participant as subject (this models sentence (12)). Most interesting is (16), showing that even when the first person Agt is less prominent than the third person Pat, the active voice will be selected (compare (16) with (8)).

Pseudo-English:

(10) I tickled Flynn.
(11) * Flynn tickled me.
(12) I was tickled by Flynn.
(13) * Flynn was tickled by me.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
V(Agt/1, Pat/3) & *\text{SUBJ}/3 & *\text{SUBJ}/x & *\text{SUBJ}/Pat \\
\hline
\Rightarrow & \text{Active A/SUBJ} > \text{P/OBJ} & \text{*!} & \text{*} \\
& \text{Passive A/OBL} > \text{P/SUBJ} & \text{*} & \text{*} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
V(Agt/3, Pat/1) & *\text{SUBJ}/3 & *\text{SUBJ}/x & *\text{SUBJ}/Pat \\
\hline
\Rightarrow & \text{Active A/SUBJ} > \text{P/OBJ} & \text{*!} & \text{*} \\
& \text{Passive A/OBL} > \text{P/SUBJ} & \text{*} & \text{*} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
This type of restriction is not encountered in Malay/Indonesian voice systems, but variants in which person-hierarchy restrictions are relevant do appear (see sections 3 and 6). More frequently the type of person-based restrictions seen here emerge in the assignment of case or agreement in Austronesian languages.

One final note needs to be made about Aissen’s model for voice systems. It is assumed in Aissen (1999) that for all the languages treated there exists a high-ranked constraint against an Agt being coded as an Object: ‘In none of the languages under discussion here is the agent ever realised syntactically as object. That is, *Oj/Agt ... is unviolated’ (Aissen, 1999:686).

As we shall see, this constraint is not highly-ranked in all of the cases we shall examine here, and in fact (as Aissen notes in her footnote 10) there is extensive documentation that supports the idea that many Austronesian languages favour Pat-primacy over Agt-primacy in the selection of subject. This will be exemplified in the analysis of some of the varieties that follows.

### 3. Standard Malay/Indonesian

Standard Indonesian (SI)\(^6\) has three main contrasting voices, not all of which may be used in all contexts (see Arka and Manning, 1998 for discussion of the evidence that leads us to posit three distinct voices).\(^7\) While there are only two dedicated morphemes involved in coding this contrast, data from reflexives and the positioning of time expressions distinguishes the two \(di\)-forms as passive and inverse. (17) shows the active, marked by the prefix \(meng\)- on bivalent verbs, while (18) and (19) show the inverse and the passive, respectively. In each example the subject of the clause is shown in bold, as is the morphology that is directly associated with grammatical function assignment. (20) shows the grammatical functions assigned to the Agt and Pat in the different clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(16)</th>
<th>V(Agt/1/x, Pat/3/X)</th>
<th>*SUBJ/3</th>
<th>*SUBJ/X</th>
<th>*SUBJ/Pat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⇒</td>
<td>Active A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) Standard Indonesian, which will be discussed in the next section, is a language in which the person of the Agt affects the selection of voice.

\(^6\) See Kana Vamarasi (1999), Sneddon (1996), and numerous articles, notably Chung (1976, 1978b), for discussion of Standard Indonesian grammar.

\(^7\) The crucial data involves the ability of an agent to bind a reflexive patient in a non-active clause, such as in (i), which is structurally analogous to (18). Here the fact that \(-nya\) is still able to bind dirinya shows that it cannot be considered to be demoted, as it would be in the ungrammatical passive version of the same clause: * Dirinya diutamakan olehnya ‘Herself is prioritised by her.’

(I) Diri-nya selalu di-utamakan-nya.

\(\text{self-3SG.GEN always NON.ACT- prioritise-3SG.GEN}\)

‘(S)he is always giving priority to her/himself.’

I shall not explicitly discuss Standard Malay, which behaves in much the same manner as regards the voices shown here. Standard (Malaysian) Malay, and some western varieties of Indonesian Malay, also allows the prefix \(ter\)-, elsewhere the accidental passive prefix, to be used in bivalent clauses. Goddard (2003) discusses the semantics of this prefix in detail for Standard Malaysian.
Active

(17) Dia me-[n]onton gadis cantik itu.
3SG ACT-watch girl beautiful that
‘He watched that beautiful girl.’

Inverse

(18) Gadis cantik itu di-tonton-nya.
girl beautiful that NON.ACT-watch-3SG.GEN
‘He watched that beautiful girl.’

Passive

(19) Gadis cantik itu di-tonton (oleh dia).
girl beautiful that NON.ACT-watch by 3SG
‘That beautiful girl was watched (by him).’

Agt Pat

(20) Active: subject object
Inverse: object subject
Passive: (oblique) subject

SI does not allow local (first or second person) Agts in passive clauses, as shown in (21). It might be expected, by analogy with (18), that inverse clauses can be formed with the appropriate local genitive enclitic, as in (22), but this is not the case. Rather, local persons use special 1SG and 2SG prefixes; alternatively the free pronouns can be used in very close constituency with the verb. The grammatical 1SG forms are shown in (23).8

Passive with local Agt

(21) * gadis cantik itu di-tonton oleh saya
girl beautiful that NONACT-watch by 1SG
‘That beautiful girl was watched by me.’

Inverse with local Agt

(22) * gadis cantik itu di-tonton-ku.
girl beautiful that NON.ACT-watch-1SG.GEN
‘I watched that beautiful girl.’

(23) a. Gadis cantik itu ku-tonton.
girl beautiful that 1SG.INV.AGT-watch
‘I watched that beautiful girl.’

b. Gadis cantik itu saya tonton.
girl beautiful that 1SG watch
‘I watched that beautiful girl.’

---

8 Any number of expressions that indicate a 1SG participant may be used; thus, a personal name might be used to indicate 1SG, and will behave just as does saya in (23b). Thus, titles, occupation descriptions, names or nicknames may all appear in close constituency with the verb if they have first (or second) person reference.
Modelling the SI voice system in terms of different constraints on the encoding of arguments is not problematic. I assume that the basis for a model of voice alternations includes the pair of ranked constraints already described in (5), and repeated as (24).

\[(24) \quad *_{\text{SUBJ}}/x \gg *_{\text{SUBJ}}/\text{Pat} \gg \ldots\]

Read: the ban on non-prominent SUBJs (x, not X) outranks the ban on Pat SUBJS

The additional variables we need to note are:

- SI allows two non-active clause types, both the inverse and the passive.
  There is variation in the coding allowed for an Agt: SI does not permit an Oblique Agt, but does allow an Object Agt.
- Local Agts are more resistant to being coded as a non-SUBJ than are non-local Agts.
  in SI a local Agt cannot be coded as an OBL, but can be an OBJ.

