

PAPERS FROM THE PARASESSION ON
FUNCTIONALISM

600

(5)

APRIL 17, 1975

EDITED BY:

ROBIN E. GROSSMAN
L. JAMES SAN
TIMOTHY J. VANCE

CHICAGO LINGUISTIC SOCIETY
GOODSPEED HALL
1050 EAST 59TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

ON COMING TO TERMS IN ACHENESE:
THE FUNCTION OF VERBAL DIS-AGREEMENT⁰

John M. Lawler

University of Michigan

Achenese is an Indonesian language spoken by a large population in Northwest Sumatra. It possesses a verb agreement system with some unusual features. The one which will occupy our attention here is the fact that when agreement occurs, it is always with the logical subject, regardless of whether it is still the subject in surface structure. In fact, as we shall see, sometimes the agreement is with the logical subject precisely because it is no longer the surface subject.

Table I is a chart of the pronominal system and corresponding verbal agreement prefixes in Achenese:¹

| Person | Pron | Sg | | Pl | |
|---|---------|------|-------------|----------|------|
| | | Pref | | Pron | Prof |
| 1 (polite) (impolite) | lón | lón- | (exclusive) | kamo | mí- |
| | ke | ku- | (inclusive) | gítanyo | ta- |
| 2 (older than spkr) (same age as spkr) (yngr than spkr) | dron | ní- | (older) | dronnyo | ní- |
| | gata | ta- | (same age) | gatanyo | ta- |
| | kah | ka- | (younger) | kahnyo | ka- |
| 3 (older or same) (yngr or neuter) | gopnyan | gí- | (older) | awa'nyan | gí- |
| | jih | ji- | (younger) | | ji- |

TABLE I

I have argued elsewhere (Lawler (1975a)) for the existence of a set of cyclic rules in Achenese (hereafter Ac), including Equi, Raising, and Passive. Ac Equi works very much like English Equi, except that in most cases the verbs in the complement retain their agreement markers (i.e. they are "finite"). The following is an example of Equi:

- (1)a uring nyan gí-ut⁰ aha ba? gí-cu límō nyan
 human that 3o-attempt irr 3o-steal cow that
 'The man attempted to steal the cow'
- b ani? nyan ji-ut⁰ aha ba? ji-cu límō nyan
 child that 3y-attempt irr 3y-steal cow that
 'The child attempted to steal the cow'

Note that the gí- appears twice in (1)a, in the upstairs S and downstairs in the complement as well, while ji- appears in (1)b. This shows the agreement.

Ac Passive is an unusual rule; it consists of promoting the object to subject and demoting the subject to a chômeur in a lé-phrase, which cannot ordinarily be deleted, while retaining the same agreement on the verb. Thus, the verb agrees with the demoted subject, not the derived subject. (2) is an example of Ac Passive:

- (2)a dron ka ní-ninging lón
 you perf 2o-see I
 'You (already) saw me'

Fi
si
NF
wi
Ra

(4)
cyc

Note
agre
with
ever
it i:
theo:

place
ment
Howe
ical
entia
is no
strai
on cy
pleme
there

- (2)b lón ka ní-ning lé-dron
 I perf 2o-see by-you_o
 'I was seen by you'

Finally, Raising, like English Raising, is easy to confuse with Equi; in fact, since there is no overt complementizer, it is difficult to tell whether the NP in question has been raised to object position or not; for this reason, I will give here an example of Raising (to object position), (3)a, and one of Raising followed by Passive on the higher cycle (3)b:

- (3)a hakém gi-dawa jih ka ji-cu límō nyan
 judge 3o-consider he_e per 3y-steal cow that
 'The judge considers^y him to have stolen the cow'
- b jih gi-dawa lé-hakém ka ji-cu límō nyan
 he 3o-consider by-judge perf 3y-steal cow that
 'He^y is considered by the judge to have stolen the cow'

The arguments for the cyclicity of these three rules are summarized by (4)-(6), which are 'sandwich' cases of rules feeding each other in separate cycles:

- (4) límō nyan gi-dawa lé-hakém ka ji-cu lé-jih
 cow that 3o-consider by-judge perf 3y-steal by-he_y
 'The cow is considered by the judge_e to have been stolen^y by him!
 [Passive downstairs feeds Raising, which feeds Passive upstairs]
- (5) jih ní-yu lé-dron ba? gi-pirét^θ a lé-do?tó
 he 2o-ask by-you_o irr 3o-examine by-doctor
 'He^y was asked by you_o to be examined by the doctor'
 [Passive downstairs feeds Equi, followed by Passive upstairs,
 which would bleed Equi]
- (6) jih ji-ut^θ aha ba? gi-dawa lé-hakém ji-cu límō nyan
 he_y 3y-attempt irr 3o-consider by-judge 3y-steal cow that
 'He^y made an attempt to be considered by the judge to have
 stolen the cow'
 [Raising on dawa cycle feeds Passive, which feeds Equi on
ut^θ aha cycle]

Note that in all cases, the verb agrees with its logical subject, and does not agree with the derived subject. This is very strange behavior. Most languages with verb agreement with subjects agree with cyclic subjects. I believe, however, that there is a reason why Ac agreement works the way it does, although it is not a reason which is capable of being handled straightforwardly in a theory of grammar that employs derivations.

Many interesting facts about Ac agreement emerge when we study the places where it does not apply. For example, the normal situation in complement Ss with Equi, as noted above, is for the agreement prefixes to be retained. However, there are some verbs which have an apparent restriction on the logical subject of the complement clause, to the effect that it must be coreferential with the governing NP in the higher clause, normally a subject. This is not unlike the English Equi-subject constraint, except that this is a constraint on logical structure, where the normal English case is a constraint on cyclic structure.² All such Ac verbs take no agreement prefixes on the complement verbs; one such verb is ci 'try'. Thus, (7)a is ungrammatical, since there is an agreement prefix on cu 'steal'.

- (7)a *t^θiʔali ji-ci ji-cu lɨmō nyan
pa-Ali 3y-try 3y-steal cow that
- b t^θiʔali ji-ci cu lɨmō nyan
pa-Ali 3y-try steal cow that
'Ali tried to steal the cow' 3

Not surprisingly, the complements of Equi-subject verbs like ci may not have Passive applied in them. Since the constraint is on logical structure, and since Equi must operate on subjects, Passive would bleed it. Thus (8) is ungrammatical in Ac.

- (8) *t^θiʔali ji-ci ni-ning lé-dron
pa-Ali 3y-try 2o-see by-you_o

Note that Passive is blocked here in a structure which blocks agreement. Another such case where agreement is barred is in relative clauses, and here there is an extremely interesting phenomenon.

In common with most Indonesian languages, Ac employs a relative marker (nyeng) which precedes the clause and follows the head noun. The subject of the clause is deleted under identity with the head noun. In normal relatives, agreement is blocked. Thus (9)a is ungrammatical, since there is an agreement morpheme present in the relative clause:

- (9)a *urɨng nyeng ji-ning dron tɨŋge di-móntat^θi 4
human rel 3y-see you_o live at-Montasi
- b urɨng nyeng nging dron tɨŋge di-móntat^θi
human rel see you_o live at-Montasi
'The person who saw you lives in Montasi'

However, Passivization is possible in relative clauses in Ac, and where it occurs, the agreement marker is not only grammatical, but obligatory. Thus, (10)b is ungrammatical, since there is no agreement morpheme present in the relative:

- (10)a urɨng nyeng ni-ning lé-dron tɨŋge di-móntat^θi
human rel 2o-see by-you_o live at-Montasi
'The person who was seen by you lives in Montasi'
- b *urɨng nyeng nging lé-dron tɨŋge di-móntat^θi
human rel see by-you_o live at-Montasi

Since there is never any optionality about the presence or absence of the agreement marker in the relative, and since the only agreement markers that can occur in the Passive are ones that agree with the demoted subject, rather than with the derived subject that has been deleted by relativization, this has the curious effect of producing dis-agreement in relatives. That is, the only agreement prefixes that are present in relative clauses are the ones that don't agree with the head noun, and such prefixes are always present; if they did agree with that NP, they would be deleted obligatorily. In relative clauses, then, we have a case where agreement is blocked, except when Passive has applied. This is in sharp contradistinction to the case with Equi-subject verbs, where agreement is blocked, and so is Passive.

