

# Voice, Valence and Focus in Makassarese

Anthony Jukes

RCLT, La Trobe University

Makassarese is a language of South Sulawesi spoken by up to 2 million people. Although it has a set of verb prefixes cognate with voice-marking morphology in other Austronesian languages of Indonesia and the Philippines, unlike many of these languages Makassarese has an asymmetrical voice system with an unambiguous passive prefix *ni-* opposed to several constructions loosely termed ‘active’. This paper examines this voice contrast, and also discusses why the verb prefixes which could appear to be marking voice are in fact doing something else. Finally, it will discuss the use of a pre-predicate focus slot, which serves several of the functions typically fulfilled by a voice system in Indonesian languages.

## 1 Basic clause structure

In order to explain the use of the verb prefixes it will first be necessary to give an overview of basic clause types. Makassarese is (morphologically) ergative, and grammatical relations are signified by pronominal clitics — some writers refer to this as verbal agreement, but given that the clitics are not restricted to appearing on verbs this term does not seem especially apt. I prefer to call it cross-referencing on the predicate: this is a terminological issue which will not be entered into here. The paradigm of the pronominal clitic system, as well as the associated free pronouns, appears below. Note in passing the similarities between the (ergative) proclitic and the possessive suffix.<sup>1</sup>

	Pronoun	Proclitic (ERG)	Enclitic (ABS)	Possessive suffix (POSS)
1 sing	<i>inakke</i>	<i>ku=</i>	<i>=a'</i>	<i>-ku</i>
2 fam	<i>ikau</i>	<i>nu=</i>	<i>=ko</i>	<i>-nu</i>
2 pol/1pl inc.	<i>ikatte</i>	<i>ki=</i>	<i>=ki'</i>	<i>-ta</i>
1 pl exc.	<i>*ikambe</i>	<i>*</i>	<i>*=kang</i>	<i>*</i>
3	<i>ia</i>	<i>na=</i>	<i>=i</i>	<i>-na</i>

### 1.1 Intransitive clauses

Intransitive clauses can be of several major types, depending on the category of the predicate head. What they have in common is that there will be an ‘absolute’ (=ABS) enclitic cross-referencing the sole argument S, if S is definite or otherwise salient in the discourse, and not in focus (§4). The ABS enclitic tends to attach to the first constituent, whatever its category, resulting in the typologically common second-position or ‘Wackernagel’ clitic.

#### 1.1.1 Verbal predicates

Intransitive verbal predicates are headed by intransitive verbs. These may be unambiguously intransitive as with (1) and (2), intransitive readings of ambitransitive verbs as with (3), or intransitive verbs which include inherent objects such as (4):

<sup>1</sup> The distinction between affixes and clitics can be drawn on phonological grounds — affixes are counted as part of the word when stress is assigned, while clitics are not. This phonological diagnostic is only useful for enclitics, because stress is counted back from the right edge of the word.

- (1) *Tinroi iAli*  
 tinro =i i Ali  
 sleep =3ABS PERS Ali  
 Ali is sleeping
- (2) *A'jappai Balandayya*  
 aC- jappa =i balanda ≡a  
 INTR- walk =3ABS Dutch ≡DEF  
 The Dutchman is walking
- (3) *Angnganrea'*  
 aN(N)- kanre =a'  
 TR- eat =1ABS  
 I'm eating
- (4) *A'jaranga'*  
 aC- jarang =a'  
 INTR- horse =1ABS  
 I ride a horse

Intransitive verbs are typically marked with a verb prefix, usually *aC-* but a small set of basic verbs such as *tinro* 'sleep' do not require these.

### 1.1.2 Adjectival predicates

Adjectives may function directly as either attributes or predicates in Makassarese. There is no copula, and the clitic pronoun is placed directly on the adjective phrase, which may contain a modifier such as the degree adverb seen in (6):

- (5) *Bambangi alloa*  
 bambang =i allo ≡a  
 hot =3ABS day ≡DEF  
 The day is hot
- (6) *Pongoro'-dudui anjo taua*  
 pongor dudu =i anjo tau ≡a  
 mad very =3ABS that person ≡DEF  
 That person is really crazy

### 1.1.3 Nominal predicates

Nominals may function as predicates directly without use of a copula or other morphosyntactic device. Clitics are placed directly on the predicate. Nominal predicates may be distinguished from verbs derived from nouns by the absence of a verb prefix, eg. compare (7) with (4) earlier, but otherwise nominal predicates may host the same range of cross-referencing and aspectual clitics as other types of predicate. Nominal predicates generally assert (or question) the identity of S.

- (7) *Jaranga'*  
 jarang =a'  
 horse =1ABS  
 I am a horse

(8) *Tau-battu-kere-ko*

tau battu kere =ko  
 person come where =2fABS

Where are you from (lit. a person coming from where you)

(9) *Atangkui anjo taua*

ata ≡ngku =i anjo tau ≡a  
 servant ≡1.POSS =3ABS that person ≡DEF

That man is my slave

(10) *Ana'naki' karaenga*

ana' ≡na =ki' karaeng ≡a  
 child ≡3.POSS =2pABS karaeng ≡DEF

You are the karaeng's son

(11) *Inakkeji*

inakke =ja =i  
 1PRO =LIM =3ABS

It's only me

**1.1.4 Numeral predicates**

An alternative to predicate possession formed with the existential verb *nia'* is a predicate headed by a numeral:

(12) *Ruai bainenna*

rua =i baine ≡nna  
 two =3ABS woman ≡3.POSS

He has two wives (lit. 'two (are) his wives)

(13) *Nikanai Patanna Langkana ka iami ampareki langkanaya, sampuloi anrua pa'daseranna.*

ni- kana =i pata ≡nna langkana ka ia =mo =i  
 PASS- word =3ABS owner ≡3.POSS palace because 3PRO =PFV =3ABS

aN- pare' =i langkana ≡a sampulo =i aN- rua  
 AF- make =3ABS palace ≡DEF ten =3ABS LK- two

pa> aC- daser <ang ≡na  
 NR> INTR- floorboard <NR ≡3.POSS

He was called 'Patanna Langkana' because he built a palace with twelve sections on pillars (lit. 'twelve (were) its sections', Maros061).

**1.1.5 Locative predicates**

In some clauses the only candidate for predicate head is a locative adverb or prepositional phrase:

(14) *Ri balla'nai*

ri balla' ≡na =i  
 PREP house ≡3.POSS =3ABS

He's at home

(15) *Anrinnima'*

anrinni =mo =a'  
 here =PFV =1ABS

Here I am!

