Voice and Applicatives in Duri

Kari Valkama[1]

[1]Summer Institute of Linguistics GLOBAL

Abstract

This paper studies the voice in Duri based on topicality. Duri is an Austronesian language spoken in the northern parts of the South Sulawesi province in Indonesia. There are about 150,000 speakers of Duri. Its closest neighbors are Toraja, Enrekang, and Maiwa languages. In my analysis, Duri has four voices: active, inverse, passive, and antipassive. In analysing voice, it is important to define what is an argument and what is an oblique NP. Voice marker for active voice is zero marking. Voice marker for inverse and antipassive voices is the N- prefix. The difference between them is that in inverse voice, the person marking enclitic on the verb refers to the P argument while in antipassive voice the enclitic refers to the Actor (S). There are also constituent order differences. With full NPs, the constituent order in inverse voice clauses is A V P and in antipassive clauses, it is V obliqueUndergoer S. Voice marker for passive is di- prefix. The applicatives -an and -i are not analysed as voice markers, since they do not change topicality.

Keywords: *Duri, Voice, Antipassive, Inverse, Argument, Oblique, Applicative*

Suggested Citation:
Kari, V. (2025). Voice and applicatives in Duri. *Langkit Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities,* 14 *(2)*, 1-33.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the voice system of Duri. And since some linguists analyze applicatives as voice markers, I have added an analysis of applicatives also. To facilitate better understanding of the article, a list of abbreviations is appended.

Duri (ISO 639-3 MVP) is a Western Austronesian language spoken in Indonesia on the island of Sulawesi. Duri belongs to the Northern South Sulawesi Family and Massenrempulu subfamily (Valkama 1987:119-136). The closest languages to Duri are Toraja, Enrekang, and Maiwa. The home area of the Duri is in the northern part of the Enrekang regency, in the subregencies of Alla, Anggeraja, Baraka, Baroko, Buntu Batu, Curio, Malua, and Masalle. Duri is also spoken in the Uluwai area (a desa consisting of several villages) in the Tana Toraja Regency. The government (Kabupaten Enrekang dalam angka 2024:74, 82) gives 149,867 as the population figure for the subregencies in Enrekang based on the census in 2023. Not all of these people are Duri speakers. Still, since there are also Duri speakers in other areas, like Toraja, Makassar, Kalimantan, Papua, and Jakarta, one can confidently say that there are more than 150,000 Duri speakers. The Duri are 2/3 of the population of the Enrekang regency, i.e. they are the biggest language group since the total population of the Enrekang regency is 231,301.

Since Duri is not an officially recognized language, the Education Department (i.e., Pusat Pengembangan Bahasa of the Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan) has not researched it. Therefore, there is a gap in the literature on the Duri language. But there are some mainly unpublished works done on the Massenrempulu subfamily by them and by Lembaga Bahasa National, Balai Penelitian Bahasa, and Direktorat Pembinaan Penelitian dan Pengabdian pada Masyarakat. (Note that in their analysis Massenrempulu is a language and Duri, Enrekang and Maiwa are dialects of Massenrempulu.)

My wife Susanne and I started learning the Duri language in 1987. We lived in Baraka, Malua, and Panyurak villages until 1992. We both did our M.A. theses on Duri in 1993. We hope we will be able to write a grammar of Duri and a dictionary.

The Duri are mainly farmers, but they have shifted from rice to vegetables, like onions, cabbage, potatoes, and cash crops, like coffee, gloves, pepper, vanilla, and cacao.

As transnational phenomena evolved, ideological and religious conflicts, alongside ecological disruptions (exemplified by the COVID-19 pandemic), have intensified awareness of the differential embodiment of power and privilege. Scholars increasingly call for broader conceptualizations and methodologies (Iwabuchi, 2021; Darvin & Norton, 2021), advocating a non-additive intersectionality perspective (Levon, 2015).

Methodology

My linguistic background is non-generative. I am a functionalist. I have been inspired by Givón, Comrie, Halliday, Dixon and Payne. For lack of a better term, one can say that I use Basic Linguistic Theory (Dixon 2010).

In linguistics, as in humanities in general, it is difficult to make an analysis that is unanimously accepted. There are so many schools of thought that it is not possible to find an analysis or description of a language that everyone can accept. It is also difficult to find an

analysis that the analyst himself or herself is hundred percent happy with. There are always some oddities. The best we can do is to choose the oddities that we are most comfortable with.

It is also important to remember that in linguistics, as in humanities in general, we search for explanations that explain the data best. So, the question is not, which explanation is right or wrong, but which explanation is most useful.

In line with that, in linguistic description it is more important to be understood, than to be agreed upon. Haspelmath (2018:92) says that descriptive linguistic categories must strike a balance between elegance and comprehensibility. As an example, he quotes Müller (2004) who says that "the Russian nominal inflectional suffix-o can be characterized by the features {[+N],[+α,+β], [-obl]}." According to Haspelmath, "This is an elegant description because it requires only four features. But it is very hard to understand because readers need to have an explanation of the highly abstract features and their values first." My goal in this paper is to be understandable, rather than elegant.

In this study, I will use the following terms to discuss voice and applicatives in Duri:

According to Pebly & Payne an "argument is used to refer to any Referring Expression (RE) that has a grammatical relation to a verb or to some other syntactic element" and "A nominal that doesn't have a grammatical relation to some other word is either called a "non-argument," or an oblique." (2024:487). An intransitive clause is thus a clause with one argument and a transitive clause is a clause with two or more arguments. In my study S is defined as the only argument of an intransitive clause. The most actor-like argument of a transitive clause is called A. P is defined as the less actor-like argument of a transitive clause.

According to Truong (2024:v): "an applicative construction (AC) is a kind of clausal construction in which overt morphology on the verbal complex coincides with the selection of a peripheral semantic role (e.g. beneficiary, goal, instrument) as a core clausal argument." In other words, applicatives mark oblique NPs as arguments. However, in Duri in some constructions the applicative does not point to an argument. See for example (48). One possibility would be to call the applicative looking suffixes homophones in those constructions, and not applicatives.

According to Klaiman (1991:1) "voice deals with the mapping of semantic roles onto syntactic functions between a verb and its arguments." According to Lee (2008:56) voice refers to "alternations in morphosyntax that affect the mapping between grammatical relations and semantic macroroles." According to Heaton (2017:60-) and Klaiman (1991) voice involves a verbal marker.

In Duri voice is marked by verbal prefixes. There are three voice-marking prefixes in Duri:

di-	'PASS'		(passive voice)
N-	'AF'	'*N*-form verb'	(inverse or antipassive voices)
Ø	'GF'	'zero-form verb'	(active voice)

The abbreviations AF and GF come from actor focus and goal focus (Friberg 1988). I do not think that they have anything to do with focus, but this is the way I have traditionally glossed them in my interlinear texts and these terms are also familiar to many linguists, so I still use AF

as a gloss. I would now call verbs marked with these prefixes N-form verbs and zero-form verbs. There are two voices with N-form verbs: inverse and antipassive. The difference between them is that the enclitic attached to the predicate in inverse voice refers to the P argument (Undergoer), and the enclitic attached to the predicate in antipassive voice refers to the S argument (Actor), since an antipassive clause is intransitive. Actor and Undergoer are semantic macro-roles. An Actor can be an agent, force, cognizer, experiencer, or causer. An Undergoer can be patient, beneficiary, maleficiary, theme, location or an instrument. (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997; Pebly & Payne 2024:484). I analyse antipassives in Duri as pragmatic antipassives (Heaton 2017:30-31). This means that "antipassives are more likely to appear as the patient becomes less referential/topical" (Givón 1984:162). Some linguists prefer to analyze this as semi-transitive, because there is no oblique marker on the oblique noun and they are not optional (Jukes 2006:336-339, 2013:70-78). If one uses the term semi-transitive, then the NP should also be analyzed as a semi-argument. So, in addition to arguments and obliques there would be semi-arguments. I prefer binary analyses: definite/indefinite, specific/non-specific and argument/oblique. Thus, if the oblique analysis were to be rejected, I would rather analyze Duri antipassive clauses as transitive clauses. Lee (2008:55, 58, 61-63) uses the term extended intransitive.

In linguistic description, there is a chicken and egg problem. For example, when one studies applicatives, the presuppositions are important. If one thinks that applicatives mark voice, then finding a locative applicative attached to the predicate of a transitive clause means that the clause is in locative voice. And if one finds applicatives in intransitive clauses, then one has to say that they are in fact not applicatives, since they do not change voice. But if one thinks that applicatives are not voice-marking affixes, and one finds locative applicatives in an intransitive clause, one is free to say that those are applicatives. And more importantly, when one finds applicatives in transitive clauses, one does not need to say that the clause in question is in a different voice than a similar clause without the applicatives.

One important presupposition is the function of case. There are two main views: (1) the *indexing or identificational* function of case marking and (2) the *distinctive or discriminatory* function of case marking. The first view says that case identifies that a certain NP has a certain function or grammatical relation. Hopper and Thomson (1980) accept this view for example. It is as if the NP in the nominative case informs that "I am a subject", the NP in the ergative case informs that "I am an Actor", and the NP in the absolutive case informs that "I am an Undergoer". And if one is consistent with this view of case, then one is compelled to say that the NP in absolutive case even in intransitive clauses has an Undergoer role instead of an Actor role. Thus, in the clause "I walk" the first-person actor is in fact an Undergoer. I think the indexing view is influenced by nominative-accusative language bias, since in those languages subject is in one case: the nominative case.

