Limited-Control Predicates In Western Austronesia: Stative, Dynamic, Or None Of The Above?

Maria Bardají I Farré, Sonja Riesberg, Nikolaus P Himmelmann

Limited-control predicates in western Austronesia: stative, dynamic, or none of the above?

Maria Bardají i Farré[1], Sonja Riesberg[1,2], Nikolaus P. Himmelmann[1]
[1]Universität zu Köln, [2]CNRS-LACITO

Abstract

In many western Austronesian languages, the fact that an agentive argument lacks full control is morphologically marked on the verb. The formatives used for this purpose are often also found on stative predicates, and it has been suggested that limited-control predicates are stative-like in that they denote the result state of a given eventuality. Here we argue that limited-control predicates differ from both stative and dynamic predicates, and constitute a category of their own. Limited-control marking primarily pertains to agentivity and not to aspectual structure, and, importantly, is only used when control is at issue. With respect to the frequent overlaps with stative morphology, we argue that historically speaking, limited-control and stative marking have a common origin. While the current investigation does not include a full account of the historical developments leading to two synchronically separate categories (stative and limited-control), we provide evidence for the hypothesis that perception predicates had a major role to play in this development.

1 Introduction

Many western Austronesian languages make a clear morphological distinction between dynamic and stative predicates. Dynamic predicates generally express actions and processes, whereas stative predicates denote states and properties. An example of the contrast between stative and dynamic predicates is provided in (1) from Totoli (Sulawesi, Indonesia). In (1)a, the root *aling* prefixed with the stative prefix *mo-* denotes a state ('be lost'). In (1)b, the same root is used transitively but still denotes a state, with the subject referring to an individual experiencing a state of loss. In (1)c, finally, the same root is used with dynamic affixation and then denotes an action ('remove').[1]

[1] All Totoli data used for the present study are available in the Totoli documentation collections by Leto et al. (2005–2010) and Bracks et al. (2017–2020).
Totoli examples are represented according to the following conventions. Elicited data are signaled by the use of standard punctuation and capitalization both in the vernacular text and the translation. Spontaneous spoken data are given in intonation units (one unit per line), do not use initial capitalization, and do not follow standard punctuation conventions. In examples from spontaneous speech, we also provide a label indicating the name of the recording and the number of the intonation unit.
Examples that involve morpho-phonologically complex processes are represented in four lines (vernacular, morpheme breaks, interlinear gloss, free translation); all other examples have only three lines (morpheme breaks are indicated directly in the vernacular line).
Examples from Totoli are not marked as such, while examples from other languages are preceded by the language name. Punctuation and capitalization in the latter is as given in the sources. Glosses have been adapted for the sake of consistency.
Vowels in Totoli prefixes assimilate to the first stem vowel if this is a low or mid front vowel (i.e. /a/ or /e/). Otherwise the prefix vowel is /o/. See Himmelmann (1991) and Bracks (2020) for further details.
The capital letter *N* in prefixes such *moN-* or *poN-* represents a nasal that assimilates to, and in some cases substitutes, the initial consonant of the stem. Before a vowel, it is realized as a velar nasal. See Himmelmann (2005a:118–120) for further details.
The abbreviations in the glosses correspond to the following terms: ACT, actor of an undergoer voice; AND, andative; APPL, applicative; APRX, approximal (adverbial); AUTO.MOT, autonomous motion; AV, actor voice; BV, benefactive voice; CAU, causative; CPL, completive; CV, conveyance voice; DIR, directional particle; DirV, directional voice; DIST, distal (demonstrative); DV, dative voice; DYN, dynamic; EMPH, emphasizer; EXIST, existential operator; GEN, genitive; GV, goal voice; HON, honorific; INCL, inclusive; ITJ, interjection; LK, linker; LOC, locative; LV, locative voice; MED, medial (demonstrative); N, nasal; NEG, negation particle; NZ, nominalizer; OV, objective voice; PART, particle; PL, plural; PN, personal name; POT, potentive; PRX, proximal (demonstrative); PV, patient voice; Q, question word; RDP, reduplication; RLS, realis; RSTR, restrictive; SF, stem former; SG, singular; SPEC, specifier; ST, stative; UV, undergoer voice; VEN, venitive.

(1) a. *maaling* *sabatu* *hurup*
mo-aling sabatu hurup
ST-be.lost one letter

'one letter is missing/got lost' [brcst_lalampulan.4308]

b. *Aku* *kolobii* *nikaalingan* *badu.*
aku kolobii ni-ko-aling-an badu
1SG yesterday RLS.UV-**ST**-be.lost-UV2 shirt

'Yesterday I lost my shirt (more lit.: yesterday, I was in the state of having lost my shirt).'

c. *nialinganmoko* *tombo'namoko* *itu* *baki* *bau itu*
ni-aling-an=mo=ko tombo'[2]=na=mo=ko itu baki bau itu
RLS.UV-be.lost-APPL2=CPL=AND throw:UV1=3SG.GEN=CPL=AND DIST head fish DIST

'he removed it and threw it away, the head of that fish' [podok_langgat.280]

As shown by these examples, Totoli verbal predicates are generally marked for mood (realis vs. non-realis, with non-realis not indicated in the glosses) and symmetrical voice (actor vs. undergoer voice). The fact that stative predicates also occur in different voices as in (1)b will be of major concern in the present investigation. Symmetrical voice alternations are further illustrated in section 2. Our investigation here is confined to western Austronesian symmetrical voice languages.

In addition to mood and voice marking, there are very productive applicative and causative derivations, which formally overlap in some instances with basic voice marking. Thus, the marking of the (stative) undergoer voice in (1)b and the applicative in (1)c both involve the suffix *-an* (cp. Himmelmann & Riesberg 2013 and Riesberg et al. 2021 for a detailed argument for distinguishing the two formations and an overview of the voice and applicative paradigms). Furthermore, some paradigms also include morphologically unmarked forms such as the (non-realis) undergoer voice form *tombo'* in (1)c.

Lexical bases such as *aling* 'be lost' and *tombo'* 'throw' differ with regard to dynamicity: *aling* is a stative base that occurs directly with stative morphology as in (1)a and b, but requires applicative or causative derivation in order to allow for dynamic morphology (as in (1)c). The base *tombo'*, on the other hand, is dynamic and allows for direct affixation with dynamic voice-mood morphology, but not with stative *mo-*. The distinction between dynamic and stative predicates thus holds not only on the level of morphosyntactic words, but also on the level of lexical bases. In Totoli, the western Austronesian language of primary concern here, many bases are either stative or dynamic, but some bases have to be classified as both dynamic and stative, as will be illustrated further below. The distribution of dynamic and stative lexical bases, however, is an area of significant variation across western Austronesian languages, with some Philippine languages like Tagalog making a much less clear-cut distinction between them (cp. section 3, and Himmelmann 2006, 2008:268ff for discussion and examples). Yet, for most languages it holds that dynamic predicates can be derived from stative bases by means of additional morphology such as causative and applicative derivation.

Apart from distinguishing stative from dynamic predicates, many western Austronesian languages make a further morphological distinction between predicates referring to eventualities where the more AGENT-like argument is not in full control of the unfolding event, and dynamic predicates that are neutral with regard to control and thus may refer to either controlled or uncontrolled eventualities. This contrast is illustrated by the example pair in (2). In (2)b, the event denoted by *taip* 'slice' is explicitly marked by the prefix *ko-* as having been performed accidentally. The default reading for (2)a is that the AGENT was in full control of the action, though this implicature can be cancelled (see further discussion in section 4.4).

[2] Word-final laterals in Totoli are regularly omitted, with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. They are represented by <'> in the practical orthography used here. The lateral is realized when a suffix is added to the based, hence *tombol-an* (with an applicative suffix). See further Himmelmann (1991) and Bracks (2020).

(2) a. *Ni-taip* *inang=ku* *taipang.*
RLS.UV-slice mother=1SG.GEN mango

'My mother sliced the mango.'

b. *Nikataipan* *inangku* *taipang.*
ni-ko-taip-an inang=ku taipang
RLS.UV-**POT**-slice-UV2 mother=1SG.GEN mango

'My mother accidentally sliced the mango.'

The major point of interest here is the fact that limited-control predicates as in (2)b overlap in their morphological marking with stative predicates. Thus, in (1)b the stative predicate is marked by the affix combination *ni-ko--an,* which is also found on the limited-control predicate in (2)b. As we will further illustrate in section 2, the degree to which stative and limited-control predicates morphologically overlap varies significantly across western Austronesian languages, ranging from almost total separation to total overlap.

In cases where limited-control predicates differ morphologically from stative predicates, they are referred to by a wide range of terms in the Austronesianist literature, including *accidental, involuntary, non-volitional, non-volitive, abilitative, potential, ability and involuntary action verbs,* etc. Here we use the term *potentive,* following Rubino (1997) and Himmelmann (2004). In cases of total overlap, it is common practice not to distinguish between stative and limited-control predicates. Instead, the relevant forms are simply labelled *stative* and then different uses of these forms are distinguished. Kroeger (1990), for example, mentions 'possibility', 'attempted action', and 'non-volitional actions' among the uses of the stative affixes in Kimaragang (Sabah, Malaysia).

The latter practice suggests that potentives are essentially stative with regard to eventuality type, though this is rarely made explicit. A major exception is Dell's (1983) classic paper on the topic, which is entitled *An aspectual distinction in Tagalog*, where 'aspectual' refers to eventuality types. Tagalog is a language where the morphological overlap between statives and potentives is only partial. As will be further discussed in sections 4.1 and 5, Dell claims that potentive marking here changes the aspectuality type from dynamic to stative. Importantly, Dell only compares dynamic and potentive uses of the same lexical bases (as in (2), where dynamic *nitaip* is contrasted with potentive *nikataipan*). He does not address the extent to which potentives are actually similar to stative predicates proper. It is the main goal of the present investigation to further explore this issue.