(16) *Anjorengji*

anjoreng =ja =i  
 there =LIM =3ABS

It's just there

## 1.2 Semi-transitive clauses

The term *semi-transitive* refers to clauses which, although clearly describing events involving two participants, only include a clitic pronoun cross-referencing one of those participants — the Actor. This is because as a general rule Undergoers must be definite to be cross-referenced — in other words referred to by name or title (or otherwise pragmatically salient such as 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person), or marked with the determiner  $\equiv a$  or a possessive suffix. Thus, semi-transitive clauses contain verbs which are lexically transitive, but which host only an absolutive enclitic indexing the Actor, while the Undergoer appears only as an NP and is not cross-referenced. The verb is marked with a verb prefix, usually *aN(N)–*.

(17) *angnganrea' taipa*

aN(N)– kanre =a' taipa  
 TR– eat =1ABS mango

I eat a mango/mangoes

In some cases, as in the example above, omission of P<sup>INDEF</sup> results in an intransitive clause which is quite well-formed (though obviously it differs in meaning).

(18) *angnganrea'*

aN(N)– kanre =a'  
 TR– eat =1ABS

I eat, I'm eating

That is because verbs such as *kanre* 'eat' are ambitransitive, equally allowing intransitive and transitive readings. In others however, such as (19), the verb *balli* 'buy' requires an overt Undergoer and there is no possible intransitive interpretation:

(19) *ammallia' ballo'*

aN(N)– balli =a' ballo'  
 TR– buy =1ABS palm.wine

I buy palm wine (cf *\*ammallia'* 'I bought')

I have elected to use the term semi-transitive for these types of clauses. This term captures the fact that these clauses are different from both typical intransitive and transitive clauses, and that they exhibit properties that fall in between those of normal intransitive and transitive clauses. They differ from intransitive clauses because of the obvious fact that these clauses contain Undergoers, both in their logical structure and in their syntax. They differ from fully transitive clauses in that the undergoer is not marked with a clitic — signalling that it is not like an ordinary P, if it is a P at all.

Other labels which have been or could be used are actor focus, actor voice, antipassive, or simply intransitive. I don't find compelling evidence for any of these options, as I will explain below.

### 1.2.1 The intransitive analysis

Examples such as (19) above, with an indefinite Undergoer which is essential to the clause and cannot be omitted, lead me to consider with suspicion claims such as those by Friberg (1996:144) and Hasan Basri (1999:19) that these clauses should be considered ‘formally intransitive’ — as does the fact that verbs in these types of clauses overwhelmingly host the prefix *aN(N)–*, which in general distinguishes lexically bivalent verbs from monovalent verbs derived with *aC–*.

Furthermore, the fact that these  $P^{\text{INDEF}}$  arguments are available for syntactic operations such as focus (in which event the clitic cross-referencing the Actor will change from =ABS (S) to ERG= (A), as in (20), suggests that  $P^{\text{INDEF}}$  is at least present in the thematic structure of these clauses:

- (20) *ballo' kuballi*  
 ballo'      ku=      balli  
 palm.wine 1ERG= buy  
 I buy palm wine

Lee (2006) has suggested labelling a parallel construction in the related language Mandar ‘extended intransitive’. I have no argument with this — the important thing is to capture the fact that this is more than an ordinary intransitive construction.

### 1.2.2 The antipassive analysis

Another possibility is that *aN(N)–* should be analysed as an antipassive marker. This is (for example) Mead’s analysis of the function of a similar prefix *poN–* in Mori Bawah (Mead 2005). This may be appropriate in a very general sense in that *aN(N)–* appears in clauses in which an ABS enclitic cross-references the Actor rather than the Undergoer, and *aN(N)–* has thus ‘demoted’ the Actor, but it is clearly not a prototypical antipassive inasmuch as in these clauses the Undergoer is not oblique. In addition, since the prefix *aN(N)–* also appears in normal intransitive constructions such as *angnganrei* ‘he’s eating’, it is difficult to simply call it an antipassive marker.

Less important, but still relevant, the prefix cannot be used simply because the speaker wishes to realign the grammatical functions in a clause, but rather its presence is a given if the Undergoer is indefinite. Finally, an antipassive analysis is made somewhat anomalous by the fact that there is the perfectly regular passive formed by *ni–*.

### 1.2.3 The ‘actor focus’ analysis

In two papers (1988; 1996), Friberg analyses the verb prefix and cross-referencing systems of the closely related language Konjo as part of a ‘focus’ system. The use of the label is confusing, since Friberg is using ‘focus’ in a Philippine-language sense (ie. **voice** (Himmelman 2002)). It essentially boils down to an opposition between ‘actor’ or ‘subject focus’ (= actor voice), and ‘goal’ or ‘object focus’ (= undergoer voice).

In her analysis, fully transitive clauses (with definite P) have ‘object focus’, while intransitive and semi-transitive clauses (with no P, or  $P^{\text{INDEF}}$ ) have ‘subject focus’. Since for any given clause these conditions are given (by the presence or absence, definiteness or indefiniteness of an Undergoer), I find that a ‘focus’ (= voice) analysis does not fit especially well. Unlike in a prototypical Philippine-type system, or other Indonesian voice systems, in which speakers may use affixes or other marking to realign the mapping of participants on to grammatical

functions in a clause,<sup>2</sup> this system is simply marking the valence of the clause — a marking which is also sensitive to the definiteness of the Undergoer and thus distinguishes three levels of transitivity: fully intransitive, semi-transitive, and fully transitive.

### 1.3 Transitive clauses

In transitive clauses both proclitic and enclitic are canonically on the verb, and there is no verb prefix.

(21) *Nakokkoka' miongku*

Na= kokko' =a' miong ≡ku  
 3ERG= bite =1ABS cat ≡1.POSS  
 My cat bit me

(22) *Lakuarengko Daeng Nakku'*

La= ku= areng =ko Daeng nakku'  
 FUT= 1ERG= name =2 (title) yearning  
 I'll call you 'Daeng Nakku'

When both arguments are 3<sup>rd</sup> person it can sometimes be unclear which clitic pronoun indexes which argument, and the order of free NPs does not help to clarify this, as can be seen in (23):

(23) *Naciniki tedongku i Ali*

Na= cini' =i tedong ≡ku i Ali  
 3ERG= see =3ABS buffalo ≡1.POSS PERS Ali  
 Ali sees my buffalo / my buffalo sees Ali

In these situations context or pragmatics must resolve the ambiguity. Exceptions to the normal transitive pattern occur for three main reasons:

- (1) either A or P may be in focus position (§4);
- (2) the clitics may appear on separate words if there is some preverbal element (a 2P phenomenon) or there may be two proclitics as a result of clitic movement, or
- (3) the clause may have an indefinite Undergoer and therefore be semi-transitive (see §1.2).