The second view claims that the function of a case is only to say that "I am different from the other cases". It is as if the NP in the ergative case says, "I am not an absolutive NP nor an oblique NP". And the NP in absolutive case in intransitive clauses says that "I am not an oblique NP". Thus, the function of case marking is to distinguish subject and object for example. Mallinson and Blake (1981:46, 79, 115) claim that this discriminating view is the dominant view. They say that Comrie (1978) and Dixon (1979:69) support this view. Also, Anderson (1976) argues for the discriminatory function of case marking. I accept this view, and it is fundamental to my analysis: the function of case is distinctive or discriminatory rather than indexing or identifying.

One can illustrate this from nature. If there is a mango tree that grows very close to other trees, then it will become a slim tree. But if the mango tree grows alone, then it becomes a big wide tree. Depending on the environment the mango trees will be different, even though they are the same species. In the same way, an absolutive case NP in a transitive clause has two other kinds of NPs as its neighbors: the ergative NP and the oblique NPs. Thus, it can only choose an Undergoer role for it. But when it occurs in intransitive clauses, it has more room, and it can take the role of an Actor, and then we do not need to think that it is an undergoer.

I think it is good to aim at defining linguistic categories and terms that are universal. While it is true that each language should be described using its own terms (Haspelmath 2010: 667-669, referring to Boas 1911:81), it is also important to note that, as Haspelmath (2018:93) says, one can "compare … causatives across languages only if we have a universally applicable definition of the comparative concepts of … causatives." At the moment, there are several terms that mean one thing in Philippine-type languages, and something else in other languages of the world. For example, the term focus in Philippine type languages does not mean the same as the term focus in other languages in the world. The same goes for voice in general and passive voice in particular. It is my starting point or presupposition in this study that voice is a function of topicality. This is similar, but perhaps not identical to Givón's idea (1983, 1994) that voice is primarily a pragmatic notion. (see also Mead 1999:114). What I mean with this, is that if one has a narrative text, the voice used for the development of the story is active. And if one has a procedural text, the voice used most often is passive. Thus, when one studies a new language, it is possible to make hypotheses concerning the voice used in a story based on the genre of the story. When one analyses the clauses of a narrative text, it is more than likely that the most common voice in the story is active, since the A and S arguments express the theme of the story being high in topicality and the P argument is low in topicality. And when one analyses a procedural text, it is more than likely that the most common voice in the text is passive. Passive voice is used when one talks about the patient which has become the S argument in a passive clause since it is the theme of the story. That argument is high in topicality. In this way, topicality helps in the identification of active and passive voice. The next step is to study the morphology of the voices. For example, in Duri, we see three possible voice-marking affixes: N-, di-, and zero marking. With the help of topicality, we can see, that di- is passive, and zero marking is active. Regarding N-form verbs, we can see that when the enclitic refers to the Actor (S), we have an antipassive; when the enclitic refers to the Undergoer or patient (P), we have an inverse voice.

If one accepts the hypothesis that voice is a function of topicality, then it is possible to arrive at a universal definition of voice, at least for active and passive. And when that has been established, we do no longer need to use terms like focus or voice with a special meaning in the Philippine-type languages.

Below is a table that expresses the functional characterization of voice in Duri taken from my M.A. thesis (Valkama 1993:74). I use topicality in the sense used by Givón, i.e. discourse topicality. According to him, topic continuity can be calculated by counting referential distance and topic persistency (Givón 1983, 1990:563-644, 893-944).

Table 1. A functional characterization of voice in Duri

Topicality of Actor	Topicality of Patient	Voice
High	Low	Antipassive
High	High Med	Active-transitive
High Med	High	Functional inverse
Low	High	Passive

Definition of An Argument

When one studies a formerly unstudied language, it is important to know which NPs are arguments and which are not, in order to know if one is dealing with active transitive or detransitivised clauses. If one wants to analyze a clause which has two Noun Phrases, it is important to be able to identify the arguments. Below we see a template of a clause with a predicate and two NPs.

Clause = VP + NP + NP

The clause which the above template represents could be transitive, if both NPs are arguments: NPA and NPP. However, the above clause is passive, if the Actor NP is demoted to oblique, and the patient is made into the S argument of the passive clause: NPObl and NPS. And if the patient argument is made into an oblique, it would be an antipassive clause: NPS and NPObl. Thus, we have three possible interpretations depending on the status of these NPs, as in the following schema. (It is to be noted that the schema below does not necessarily show the correct constituent order.)

Actor	Undergoer
Active:	NP_A + NP_P
Passive:	NP_{Obl} + NP_S
Antipassive:	NP_S + NP_{Obl}

Thus, reliable identification of arguments is important. Since in a detransitivised clause (passive or antipassive) either the Actor or the Undergoer is no longer an argument, it is important to be able to identify, which NP is an argument, and which NP is an oblique. According to Ross (2002:28) there are three conditions for arguments.

(1) The argument has morphosyntactic relationship to the verb. This is marked by coding on the verb, or by coding on the arguments, or by position of the argument in the clause.
(2) The argument is required by the valence of the verb.
(3) The argument has reference-related functions.

In Duri the first condition would mean person marking clitics on the verb. This is fulfilled with the exception of third person, which is often absent. (The rules for that need

some further studies.) Duri does not have case marking on arguments, so instead I take the first condition to mean definiteness or specificness of the NP. Position of the argument is important, since with P-fronting the core argument is not definite or specific. According to Ross, the first condition is sufficient. We will concentrate on it.

We will start this investigation of arguments in Duri with passive constructions, which are marked by the prefix *di-* 'PASS', since in these clauses it is clear that there is only one argument: S.

Arguments in passive clauses

In (1), we see the only required nominal *rinding* 'wall', being both definite with the determiner to 'DEF' and specific with the possessive *=na* '3POS'. The material that is used for building the walls is in a prepositional phrase which starts with *jio mai* 'from', so it is clearly an oblique. It is important to note that there are no person-marking clitics on the predicate. (In this clause the lack of person marking clitics is expected, since in Duri, arguments that occur before the predicate are not usually referred to by person marking clitics.) That shows that it is possible for an NP to be an argument, even though it is not referred to by clitics.

	S				Oblique		
1	*ia*	*to*	*rinding=na*	*di-ka-buaq*	*jio mai*	*kaju*	*papan*
	3	DEF	wall=3POS	PASS-AFF-make	from	wood	board
	'Its walls were made from wooden boards.'						

The example (1) above is influenced by Indonesian grammar, which also uses a preposition *dari* 'from', and the clause with the same meaning in Indonesian is as follows: *Dindingnya terbuat dari kayu papan*. However, there is another way of saying it in Duri, which is a more indigenous way, as shown in (2). The main thing to note here is that the NP referring to the material *kaju papan* 'wooden board' cannot be an argument, since the NP *kaju papan* is not obligatory. It is the rinding 'wall', that is the argument since it is obligatory. Note also that this NP has the determiner to 'DEF' and the possessive *=na* '3POS', while the NP kaju papan is indefinite and unspecific. (However, later we will see that with P-fronting the NP does not need to be definite or specific to be an argument.)

	S			Oblique		
2	*ia*	*to*	*rinding=na*	*kaju*	*papan*	*di-ka-buaq*
	3	DEF	wall=3POS	wood	board	PASS-AFF-make
	'The walls were made from wooden boards.'					

Example (3) shows a passive clause, where again there are no clitics on the predicate referring to the S argument *bumbu* 'spice'. It is specific since it is possessed.

			S
3	*...maneq*	*di-tuqtuk*	*bumbu=nna*
	then	PASS-pound	spice=3POS
	'… then its spices are pounded.'		

Example (4) shows a passive clause where the S argument *kandoaq* ‘tuber’ precedes the predicate. There are no clitics on the predicate referring to the S argument, which is indefinite and non-specific. Tubers were the only thing they could eat.

			S		
4	*den=mo*	*sang-taun*	*kandoaq*	*bang=ra*	*di-kande*
	exist=CMP	one-year	tuber	only=CTR	PASS-eat

‘There was one year (in which) only tubers were eaten.’

In (5), we have a problematic clause, since it seems to have two arguments: *dadikkina* ‘its milk’ and *pangpanianan* ‘vessel’ even though it is passive. The enclitic =i ‘3’ on the predicate refers to the milk. (This can be tested by changing the person from third to first. Then the =i ‘3’ on the predicate *dipatanannimi* changes into =q ‘1SG’ dipatanannimoq. (=q is shortening of =*naq* ‘1SG’.)) The word *pangpanianan* is rather complex when analyzed into morphemes, but the basic meaning is easy, it means a vessel. The milk is put into a hollow vessel, which has been mentioned before in the text, so it is definite. It is noteworthy that there is locative -i ‘LOC’ on the predicate, which refers to the vessel. (Note also that the word final nasal n geminates so the -*i* ’LOC’ is realized as -*ni*). Usually with locatives the place is a core argument. For example, the verb *tanan* ‘plant’ can have rice as its P argument. But with the locative -*i tanan-ni* it is the field that is the P argument. I am still looking for an explanation why there seems to be two arguments in a passive clause.

5	*na*	*ia*	*joo*	*dadik=kina*	*di-pa-tanán-ni=m=i*
	and	3	D3	milk=3POS	PASS-CAUS-retain-LOC=CMP=3

to	*pang-pa-ni-án-an*	*ma-loqbok*	*nenaq*
DEF	NOM-CAUS-is.located-BEN-NOM	VS1-hollow	a.moment.ago

‘And that milk is retained in the hollow vessel mentioned a moment ago.’

As a conclusion we can say that the S argument in passive clauses may be a definite NP (marked with *to*, as in (1) and (2)), a specific NP (possessed, as in (1) and (3)), or an indefinite and non-specific NP (as in 4). As to the person marking clitics, sometimes the third person is absent. Example (5) needs further studies.

