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Abstract

Minangkabau is an Austronesian, Indonesian-type language spoken in West Sumatra by approximately seven million speakers. Despite its large number of speakers and the spread of Minangkabau people throughout the Indonesian Archipelago, Minangkabau remains under-described when compared to other Indonesian-type languages like Javanese. This study seeks to improve current understanding about Minangkabau by describing its system of voice alternations and verb morphology. This study presents a novel analysis of the forms and functions of voice marking in Minangkabau, incorporating naturalistic data into the analysis as well as taking the findings of recent typological and theoretical studies of Austronesian languages into consideration.

The study makes use of naturalistic, conversational and narrative data from a database maintained by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology Field Station in Padang. The study also makes use of elicited data collected in Perth and during fieldwork in Padang. Naturalistic and more formal, elicited Minangkabau data reveals different kinds of linguistic patterns, therefore this study makes a distinction between Colloquial Minangkabau and Standard Minangkabau.

The study concludes that Minangkabau has a pragmatically motivated voice system encoded by the alternation between active voice, passive voice and the pasif semu construction. In addition, the study concludes that Minangkabau also has a conceptually motivated voice system that is encoded by a series of semantic and lexical/derivational affixes (ta-, pa-, and ba-) which show how the action originates and develops. The Minangkabau applicatives -an and -i are for the most part valency changing devices but operate within both the pragmatic and conceptual domains of Minangkabau voice. The active voice marker maN- also operates in both pragmatic and conceptual domains whereas the use of the passive voice marker di- is primarily motivated by pragmatic and syntactic factors. This analysis is supported by the finding that di- is a morphosyntactic clitic whereas the conceptual voice markers are affixes and have mainly lexico-semantic properties.
The study further demonstrates that although voice marking is obligatory in Standard Minangkabau, bare verbs (i.e. verbs that are not marked for voice) are a prevalent feature of Colloquial Minangkabau. Bare verbs show that morphological underspecification is acceptable in Colloquial Minangkabau. As such, it is argued that Standard Minangkabau can be characterised as having an Indonesian-type voice system whereas Colloquial Minangkabau can be characterised as having a Sundic-type voice system. The existence of bare verbs does not entail that Minangkabau is a precategorial language and the study argues that Minangkabau has a clear lexical distinction between nouns and verbs.

This study is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the scope of the study and Chapter 2 constitutes a review of the relevant literature concerning the descriptive and theoretical issues involved in writing about Austronesian voice systems. Chapter 3 summarises the methodological concerns involved in collecting the linguistic data for this study. The major findings and the analysis and description of Minangkabau can then be found in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Chapter 4 describes the Minangkabau parts of speech and predicate construction, and also discusses some derivational morphological processes. Chapter 5 provides an analysis of the pragmatically and conceptually motivated voice systems of Minangkabau. Chapter 6 then describes the use bare verbs and addresses some of the theoretical implications of their use in Colloquial Minangkabau. Finally, concluding remarks can be found in Chapter 7.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Minangkabau: Speakers and Location

Minangkabau is an Austronesian language with approximately 7 million speakers (Gordon, 2005). It is primarily spoken around Padang and in the highlands of West Sumatra but it is also spoken throughout the Indonesian Archipelago due to the Minangkabau marantau tradition of migration (Drakard, 1999). The Minangkabau homeland borders areas where the Batak languages, Kerinci Malay and Riau Indonesian are spoken (Moussay, 1998).

There are approximately 12 recognisable dialects of Minangkabau (Gordon, 2005; Medan, n.d.) and there is some evidence that a standard form of the language exists for intergroup communication (Adnani, 1971: 4). Moussay (1998) recognises the Padang dialect as the prestige form and argues that it is used for intergroup communication throughout the Minangkabau homeland. Standard and Colloquial Indonesian are also used by Minangkabau speakers and it seems likely that contemporary speakers would also use a Colloquial Minangkabau/Indonesian koiné for intergroup communication as well (Gil, 2003).

In this dissertation, I make a distinction between Standard Minangkabau, which is comparable with the prestige form recognised by Moussay (1998), and Colloquial Minangkabau. Standard Minangkabau is used for intergroup communication, in formal contexts and in the written medium, for example in newspapers and magazines. Standard Minangkabau is similar to Standard Indonesian in terms of its syntactic structures and voice system and may also be influenced by the prescriptivist rules that inform the use of Standard Indonesian. Colloquial Minangkabau, on the other hand, is used in informal and familiar contexts and is more susceptible to dialectal variation than Standard Minangkabau. Colloquial Minangkabau can be characterised by its freer word order and the use of bare verbs (see Chapter 6).
Typologically speaking, Minangkabau can be characterised as an Indonesian-type language since its voice system resembles that of Malay/Indonesian, although Colloquial Minangkabau might be better characterised as a ‘Sundic-type’ language (see Section 2.4). Minangkabau can be genetically classified as a member of the Malayic sub-group of the Malayo-Polynesian branch of Austronesian. The Malayic sub-group also includes languages such as Jakarta Malay, Kelantan Malay, Kerinci Malay, Banjar Malay, Iban and Kendayan. Minangkabau can then be further classified as a Para-Malay language of the Malayan sub-group with its closest relatives being Duano’, Pekal, Urak Lawoi’ and Muko-Muko (Gordon, 2005). It is closely related to, although not mutually intelligible with, Malay and Bahasa Indonesia but it has a “clearly apparent character of its own” (Voorhoeve, 1955).

It is important, however, to recognise that the internal classification of the Malayic sub-group remains a contentious issue amongst historical linguists. It is therefore difficult to establish categorically which languages Minangkabau is most closely related to. Adelaar (2005a) attributes the difficulty of sub-grouping Malayic languages to lack of evidence. Where evidence is available it also often contradictory. There is also the added complexity of centuries of language contact in the region. Separating and identifying independent historical change from contact induced change becomes especially difficult considering the influence that early contact varieties of Malay, as well as contemporary standard and colloquial varieties of Malay and Indonesian, might have had on the Malayic languages (Adelaar, 2005a). Furthermore, it might be argued that, for sub-grouping at this lower level, a history recognising contact is more revealing than a definitive sub-grouping in the traditional sense.

1.2 Minangkabau: Existing Studies

Despite its large number of speakers and the spread of Minangkabau people throughout the Indonesian Archipelago, Minangkabau remains under-described when compared to other Indonesian-type languages like Javanese. Some descriptive work on the language was carried out by Dutch scholars in the 19th and early 20th centuries. This work mainly focuses on its Arabic-based orthography and the creation and implementation of a Romanised orthography (for further discussion see Voorhoeve, 1955). There are also a
number of Minangkabau word lists, dictionaries, collections of folk tales and a grammatical sketch of the language that were published during this period (cf. van der Toorn, 1899). However, the scholarship of these early Dutch works has long been surpassed by studies grounded in modern descriptive linguistics.


A number of these studies (cf. Fortin, 2001; 2004; Moussay, 1998; Williams, 1961) also examine Minangkabau voice and morphosyntax, which is the focus of this dissertation. However, a shortcoming of these works is that they rely primarily on elicited data and/or examples of formal Minangkabau for their analysis. In writing this dissertation, I have had access to naturalistic, informal and conversational Minangkabau data. The nature of this data means that I present a different and more complete picture of the nature of voice in Minangkabau than presented in previous studies (see Chapters 4, 5 and 6).

Nevertheless, the existing studies raise a number of interesting questions about Minangkabau morphology that provide a useful departure point for discussion in this dissertation. The grammatical descriptions presented by Fortin (2001; 2004) and Moussay (1998) suggest that there are two features of Minangkabau morphology that present major problems for the analysis of voice. First, many of the Minangkabau affixes are multifunctional. Second, some of the affixes are difficult to distinguish since they have an overlapping distribution and/or function in a similar semantic domain.
To illustrate the multifunctionality of Minangkabau morphology, consider Moussay’s (1998: 254-56) analysis of the Minangkabau prefix *ba-*. Moussay argues that it can be used to form intransitive verbs with a number of different functions, including a *referential* function, an *existential* function and a *reflexive* function. He also claims that the *ba-* prefix can combine with an active intransitive root to form a transitive verb which shows a *habitual* meaning. Unfortunately Moussay does not provide a unified analysis for the *ba-* prefix nor does he argue why he has presented a multifunctional analysis of the prefix (as opposed to an analysis which treats each use of *ba-* as a different morpheme).

Many other verbal affixes in Minangkabau can be analysed as multifunctional. The analysis of the distribution of the various functions of an affix, as well as the motivations behind their selection, impacts directly on how we understand voice and morphosyntax. In this dissertation I discuss the multifunctional uses of *ba-* as well as other affixes including *ta-, pa-,* and *maN-*. Based on Shibatani’s (2006) “evolution of action” framework for understanding voice phenomena, I also seek to provide a unified description of each of these affixes so that their role in Minangkabau’s voice system is made clear (see Chapter 5).

Now let us examine an example of two Minangkabau morphemes with an overlapping distribution. Examples (1) and (2) show the uses of the two applicatives *-an* and *-i*. Fortin (2001) argues that *-an* and *-i* function primarily as valency changing devices and this is reflected by her glossing of the morphemes as *APP*, ‘applicative’. Fortin’s translation makes it clear that the applicatives cause significant shifts in meaning to the root *garam*, ‘salt’, and her analysis also reveals that the *-an* applicative has a causative meaning whereas the *-i* applicative adds a locative NP to the core argument structure of the verb.

---

1 Fortin’s (2001) Minangkabau consultant uses *-kan*, which is a prestige variant of *-an* and possibly a calque of the cognate Standard Indonesian applicative *-kan.*
(1)  *Ambo manggaramkan ayia lawik.*

ambo  maN-garam-kan ayia lawik
1sg    TRANS-salt-APP water sea

‘I make the sea water become salt.’

(adapted from Fortin, 2001: 44)

(2)  *Ambo manggarami makanan.*

ambo  maN-garam-i makan-an
1sg    TRANS-salt-APP eat-NOM

‘I salt the food.’

(adapted from Fortin, 2001: 44)

I agree with Fortin that -an and -i are both applicatives and that they operate primarily as valency changing devices. My analysis also reveals that -an and -i function to show the termination point of an action. The difference is that -i is a locative applicative, i.e. it shows that the termination point of the action is a location, whereas -an marks undergoers, recipients and benefactors as the end points of the action (see Chapter 5).

To illustrate this point, note that in (1) *ayia lawik*, ‘sea water’, is an undergoer, whereas in (2), *makanan*, ‘food’, is a location.

Similarly, *di-* and *ba-* also have an overlapping distribution in Minangkabau, as demonstrated by examples (3) and (4).

(3)  *Barang ko dibao* *k dari kam* *puang.*

Barang ko di-bao* k dari kam* puang.
thing DEM PASS-carry from village

‘Those things were carried from the village.’

(adapted from Fortin, 2001: 24)

(4)  *Barang ko babaok dari kam* *puang.*

Barang ko ba-bao* k dari kam* puang.
thing DEM ACT-carry from village

‘Those things were carried from the village.’

(adapted from Fortin, 2001: 24)

---

2 It is noted below each example whether it is obtained by elicitation or from some other source. Examples from the MPI EVA Padang Field Station Minangkabau Corpus are referenced by their Text ID number. Glossing conventions and explanation of the abbreviations used in examples can be found in Appendix 1.
Fortin (2001) gives the morphemes *ba-* and *di-* a different gloss but her English translations do not reflect this distinction. Clearly, the two morphemes represent a semantic distinction that is not available in English. I argue instead that *di-* is a passive voice marker whereas *ba-* is used to mark the middle voice. This analysis adequately explains the semantic differences between *di-* and *ba-* and does not conflict with my analysis of other verb morphology within Shibatani’s (2006) “evolution of action” framework (see Chapter 5).

1.3 Examination of Minangkabau Voice and Morphosyntax in this Study

The examination of Minangkabau voice and morphosyntax in this study aims to contribute some answers to questions raised in previous studies of Minangkabau as well as to overcome some of the shortfalls of previous studies. I present a novel analysis of the form and function of voice in Minangkabau, incorporating naturalistic data into the analysis. My analysis of Minangkabau voice and morphosyntax also takes the findings of recent typological and theoretical studies of Austronesian languages into consideration.

My analysis of the Minangkabau voice system can be found in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. The major findings presented in these chapters are listed below:

1. Standard Minangkabau voice can be characterised as an Indonesian-type system whereas Colloquial Minangkabau voice is more effectively characterised as a Sundic-type system.

2. Minangkabau voice morphology can be usefully described in terms of Shibatani’s (2006) “evolution of action” framework for analysing voice phenomena. This is summarised in Table 1.
Table 1. Voice and the “evolution of action” in Minangkabau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHICH PART OF THE “EVOLUTION OF ACTION”?</th>
<th>VOICE MARKER</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. ORIGIN OF ACTION</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td>Involuntary, superlative &amp; ability predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pa-</td>
<td>Causative voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. DEVELOPMENT OF ACTION</td>
<td>maN-</td>
<td>Active voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>Middle voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. TERMINATION OF ACTION</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>Applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>Locative applicative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The passive voice marker di- is a clitic. Its primary function is syntactic, whereas other Minangkabau voice markers function primarily in the semantic and lexical/derivational domain.

4. Naturalistic, conversational and informal data reveal that bare verbs (i.e. verbs that are not marked for voice) are a prevalent feature of Colloquial Minangkabau.

5. Bare verbs show that morphological underspecification is acceptable in Colloquial Minangkabau.

6. The existence of bare verbs does not entail that Minangkabau is a precategorial language. In fact, Minangkabau has a clear lexical distinction between nouns and verbs.
Chapter 2. Literature Review : Voice in Austronesian Languages

2.0 Introduction

The rich systems of verbal morphology evident in many Austronesian languages are one of the most striking and unusual features of the language family. This chapter will examine some existing studies of the verb morphology and voice systems of some of these languages. The chapter will begin with a description of voice in Philippine-type languages and will then outline the features of the Indonesian-type voice system, the unusual Acehnese-type voice system, and the basic ‘Sundic-type’ voice system (cf. Gil, 2008).

There are a number of recurrent theoretical issues that emerge in descriptions of Austronesian voice systems. First, descriptions of Austronesian voice systems are primarily concerned with how semantic roles are mapped to grammatical function and thus how grammatical relations are organised in these languages. As this chapter will demonstrate, Philippine-type languages make a clear distinction between pivot and non-pivot grammatical functions, whereas languages such as Acehnese, and the Sundic-type language Riau Indonesian, are pivotless languages.

A second theoretical issue that emerges from studies of Austronesian voice systems is the role that discourse/pragmatics plays in grammatical organisation. Studies have shown that the relative topicality of participants in a clause is the primary motivator for the choice of one voice construction over another in both Indonesian-type languages and Philippine-type languages (cf. Cooreman, Fox and Givon, 1984; Cumming and Wouk, 1987; Du Bois, 1987; Hopper, 1979; Payne, 1982; Rafferty, 1982; Schachter, 1977; 2002; Wouk, 1989; 1996; 1999; 2004a).

Other linguists argue that voice is a semantic and conceptual phenomenon. For example, Gil (2002a) argues that the voice opposition between N- and di- in Riau Indonesian is used to show the relative conceptual saliency of the agent or patient participant rather than to encode any grammatical distinctions. Similarly, Croft (1994)
and Shibatani (2006) claim that voice can encode an ‘event view’ distinction, that is voice can highlight a particular stage in the action encoded by the verb, whether this be the inception, development or termination of the action (see Chapter 5). Some Austronesian voice markers also have aspectual qualities which may be linked with their role in showing semantic and conceptual notions (cf. Himmelmann, 2006a; Hopper, 1979; Rafferty, 1982; Soh and Nomoto, 2008; Son and Cole, 2008).

The discussion of Austronesian voice and verb morphology in this chapter aims to contextualise the study of Minangkabau presented in this dissertation as well as to provide a theoretical framework for examining voice phenomena in Minangkabau. It also aims to support my characterisation of Minangkabau as a language that possesses features of both a pragmatically motivated voice system and a voice system that is used to encode conceptual properties of events.

2.1 Philippine-type Voice

In Philippine-type languages the discourse notion of ‘topic’ has been grammaticalised. This means that the most topical participant in a given utterance has control over morphological marking of the verb (i.e. the voice of the verb) as well as the syntactic organisation of the clause (Schachter and Otanes, 1972; Schachter, 1976; 1977). Foley and Van Valin (1985; 1984) refer to the kind of grammatical function that the topic performs in Philippine-type language as the ‘pivot’. Their term ‘pivot’ also refers to the kind of grammatical function that the subject in English performs. The pivot is the participant that occupies the highest position in terms of grammatical relations. It dictates morphological ‘agreement’ or marking on the verb, as well having control over some elements of clausal syntax. The pivot is also highly referential and typically definite.

The pivot is a useful concept for talking about grammatical relations in Philippine-type languages because its grammatical functions are not adequately characterised by a universal definition of ‘subject’ (cf. Keenan, 1976). Schachter (1976; 1977) argues that subjects have both reference related properties, i.e. the subject is typically the most referentially salient participant in the clause and it thus has control over the syntactic
organisation of the clause, and role related properties, i.e. subjects are typically actors and the semantic controllers or instigators of events. According to Schachter (1976; 1977), in Philippine-type languages, there is a division of these role and reference related properties of subjects between the actor and the pivot. The reference related properties of subjects, such as the ability to be relativised and to launch floating quantifiers, correspond most closely to the function of the pivot, whereas the role related properties are performed by the actor participant, whether the actor is aligned with the pivot function or not (see below).

Foley and Van Valin (1985; 1984) argue that voice in Philippine-type languages constitutes a realignment between the grammatical function of pivot and semantic role. This means that voice marking on the verb changes according to the semantic role of the participant that is selected to be the pivot. Philippine-type languages are conservative (when compared to Indonesian-type languages) and have rich voice systems that allow for a range of different participant types to be selected as pivot (Ross, 2002).

Tagalog is described as having four voices, as example (5) demonstrates.

(5) a. **Mag-salis** **ang babae ng bigas sa sako para sa bata.**
   ACT:TOP:will-take-out TOP woman GOAL rice DIR:sack BENF child
   ‘The woman will take some rice out of a/the sack for a/the child.’

b. **Aalisin** **ng babae ang bigas sa sako para sa bata.**
   GOAL:TOP:will-take-out ACT woman TOP rice DIR:sack BENF child
   ‘A/the woman will take the rice out of a/the sack for a/the child.’

c. **Aalisan** **ng babae ng bigasang sako para sa bata.**
   DIR:TOP:will-take-out ACT woman GOAL rice TOP sack BENF child
   ‘A/the woman will take some rice out of the sack for a/the child.’

d. **Ipag-salis** **ng babae ng bigas sa sako ang bata.**
   BENF:TOP:will-take-out ACT woman GOAL rice DIR:sack TOP child
   ‘A/the woman will take some rice out of a/the sack for the child.’

(adapted from Schachter, 1976: 494-95)

In (5a), the verb is marked for active voice. This means that the participant that holds the actor semantic role, in this case *babae*, ‘woman’, is topical and has therefore been assigned pivot status. This is evidenced not only by the morphological marking on the
verb but also by the fact that *babae*, ‘woman’, is marked by the article *ang*, which denotes pivot status. The other participants in the clause are marked by articles that show their semantic role; for example the benefactor *bata*, ‘child’, is marked by the benefactive composite *para sa* and so on.

Sentences (5b), (5c) and (5d) show the three other Tagalog voice types. In (5b) the verb is marked for goal voice, meaning that the goal *bigas*, ‘rice’, is the pivot. In (5c) the direction is the pivot therefore the verb is marked for locative voice, and in (5d) the benefactor is pivot therefore the verb is marked for benefactive voice.

An additional typologically salient feature of Philippine-type voice systems is that they are symmetrical (Foley, 1998; Himmelmann, 2005; 2008). This means that no single voice is basic or ‘underlying’, nor can any voice be directly derived from another voice. Philippine-type voice systems are also symmetrical in the sense that voice marking does not encode a change in valency of the verb root (Ross, 2002). Foley (1998) argues that the symmetry of Philippine-type voice systems has a number of implications for how we ought to understand the grammar of Philippine-type languages. First, since no single voice type is basic, this implies that a verb’s argument structure is realised as a result of voice affixation and is therefore not specified in the lexicon. Second, since argument structure is not specified in the lexicon, then there can be no underlying lexical distinction made between nouns and verbs (see Chapter 6). Thus, voice marking in Philippine-type languages also has a verbal derivational function.

### 2.2 Indonesian-type Voice

Like Philippine-type languages, Indonesian-type languages have symmetrical voice systems that mark the realignment of the pivot function with semantic role (1985; Foley and Van Valin, 1984; Himmelmann, 2005). However, unlike Philippine-type languages, which allow for a range of participant types to be assigned pivot status, in Indonesian-type languages voice alternation centres around the alignment of the pivot function with either the actor or the undergoer (cf. Klamer, 1996). If the actor is selected as the pivot then the verb is marked for active voice, however if the undergoer is selected as the pivot then the verb is marked for passive voice.
In Indonesian-type languages active voice is marked on the verb by a prefix that contains a final homorganic nasal $N$. Ross (2002: 54) argues that $maN$- is the most conservative form of the active voice prefix in Malayic languages and suggests that the prefix is an innovation, replacing *um- which marked actor pivot constructions in Proto Austronesian. Minangkabau marks active voice using the conservative form of the prefix $maN$-, whereas Standard Malay/Indonesian makes use of the cognate form $meN$-. Some more innovative Indonesian-type languages, such as non-standard varieties of Malay/Indonesian, have retained only the homorganic nasal part of the active voice prefix. A typical Indonesian-type active voice construction will not only have voice marking on the verb, but the actor will also occupy pre-verbal position and if the verb is transitive, the undergoer will follow the verb.

In most Indonesian-type languages passive voice is marked on the verb by an oral prefix (i.e. a prefix with an initial oral, as opposed to nasal, stop) or a pronominal cliticised form of the agent (Ross, 2002: 54-56). In some other Indonesian-type languages the passive voice verb is unmarked. In an Indonesian-type passive voice clause the undergoer typically occupies pre-verbal position because it is the pivot. If the actor is not cliticised to the verb then it appears in post-verbal position.

Indonesian-type languages include standard and non-standard varieties of Malay and Indonesian, as well as the Malayic languages of Indonesia. The Malayic languages are mainly contained to Western Indonesia, including Sumatra, Java, Bali and parts of Borneo. The languages of Eastern Indonesia, which includes Sulawesi, the islands of Nusa Tenggara as well as parts of Borneo, have voice morphology that is more similar typologically to Philippine-type languages (Himmelmann, 2002; Ross, 2002). Minangkabau, the focus of this study is also an Indonesian-type language since it shows an alternation between active and passive voice. Active voice is marked by the prefix $maN$- whereas passive voice is marked by the clitic $di$-. However, the “associative” nature of Colloquial Minangkabau lends itself more towards a ‘Sundic-type’ classification (see Section 2.4, Chapter 5, Chapter 6).
One of the most widely researched Indonesian-type languages is Standard Indonesian. As well as having the standard symmetrical active voice and passive voice constructions characteristic of Indonesian-type languages, Standard Indonesian also has an asymmetric passive construction and a *pasif semu* construction in which the undergoer is selected as the pivot (see Table 5 in Section 2.4 for a summary of the Standard Indonesian voices).

In Standard Indonesian, active voice is marked on the verb by the prefix *meN*- . In an active voice construction the actor functions as the pivot and occupies pre-verbal position. If the verb is transitive then any other non-pivot arguments of the predicate come after the verb. In a passive voice construction pivot status is assigned to the undergoer and the verb is marked by *di*- . The undergoer appears in pre-verbal position and the actor appears after the verb (Arka and Manning, 2008).

Example (6) illustrates the form of symmetrical active and passive voice in Standard Indonesian. In (6a) the actor *Sul* is the pivot and the verb is marked by the active voice prefix *meN*- . In (6b) the pivot function is aligned with the undergoer *Ali* . For this reason *Ali* is in pre-verbal position and the verb is marked for passive voice by *di*- . The actor *Sul* is consequently in post-verbal position.

   Sul AV-hit Ali
   ‘Sul hit Ali’

b. *Ali dipukul Sul.*
   Ali PV-hit Sul
   ‘Ali was hit by Sul.’

c. *Ali dipukul oleh Sul.*
   Ali PV-hit by Sul
   ‘Ali was hit by Sul.’

(Elicitation)

To understand the form and function of Standard Indonesian’s other two voice types it is necessary to recognise the concept of a core argument and a non-core argument. Using Foley and Van Valin’s (1984: 79) terminology, a core argument is licensed by the verb’s argument structure and has a privileged syntactic status. This means that it is
available to undergo a range of syntactic operations, including being selected as the pivot. A non-core argument, on the other hand, is “peripheral” in the sense that it is not as syntactically ‘available’ as a core argument. Non-core arguments are typically adjunct-like and their non-core status is often marked by the presence of adpositions (Arka, 2003b).

So, in contrast to the symmetric passive construction, in Standard Indonesian’s asymmetric passive, the actor argument is syntactically demoted and given non-core status (Arka, 2003b; Cole, Hermon and Yanti, 2007). This is marked by the presence of the agentive/causal preposition *oleh*. An example of this can be seen in (6c) where the actor *Sul* has been given non-core status and is thus preceded by the preposition *oleh*.

However, in the *pasif semu*, also referred to as the ‘pseudo passive’, the object voice, or passive type two (hereafter the P2 construction), both actor and undergoer are retained as core arguments (Arka and Manning, 2008; Musgrave, 2000). In the P2 construction, the undergoer is selected as the pivot (cf. Chung, 1976a) and precedes the verb. The P2 verb is not marked for voice but hosts a pronominal proclitic coding the actor. The sentence in (7) shows an example of a P2 construction. In this example notice that the undergoer *buku ini*, ‘this book’, is the pivot and thus precedes the verb, *baca*, ‘read’. The first person actor, *ku*, then appears as a proclitic on the verb.

(7)  
\[ \text{Buku ini sudah ku=baca.} \]  
\[ \text{book DEM:prox PFCT 1sg=read} \]  
\[ 'I have read this book.' \]  
\[ \text{(adapted from Sneddon, 1996: 249)} \]

Since the actor and the undergoer are retained as core arguments in both the symmetrical *di-* passive and the *pasif semu*, what is the motivation to chose one construction over the other? Sneddon (1996) argues that the P2 is the preferred passive for first and second person pronominal actors because they are ungrammatical in a *di-* passive. However, as has been pointed out by Chung (1976a) and Wouk (1989), in more informal contexts, and in regional and non-standard varieties of Indonesian, first and second person actors are quite acceptable in *di-* passives.
Non-standard and Colloquial varieties of Indonesian also have voice oppositions that are similar in form to the Standard Indonesian voice oppositions discussed above, except that they also encode discourse/pragmatic and conceptual distinctions.

One variety of Colloquial Indonesian, Spoken Jakarta Indonesian (hereafter SJI), has a number of verbal affixes that correspond closely in form and function to the set of verbal affixes used to mark voice in Standard Indonesian. These affixes are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. *Spoken Jakarta Indonesian Verbal Affixes.*

(Wouk, 1989: 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SJI AFFIXES</th>
<th>STANDARD INDONESIAN AFFIXES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>meN-, N-, Ø-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE</td>
<td>di-, Ø-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2 shows, in SJI, many verbs that would require voice morphology in Standard Indonesian are left bare. Another formal difference between the two varieties is that the Standard Indonesian active voice marker meN- is often replaced with a simple nasal form N-. The SJI voice markers N- and di- encode an active and passive voice distinction like their cognate Standard Indonesian counterparts.

Wouk (1989; 1996; 2004a) argues that the use of N- and di- is also determined by discourse/pragmatic factors such as discourse transitivity, as well as topicality and thematicity. Her analysis draws on Hopper and Thompson’s (1980) Transitivity Hypothesis, which works on the grounds that a clause can be assigned a level of transitivity on a continuum ranging from high to low transitivity. The level of transitivity is assigned according to the Transitivity Schema, which is presented in Table 3.

---

3 A similar phenomenon also occurs in Colloquial Minangkabau (see Chapter 6).
Table 3. Transitivity Schema.

(Hopper and Thompson, 1980: 252)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>HIGH TRANSITIVITY</strong></th>
<th><strong>LOW TRANSITIVITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PARTICIPANTS</td>
<td>2 + participants (A and O)</td>
<td>1 participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. KINESIS</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>non-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ASPECT</td>
<td>telic</td>
<td>atelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. PUNCTUALITY</td>
<td>punctual</td>
<td>non-punctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. VOLITIONALITY</td>
<td>volitional</td>
<td>non-volitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. AFFIRMATION</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. MODE</td>
<td>realis</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. AGENCY</td>
<td>A high in potency</td>
<td>A low in potency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. AFFECTEDNESS OF O</td>
<td>O totally affected</td>
<td>O not affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. INDIVIDUATION OF O</td>
<td>O highly individuated (e.g.: concrete, referential, definite, count, animate)</td>
<td>O non-individuated (e.g.: abstract, non-referential, mass, inanimate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Transitivity Schema works on a comparative scalar system so that not all criteria need to be satisfied in order for a clause to be transitive. If a clause satisfies more conditions of low transitivity than high transitivity, then that clause will be seen as being low in discourse transitivity. Even if a clause has only one participant, it can satisfy more transitivity conditions than a clause with two participants if the conditions B to H are high in transitivity (Hopper and Thompson, 1980: 254). The Transitivity Hypothesis then predicts that if two clauses show a difference in transitivity (i.e. one is high in discourse transitivity whereas the other is low in discourse transitivity) and that if one clause is grammatically marked in some way, then the difference in transitivity will be encoded by that marked grammatical construction (Hopper and Thompson, 1980: 255).

In Wouk’s (1989; 1996; 2004a) study of SJI, she found that verbs marked by the active voice marker N- were more frequently found in clauses that were low in discourse transitivity whereas verbs marked by the passive voice marker di- were more frequently found in clauses that were high in transitivity. Clauses with N- marked verbs were irrealis, stative, off the timeline of the main narrative events, and more likely to have non-referential patients. Clauses with di- marked verbs, on the other hand, were
indicative, eventive, and on the timeline of the main narrative events. These clauses were also more likely to have referential patients that were individuated, animate, and that had continuous mention throughout the text (Wouk, 1989: 132-40).

However, the transitivity factors alone are not enough to predict the choice of N- and di- in SJI. So, Wouk (1989: 233-34; 1996: 366; 2004a) argues that the relative saliency of actor and patient arguments “as mediated through theme and topic” also motivates the choice of voice morphology. As Wouk (1996: 381) defines it, a “theme” is a “referent that is the focus of attention”. It is a referent that has a high frequency of mentions throughout a text and is most often a pronoun or zero anaphora. A topic, on the other hand, is essentially “what a text or segment of text is about. [It] need not be an individual entity; it may also be a class or concept”. Topics can be identified by continuity of mention (Wouk, 1996: 382). So di- clauses are used when the patient participant is thematic and/or topical, and N- clauses are used when the actor participant is thematic and/or topical.

For example, consider the SJI dialogue presented in (8). The choice of the passive voice marker di- in A1, A2 and A4 is triggered by the thematicity and topicality of the patient participant. The thematic referent, i.e. the patient, is the person telling the story, participant A, who is recounting meeting her new boyfriend’s parents. The patient is not overtly expressed in A’s first and second utterances but it is understood to refer to the speaker and to be thematic. Notice that the verbs dianggap, ‘consider’, and dikenal-kenalin, ‘introduce’, are marked for passive voice by di-. This is because even though it is not overtly expressed, the patient is the most referentially salient participant.

(8)  
A1: *Heeh, udah dianggap anak nih.*
   uhuh, already DI-consider child this 
   ‘uhuh, they consider (me) their child.’

   B1: *Oh ya.*

A2: *Udah dikenal-kenalin ke keluarganya.*
   already DI-know-in to family-GEN 
   ‘They’ve introduced (me) to their family.’

   B2: *Hm.*
A3: _Itu saudaranya Okki, Okki peragawati._
    
    ‘One of their relatives is Okki, Okki the fashion model.’

B3: _Oh Okki, Okki._

A4: _Hm hm saya dibawa udah dibawa ke situ,
    hm hm I DI-bring already di-bring to there
    ‘Uuhh, they brought me there.’

(adapted from Wouk, 1989: 188)

After the mention of _Okki_, in A’s forth utterance, the speaker is explicitly reintroduced into the discourse again, this time in the form of the first person pronoun _saya_. In A4, _saya_ is encoded as a patient and the verb _dibawa_, ‘bring’, is marked for passive voice. As a topic, _saya_ satisfies the continuity of mention criterion and _saya_ is also “inherently and situationally thematic” because it refers to the storyteller and is therefore the most referentially salient participant (Wouk, 1989: 187-88).

Wouk’s (1989; 1996; 2004a) characterisation of SJI focuses on the discourse/pragmatic factors involved in voice alternation. However, voice alternation in Indonesian-type languages has also been shown to correlate with semantic and conceptual factors such as aspect (Hopper, 1979; Rafferty, 1982; Soh and Nomoto, 2008). For example, Rafferty (1982) argues that voice morphology in Chindo, a non-standard variety of Indonesian spoken by ethnically Chinese Indonesians in Malang, East Java, encodes an aspectual distinction.

The variety of Chindo that Rafferty examined has a nasal prefix _N_- , which is cognate with the Standard Indonesian active voice marker _meN_- and is used to mark verbs with active aktionsart. Chindo also has a _di_- prefix cognate with Standard Indonesian _di_- . Rafferty (1982: 25-30) argues that although the _N_- and _di_- are thought to encode an active and passive voice distinction in the traditional literature, in Chindo, _N_- is a marker of imperfective aspect and _di_- is a marker of perfective aspect.

Example (9) shows an example of an _N_- verb, _mbalek_, ‘return’. Rafferty argues (1982: 44) that the verb in this example is imperfect because the activity of returning the motorbike is happening simultaneously with the conversation about where the employee
had gone. Contrastively, example (10) shows the use of the di- verbs *ditumbok*, ‘mash’, and *diminum*, ‘drink’. According to Rafferty (1982: 46), in this example the verbs refer to “real (past, present or future) events” and that the *di*- prefix therefore encodes perfective aspect.

(9) *Pas amblas barangkalimbalekno hondae.*
exact disappear perhaps N-return-3sg Honda-that
‘(He’s) completely disappeared, (he’s) probably returning a/the motorbike.’

(Rafferty, 1982: 44)

(10) *Suru ditumbok sebelume pagi, sebelume makan itu diminum.*
ask di-mash before-it morning, before-it eat that di-drink
‘(She) told me to mash (it), and in the morning, before eating, to drink (it).’

(Rafferty, 1982: 46)

Hopper (1979) has also argued that the Indonesian-type language Early Modern Malay had a distinction between imperfective and perfective clauses. However, he argues that the aspectual distinctions are a result of some clauses being foregrounding, i.e. they are central to the development of the narrative and are perfective, and some clauses being backgrounding, i.e. they provide information that supports, but is not central to, the main events of the narrative and are imperfective. He found that in Early Modern Malay the voice markers *meN-* and *di-*, which are cognate with Standard Indonesian *meN-* and *di-*, as well as Chindo *N-* and *di-*, are associated with backgrounding and foregrounding clauses respectively and the aspectual properties of these clauses are a ‘by-product’ of the voice markers. That is to say, that perfectivity and imperfectivity are not encoded by the voice markers, rather these aspectual notions are associated with the voice markers due to their propensity to appear in either foregrounding or backgrounding clauses.

Interestingly, Davies’ (2005) study of Madurese, which is an Indonesian-type language spoken in Madura and East Java, suggests that the active and passive voice markers in this language are also used to encode a foregrounding/backgrounding distinction and are associated with an aspectual distinction. Davies (2005: 213) found that in Madurese, foregrounding clauses were more likely to occur in passive voice, which he refers to as “object voice” and which is marked by the prefix *e*-; Backgrounding clauses, on the other hand, were more likely to occur in the active voice, which is marked by a
homorganic nasal prefix *N*- Foregrounding clauses were also more likely to be perfective, and backgrounding clauses to be imperfective. He argues then that *e*- and *N*- are associated with this aspectual distinction not categorically, but by virtue of their appearance in foregrounding and backgrounding clauses respectively.

Examples (11) and (12) come from a recounting of the folk tale *Bang Mera so Bang Pote*, ‘Onion and Garlic’, which tells of the fate of two sisters named Onion and Garlic. In (11) we see an example of active voice used in a clause containing background information. In (12) we see use of the “object voice” in a foreground clause used to describe an “action that moves the story forward” (Davies, 2005: 213).

(11) *Reng lagelle’ ngrabadi Bang Pote.*
    person male previous AV-care-APP Garlic
    ‘The man took care of Garlic.’
    (Davies, 2005: 213)

(12) *Samper gelle’ etabang bi’ Bang Pote.*
    cloth previous OV-search with Garlic
    ‘Garlic searched for the cloth.’
    (Davies, 2005: 213)

From this discussion about Indonesian-type languages it should be clear that although voice constructions in these languages are similar both morphologically and syntactically, that Indonesian-type voice systems also have discourse/pragmatic, semantic and conceptual features in common. These features include the fact that the choice of voice morphology is dictated by the thematicity and/or topicality of the participants in the clause and that active voice is associated with backgrounding clauses and imperfective aspect whereas passive voice is typically associated with foregrounding clauses and perfective aspect. As it will be shown in Chapter 5, these discourse/pragmatic and conceptual properties also play a role in the Minangkabau voice system.
2.3 Acehnese-type Voice

Acehnese is spoken in the northernmost tip of Sumatra, in Aceh province. Although it shares some typological characteristics with the Malayic languages that are spoken in surrounding areas, Acehnese is a Chamic language and therefore displays characteristics that are distinct in comparison to Malayic languages (Adelaar, 2005a: 17). Most importantly, Acehnese is a pivotless language, and therefore it does not display the kind of verbal voice marking that is characteristic of Philippine-type and Indonesian-type languages (Durie, 1985a; Foley and Van Valin, 1984: 120).

Acehnese has a system of pronominal marking on its verbs which cross-references the agent and undergoer arguments. Pronominal proclitics are always co-referential with the agent argument whereas pronominal enclitics are always co-referential with the undergoer argument. In Acehnese, grammatical relations are not affected by the split between intransitive and transitive clause types, instead they depend on this distinction between the roles of agent and undergoer. Thus both intransitive and transitive verbs are marked in the same way depending on whether they are agent oriented or undergoer oriented (Durie, 1985a).

Some Acehnese examples that demonstrate this pronominal clitic cross-referencing can be found in (13), (14) and (15).

(13) \[ Lôn \text{ teungöh}=lôn=jak. \]
\[ I \text{ middle}=1=go \]
\[ ‘I am going/walking.’ \]

(Durie, 1985a: 55)

(14) \[ Gopnyan \text{ galak}=geuh \text{ that.} \]
\[ he \text{ happy}=3 \text{ very} \]
\[ ‘He is very happy.’ \]

(Durie, 1985a: 56)
Example (13) shows a clause with an intransitive, agent oriented verb *jak*, ‘go’. In this example, the first person pronoun *lôn* is the agent, therefore the verb is marked by the first person agent proclitic *lôn*. Example (14), on the other hand shows an example of an intransitive, undergoer oriented verb *galak*, ‘happy’. Since the undergoer *gopnyan*, ‘he’, is in the third person, the verb is thus marked by the third person undergoer enclitic *geuh*.

In example (15), the transitive verb *poh*, ‘hit’, is used. Notice that the verb is marked by both the proclitic *ji*, which is co-referential with the (null) agent, and the enclitic *geuh*, which is coreferential with the undergoer, *gopnyan*, ‘he’. In Acehnese transitive verbs, the agents are compulsorily referenced by proclitics whereas undergoers are only optionally referenced by enclitics. The presence of undergoer enclitics implies that the undergoer is topical therefore it is rare to have a undergoer cross-referencing on the verb if the agent is topical (Durie, 1985a: 201-06). In example (15) the undergoer is indeed topical since the agent is not overtly expressed. Notice also that the undergoer appears before the verb. The ability to appear in pre-verbal position is a property of Core Topics in Acehnese (see below).

Since both active and stative verbs can be either agent oriented or undergoer oriented, Durie (1985a) argues that the split between agent oriented verbs and undergoer oriented verbs is instead defined according to the semantic notions of control and de-control. If a verb takes an agent, the ultimate initiator of the event, it is a controlled verb, whereas if a verb takes an undergoer, the participant that is ultimately affected by the event, then it is a de-controlled verb (Durie, 1985a: 55-56). Table 4 shows some examples of agent oriented (i.e. controlled) verbs and undergoer oriented (i.e. de-controlled) verbs. Notice that both the controlled and de-controlled categories include verbs which are semantically active and verbs which are semantically stative.
Acehnese also has two verbal affixes, *meu-* and *teu-* that can alter the level of control implied by the semantics of the verb root. The prefix *meu-* can change a de-controlled verb root into a controlled verb. Example (16) illustrates this with the verb root *gota*, ‘good’. This verb root is a de-controlled stative verb, however the addition of the *meu*-prefix derives the controlled verb *meugöt*, ‘make up’. As a result, the verb now licenses an agent argument, the first person pronoun *lôn*, and the verb is accordingly marked by the co-referential first person agent proclitic *lôn*.

(16) Lôn ka=lôn=meu-göt ngön=jih.
    I IN=1=INTR-good with=he
    ‘I have made it up with him.’

    (Durie, 1985a: 91)

The prefix *teu-* conversely, can add the element of de-control to a controlled verb root. Example (17) shows how the two de-controlled verbs *teujak* and *teudöng* have been derived from the controlled roots *jak*, ‘go’, and *döng*, ‘stand’, with the use of *teu-. The meaning implied here is that the agent *jih*, ‘he’, appears as though he has lost his mind and therefore does not have control over his movements.

(17) Jih teu=jak teu=döng lagee=ureung=gadöh=tuwah.
    he DC=go DC=stand manner=person=lost=mind
    ‘He is wandering about stopping and starting as though out of his mind.’

    (Durie, 1985a: 73)
Example (18) provides another example of how the *teu-* prefix is used.

(18) a.  
\[ Beu=neu=inga\text{t} \text{ keu } lôn. \]
HORT=2=remember to I
'Remember me!'

b.  
\[ Gopnyan \text{ } k\text{'a} \text{ } h'an \text{ } teu=ingat=geuh \text{ keu } lôn. \]
\begin{list}{}{\itemize}
\item he already not DC=remember=3 to I
\end{list}
'He does not (cannot) remember me.'

(Durie, 1985b: 49)

In (18a), notice that the verb *ingat*, 'remember', is marked by the second person agent proclitic *neu*, which is coreferential with the addressee. This is because the addressee is in 'control' over the act of remembering. However, in (18b) the act of remembering has been de-controlled due to the addition of the *teu-* prefix on the verb. Notice also that the de-controlled verb in (18b) is now undergoer oriented and is therefore marked by an undergoer enclitic, *geuh*, which is co-referential with the undergoer *gopnyan* (Durie, 1985b: 49).

The pronominal proclitic marking on Acehnese verbs is remarkable, not just because of the semantic distinctions about control and de-control that it entails, but because it does not encode grammatical relations or a voice distinction in the way that verbal marking does in Philippine and Indonesian-type languages. Acehnese is a pivotless language, which means that no one argument has a more privileged syntactic status than another. Agents and undergoers have control over various different constructions, for example only agents can be the addressees of imperatives, but this is based on the semantic qualities of the two argument types rather than any syntactic differences. Syntactic tests used to identify pivots also prove unsuccessful in Acehnese since the language has “no switch reference marking; any argument can be ellipsed in context; there is no syntactic passive or anti-passive to promote or demote arguments to or from a privileged syntactic status; there are no raising phenomena [...] ; both agents and undergoers can be relativised in the same way; [and] there are no syntactic dummies” (Durie, 1985a: 190).

However, Durie (1985a: 180) does make a distinction between ‘Core Roles’ and ‘non-Core Roles’ in Acehnese. He argues that a Core Role is a participant licensed by the
verb’s argument structure that is syntactically ‘available’. Core Roles are more syntactically privileged than adjunct NPs, which can be identified by prepositional marking. Only agents, undergoers and datives can be Core Roles.

Durie (1985a: 191) also argues for the existence of a ‘Core Topic’. The Core Topic has a similar pragmatic function to the English subject in that it is refers to a referentially salient participant. However, unlike the English subject, no participant is underlyingly selected as the Core Topic therefore any one of the Core Roles in a clause may be selected. Also unlike the English subject, Core Topics are not obligatory therefore it is possible for clauses to have no overt Core Topic.

Core Topics have a syntactic effect in that the Core Topic must occupy pre-verbal position. However, the selection of agent or undergoer as Core Topic has no effect on pronominal clitic marking on the verb except that it is rare for there to be undergoer cross-referencing on the verb if the agent is selected as the Core Topic (see example (15)). When the undergoer is selected as the Core Topic, the agent argument occurs in post-verbal position and is marked by the preposition lé (Durie, 1988). An example of this construction can be found in (19).

(19) a. *Gopnyan* ka *geu=côm* lôn.
she already 3-kiss I
‘She (already) kissed me.’

b. *Lôn* ka *geu=côm* lé *gopnyan*.
I already 3=kiss by she
‘I’ve (already) been kissed by her.’

(adapted from Lawler, 1977: 225)

In (19a) the agent, *gopnyan*, ‘she’, is the Core Topic and is therefore in pre-verbal position. In (19b), however, the undergoer has been selected as the Core Topic. This has resulted in no difference in the pronominal clitic marking on the verb but the undergoer, *lôn*, is now in pre-verbal position and the agent appears in post-verbal position marked by the *lé* preposition.
Lawler (1977) argues that constructions like those in (19) represent an opposition between active voice (19a) and passive voice (19b). However, as Durie (1988) points out, there is no evidence that Acehnese has an underlying subject/pivot nor does the undergoer in constructions like (19b) have any privileged syntactic status when compared to the agent. The fact that there is no change in pronominal clitic cross-referencing on the verb also constitutes further evidence that the syntactic status of the agent and undergoer has not been altered and that (19b) is therefore not an example of passive voice (Durie, 1988).

### 2.4 Sundic-type Voice

The final type of voice system to be discussed in this chapter is the ‘Sundic-type’. The term ‘Sundic-type’ was coined by Gil (2008) to characterise a set of typologically similar languages, which, like Acehnese, appear to be pivotless. In this set, Gil (2008) includes Sundanese (cf. Hardjadibrata, 1985), Riau Indonesian and other Colloquial Malay/Indonesian varieties such as Jakarta Indonesian, Sulsel Indonesian, Irian Indonesian and Kuala Lumpur Malay (cf. Gil, 2002a), Colloquial Javanese (cf. Conners, 2008), as well as Colloquial Minangkabau. Gil (2008) also argues that Mentawai displays some Sundic-type features. All these languages have traditionally been characterised as having ‘Indonesian-type’ voice systems. However, Gil (2008) shows this to be a false assumption and demonstrates that ‘voice’ morphology in these languages actually encodes a semantic distinction rather than a syntactic distinction.

As we saw in Section 2.2, Indonesian-type languages have symmetric active and passive voice constructions. In addition to this, Standard Indonesian also has an asymmetric passive construction and a *pasif semu* construction. Sundic-type languages, on the other hand, have a three-way distinction between a neutral construction where the verb is unmarked for ‘voice’, a generalised active construction where the verb is marked by a ‘generalised active’ morpheme, and a generalised passive construction in which the verb is marked by a ‘generalised passive’ morpheme. An additional difference is that unlike Indonesian-type languages, in which the pivot must precede the verb, Sundic-type languages are pivotless therefore any NP may precede the verb (Gil, 2008). The differences between these two kinds of voice systems are summarised in Table 5.
### Table 5. Indonesian-type voice and Sundic-type voice.

(Gil, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Structure</th>
<th>Voice Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. INDONESIAN-TYPE VOICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor AV-Verb Undergoer</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergoer PV-Verb Actor</td>
<td>passive (symmetric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD INDONESIAN ALSO HAS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergoer PV-Verb PP Actor</td>
<td>passive (asymmetric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergoer Actor-Verb</td>
<td>pasif semu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. SUNDIC-TYPE VOICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP Verb NP</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP general.ACT-Verb NP</td>
<td>generalised active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP general.PASS-Verb NP</td>
<td>generalised passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Riau Indonesian, a colloquial variety of Indonesian used for inter-ethnic communication in Riau Province, Sumatra, has been described in detail by Gil (cf. 1994; 2001; 2002a; 2006) and perhaps demonstrates the typological properties of the Sundic-type most effectively. In Riau Indonesian, Gil (2002a) argues that the prefix *N*- and the proclitic *di*-, cognate with Standard Malay/Indonesian *meN*- and *di*-, are generalised verbal semantic markers and do not encode a voice distinction. According to Gil’s analysis, *N*- marks the fact that the actor participant is referentially salient or conceptually significant in the utterance. Similarly, *di-* marks the patient participant as referentially or conceptually important. The Riau Indonesian semantic markers *N*- and *di-* do not correspond with any shift in word order or syntactic structure and can even be used to mark the conceptual salience of a null actor or a null patient.