We argue that potentive marking does not directly change aspectual structure, though in some instances it may have consequences for aspectual interpretation. Furthermore, potentive marking also does not change argument structure proper, that is, the number and the thematic role of the core arguments lexically entailed by the predicate. Such a change would be implied by changing a dynamic predicate into a stative one, because dynamic predicates typically include an agentive argument, while stative ones lack them by definition. What potentive marking does change is the degree of control normally attributed to the AGENT or EXPERIENCER argument in eventualities that include such arguments, as implied by widely used labels such as *involuntary* or *non-volitional*.

While these labels point in the right direction, we further show that, to date, the semantic properties of potentives have not been properly analyzed. Following leads in the literature on limited-control predicates in Salishan languages (see Davis & Matthewson 2009 and Jacobs 2011 for discussion and further references), we claim that 'limited control' is the core meaning of Austronesian potentives, which underlies both involuntary and accidental uses of the potentive. Identifying this core meaning is a prerequisite for a proper comparison of potentives and statives.

Our comparison of potentives and statives in section 5 shows that the two predicate types clearly differ semantically as well as syntactically. This raises the question as to how the pervasive morphological overlap between these two types of predicates can be accounted for (it is not likely to be a historical coincidence, cp. section 2). A full diachronic account of the overlap is beyond the scope of the current investigation. We believe, however, to be in a position to point to two factors that are likely to be important in this regard. First, western Austronesian statives marked with a prefix of the shape *mV-*

typically denote result states next to pure states, especially when accompanied by completive markers. And there is a cross-linguistically well attested link between completion marking and limited control (Fauconnier 2013). Second, for certain types of predicates, including in particular perception predicates, there is a systematic ambiguity between an intransitive (result) state reading and a transitive limited-control reading, suggesting that these predicates have a major role to play in the development of dedicated potentive marking, as further discussed in section 6.

Importantly, for our overall argument regarding the (synchronic) relationship between statives and potentives, the fact that a form denoting result states may be the original source for potentive marking does not mean that potentives synchronically denote result states. Rather, we would argue that once potentive uses are fully productive and grammaticized, potentives constitute a grammatical category of their own, which shares properties both with dynamic and with stative predicates. Hence, the short answer to the question in the title of this paper is "none of the above".

On a more general, theoretical level, the present investigation is based on, and provides further support for, the position that event structure and argument realization are determined by at least four partially independent, but also closely intertwined factors. As Levin & Rappaport Hovav (2005:128) put it, "four broad types of semantic factors play a role in argument realization: causal notions, aspectual notions (e.g. telicity, incremental theme), event complexity, and notions such as sentience, animacy, and volitionality."[3] The last-mentioned notions (sentience, animacy, and volitionality), in our understanding, also include 'control' (see further section 4). Here, we call them agentivity-related notions and speak more generally about 'low' or 'high agentivity' in reference to eventualities where they play a role. To a considerable degree, agentivity is referent-based;[4] that is, it depends on the referent of a linguistic expression whether it can be conceived of as being agentive or, in other words, able to control an eventuality. An (adult) human is the prototypical agentive argument, stones and trees are typically not agentive.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, we provide the morphological evidence for similarities and differences between stative and potentive predicates. To do this, we briefly introduce the voice alternations of stative and potentive predicates, as the wide-spread similarities make clear that the overlap is unlikely to be due to chance. Section 3 makes more precise the notion of 'stative predicate' as used in the current investigation. Most importantly, it is only one particular type of stative predicate that is relevant here, namely stative predicates marked with the non-realis prefix *mV-* or its realis counterpart *nV-*, and related voice alternations containing the prefix *kV-*.[5]

In section 4, we turn to potentive predicates and argue that 'limited control' is the meaning component that captures best what all their uses have in common. An important part of the argument pertains to the fact that ability readings of potentives are restricted to *external* ability, a point not clearly recognized in the literature so far. Furthermore, we show that dynamic predicates are underspecified for control; that is, they may refer to controlled as well as uncontrolled eventualities. Potentive marking is only used whenever control in a particular eventuality is at issue.

In section 5, aspectual and argument-structural properties of stative and potentive predicates are directly compared to each other with the goal of delimiting more precisely where they overlap and where they differ. We argue that, contrary to some proposals in the literature, potentive marking does not primarily bring about a change in aspectual structure, but rather signals limited control on the part of the agentive argument, which in turn may have repercussions for aspectual structure. Section 6, finally, turns to the problem of explaining the pervasive morphological overlap between statives and potentives in western Austronesian. We speculate that perception predicates are of relevance in this regard.

[3] "Causal notions" refers to the observation that many events can be analyzed as involving causal chains where an initiating participant brings about a change in another participant (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2005:117–125). "Event complexity" pertains to the idea that events may consist of subevents that together form a coherent complex event, causatives and resultatives being standard examples (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2005:112–117).
[4] The other major factor relevant in this regard are verbal entailments in the sense of Dowty 1991, most importantly the proto-agent entailments cause and autonomous motion.
[5] In the remainder of the paper, we use "*mV*-(marked)" as a shorthand for referring to the full stative paradigms exemplified in section 2.

To date, the commonalities and differences in the syntax and semantics of potentive and stative predicates have received little attention in the literature, a major exception being earlier work by Himmelmann (Himmelmann & Wolff 1999; Himmelmann 2004, 2006). A further, very recent exception is Hauk (2019), which in turn builds on Himmelmann (2006). Hauk (2019) frames the issue as an either-or problem: either statives and potentives belong to different categories or they belong to a single supercategory, called 'non-volitional'. Category status, in this view, essentially depends on morphological marking. If there are morphological differences, we are dealing with two categories, otherwise, there is a single overarching category. Here we argue for a more complex and nuanced view. As we will show in section 2, even on the morphological level, things are less clear-cut than it might appear in Hauk's presentation.

In concluding this introduction, two notes of caution are in order. First, while the title uses 'western Austronesia' to delimit the languages under discussion, strictly speaking, this paper is mostly about the northern Central Sulawesi language Totoli and, secondarily, about Tagalog. The authors are most familiar with these two languages and, more importantly, have first-hand data on statives and potentives at their disposal. For most other western Austronesian languages, the information on statives and potentives is often scant, often hardly going beyond the basic morphological information we present in section 2. The little that is known about their syntax and semantics, however, makes it clear that significant variation across the languages is to be expected. Hence, we often confine claims and observations specifically to Totoli or Tagalog. More general claims regarding the group as a whole should be read *cum grano salis*.

Second, for western Austronesian languages aspectual structure is an under-researched topic, with even the most basic questions unanswered (but see Walton 1986, Boutin 1994, and Travis 2000, 2005 for important contributions). This includes the two languages of primary interest to us, Totoli and Tagalog, where it is not clear what the full inventory of aspectual distinctions looks like and how different levels of morphological marking, including voice-mood morphology, reduplication, and postverbal particles, affect the aspectual meaning of a clause. In referring to eventuality types, we mostly make use of the widely known time schemata proposed by Vendler (1957), with the caveat that a fuller investigation is needed before it can be concluded that the relevant distinctions actually exist in the language(s) at hand. Specifically, we use 'state', 'activity' and 'transitive accomplishment' in Vendler's sense, but will avoid 'achievement', as this term has been used in particularly diverse ways. Instead, we will refer to *punctual events* for eventualities such as 'explode', 'arrive', 'notice' and 'die', and to *gradual* (*bounded*) *processes* for eventualities such as 'grow', 'wilt', and 'corrode'. Punctual events and gradual processes have in common with each other, and with states, that they do not involve an agentive argument, unlike activities and transitive accomplishments.

2 The morphology of stative and potentive predicates: similarities and differences

As pointed out in section 1, statives and potentives share the same voice-mood morphology in many western Austronesian languages. The degree of similarity, however, varies significantly, which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been properly taken note of to date. As voice-mood forms typically come in paradigms (Himmelmann 2006), differences and similarities have to be assessed with regard to these paradigms. Thus, before illustrating the range of variation in the overlap between stative and potentive morphology, we briefly introduce the basic structure of voice-mood paradigms.

The defining feature of symmetrical voice alternations is that both actor and undergoer voice are transitive, but with reversed role alignments. In actor voice, the actor functions as subject argument, while the undergoer functions as non-subject core argument, defined by its obligatory immediate post-verbal position. In undergoer voice, the undergoer functions as subject and the actor as non-subject core argument (and hence occurs in immediate postverbal position). Example (3) illustrates this alternation between actor voice (a) and undergoer voice (b); a detailed discussion can be found in Riesberg (2014).

(3) a. *Inangku* *nanaip* *taipang.*
inang=ku noN-taip taipang
mother=1SG.GEN AV.RLS-slice mango

'My mother sliced a/the mango.'

b. *Taipang* *ana* *ni-taip* *inang=ku.*
mango MED RLS.UV-slice mother=1SG.GEN

'My mother sliced the mango.'