This implies the following pair of constraints:

\[(25) \quad *_{\text{OBL}}/\text{Local/Agt} \gg *_{\text{SUBJ}}/x \gg \ldots\]

Read: an OBL (oblique) local Agt is more highly disfavoured than a Pat SUBJ

We also need a means of selecting between the inverse and the passive clauses, when the Agt is not local. Based on textual evidence regarding the selection of the different voice types demonstrating the low frequency of ‘active voice’ forms in many languages from Taiwan to western Indonesia (e.g., Cumming and Wouk, 1987; Wouk, 1994, 1996), I suggest the constraint shown in (26) is appropriate to model the variation.

\[(26) \quad *_{\text{OBL}}/x \quad \text{Read: avoid coding a prominent participant as an OBL (oblique)}\]

This constraint, the mirror of both \(*_{\text{OBL}}/x\) and \(*_{\text{SUBJ}}/x\), calls for any prominent participants to be coded as core arguments, either subject or object.

This constraint implies the existence (or at least prior existence) of an applicative, and preferably an inverse voice as well.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, Aissen assumes that \(*_{\text{OBL}}/\text{Agt}\) is a very highly-ranked constraint in most languages; but this is necessarily violated in languages with non-demoting inverse voice systems. (This also implies that \(*_{\text{SUBJ}}/\text{Agt}\) is a very low-ranked constraint; it does not feature in the organisation of grammar in languages described in Aissen’s article (though it is a logical way to model a ‘syntactically ergative’ language such as Central Inuit, or Mam)).

However, just this constraint is a well-established feature of many Austronesian languages: as mentioned above, there are many reports of the unmarkedness of ‘patient voice’ clauses in western Austronesian languages.

\[(27) \quad *_{\text{SUBJ}}/\text{Agt} \gg *_{\text{SUBJ}}/\text{Pat} \gg \ldots\]

Read: an Agt SUBJ is more highly disfavoured than a Pat SUBJ.

This constraint preferentially selects a non-active voice.
(28) $\ast \text{OBJ/Agt} \rightarrow \ast \text{OBL/Pat} \rightarrow \ldots$
Read: an Agt OBJ is more highly disfavoured than an Agt OBL.
This constraint selects passives by preference to active clauses; it is very low-ranked in SI.

The constraint rankings that I assume to be the determining factors for the SI data are shown in (29). (29) is more inclusive than is necessary to capture the voice system of SI, but the range of constraints considered has been extended to cover all of the varieties under consideration in this article.

Complete constraint rankings for SI/Malay
(29) $\ast \text{OBL/L/Agt} \rightarrow \ast \text{SUBJ/x} \rightarrow \ast \text{OBL/X} \rightarrow \ast \text{SUBJ/Agt} \rightarrow \ast \text{OBJ/x} \rightarrow \ast \text{OBJ/Agt} \rightarrow \ast \text{SUBJ/Pat} \rightarrow \ast \text{OBL/Agt}$

In addition to those that have been introduced earlier, the following additional constraint is found in (29):

(30) $\ast \text{Obl/Agt}$
Do not assign the grammatical function oblique to arguments bearing the syntactic role of Agt.
This constraint rules out passive codings of events, since they would assign an oblique grammatical function to the Agt.

The tableaux below show the interaction of the highest-ranking of these constraints to select the voice used in clauses with different feature values. Examining clauses with a 1sg Agt and a 3sg Pat, in which neither argument is particularly prominent, we find (31) is a model of the voice selection constraints. A passive clause is ruled out by the ungrammaticality of passives with local Agts (see (21) and (22) earlier). The selection of the inverse, rather than the active, for this clause hinges on the operation of the (cross-linguistically highly marked) $\ast \text{SUBJ/Agt}$ constraint. When both of the participants are prominent, the same voice is selected, for the same reasons. (33) models this situation, also resulting in the clause in (32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(Agt/L/x, Pat/3/x)</th>
<th>$\ast \text{OBL/L/Agt}$</th>
<th>$\ast \text{SUBJ/x}$</th>
<th>$\ast \text{OBL/X}$</th>
<th>$\ast \text{SUBJ/Agt}$</th>
<th>$\ast \text{OBJ/x}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverse A/OBJ &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(32) *Dia saya lihat.*
3sg 1sg see
*I saw her/him.*
A different voice selection results from the Agt being prominent and the Pat not. In this case, shown in (34), the active voice will be selected, as shown in (35).

(35) Saya me-lihat dia.
1sg act-see 3sg
‘I saw her/him.’

When the Pat is prominent and the Agt is not, the inverse will be selected, due to the constraint against non-prominent subjects (*SUBJ/x), again resulting in (32). The tableau for these parameters is shown as (36).

When we deal with non-local Agts we find different voice selections are made. When neither of the participants are prominent the passive will be used, in contrast to the inverse selected in (31). In (37) we find that *OBL/L/Agt plays no role in the process, and so after *SUBJ/Agt has ruled out the active voice *OBJ/x selects for the passive, which contains no object, rather than the inverse.

(38) Saya di-lihat oleh-nya.
1sg non.active-see by-3sg.gen
‘I was seen by her/him.’
A passive is also selected if the Pat is prominent while the Agt is not, as shown in (39).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(39)</th>
<th>V(Agt/3/X, Pat/L/X)</th>
<th>*OBL/L/Agt</th>
<th>*SUBJ/X</th>
<th>*OBL/X</th>
<th>*SUBJ/Agt</th>
<th>*OBJ/X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inverse A/OBJ &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with (34), a prominent Agt and a non-prominent Pat will result in active voice selection, shown here as (40) (with the example illustrating this being (41)). When both are prominent, however, the inverse is selected, as in (42), resulting in the clause shown as (43).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(40)</th>
<th>V(Agt/3/X, Pat/L/x)</th>
<th>*OBL/L/Agt</th>
<th>*SUBJ/X</th>
<th>*OBL/X</th>
<th>*SUBJ/Agt</th>
<th>*OBJ/X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inverse A/OBJ &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (41) | Dia me-lihat saya. |
|      | 3SG ACT-see 1SG |
|      | ‘She/He saw me.’ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(42)</th>
<th>V(Agt/3/X, Pat/L/X)</th>
<th>*OBL/L/Agt</th>
<th>*SUBJ/X</th>
<th>*OBL/X</th>
<th>*SUBJ/Agt</th>
<th>*OBJ/X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inverse A/OBJ &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (43) | Saya di-lihat-nya. |
|      | 1SG NON.ACT-see-3SG.GEN |
|      | ‘She/He saw me.’ |

The parts of the SI voice system that are important to remember include the presence of a non-demoting inverse voice, and the ban on passive voices involving local Agts. In the following sections I shall present sketches of the voice systems of a number of other varieties of Malay/Indonesian, emphasising the differences between these other systems and SI.

4. Makassar Malay

Makassar Malay was originally spoken in and around Makassar (formerly Ujung Pandang) in south-west Sulawesi, but varieties of what may loosely be called Makassar Malay are now spoken in much of southern Sulawesi. The variety described here, referred to as ‘Melayu Makassar’ by its speakers when they wish to differentiate it from more standard or more eastern varieties of Malay/
Indonesian, is spoken in the city of Kendari, in Southeast Sulawesi, a city notable for its large expatriate population from South Sulawesi, where Makassar is found. Makassar Malay has a significantly different voice system to that found in more western varieties of Malay/Indonesian.