Example (20) provides a minimal pair to demonstrate the use of *N*- and *di-* with the same verb root, *simer*, ‘polish’.
(20) a.  *Mister, aku nyimer lagi.*
White.person 1sg N-polish CNJ.OP
‘I’m going off to shine shoes.’
[Context: At table with shoeshine boys; speaker takes leave.]

(Gil, 2002a: 262)

b.  *Aden disimer.*
1sg DI-polish
‘I’m polishing them.’
[Context: Shoeshine boy pointing to potential customer’s sandals, addressing other shoeshine boys, who are possible competitors.]

(Gil, 2002a: 249)

In both (20a) and (20b) the actor precedes the verb and in neither examples is a patient overtly expressed. Nevertheless, the verb in (20a) is marked by the generalised active marker *N*- whereas the verb in (20b) is marked by the generalised patient marker *di*-. Since the shift in verb marking does not entail any change to syntactic organisation or grammatical relations, Gil (2002a) concludes that they must encode a semantic or conceptual distinction. Indeed, if we look at the context for each of the utterances in (20) we find that in (20a) the actor, the boy taking leave, is more conceptually salient, whereas in (20b) it is the patient, the customer’s sandals, that is the conceptually salient participant. It is this conceptual shift in focus to the actor or patient that triggers the use of *N-* and *di-* respectively.

Sundic-type languages like Riau Indonesian also have a ‘neutral’ construction (see Table 5) in which the verb is unmarked for voice. The sentences in (21) show two Riau Indonesian ‘neutral’ constructions in which the verb *beli*, ‘buy’, is unmarked.

(21) a.  *Beli aku laser, kan.*
buy 1sg laser Q
‘I’ll buy a laser, right.’
[Context: Contemplating a shopping trip.]
b. *Beli nasi goreng aku.*

buy rice fry lsg

‘I bought the fried rice.’

[Context: Group of people decide they want to play cards; somebody tells speaker to go out and buy some; speaker objects on the grounds that it's somebody else's turn to go out.]

(Gil, 2006: 43)

Like the generalised active and passive constructions, a ‘neutral’ construction does not entail any shift in grammatical relations and actor and patient NPs are unrestricted in terms of which position in the clause they can appear. In (21a) notice that the verb is followed by the actor, the first person pronoun *aku*, and then the patient, *laser*, ‘a laser’. However, in (21b) the verb is followed by the patient, *nasi goreng*, ‘fried rice’, and then the actor, *aku*.

The fact that ‘voice’ in Riau Indonesian does not encode any distinctions in grammatical relations, coupled with the additional fact that ‘neutral’ verbs can be left unmarked, implies that unless significant contextual background is given, the semantic roles of the participants in the clause will be underspecified. In other words, since neither word order nor verbal marking can tell us who is the patient and who is the actor, Riau Indonesian clauses remain rather vague. According to Gil (2001; 2002a; 2006; 2007), the vagueness and underspecification of semantic roles (and many other clausal elements in Riau Indonesian) does not impede communication in the language and the interpretability of underspecified utterances in the language actually relies on a system of “Associational Semantics” (see Chapter 6). In fact, since Sundic-type voice systems entail underspecification of semantic roles by their very nature, Gil (2008) argues that “Associational semantics” are a feature of all Sundic-type languages.

As the discussion in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 will demonstrate, although Standard Minangkabau resembles a typical Indonesian-type language, the flexible word order and presence of bare verbs (i.e. Gil’s (2008) ‘neutral’ construction) in Colloquial Minangkabau means that it is better characterised as a Sundic-type language.
2.5 Conclusion

From this chapter’s description of voice in Philippine-type languages, in Indonesian-type languages, in Acehnese, and in Sundic-type languages, a number of recurrent theoretical issues emerge. First, the characterisation of voice relies heavily on the nature of grammatical relations in the language. Second, in addition to the syntactic processes that motivate voice, it is also essential to consider the motivating discourse/pragmatic factors involved. Third, as well as encoding syntactic distinctions, voice marking may also encode semantic and conceptual distinctions such as aspectual notions. This third issue is especially important to consider for pivotless languages like Acehnese, since ‘voice’ marking does not encode grammatical relations in this kind of language. These theoretical themes also heavily inform my characterisation of the syntactic, discourse/pragmatic, and semantic properties of voice in Minangkabau (see Chapter 5).
Chapter 3. Methodology

3.0 Introduction

The Minangkabau data discussed in this dissertation comes from two sources: an electronic corpus of naturalistic Minangkabau data maintained by researchers at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (MPI EVA) Field Station at Bung Hatta University in Padang, Indonesia, and a corpus of elicited Minangkabau data collected during fieldwork in Perth and in Padang (please see the Acknowledgements). This chapter will outline the role each of these data sources has played in this dissertation as well as discussing the methodological considerations involved in data collection. It will also define the differences between the Standard Minangkabau and Colloquial Minangkabau data that was collected.

Section 3.1 describes the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus and explains the role it played as the main source of data for this dissertation. Section 3.2 describes how fieldwork also played a part in data collection for this dissertation. Section 3.3 then outlines how I differentiate between Standard Minangkabau and Colloquial Minangkabau in this dissertation.

3.1 The MPI EVA Minangkabau Corpus

The MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus is one of a number of corpora of Indonesian languages run as part of the MPI EVA Jakarta Field Station Project\(^4\). The MPI EVA Jakarta Field Station Project is funded by the Department of Linguistics at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, Germany. It aims to collect naturalistic data from a range of Indonesian minority languages across the archipelago in order to enable language description and to investigate language acquisition and

\(^4\) Further information about the MPI EVA Jakarta Field Station Project can be found on their website at: [http://lingweb.eva.mpg.de/jakarta/](http://lingweb.eva.mpg.de/jakarta/)
language contact in the region. The MPI EVA Jakarta Field Station Project was initiated by David Gil and Uri Tadmor in 1999.

MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus is maintained by researchers at the Padang Field Station at Bung Hatta University. These researchers are engaged in a long term project of recording, transcribing and glossing a wide variety of naturalistic Minangkabau texts from all over West Sumatra. Researchers at the Padang Field Station are also working towards establishing naturalistic corpora of the Mentawai, Besemah and Kerinci languages.

The MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus contains over sixty-thousand utterances and includes data from a wide variety of text types including personal narratives and personal histories, traditional folk tales, gossip, conversations and interviews. In order to give an accurate cross section of Minangkabau society, the data comes from speakers who vary in age, gender, regional background and social status. The corpus is managed using the Filemaker Pro database programme which has been designed and reformatted specifically for linguistic data collection by Brad Taylor.

The MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus provided the main source of data for this dissertation. The variety of text types in the corpus, as well as the large volume of naturalistic data, enabled comparisons to be made against the less spontaneous and more formal Minangkabau data I elicited during fieldwork. One of the most striking differences between the two data sets is the high frequency of bare verbs found in the naturalistic data (see Chapter 6). Naturalistic data, especially conversational data, is particularly important to consider for linguistic analysis since it reveals a range of linguistic structures not found in elicited data. Having a range of text types in a corpus is also important in order to paint an accurate and representative picture of a language (cf. Biber, Conrad and Reppen, 1998; Biber, 2000; Francis, 1993; Mosel, 2006; Nerbonne, 1998; Wouk, 1999).

An electronic corpus like the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus also counteracts the methodological failings of purely elicitation based analyses of language which often rely on intuition, introspection and potentially biased native speaker judgements.
Arguments for the existence of certain constructions, or arguments about the motivation for certain constructions, can instead be made on an empirical basis (Biber, 2000; Bybee and Hopper, 2001; Keller, 1999; Schütze, 1996). This is because a sophisticated electronic database like the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus allows for usually time consuming and tedious tasks such as searching and counting to be performed quickly and easily. This means that the researcher can speedily search for specific constructions and morphemes in order to do comparisons, to check their frequency and to perform empirical analyses.

Another benefit of this corpus is that it allows for the posterity of the primary linguistic data. This means that the primary data can be made available for future language maintenance efforts in the community. Since future developments in linguistic theory can have a significant impact on grammatical analysis it is also important to have the primary data available so that further analysis of the language can be undertaken (Himmelmann, 2006b: 18-19).

3.2 Fieldwork

Although corpus based analyses of language have a number of benefits, fieldwork is also an important aspect of linguistic research. So as well as using the texts and naturalistic data found in the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus I also conducted fieldwork in order to help answer some of the questions that the data in the corpus raised. I conducted ‘fieldwork at home’, working with a native speaker of Minangkabau in Perth over a number of months. I also conducted ‘fieldwork in the field’ in Padang, West Sumatra for a period of two and a half months working every day with three primary language consultants.

Undertaking fieldwork in Perth was useful to gain a basic understanding of the phonology, morphology and syntax of the language before I went to Padang. However, ‘fieldwork in the field’ was a much richer and intense experience. Nothing can compare to a fieldwork situation in which you speak, hear and live the language every day. Fieldwork in Padang provided a wealth of data because of the variety of formal and informal linguistic situations I was exposed to. Being able to engage in the community
and take part in everyday activities as well as culturally significant activities (which ranged from trips to the market, to cooking, to weddings and being at an *Aqiqa* ceremony\(^5\)) also not only benefited the quality of research but also meant that I formed a long lasting bond with the community.

The aim of the fieldwork was primarily to collect data from elicitation. Elicitation is an important and well established method for linguistic data collection. It does not provide a representative sample of actual language use when used as the sole method of collecting data. However, during the initial stages of language description and documentation, elicitation is useful to gain an insight into the language’s basic structure. It is also an effective technique to test hypotheses about what are and what are not acceptable or possible constructions in the language (Chelliah, 2001; Mosel, 2006; Munro, 2003).

I conducted elicitation sessions in Bahasa Indonesia and, as my proficiency improved, in Minangkabau. The elicitation sessions were designed to ask questions about the usage and grammaticality of unusual constructions I had noticed in the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus and to fill incomplete paradigms that I had created based on the corpus data. In elicitation sessions I also asked speakers for their judgements and intuitions about the ‘correctness’ of certain constructions and the appropriateness of their use in certain contexts. I also asked for translations of specific syntactic constructions that were designed to test the use of Minangkabau voice morphology.

One of the most interesting patterns of language use I observed in the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus was the high frequency of bare verbs, i.e. verbs that are unmarked for voice (see Chapter 6). This raised questions not only about the obligatoriness of voice marking but also how speakers are able to determine the semantic roles of the participants in the clause. Conducting elicitation was an essential stage in the process of understanding these bare verb forms because I was able to ask speakers about the restrictions on using these bare forms and also to test the productivity and use of these forms in syntactic and pragmatic contexts not found in the corpus.

---

\(^5\) An *Aqiqa* is a Muslim ceremony in which a new born baby is named.
All elicitation sessions were recorded using a Marantz Professional PMD660 Digital recorder and microphone kit. The sessions were transcribed using Audacity, an open source digital audio editing programme, and then kept in an electronic database using the Filemaker Pro programme.

Elicitation and community fieldwork involve a number of important ethical considerations. A good overview of the ethics of linguistic fieldwork can be found in Crowley (2007), Dwyer (2006), Mosel (2006) and many of the articles found in Newman and Ratliff (2001). Reading about the ethics of fieldwork can help prepare the researcher for what to expect but it is important to remember that every community is different and that any unexpected problems that do arise can only be resolved in consultation with the community. My project was designed to comply with standard human ethics research protocol to ensure the best interests of the language consultants with whom I conducted elicitation work. Language consultants were recruited through an informed consent process and their thoughts about the methodologies and goals of the research were considered throughout my fieldwork. Every effort was made to maintain a sensitive and balanced relationship with the language consultants and to ensure that they were recompensed for their time spent on the project.

3.3 Differentiating Standard Minangkabau and Colloquial Minangkabau

In this dissertation I make a distinction between Standard Minangkabau and Colloquial Minangkabau (see Section 1.1). The distinction between the two varieties is recognised by speakers of Minangkabau primarily as a difference in formality: Standard Minangkabau being used in formal and ritual contexts and Colloquial Minangkabau being used in more informal, familiar and intimate situations. My consultants also agree that Standard Minangkabau is found in the written medium (cf. Moussay, 1998) whereas Colloquial Minangkabau is primarily a spoken variety and is subject to regional variation. It is not surprising then that the naturalistic data of the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus reveals more examples of Colloquial Minangkabau, whereas much of the elicited data contains examples of Standard Minangkabau.
Although the distinction my consultants make between Standard and Colloquial Minangkabau is primarily one of register, there are also formal differences between the two varieties that lend further support to making the distinction. Many examples of Indonesian borrowings can be found in Standard Minangkabau and speakers sometimes even use Indonesian verb morphology in place of the Minangkabau cognates (for instance, the use of the -*kan* applicative as opposed to -*an*, see example (1)). In comparison, Colloquial Minangkabau verbs are very frequently affixless or ‘bare’ (see Chapter 6). One can also find many examples of ‘non-canonical’ word order constructions in Colloquial Minangkabau, whereas the syntactic rules of Standard Minangkabau are more rigidly defined (see Section 5.1.1.4). A final clear formal difference between the two varieties is that the P2 construction can be found in Standard Minangkabau but it is not used as a distinct ‘voice’ construction in Colloquial Minangkabau (see Section 5.1.4 and Section 6.1.2.4).
Chapter 4. Parts of Speech and Predicate Types

4.0 Introduction

This chapter will define the parts of speech of Minangkabau and describe the Minangkabau predicate construction. It will first examine a number of theories concerned with defining parts of speech categories (See Section 4.1) and will then proceed to describe the open class (see Section 4.2.1) and closed class (see Section 4.2.2) categories of Minangkabau. The various kinds of predicate constructions in Minangkabau will then be discussed in Section 4.3. Understanding how Minangkabau parts of speech operate across different functional domains, including in the predicate construction, is necessary before examining the system of voice and verbal morphology in Chapter 5.

4.1 Defining Parts of Speech

4.1.1 Traditional Classification of Parts of Speech

Current linguistic understanding about parts of speech has its origins in the Aristotelian philosophy of language, which defined parts of speech according to the nexus between notional principles and formal principles (Lyons, 1968). Central to the Aristotelian philosophy of language was the idea that the structure of language (i.e. the formal properties of language) reflected the structure of the world.

According to Lyons (1968: 271), Aristotelian grammarians argued that “the physical world consists of things (‘substances’) which have certain properties (‘accidents’), initiate or undergo certain processes, stand in a certain relationship to one another, or have a certain extension or location in space and time”. In other words, a ‘substance’ is an individual entity in the real world that exists in abstraction from its ‘accidents’ (i.e. its properties of existence in space and time). This translates in grammatical terms to a distinction between a lexeme (which refers to some ‘substance’ in the real world) and its
various inflections (which show the word’s ‘accidents’ or properties). The ‘accidental’
categories of inflection can be equated with grammatical categories such as person,
number, gender, case tense, aspect, and mood. The formal properties of grammatical
category inflection can then be used to identify which part of speech category a word
belongs to. Thus, according to Aristotelian theory, a noun refers to a substantive entity
that exists in the real world whose ‘accidents’, such as person, number and case, are
marked in a certain, consistent way (Lyons, 1968).

The use of formal criteria to establish parts of speech is useful in that it helps to avoid
the inherent circularity of defining parts of speech on notional grounds. However, any
formal definitions are unavoidably language specific. So in contrast to traditional
theories about parts of speech, Generative Linguistics aims to make generalisations
across a range of different languages and, in order to do this, assumes an underlying
level of language structure in addition to language specific surface structure. Thus
Generativists “define the parts of speech, not as classes of words in surface structure,
but as deep structure constituents of sentences” (Lyons, 1968: 319).

4.1.2 The Generative Classification of Parts of Speech

More specifically, the traditional Generative view is that parts of speech can be defined
according to two ‘deep structure’ primitive features: [±noun] and [±verb] (Chomsky,
1970). For a language like English, Chomsky (1970) argued that there are four major
parts of speech: nouns, verbs, adjectives and adpositions which can be characterised in
terms of these deep structure constituents. Verbs are [+verb] and [-noun], whereas
nouns are [+noun] and [-verb]. Since adjectives display verbal like features, but are used
to modify nouns, they are [+verb; +noun]. The fourth category, adpositions, are [-verb;
-noun]. This classification system is presented in Table 6.
Chomsky’s (1970) feature based classification system for parts of speech provided some useful first steps towards a thorough definition of lexical categories in universal terms. Nevertheless, there are a number of problems with his framework. One such problem is that the features themselves are not well defined. Croft (2000: 66) argues that since the features \([±\text{noun}]\) and \([±\text{verb}]\) are assumed to be universal operators there is no rigorous methodology available to establish exactly what semantic, morphological, syntactic and distributional properties are associated with them. So we nevertheless end up with a circular definition about parts of speech; a verb is something that is \([+\text{verb}]\) and a noun is something that is \([+\text{noun}]\); \([+\text{verb}]\) describes verbal properties of parts of speech and \([+\text{noun}]\) describes nominal properties of parts of speech. It is clear then that we need a comprehensive methodology to establish the precise features associated with each lexical class before we can characterise the similarities and differences between them.

A further argument against Chomsky’s (1970) classification system arises from the fact that the natural classes the features suggest do not stand up to scrutiny. Baker (2003) reasons that the features \([±\text{noun}]\) and \([±\text{verb}]\) divide the four categories noun, verb, adjective and adposition, into natural classes. For example nouns and adjectives form a natural class because they are both \([+\text{noun}]\).

Chomsky’s (1970) classification system also suggests that certain parts of speech are incompatible because their feature specifications are diametrically opposed; nouns and verbs cannot form a natural class and neither can adjectives and adpositions. Nevertheless, syntactic and distributional evidence suggests that at least one of these ‘unnatural’ classes is false. In fact, adjectives and prepositions form a natural class in English because they can occur in constructions in which nouns and verbs cannot. To demonstrate this, Baker (2003: 2) argues that both adjectives and prepositions can appear clause finally in English transitive constructions showing the goal or result of an
action, whereas nouns and verbs cannot. The examples Baker cites are repeated here in (22). Notice that the goal or result of the action can be encoded by an adjective in (22a) and a preposition in (22b). Examples (22c) and (22d) show that nouns and verbs are ungrammatical in this position. Baker’s (2003) distributional evidence demonstrates that adjectives and prepositions form a natural class. However, this distinction is not captured by Chomsky’s (1970) classification framework.

(22) a. John pounded the metal flat. (AP)
    b. John threw the ball into the barrel. (PP)
    c. *John pounded the metal a sword. (NP)
    d. *John polished the table shine. (VP)

(Baker, 2003: 2)

Typological evidence also reveals further problems with Chomsky’s (1970) framework. For example, Nootkan languages (cf. Jacobson, 1979; Swadesh, 1939), Salishan languages (cf. Jelinek and Demers, 1994; Kinkade, 1983; Kuipers, 1968) and Polynesian languages (cf. Broschart, 1997; Mosel and Hovdhaugen, 1992) are said to lack a noun-verb distinction; therefore it cannot be said that the primitive features [+noun] and [+verb] are underlying in these languages. Similarly in Minangkabau both nouns and verbs can function as predicates, a function typically assumed to be ‘verbal’ in nature. There is also evidence to suggest that languages like Malay/Indonesian do not have an adjective-verb distinction (Steinhauer, 2008). The indeterminacy involved in defining category membership in these languages cannot be captured or explained by the traditional Generative view espoused by Chomsky (1970). In an effort to rethink the traditional generative criteria for assigning category labels, typological studies of language have moved towards thinking about lexical categories as ‘prototypes’. The ‘prototype’ approach is described in Section 4.1.3.

4.1.3 Prototypes

Typological discoveries about the variety of parts of speech systems in different languages raises questions primarily about a binary approach to defining these parts of speech. If the Nootkan, Salishan and Polynesian languages are said to lack a noun-verb distinction (see above) then do we characterise these parts of speech as [+noun, +verb]
thus equating them with adjectives, or do we negate both the operators, describing them as [-noun, -verb] and leaving no way of distinguishing them from adpositions? What about languages like Malay/Indonesian whose class of so-called ‘adjectives’ behave more like stative verbs (Steinhauer, 2008)? The binary approach does not allow us to show that adjectives in Malay/Indonesian are ‘verbier’ than adjectives in English.

To resolve this kind of problem, we can instead think about parts of speech as prototypes (Croft, 1990; 1991; 2000; Gil, 2000; Langacker, 1987a; 1987b). According to prototype theory, lexical categories are defined in terms of the semantic, morphological, syntactic and distributional properties they possess as well as the conceptual domains in which they operate. Evidence based on typological tendencies as well as general cognitive principles is used to establish these semantic, morphological, syntactic, distributional and conceptual parameters. Prototypical members of parts of speech categories display all of these typical features. According to this theory, the prototypes are universal whereas language specific parts of speech categories fall somewhere within the domain of the prototypical categories.

There are two facts about Minangkabau parts of speech that are inadequately described by the Generative model. First, there is some indeterminacy about the boundaries between nouns and verbs in Minangkabau. Second, there is also some indeterminacy about the nature of adjectives. Theories about parts of speech based on the prototype approach are able to account for the Minangkabau situation more convincingly. Two such theories are described in Sections 4.1.3.1 and 4.1.3.2. The first theory, promoted by Langacker (1987a; 1987b), defines parts of speech along conceptual grounds. The second, outlined in Croft (1990; 1991; 2000), bases categorisation of parts of speech on functional grounds.

4.1.3.1 Langacker

Langacker (1987a; 1987b) argues that nouns, verbs and adjectives are distinct categories and that these categories can be defined according to the general cognitive, conceptual and semantic principles ‘relationality’ and ‘scanning’. These principles unite the functions of these parts of speech categories cross-linguistically. Langacker’s view
accounts for languages that appear to have no noun and verb distinction by suggesting that the roots themselves may not be category-specific. He further explains that the roots must take on nominal or verbal properties according to the construction in which they are used. He says, “even if a language has a single class of stems that function as either nouns or verbs, a stem nevertheless takes on the differentiating properties of one class or the other whenever it is employed in a particular construction” (Langacker, 1987a: 54).

Langacker’s (1987b) conceptual analysis of parts of speech is summarised in Table 7. Nouns are non-relational because they refer to discrete entities whereas verbs and adjectives are relational. Verbs are used to predicate, which implies relationality between the participants and the event. Adjectives modify, therefore they have a relational function: connecting nouns with their properties. Gradable adjectives (for example, happy, big) are also relational in the sense that they specify the property of the noun at a certain point along a scale of comparison. Polar adjectives (for example, dead, pregnant) are relational in that they specify the property of the noun in relation to an opposite quality.

Table 7. Langacker’s (1987b) conceptual categorisation of parts of speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RELATIONALITY</th>
<th>SCANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOUN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJECTIVE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Langacker’s (1987b) notion of ‘scanning’ refers to the perception of these entities (nouns, verbs and adjectives, i.e. objects, events, and qualities) over time. According to Langacker, nouns involve summary scanning; we need only to glance at an object summarily in order to tell what kind of object it is. Similarly adjectives describe some kind of static quality inherent in the noun. Langacker (1987b) argues that this means we conceptualise the properties encoded by adjectives in a summary way. He argues that verbs, on the other hand, involve change over time, therefore we supposedly perceive events in a sequential way; a snapshot view of a person mid-motion will not tell us if that person is standing, jumping, running, falling or involved in any number of other
possible events. Since verbs describe events that occur over a period of time they must have sequential scanning.

But what of languages like Minangkabau, that appear not to have a class of adjectives? Minangkabau has a distinct class of stative verbs. Notions encoded as adjectives in languages like English, in Minangkabau belong instead to this class of stative verbs. Even languages like English which have a class of stative verbs distinct from adjectives are problematic. Since stative verbs are telic and involve no change over time, according to Langacker’s (1987b) framework, they must involve summary scanning. This then provides no way of distinguishing between conceptualisations of stative verbs and adjectives. Does this then mean that adjectives and states are the same thing? Or that states are just non-prototypical verbs? Or indeed that states are non-prototypical adjectives? These questions suggest that the solutions may be language-specific (see Section 4.1.3.2).

There are a number important ideas raised by Langacker’s (1987a; 1987b) framework of parts of speech that I draw on in my analysis of categories in Minangkabau. First, categorisations of parts of speech ought to be in part based on the way humans perceive and conceptualise objects, events and qualities. Second, there are prototypical and non-prototypical instantiations of parts of speech. And third, where categories can function in a number of non-prototypical ways, it is useful to think of the properties of the construction as a whole to differentiate one instantiation of the category from another.

4.1.3.2 Croft

Croft (1991: 38-39) argues that problems with defining parts of speech arise when there is a mismatch between semantic category membership and syntactic criteria, i.e. when there is a mismatch between external, notional criteria and internal, formal criteria. For example, Minangkabau has a class of words that are notionally like adjectives but formally like verbs. So, like Langacker, Croft (1990; 1991; 2000) argues that parts of speech can be thought of as prototypical categories and that language specific instantiations of categories may fall somewhere within the specified prototypical domain. Properties of parts of speech can then be defined in terms of the language.
specific constructions in which they appear rather than being inherent properties of the categories themselves.

Where Langacker (1987a; 1987b) defines parts of speech along conceptual grounds, Croft (1990; 1991; 2000) presents a more functional analysis of parts of speech prototypes based on typological trends and universal principles. He argues that we conceptualise the world primarily in terms of objects, properties and actions and that these categories perform three central functions: to show reference, modification and predication. According to Croft, the prototypical function of objects is to refer, the prototypical function of properties is to modify and the prototypical function of actions is to predicate. When performing their prototypical functions objects, properties and actions are realised in a given language as unmarked nouns, adjectives and verbs respectively.

However, language specific instantiations of these parts of speech may differ from their prototypical instantiations. If this is the case, Croft (1990; 1991; 2000) argues that the non-prototypical instantiation of a word will show structural markedness in the form of derivational morphology, prepositional marking or some other kind of distinct syntactic marking. To illustrate this point, consider the word child. Child is an object and therefore its prototypical function is a referential one. This means that when functioning within its prototypical functional domain it will be realised as an unmarked noun. However, if the same concept is used to modify or predicate then it becomes structurally marked. For example, when used to modify child becomes childish, and when used to predicate child becomes be a child.

Croft’s (1990; 1991; 2000) functional categorisation of parts of speech is presented in Table 8. The conceptual categories are listed along the vertical axis of the table and the functional domains are listed along the horizontal axis. The highlighted areas of the table show the prototypical use of each conceptual category. Where a category is used in a non-prototypical function some examples of the kinds of constructions used are given. Notice that in each box I have also given a word in English to illustrate the particular function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>MODIFICATION</th>
<th>PREDICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td><strong>Unmarked nouns.</strong></td>
<td>Genitive,</td>
<td>Predicate nominals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>eg: child</em></td>
<td>adjectivalisations, PPs on nouns.</td>
<td>copulas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*eg: ‘childish’</td>
<td>*eg: ‘be a child’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY</td>
<td>De-adjectival nouns.</td>
<td><strong>Unmarked adjectives.</strong></td>
<td>Predicate adjectives,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*eg: ‘bigness’</td>
<td>*eg: ‘big’</td>
<td>copulas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*eg: ‘be big’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>Action nominals,</td>
<td>Participles, relative</td>
<td><strong>Unmarked verbs.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complements,</td>
<td>clauses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infinitives, gerunds.</td>
<td>*eg: ‘production’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*eg: ‘production’</td>
<td></td>
<td>*eg: ‘produce’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4 Defining Parts of Speech in Austronesian Languages

Like Langacker (1987a; 1987b), Croft (1990; 1991; 2000) stresses the importance of thinking about parts of speech in terms of the constructions in which they appear rather than assigning words in the lexicon a part of speech category in isolation. This framework is useful for the linguist who has to account for indeterminacy of category membership. In Minangkabau, for instance, object words and property words can function to predicate, but remain unmarked. Bare verbs can also operate across a range of functional domains (see Chapter 6). So instead of assigning each of these categories an inherent function in Minangkabau, we can instead assign category membership according to the construction specific properties of the word.

The prerogative to assign category membership according to the functional role of a word within a particular construction then raises questions about the nature of categorisation in the lexicon. Croft (2000: 97) argues that the more marked the word is when functioning in a non-prototypical constructions, the more inherent the prototypical function of the word. The less marked the word then the less inherent is its prototypical function. Furthermore, the more categories an uninflected root can belong to, the more ‘precategorial’ the root is (Lehmann, to appear).
Questions about categorisation have also been asked about a number of Austronesian languages related to Minangkabau. Gil (2000) argues that there is indeterminacy about category membership in Malay/Indonesian, particularly in non-standard regional varieties of the languages. Since object words, property words and action words are all able to function to refer, modify and predicate in unmarked forms he argues that there are just two categories in these languages. There is a single category of open class items, consisting of object, property and action words, and a single category of closed class items, consisting of syntactic function words such as pragmatic particles, prepositions, TAM markers and conjunctions. There is also some indeterminacy about the classification of nouns and verbs in Philippine-type languages (cf. Donohue, 2008; Foley, 1998; Himmelmann, 2006a; 2008; Kaufman, 2007; Kroeger, 1998) (see Section 6.3.1).

In Minangkabau, the multifunctionality of object and property words, as well as the existence of bare verbs, suggests that Minangkabau may also be precategorial. Ultimately I argue that Minangkabau is not a precategorial language (see Chapter 6). In fact, using prototype theory and the conceptual, cognitive and functional definitions for parts of speech discussed in Sections 4.1.3.1 and 4.1.3.2 as a guiding framework to describe parts of speech in Minangkabau, I argue that Minangkabau clearly has a class of object words (nouns) and a class of action words (verbs) but that both classes can be used in non-prototypical ways (see Sections 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.2). Minangkabau also has a class of ‘property words’, but since these property words are used to predicate I argue that they represent a sub-type of stative verb. As well as nouns and verbs I also argue that Minangkabau has a class of adverbs, which are discussed in Section 4.2.1.3. Nouns, verbs and adverbs are open class items, but Minangkabau also has a number of closed class items including pronouns, prepositions, specifiers, negators, TAM adverbials and pragmatic particles. Closed class items are discussed in Section 4.2.2.
4.2.1 Open Class Items

4.2.1.1 Nouns

Section 4.1.3.2 established that the prototypical function of nouns is to refer (Croft, 1990; 1991; 2000). It is now necessary to establish the formal linguistic features of reference typologically and, more specifically, in Minangkabau. Andrews (1985) claims that there are three major factors involved in reference: semantics, pragmatics and syntax. By semantics, Andrews means the kind of meaning the noun has in a sentence, i.e. its semantic role. By pragmatics, Andrews is referring to the fact that the referents of nouns are inextricably linked with context; discourse-pragmatic contextual information determines what the speaker presumes is prior knowledge as well as the relative topicality status of the noun’s referent. The syntactic factors involved in reference are the relationships that the nouns have with the syntactic organisation of the clause because nouns encode grammatical relations.

As well as these general functional properties of nouns, there are specific morphological, syntactic and distributional formal properties of nouns that relate to their definitional referential role. Typological studies show that cross-linguistically nouns are marked for number, can be assigned class membership (for example gender), can have diminutive forms, and are marked for definiteness or deictic status. Since their syntactic function is to encode grammatical relations, nouns are also marked for case and argument type (Anderson, 1985).

In Minangkabau, nouns are those words which relate to Croft’s (1990; 1991; 2000) conceptual category of ‘object’ and which are prototypically used to refer (although nouns can also be used to predicate, see Section 4.3.1.1). Nouns in Minangkabau also show many of the formal properties associated with reference discussed by Anderson (1985), as shown in Table 9.
Table 9. Formal properties of nouns in Minangkabau.

(adapted from Anderson, 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMAL PROPERTIES OF NOUNS</th>
<th>HOW THESE PROPERTIES ARE REALISED IN MINANGKABAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inherent properties of nouns:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number | • Nouns are modified for number but this is not morphologically marked.  
• Noun roots are reduplicated to show plurality (in contrast to verb roots which are reduplicated to encode aspectual notions).  
• There is a singular/plural distinction encoded in pronouns. |
| Gender/Classifiers | • Numerical classifiers are used when counting but they are not morphologically marked. |
| Diminutives | • There are no diminutive forming processes in Minangkabau. |
| Definiteness/deictic status | • Demonstratives are used to show the deictic status of nouns. |
| 2. Relational properties of nouns: | |
| Case/grammatical relations | • Benefactive, instrumental, comitative, recipient and location non-core arguments are marked by specific prepositions.  
• There is no marking of core grammatical relations on nouns; pivot and non-pivot arguments are determined by verbal marking, referential status and word order. |
| Possession | • Possession is not morphologically marked on nouns. |
| 3. Agreement properties of nouns: | |
| Possessive structures | • Possessive structures such as alienable/inalienable possession do not exist in Minangkabau. |

From Table 9 it is evident that Minangkabau nouns exhibit a number of the formal properties of nouns described by Anderson (1985), although none of these are morphologically marked except plurality. Noun plurals are created by reduplicating the substantive word (although a single non-reduplicated noun root can also be interpreted as plural if the context requires it). Example (23) shows how the noun root sanak, ‘sibling’, is reduplicated to indicate plurality.
On the other hand, the effect of reduplication on verbal roots provides nuances of continuous aspect (see *makan-makan*, ‘eat’, in (24)), iteration (see *manelpon-nelpon*, ‘phone’, in (25)), and intensity (see *rajin-rajin*, ‘conscientious’, in (26))\(^6\).

(24) \textit{Ndak buliah makan-makan.} \\
\textsc{neg may RED-eat} \\
‘You can’t just eat it.’

(Text ID: 467756102929100506)

(25) \textit{Manga Uni bisa manelpon-nelpon jo urang, cowok lain kan.} \\
\textsc{why older.sister can AV-RED-N-phone.call with person guy other EMPH} \\
‘How come you can keep phoning other people, other guys, you know?’

(Text ID: 465924121203230506)

(26) \textit{Kalo urang Bali tu rajin-rajin nyo.} \\
\textsc{top person Bali DEM:dist RED-conscientious 3} \\
‘As for the Balinese, they’re really conscientious they are.’

(Text ID: 139498123727191206)

Nouns in Minangkabau are marked, in a syntactic sense, for number and class membership by numerals and numerical classifiers. Nouns are also marked for definiteness and deictic status by demonstratives. In terms of the relational properties of nouns, which reflect their syntactic function as described by Andrews (1985), Minangkabau nouns which perform non-core grammatical relations, such as benefactors, instruments, recipients, locations and comitative participants, are marked by specific prepositions. Nouns with core argument status are unmarked but their grammatical relation is determined by their relative position in the clause or by their referential status. In Minangkabau there is no ‘genitive case’ as possession is not marked morphologically. Instead the possessor is encoded as a nominal or pronominal modifier that follows the possessed noun. Minangkabau does not have nominal

\(^6\) Reduplicative morphology derives “verbal aspects (such as ‘iterative’, ‘repetitive’, ‘durative’, ‘continue to be’)” in many Austronesian languages (Klamer, 2002: 938).
agreement categories or possessive structures such an alienable/inalienable possession
distinction common in Oceanic languages (cf. Crowley, 2002), nor does it have regular
diminutive forming processes.

Some examples of these formal properties of Minangkabau nouns follow in examples (27) to (35). Example (27) shows number marking, examples (28) and (29) show how numerical classifiers work, examples (30), (31) and (32) show how possession is marked, example (33) shows how nouns can also be modified by attributive nouns, and examples (34) and (35) show the use of demonstratives.

Example (27) shows a Minangkabau noun that is marked for number. Number is not morphologically marked in Minangkabau, instead numerals precede the noun. Example (27) illustrates this; the noun taun, year, is preceded by the numeral tigo.

(27) Lai tigo taun lebih kurang.
more three year more less
‘More or less three years ago.’

(Text ID: 979548152848070306)

Minangkabau nouns can also marked by numerical classifiers. Minangkabau classifiers are not morphologically marked on the noun, instead they consist of a noun root modified by a preceding cardinal number. They are typically inserted before the noun root but may also appear after the noun. Classes are based on the size or shape of the object and the classifier words themselves are derived from nouns denoting a prototypical member of the class. For example, thin, stick or branch shaped things belong to the batang ‘tree’ class, animals belong to the ikua ‘tail’ class, small round objects belong to the incek ‘seed’ class, and large roundish or squarish objects belong to the buah ‘fruit’ class. Numerical classifiers are not obligatory and are used mainly in the context of counting.

Examples (28) and (29) illustrate the use of two classifiers ikua and incek. In (28) ikua is the numerical classifier for lauak, ‘fish’. In (29) the classifier incek refers to the (seed-shaped) object that inyo, ‘he’, would like to buy.
In many languages, possession is marked morphologically on the noun and languages with case systems tend to encode possession as genitive case marking. In Minangkabau, possession is not morphologically marked on the noun. Instead, the verb punyo, ‘have’, is used to show a possessive relationship between the possessor and the possessed (see example (30)). Nouns can also be modified for possession by a following noun or pronoun. For example in (31), the noun abuak, ‘hair’, is marked for possession by the enclitic third person pronoun nyo. Similarly in (32), mainan, ‘toy’, is marked for possession by NP anak tu, ‘the child’.

(30) Punyo den ma.
    have 1sg EMPH
    ‘It’s mine.’

(Elicitation)

(31) Inyo manyikek abuaknyo.
    3 AV-brush hair-3
    ‘She brushed her hair.’

(Elicitation)

(32) Mainan anak tu.
    play-NOM child DEM:dist
    ‘The child’s toy.’

(Elicitation)

It is important to note that the constructions in (31) and (32) cannot be described exclusively as genitive constructions. Gil (2000: 192) argues that similar constructions
in Malay, for example *rumah Bobok*, ‘Bobok’s house’ are in fact nominative attributive constructions. This is true also of Minangkabau, since similar ‘NP + NP_{[modifier]}’ constructions are used to show relationships between nouns other than possession. For example, in (32) the NP *manian anak tu* could be construed not just as a possessive construction but also as an attributive construction, i.e. the NP could be just as easily translated as ‘a toy for children’ rather than ‘the child’s toy’. The exact nature of modification intended will be determined by context. Similarly in (33) the noun *pakaian-pakaian*, ‘clothes’, is modified by the nominal *adat*, ‘tradition’. *Adat* shows an attributive relationship to the noun *pakaian-pakaian* rather than a possessive one. Nouns can also be modified by verbs and relative clauses that occupy the same slot as attributive NPs (see (36)).

(33)  
\[ \text{Pakaian-pakaian adat.} \]
\[ \text{RED-wear-NOM} \quad \text{tradition} \]
\[ \text{‘Traditional clothes.’} \]

(Text ID: 212694092757020606)

Minangkabau nouns can also be marked by the specifiers *iko* or *ko* and *itu* or *tu*, which are proximal and distal demonstratives respectively. The opposition between *iko* and *itu* is much like the difference between ‘this’ and ‘that’ in English. Example (34) shows the use of the demonstrative *tu*, which is marking the noun *gambar*, ‘picture’.

(34)  
\[ \text{Inyo nan mambuek gambar tu.} \]
\[ 3 \quad \text{REL AV-make} \quad \text{picture} \quad \text{DEM:dist} \]
\[ \text{‘He was the one who drew that picture.’} \]

(Elicitation)

The demonstratives *itu* and *iko* can also be used to show deixis. Consider the passage in (35), taken from the Minangkabau folk tale *Kak Kancia nan Cadiak*, ‘The Clever Mousedeer’. The protagonist *kak Kancia* begins his adventure when he falls into a hole. In (35a) *Kancia* is the most topical participant, so is therefore marked by the proximal demonstrative *ko*. The demonstrative indicates that *Kancia* is pragmatically salient. Notice that *lubang*, ‘hole’, is unmarked when it is first introduced in (35a). However, in (35b) *lubang* refers to a specific hole, i.e. the one mentioned in the previous utterance. This means that it becomes more pragmatically salient and is marked by the distal
demonstrative *tu* as a result. In (35c) *lubang* becomes topical. This is reflected by the fact that *lubang* is now marked by the proximal demonstrative *ko*.

(35) a. *Jadi Kancia ko taparosok ka dalam lubang.*
    happen mousedeer DEM:prox INV-slip to inside hole
    ‘So Mousedeer had accidentally fallen into a hole.’

    (Text ID: 375360092028280607)

    b. *Lubang tu sabananyo bukan untuak kak Kancia.*
    hole DEM:dist ONE-true-3 NEG for older.sibling mousedeer
    ‘(But) the hole wasn’t really meant for Mousedeer.’

    (Text ID: 286076092135280607)

    c. *Lubang ko untuak sangajo manangkok arimau.*
    hole DEM:prox for on.purpose AV-catch tiger
    ‘The hole had been made to catch a tiger.’

    (Text ID: 890973092245280607)

Minangkabau nouns function as the head of NPs and accordingly slot into formally defined NP frames. In a clause, pivot NPs typically precede the verb whereas non-pivot NPs typically follow the verb with core arguments preceding non-core arguments (see Section 5.1.1.4). The NPs themselves also have a strict structure with specific modificatory elements preceding and following the noun. If all the modificatory elements appear in a clause then the ordering follows the general order as listed in (36). None of these elements is obligatory to form a noun phrase except the noun itself, as the brackets indicate. A specifier can consist of a quantifier, a numeral or a classifier (see Section 4.2.2.3). Note that a post-noun modifier can be a VP (stative or otherwise), a genitive NP, an attributive NP, or an adverb. If the modifier is a VP then it may also be preceded by the relative marker *nan* to form a relative clause.

(36) **NP** = (preposition → (specifier) → **NOUN** → (modifier) → (demonstrative))

An example of a Minangkabau NP with all the modificatory elements listed in (36) can be found in (37). The NP would be perfectly well formed if it consisted just of the
substantive noun *anjiang*, ‘dog’. Various reduced permutations of the full NP frames are also well formed as the brackets indicate.

(37) \(((Jo)\ (tigo\ ikua)\ anjiang\ ((nan)\ lia)\ (tu))\).

‘With those three wild dogs.’

(Elicitation)

In summary, there is a class of words denoting objects in Minangkabau. Since the unmarked function of these words is to refer, according to Croft (1990; 1991; 2000), these words can be described as nouns. Reference involves specific kinds of syntactic, morphological, and distributional formal properties (see Table 9). This section has shown that Minangkabau object words display many of these specific formal properties associated with reference and also occupy a specific syntactic frame (see (36)). Therefore we can conclude that the language has a distinct category of nouns.

4.2.1.2 Verbs

We can also look for evidence of verbs in Minangkabau using the same logic. Minangkabau has a class of words that denote actions and these action words are used to predicate. According to Croft (1990; 1991; 2000) verbs are those unmarked action words whose prototypical function is to predicate. In Minangkabau, action words are unmarked in predicate position and show many of the cross-linguistically prominent formal properties of verbs described by Anderson (1985). We can safely assume then that Minangkabau also has a class of verbs.

A Minangkabau verb functions as the head of a VP. The syntactic frame of a VP is represented in (38). Apart from the verb, none of the elements listed in (38) are required to form a VP. Please note that the ordering of the VP frame listed in (38) is also a generalisation since word orders vary greatly in naturalistic, colloquial discourse. The NPs represent the verb’s arguments. Typically the pivot NP will precede the verb and the non-pivot NPs will follow the verb, but this is not always the case (see Chapter 5). TAM adverbials occur in pre-verbal position, except in a *pasif semu* clause (see Section
5.1.4), and along with voice marking represent the best diagnostic features for identifying verbs.

\[(38) \text{VP} = ((\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{negator}) \rightarrow (\text{TAM}) \rightarrow (\text{voice marking})-\text{VERB}-(\text{applicative}) \rightarrow (\text{adverb}) \rightarrow (\text{NP}))\]

Other parts of speech such as nouns and adverbs can also function predicatively as the head of a VP. In this case, the syntactic frame can be described as a more general ‘predicate construction’ with a predicate (‘PRED’) as its head. The predicate construction is represented in (39) and described in further detail in Section 4.3.

\[(39) \text{Predicate Construction} =
((\text{NP}) \rightarrow (\text{negator}) \rightarrow (\text{TAM}) \rightarrow (\text{voice marking})-\text{PRED}-(\text{applicative}) \rightarrow (\text{adverb}) \rightarrow (\text{NP}))\]

Minangkabau verbs also display many of the formal properties of verbs described by Anderson (1985). These formal properties include the fact that verbs are marked for adverbal notions such as negation as well as tense, aspect and mood distinctions. Cross-linguistically verbs are also divided into classes based on their aktionsart properties or are divided into conjugation classes. According to Anderson’s (1985) schema, verbs also display formal properties based on their relational functions, i.e. licensing particular argument structures. These properties include showing valency, marking causative constructions, displaying voice marking, and showing reflexive and reciprocal processes. Table 10 lists each of these formal properties of verbs and describes how these properties are realised in Minangkabau.
Table 10. Formal properties of verbs in Minangkabau.

(adapted from Anderson, 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMAL PROPERTIES OF VERBS</th>
<th>HOW THESE PROPERTIES ARE REALISED IN MINANGKABAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Inherent properties of verbs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Adverbial Notions         | • There is no marking of evidentiality in Minangkabau.  
                             • Negation is not encoded morphologically. Verbs are negated by the negative operator *ndak* or the prohibitive particle *jan*. |
| Tense, aspect, mood       | • TAM is not encoded morphologically on the verb instead speakers use a range of adverbial markers. |
| Aktionsart Class          | • Minangkabau distinguishes between states and activities.  
                             • Stative verbs are unmarked whereas activities can be marked by the active voice marker *maN*-  |
| Conjugation Class         | • Minangkabau does not have conjugation classes. |
| **2. Relational properties of verbs (see Chapter 5):** |                                                  |
| Valency Inflection        | • Changes to the valency of the verb root are marked on the verb by the applicatives *-an* or *-i*. |
| Causatives                | • Causatives are marked on the verb by the prefix *pa-*  
                             • The applicatives *-an* and *-i* also encode causative semantics. |
| Voice                     | • Minangkabau has a rich system of verbal morphology used to show pragmatically motivated voice as well as non-pragmatically motivated voice. |
| Reflexives and Reciprocals| • Reflexives and reciprocals are marked on the verb by the prefix *ba-*  
                             • Some reflexives are also encoded using the reflexive pronoun *diri*. |
| Switch Reference          | • There is no switch reference marking in Minangkabau. |

The ‘inherent’ formal properties displayed by Minangkabau verbs are discussed in reference to the examples that follow in the remainder of this section. The relational properties of verbs in Minangkabau are inextricably linked to the language’s system of voice marking. Since voice in Minangkabau is the focus of Chapter 5, discussion of these relational properties can be found in Chapter 5 instead.

First, let us examine the adverbial notions associated with verbs in Minangkabau. As Table 10 shows, negation, but not evidentiality, is a grammatical category in Minangkabau.
In Indonesian, verbal and nominal predicates can be distinguished by the choice of negator. Verbal predicates are negated by *tidak* as in (40), whereas nominal predicates are negated by *bukan* as in (41).

(40)  *Mereka tidak menolong kami.*  
3pl NEG AV-help 1pl  
‘They didn’t help us.’

(adapted from Sneddon, 1996: 195)

(41)  *Dia bukan guru.*  
3 NEG teacher  
‘He is not a teacher.’

(adapted from Sneddon, 1996: 195)

However, in Minangkabau, both nouns and verbs are negated by *indak* (or the reduced form *ndak*). In (42) the NP *guru*, ‘teacher’, is negated by *indak* and in (43) the verbal predicate *manggigik*, ‘bite’, is also negated by *indak*. This means that the presence of *indak* or *ndak* cannot be diagnostic for whether we are dealing with a verb or a noun.

(42)  *Jadi nyo indak guru do?*  
become 3 NEG teacher NEGPOL  
‘So she’s not a teacher?’

(Elicitation)

(43)  *Ula tu babunuah supayo indak manggigik.*  
snake DEM:dist MID-kill in.order.that NEG AV-bite  
‘The snake was killed so that it wouldn’t bite (anyone).’

(Elicitation)

Minangkabau uses a different negation strategy for imperative verbs. Instead of using *indak*, the prohibitive particle *jan* is inserted before the verb (see Section 4.3.2.5). An example of this can be seen in (44), where the prohibitive particle *jan* negates the verb *masak*, ‘cook’. *Jan* cannot be used with NPs as example (45a) shows. To use a prohibitive construction with an NP, the verb *jadi*, ‘become, happen’, must be used, as shown in example (45b).
Another formal property of verbs in that they show tense, aspect and mood distinctions. In Minangkabau TAM distinctions are not morphologically marked on the verb. Instead the verb is modified by preceding adverbial TAM markers (see Table 14).