In many languages of the Philippines, northern Borneo and the northern half of Sulawesi, but not, for example, in Balinese, Madurese or the many variants of Malay, voice forms typically come in two moods: realis (as in (3)) and non-realis. The non-realis form corresponding to actor voice *nanaip* in (3)a is *manaip*, while the non-realis form of undergoer voice *nitaip* in (3)b is *taip* (i.e. the bare stem). In actor voice, mood is widely marked by the alternation of an *m*-initial prefix with an *n*-initial prefix (e.g. non-realis *moN-* vs. realis *noN-*). In undergoer voice, realis mood is widely marked by a prefix (*ni-* or *i-*) or the infix <*in*>. There is no formative unambiguously signalling non-realis mood in undergoer voice. For better readability, the paradigms presented in the remainder of this section only include the non-realis forms.

Many western Austronesian languages, especially those that morphologically distinguish realis and non-realis mood, make use of more than one undergoer voice. The classic example is provided by Tagalog, where three different undergoer voices are formally differentiated. The patient voice (PV) form seen in (4)a is used for a broad range of more or less strongly affected undergoers. Locative voice (LV) is common when GOALS and RECIPIENTS occur in subject function, as in (4)b. In conveyance voice (CV), the subject is usually a THEME – an object that is being moved or transferred – as in (4)c.

(4) Tagalog[6]

a. *Li-linís-in* *ko* *ang* *kuwárto.*
RDP-clean-PV 1SG.GEN SPEC room

'I will clean the room.' (Himmelmann 1987:108)

b. *Pukúl-an* *mo* *ako* *ng* *prútas.*
throw-LV 2SG.GEN 1SG GEN fruit

'Throw some fruits to me.' (Himmelmann 1987:109)

c. *Ibinalik* *nila* *ang* *báta?.*
i-b<in>alik nila ang báta?
CV-<RLS>return 3PL.GEN SPEC child

'They returned the child.' (Himmelmann 2008:253)

d. *Ipangpúpútol* *ko* *na* *lang* *itong* *kutsílyo.*
i-paN-RDP-putol ko na lamang ito-ng kutsílyo
CV-SF-RDP-cut 1SG.GEN now only PRX-LK knife

'I will just cut it with this knife.' (Wolff et al. 1991:367)

In some analyses, more than three undergoer voices are differentiated. In Tagalog, for example, an instrumental voice (IV) is sometimes distinguished in addition to the conveyance voice (CV), based on an additional stem-forming prefix. Compare (4)c with (4)d. In a similar way, a benefactive voice (BV) may be added to the inventory. There is also considerable variation in the terminology used. What is called *locative voice* in (4)b is often called *goal voice* (GV), *dative voice* (DV) or *directional voice* (DirV). Patient voice is sometimes called *objective voice* (OV).

[6] Acute accents in Tagalog examples indicate long vowels.

Importantly for current purposes, voice alternations are attested for lexical bases of all types, including stative ones. Stative bases typically occur with the prefix *mV-* when used intransitively, as in Totoli *mo-ongot* 'be sore'. In addition, many western Austronesian languages allow for derived transitive statives that take part in voice alternations. Stative actor voice constructions usually denote a non-volitionally caused state, as Totoli *noko-ongot* 'cause to become sore' in (5), with the CAUSE argument occurring in subject function and the affected argument in non-subject core function (= immediate post-verbal position).[7]

(5) *Mata ondo noko-ongot baki.*
eye day **ST**.AV.RLS-sore head

'The sun causes headaches.' (Lit. 'The sun makes the head sore.')

The corresponding realis undergoer voice marked by *ni-ko--an* also denotes a non-volitionally caused state, but in this case the CAUSE argument occurs in non-subject core function and the affected argument in subject function, as seen in (6).

(6) *Baduku nikabasoan udan.*
badu=ku ni-ko-baso-an udan
shirt=1SG.GEN RLS.UV-**ST**-wet-UV2 rain

'My shirt got wet on account of the rain.'

Potentive derivations allow for the same voice alternations as their dynamic counterparts. Example (7) shows corresponding actor voices, example (8) corresponding undergoer voices, and example (9) corresponding locative voices.

(7) a. *kurang sia mangaan daging*
kurang sia moN-kaan daging
less 3SG AV-eat meat

'she doesn't eat much meat' [conv_cl.550]

b. *ana makakaan sabatu*
ana moko-kaan sabatu
if **POT**.AV-eat one

'if one (fish) happens to bite (the bait)' [fishing_2. 323]

(8) a. *manuk tu kaan=na*
chicken DIST eat:UV1=3SG.GEN

'he eats the chicken' [chicken_eagle.275]

b. *kakaaninamoko to*
ko-kaan-i=na=mo=ko to
POT-eat-UV2=3SG.GEN=CPL=AND ITJ

'it (the fish) already happened to eat (bite) it, yeah?' [fishing_2.446]

(9) a. *Baleku niposumeokan saa.*
bale=ku ni-po-s<um>eok-an saa
house=1SG.GEN RLS.UV-SF-<AUTO.MOT>enter-LV snake

'A snake entered my room.'

[7] Formally speaking, this is not a causative construction. 'Proper' causatives can be derived from both dynamic and stative bases by prefixing *po-*.

b. *Bale ia ni-po-ko-tiing-an=ku seetan.*
house PRX RLS.UV-SF-**POT**-hear-LV=1SG.GEN devil

'I heard spirits in this house.'

The preceding examples of potentive actor and undergoer voices all involve the prefix *ko-*, which also occurs in stative voice alternations, as seen in (5) and (6). In many, but not all, of the languages investigated for this article, there is also a transitive potentive form marked solely with the prefix *mV-* shown in example (10).

(10) Tagalog (Himmelmann 2004:105)
na-dala ko ang libro
RLS.**POT**.PV-carried 1SG.GEN SPEC book

'I took the book by accident'

Formally, this potentive formation is identical to stative derivations with the prefix *mV-* illustrated in (1)a, which also simply consist of the prefix and the lexical base. But note that, while potentive *mV-* forms are transitive, stative predicates with *mV-* are always intransitive.[8] We return to this issue in section 5.3.

In the paradigms given in the following two subsections, the labels for the different voices are taken from the quoted sources, which generally follow the usage introduced at the beginning of this section. Note that voices with identical labels in different languages will typically not have identical functions and distributions. They are similar, but details vary significantly across languages. Note also that with regard to the stative-potentive distinction, we have to rely on the information published in grammars and other descriptive works. As noted in the introduction, this information is often sparse, and usually no in-depth analysis is provided. Thus, it is possible that the paradigms presented in the following do not provide a fully adequate picture of the morphological differences between potentive and stative marking in the language concerned. Still, we believe that they are adequate to support the main point we want to make here, that is, that the degree of morphological overlap between statives and potentives varies from language to language.

The remainder of this section is structured as follows. Section 2.1 presents the voice-mood paradigms for potentives and statives from a number of western Austronesian languages in three groups: languages where there is no overlap between the two paradigms; languages where there is partial overlap; and languages where the overlap is total (i.e. there is only a single paradigm allowing for stative and potentive uses). Section 2.2. turns to other morphological formations where stative and potentive forms differ, most importantly nominalizations.

2.1 Morphological overlap in voice-mood paradigms

We begin our survey with Arta (Philippines; Kimoto 2017), where stative prefixes differ from potentive ones not only in form but also in the number of voices available (Table 1).

Table 1 Arta potentive and stative paradigms

	POTENTIVE	**STATIVE**	
AV	maka-	tiC-	agentive.ST
PV	ma-	maŋa:-	patientive.ST
LV	ma- -an	makaN-	possessive.ST

[8] Throughout this paper, we consider potentive *mV-* predicates as undergoer voice forms on the basis of their non-potentive counterparts, which unequivocally are undergoer voice forms. With much of the literature, we consider it very likely that both stative *mV-* and potentive *mV-* historically derive from a formation that included the infix *-um-*. However, we are not sure that the original function of *-um-* is best characterized as marking actor voice.

CV	ma-; me:-	--

Another example for the total separation of the two paradigms is Sinama (Philippines), where potentive forms are marked by the prefixes shown in Table 2, whereas stative forms are unaffixed or combine with the infix <*in*> for an adversative meaning (Akamine 2005).

Table 2 Sinama potentive paradigm

	POTENTIVE	**STATIVE**
AV	maka-	unmarked
PV	ta-	
LV	kapaN-	
BV	ka-	
IV	tapaN-	

The complete separation of paradigms clearly shows that stative and potentive meanings can be treated as instances of two different morphosyntactic categories. In western Austronesia, however, fully distinct marking for the two functions is the exception rather than the rule.

Many western Austronesian symmetrical voice languages belong to a second group, where the potentive and the stative paradigms partially overlap. In these cases, potentive and stative actor voice forms are identical, while the locative and conveyance voices involve different formatives. Forms marked with m*V*- are transitive patient voice (PV) forms in the potentive paradigm (i.e. the undergoer functions as subject), while in the stative paradigm *mV*- forms are intransitive. The following paradigms from Tagalog (Table 3; Himmelmann 2005b) and Northern Alta (Philippines; Table 4; García Laguía 2018) illustrate typical paradigms of this type.

Table 3 Tagalog potentive and stative paradigms

	POTENTIVE	**STATIVE**	
AV	maka-	maka-	ST.AV
PV	ma-	ma-	ST
LV	ma- -an	ka- -an	ST.LV
CV	ma-i-	i-ka-	ST.CV

Table 4 Northern Alta potentive and stative paradigms

	POTENTIVE	**STATIVE**	
AV	me'e-	me'e	ST.AV
PV	me-	me-	ST
LV	me- -an	a- -an	ST.LV
CV	me'i-	i'a-	ST.CV

Toratán (Sulawesi, Indonesia; a.k.a. Ratahan; Table 5; Himmelmann & Wolff 1999) illustrates a different type of partial overlap. In this language, the formatives are identical across both paradigms but

the paradigms differ with regard to which voices are marked. There is no dedicated potentive marking for the patient voice. The stative paradigm, on the other hand, lacks an actor voice. With regard to the latter, it should be noted that actor voice derivations for statives are often not fully productive in western Austronesian languages, as noted, for example, for Tagalog by Himmelmann (2006:500).