#### 1.3.1 Reflexives

Reflexives are a subtype of transitive clause in which P is the reflexive noun *kale* 'self' plus a possessive marker:

(24) *Naciniki kalenna ri kaca*

na= cini' =i kale ≡nna ri kaca  
 3ERG= see =3ABS self ≡3.POSS PREP glass  
 She saw herself in the mirror

(25) *... kisa'ringkai kalenta karaeng–dudu*

ki= sa'ring =ka =i kale ≡nta karaeng dudu  
 2pERG= feel =or =3ABS self ≡1pl.POSS king very  
 or we will feel ourselves to be kings

<sup>2</sup> The Makassarese passive does exactly this — it promotes the Undergoer of the parallel active transitive clause so that it is S, the only core argument of an intransitive clause. The Actor, if it is expressed, is done so by means of an oblique.

(26) *Kukaluppai kalengku*

ku= kaluppa =i kale ≡ngku  
 1ERG= forget =3ABS self ≡1.POSS  
 I fainted (lit. I forgot myself)

The reflexive pronoun is always cross-referenced with a 3<sup>rd</sup> person enclitic. It cannot be focused or topicalised, ie: \**kalenna nacini* ‘she saw **herself**’, \**kalenna, naciniki* ‘herself, she saw it’.

#### 1.4 Ditransitive clauses

There is only one unambiguously ditransitive verb: *sare* ‘give’, though there are productive ways to license three-place predicates with other verbs, for example with the use of benefactive *-ang* or causative *pa-*. *Sare* itself occurs in clauses of two main types: those in which the secondary object (theme) is indefinite and is not marked on the verb, and those in which the secondary object is definite, this fact being marked by a special use of the applicative *-ang*:

(27) *Lakusareko doe'*

la= ku= sare =ko doe'  
 FUT= 1ERG= give =2fABS money  
 I'll give you some money

(28) *Lakusaréangko doekku*

la= ku= sare -ang =ko doe' ≡ku  
 FUT= 1ERG= give -BEN =2fABS money ≡1.POSS  
 I'll give you my money

The NP denoting the indefinite secondary object is not omissible (\**lakusareko* ‘I'll give you’), but may be omitted if definite (*lakusaréangko* ‘I'll give you it’). This is reminiscent of the distinction between transitive and semi-transitive clauses, and suggests the label **semi-ditransitive**.<sup>3</sup> However further investigation of these types of clause is needed.

## 2 The verb prefixes

The class of verbs in Makassarese is largely defined and subclassified by association with a paradigm of verb prefixes whose exact functions have been much debated in the literature but without much consensus having been reached. For lack of a more suitable label this subgroup will simply be referred to as ‘verb prefixes’. This section will begin with a general introduction to the circumstances in which they are found, and a discussion of each prefix with lists of sample derived forms.

In an active intransitive or semi-transitive clause, a verbal predicate will be marked with one of the verb prefixes, usually either *aC-* or *aN(N)-*, and host an enclitic pronoun referencing S, as in (29), (30) and (31); while in a transitive clause the verb will host both ERG= proclitic and =ABS enclitic pronouns referencing A and P, but will not be marked with a verb prefix (32):

(29) *A'jappai*

aC- jappa =i  
 INTR- walk =3ABSABS  
 He walks

<sup>3</sup> Lee (2006) has suggested ‘extended transitive’ for similar constructions in Mandarin.

(30) *Angnganrea'*

aN(N)– kanre =a'  
 TR– eat =1ABSABS

I eat

(31) *Angnganrea' taipa*

aN(N)– kanre =a' taipa  
 TR– eat =1ABSABS mango

I eat mangoes

(32) *Kukanrei taipanu*

ku= kanre =i taipa ≡ nu  
 1ERG= eat =3ABSABS mango ≡ 2f.POSS

I eat your mangoes

Thus, at first glance it appears that the function of these verb prefixes is simply to mark verbs as intransitive (or semi-transitive), as opposed to fully transitive, leading some writers on Makassarese and similar languages to label them **intransitivisers** (Hasan Basri 1999; Mithun and Basri 1987; Ceria 1993). This is not especially apt since it implies valence reduction, but in fact *aC*– usually appears on verbs which are inherently intransitive already and thus need no such reduction, whereas *aN(N)*– usually occurs on verbs which are lexically transitive, but which appear in clauses as semi-transitive due to an indefinite Undergoer, but are not ‘intransitive’ as such.

Rather than give both the prefixes the misleading label **intransitiver**, I have elected to analyse these prefixes as (a) markers of verbhood, and (b) markers of lexical valence. I have thus glossed them as either *INTR*– or *TR*– for intransitive/monovalent or transitive/bivalent, which is to say they subcategorise for one or two arguments respectively. The combination of a verb plus prefix, without further marking, functions as an infinitive form of a verb, for the simple reason that without further morphological marking (in the form of pronominal or aspect clitics) such forms contain no information about argument structure or tense/aspect, and furthermore these are the forms typically found as complements of verbs such as *ero* ‘want’, *isseng* ‘know’, and the like, as seen in (33) and (34):

(33) *Eroka' angnginung*

ero' =a' aN(N)– inung  
 want =1ABS TR– drink

I want to drink

(34) *Tanaissengai a'lange*

ta= na= isseng –a =i aC– lange  
 NEG= 3ERG= know –SBJV =3ABS INTR– swim

He doesn't know how to swim

The fundamental contrast between the two major verb prefixes *aC*– and *aN(N)*–, is that they denote (roughly) lexically intransitive and transitive verbs respectively — by which I mean that the verbs either proscribe or require the presence of an Undergoer, as will be shown in §2.1.1 and §2.1.2. Some verb roots can appear with either prefix, usually with a difference in meaning (§2.1.3). A smaller class of vowel-initial intransitive verbs take the less common prefix form *amm*–. Some verbs, the so-called ‘basic’ verbs, do not appear with verb prefixes at all.



Thus, verbs can roughly be formally divided into four main groups: basic verbs, *aC-* verbs, *aN(N)-* verbs, and *amm-* verbs. Basic verbs, *aC-* verbs and *amm-* verbs are overwhelmingly lexically intransitive, while *aN(N)-* verbs are predominantly lexically transitive. In context within a clause the prefixes can be seen as valence-signalling (rather than valence-reducing), in that their very presence identifies a clause as being less than fully transitive (ie: intransitive or semi-transitive), because a fully transitive clause will have an ERG= proclitic pronoun rather than a verb prefix.

In many cases the morphological connection between verb prefixes and roots is not part of speakers' metalinguistic awareness and the prefixes are believed to be part of the root — this is particularly the case with some members of the *amm-* class such as *ammotere* 'return' or *ammempo* 'sit', whose roots are generally explained by speakers as being *motere* and *mempo* respectively. This can also extend to the nasal-substituting prefix *aN(N)-* and I have had *nganre* offered as the root for *angnganre* 'eat' (← *kanre*) on several occasions. This is despite the fact that there are derived forms which serve as counter-examples, such as passives and causatives, eg. *niempói* <PASS-sit-APPL> 'be sat upon' or *pakanre* <CAUS-eat> 'make/let eat'.