Makassar Malay voice system does not show a distinction in coding possibilities between local and non-local persons, in contrast to SI, and additionally lacks passive constructions. There are voice alternations, but only between active and inverse clauses. As with the Philippine-type languages to the north, applicatives (or applicative-like constructions) are more prominent in the grammar of Makassar Malay than they are in SI. The constraint *Obl/X, specifying that prominent participants should not be encoded as non-terms, is also prominent in the operation of the voice system in Makassar Malay. The active and the inverse voices both show two morphological coding possibilities, one with prefixal agreement and one without. The prefixal agreement prefixes occur in the same place as the voice-indicating morphology, and so the two cannot cooccur: sentences such as *say-me[m]ukul dorang are ungrammatical.

Active clauses with free pronoun and with bound pronoun

(44) a. Saya me-[m]ukol dorang. ~ b. Say-pukol dorang.

1SG ACT-hit 3PL 1SG-hit 3PL

‘I hit them.’

Incompatibility of a bound pronoun with overt voice marking

(45) * Say-me-[m]ukol dorang.

1SG-ACT-hit 3PL

‘I hit them.’

Inverse clauses with pronominal enclitic and with proclitic


3PL INV-hit-1SG 3PL 1SG-hit

‘They were hit by me.’

‘They were hit by me.’

Singular Agt agreement affixes in Makassar Malay

(48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Inverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>say-pukol</td>
<td>di-pukol-ku ~ ku-pukol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ko-pukol</td>
<td>di-pukol-mu ~ ko-pukol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>de-pukol</td>
<td>di-pukol-nya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 The evidence that clauses such as (47) should be considered to be inverse, and not passive, can be found when we examine non-active clauses with reflexives, analogous to the Standard Indonesian clauses seen in footnote 7. This is also true of many of the languages native to Sulawesi, such as Makassar itself. Although the form of the clause resembles that of a passive, with the Agt appearing in a preposition phrase headed by ri, the evidence from binding is that the Agt is still a core argument. This can be seen in the following example (Jukes, 2006:188), in which a reflexive is bound by a non-subject in a clause with inverse voice.

(i) Ni-tunrung=i ri kale=nna.

PASS-hit=3 PREP self=3GEN

‘He was hit by himself.’

10 The prefixes have full pronominal status; they may not cooccur with independent free pronouns.

11 Apart from the choice of pronominal marking on the verb the word order of the active and the inverse clauses will also be different, with active clauses showing VPA ~ AVP order, and inverse clauses showing PVA ~ PAV order. This will not be discussed further here.
The constraints that determine the operation of the voice system in Makassar Malay are shown in (49).

Primary constraint rankings for Makassar Malay

(49) *OBL/Agt » *SUBJ/x » *OBJ/x » *SUBJ/Pat

The high-ranked constraint *OBL/Agt bans passive constructions; this is the salient constraint behind the organisation of the Makassar voice system, and is inherited from the proto-Austronesian system, which did not employ a passive voice.\(^\text{12}\) The constraints against Agt subjects or prominent obliques, which were important in the more western languages examined so far, are not prominent in Makassar Malay, where the (cross-linguistically more ‘normal’) constraint *SUBJ/Pat appears, favouring active constructions over inverse (or, conceivably, passive) ones. The presence of a *OBJ/x constraint licenses the operation of applicative constructions when there are non-subcategorised for participants in the clause that are prominent in the discourse.\(^\text{13}\) In (50) we can see the application of these constraints to a clause with a set of grammatical features identical to those seen in (35). Just as in SI the inverse is chosen, though the morphological realisation of this voice differs in Makassar Malay, as shown in (51) and (52). Unlike SI, since there are no constraints sensitive to the local/nonlocal person dichotomy in Makassar Malay, a clause with a non-prominent third person Agt (analogous to (38) earlier) will also result in an inverse selection for the same reasons as shown in (50).

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(50) & V(Agt/L/x, Pat/3/X) & *OBL/Agt & *SUBJ/x & *OBJ/x & *SUBJ/Pat \\
\hline
\Rightarrow & \text{Active A/SUBJ > P/OBJ} & \text{!} & \text{!} & \text{!} & \text{!} \\
\Rightarrow & \text{Inverse A/OBJ > P/SUBJ} & \text{!} & \text{!} & \text{!} & \text{!} \\
\Rightarrow & \text{Passive A/OBL > P/SUBJ} & \text{!} & \text{!} & \text{!} & \text{!} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Additional low-ranking violations for the winning candidate: *OBL/Agt

(51) ~ Laki ku-liat.

\begin{verbatim}
man 1SG.ACT.NOM-see
\end{verbatim}

'I saw the man.'

(52) ~ Laki di-liat-ku.

\begin{verbatim}
man NONACT-see-1SG.GEN
\end{verbatim}

'I saw the man.'

The two coding choices shown in (51) and (52) will be selected depending on the status of the Agt in discourse, whereby a more prominent Agt is more likely to be encoded as in (51), and a less topical Agt as in (52) (detailed textual studies on these differences are yet to be carried out).

\(^{12}\) Languages of the Philippines, such as Tagalog, are more conservative than the southern Austronesian languages reported here, and similarly lack passive voices involving demotion of the Agt. A sketch of the essential basics of the Tagalog voice system is presented in section 8.

\(^{13}\) The *OBL/X constraint proposed for SI (and highly relevant for the Philippine languages) is an even stronger licenser of applicative or applicative-like constructions. The combination of these two constraints in one grammar would be the strongest license for applicatives; this appears to be attested in Jakarta Malay and in other languages of Java and southern Sumatra.
This provides further support for the idea that we need to allow for more than the two simple levels of prominence or topicality in the analysis (as Sells, 2001 proposes).

In (53) we see a tableau with a prominent Agt and a non-prominent Pat; these input features are analogous to those seen in (33) and (39); again, the active voice is selected in both SI and Makassar Malay.

(54)  
De-liat laki tu.  
3sg-see man that  
‘He/She/It saw that man.’

(55) shows a contrast between SI and Makassar Malay. In SI the equivalent clause (shown earlier as (31)) selects an inverse clause on the basis of the *SUBJ/Agt constraint. This is not an option available for the participants in Makassar Malay, since in this language *SUBJ/Pat is operative.

(56)  
Say-liat laki tu.  
1sg-see man that  
‘I saw that man.’

In short, Makassar Malay shows a range of options that are very different from those found in SI, and also has a very different set of preferences that select between active and inverse voices.

5. Ambonese Malay

The Ambonese Malay voice system does not contain an inverse option, but does have an active-passive distinction, a pattern that continues in Malays spoken further east. Correlating with the lack of an inverse voice is the absence of any morphological coding for the passive, a separate auxiliary, dapa ‘get’, being used instead.\footnote{See Grimes (nd), Grimes (1991), and van Minde (1997) for sources on Ambonese Malay.}

The constraint rankings for Ambonese Malay are shown in (57), and they correspond to the description of English passives in Aissen (1999), the only addition being the overt presence of *OBJ/Agt as a highly ranked constraint. This constraint determines the lack of an inverse system,
and is a useful basis for comparison with the other Malay varieties discussed earlier, which do not feature this constraint highly.