Table 5 Toratán potentive and stative paradigms

	POTENTIVE	**STATIVE**	
AV	maka-	--	ST.AV
PV	--	ma-	ST
LV	ka- -an	ka- -an	ST.LV
CV	ka-	ka-	ST.CV

Totoli provides an interesting additional partial overlap scenario, which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been reported to occur elsewhere. In Totoli, there are *two* potentive paradigms. The 'standard' potentive paradigm (leftmost column in Table 6), which is attested with a broad range of dynamic lexical bases, lacks a *mV-* form, and thus only has three forms. That is, as shown in (2), repeated here as (11), for most dynamic bases, it is possible to derive a potentive form marked with *ko- -i* (or realis *ni-ko- -an*), but not with *mo-* (or realis *no-*). For a small group of verbs that includes perception predicates, however, the paradigm consists of four forms, with two different undergoer voices, as shown in the second column. This second paradigm is further discussed in section 6. In addition, both potentive paradigms differ from the stative paradigm with regard to the locative voice. Potentive locative voice formatives include the dynamic stem-forming prefix *po-*, which does not occur in stative locative voices (see also section 2.2).

Table 6 Totoli potentive and stative paradigms

	POTENTIVE	**POT.PERCEPTION**	**STATIVE**	
AV	mo-ko-	mo-ko-	mo-ko-	ST.AV
UV	--	mo-	mo-	ST
UV	ko- -i	ko- -i	ko- -i	ST.UV
LV	po-ko- -i	po-ko- -i	ko- -i	ST.LV

(11) a. *Ni-taip* *inang=ku* *taipang.*
RLS.UV-slice mother=1SG.GEN mango

'My mother sliced the mango.'

b. *Nikataipan* *inangku* *taipang.*
ni-ko-taip-an inang=ku taipang
RLS.UV-**POT**-slice-UV2 mother=1SG.GEN mango

'My mother accidentally sliced the mango.'

c. **Notaip inangku taipang*
For: 'My mother accidentally sliced the mango'

Finally, in a third, also quite large group of western Austronesian symmetrical voice languages, the overlap between the two morphological paradigms is total, the two categories thus not being formally

distinguishable. This third group is here illustrated with paradigms from Ilocano (Philippines; Table 7; Rubino 2005), Buol (Sulawesi, Indonesia; Table 8; Zobel 2005), Kimaragang (Table 9; Kroeger 1990, 2005), and Subanon (Philippines; Table 10; Hauk 2019). The form in the second line of each table functions as marker of both intransitive stative and transitive potentive patient voice predicates.

Table 7 Ilocano potentive and stative paradigms

	ST/POT
AV	maka-
ST/PV	ma-
DirV	ma- -an
CV	mai-
BV	mai- -an

Table 8 Buol potentive and stative paradigms

	ST/POT
AV	moko-
ST/PV	mo-, moi-
DV	ko- -an

Table 9 Kimaragang potentive and stative paradigms

	ST/POT
AV	ko-
ST/OV	o-
DV	o- -an
IV	ko-

Table 10 Subanon potentive and stative paradigms

	ST/POT
AV	moko-
ST/PV	mo-
GV	ko- -an

In the literature, the predicates formed with the affixes shown in Tables 7–10 are generally called ‘stative’. Their potentive uses are rarely discussed in full. Rather, it is typically only noted that stative predicates allow for ‘accidental’ or ‘abilitative’ uses when combined with dynamic lexical bases.

While the preceding paradigms share many similarities, each paradigm formally differs in a number of regards from all the others. If the overlap between potentives and statives were purely coincidental, it would be surprising that identical forms for potentives and statives are found again and again, across a

number of languages that are not very closely related in terms of their geography and the genetic subgroups they belong to. We therefore believe that it is warranted to base our investigation on the assumption that the morphological overlap between potentives and statives is not a historical coincidence.

2.2 Morphological differences in nominalizations

Voice-mood paradigms are not the only place where statives and potentives may differ with regard to their morphological marking. Rather, differences may be attested in other derivations as well, even in those cases where the voice-mood paradigms are identical. In Ilocano, for example, stative causatives are built with the prefix *ika-*, as in *ika-dakkél* (CAU.ST-big) 'enlarge', whereas potentive verbs take the same prefix as dynamic causatives, namely the prefix *pa-*, as in *maka-pa-dakkél* (POT-CAU-big) 'happen to cause to grow (as of vitamins)' (Rubino 2005:341–343). The option of using reduplication to derive progressive forms is another example, further discussed in section 5.2.

Here we are primarily concerned with differences in nominalization patterns, illustrated with data from Totoli. Unfortunately, this is a topic that is rarely properly addressed in the available descriptive sources of western Austronesian languages. Consequently, a more systematic survey is not possible at this point.

Totoli distinguishes three (event) nominalization processes,[9] one each for stative, potentive and dynamic bases. If the nominalized event is a dynamic one, the nominalized form consists of the prefix *poN-*[10] plus reduplication of the first syllable of the stem, as shown in (12). When the nominalized form expresses a potentive meaning, the lexical base is prefixed by *ko-* in addition to being prefixed with *poN-* and the reduplication of the first syllable of the stem, as in (13). Stative nominalizations are formed by the prefix *ko-* but they lack the prefix *poN-*. Again, the first syllable of the stem undergoes reduplication, as seen in (14)a. In the case of vowel-initial bases, a second *ko-* prefix is added before reduplication takes place, resulting in a form where *ko-* occurs twice, as seen in (14)b.

(12)

Paddaam	*inangku*	*badu*	*mopore*	*laus.*
po-RDP1-daam	inang=ku	badu	mo-pore	laus
NZ-RDP1-sew	mother=1SG.GEN	shirt	ST-good	very

'My mother's sewing of shirts is very good.'

(13)

Moporega	*pakkaalamu*	*kolobii*	*itu.*
mo-pore=ga	po-RDP1-ko-ala=mu	kolobii	itu
ST-good=RSTR	NZ-RDP1-SF.**POT**-fetch=2SG.GEN	yesterday	DIST

'What you managed to get yesterday is good.'

(14) a.

I	*aku*	*molinggo*	*dei*	*kabbaanita.*
i	aku	mo-linggo	dei	ko-RDP1-baani=ta
HON	1SG	ST-be.afraid	LOC	NZ.**ST**-RDP1-brave=2.GEN

'I am afraid of your braveness.'

b.

Kakkaate	*ponianan**mu***	*aku*	*dei*	*Palu.*
ko-RDP1-ko-ate	ponianan=mu	aku	dei	Palu
NZ.**ST**-RDP1-**ST**-dead	uncle=2SG.GEN	1SG	LOC	Palu

'When your uncle died, I was in Palu.'

As an aside, we may note that the formal differences between the three nominalization strategies provide an important diagnostic for determining whether a given lexical base is dynamic or stative. This is a

[9] The same differences are found in locative nominalizations, which differ from event nominalizations only by the addition of the suffix *-an* (e.g. *pollogoan* 'place for washing hands' [< *logo* 'wash hands']).
[10] Recall from footnote 1 that prefix vowels assimilate to stem vowels when these are mid or low front vowels. For vowel-initial roots, the nominalizing prefix is *pog-*. And it is *po-* rather than *poN-* for a number of consonant-initial bases.

problem that occurs in particular with lexical bases that are primarily attested with the prefix *mo-* such as *dabu* ‘fall’ or *sumbo*' ‘live’, because *mo-* in Totoli can mark either (dynamic) actor voice or stative forms. For instance, when an intransitive form is affixed by *mo-* (or *no-*) such as in (15)a and (16)a, there is no formal evidence for its status as a dynamic actor voice or a stative predicate. It thus depends on the dynamicity of the base whether these forms denote a (dynamic) process (e.g. ‘to fall’ and ‘to live’) or a (result) state (e.g. ‘fallen’ and ‘alive’). The form of the nominalization that is permitted for a given base (without any further stem-forming) here provides decisive evidence. In the case of *dabu*, only the stative nominalizing formatives are allowed, as shown in (15)b, suggesting that *dabu* is a stative base meaning ‘fallen’. In contrast, *sumbo*' in (16)b only allows the dynamic nominalizing affixes, suggesting that *sumbo*' is a dynamic base meaning ‘to live’.

(15) a.

Waktu	*nadabu*	*dei*	*dalan,*	*ingga*	*daan*	*tau*	*monurungi.*
waktu	no-dabu	dei	dalan	innga	daan	tau	moN-turung-i
time	**ST**.RLS-fall	LOC	road	NEG	EXIST	person	AV-help-APPL2

‘When fallen on the road, there was no one who could help.’

b.

Kaddabuna	*dei*	*dalan,*	*ingga*	*daan*	*tau*	*monurungi.*
ko-RDP1-dabu=na	dei	dalan	ingga	daan	tau	moN-turung-i
NZ.**ST**-RDP1-fall=3SG.GEN	LOC	road	NEG	EXIST	person	AV-help-APPL2

‘During his/her state of having fallen on the road, there was no one who could help.’