### 2.1.1 *aC-* verbs

The most common use of *aC-* is to derive an intransitive verb from a nominal root. The derived verb will mean 'having/using/making X', where X is the root. They may seem at first glance to be transitive, but the patient is inherent.<sup>4</sup> This contrasts with the use of unaffixed nouns as nominal predicates, as in *olo'-oloka'*, *tedonga'* 'I'm an animal, I'm a buffalo'.

<i>jarang</i>	horse	<i>a'jarang</i>	ride a horse
<i>tedong</i>	buffalo	<i>attedong</i>	keep buffalo
<i>oto</i>	car	<i>a'oto</i>	go by car
<i>buburu'</i>	rice porridge	<i>a'buburu'</i>	make rice porridge
<i>bayao</i>	egg	<i>a'bayao</i>	lay an egg
<i>jonga</i>	deer	<i>a'jonga</i>	hunt deer
<i>juku'</i>	fish	<i>a'juku'</i>	go fishing

#### (35) *massing eroki antama ri romanga a'jonga.*

massing ero' =i antama ri romang ≡a aC- jonga  
 each want =3ABS enter PREP forest ≡DEF INTR- deer

they all wanted to go into the forest to hunt deer (PT:7)

If the root is a place, the result means 'go to X':

#### (36) *Appasaraka' ri bari'basa'*

aC- pasar =a' =a' ri bari'bas =a'  
 INTR- market =EC =1ABS PREP morning =EC

I go to market in the mornings

If the root is a temporal noun, the result means 'spend X amount of time':

#### (37) *A'bulangi ri Malino ri timoro' karring*

aC- bulang =i ri Malino ri timor =o' karring  
 INTR- month =3ABS PREP Malino PREP east.monsoon =EC dry

He stays months in Malino during the dry season

If the root is an interjection, the result means 'say X':

<sup>4</sup> The patient may be made explicit using the suffix *-ang*.

(38) *Tangngassengai attaena*

ta= aN(N)- asseng -a =i aC- taena  
 NEG= TR- know -SBJV =3ABS INTR- no

He doesn't know how to say 'no'

If the root is a kin term or title, the result can mean either 'call someone X', 'become X', or 'have X':

*daeng* uncle      *a'daeng* call someone *daeng* <sup>5</sup>  
*karaeng* king      *akkaraeng* become *karaeng*  
*mangge* father      *a'mange* have a father <sup>6</sup>  
*anrong* mother      *a'anrong* have a mother

If the root is a numeral, the verb means 'be X', with metaphorical extensions in some cases:

(39) *Asse're-ngasengi taua*

aC- se're ngaseng =i tau ≡a  
 INTR- one all =3ABS person ≡DEF

All the people gathered

**2.1.2 aN(N)- verbs**

Another set of verbs are derived through prefixation with *aN(N)-*,<sup>7</sup> where the second nasal is formed by nasal substitution of the initial consonant of the stem, at the same place of articulation. This occurs on roots with voiceless initial consonants (excluding marginal /h/, and /b/. With roots in /s/ the nasal may be alveolar or palatal in seemingly free variation. The list below shows examples of verbs derived with this prefix. Notice that they all lend themselves to a transitive interpretation — a patient is assumed, though not inherent to the verb as with *aC-* examples such as *a'jarang* 'ride a horse'. Note however that in fully transitive examples with definite P, *aN(N)-* does not appear and instead there is an ERG= clitic pronoun referencing A.

	ROOT	ROOT GLOSS		VERB FORM	DERIVED VERB MEANING
<i>aN(N)-p</i>	<i>pekang</i>	hook	→	<i>ammekang</i>	fish with a hook
<i>aN(N)-b</i>	<i>balli</i>	price	→	<i>ammalli</i>	buy
<i>aN(N)-t</i>	<i>tunrung</i>	*hit	→	<i>annunrung</i>	hit
<i>aN(N)-s</i>	<i>sanggara'</i>	fried	→	<i>annyanggara'/</i> <i>annangara'</i>	fry
<i>aN(N)-c</i>	<i>cokko</i>	secret	→	<i>annyokko</i>	hide (something)
<i>aN(N)-k</i>	<i>kanre</i>	rice/food	→	<i>anganre</i>	eat

(40) *Angnganrea' unti*

aN(N)- kanre =a' unti  
 TR- eat =1ABS banana

I eat bananas

(41) *Ammalliko golla'?*

aN(N)- balli =ko golla'  
 TR- buy =2fABS sugar

Did you buy sugar?

<sup>5</sup> The person called *daeng* is in a prepositional phrase, eg. *a'daengi ri bura'nenna* <INTR-*daeng*=3ABS PREP man≡3.POSS> 'she calls her husband *daeng*'.

<sup>6</sup> As the antonym of 'be orphaned'.

<sup>7</sup> A reflex of PMP \*maŋ- 'active verb' (Blust 2003:473).

(Compare the fully intransitive parallel to (40))

(42) *kukanrei untia*

ku= kanre =i unti ≡a  
 1ERG= eat =3ABS banana ≡DEF  
 I eat the bananas

Roots which begin with voiced stops other than /b/, and also with /h/, are not subject to nasal substitution, so the allomorph *aN-* is found, as shown below. This means that the contrast between *aN(N)-* and Actor Focus *aN-* is neutralised in these environments.

	ROOT	ROOT GLOSS		VERB FORM	DERIVED VERB MEANING
<i>aN(N)-d</i>	<i>doli'</i>	*tumble	→	<i>andoli'</i>	tumble, somersault
<i>aN(N)-j</i>	<i>jama</i>	*work	→	<i>anjama</i>	work
<i>aN(N)-g</i>	<i>gappa</i>	*reach	→	<i>anggappa</i>	reach
<i>aN(N)-h</i>	<i>hukkung</i>	law	→	<i>anghukkung</i>	punish

With vowel-initial roots *aN(N)-* is realised as *angng-*, which contrasts with both *aC-* (realised as [aʔ]), and the irregular prefix *amm-*.

	ROOT	ROOT GLOSS		VERB FORM	DERIVED VERB MEANING
<i>aN(N)-</i>	<i>alle</i>	*take	→	<i>angngalle</i>	take
<i>aN(N)-</i>	<i>erang</i>	belongings	→	<i>angngerang</i>	bring
<i>aN(N)-</i>	<i>inung</i>	*drink	→	<i>angnginung</i>	drink
<i>aN(N)-</i>	<i>ondang</i>	*chase	→	<i>angngondang</i>	chase
<i>aN(N)-</i>	<i>unte</i>	*wring	→	<i>angngunte</i>	wring

It can be observed here that, compared to *aC-* verbs which often come from nominal roots, a larger proportion of *aN(N)-* verbs come from roots which do not appear without verbal morphology.