Arguments in *N*-form antipassive clauses

Both passive and antipassive clauses are syntactically intransitive. In passive clauses the A argument is deleted or demoted to oblique. In antipassive clauses the Actor becomes an S, since the patient is made into an oblique. In antipassive clauses, the Actor is highly topical and the patient, which is made into an oblique, is low in topicality (Silverstein 1976).

The antipassive in Duri is a construction where the predicate has the *N*-prefix and an enclitic that refers to the actor, which is the S argument. The *N*-prefix is often called actor focus prefix (Friberg 1988) and that is the gloss I have given it in my interlinearized texts, even though it has nothing to do with focus. In antipassive clauses there is no clitic that refers to the oblique NP, i.e. the Undergoer.

In (6), the NP *dangke* ‘cottage cheese’ is oblique, because the person marking clitic on the verb does not refer to it, and it is not definite nor specific. Functionally, this is similar to object incorporation, ‘I am cheese-eating’.

	=S	Oblique
6	*ng-kande=naq*	*dangke*
	AF-eat=1SG	cottage.cheese
	‘I am eating cottage cheese.’	

In (7), we have the same clause as above, but now it is in third person. The enclitic =i ‘3’ on the predicate refers to the S argument *meong* ‘cat’, which is definite (*to*). The Patient argument dangke ‘cottage cheese’ is oblique, since it is not definite nor specific. Note that in antipassive clauses the Undergoer (*dangke*) occurs between the predicate and the Actor.

	=S	Oblique	S	
7	*ng-kande=i*	*dangke*	*to*	*meong*
	AF-eat=3	cottage.cheese	DEF	cat
	‘The cat is eating cottage cheese.’			

In (8), we have a clause where the S argument *sola* ‘friend’ is specific, since it is possessed.

	=S	Oblique	S
8	*ng-kande=i*	*dangke*	*sola=kuq*
	AF-eat=3	cottage.cheese	friend=1SG.POS
	‘My friend is eating cottage cheese.’		

In (9), we have an ungrammatical clause, since the S argument *meong* ‘cat’ is indefinite. The clause is interpreted to mean that *meong* modifies the cottage cheese, i.e. it is made from cat’s milk. (Cottage cheese is made from cow milk or water buffalo milk.)

	=S	Oblique	S
9	**ng-kande=i*	*dangke*	*meong*
	AF-eat=3	cottage.cheese	cat
	‘A cat is eating cottage cheese.’		

Next, we will have a look at two interesting antipassive clauses which need explanation. Both are such that there seems to be two arguments. Both have an NP, which is possessed and therefore should be specific, and thus not oblique.

In (10), the S argument is second person and the enclitic =*ko* ‘2FAM’ refers to it. This is a command. The Undergoer *musu* ‘enemy’ seems to be specific, since it is possessed. One possible explanation is that since this is a general command, one can say that the enemy is not specific, even though it is possessed. One can also argue that possession does not necessarily imply specificity. The applicative -i ‘LOC’ points to the enemy.

This raises the question whether the -*i* really is locative, since applicatives have a valency increasing function and antipassives have valency decreasing function. One possibility is to say that applicatives do not always raise NPs into arguments (See example

48 below). Another possibility is to say that there is a yo-yo effect similar to causatives and passives. The causative *pa-* 'CAUS' increases the valency and after that the passive *di-* 'PASS' decreases the valency. Similarly, in (10) the locative -i 'LOC' increases the valency and after that the antipassive *N-* 'AF' decreases the valency. The final possibility is specific to this verb root *mase* 'pity'. Stative verbs like *ma-mase* 'pity' can be made transitive with the prefix *ka-* 'AFF'. Usually only *ka-* is added, as in *ma-lajaq* / *ka-lajaq* 'be afraid', and *ma-siriq / ka-siriq* 'be ashamed'. But with *mamase* 'pity' there is additionally the suffix *-i: ka-mase-i* 'pity'. This opens up the possibility to analyse this as not an applicative but a homophonous form or a circumfix. Further studies are needed.

		=S	Oblique
10	*la*	*ng-ka-mase-i=ko*	*musu=mmu!*
	IRR	AF-AFF-pity-LOC=2FAM	enemy=2POS
	'Love your enemies!'		

In (11), we have an interesting clause with applicative *-an* 'BEN'. (Note that I use the gloss BEN for all *-an* applicatives regardless of their function. The precise function of them needs to be determined later.) The S argument is first person. The object seems to be specific since it is possessed. There is no enclitic on the predicate *rannu* 'hope'. The applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to the help and love. The question is, is this antipassive or inverse? If the adverb *tattaq* 'constantly' were deleted, then the enclitic on it would be placed on the predicate *rannu* 'hope', and then we would have *rannuannaq*, i.e. the enclitic would be the Actor, and then this would be antipassive. The problem with this analysis is that the undergoer seems specific, which should not be possible with antipassives. One possible solution is that even though the NP is possessed, in this context it is not specific, since this is a general statement.

		=S		Oblique
11	*sanga*	*tattaq=naq*	*r-rannú-an*	*pang-tulung=na*
	because	constantly=1SG	AF-hope-BEN	NOM-help=3POS
	sola	*ka-ma-mase-an=na*		
	with	NOM-VS1-pity-NOM=3POS		

'because I constantly put my hope in His help and love.'

As a conclusion, we can say that the S arguments in antipassive clauses are specific or definite nominals, either an enclitic (e.g. first person *=naq*, as in (6)), definite NPs (marked with *to*, as in (7)), or possessed and thus specific (as in (8)). The oblique Undergoer is indefinite or non-specific. With respect to possessed NPs one can claim that contextual or pragmatic factors can override their specificity.

Arguments in *N*-form transitive clauses

Since *N*-form predicates are transitive, there are two arguments in the clauses. In Duri the transitive *N*-form (or actor focus, see Friberg 1988) clauses differ from antipassives in that there are no clitics that refer to the actor on the predicate. Also, the A argument occurs before the predicate. (This is noteworthy, since Duri is a VSO or VAP language.) Most often the A argument is not definite nor specific, when in third person. The exception to this is when the A argument is left-dislocated as in (13). The P argument is definite or specific and

there is usually an enclitic on the predicate that refers to it. The topicality of the A argument is medium, and the topicality of the P argument is high. I will call this inverse voice after Givón (1983, 1990). It refers to transitive constructions where the topicality of the patient is high while the topicality of the agent is less: high to medium. This is in contrast with the other transitive construction called active-transitive, where topicality of the patient is less: high to medium while the topicality of the actor is high. Thus their topicalities are reversed. (See Table 1 above).

In (12), we see that the A argument *meong* 'cat' looks like an oblique, but in my analysis, it is considered a core argument. It is not referred to by a clitic, and it is not definite nor specific. This clause occurs in a situation where the cheese has disappeared, and one wants to know what happened to it. The answer is that a cat ate it. The P argument is clearly definite, since it has the determiner to. Theoretically the third person enclitic could refer to the cat, since both the cat and the cheese are third person. However, in Duri the person marking clitics usually do not refer anaphorically to preceding NPs. This fact is crucial for the analysis, and it can be tested by changing the clause to first person, as in (14) below.

	A	=P		P
12	*meong*	*ng-kande=i*	*to*	*dangke*
	cat	AF-eat=i	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'A cat ate the cottage cheese.'			

It is also possible to have a definite cat (marked with *to*) eat the cheese as in (13). This type of construction is rare, and it usually occurs when a participant is reintroduced into the story mainline. This is called left dislocation. The P argument is definite (marked with *to*).

	A			=P		P
13	*ia*	*to*	*meong*	*ng-kande=i*	*to*	*dangke*
	3	DEF	cat	AF-eat=3	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'The cat ate the cottage cheese.'					

In (14), we see a clause with first person A argument *akuq* '1SG'. The P argument is definite (marked with *to*). The fact that the rest of the clause remains the same when *meong* in (12) is changed into *akuq* '1SG' shows that the enclitic *=i* '3' on the predicate refers to the cheese.

	A	=P		P
14	*akuq*	*ng-kande=i*	*to*	*dangke*
	1SG	AF-eat=3	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'I ate the cottage cheese.'			

As a conclusion we can say that the A arguments in *N*-form transitive clauses occur before the predicate and they are most often indefinite and non-specific on the third person (as in (12)). The P argument is definite or specific (marked with *to*, as in (12), (13) and (14)).

Arguments in zero-form transitive clauses

In (15) and (16), we see two zero-form (also called goal focus, see Friberg 1988) transitive clauses. In both (15) and (16) the P argument is definite. Example (16) is a general statement: cats are animals that eat cottage cheese. It is not referred to by a clitic pronoun (Ø). With type-token distinction it would be called type. In (15) the cat is referred to by a clitic

pronoun =*i* '3', since it is a real cat, not a general cat, a token. The A argument in both examples looks like an oblique, since it is not definite nor specific, but in my analysis, it is considered a core argument. As a proof, it is referred to by the proclitic person marker *na*= '3' and it is fronted. This shows how pragmatics (i.e. habitual and generic readings) can affect the argument marking in Duri.

	A= =P	A		P
15	*na=kande=i*	*meong*	*to*	*dangke*
	3=eat=3	cat	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'A cat ate the cottage cheese.'			

	A=	A		P
16	*na=kande=Ø*	*meong*	*to*	*dangke*
	3=eat	cat	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'Cats eat cottage cheese.'			

In (17), we see a clause with first person A argument referred to by the proclitic *ku*= '1SG'. The P argument is referred to by the enclitic =*i* '3' and it is definite (*to*).