(16) a.

mo-sumbo'	*dei*	*kota*
AV-live	LOC	city

‘(they) live in town’ [speech_1.096]

b.

siritaan	*possumbo*'
sirita-an	po-RDP1-sumbo'
story-APPL1	NZ-RDP1-live

‘tell about your life (your process of living)’ [explanation-wedding-tradition_ZBR.236]

The formal make-up of the three nominalization patterns suggests that potentives are somewhere in the middle ground between dynamic and stative verbs, sharing features with both of them (cp. Table 11). On the one hand, potentive nominalizations are formed with *poN-*, a trait shared with dynamic nominalizations. On the other hand, potentives and statives are similar in that they both make use of the prefix *ko-*, though in different positions. In the case of potentives, *ko-* appears in what can be analyzed as stem-forming function (immediately preceding the lexical base) to which then the nominalization formatives proper (*poN-* + RDP) are added. In the case of (consonant-initial) statives, *ko-* + RDP function as nominalizing formatives. (Vowel-initial statives are hybrid, showing *ko-* in both stem-forming and nominalizing functions.)

Table 11 Event nominalizations in Totoli

Dynamic	**Potentive**	**Stative**
poN- RDP-	poN- RDP- ko-	ko- RDP- ko- RDP- ko- (for vowel-initial roots)

But what exactly does it mean to say that potentives are “somewhere in the middle ground between dynamic and stative verbs”? Which semantic and syntactic features do they share with statives? Which with dynamic verbs? As we will argue in the remaining sections, there is some truth to the metaphor of the “middle ground”, but this metaphor also easily leads to misinterpretations. We begin our exploration of the relationship between potentives and statives by looking more closely at the syntax and semantics of statives in the next section.

3 The syntax and semantics of statives with *mV-*

Western Austronesian languages usually provide for a number of different ways to refer to states. Here we are only interested in formations with the prefix *mV-* (realis *nV-* in mood-marking languages), because only these formally overlap with potentives in the ways illustrated in section 2.[11]

Importantly for current purposes, intransitive forms with *mV-* may have two different meanings. They may be 'pure' statives, referring only to a state without any indication about its temporal boundaries (e.g. the predication *the wall is green* does not contain any indication as to whether the wall used to be, or will be at a later point in time, of a different colour). Or they may be result statives, referring to a state with an initial boundary and thus, indirectly, also to a change of state (e.g. a broken vase was unbroken at some point before entering the broken state). The latter are also known as *resultatives* or *inchoatives*. In Tagalog, these two uses are separated fairly strictly according to the lexical meaning of the base. With one class of lexical bases, *mV-* forms denote pure states as in (17). With another class, they denote result states as in (18).[12]

(17) Tagalog

mabahaʔ	'flooded'	< bahaʔ 'flood'
maganda	'beautiful'	< ganda 'beauty'
madaliʔ	'quick'	< daliʔ 'quickness'
mabáhay	'having many houses on it'	< báhay 'house'

(18) Tagalog

mahinog	'become ripe, ripen'	< hinog 'ripe'
mámúra	'become cheap'	< múra 'cheap'
madurog	'become crushed'	< durog 'crushed, splintered'
malúto?	'be/become cooked'	< lúto? 'cooked, cuisine'
mapútol	'get cut off'	< putol 'be.cut'
magálit	'become angry'	< galit 'angry'
magútom	'become/feel hungry'	< gutom 'hungry'

As seen in (18), roots can also denote states and properties by themselves, without further affixation. This is found not only in Tagalog, but in many other languages. However, in many of these other languages the distinction between pure and result states with regard to *mV-* forms is not as clearly made as in Tagalog. In Totoli, for example, most *mo-* statives in principle allow for both pure and result state readings. However, there are strong preferences for one or the other reading depending on mood marking and the meaning of the lexical base. Lexical bases that denote (more permanent) properties usually occur in non-realis mood and refer to pure states, as in (19). Lexical bases that denote the result state of a process, such as 'dry' in (20), usually occur in realis mood and refer to such a result state. Lexical bases that denote a bodily state, such as 'hungry' in (21), or an emotion, like 'afraid' in (22), are often ambiguous between a pure and a result state reading. The non-realis forms favor a pure state reading, while the realis forms often co-occur with the completive clitic *=mo* and favor a result state reading.

(19) *Mata=na* *mo-itom.*
eye=3SG.GEN **ST-**black

'Her eyes are black.'

[11] There is another prefix, *ter-/tV-*, widely attested in Malayic languages, which also allows for potentive and stative uses, but meaning and grammar differ significantly from *mV-*. Among other things, *ter-* forms are not part of voice paradigms. See Goddard (2003) for examples and discussion.

[12] Some of the lexical bases in (17) make use of a different derivation to form inchoatives, i.e. infixing <*um*> as in *gumanda* 'become/turn beautiful' (cp. Himmelmann 2008:268–274 for further discussion and exemplification).

(20) *njan no-tuu gula=na*
after **ST**.RLS-dry sugar=3SG.GEN

'when the sugar is dry' [red_sugar.330]

(21) a. *Anak ia maalom.*
anak ia mo-alom
child PRX **ST**-hungry

'This child is hungry.'

b. *injan naalommo*
injan no-alom=mo
after **ST**.RLS-hungry=CPL

'when (she) got hungry' [food.129]

(22) a. *mo-linggo deuk dei saa*
ST-afraid dog LOC snake

'the dog is afraid of the snake' [maptask_1.0560]

b. *ingga mangana itu no-linggo=mo ee*
NEG little.child DIST **ST**.RLS-fear=CPL EMPH

'no (they do not speak Totoli), those children are already afraid/ashamed (to do so)' [siote_2.251]

As shown by the above examples, in Totoli stative bases are generally prefixed by *mV-* when used predicatively, regardless of the meaning of the base and whether they refer to pure or result states. Totoli also allows unaffixed uses of stative lexical bases, but these generally only occur in attributive function as in *saa itom* 'black snake'. In these regards, Totoli and Tagalog differ clearly, providing a typical example of the range of variation to be expected in the use of *mV-* formations across western Austronesian languages.

Turning to syntax, *mV-* statives are intransitive. Their single core argument refers to a THEME or an EXPERIENCER, such as, respectively, *mata* 'eye' in (19) and *deuk* 'dog' in (22)a. The STIMULUS or CAUSE of a stative eventuality, if overtly expressed in a *mV-* construction, is usually realised as an oblique argument marked by a preposition, like *dei saa* 'LOC snake' in (22)a. However, the use of a preposition is optional in some instances (exact conditions are unclear), giving rise to constructions that deceptively look like transitive constructions, as in (23).

(23) *Boko no-itom=mo mata ondo.*
skin **ST**.RLS-black=CPL eye day

'The skin got dark because of the sun.'

Unlike in proper transitive constructions, the STIMULUS or CAUSE argument in this construction always allows the insertion of a preposition or of a further verb specifying the exact way the THEME argument is affected (e.g. 'being hit by/exposed to the sun'). Furthermore, the STIMULUS or CAUSE argument has to have non-specific reference, that is, modification by a demonstrative or possessive pronoun is not possible.

Underived transitive statives are rarely attested in western Austronesian languages (derived transitives were already discussed in section 2 above). Concepts such as 'know', 'like', or 'hate' are often expressed in special constructions consisting of a lexical base that is unmarked for voice and mood as in (24).[13]

[13] Further options include the obligatory dynamic construal of such eventualities. In Totoli, for example, 'know' is expressed by the applicative derivation *koto-i*, which is unambiguously a dynamic transitive verb in terms of its morphological structure (cp. example (32)b). The lexical base *koto* is neither attested as an unmarked form nor with stative affixation.

Sometimes, the EXPERIENCER is expressed both in topic position and in a genitive phrase, as in example (25) from Tajio (Sulawesi, Indonesia).

(24) Tagalog (Schachter & Otanes 1972:263)
Íbig ni Pédro ang libro.
like GEN PN SPEC book

'Pedro likes the book.'

(25) Tajio (Mayani 2013:175)
sia'u seelu='u vai tabako me-ntoos eua
1SG want=1SG ITJ tobacco DYN-rolled DIST

'I really wanted that cigarette.'

This concludes our brief discussion of stative *mV-* formations. Three points are of major relevance for the following discussion. First, *mV-* statives are intransitive. Second, they allow for two different readings, pure state or result state. Third, they license transitive derivations that denote caused states, a point already briefly noted in the introduction to section 2 and further expounded in section 5.3.

4 The meaning of Totoli potentives: limited control

Potentive predicates can be argued to be in primary opposition to dynamic predicates because all potentive predicates have a dynamic counterpart (but the converse does not hold, cp. section 4.3 below). The semantic difference between the two formations has been said to pertain to volitionality: dynamic predicates denote voluntary actions while potentive predicates express involuntary actions and abilities. However, as further discussed in section 4.1, 'volitional' is not precise enough to capture the meaning of potentive forms. Instead, we propose that the notion of 'limited control' is better suited to characterize the core meaning of potentives.

In addition to the 'accidental' or 'involuntary' readings, potentive predicates may also have an abilitative interpretation, as already noted a number of times. The link between these two major uses of potentives is not obvious and, to date, has not been properly explicated. Here, we pursue the hypothesis that the two major uses share a common core meaning. This hypothesis is suggested by the fact that there are other unrelated languages where verbal derivations with a similar functional range occur, in particular the limited-control predicates in Salishan languages (Thompson 1985; Davis et al. 2009; Jacobs 2011) and the so-called involitive verbs in Sinhala (Inman 1993). In section 4.2, we argue that the notion of 'limited control' is what both major uses of potentives have in common.

In section 4.3, we show that potentive marking is only used when control is at issue. That is, not all types of dynamic eventualities lacking a controlling agentive argument are marked in this way. Thus, for example, gradual bounded processes such as 'grow' or 'wilt' typically are not expressed by potentive-marked predicates. Consequently, dynamic predicates are, strictly speaking, underspecified for control. They can denote controlled or uncontrolled eventualities.