### 2.1.2.1 Intransitive examples

Just as the basically intransitive marker *aC-* appears on some transitive verbs, there are some *aN(N)-* verbs which can appear in intransitive clauses. These are clauses where Undergoers are completely unspecified (not to be confused with semi-transitive clauses. The most obvious of these ambitransitive verbs are *angnganre* 'eat' and *angnginung* 'drink', shown in intransitive (43), semi-transitive (44), and fully transitive (45) examples below.

(43) *Angnginunga'*

aN(N)- inung =a'  
 TR- drink =1ABS  
 I drink

(44) *Angnginunga' ballo'*

aN(N)- inung =a' ballo'  
 TR- drink =1ABS palm.wine  
 I drink palm wine

(45) *Kuinungi ballo'nu*

ku= inung =i ballo' ≡nu  
 1ERG= drink =3ABS palm.wine ≡2f.POSS  
 I drink your palm wine

Clearly though, although these verbs can appear in intransitive clauses, they are still lexically transitive and obviously at least permit the presence of a specific Undergoer, even if it is not required.

### 2.1.3 Verbs with either *aC-* or *aN(N)-*

Generally roots are associated with only one of the major prefixes, but there are also several examples of roots which can take either *aC-* or *aN(N)-* with intransitive and transitive meanings respectively. A small selection of these is seen below.

<i>banynyang</i>	*stretch	→	<i>a'banynyang</i>	stretch (self)	
			→	<i>ammanynyang</i>	stretch (something)
<i>kanuku</i>	nail, claw	→	<i>akkanuku</i>	have nails/claws	
			→	<i>angganuku</i>	scratch with nails/claws
<i>kanyame</i>	taste	→	<i>akkanyame</i>	have a flavour	
			→	<i>angnganyame</i>	try, sample
<i>kokkoro'</i>	crumbling	→	<i>akkokkoro'</i>	tumble down	
			→	<i>angngokkoro'</i>	knock down
<i>cokko</i>	secret	→	<i>accokko</i>	hide (self)	
			→	<i>anynyokko</i>	hide (something)
<i>jari</i>	so	→	<i>a'jari</i>	become something	
			→	<i>anjari</i>	succeed in something
<i>kanre</i>	food	→	<i>akkanre</i>	be consumed	
				(eg.	
				by fire)	
		→	<i>angganre</i>	eat	
<i>lesang</i>	*move	→	<i>a'lesang</i>	move (self)	
		→	<i>allesang</i>	move (something)	

## 2.2 Actor Focus *aN-*

This prefix is found on verbs in a particular syntactic circumstance: when a transitive verb (with a definite Undergoer) appears without a proclitic referencing the Actor as a result of Actor Focus (this is further discussed in §4). The Actor is not cross-referenced, the Undergoer is cross-referenced with an =ABS enclitic.

### (46) *Inai angkanrei untiku?*

i- nai aN- kanre =i unti ≡ku  
 PERS- who AF- eat =3ABS banana ≡1.POSS

who ate my banana? (cf. *inai angganre unti* 'who ate bananas?')

### (47) *Kongkonga ambunoi miongku*

kongkong aN- buno =i miong ≡ku  
 dog AF- kill =3ABS cat ≡1.POSS

a dog killed my cat

## 2.3 Passive *ni-*

The passive prefix *ni-* attaches to bare verb stems, in complementary distribution with the verb prefixes or ERG= proclitics. It functions to promote an Undergoer to the only core argument (S), which is marked with an =ABS enclitic. The demoted Actor may optionally be expressed in an adjunct preceded by the preposition *ri* — this must follow the verb. The contrast between a passive clause and an active transitive clause is shown below:

(48) *Nikokkoka' (ri meongku)*

ni- kokko' =a' (ri meong ≡ku)  
 PASS- bite =1ABS (PREP cat ≡1.POSS)

I was bitten (by my cat)

(49) *Nakokkoka' meongku*

na= kokko' =a' meong ≡ku  
 3ERG= bite =1ABS cat ≡1.POSS

My cat bit me

Note that passivisation is not the only way to put emphasis on the Undergoer, as Undergoer focus will also do this (see §4).

(50) *Inakke nakokko' meongku*

i- nakke na= kokko' meong ≡ku  
 PERS- 1PRO 3ERG= bite cat ≡1.POSS

My cat bit **me**

For this reason it may be more accurate to analyse the passive as a way of taking emphasis off the Actor, rather than putting it on the Undergoer *per se*, however the exact discourse motivations for choosing the passive (and the effects on information structure) require further research.

The frequency of passive clauses is variable according to the style and genre of texts, with older, more formal, literary texts showing a larger proportion. For example, the extract from the Gowa chronicle (Jukes 2006) shows 55 passive clauses in 108 sentences, and the Maros chronicle (Cummings 2000) shows 127 out of 247 (both roughly 51%); while the folktale *Karaeng ammanaka bembe* (Jukes 2006) has 23 passive clauses out of 123 sentences (18%), and *Caritana Pung Tedong* (Jukes 1998) only 20 out of 248 (8%).

In narrative contexts the most common use of the passive is when the Actor cannot be identified, as in (51) where it is magic, or (52) where it is generic 'they' or people in general:

(51) *Niroko'mi bulaeng balla'na Puttiri Bida Sari.*

ni- roko' =mo =i bulaeng balla' ≡na puttiri Bida Sari  
 PASS- pack =PRF =3ABS gold house ≡3.POSS princess Bida Sari

Puttiri Bida Sari's house was filled with gold (by magic, PT:196).

(52) *areng kalenna. iangku mabassung. nikana. I Mangayoaberang.*

areng kale ≡nna iang ≡ku ma- bassung ni- kana  
 name self ≡3.POSS PROH ≡1.POSS STV- swollen.belly PASS- word

I Mangayoaberang  
 PERS Mangayoaberang

His personal name, may I not swell up, was called I Mangayoaberang (KIT:1:10)

The subject of a passive clause may be focused, in which case there will be no enclitic. Example (53) shows S in focus position, as does (52), albeit with the formulaic expression *iangku mabassung* intruding between it and the verb. (54) is a clause with an ellipsed focused S inherited from a previous clause:

(53) *Meongku nibuno (ri kongkong)*

meong ni- buno ri kongkong  
 cat PASS- kill PREP dog

My cat was killed (by a dog)

(54) *Apaji na nicini'mo ri Puttiri Bida Sari siagang bura'nenna.*

apa =ja =i na ni- cini' =mo ri puttiri Bida Sari  
 what =LIM =3ABS COMP PASS- see =PFV PREP princess Bida Sari

siagang bura'ne ≡ nna  
 with man ≡ 3.POSS

So (she) was seen by Puttiri Bida Sari and her husband (PT:178).