Three TAM adverbials, nio, alah and alun, are exemplified in examples (46), (47) and (48) respectively. Notice that the TAM markers precede the verb in all examples.

(44) *Jan guru.  PROHIB teacher
    ‘Don’t be a teacher.’

(45) b. Jan jadi guru.  PROHIB become teacher
    ‘Don’t be a teacher.’

(46) Inyo duduak karano nio makan.  3 sit because want eat
    ‘He sat down because he wanted to eat.’

(47) Alah dipotongnyo cimangko?  PFCT PV-cut-3 watermelon
    ‘Has the watermelon been cut up yet?’

(48) Alun ujan ari ko.  not.yet rain day DEM:dist
    ‘It hasn’t rained yet today.’
According to Anderson (1985), aktionsart can also be a formal or semantic property of verbs. In fact, in Minangkabau there is a distinction between stative verbs and activity verbs. Stative verbs are unmarked by verbal morphology whereas activity verbs are marked by the active voice prefix *maN*- (see Section 4.3.2). Since the morphological and semantic properties of Minangkabau ‘property words’ (i.e. those NP modifiers that express the adjectival concepts of dimension, physical property, colour, human propensity, age, value, and speed (cf. Dixon, 1982; 2006)) resemble those of stative verbs, property words also form a part of Minangkabau’s class of stative verbs.

Interestingly, in Malay/Indonesian there is some indeterminacy about the status of property words or adjectives as a class distinct from verbs because of their aktionsart properties (cf. Gil, 2000; Steinhauer, 2008). In terms of their prototypical function, adjectives are quite distinct from verbs because they are used to modify rather than predicate (Croft, 1990; 1991; 2000). However, cross-linguistically it seems that adjectives are a special kind of ‘state’ because their inherent time schemata is stative, i.e. they involve no change over time (Langacker, 1987b; Vendler, 1957). In Malay/Indonesian adjectives resemble stative verbs because they are used to predicate and their interaction with verbal morphology is the same as for stative verbs.

Similarly, Minangkabau property words, or adjectives, can be used like stative verbs to predicate. For example, in (49) notice that the ‘property word’ *gadang*, ‘big’, is used both attributively and predicatively. In (49a) *gadang* is used attributively to modify the noun *rumah*, ‘house’. In (49b) *gadang* functions as the predicate. Notice that when functioning predicatively *gadang* remains unmarked. In Minangkabau, stative verbs are also unmarked by verbal morphology when used predicatively. Like property words, unmarked stative verbs can also be used attributively (see Section 4.3.2.1).

---

7 There is also a division of activity verbs based on the semantic transitivity of their root. Minangkabau has three classes of activity verbs: intransitive active verbs (i.e. active intransitives), transitive verbs and ditransitive verbs (see Section 4.3.2.).

8 Minangkabau also has a small class of semelfactive verbs which, like stative verbs, cannot take the active voice prefix *maN*, but unlike stative verbs, can appear in progressive constructions (see example (i), which shows the semelfactive verb *batuak*, ‘cough’). Further study is required to establish the exact distribution of Minangkabau semelfactive verbs.

---

i. *Ambo* (*mam-*)batuak samalaman.
   1sg (*AV-*)cough ONE-night-NOM
   ‘I coughed all night.’

   (Elicitation)
In Minangkabau the transitivity and aktionsart of stative verbs can be altered by the use of verbal morphology. When affixed to a stative root, the active voice prefix *maN-* creates a change of state verb. The addition of the applicative *-an* on the verb will then create a transitive causative verb (see Section 4.3.2.1). Verbal morphology has these same effects on Minangkabau property words. This is illustrated in (49). In (49c) the property word *gadang* is prefixed by the active voice marker *maN-* thus deriving the change of state verb ‘to get big’. In (49d) the applicative *-an* has been cliticised to the verb, which has altered the transitivity of the verb and added a causative nuance: ‘cause to get big’.

(49) a. *Rumah Gadang* masih ado.
    house big still exist
    ‘Minangkabau traditional houses still exist.’

    b. *Rumahnyo gadang.*
    house-3 big
    ‘His house is big.’

    c. *Balon tu manggadang dek diambuih.*
    balloon DEM:dist AV-big CAUSE PV-blow
    ‘The balloon got bigger from being blown up.’

    d. *Paman manggadangan awak.*
    uncle AV-big-APP 1
    ‘My uncle raised me.’

(Elicitation)

Nevertheless, for Malay/Indonesian at least, it is argued that *gradable* property words should be distinguished from *non-gradable* property words. This then allows for a distinction to be made between stative verbs, which are not gradable, and a special class of property words that are gradable (Steinhauer, 2008). In fact, property words cross-linguistically are comparative, i.e. gradable (Anderson, 1985; Croft, 1991; Dixon, 1982; Schachter, 1985), which stative verbs are not. In Minangkabau, property words are gradable too, as example (50) shows; the comparative prefix *sa-* on *gadang*, ‘big’, shows that *gadang* is gradable. According to Langacker’s (1987b) terminology, this

---

9 *Rumah Gadang* translates literally as ‘big house’ but the term is actually used to refer to the distinctive Minangkabau traditional houses with pointed curved roofs intended to signify the horns of a water buffalo.
means that *gadang* is relational and therefore notionally an adjective. However, as we established in Section 4.1.2.1, stative verbs can also be construed as relational since their meaning is framed against a polar opposite.

(50) *Bulek-bulek sagadang talua puyuah.*  
RED-round COMP-big egg quail  
‘It is round and as big as a quail’s egg.’

(Steinhauer 2008) cites colours and emotions as prototypical examples of gradable property words in Indonesian. Emotions are especially interesting cases because they have special syntactic valence (cf. Klamer, 2002: 941). In Indonesian, property words are intransitive. Property words denoting emotions are also syntactically intransitive but can be semantically transitive. This means that second arguments are required to be marked by a preposition. The Indonesian property word *marah*, ‘angry’, can have two participants: the core argument is the person who is angry, i.e. the undergoer, the second participant has the role of being either the recipient or the cause of the anger. The recipient or cause is not a core syntactic participant therefore they must be preceded by a preposition which denotes their relationship to the action, for example *dengan*, ‘with’, *kepada*, ‘to’, *pada*, ‘on’, *terhadap*, ‘regarding’, or *akan*, ‘about’. In Minangkabau, property words denoting emotions have similar special syntactic valence. For example, in (76) notice that *awak*, the recipient of the emotion, is marked by the preposition *ka*.

In Minangkabau, colours do not behave differently to other gradable property words. In (51) notice that the property word *itam*, ‘black’, occurs in constructions similar to those in (49) in which *gadang*, ‘big’, was the property word. In (51a) *itam* functions attributively to modify the noun phrase *baju*, ‘shirt’. In (51b) *itam* functions predicatively like a stative verb. In (51c) the prefixation of the active voice marker *maN*- creates a change of state verb from the root word and in (51d) the addition of the applicative –*an* derives a transitive, causative verb.

(51) a. *Baju itame tu nan gaek-gaek tu.*  
shirt black-3 DEM:dist REL RED-old DEM:dist  
‘The old people wear black shirts.’

(Text ID: 445038115055260406)
To conclude, in Minangkabau verbs can be categorised according to their aktionsart, therefore stative verbs and activity verbs form two distinct classes. Minangkabau also has a class of property words that function both attributively and predicatively. Since neither one of these functions is marked we cannot argue that either one of these functions is inherent and the other derived. When property words function predicatively their syntactic and morphological features resemble those of stative verbs, but with two exceptions. The first is that property words are gradable whereas states are not. The second is that emotion property words have special syntactic valence whereas states are without exception intransitive. However, the similarities between property words and stative verbs is such that rather than assign property words a separate category in Minangkabau, it is better to think of them as special kinds of gradable stative verbs. Drawing on Langacker’s (1987b) framework of parts of speech, we can characterise true stative verbs as having polar relationality and stative verbs denoting properties as having scalar relationality.

Finally, since the question of precategoriality has been raised by the fact that unmarked nouns can function predicatively in Minangkabau (see Section 4.3.1.1), it is necessary to establish whether verbs can function to refer, as nouns prototypically do. The answer is that verbs can function referentially but that they are morphologically marked when
they do so. This would indicate that predication really is an inherent, prototypical function of verbs in Minangkabau and that reference is a non-prototypical function.

Examples (52), (53) and (54) illustrate how verbs can be used referentiality with the use of the nominalising affixes -an, pa- and paN-. In (52) the noun tanaman, ‘plant’, is derived from the verb root tanam, ‘to plant’, in combination with the nominalising affix -an. The noun parampok, ‘thief’, in (53) makes use of the agentive nominaliser pa- to derive the form from the verb root rampok, ‘rob, steal’. The nominaliser -an is also used in (54) in combination with the paN- nominaliser to derive the noun panyalasaian, ‘ending’, from the verb root salasai, ‘finish’. Please see Section 6.3.1.2 for further discussion about Minangkabau nominalisers.

(52) a. Ambo mananam bungo di kabun.
   1sg AV-plant flower LOC garden
   ‘I planted some flowers in the garden.’

   b. Tanaman
      plant-NOM
      ‘A plant.’

      (Elicitation)

(53) a. Nyo sudah marampok urang ko.
   3 PFCT AV-rob person DEM:prox
   ‘He’s already robbed this person.’

   (Text ID: 223549133923270306)

   b. Parampok.
      NOM-rob
      ‘A thief.’

      (Elicitation)

(54) a. Aden alah salasai mangarajoan tugeh tu.
   1sg PFCT finish AV-work-APP task DEM:dist
   ‘I’ve already finished doing that task.’

   b. Panyalasaian.
      NOM-finish-NOM
      ‘The ending.’

      (Elicitation)
4.2.1.3 Adverbs

We have established that Minangkabau has a class of nouns and verbs and that property words, or adjectives, are actually a sub-type of stative verb. In addition to these parts of speech, Minangkabau also has a class of adverbs.

As we saw in Section 4.2.1.2, adverbial notions such as negation as well as tense, aspect and mood are not encoded morphologically on the verb, rather they are realised as distinct lexical items that precede the verb. These kind of adverbs represent two distinct closed classes: negation and TAM adverbs. Adverbial notions such as manner and intensity of action, on the other hand, represent an open class. Manner and intensity adverbs are also realised as distinct lexical items, except they come after the verb instead of preceding it.

Just as nouns function across a range of functional domains, adverbial words denoting manner and intensity of action are also multifunctional as attributive devices. They can be used to modify not just verbs, but nominals and gradable stative verbs as well. Unmarked adverbs can also function to predicate.

Example (55) illustrates the use of the manner adverb *capek*, ‘fast, quickly’. In (55a) *capek* functions prototypically as a verbal modifier. Notice that *capek* appears in the slot following the active intransitive verb *lari*. In (55b) we find *capek* modifying the same verb *lari*. However, in this example, *lari* is performing a referential role since the enclitic *nyo* refers to a possessor rather than an actor. This is evidence that words denoting adverbial notions can also function attributively to modify nominals. In (55c) we find another instance of *capek* performing a non-prototypical function. In this example *capek* functions predicatively. Evidence for this comes from the use of the imperative marker -lah.

(55) a. *Inyo lari capek*  
     3 run fast  
     ‘She runs fast.’
b. *Larinyo capek.*
   
   run-3 fast
   
   ‘Her running is fast.’

c. *Capeklah!*
   
   fast-IMP
   
   ‘Hurry up!’

(Elicitation)

The sentences in (56) show how the intensifying adverb *bana* is used. Like *capek*, *bana* is used attributively with a range of parts of speech. Example (56a) shows the prototypical use of *bana* in with the verb *amuah*, ‘want’. In (56b) *bana* modifies the gradable stative verb *dingin*, ‘cold’. Finally, in (56c) *bana* is used to modify the nominal *rumah gadang tu*.

(56) a. *Baju iko inyo amuah bana.*
   
   shirt DEM:dist 3 want true
   
   ‘She really wants this top.’

b. *Udara dingin bana.*
   
   air cold true
   
   ‘It’s really cold.’

c. *Tapi memang rumah gadang tu bana nan alah layak runtuah.*
   
   but indeed house big DEM:dist true REL PFCT suitable collapse
   
   ‘But indeed it really is the *rumah gadang* that is ready to collapse.’

(Elicitation)

That adverbs operate across this range of functional domains again raises questions about the nature of categoriality in Minangkabau. These issues are discussed further in Chapter 6.

4.2.2 Closed Class Items

As well as the open class parts of speech discussed in Section 4.2.1 Minangkabau also has a number of closed class items that are restricted in terms of their syntactic environment. These closed class items include pronouns, prepositions, specifiers, negators, TAM adverbs and pragmatic particles.
4.2.2.1 Pronouns

Minangkabau marks a singular/plural distinction on its pronouns but notice that there is no singular/plural distinction in the third person. The Minangkabau pronoun paradigm is illustrated in Table 11.

Table 11. The Minangkabau pronoun paradigm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>REDUCED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>aden</td>
<td>den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ambo</td>
<td>mbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>denai</td>
<td>den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>waang</td>
<td>ang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engkau</td>
<td>kau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>inyo</td>
<td>nyo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reduced forms of the pronouns can be found as enclitic actors on the passive voice verb and as enclitics on nominals to indicate possession. The reduced forms of all pronouns often appear in casual discourse in place of the full forms. In this case, the difference is merely stylistic. Pronouns that do not have a reduced form are used in full to show possession but cannot be cliticised to the passive voice verb.

Minangkabau speakers also often substitute first and second person pronouns with personal names or epithets. Names are used to show solidarity towards addressees younger than the speaker or between speakers and addressees of the same age group. Epithets are based on kinship terms and are used to show politeness. Their use is determined by the addressee’s generational age, i.e. whether they are a child, a young adult, a parent-aged adult or a grandparent-aged adult, and the speaker’s age in relation to the addressee. For example, if I were speaking to a younger child I would refer to them by their name or by the epithet adik, ‘child’, and refer to myself as uni, ‘older

\(^{10}\) Awak, or wak, is also sometimes used to refer to the first person singular. Since it has an ‘inclusive’ meaning, its use in the singular is motivated by politeness as speakers use it to show solidarity with addressees.
sister’, or uni Sophie. If I were speaking to an older woman I could refer to myself by name or by a pronoun. To maintain politeness I would have to refer to the older person by an epithet, either uni, buk, or inyiak based on their generational age (see Table 12).

Table 12. Some commonly used Minangkabau epithets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERATION</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young child</td>
<td>adik</td>
<td>adik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older child, young adult</td>
<td>uda</td>
<td>uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>pak</td>
<td>buk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>angku</td>
<td>inyiak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.2 Prepositions

The relational status of nouns that have core grammatical roles in Minangkabau is not marked morphologically; rather it is reflected in the syntactic organisation of the clause and the relative topicality of the core participants. Non-core participant nominals however, are marked by prepositions that show their semantic role.

Table 13 exemplifies each of the prepositions used in Minangkabau to show semantic roles: dek, ka, untuak, di, dari and jo.

Table 13. Minangkabau prepositions showing semantic roles of non-core arguments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREPOSITION</th>
<th>SEMANTIC ROLE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dek</td>
<td>cause, actor in passive clause</td>
<td>dek inyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>recipient, location</td>
<td>ka Silvie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untuak</td>
<td>benefactor</td>
<td>untuak Udin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di</td>
<td>location</td>
<td>di kabun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dari</td>
<td>source</td>
<td>dari Padang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jo</td>
<td>instrument, comitative</td>
<td>jo pisau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2.3 Specifiers

Specifiers function to make the referent of a noun phrase explicit. Unlike attributive modifiers which follow the noun, in Minangkabau, specifiers precede the noun. Minangkabau specifiers include cardinal numbers, classifiers, quantifiers such as banyak, ‘lots’, and saketek, ‘a little’. The demonstratives itu or tu, and iko or ko form a separate class of specifiers which follow the noun. Please see section 4.2.1.1 for examples demonstratives as well as numbers and classifiers.

4.2.2.4 Negators

Minangkabau has two negators: the prohibitive particle jan which can only occur in a VP, and the general negator indak or ndak which can appear in both NP and VP frames (see Section 4.2.1.2).

4.2.2.5 TAM Adverbs

Minangkabau TAM adverbials are restricted to VP frames and occur in pre-verbal position. Some common TAM adverbials are listed in Table 14.

Table 14. Some Minangkabau TAM adverbials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAM MARKER</th>
<th>GLOSSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alah</td>
<td>PFCT ‘already’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>FUT ‘will, going to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadang</td>
<td>PROG ‘is doing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alun</td>
<td>not.yet ‘not yet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nio</td>
<td>want ‘want, will’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acok</td>
<td>often ‘often’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jarang</td>
<td>seldom ‘seldom’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulu</td>
<td>before ‘before’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masih</td>
<td>still ‘still’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2.6 Pragmatic Particles

Minangkabau pragmatic particles function in the discourse pragmatic domain of language therefore their use is not restricted by co-occurrence with specific parts of speech. They function primarily to show pragmatic emphasis, to establish politeness and solidarity, and to aid the flow of information from the “private world” of the speaker into the “shared world” of collaborative discourse (Schourup, 1983; 1999). Minangkabau speakers also make use of many Colloquial Indonesian pragmatic particles in informal contexts (cf. Wouk, 1998; 2001).

Table 15 lists some common Minangkabau pragmatic particles and their functions.

Table 15. Minangkabau pragmatic particles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICLE</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>onde</td>
<td>exclamatory</td>
<td>‘oh my’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nak</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td>‘you know, isn’t it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>marking shared information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>solidarity marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>politeness marking (of negatives)</td>
<td>‘isn’t it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lah</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td>‘just, you know’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>solidarity marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>showing lack of speaker control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>marking pragmatic focus</td>
<td>‘right’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>foregrounding</td>
<td>‘furthermore’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kok</td>
<td>topic marking</td>
<td>‘as for’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 The Predicate Construction

Section 4.3.2 demonstrated that Minangkabau has the distinct parts of speech noun, verb and adverb, and that nouns and adverbs are able to function predicatively like verbs. This is a non-prototypical function for these parts of speech. A number of other parts of speech can also function to predicate in Minangkabau, as will be discussed in Section 4.3.1.
Chapter 5 describes the Minangkabau system of voice and verbal morphology. In order to appreciate the claims made in that chapter it is necessary to have a preliminary understanding of verbs and predication in the language. Section 4.2.1.2 described the formal properties of verbs in Minangkabau and showed the syntactic frame of the predicate construction (see example (39)). However, the features of the predicate construction in general, including non-prototypical predicate constructions, also need to be examined. It is towards this aim that the remainder of this chapter will examine this construction in detail. Non verbal predicate constructions are discussed in Section 4.3.1. These predicate types include nominal predicates (Section 4.3.1.1), numeral predicates (Section 4.3.1.2), existential predicates (Section 4.3.1.3) and locative predicates (Section 4.3.1.4). The details of verbal predicates are discussed in Section 4.3.2.

4.3.1 Non-verbal Predicates

4.3.1.1 Nominal Predicates

Clauses with nominal predicates have a noun phrase as their head. Clauses with nominal predicates are usually equative or identifying (Lyons, 1995); they construct the pivot NP as being the same as the NP that predicates. For example, in (57) the pivot NP *namo anak tu*, ‘that child’s name’, is equated with the noun phrase *Ana*.

(57) \[
\text{Namo anak tu Ana.}
\]
\begin{tabular}{llll}
name & child & DEM:dist & Ana \\
\end{tabular}

‘That child’s name is Ana.’

(Elicitation)

Nominal predicates can also function in a similar way to statives. For example, in (58) the predicate NP *guru*, ‘teacher’, is attributive. Also notice that in (58) the predicate is modified by the aspectual marker *alah*. All nominal predicates can be modified by TAM adverbials just as verbs are.
(58) *Inyo alah guru.*
3 PFCT teacher
‘She is already a teacher.’

(Elicitation)

Verbal predicates can be also derived from nominals with the addition of the multifunctional affix *ba-* . The affix derives middle verbs from nouns as demonstrated in (59) and (60) (please also see Chapter 5).

(59) *Basuami jo urang Lampuang.*
MID-husband with person Lampung
‘She married a man from Lampung.’

(Text ID: 337497105305200306)

(60) *Si Emi basakolah, si Roni sagalo si Ann lai ado rumah.*
PERS Emi MID-school PERS Roni all PERS Ann more exist house
‘Emi went to school, so did Roni, all of them did, but Ann stayed at home.’

(Text ID: 562203133739080306)

Verbal predicates can also be derived from nominals with the use of the active voice prefix *maN-* . For example, in (61) the verb *mancarito-carito*, ‘tell a story’, has been derived from the NP *carito*, ‘story,’ (see Section 6.3.1.3 for more examples of active verbs derived from nominals).

(61) *E ado mancarito-carito jo ambo.*
FILL exist AV-RED-story with 1sg
‘Somebody told me the story.’

(Text ID: 157057083427161106)

Unmarked nominals can be predicative even when a marked alternative exists. For example, in (62) notice that the unmarked form *namo*, ‘name’, functions predicatively in the same way as the marked form *banamo*.

(62) a. *Namo nyo Ana.*
name 3 Ana
‘She is called Ana.’
4.3.1.2 Numeral Predicates

Minangkabau also has numeral predicates. Numeral predicates, like some nominal predicates, are attributive. In (63) the numeral head *duo*, ‘two’, modifies the argument *anak den*, ‘my children’.

(63) \[ \text{Anak } \text{den } \text{duo.} \]
\[ \text{child} \ 1\text{sg} \ \text{two} \]
‘I have two children.’
[ Literally: ‘my children are two in number.’ ]

(Elicitation)

Also like nominal predicates, numeral predicates can be preceded by TAM adverbials. In (64) notice that *duo* is modified by the perfective marker *alah*.

(64) \[ \text{Anak } \text{aden } \text{alah } \text{duo.} \]
\[ \text{child} \ 1\text{sg} \ \text{PFCT} \ \text{two} \]
‘I already have two children.’
[ Literally: ‘my children are already two in number.’ ]

(Elicitation)

Numerals can also productively combine with the affix *ba-*. In (65a) *ba-* is affixed to *duo* to indicate that the pivot *nyo* is in a state of ‘twoness’. In (65a), the *ba-* affix forces the interpretation that the pivot *nyo* is a single entity consisting of two parts, these two parts performing the action together. Whereas in (65b), *duo* refers to two separate entities.

(65) a. \[ \text{Datang } \text{nyo } \text{baduo.} \]
\[ \text{come} \ 3 \ \text{MID-two} \]
‘They came together.’
Quantifiers can also function as the head of a predicate construction and have the same attributive function. For example, in (66) the predicate is the quantifier banyak, ‘a lot’, which modifies the NP saudara ibu, ‘your brothers and sisters’, and in (67) the quantifier saketek, ‘a little bit’, functions as the head to modify the NP nasi, ‘rice’.

(66) Saudara ibuk masih banyak?
sibling mother still many
Do you still have many brothers and sisters?

(Text ID: 574966094643200306)

(67) Nasi saketek.
cooked.rice ONE-small
‘There’s only a little bit of rice.’

(Text ID: 833517024233300606)

4.3.1.3 Existential Predicates

Existential predicates are those which have the auxiliary verbs ado, ‘to be, to exist’, or punyo, ‘to have’, as their head.

The verb ado licenses a single nominal argument. In examples (68) and (69) ado is the head of the predicate construction and ujan, ‘rain’, and banyak samuik, ‘lot of ants’, are the respective arguments.

(68) Ado ujan.
exist rain
‘It’s raining.’

(Elicitation)
(69)  Ado banyak samuik di tampek gulo.
     exist many ant LOC place sugar
     ‘There are lots of ants in the sugar container.’

     (Elicitation)

If *ado* is deleted the existential clause becomes a locative predicate. To illustrate this, consider example (70). This example is similar in meaning and structure to (69), except that in (70) the locative phrase *di tampek gulo*, ‘in the sugar container’, is the head.

(70)  Banyak samuik di tampek gulo.
     many ant LOC place sugar
     ‘Lots of ants are in the sugar container.’

     (Elicitation)

Similarly in (71), the locative phrase *di belakang rumah den*, ‘behind my house’, is the head (see Section 4.3.1.4).

(71)  Banyak batang pisang di balakang rumah den.
     many trunk banana LOC behind house 1sg
     ‘Many banana trees are behind my house.’

     (Elicitation)

Example (72) illustrates a possessive construction which has the possessive verb *punyo* as its head. This type of construction is a sub-type of existential constructions (Lyons, 1995) and is transitive. In (72) the first person *aden* is the pivot and *duo anak*, ‘two children’, is the possessed NP.

(72)  Aden punyo duo anak.
     1sg have two child
     ‘I have two children.’

     (Elicitation)

4.3.1.4 Locative Predicates

Locative predicates do not contain a prototypical Minangkabau verb, instead a locative phrase (which consists of a locative preposition and an NP) functions as the head (see
examples (70) and (71)). Like verbal predicates, locative predicates can also be modified by preceding adverbials, including negators and TAM adverbials.

An example of a locative predicate can be found in (73). In this example the locative phrase *ka rumah den*, ‘to my house’, is the head.

(73) \[ \text{Inyo alun ka rumah den.} \]
\[ 3 \text{ not yet to house 1sg} \]
‘He hasn't been to my house yet.’

(Elicitation)

Another example can be found in (74) where the locative phrase *di kantua*, ‘at the office’, functions as the head. Notice that in this example the perfective marker *alah* precedes the predicate.

(74) \[ \text{Inyo alah di kantua.} \]
\[ 3 \text{ PFCT LOC office} \]
‘He's already at the office.’

(Elicitation)

**4.3.2 Verbal Predicates**

The prototypical predicate construction in Minangkabau has a verb as its head. Minangkabau verb roots can be divided into two types: statives and actives (see Section 4.2.1.2). Active verb roots can further be divided into three types: active intransitives, transitives and ditransitives. Predicate constructions using each of these verb types are discussed in the sections that follow. For statives see Section 4.3.2.1, for active intransitives see Section 4.3.2.2, for transitive see Section 4.3.2.3, and for ditransitives see Section 4.3.2.4. The imperative construction will then be described in Section 4.3.2.5.
4.3.2.1 Stative Predicates

Basic stative clauses have a stative verb as their head and a single undergoer argument which acts as the pivot and canonically precedes the verb. Stative predicates are not marked by verbal morphology and can be distinguished from other verb types because of their stative aktionsart. Example (75) illustrates a canonical, basic stative clause with the verb *berang*, ‘angry’. Please note that *berang* forms part of a special class of gradable stative verbs (see Section 4.2.1.2).

(75)  \[ \textbf{Amak } \textit{berang}. \]
     \[ \text{mum angry} \]
     \[ ‘\text{Mum is angry.’} \]

     (Elicitation)

Since *berang* is an emotion stative it has special syntactic valence. This means that a second argument can be added to this basic stative clause type with the addition of the preposition *ka*, as shown in (76).

(76)  \[ \textbf{Amak } \textit{berang } \textit{ka } \textit{awak}. \]
     \[ \text{mum angry to 1} \]
     \[ ‘\text{Mum was angry at me.’} \]

     (Elicitation)

Like *berang*, *takuik*, ‘fear, scared’, has special syntactic valence. This means that a clausal complement (the cause) can be introduced into the clause with the use of a preposition. In (77) the cause of the fear, that the dog will bite, is marked by the causal marker *dek*.

(77)  a.  \[ \textit{Inyo } \textit{takuik}. \]
     \[ 3 \text{ fear} \]
     \[ ‘\text{He’s scared.’} \]

     b.  \[ \textit{Den } \textit{takuik } \textit{dek } \textit{anjiang } \textit{tu } \textit{ka } \textit{manggigik } \textit{den}. \]
     \[ 1sg \text{ fear CAUSE dog DEM:dist FUT AV-bite 1sg} \]
     \[ ‘\text{I’m scared that dog will bite me.’} \]

     (Elicitation)
As well as emotional states, Minangkabau stative clauses can also comprise inherent gradable physical states, for example *pendek*, ‘short’, *tinggi*, ‘tall’. Stative clauses with inherent physical state predicates have the same clause structure as emotional states but do not have the same special syntactic valence that allows for a second argument to be introduced into the clause. An example of a gradable stative predicate can be found in (78). The clause structure resembles the clause structure of a typical state as the undergoer pivot (the pronoun *nyo*) precedes the predicate *tinggi*, ‘tall’.

(78)  
\[ Yo \ iko, \ nyo \ tinggi \ a. \]  
\[ yes \ DEM:prox \ 3 \ tall \ FILL \]  
‘Yes this, its big eh.’

(Text ID: 435063103250150406)

Gradable stative predicates can also be modified by comparative markers. In (79) the stative predicate *tinggi* is modified by the comparative *labiah*, ‘more’. Comparatives are inserted before the predicate and after any tense or aspect adverbials. Comparatives cannot be used with attributive nominal predicates like those exemplified in (58).

(79)  
\[ Anak \ tu \ alah \ labiah \ tinggi \ dari \ udanyo. \]  
\[ child \ DEM:dist \ PFCT \ more \ tall \ from \ older.brother-3 \]  
‘That kid is already taller than his older brother.’

(Elicitation)

However, a comparative marker is not absolutely necessary for a comparative reading of a gradable stative as (80) demonstrates. In this example the comparative marker *labiah*, ‘more’, on *pendek*, ‘short’, is missing but the interpretation *shorter* is still available. The comparative reading relies on the presence of the prepositional phrase *dari pisau tu*.

(80)  
\[ Pisau \ ko \ pendek \ dari \ pisau \ tu. \]  
\[ knife \ DEM:prox \ short \ from \ knife \ DEM:dist \]  
‘This knife is shorter than that one.’

(Elicitation)
Non-gradable states do not co-occur with comparative markers because they represent inherent polar states. Example (81) illustrates the use of the non-gradable stative predicate *mati*, ‘dead’. Stative predicates, like all predicate constructions, can be modified by preceding TAM adverbials. In (81) the TAM adverbial *alah* is used to mark perfective aspect. It is inserted before the stative predicate *mati*, but after the undergoer, *maliang tu*, ‘the thief’.

(81) \[ \text{Maliang tu alah mati.} \]
\[ \text{thief DEM:dist PFCT dead} \]
\[ \text{‘The thief died.’} \]

(Elicitation)

Another feature of stative predicates is that they productively derive active transitive verbs with the addition of active voice morphology and the applicative *-an*. Most active transitive verbs derived from statives this way will have a causative meaning. In (82) the active transitive verb *mandinginan*, ‘to cause to be cold’, has been derived by adding the active voice prefix *maN*- and the applicative *-an* to the stative root *dingin*.

(82) \[ \text{Ambo mandinginan gulai.} \]
\[ \text{1sg AV-cold-APP curry} \]
\[ \text{‘I’m cooling down the curry.’} \]

(Elicitation)

Stative predicates which derive causatives can also form change of state verbs with just the addition of the active voice prefix *maN*- as (83) demonstrates. In colloquial contexts, speakers of Minangkabau will often omit the active voice prefix *maN*. This means that if a speaker uses a bare form of a stative verb then the difference between a state and a change of state is not explicitly encoded.

(83) \[ \text{Mandingin se udaro ko yo.} \]
\[ \text{AV-cold just air DEM:prox EMPH} \]
\[ \text{‘The weather is getting cold, isn't it?’} \]

(Elicitation)
The semantics of some active transitive verbs formed from statives are unpredictable. For example in (84) the active transitive verb formed from the state *berang*, ‘angry’, is not a causative. Instead the form *mamberangan*, ‘get angry at’, implies that *awak* is the subject of *amak*’s anger. Notice that *awak* does not undergo a change of state like an undergoer in a causative construction would. This behaviour is probably due to *berang*’s special syntactic valence (see example (76)).

(84)  

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Amak } & \text{mamberangan } \text{ awak.} \\
\text{mum} & \text{AV-angry-APP } \text{1} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Mum got angry at me.’

(Elicitation)

**4.3.2.2 Active Intransitive Predicates**

Minangkabau active intransitive predicates display active aktionsart. Where statives have an undergoer pivot, active intransitives have an actor pivot which typically precedes the verb. The majority of active intransitive verb roots combine productively with the active voice prefix *maN-*. However, many speakers treat the active voice prefix as optional, especially in informal interaction (see Chapter 6).

Some examples of typical active intransitive predicates follow. In (85) *manyuruak*, ‘hide’, is the predicate and *ambo*, ‘I’, the actor pivot. The locative phrase *belakang batang kambria*, ‘behind the coconut tree’, is not part of the core argument structure of the predicate hence it is marked by the preposition *di*. In (86) *manumbuah*, ‘grow’, is the active intransitive predicate and *rambuik anak tu*, ‘the child’s hair’, is the actor pivot.

(85)  

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Ambo } & \text{manyuruak } \text{ di belakang batang kambria.} \\
\text{1} & \text{AV-hide LOC behind tree coconut} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I’m hiding behind a coconut tree.’

(Elicitation)
Both the sentences (85) and (86) would be equally well formed if the active intransitive predicates were to appear without the active voice prefix, as (87) and (88) demonstrate. Examples (87) and (88) do not differ from (85) and (86) in terms of syntax or semantics, the main difference is one of register; the presence of the active voice prefix in (85) and (86) makes these sentences more formal and refined than (87) and (88) which are more representative of informal, casual and intimate speech in which the bare forms of active intransitive predicates frequently occur.

Active intransitive predicates also productively combine with the applicative -an to produce active transitive predicates. The applicative functions to license an undergoer argument to appear as part of the predicate’s argument structure (see Chapter 5). In canonical transitive clauses the undergoer argument is inserted directly following the predicate. In (89) the applicative -an has licensed the undergoer argument buku, ‘book’. Similarly in (90), -an has made the predicate tumbuh, ‘grow’, transitive by licensing the undergoer argument lado jo jagung, ‘pepper and corn’.

(85) Rambuik anak tu mulai manumbuah.
    hair child DEM:dist start AV-grow
    ‘That child’s hair has started to grow.’

(86) Rambuik anak tu mulai tumbuah.
    hair child DEM:dist start grow
    ‘That child’s hair has started to grow.’

(87) Ambo suruak di belakang batang karambia.
    1 hide LOC behind tree coconut
    ‘I’m hiding behind a coconut tree.’

(88) Rambuik anak tu mulai tumbuah.
    hair child DEM:dist start grow
    ‘That child’s hair has started to grow.’

(89) Ambo manyuruakan buku.
    1 AV-hide-APP book
    ‘I hid the book.’

(90) Rambuik anak tu mulai tumbuah.
    hair child DEM:dist start grow
    ‘That child’s hair has started to grow.’

(91) Rambuik anak tu mulai tumbuah.
    hair child DEM:dist start grow
    ‘That child’s hair has started to grow.’

(92) Rambuik anak tu mulai tumbuah.
    hair child DEM:dist start grow
    ‘That child’s hair has started to grow.’
(90) *Inyo manumbuahan lado jo jagung.*
3 AV-grow-APP chilli with corn
‘He is growing peppers and corn.’

(Elicitation)

In (91) notice that the undergoer argument is not overtly expressed. The presence of the applicative -an on the verb alone is responsible for the transitive interpretation of the predicate; it is understood that something was hidden even though exactly what was hidden is not expressed. Example (91) is taken from naturalistic conversation. In fact such a sentence could only occur in discourse where the undergoer argument can be retrieved from the discourse context.

(91) *Nyo suruakan Ø dalam samak tu.*
3 hide-APP Ø inside bush DEM:dist
‘He hid (it) in that bush.’

(Text ID: 860134120315290306)

Minangkabau also has a series of active intransitive predicates that are lexically bare. The verbs *pai*, ‘go’, and *kalua*, ‘go out’, are two of the most frequent of these predicate types and are exemplified in (92) and (93). These predicates also do not regularly combine with the active voice prefix *maN* as shown in the examples.

(92) *Inyo (*mam-*)pai surang.*
3 (*AV-*)go ONE-person
‘He went alone.’

(Elicitation)

(93) *Aden suko (*mang-*)kalua malam minggu.*
1 like (*AV-*)go.out night week
‘I like going out on Saturday nights.’

(Elicitation)

Nevertheless, active transitive forms can be derived from these verbs with the use of the applicative -an. Only then can these lexically bare stems combine with the active voice prefix. In (94) an active transitive verb has been derived from *pai* and in (95) the same process has affected *kalua*. 
4.3.2.3 Transitive Predicates

Canonical transitive clauses in Minangkabau have the order ‘pivot + predicate + undergoer’. In a typical transitive clause an active transitive verb root functions as the head and is marked by the active voice prefix maN-. Adjuncts do not form part of the predicate’s core argument structure and are marked by a preposition. Like active intransitives, active transitive predicates can be marked by the active voice marker maN-. Example (96) illustrates a canonical active transitive clause with the active transitive predicate mancuci, ‘wash’. Notice that sabun, ‘soap’, is marked by the preposition jo because it is an adjunct.

(96) Inyo mancuci tangannyo jo sabun.
3 AV-wash hand-3 with soap
‘He washed his hands with soap.’

Like active intransitive verbs, transitive verbs are not obligatorily marked by the active voice prefix in simple clauses. In (97) the verb cuci appears in bare form without maN-. However, there are no major syntactic differences between this sentence and example (96) in which the verb is marked by the active voice prefix. The actor argument precedes the verb in both sentences but in (97) there is no overt undergoer argument. The undergoer argument is ‘understood’ as it is retrievable from prior discourse.
Transitive verbs also productively combine with the applicative -an to introduce an additional argument into the clause. In (98) notice that the beneficiary *bininyo*, ‘his wife’, is marked as an adjunct by *untuak* in (98a) and (98b) regardless of the presence of the applicative. However, the adjunct marking preposition *untuak* can be deleted and the beneficiary can be moved to post verbal position if the applicative -an is present. In (98c) and (98d) sentences the beneficiary *bininyo* has been moved to post verbal position and *untuak* has been deleted. However, notice that (98c) is ungrammatical because there is no applicative on the verb. This suggests that in (98d) *bininyo* is part of the core argument structure of the verb whereas in (98c) it is not (see Chapter 5).

(98) a.  *Inyo mambuek kopi untuak bininyo.*
    3 AV-make coffee for wife-3
    ‘He made coffee for his wife.’

       b.  *Inyo mambuek an kopi untuak bininyo.*
    3 AV-make-APP coffee for wife-3
    ‘He made coffee for his wife.’

       c.  *inyo mambuek bininyo kopi.*
    3 AV-make wife-3 coffee

       d.  *Inyo mambuek an bininyo kopi.*
    3 AV-make-APP wife-3 coffee
    ‘He made his wife coffee.’

    (Elicitation)

The benefactive reading of the -an applicative when it combines with active transitive verbs is so strong that the beneficiary argument may be unexpressed, but still understood as being an underlying part of the verb’s argument structure. For example, the number of expressed arguments is the same in both (99a) and (99b); the actor, *Santi*, and the undergoer, *baju Silvie*, ‘Silvie’s shirt’. However, the presence of the applicative -an in (99b) coerces the interpretation ‘Santi is washing Silvie’s shirt for Silvie’, whereas a benefactive interpretation of the verb *mancuci* in (99a) is not possible.
(99) a. *Santi mancuci baju Silvie.*
   *Santi AV-wash shirt Silvie*
   ‘Santi washed Silvie’s shirt.’

b. *Santi mancucian baju Silvie.*
   *Santi AV-wash-APP shirt Silvie*
   ‘Santi washed Silvie’s shirt (for her).’

(Elicitation)

4.3.2.4 Ditransitive Predicates

Minangkabau also has a ditransitive predicate construction which has a ditransitive verb root as its head. Ditransitive verb roots productively combine with the active voice prefix *maN-* and license three arguments.

The sentences in (100) illustrate the use of the ditransitive predicate *maagiah*, ‘give’. Notice that each of the sentences in (100) has three arguments: the actor pivot *ambo*, ‘I’, the undergoer *pitih*, ‘money’, and the recipient *urang tu*, ‘that guy’. Since the verb root *agiah* is ditransitive the presence of the applicative *-an* is not required to change the argument structure of the verb nor the organisation of the basic clause, as comparison between (100a) and (100b) shows. Instead, *-an* explicitly marks the recipient as the end point of the action (see Section 5.3.1).

(100) a. *Ambo maagiah pitih ka urang tu.*
   *1sg AV-give money to person DEM:dist*
   ‘I gave money to that guy.’

b. *Aden maagiahan pitih ka urang tu.*
   *1sg AV-give-APP money to person DEM:dist*
   ‘I gave money to that guy.’

c. *Ambo maagiah inyo pitih.*
   *1sg AV-give 3sg money*
   ‘I gave that guy money.’
d. *Ambo maagiahan inyo pitih.*
   1sg AV-give-APP 3 money
   ‘I gave that guy money.’

(Elicitation)

Another feature of ditransitive verbs is that the recipient argument can be assigned core argument status and swap places with the undergoer argument. For example, in (100c) and (100d) notice that the recipient *urang tu*, ‘that guy’, has been moved to core argument position following the verb. Its prepositional marker *ka* has also been deleted. A similar construction also exists in Indonesian, which Chung (1976b) calls the “dative” construction (see Chapter 5).

Also compare the sentences in (100c) and (100d) to those in (98c) and (98d). Notice that the “dative” construction is ungrammatical in (98c) because the applicative *-an* does not appear on the verb whereas the applicative is not required in (100c). The fact that the applicative has a different role for these two verbs shows that semantic valence is specified by the Minangkabau verb root.

4.3.2.5 Imperatives

The discussion in Section 4.3 has so far focused only on predicates in the indicative mood. This section provides an overview of Minangkabau imperatives in order to complete our understanding of the predicate construction.

In Minangkabau, only verbal predicates can be used in the imperative construction. This suggests that predication is indeed the prototypical function of verbs in Minangkabau and that other parts of speech are not able to predicate in as complete a way as verbs. The imperative construction is marked on a bare verb root by *-lah*, the imperative post-clitic. If applicatives are required in the indicative form of the verb then these are retained in the imperative form. Prohibitives are formed by marking the verb with the prohibitive particle *jan*. Verbs in prohibitive constructions retain their voice marking.

---

11 Note that the imperative post-clitic *-lah* and the particle *lah* are two distinct forms. They have different prosodic qualities and very different semantic effects. Imperative *-lah* is also restricted to VP frames whereas the particle *lah* is unrestricted.
Some examples of imperative verbs marked by the imperative marker -lah follow. In (101) the imperative verb is the stative verb sanang, ‘happy’. Notice that the clitic does not cliticise directly on to the verb because there is an intervening pragmatic particle. Example (102) illustrates the use of the imperative marker -lah with the active intransitive verb root tari, ‘dance’, and example (103) shows the imperative form of the transitive verb tolong, ‘help’. In (104) there is an example of a transitive verb derived from the stative stem mati, ‘dead’. Notice that in this example the applicative -an must still appear on the verb.

(101) Sanang se lah.  
happy just IMP  
‘Be happy.’  
(Elicitation)

(102) Tarilah!  
dance-IMP  
‘Dance!’  
(Elicitation)

(103) Tolonglah kawan tu.  
help-IMP friend DEM:dist  
‘Help your friend!’  
(Elicitation)

(104) Matianlah lampu dulu.  
dead-APP-IMP light first  
‘Switch off the light.’  
(Elicitation)

If the imperative marker -lah is removed, the bare verb can still be interpreted as an imperative form if context allows it (although a -lah form is considered more polite). An imperative interpretation of a bare verb often relies on emphatic intonation on the verb root and the presence or absence of the addressee NP. For example in (105a) an imperative interpretation is only available for the bare verb form balian, ‘buy (benefactive)’, because the NP Santi appears in a separate intonation unit and is therefore understood as the addressee. However in (105b) the entire sentence is one
intonation unit and *Santi* must be understood as the actor pivot of a bare active construction.

     Santi buy-APP book for Ali
     ‘Santi, buy a book for Ali.’

     Santi buy-APP book for Ali
     ‘Santi bought a book for Ali.’

(Elicitation)

The final feature of imperatives in Minangkabau is the prohibitive construction. Some illustrative examples of this construction can be found in (106) to (108). In (106) the prohibitive marker *jan* creates a negative imperative from the stative verb *berang*, ‘angry’.

(106) *Jan berang!*
     PROHIB angry
     ‘Don’t be angry.’

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (107) the prohibitive marker precedes the verb, in this case the active transitive verb *masak*, ‘cook’, to create the prohibitive construction.

(107) *Jan masak nasi kini, beko se.*
     PROHIB cook rice now later just
     ‘Don’t cook the rice now, just do it later.’

(Elicitation)

Note that the prohibitive construction allows voice marking to remain on the verb. For example, in (108) notice that the verb *dimatian*, ‘switch off’, retains its passive voice marking.
(108) *Jan dimatian.*

PROHIB PV-dead-APP

'Don’t switch it off.'

(Elicitation)

### 4.4 Conclusion

In order to prepare the reader for discussion of voice morphology in Chapter 5 this chapter has provided a description of the parts of speech categories in Minangkabau and has also presented a detailed description of the language’s predicate construction. Minangkabau has the open category parts of speech noun, verb and adverb and a number of closed category parts of speech which are restricted in terms of which open category they may co-occur with.

However, the multifunctionality of Minangkabau parts of speech, as well as the existence of bare verbs, challenges some of the assumptions about parts of speech categories made in this chapter. Further discussion about bare verbs and the theoretical problems they pose can be found in Chapter 6.
Chapter 5. Voice and Verb Morphology

5.0 Introduction

Standard Minangkabau resembles a typical Indonesian-type language with an opposition between active voice, which is marked on the verb by the prefix $maN$-, and passive voice, which is marked on the verb by the proclitic $di$-. Like Standard Indonesian, Standard Minangkabau also has a *pasif semu* construction in which the verb is unmarked (see Section 2.2). In addition, and also like Standard Indonesian and other Malayic languages, Minangkabau has a class of lexical/derivational verbal affixes, including the involuntary marker $ta$-, the causative marker $pa$-, and the multifunctional prefix $ba$-. The active voice marker $maN$- also forms part of this class of affixes since it has a number of lexical/derivational functions as well (see Section 5.1.2.3). Minangkabau also makes use of two applicatives: -$an$ and -$i$. Although the applicatives have a primarily syntactic function, they also have semantic and lexical/derivational functions.

Colloquial Minangkabau, on the other hand, is better characterised as having a ‘Sundic-type’ voice system (see Chapter 2 and Chapter 6). Colloquial Minangkabau makes use of the applicatives -$an$ and -$i$ as well as the lexical/derivational affixes $ta$-, $pa$-, and $ba$-. However, unlike Standard Minangkabau, in Colloquial Minangkabau bare verbs are frequently found in contexts where we would expect to find a verb marked for active or passive voice. Utterances with bare verbs are not *ungrammatical*, rather they are *underspecified*. This means that in Colloquial Minangkabau $maN$- and $di$- are optional and that their function is primarily semantic/pragmatic as opposed to syntactic.

In Standard Minangkabau, active voice, passive voice and the *pasif semu* work to realign the roles of actor and undergoer with the pivot function. Like the applicatives -$an$ and -$i$, $maN$-, $di$- and the *pasif semu* construction also alter the verb’s argument structure, for example $di$- demotes the actor to non-core argument status (see Section 5.1.3) The opposition between active voice, passive voice and the *pasif semu* in Standard Minangkabau is primarily pragmatically motivated. This means that the verb
is marked to indicate the discourse relevance of its actor and undergoer participants, i.e. the degree of participant involvement in the event as well as the degree of participant relevance according to the context.

Shibatani (2006) observes that although active/passive voice systems (as well as direct/inverse voice systems and Philippine-type voice systems) are pragmatically motivated, voice oppositions ultimately encode conceptual phenomena. These conceptual phenomena include showing the pragmatic relevance of event participants but also how the event itself progresses, a concept that Shibatani refers to as the “evolution of action” (similar positions are also taken in Croft, 1994; Gil, 2002a; Kemmer, 1993). Shibatani (2006) argues that voice marking reflects human conceptualisations of events and that the “evolution of action” reflects the fact that humans understand different events to have a focus either on the event’s origins, its development, or its end point. Thus voice marking encodes how the action originates “origin of action”, how the action progresses “development of action”, and how and where the action ends “termination of action” (Shibatani, 2006). For example, transitive actions typically end in the patient being affected, however in some events, the action terminates at a third entity, perhaps a recipient or a benefactor, thus the focus is on the end point of the action. If voice marking encodes this kind of situation type then it can be said to show the “termination of action”. Types of voice marking that fall into this category include benefactives, malefactives and applicatives (Shibatani, 2006: 240). Other types of voice marking used to encode distinctions at each point in the “evolution of action” are listed in Table 16.

Table 16. Types of conceptual voice marking.