	A= =P		P
17	*ku=kande=i*	*to*	*dangke*
	1SG=eat=3	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'I ate the cottage cheese.'		

With P-fronting, when the P argument is in focus, it may be without possessive or determiner, so it looks like oblique. However, since it is in a focus position, I analyse it as a core argument. In (18), the situation is such that one explains what s/he bought. There is a choice. Thus, clearly bananas are topical, even though there is no morphology to mark them as definite. So, even without morphological marking, the fronted P functions as a core argument due to its focus and topicality.

	P	A=		
18	*punti*	*ku=alli,*	*tangngia*	*bandikiq*
	banana	1SG=buy	NEGNV	papaya
	'I bought bananas, not papayas.'			

Arguments in intransitive clauses

In (19), we see an intransitive clause that describes how to make cottage cheese from milk. The S argument is the milk, which squirts from the teats, when they are squeezed. The S argument is definite with to 'DEF'. *ia=na* '3=3POS' functions as a connector meaning 'when'.

			=S	S	
19	*ia=na*	*di=parra=mo,*	*cic-coro=m=i*	*to*	*dadik=kina*
	3=3POS	PASS=squeeze=CMP	NVOL-squirt=CMP=3	DEF	milk=3pos
	'When they (the teats) are squeezed, their milk squirts already.'				

In (20), the S argument is allo '*sun'*, and we see that the S argument does not need to be definite nor specific, but note that the enclitic =*i* '3' on the verb *rabun* 'set' refers to it. We see that pronominal indexing of S arguments can sometimes be more important than definiteness

or specificity.

20	*langkan*	*tua*	*jao*	*barana*	*k<um>eok-meok*
	eagle	old	up.on	tree	<VI6>-shriek-RED
				=S	S
	ke	*la*	*rabun=m=i*		*allo*
	if/when	IRR	sun.sets=CMP=3		sun

'An old eagle on top of a tree screeches, when sun sets.'

In (21), we see an intransitive predicate with intransitive *maN-* 'VI3' prefix. The word *rido* 'hulled rice' is oblique, since this is an intransitive clause, and it can be omitted, as can be seen in example (22). The seven containers are not cooked, but they are used to measure the volume of the cooked rice. (Note that *=mo* 'CMP' becomes *=mi* 'CMP' when it occurs with *=kiq* '2HON'.)

			=S	Oblique	
21	*man-nasu*	*bang=mi=kiq*	*pitu*	*baka*	*rido*
	VI3-cook	just=CMP=2HON	seven	baka.container	hulled.rice

'Just cook seven baka containers of rice.'

	S			=S	Oblique	
22	*ia*	*to*	*indo=na*	*man-nasu=m=i*	*pitu*	*baka*
	3	DEF	mother=3POS	VI3-cook=CMP=3	seven	baka.container

'His mother cooked seven baka containers (of rice).'
Lit.: The mother of his cooked seven baka containers (of rice).

As a conclusion we can say that the third person S argument in intransitive clauses may be a definite NP (marked with to as in (19) and (22), or an indefinite and non-specific NP (as in 20).

As a comparison between the S arguments in intransitive, passive and antipassive clauses, one can say that there is more similarity between the S arguments of intransitive and passive clauses. They can sometimes be indefinite and non-specific, but the S arguments of antipassive need to be definite or specific.

Summary

The identification of nominal arguments in Duri depends on the role of the referring expressions in the clause in that arguments that are Undergoers (P) and arguments that are Actors (A or S) are treated differently. Arguments that are Undergoers need to be definite (as indicated by the definite determiner *to*) or specific (as indicated by possessive enclitic) to be P arguments or need to be focused. Without *to* or a possessive enclitic in a non-focused position, I consider them to be obliques. They have no status as syntactic pivots, or main topics of conversation. However, actors may be arguments (A or S) with or without to or possessive enclitics. Also verbal indexing is a factor, as well as the position of the nominal argument in the clause.

Active voice and applicatives

Now that we have a clear definition of the term argument, we can start our discussion of voice. We will start with transitive clauses, but we will also discuss basic intransitive clauses (excluding antipassives and passives, which are detransitivised intransitives). The reason for this will become clear below (it is because of applicatives). Ordinary intransitive clauses are of course active voice. Active voice is used in narrative and other non-procedural texts, where the Actor is topical.

Transitives

Transitive zero-form verbs have no verbal prefix indicating voice. Thus, the omission of an overt verbal prefix indicates active voice in transitive clauses. Clauses with zero-form verbs are traditionally called goal focus (GF) constructions (Friberg 1988). I don't want to use the term focus, since it is not a question of focus, even though I still use the label AF for the *N-* 'AF' prefix. The ordinary constituent order is V A P, but other orders are also possible, as seen in certain fronting constructions. Also, the occurrence of the third person enclitic is a topic for further studies.

Clause:	V	A	P
Predicate:	(Actor) proclitic=Ø-V=enclitic		(Undergoer)

In (23), the A argument is *meong* 'cat'. The cat has eaten the P argument *dangke* 'cottage cheese', which is definite (*to* 'DEF'). The P argument of transitive zero-form predicates must be definite or specific. The proclitic *na=* '3' refers to *meong* 'cat', and the enclitic *=i* '3' refers to *dangke* 'cottage cheese'.

23	*na=kande=i*	*meong*	*to*	*dangke*
	3=eat=3	cat	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'The cat ate the cottage cheese.'			

In (24), we have a clause, where both the A argument and P argument are referred to by clitics: *na=* '3' and *=naq* '1SG' respectively. The NP meaning 'coffee and cookies' is oblique, since it is indefinite and is not indexed on the predicate.

24	*na=ben=naq*	*kopi*	*sola*	*deppa*
	3=give=1SG	coffee	with	cookie
	'… they gave me coffee and cookies.'			

The clause above may be changed into a ditransitive clause, as in (25), by adding *joo* 'D3' to the oblique NP to make it a definite NP.

25	*na=ben=naq*	*joo*	*kopi*
	3=give=1SG	D3	coffee
	'… they gave me that coffee.'		

In (26), we have a clause where the A argument is marked by the proclitic *na=* '3' and the P argument is definite *joo punti* 'that banana tree'.

26	*na=táqbang=ngi*	*joo*	*punti*

3=cut=3 D3 banana
'He cut that banana tree.'

In (27), we see first person A argument *ku=* '1SG' planting corn in his or her garden. The P argument is the definite *dalle* 'corn'. The location is indicated with prepositional phrase *jio baraqbahkuq* 'in my garden'.

27 *ku=tánan=ni* *to* *dalle* *jio* *baraqbah=kuq*
1SG=plant=3 DEF corn at.in garden=1SG.POS
'I planted corn in my garden.'

Transitives with Applicatives

Transitive zero-form verbs can also have two kinds of applicatives, but they do not constitute different voices, they remain simply active voice. (As we saw above, intransitive verbs can take applicatives and below we will see that also *N*-form verbs can take applicatives, so they are not restricted to zero-form verbs and active voice.)

In (28), we have the same clause as in (25) with the addition of applicative *-an* 'BEN'. The applicative points to the person receiving the coffee. Thus, the applicative *-an* 'BEN' does not increase the number of core arguments, since the first person was already a core argument. Both (25) and (28) are ditransitive clauses.

28 *na=beng-an=naq* *joo* *kopi*
3=give-BEN=1SG D3 coffee
'… they gave me that coffee.'

Next, we will have examples with the verb *bantu* 'help'. In (29), we have the verb without the applicative *-an* 'BEN'. The Actor and A argument is second person referred to with enclitic *=kiq* '2HON' on the verb 'want', and the Undergoer and P argument is referred to with enclitic *=naq* '1SG' on the verb 'help'.

29 *meloh=ri=kiq=ka* *m=bántu=naq?*
want=CTR=2HON=Q AF=help=1SG
'Would you like to help me?'

In (30), we see an example of the same verb *bantu* 'help' with the benefactive applicative *-an* 'BEN'. There is no change in the verbal prefix which is still zero. A person asks how s/he could help the other person or persons. The proclitic *ku=* '1SG' refers to the A argument. The enclitic *=kiq* '2HON' refers to the P argument. Both are specific. The applicative *-an* 'BEN' refers to the possible ways to help someone, to the question word *apa* 'what'. For example, washing dishes, cleaning the house etc. It does not point to the person receiving the help.

30 *apa=ra* *waqding* *ku=bantú-an=kiq?*
what=CTR may 1SG=help-BEN=2HON
'What can I help you with?'

In (31), we see that the way to help is to hoe the garden.

31 *t<um>orak* *la=* *ku=bantú-an=kiq*
<VI6>hoe IRR= 1SG=help-BEN=2HON
'I will help you by hoeing.'

In (32), we see a clause (26) repeated, where the P argument is *punti* 'banana'. It is specific, because of the demonstrative pronoun *joo* 'D3'. The proclitic *na*= '3' refers to the A argument. It is also specific.

32 *na=táqbang=ngi* *joo* *punti*
3=cut=3 D3 banana
'He cut that banana tree.'

In (33) and (34), we see the same verb with the addition of benefactive *-an*. The situation is again such that a person is cutting a banana tree, but this time for the benefit of another person. The applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to that person, and the question word *inda* 'who' refers him/her. It is the P argument. There is no clitic on the predicate that refers to the P argument, since it occurs before the predicate. In (33) the word *punti* 'banana' is oblique, since it is not definite, nor specific and the predicate does not refer to it. The proclitic *na*= '3' refers to the person who is cutting the banana tree.

33 *inda=ra* *na=taqbáng-an* *punti?*
who=CTR 3=cut-BEN banana
'Who is he cutting a banana tree for?'