Finally, telic potentive predicates differ from telic dynamic predicates with regard to event culmination. A potentive predicate entails that the end point of a telic eventuality has been reached. This property appears to be the main reason why potentives have been likened to result statives. But, as we will see in section 4.4, this property in fact supports an agentive analysis.

Examples in this section mostly come from Totoli and, strictly speaking, all claims regarding the meaning of potentives are restricted to Totoli. We suspect that the basic claims also hold for potentives in other western Austronesian languages. However, it is also very likely that there is considerable variation across these languages. As not enough is known about this variation, it would be premature to make generalizing claims across the whole group.

4.1 Volition, intention, or control?

It is customary in Austronesian linguistics to characterize potentive predicates such as Totoli *makabagu*' 'accidentally hit someone (actor voice)' as signalling the lack of volition or intention. The notion of

control is more rarely evoked to characterize the meaning of potentives, and if so, usually as a further explication for what is meant by 'volition' or 'intention'. Thus, for example, Dell (1983), the first major paper exploring the semantics of potentives, uses *intention* to characterize the major meaning difference between a potentive and a dynamic use of a lexical base.

> Most Tagalog verbs contrast a N (neutral) form and an A (AIA; ability and involuntary-action) form. Tag. *Ben N-crushed the box* means 'Ben did something with the intention of thereby crushing the box' and does not entail that the box was actually crushed, whereas Tag. *Ben A-crushed the box* means 'the box was crushed as a result of Ben's doing something to it (intentionally or not)'. (Dell 1983:175)

Importantly, while Dell uses "neutral" as a label for the dynamic form, the actual explication says that dynamic predicates are more marked (i.e. [+intention]) than potentives, which are [+/-intention]. This ambivalence as to the semantic relation between the two forms is, in fact, widespread in the literature. Another example is Rubino (2008), who writes:

> The dynamic mode is the semantically unmarked mode where all transitive action verbs and many intransitive verbs signal some sort of intent or control on the part of the actor. (Rubino 2008:284)

Here again, dynamic forms are characterized as 'unmarked' but at the same time they are said "to signal some sort of intent or control". The exact nature of the opposition between the two forms is thus often left unclear, a topic we will return to in section 4.3 below. A major exception is Hauk (2019), who explicitly presents the relation between dynamic and potentive forms as an equipollent opposition (without using the term) and thus runs into the problem of having to explain why eventualities with involuntary AGENTS occur with dynamic morphology (Hauk 2019:288f).

In Salishan languages, verbs can occur with morphological marking that is semantically very similar to western Austronesian potentives. The notion of control has been central in the analysis of this marking, following a classic paper by Thompson (1979). It is not clear why the Austronesianist literature has focussed on volition and intention rather than control, but this is probably mostly due to chance rather than reflecting a deeper difference between the Salishan and the Austronesian formations. In fact, the three notions volition, intention, and control are often used more or less interchangeably in much of the literature on verb semantics and argument structure. To be sure, for specific lexical items and constructions, it is often difficult to discern a difference between a lack of volition or intention and a lack of control. If someone accidentally falls, there is a lack of volition and intention, and a lack of (body) control. In the case of other lexical items and constructions, however, the three notions of 'volition', 'intention', and 'control' are clearly not interchangeable. Specifically, there are various types of examples where AGENTS appear to act volitionally and intentionally, but control is limited by circumstances that are beyond their control (see Jacobs 2011:5–26 for a similar argument regarding Sḵwx̱wú7mesh, a.k.a. Squamish). This is illustrated here with two types of examples.

One type of example pertains to 'hitting' and related bodily actions that may negatively affect other participants. When the root *bagu*' 'hit' occurs with dynamic morphology, as in (26)a, the predicate is typically interpreted as referring to a volitional and intentional action. When the same root is marked by potentive morphology, as in (26)b, the AGENT is said to lack volition or intention.

(26) a. *Isia* *namagu*' *i* *aku.*
Isia noN-bagu' i aku
3SG AV.RLS-hit HON 1SG

'She hit me.'

b. *Isia* *nakabagu*' *i* *haji.*
Isia noko-bagu' i haji.
3SG **POT**.AV.RLS-hit HON Haji

'She accidentally hit the Haji.'

However, the preceding description of the examples in (26) is not fully adequate. The verb *bagu*' 'hit, beat' strictly speaking refers to the movements involved in a beating action. Inasmuch as initiating the

relevant movements involves the (prior) intention[14] to carry out a beating action, and also the volitional act to do so, both examples in (26) are strictly speaking intentional and volitional. Thus, the typical situation for (26)b to apply is when someone wants to hit another being and by accident hits someone else, in this case the Haji. It is not appropriate for a situation where someone inadvertently moves their arm and thereby touches the Haji (for this situation, the verb *kode* 'strike, touch' is more appropriate). Potentive actions may thus involve (prior) intention and volition. What is essential, is the fact that the action is carried out without the AGENT's full control, which includes unexpected results.

The notion of an unexpected result is to be taken in a very broad sense, as shown by example (27).

(27) *moko-tundak* *ngia*
POT.AV-step.on APRX

'(whoever) happens to step on it here (will become unconscious)' [village_names_5.197]

The lexical base *tundak* in (27) refers to the action of 'stepping or treading on something, usually forcefully as in stepping on a brake'. This action is carried out voluntarily, intentionally and in full bodily control in the event referred to in (27). What the potentive marking in (27) conveys is that the action of stepping on something has an unforeseen consequence beyond the AGENT's control (i.e. that the person who carries out the stepping action will become unconscious). This example thus shows that the lack of full control conveyed by potentives does not necessarily directly pertain to the eventuality denoted by the predicate. Instead, it may pertain to an ensuing eventuality that is causally closely connected to it.

The second type of example where volition and intention are not in question, but control is, pertains to the uses of potentives that are typically translated with 'manage to'. Example (28) illustrates.

(28) *ingga kakaanankuai* *jaja* *ipogutuku*
ingga ko-kaan-an=ku=ai jaja i-po-gutu=ku
NEG **POT**-eat-UV2=1SG.GEN=VEN cake RLS.UV-SF-make=1SG.GEN

'I didn't manage (find the time) to eat the cake I made' [lifestory_TS-IA.207]

In this type of example, it is clear that the AGENT has the intention of carrying out the action, but there are circumstances that prevent them from doing so. This type of use is very close to the ability use discussed in the next section.

The two types of examples just reviewed suggest the hypothesis that whenever volition and intention do not fully overlap with full control, it is the lack of full control rather than the lack of volition or intention that is signalled by potentive forms. That is, the core meaning of potentives is limited control. This is also suggested by the fact that potentives are used to express unintended results (as in (26) and (27)) as well as results that contradict or frustrate intentions (as in (28)).[15]

This hypothesis, of course, needs further testing and a more precise statement of what exactly is meant by 'limited control'. For current purposes it will suffice to quote from the definition proposed by Thompson & Thompson (1992) in their grammar of Nlaka'pamuctsin (a.k.a. Thompson language):[16]

> Controlled situations are those in which the agent functions with usual average capacities in keeping things under control. Other situations are uncontrolled, and include a variety of circumstances: … acts or states for which agents may be responsible or concerned, but over

[14] Without wanting to enter into the details of the extensive philosophical literature on the topics of intention and volition, Searl's (1983) distinction between the *prior intention* to carry out an action and the *intention-in-action* is relevant here. The latter refers to the coordination of the activities during the action by the agentive argument and thus basically corresponds to what is called 'control' here.

[15] Cp. Kroeger (2017) for an instructive study of frustratives in Kimaragang, which, importantly, do not involve potentive or stative marking.

[16] Their list of uncontrolled situations also includes "events which are natural, spontaneous – happening without the intervention of any agent" (Thompson & Thompson 1992:51). As we will see in section 4.3, reference to this type of eventuality is generally not marked as potentive in western Austronesian languages.

> which they exert at best limited control. Thus, the category NONCONTROL covers not only unintentional, accidental acts, but also intentional premeditated ones which are carried out to excess, or are accomplished only with difficulty, or by means of much time, special effort and/or patience and perhaps a little luck. The English expression *manage to* (*do something*) can cover roughly the same noncontrol range, as in *he managed to escape from the maximum security cell* on the one hand, and *he managed to make himself unpopular with the authorities* on the other, although the latter sort of use generally carries an ironic connotation. (Thompson & Thompson 1992:51)

Importantly, as already pointed out by Dell (1983), the question of whether or not a given event involves limited control is largely a question of construal and not inherently given, although the freedom in the choice of perspective is perhaps a bit overstated, as we will see in section 4.3. In Dell's terms:

> Any completed action, even one in which everything works out as planned by the agent, can thus be viewed in two different perspectives. In the first the emphasis is laid on the fact that the result came about only because the agent deliberately initiated a causal chain which he had reasons to think would bring it about. In the second perspective, the emphasis is laid rather on the fact that the result came about only because certain circumstances not under the agent's control allowed it. (Dell 1983:192)

Unlike in the quote given at the beginning of this section, Dell here also uses 'control' rather than 'intention' or 'volition' to characterize the core meaning of potentives. The "circumstances not under the agent's control" are also at the core of what is known as the ability use of potentives, to which we now turn.

4.2 Ability uses

One major meaning that can be conveyed by potentive formations is ability, as illustrated by the potentive form of the verb *umbang* 'run' in (29)a in opposition to its dynamic form in (29)b.