(57) $*\text{OBJ/Agt} \rightarrow *\text{SUBJ/x} \rightarrow *\text{SUBJ/Pat} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow *\text{GF/Pers}$

The active voice clause in (59) is selected by the features that are the input to the tableau in (58). Given two arguments with equal prominence, or with the Agt being more prominent than the Pat, the active voice must be selected.

$$
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
(58) & V(\text{Agt/3/x, Pat/L/x}) & *\text{OBJ/Agt} & *\text{SUBJ/x} & *\text{SUBJ/Pat} \\
\Rightarrow & \begin{array}{c}
\text{Active A/\text{SUBJ} > P/\text{OBJ}} \\
\text{Inverse A/\text{OBJ} > P/\text{SUBJ}} \\
\text{Passive A/\text{OBL} > P/\text{SUBJ}}
\end{array} & * & * & *
\end{array}
$$

(59) $\text{De}=\text{lia beta.}$

$3\text{SG}=\text{see 1SG}$

‘He/She saw me.’

The tableaux for two passive coding choices are shown in (60) and (62), differing only in the values present for the person feature of the Pat. While the outcomes are identical for identical reasons, since person does not play a role in the Ambon Malay voice system, the two tableaux are useful for comparison with the Serui Malay data in the following section, where we see that person can play a role in the selection of voice.

$$
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
(60) & V(\text{Agt/L/x, Pat/3/x}) & *\text{OBJ/Agt} & *\text{SUBJ/x} & *\text{SUBJ/Pat} \\
\Rightarrow & \begin{array}{c}
\text{Active A/\text{SUBJ} > P/\text{OBJ}} \\
\text{Inverse A/\text{OBJ} > P/\text{SUBJ}} \\
\text{Passive A/\text{OBL} > P/\text{SUBJ}}
\end{array} & * & * & *
\end{array}
$$

Additional low-ranking violations for the winning candidate: $*\text{OBL/Agt}, *\text{OBL/L/Agt}$

(61) $\text{De}=\text{dapa lia dari beta.}$

$3\text{SG}=\text{get see from 1SG}$

‘He/She was seen by me.’

$$
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
(62) & V(\text{Agt/3/x, Pat/L/X}) & *\text{OBJ/Agt} & *\text{SUBJ/x} & *\text{SUBJ/Pat} \\
\Rightarrow & \begin{array}{c}
\text{Active A/\text{SUBJ} > P/\text{OBJ}} \\
\text{Inverse A/\text{OBJ} > P/\text{SUBJ}} \\
\text{Passive A/\text{OBL} > P/\text{SUBJ}}
\end{array} & * & * & *
\end{array}
$$

Additional low-ranking violations for the winning candidate: $*\text{OBL/Agt}$
While there is a clear passive in Ambonese Malay, we cannot easily attribute it to substratal influence from the languages native to the Ambon area. While much data has been lost to us, what is attested in contemporary Ambonese speech communities does not indicate that a passive is part of the grammar of these languages. Florey (2001) makes no mention of a passive in Alune, nor is one attested in Larike (Laidig and Laidig, 1995), Nuaulu (Bolton, 1990) or Sou Amana Teru (Musgrave, personal communication). Unlike the Makassar Malay data, in which the local variety of Malay shows simplifications compared to the Standard Indonesian data found further west in the direction of normalisation towards the local variety, in Ambonese Malay the normalisation is towards a cross-linguistically modal set of voice alternations, an active and a passive, and not towards a substrate. This is also true of Serui Malay, a yet more easterly variety.

6. Serui Malay

Serui Malay system (as well as many other varieties of eastern Malay) uses the same dapa auxiliary that is found in Ambonese Malay, and differs morphologically only in that the oblique Agt is marked with the comitative preposition deng, not the ablative dari that was found in Ambonese Malay. The same *Obj/Agt constraint that operates against an inverse system in Ambonese Malay also applies to Serui Malay; furthermore, there is a high-ranking constraint that forbids local Agts being coded as oblique arguments, and so works against the appearance of forms such as ‘They were seen by me’, while allowing ‘I was seen by them.’ (see the discussion concerning (9)–(16) earlier). This same constraint was seen in SI; the difference between the two systems is that SI has an additional non-active coding choice, the inverse, a choice that is not available in Ambonese Malay. The high-ranking constraints in Serui Malay are shown in (64).

```
(64) *Obj/Agt > *OBL/L > *SUBJ/X > *SUBJ/Pat > ... > *GF/Pers
```

The tableaux in (65) show a highly prominent third person Pat in a clause with a local Agt, which must be coded as active regardless of this prominence relationship; while (66) is perfectly grammatical, there are no circumstances in which (67) is acceptable. (68) shows that with a third person Agt (and otherwise identical pragmatic and semantic conditions) a passive will be...

---

15 Attempts to translate clauses such as (i) in footnotes 7 and 9, or (101) from Tagalog, in which the antecedent of the reflexive is the non-subject Agt, are not grammatical in Ambonese Malay.

(i) * De=pung diri dapa potong dari dia.
   3SG=POSS self get cut from 3SG
   ‘He was cut by himself.’

While there is no conventional voice system in the Malukan languages, there is evidence that there might be a pronominal voice opposition (Donohue, 2004b), evidence that is strengthened in the light of detailed studies on the voice systems of Flores (Arka and Kosmas, 2005; Donohue, 2005a) that lack any morphological exponent. Pronominal voice systems are discussed in the following section, where the Austronesian languages Ambai and Ansus are exemplified.

16 See van Velzen (1995) for an introduction to aspects of the grammar of this variety of Malay.

17 Serui Malay, as modelled here, shows the same conditions on voice as does Lushootseed in Aissen’s (1999) analysis. There is a voice alternation, but the constraints that govern the voice alternation are outranked by the need to keep local persons as arguments of the verb.
selected. If the Pat is first (or second) person and the Agt is third person, as in (70), then the passive is also allowed, and will be selected if the first person argument outranks the third person argument in terms of prominence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(65)</th>
<th>V(Agt/L/x, Pat/3/X)</th>
<th>*OBJ/Agt</th>
<th>*OBL/L/Agt</th>
<th>*SUBJ/x</th>
<th>*SUBJ/Pat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⇒</td>
<td>Active A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inverse A/OBJ &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional low-ranking violations for the winning candidate: *SUBJ/Agt, *SUBJ/x

(66)  **Kita lia dia.**  
1SG  see 3SG  
‘I saw her/him.’

(67)  * **Dia dapa lia deng kita.**  
3SG  get  see  with 1SG  
‘He/She was seen by me.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(68)</th>
<th>V(Agt/3/x, Pat/3/X)</th>
<th>*OBJ/Agt</th>
<th>*OBL/L/Agt</th>
<th>*SUBJ/x</th>
<th>*SUBJ/Pat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⇒</td>
<td>Active A/SUBJ &gt; P/OBJ</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inverse A/OBJ &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive A/OBL &gt; P/SUBJ</td>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image22.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional low-ranking violations for the winning candidate: *OBL/Agt

(69)  **De dapa lia deng dia.**  
3SG  get  see  with 3SG  
‘He/She was seen by her/him.’