(Shibatani, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVOLUTION OF ACTION</th>
<th>TYPE OF VOICE MARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. causative/non-causative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Development of an action: | a. active/middle  
|                              | b. ergative/antipassive |
| 3. Termination of an action: | a. benefactive/maleactive/applicative |
Shibatani’s (2006) framework provides a coherent typological approach for describing the pragmatic properties as well as the conceptual, event-based properties of voice. So, based on this framework, I argue that the opposition between active and passive voice in Minangkabau is pragmatically motivated whereas Minangkabau’s lexical/derivational affixes *ta-, pa-, ba-*, as well as the active voice prefix *maN*- and the applicatives -*an* and -*i* are primarily motivated by conceptual factors to show the “evolution of action”. Shibatani (2006: 218) also acknowledges the fact that “many voice phenomena straddle the semantics-pragmatics boundary”. It is clear that Minangkabau’s voice system also straddles this boundary, since, for example, the use of the active voice marker *maN*- is motivated by both discourse/pragmatic and semantic/conceptual notions. Therefore, I also argue that the pragmatic and semantic/conceptual voice systems of Minangkabau overlap and complement each other.

This chapter will first describe the pragmatically motivated voice system of Minangkabau, examining the properties of active voice, passive voice and the *pasif semu* (see Section 5.1). Examination of the lexical/derivational affixes that function as part of Minangkabau’s conceptually motivated voice system will then follow in Section 5.2. A description of the Minangkabau applicatives can be found in Section 5.3.

### 5.1 Pragmatically Motivated Voice

In a pragmatically motivated voice system, one argument is assigned discourse relevance for a number of reasons, including that it: 1) has “constitutive relevance” (i.e. it refers to a first or second person speech act participant); 2) “it is most salient in the speaker’s mind”; 3) “it plays an important role in the propositional act” (i.e. it refers to old information or is particularly conceptually salient); and 4) “it is the entity on which the hearer’s attention is focused” (Shibatani, 2006: 259). The high discourse relevance of the argument is reflected morphologically in that it triggers corresponding verbal marking, and syntactically by the fact that it has control over a number of restricted syntactic constructions. Thus in pragmatically motivated voice systems the notion of discourse relevance has been grammaticalised.
In Minangkabau, the argument assigned the highest degree of discourse relevance is identified as the pivot. The pivot has control over a number of syntactic constructions (see Section 5.1.1.4) and triggers active voice marking if it is an actor, and passive voice marking if it is an undergoer. Section 5.1.1 explains the role of discourse pragmatics in selecting the pivot in Minangkabau, examines the Minangkabau pivot function in the context of semantic roles and grammatical relations, and also demonstrates how to identify a pivot in Minangkabau by showing the range of syntactic structures over which it has control. Sections 5.1.2, 5.1.3, and 5.1.4 then describe active voice, passive voice and the pasif semu (P2) constructions respectively, and show how these voice constructions interact with the pivot, how they alter grammatical relations, and how they also operate within the semantic and lexical/derivative domains.

5.1.1 The Pivot Function

5.1.1.1 Pivots and Discourse Pragmatics

In Minangkabau, there are a number of discourse pragmatic factors that affect voice marking. Definite NPs, discourse topical NPs, and NPs that refer to speech act participants are more highly referential than other nominals. These nominals are therefore more likely to be selected as the pivot and trigger corresponding voice marking.

Pivots in Minangkabau are definite. This means that the referential “scope” of pivots in Minangkabau is more restricted than the scope of non-pivots. Consider the sentence ‘Every boy kissed a girl’. This sentence has two possible interpretations due to the undefined scope of the non-pivot argument a girl; either the sentence reads ‘every boy kissed a girl each’, or ‘every boy kissed the same girl’ (cf. Keenan, 1976). This sentence has been translated into Minangkabau in (109). Example (109a) shows that the sentence has the same ambiguity as it does in English. This is because the quantifier scope of the non-pivot argument, padusi, ‘girl’, is undefined. In (109b) the ambiguity is avoided because the demonstrative tu indicates that the referent of padusi is definite. However, in (109c) note that the demonstrative tu is not obligatory for the sentence to read ‘the
same girl kissed every boy’. This is because padusi is the pivot and, by definition, highly referential and definite.

(109)a. Satiok laki-laki mancium padusi.
   ONE-every RED-male AV-kiss female
   ‘Every boy kissed a girl.’
   [Every boy kissed a girl each/Every boy kissed the same girl.]

b. Satiok laki-laki mancium padusi tu.
   ONE-every RED-male AV-kiss female DEM:dist
   ‘Every boy kissed a girl.’
   [Every boy kissed the same girl.]

c. Padusi (tu) mancium satiok laki-laki.
   female (DEM:dist) AV-kiss ONE-every RED-male
   ‘A girl kissed every boy.’
   [The same girl kissed every boy.]

(Elicitation)

The pivot argument in Minangkabau is also discourse topical. This means that the pivot’s referent is old information; it will be known to the hearer because it has been established in prior discourse. As a result, the pivot argument is often left unexpressed because its referent can be easily established from the discourse context. For example, in (110) the undergoer argument of the verb diagiah, ‘given’, which also happens to be the pivot, is unexpressed (as shown by the null constituent symbol Ø). Since the reference set of the null pivot includes a participant in the conversation, i.e. the speaker, who is also introduced in the previous clause uang saku punyo awak, ‘we have our own pocket money’, the null pivot’s referent is highly referentially salient and retrievable from the discourse context.

(110) Uang saku punyo awak se lai tapi beko Ø diagiahnyo snack.
   money pocket own 1 only more but later Ø PV-give-3 snack
   ‘We have our own pocket money but later on (we) get given snacks.’

(Text ID: 627106104107130306)

Similarly, the referent of the missing pivot in (111b) is also retrievable from the discourse context. It is clear from (111a) that the actor, Kancia, ‘Mousedeer’, is a
discourse topical participant, since the story\textsuperscript{12} is about him. Therefore, Kancia is also assumed to be the missing pivot in (111b).

(111) a. \textit{Carito nyo bamulo dari saikua Kancia.}  
\textit{story 3 POSS-begin from ONE-CLASS:tail mousedeer}  
\textit{‘The story begins with a Mousedeer.’}  

\textit{(Text ID: 135333143557140607)}

b. \textit{Ø Maendap-endap ka mancilok mantimun pak tani.}  
\textit{Ø AV-RED-crouch FUT AV-steal cucumber Father farm}  
\textit{‘(Mousedeer) was creeping around wanting to steal the farmer's cucumbers.’}  

\textit{(Text ID: 857720144150140607)}

Another example of pivot omission can be found in (112). This example comes from a conversation about traditional weddings. The topic of this particular conversation, i.e. what the conversation is about, is isi jalange, ‘the contents of the wedding gift’. Being the discourse topic, isi jalange is necessarily referentially salient and is interpreted as the unexpressed pivot, the undergoer argument specified by the verb the verb dicaliak, ‘examined’, in (112b).

(112) a. \textit{Nyo kan ditanyo a isi jalange.}  
\textit{3 EMPH PV-ask what contents wedding.gift-3}  
\textit{‘They were asked what was in the wedding gift.’}  

\textit{(Text ID: 113014112832080506)}

b. \textit{Ø Dicaliak dekurang ma.}  
\textit{Ø PV-look CAUSE person EMPH}  
\textit{‘(The contents of the wedding gift) were examined by people.’}  

\textit{(Text ID: 570264113048080506)}

Arguments are selected as pivots because they are highly referential and discourse topical. Arguments are discourse topical if their referents are participants in the conversation. Arguments are also discourse topical if they have a high number of mentions in the discourse, i.e. if the discourse is about these particular participants

\textsuperscript{12} A transcript of the Minangkabau folk tale ‘Yang Lamah Yang Cadiak or The Weak and The Cunning’, from which these examples are taken, can be found in Appendix 4.
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(Wouk, 1989). The referential saliency of arguments can also be determined by the pragmatic effects of contrastive focus (Arka, 2003a).

To test the effects of contrastive focus on pivot selection in Minangkabau I asked my language consultants the question in (113a), ‘sia nan mambali oto baru?’ , ‘who bought a new car?’ , and added that they should imagine that I already knew that it was either Udin or somebody else. This meant that their answer would then provide contrastive focus between the two possible answers. In (113b) the answer Udin is given, but this answer should be understood in context; i.e. it was Udin that bought the new car (rather than somebody else). Since the answer Udin provides contrastive focus, this means that Udin the NP is referentially salient and therefore selected as the pivot. This in turn triggers active voice marking on the verb since Udin is an actor. Notice that although (113c) is grammatically well formed, in this context it is infelicitous (as shown by the # symbol). This because the NP oto baru, ‘a new car’, has been selected as the pivot even though it is not the most referentially salient argument.

(113) a.  
\[ \text{Sia } \text{nan mambali oto baru?} \]  
\[ \text{who REL AV-buy car new} \]  
‘Who bought a new car?’ [Udin or somebody else?]

b.  
\[ \text{Udin nan mambali oto baru.} \]  
\[ \text{Udin REL AV-buy car new} \]  
‘Udin bought a new car.’ [rather than somebody else]

c.  
\[ \#Oto baru nan dibali Udin.\]  
\[ \text{car new REL PV-buy Udin} \]  
‘Udin bought a new car.’

(Elicitation)

Compare example (113) to (114). In example (114), contrastive focus is placed on the undergoer argument a, ‘what’, in (114a). This means that in the answer provided in (114b), the most referentially salient participant is the undergoer, oto baru, ‘a new car’, thus the undergoer is selected as the pivot and the verb is correspondingly marked for passive voice by the proclitic di-. The answer provided in (114c), however, is pragmatically inappropriate because the actor argument, Udin, has been selected as the pivot but is the least referentially salient argument according to this context.
Referentiality is a relative measure. In Minangkabau, if one participant is underspecified then the other will automatically be more referential. This means, for example, that if the actor participant is unknown or underspecified, then the undergoer will be automatically assigned a higher degree of referential saliency and therefore selected as the pivot. Thus a di-passive construction will be the preferred way to encode the event.

For example, in (115) and (116) passive voice is preferred because the actor is underspecified. In (115), the speaker does not know the referent of the actor (the person who broke the flower stem), therefore the undergoer *bungo*, ‘flower’, is more referentially salient and selected as the pivot. This then triggers the use of passive voice. Notice that (115b) is a grammatically well constructed sentence but the use of active voice is infelicitous in this context.

Similarly in (116) the referent of the actor participant *nyo* is unknown therefore the undergoer is naturally more referentially prominent and is selected to be the pivot. The
use of the passive voice in (116a) is pragmatically appropriate but the use of the active
voice in (116b) is grammatically well formed but pragmatically strange.

(116) a. Anjiang lia tu dikabeknyo jo tali.
    dog wild DEM:dist PV-tie-3 with rope
    ‘Someone tied that wild dog up with rope.’
    [Context: speaker is replying to question, ‘what happened to the wild dog?’]

b. #Inyo mangabek Anjiang lia tu jo tali.
    3 AV-tie dog wild DEM:dist with rope
    ‘Someone tied that wild dog up with rope.’
    [Context: speaker is replying to question, ‘what happened to the wild dog?’]

(Elicitation)

5.1.1.2 Pivots and Semantic Roles

In Minangkabau’s pragmatically motivated voice system, voice marking essentially
marks the realignment of the pivot function with different semantic roles. In active
voice, the prefix maN- marks the fact that the pivot function is being performed by the
actor argument, whereas in passive voice, the passive voice marker di- indicates that the
pivot function is being performed by the undergoer argument. Similarly, the bare verb
and distinctive clausal syntax of the pasif semu (P2) construction also indicate that the
pivot is aligned with the undergoer role.

In Minangkabau, actors are those participants that posses the role-related properties of
subjects (cf. Schachter, 1977). Semantically speaking, they are the participants who
ultimately initiate the action by their own control or because they are being acted on by
external forces. As such actors can be either volitional or non-volitional agents. They
can also be experiencers (cf. Van Valin, 1999)\(^{13}\).

\(^{13}\) Inanimate actor arguments of change of state verbs can also sometimes possess undergoer-like qualities
as is the case for kopi, ‘coffee’, in (i). However, note that this kind of usage is rare and speakers are more
likely to use a stative construction, as in (ii).

i. Kopinyo mandingin.
    coffee-3 AV-cold
    ‘His coffee is getting cold.’

    (Elicitation)
Examples (117) to (122) illustrate the use of *maN-* with the active verbs *manyipak*, ‘kick’, *mangumpua*, ‘gather, swarm’, *maloncek*, ‘jump’, *mandanga*, ‘hear’, *mamikia*, ‘think’, and *mambanci*, ‘hate’. These verbs have pivots that are aligned with a range of different kinds of actor arguments (which are marked in the examples in bold).

In (117), *Santi* is an agent and has volitional control over the ‘kicking’ event.

(117)  
*Santi* manyipak batu karikia.  
*Santi* AV-kick CLASS:stone pebble  
‘Santi kicked a pebble.’

(Elicitation)

However, in (118) and (119) the actors *samuik*, ‘the ants’, and *sagadang cindua ko*, ‘most of the cendol drink’, are not prototypical agents because the origin of the action has an external cause. In (118) the gathering of the ants is an incidental consequence of them looking for sugar and in (119) the cendol drink ‘jumps’ out of Ajo Asai’s mouth due to him involuntarily coughing.

(118)  
*Samuik* mangumpua dek ado gulo.  
*ant* AV-gather CAUSE exist sugar  
‘The ants were swarming because of the sugar.’

(Elicitation)

(119)  
*Bakacau* batuak tabik. *Khek.* *Maloncek* lah *sagadang cindua*  
*MID-stir* cough rise IMIT AV-jump EMPH ONE-big cendol.drink  
ko, dari muncuang Ajo.Asai ko ka dalam pariuak.  
DEM:prox from mouth Ajo.Asai DEM:prox to inside cooking.pot  
‘He stirred it then coughed. Splat! Most of the cendol drink jumped out of Ajo Asai’s mouth and into the cooking pot’

(Text ID: 780120002419210606)

ii.  
*Kopinyo* dingin.  
coffee-3 cold  
‘His coffee is cold.’

(Elicitation)
In (120), (121) and (122) the actor arguments are experiencers. More specifically, in (120) *aden* is a perceiver, in (121) *inyo* is a cogniser and in (122) *inyo* is an emoter.

(120)  

Amak berang waktu nyo tau aden mandanga rahasionyo.  
mum angry time 3 know 1sg AV-hear secret-3  
‘Mum was angry when she found out that I heard her secret.’  

(Elicitation)

(121)  

Inyo mamikia baa caronyo kalua dari siko.  
3 AV-think POSS-what method-3 go.out from here  
‘He's thinking about how to get out of here.’  

(Elicitation)

(122)  

Inyo mambanci ibuknyo.  
3 AV-hate mother-3  
‘He hates his mum.’  

(Elicitation)

Undergoers are those participants who are ultimately affected by the action. Undergoers include those participants undergoing a change of state (*gulai dagiang*, ‘beef curry’, in (123)) or a change of location (*roti*, ‘bread’, in (124)). They can also be recipients (*anak tu*, ‘the child’, in (125)), benefactors (*inyo*, ‘he’, in (126)), or locations (*kabun*, ‘garden’, in (127)). Undergoers are also the only arguments of stative predicates (*padusi tu*, ‘the girl’, in (128)).

(123)  

Gulai dagiang dimasaknyo.  
curry meat PV-cook-3  
‘Somebody cooked a beef curry.’  

(Elicitation)

(124)  

Roti diagiahan dek ibuk ka anaknyo.  
bread PV-give-APP CAUSE mum to child-3  
‘Bread was given by the mum to her child.’  

(Elicitation)
(125)  Anak tu diagiahan roti dek ibuknyo.
      child DEM:dist PV-give-APP bread CAUSE mum-3
      ‘The child was given bread by his mum.’

      (Elicitation)

(126)  Inyo dibuekan kue dek ibuknyo.
      3 PV-make-APP cake CAUSE mum-3
      ‘He was made a cake by his mum.’

      (Elicitation)

(127)  Kabun ditanaminyo jo bungo.
      garden PV-plant-APP:loc-3 with flower
      ‘The garden was planted with flowers.’

      (Elicitation)

(128)  Padusi tu sadiah.
      female DEM:dist sad
      ‘That girl is sad.’

      (Elicitation)

5.1.1.3 Pivots, Core Arguments, and Non-core Arguments

Pivots play an important role in Minangkabau grammatical relations because they trigger the use of corresponding voice morphology on the verb and also have a highly privileged syntactic position (see Section 5.1.1.4). In Minangkabau, only core arguments can be selected as pivots. The distinction between core and non-core arguments reflects a difference in syntactic status, but it also reflects a difference in their “degree of discourse relevance” (Shibatani, 2006: 261). Core arguments are unmarked and are licensed by the verb’s argument structure. They are also assigned more discourse relevance than non-core arguments. Non-core arguments on the other hand, are not part of the verb’s argument structure and are often accordingly case marked (Foley and Van Valin, 1984: 79). In Minangkabau, non-core arguments are marked by prepositions (see Section 4.2.2.2).

In Minangkabau, the argument structure of intransitive verb roots licenses a single core argument: stative verbs license an undergoer whereas active intransitives license an actor. Transitive verb roots license two core arguments: an actor and an undergoer,
either of which may be selected to be the pivot. Ditransitive verb roots, on the other hand, license a third argument which can be assigned core argument status in a ‘dative’ construction. Non-core arguments can also be assigned core status, and thus become available to be selected as the pivot, with the use of the general applicative -an or the locative applicative -i (see Section 5.3).

To demonstrate how the core/non-core distinction has an effect on which argument can be selected as the pivot, consider the two verbs agiah, ‘give’, and buek, ‘make’. The verb agiah is ditransitive so specifies three arguments as part of its underlying argument structure: an actor, an undergoer and a recipient. However, buek is transitive so only specifies two arguments: an actor and an undergoer, but the use of the applicative -an licenses an additional benefactor participant.

Examples (129) and (130) show the use of these two verbs, agiah, ‘give’, and buek, ‘make’, respectively. In (129b) the recipient argument, inyo, ‘him’, (which is marked in bold), is assigned core argument status. This means that it can appear unmarked, i.e. without the preposition ka, in post-verbal position. This also means that if agiah, ‘give’, is marked for passive voice, both the undergoer pitih, ‘money’, and the recipient inyo, ‘him’, are available to be selected as the pivot (see (129c) and (129d)).

Ali AV-give money to 3
‘Ali gave money to him.’

b. Ali maagiah inyo pitih.
Ali AV-give 3 money
‘Ali gave him money.’

c. Pitih diagiah dek Ali ka inyo.
money PV-give-APP CAUSE 1sg to 3
‘Ali gave money to him.’

d. Inyo diagiah pitih dek Ali.
3 PV-give money CAUSE Ali
‘Ali gave him money.’

(Elicitation)

In (130), the benefactor argument, Udin, is not specified by the argument structure of the verb buek, ‘make’, and is therefore a non-core argument. However, Udin can be
assigned core argument status with the cliticisation of the -an applicative on the verb. In (130b) Udin is a core argument and appears without the benefactive preposition untuak, ‘for’, in post-verbal position, and (130e), which is in passive voice, Udin is again assigned core argument status and is thus available to be selected as the pivot. However, notice that Udin may only be assigned core argument status if the verb is marked by the applicative -an (see (130c) and (130f)).

(130) a. Bininyo mambuekan kopi untuak Udin.
wife-3 AV-make-APP coffee for Udin
‘Udin’s wife made coffee for him.’

b. Bininyo mambuekan Udin kopi.
wife-3 AV-make-APP Udin coffee
‘Udin’s wife made him coffee.’

c. *Bininyo mambuek Udin kopi.
wife-3 AV-make Udin coffee

d. Kopi dibuekan dek bininyo untuak Udin.
coffee PV-make-APP CAUSE wife-3 for Udin
‘Udin’s wife made coffee for him.’

e. Udin dibuekan kopi dek bininyo.
Udin PV-make-APP coffee CAUSE wife-3
‘Udin’s wife made him coffee.’

f. *Udin dibuek kopi dek bininyo.
Udin PV-make coffee CAUSE wife-3

(Elicitation)

5.1.1.4 Pivots and Syntax

By definition, pivots in Minangkabau occupy the most privileged syntactic position in the clause. As well as (typically) occurring in pre-verbal position, Minangkabau pivots also have control over a number of syntactic constructions such as raising, relativisation, extraction and zero anaphora, as the following examples will demonstrate.

Example (131) demonstrates the three-way voice opposition between active voice, passive voice and the pasif semu with the verb tulih, ‘write’. In (131a) the verb is
marked for active voice, this reflects the fact that the actor *aden* has been selected as the pivot. In (131b) and (131c), the undergoer, *surek tu*, ‘the letter’, is selected as the pivot, thus the verb is marked for passive voice in (131b) and appears in *pasif semu* form in (131c). Notice that in each of these examples the pivot occupies pre-verbal position.

The pre-verbal slot is typically reserved for the pivot, although examples of more flexible word orders can be found in informal discourse (see Section 5.1.2.2 and Section 5.1.3.2). The pre-verbal position is preferred for pivots because it is iconic; the most referentially important participant comes first.

(131) a.  *Aden manulih surek tu.*  
1sg AV-write letter DEM:dist  
‘I wrote the letter.’

b.  *Surek tu ditulih dek aden.*  
letter DEM:dist PV-write CAUSE 1sg  
‘I wrote the letter.’

c.  *Surek tu den tulih.*  
letter DEM:dist 1sg write  
‘I wrote the letter.’

(Elicitation)

In Minangkabau only pivots can be raised. In (132) the actor argument, *amak*, ‘mum’, is the pivot. The basic sentence in (132a) appears in (132b) as a complement clause introduced by the head *nampaknyo*, ‘it seems’, where *nyo* acts like a dummy subject. Since only the pivot of the complement clause can be raised to pivot position in the matrix clause, this means that only the actor argument *amak* can be raised, as we see in (132c) and (132d).

(132) a.  *Amak ka mamberangan awak.*  
mum FUT AV-angry-APP 1  
‘Mum is going to get angry with me/ scold me.’

b.  *Nampaknyo amak ka mamberangan awak.*  
seem-3 mum FUT AV-angry-APP 1  
‘It seems that mum is going to get angry with me/ scold me.’

c.  *Amak nampaknyo ka mamberangan awak.*  
mum seem-3 FUT AV-angry-APP 1  
‘Mum seems like she is going to get angry with me/ scold me.’
Similarly in (133), only the undergoer argument, the first person pronoun *awak*, can be raised to pivot position in (133c). This is because *awak* is the pivot of the complement clause.

(133)

(a. \textit{Awak ka diberangan dek amak.} \\
\textit{I’m going to be scolded by mum.}

(b. \textit{Nampaknyo awak ka diberangan dek amak.} \\
\textit{It seems that I’m going to be got angry at/ scolded by mum.}

(c. \textit{Awak nampaknyo ka diberangan dek amak.} \\
\textit{I seem like I’m going to be got angry at/ scolded by mum.}

(d. \textit{*Amak nampaknyo awak ka diberangan.} \\
\textit{(Elicitation)}

Another property of pivots in Minangkabau is that they have control over relativisation, i.e. the pivot of a relative clause must be also be the head of the relative clause. For example, in (134), *anak*, ‘child’, the relativised NP head, must also be the pivot of the relative clause for (134a) to be grammatical. This means that the relative clause must be in active voice because *anak*, ‘child’, has the semantic role of actor. In (134b), notice that the assignment of semantic roles has shifted due to the presence of the applicative on the verb. *Anak*, ‘child’, is now an undergoer and the new argument, the third person pronoun *inyo*, is the actor. In this sentence the pivot of the relative clause is *inyo* but the relativised NP is *anak*, making the sentence ungrammatical. We can fix (134b) by making *anak* the pivot of the relative clause in (134c) and correspondingly marking the verb *suruakan*, ‘hide’, for passive voice.

(134)

(a. \textit{Anak nan manyuruak di belakang batang karambia alah lari.} \\
\textit{The child who hid behind the coconut tree ran away.}
b. *Anak nan inyo manyuruakan di belakang batang karambia alah lari.  
child REL 3 AV-hide-APP LOC behind tree coconut PFCT run

‘The child who he hid behind the coconut tree ran away.’

c. Anak nan disuruakannyo di belakang batang karambia alah lari.  
child REL PV-hide-APP-3 LOC behind tree coconut PFCT run

‘The child who was hidden behind the coconut tree ran away.’

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (135), notice that the undergoer argument, *kue*, ‘cake’, is the relativised pivot. This means that the verb must be marked for passive voice.

(135)a. Kue nan disuruakannyo tu alah masak.  
cake REL PV-hide-APP-3 DEM:dist PFCT cook

‘The cake that was hidden by him is already cooked.’

b. Ambo makan kue nan disuruakannyo.  
1sg eat cake REL PV-hide-APP-3

‘I ate the cake that was hidden by him.’

c. *Kue nan inyo manyuruakan tu alah masak.  
cake REL 3 AV-hide-APP DEM:dist PFCT cook

‘The cake that he hid is already cooked.’

(Elicitation)

Another syntactic property of Minangkabau pivots is that only the pivot can be extracted from an embedded clause. For example, notice that *Ana*, the actor argument, is the pivot in (136a). *Ana* is also the pivot of the embedded clause in (136b). Notice that the extraction of the pivot, *Ana*, in (136c) is grammatical whereas the extraction of the undergoer, i.e. the non-pivot argument, in (136d) produces an ungrammatical sentence.

(136)a. Ana manguduang cimangko.  
Ana AV-cut watermelon

‘Ana cut the watermelon.’

b. Dikironyo Ana nan manguduang cimangko tu.  
PV-think-3 Ana REL AV-cut watermelon DEM:dist

‘They think it was Ana who cut the watermelon.’
c. *Ana dikironyo nan manguduang cimangko tu.
Ana PV-think-3 REL AV-cut watermelon DEM:dist
‘Ana think they was the one who cut the watermelon.’

d. *Cimangko tu dikironyo Ana nan manguduang.
watermelon DEM:dist PV-think-3 Ana REL AV-cut

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (137) only the pivot argument of the embedded clause in (137b) can be extracted. Since the embedded clause is in passive voice, the undergoer argument must be the pivot. This means that only the undergoer argument *cimangko*, ‘watermelon’, can be extracted. And as we see in (137d) extraction of the non-pivot argument *Ana* results in an ungrammatical sentence.

(137)a. *Cimangko tu alah dikuduangnyo.
watermelon DEM:dist PFCT PV-cut-3
‘The watermelon has already been cut by somebody.’

b. Dikironyo cimangko tu nan dikuduang dek si Ana tu.
PV-think-3 watermelon DEM:dist REL PV-cut CAUSE PERS Ana DEM:dist
‘They think that it was the watermelon that Ana cut.’

c. *Cimangko tu dikironyo nan dikuduang dek si Ana tu.
watermelon DEM:dist PV-think-3 REL PV-cut CAUSE PERS Ana DEM:dist
‘It was the watermelon they think that was cut by Ana.’

d. *Si Ana tu dikironyo cimangko tu nan dikuduang.
PERS Ana DEM:dist PV-think-3 watermelon DEM:dist REL PV-cut

(Elicitation)

Finally, Minangkabau pivots also have control over coreferentiality in cases of zero anaphora. In clausal conjunction, if the pivot of the main clause is also the pivot of a conjoined clause, then the pivot of the conjoined clause can be null and still be correctly interpreted as having the same referent as the pivot of the main clause. In cases where the pivot of the main clause and the pivot of the conjoined clause are different, the pivot of the conjoined clause must be explicitly stated.

To demonstrate these facts consider example (138). In all sentences the actor argument, *Efendi*, is the pivot of the main clause. This is demonstrated by the fact that the verb *mancaliak*, ‘see’, is marked for active voice. In sentences (138a) and (138b) the referent
of the pivot of the conjoined clause is left ambiguous. In (138a) the pivot of the conjoined clause is the third person pronoun *inyo and in (138b) it is phonologically null. However, since only pivots can be coreferential in cases of zero anaphora, it is understood that *Efendi is the intended referent for the pivot of the conjoined clauses in both (138a) and (138b). However in (138c), *Ali is the pivot of the conjoined clause. This must be overtly stated because *Ali is not coreferential with the pivot of the main clause.

   Effendi AV-see *Ali direct 3 run
   ‘*Efendi saw *Ali and then he (*Efendi) ran away.’

   Effendi AV-see *Ali direct run
   ‘*Efendi saw *Ali and then (he, *Efendi) ran away.’

   Effendi AV-see *Ali *Ali straight run
   ‘*Efendi saw *Ali and then *Ali ran away.’

   (Elicitation)

5.1.2 Active Voice

When the pivot is aligned with the actor participant, this triggers active voice marking on the verb. Section 5.1.2.1 details the phonological properties of the active voice prefix *maN- and Section 5.1.2.2 describes its syntactic properties. The active voice prefix also has a number of lexical/derivational and semantic properties and these are discussed in Section 5.1.2.3.

5.1.2.1 Phonological Properties of *maN-

In Minangkabau, active voice is marked on the verb by the prefix *maN-. The prefix is a reflex of the Proto Malayic agent oriented verb marker *mAN- (Adelaar, 1992a: 161), which is thought to be a descendent of *um-, a marker of the actor pivot construction in Proto Austronesian (Ross, 2002: 54). The Minangkabau active voice prefix consists of the sequence *ma and a homorganic nasal consonant. The phonological effects of the
homorganic nasal on the verb stem are described in Adelaar (1992a; 1995) and listed in Table 17 (see Appendix 2 for a more detailed phonological sketch of Minangkabau).

Table 17. Phonological Effects of maN- prefixation.

(Adelaar, 1995: 438)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Homorganic nasal substitution for initial voiceless stops p, t, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Palatal nasal substitution for initial s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Homorganic nasal accretion before initial voice stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>In all other cases only ma- is used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of each of the morphophonemic changes caused by maN- prefixation can be found in Table 18.

Table 18. Examples of maN- prefixation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>VERB ROOT</th>
<th>PREFIXATION of maN-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>pagang</td>
<td>mambali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tolong</td>
<td>mandorong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kecek</td>
<td>manggaleh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mambali</td>
<td>‘buy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manolong</td>
<td>‘help’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mangecek</td>
<td>‘say, talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mamagang</td>
<td>‘hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manolong</td>
<td>‘help’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mangecek</td>
<td>‘say, talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>sabarang</td>
<td>manyabarang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bali</td>
<td>mambali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dorong</td>
<td>mandorong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>galeh</td>
<td>manggaleh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caliak</td>
<td>mancaliak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>janji</td>
<td>manjanji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bali</td>
<td>‘buy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dorong</td>
<td>‘push’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>galeh</td>
<td>‘sell’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caliak</td>
<td>‘see, look’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>janji</td>
<td>‘promise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sabarang</td>
<td>manyabarang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>masak</td>
<td>mamasak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nikah</td>
<td>manikah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nyunyuik</td>
<td>manyunyuik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngango</td>
<td>mangango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rantau</td>
<td>marantau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lapeh</td>
<td>malapeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iduik</td>
<td>maiduikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masak</td>
<td>‘cook’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nikah</td>
<td>‘get married’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nyunyuik</td>
<td>‘suck’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngango</td>
<td>‘gape’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rantau</td>
<td>‘wander, leave home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lapeh</td>
<td>‘set free, release’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iduik</td>
<td>‘switch on’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many varieties of Non-Standard Malay/Indonesian, instead of the full prefix, the homorganic nasal is used to mark agent oriented verbs (Gil, 2002a). For example, one of the distinguishing features of Jakarta Indonesian is that speakers use the N- form of the active voice prefix rather than the Standard Indonesian meN- (Cole, Hermon and
Tjung, 2006; Wouk, 1989). Example (139) is from Jakarta Indonesian. Note that the form of the verb in this example is *nulis*, whereas in Standard Indonesian the form would be *menulis*.

(139)  \[ \text{Siti nulis surat itu.} \]
\[ \text{Siti N-tulis surat itu} \]
\[ \text{Siti N-write letter that} \]
\[ \text{‘Siti wrote the letter.’} \]

(Cole, Hermon and Tjung, 2006: 67)

Speakers of Jakarta Indonesian also use bare verbs as they would *N*-marked active verbs as (140) shows.

(140)  \[ \text{Siti tulis surat itu.} \]
\[ \text{Siti Ø-tulis surat itu} \]
\[ \text{Siti write letter that} \]
\[ \text{‘Siti wrote the letter.’} \]

(Cole, Hermon and Tjung, 2006: 68)

Speakers of Minangkabau also use the homorganic nasal form *N*- to mark active voice verbs instead of the full form *maN*- (see example (141)). The use of the homorganic nasal in place of the full prefix is restricted to Colloquial Minangkabau.

(141) a.  \[ \text{Sia mbuek?} \]
\[ \text{sia N-buek} \]
\[ \text{who AV-make} \]
\[ \text{‘Who made it?’ (Colloquial Minangkabau.)} \]

(Text ID: 215709222814310506)

b.  \[ \text{Sia mambuek?} \]
\[ \text{sia maN-buek} \]
\[ \text{who AV-make} \]
\[ \text{‘Who made it?’ (Standard Minangkabau.)} \]

(Elicitation)

Perhaps more characteristic of Colloquial Minangkabau than the use of the *N*- prefix, is the use of bare verbs in place of active voice marked verbs (see example (142)). Many speakers of Minangkabau would describe the use of *buek* instead of *mambuek* in (142a)
as ill formed. However, bare verbs are used with high frequency in both active and passive clauses and are better described as underspecified rather than ungrammatical (see Chapter 6).

(142) a. Nyo buek agak limo puluah buah.  
    nyo Ø-buek agak limo puluah buah  
    3 make quite five ten CLASS:fruit  
    ‘He made about fifty of them.’ (Colloquial Minangkabau.)

    (Text ID: 35532010432470306)

b. Nyo mambuek agak limo puluah buah.  
    nyo maN-buek agak limo puluah buah  
    3 AV-make quite five ten CLASS:fruit  
    ‘He made about fifty of them.’ (Standard Minangkabau.)

    (Elicitation)

The Minangkabau active voice marker maN- is an affix and once affixed it becomes part of the whole phonological word and undergoes the same phonological processes as the word, including stress and intonation placement. Evidence from the Sorba ludling helps demonstrate these facts (see Appendix 3 for the Sorba rules). The Sorba transformational rules affect the whole phonological word. In this case we’d expect that affixation occurs prior to the ludling transformations and this is indeed what happens. As example (143) illustrates, the phonological rules governing the affixation of maN- to the stem are applied before the ludling’s transformational rules take effect. So in (143) we find the forms cermange and ngirmana-ngirmana and not *mancerke and *mangirna-mangirna (note that the Sorba data is italicised with the Minangkabau translation directly underneath).

(143) a. A narti cermange se lai.  
    A xx mangecek se lai.  
    FILL xx AV-talk just more  
    ‘Ah it’s just the talking left to do.’

    (Text ID: 28041602052130906)

b. A ngirma ngirmana-ngirmana nyo  
    A xx manangih-manangih nyo.  
    FILL xx RED-AV-cry 3  
    ‘Ah she cried and cried.’

    (Text ID: 751832215544061206)
The *Sorba* facts support the analysis of *maN-* as an affix but this evidence is only revealing if we compare how the ludling affects non-affixes. Section 5.1.3.1 presents some data that illustrates how the passive voice marker *di-* is affected by the *Sorba* ludling. Since *di-* attaches to the word after the *Sorba* ludling transformations have taken place, the evidence suggests that *di-* is a proclitic.

Affixation occurs at the word level of phonological representation, before the ludling operations take effect, whereas cliticisation occurs after all phonological processes that affect the word have taken place. These phonological behaviours reflect the fact that affixes function lexically and reflect semantic changes whereas clitics operate post-lexically and are licensed as a result of syntactic processes (Anderson, 2005: 34; Zwicky, 1985). This distinction is important to make for Minangkabau in regards to the alternation between *maN-* and *di*-. Since processes affecting *maN-* affixation occur at the lexical level, this supports the idea that *maN-* has a lexical/derivational and semantic functions. The clitic *di-* on the other hand, is licensed by processes that occur post-lexically, which supports the analysis of *di-* as having a primarily pragmatic and syntactic function. These ideas are supported by the finding that *maN-* functions as a part of Minangkabau’s non-pragmatically motivated voice system whereas *di-* does not (see Section 5.1.2.3).

### 5.1.2.2 Syntactic Properties of *maN-*

Since the active voice prefix *maN-* is used to mark the fact that the pivot function is aligned with the actor argument, it can only be used with a verb that specifies an actor as part of its argument structure. As such, the prefix can be used with active intransitive verb roots, transitive verb roots and ditransitive verb roots (see Chapter 4) where its role is to show that the actor has been selected as the pivot. However, *maN-* can also affix to noun roots and stative verb roots. In this case, *maN-* not only marks the fact that the pivot is aligned with the actor role, it has the additional derivational effect of altering underlying argument structure of the root (see Section 5.1.2.3).
In a typical *maN*- clause, the actor appears in pre-verbal pivot position. If the verb is transitive, then the undergoer appears in post-verbal position. This canonical word order is exemplified in (144).

(144)  
*Tadi malam den mandanga musik.*  
before night 1sg AV-hear music  
ACTOR VERB UNDERGOER  
‘Last night I listened to music.’  

(Elicitation)

Non-core arguments typically occur after the undergoer and are marked by a preposition. In (145a) note that the locative non-core argument *kabun*, ‘garden’, is marked by the locative preposition *di*. The addition of an applicative on the verb allows the non-core argument core status. This results in a change in word order as the new core argument is moved to post-verbal position. In (145b) the locative applicative -i is used, resulting in the movement of *kabun*, ‘garden’, from non-core position to core position (also see Section 5.3).

(145) a.  
*Ambo mananam bungo di kabun*  
1sg AV-plant flower LOC garden  
ACTOR VERB UNDERGOER NON-CORE  
‘I’m planting flowers in the garden.’

b.  
*Ambo mananami kabun tu jo bungo.*  
1sg AV-plant-APP garden DEM:dist with flower  
ACTOR VERB CORE NON-CORE  
‘I planted the garden with flowers’

(Elicitation)

Many examples of non-canonical word orders can be found in Colloquial Minangkabau. In fact, in many clauses with intransitive *maN*- verbs, the actor appears in post-verbal position. This kind of word order occurs in discourse when the actor argument is given as an afterthought, or if the actor argument is particularly pragmatically salient in terms of the development of narrative events. Examples of the ‘verb + actor’ word order can be found in (146), (147), and (148).
Although unusual, an ‘undergoer + verb’ word order is also possible in transitive maN-clauses. Examples of this kind of word order can be found in (149) and (150). Whether this kind of word order has discourse pragmatic significance, or whether it is a symptom of Colloquial Minangkabau’s ‘associational’ semantic nature requires further examination. Interestingly, the ‘associational’ nature of Minangkabau also allows for word order variation in clauses with bare verbs (see Chapter 6).

Another fact of Colloquial Minangkabau is that transitive maN-verbs may appear in informal discourse with one or more of their arguments omitted. Example (111b) illustrated the use of a maN-verb with a null actor argument. Sentences (151) and (152)
show two examples in which the *maN*- verb is transitive, but in which the undergoer argument is not specified.

In (151) the undergoer argument of *mananyo*, ‘ask’, is omitted because it is clear from A’s utterance that *perasaan inyo*, ‘his feelings’, is the intended referent.

(151) A: *Tanyo perasaan inyo nan sabana nyo.*  
ask NOM-feel-NOM 3 REL ONE-true 3  
‘Ask him what his true feelings are.’

B:  
A *baa caro mananyo Ø dek Engki?*  
FILL POSS-what manner AV-ask Ø CAUSE TRU-Hengky  
‘But what is the way to ask (him about it) Engki?’

In (152a) both the actor and undergoer arguments of *manggaleh*, ‘sell’, are omitted. The actor argument is understood from the context since its referent is the topic of conversation. The omission of the undergoer in (152a) means that the utterance is vague, but nonetheless well formed. The speaker then specifies the undergoer argument, *asksesori honda*, ‘motorcycle accessories’, in (152b).

(152) a. *Ø La tingga lo samojo uda tu manggaleh Ø.*  
Ø PFCT live furthermore with with older.brother DEM:dist  AV-sell Ø  
‘(He) lives with his older brother selling (stuff).’

b. *Manggaleh apo aksesori honda ko a.*  
AV-sell what accessory motorcycle DEM:prox EXCL  
‘Selling motorcycle accessories.’

Clauses with ditransitive verbs also appear in naturalistic discourse with some of their arguments omitted. In (153) notice that the recipient argument specified by the verb *agiah*, ‘give’, is not overtly expressed but is nevertheless understood from the discourse context.
Fortin (2001) argues that even if all the possible arguments of a verb are not overtly expressed, as long as the verb is marked by \textit{maN-}, then the verb is understood as transitive and any unexpressed arguments are ‘understood’ but underspecified. In addition to this, Fortin also claims that clauses which have omitted arguments are illegal if the verb is unmarked.

So, by Fortin’s (2001: 14) analysis, a sentence like (154), in which the verb is bare and one or more of its arguments are omitted, is illegal. The verb \textit{gigik}, ‘bite’, in (154) is transitive and therefore specifies an undergoer argument but in this example the undergoer argument is omitted and the verb is not marked for active voice. This means that “the semantic transitivity of the verb root is not represented” thus causing the clause to be ungrammatical (Fortin, 2001: 14). Although Fortin’s claims may represent the judgments of many Minangkabau speakers, the conversational data in the MPI EVA Minangkabau database reveals a different picture. Bare verbs are a systematic feature of Colloquial Minangkabau and sentences like (154) abound. For this reason I do not consider (154) an ungrammatical sentence.

(154) \textit{Inyo gigik} \textit{Ø}. \\
3 bite Ø \\
‘He bites (something).’

(adapted from Fortin, 2001: 14)

In Colloquial Minangkabau bare forms of transitive verb roots regularly appear in clauses in which some of their arguments are omitted (see Chapter 6). For example, in (155) the verb \textit{agiah}, ‘give’, appears in its bare form even though two of the verb’s arguments, the undergoer and the recipient, are unexpressed. Similarly in (156) the undergoer argument of the bare verb \textit{tokokan}, ‘hit’, is omitted.
Constructions like those presented in (155) and (156) are frequently found in Colloquial Minangkabau, suggesting that speakers regularly use bare verb forms, even in cases where one or more of the verb’s arguments are unexpressed. These findings raise questions about the obligatoriness of the maN- prefix (see Chapter 6) and require us to rigorously assess the nature of argument structure in Minangkabau.

Thompson and Hopper’s (2001) study of argument structure in English examined a corpus of naturalistic conversational data. Their study revealed that speakers’ intuitions and linguists’ introspections about argument structure in English differ radically from the patterns revealed in their conversational data. One of their most significant findings is that verbs traditionally ascribed to the transitive category are frequently rendered intransitive in discourse. They also “identified both a range of uses and collocations of verbs as well as frequency effects that have not been addressed in argument structure discussions based on introspection” (Thompson and Hopper, 2001: 41). These findings indicate the importance of using naturalistic data, rather than elicited data or introspection, in order to paint an accurate picture of the variety of structures used in a language. If we see grammar as a reflection of how people use language then their study also reveals that in order to know all of the possible grammatical structures in a language then we must empirically examine the kinds of structures people use.

Thompson and Hopper’s (2001) study of argument structure in English is important to keep in the back of our minds as we consider the Minangkabau data. The Minangkabau data reveals that argument structure is determined by the verb root but can be modified by verbal morphology. The data also reveals that the arguments specified by a verb’s frame need not necessarily all be expressed. These findings demonstrate that

(155)  
Tapi ketiko ado awak agiah Ø Ø se nanti. 
but when exist 1 give Ø Ø just later 
‘But when it’s here I’ll just give (it (to you)) later.’

(156)  
Baa ko nyo tokokan Ø kayak gitu tu Yes? 
POSS-what DEM:prox 3 hit-APP Ø like DEM:dist DEM:dist TRU-Maiyes 
‘How come he hit (it) like that Yes?’

(Text ID: 170492105523080606)
5.1.2.3 Semantic and Lexical/Derivational Properties of maN-

The primary function of maN- is to encode the fact that the pivot function is aligned with the actor role. The maN- prefix also has some lexical/derivational effects, being able to derive active verbs from NPs and stative verbs. The prefix also has semantic effects and adds active aktionsart to the NP roots and stative roots as part of the derivational process. In fact, all maN- verbs have active aktionsart. As such, the semantic effects of maN- can be described in terms of Shibatani’s (2006) “evolution of action” framework (see below).

When combined with a noun, the maN- prefix adds an active aktionsart to the root’s meaning. It can form active intransitive verbs meaning ‘to use noun’ (Moussay, 1998) and can also combine with nominal roots to form transitive verbs\(^{14}\). For example, in (157) the verb maN- derives the verb manggulai, ‘make a curry’, from the NP root gulai, ‘curry’. Notice that the derived verb is transitive: it specifies an actor argument, inyo, ‘she’, the person making the curry, and an undergoer argument, kambiang, ‘goat’, the thing being turned into a curry.

(157) Inyo manggulai kambiang.

3 AV-curry goat
‘She’s making a goat curry.’

(Elicitation)

The prefix maN- can also derive intransitive ‘change of state’ verbs from stative roots. In this case, the prefix changes the inherent aspect of the verb root from a state to an activity. The prefix also licenses an actor argument, which is automatically assigned pivot status since the verb is intransitive. Causative verbs can also be derived from

\(^{14}\) Adelaar (1992a) claims that maN- can also derive intransitive verbs from nouns that mean ‘to be on noun’. I did not find any examples of this kind of derivation in my data so I do not discuss it here.
‘change of state’ verbs with the addition of the applicative clitic -an, which has the effect of transitivising the verb by licensing an undergoer argument.

For example, in (158a), the change of state verb *mandingin*, ‘get cold’, has been derived from the stative root *dingin*, ‘cold’. The causative, transitive verb *mandinginan*, ‘cool something down’, is then derived in (158b) with the addition of the applicative -an. Notice that the presence of the undergoer argument in (158c) is ungrammatical without the applicative.

(158)a.  *Badan ambo mandingin.*
body 1sg AV-cold
‘I’m getting cold.’

b.  *Aden maambuih kopi untuak mandinginan nyo.*
1sg AV-blow coffee for AV-cold-APP 3
‘I blew on the coffee to cool it down.’

c.  *Aden maambuih kopi untuak mandingin nyo.*
1sg AV-blow coffee for AV-cold 3

(Elicitation)

Shibatani (2006) observes that active verbs are often associated with progressive and active aspectual properties and argues that this is a feature of their role in showing the development stage in the “evolution of action”. Thus, for Shibatani, although active voice indicates a pragmatically motivated opposition to passive voice, it also has conceptual underpinnings. The Minangkabau active voice marker *maN-* also occupies this intersection between semantics and pragmatics and also functions to show the development of an action. In Colloquial Minangkabau the functional load of *maN-* is primarily semantic since it is not used to mark a pragmatic voice distinction (see Chapter 6).

There is also evidence to support an analysis of *meN-* in Malay/Indonesian as a semantic/conceptual device used to mark aspectual notions. Hopper’s (1979) work argues that the foregrounding and backgrounding of events in Classical Malay discourse is achieved through voice marking, whereas other languages achieve this through various other strategies including tense-aspect marking on the verb, word order, and
sentence particles. Hopper found that in Classical Malay, clauses containing *di-* marked verbs were perfective, realis, active and used to encode foregrounded events, which are central to the progression of the narrative. Clauses containing *meN-* verbs on the other hand were imperfective, often irrealis and frequently found in backgrounded clauses.

Similarly, a recent study of contemporary Malay *meN-*, also found that the prefix was associated with imperfective and progressive aspect (Soh and Nomoto, 2008). Furthermore, in her study of Chindo, a variety of Non-Standard Indonesian spoken by the Peranakan Chinese community in Malang, East Java, Rafferty (1982) argues that the homorganic nasal prefix *N-*, traditionally thought of as encoding active voice, functions primarily as a marker of imperfective aspect. The passive voice marker *di-* conversely has the function of marking perfective aspect in this variety (see Section 2.2).

None of these studies claims that *meN-* or *N-* encodes imperfective aspect but it is clear that the use of the active voice prefix correlates closely with clauses that display these imperfective aspectual qualities. The fact that Minangkabau *maN-* has similar aspectual qualities is a result of its role in showing the development of action.

5.1.3 Passive Voice

To complete our understanding of Minangkabau’s pragmatically motivated voice system now let us discuss the phonological, syntactic and semantic effects of the passive voice marker *di-*.