Example (34) shows that the banana tree can be specific. Then the clause is ditransitive. Note that there is no enclitic on the predicate *taqbang* 'cut', even when the patient is specific with *joo* 'D3', because it would have referred to the beneficiary, which occurs before the verb. Note that there is no change in morphosyntax on the verb between (33) and (34). Yet, we can say that in (33) *punti* 'banana' is oblique and in (34) *joo punti* 'that banana' is an argument, because by our definition mentioned at the end of chapter 2, Undergoers that are arguments need to be definite or specific. If they are not, they are oblique.

34 *inda=ra* *na=taqbáng-an* *joo* *punti?*
who=CTR 3=cut-BEN D3 banana
'Who is he cutting that banana tree for?'

Another applicative is the locative, which can be seen in (35) below. There the P argument is the *kolak* 'coconut shells'. Sit is an intransitive verb, so ordinarily it would require a prepositional phrase to indicate the location of the sitting. But since this applicative *-i* 'LOC' points to the coconut shells, they are the P argument, and the A argument s/he/it is sitting on them. (In this story the A argument is a monkey.) The coconut shells are specific, which is indicated by the demonstrative pronoun *joo* 'D3'. (In the first clause the enclitic *=na* '3' is attached to the connector *toN-* 'when'. Note that actually linguistically it is proclitic on the predicate *ampaq* 'find', but because of orthographic reasons it is written on the connector and not on the predicate.)

35 *ia* *ton=na=* *ampaq=m=i,* *taqpa*
3 when=3 find=CMP=3 immediately

na=cadokkó-i=m=i *joo* *kolak*

3=sit-LOC=CMP=3 D3 coconut.shell

'When he found them, he immediately sat on those coconut shells'

Next, we see a pair of clauses that are related to each other. In (36), which is a repetition of (27) above, the P argument is the *dalle* 'corn' which is planted in the garden. The garden is oblique even though it is possessed, since it is mentioned in a prepositional phrase. The stress in Duri is on the penultimate, so the stress is on the first /a/: *kutánanni*. (Note that person clitics are extra-metrical and do not count. Possessive clitics do change the stress.)

36 *ku=tánan=ni* *to* *dalle* *jio* *baraqbáh=kuq*
1SG=plant=3 DEF corn at.in garden=1SG.POS
'I planted corn in my garden.'

In (37), we have a clause where the garden is the P argument and the locative *-i* 'LOC' points to it. Also, the enclitic *=i* '3' refers to it. It is definite with *to* 'DEF'. Thus, this is not a ditransitive clause, since the corn is not definite, nor specific and no clitic on the predicate refers to it. Therefore, it is oblique. Since applicatives are suffixes, they change the stress, thus with locative, the stress is on the second /a/: *kutanánnii*.

37 *ku=tanán-ni=i* *dalle* *to* *baraqbah=kuq*
1SG=plant-LOC=3 corn DEF garden=1SG.POS
'I planted my garden with corn.'

If applicatives were voice markers, then this active voice should be divided into three distinct voices: active, active benefactive and active locative. In my analysis they are the same voice. Since voice is a function of topicality, then a change of voice should also mean a change of topicality, but in active voice clauses, even with the applicative suffixes, it is the A argument that has the highest topicality (Valkama 1993). Applicatives do not change that. Topicality can be calculated with topic persistency and referential distance of A and P arguments (Givón 1983, 1990).

Intransitives

Intransitive predicates may have verbal prefixes (VI) or they may be zero marked (Ø). The enclitic refers to the Actor, except in split S constructions, when the person marking is done with proclitics. The ordinary constituent order is V S, but S V is also possible. See examples (1), (2), and (4) in chapter 2. The occurrence of the third person enclitic is a topic for further studies.

Clause:	V	S
Predicate:	VI-V=enclitic (Actor)	
	Ø-V=enclitic (Actor)	

In (38), we see an intransitive verb *tuo* 'live' without a verbal prefix. The S argument *tomatua* 'parents' is definite (marked with *to*), specific with possessive, and the enclitic *=i* '3' refers to them (parents here is plural, as Duri does not have plural marking on nouns).

38 *tuo* *una=p=i=ra=ka* *to* *to-ma-tua=ntaq*
live still=inCMP=3=CTR=Q DEF PRS-VS1-old-2.HON.POS

'Are your parents still living?'

In (39), we see an intransitive verb *male* 'go'. The S argument *baine* is indefinite and non-specific; it refers to women in general. There is no clitic on the predicate, since the S argument is fronted.

39	*ia*	*to*	*indeq*	*Duri*	*biasa=nna*	*baine=ra*
	3	DEF	here	Duri	usually=3POS	woman=CTR
	to	*male*	*pasaq*			
	REL	go	market			

'Here in Duri, usually it is the women who go to market.'

In (40), we see an intransitive verb *menariq* 'dance' with the verbal prefix *me-* 'VI4'. The S argument *pea* 'child' is specific with to 'DEF' and there is no clitic referring to it.

40	*me-nariq*	*to*	*pea*	*jio*	*pas-sikola-n*
	VI4-dance	DEF	child	at	NOM-school-NOM
	'The child danced at the school'				

In (41), we see an intransitive verb *mangtajan* 'wait' with the verbal prefix *mang-* 'VI3'. The S argument is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3' on the adverb *too* 'also', which modifies the stative verb *marosso* 'be bored'. When there are two intransitive verbs in a clause, only the first one takes person-marking.

41	*ma-rosso*	*too=m=i*	*mang-tajan*
	VS1-bored	also=CMP=3	VI3-wait
	'He was also bored of waiting'		

In (42), we see an intransitive clause with two intransitive verbs. The first verb *mendoq* 'go down' has the verbal prefix *meN-* 'VI5'. The S argument is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3'.

42	*men-doq=m=i*	*mammaq*
	VI5-down=CMP=3	sleep
	'S/he lied down to sleep.'	

In (43), we see an intransitive clause with two intransitive verbs. The second one has the verbal prefix *maN-* 'VI1'. The S (*ta=* '1PL.INCL') is not marked on the second verb (*mantunu-tunu* 'roast'), since it is already marked on the first verb *male* 'go'. Corn is oblique.

43	*ta=male*	*lako*	*baraqbah=kuq*	*man-tunu-tunu*	*dalle!*
	1PL.INCL=go	to	garden=1SG.POS	VI1-roast-RED	corn
	'Let's go to my garden for some roasting of corn!'				

Intransitives with applicatives

It is noteworthy to see that intransitive verbs can also get applicatives, and that is the

reason we included intransitives in this discussion on active voice.

We will first look at a sentence with a verb without the applicative. The verb is *pole* 'return'. See (44) below. The S argument is the third person, who returns to his/her home village. The enclitic *=na* '3' is attached to the connector *toN-* 'when'. Note that linguistically it is proclitic on the predicate *pole* 'return', but because of orthographic reasons it is written on the connector and not on the predicate.

44	*ia*	*ton=na=*	*pole*	*lako*	*kampong=na…*
	3	when=3=	return	to	village=3POS
	'When s/he returned to his/her village …'				

In (45), we have the same verb *pole* 'return' with applicative *-an* 'BEN'. The meaning of the sentence is that the work is useless, there is no benefit (or 'returns') of the work. The S argument is the noun *jama* 'work'. Also, the benefactive *-an* points to it. Note that here we do not have the normal enclitic *=i* '3', but a proclitic *na=* '3' referring to the S argument. This is called split S alignment in which the S argument is referred to with proclitics instead of the normal enclitics in intransitive clauses. In Duri split S alignment occurs for example after negatives.

45	*teqda*	*na=pole-an*	*tuu*	*jama-jama-n=mu*
	not	3=return-BEN	D2	work-RED-NOM=2FAM.POS
	'That work of yours is of no use.' Lit. has no return.			

The next verb is *jaji* 'be born' in (46) below. The S argument is the younger sibling of Rusna, who was born. It is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3'.

46	*jaji=m=i=ra=ka*	*adi=nna*	*Rusna*	*pu-bongi?*
	be.born=CMP=3=CTR=Q	younger.sibling-3POS	Rusna	last-night
	'Was Rusna's younger sibling born last night?'			

In (47), we have the same verb *jaji* 'be born' with intransitive verbal prefix *mang-* 'VI3' and the applicative *-an* 'BEN'. The S argument is *=kan* '1PL.EXCL' and the Undergoer is *anak* 'child', which is oblique since it is general. The question is about the possibility of begetting children. Since child is oblique, (47) is an intransitive clause. The beneficiary would be the child, since the applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to the child being born. This means that the applicative does not raise the NP into an argument. In other words, it does supply a semantic role but does not determine argumenthood of the NP. The predicate *mangjajian* 'beget' can be replaced by *keanak* 'give birth', which does not have the applicative.

47	*la*	*waqding*	*una=pa=ra=kan=ka*	*mang-jaji-an*	*anak?*
	IRR	may	still=inCMP=CTR=1PL.EXCL=Q	VI3-beget-BEN	child
	'Could we still beget children?'				

In (48), we have a sentence with the predicate *mangrannuan* 'hope for'. The S argument is Daud, who is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3' on the adverb *tattaq* 'still'. He hoped for help from God, so the applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to God, which is oblique, because it is in a prepositional phrase. This example also shows that applicatives do not always raise NPs into arguments.

48 *...apa* *tatta=i* *Daud* *mang-rannu-an* *lako* *Puang Allataala*
but still=3 Daud VI3-hope-BEN to Lord God
'…but Daud steadfastly trusted/hoped in Lord God.'

The fact that applicatives can occur in intransitive clauses, proves that applicatives are not voice-marking affixes. If they were, one would need to establish a voice for them.