S NPs in post-verbal position in passive clauses must be definite — (55) is ungrammatical:

(55) \**Nikanre ruku' ri tedong*

ni- kanre ruku' ri tedong  
 PASS- eat grass PREP buffalo

Grass was eaten by the buffalo

However, indefinite S is permitted in focus position:

(56) *Ruku' nikanre ri tedong*

ruku' ni- kanre ri tedong  
 grass PASS- eat PREP buffalo

Grass was eaten by the buffalo

There is no formal way to distinguish between an oblique representing the agent and a locative or temporal prepositional phrase, but in general context will make this clear, as can be seen in examples (57) and (58), where the PP can only be agent, and (59) where it can only be a location:

(57) *Nikodi ri kaluru'*

ni- kodi -i =i ri kalur =u'  
 PASS- bad -TRS =3ABS PREP cigarette =EC

He feels sick because of the smoke

(58) *Battu ri gau'nai<sup>8</sup> na niba'ji ri taua*

battu ri gau' ≡ na =i na ni- ba'ji =i ri tau ≡ a  
 come PREP deed ≡ 3.POSS =3ABS COMP PASS- biff =3ABS PREP person ≡ DEF

It comes from his actions (it's his own fault) that he was beaten by the people (C:91)

(59) *Apaji na nipangngalleammi je'ne' ri kaca bulaeng*

apa =ja =i na ni- pa- aN(N)- alle -ang =mo =i je'ne'  
 what =LIM =3ABS COMP PASS- CAUS- TR- take -BEN =PFV =3ABS water

ri kaca bulaeng  
 PREP glass gold

So they were made to take water (for themselves) in a gold cup (PT:225).

<sup>8</sup> *Battu ri X* collocations are often lexicalised, which explains why the enclitic pronoun occurs at the end rather than apparent 2P after *battu*.

In the event of both Actor and locative PPs occurring in a clause it seems to be preferred for the Actor to come first as in (60), it should be noted however that this is a rather stilted invented example:

- (60) *Anjo taua pa'risi' bangkenna nasaba' nikokkoki ri kongkonga ri kokonna*  
 anjo tau   ≡<sub>a</sub>   pa'ris =i'   bangkeng ≡<sub>na</sub>   na=   saba' ni-   kokko' =i  
 that person ≡<sub>DEF</sub> pain =<sub>EC</sub> leg           ≡<sub>3.POSS</sub> 3ERG= reason PASS- bite =<sub>3ABS</sub>  
  
 ri   kongkong ≡<sub>a</sub>   ri   koko   ≡<sub>nna</sub>  
 PREP dog       ≡<sub>DEF</sub> PREP garden ≡<sub>3.POSS</sub>  
 That man has a sore leg, because he was bitten by the dog in his garden

### 3 Voice

In this section I will discuss the voice system of Makassarese, examine analyses which assume a more pervasive voice system than I do, and give justification for the limited use of voice in my analysis.

The major voice alternation in Makassarese is between (unmarked) active voice and (marked) passive voice. Makassarese does not have a symmetrical voice system as found in languages such as Malay/Indonesian, nor anything comparable to the more complicated voice systems seen in Phillipine type languages.<sup>9</sup>

Voice is conventionally understood as being a means whereby the speaker can realign the mapping of participants onto grammatical functions in a clause. The Makassarese passive prefix *ni-* does exactly this — it promotes the Undergoer (P in a corresponding transitive clause) so that it is S, the only core argument of an intransitive clause. The Actor, if it is expressed, is done so by means of an oblique. The difference between an active and passive clause is seen in examples (61) and (62):

- (61) *Nakokkoka' meongku*  
 na=   kokko' =a'   meong ≡<sub>ku</sub>  
 3ERG= bite   =1ABS cat   ≡<sub>1.POSS</sub>  
 My cat bit me
- (62) *Nikokkoka' (ri meongku)*  
 ni-   kokko' =a'   ri   meong ≡<sub>ku</sub>  
 PASS- bite   =1ABS PREP cat   ≡<sub>1.POSS</sub>  
 I was bitten (by my cat)

<sup>9</sup> Malay/Indonesian, for example, shows alternations such as the following (Himmelmann 2005:112):

Anak saya me-lihat orang itu  
 child 1s AV-see person DIST  
 My child saw that person.  
  
 Orang itu di-lihat anak saya  
 person DIST UV-see child 1s  
 My child saw that person

The first is in Actor voice, and the second in Undergoer voice. Arguably, neither can be considered clearly the 'basic' form, since in both the verbs are marked with voice prefixes and both clauses are syntactically equivalent, with only the order of arguments being changed.

Active voice is associated with the other verb prefixes (which are valence-signalling rather than voice marking *per se*), or the absence of a prefix altogether. The set of verb prefixes was discussed in detail earlier in this paper, but those which are relevant to discussion here mark a clause as being intransitive (*aC-*) or semi-transitive (*aN(N)-*), while the absence of a verb prefix and presence of an ERG= proclitic marks a clause as being fully transitive.

This difference between fully transitive and semi-transitive clauses, which turns on whether the Undergoer is definite ( $P^{DEF}$ ) or indefinite ( $P^{INDEF}$ ) respectively, has itself been analysed by some writers as a type of voice (or ‘focus’) phenomenon, in some sense similar to the symmetrical alternation between actor voice and undergoer voice in other West Austronesian languages. (See for example Friberg 1988; Hanson 2003). As is plain by my choice of label, I prefer to view it as a marking of different levels of transitivity: basically there is a type of clause intermediate to intransitive and transitive clauses. My reasoning for this reflects the fact that a speaker cannot select a prefix in order to realign participants and grammatical functions in the way that one might expect of either an Indonesian or Philippine-type voice system, but rather the selection falls out automatically depending on whether there is an Undergoer, and if so, whether it is definite or not.

Voice (‘focus’) in the closely related language Konjo has been discussed in two influential articles by Friberg (1988, 1996). Her analysis is entirely different to mine. The most obvious difference is terminological — Friberg is using ‘focus’ in a Philippine-language sense (ie. voice (Himmelman 2002)) whereas I prefer to use focus to describe the fronting of arguments (see §4) in a way which is more compatible with syntactic theory (eg. Van Valin 1999). However, even substituting the term ‘voice’ for ‘focus’ leaves Friberg’s analysis unclear.