5.1.3.1 Phonological Properties of *di-*

In Minangkabau, passive voice is encoded by the morpheme *di-*. The Minangkabau passive voice marker is cognate with Malay/Indonesian *di-*, which is described as a prefix (Dardjowidjojo, 1978; Musgrave, 2000; Sneddon, 1996). However, *di-* does not behave like a prefix in Minangkabau. Williams (1961: 66-67) labels the Minangkabau passive voice marker *di-* a “quasi prefix” but I argue that it is a proclitic. Evidence
comes from the fact that the morphophonemic and prosodic qualities of \textit{di} differ considerably from those of the Minangkabau prefixes \textit{maN-}, \textit{ta-}, \textit{pa-}, and \textit{ba-}.

Unlike the affix \textit{maN-}, which merges and assimilates with immediately adjacent segments, \textit{di} preserves its phonological shape. In cases where \textit{di} cliticises with a vowel initial stem that has a glottal stop onset, the glottal stop will be preserved and the [i] vowel in \textit{di} will not merge with the initial vowel of the stem. However, \textit{di} cannot stand alone as a prosodic word and must ‘lean on’ adjacent words. This means that \textit{di} satisfies Anderson’s (2005: 23) definition of a phonological clitic: “a linguistic element whose phonological form is deficient in that it lacks prosodic structure at the level of the (prosodic) word”.

The passive voice marker \textit{di} is also restricted in terms of which class of substantive word it may cliticise with since it only cliticises with bi-valent verbs. \textit{Di} may also only occur in a certain specific syntactic frame, i.e., a passive clause. This makes \textit{di} a ‘special clitic’, according to Zwicky’s (1977) terminology, and ‘morphosyntactic clitic’ according to Anderson (2005: 31). Since \textit{di} does not alternate with a non-clitic form as some ‘special clitics’ are seen to do, Anderson’s term ‘morphosyntactic clitic’ more accurately describes the behaviour and functions of \textit{di}.

A further feature that distinguishes \textit{di} from Minangkabau affixes is how it is affected by prosodic structure. Affixes, which combine with the root to form a substantive word, are subject to word stress and phrasal stress. However clitics, which include the applicative \textit{-an}, pronominal enclitics such as \textit{-e} and \textit{-nyo}, as well as the passive voice marker \textit{di}, do not attract lexical or phrasal stress. There is evidence to suggest that phrasal stress in Minangkabau is syllable final yet clitics are not affected by this tendency. For example, in (159a) stress falls on the final syllable of \textit{dimasak}, which has been underlined and marked in bold in the example. Notice in (159b) that the applicative clitic \textit{–an} has been introduced to provide a benefactive reading. Despite this extra phonetic material stress still falls on the \textit{-sak} syllable (see Appendix 2 for information about stress in Minangkabau and Section 5.3 for discussion about applicatives).
a. *Gulai dagiang dimasak.*
   curry meat PV-cook
   ‘The beef curry has been cooked.’

b. *Gulai dagaiing dimasakan.*
   curry meat PV-cook-APP
   ‘The beef curry was cooked (for somebody).’

(Elicitation)

The *Sorba* ludling provides further evidence for *di-*’s status as a clitic (see Appendix 3 for *Sorba* rules). Unlike the active voice prefix *maN-*, which is incorporated into the substantive word before the word undergoes the ludling transformations, *di-* is not affected by the ludling rules. For example, in (160) and (161) notice that *di-* cliticises to the verbs, *cabuik*, ‘pull’, and *opor*, ‘move’, respectively, after the verb stems have undergone the ludling transformations (note that the *Sorba* data is italicised with the Minangkabau translation directly underneath). If *di-* cliticised to the word before the ludling transformations took effect, the incorrect forms *burdica* and *pordio* would be produced. Instead, the stems undergo the *Sorba* transformations first to produce *burca* and *poro*, then the forms become *diburca* and *diporo* after cliticisation. The fact that the clitic does not undergo the ludling transformations suggests that it is not part of the internal structure of the word and is thus outside of the phonological processes that affect the word.

(160) *Baru tu jan diburca juo.*
   Uban tu jan dicabuik juo.
   white.hair DEM:dist PROHIB PV-yank also
   ‘Don’t pull out your white hairs.’

(Text ID: 864386022458180906)

(161) *Tora ko kan bisa lo diporo ka purda tu.*
   Atok ko kan bisa lo diopor ka dapua tu.
   roof DEM:prox EMPH can furthermore PV-move to kitchen DEM:dist
   ‘This roof you know can be moved to the kitchen too.’

(Text ID: 123813212520280906)

The phonological and syntactic behaviour of *di-* in Minangkabau can partly be explained by its historical origins. Adelaar (1992a; 1992b; 2005b; 2008) suggests that *di-* has the same historical origins as the locative preposition *di* but that it once had a
much wider range of prepositional uses. His evidence comes from the fact that in some Malayic varieties, such as Kelantan Malay, \textit{di-} functions as an agent marking preposition as well as a passive voice marker. The \textit{di-} clitic is also used as an agent marking preposition in Salako where a homorganic nasal prefix is used to mark the passive voice instead (Adelaar, 1992b; 2005b). In Standard Malay/Indonesian the morphosyntactic and phonological behaviour of \textit{di-} closely resembles that of the active voice prefix \textit{meng-} (Musgrave, 2000). This may be because \textit{di-} is at a later stage of grammaticalisation in Malay/Indonesian, whereas the morphosyntactic behaviour of \textit{di-} in Minangkabau reflects more closely its earlier, prepositional usage.

Evidence of archaic and literary usage of \textit{di-} in Minangkabau supports the idea that it once had a much wider prepositional usage. For example, in (162a) \textit{di} functions as an agent marking preposition on \textit{nyo}. This example is representative of ‘archaic’ usage. The example has been rendered into contemporary Colloquial Minangkabau in (162b). Notice these changes in particular: \textit{di-} is now cliticised to the verb and \textit{nyo} now appears as an enclitic on the verb.

\hspace{0em}
\begin{align*}
(162) \text{a. } & \text{Himbau den indak tingaran\textsuperscript{16} di nyo.} \\
& \text{call 1sg NEG hear-APP PREP 3} \\
& \text{‘He didn’t hear my call.’} \\
& \text{(adapted from van der Toorn, 1899: 122)}
\end{align*}

\hspace{0em}
\begin{align*}
& \text{b. Himbau den indak didangaannyao.} \\
& \text{call 1sg NEG PV-hear-APP-3} \\
& \text{‘He didn’t hear my call.’} \\
& \text{(Elicitation)}
\end{align*}

Examples (163), (164) and (165) are also representative of ‘archaic’ Minangkabau. They come from a collection of Minangkabau texts dated from the mid to late Nineteenth Century kept at the Leiden University Library. In (163) \textit{di} is performing a prepositional function that cannot be described as locative marking or agent marking. Its meaning seems to be similar to English \textit{about}. In any case, this example also provides

\textsuperscript{15} Musgrave’s (2000) syntactic study of Malay/Indonesian also supports a prepositional origin for \textit{di-}.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{tinga} (van der Toorn’s orthography) is \textit{danga}, ‘hear’, in modern Minangkabau orthography.
evidence to support the idea that *di-* once had a much wider prepositional usage. Examples (164) and (165) show the agent marking function of *di*. Note that modern Minangkabau speakers do not use such constructions.

(163) \textit{Baantah-antah *di* bulan, baanta-antah *di* bintang.}  
RFLX-RED-wonder PREP moon RFLX-RED-wonder PREP star  
‘(She) wondered to herself about the moon, wondered about the stars.’  
(Cod. Or. 3205 (2), ff. 37v-38r., (Wieringa, 2007: 39))

(164) \textit{Kadangaran *di* suaminyo itu suaro parampuannyo.}  
undergo-hear-APP PREP husband-3 DEM:dist voice female-3  
‘What the husband heard was the voice of his wife.’  
(Cod. Or. 3303 I (3. pp. 112–113.), (Wieringa, 2007: 210))

(165) \textit{Jadi tadanga *di* urang banyak.}  
happen INV-hear PREP person many  
‘So many people heard it (without meaning to).’  
(Cod. Or. 3303 I (7. pp. 126–127.), (Wieringa, 2007: 211)).

The morphophonemic behaviour of the Minangkabau passive voice marker *di-* can thus be attributed to its origins as a preposition. However, an explanation for the initial appearance of *di-* on verbs still requires further investigation.

5.1.3.2 Syntactic Properties of *di-*

*Di-* functions primarily in the syntactic domain to alter clause structure. *Di-* functions as a marker of passive voice, i.e. it shows that the pivot function is aligned with the undergoer. Passive voice clauses are highly marked structures in the language and typically follow a rigid set of structural parameters.

In passive voice, undergoers occupy canonical, pre-verbal pivot position whereas actors are demoted to non-core argument status and appear in post-verbal position. The actor may be expressed as a post-verbal enclitic, as a full NP, or as an adjunct NP marked by the cause/agent marking preposition *dek*.
For example, in (166), the pivot *awak*, which also happens to be an undergoer, appears in pre-verbal position. The verb is correspondingly marked for passive voice by the proclitic *di-* and the actor appears in post-verbal position. Notice that in (166a) the actor, *nyo*, ‘him’, is expressed as an enclitic, whereas in (166b) it is expressed as a full NP, *paman*, ‘uncle’, and in (166c) as an adjunct NP, *dek paman*, ‘by my uncle’. Note that adding *dek* in (166c) clearly marks the non-core argument status of the actor and enables the hearer to decode the semantic roles of the participants. This is especially important if the word order is non-canonical (see (166d) and (166e)). *Dek* is also a marker of agency and causality and implies that the actor in (166c) has a greater degree of agency than the actor in (166b)\(^{17}\).

(166) a. *Awak digadangannyo.* 
   1 PV-big-APP 3 
   ‘I was raised by him.’

b. *Awak digadangan paman.* 
   1 PV-big-APP uncle 
   ‘I was raised by my uncle.’

c. *Awak digadangan dek paman.* 
   1 PV-big-APP CAUSE uncle 
   ‘I was raised by my uncle.’

d. *Dek paman awak digadangan.* 
   CAUSE uncle 1 PV-big-APP 
   ‘I was raised by my uncle.’

\(^{17}\) *Dek* is also used to mark agency and causality in other contexts. For example, in (i) it is used emphatically in an active voice clause to show that *mama*, the speaker, will be the one pushing (i.e. the agent). In (ii) and (iii) it is used to show a causal connection between the causer and the resultant state.

i. *Nyo barek, baa ambo mandorong nyo dek mama.* 
   3 heavy POSS-what 1sg AV-push 3 CAUSE mother 
   ‘It’s heavy, how can I push it.’

(Text ID: 443440120503080306)

ii. *Aden marasoan sadiah dek hilang HP den.* 
   1sg AV-feel-APP sad CAUSE lost mobile.phone 1sg 
   ‘I feel sad because I lost my mobile phone.’

(Elicitation)

iii. *Dek sapatu ko kaki den sakik.* 
   CAUSE shoe DEM:prox foot 1sg hurt 
   ‘These shoes hurt my feet.’

(Elicitation)
All passive voice verbs are necessarily bivalent since they require an undergoer and an actor, although not all arguments are necessarily overtly expressed in the clause (see examples (177), (178), and (179)). If the verb root being passivised is stative or an active intransitive, an applicative is required to license an additional argument first. For example, in (167) note that the stative verb root *dingin*, ‘cold’, must be marked by the applicative clitic *-an* in order to be passivised. The applicative transitivises the verb root, creating a causative verb which requires both an actor (*-nyo*) and an undergoer (*nasi tu*, ‘the rice’).

(167) a. *Nasi tu didinginannyo.*
   rice DEM:dist PV-cold-APP-3
   ‘He has cooled the rice down.’

   b. **Nasi tu didinginnyo.**
   rice DEM:dist PV-cold-3

   (Elicitation)

Similarly in (168), the *-an* applicative is required to transitivise the active intransitive verb root *suruak*, ‘hide’, in order for it to be passivised.

(168) a. *Kue disuruakannyo.*
   cake PV-hide-APP-3
   ‘He hid the cake.’

   b. **Kue disuruaknyo.**
   cake PV-hide-3

   (Elicitation)

Transitive verb roots do not require an applicative in order to be passivised because they already have the required number and type of arguments. The verb root *tolong*, ‘help’, in (169) is transitive therefore it specifies both an actor and an undergoer argument. In (169a) the verb is marked by the active voice marker *maN*-.. The pre-verbal actor
participant *nyo* is the pivot and the post-verbal participant *setiap urang*, ‘everyone’, is the undergoer. In (169b) the sentence has been passivised. Note that the verb is now marked for passive voice by *di-*.

The undergoer is now assigned pivot status and thus appears in pre-verbal position. The actor -*nyo* has been demoted to non-core status and is encoded as a post-verbal enclitic.

(169) a. *Nyo nio manolong setiap urang.*
    3 want AV-help ONE-every person
    ‘He wants to help everyone.’

    b. *Setiap urang nio ditolongnyo.*
    ONE-every person want PV-help-3
    ‘Everyone wants to be helped by him.’

(Elicitation)

Ditransitive verb roots also do not require an applicative to be passivised because the verb’s argument structure already specifies the appropriate number and type of arguments. For example, refer to (129c) and (129d) in which the ditransitive verb *agiah*, ‘give’, is passivised. Note that both the undergoer *pitih*, ‘money’, and the pronominal recipient *inyo* can be assigned pivot status. Ditransitive verbs can also be derived from transitive verb roots with the addition of an applicative.

The *-an* applicative allows for non-core benefactor arguments to be reassigned core argument status and thus makes them available to be selected as the pivot in a passive clause (see example (130e)). However, recipients (see example (235)) and instruments or comitative participants (see example (170)) must remain non-core arguments and may not be selected as the pivot even if an applicative is used. If they appear in pre-verbal position they must be marked by a preposition in order to disambiguate semantic roles.

(170) a. *Cimangko tu dikuduangnyo jo pisau.*
    watermelon DEM:dist PV-cut-3 with knife
    UNDERGOER VERB-ACTOR NON-CORE
    ‘He cut the watermelon with a knife.’
The locative applicative -i, on the other hand, allows a locative argument to be assigned core status and to be made available for pivot selection in a passive clause. For example, in (171a) the location kabun, ‘garden’, is a non-core argument and is thus marked by the locative preposition di. Notice that it also appears in clause final position. The undergoer argument bungo, ‘flowers’, is the pivot and appears in canonical pre-verbal pivot position. In (171b), kabun appears in pre-verbal pivot position. However, since there is no applicative on the verb, kabun is still a non-core argument and is therefore ungrammatical in this position. In (171c) the locative applicative -i appears on the verb, thus assigning core argument status to the location, allowing it to be selected as the pivot. Note that the undergoer bungo, ‘flower’, from (171b) has been reassigned non-core status in (171c).

(171)

a. Bungo ditanamnyo di kabun.
   flower PV-plant-3 LOC garden
   UNDERGOER VERB-ACTOR NON-CORE
   ‘He planted flowers in the garden.’

b. *Kabun ditanamnyo bungo.
   garden PV-plant-3 flower
   NON-CORE VERB-ACTOR UNDERGOER

c. Kabun ditanaminyo jo bungo.
   garden PV-plant-APP:loc-3 with flower
   CORE VERB-ACTOR NON-CORE
   ‘The garden was planted with flowers.’

d. Di kabun ditanamnyo bungo.
   LOC garden PV-plant-3 flower
   NON-CORE VERB-ACTOR UNDERGOER
   ‘He planted flowers in the garden.’

(Elicitation)
Examples (166d), (170b), (171d) demonstrate that although *di-* passives typically adhere to a rigid syntactic structure, non-pivot arguments are able to appear in pre-verbal position so long as their semantic role is specified by a preposition. Many examples of non-canonical word orders in *di-* passive clauses can also be found in Colloquial Minangkabau. In this register, the non-canonical word order may be pragmatically motivated. In any case, Colloquial Minangkabau is highly ‘associational’, which means that syntactic clues are not necessary to determine semantic role assignment (See Chapter 6). For example, in (172) the undergoer, *Ida* appears in post-verbal position. *Ida* is a participant in the conversation and therefore highly referential. Since the most referential participant in the clause is assigned pivot status, *Ida* is interpreted as the pivot of the clause even though the NP does not appear in canonical pivot position. The referentially of *Ida* is further heightened by the fact that the speaker refers to herself again as *Da tu* clause finally.

(172)  *Disuruah lari Ida Ni Da tu.*  
PV-order run Ida TRU-older.sister TRU-Ida DEM:dist  
VERB UNDERGOER ADDRESSEE UNDERGOER  
‘Uni, I, Ida was ordered to run.’  

(Text ID: 444694140857050506)

Example (173) comes from a popular children’s song and its unusual word order may be a feature of idiomatic or literary usage. Note that the undergoer *pisang*, ‘banana’, is in post-verbal position. Usually, the NP in this position would be interpreted as the actor of the clause. However, since *pisang* is the only participant present and since the undergoer is referentially salient in a *di-* clause, *pisang* is understood to be the undergoer.

(173)  *Dibali, dibali pisang, dibali pisang tidak mau makan.*  
PV-buy PV-buy banana PV-buy banana NEG want eat  
VERB UNDERGOER VERB UNDERGOER  
‘He bought a banana but didn’t want to eat it.’  

(Text ID: 638971025505290506)

Similarly in (174) the undergoer participant *vila* is in non-canonical post-verbal position. However, since only the actor may appear as a pronominal enclitic on the verb, only one interpretation is possible; *nyo* is the actor and *vila* is the undergoer.
There are also many examples of bare stems, i.e. verbs that are not marked for voice, in Colloquial Minangkabau. Even though the stems are not marked for voice, hearers are able to decode the utterances and assign the appropriate semantic roles to the participants. Often both passive and active readings of bare stems are possible. However, if there is a post-verbal participant marked by the preposition *dek* then the clause must be interpreted as passive. This demonstrates that the clause structure of di-passives is highly syntactised, i.e. canonical passive clause structure is enough to allow a passive reading even if the verb is not marked for voice (see Chapter 6).

The final point to be made about the syntax of the passive voice construction is that, like active voice constructions, the verb’s arguments are often omitted in discourse if the context permits. Since it is the pivot and therefore highly referential, the undergoer argument is often unexpressed in passive voice clauses, as examples (110) and (112) (repeated here as (175) and (176)) demonstrate.

(174)  *Dibuatnyo vila kan.*  
PV-make-3 villa EMPH  
VERB-ACTOR UNDERGOER  
‘He built a villa you know.’

(175)  *Uang saku punyo awak se lai tapi beko Ø diagiahnyo snack.*  
money pocket own 1 only more but later Ø PV-give-3 snack  
‘We have our own pocket money but later on (we) get given snacks.’

(176)  
(176)a.  *Nyo kan ditanyo a isi jalange.*  
3 EMPH PV-ask what contents wedding-gift-3  
‘They were asked what was in the wedding gift.’
b. \( \emptyset \) Dicaliak dek urang ma.
\( \emptyset \) PV-look CAUSE person EMPH

‘(The contents of the wedding gift) were examined by people.’

(Text ID: 570264113048080506)

The actor argument is also frequently not expressed if it is retrievable from the discourse context or if it is underspecified in some way. For example, in (177), (178) and (179) the actor participants are underspecified but understood to mean ‘someone’. Since the actor is underspecified and ‘general’ it is unexpressed.

(177) \textit{Patah rodanyo kalau didorong} \( \emptyset \).  
\textit{broken wheel-3 TOP PV-push} \( \emptyset \)  

‘Its wheel will break if (one) pushed it.’

(Text ID: 343568121441080306)

(178) \textit{Duo jalur ka dibuek} \( \emptyset \) di sinan tu tu ma.  
\textit{two lane FUT PV-make} \( \emptyset \) LOC there DEM:dist DEM:dist EMPH  

‘(They’re) going to make it two lanes over there you know.’

(Text ID: 377181144506100306)

(179) \textit{Tu dak ditanyo} \( \emptyset \) samo guru kok bisa dapec sapuluah.  
\textit{DEM:dist NEG PV-ask} \( \emptyset \) with teacher EMPH can get ONE-ten  

‘(Nobody) asked the teacher how (he) could have got ten (out of ten).’

(Text ID: 811156095359280306)

5.1.3.3 Semantic Properties of \textit{di-}

Gil (2002a) argues that in Riau Indonesian both \textit{N-} and \textit{di-} have primarily semantic functions (see Section 2.4). \textit{Di-} in Riau Indonesian exhibits clitic-like behaviour similar to \textit{di-} in Minangkabau. The Riau Indonesian locative preposition \textit{di} also displays similar morphophonemic behaviour. Since ‘locative’ \textit{di} and ‘patient marker’ \textit{di-} also have similar syntactic distribution Gil argues that they are one and the same; a generalised ‘patient marker’.

A significant part of Gil’s argument for assigning \textit{di} a semantic as opposed to syntactic role in Riau Indonesian is that \textit{di} clauses to not display the rigid clause structure found
in *di-* passive clauses in Standard Malay/Indonesian (see Section 2.4). But unlike Riau Indonesian, *di-* clauses in Minangkabau have strict syntactic organisation (see Section 5.1.3.2). The preferred preverbal participant in a *di-* clause is the undergoer. If the preverbal participant is unmarked it must be the pivot of the clause. However, the function of Minangkabau *di-* straddles the syntax/pragmatics boundary since its use is motivated by the existence of a conceptually salient and referential undergoer participant. The conceptual saliency and referential individuation of the undergoer participant also has semantic consequences.

Because of the focus it places on the undergoer, i.e. the *affected* participant, it has been argued that in some varieties of Malay/Indonesian, *di-* is associated with completive or perfective aspect (cf. Rafferty, 1982). Similarly, in Minangkabau the use of *di-* coerces a telic reading of the verb.

In example (180a) *di-* co-occurs with the future marker *ka*, and in (180b) with the perfective aspect marker *alah*. However, if the clause is not marked for tense/aspect as it is in (180c) then a telic reading of the verb is preferred.

(180)a. *Lauak ka dibalinyo dari lapau tu.*
   fish FUT PV-buy-3 from shop DEM:dist 'He will buy fish from that shop.'

b. *Lauak alah dibalinyo dari lapau tu.*
   fish PFCT PV-buy-3 from shop DEM:dist 'He bought fish from that shop.'

c. *Lauak dibalinyo dari lapau tu.*
   fish PV-buy-3 from shop DEM:dist 'He bought fish from that shop.'

(Elicitation)

The aspectual properties of *di-* are more likely to occur as a ‘side effect’ of the clitic’s primary function as a marker of passive voice, rather than the clitic functioning exclusively as an aspect marker. In fact, passive clauses cross-linguistically are generally associated with telic or perfective aspect. Hopper (1979) argues that just as the active voice is used in Classical Malay in backgrounded clauses, the passive voice is
used in foregrounded clauses. Foregrounded clauses are typically realis and are associated with perfective or telic aspect.

Hopper and Thompson (1980) also argue that passive clauses are associated with telic aspect. In passive clauses, the undergoer is conceptually salient and highly referential. According to Hopper and Thompson, this suggests that the undergoer is highly individuated, which in turn also means that the clause is high in transitivity. Another feature of clauses high in transitivity is that they are associated with telic aspect due to the degree of affectedness of the undergoer. Thus *di-* clauses in Minangkabau can be given a telic reading not because aspectual marking is a direct property of *di-* but because *di-* clauses are high in transitivity.

**5.1.4 The Pasif Semu**

In Standard Minangkabau, there is another kind of passive voice construction called the *pasif semu* (henceforth the P2 construction). Like a *di-* passive, the undergoer in a P2 construction performs the pivot function. However, unlike a *di-* passive, the actor in a P2 construction retains its status as a core argument. The P2 verb is unmarked yet the construction remains distinctive from a bare active construction because of the word order constraints it exhibits. However, due to the high frequency of bare verbs and the flexible word order constraints of Colloquial Minangkabau, the P2 is not a distinctive construction in this variety (see Section 3.3 and Section 6.1.2.4).

The P2 construction in Standard Minangkabau closely resembles the P2 construction of Malay/Indonesian. In the Malay/Indonesian P2 construction, the verb is not marked for voice and the actor-verb word order of an active sentence is retained. However, the undergoer occurs in pre-verbal position and is assigned pivot status (Chung, 1976a). In the Malay/Indonesian *di-* passive construction, the actor is clearly demoted to non-core argument status, whereas the actor in a P2 clause remains a core argument of the verb (Arka and Manning, 2008; Cole, Hermon and Tjung, 2006). A further distinguishing feature of the P2 construction is that no auxiliaries (i.e. negators and TAM adverbials) may intervene between the actor and the verb (Sneddon, 1996: 249) (see Section 2.2).
To demonstrate that the undergoer is the pivot in an Indonesian P2 clause we can apply raising tests to the undergoer and actor NPs to check for grammaticality (Chung, 1976a). Example (181a) shows a typical Indonesian P2 clause in which the verb beli, ‘buy’, is unmarked. In (181b) this P2 clause has been embedded in a matrix clause. If we raise the undergoer participant baju ini, ‘this shirt’, to pivot position in the matrix clause, then the sentence is grammatical, as shown in (181c). However, if we raise the first person pronoun actor saya, then an ungrammatical sentence is produced in (181d). This provides evidence that the undergoer NP is the pivot in a P2 clause.

(181) a. Baju ini sudah saya Ø-beli.  
   shirt DEM:prox PFCT 1sg Ø-buy  
   ‘I’ve already bought this shirt.’

   b. Mereka menganggap (bahwa) baju ini sudah saya Ø-beli.  
      3pl AV-believe (CP) shirt DEM:prox PFCT 1sg Ø-buy  
      ‘They believe that I’ve already bought this shirt.’

   c. Baju ini dianggap mereka sudah saya Ø-beli.  
      shirt DEM:prox PV-believe 3pl PFCT 1sg Ø-buy  
      ‘They believe that I’ve already bought this shirt.’

   d. *Saya dianggap mereka baju ini sudah Ø-beli.  
      1sg PV-believe 3pl shirt DEM:prox PFCT Ø-buy

(adapted from Chung, 1976a)

An example of a canonical Minangkabau P2 clause can found in (182). In this example, the undergoer argument, buku tu, ‘that book’, is in pivot position. Notice also that the verb is unmarked for voice and that the TAM adverbial alun cannot intervene between the actor, aden, and the verb, baco, ‘read’.

(182) Buku tu alun aden Ø-baco.  
      book DEM:dist not.yet 1sg Ø-read  
      ‘I haven’t read that book yet.’

(Elicitation)

Also consider example (183). Example (183a) follows canonical word order constraints; the aspectual maker alah does not intervene between actor and verb so the sentence is grammatical. However, if we apply the word order of a basic active sentence to allow an ‘actor + auxiliary’ word order, then we get an ungrammatical P2 sentence but we do get
a grammatical sentence with a slightly different meaning. Due to the actor-auxiliary inversion in (183b) *ambo* is now a possessor rather than an actor and the verb *masak*, ‘cook’, has a stative reading. So (183b) reads ‘my beef curry is already cooked’. These word order constraints show that the P2 construction is a distinctive construction in Standard Minangkabau.

(183) a. *Gulai dagiang alah ambo Ø-masak.*  
    curry meat PFCT 1sg Ø-cook  
    ‘I’ve cooked a beef curry.’

    b. *Gulai dagiang ambo alah masak.*  
    curry meat 1sg PFCT cook  
    ‘My beef curry is already cooked.’

(Elicitation)

Further evidence that the P2 is a distinctive construction in Standard Minangkabau comes from the fact that only the undergoer argument in an embedded P2 clause can be raised to pivot position in the matrix clause. This demonstrates that the undergoer is the pivot in a P2 clause, differentiating the P2 clause from a bare active construction. In example (184a) the NP *gulai dagiang*, ‘beef curry’, is the undergoer but also the pivot of the embedded clause. We can show that *gulai dagiang* is the pivot, and also demonstrate that the embedded clause is a P2 construction and not a bare active construction, by raising the NP to pivot position in the matrix clause. Notice in (184b) that *gulai dagiang* has been raised and is now the undergoer pivot of the verb *dianggap* in the matrix clause. (184b) is perfectly well formed. However, if we raise the actor argument *ambo* to pivot position in the matrix clause, as is the case in (184c), then we get an ungrammatical sentence. This is because the actor argument *ambo* is not the pivot of the embedded P2 clause.

(184) a. *Inyo maanggap gulai dagiang alah ambo Ø-masak.*  
    3 AV-believe curry meat PFCT 1sg Ø-cook  
    ‘They believe I’ve already cooked the beef curry.’

    b. *Gulai dagiang dianggapnyo alah ambo Ø-masak.*  
    curry meat PV-believe-3 PFCT 1sg Ø-cook  
    ‘They believe I’ve already cooked the beef curry.’
Although the Standard Minangkabau P2 construction resembles the P2 construction of Malay/Indonesian, many of the restrictions applied to the P2 in Malay/Indonesian do not apply in Standard Minangkabau. The P2 construction in Standard Malay/Indonesian is motivated by the choice of a first or second person pronominal actor argument because these argument types are not possible in a di-passive (Sneddon, 1996). However, these person restrictions do not apply to the P2 construction in Minangkabau. Third person pronouns and full NPs can function as actors in P2 constructions and first and second person pronouns may also function as actors in di-passive constructions.

For example, in (185a) notice that the first person pronoun *Ambo* appears as the actor in the P2 construction. *Ambo* can also function as the actor in a *di*-passive construction, as shown in (185d). Examples (185b) and (185c) show that the third person pronoun *nyo* and the full NP *Udin* can also function as actors in a P2 clause without reducing grammaticality.

(185) a. Lauak tu alah ambo Ø-bali dari lapau tu.
    fish DEM:dist PFCT 1sg Ø-buy from shop DEM:dist
    'I bought fish from that shop.'

    b. Lauak tu alah inyo Ø-bali dari lapau tu.
    fish DEM:dist PFCT 3 Ø-buy from shop DEM:dist
    'He bought fish from that shop.'

    c. Lauak tu alah Udin Ø-bali dari lapau tu.
    fish DEM:dist PFCT Udin Ø-buy from shop DEM:dist
    'Udin bought fish from that shop.'

    d. Lauak tu alah dibali dek ambo dari lapau tu.
    fish DEM:dist PFCT PV-buy CAUSE 1sg from shop DEM:dist
    'I bought fish from that shop.'

    (Elicitation)

There are also restrictions on which verbs can predicate in an Indonesian P2 clause. For example the verbs *ingin*, ‘want’, and *percaya*, ‘believe’, *mirip*, ‘resemble’, cannot appear in a P2 clause but may occur in object relativisations (Chung, 1976a: 77). For
example, notice that the verb *ingin* cannot be passivised in (186a) and cannot appear as the predicate in a P2 clause in (186b). However, it is well formed in the object relativisation construction in (186c).

\[(186)\]

\(a.\) *Buku ini diingin oleh saya.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{book DEM:prox PV-want by 1sg} \\
\text{‘I want this book.’}
\end{array}
\]

\(b.\) *Buku ini saya ingin.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{book DEM:prox 1sg want} \\
\text{‘I want this book.’}
\end{array}
\]

\(c.\) *Buku ini yang saya ingin.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{book DEM:prox REL 1sg want} \\
\text{‘It is this book that I want.’}
\end{array}
\]

(adapted from Chung, 1976a: 77)

These constraints do not apply in Minangkabau. The examples in (187) demonstrate this with regard to the verb *picayo*, which is cognate with Malay/Indonesian *percaya* ‘believe’. These examples show that *picayo* can be used in a bare active constructions as well as P2 constructions.

\[(187)\]

\(a.\) *Aden picayo inyo.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{1sg believe 3} \\
\text{‘I believe him.’}
\end{array}
\]

\(b.\) *Inyo picayo aden.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{3 believe 1sg} \\
\text{‘He believes me.’}
\end{array}
\]

\(c.\) *Inyo aden Ø-picayo.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{3 1sg Ø-believe} \\
\text{‘I believe him.’}
\end{array}
\]

\(d.\) *Inyo alah aden Ø-picayo.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{3 PFCT 1sg Ø-believe} \\
\text{‘I already believe him.’}
\end{array}
\]

\(e.\) *Inyo dianggapnyo alah aden Ø-picayo.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{3 PV-believe-3 PFCT 1sg Ø-believe} \\
\text{‘They believe that I already believe him.’}
\end{array}
\]

\(f.\) *Aden dianggapnyo inyo alah Ø-picayo.*
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{1sg PV-believe-3 3 PFCT Ø-believe}
\end{array}
\]

(Elicitation)
Example (187a) is a canonical bare active construction in which the actor pivot *aden* precedes the verb and the undergoer *inyo* follows the verb. Semantic role assignment in this case is determined by word order. As we see in (187b), if we swap the positions of *aden* and *inyo* in the clause then this affects the assignment of semantic roles. As *inyo* precedes the verb in (187b) it becomes the actor. The first person pronoun *aden* then becomes the undergoer.

Example (187c) is a P2 construction. Note that the actor precedes the verb and the undergoer *inyo* occupies clause initial position, which is the pivot slot in a P2 clause. Example (187d) provides further evidence that *picayo* can appear in a P2 construction as it displays the ‘auxiliary + actor’ word order distinctive of a P2 construction. Examples (187e) and (187f) provide further evidence that the construction in (187c) is a P2 construction since only the undergoer *inyo* can be raised.

Although the P2 is a distinct construction in Standard Malay/Indonesian and in Standard Minangkabau, there is evidence to suggest that in some non-standard, regional, and contact varieties of Malay/Indonesian, such as Basilectal Jakarta Indonesian, Sarang Lan Malay, Mundung Darat Malay and Kuching Malay, the P2 construction has lost its distinctiveness (Cole, Hermon and Tjung, 2006; Cole, Hermon and Yanti, 2007). The pervasive use of bare verbs in these varieties, coupled with flexible word order constraints, has meant that the P2 has merged with the bare active construction. Evidence suggests that the P2 has also merged with the bare active in Colloquial Minangkabau as well (see Chapter 6).

### 5.2 Voice and the “Evolution of Action”

As well as the pragmatically motivated voice alternation between active voice, passive voice and the *pasif semu*, Minangkabau also makes use of a series of multifunctional lexical/derivational verbal affixes that encode some conceptual properties of voice. These affixes include the involuntary marker *ta-*, the causative prefix *pa-*, and the multifunctional affix *ba-*. Based on Shibatani’s (2006) framework for describing the
conceptual properties of voice phenomena (see Section 5.0), I describe the primary function of these affixes in terms of the “evolution of action”: to show the origins of an action, the level of control participants have over the action, and how the action develops and affects other event participants. More specifically, the involuntary marker ta- encodes the origin of the action and marks the fact that the action originates spontaneously (see Section 5.2.1), the causative prefix pa- also encodes the origin of the action except to show that the action is instigated by causal mechanisms (see Section 5.2.2), whereas the multifunctional affix ba- shows the development of the action (see Section 5.2.3).

The active voice prefix maN- also functions as part of this class of lexical/derivation al affixes, to show the development of the action, since it has a role in encoding active aktionsart (see Section 5.1.2.3). The applicatives -an and -i, although functioning primarily in the syntactic domain as valency changing devices, also function as part of Minangkabau’s conceptually motivated voice system to show the termination of the action (see Section 5.3). The passive voice marker di- does not belong in this class because its functions are primarily syntactic and pragmatic. Its status as a morphosyntactic clitic also supports this analysis.

5.2.1 Involuntary ta-

The Minangkabau involuntary marker ta- is a reflex of the Proto Malayic affix *tAr- (Adelaar, 1992a: 154) and is cognate with the Malay/Indonesian affix ter-. The prefix is used to show an involuntary or spontaneous origin to events in opposition to causatives and passives where a volitional agent is implied. Ta- does not co-occur with any of the other Minangkabau verbal prefixes. However, there is at least one ta- verb that requires the applicative -an to license the correct argument structure: the verb tamandian, ‘to accidentally bathe someone’ (see example (188)).

(188)  Walaupun anaknyo damam tamandian juo dek inyo.
      even.though child-3 fever INV-bathe-APP also 3
      ‘Even though her child had a fever she bathed him anyway (without knowing that she ought not to).’

      (Elicitation)
In Minangkabau, *ta-* not only functions to mark involuntary predicates, but also to mark stative ‘ability’ predicates and superlatives. Its semantic uses are similar to the Tagalog affix *ma-* (cf. Himmelmann, 2006a) and the Acehnese affix *ter-* (cf. Durie, 1985b), which both have involuntary and ability uses. The semantics of *ta-* also resemble those of *ter-* in Malay/Indonesian. In Indonesian, *ter-* may only be used with its involuntary meaning if the predicate is undergoer-oriented. However, involuntary *ter-* in Malay can be used in both actor-oriented and undergoer-oriented senses (Adelaar, 1992a: 151). As well as encoding involuntary actions, Malay *ter-* also functions to mark uncontrolled and unintended actions and adds a sense of momentariness to experiential predicates (Goddard, 2003). Shibatani (2006: 224) argues that *ter-* primarily expresses unintended or accidental actions and thus marks a spontaneous construction that is a marked alternative to volitional, active constructions.

Like Malay *ter-*., Minangkabau involuntary *ta-* is also able to function in both actor-oriented and undergoer-oriented predicates. Generally speaking, *ta-* forms superlatives from stative verbs and involuntary predicates from active intransitive verbs, and stative verbs. When *ta-* affixes to a transitive verb it has a de-transitivising effect and creates a stative ‘ability’ predicate. Each of these functions of *ta-* is illustrated in the examples that follow.

First, *ta-* can create a superlative from a stative predicate. For example, the stative predicate *cinto,* ‘love’, in (189a) is turned into a superlative *tacinto,* ‘the most loved’, in (189b). There is also a change in argument status in the two examples. In (189a), *uda,* ‘older brother’, is the participant who loves, whereas in (189b), *uda* is the participant being loved.

(189)a.  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{uda} \ \text{nan} \ \text{cinto} \ \text{inyo.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{older.brother} & \text{REL} & \text{love} & 3
\end{array}
\]

‘Older brother, who loves her.’

(189)b.  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{uda} \ \text{nan} \ \text{tacinto} \ \text{dek} \ \text{inyo.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{older.brother} & \text{REL} & \text{SUP-love} & \text{CAUSE} & 3
\end{array}
\]

‘Older brother who is the most loved by her.’

(Elicitation)
In example (190) the stative predicate *gadang*, ‘big’, is also turned into a superlative, *tagadang*, ‘the biggest’, with the addition of *ta*- in (190b). Notice in (190c) that *ta*- can also create an involuntary predicate from *gadang*: *tagadang*, ‘accidentally stretched’. I treat superlative *ta*- and involuntary *ta*- as two different uses of the same multifunctional prefix. In cases where the meaning is ambiguous and both the superlative and involuntary readings of *ta*- are possible, the exact reading of *ta*- will be determined by discourse and contextual factors.

(190) a. *Baju nan dibali tu *gadang*.  
shirt REL PV-buy DEM:dist big  
‘The shirt that he bought is big.’

b. *Baju nan dibali tu *tagadang*.  
shirt REL PV-buy DEM:dist SUP-big  
‘The shirt that he bought is the biggest.’

c. *Baju nan dibali tu *tagadang*.  
shirt REL PV-buy DEM:dist INV-big  
‘The shirt that he bought got stretched accidentally.’

(Elicitation)

Examples (191) and (192) show the involuntary use of *ta*- . However, notice both actor and undergoer semantic roles are possible for the participants *aden*, ‘I’, and *TV tu*, ‘the TV’. In (191) *aden* may be understood as an actor. In this case, the interpretation of the clause would be ‘I unintentionally woke up because of something I did (for example, I had a bad dream)’. If *aden* were understood as an undergoer then the sentence would mean something like ‘I was unintentionally woken up by something or someone’.

(191) *Aden *tajago*.  
1sg INV-wake  
‘I woke up.’

(Elicitation)

In example (192), *TV tu*, ‘the TV’, can be understood to have switched itself on, for example due to a power surge or some supernatural phenomenon, in which case it would be an actor. Conversely, somebody could have unintentionally switched the
television on, maybe by sitting on the remote control, in which case TV tu would be understood to be an undergoer.

(192) \textit{TV tu} \textit{taiduik.} \\
TV DEM:dist INV-live \\
‘The TV switched on.’ \\
(Elicitation)

Sentences (193) and (194) provide some examples of involuntary \textit{ta-} predicates which are clearly actor-oriented. In (193) the predicate \textit{tadanga}, ‘heard’, is controlled by the actor argument \textit{den}. Similarly in (194) \textit{Sophie} is the actor pivot of the predicate \textit{tanaiak}. The fact that only actor pivots are possible with these verbs is because the \textit{ta-} form is derived from an active verb root.

(193) \textit{Suaru bom tu} \textit{tadanga} \textit{dek} \textit{den.} \\
voice bomb DEM:dist INV-hear CAUSE 1sg \\
‘I heard the sound of the bomb.’ \\
(Elicitation)

(194) \textit{Sophie} \textit{tanaiak} \textit{oto Labor.} \\
Sophie INV-go.up car Labor \\
‘Sophie mistakenly took the Labor bus.’ \\
(Elicitation)

Examples (195) and (196) provide some further illustrations of the way in which \textit{ta-} is used to mark involuntary predicates. However, in these examples the pivot participant must be an undergoer. This is because the \textit{ta-} forms are derived from stative verb roots. In (195) the involuntary predicate \textit{tabanam} is derived from the stative stem \textit{banam}, ‘sink’, and the pivot \textit{urang tu} is an undergoer.

(195) \textit{Urang tu} \textit{tabanam} \textit{di} \textit{lawik.} \\
person DEM:dist INV-sink LOC sea \\
‘That person drowned in the sea.’ \\
(Elicitation)
Similarly in (196), *taseba*, ‘spread’, is derived from a stative verb root therefore the pivot participant *kaba tu*, ‘the news’, must be an undergoer.

(196)  
\[ \text{Kaba tu alah taseba di kampuang.} \]  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{news} & \text{DEM:dist} & \text{PFCT} & \text{INV-spread LOC village} \\
\end{array}
\]  
‘The news had already spread through the village.’

(Elicitation)

The involuntary form *tabaka* is derived from the stative root *baka*, ‘burnt’, therefore the pivot *rumahnyo*, ‘his house’, must be an undergoer in (197a). However, notice in (197b) that the same sentence can also be rendered in passive voice. In this example *rumahnyo* remains the undergoer pivot but the semantics of the clause have changed. In (197b), it is understood that the action was instigated by an actor participant, even though the actor is not overtly expressed. In (197a) no external actor is implied and we do not know how the fire started. All the verb *tabaka* tells us is that the fire started involuntarily, either somebody set the house alight by accident or the house spontaneously combusted. Although involuntary *ta*- clauses resemble passive constructions in their English translations, it is important to remember that no external actor is implied.

(197) a.  
\[ \text{Rumahnyo tabaka.} \]  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{house-3} & \text{INV-burnt} \\
\end{array}
\]  
‘His house burned down.’

b.  
\[ \text{Rumahnyo dibaka.} \]  
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{house-3} & \text{PV-burnt} \\
\end{array}
\]  
‘His house was burned down (by somebody).’

(Elicitation)

Finally, when combined with transitive verb roots, *ta*- has a detransitivising effect and creates stative ‘ability’ predicates, which encode the fact that the pivot could potentially undergo the action. Since the derived *ta*- verb is stative, it also must be undergoer-oriented. In (198) the verb *taubuang* is created from the transitive root *ubuang*, ‘connect’, and means that the undergoer *iko* ‘(has the potential to be) connected to something else’.
Similarly in (199) and (200) the predicates taraso, ‘taste’, and tagantuang, ‘hang’, imply that the respective undergoer arguments lauak tu, ‘the fish’, and lukisan, ‘painting’, can be tasted or hung because the ability is inherent in the participant. These predicates are similar to involuntary ta- predicates in that no external actor is implied; the actions can be performed by virtue of the undergoers inherently possessing the ability to perform these actions.

(Elicitation)

(199) Lauak tu taraso lamak.
     fish DEM:dist AB-feel delicious
  ‘The fish tastes delicious.’

(Elicitation)

(200) Lukisan tagantuang di dindiang tu.
     paint-NOM AB-hang LOC wall DEM:dist
  ‘The painting is hanging on the wall.’

(Elicitation)

5.2.2 Causative pa-

Like ta-, pa- is also used to encode the origin of the action. The prefix encodes the fact that the action was instigated by a volitional actor-causer, which is distinct from the actor of the main action (cf. Shibatani, 2006: 230). It is cognate with the Malay/Indonesian causative prefix per- (Adelaar, 1992a).

Pa- may co-occur with either the active voice marker maN- or the passive voice marker di- and is prefixed to the root prior to maN- prefixation or di- cliticisation. The prefix can also affix to an applicative-marked verb. When the verb root is active then both pa- and the applicative are required, for example in the verb ‘to teach’, mampalajari requires both pa- and the applicative -i. However, in causative verbs derived from stative stems, there is no significant shift in meaning if a verb is marked by both the
causative prefix and an applicative, or just the causative prefix, or just an applicative (see examples (201) and (202)).

The causative prefix *pa-* functions productively to create causative verbs from stative stems but its effects on active stems are often unpredictable and idiomatic. Let us first examine some examples of causatives derived from stative verb roots before discussing some of the idiomatic effects of *pa*.

Examples (201) and (202) show how causative verbs are derived from stative verb roots. In (201) the causative verbs *mampapanjang*, *mamanjangan*, and *mampapajangan*, which all mean ‘lengthen’ (or literally ‘cause to become long’), are derived from the same stative root *panjang*, ‘long’. Notice that the causative verb can be derived using the causative prefix *pa-* as in (201a), the applicative -*an* as in (201b), or both the causative prefix and the applicative marker as in (201c).

(201) a. *Panmarintah daerah nio mampapanjang jalan bypass.*
NOM-order area want AV-CST-long road bypass
‘The local government will lengthen the bypass.’

b. *Panmarintah daerah nio mamanjangan jalan bypass.*
NOM-order area want AV-long-APP road bypass
‘The local government will lengthen the bypass.’

c. *Panmarintah daerah nio mampapajangan jalan bypass.*
NOM-order area want AV-CST-long-APP road bypass
‘The local government will lengthen the bypass.’

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (202), a causative form meaning ‘fix, improve’ may be derived from the stative verb root *elok*, ‘good’, with the use of the causative prefix *pa-* (see *mampaelok* in (202a)), the applicative -*an* (see *maelokan* in (202b)), or both the causative prefix and the applicative marker (see *mampaelokan* in (202c)).

(202) a. *Inyo mampaelok otonyo.*
3 AV-CST-good car-3
‘He is fixing his car.’
b. *Inyo maelokan* otonyo.
   3 AV-good-APP car-3
   ‘He is fixing his car.’

c. *Inyo mampaelokan* otonyo.
   3 AV-CST-good-APP car-3
   ‘He is fixing his car.’

(Elicitation)

Minangkabau speakers perceive subtle semantic differences between each of these variants of the causative verbs shown in (201) and (202), which may be due to the fact that *pa-* is concerned with the origin of the action and the applicative -*an* is concerned with the termination of the action (see Section 5.3). Further investigation is required to test this. However, a similar opposition also exists between the Standard Indonesian causative prefix *per-* and the applicative -*kan*. Alwi et al (1998) argue that the *per-* verbs express an increase in the quality named by the stative verb root whereas the -*kan* verbs describe a complete change of state. So in Indonesian these two affixes encode similar processes: *per-* focuses on the origin of the event whereas -*kan* shows its end point.

In examples (203) to (206) the function of the prefix *pa-* is less easy to predict. In these examples *pa-* has a different semantic effect when it affixes to active verb roots *aja*, ‘teach’, *duduak*, ‘sit’, *tagak*, ‘stand’, and *cuci*, ‘wash’. The effect of applicative marking on each of these verbs is also different and this also has an effect on how *pa-* interacts with the applicatives.

In (203) we see three different active forms of the transitive verb root *aja*, ‘teach’. In (203a) the verb is marked for active voice and the sentence is a simple transitive construction. In (203b) the verb is marked by the applicative -*an* which alters argument structure of the verb. *Maajaan* is a ditransitive verb and the recipient participant anak-anak, ‘children’, can appear in undergoer position directly following the verb. In (203c) the verb *mampalajari*, ‘learn’, is marked by the causative marker *pa-* . Notice that this verb must also be marked by the locative applicative -*i* to be grammatical. The interaction of the causative prefix *pa-* with the locative applicative changes the semantics of the verb root entirely so that we get an almost reflexive meaning, i.e. ‘teach to oneself’.
In example (204) the active intransitive verb root duduak, ‘sit’ is the predicate head. Notice in (204b) that the verb is marked by the applicative -an which creates a causative change of state verb. Manduduakan can be translated literally as ‘cause to become seated’. In (204a) the verb is also marked by the applicative -an, which is required to make the verb bivalent, but the causative prefix pa- is also used. If duduak were a stative root we would perceive no great difference in meaning between (204a) and (204b) since they would both encode causative events in which a change of state occurred. However, the effect of pa- on the verb stem in (204a) is quite unpredictable and idiomatic. The resultant verb form, mampaduduak, means ‘put to rest, solve’.