In (49), we have a clause with the predicate *mentaqdeanmi* 'disappear'. The applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to the person who disappeared. Thus, it points to the NP *joo tau* 'that person' which is already an argument (S). It is referred to by an enclitic *=i* '3' on the predicate. This shows that the applicative *-an* 'BEN' does not necessarily create a new core argument, there is no change in clitic alignment, nor shift in topicality, and the clause remains intransitive.

49 *mangka=i* *joo too,* *men-taqde-an=m=i* *joo* *tau*
finish=3 D3 VI5-not.exist-BEN-CMP=3 D3 person
'After that, that person disappeared'

Passive Voice

Next is passive voice. As mentioned in the introduction, passive voice is used in procedural texts, for example in a text that explains how chickens are slaughtered or how cottage cheese is made. In procedural discourse the Undergoer is topical and the Actor is irrelevant. In Duri passive voice, the original A argument or Actor is obligatorily omitted. The passive voice prefix is *di-* 'PASS'. The normal constituent order is V S, but S V is also possible. With passives the marking of the S argument on the predicate is a topic for further studies, since zero marking does occur. Clear zero marking cases include fronted NPs like (50). Another explanation is high topicality as in (52). Further studies are needed for more detailed explanation of third person marking in Duri in general.

Clause: V S (Undergoer)
Predicate: *di*-V=enclitic (Undergoer)

In (50), we see two passive clauses. In the first clause, the S argument is *tedong* 'water buffalo', which is being milked, so it is the Undergoer. In the second clause, the S argument is the *dadik* 'milk', which is collected to be used in the cheese-making process, so it is also the Undergoer. Both S arguments are definite with the determiner *to* 'DEF'.

The proclitic *na=* '3' is used in the second clause, since these two clauses are closely connected, which is shown in the translation by the phrase '*and then'*. This is another example of split S alignment in Duri. Sirk (1983:64-66) calls this consecutiveness ('and/hence'), since the constructions are consecutively linked or joined.

50 *jaji,* *ia* *to* *tedong* *di-anduq=ra* *joloq,*
so 3 DEF water.buffalo PASS-milk=CTR first

na=di-ala *to* *dadik=kina*
3=PASS-take DEF milk=3POS

'So, the water buffalo is milked first, and then its milk is taken.'

In (51), we have two passive clauses. In both clauses the S argument is *dadik* 'milk' which is definite (*to* 'DEF'). Here also the proclitic *na*= '3' is used because the clauses are closely linked. The cooking pot *kurin* is oblique, since it is indefinite and non-specific and it is not referred to by the predicate.

51	*di-ala=m=i*	*to*	*dadik,*	*na=di-pa-tama*	*kurin*
	PASS-get=CMP=3	DEF	milk	3=PASS-CAUS-enter	cooking.pot

'the milk is taken, and then it is put in a cooking pot'

In (52), which is a direct continuation from (51), we see two passive clauses followed by an intransitive clause. In the first passive clause the pot or milk is put (*dipatoppoq*) on top of a fire pit and in the second passive clause that pot, or the milk in the pot is heated (*dinasu*) until it boils. In both cases the S argument is not mentioned and it is not marked on the predicate. The ellipsis is proof that the pot and the milk are highly topical, even though there is no overt marking on the predicates. Only in the last clause, on the adverb *aranna* 'until' there is an enclitic =*i* '3' referring to the milk.

52	*maneq*	*di-pa-toppoq*	*jao*	*dapoh,*
	then	PASS-CAUS-top	up.in	fire.pit

di-nasu,	*aranna=i*	*lonta-lonta*
PASS-cook	until=3	boil-RED

'Then it (pot) is put on top of a fire pit, and it is cooked, until it boils well.'

Passive with applicatives

Applicatives can also occur in passive clauses. In (53), one asks if it is a custom to slaughter a goat for the benefit of a newborn baby, to celebrate the birth. The applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to pea 'child', which is the S argument. It is definite with the determiner to 'DEF'. The previous P argument *beke* 'goat' has become oblique. It is not definite nor specific, and there is no clitic on the predicate that refers to it. It is noteworthy that applicatives can be used in passive clauses, which are intransitive.

53	*biasa=ra=ka*	*di-gerét-an*	*beke*	*to*	*pea,*
	usually=CTR=Q	PASS-slaughter-BEN	goat	DEF	child

ke	*maneq*	*jaji=i*
when/if	just	is.born=3

'Does the child usually have a goat slaughtered for him/her,
when he/she has just been born?'

In (54), one asks about funeral celebrations. After a death, one waits a certain time before one slaughters and eats a goat on behalf of the deceased, to commemorate him or her. So, the benefactive *-an* 'BEN' on the verb *kande* 'eat' points to the deceased *tomate* 'dead person', which is the S argument, and the *beke* 'goat' has become oblique. It is not specific, nor definite and there is no clitic on the predicate that refers to it.

54	si-pirang		bongi=ra	na=di-kandé-an	beke
	REC-how.many		night=CTR	3=PASS-eat-BEN	goat
	to	*to-mate*	*indeq*	*Duri?*	
	DEF	PRS-dead	here	Duri	

'How many nights does a dead person have a goat eaten for him/her?'

Also, the applicative *-i* 'LOC' can occur with passives. In (55), the predicate *tamba* 'call' gets the locative *-i* 'LOC'. The fact that it is locative *-i* 'LOC' and not enclitic *=i* '3', is shown by the change of stress: *ditambái* instead of *ditámbai*. The locative points to *tau* 'people', which is definite with to 'DEF', and it is also the S argument. In the following clause the predicate has a proclitic attached to it, similar to example (51) above. These two clauses are closely linked, which shows in the translation '*and then'*.

55	*di-tambá-i*	*to*	*tau,*	*na=di-kande*	*sola*
	PASS-call-LOC	DEF	person	3=PASS-eat	with

'People are called / invited, and then one eats together with them.'

In (56), the predicate *buno* 'hit' changes its meaning with the addition of the locative applicative. Now it means to 'kill'. The applicative *-i* 'LOC' points to *tau* 'person/people', which is definite (marked with *to*).

56	*di-bunó-i*	*to*	*tau*
	PASS-hit-LOC	DEF	person

'The people were killed.'

It is to be noted that if applicatives were voice markers, then this passive voice should be divided into three distinct voices. Since voice is a function of topicality, then a change of voice should also mean change of topicality, but in passive voice clauses, even with the applicative suffixes, it is the S argument that has the highest topicality. Applicatives do not change that. Of course the counter argument would be to say that these are not applicatives. This is one example of the chicken and egg problems in linguistics.

My view is that since *-i* 'LOC' and -an 'BEN' do function as true applicatives and can raise obliques into arguments, then the same suffixes are applicatives also in constructions where this does not happen.

Inverse Voice

There are two types of clauses which have *N*-form predicates. The one described here first is called inverse voice. Its distinguishing feature is that the enclitic on the predicate refers to the P argument, which is highly topical and definite or specific. The A argument is medium to high in topicality, and it is always preverbal. Inverse voice clauses are transitive. In antipassive voice the enclitic on the predicate refers to the A argument. And in active voice the topicality is reversed.

The ordinary constituent order of inverse voice clauses is A V P. The occurrence of the third person enclitic is a topic for further studies.

Clause:	A	V	P
Predicate:	*N*-V=enclitic (Undergoer)		

In (59), the P argument *dangke* 'cottage cheese' is definite with *to* 'DEF' and the enclitic *=i* '3' refers to it. The A argument is *meong* 'cat'. It is indefinite and non-specific and there is no clitic referring to it on the predicate. To refer to it with a clitic would be ungrammatical. But since it is fronted, it is an argument.

57	*meong*	*ng-kande=i*	*to*	*dangke*
	cat	AF-eat=3	DEF	cottage.cheese
	'A cat ate the cottage cheese.'			

In (60), the P argument of the verb *bantu* 'help' is first person and it is referred to by the enclitic *=naq* '1SG'. The A argument is referred to on the previous verb with enclitic *=kiq* '2HON'. An enclitic is used on the first verb, since *meloh* 'want' is an intransitive verb.

58	*meloh=ri=kiq=ka*	*m-bantu=naq*
	want=CTR=2HON=Q	AF-help=1SG
	'Would you please help me?'	

In (61), the P argument is *dea* 'sedge grass', which is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3' on the predicate *passan* 'carry on the shoulder'. (Word final nasals geminate before the enclitic *=i*, so it becomes *=ni*.) The A argument is already referred to by an enclitic *=i* '3' on the first verb *tarruh* 'continue'.

59	*tarruh=m=i*	*male*	*m-passan=ni*	*joo*	*dea*
	continue=CMP=3	go	AF-carry=3	D3	sedge.grass
	'He continued and went to carry that sedge grass.'				

In (62), the P argument is *petumpak* 'support', which is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3' on the predicate *sumpun* 'burn'. The definite A argument is *tau* 'people'.

60	*ku=sua=m=i*	*to*	*tau*	*s-sumpun=ni*
	1SG=order=CMP=3	DEF	person	AF-burn=3

joo	*pe-tumpak=kana*
D3	NOM-support=3POS

'I ordered the people to burn that support (supporting beam).'

[1] I am open name suggestions. It does not need to be called inverse. I do not mean to claim that Duri is an inverse language.

Inverse voice with applicatives

The *N*-form transitive verbs can also take applicatives. In (63), Lajanak's father throws the roll of grass down to the earth. The proclitic *na*= '3' on the connective *maneq* 'then' refers to the father. The predicate *bassan* 'throw down' takes the applicative *-an* 'BEN', which points to the roll of grass. The enclitic *=i* '3' also refers to the roll of grass. Note that I use the gloss BEN for all *-an* applicatives regardless of their function. The precise function of them needs to be determined later. Therefore, there does not need to be a beneficiary in the clause.