(70)  **Kita dapa lia deng dia.**  
1SG  get  see  with 3SG  
‘I was seen by her/him.’

Apart from the addition of the constraint against passives with local Agts, the same remarks apply to Serui Malay as were given for Ambonese Malay. As with Ambonese Malay, the ‘direction’ that the voice system has taken cannot be (directly) attributed to the structure of the local languages. There are two groups of languages native to the Serui area, the non-Austronesian languages that form the eastern extension of the West Papuan group, and the Austronesian languages that form a dialect chain from west to east along the south coast of the island, excluding only Wabo in the far east, which shows more distant relations.

The non-Austronesian languages of the area similarly do not display any voice systems, though they do have a system of semantic alignment (Donohue and Wichmann, 2007) such that agent and theme arguments are marked identically regardless of the syntactic role that they place. Examples from Saweru (Donohue, 2001a, 2004a) are shown in (71)–(72).
Semantic alignment with no voice distinctions in Saweru

(71) a. \(Mo=rayan-i.\) b. \(Ra-teson-i.\)
\[\begin{align*}
3SG.F.NOM&=\text{swim-TNS} & 3SG.F.GEN&=\text{diarrhoea-TNS} \\
\text{‘She swam.’} & \quad \text{‘She has diarrhea.’}
\end{align*}\]

(72) a. \(O=ra-en-i.\) b. \(Mo=na-en-i.\)
\[\begin{align*}
1SG.NOM&=3SG.F.GEN=\text{see-TNS} & 3SG.F.NOM&=1SG.GEN=\text{see-TNS} \\
\text{‘I saw her.’} & \quad \text{‘She saw me.’}
\end{align*}\]

Particularly striking is the fact that Saweru instantiates a three-way split in intransitive verbs, with a small class of experiential verbs (such as \(\text{manano} \) ‘be lonely’) inflecting with dative agreement suffixes, as in (73a). These same agreement suffixes are used to code objects that are relatively unaffected by the predicate, such as that in (73b).

(73) a. \(\text{Manano-inai}.\) b. \(\text{Mo=komi-inai}.\)
\[\begin{align*}
\text{lonely-1SG.DAT} & \quad 3SG.F.NOM=\text{look for-1SG.DAT} \\
\text{‘I’m lonely.’} & \quad \text{‘She looked for me.’}
\end{align*}\]

There is some passive-like morphology in the Austronesian languages, such as Ambai (the dominant language spoken just east of Serui), which has the accidental passive prefix \(ta-.\) This prefix is not, however, synchronically productive. It appears in alternation with non-prefixed forms in sentences such as (74) and (75), but many prefixed forms do not have a non-prefixed counterpart, as in (76), which lists the results of a dictionary search for lexemes beginning with a suspicious \(ta-.\)

Passive-like morphology in Ambai

(74) \(\text{Mundiai fiobau kahofafoi wape tikuhung aha.}\)
\(\text{Mundiai f}<i><o>-bau \ kahofa=foi \ wape \ t}<i>(a)-kukun \ aka.\)
\(\text{earthquake DISTR<3SG>-split earth=DEF but PASS<3SG>-close PERF}\)
\(\text{‘The earthquake split apart the ground but it closed up again.’} \quad (\text{Price, nd})\)

(75) \(\text{Kuhung boromuawai.}\)
\(\text{K}<bu><ukun \ borom-mu \ ai.}\)
\(\text{close<2SG> mouth-2SG.GEN talk}\)
\(\text{‘You have shut your mouth.’} \quad (\text{Price, nd})\)

(76) \(\text{tabari} \) ‘collapsed’ \quad (*bari) \n\(\text{tabata} \) ‘uprooted’ \quad (*bata) \n\(\text{tabau} \) ‘broken’ \quad \text{baur} \ ‘split, break’ \n\(\text{tafai} \) ‘be open’ \quad \text{fair} \ ‘open (tr)’ \n\(\text{tafasa} \) ‘be unattached’ \quad \text{fasa} \ ‘open, loosen (tr)’ \n\(\text{tafatang} \) ‘be pulled up’ \quad \text{fatin} \ ‘pull out’ \n\(\text{tafuфа} \) ‘be loose’ \quad (*fufa) \n\(\text{takuhung} \) ‘be closed’ \quad \text{kuhun} \ ‘close (tr)’

In Ansus, the politically dominant language spoken to the west of Serui, we see a system of inflection that requires nominative agreement, but allows accusative agreement without requiring
it (a morphologically identical system is found in Ambai, though the syntax of this system in Ambai is less categorial than in Ansus). Examples of the two options are shown in (77) and (78); in both cases the infix \(<bu>\) marks the 2SG agent, but only in (78) is the 3SG theme indexed on the verb.

(77) \[ Au \; k<o>pa \; i. \]
    kapár<bu>
\[ 2SG \; kick<2SG> \; 3SG \]
‘He/It/She kicked her/him/it.’

(78) \[ Au \; k<o>par-i. \]
\[ 2SG \; kick<2SG>-3SG.P \]
‘You kicked her/him/it.’

The choice of an indexed or non-indexed theme has a number of syntactic consequences. In (79) and (80) we can see that the preferred interpretation of controlled arguments in conjunction reduction constructions is that the theme of a first clause be interpreted as the controller of the second, if in the first clause the verb shows agreement for that theme. If there is no accusative agreement in the first clause, then the agent of the first clause is the controller. Data such as this, and restrictions on relative clauses (seen in (81)–(84)) suggest that this can be treated as a pronominal voice system (Donohue, 2004b). It is not, however, a passive alternation.18

(79) \[ Yoel, \; Deki \; de-dut-i \; na \; Arui, \; paina \; t<e>weri. \]
\[ Yoel \; Deki \; 3SG-meet-3SG.P \; OBL \; Serui \; and \; return<3SG> \]
‘Dekii met Yoelj in Serui, and then he*i /*j went home.’

(80) \[ Deki \; de-du \; Yoel \; na \; Arui, \; paina \; t<e>weri. \]
\[ Deki \; 3SG-meet \; Yoel \; OBL \; Serui \; and \; return<3SG> \]
‘Dekii met Yoelj in Serui, and then he*i /*j went home.’