The effect of the causative prefix pa- is also unpredictable in examples (205) and (206). The causative verb mampatagakan is derived from the active intransitive verb root tagak, ‘stand’ in (205a). The resultant pa- derivation of the verb uses tagak in a metaphorical sense to mean ‘defend’. Notice that (205b), which makes use of the applicative -an but not the causative prefix pa-, has quite a different meaning from (205a), as managakan means ‘build, erect’ (literally ‘cause to become standing’).
(205)a. *Inyo mampatagakan anaknyo walaupun salah.*
   3 AV-CST-stand-APP child-3 even.though wrong
   ‘He defended his child even though his child was wrong.’

   b. *Jadi nan paralu dalam managakan Rumah Gadang adolah adat!*
   happen REL need inside AV-stand-APP house big EQV.OP tradition
   ‘So all you need to build a Rumah Gadang is tradition!’

   (Elicitation)

Similarly in (206) the applicative -an has the effect of changing the valency of the transitive verb root *cuci*, ‘wash’, and inferring a benefactor participant. However the use of the causative prefix *pa-* in (206a) creates a causative that uses the sense of the verb root metaphorically.

(206)a. *Inyo mampacucian namo baiaknyo.*
   3 AV-CST-wash-APP name good-3
   ‘He cleared his good name.’

   b. *Santi mancucian baju Silvie.*
   Santi AV-wash-APP shirt Silvie
   ‘Santi washed Silvie’s shirt for her.’

   (Elicitation)

5.2.3 Multifunctional *ba-*

Now let us discuss the multifunctional prefix *ba-*. Where *ta-* and *pa-* function to show the origin of the action, *ba-* shows how the action develops. Furthermore, *ba-*, like *ta-*, does not co-occur with any of the other Minangkabau voice markers, although it can combine with the applicatives -an and -i when argument structure requires it.

The prefix is sometimes realised as *bar-* rather than *ba-*, which has lead some linguists to treat the two variants as different affixes (cf. Moussay, 1998). The words *bara*, ‘how much is it?’, and *baa*, ‘how is it?’, appear to provide evidence of a minimal pair to support the claim that *bar-* and *ba-* are different affixes. At first glance, it appears that *bara* consists of the prefix *bar-* and the Minangkabau word for ‘what’, *a*, whereas *baa* consists of *ba-* and *a*. However, evidence from the reconstruction of Proto Malayic
reveals that *bara and *baa in fact have historically different origins. Baa, ‘how is it?’, consists of the prefix ba- and the Minangkabau word for ‘what’, a, but bara is probably a compound descended from the Proto Malayic words *baraʔ and *apa. The word *baraʔ is a “marker of uncertainty and indefiniteness of object or number” (Adelaar, 1994: 1) and *apa means ‘what’ and has the reflexes a and apo in Minangkabau.\(^{18}\)

In addition to this historical evidence, my language consultants perceive no difference in meaning between bar- and ba-. There is a preference for the bar- allomorph with vowel initial roots, particularly /a/ initial roots, therefore I conclude that bar- and ba- are allomorphs rather than two different affixes.

The ba- prefix is cognate with the Malay/Indonesian prefix ber- and performs many of the same functions (cf. Sneddon, 1996: 60-65). In Minangkabau, ba- is used primarily in reflexive, reciprocal and middle constructions and can also be used to create stative from transitive verb roots. These stative constructions resemble the stative ‘ability’ ta-predicates but they are more passive-like because an agentive participant is implied. The prefix also combines productively with nominal roots to create stative possessive predicates.

Let us look first at the possessive predicates created when ba- affixes to a nominal root. In example (207), ba- is prefixed to the noun ubuangan, ‘connection’ (which is derived from the verbal root ubuang, ‘connect’), to create a verbal predicate baubuangan, which means ‘to have a connection’.

\[
(207) \quad \text{Iko} \quad \text{baubuangan} \quad \text{jo} \quad \text{politik.}
\]

DEM:prox POSS-connect-NOM with politics

‘This has a connection with politics.’

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (208), the ba- prefix has combined with the nominal root anak, ‘child’, to create the predicate baanak, which means ‘to have a child.’

---

\(^{18}\) According to Adelaar (1994: 1), the cognate Indonesian word berapa, ‘how much is it?’, has the same historical origins as bara in Minangkabau.
(208) Yo awak baanak padusi kan. 
yes 1 POSS-child female EMPH 'Yeah, we have a little girl you know.' 

(Elicitation)

Now let us focus on the primary function of ba-, which is to show the development of an action. Examples (210) to (212) show how ba- can function to mark reflexive predicates. In this kind of construction the event described is active but it does not affect an undergoer participant. Instead, the action affects the actor as well. Some reflexive predicates can be encoded like a simple active clause with the use of a reflexive pronoun in undergoer position. For example, in (209) diri, ‘self’, is used as a reflexive pronoun much like the English reflexive pronoun ‘himself’. The pronoun occupies undergoer position in this example and the clause resembles a simple active construction. However, reflexive predicates marked by the ba- prefix do not require an undergoer argument because the actor is also understood as the ‘affectee’.

(209) Inyo bunuah diri. 
3 kill self 'He killed himself.' 

(Elicitation)

In example (210) a reflexive predicate baraja has been created from the transitive verb root aja ‘teach’ and the reflexive marker ba-. The predicate baraja translates well into the English verb ‘study’, but translates literally as ‘teach oneself’.

(210) Aden mulai baraja baso Minang duo minggu nan lalu. 
1sg start RFLX-teach language Minang two weeks REL pass 'I started to study Minangkabau two weeks ago.' 

(Elicitation)

Examples (211) and (212) show the use of ba- with the two cognitive predicates pikia, ‘think’, and sangko, ‘suspect’. The resultant forms bapikia and basangko translate literally as ‘think to oneself’ and ‘suspect to oneself’. Experiential predicates, particularly predicates denoting cognitive processes are encoded as reflexives in a
number of languages (Kemmer, 1994) so it is not unusual for these forms to exist in Minangkabau.

(211)  
\[\text{Banyak urang maabiahan pitih, ndak nyo bapikia dulu.}\]
many person AV-finish-APP money NEG 3 RFLX-think before

‘Many people spend money without thinking about it first.’

(Elicitation)

(212)  
\[\text{Inyo basangko buruak.}\]
3 RFLX-suspect had

‘He suspects something bad.’

(Elicitation)

The \textit{ba-} prefix also functions to mark reciprocal predicates. Like reflexive predicates, the verb root to which \textit{ba-} affixes is transitive but an undergoer argument is not specified. This is because the actor is also understood to be the affectee of the action because of the way the \textit{ba-} prefix shows how the action develops. Reciprocal rather than reflexive interpretations are available for examples (213) to (215) because the actors are plural and the verb roots encode naturally reciprocal events.

In (213) the reciprocal verb \textit{bacakak}, ‘fight each other’, has been created from the transitive verb root \textit{cakak}, ‘fight’, and in (214) the reciprocal form \textit{basukoan}, ‘like each other’, comes from the verb root \textit{sukoan}, ‘like (something)’. In example (215) there are two reciprocal verb forms. The first \textit{balagu}, ‘sing to each other’, comes from the verb root \textit{lagu}, ‘sing’, and \textit{bacinto}, ‘make love’, comes from the verb root \textit{cinto}, ‘love’.

(213)  
\[\text{Anak-anak tu bacakak.}\]
RED-child DEM:dist RECP-fight

‘Those children are fighting each other.’

(Elicitation)

(214)  
\[\text{Inyo basukoan dari dulu.}\]
3 RECP-like-APP from before

‘They liked each other from the start.’

(Elicitation)
There are also a number of other ba- predicates in Minangkabau that do not quite fit the label ‘reflexive’ or ‘reciprocal’, but that function to show the development of the action. For these predicates, I argue that ba- functions to mark middle voice. These middle predicates are intransitive but it is clear that the actor also undergoes some change, so in this sense they are broadly reflexive. Middle voice in Minangkabau resembles the middle voice of Greek which is used to mark transitive predicates that are somewhere between an active and a passive, or intransitive predicates that have a passive like relation to their subject (Bakker, 1994). In fact, the reflexive and reciprocal predicates can also be described as middle constructions since the action does not extend beyond the sphere of the actor. According to Croft’s (1991; 1994) event-based framework for voice phenomena, reflexives and reciprocals have the same event frame as middle verbs since they involve a situation in which the subject is both the initiator and end point of the action.

Cross-linguistically, the middle voice is associated with a number of situation types that involve similar aktionsart and event properties. Based on Talmy’s (1972) classification of event types, Kemmer (1994: 181-83) lists ten middle situation types that might involve middle marking in languages that have a middle voice. Kemmer’s middle situation types are listed in Table 19.
Table 19. Kemmer’s (1994) middle situation types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation Type</th>
<th>Example Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Grooming or body care</td>
<td>wash, shave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nontranslational motion</td>
<td>stretch, turn, bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change in body posture</td>
<td>sit down, kneel down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Translational motion</td>
<td>climb up, go away, walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Naturally reciprocal events</td>
<td>embrace, wrestle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Indirect middle</td>
<td>acquire, ask, take, desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emotion middle</td>
<td>be/become frightened, be angry, grieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emotive speech actions</td>
<td>complain, lament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cognition middle</td>
<td>reflect, ponder, believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Spontaneous events</td>
<td>germinate, sprout, vanish, recover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kemmer (1994) also argues that the Indonesian prefix ber-, which is cognate with Minangkabau ba-, is used to mark middle voice. Kemmer (1994: 183) provides some examples (repeated here as examples (216) to (221)) to show that Indonesian marks middle voice for at least six middle situation types including grooming or body care, change in body posture, translational motion, naturally reciprocal events, cognition middles and spontaneous events.

(216) Grooming or body care: ber-dandan ‘get dressed’
(217) Change in body posture: ber-lutut ‘kneel down’
(218) Translational motion: ber-jalan ‘walk, stroll’
(219) Naturally reciprocal events: ber-gumul ‘wrestle’
(220) Cognition middle: ber-pikir ‘be cognating’
(221) Spontaneous events: ber-henti ‘come to a stop’

(Kemmer, 1994: 183)

The functional domain of the Minangkabau middle prefix ba- is very similar to ber- in Indonesian. Examples (222) to (225) provide some examples of Minangkabau middle constructions and show that they encode the same middle situation types as Indonesian.
In (222) the verb *baranang*, ‘swim’, is an example of translational motion. Like Indonesian, Minangkabau also makes use of the middle voice to encode the verb ‘to walk, stroll’, which is *bajalan*. The middle verb *barubah* in example (223) is an example of a spontaneous event, as is *baranti*, ‘stop’, in example (224) and *barambuih*, ‘blow’, in example (225).

(222)  *Santi*  *baranang*  *di*  *batang*  *aia.*

*Santi* MID-*swim* LOC CLASS:cylinder water

‘Santi is swimming in the river.’

(Elicitation)

(223)  *Mukonyo*  *alah*  *barubah*.

face-3 PFCT MID-*change*

‘His face has changed.’

(Elicitation)

(224)  *Oto*  *tu*  *baranti*  *di*  *muko*  *kampus*.

bus DEM:dist MID-*stop* LOC face campus

‘The bus stopped in front of uni.’

(Elicitation)

(225)  *Angin*  *barambuih*  *dari*  *lawik*.

wind MID-*blow* from ocean

‘The wind is blowing from the ocean.’

(Elicitation)

Examples (226) and (227) are harder to classify according to Kemmer’s (1994) list of middle situation types. In its literal sense of ‘bloom’ (i.e. for flowers), *bakambang* could be an example of a spontaneous situation type. However, in example (227) *bakambang* is used to mean ‘develop’. This metaphorical use of *bakambang* clearly does not involve a spontaneous event and may be better characterised as involving motion, albeit metaphorical, resulting in a change of state. Similarly in example (226), *bakumpua*, ‘gather’, also involves motion resulting in a change of state. In fact, according to Croft’s (1994) analysis, all middle situations involve an event resulting in a change of state. Both examples *bakumpua*, ‘gather’, and *bakambang*, ‘develop’, are also broadly reflexive because the action does not extend beyond the sphere of the actors, but the actors are clearly still affected in some way.
(226) *Urang sakampuang alah bakumpua untuak mancaliak urang manari.*
person ONE-village FFCT MID-gather for AV-see person AV-dance
‘The village people gathered themselves together to watch the dancing.’

(Elicitation)

(227) *Nagari tu disabuik nagari nan sadang bakambang.*
country DEM:dist PV-refer country REL PROG MID-bloom
‘That country can be described as a developing country.’

(Elicitation)

The *ba-* verbs in examples (228), (229) and (230): *babaka*, ‘burn’, *bagadangan*, ‘stretch’, and *baiduikan*, ‘switch on’, resemble passives but can also be characterised as middle verbs. These verbs involve a change of state but their pivots possess both undergoer and actor elements.

For example, notice that the pivot *lauak tu*, ‘the fish’, is semantically undergoer-like in (228a) but no external agent is implied. In (228b) the verb *baka*, ‘burn’, has been passivised by *di-* . In this example *lauak tu* is clearly an undergoer and even though an actor argument is not overtly expressed, it is clear that an external participant *acted* on the fish so that it became roasted. Also compare *babaka* in (228) to *tabaka* in example (197) (see Section 5.2.1). In (197) the pivot *rumahnyo*, ‘his house’, involuntarily or spontaneously caught fire whereas the *babaka* predicate implies that the event is occurring volitionally.

(228) a. *Lauak tu babaka jo baro.*
fish DEM:dist MID-roast with ember
‘The fish is roasting in embers.’

b. *Lauak tu dibaka.*
fish DEM:dist PV-roast
‘(Somebody) roasted the fish.’

(Elicitation)

Examples (229) and (230) are similarly somewhere in between an active and a passive. In (229a) we cannot definitively infer an external actor for *bagadangan*, ‘stretch’, but in
(229b) the event referred to by digadangan, ‘stretched’, is clearly initiated by an external actor, even though this participant is not overtly expressed.

(229)a. Sarawah tu bagadangan supayo lapang.  
trouser DEM:dist MID-big-APP in.order.that loose  
‘The trousers got stretched until they were loose.’

b. Sarawah tu digadangan supayo lapang.  
trouser DEM:dist PV-big-APP in.order.that loose  
‘(Somebody) stretched the trousers until they were loose.’

(Elicitation)

In (230a) the television could have switched on of its own accord or it could have been switched on deliberately by somebody, this is not clear. However in (230b) we must infer an actor participant because the verb iduikan, ‘switch on’, has been passivised.

(230)a. TV tu baiduikan.  
TV DEM:dist MID-live-APP  
‘The TV switched on.’

b. TV tu diiduikan.  
TV DEM:dist PV-live-APP  
‘(Somebody) switched the TV on.’

(Elicitation)

Like babaka, ‘roast’, we can also compare these ba- middle verbs bagadangan, ‘stretch’, and baiduikan, ‘switch on’, to their involuntary ta- counterparts in Section 5.2.1. In (190) the origin of the tagadang, ‘stretch’, event is clearly spontaneous and non-volitional. Similarly in (192) taiduik, ‘switch on’, is an involuntary event. However, the origin of the action in (229) and (230) is not revealed by the ba- prefix. Notice also that the ta- forms of the verb roots gadang and iduik do not require an applicative, whereas the ba- forms do. This is because the ba- middle verbs are clearly two participant events; bagadangan and baiduikan imply that there is both an actor and an undergoer but unlike an active or a passive clause, we are unaware as to whether the actor participant is the same as the undergoer participant or an external entity.
This ends our discussion of the lexical/derivational affixes of Minangkabau. The following section describes the Minangkabau applicatives -an and -i: how they operate syntactically and how they show the end point in the ‘evolution of an action’.

5.3 Applicatives

Many Austronesian languages have at least one transitivising and/or applicative device (Klamer, 2002: 944). Cross-linguistically, applicatives function as transitivisers. For intransitive verb roots applicatives license an additional argument and for transitive roots they function to increase the transitivity of the verb, or to modify the verb’s argument structure. Applicatives also allow for non-core arguments such as prepositional, indirective, benefactive and instrumental participants, to be included as part of the verb’s core argument structure (Peterson, 2007: 2). Some applicatives also allow comitative and ‘reason’ participants to be raised to core argument status (Sirk, 1996). Furthermore, applicatives may have secondary semantic functions in addition to their valency changing functions, including deriving verbs from nominal sources and marking aspectual notions such as continuous, iterative and intense activity (Klamer, 2000).

The Minangkabau applicatives -an and -i function primarily as valency changing devices. They function to alter the argument structure of the verb, either by increasing the valency of the verb, or by promoting non-core arguments to core argument position. The -an applicative enables recipient and benefactor participants to be raised to core argument status, whereas the -i applicative has the same effect on locative arguments. Like the lexical/derivational affixes described in Section 5.2, -an and -i also function as part of Minangkabau’s conceptually based voice system. The affixes tu- and pa- show how an action originates, man- and ba- show how the action develops, whereas -an and -i show how the action terminates, encoding the degree of affectedness of the undergoer argument.
5.3.1 Multifunctional -an

The Minangkabau applicative -an acts as a valency increaser, deriving transitive verbs from intransitive roots and deriving ditransitive verbs from transitive roots. In ditransitive active voice constructions it allows for recipient and benefactor participants to be promoted to core argument status. The applicative also allows for benefactive, but not recipient participants, to be realised as the undergoer pivot in passive voice constructions.

The -an applicative also has some secondary semantic functions. It can be seen to act as a causative marker when deriving transitive verbs from stative verb roots. It also has some aspectual properties, adding completive aspect to activity verbs. These semantic properties are a ‘side effect’ of -an’s role in showing the evolution of the action. Since -an functions to show the termination point of an event, it marks the degree of affectedness of the undergoer. This in turn produces these secondary semantic effects.

The semantic effects of -an will be discussed further in Section 5.3.1.3 but first let us examine the syntactic effects of this applicative.

5.3.1.1 Syntactic Effects of -an

Examples (231) and (232) show how -an functions as a valency increasing device when it combines with a stative verb root. In (231a), the root sakik, ‘hurt, sick’, is a stative verb. In (231b), -an modifies the argument structure of the stative verb root to create the active transitive verb manyakikan, ‘hurt’. The applicative also gives the verb a causative meaning; in terms of its event structure manyakikan means ‘cause to become hurt’. Note that -an can occur on stative roots to derive transitive verbs without the need for maN-prefixation as (231c) shows. Note also that although the affixation of maN- derives an intransitive change of state verbs from stative roots (see Section 5.1.2.3), the form *manyakik does not exist.
Similarly in (232), -an derives the causative transitive verb *mamatian, ‘cause to be switched off’, from the stative verb root *mati, by increasing the valency of the verb root. Active voice prefixation is not obligatory so the form *matian, ‘cause to be switched off’, is also acceptable, as shown in (232c). Note that active voice prefixation without applicativisation creates the meaningless form *mamati.

The applicative -an can also create transitive verbs from active intransitive verbs. The applicative has the effect of changing the valency of the active intransitive verb root by licensing an undergoer argument. The applicative also adds causative semantics to the intransitive verb root, as it does for stative verb roots. As we see in (233) the transitive verb form *mangumpuaan, ‘collect’, is derived from the intransitive form *mangumpua, ‘gather’. Notice that not only has the applicative licensed the presence of an undergoer argument, but it also gives the verb a causative meaning.
(233)a. Samuik mangumpua dek ado gulo.
   ant AV-gather CAUSE exist sugar
   ‘The ants are swarming because of the sugar.’

b. Aden suko mangumpuaan parangko.
   lsg like AV-gather-APP stamp
   ‘I like collecting stamps.’

(Elicitation)

In (234) -an creates the transitive verb mangaluaan, ‘take out’, from the active
intransitive verb root kalua, ‘go out’. Notice that mangaluaan can also be interpreted as
a causative verb and can be understood in terms of the event frame ‘cause to go out’.

(234)a. Aden suko kalua malam minggu.
   lsg like go.out night week
   ‘I often go out on Saturday nights.’

b. Inyo mangaluaan hape dari sakunyo.
   3 AV-go.out.-APP hand.phone from pocket-3
   ‘He took his mobile phone out of his pocket.’

(Elicitation)

When -an combines with a transitive verb root it has the effect of increasing the valency
of the verb by licensing a recipient or benefactive argument. The applicative also allows
for these non-core arguments to become core arguments (see Section 5.1.1.3). For
example, in (235) the transitive verb manyipak, ‘kick’, can be modified by the -an
applicative to create the ditransitive form manyipakan, ‘kick to someone’.

The presence of the applicative in manyipakan also allows for a shift in grammatical
relations. In (235b) notice the recipient Silvie is marked as an adjunct by the preposition
ka. However, (235c) shows that the recipient can also be realised as a core argument as
Silvie can appear in post-verbal position: the slot reserved for the undergoer argument.
The ability of -an to alter the grammatical relations of the clause, while allowing each of
the arguments to retain its semantic role, is a feature common to applicatives cross-
linguistically (Peterson, 2007). In fact, in Standard Indonesian the applicative marker
-kan has a similar effect on argument structure, allowing recipients and beneficiaries to
be raised to core argument status. Chung (1976b) describes this type of -kan
construction as “dative”.
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Notice that (235d), (235e) and (235f) are in passive voice. In these sentences, Silvie cannot appear in pivot position unless marked by the preposition ka. Silvie is a recipient and not an undergoer therefore prepositional marking is required to disambiguate these semantic roles. If Silvie were to occupy pre-verbal pivot position in a passive clause and be unmarked by the preposition ka, she would be interpreted as an undergoer. This is why (235d) is strange; Silvie is interpreted as the undergoer and bola as the actor.

Also consider (235f). In this sentence, ka Silvie has become the head of a relative clause but the resulting sentence is ungrammatical. This is because ka Silvie is not the true pivot of the clause and therefore cannot be the head of the relative clause (see Section 5.1.1.4). This provides evidence that although the applicative -an allows for the recipient to appear in core-argument position in active voice constructions, recipient arguments are not available be raised to pivot position in passive voice sentences\(^\text{19}\).

\(^{\text{19}}\) However, in naturally ditransitive verb roots the recipient is indeed available to be selected as the pivot (see example (129)).
Unlike recipients, benefactors can be raised to pivot position in passive clauses as a result of the applicative -an. The applicative -an licenses benefactors for transitive verbs whose semantics prevent a dative-like ‘giving’ reading. For example, in (236) the applicative -an combines with the transitive verb root *masak*, ‘cook’, to create the benefactive verb *mamasakan*, ‘cook for someone’. The applicative licenses a benefactive participant and not a recipient participant due to the semantics of the verb root *masak*. The verb root implies a change of state in the undergoer rather than movement of the undergoer, therefore a ‘*cook to someone*’ interpretation is not possible.

(236) a. *Ambo mamasak gulai.*
   1sg AV-cook curry
   ‘I’m cooking a curry.’

b. *Ambo mamasakan gulai.*
   1sg AV-cook-APP curry
   ‘I’m cooking a curry (for someone).’

c. *Ambo mamasakan gulai untuak urang tu.*
   1sg AV-cook-APP curry for person DEM:dist
   ‘I’m cooking a curry for that guy.’

d. *Ambo mamasakan urang tu gulai.*
   1sg AV-cook-APP person DEM:dist curry
   ‘I’m cooking that guy a curry.’

e. *Urang tu dimasakan gulai dek ambo.*
   person DEM:dist PV-cook-APP curry CAUSE 1sg
   ‘I cooked that guy a curry.’

f. *Urang tu nan dimasakan gulai dek ambo, urang baiak.*
   person DEM:dist REL PV-cook-APP curry CAUSE 1sg person good
   ‘The guy I cooked a curry for is a nice person.’

Notice that even though the benefactor is not overtly expressed, a benefactive reading of the verb, i.e. ‘cook for someone’, is still possible in (236b) because of the semantics of -an. In Indonesian, the applicative -kan also allows for a benefactive interpretation of a verb even if the benefactor is phonologically null (Cole and Son, 2004: 342).

As well as just licensing a benefactor participant the applicative -an also allows for the benefactor to be raised to core argument status and appear in pivot position in passive
constructions. In (236d) notice that the benefactor *urang tu*, ‘that guy’, has been assigned core argument status and appears in undergoer position. In (236e) the sentence is in passive voice and the benefactor *urang tu* acts as the pivot. We can demonstrate that *urang tu* is the pivot because the argument heads the relative clause in (236f) (see Section 5.1.1.4).

The role of -an in changing the argument structure of a verb is much like the role of the Madurese applicatives described by Davies (2005). The Madurese applicatives interact with the existing passive and active voices to allow a range of argument types, including benefactors, recipients and instruments, to be raised from adjunct status to pivot status. In this way, Madurese is able to make available as subject “the full range of arguments that can be selected as subject in Western Austronesian languages possessing much richer voice systems” (Davies, 2005: 207). As we have seen, Minangkabau *-an* allows benefactors to be selected as pivots and we will see in Section 5.3.2, that the applicative -i allows for locative arguments to be promoted to pivot status.

5.3.1.2 Obligatoriness of -an

It is evident from the above discussion that -an plays a clearly defined role as a valency changing device but also as a means to promote non-core arguments to core argument status. However, some examples from the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus show that in Colloquial Minangkabau these valency changing and argument structure altering effects of -an are possible even without the use of the applicative.

For example, in (237) we see that a ‘dative’ construction is possible without the use of the applicative. The verb *mambao*, ‘bring’, is transitive. In this example it is interpreted as ditransitive. The recipient participant *den*, ‘me’, appears in core argument position even though an applicative has not been used to license a recipient participant. Because the applicative has not been used, most speakers of Standard Minangkabau would label this example ungrammatical and prefer the verb *mambaoan* instead. However, the existence of this example shows that the applicative is not always required to create a ‘dative’ construction in Colloquial Minangkabau.
Example (238) also shows that the applicative -an is not always required to create transitive causative verbs from intransitive verb roots in Colloquial Minangkabau. Sentence (238a) shows how the verb *malarian*, ‘kidnap’, is used. The verb is transitive and causative and is created by cliticising -an to the active intransitive verb root lari, ‘run’. Sentence (238b) shows that the ‘kidnap’ interpretation of the verb is also possible even if the verb is not marked by the applicative. We would expect that the sentence in (238b) would mean ‘yes the child ran’, but it is very clear from the context that the speaker intends the ‘kidnap’ meaning of the verb. It is also clear from the context that the other participants in the conversation also correctly interpret the meaning intended by the speaker. Example (238b) could of course also be an example of a sporadic hapology since [an], the first syllable of anak, ‘child’, has the same form as the applicative.

(238a)  *Malarian anak surang.*  
AV-run-APP child ONE-person  
‘He kidnapped his own child.’  

(Text ID: 880233134220161006)

b.  *Yo malarî anak yo.*  
yes AV-run child EMPH  
‘Yes he kidnapped his child.’  

(Text ID: 498720134358161006)

5.3.1.3 Semantic Effects of -an

As well as functioning in the syntactic domain the applicative -an also has a number of semantic functions, including showing causality and completive aspect. These semantic effects occur as a ‘side effect’ of the applicative’s primary role as a valency changing device (since -an’s focus is on the ultimately affected participant) and are linked to the
applicative’s main semantic function, which is to show the termination point of an event.

The Malay/Indonesian applicative suffix -kan, which is cognate with the Minangkabau applicative -an, is also a valency changing device and has a range of similar syntactic functions including creating causatives from intransitive verb roots, creating benefactives, marking goal PP constructions, and marking inherent ditransitives (Cole and Son, 2004; Son and Cole, 2008). The Malay/Indonesian applicative also has similar semantic effects to the Minangkabau applicative. For example, in Riau Indonesian -kan functions to mark the semantic end point of an event (Gil, 2002b) and this may be true of -kan in Standard Indonesian as well.

Two further studies of -kan in Indonesian propose a semantic analysis of the affix to unify its various functions. Son and Cole (2008) use an event decomposition model of verb structure (cf. Dowty, 1979) to argue that all uses of -kan map onto the RESULT head of event decomposition. Kroeger’s (2007) approach to account for the multifunctionality of -kan is to posit the existence of two -kan affixes: -kan₁ and -kan₂. He argues that -kan₁ is a morphosemantic affix which alters the “Lexical Conceptual Structure” (Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 1998; 2005) of the verb, whereas -kan₂ is a morphosyntactic affix. Uses of -kan with inherent ditransitive verbs involve -kan₂ since there is no change in meaning, just a change in argument realisation. Other uses of -kan, which result in causative and benefactive verbs, involve -kan₁. The -kan₁ affix “specifies that one argument causes the other argument to change location” and maps onto the event frame CAUSE-BECOME-AT (Kroeger, 2007: 232).

Whether we accept Son and Cole’s (2008) proposal or Kroeger’s (2007) view, it is clear that -kan in Indonesian marks the end point of an event. I argue that Minangkabau -an has this same semantic function as the following discussion will demonstrate.

Examples (231) to (234) demonstrated how -an derives transitive verbs from stative and active intransitive verbs roots. The resultant transitive verbs manyakikan, ‘hurt’, mamatian, ‘switch off’, mangumpuaan, ‘collect’, mangaluaan, ‘take out’, all have causative semantics (see Section 5.3.1.1). In terms of Croft’s (1994: 112-13) framework
for deconstructing the semantic components of events, *manyakikan, mamatian, mangumpuaan* and *mangaluuan* all have a CAUSE-BECOME-STATE event view, i.e. each of these events results in a change of state. In (231) the event results in the foot entering into the state of *sakik*, ‘hurt’, and in (232) the event results in the lamp becoming switched off. In (233) and (234) the action also results in the undergoer entering into a state of ‘collected-ness’ in (233), and in (234) the undergoer goes from being inside the pocket to being outside the pocket. The semantic event view of each of these predicates is a direct effect of *-an*’s primary function to add an undergoer argument and thus show the termination of an event. In this case, the end point of the event is the undergoer experiencing a complete change of state or location.

A related semantic phenomenon of *-an* is its ability to encode completive aspect. Notice that examples (239) and (240) both show evidence of completive aspect, even though no TAM adverbials are used. These aspectual features are a result of the applicative *-an*. In both examples *-an* does not alter the transitivity of the verbs. In (239) *mangarekan* comes from the transitive verb root *karek*, ‘cut’, but *-an* does not make the verb ditransitive. Similarly in (240) *mambatuakan* comes from the active intransitive verb root *batuak*, ‘cough’, but *-an* does not license any further arguments for the verb. Instead *-an* creates completive predicates from these potentially iterative activity verbs.

In (239) the use of the verb *mangarekan* as opposed to *mangarek* implies that the entire tree was cut down rather than just some of it.

(239)  
\[
\text{PK Amr } \text{mangarekan batang rambutan.} \\
\text{Father Amir AV-cut APP tree rambutan} \\
\text{‘Pak Amir cut down a rambutan tree.’} \\
\text{(Elicitation)}
\]

In (240) the use of *-an* in *mambatuakan* shows that the coughing resulted in the bread coming out of the child’s mouth and therefore had a discrete end point.
Anak tu mambatuakan supayo roti tu kalua.
child DEM:dist AV-cough-APP in.order.that bread DEM:dist go.out
‘That child coughed up the bread.’

(Elicitation)

5.3.2 Locative -i

The locative applicative -i interacts with the Minangkabau voice system in a similar way to -an. The locative applicative functions to alter the argument structure of the verb by making locative adjuncts available to be selected as core arguments. By promoting the location to undergoer status the applicative is able to show that the location is totally affected by the action. In this way, like -an, the primary semantic function of -i is to show the end point of an action, except that the end point is a location.

The sentences in (241) provide a clear example of how -i differs from -an. In (241a), the -i applicative makes lauak, ‘fish (the location)’, a core argument, whereas in (241b) -an creates a causative verb in which lauak, ‘fish’, is the undergoer experiencing a change of state, i.e. going from being not salty to being salty\(^\text{20}\).

(241) a. Aden manggarami lauak.
1sg AV-salt-APP:loc fish
‘I put salt on the fish.’

b. Aden manggaraman lauak.
1sg AV-salt-APP fish
‘I salted the fish.’

(Elicitation)

Some further examples illustrating the use of -i can be found in (242), (243) and (244). In these examples the undergoer arguments lawik, ‘the ocean’, rumah barunyo, ‘their new house’, and rumahnyo, ‘his house’, are all locations. In Minangkabau, locations are usually encoded as adjuncts marked by prepositions showing the nature of movement to or from the location. However, in these examples -i allows for the locations to appear as

\(^\text{20}\) Fortin discusses a similar example in her (2001) description of Minangkabau morphology in which the two applicatives modify the nominal root garam, ‘salt’. She argues that -i adds a locative NP to the core argument structure of the verb whereas -kan (a prestige variant of -an) provides a causative meaning.
core undergoer arguments. The applicative also shows the degree of affectedness of the location since the location is marked as the termination point of the event.

\[(242)\]  
\[\text{Inyo maranangi lawik.} \]
\[3\text{ AV-swim-APP:loc ocean}\]
\[\text{‘He swam across the ocean.’}\]

(Elicitation)

\[(243)\]  
\[\text{Urang tu manaiaki rumah barunyo.}\]
\[\text{person DEM.dist AV-go.up-APP:loc house new-3}\]
\[\text{‘That person moved in to their new house.’}\]

(Elicitation)

\[(244)\]  
\[\text{Pitihi maujani rumahnyo.}\]
\[\text{money AV-rain-APP:loc house-3}\]
\[\text{‘Money rained down on his house.’}\]

(Elicitation)

The examples above show how -i allows locations to be selected as core arguments in active voice constructions. Since -i promotes locative adjuncts to undergoer status, it also allows for locations to be selected as the pivot in passive voice constructions. Example (171) (repeated here as (245)) shows how the location kabun, ‘garden’, becomes the pivot in a passive voice construction using the verb ditanami, ‘planted’ in sentence (c).

\[(245)\]a.  
\[\text{Bungo ditanamnyo di kabun.}\]
\[\text{flower PV-plant-3 LOC garden}\]
\[\text{‘He planted flowers in the garden.’}\]

\[\text{b. *Kabun ditanamnyo bungo.}\]
\[\text{garden PV-plant-3 flower}\]

\[\text{c. Kabun ditanaminyo jo bungo.}\]
\[\text{garden PV-plant-APP:loc-3 with flower}\]
\[\text{‘The garden was planted with flowers.’}\]

\[\text{d. Di kabun ditanamnyo bungo.}\]
\[\text{LOC garden PV-plant-3 flower}\]
\[\text{‘He planted flowers in the garden.’}\]

(Elicitation)
5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a unified account of Minangkabau’s system of voice oppositions. It was shown that maN- and di- function as part of a system of pragmatically motivated voice, showing active and passive voice respectively. The pasif semu, or P2 construction, also plays a role in this system to place the undergoer participant in pivot position whilst maintaining the actor as a core argument.

This chapter also demonstrated that the lexical/derivational affixes ta-, pa-, and ba-function to show the “evolution of action” (cf. Shibatani, 2006). More specifically ta- and pa- show the origin of the action, whereas ba- shows the development of the action. The applicatives -an and -i, although primarily functioning in the syntactic domain as valency changing devices, also operate as part of Minangkabau’s semantic/conceptual voice system to show the termination of the action. The active voice prefix maN- also plays a role in this system but the di- passive voice marker does not. The active voice marker shows the development of the action whereas di-’s role is primarily syntactic.
Chapter 6. Bare Verbs

6.0 Introduction

Throughout this study, reference has been made to ‘bare verbs’, i.e. verbs that are not marked by voice morphology. Some predicate constructions obligatorily require a bare verb (see Section 4.3) and bare verbs are also required in the P2 construction (see Section 5.1.4). Other bare verbs occur non-obligatorily in constructions where we would expect to find voice marked verbs. These non-obligatory bare verbs are more frequently found in informal and conversational language, which suggests that they are a feature of Colloquial Minangkabau rather than Standard Minangkabau.

This chapter describes the distribution of bare verbs in Minangkabau and explains their functions (see Section 6.1). In Colloquial Minangkabau, the use of bare verbs in place of voice marked verbs raises questions about the obligatoriness of voice marking. It also presents problems for our analysis of grammatical relations in Minangkabau since the semantic roles of the participants in a bare verb clause are unspecified and grammatical relations remain indeterminate. The existence of multifunctional bare verbs also raises questions about the nature of categoriality in the language. These issues are discussed in Section 6.2. To help understand the categoriality problems that multifunctional bare verbs present, the arguments for precategoriality in Austronesian languages will be discussed in Section 6.3.1. Then, to better understand the issues involved in indeterminate semantic roles and grammatical relations, Gil’s (2001; 2007) notion of Associational Semantics will be examined in Section 6.3.2.

It will be concluded that despite the multifunctionality of bare forms, Minangkabau does make a lexical distinction between nouns and verbs and therefore cannot be categorised as having precategorial lexicon. It will also be suggested that Minangkabau speakers rely on Associational Semantics (cf. Gil, 2001; 2007) to decode the meaning of underspecified utterances. This allows an account of the use of bare verbs in Colloquial Minangkabau. It also allows for an account of the indeterminacy about semantic roles and grammatical relations that the use of bare verbs entails. It can be concluded that
speakers of Minangkabau rely on pragmatic knowledge and contextual information to decode the meaning of the underspecified elements in a bare verb clause though the exact nature of this pragmatic knowledge requires further investigation.

6.1 Bare Verbs

In Standard Minangkabau bare verbs are used obligatorily in a number of constructions (see Section 6.1.1). The use of bare verbs in place of voice marked verbs is generally thought to be ‘incorrect’ and ‘improper’ by native speakers. However, data from the MPI EVA corpus of conversational Minangkabau indicates that, in the colloquial register of the language, bare verb forms are used frequently in places where we would expect a voice marked verb in the standard register. Hearers are nonetheless able to interpret the meaning of bare verbs, understand the referents of the participants in the clause and assign them their correct semantic roles. This indicates that the use of bare verbs is clearly a systematic feature of Colloquial Minangkabau.

Minangkabau is not the only Austronesian language to show evidence of bare verbs. For example, bare verbs can be found in object voice constructions in Madurese where voice marked verbs would be expected instead. Interestingly, most speakers find this kind of bare verb construction unacceptable even though they might frequently use it themselves in conversation, albeit unawares (Davies, 2005: 201). Bare verb forms are also used in Spoken Jakarta Indonesian (Wouk, 1989). These forms are treated by Wouk as unaffixed active verbs that have a slightly different discourse function to voice marked active verbs. Similarly in colloquial ‘low’ varieties of Malay, bare forms of active verbs are used with more frequency than voice marked forms (Benjamin, 1993: 366-67). And in Tagalog, bare active verbs also occur moderately frequently in naturalistic data (Himmelmann, 2008). These recent studies of conversational and naturalistic data suggest that unaffixed use of verbs might not be a peculiar feature of Minangkabau, rather a systematic feature of colloquial registers of Austronesian languages more generally.
6.1.1 Obligatory uses of Bare Verbs

Let us now look more specifically at the use of bare verb forms in Minangkabau. Bare verbs are used obligatorily in a number of constructions in the language. Stative verbs, imperatives and prohibitives must be unaffixed, as must be the main verb in a P2 construction. There are also a number of lexicalised bare active verbs in Minangkabau that cannot be marked for voice.

An example of a stative verb can be found in (246). In (246a) the inherent stative meaning of the verb root dingin, ‘cold’, is intended therefore the verb must be unaffixed. In (246b) the verb root is marked for active voice by the prefix maN-, this alters the inherent aktionsart of the root and derives a change of state verb (see Section 5.1.2.2).

(246)  a. Udaro ko dingin.
air DEM:prox cold
‘It’s cold.’

b. Mandingin se udaro ko yo.
AV-cold just air DEM:prox EMPH
‘It’s getting cold isn’t it.’

(Elicitation)

In Minangkabau, imperative verbs obligatorily occur in the bare form (see Section 4.3.2.5). Example (247) demonstrates this fact with the verb tutuik, ‘shut’. Sentence (247a) is a basic transitive active construction and the verb root tutuik is marked for active voice by the prefix maN- prefix. Sentence (247b) exemplifies the use of the verb in the imperative construction. Notice that voice marking in (247c) creates an ungrammatical sentence.

(247)  a. Inyo manutuik pintu tu.
3 AV-shut door DEM:dist
‘He shut the door.’

b. Tutuiklah pintu tu.
shut-IMP door DEM:dist
‘Shut the door.’
c. *Manutuiklah pintu tu.
   AV-shut-IMP door DEM:dist
   ‘Shut the door.’

   (Elicitation)

In the P2 construction the undergoer argument is the pivot. This would normally require
that the verb is marked for passive voice by the passive voice marker *di-. However, the
P2 construction obligatorily requires that the main verb be unaffixed (see Section 5.1.4).
In (248a) the verb *bali, ‘buy’, is the main verb in this P2 clause therefore it must be left
bare. Notice that passive voice marking is incompatible with the clausal syntax of the
P2 construction, as shown in (248b).

(248) a. Lauak tu alah nyo Ø-bali dari lapau tu.
   fish DEM:dist PFCT 3 Ø-buy from shop DEM:dist
   ‘She bought fish from that shop.’

b. *Lauak tu alah nyo dibali dari lapau tu.
   fish DEM:dist PFCT 3 PV-buy from shop DEM:dist

   (Elicitation)

Finally, there are a number of lexicalised bare active verbs in Minangkabau. Active
intransitive and transitive verbs in the language are usually marked for voice. However,
there are a number of active intransitive verbs in Minangkabau that cannot be marked
for voice without having their valency modified by the applicative -an first. I refer to
these forms as lexicalised bare active verbs. Members of this class include the verbs,
pai, ‘go’, and kalua, ‘go out’, (see examples (92) and (93) in Section 4.3.2.2 in which
these verbs are used as bare actives).

### 6.1.2 Bare Verbs in place of Voice Marked Verbs

In Colloquial Minangkabau, bare verb forms can be found to function in clauses where,
in Standard Minangkabau, we would expect to find a voice marked verb. Unlike
Madurese where bare verbs are only used in object voice (cf. Davies, 2005), or Spoken
Jakarta Indonesian (cf. Wouk, 1989; 2004b), colloquial Malay (cf. Benjamin, 1993) and
Tagalog (cf. Himmelmann, 2008) where bare verbs are treated as unmarked active
verbs, bare verbs in Minangkabau can be found in both active voice (see Section
6.1.2.1) and passive voice (see Section 6.1.2.2) clauses. In some cases, whether the bare verb is intended as active or passive is indeterminate (see Section 6.1.2.3). Furthermore, the pervasive use of bare verbs in Colloquial Minangkabau has meant that the P2 is not a distinctive construction (see Section 6.1.2.4).

The following sections will show some examples of bare verbs found in the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus and discuss some of the ways in which speakers are able to decode the ‘voice’ of the bare verb forms and assign semantic roles to the participants in the clause. Discourse-pragmatic and contextual factors play a significant role in determining this. The syntactic organisation of the clause also affects the interpretation of bare verbs as active or passive since passive voice clauses are highly syntactised.

### 6.1.2.1 Bare Actives

Like Spoken Jakarta Indonesian (cf. Wouk, 1989; 2004b), bare verbs are frequently used in place of verbs marked for active voice. Both transitive and intransitive bare active verbs were found in the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus, but intransitive verbs were found to be unmarked more frequently than transitives. Using the bare form of an active intransitive verb instead of the voice marked form is unambiguous because only one participant, the actor, is licensed by the verb. This means that assigning a semantic role to the participant is based on the inherent argument structure of the verb rather than syntactic or discourse-pragmatic factors.

Some examples of bare active intransitive verbs follow in (249) and (250). In (249) the active intransitive verb *lari*, ‘run’, is not marked for voice yet the third person participant *nyo* is clearly an actor because this is the only participant role specified by the verb. Similarly in (250) the active intransitive verb *tagak*, ‘stand (up)’, is not marked for voice. The first person plural pronoun *kami* is assigned the actor role because it is the only role specified by the verb.
(249)  *Lari lah nyo ka dalam rimbo.*
run PFCT 3 to inside jungle
‘He ran into the jungle.’

(Text ID: 145657131629280607)

(250)  *Makin banyak, kami tagak jo situ.*
increasingly many 1pl stand also there
‘There were more and more (of them, but) we just kept standing there.’

(Text ID: 599753113331130406)

The omission of the active voice prefix *maN-* can also occur if the verb root is transitive. Assigning semantic roles to the arguments of bare active transitive verbs relies on discourse-pragmatic clues and real world knowledge. Some examples of bare transitive verbs with actor pivots, i.e. bare verbs that would be marked for active voice in Standard Minangkabau, can be found in examples (251), (252) and (253). The (a) sentences in this set of examples come from the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus. The sentences were then taken out of context and my Minangkabau language consultants were asked to assign the actor and undergoer roles to each of the participants in the clause and transform the sentence into active and passive voice. The active and passive alternatives given by the consultants are provided in the (b) and (c) sentences.

In example (251) the pre-verbal participant *nyo*, the third person pronoun, was unreservedly assigned the actor role and *matonyo*, ‘his eyes’, the undergoer role. This is because the construction *gadang-gadangan mato*, ‘to stare’ (literally: ‘to widen one’s eyes’), is an idiomatic expression and the language consultants’ experience using and hearing this expression allows them immediately to rule out *matonyo* as the actor. By this logic, the other participant in the clause, the pronoun *nyo*, must be assigned the actor role instead. Since *nyo* occupies pre-verbal position then this bare verb *gadang-gadangan* is only compatible with active voice marking (see example (251b)) and not passive voice marking (see example (251c)).

why 3 RED-big-APP eye-3 to 1sg talk-3
‘Why are you staring at me, he said.’

(Text ID: 135016150923110406)
In example (252) the pre-verbal participant, *Eka tu*, was also assigned the actor role. However, the language consultants based this choice on contextual factors, as well as their knowledge of world, rather than syntactic facts. In (252) *Eka tu* is clearly more topical than *mi*, ‘noodles’, because she is marked by the distal demonstrative, which makes her definite, more referentially salient and therefore more likely to be selected as the pivot. Since it is also more likely that *Eka* is doing the cooking rather than the *mi* doing the cooking, *Eka* must be the actor. So, since *Eka* is in pre-verbal position, it is plausible that the bare stem is intended to be active. Sentences (252b) and (252c) show that both active and passive interpretations of the bare verb are possible, but that a passive interpretation would be pragmatically marked in this context.

(252a) *Eka tu* masak di dapua, masak *mi* untuk cowoke.
Eka DEM:dist cook LOC kitchen cook noodles for guy-3
‘*Eka* is in the kitchen making noodles for her boyfriend.’

(Text ID: 275960133308010606)

b. *Eka tu* mamasak di dapua, mamasak *mi* untuk cowoke.
Eka DEM:dist AV-cook LOC kitchen AV-cook noodles for guy-3
‘*Eka* is in the kitchen making noodles for her boyfriend.’

(Elicitation)

c. #*Eka tu* dimasak di dapua, dimasak *mi* untuk cowoke.
Eka DEM:dist PV-cook LOC kitchen PV-cook noodles for guy-3
‘*Eka* is being cooked in the kitchen, cooked by noodles for her boyfriend.’

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (253), real world knowledge suggests that *urang*, ‘the person’, is more likely the one buying the *padi*, ‘rice plants’, rather than the other way around. This means that *urang* must be the actor and that therefore an active interpretation of the bare
verb is more fitting, especially considering *urang* is in pre-verbal position. Assigning *urang* the undergoer role and putting the verb in passive voice creates a grammatical sentence but in this context the construction is pragmatically inappropriate.

(253)a. *Kebetulan ado urang bali padi.*

    in.fact exist person buy rice.plant

   'In fact there was a person who bought the rice plants.'

   (Text ID: 557465101327200606)

b. *Kebetulan ado urang mambali padi.*

    in.fact exist person AV-buy rice.plant

   'In fact there was a person who bought the rice plants.'

   (Elicitation)

c. *#Kebetulan ado urang dibali padi.*

    in.fact exist person PV-buy rice.plant

   'In fact there was a person who was bought by the rice plants.'

   (Elicitation)

6.1.2.2 Bare Passives

In a canonical passive voice clause the undergoer precedes the verb. The verb is marked by the clitic *di-* and then followed by the actor participant. The actor can be denoted by a full NP, an enclitic pronoun or a full pronoun. Full NPs and full pronouns can also be marked by the preposition *dek* (see Section 5.1.3.2). This passive clause structure is highly syntactised. This means that if a bare verb is used in place of a verb marked by *di-*, in a clause with passive syntax, a passive interpretation of the verb is still available. In fact, in narratives, bare verbs are often found in place of *di-* verbs in syntactised passive clauses of this nature. To demonstrate this, consider examples (254), (255) and (256).