61 *na=maneq* *m-pem-bassán-an=ni*
3=then AF-VT5-throw.down-BEN=3
'Then he threw it down.'

In (64), the predicate is an *N*-form verb *jaji* 'be born', which gets the applicative *-an* 'BEN', which points to the newborn child (i.e. you). The A argument is not mentioned because of the passive *dini* 'is located'. The P argument is the second person enclitic *=kiq* '2PL.HON', which refers to the child who was born.

62 *umbo=ra* *di-ni* *n-jaji-an=kiq?*
where=CTR PASS-is.located AF-born-BEN=2PL.HON
'Where were you born?' Lit.: Where is the place (someone) gave birth to you?

In (65), there is a fire and the people were not able to put it out. The A argument is *tau* 'person', which is definite with *to* 'DEF'. The P argument is the fire, which is mentioned previously in the discourse. It is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3' on the predicate *bosi* 'extinguish'(*=ni* because of gemination of the preceding nasal n). Also, the applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to the fire that was put out.

63 *tang=na=tanan=ni* *to* *tau* *m-bosí-an=ni*
NEG=3=be.able=3 DEF person AF-extinguish-BEN=3
'They were not able to extinguish it.'

An intransitive clause with *bosi* 'go out (of fire)' looks like (66).

64 *bósi=i* *to* *api*
go.out=3 DEF fire
'The fire went out.'

In (67), we have an interesting case, where there are two *-an* 'BEN' applicatives on the same verb. One possible analysis or explanation is that one applicative points to the child, who is being proposed to, and the second applicative points to the first cousin, on whose behalf this proposing is being done. With that analysis, one of the P arguments is the *anak* 'child', and the other is *sampu pissen* 'first cousin'. The A argument of the predicate *mangkada* 'talk' is clear, it is the first person who was asked by the first cousin to propose on his behalf.

65 *den* *sampu* *pissen=kuq* *s-sua=naq*
exist cousin once=1SG.POS AF-order=1SG

m-pang-kadá-n-an=ni *anak=kataq*
AF-VT3-say-BEN-BEN=3 child=2PL.HON

'I have a first cousin, who ordered/sent me
to propose to your child on his behalf.'

The *N*-form verbs can also take the locative applicatives. In (68), the person is going to examine the coffins that were dropped down from a made burial cave in a cliff. The enclitic *=q*, which is a shortening from *=naq* '1SG' on the first verb *male* 'go' refers to the A argument. The P argument is the coffin that is referred to by the enclitic *=i* '3' on the second verb *kita* 'see'. The locative changes the meaning of the verb from 'see' to 'examine', and it points to the coffins going to be examined.

66 *...male=mo=q* *ng-kitá-i=i*
go=CMP=1SG AF-see-LOC=3
'… I went to examine them.'

In (69), *tau* 'person/persons' is the A argument, even though it is indefinite, since it is fronted. Inverse voice is transitive with two arguments where the P argument, Lajanak in this example, is referred to by *=ko* '2 FAM'. It cannot be antipassive, since in antipassive the enclitic would refer to the Actor, which is *tau* 'person'. The applicative *-i* 'LOC' also points to Lajanak.

67 *pira=ra* *tau* *m-balí-i=ko* *man-tanan* Lajanaq
how.many=CTR person AF-help-LOC=2FAM VI1-plant Lajanaq
'How many people will help you plant Lajanak'?

It is to be noted that if applicatives were voice markers, then this inverse voice with *N*-form verbs should be divided into three distinct voices. Since voice is a function of topicality, then a change of voice should also mean change of topicality, but in inverse voice clauses, even with the applicative suffixes, it is the P argument that has the highest topicality. Applicatives do not change that. They just change which NP is the P argument. This is similar to English clauses: *John gave the book to Mary* and *John gave Mary the book*.

Antipassive Voice

The second type of clauses with *N*-marked predicates is called antipassive voice. The following discussion is based on Heaton (2017:60-64). Creating a definite definition for antipassive is difficult. Our starting point is that antipassive is a kind of voice. And voice involves a verbal marker, which in Duri is *N-* 'AF' as opposed to transitive voice, where the marker is zero. Antipassive corresponds to a transitive event type, even though syntactically it is intransitive. In Duri these corresponding transitive event types are expressed either by active voice or inverse voice. The distinguishing feature is that in antipassive the enclitic on the predicate refers to the Actor, the S argument, which is definite or specific. This is similar to intransitive constructions. It distinguishes antipassives from inverse voice, where the enclitic refers to the P argument, and other derived intransitives like passive, where the S argument is Undergoer. In antipassives the Undergoer is oblique, even though it does not have an overt oblique marker.

The topicality of the Actor argument is high, and the topicality of the oblique Undergoer is low. It is non-specific or indefinite. This is what is called the pragmatic antipassive (Heaton 2017:30-31). It is also noteworthy that the Actor NP comes after the

oblique Undergoer NP, which comes directly after the predicate. Thus, there are two distinctive features of antipassives. First, the Undergoer or oblique NP comes immediately after the verb, even though the common word order in Duri is V A P. Secondly the enclitic on the predicate refers to the Actor, which is what happens also in intransitive clauses. The Undergoer is not referred to by the predicate. It is to be noted that antipassives also seem to have an aspectual function. They are often incompletive aspect, which means they can refer to present action, to something that is happening while one is speaking, or to something continuous. Even past events can be incompletive if they are understood as past continuous. In English an example would be "I was reading."

The normal constituent order is V Obl-NP S (verb + oblique NP + S argument). The occurrence of the enclitic is a topic for further studies.

Clause:	V	Obl-NP	S
Predicate:	N-V=enclitic (Actor)		

In (70), the S argument is *meong* 'cat'. The enclitic *=i* '3' on the predicate *kande* 'eat' refers to it, since it is definite with *to* 'DEF' and the oblique patient or Undergoer is *dangke* 'cottage cheese' is indefinite and non-specific, and there is no clitic that refers to it on the predicate. Note that it occurs immediately after the predicate, before the S argument. Proof that the enclitic *=i* '3' refers to *meong* 'cat' and not *dangke* is given by (71) which shows the same clause with first person S argument *=naq* '1SG' attached to the predicate *kande* 'eat'. This proves that it is not the oblique cottage cheese that the enclitic in example (70) refers to. Of course, in (71) the enclitic *=naq* '1 SG' cannot refer to the oblique *dangke* 'cottage cheese'.

68	*ng-kande=i*	*dangke*	*to*	*meong*
	AF-eat=3	cottage.cheese	DEF	cat
	'The cat is eating cottage cheese.'			

69	*ng-kande=naq*	*dangke*
	AF-eat=1SG	cottage.cheese
	'I am eating cottage cheese.'	

In (72), the S argument is first person and it is referred to by the enclitic on the preceding verb *male* 'go'. The oblique undergoer is *bale* 'fish'. Again, the enclitic *=naq* '1 SG' cannot refer to the *bale* 'fish'.

70	*male=naq*	*n-jokko*	*bale*
	go=1SG	AF-catch	fish
	'I am going to catch fish.'		

In (73), the S argument is first person singular enclitic attached to the adverb *poleq* 'again'. (*=q* is shortening of *=naq* '1SG'.) Since the first plan didn't work, the person is thinking about a new plan, which is oblique in this clause. The oblique Undergoer is *akkalan* 'plan'.

71	*n-tiro*	*poleq=mo=q*	*paleq*	*akkalan*
	AF-look.for	again=CMP=1SG	EMPH	plan
	'I was looking again for a plan ...'			

In (74), the A argument is first person plural inclusive enclitic *=kiq* '1PL.INCL', which refers to the people going to do the burning. The oblique is not even mentioned, it is wood that the people will gather.

72	*la*	*n-tunu=kiq*	*to*	*pitu=pa*	*too*
	IRR	AF-burn=1PL.INCL	DEF	seven=inCMP	now

'We will be burning (it) after seven days.' (We will do burning …)

Antipassive with applicatives

With antipassive verbs you can also have applicatives. In (75), there is the *-an* 'BEN' applicative on the predicate *taqde* 'not exist'. The S argument is first person plural inclusive *=kiq* '1PL.INCL'. The oblique Undergoer is *kamabirisan* 'anger'. The applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to the anger.

73	*ia*	*ke*	*n-taqdé-an=kiq*	*ka-ma-biris-an*
	3	if	AF-not.exist-BEN=1PL.INCL	NOM-VS1-angry-NOM
	lan	*mai*	*penawa=ntaq*	
	in	from	soul=1PL.INCL.POS	

'If we make anger disappear from our hearts...'

The above example can also use locative -i on the verb: *ntaqdéikiq*, in which case the locative also points to anger.

In (76), the applicative *-an* 'BEN' points to the machete, which is oblique. It is indefinite, non-specific and no clitic refers to it. The S argument is first person enclitic *=naq* '1SG'.

74	*n-taqdé-an=naq*	*laqboh*
	AF-not.exist-BEN=1SG	machete

'I have lost a machete.'

In (77), the predicate *buno* 'hit' has the applicative *-i* 'LOC', which changes the meaning of the verb into 'kill'. It points to the people being killed. The clause is antipassive, because the NP *tau* 'people' is oblique. The are no clitics on the predicate.

75	*ia*	*joo*	*surudadu*	*m-bunó-i*	*bang*	*tau*
	3	D3	soldier	AF-hit-LOC	just	person

'Those soldiers were just killing people.'