In the earlier article, she analyses focus as being designated by the choice of verb prefixes in transitive clauses, with *aN(N)-* being used for ‘actor focus’, and *aN-* being used for ‘goal focus... when the actor is a free form pronoun or a noun’ (1988:109). The fact that this noun or pronoun should canonically be in pre-predicate position is not made explicit, though tellingly she later remarks that ‘the absolutive suffix is dropped when the object (whether definite or indefinite) is fronted for focus’ (1988:117). Thus, by this definition, actors receive focus simply as a result of there being an indefinite goal, while goals receive focus simply by virtue of being definite; on the other hand objects (= goals) may also be focused by being fronted. There are two problems here: the first being that there is no real explanation of what ‘focus’ is, or what it does (made all the more confusing by the fact that she is clearly using it in two different ways); and the second being that the article misses the point that if arguments can also be ‘fronted for focus’, then the *aN-* prefix (marking goal focus) appears in clauses where the actor has been ‘fronted for focus’, resulting in both the actor and goal being focussed at the same time.

In the later article, the terms are changed somewhat. Actor and goal focus have been replaced by subject and object focus, in which:

*Subject focus* implies that there is no object, or that the object is not relevant to the action at hand. *Object focus* implies that there is a specifically referred-to object. Subject focus requires an ‘absolutive’ enclitic referent to the subject. Object focus requires an ‘ergative’ proclitic referent to the subject while the object is referred to by an ‘absolutive’ enclitic. (Friberg 1996:143).



In this article, the phenomenon of ‘fronting for focus’ (actual focus, see §4) is analysed as topicalisation.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, in the latter article focus was more-or-less defined, but there are problems with the definition. For example, one of Friberg’s examples of a sentence with subject focus is the following:

(63) *Langnginranga berangta*

la= aN(N)- inrang =a berang ≡ ta  
 FUT= VRt- borrow =1ABSABS knife ≡2(H)POSS

I want to borrow (one of) your knives (Friberg 1996:144).<sup>11</sup>

I find no obvious way to interpret this clause as having ‘no object, or that the object is not relevant to the action at hand’ (Friberg 1996:143), as clearly the object is integral to the event. Rather, the point (as made in Friberg’s earlier paper (1988:108)), is that there is no **specific** referent. This however seems more relevant to the interaction between specificity/definiteness and cross-referencing rather than focus (=voice) as such.

But by far the biggest problem with Friberg’s analysis of ‘focus’ or voice is that it is essentially redundant. What it boils down to, in its 1996 formulation, is that the argument cross-referenced by an =ABS enclitic is focused; ie. S in intransitive clauses (with or without indefinite P), and P in fully transitive clauses. Thus, by this definition, a clause can be transitive and have ‘object focus’ (= undergoer voice), or intransitive and have ‘subject focus’ (= actor voice). Since no other possibilities are permitted, saying that a clause has ‘object focus’ is the same as saying it is transitive, and vice versa. But if the notions of transitivity and focus are so inextricably linked (and cross-defined), it is difficult to see that they are both necessary.

A similar criticism could be made of Hanson’s (2001:159) analysis of focus, in which:

the unmarked focus being ‘Patient focus’, the *maC-* construction indicating ‘Agent focus’ and the benefactive and locative suffixes (*-əŋ* and *-i*) representing ‘Benefactive’ and ‘Locative’ focus respectively.

Since *maC-* in Bugis seems to behave much like *aC-* in Makassarese (ie. marking intransitive verbs), the notion that it should also remove focus from the (non-existent) Patient is not especially enlightening. And again, if stating that a clause has a particular argument ‘focus’ is just a way of saying that there is that argument in the clause, it is difficult to reconcile this with a productive voice system.

The error in the approaches presented above is, I believe, in attempting to analyse South Sulawesi languages as having symmetrical voice systems, whereas as Himmelmann has argued (2005), they do not have this characteristic. In any event, I prefer to separate the two issues of valence-signalling and voice. The notion of transitivity in Makassarese certainly has degrees, and is sensitive to the definiteness or specificity of the Undergoer (though I do not go so far as to say that clauses with indefinite Undergoers are intransitive, see §1.2). But rather than the speaker realigning the grammatical functions by placing an affix on the verb, the choice of affix is given according to a tripartite distinction in valence: fully intransitive, semi-transitive, and fully transitive.

<sup>10</sup> I made the same error in my Masters thesis (Jukes 1998).

<sup>11</sup> VRt = Transitive verbaliser, H = Honorific.

## 4 Focus

Alongside the marking of voice and transitivity, there is a phenomenon best described by the label **focus**, despite the unfortunate overuse of that term in the Austronesianist literature (Himmelman 1996; Himmelman 2002). In its most basic manifestation, this involves an NP referring to a core argument being placed in pre-predicate position. The prefix *aN-* explicitly marks Actor focus (appearing in the place of the ERG= proclitic as has been discussed in §2.2), whereas Undergoer focus is marked by the absence of an =ABS enclitic. (I use the macrorole labels here because both P and P<sup>INDEF</sup> may be focused).

Thus, arguments which occur as full NPs directly preceding the predicate are not cross-referenced — for example, compare (64) and (65):

(64) *Tinroi i Ali*

tinro =i i Ali  
 sleep =3ABS PERS Ali  
 Ali is asleep

(65) *I Ali tinro*

i Ali tinro  
 PERS Ali sleep  
**Ali** is asleep

This pre-predicate slot performs a variety of pragmatic functions associated with focus, such as disambiguating, emphasizing, adding certainty or uncertainty. So while (64) is just a statement of fact, (65) with S in focus can express such meanings as: ‘Are you sure it’s Ali who is asleep?’, ‘I tell you that Ali is asleep’, ‘I’ve heard that Ali is asleep’. It is also the answer to the question *inai tinro?* ‘who is asleep?’ (interrogative pronouns are typically focused). Another example of how focus conveys extended meanings is the following:

(66) *Ballakku kicini'*

balla' ≡ku ki= cini'  
 house ≡1.POSS 2pERG= see  
 You see **my house**

This could be given as an answer to the question: what can you give as a guarantee for a loan? (The unmarked way of saying ‘you see my house’ is *kiciniki ballakku* <ki=cini'=i balla≡ku | 2fERG=see=3ABS house≡1.POSS>).

In transitive clauses either A or P can be in focus. The following two sentences show A focus and P focus respectively where both arguments are definite:

(67) *Kongkonga ambunoi mionga*

kongkong ≡a aN- buno =i miong ≡a  
 dog ≡def AF- kill =3ABS cat ≡DEF  
 The **dog** killed the cat

(68) *Mionga nabuno kongkonga*

miong ≡a na= buno kongkong ≡a  
 cat ≡DEF 3ERG= kill dog ≡DEF  
 The dog killed the **cat**

Thus, in (67) there is no proclitic cross-referencing *kongkonga* (A), while in (68) *mionga* (P) lacks a corresponding enclitic.<sup>12</sup> Also note that in (67) the verb is marked with the Actor Focus prefix *aN-*.