These facts, and the fact that agreement is obligatory in both active and Passive normal Ss, lead us initially to posit a hierarchy of constraints, with some interesting properties. Table II gives the constraints, in order.

- 1) Equi-subject constraint: bars agreement in complement Ss of Equi-subject verbs.
- 2) Passive constraint: requires agreement in Ss where Passive applies.
- 3) Relativization constraint: bars agreement in relative clauses.
- 4) Normal Agreement constraint: requires agreement of verbal predicates with their subjects.

TABLE II

The constraints in Table II predict completely the appearance of agreement morphemes in Ac, provided they are applied in order of strength, with the strongest winning in case of disputes. There are some interesting properties in this table: note, for example, that the odd-numbered constraints block agreement, while the even-numbered ones require it; such a see-saw effect is unusual.

This interaction among constraints is a solution to a dilemma in which Ac has found itself, and can be further explicated. This explication will have recourse to two facts: (a) Passive cannot occur unless there is an agreement morpheme; put another way, the output of Passive is ill-formed unless there is an agreement morpheme which agrees with the logical subject in it; and (b) close binding of a verb to a prior structure is expressed by lack of agreement. The latter condition is familiar to linguists from English, where non-finite forms of the verb express many types of subordinate relationships, and where, in particular, there is a full range of forms from tensed verb to abstract noun, each of which, as Ross (1974) has demonstrated, signals an increasing degree of nouniness, and a lessened degree of verbiness. This is ordinarily no problem for a language to deal with, as there are plenty of mechanisms available to produce the forms, and these will give perceptual clues to the sense of the sentence. However, the first consideration intervenes in Ac.

The reason for this interference is that a number of processes in Ac are sensitive to the category 'subject'. This is hardly unusual; however, one of the most sensitive is relativization. In common with all Austronesian languages, Ac can relativize only subjects (see Keenan (1972) for details); furthermore, relatives are considerably more common and more useful in Ac than in some other (non-Austronesian) languages, and are extremely important. Since it is obviously worthwhile to be able to relativize elements which do not originate in LS as subjects, Austronesian languages tend to have complex and well-developed voice systems, which have the effect of being able to bring virtually anything within range of relativization. Ac, however, suffers from a lack of elaboration in its voice system; this is of a piece with the surprising paucity of morphology in Ac---there are only about half a dozen productive morphological processes, and all save the agreement morphemes are derivational in nature. Ac therefore is forced to use the agreement morphemes to amplify the voice system. Given these facts, it is not hard to see why the tendency to use non-finite forms in relatives is superseded by the necessity to have agreement morphemes present, in order to signal Passive. One of the major purposes of Passive is to be able to form relatives, after all; if they were blocked by something extraneous, the entire voice system would be subverted. This explains the fact that constraint (2) above outranks (3). Constraints (1) and (3), on the other hand, are the results of the same or similar trends---namely, the desire to express close semantic relationships by using non-finite forms. In the case of (1), the relationship is one of predication, and is not dissimilar

to that expressed in many languages by so-called "auxiliary verbs", which typically accompany non-finite verb forms; in the case of (3), the relationship is that of identification (description, restriction), and is paralleled in English by the relation of derived adjectives (which are non-finite) to fully-tensed relative clauses. Ac simply carries the correlation out more thoroughly, and since the major difference in Ac between adjectival and verbal predicates is the absence or presence of agreement, respectively, the relative clause constraint has the effect of making an adjective out of the verb in the relative clause, a process that is entirely in accord with the function and nature of a relative. It is instructive to note that Ac relative clauses with adjective predicates abound, and in them there is never any trouble about agreement; since adjectives are not transitive, they cannot be passivized, and the problem never arises:

- (11) ur̄ng nyeng t^θ akét t̄nge di-móntat^θ i
 human rel sick live at-Montasi
 'The person who is sick lives in Montasi'

In this light, then, it is not difficult to see why (2) outranks (3); and the supreme position of (1) is actually misleading. Since the relationship of the governor in the higher S is with the logical subject, Passive is blocked from the start for independent reasons, and there is in fact never any interaction between (1) and (2), and thus never any reason to have agreement, of whatever sort. This is not true of relative clauses; on the contrary, as we have seen, there is every reason to want to have derived subjects relativized, and when this is the case, Ac is willing to pay the price of having agreement present. However, the cost of this arrangement is cut by the device of never having real agreement present---the only kind that shows up is dis-agreement, and I suspect (not being a native speaker, I will probably never know for certain) that this is perceived as being the same kind of non-finiteness as the lack of agreement on adjectives and normal verbs in relatives.⁵ In any event, it signals adequately the anomalous state of affairs that obtains when you must not have an agreement morpheme, and at the same time you must.

Table II, then, while correct descriptively, masks a lot of what is going on in Ac. I suspect that this is because it is stated in terms of rules and derivations, necessarily without regard for the perceptual functions that agreement serves in Ac. What we should be talking about is a series of compromises among several conflicting tendencies, each of which is motivated by a different function which agreement morphemes express, and each of which is represented by a different agreement strategy. This is infinitely preferable to proposing ad hoc constraints on derivations, which is what Table II does.

Table III gives a revised version of the competing strategies from this perspective:

| Function | Strategy |
|--|--|
| a) Signal agreement between subject and verb | Verb agrees with subject |
| b) Signal Passive (i.e, presence of derived subject) | Verb agrees with <i>chômeur</i> agent |
| c) Signal close relationships of (e.g.) identification and predication | Verb has no agreement (i.e, is non-finite) |

TABLE III

In isolation, the strategies used to fulfill the functions are simple: (a) says the subject and the verb should agree, and they do, normally. (c) says that relatives and complements of Equi-subject verbs should have no agreement, and they don't, normally. (b), because of the fact that Ac uses its agreement system to signal Passive, complicates matters; normally, languages with subject-verb agreement have only functions (a) and (c), with the appropriate strategies, and the problem of disagreement does not arise. If function (b) is to be fulfilled, one or both of the other functions will be violated---in a normal S, the subject and verb will not be in agreement if the agreement is with the agent *chômeur*, thus violating (a), and in a relative clause, there will be some agreement on the verb, thus violating (c). This seems to be a price that Ac is willing to pay, since it is more important to signal the subject's status as derived than its status as subject, and there is sufficient redundancy in word order to make the surface syntax clear. (This, incidentally, explains why Ac has stricter word order than most Indonesian languages.) (a) and (c) themselves conflict to some extent (and this conflict extends to all languages with such agreement), but there seems to be little difficulty, in Ac or elsewhere, in resolving the problem. If the normal situation is the presence of agreement, its absence must signal something special, provided it can be determined just what the subject is without the help of agreement. And in a relative or an Equi-subject complement, the subject is always deleted under identity with some other NP, so agreement is not needed for this purpose; in addition, word order is very strict in these constructions, so that the verb can be placed in its correct perceptual slot without the benefit of agreement. Finally, the interaction of all three goals in Table III is resolved in favor of limited agreement---namely, dis-agreement in relative clauses, which seems to be an elegant compromise among all the things which the grammar should do with agreement prefixes.