(254) *Nyo ambuangan lah dek gajah jo balalai.*

    3 throw-APP EMPH CAUSE elephant with trunk

   'Elephant threw him out with his trunk.'

   (Text ID: 8340777131150280607)
Examples (254), (255) and (256) come from two folk tales about Kak Kancia, ‘Brother Mousedeer’, (see Appendix 4 for a full transcription of the folk tale Yang Lamah Yang Cadiak, ‘The Weak and The Cunning’, from which example (256) is taken). Because he is the central character in these stories Kak Kancia is highly topical and is therefore encoded as the pivot in almost every mention. In examples (254), (255) and (256), Kak Kancia, referred to by the third person pronoun nyo, is the undergoer. We would expect that since the undergoer is topical, that the clause’s pivot would be an undergoer and that the verb would be marked for passive voice. Instead, we find a bare verb in each example: ambuangan, ‘throw’, sasakan ‘surround’, and tangkok, ‘catch’. Nevertheless, a passive interpretation is available for each of these examples.

In (254) the verb is followed by the causative preposition dek and then the full NP gajah jo balalai, ‘the elephant with his trunk’, which refers to the actor. The undergoer participant is nyo is in pre-verbal position. Since nyo is a topical participant, and the organisation of the clause adheres to the structure of a di- passive construction, a passive interpretation is the only interpretation available for this example even though the verb is bare. Similarly in (255) and (256), the topical undergoer nyo is in pre-verbal position and the verb is followed by a full NP actor adjunct: dek baruak ko, ‘by the crowd of short-tailed macaques’ in (255), and dek pak tani, ‘by the farmer’ in (256). So even though the verb is unmarked for voice, the conditions for a passive interpretation are satisfied because there is a topical undergoer and the syntactised clause structure of a di- passive is maintained.

The facts about examples (254), (255) and (256) suggest that di- is not required to mark passive voice on the verb so long as the undergoer is topical and known to the hearer,
and the rigid structural organisation of the passive clause is adhered to. The clearest indicator of passive clause organisation is the presence of the actor marking preposition *dek*. This preposition simplifies the task of assigning semantic roles to the participants; *dek* marks the actor, therefore if there is a pre-verbal participant then it must be the undergoer. In fact, the presence of a post verbal ‘*dek + actor*’ phrase is incompatible with active voice syntax as examples (257) and (258) illustrate.

(257)a.  *Tapi nyo agiahe dek urang ceke.*
  but 3 give-3 CAUSE person talk-3
  ‘But he was given it by someone, he said.’

  (Text ID: 47493409164803406)

  b.  *Tapi nyo diagiahe dek urang ceke.*
  but 3 PV-give-3 CAUSE person talk-3
  ‘But he was given it by someone, he said.’

  (Elicitation)

  c.  *Tapi nyo maagiahe dek urang ceke.*
  but 3 AV-give-3 CAUSE person talk-3

  (Elicitation)

(258)a.  *Nyo jawek dek si Malin ko.*
  3 answer CAUSE PERS Malin DEM:prox
  ‘Malin answered him.’

  (Text ID: 273888090906280208)

  b.  *Nyo dijawek dek si Malin ko.*
  3 PV-answer CAUSE PERS Malin DEM:prox
  ‘Malin answered him.’

  (Elicitation)

  c.  *Nyo manjawek dek si Malin ko.*
  3 AV-answer CAUSE PERS Malin DEM:prox

  (Elicitation)

The (a) sentences in examples (257) and (258) come from the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus. The main verbs in these examples *agiah*, ‘give’, and *jawek*, ‘answer’, are bare verbs and the bare verbs are followed by the *dek* preposition and a full NP. In both examples my Minangkabau consultants assigned the undergoer role to the pre-verbal
participant without hesitation. The NPs marked by dek were categorically assigned the actor role. So, in (257) the pronoun nyo is the undergoer and urang, ‘person’, must be the actor since it appears in post-verbal position and is marked by the preposition dek. Similarly in (258) si Malin ko is in post-verbal position and marked by the preposition dek and therefore the actor. This means that nyo must be the undergoer.

Since the undergoer is in pre-verbal position and the actor marked by dek in both examples (257) and (258), only a passive interpretation is available for the bare verb root. The (b) sentences show that marking the verb for passive voice with di- is compatible with the structure of the sentences. However, marking the verb for active voice creates an ungrammatical structure as the (c) sentences demonstrate.

Example (259) shows another sentence from the MPI EVA corpus that contains a bare verb. Assigning semantic roles to the participants nyo and sawit, ‘palm oil trees’, is more difficult than in examples (257) and (258) because neither participant occupies the pre-verbal slot and dek is not used to disambiguate actor from undergoer. However, like the examples above, marking the verb for passive voice is compatible with the existing structure whereas marking it for active voice is not. This is because the pronoun nyo occurs as a post-verbal enclitic. The appearance of pronominal post-verbal actor enclitics is a distinctive feature of passive clauses (see Section 5.1.3.2), so the syntax of this construction allows for only one interpretation; nyo must be the actor therefore the bare verb must be passive.

(259)  a. **Tanamnyo sawit.**
      plant-3 palm.oil.tree
      ‘He planted palm oil trees.’

      (Text ID: 421384121144170706)

   b. **Ditanamnyo sawit.**
      PV-plant-3 palm.oil.tree
      ‘He planted palm oil trees.’

      (Elicitation)

   c. **Mananamnyo sawit.**
      AV-plant-3 palm.oil.tree

      (Elicitation)
There are also a number of ‘passive’ bare verbs in the MPI EVA corpus that appear in more loosely organised clauses. In these cases it is context and world knowledge that determines the semantic roles of the participants and decides which of the participants is most likely to be the pivot.

Examples (260), (261) and (262) show clauses with bare transitive verbs as their head: gigik, ‘bite’, in (260), karek-karek, ‘cut up’, in (261) and bukak, ‘open’, in (262). Each of these examples also has a pre-verbal participant whose semantic role is not revealed by the syntax of the clause. When the examples are taken out of context, the pre-verbal participants in each of the (a) sentences can be assigned either the actor or undergoer role without affecting the grammaticality of the clause. In fact, as the (b) and (c) sentences reveal, assigning the pre-verbal participant the undergoer role and marking the verb for passive voice produces a sentence equally as acceptable as assigning the participant the actor role and marking the verb for active voice.

(260) a. *Tu gigik acek ndak Mbon?* 
DEM:dist bite leech NEG TRU-Mambon
‘It was bitten by a leech wasn’t it Mbon?’

(Text ID: 837845093215200406)

b. *Tu digigik acek ndak Mbon?* 
DEM:dist PV-bite leech NEG TRU-Mambon
‘It was bitten by a leech wasn’t it Mbon?’

(Elicitation)

c. *#Tu manggigik acek ndak Mbon?* 
DEM:dist AV-bite leech NEG TRU-Mambon
‘It bit a leech didn’t it Mbon?’

(Elicitation)

(261) a. *Tu pisang karek-karek potong-potong.* 
DEM:dist banana RED-chop RED-cut
‘Then the banana is chopped up, cut up.’

(Text ID: 346157221330230506)
Only pragmatic knowledge and contextual clues, coupled with some real world knowledge, reveal that all the pre-verbal participants in examples (260), (261) and (262) must be undergoers. In (260) contextual information reveals that the referent of the demonstrative *tu* is the more likely participant to have been bitten and is therefore the undergoer. In (261) real world knowledge tells us that unless the situation is highly pragmatically marked, *pisang*, ‘the banana’, must be the undergoer and not the actor. In (262) *Puskesmas*, ‘the Community Health Centre’, must also be the undergoer for similar reasons. These pragmatic facts mean that since the undergoer participants are in pre-verbal position in these examples, only a passive interpretation of the bare stems is available.
6.1.2.3 Ambiguous Bare Verbs

Contextual information, as well as pragmatic and real world knowledge, are extremely important in helping to decode the semantic roles of participants in a clause with a bare verb and also for deciding what the intended ‘voice’ of the bare verb is. So much contextual knowledge is required to disambiguate bare verbs that outsiders to the conversation are unable to do so. The sentences in (263), (264) and (265) illustrate some underspecified clauses with bare verb heads. Since these examples lack contextual information, my language consultants were unable to disambiguate the ‘voice’ of the bare verbs contained in them.

(263)a. *Lah cuci muko Afif?*
    PFCT wash face Afif
    ‘Have you washed your face yet Afif?’

    (adapted from Text ID: 937982152454210207)

b. *Lah mancuci muko Afif?*
    PFCT AV-wash face Afif
    ‘Have you washed your face yet Afif?’

    (Elicitation)

c. *Lah dicuci muko Afif?*
    PFCT PV-wash face Afif
    ‘Has your face been washed yet Afif?’

    (Elicitation)

(264)a. *Tu masak nyo baa?*
    DEM:dist cook 3 POSS-what
    ‘How is it cooked?’

    (Text ID: 652922120732220306)

b. *Tu mamasak nyo baa?*
    DEM:dist AV-cook 3 POSS-what
    ‘How is it cooked?’

    (Elicitation)

c. *Tu dimasak nyo baa?*
    DEM:dist PV-cook 3 POSS-what
    ‘How is it cooked?’
In (263a), which is a real example from the MPI EVA corpus, both active and passive interpretations are available for the bare verb *cuci*, ‘wash’. *Afif* is the addressee in (263a) but it is unclear whether he is the intended actor as well since the actor is not overtly expressed. Common sense tells us that *muko*, ‘face’, must be the undergoer so the interpretation of the verb as passive or active depends on whether the actor role is assigned to *Afif* or to another unexpressed participant. Since *Afif* is the addressee he must be topical, so if he is assigned the actor role then the verb can be marked for active voice by *maN*-. However, if the actor role is assigned to some unexpressed third party (perhaps, for example, *Afif*’s mother) then *muko*, ‘Afif’s face’, becomes more topical and the verb is marked for passive voice by the clitic *di*-. Both sentences (263b) and (263c) are grammatical and, according to my Minangkabau language consultants, both sentences (‘*Afif* is washing his face’, as opposed to ‘someone else is washing *Afif*’s face’) represent equally possible interpretations. However, how the semantic role assignment was intended by the speaker of (263a) remains indeterminate.

The main verb *masak*, ‘cook’, in example (264) is also bare, which means that the semantic roles of the participants in the clause are underspecified. Example (264a) comes from the MPI EVA corpus. The reading preferred by my Minangkabau consultants was that both *tu* and *nyo* refer to the same participant, the thing being cooked, which was assigned the undergoer role. For this reading, based on the syntax of
the clause, only marking the verb for active voice would produce a grammatical sentence. Sentence (264b) shows the active voice reading. However, my consultants agreed that *nyo* could also refer to the actor. In this case, the sentence could also be rendered in passive voice, as (264c) shows. It could also be the case that *cuci* and *masak* in (263) and (264) are intentionally left bare so that the participants *muko*, ‘face’, and *nyo*, ‘it’, are potentially both actors and undergoers thus coercing a reflexive or middle interpretation of the event.

Finally, since the verb *caliak*, ‘see’, in (265a) is not marked for voice, determining the semantic roles of the participants referred to by the pronouns *den* and *-e* is a difficult task if the sentence is taken out of context.

Both active and passive permutations of the sentence are possible as (265b) and (265c) demonstrate; in (265b) *den* is the actor and *-e* the undergoer, whereas in (265c) *den* is the undergoer and *-e* is the actor. However, my language consultants agreed that although the passive interpretation of the sentence presented in (265c) is plausible, the interpretation presented in (265b) is preferred. This is because the way the progression of events is encoded in (265c), i.e. the speaker laughing then being looked at by someone, is unusual. It is much more likely that if the event *aden galak*, ‘I laughed’, is a reason or cause for the speaker to be looked at, following principles of iconicity, it ought to come after the main verb *caliak*, ‘see’. So for a passive interpretation to be as available as an active one, the sentence ought to read *den dicaliake ma (dek) aden galak*, ‘he looked at me (because) I laughed’, instead.

Of all the kinds of clauses with bare verb stems, the most interesting are those cases where the intended semantic roles of the participants are most ambiguous. These cases indicate the importance of pragmatics for determining semantic roles and also raise questions about the importance of specifying semantic roles in the first place. These issues are discussed further in Section 6.2.
6.1.2.4 Bare Verbs and the P2 Construction

The P2 construction is a distinctive voice construction in Standard Minangkabau (see Section 3.3 and Section 5.1.4). However, the pervasive use of bare verbs and the flexible word order constraints of Colloquial Minangkabau have meant that the properties that make the P2 construction distinct in Standard Minangkabau do not apply in Colloquial Minangkabau. In fact, the evidence suggests that the P2 construction has merged with the bare active construction in the Colloquial variety.

As described in Section 5.1.4, the P2 construction in Standard Malay/Indonesian and in Standard Minangkabau has a restrictive set of word order constraints. In Standard Minangkabau, nothing must intervene between the actor and the verb in a P2 clause, therefore all auxiliaries (i.e. negators and TAM adverbials) must precede the actor, whereas in a Standard Minangkabau active sentence, auxiliaries can intervene between the actor and the verb. In fact, if these clausal components occurred before the actor NP, then the sentence’s acceptability would be very much reduced. We do not find these word order constraints in Colloquial Minangkabau and in fact find that clauses with bare verbs allow both ‘auxiliary + actor’ and ‘actor + auxiliary’ word orders.

For example, consider the sentences in (266) which show that there are no constraints on the ordering of the actor NP and the auxiliary components in an active clause.

(266)a. Inyo acok ubah gayanyo.
   3 often change style-3
   ‘He often changes his style.’

b. Acok inyo ubah gayanyo.
   often 3 change style-3
   ‘He often changes his style.’

c. Acok inyo maubah gayanyo.
   often 3 AV-change style-3
   ‘He often changes his style.’

(Elicitation)
In example (266a) a bare active verb is used. The construction follows the canonical word order of an active sentence with the adverbial acok, ‘often’, following the actor inyo and preceding the bare verb ubah, ‘change’. In (266b) the word order has changed and we find that the adverbial acok now intervenes between the actor and the verb. The ‘auxiliary + actor’ word order is restricted to P2 clauses in Standard Minangkabau but example (266c) demonstrates that the word order is also acceptable in a Colloquial Minangkabau active construction.

Like examples (266a) and (266b), examples (267a) and (267b) demonstrate that both ‘actor + auxiliary’ (aden alah) and ‘auxiliary + actor’ (alah aden) orders are acceptable in bare active constructions in Colloquial Minangkabau. Notice that both orders are also possible in (267c) and (267d). These sentences resemble P2 constructions because the undergoer argument buku ko, ‘this book’, appears in pre-verbal position. The grammaticality of the sentence in (267d) is nevertheless unaffected.

(267) a.  

Aden alah baco buku ko.  

1sg PFCT read book DEM:prox  

‘I have read this book.’

b.  

Alah aden baco buku ko.  

PFCT 1sg read book DEM:prox  

‘I have read this book.’

c.  

Buku ko alah aden baco.  

book DEM:prox PFCT 1sg read  

‘I have read this book.’

d.  

Buku ko aden alah baco.  

book DEM:prox 1sg PFCT read  

‘I have read this book.’

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (268a), notice that the ordering of the auxiliary and the actor (alah aden tu) resembles the ordering of a canonical P2 clause. The clause can also be interpreted as a bare active since the verb can be optionally marked by the active voice marker maN- as shown in (268b).
(268)a. *Alah aden tu pa racik den racik sadoe dulu tu.*
  PFCT 1sg DEM:dist xx thinly.slice 1sg thinly.slice all-3 moment DEM:dist
  ‘I’ve already sliced it, I sliced it all before.’

(268)b. *Alah aden tu (ma)racik den racik sadoe dulu tu.*
  PFCT 1sg DEM:dist (AV-)thinly.slice 1sg thinly.slice all-3 moment DEM:dist
  ‘I’ve already sliced it, I sliced it all before.’

(Elicitation)

There are thus no surface syntactic differences between the bare active and the P2 in Colloquial Minangkabau. To determine whether a certain sentence is indeed a P2 construction in Colloquial Minangkabau we could apply raising tests (see Section 5.1.4). However, notice in examples (269)b) and (269)c) that both the undergoer and the actor can be raised. This demonstrates that there are also no underlying syntactic features that differentiate the P2 construction from the bare active in Colloquial Minangkabau.

(269)a. *Dianggapnyo buku ko alah aden baco.*
  PV-believe-3 book DEM:prox PFCT 1sg read
  ‘They believe I have read this book.’

b. *Buku ko dianggapnyo alah aden baco.*
  book DEM:prox PV-believe-3 PFCT 1sg read
  ‘They believe I have read this book.’

c. *Aden dianggapnyo buku ko alah baco.*
  1sg PV-believe-3 book DEM:prox PFCT read
  ‘They believe I have read this book.’

(Elicitation)

6.1.3 Multifunctional Bare Verbs

Bare verbs create problems for analysis of the Minangkabau voice system because their very existence implies that active and passive voice marking on the verb is optional. Bare verb stems are also problematic because the semantic roles of the participants in the clause become underspecified. As it will be demonstrated in this section, bare verbs also raise questions about the nature of categoriality in Minangkabau since they can function in both predicative and non-predicative constructions.
To examine this issue, first, let us look at the phenomenon of verbs that also function to refer, which is a prototypically nominal function. Examples (270) and (271) show how the two stative verbs berang, ‘angry’, and gaek, ‘old’, can function referentially.

(270)a.  Jan  berang!
        PROHIB angry
        ‘Don’t be angry!’

(Elicitation)

b.  Tambah berang-berang Buayo ko.
    add RED-angry crocodile DEM:prox
    ‘But Crocodile’s anger just increased.’

(Text ID: 980031104710220607)

c.  Baa, tambah urang duo lai untuk maota?
    POSS-what add person two more for AV-talk
    ‘How about we get two more people to chat?’

(Text ID: 919266230255181006)

In (270a), berang, ‘angry’, is functioning predicatively as a stative verb and is therefore obligatorily unmarked. In (270b) notice that berang remains morphologically unmarked even though it is performing a referential function. In (270b) berang-berang becomes the undergoer argument of the verb tambah, ‘add, increase’. Sentence (270c) shows the use of the ‘tambah + NP’ construction with a nominal urang duo, ‘two people’, for comparison with the sentence in (270b). Notice that both sentences have the same word order despite the fact that the roots berang and urang duo come from different parts of speech categories.

Example (271) also illustrates how a stative verb root can function referentially but still be unmarked.

(271)a.  Rang tu lah gaek kini.
        person DEM:dist PFCT old now
        ‘That person’s already old.’

(Text ID: 532804094630120406)
b. *Ado urang gaek mancari Apak.*

exist person old AV-find Father

‘There’s an old person looking for you Sir.’

(Elicitation)

c. *Nan gaek ko ndak tantu do ma.*

REL old DEM:prox NEG certain NEGPOL EMPH

‘The old ones aren’t sure.’

(Text ID: 742150150410290306)

Example (271a) shows the stative root *gaek*, ‘old’, functioning prototypically as a predicate. Notice that the predicate is unmarked and is modified by the perfective TAM marker *lah*. Gradable stative verbs like *gaek* can also be used to modify (see Section 4.2.1.2). Sentence (271b) provides an example of *gaek*, ‘old’, functioning as a modifier for the noun *urang*, ‘person’. Finally, sentence (271c) shows how *gaek* can also function referentially. In this example *gaek* is introduced as the head noun by the relative marker *nan*, it is then marked for its referential status by the proximal demonstrative *ko* as referential nouns normally would be. Notice that there is no difference in the morphological marking of *gaek* in (271a), (271b) and (271c) even though the stative root performs a different function in each example.

Now let us consider an example of multifunctionality with an active verb root. The active verb root *makan*, ‘eat’, is transitive and frequently appears in its bare form. Notice in (272a) that *makan* is performing this prototypical predicative function and appears as a bare verb. However, *makan* can also function referentially to mean ‘food’. In Standard Malay/Indonesian the same verb *makan* is used to mean ‘eat’ but a nominalising suffix is added to the root to form the noun *makanan*, ‘food’. However, in Minangkabau, the bare form *makan* can be used referentially without the need for morphological marking as sentences (272b) and (272c) show. The major indicator that *makan* is being used referentially in these examples is that it is marked by the demonstratives *ko* and *tu*, which are used to show the referential status of NPs (see Section 4.2.1.1).
The bare active verb roots *nyanyi*, ‘sing’, and *jalan*, ‘walk’, can also function as nouns. Notice in (273a) that *nyanyi*, ‘sing’, functions as the verbal head of the clause, whereas in (273b) *nyanyi*, ‘song’, is the NP argument licensed by the existential predicate *ado*.

(273)a. *Nyanyi wak lah.*

sing 1 IMP

‘Come on let’s sing.’

(Text ID: 356448092030040706)

b. *Ndak ado nyanyi do.*

NEG exist song NEGPOL

‘I don’t know the song/ there isn’t a song.’

(Text ID: 135915092110040706)

Similarly in (274a) *jalan*, ‘walk’, functions as the verbal head of the clause whereas in (274b) the noun *jalan*, ‘road’, is the undergoer argument licensed by the verb *manyabarang*, ‘cross, traverse’.

(274)a. *Inyo jalan ka siko dari Pantai Padang.*

3 walk to here from beach Padang

‘He walked here from Padang Beach.’
b. *Ujang mamacik anak nyo wakatu manyabarang jalan.*  
   *Ujang AV-hold child-3 time AV-cross road*  
   ‘Ujang held on to her child as she crossed the road.’

(Elicitation)

We have established that both stative and active verb roots in Minangkabau can be used predicatively and referentially without changing the morphological marking of the root. As we saw in example (271), morphologically unmarked gradable stative verbs can also be used to modify. Examples (275) and (276) demonstrate that morphologically unmarked active verbs can also be used to modify. In (275) the active verb root *tari*, ‘dance’, is used attributively to modify the noun *pakaian*, ‘clothes’, to mean ‘dancing clothes’, i.e. clothes for dancing. Similarly in (276) the active verb root *cuci*, ‘wash’, is used to modify the nominal *masin*, ‘engine, machine’.

(275) *Sudah tu pakaian tari nyo bacari surang.*  
   PFCT DEM:dist clothes dance 3 MID-look.for ONE-person  
   ‘And then we have to find our dancing clothes ourselves.’  
   (Text ID: 249243102345030406)

(276) *Masin cuci.*  
   engine wash  
   ‘Washing machine.’  
   (Elicitation)

It was demonstrated in Chapter 4 that Minangkabau nouns are also multifunctional. Their prototypical function is to refer, for which purposes they are morphologically unmarked. Nouns can also be used to predicate and modify.

Let us first examine some examples of predicative nominals. Voice morphology can be used to derive a predicative nominal from a noun root, but bare noun roots can also function predicatively. The sentences in (277) exemplify the use of the nominal root *ujan*, ‘rain’. In the (277a) sentence *ujan* is functioning to refer and its syntactic frame is a nominal one since it is an argument of the existential predicate *ado*. However in (277b) and (277c) *ujan* functions predicatively. The evidence for the ‘verb-hood’ of *ujan* in these examples comes from the fact that it is marked by the TAM marker *alun* in (277b) and in (277c) it licenses the argument *pitih*, ‘money’.
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(277)a. *Ado ujan.*
   exist rain
   'It’s raining.’

b. *Alun ujan ari ko.*
   not.yet rain day DEM:prox
   'It hasn’t rained yet today.’

c. *Ujan piti di rumah tu.*
   rain money LOC house DEM:dist
   'It’s raining money on that house.’

(Elicitation)

Example (278) also shows how a nominal root can function predicatively. In (278a) the nominal root *sakolah*, ‘school’, functions as the head of an NP since it is marked by the preposition *ka*, which denotes motion towards an object. However, in (278b) *sakolah* functions predicatively; it occupies the syntactic slot reserved for the verb and functions as the head of the clause. Notice that the root remains morphologically unmarked in this example.

(278)a. **Awak ka sakolah naiak oto nyo.**
   1 to school go.up car 3
   ‘I go to school by car.’

(Text ID: 447537094637040406)

b. **Sanang sakolah situ Na?**
   like school there TRU-Husna
   ‘Do you like going to school there Na?’

(Text ID: 847465151954230306)

Example (279) shows another instance of a nominal root performing predicatively. In (279a) the root in question, *gandang*, ‘drum’, performs its prototypical nominal function: reference. In this sentence *gandang* is the undergoer argument of the verb *digaduah*, ‘disturb’, and is modified for possession by the NP *nenek moyang den*, ‘my ancestors’. In (279b), *gandang* functions as the verbal head of the clause and has licensed the first person pronoun actor argument *kito*. As well as functioning predicatively *gadang* can also be used to modify. We see an example of this in (279c)
where *gadang* modifies the nominal head *bunyi*, ‘sound’. Notice that the root remains morphologically unmarked regardless of its function.

(279)a. *Gandangnenek moyang den jan dianuan, digaduah.*
    k.o.drum ancestor 1sg PROHIB PV-whatchamacallit APP PV-disturb
    ‘It’s the drum of my ancestors, don’t whatchamacallit, disturb it.’

    (Text ID: 169489132243280607)

b. *Ndak kito gandang kak Kancia?*
    NEG 1pl k.o.drum older.sibling mousedeer
    ‘Can’t we beat the drum Mousedeer?’

    (Text ID: 705085132325280607)

c. *Kalau taranga den bunyi gandang ko ibo juo ati den.*
    TOP INV-hear 1sg sound k.o.drum DEM:prox piety also liver 1sg
    ‘If I hear the sound of the drum I’ll be sad.’

    (Text ID: 127491132934280607)

Some more examples of nominal roots functioning to modify can be found in (280) and (281). In (280) the nominal root in question is *api* ‘fire’. In (280a) *api* is the head of the NP *api tu*, ‘the fire’, whereas in (280b) *api* functions attributively to modify the noun phrase *kayu*, ‘wood’. Notice that there is no difference in the morphological marking of these two instantiations of *api*.

(280)a. *Kalua dari api tu.*
    go.out from fire DEM:dist
    ‘It came out of the fire.’

    (Text ID: 211538101510150606)

b. *Kayu api untuak batanak.*
    wood fire for MID-cook
    ‘Fire wood for cooking.’

    (Text ID: 443312100359270208)

Similarly in (281) the nominal root *kapa*, ‘ship’, can function both referentially and attributively without any change to its morphological marking. In (281a) it is the head of the NP *kapa tu*, ‘the ship’, whereas in (281b) it functions attributively to modify the noun head in the actor NP *urang kapa ko*, ‘the ship’s people’.
This section has demonstrated that verbal and nominal roots in Minangkabau can operate across a range of functional domains and may perform non-prototypical functions. Verbal roots function prototypically to predicate but they can also be used to refer and to modify. Minangkabau nouns prototypically function to refer, but like verbs they can also function to predicate and to modify. It is not unusual for parts of speech to be multifunctional. However, roots in non-prototypical functions are usually morphologically marked (Croft, 1990; 2000). The interesting thing about the Minangkabau case is that verbal and nominal roots may remain morphologically bare in both prototypical and non-prototypical instantiations. The practical and theoretical implications of this are discussed in Section 6.2.

### 6.2 Why Bare Verbs are Problematic

The use of bare verbs in Minangkabau raises three major questions:

1. Is voice marking obligatory?
2. How are semantic roles determined?
3. Do parts of speech categories have inherent functions?

Each of these questions is discussed respectively in Sections 6.2.1, 6.2.2, and 6.2.3. Some theoretical solutions for these problems are then outlined in Section 6.3.
6.2.1 Is voice marking obligatory?

Bare verbs are a systematic feature of Colloquial Minangkabau. They are used in places where we would expect to find a verb marked for voice, which suggests that voice marking is not obligatory in this register. However, it is only the voice markers maN- and di- which appear to be optional. If a speaker intends a reading of the verb other than an active/passive reading, for example, a reflexive or involuntary reading, then this must be marked on the verb using one of the language’s lexical/derivational affixes.

To demonstrate this, consider the examples in (282). Example (282a) contains the bare verb pikia, ‘think’. In (282b) and (282c) the same verb is marked by the active voice marker maN- and the reflexive marker ba- respectively. Even though these two morphological and semantic permutations are available for the verb in this sentence, only the active interpretation is available for the bare verb in (282a).

(282) a. Banyak urang maabiahan pitih, ndak nyo pikia dulu.
many person AV-finish-APP money NEG 3 think first
‘Many people spend money without thinking about it first.’

b. Banyak urang maabiahan pitih, ndak nyo mamikia dulu.
many person AV-finish-APP money NEG 3 AV-think first
‘Many people spend money without thinking about it first.’

c. Banyak urang maabiahan pitih, ndak nyo bapikia dulu.
many person AV-finish-APP money NEG 3 RFLX-think first
‘Many people spend money without thinking to themselves first.’

(Elicitation)

Similarly in (283), the bare verb baka, ‘burn’, only has an active interpretation available even though both active and involuntary morphology are possible for the verb.

(283) a. Inyo baka lauak tu.
3 burn fish DEM:dist
‘He roasted the fish.’

b. Inyo mambaka lauak tu.
3 AV-burn fish DEM:dist
‘He roasted the fish.’
Lexical/derivational affixes are required to mark the stage of ‘evolution of action’ on the verb, but the *maN-* prefix is not. A bare verb root can only then be assigned active semantics. These facts suggest that active voice marking is not obligatory and that active voice is basic, which is also the case in Spoken Jakarta Indonesian (cf. Wouk, 1989; 2004b).

The evidence presented in Section 6.1.2.2 also suggests that since bare verbs can also be given a passive reading, that passive voice marking is not obligatory either. The most common place to find a bare passive verb is in a construction that resembles the syntactised passive voice construction: ‘pre-verbal undergoer + *di-*verb + *dek* + actor’. Because this construction is so highly marked, perhaps the *di-* marking on the verb becomes redundant and is therefore not obligatory. However, examples (260), (261), (262), (263), (264) and (265) showed that even sentences that do not adhere to this highly syntactised pattern can be given passive interpretations. One would think then, that passive and active voice marking is only obligatory when semantic roles require disambiguation. Yet, as examples (263), (264) and (265) show, even in ambiguous cases voice marking is not required.

So do bare verbs mean the same as voice marked verbs? In Colloquial Minangkabau bare verbs are clearly underspecified in comparison to voice marked verbs. However, speakers are generally able to assign semantic roles to participants in a clause with a bare verb, which suggests that the role of voice marking in Colloquial Minangkabau is not syntactic. In Standard Minangkabau, *maN-* has a clearly delineated semantic function (see Section 5.1.2.3) and *di-* has some associated semantic and aspectual properties as a result of its syntactic role in individuating the undergoer participant (see Section 5.1.3.3). So in Colloquial Minangkabau, the opposition between bare verbs, *maN-*, and *di-* must be primarily motivated by these semantic factors in a similar way to the opposition between the active and passive voice markers *N-* and *di-* in Riau Indonesian (see Section 2.4 and Section 6.3.2). In Colloquial Minangkabau, bare verbs
are semantically underspecified (which has no syntactic consequences), whereas verbs that are voice marked show that the actor or undergoer is particularly conceptually salient, or show that the event has certain aspectual properties.

### 6.2.2 How are semantic roles determined?

The fact that bare verbs are underspecified means that the semantic roles of the participants in a transitive clause are ambiguous, particularly when utterances are taken out of context. In Minangkabau it is usually the pre-verbal participant that is the pivot, but if the verb is not marked for voice then it is unclear whether the pre-verbal participant is an actor or an undergoer. However, as the examples in Section 6.1.2 showed, speakers are usually able to disambiguate the semantic roles of the participants and work out what the intended ‘voice’ of the verb is.

As discussed in Section 6.1.2, discourse context and real world knowledge provide the clues that allow hearers to disambiguate the semantic roles of the bare verb’s arguments. If one of the arguments in the clause refers to a participant in the conversation, is the protagonist of the narrative, has had more previous mentions than another participant, or if one of the participants is definite and the other is not, then that participant will be highly referential and topical and will therefore serve as the pivot. Establishing which is an actor and which is an undergoer is more difficult. Some contextual background can also help, and so can some knowledge of the world, for example bananas are more likely to be chopped than be the ones chopping (see example (261)).

However, in some cases, as examples (263), (264) and (265) demonstrated, only extremely detailed knowledge of the context and pragmatics of the situation can provide the clues to work out the intended semantic roles of the bare verb’s arguments. But perhaps in these cases the speaker doesn’t intend anything, therefore the hearer has no need to disambiguate in the first place. Perhaps bare verb constructions don’t represent some kind of defective or underspecified version of a voice marked verb construction. Instead, they are used in cases where voice and semantic roles are not just underspecified, but unimportant. This is because ambiguity is a perfectly acceptable feature of Colloquial Minangkabau discourse. Gil (2002a; 2006) explores similar ideas
in his discussion of Riau Indonesian’s voice system. He argues that no morphosyntactic devices exist in the language to disambiguate semantic roles and that semantic roles are therefore typically vague and underspecified. Gil’s (2001; 2007) theory of Associational Semantics may explain why semantic roles can be underspecified not only in Riau Indonesian, but in Minangkabau as well (see Section 6.3.2).

6.2.3 Do categories have inherent functions?

The final question that the Minangkabau bare verbs raise is the question of categoriality. We saw in Section 6.1.3 that Minangkabau parts of speech are multifunctional; nouns prototypically function to refer but can also function to predicate and modify; and verbs prototypically function to predicate but can also function to refer and modify. Verbal functions are usually indicated by the presence of verbal morphology, however Section 6.2.1 demonstrated that voice marking on the verb is not obligatory. Therefore we have a set of roots in Minangkabau that can appear in a range of construction types (referential, modificatory, predicative) but that are not differentiated at the morphological level. Does this mean that each root can only then be assigned category membership based on the construction that it appears in?

As we saw in Chapter 4, according to Croft (1990; 2000), the less marked an item is when performing a non-prototypical function, the less inherent is its own prototypical function. If we apply Croft’s logic to the Minangkabau case, this would suggest that roots do not have inherent functions. Because nouns and verbs can function in non-prototypical ways without any changes to their surface forms, these roots are not inherently nominal or verbal, some roots are just more likely to occur in nominal or verbal position due to their semantics. If we take this hypothesis to its extreme, a possible conclusion is that Minangkabau roots are precategorial; that is, categories can be defined on the basis of the construction type and lexemes do not have any ‘underlying’ category membership; they acquire nominal or verbal status only when they are used in a nominal or verbal construction.

Similar questions have been raised about the categorical status of roots and the role of voice morphology in other Austronesian languages, particularly Philippine-type
languages (cf. De Guzman, 1991; Donohue, 2008; Foley, 1998; Gil, 2000; Kaufman, 2007). In Minangkabau these questions exist because of the use of bare forms, whereas in Philippine-type languages it is the prevalent use of voice morphology with a range of non-verbal parts of speech that causes the conundrum. This had led some linguists to propose that roots in Philippine-type languages are precategorial. That is to say, distinctions between nominal and verbal parts of speech are not made in the lexicon, instead the distinctions depend on the syntactic and morphological frames in which the roots are used. A summary of the arguments that have been made for and against a precategorial analysis of Philippine-type languages are presented in Section 6.3.1. The arguments are then applied to the Minangkabau case and it will be demonstrated that there is indeed evidence to support a categorisation of roots at the lexical level, and that the language is therefore not precategorial.

6.3 Some Theoretical Solutions

6.3.1 Precategoriality

In this section I will first discuss Foley’s (1998; 2008) proposal that Philippine-type languages are precategorial. I will then discuss some alternative solutions to the categoriality problem in Philippine-type languages presented by Kroeger (1998) and Himmelmann (2006a; 2008). I will then show some evidence to support the idea that Minangkabau is not precategorial.

Foley’s (1998) argument that Philippine-type languages have no lexical distinction between nouns and verbs, and that roots in these languages are therefore precategorial, is based on two main observations. First, there are no clear nominalising processes in Philippine-type languages. All affixes that are used to derive nominal forms can also be used as voice marking affixes, therefore there are no unique nominalising affixes. In addition to this, inflected verb forms can also function as NP heads without any change to their morphological marking. Second, Foley argues that roots do not have an underlying argument structure. If this is the case then this means there is nothing at the lexical level to differentiate verbs from nouns.
Foley (1998: 30) proposes that if roots do not entail argument structure, then they specify “some generalized conceptual structure” in the lexicon instead. For example, he suggests that a root like *bigay*, ‘give’, will specify the conceptual paradigm ‘giving by X of Y to Z’, but will not specify how X, Y and Z’s semantic roles map onto argument structure. The role of voice morphology is then to specify how the semantic roles specified by the root’s conceptual structure ought to be realised syntactically. To do this, the root must first become a verb. So, according to Foley, voice morphology actually performs a single derivational process: deriving a verb from a precategorial root and selecting a specific semantic role as the pivot.

Since argument structure is not specified in the lexicon, according to Foley (1998; 2008) this means that there is no preference as to which of the participants entailed by the root’s conceptual structure gets realised as the pivot. This, he argues, shows that no one voice type is basic and that voice in Philippine-type languages is ‘symmetrical’ (see Section 2.1). Naturally, precategoriality and symmetrical voice systems are complementary features and it is these features, he argues, that are typologically salient in Philippine-type languages.

Nevertheless, whether Philippine-type languages are precategorial or not is still a matter of debate and a number of alternate analyses have been put forward. Two of these alternate analyses are discussed here. First, we will examine Kroeger’s (1998) argument against precategoriality, and second, we will discuss Himmelmann’s (2006a; 2008) proposal that the morphology of Philippine-type languages is multifunctional.

Citing evidence from Tagalog, Kimaragang Dusun and Blaan, Kroeger (1998) argues that nominal and verbal roots in Philippine-type languages can be distinguished in the lexicon. He argues that the argument structure of a verb is underlying therefore the role of voice affixation is not as Foley (1998) claims to derive verbs from precategorial roots, but purely to select a participant as the pivot.

Kroeger (1998) gives four significant pieces of evidence to support his claims. The first is that applicative formation can alter the argument structure of a verb independently of focus or voice marking. Applicatives operate as valency changing devices and also
function to promote non-core arguments to core argument status. For example a
*location* adjunct can be reassigned core argument status as *an undergoer* with the use of
an applicative. Since this process can occur prior to or independently of other kinds of
voice affixation, according to Kroeger (1998), this shows that argument structure, i.e.
which participants are assigned core and non-core argument status, is entailed by the
verbal root.

The second piece of evidence to support the idea that argument structure is specified in
the lexicon is that bare verb forms in Blaan select a ‘default’ pivot based on the lexical
properties of the verb root. Kroeger (1998) argues that pivot choice is determined by
morphosyntax but that a pre-ordained argument structure also influences speakers’
preference for pivot selection. He explains that most experiencer verbs in Blaan select
the experiencer as pivot in their basic form, however other experiencer verbs (e.g.
‘hear’) select the stimulus as their ‘default’ pivot and some (e.g. ‘see’, ‘smell’) even
select the instrument. It does not follow from the semantics of the class of experiencer
verbs that stimuli or instruments be the basic pivot choice for only some verbs, therefore
he concludes that the specifications for the ‘default’ pivot must be stipulated in the
lexicon.

The third piece of evidence provided by Kroeger (1998) counters Foley’s (1998) claims
that there are no unique nominalising processes in Philippine-type languages. Kroeger
(1998) argues that the Kimaragang infix *-in-*, although used as a marker of past tense
when combined with verbal roots, can also function as a nominaliser, combining not
only with verbal roots but nominal and adjectival ones as well. Kroeger (1998) argues
that the resultant nominalisations are lexically distinct from the past tense forms of the
verbs and also have unpredictable semantics. Some examples of nominalisations based
on verbal roots in Kimaragang can be found in (284). Note that the *-in-* infix results in a
semantic narrowing of the root in the nominalised forms.
Finally, whereas Foley (1998) argues that roots are precategorial because voice affixation can occur with any root, Kroeger (1998) presents evidence to show that voice affixation actually affects some roots differently to others. He states that there are a number of differences in how voice affixation patterns with nominal and verbal roots in Tagalog. Most importantly, voice affixation is obligatory and productive with verbal roots, but it is optional and unsystematic with nominal roots and creates forms with highly unpredictable semantics. Moreover, for verbal roots, voice affixation functions to select different arguments as the pivot but does not change the lexical meaning of the root. However, for nominal roots, different voice affixes on the same root create forms that range greatly in meaning.

Precategorial languages must be both bidirectional and compositional, i.e. any substantive root must be able to function in any available syntactic slot and any morphological devices must have the same effects on all roots (cf. Evans and Osada, 2005). Therefore, Kroeger’s (1998) evidence that the effects of voice affixation on nominal roots are unpredictable provides the most convincing argument to support the idea that there is indeed a lexical distinction between nominal and verbal roots in Philippine-type languages.

Himmelmann (2006a; 2008) proposes an alternative solution to both Foley’s (1998; 2008) and Kroeger’s (1998) analyses. Like Foley (1998), he argues that voice affixation is by definition derivational; there is no one basic voice type and all words bearing voice marking must belong to the same morphosyntactic class of verb regardless of their lexical class (Himmelmann, 2008). However, instead of arguing for or against the precategoriality hypothesis, he proposes that it is the multifunctionality and polysemy of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB ROOT</th>
<th>NOMINALISED FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>liking</td>
<td>liniking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salaw</td>
<td>sinalaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reet</td>
<td>rineet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kroeger, 1998: example 30c)
voice morphology in Philippine-type languages that causes the difficulty in assigning root words to a lexical category.

Himmelmann (2006a: 489) talks about Philippine-type voice morphology not as “minimal units of form and meaning” but as “(bound) formatives”. This means that each voice affix has a bundle of syntactic and semantic features, only some of which are profiled in a given instance. However, the correlations between the specific syntactic and semantic sense of the affix being used and the ontological type of the root undergoing derivation is difficult to clarify. For example, in Tagalog the prefix ma- can occur with a large majority of all content words and can mean either ‘to have ROOT’ or ‘to become ROOT’ yet there is no clear and consistent patterning of nominal or verbal roots with either of these meanings (Himmelmann, 2008: 16-17).

Neither Foley’s (1998; 2008), nor Kroeger’s (1998), nor Himmelmann’s (2006a; 2008) proposals can directly explain the categoriality status of the Minangkabau bare verb forms since their analyses are made to account for the peculiarities of Philippine-type languages. Nevertheless, these analyses point to three main factors for consideration before making assessments about the categorical status of roots in Minangkabau: whether the argument structure of verbs is specified in the lexicon, whether there are unique nominalisation or verbalisation processes in the language, and whether the multifunctionality of morphology patterns with specific lexical categories. I will now discuss each of these factors in turn.

6.3.1.1 Argument Structure

We cannot argue that Minangkabau makes no distinction between nouns and verbs in the lexicon because some aspects of a verb’s argument structure are in fact lexically specified. The transitivity of verb roots is specified in the lexicon (this is also true of noun roots as well: see manggulai, ‘make a curry’, and manggandang, ‘beat on the drum’, in example (288)) and can only be increased by applicative formation. For example, a distinction is made in the lexicon between intransitive and transitive active verbs and applicative formation is required to increase the syntactic valency of the intransitive verb root (see Chapters 4 and 5). In addition to this, a lexical distinction is
also made between a verb’s core and non-core arguments since applicative formation on transitive roots functions to alter the verb’s existing argument structure by changing the lexically specified alignment between macro role and core or non-core argument.

However, unlike Blaan (cf. Kroeger, 1998), Minangkabau does not have any lexical specifications about a verb’s ‘default’ pivot or its basic voice. This idea is supported by the fact that, when bare verbs are used in place of voice marked verbs, the ‘voice’ of the verb and the semantic roles of the verb’s arguments are underspecified (see Section 6.1.2). This suggests that some elements of the verb’s argument structure are dependent on the surface realisation of syntactic structures and voice morphology on the verb. Rather than claiming that the unmarked verb is precategorial, we can propose that some aspects of its argument structure in Minangkabau are underspecified (see Section 6.3.2). We could also propose a solution similar to Himmelm ann’s (2006a; 2008) and argue that some elements of argument structure are specified by the verb root and other elements are specified by the voice marker. The interaction of root with voice marker and the effects that this has on argument structure must depend on the category and semantics of the root.

6.3.1.2 Nominalisation Processes

As discussed in Section 4.2.1.2, Minangkabau has productive nominalising morphology and makes use of three main nominalising affixes: \textit{pa}-, \textit{paN}-, and \textit{-an}. Like many of the nominalising affixes used in Philippine-type languages, two of the Minangkabau nominalisers, \textit{pa}- and \textit{-an}, are apparently homophonous with verbal morphological markers: the causative prefix \textit{pa}- and the applicative \textit{-an} respectively (see Section 6.3.1.3). The examples in (285) show how \textit{pa}- and \textit{-an} affect the verbal roots to create phonologically identical nominal and verbal forms.
The *paN*- nominaliser does not have a verbal counterpart. Nevertheless, nominalisations derived from the *paN*- affix can also appear in the predicate slot. This affix is a nominaliser of verbal roots, but it also narrows the semantic field of nouns to create different nominal forms. Example (286) shows that the verb *panangi*, ‘hit’, has been derived from the nominal form *panangan*, ‘a blow, a hit’, which in turn derives from the nominal root *tangan*, ‘hand’. Similarly, example (287) demonstrates that the nominal form *panyapo*, ‘a greeting’, is able to appear in the predicate slot.

The *paN*- nominaliser does not have a verbal counterpart. Nevertheless, nominalisations derived from the *paN*- affix can also appear in the predicate slot. This affix is a nominaliser of verbal roots, but it also narrows the semantic field of nouns to create different nominal forms. Example (286) shows that the verb *panangi*, ‘hit’, has been derived from the nominal form *panangan*, ‘a blow, a hit’, which in turn derives from the nominal root *tangan*, ‘hand’. Similarly, example (287) demonstrates that the nominal form *panyapo*, ‘a greeting’, is able to appear in the predicate slot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>NOMINAL</th>
<th>VERBAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. tanam ‘plant’</td>
<td>tanaman ‘plant’</td>
<td>(man)(t)anaman ‘plant for.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. tolong ‘help’</td>
<td>patolongan ‘help’</td>
<td>(mam)patolongan ‘help’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. tamu ‘meet’</td>
<td>patamuan ‘meeting’</td>
<td>(mam)patamuan ‘introduce’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ingek ‘remember’</td>
<td>paringekan ‘warning’</td>
<td>(mam)paringekan ‘warn’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *paN*- nominaliser does not have a verbal counterpart. Nevertheless, nominalisations derived from the *paN*- affix can also appear in the predicate slot. This affix is a nominaliser of verbal roots, but it also narrows the semantic field of nouns to create different nominal forms. Example (286) shows that the verb *panangi*, ‘hit’, has been derived from the nominal form *panangan*, ‘a blow, a hit’, which in turn derives from the nominal root *tangan*, ‘hand’. Similarly, example (287) demonstrates that the nominal form *panyapo*, ‘a greeting’, is able to appear in the predicate slot.

(286)a. *Panangan.*

    NOM-hand

    ‘A blow, a hit.’

    (Elicitation)

b. *Kadang-kadang laki ko panangani bini.*

    RED-occasional male DEM:prox NOM-hand-APP:loc wife

    ‘Sometimes he hits his wife.’

    (Text ID: 477748104228160506)

(287)a. *Panyapo.*

    NOM-greet

    ‘A greeting.’

    (Elicitation)

b. *Panyapo urang siko ndak?*

    NOM-greet person here NEG

    ‘Do people greet each other here?’

    (Text ID: 734480141109270306)

The fact that some nominalisers are homophonous with verbal markers and that nominalised forms can appear in the predicate slot demonstrates that the nominalising
processes in Minangkabau are not unique. However, this evidence alone is not sufficient to argue that the language is precategorial.

6.3.1.3 Multifunctional Morphology

Of course, it could be the case that the nominalisers _pa_- and _-an_, and the verbal markers _pa_- and _-an_ are not homophonous, but the same, multifunctional morphemes. Cases of multifunctionality abound in Minangkabau morphology and the language’s lexical/derivational affixes _ta_-, _pa_- and _ba_- are particularly multifunctional (see Section 5.2). The correlations between the syntactic and semantic properties of the root and the meaning or syntactic function of the affix being profiled are relatively transparent. For example, _ta_- derives superlative forms only from stative roots and creates stative ‘ability’ predicates only from transitive verb roots. Nevertheless it remains difficult to clarify the exact correlations between the category of the root and the intended use of the affix in a number of other cases, for example the causative marker _pa_- when it occurs with non-stative roots (see Section 5.2.2).