It is to be noted that if applicatives were voice markers, then this antipassive voice should be divided into three distinct voices. Since voice is a function of topicality, then a change of voice should also mean change of topicality, but in antipassive voice clauses, even with the applicative suffixes, it is the S argument or Actor that has the highest topicality. Applicatives do not change that.

Conclusion

It is my analysis that Duri has four voices: active, passive, antipassive and inverse. I follow Givón and see voice as a function of topicality. In my analysis the applicatives are not voice markers, since they do not affect the topicality of arguments. Also, one would have over ten voices if applicatives were voice markers.

Distinguishing core arguments from oblique NPs is crucial in my analysis. Definiteness and specificness as well as person marking are important for core arguments and inversely indefinite or non-specific NPs, which are not referred to by person marking clitics on the predicate are analysed as oblique arguments.

Here is a summary of the voices with their basic constituent orders. The optionality of third person marking on the predicates is a topic for further studies.

Intransitive (I analyse it being active voice):

Clause:	V S
Verb:	VI-V=enclitic (Actor)
	ø-V=enclitic (Actor)

Active voice (some people call this active-transitive or goal focus) with zero form verbs:

Clause:	V A P
Verb:	proclitic (Actor)=ø-V=enclitic (Undergoer)

Inverse voice (some people call this actor focus) with *N*-form verbs:

Clause:	A V P
Verb:	*N*-V=enclitic (Undergoer)

Antipassive voice (some call this actor focus or semi-transitive) with *N*-form verbs:

Clause:	V Obl. NP S
Verb:	*N*-V=enclitic (Actor)

Passive voice:

Clause:	V S
Verb:	*di*-V(=enclitic) (Undergoer)

Appendix

Pronouns

Pronouns in Duri can be seen in the table below. Note that the 1INCL and 2HON are the same. Thus bola=taq can mean either ‘our (inclusive) house’ or ‘your (polite) house’. The Duri people claim that 2FAM is only singular. However, I have heard a sentence addressed to a group of pupils as in (78) below. As can be seen from that sentence, the enclitic *=ko* ‘2FAM’ refers to several pupils, not only one. When I discuss this topic with Duri people, their usual

explanation is that the speaker has chosen one pupil from the group to talk to. I do not believe that explanation. My assumption is that this is influence from Indonesian, where -ko is singular. Therefore, it is possible that the meaning of *=ko* is changing. It used to mean '2FAM' but now it means '2SG.FAM'. Further studies are needed to determine, if that change has indeed happened.

76	*pole*	*umbo=ko*	*pea?*
	return	where=2FAM	child
	'Where are you coming from, children?'		

1EXCL and 1INCL are inherently plural, so they are not glossed PL. Exclusive means our, excluding the hearer, and inclusive means *our* including the hearer. 2HON and 2FAM can be either singular or plural. The 2PL is in the middle level regarding politeness. There is no enclitic form, so the free form *kamuq* is used instead. The third person clitics and pronouns may refer to singular or plural entities.

Table 2. Pronouns in Duri.

	possessive	proclitic	enclitic	free
1SG	*=kuq*	*ku=*	*=naq*	*akuq*
1EXCL	*=kiq*	*ki=*	*=kan*	*kamiq*
1INCL	*=taq*	*ta=*	*=kiq*	*kitaq*
2HON	*=taq*	*ta=*	*=kiq*	*kitaq*
2FAM	*=mu*	*mu=*	*=ko*	*iko*
2PL	*=mi*	*mi=*	-	*kamuq*
3	*=na*	*na=*	*=i*	*ia*

Table 3. Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
A	A-argument
AF	actor focus
AFF	affective
BEN	benefactive
CAUS	causative
CMP	completive aspect
CTR	contrastive
D2	deictic 2 (close to hearer)
D3	deictic 3 (far from both)
DEF	definite
EMPH	emphasis
FAM	familiar form
GF	goal focus
HON	polite form
INCL	inclusive
INCMP	incompletive aspect

IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
NEGNV	negative on nouns
NOM	nominalizer
NP	noun phrase
NVOL	non-volitional
OBL	Oblique argument
P	P-argument
PASS	passive
PL	plural
POS	possessive
PRS	person
Q	question
REC	reciprocal
RED	reduplication
REL	relative word
S	S-argument
SG	singular
VI1	intransitive verb prefix 1
VI3	intransitive verb prefix 3
VI4	intransitive verb prefix 4
VI5	intransitive verb prefix 5
VI6	intransitive verb infix
VP	verb phrase
VS1	stative verb prefix 1
VT3	transitive verb prefix 3
VT5	transitive verb prefix 5

References

Alexander Adelaar (Ed.). (2013). *Austronesian languages of Indonesia*. NUSA 54.

Anderson, Stephen R. (1976). On the notion of subject in ergative languages. In Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, 1-23. New York: Academic Press.

Boaz, Franz. (1911). Introduction. *Handbook of American Indian languages*, vol. 1. (Bureau of American Ethnology, bulletin 40.) Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Comrie, Bernard. (1978). Ergativity. In Lehmann (Ed.), *Syntactic Typology.* Studies in the Phenomenology of Language, 329-394. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. (Ed.) (1976). *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Dixon, Robert M. W. (1979). Ergativity. *Language* 55.59-138.

Dixon, Robert M. W. (2010). *Basic Linguistic Theory*. Volume 1. Oxford: OUP.

Friberg, Timothy (Ed.). (1987). UNHAS-SIL *South Sulawesi Sociolinguistic Surveys 1983-1987*. Workpapers in Indonesian Languages and Cultures, Volume 5. Summer Institute of Linguistics: Jayapura.

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. 103–130. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

Givón, Talmy. (1983). *Topic Continuity in Discourse: Quantified Cross-language Studies*. Typological Studies in Language, 3. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Givón, Talmy. (1984). *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Givón, Talmy. (1990). *Syntax. A Functional Typological Introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Givón, Talmy. (1994). *Voice and Inversion*. Typological Studies in Language, 28. John Benjamins.

Harlow, R., Clark, R. (Eds.). (1988). *VICAL 2: Western Austronesian and contact languages: papers from the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Linguistic Society of New Zealand.

Haspelmath, Martin. (2010). Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language*, (86) 2.

Haspelmath, Martin. (2018). *How comparative concepts and descriptive linguistic categories are different*. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110607963-004

Raina, Heaton. (2017). *A Typology of Antipassives, with Special Reference to Mayan*. Diss. University of Hawai'i.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. (1980). Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56.251-299.

Jukes, Anthony. (2006). *Makassarese. A Description of an Austronesian language of South Sulawesi*. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics. The University of Melbourne.

Jukes, Anthony. (2013). Voice, valence, and focus in Makassarese. Voice variation in Austronesian languages of Indonesia, Ed. by Alexander Adelaar. NUSA 54, 67-84.

Kabupaten Enrekang dalam angka. Enrekang Regency in figures 2024. (2024). Volume 49 Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Enrekang. BPS-statistics of Enrekang Regency. https://enrekangkab.bps.go.id/en/publication/2024/02/28/cbde803825966ba0d35400d1/enrekang-regency-in-figures-2024.html

Klaiman, M. H. (1991). *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.

Lee, J.K.L. (2008). Transitivity, Valence and Voice in Mandar. *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures* 19, 55-66.

Lehmann, Winfred. (Ed.) (1978). *Syntactic Typology. Studies in the Phenomenology of Language*. University of Texas Press.

Li, Charles. (Ed.) (1976). *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press.

Mallinson, Graham and Barry J. Blake. (1981). *Language Typology*. North-Holland Linguistic Series 46. North-Holland Publishing Company.

Mead, David. (1999). *Agreement marking in Bungku-Tolaki languages: Toward an historical ac- count*. Paper presented in the Rice University Department of Linguistics Colloquium Series, 28 Jan, Houston, TX. https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/88049.

Müller, Gereon. (2004). On decomposing inflection class features: Syncretism in Russian noun inflection. In Gereon Müller, Lutz Gunkel & Gisela Zifonun (eds.), *Explorations in nominal inflection*, 189–227. De Gruyter.

Müller, Gereon, Lutz Gunkel & Gisela Zifonun (Eds.). (2004). *Explorations in nominal inflection*. De Gruyter.

Pebly, Carol J. and Thomas E. Payne. (2024). *A Grammar of Kagayanen.* Comprehensive Grammar Library 8.

Ross, Malcolm. (2002). The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice marking. In Wouk, Fay and Ross, Malcolm, (Eds.), *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*. 17-62. Pacific Linguistics.

Silverstein, Michael. (1976). Hierarchy and Features and Ergativity. In Dixon, R. M. W. (Ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages,* 112-171Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Sirk, U. (1982). *The Buginese Language*. USSR Academy of Sciences. Institute of Oriental Studies. Nauka.

Truong, Christina L. (2024). *Western Austronesian Applicative Constructions: Typological and Functional Approaches*. Diss.

Van Valin, Robert D. & Randy J. LaPolla. (1997). *Syntax: structure, meaning, and function* (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics). Cambridge University Press.

Valkama, Kari. (1987). Toraja (Kabupatens Pinrang, Enrekang, Tana Toraja, Luwu and Eastern part of Polewali Mamasa). In Friberg, T. (ed.). (1987). *UNHAS-SIL South Sulawesi Sociolinguistic Surveys 1983-1987*. Workpapers in Indonesian Languages and Cultures, 5. Summer Institute of Linguistics, 119-136.

Valkama, Kari. (1993). *Studies in Duri grammar. Person-marking, basic constituent order and grammatical relations and voice in Duri*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Helsinki.

Valkama, Susanne (1993). *Notes on Duri Transitivity*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Helsinki.

Wouk, Fay and Ross, Malcolm (Eds.) (2002). *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*. Pacific Linguistics.