If P is indefinite (ie. if the corresponding non-focused clause is semi-transitive) either argument may still be focused, so sentence (69) shows A focus, while (70) shows P<sup>INDEF</sup> focus:

(69) *Inakke angnganre juku'*  
 inakke aN(N)- kanre juku'  
 1PRO TR- eat fish  
**I'm eating fish**

(70) *Juku' kukanre*  
 juku' ku= kanre  
 fish 1ER eat  
 G=  
**I'm eating fish**

Note that in (69) the verb is marked as semi-transitive with the prefix *aN(N)-* (the missing clitic pronoun being 1<sup>st</sup> person =*a'*), but in (70) the verb hosts a proclitic, identical to clauses with focused definite P such as (68) above. This suggests that focus promotes P<sup>INDEF</sup> to P (ie. promotes it from a non-core to a core argument), with concomitant promotion of S<sup>A</sup> to A.<sup>13</sup>

Sentences with indefinite A are marginal as a general rule, and examples (71) and (72) are no exception.

(71) *?Miong ammuno kongkong*  
 miong aN(N)- buno kongkong  
 cat TR- kill dog  
**A cat killed a dog / cats kill dogs**

(72) *?Kongkong nabuno miong*  
 kongkong na= buno miong  
 dog 3ERG= kill cat  
**A cat killed a dog / cats kill dogs**

Note however, that to make it even marginally acceptable in (72) *miong* (A) has been cross-referenced with *na=* even though it is indefinite and indefinite arguments are not usually cross-referenced. This could again suggest that focusing P<sup>INDEF</sup> promotes it to P, which further promotes A<sup>INDEF</sup> to A.

Finally, sentences in which A is not only indefinite but lower on the animacy hierarchy than P are unacceptable.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> When A is in focus this has obvious similarities with the phenomenon of 'ergative extraction' as described for Mayan languages (Aissen 1992)— except that there is a parallel 'absolutive extraction' when O is in focus.

<sup>13</sup> Basri & Finer (1987) have a different analysis, in which it is the trace (left behind when P<sup>INDEF</sup> is moved) that is definite and which triggers the ERG= marking of S<sup>A</sup>. I prefer an analysis in which focus itself promotes an argument to core status.

<sup>14</sup> This appears to be the case whether or not focus is involved.

(73) \**Miong angkokkoka'*  
 miong aN- kokko' =a'  
 cat AF- bite =1ABS  
**A cat bit me**

(74) \**Inakke nakokko' miong*  
 inakke na= kokko' miong  
 1PRO 3ERG= bite cat  
**A cat bit me**

## 5 Conclusions

It has been shown that the Makassarese voice system is unlike 'typical' Indonesian voice systems in that it is not symmetrical, and that prefixes which might be analysed as marking voice are instead coding levels of transitivity. Makassarese uses this system in conjunction with a focus position to parallel the use of voice in other Indonesian languages.

## References

- Aissen, J. (1992) Topic and Focus in Mayan. *Language*, **68**, 43–80.
- Blust, R.A. (2003) Three Notes on Early Austronesian Morphology. *Oceanic Linguistics*, **42:2**, 438–478.
- Ceria, V. (1993) Verb morphology and valence change in Selayarese. *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics*, **II**, 76–185.
- Cummings, W. (2000) Reading the histories of a Maros chronicle. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, **156**, 1–31.
- Friberg, B. (1988) Ergativity, focus and verb morphology in several South Sulawesi languages. *VICAL 2: Western Austronesian and contact languages: papers from the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, (Eds, Harlow, R & Clark, R). Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand. 103–130.
- Friberg, B. (1996) Konjo's peripatetic person markers. In *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics No. 3*, (Ed, Steinhauer, H.) Pacific Linguistics, Canberra, pp. 137–171.
- Friberg, B. (2002) Grammatical construction differences between Makasar and Konjo. Handout from 9ICAL (the Ninth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics).
- Hanson, C. (2001) A description of basic clause structure in Bugis. *La Trobe Papers in Linguistics*, **11**, 143–160.
- Hanson, C. (2003) *A grammar of Bugis based on the Soppeng dialect*. Ph.D. thesis, La Trobe University.
- Hasan Basri. (1998) Number marking in Selayarese. In *Recent Papers in Austronesian Linguistics: Third and Fourth meetings of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, (Ed, Pearson, M.) UCLA, pp. 45–59.
- Hasan Basri. (1999) *Phonological and syntactic reflections of the morphological structure of Selayarese*. Ph.D. thesis, SUNY Stony Brook.
- Hasan Basri, Broselow, E., Finer, D. (1999) Clitics and crisp edges in Makassarese. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics: Proceedings of AFLA VI (The sixth meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association)*.
- Hasan Basri & Chen, Y. (1999) When harmony meets reduplication in Selayarese. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics: Proceedings of AFLA VI (The sixth meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association)*.
- Himmelman, N. (1996) Person marking and grammatical relations in Sulawesi. In *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics No. 3*, (Ed, Steinhauer, H.) Pacific Linguistics, Canberra, pp.

115–136.

- Himmelman, N. (2002) Voice in western Austronesian: an update. In *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*, (Eds, Wouk, F. & Ross, M.) Pacific Linguistics, Canberra, pp. 7–16.
- Himmelman, N. (2005) Typological characteristics. In *The Austronesian Languages Of Asia And Madagascar*, (Eds, Adelaar, K.A. & Himmelman, N.) Routledge, London, pp. 110–181.
- Jukes, A. (1998) The phonology and verbal morphology of Makassar. M.A. thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Jukes, A. (2005) Makassar. In *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, (Eds, Adelaar, K.A. & Himmelman, N.) Routledge, London, pp. 649–682.
- Jukes, A. (2006) Makassarese. PhD Thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Lee, J.K.L. (2006) Transitivity, Valence and Voice in Mandar. Paper presented at the Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics.
- Mead, D. (2003) Evidence for a Celebic supergroup. In *Issues in Austronesian phonology*, (Ed, Lynch, J.) Pacific Linguistics, Canberra,
- Mead, D. (2005) Mori Bawah. In *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, (Eds, Adelaar, K.A. & Himmelman, N.) Routledge, London, pp. 683-708.
- Mithun, M. & Basri, H. (1987) The phonology of Selayarese. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 25, 210–254.
- Van Valin, R.D. (1999) A Typology of the Interaction of Focus Structure and Syntax. In *Typology and the Theory of Language: From Description to Explanation*, (Eds, Raxilina, E. & Testelec, J.), Languages of Russian Culture, Moscow, pp 511–524.