We have seen, then, that consideration of two independent and perceptually-motivated facts about the uses of agreement morphemes introduces order and explanatory power into a confused set of data. We will not consider here any further the concept of "non-finiteness" and the implications of this concept as we have used it. This is not to say that it is unimportant---on the contrary, it is of extreme importance, and bids fair to be a universal; obviously much more serious thought is needed on this subject. However, the use of agreement to signal voice distinctions is emphatically not a universal, and the state of affairs in Ac is unusual, to say the least. We need to know more about just why Ac is able to do this, and why it feels it has to. In order to do this, we will look at one more syntactic rule in Ac, and then examine the Passive situation in two dialects of Indonesian.

Ac has a rule which I will here call Subject Pre-Clitic (SPC) (in Lawler (1975a) this rule is called Fronting II (FII), for reasons which are irrelevant to our discussion here, and are probably mistaken, to boot). It has the effect of substituting a full pronoun or noun for an agreement prefix coreferential to it, under certain conditions: a) obviously, there must be an agreement prefix to substitute for; and b) the logical subject of the S to which SPC applies may not be present as the surface subject. This latter condition may be met by Passive, where the logical subject is demoted, and where there is a derived subject, in which case the lé-phrase is not present, as in (12)b:

- (12)a *límō nyan ka gí-cu lé-gopnyan* [Passive]
 cow that perf 3o-steal by-he
 'The cow was stolen by him' °

- (12)b lĩmō nyan ka gopnyan-cu [Passive + SPC]
 cow that perf he -steal
 'The cow was stolen by him'

or by Raising or Equi, with or without Passive downstairs, as in (13)-(14), where there is no Passive in the complement:

- (13)a lón lón-pĩ'ingat do'tó ba' gi-pirét^θ a jih [Equi]
 I lpol-remind doctor irr 3o-examine he_y
 'I reminded the doctor to examine him'
 b lón lón-pĩ'ingat do'tó ba' gopnyan-pirét^θ a jih [Equi + SPC]
 I lpol-remind doctor irr he -examine he_y
 'I reminded the doctor to examine him himself'
 (14)a lón lón-dawa do'tó ka gi-pirét^θ a jih [Raising]
 I lpol-consider doctor perf 3o-examine he_y
 'I consider the doctor to have examined him'
 b lón lón-dawa do'tó ka gopnyan-pirét^θ a jih [Raising + SPC]
 I lpol-consider doctor perf he -examine he_y
 'I consider the doctor to have examined him himself'

A significant fact about this rule is that it is blocked in two places: in the complements of Equi-subject verbs, as in (15), and in active relative clauses, as in (16), even though both of these constructions meet condition (b) of the rule in that the logical subject is not the surface subject---in both cases they are deleted. In Passive relatives, however, it is fully grammatical, as in (17).

- (15)a do'tó gi-tém pirét^θ a jih
 doctor 3o-want examine he_y
 'The doctor wants to examine him'
 b *do'tó gi-tém gopnyan-pirét^θ a jih
 doctor 3o-want he -examine he_y
 (16)a do'tó nyeng pirét^θ a jih tĩngē di-móntat^θ i
 doctor rel examine he_y live at-Montasi
 'The doctor who examined him lives in Montasi'
 b *do'tó nyeng gopnyan-pirét^θ a jih tĩngē di-montat^θ i
 doctor rel he_o-examine he_y live at-Montasi
 (17) urĩng nyeng tĩngēh do'tó-pirét^θ a tĩngē di-móntat^θ i
 human rel prog doctor-examine live at-Montasi
 'The person the doctor is examining lives in Montasi'

In (17), note the use of a noun instead of a pronoun as a pre-clitic; this is less common, but possible. That the noun is in fact a pre-clitic and not a normal subject is shown by the fact that the particle tĩngēh (progressive) precedes it---this particle, like all others in Ac, is severely constrained in its word order, and must follow subject NPs and precede agreement prefixes (and clitics that fill their slot); there are no exceptions to this rule and thus the presence of the particle shows the operation of SPC. SPC is, of course, fed by Passive, which creates the derived subject urĩng 'person' which is deleted by the formation of the relative clause. This suggests that condition (a) on SPC means exactly what it says---that it is a substitution of a lexical item for an agreement morpheme, since the two places where condition (b) is met but the rule blocks are precisely those in which there is, for reasons we have already discussed, no agreement prefix on the verb. This is surely a

strange thing to do with an agreement morpheme, and raises questions about the status of the cliticized NPs as terms; these are discussed more extensively in Lawler (1975a). The pragmatic force of SPC is interesting, as well; it has the effect of focussing on the cliticized noun, essentially the same as contrastive stress in English, as indicated by the glosses for (12)-(14).