Ansus: verbal morphology in relative clauses must include agreement for head

(81) \[ muang\_i \; mani \; de-du \; Yoel\_j \]
\[ man \; \text{TOP}/\text{REL} \; 3SG-meet \; Yoel \]
‘the man who met Yoel’

(82) \[ muang\_i \; mani \; Yoel\_j \; de-dut-i\_i \]
\[ man \; \text{TOP}/\text{REL} \; Yoel \; 3SG-meet-3SG.P \]
‘the man who Yoel met’

(83) * \[ muang\_i \; mani \; Yoel\_j \; dedu \]
(84) * \[ muang\_i \; mani \; Yoel\_j \; deduti\_i \]

18 Though see Donohue (2004c) for discussion of the historical underpinnings of the agreement system in the Yapen Austronesian languages, which lies in the morphological alternations that marked voice in earlier Austronesian languages, and still do in Tagalog.
In short, the use (or non-use) of P-suffixes or P-enclitics in Ansus (and other Yapen languages) is the morphological means used to monitor a change in grammatical functions: this is a voice choice, using pronominal marking choices to indicate the changing pragmatic and grammatical status of the two arguments of a bivalent clause (see Pearson, 2005 for discussion of the pragmatic underpinnings of ‘voice’ in Austronesian languages, notably Malagasy). The fact that both pragmatic and syntactic factors are involved allows us to draw on previous literature concerning the optionality of pronominal agreement markers. The presence of an object prefix in a language like Chichewa that allows well-formed verbs to appear without such markers has been assumed to bear a discourse function, as well as a pragmatic function (Bresnan and Mchombo, 1987); similar, though varying, data are reported for a wide variety of languages. In languages with pronominal voice we similarly find discourse function effects, as would be predicted for an Austronesian language, tied in with syntactic effects, thus a voice system, but monitored by pronominal morphology. The fact that pronominal features bear a role in the Yapen area Austronesian languages makes an analogy with the voice system of Serui Malay, involving as it does a scale of eligibility for subjecthood that depends on the pronominal hierarchy, tempting. A caution against adopting too direct a version of this hypothesis is the fact that a pronominal voice system is functionally an inverse, without demotion of an argument (note that in (78) the Agt still shows agreement on the verb, not a characteristic that would be expected of a demoted argument. In the Serui Malay data it is clear, by the presence of the preposition deng as well as by other tests, that a demoting voice system is in operation.

7. Papuan Malay

The voice system of Papuan Malay is the simplest of any described here, and indeed is empirically the simplest possible system that can be found in any language. This is because there are no choices in the coding of arguments with respect to voice selection: all Papuan Malay clauses are active, there being no passive or inverse coding options.\footnote{The variety described here is a conservative, rural variety of Papuan Malay from the area near Jayapura on the north coast (see Donohue, in press; Donohue and Sawaki, in press; Suharno, 1979). Most urban speakers of local varieties of Malay in Papua now employ a passive, similar to the Ambonese Malay passive described in 5. Non-urban speakers, however, lack this voice alternation, and preserve pronouns such as kita ‘1SG’, which is not recognised by urban speakers.}

The relevant constraints that derive this invariant active selection are shown in (85). The constraint *Obj/Agt works against the selection of inverse constructions, and in combination with *Subj/Pat, which bans passive constructions, these constraints rule out any voice alternation, regardless of the relative prominence of the two participants.

\begin{equation}
\text{Primary constraint rankings for Papua Malay}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
*\text{Obj/Agt} \gg *\text{Subj/Pat} \gg \ldots \gg \{*\text{GF/Pers}, *\text{GF/χ}\}
\end{equation}

The following tableau shows a local Agt and a non-local Pat in the same clause. While prominence has been marked, it is in fact irrelevant for the analysis.
Papua Malay, with its lack of any voice construction, serves as an example of the most extreme adaptation possible away from the three-voice systems of western Indonesia, in that no aspects of any voice alternation are found.

The indigenous languages of the Jayapura area are, like those of the area surrounding Serui, divided into Austronesian and non-Austronesian groups. The Austronesian languages do not show any voice oppositions, although there is a form of diathesis in the shape of case making and word order alternations: Tobati, spoken in Entrop (central Jayapura), has changed to an OSV clausal order, as in (88) (Donohue, 2002a). There is an alternative, with SOV order and case marking for the object, available for all clauses, shown in (89).20

(88) Hony-o for-o rom-i.
dog-FV pig-FV see-3SG
‘The pig saw the dog.’
NOT ‘The dog saw the pig.’

(89) Hony-o for-ad rom-i.
dog-FV pig-ALL see-3SG
‘The dog saw the pig.’
NOT ‘The pig saw the dog.’

When verbal indexing makes the reference of the core arguments unambiguous, this order is relaxed. The following sentence shows the optional use of the allative case to mark an object, and the appearance of SOV, rather than OSV, word order. Thus in addition to (90), which is structurally analogous to (89) at the clause level, we also find (91).

(90) Nehu man ros-ad j-om-ric.
1SG bird two-ALL 1SG-see-3PL
‘I saw two birds.’

20 The data in (88) and (89) may be interpreted as evidence that (89) represents a basic clause, and that (88) displays a clause-external topical Pat (thanks to Yuko Otsuka for this suggestion). While tempting, this ignores the much greater frequency of sentences such as (88). I suggest that the topic position has become grammaticised in Tobati, something that is attested in other languages of New Guinea such as Kirikiri (Donohue, 2005b).
In light of the pronominal voice systems seen further west, and the presence of morphologically unmarked or minimally marked voice oppositions in Flores (Arka and Kosmas, 2005; Donohue, 2005a), it is possible that there is a voice opposition involved here, rather than a simple pragmatic opposition in terms of topicalisation and the grammaticalisation of a clause-external structural position (Aissen, 1992; Donohue, 2005b). To date no evidence supports this speculation, however.

Amongst the non-Austronesian languages, no voice oppositions are reported for Sentani (Cowan, 1965), the closest and largest of the non-Austronesian languages to Jayapura. In Skou, however, there is a limited voice alternation: only one predicate, ká ‘hit’, has a (lexical) passive, mông wí ‘be hit’, as shown in (92) and (93). Note that in (93) the Agt is encoded postverbally, the position reserved (in this SOV language) for obliques and adjuncts, as seen in (94).

\[(92)\]
\begin{align*}
Ke=ba\=inga & \quad n\=ke=ká.
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
3SG.NF=man=the & \quad 1SG \quad 3SG.NF=hit
\end{align*}
‘The man hit me.’

\[(93)\]
\begin{align*}
N\=ni\=m\=ong \quad n\=i\=w\=í & \quad ke=ba\=inga.
1SG \quad wound & \quad 1SG=’get’ \quad 3SG.NF=man=the
\end{align*}
‘I was hit by the man.’

\[(94)\]
\begin{align*}
N\=ni \quad n\=i\=tahu\=ng \=p\=á.
1SG \quad 1SG=sit & \quad house
\end{align*}
‘I sat in the house.’

While Skou does show a (very limited) voice alternation (see Donohue, in press), it is unlikely that this language influenced the development of Papuan Malay to any significant extent. Most languages of the New Guinea region behave like Sentani or Tobati, and lack voice alternations, and the lack of any voice alternation in Papuan Malay reflects this linguistic input.