(29) a. *ngadaan* *mokoumbang*
ingga daan moko-umbang
NEG EXIST **POT**.AV-run

'(carrying the nets he) cannot run' [conversation_2.0919]

b. *mog-umbang=ko* *ina=ko* *kau*
AV-run=AND Q=AND 2SG

'where are you running to' [conversation_2.0897]

However, the ability to do something can also be conveyed in various other ways in Totoli. For example, stative predicates such as *mapande* 'be clever, good at something' in (30) also convey ability, as do dynamic predicates such as *kuasai* 'master' in (31).

(30) *mapande* *molumolon*
mo-pande mo-l<um>olon
ST-clever AV-<AUTO.MOT>swim

'(the monkey) is good at swimming' [monkey_turtle_2.259]

(31) *Nanong* *ia* *sia* *kan* *kuasai=na* *bahasa* *Inggris* *to*
PN PRX 3SG PART master:UV1=3SG.GEN language English ITJ

'Nanong here, him, he is able to speak English, right?' [conv_cl.290]

To delimit more precisely which kind of ability potentive forms refer to, it needs to be recalled that in root modality – the modality concerned with the possibility and the necessity of the action performed by a participant – abilities may be of two kinds: internal and external (cp. Lehrer 1968; Coates 1983; Palmer 1990, 2001, among others). Internal abilities denote abilities that depend on the inherent skills

of the individual they are attributed to. The external ability (or possibility) to perform a certain action is determined by external factors such as luck, fate or other outer circumstances, but not an aptitude that is inherent to the individual carrying out the action.

Clearly, then, the abilities shown in (30)–(31) are internal abilities, while the one in (29)a belongs to external abilities. Example (32) below provides a further illustration. The potentive construction in (32)a denotes only the possibility (determined by external factors) to drive a motorcycle, not the (acquired) skills necessary to drive it. To have this skill is expressed by other means, such as the dynamic verb *koto* 'know' in (32)b.

(32) a.

Ana	*aku*	*mokosumake*	*motor,*	*kupakagaan.*
ana	aku	moko-s<um>ake	motor	ku-po-ko-gaan
if	1SG	**POT**.AV-<AUTO.MOT>get.on	motorcycle	1SG.ACT-CAU-ST-fast

'If I had the chance to drive a motorcycle, I would drive it fast.'

b.

Isia	*kumotoi*	*mosumake*	*motor.*
isia	k<um>oto-i	mo-s<um>ake	motor
3SG	<AV>know-APPL2	AV-<AUTO.MOT>get.on	motor

'S/he already knows how to ride a motorcycle.'

External abilities are characterized by the fact that the AGENT does not have full control over the unfolding situation, as this is, in part at least, also determined by circumstances beyond the AGENT's control. Once this is properly recognized, the link between the involuntary and accidental uses of potentives and their ability uses becomes clear. In all uses of the potentive, the agentive argument is construed as not being in full control of the action instigated or carried out by it.[17]

Kaufman (2012:10–11) suggests that the two major uses of potentives, abilitative and accidental, are both a plausible extension from predicates marked by a Proto-Austronesian prefix **ka-* meaning 'have'. He adds that, in fact, the same extension has happened in English with the verb *get*, as exemplified in (33)a and b.

(33) Extensions of *get:*

a.	*John got hit*.	UNINTENTIONAL	(Kaufman 2012:10)
b.	*to get to talk* (= to be able to talk)	ABILITATIVE	(Kaufman 2012:11)

Whether or not there is a common source meaning 'have' for the different uses of potentives, we would hold that 'limited control' is the notion that covers the core of all potentive uses in a language such as Totoli. As we will show in the following section, this characterization is still somewhat too broad, however, and thus in need of further delimitation.

4.3 Potentive marking only occurs when control is 'at issue'

An important point noted by Kittilä (2005) in his typological study of involuntary AGENT constructions is the fact that these constructions tend to be used only when control is at issue, that is, when one could reasonably have expected that the eventuality expressed in a clause should involve an agentive argument in full control, but, unexpectedly, it doesn't (see also Fauconnier 2012, 2013). Potentive forms thus often convey surprise or counter-expectedness, which we consider epiphenomena of the fact that potentive marking only occurs when full control is possible in principle in the eventuality denoted by a predicate.

This hypothesis predicts that potentive marking should not occur in expressions that do not allow for agentive arguments. By definition, statives lack agentive arguments. However, inasmuch as stative and potentives are not formally distinguished, stative predicates are not the best examples to support the hypothesis. Relevant examples are dynamic predicates lacking agentive arguments. Here, the most

[17] In passing, we may note that the restriction of potentive forms to external abilities so far has not been properly noted in the literature. More often than not, the relevant forms are simply characterized as denoting "the ability of the AGENT to do or achieve something" (Himmelmann 2004:105). Sometimes, internal abilities are – wrongly! – mentioned explicitly as a possible denotation for potentive forms (e.g. Himmelmann loc. cit).

trivial example type are meteorological expressions. But also gradual processes such as ‘grow’ and uncontrolled punctual events such as ‘explode’ or ‘arrive’ (the latter often called achievements) belong to this category. In reference to all these eventuality types, dynamic predicates should be used. This is actually the case, as shown in this section.

Limited-control marking does not only presuppose that the eventuality denoted by a predicate is of a type that allows for full control. It also requires that the agentive argument is actually capable of control. If this is correct, our hypothesis further predicts that potentives should only occur with animate and preferably with human agentive arguments. Inanimate referents in agentive function should thus not occur with potentive predicates, or at least be limited to exceptional cases. The data also support this prediction.

Furthermore, the hypothesis predicts that strictly speaking, dynamic predicates should be neutral (underspecified) with regard to control. That is, if potentive forms are only used when control is at issue, dynamic forms should be used whenever control is not at issue (for whatever reason). Note that this hypothesis differs from the claim that the opposition between potentive and dynamic forms pertains to whether or not the agentive argument has full control, which is often found in the literature (cp. the beginning of section 4.1 above). If dynamic predicates are underspecified for control, then full-control readings are predicted to arise via implicatures. If so, the further prediction follows that control implicatures can be cancelled. Again, we show below that these predictions hold.

Turning to our first prediction, let us briefly review some dynamic predicates that denote eventualities that principally do not allow for controlling agentive arguments. According to our hypothesis, these predicates should not occur with potentive marking. One example are meteorological expressions that typically involve dynamic affixation if they make use of a verbal predicate. This is illustrated in examples (34) and (35) from Tagalog and Toratán, respectively. Alternatively, in languages like Totoli, meteorological expressions occur unaffixed (e.g. *udan* ‘rain’ or ‘it is raining’).

(34) Tagalog (Schachter & Otanes 1972:547)

Lumindol	*daw*	*at*	*nagbaha?*	*sa*	*Mindanaw*.
l<um>indol	daw	at	nag-baha?	sa	Mindanaw
<AV>earthquake	PART	and	AV-flood	LOC	Mindanao

‘They say there was an earthquake and a flood in Mindanao.’

(35) Toratán (Himmelmann & Wolff 1999:41)

nanaiti
naN-taiti
AV-rain

‘it’s raining heavily’

Turning to gradual processes such as ‘grow’, etc., these are generally expressed by predicates marked with dynamic morphology, as in examples (36) and (37).

(36) Tagalog (Schachter & Otanes 1972:70)

Tumatanda?	*ang*	*áso.*
RDP-<um>tanda?	ang	áso
RDP-<AV>grow.old	SPEC	dog

‘The dog is growing old.’

(37)

memang	*no-sumbo*'	*dei*	*kanau*	*sadako*	*ia*
in.fact	AV.RLS-grow	LOC	sugar.palm	many	PRX

‘in fact, many are growing on the sugar-palm tree here’ [red_sugar.321]

To this group one may add expressions for uncontrollable movements such as ‘floating on water’, as in (38), which also generally involve dynamic morphology.

(38) *Kayu ana molumantap.*
kayu ana mo-l<um>antap
wood MED AV-<AUTO.MOT>float

'The wood is floating down the river.'

With regard to uncontrolled punctual events such as 'explode' or 'arrive' (often referred to as achievements), matters are somewhat more complex. First, it needs to be noted that the lexical bases referring to such events in western Austronesian languages more often than not are stative, such as Totoli *botu* 'burst'. It is thus quite common to report such events in a state construal, that is, 'explode' is construed as 'be in an exploded state'. Second, a distinction has to be made between punctual events that typically occur without a run-up phase such as 'explode' and ones that typically are preceded by a (non-incremental) phase leading up to the event such as 'arrive' and 'die' (cp. Croft 2012:40ff on the notion of run-up achievements). The former are typically attested with dynamic morphology as shown in (39) and (40), if they are not construed as states.

(39) Toratán (Himmelmann & Wolff 1999:80)

lumalekeq	*taiq*	*bren*	*te*	*karingi*	*ku*	*taiq*	*humunggóng*
RDP-<um>lekeq	ta=naiq	bren	te	ka-ringi	ku	ta=naiq	h<um>unggóng
RDP-<AV>explode	AND=DIR	gun	CON	**POT**.CV-hear	1SG.GEN	AND=DIR	<AV>scream

'the guns exploded (in an upward direction), and then I heard screaming up there'

(40) Tagalog (www)

Pumutok	*ang*	*gulong.*
p<um>utok	ang	gulong
<AV>blast	SPEC	wheel

'The tire blew up.'

As for punctual events with a run-up phase ('arrive', 'understand', 'die' etc.) there are three options: stative, as in (41), dynamic, as in (42), and potentive, as in (43).