We will now consider how Passive is done in two dialects of Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia), which I will call BI_1 and BI_2 . BI_1 is the standard literary language, and is the usual textbook exemplar. BI_2 is a dialect examined recently by Chung (1975), which is distinguished from BI_1 for our purposes by the possibilities of the Passive. I should emphasize that I am not contrasting a "standard" language with one that has native speakers---there are native speakers for both dialects; due to a number of circumstances, Bahasa Indonesia is heir to a great deal of syntactic variation, and some dialects have achieved more status than others, for entirely irrelevant reasons.

In the two dialects, the prefix di- is the usual signal of the Passive. In BI_1 , however, this signal is restricted to third person---that is, to situations where the logical subject is third person. In BI_2 , it is not so restricted, and is the general passive marker for all persons. di- is cognate to Ac ji-, and in fact, di- is a common variant of ji- in some dialects of Ac; in addition, there is an Indonesian pronoun, dia 'third person' which bears clear relation to di-. All of the above suggests that BI_1 Passive, at least, is more similar to Ac Passive than might have been thought. The situation in the other persons (and numbers) of BI_1 is also interesting. Here there is a construction similar to the SPC construction in Ac. In this construction, the subject pronoun (nouns are forbidden) is cliticized to the verb, exactly as in Ac, but the conditions are different---SPC in BI_1 cannot apply to verbs in complements of Equi or Raising verbs, as it can in Ac, but is solely restricted to Passive cases---in addition, it is blocked in third person, where the di- form must be used. In BI_2 , on the other hand, SPC (which Chung (1975) calls "Object-fronting") can be used in all persons, independently of the di- Passive. Table IV presents the data in chart form:

| TABLE IV: | Ac | BI_1 | BI_2 |
|------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| A.Passive— | | | |
| persons: | { 1 [agree- | * | <u>di-</u> |
| | 2 ment mor- | * | <u>di-</u> |
| | 3 phemes] | <u>di-</u> | <u>di-</u> |
| B.Subject pre- | | | |
| clitic— persons: | { 1 OK | OK | OK |
| | 2 OK | OK | OK |
| | 3 OK | * | OK |

(18)-(19) are examples from Indonesian of the various constructions; asterisks refer only to BI_1 --- all are grammatical in BI_2 .

(18) buku itu di-baca oleh *saya/*kita/urang itu/*saudara [Passive]
 book that di-read by I / we / human that/ you
 'The book was read by me/us/that man/you'

(19) buku itu saya-/kita-/*dia-/*mereka-/saudara-baca [SPC]
 book that I-/ we-/ he-/ they-/ you-read
 'The book was read by me/us/him/them/you'

Chung (1975) argues that in BI_1 there are two independent Passive rules: the di-Passive and SPC (which she calls "Object-fronting"). This explanation will obviously not suffice for Ac, since the data from Equi and Raising complements ((13)-(14)) clearly shows that SPC is not a Passive rule at all in Ac, but rather a rule that can be fed by Passive, among others. We must then propose a "one-Passive" analysis for Ac, and, if Chung is correct, a "two-Passive" analysis for BI_2 . This leaves us with BI_1 to deal with; will we have to resort to $1\frac{1}{2}$ Passives? A glance at Table IV will tell us that Ac and BI_2 have far more in common than either one has with BI_1 , yet they are the end points on the cline of Passives; BI_1 has exactly one way to make a Passive in any given situation, but it is not always the same way, whereas BI_2 has two ways in which to make Passives in all cases. The problem seems to be the status of SPC as a Passive rule. In Ac it is clearly not one; in BI_1 it seems to be one, and in BI_2 there is some doubt; Chung's claim that it is a second Passive is at least open to some questions.⁶