8. Philippine voice—a summary of an early Austronesian system

Most reconstructions of Malayo-Polynesian languages assume that the parent language had a structure similar to that attested today in most languages of the Philippines, and for the sake of simplicity this view shall be assumed here as well.\(^{\text{21}}\) The salient facts about Philippine-type languages, and to a lesser extent their relatives in (western) Indonesia, that diverge from general

\(^{\text{21}}\) The morphosyntactic ‘type’ that is instantiated in the languages of the Philippines is also found in northern Borneo and northern Sulawesi, and some areas of Formosa. Note that an alternative historical view, in which a reconstruction of the syntax of proto Malayo-Polynesian reveals a more Chamorro- or Nias-like morphosyntax (a fact suggested by the distribution of these, and other, three-voice languages in the Austronesian world), would have a different view on the original system, one that is not so divergent from the Indonesian/Malay model (for reference materials underlying this proposal, see materials on Chamorro (Topping, 1973; Gibson, 1992), Nias (Brown, 2001; Sundermann, 1905, 1913), or Tukang Besi (Donohue, 1999)).
typological norms, as far as this paper is concerned, are summarised in the following points. Philippine-type languages:

- typically have many voice options, beyond simply allowing either Agt and Pat as SUBJ, as is found in English.
- this correlates with the fact that prominent participants of any role are preferentially coded as subject. In Indonesian languages that lack a multiple voice system there is heavy and productive use of applicatives.
- do not have a demotional voice system.
- non-subject Agts are objects, not obliques. There is no passive voice in the northern languages, but Indonesian languages typically do allow a passive.
- show a textual and lexical preference for non-active voice(s).
- some lexemes cannot appear in main clauses with an active voice, but must code their Pat as SUBJ. Textually, approximately 75% of clauses are not in active voice (see, for instance, Bresnahan, 1991 for Tagalog), but appear with a non-Agt as SUBJ.

Note that there are no constraints on the assignment of grammatical functions to particular persons: any of first, second or third persons may be subject, or object, as either Agt or Pat. The salient constraints that we need to model these facts, and their relative rankings, are shown in (95).

Primary constraint rankings for Philippine-type languages (specifically Tagalog)

(95) \[ *\text{OBL}/\text{Agt} \gg *\text{SUBJ}/x \gg *\text{OBL}/x \gg *\text{SUBJ}/\text{Agt} \]

The \(*\text{OBL}/x\) and \(*\text{OBL}/\text{Agt}\) constraints are the most salient in this language in determining the coding choices. The ban on oblique Agts is satisfied by not allowing any passive voice options. The ban on obliquely-coded participants that are high in discourse prominence is satisfied in Philippine-type languages by having a range of voice choices (sometimes called ‘superapplicatives’ in the literature) which appear in clauses with a non-subcategorised for participant as subject. Through the use of these ‘non-basic’ voice options any prominent participant will be preferred as subject. For instance, in (87) we can see a monovalent verb used with an adjunct; the subject of the clause is the Agt \textit{siya}, and the adjunct ‘car’ is marked with dative case, governed by the preposition \textit{mula} ‘from’. This same adjunct may, with a

\[ N\text{-see}=3\text{SG.}\text{NOM} \text{ DAT} \ 1\text{SG.}\text{DAT} \]

\[ '\text{He/she saw me.'} \]

\[ \text{DAT} \ 1\text{SG.}\text{DAT}=3\text{SG.}\text{NOM} \text{ AV-see} \]

\[ '\text{He/she saw me.'} \]

\[ \text{DAT} \text{ market}=3\text{SG.}\text{NOM} \text{ go.AV} \]

\[ '\text{He/she went to the market.'} \]

\[ \text{AV-see}=3\text{SG.}\text{NOM} \text{ DAT} \ 1\text{SG.}\text{DAT} \]

\[ '\text{He/she saw me.'} \]

\[ * \text{sa} \ \text{akin}=\text{siya} \ naka-kita \]

\[ '\text{He/she saw me.'} \]

\[ \text{DAT} \text{ market}=3\text{SG.}\text{NOM} \text{ go.AV} \]

\[ '\text{He/she went to the market.'} \]

\[ *\text{OBL}/\text{Agt} \text{ to prohibit not only overtly expressed oblique agents, but also ‘demotion by omission’, to characterise agentless passives.} \]
change in voice, mark the location as the subject of the clause, as in (88), while the Agt appears as a non-subject, non-adjunct. The use of the -an suffix in (96) indicates that the ang-marked subject of the clause is a location, and the clitic =mo indicates the Agt of the clause. In (97), on the other hand, the infix <um> indicates that the subject is an Agt, and the oblique ‘car’ is marked with the dative case sa.

(96) Lunsar-an=mo ang kotse.
alight-dv-2SG.GEN NOM car
‘Alight from the car.’

(97) L<um>unsad=siya mula sa kotse.
alight<AV>=3SG.NOM from DAT car
‘He alighted from the car.’

In (98) and (99) we can see a similar alternation with a bivalent root; here kita ‘see’. When the P is less prominent than the A the active voice must be used to allow the Agt to function as subject. Otherwise the P is coded as subject, as in (99).

(98) Naka-kita=ako ng bata.
AV-see=1SG.NOM GEN child
‘I saw a/?the child.’

(99) Na-kita=ko ang bata.
PV-see=1SG.GEN NOM child
‘I saw the child.’

Evidence that (99) represent a passive can be seen in the fact that both (100) and (101) are grammatical. These clauses show that the choice of voice does not affect the ability of an Agt to be the antecedent of a reflexive (although both of the following sentences are grammatical, the second is greatly preferred).

(100) Naka-kita=ako ng aki(n)-ng sarili.
AV-see=1SG.NOM GEN 1SG.DAT-LNKR self
‘I saw myself.’

(101) Na-kita=ko ang aki(n)-ng sarili.
PV-see=1SG.GEN NOM 1SG.DAT-LNKR self
‘I saw myself.’

In Tagalog high prominence with ANY participant requires that it be selected as subject. The only Agt that can be coded as SUBJ is one that is more highly prominent than any other participants in the clause, Pat or adjuncts.

While the voice systems of the Indonesian languages do not allow for such a wide range of alternations, the constraint on marking pragmatically salient participants as more than oblique

---

24 We can test the adjunct status of the car with the same adjunct fronting construction used in footnote 19: Mula sa kotse siya lumansad. Note that kotse in (87) is marked with a specific preposition, mula, as well as the general dative (oblique) sa.
nominals is a pervasive one in the languages that have some form of applicative alternation (see Donohue, 2001b).

9. Variation in voice and the structure of Austronesian

We have seen the following variation in parametric settings between the voice systems of the different varieties of Malay/Indonesian25:

- the number and nature of voice contrasts; some languages show an active-inverse-passive contrast; others show just active-inverse or active-passive, or simply active.

- the status of the Agt in a non-active clause; the inverse voice requires an object Agt, while the passive requires an oblique Agt.

- the role of the person (first, second, or third) of an Agt on eligibility for different voices; SI and Serui Malay show local person effects on the realisation of voice in a clause.

Ignoring for the moment the constraints that lead to this typology, Table 1 sets out the voice selections that are available to the different varieties described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice selections available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keys:** Ph: Philippine-type languages such as Tagalog; SI: Standard Indonesian; MM: Makassar Malay; AM: Ambonese Malay; SeM: Serui Malay; PM: Papuan Malay.

The differences can be compared in terms of the constraints that are more important than *SUBJ/x in each of the languages. This is shown in Table 2, where a ‘typical’ northern Philippine system has been added for comparison.