The active voice marker _maN_- is also multifunctional. It can be used to derive active verbs from nominal roots as well as mark active voice on verbal roots. However, the uses of _maN_- with verbal roots are predictable whereas the semantics of _maN_- verbs derived from nominal roots are quite difficult to predict. The examples in (288) demonstrate this. Although the derived verbal forms all share active semantics, the conceptual framework for each of the events is quite different. First, the transitivity of derived verbal forms is not predictable. For example, (288d) is intransitive whereas the other verbs are transitive. This indicates that some elements of the argument structure of nominal roots are specified in the lexicon. One can also not predict what kind of activity the nominal root entails. According to Moussay (1998) _maN_- derives verbs meaning ‘to use _noun_’ from nominal roots. The verb _manggandang_, ‘beat on the drum’, is clearly an example of this type. In addition, Adelaar (1992a) finds that nouns can also form intransitive _maN_- verbs meaning ‘to be on _noun_’. Based on the examples in (288) we can also add ‘to send _noun_ to someone’ (_manesemes_), ‘to put _noun_ on something’ (_mancat_), and ‘to make _noun_’ (_manggulai_), to the list. Examples of each of these verbs predicating in a sentence can be found in (289), (290), (291), and (292).
One of Kroeger’s (1998) arguments for a lexical noun/verb distinction in Philippine-type languages is that the semantics of voice affixed forms derived from nominal roots are unpredictable, whereas voice affixation on verbal roots is a regular and predictable process. We can argue similarly for Minangkabau and claim that the unpredictable behaviour of man-N-verbs derived from nominal forms demonstrates that a clear distinction between nominal and verbal roots must be made in the lexicon.

Croft’s (1990, 2000) theory suggests that the presence of multifunctional bare forms means that roots do not have inherent prototypical functions. However, based on the
evidence presented in this section, we cannot argue strongly that Minangkabau is a precategorial language.

6.3.2 Associational Semantics

The use of bare verbs nevertheless poses a problem for our analysis of Minangkabau’s voice system. This section will discuss Gil’s (2001; 2007) notion of Associational Semantics in a further effort to understand why we find bare verbs in Colloquial Minangkabau.

Gil (1994; 2000; 2001; 2007; 2008) argues that Riau Indonesian as a monocategorial language with some isolating morphology. He also suggests that it is a typologically ‘simplistic’ language. Monocategoriality and isolating morphology also mean that constructions in this language are often underspecified. For this reason, Gil (2007) proposes that Riau Indonesian is a highly Associational language, i.e. the interpretability of underspecified utterances in this language relies on Associational Semantics. Gil (2008) argues that Minangkabau, as well as Mentawai and Sundanese, are also Associational languages. It is these typological traits, Gil argues, that form the basis of the Sundic-type voice system (see Section 2.4).

According to Gil (2001; 2007), if a language is Associational it means that there will be a large amount of available interpretations for any utterance that is underspecified. The interpretations rely on the fact that the entities and events referred to in the utterance are semantically associated with each other in a variety of possible ways. For example, consider the Riau Indonesian sentence in (293) which is highly underspecified. Not only is makan, ‘eat’, not specified for tense and aspect but ayam, ‘chicken’, is not marked for definiteness. The semantic role of ayam, ‘chicken’, is also unspecified since there is no voice marking on the verb. This means that ayam could be interpreted as an agent, in which case the interpretation of the sentence would be ‘the chicken is eating’. However, ayam could also be a patient (‘someone is eating the chicken’), a benefactor (‘someone is eating for the chicken’), or even a comitative participant (‘someone is eating with the chicken’). The ontological type of the utterance is also unspecified therefore we cannot be sure if ayam makan is actually referring to an event. Some of the other available
interpretations of ontological type might include an entity (‘the chicken that is eating’, ‘chicken food’), a location (‘where the chicken is eating’), or indeed a time (‘when the chicken is eating’) (Gil, 2007).

(293) Ayam makan.
chicken eat
‘The chicken is eating... etc.’

(Gil, 2007: 73)

Gil has devised an experiment to test the Associationality of a range of languages to first, establish what the typological restrictions on Associational Semantics are, and second, to find out whether Associationality is a salient feature of Creole languages. The experiment is ongoing but to date Gil (2007; 2008) has run the experiment on speakers of English, Hebrew, Papiamentu, Sranan, Bislama, Twi, Fongbe, Yoruba, Vietnamese, Sundanese, Mentawai and Minangkabau. In the experiment, subjects are presented with a sentence in their language and two pictures. Subjects are then asked to evaluate whether the situation entailed by the test sentence is accurately portrayed in any of the pictures. Subjects may choose only one of the pictures, both of the pictures or neither of the pictures. One of the pictures shows the test interpretation. If subjects choose this picture, then this demonstrates that an Associational interpretation is available in their language.

A sample of some of the test sentences from Gil’s (2007) Associationality experiment with Minangkabau speakers and English speakers can be found in Table 20.
Table 20. Some Test Sentences from the Associationality Experiment.

(Gil, 2007: 96, 105)

A. **Bare Peripheral Sentences:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINANGKABAU TEST SENTENCES</th>
<th>ENGLISH TEST SENTENCES</th>
<th>TEST PICTURE SHOWS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Badut minum buku</td>
<td>‘The clown is drinking the book’</td>
<td>Clown drinking while reading book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clown drink buku</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Badut bali sanang</td>
<td>‘The clown is buying happiness’</td>
<td>Clown buying fruit with happy face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clown buy happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kopi galak</td>
<td>‘The coffee is laughing’</td>
<td>Person spilling coffee, onlooker laughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coffee laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pitih sanang</td>
<td>‘The money is happy’</td>
<td>Man holding money with happy face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Bare Patient Preceding Sentences:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINANGKABAU TEST SENTENCES</th>
<th>ENGLISH TEST SENTENCES</th>
<th>TEST PICTURE SHOWS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Buruang makan</td>
<td>‘The bird is eating’</td>
<td>Cat eating a bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bird eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Harimau takuik</td>
<td>‘The tigers are afraid’</td>
<td>People fearing tigers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiger afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mancik kaja kuciang</td>
<td>‘The mouse is chasing the cat’</td>
<td>Cat chasing mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouse chase cat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oto tundo padusi</td>
<td>‘The car is pushing the woman’</td>
<td>Woman pushing car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car push woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘Bare Peripheral’ sentences show the juxtaposition of an event and an entity which do not belong in the same semantic frame. Gil argues that, in an Associational language, an interpretation can be made from the juxtaposed elements that fits the situation portrayed in the test picture, whereas in a non-Associational language, the interpretation will not fit. Consider sentence (1) in Table 20. In an Associational language, the juxtaposed elements CLOWN DRINK BOOK refer to an event which is associated with a
clown, drinking and a book. Therefore, the interpretation represented in the test picture, 
*clown drinking while reading book*, will be available. However, in a non-Associational 
language the interpretation represented in the test picture will not be available since 
*book* will have to be interpreted as part of the argument structure, or semantic frame, of 
*drink*, which is semantically odd (Gil, 2007).

The ‘Bare Patient Preceding’ sentences contain two elements: an event preceded by an 
entity which is understood to be the patient. In an SVO language the preceding entity 
will be interpreted as the agent therefore the situation represented in the test picture will 
not be available. However, in an Associational language the test interpretation will be 
available since all the sentence entails is an ‘event X associated with entity Y’ (Gil, 
2007).

The results of the experiment (see Table 21) show that the percentage of available 
Associational interpretations of the test sentences was much higher for Minangkabau 
than it was for English (Gil, 2007). These findings suggest that underspecified 
utterances in Minangkabau are interpretable because the compositional Associationality 
of the language allows for a range of possible meanings to be drawn from the individual 
elements in the utterance.

*Table 21. Results of Associationality Experiment for Minangkabau and English.*

(Gil, 2007: 86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SUBJECTS</th>
<th>% AVAILABLE ASSOCIATIONAL INTERPRETATION:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BARE PERIPHERAL</td>
<td>BARE PATIENT PRECEDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINANGKABAU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Associational nature of Minangkabau in part accounts for the presence of bare 
verbs in the language. Notice in Table 20 that none of the verbs in the Minangkabau test 
sentences is marked by verbal morphology. This makes these sentences very similar to 
those described in Section 6.1.2, where the absence of voice morphology means that the
mapping of semantic roles and grammatical relations with the participants in the clause is unspecified. The Associational nature of Minangkabau then allows for a number of interpretations to be available, even if the verb is morphologically unmarked.

Nevertheless, Gil (2007) acknowledges that even languages that have a high percentage of available Associational interpretations are not completely Associational. For example, he argues that although in Riau Indonesian there are a range of interpretations available for a sentence like ayam makan (see example (293)), there is a preference for ayam to be understood as the agent. Thus Riau Indonesian must have a set of additional semantic rules that make reference to head-modifier structure, iconicity and information flow (Gil, 2007). Similarly, as discussed in Section 6.1.2, there is a preference for bare verbs in Minangkabau to be interpreted as active rather than passive. Therefore, although the Associational nature of Minangkabau can perhaps account for the presence of bare verbs, and can also perhaps explain how speakers interpret clauses with bare verb heads, further investigation is required to discover the additional syntactic, pragmatic, and semantic rules that speakers of Minangkabau make use of when presented with bare verbs.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter has provided some examples of bare verb forms in Minangkabau and explained their use. The bare verb forms are problematic for our analysis of Minangkabau for a number of reasons. Their very existence implies that voice morphology is not obligatory. The fact that the bare verbs are morphologically underspecified also means that the semantic roles of participants in a bare verb clause are also indeterminate. It was suggested that Gil’s (2001; 2007) notion of Associational Semantics can explain how the underspecification of elements in an utterance (caused by the existence of bare verbs) is acceptable to speakers of Minangkabau. This is because Associational Semantics allows for a wide range of possible interpretations of the utterance to be available.

Bare verb roots are also multifunctional and so are bare nominal roots. The morphological underspecification of these nominal and verbal roots implies that there is
no underlying categorical distinction between them. However, this chapter has also argued that Minangkabau is not a precategorial language and that there is indeed a lexical distinction between nouns and verbs.

Although this chapter has addressed a number of the problems that the bare verbs present for our analysis of Minangkabau, the question of *how* speakers correctly decode the intended meaning of an underspecified utterance or correctly assign semantic roles to participants in a bare verb clause requires further investigation. Associational Semantics and pragmatic knowledge play a part in a Minangkabau speaker’s ability to do this, yet the exact specifications about the parameters of Associational Semantics as well as the specifications about what kind of pragmatic knowledge is required, and how much, needs further empirical study. Because of its naturalistic data, and because of the sheer amount of it, the MPI EVA Minangkabau corpus would be the perfect tool for this kind of further study.
Chapter 7. Conclusion

This study has presented a novel analysis of the forms and functions of voice in Minangkabau. The analysis draws on some recurrent theoretical themes that emerge from studies of voice in Philippine-type, Indonesian-type, and Sundic-type languages as well as in Acehnese. These were discussed in Chapter 2. The characterisation of Minangkabau voice presented in this study also takes into account the nature of grammatical relations in the language, considers the motivating discourse/pragmatic factors involved in voice alternation, and describes the semantic and conceptual distinctions that voice marking encodes. As discussed in Chapter 3, the study makes use of both naturalistic and elicited data in order to provide the most representative view of voice and verb morphology in Minangkabau.

Chapter 4 provided a description of parts of speech in Minangkabau and presented a detailed account of the predicate construction. It was concluded that Minangkabau has the open category parts of speech noun, verb and adverb and a number of closed category parts of speech which are restricted in terms of which open category they may co-occur with. Chapter 4 also demonstrated how voice marking interacts with the part of speech category of the predicate’s head.

Chapter 5 then provided a unified account of Minangkabau’s system of voice oppositions. It was argued that Standard Minangkabau has an Indonesian-type voice system whereas Colloquial Minangkabau has a Sundic-type voice system. Chapter 5 demonstrated that in Standard Minangkabau maN- and di- function as part of a system of pragmatically motivated voice oppositions, showing active and passive voice respectively. The pasif semu, or P2 construction, also plays a role in this system to place the undergoer participant in pivot position whilst maintaining the actor as a core argument.

Chapter 5 also demonstrated that the active voice marker maN-, as well as the affixes ta-, pa-, and ba-, have lexical/derivational functions. Similarly, the applicatives -an and -i, although functioning primarily in the syntactic domain as valency changing devices,
also have semantic and lexical/derivational properties. It was argued that this class of lexical/derivational devices function to show a conceptually motivated system of voice oppositions and that this voice system can be usefully described in terms of Shibatani’s (2006) “evolution of action” framework. Thus ta- and pa- show the origin of the action, ba- and maN- show the development of the action, and the applicatives -an and -i show the end point of the action. Chapter 5 also suggested that the passive voice marker di- does not operate within this conceptually motivated voice system. This idea is supported by the finding that di- is a morphosyntactic clitic and that its functions are primarily syntactic and pragmatic.

Chapter 6 then showed that bare verbs, i.e. verbs that are not marked for voice, are a pervasive feature of Colloquial Minangkabau. It was argued that the existence of bare verbs implies that voice morphology is not obligatory in this variety and that the morphological underspecification of bare verbs leads to indeterminacy in assigning semantic roles to the verb’s arguments. It was suggested that Colloquial Minangkabau can be described as an ‘Associational’ language (Gil, 2001; 2007), meaning that the language allows for a wide range of possible interpretations of an utterance to be available. This explains how the underspecification of elements in an utterance created by the existence of bare verbs is acceptable to speakers of Minangkabau.

Chapter 6 also revealed that bare verbs and bare nominals are multifunctional. It was noted that the morphological underspecification of these multifunctional verbal and nominal roots might imply that there is no underlying categorical distinction between them. However, Chapter 6 argued against a precategorial analysis for Minangkabau and concluded that there is a lexical distinction between nouns and verbs.

Though providing a comprehensive picture of voice and verb morphology in Minangkabau, this study also raises a number of issues that require further investigation. As discussed in Chapter 5, it is clear that the active and passive voice markers maN- and di-, and the applicative -an, encode aspectual notions. Whether this property is independently productive or whether it is just a ‘side effect’ of the voice markers’ other functions remains to be seen. Chapter 5 also presented some evidence to suggest that the passive voice marker di- originally had a generalised prepositional
function. However, a full historical analysis which accounts for \textit{di-}'s appearance on verbs is still required. Furthermore, the question that was raised in Chapter 6 about how speakers correctly decode the intended meaning of an underspecified utterance, and how speakers correctly assign semantic roles to participants in a bare verb clause, also requires further empirical study.
Appendices.

Appendix 1. Glossing conventions.

The following abbreviations are used in this dissertation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>stative ability predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP:loc</td>
<td>locative applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>active voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENF</td>
<td>benefactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>cause/reason marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNJ.OP</td>
<td>conjunction operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>complementiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>causative predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>de-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM:dist</td>
<td>distal demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM:prox</td>
<td>proximal demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQV.OP</td>
<td>equivalency operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclamative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILL</td>
<td>filler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMIT</td>
<td>imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>involuntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.o.</td>
<td>a kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>middle voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>homorganic nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGPOL</td>
<td>negative polite particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>object voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTRED</td>
<td>partial reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERS</td>
<td>personal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCT</td>
<td>perfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>generalised preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROHIB</td>
<td>prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>passive voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECP</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relativiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFLX</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>superlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic, topicalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>truncation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>null constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>unclear speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>infelicitous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pronouns are glossed as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other symbols used include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>null constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>unclear speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>infelicitous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Phonological Sketch

**Phonemic Inventory and Orthographic Conventions**

Table 22 shows the Minangkabau consonant inventory and Table 23 presents the Minangkabau phonemic vowels. The phonemes are transcribed according to standard Minangkabau orthographic conventions and I use these conventions throughout this dissertation.

*Table 22. Minangkabau Consonant Inventory.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BILABIAL</th>
<th>ALVEOLAR</th>
<th>VELAR</th>
<th>PALATAL</th>
<th>GLOTTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLOSIVE</td>
<td>p/b</td>
<td>t/d</td>
<td>k/g</td>
<td>c/j</td>
<td>{ʔ}(^{21})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASAL</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ny(^ {22})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRILL</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRICATIVE</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROXIMANT</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATERAL APPROXIMANT</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 23. Minangkabau Vowel Inventory.*

The glottal stop is used predictably in Minangkabau, therefore its status as a phoneme is indeterminate. Glottal stops are inserted word initially on citation forms of vowel initial words to preserve the ideal Minangkabau CV syllable structure. To avoid a vowel initial word in more natural forms of speech the coda of the previous word is syllabified as the onset of the vowel initial word. If the final syllable of the previous word ends in a vowel then a glottal stop will be inserted. However, in fast speech two adjacent vowels will often be pronounced as a single syllable nucleus. The same rules for vowel initial words also apply to vowel initial syllables. The glottal stop also appears predictably in word final position. It is the Minangkabau reflex of word final Proto Malayic *p, *t and *k (Adelaar, 1995: 436). However Moussay (1998) treats word final [ʔ] as an allophone of [k]. Word final glottal stops are transcribed as ‘k’ in the standard orthography.

Note that palatal nasals before palatal stops /c/ and /j/ are transcribed as ‘n’.

---

\(^{21}\) The glottal stop is used predictably in Minangkabau, therefore its status as a phoneme is indeterminate. Glottal stops are inserted word initially on citation forms of vowel initial words to preserve the ideal Minangkabau CV syllable structure. To avoid a vowel initial word in more natural forms of speech the coda of the previous word is syllabified as the onset of the vowel initial word. If the final syllable of the previous word ends in a vowel then a glottal stop will be inserted. However, in fast speech two adjacent vowels will often be pronounced as a single syllable nucleus. The same rules for vowel initial words also apply to vowel initial syllables. The glottal stop also appears predictably in word final position. It is the Minangkabau reflex of word final Proto Malayic *p, *t and *k (Adelaar, 1995: 436). However Moussay (1998) treats word final [ʔ] as an allophone of [k]. Word final glottal stops are transcribed as ‘k’ in the standard orthography.

\(^{22}\) Note that palatal nasals before palatal stops /c/ and /j/ are transcribed as ‘n’.
Syllable Structure and Word Structure

Minangkabau has four possible syllable structures. CV and CVC syllables can occur anywhere in the word, whereas CVV and CVVC syllables are restricted to word final position. ‘C’ includes all consonants, nasals and glides as presented in Table 22. ‘C’ includes single consonants and also consonant clusters. Clusters are restricted to a homorganic nasal and stop sequences. Word final consonant codas are restricted to glottals and alveolar and velar nasals. ‘V’ includes all vowels as presented in Table 23. ‘VV’ means a vowel sequence of the type /ui/, /ua/ and /ia/. Most roots in Minangkabau have a CV(C)CV(V)(C) pattern. Other word patterns include CV(C) and (CV(C))(CV(C))CV(C)CV(V)(C) (Adelaar, 1992a: 14; 1995: 437; Moussay, 1998).

Stress Placement

Gil (2006) argues that Minangkabau does not have word stress per se but that stress is assigned according to intonation groups, or intonation units. Minangkabau intonation units are “final prominent” (Gil, 2006), that is, an intonation unit in Minangkabau has a gradually rising contour that places stress on the final syllable. Furthermore, Gil argues that within each intonation unit some words are optionally assigned semantic focus. Semantic focus is realised prosodically, with the penultimate syllable of the focused word acquiring pitch prominence and a lengthened syllable rhyme.

However, Adelaar (1992a: 12; 1995: 437) and Zarbaliev (1987: 23) argue that Minangkabau has word stress with stress falling on the penultimate syllable.

I have conducted a preliminary acoustic study of stress in Minangkabau. The study supports the idea that Minangkabau has phrasal final stress and lend support to Gil’s (2006) claims about phrasal stress in Minangkabau. I found that syllables in intonation unit final position were markedly longer and more intense than the same syllable in non-final position. A comparison of the length and intensity of penultimate and word final syllables did not reveal conclusive results. The results from analysis of pitch contours were also inconclusive.
Appendix 3. Sorba Rules

*Sorba* is a Minangkabau reversing ludling, or word game, that involves syllable transposition and coda replacement. The basic rule for speaking *Sorba* is presented in (294).

(294) *In each word replace the coda of the final syllable with [r], then move the final syllable to word initial position.*

The *Sorba* rule is based on the available *Sorba* data but the rule has also been informed by the way *Sorba* speakers articulate the ludling rule themselves. *Sorba* is a word game so it is played for fun. Speakers also use *Sorba* to signal group solidarity and to conceal their speech from outsiders. The ludling rules must be actively learned before one can become a competent member of the *Sorba* speech community and speaking *Sorba* involves a conscious effort to disguise natural language (cf. Crouch, 2008).

An example of a *Sorba* utterance can be seen in (295) (the *Sorba* data appears in italics with a Minangkabau gloss underneath).

(295)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morla</th>
<th>morla</th>
<th>tigo</th>
<th>puluah</th>
<th>anam</th>
<th>larbu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamo</td>
<td>lamo</td>
<td>tigo</td>
<td>puluah</td>
<td>anam</td>
<td>bulan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long. time</td>
<td>long. time</td>
<td>three</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>six</td>
<td>month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘For thirty-six months in total.’

(Text ID: 289946224047051206)

In (295) the *Sorba* rules apply to derive *larbu* from *bulan*, ‘month’, and *morla* from *lamo*, ‘long time’. To derive *larbu* from *bulan*, ‘month’, the coda [n] is replaced by [r], the final syllable [lar] is moved to word initial position, and the word becomes *larbu*. If the word ends in a vowel like *lamo*, ‘long time’, then the null coda is replaced by [r], the final syllable [mor] is moved to word initial position, and the word becomes *morla*. 
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Appendix 4. Text: ‘Yang Lamah Yang Cadiak’

Title: ‘Yang Lamah Yang Cadiak’ or ‘The Weak and The Cunning’
Duration: 08.42 minutes.
Genre: Narrative/Folktale
Session Name: PDG-20070613-YSS

1. RST
   Di jaman daulu.
   ‘In the olden days.’

2. RST
   Di saat...
   ‘When...’

3. EXP
   Judule judul alun lai.
   ‘The title (you haven't said) the title yet.’

4. RST
   A judul nyo yang lamah alun tantu e yang lamah yang cadiak.
   ‘The title is The Weak, (I'm) not sure, er The Weak and The Cunning.’

5. YET
   Yang lamah yang cerdik.
   ‘The Weak and The Cunning.’

6. YET
   Yang lamah yang...
   ‘The weak the...’

7. RST
   Di jaman waktu binatang bisa mangecek-ngecek
   ‘In the time when animals could talk our story begins.’

8. RST
   Ko carito nyo.
   ‘This is the story.’

Transcript appears with kind permission from the MPI EVA Padang Field Station. Many thanks to the speakers Rustam, Yessy, Yettati and Dila. Special thanks to Yessy Prima Putri for recording and transcribing this story. The glossing and English translations are my own.
The story begins with a Mousedeer.

(Mousedeer) was creeping around wanting to steal the farmer's cucumbers.

‘Is maendap-endap the same as manyuruak-nyuruak?'

‘He was hiding because he was hungry. He hadn’t had any food for three days and three nights.’

(Mousedeer) wanted to eat again.

‘Poor Mousedeer.’

‘Food.’

‘So he crept into the farmer's field seeing the farmer's nice young cucumbers.’

‘Manyuruak-nyuruak, yeah, is Minangkabau, manyuruak is the one right.'
19. **RST**

*Masuak ka dalam ladang.*

enter to inside dry.field

‘(He) entered the field.’

20. **RST**

*Namo nyo binatang indak baraka.*

name 3 animal NEG POSS-mind

‘Animals being animals don't have common sense.’

21. **RST**

*Dipupuah nyo makan lah antimun tu.*

PV-gorge 3 eat EMPH TRU-cucumber DEM:dist

‘He gorged himself eating the cucumbers.’

22. **YET**

*A nyo makan nyo antimun?*

FILL 3 eat 3 TRU-cucumber

‘Ah did he eat cucumbers did he?’

23. **EXP**

*Si Kancia ko makane timun?*

PERS mousedeer DEM:prox eat-3 TRU-cucumber

‘Did Mousedeer eat cucumbers?’

24. **RST**

*A mantimun.*

FILL cucumber

‘Aha cucumbers.’

25. **RST**

*Cuma setelah nyo makan sahari, nyo lari bisuak pak tani bapikia lai.*

only after 3 eat ONE-day 3 run tomorrow father farm

RFLX-think more

‘Only after (Mousedeer) had eaten the whole day long and run off, the next day the farmer started to think.’

26. **RST**

*‘Baa mangko a nan mamakan rupo nampak dek nyo o iko kak Kancia ma,’ cek nyo.*

POSS-what then what REL AV-eat shape appear CAUSE 3 FILL

DEM:prox older.sibling mousedeer EMPH talk 3

‘‘What is it then that's eating (my cucumbers), it seems that it's the Mousedeer’, he said.’

27. **RST**

*Nyo buek lah perangkap dek pak tani lai.*

3 make PFCT trap CAUSE father farm more

‘So the farmer made a trap.’

28. **RST**

*A perangkap nan nyo buek,*

FILL trap REL 3 make

‘Ah the trap that he made,’
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29. RST  
nyo buek lah dari latak dari a anu dari gatah yang
make EMPH from place from what whachamacallit from sap REL

3 ado di dalam lubang.
exist LOC inside hole

‘he made it from placing from er whachamacallit from sap which was put inside the hole.’

30. EXP  
Lubang.
hole

‘A hole.’

31. RST  
Nyo timbun lah jo sarok-sarok supayo lubang tu ndak nampak.
heap EMPH with RED-rubbish so.that hole DEM:dist NEG appear

‘He covered it with rubbish so that the hole couldn't be seen.’

32. YET  
Yang ado tu xx.
exist DEM:dist xx

‘Which had it...’

33. RST  
Bisukari nyodatang lah kak Kancia baliak untuk mancilok
tomorrow day 3 come EMPH older.sibling mousedeer go.back for AV-steal

mantimun tu.
cucumber DEM:dist

‘The next day Mousedeer came back again to steal the cucumbers.’

34. RST  
Yo dasar binatang ndak aqak kurang punyo aka.
EXCL base animal NEG quite less have mind

‘Yes these animals more or less don't have any common sense.’

35. RST  
Dek kalamakan malangkah, tapuruak lah ka dalam lubang.
CAUSE STAT-delicious-NOM AV-step INV-sink EMPH to inside hole

‘Because he was so engrossed walking along (Mousedeer) sank into the hole.’

36. RST  
A baru sadar kak Kancia baso kak Kancia ko
FILL new aware older.sibling mousedeer CP older.sibling mousedeer DEM:dist

lah kanai tipu.
PFCT undergo trick

‘Ah the Mousedeer only then realised that he had been tricked.’

37. EXP  
Lah tatangkok lah nyo?
PFCT INV-catch PFCT 3

‘So he was caught?’

38. YET  
Masuak lubang tu yo tatangkok nyo.
enter hole DEM:dist EXCL INV-catch 3

‘He went into the hole and yes (he) was caught.’

39. RST  
Singkek carito, lah nyo tangkok dek pak tani.
short story PFCT 3 catch CAUSE father farm

‘To cut the story short, he got caught by the farmer.’
40. RST Dek pak tani gadang ati bakuruang lah di dalam kandang. 
CAUSE father farm big liver MID-cage EMPH LOC inside shed

‘Because the farmer was so happy he had Mousedeer caged in a shed.’

41. RST Mangecek lah ka urang kampuang, ‘Aden dapek saikua
AV-talk EMPH to person village lsg get ONE.CLASS:tail

Kancia.’
mousedeer

‘And he said to the village people, ‘I've got a mousedeer.’”

42. EXP A kecek nyo pa?
what talk 3 Father

‘What did he say Dad?’

43. EXP ‘Oi...’
EXCL

“Oi...”

44. RST ‘Oi rang kampuang aden bisuak datanglah ka rumah den ka
EXCL person village lsg tomorrow come-IMP to house lsg to

mandabiah Kancia.’
AV-slaughter mousedeer

“Oi! People of the village! Tomorrow come to my house where I will slaughter the Mousedeer.”

45. EXP ‘Ka manggulai.’
FUT AV-curry

“‘To make a curry (out of him).’”

46. EXP ‘Kancia.’
mousedeer

“(Out of) Mousedeer.”

47. RST ‘Kancia.’
mousedeer

“Mousedeer.”

48. RST ‘Yo lah,’ kecek rang kampuang.
EXCL PFCT talk person village

‘Yes ok,’ said the village people.’

49. RST A ntah manga pulo mancucuak lo lah
FILL wonder AV-what furthermore AV-appear furthermore EMPH

saikua anjiang ka sinan.
ONE-CLASS:tail dog to there

‘Who knows why but a dog appeared there.’
Mancuak tu manga tu pa?

AV-pierce DEM:dist AV-what DEM:dist Father

‘What is mancuak Dad?’

Mancuak tu arti nyo madok.

AV-pierce DEM:dist meaning 3 face

‘Mancuak means appear’.

Datang.

come

‘Come.’

Datang lah ka tampek ka kandang nan tampek kak

come EMPH to place to shed REL place older.sibling

Kancia ko.
mousedeer DEM:prox

‘(He) came to the place, to the cage where Mousedeer was.’

Dek binatang waktu xx bisa mangecek.

CAUSE animal time xx can AV-talk

‘Because animals at that time could speak.’

Mangecek lah Kancia ka ka anjiang ko.

AV-talk PFCT mousedeer xx to dog DEM:prox

‘Mousedeer spoke to the Dog.’

‘A manga Kancia?’

FILL AV-what mousedeer

‘Ah what’s going on Mousedeer?’

‘Eh jan kareh-kareh bana mangecek,’ nan kecek kak

EXCL PROHIB RED-hard true AV-talk REL talk older.sibling

Kancia ka anjiang.
mousedeer to dog

‘Ah don’t speak so loudly’ said Mousedeer to the Dog.’

‘Aden ka jadi marapulai.’

1sg to become bridegroom

‘I’m going to be a bridegroom.’

Lai nampak urang tu marameh ka santan tu a di more appear person DEM:dist AV-squeeze to coconut.milk DEM:dist what LOC ateh rumah.

up house

‘Look at the people squeezing out coconut milk up there at the house.’

‘Ka baralek Kancia tu?’

FUT MID-wedding.party mousedeer DEM:dist

‘Are you going to have a wedding party Mousedeer?’
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A iyo,' kecek Kancia bantuak itu.

"Ah yes," said Mousedeer like that."

Ka mangicuah anjiang ko.

'(He) wanted to trick the Dog.'

'Aden se lah Kancia.'

"How about me Mousedeer (can I get married, can we trade places)?"

'Ma buliah.'

"Not possible."

Dari pado itutu, lamo jo lambeke,

'After that, after a while,'

nyo rayu lah anjiang.

'The Dog convinced him.'

Dengan syarat-nyo, 'bukakan pintu setelah tutu, lah

'(Mousedeer gave) the instructions, 'after you open the door I’ll wait from far away and then I’ll shout.'

Singkek...

'(To cut it) short...

'Tu waang manggantian den dalam kandang ko'.

"Then you will take my place in the shed."

A singkek carito...

'To cut the story short...'

Masuak dalam kandang tu.

'(He) got into the shed.'
Yo lah masuak kak anjiang dalam tu.
EXCL PFCT enter older.sibling dog inside DEM:dist
‘Yes Dog got in.’

‘Beko den jauh-jauh baru den basorak, a itu.’
later 1sg RED-far new 1sg MID-cheer FILL DEM:dist
‘Then when I am far far away from here then I’ll shout, okay.’

Jadi dari pado itu, ari lah sanjo.
become from on DEM:dist day PFCT twilight
‘So after that it was already twilight.’

Pak tani ko ka maambiak Kancia ko ka didabiah.
father farm DEM:prox FUT AV-take mousedeer DEM:prox FUT PV-slaughter
‘The farmer was going to take Mousedeer to be slaughtered.’

Basorak lah Kancia.
MID-cheer EMPH mousedeer
‘Mousedeer yelled out.’

‘Oi rang kampuang...’
EXCL person village
‘Oi people of the village...’

‘O rang kampuang...’
FILL person village
‘Oh people of the village...’

‘Ciek urang mandabiah anjiang.’
one person AV-slaughter dog
‘Somebody is slaughtering a dog.’

Kancia.
mousedeer
‘Mousedeer.’

‘Pak tani manggulai anjiang.’
father farm AV-curry dog
‘The farmer is making dog curry.’

A nyo sorakan tu.
FILL 3 cheer-APP DEM:dist
‘He shouted it.’

Takajuik rupe nyo iyo.
INV-shock shape 3 yes
‘They seemed shocked.’
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84. RST  Nyo  buru lah  kak  Kancia  ko  sampai  ka  dalam  rimbo.
3  chase  EMPH  older.sibling  mousedeer  DEM:prox  arrive  to  inside  jungle

‘And they chased Mousedeer into the jungle.’

85. EXP  A  tu  pa?
what  DEM:dist  father

‘What then Dad?’

86. RST  Nyo...
3

‘He...’

87. DILA  Dalam  rimbo?
inside  jungle

‘(He was) in the jungle?’

88. RST  Ka  dalam  rimbo  gadang.
to  inside  jungle  big

‘(He) went into dense jungle.’

89. DILA  Oo.
EXCL

‘Oh.’

90. RST  Dek  kak  Kancia  ko  balari  balari  balari  ndak  tantu
CAUSE  older.sibling  mousedeer  DEM:prox  MID-run  MID-run  MID-run  NEG  certain
a  do...
what  NEGPOL

‘Because Mousedeer had run run run he wasn't sure (where he was going)...’

91. RST  Tasangkuik  iduangge.
INV-hook  nose-3

‘His nose got caught (on something).’

92. EXP  Kak  Kancia  namoe?
older.sibling  mousedeer  name-3

‘You mean Brother Mousedeer?’

93. RST  Iyo.
yes

‘Yes.’

94. RST  Daulu  nyo  kalau  ka  binatang  kan  bakakan.
before 3  TOP  to  animal  EMPH  RECP-older.sibling-APP

‘In the olden days, animals called each other Kak, brother, you know.’

95. RST  Kak  kak  Kancia,  Kak  bangau.
older.sibling  older.sibling  mousedeer  older.sibling  heron

‘Brother Mousedeer, Brother Heron.’
96. EXP  
*Kabau tu?*
water.buffalo DEM:dist

‘What about water buffalo?’

97. RST  
*A kabau ndak Kak kabau lai do.*
FILL water.buffalo NEG older.sibling water.buffalo more NEG POL

‘Water buffaloes, they weren’t ‘Brother Water buffalo’.’

98. EXP  
*Kabau saja?*
water.buffalo just

‘Just ‘water buffalo’?’

99. RST  
*Kabau saja istilahnya.*
water.buffalo just term-3

‘Yeah just ‘water buffalo’ is the term.’

100. RST  
*Rupo nyo iduang kak Kancia ko lah taatua.*
shape 3 nose older.sibling mousedeer DEM:prox PFCT INV-pierce

‘So it seemed that Mousedeer’s nose had got caught (on something).’

101. YET  
*E tu xx.*
FILL DEM:dist xx

‘Er that xx.’

102. EXP  
*Taatua tu a tu pa?*
INV-pierce DEM:dist what DEM:dist Father

‘What’s taatua Dad?’

103. EXP  
*Taatua tacucuak iduang ko.*
INV-pierce INV-pierce nose-3 DEM:prox

‘Taatua means that his nose got pierced (by something).’

104. EXP  
*Tersangkut?*
INV-hook

‘Hooked (on something)?’

105. RST  
*Tasangkuik a bantuak dicucuak bai tu a.*
INV-hook what form PV-pierce POSS-DEM:dist FILL

‘Hooked or pierced like that eh.’

106. RST  
*Alah bararayun lah kak Kancia ko kalau*
PFCT MID-PARTRED-swing EMPH older.sibling mousedeer DEM:prox TOP

*ndak sakik dan sakike ndak dapek ka disabuik.*
NEG hurt and hurt-3 NEG get to PV-mention

‘So Mousedeer was swinging and was in so much pain that it doesn’t bear mentioning.’

107. RST  
*Antah manga-manga pulo,*
wonder RED-AV-what furthermore

‘Who knows why;’
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108. RST  

datang lo lah ka sinan siamang.
come furthermore PFCT to there gibbon

‘(but) a gibbon also came along.’

109. RST  

Baruak awak dulue siamang kini koko.
short.tailed.macaque 1 before-3 gibbon now RED-DEM:prox

‘Before we used to say it was a a short tailed macaque but now people say it’s a gibbon.’

110. RST  

Sejenis itu lah pokoke.
ONE-sort DEM:dist PFCT main-3

‘The main thing is it was that kind of a creature.’

111. RST  

‘A manga Kancia ko?’
what AV-what mousedeer DEM:prox

‘What are you doing Mousedeer?’

112. EXP  

‘Ndak ado bararayun.’
NEG exist MID-PARTRED-swing

‘Nothing much, (just) swinging.’

113. RST  

‘A bararayun ko a ko buaian anu
FILL MID-PARTRED-swing DEM:prox what DEM:prox swing-NOM whatchamacallit

a buaian dari nenek.moyang.’
what swing-NOM from ancestor

‘Ah (I’m) swinging the dance of my ancestors.’

114. EXP  

Nenek.moyang.
ancestor

‘Ancestors.’

115. RST  

‘Nenek.moyang buaian nenek.moyang den.’
ancestor swing-NOM ancestor 1sg

‘The dance of my ancestors.’

116. RST  

‘Sato ciek Kancia.’
follow one mousedeer

‘I'll try it too Mousedeer.’

117. RST  

‘Jaan berang nenek.moyang den beko.’
PROHIB angry ancestor 1sg later

‘Don’t! (You’ll make) my ancestors get angry.’

118. RST  

A kan bantuak itu.
FILL EMPH form DEM:dist

‘Ah you know like that.’
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And as (he was) swinging the macaque squeezed up (to Mousedeer).

Or the gibbon.

‘A syaraike ado.’

‘There are some rules.’

Loosen this a bit first then I'll attach this to er your whatist', Mousedeer said to the macaque.

‘To your nose.’

And he pierced it.

The gibbon cried out as soon as he began to swing.

Gibbon, Dad.

The gibbon.

‘The gibbon was swinging away screaming at the top of his lungs.’
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129. RST  *Nan*  *Kancia ko*  *dipupuah lari.*

REL mousedeer DEM:prox PV-hurry run

‘And Mousedeer quickly ran away.’

130. RST  *Cuman nasib nasib nan malang dek kak Kancia ko.*

only fate fate REL unlucky CAUSE older.sibling mousedeer DEM:prox

‘It’s just that Mousedeer's fate was unlucky.’

131. YET  *Tibo di batang.aia.*

arrive LOC river

‘He came to a river.’

132. RST  *Ndak tibo di batang.aia do.*

NEG arrive LOC river NEGPOL

‘No, he didn't come to a river.’

133. EXP  *Rasai lah Ma lai.*

suffer EMPH TRU-mother more

‘He had more trials still Mum.’

134. RST  *Iyo.*

Yes

‘Yes.’

135. YET  *Baa ka nyo xx batang.aia ko?*

POSS-what FUT 3 xx river DEM:prox

‘How come he doesn’t go to the river?’

136. RST  *Tibo di tapi aia.*

arrive LOC edge water

‘He came to a river bank.’

137. RST  *Yo tapi aia batang.aia tapi aia kan sama.*

EXCL edge water river edge water EMPH same

‘Yeah (okay) river bank, river it's the same thing right.’

138. RST  *Nyo tau baso di tapi batang.aia ko babuayo banyak.*

3 know CP LOC edge river DEM:prox POSS-crocodile many

‘He knew that at the river's edge there were lots of crocodiles.’

139. RST  *A bantuak itu.*

FILL form DEM:dist

‘Ah like that.’

140. YET  *Baa caro manyubarang.*

POSS-what manner AV-traverse

‘How did (he) cross (the river)?’
‘How do I do it?’ he said.

‘He crept along, creeping, creeping.’

‘At the river’s edge his foot was bitten by Crocodile.’

‘And pulled.’

‘But our Mousedeer is cunning.’

‘Mousedeer spoke.’

‘Oh Brother Crocodile the thing that you caught isn’t my foot,’ and he knocked on some wood.

‘This is my foot.’

‘And then (Crocodile) let go of (Mousedeer’s foot) and he thrust the wood into Crocodile’s mouth.’

‘Then he could swim to the other bank.’
152. RST  
Ma tu salah tu ma.  
EMPH DEM:dist wrong DEM:dist E

‘Oh no that's wrong.’

153. RST  
A lo lah salah lo.  
FILL futhermore Ewrong futhermore

‘Oh it’s really wrong.’

154. YET  
A danga dulu.  
FILL hear before

‘Ah just listen (to me).’

155. RST  
Jadi...  
become

‘So...’

156. YET  
Dangalah iko bacakak lah nyo Buayo jo Kancia ko.  
hear-IMP DEM:prox RECP-fight E3 crocodile with mousedeer DEM:prox

‘Listen they fought each other, Crocodile and Mousedeer.’

157. RST  
O lah.  
FILL PFCT

‘Oh right.’

158. YET  
A cakak nyo ndak.  
FILL fight 3 NEG

‘They fought, right.’

159. YET  
O nyo disorongan kayu,  
FILL 3 PV-push-APP wood

‘(Because) the wood got shoved (in his mouth),’

160. YET  
tambah berang-berang Buayo ko.  
add RED-angry crocodile DEM:prox

‘Crocodile got angrier and angrier.’

161. YET  
‘A waang kurang aja ang nyo, ang sorongan kayu ka  
FILL 2sg:masc less teach 2sg:masc 3 2sg:masc push-APP wood to  
muncuang den,’ cek nyo.  
mouth 1sg talk 3

‘Ah you imbecile, you pushed a bit of wood into my mouth,’ he said.

162. RST  
Em.  
EXCL

‘Em.’

163. YET  
A cek nyo.  
what talk 3

‘(And) what did he say.’
‘Kalau yo bagak bana waang’, cek nyo.’

‘As for you you're a brave one,’ he said.’

‘Tu cek Kancia a ‘waang Buayo bodoh’, cek nyo ndak.

‘What did Mousedeer say? ‘You're an idiot Crocodile,’ he said.’

‘Hajar!’

‘Smash!’

‘O kecekan lah ka xx kok bagak’, cek nyo ndak.

‘Oo say that to (me) if you're really that brave,’ he said.’

‘O jadi den xx.’

‘Oh so I'll …’

‘Lalu…

‘Then…’

‘O bara bana bana banyak waang’ cek nyo, ka ka Buayo

‘How many of you are there really?’ he asked Crocodile, right.’

‘Bara banyak waang’ cek nyo, ‘co lawan-lawan baparang wak a’,

‘How many of there are you?’ he said, ‘are there enough for us to go to war,’ he said.’

‘Banyak den,’ cek nyo ndak.

‘There are loads of us,’ he said.’

Jadi kiro yo banyak.

‘So then (he) knew there were a lot.’


‘How many of there are you?’, ‘There's lots of us,’ he replied.’
'Kini imbauulah kawan-kawan waang tu', cek nyo nak. now call-IMP RED-friend 2sg:masc DEM:dist talk 3 EMPH

“Now call all of these friends,’ he said right.’

'Den imbau lo kawan-kawan den xx’.
1sg call futhermore RED-friend 1sg xx

‘And I'll also call all of my friends.’

'Itu nyo nyasar ka pulau.’
DEM:dist 3 AV-lost to island

‘That’s them (my friends) that strayed onto the island.’

Nyo manyubarang ka sungai tu ma.
3 AV-across to river DEM:dist EMPH

‘So he went across to the river.’

Iyo nyo bae bajalan di tapi di tapi batang aia tu
EXCL 3 just MID-walk LOC edge LOC edge river DEM:dist
banyak-banyak banyak-banyak.
RED-many RED-many

‘And he just walked along the river's edge taking many many steps.’

A tu kan, ‘ma kawan ang’, ‘tu a caliaklah tu’
FILL DEM:dist EMPH where friend 2 DEM:dist FILL see-IMP DEM:dist
a banyak jajak nyo a’ cek nyo.
what many footstep 3 what talk 3

‘Then (Crocodile said) ‘Where are all your friends?’ ‘That's them, see how many steps they've taken,’ he said.’

'Tu tadi nyo pai manyuruak’, cek nyo ndak.’
DEM:dist earlier 3 go AV-hide talk 3 NEG

‘Before they were hiding’, he said.’

Tu carito Baruak tu ma jo Buayo.
DEM:dist story short.tailed.macaque DEM:dist EMPH with crocodile

‘That’s the story of Macaque and Crocodile.’

‘Nyo nyuruak,’ cek nyo ndak.
3 AV-hide talk 3 NEG

‘They’ve been hiding,’ he said.’

'Jadi waang bara banyak nyo’, kecek Kancia ko ka
become 2sg:masc how.many many 3 talk mousedeer DEM:prox to
Buayo ndak.
crocodile NEG

‘So how many of you are there?’ said Mousedeer to Crocodile.’
185. YET  ‘O aden sagitu a’, cek nyo.
FILL 1sg ONE-DEM:dist FILL talk 3
‘Oh you know around about that much,’ he said.

186. YET  ‘A giko a cek nyo den etong ang dulu,’ cek nyo.
FILL DEM:prox FILL talk 3 1sg count 2sg:masc before talk 3
‘‘If you’re going to be like that, I’ll have to count you,’ he said.’

187. YET  ‘Bajeje ang dari ko ka suduik tu ka ujuang tu
MID-aligned 2sg:masc from DEM:prox to angle DEM:dist to tip DEM:dist
a ka subarang tu a,’ cek nyo.
FILL to across DEM:dist FILL talk 3
‘‘Line up from here to that corner, from this end to the other side,’ he said.’

188. YET  Jadi bajeje bajejer lah Buayo ko.
become MID-aligned MID-aligned EMPH crocodile DEM:prox
‘So the Crocodiles lined up in a row.’

189. YET  Dasar Buayo pakak.
base crocodile deaf
‘Crocodiles are stupid.’

190. RST  Babaris yo.
BA-line EXCL
‘(So they) lined up yeah?’

191. YET  Ba babaris.
xx MID-line
‘(They) lined up.’

192. YET  Babaris lah Buayo ko dari ujuang ko, dari tapi sungai
MID-line EMPH crocodile DEM:prox from tip DEM:prox from edge river
ko ka tapi sungai kian lo.
DEM:prox to edge river this.much furthermore
‘So the Crocodiles were lined up from the end, from one edge of the river right up to the other edge.’

193. YET  A malompek lah Kancia ko, ‘den etong ang dulu’,
FILL AV-jump EMPH mousedeer DEM:prox 1sg count 2sg:masc before
‘jadi’ cek nyo.
become talk 3
‘And mousedeer jumped up, ‘I'm going to count you first.’ ‘Alright,’ said Crocodile.’

194. YET  Ciek duo tigo ampek limo anam tujuah lapan sambilan sampai lah
one two three four five six seven eight nine arrive EMPH
limo puluah.
five ten
‘One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine until (he) got to fifty.’
195. YET

Sampai limo puluah.
arrive five ten

‘Until (he) got to fifty.’

196. YET

Sampai lah Buayo Kancia ko ka subarang.
arrive EMPH crocodile mousedeer DEM:prox to across

‘Until the Crocodiles, until Mousedeer reached the other edge of the river.’

197. YET

Ndak, sampai Buayo ka subarang.
NEG arrive crocodile to across

‘No, until the Crocodiles reached the other edge.’

198. YET

‘O waang banyak limo puluah ma waang tapi ang bodoh,’
FILL 2sg:masc many five ten EMPH 2sg:masc but 2sg:masc stupid
cek nyo.
talk 3

‘Oh there are lots of you, fifty of you, but you're stupid,’ he said.

199. YET

‘Aden subananyo nio manyabarang batang.aia ko ndak pandai,’
1sg ONE-very-3 want AV-across river DEM:prox NEG skillful
cek nyo.
talk 3

‘I actually wanted to cross the river but couldn't,’ he said.

200. YET

‘Tu den mako den suruah waang barih babarih.’
DEM:dist 1sg then 1sg order 2sg:masc line MID-line

‘That's why I wanted you to line up.’

201. YET

A tu nyo bae tabang lai.
FILL DEM:dist 3 just fly more

‘And then he just disappeared off again.’

202. YET

Lari ka xx.
run to xx

‘(He) ran to xx.’

203. YET

Lapeh lah carito ko.
come.off EMPH story DEM:prox

‘He ran away, the story goes.’

204. YET

Lapeh lah Kancia ko ka rimbo.
come.off EMPH mousedeer DEM:prox to jungle

‘And Mousedeer ran away into the jungle.’

205. YET

Lapeh ka rimbo abih lah carito.
come.off to jungle finished EMPH story

‘He ran away into the jungle and that's the end of the story.’
206. RST  Sampai sinan carito ko.
arrive there story DEM:prox

‘The story finishes here.’

207. RST  A beko wak masuak ka carito nan kaduo.
FILL later I enter to story REL STAT-two

‘And later we’ll continue with the second story.’

208. END  @END
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