In discussing this matter, however, let us not be led astray by considerations of whether Chung is correct in her di-Passive theory for BI_1 . Her argumentation is sound, and she describes the data fully--the fact of the matter is that such an analysis can be maintained for BI_1 , on the evidence. What I am concerned with is the processes that can lead to a situation like that in Ac and BI_1 , where the best available analyses give us results that do not reflect the obvious close affinity among the three languages. What processes make such analyses maintainable? Basically, they are of two types: real and illusory. The former represents actual changes in the syntax of the languages, as they are perceived by the speakers and listeners; in the latter I would include all theoretical perspectives which fail to ask the questions that will lead us to the real processes, and which force us to posit analyses that cannot capture them, even if we should chance to stumble across them. Among these I number the notion of "derivation" as generative linguists normally use it. (See Lawler (1975b) for further discussion of the inadequacy of derivations)

I would like to suggest that person markers and voice markers are intimately related, and that such a relationship is evident in all of the data we have examined here. A proper examination of the perceptual processing of language should tell us how and why they are related. I believe that one way of going about such an examination is by means of a "cognitive grammar" like that proposed by G. Lakoff and Thompson (1975a, 1975b). While the results are not all in yet, it appears that this schema has a chance to capture some of the generalizations that derivationally-based grammars cannot, while retaining those benefits that derivations were originally posited to reap. In a cognitive model, the hearer continually makes "guesses" as to the meaning of the S as it is being processed, and revises these guesses when further information is presented that changes the initial guesses. This has the benefit of taking into account real-time processing, and putting a premium on the signals that allow the hearer to decode the S properly. Obviously, one thing that the listener has to keep track of is what the subject is, and how it relates to the logical subject; in simple sentences, there is no problem, and no revisions need be made in the initial guess, but in Passives, there are two subjects, one derived and one logical, and both need to be accounted for. A simple form of a cognitive grammar of Ac (or English, since both are surface SVO languages) will assign the first NP encountered in the S to the location marked "subject". If a Passive marker is encountered this NP will be removed from that location and placed in the "object" file. The difference between English and Ac is that Ac gives further information with its Passive signal, in that it gives the per-

son and (sometimes) the number of the NP with which to refill the "subject" file; English grammar has to leave a dummy, which is sometimes not filled, since the agent may be deleted. BI_1 , regardless of the details of its Passive(s), gives precisely the same information as Ac, since the di- Passive is specific for third person, and SPC by itself gives information as to the person and number of the logical subject as it signals Passive. BI_2 can do either, and therefore has a pragmatic distinction to exploit; similarly, Ac can use SPC to give full information immediately as to the identity of the logical subject, thereby stressing the importance of such identity. If SPC has applied, then, in Ac or BI_2 , the listener has full information as to the identity of the subject and object before the verb has been processed; in a language which is not verb-final, such specificity is unusual, and signals special pragmatic force. BI_1 has SPC, but here it is restricted to 1st and 2nd persons, and there are very few exploitable distinctions in these persons ---Ac Passive gives as much information without SPC. In third person, however, there are many persons and objects that ji- or gi- can refer to, and by cliticizing them, Ac conveys the pragmatic force of emphasis; this is lacking in BI_1 with either form.

In sum, then, there are several points worth thinking about: (1) Ac agreement is unusual, but can be explained in terms of function, and is not at all surprising when viewed from a perceptual viewpoint; agreement and voice have an intimate relationship, as is predictable from a perceptual model; and (3) regardless of the lengths to which derivational models force us in analyzing particular models, it is necessary to account at some point for the changes that have occurred to make the languages so different---I suggest that a perceptual view of the Passive situation in the languages under discussion here makes better sense of the processes of diachronic change than a derivational one, and that alone is enough to argue for its adoption.