The interaction of these constraints results in the voice systems shown earlier. We can compare these different voice selections with those found in other languages or language families cross-linguistically, as shown (non-exhaustively) in Table 3.

As we can see, most of the world linguistic diversity in terms of voice systems can be found in the various varieties of Malay/Indonesian found across the archipelago. Those varieties that do

---

25 Other relevant parameters include: the morphological coding of oblique agents, any polysemy between this morphological expression and other uses of the same morphology; the non-voice/non-transitivity uses of voice morphology in different varieties; the morphology employed in the different voice choices (and any markedness relationship between them).
not involve a high-ranking *OBJ/Agt, the systems with inverse voices, are rare, showing that, while not unviolable, this is a constraint with a great deal of cross-linguistic support.\(^{26}\) The only major voice variety that is not attested in Malay/Indonesian varieties is an unambiguous antipassive, such as attested in many Mayan languages, a few Australian languages (mainly in the north-east), and various other areas.

The languages with the cross-linguistically most ‘normal’ (in the statistical sense) voice systems are the ones in the east, seen in Ambonese Malay, Serui Malay and Papuan Malay. This correlates with the typological types of non-Malayic languages in those areas. Fig. 1 shows, in very rough form, a loose description of the genetic relations of the extra-Formosan Austronesian languages, and beneath it the varieties of Malay/Indonesian that have been described in this paper are positioned according to the region in which they are found. In the southern Austronesian area in which we are concentrating the languages are found along a west-east axis, with the Oceanic languages at the far east of Indonesia (and beyond), and the ‘western Malayo-Polynesian’ languages in the west of Indonesia (and beyond).

\(^{26}\) This also implies that *SUBJ/Agt is a very low-ranked constraint; it does not feature in the organisation of grammar in languages; such a constraint is, however, a logical way to model a language in which the syntax is overwhelmingly ‘ergative’, such as Central Inuit (e.g. Fortescue, 1984; Manning, 1996), or Mam (England, 1983).
We have seen an instance of a conservative ‘Western Malayo-Polynesian’ language in Tagalog, in section 8. A number of broad typological generalisations, as relevant to the discussion here, can be made about various other of the groups:

- The languages of Sulawesi, on which Makassar is found, show a great range of voice systems. In the south, around Makassar, there are typically active-inverse contrasts; substratal influence could easily explain the voice system of Makassar Malay.
- Central Malayo-Polynesian area languages lack inverse systems, except for some evidence in the far south-west of the region (in Flores; Arka and Kosmas, 2005; Donohue, 2005a); the passive alternations found in Ambonese Malay CANNOT be explained as a result of substratal influence.
- The Austronesian languages of Yapen island, the home of Serui, show complex systems of diathesis that clearly evolved as a result of person-hierarchy based constraints on the operation
of an earlier voice system (Donohue, 2004c). The passive alternations found in Ambonese Malay cannot be explained as a result of substratal influence.

- The only variety for which the hypothesis of Austronesian substratal influence is not useful is Papuan Malay, from the area around Jayapura in North-Central New Guinea. This is because the major substrate is not Austronesian and the non-Austronesian languages of this part of the world tend overwhelmingly not to have voice systems. While Austronesian languages do not form a strong substrate, the notion of substrate influence is very plausible, coming from the non-Austronesian languages of the area.

Most importantly, those instances in which the variation in the Malay/Indonesian varieties can be explained as substratal influence – the hypothesis would be that the variation in voice systems found in the different Malay/Indonesian varieties is simply a reflection of the voice systems of the dominant language(s) of that area – only removes the burden of explanation one level: why is it that the further east one goes, the more the languages lose the traits associated with western Austronesian languages, and appear more and more ‘normal’, from a cross-linguistic perspective?

10. Austronesian languages, Malay normalisation and universal grammar

As we follow the historical development of the languages away from the conservative model that is preserved in Formosa and the Philippines, we observe the effect of some sort of ‘normalising’ pressure on the grammar of the languages. This is clearly not an insurmountable pressure, as the continued existence of the grammatically conservative languages attests, but in the less conservative Austronesian areas, the grammatical systems are approximating the cross-linguistically more ‘modal’ state of affairs in which *OBL/Agt is a more highly ranked constraint, and *SUBJ/Agt is ranked very low.

These developments towards world-modal patterns are also observed when we come to the south of the range of Austronesian expansion: when the Austronesians moved into the already-occupied islands that are now Indonesia, their languages developed passive voice choices, choices that in the east ended up supplanting rather than complementing the inverse systems of their ancestral language, or else disappearing altogether. The fact that this series of changes should happen just as the Austronesians came into regular contact with other well-established groups is not accidental.

We can posit contact and interaction with non-Austronesian languages in southern Austronesia, particularly in eastern Indonesia (human habitation is known to be at least 30,000 years old in central Indonesia); and we know that while this contact involved the complete loss of the pre-Austronesian linguistic lineages across the great part of the archipelago, the Austronesian languages were the recipients of a great number of changes involving word order (see Donohue, 2005a).

This implies that some level of language assimilation, with input from the non-Austronesian original inhabitants, took place in the area, including the learning of Austronesian languages by other speakers. I do not claim that this necessarily involved creolisation, but it certainly involved language adaptation; the speed of Austronesian dispersal (estimated from archaeological findings to involve not more than 800 years from the northern Philippines to eastern New Guinea) implies fast language contact, and unstable L1 and L2 situations. Most likely the model was of an Austronesian variety being partially learned, and then this partial variety being transferred, along with human passage, further along the migration paths.
During this period the Austronesian languages in the southern Austronesian area were in contact with a wide variety of non-Austronesian speakers, who probably outnumbered the technologically advanced ocean-going Austronesian population. This large indigenous population provided a large pool of L2 Austronesian speakers in each new locality.

In any event, the arrival of the Austronesians, and the learning of the languages that accompanied them by the indigenous populations, involved (through the process of L2 acquisition) repeated access to components of UG by enforcing the high rankings for constraints such as *OBJ/Agt and *SUBJ/Pat (logically this also includes a very low ranking for *SUBJ/Agt and *OBJ/Pat).

This model explains the history of the Austronesian languages once they arrived south of the Philippines, and developed more in line with cross-linguistically attested modal settings, through access to UG. While much of the variation in voice systems in varieties of Malay and Indonesian can be attributed to substratal influence from the languages in the areas in which they are spoken, in many cases the grammar of the local Malay diverges from that as well. We have seen that those cases in which the local Malay variety differs from the local substrate can all be explained by appealing to cross-linguistically unmarked settings for the constraints that govern voice choice—and this can only be construed as being the result of access to UG in the same way that the local non-Malay languages developed originally. Malay, then, can be seen as mirroring the development of the local Austronesian languages in the areas in which it is found as a lingua franca, for the same reasons that those languages diverged from the original, typologically unusual, Austronesian mould that is attested in a more conservative shape in the languages of Taiwan, the Philippines, and certain fringe areas of the Western Malayo-Polynesian region in the south-west of the Austronesian zone (see Donohue, 2005c).
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