==*

NOTES

0. I wish to thank Drs. Idris Ibrahim, our informant, and Russ Tomlin, Jeff Dreyfuss, Roy Cayetano, Roger Mills, and Phil Tedeschi for much help in threading through the wilds of Achenese grammar. Helpful advice is also gratefully acknowledged from Pete Becker, Charlie Pyle, Ann Borkin, Sandy Chung, and Ed Keenan, and a special word of thanks for Paul Postal for motivating this study and my other work on Achenese in the first place. None of the above should be taken as an indication that any of the above people agree with what I say here.

The terminology used in this paper (and in Lawler (1975a)) in describing Ac Passive and other rules and processes is primarily generative, despite the fact that the point of this paper, at least, is that generative derivationally-based grammars are inadequate to describe and explain the phenomena under discussion. This is because I don't know any other way to describe the phenomena yet, and have had to rely on the (admittedly) incorrect terminology I grew up with. I hereby beg the reader's pardon, without, I hope, begging the question also.

1. The Achenese phonological system is considerably complex, and I have not come close to solving its mysteries. The transcription I use here is fairly close to phonetic, and has the following idiosyncracies: acute accent over vowels [é], [ó] denotes high mid; low mid is unmarked. Tilde [˜] over

vowels denotes phonemic nasalization. [ny] denotes [ñ], and [ng] denotes [ŋ]. There are three types of nasal consonants in Ac: plain, aspirated (which do not occur in the data in this paper), and "funny"; these latter are marked by a háček over the nasal, and represent a consonant with oral closure in the appropriate place, but with significantly less nasal opening, less air passed through the nose, and a slightly longer duration. They represent the historic fate of some Proto-Indonesian nasal+voiced stop clusters, but not all. Pepet [ě] represents phonetic schwa [ə], of which there are probably three or four different types. Word stress is on the final syllable. For further details see Lawler (1975a).

2. Thus many English speakers do not find (20) ungrammatical:

(20) *He tried to be examined by Dr. Smith.

even though it violates the Equi-subject constraint if it is stated as a constraint on deep or logical subject, since Passive has created the victim of Equi; this must be viewed as a case of required Equi, with the constraint on cycle-final structure.

3. Belatedly, the abbreviations used in the interlinear translations of examples are: pa=personal article; irr=irrealis mode; perf=perfective aspect; rel=relative marker; prog=progressive aspect; lpol=1st person polite agreement marker; 2o=?nd person older than speaker agreement marker; you=?nd person older than speaker personal pronoun; 3y=third person younger^o than speaker (or neuter) agreement marker; he_y=third person younger than speaker personal pronoun, etc. Prefixes and prepositions are separated by hyphens from their heads for convenience.
4. tinge, the predicate of the matrix S in this S, is a lexical adjective, and does not take agreement prefixes. This is irrelevant to the point under discussion.
5. In fact, I suspect that it has exactly the type of non-finiteness (and for exactly the same reasons) found in English past participles, which are notoriously easy to confuse with Passives.
6. Some (including the present author) would prefer to avoid the difficulties encountered here by denying Chung's hypothesis, especially in view of the evidence that Ac is a one-Passive language, and that the BI di-Passive is related to a system of agreement markers like that of Ac. The point at issue, however, is how one such system can change to another, regardless of the merits of Chung's theory.

REFERENCES

- Chung, Sandra (1975) On the Subject of Two Passives in Indonesian. MS, dittoed.
- Keenan, Edward (1972) Relative Clause Formation in Malagasy. In Chicago Which Hunt, CLS.
- Lakoff, G. & H. Thompson (1975a) Introducing Cognitive Grammar. In BLS 1.
- _____ (1975b) Dative Questions and Cognitive Grammar. In this volume.
- Lawler, J. (1975a) A Agrees with B in Achenese: A Problem for Relational Grammar. To appear.
- _____ (1975b) Elliptical Conditionals and/or Hyperbolic Imperatives: Some Remarks on the Inherent Inadequacy of Derivations. In CLS 11.
- Ross, J.R. (1974) Nouniness. To have appeared.