(41)

tau	*dako*	*naate*	*to*
tau	dako	no-ate	to
person	big	**ST**.RLS-dead	ITJ

'the father is dead, right?' [Mansur's_work.0091]

(42) Tagalog (www)

Umabot	*din*	*siya*	*sa*	*finals*	*ng*	*1998*	*US*	*Open.*
<um>abot	din	siya	sa	finals	ng	1998	US	Open
<AV>reach	too	3SG.NOM	LOC	finals	LK	1998	PN	PN

'He also reached the finals of the 1998 US Open.'

(43)

injan	*noko-uma*	*isia*
after	**POT.**AV.RLS-arrive	3SG

'after she (the bride) has happened to arrive' [wedding_expl_TTL.379]

The potentive option in (43) appears to contradict our hypothesis. However, this exception can be explained if we assume that punctual events allow for three different kinds of construal or phase selection in terms of selection theories of aspect (cp. Sasse 2002:222–225 for a brief summary). In reporting punctual events the focus can be on the state holding after the event occurred, which is denoted by stative predicates. When the focus is on the punctual change of state that initiates the post-event state, dynamic morphology is used, in line with our prediction: the punctual change itself and sometimes also the moment it occurs is not controllable. In example (42), the only point of relevance is that the transition to the finals took place. Finally, the run-up phase that leads up to the punctual change of state usually consists in an activity that is directed towards achieving the change of state and thus typically involves

an element of control, but not full control. Hence, potentive morphology can be used when selecting this phase in reporting a punctual change of state. In example (43), a lot of activities have occurred before the bride arrives in the house of the groom's relatives (and thereby initiates the finalization of the wedding contract). Note that it has been widely observed in the aspect literature that achievements can be construed in different ways and then also occur in constructions which, in principle, are not compatible with punctual eventuality types. In English, for example, they are then also acceptable in the progressive form (e.g. 'she is reaching the summit') and with adverbials denoting a time interval ('it took them three hours to reach the summit', cp. Croft 2012:36, 40).

Another set of examples supporting our hypothesis pertains to uncontrollable bodily processes such as "sneeze", "yawn", "cry", "cough", etc. As exemplified in (44)–(46), these are usually marked as dynamic.

(44) Tagalog (Schachter & Otanes 1972:398)

Tumáwa	*nang*	*tumáwa*	*si*	*Juan.*
t<um>áwa	nang	t<um>áwa	si	Juan
<AV>laugh	LK	<AV>laugh	SPEC	Juan

'Juan laughed and laughed.'

(45) Toratán (Himmelmann & Wolff 1999:61)

nangoyaf
naN-oyaf
AV-yawn

'yawn'

(46)

nengngeekko	*i*	*Bibi*	*dei*	*abu*	*itu*
noN-RDP1-ngeek=ko	i	Bibi	dei	abu	itu
AV.RLS-RDP1-cry=AND	HON	PN	LOC	kitchen	DIST

'Bibi is crying in the kitchen' [conversation_2.0872]

To sum up the discussion so far, whenever expressions referring to dynamic eventualities do not include an agentive argument in their argument structure, they are not marked as potentive in western Austronesian languages. That is, it would be wrong to say that potentives signal the lack of a fully controlling agentive argument. Rather, it is more precise to say that potentives signal the lack of full control in those instances where it can, in principle, be expected.

This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that even when the predicate denoting a dynamic eventuality allows for a fully controlling agentive argument, potentive morphology is usually not used when the agentive argument is inanimate, as seen in (47)a-c. As example (47)d shows, potentive-marked forms in these contexts are rejected in elicitation.

(47) a.

Masina	*ia*	*madaam*	*kaeng.*
masina	ia	mo-daam	kaeng
sewing.machine	PRX	AV-sew	cloth

'This machine sews clothes.'

b.

Laalamba	*ddako*	*malampean*	*peangan*	*pantadko.*
laalamba	RDP1-dako	mo-lampe-an	peangan	pantad=ko
wave	RDP1-big	AV-be.stranded-APPL1	boat	shore=AND

'The big waves drove the boat ashore.'

c.

Bodung	*ia*	*nongoot*	*utan*	*takin*	*mopido.*
bodung	ia	noN-koot	utan	takin	mo-pido
knife	PRX	AV.RLS-cut	vegetables	with	ST-good

'This knife cuts vegetables well.'

d. **Bodung ia nokokoot utan takin mopido.*

The use of dynamic morphology in all these instances makes sense on the assumption that inanimate AGENTS generally lack the capacity for control (see also Kittilä 2005; Fauconnier 2012).

In passing we should note, however, that matters are more complicated than we make them appear here. Potentive forms can, occasionally, be used with inanimate agents, as also noted by Dell (1983:200f). Like Dell, we are not in a position to offer a precise statement as to when exactly this is possible. Remarkably, perhaps, in Dell's Tagalog example the inanimate agent is *agos* 'current' ('the boxes were carried away by the current'). Himmelmann (2006:483) presents an almost identical example with *tubig* 'water' ('the leaf was being carried along by the water'), also from Tagalog. A possible explanation for these uses would involve the hypothesis that some natural forces such as currents or the wind allow for alternative construals as entities inherently capable of control. This appears to be a wider phenomenon which does not only concern potentive marking. Rather, such construals can be observed in different languages with regard to a broader range of phenomena. For instance, Durie (1985:68) notes that in Acehnese, natural forces behave like controlling animate agents in that they are also cross-referenced with agentive proclitics. Furthermore, psychological research shows that some natural forces are cognitively processed like animate entities (Lowder & Gordon 2015). Still, while the use of potentive marking with natural forces may thus find a systematic explanation, there are other uses which cannot be explained in this way. For example, we also find examples meaning 'the tree reached the roof' with potentive morphology in our data. In short, a much more rigorous investigation is needed to properly identify the constraints on inanimate agents in potentive constructions.

Finally, if potentive marking only becomes an option when control is at issue, it follows that dynamic forms may refer to both controlled and non-controlled events, as shown by the examples in this section. In terms of meaning oppositions, this implies that dynamic forms are underspecified for control. The fact that examples such as (26)a above (*isia namagu' i aku* 'she hit me') are generally interpreted as referring to a controlled action ('she hit me being in full control of her movements and hence intentionally') is therefore based on a conversational implicature. Speakers uttering (26)a have to make two choices. First, they have to decide whether control is at issue for the eventuality they are going to report. If so, they have to choose whether or not the agentive argument is to be represented as being in full control of the unfolding event. If not, potentive marking is chosen. If yes, a dynamic form is used. Consequently, in those instances where control is at issue, dynamic forms conversationally implicate that the agentive argument was in full control. As an implicature, however, this can be cancelled, as seen in (48) and (49). In both examples, a dynamic voice-mood marked predicate – *nadabuan* 'drop, throw down' in (48) and *motundaki* 'step on sth.' in (49) – is followed by an adversative clause that asserts that something was done unintentionally and hence without full control (*ingga nitunggaan* 'not intend to' in (48) and *geiga manyadari* 'be not aware of' in (49)).

(48) *Isia madabuan HPna dei sasik*
isia mo-dabu-an HP=na dei sasik
3SG AV-fallen-APPL1 handphone=3SG.GEN LOC sea

tapi ingga nitunggaanna.
tapi ingga ni-tungga-an=na
but NEG RLS.UV-intention-APPL2 =3SG.GEN

'He dropped his mobile phone into the sea but he did not intend to.'

(49) *Kita motundaki seom tapi kita geiga manyadari.*
kita mo-tundak-i seom tapi kita geiga moN-sadari
2PL AV-step-APPL2 ant but 2PL NEG AV-be.aware

'You stepped on an ant, but didn't notice.'

The preceding two examples clearly show that the intention to carry out a particular action can be explicitly denied, but the verb form used to refer to the action is dynamic and not potentive. Hence, dynamic forms are underspecified for control.

To summarize the argument in this subsection, control is implicated (and not implied) by dynamic predicates only in those instances where control is actually at issue. With eventualities that do not allow for control such as gradual or bodily processes, control is not at issue and hence no such implicature arises. This in turn means that the dynamic forms are not simply the unmarked member in a [± control] opposition, where potentive is [-control] and dynamic is [+control]. Instead, dynamic forms lack a control feature altogether, which is the reason why they are used in all instances where control is not at issue. If one were to assume that dynamic predicates are [+control], one would have to explain why there are quite a few dynamic predicates that either regularly lack an agentive argument altogether or lack one that is in full control.

4.4 The evidence from event culmination

We are now in a position to address an aspect of the meaning of potentives that, at first sight, may appear to favour the hypothesis that potentive marking changes aspectual structure rather than agentivity. With telic predicates, potentives are necessarily culminative. That is, the inherent endpoint of the action referred to by a potentive telic predicate is actually reached, whereas dynamic predicates also allow for non-culminating interpretations.[18] This property of potentives has been observed by Dell (1983) for Tagalog, by Kroeger (2017) for Kimaragang and by Paul et al. (2020) for Malagasy.[19] It is also found in Totoli, as demonstrated by the following example pair. The dynamic predicate in (50)a can be used in a context where the endpoint of the action denoted by it is not reached, whereas the potentive construction in (50)b is not compatible with such a context.

(50) a.

Inang	*nonibok*	*taipang*	*tetapi*	*ingga*	*nikologna.*
inang	noN-tibok	taipang	tetapi	ingga	ni-kolog=na
mother	AV.RLS-divide	mango	but	NEG	RLS.UV-cut=3SG.GEN

'The mother (tried to) split the mango but she didn't cut it.'

b.

Inang	*noko-tibok*	*taipang*	*# tapi*	*ingga*	*ni-kolog=na.*
mother	**POT**.AV.RLS-divide	mango	# but	NEG	RLS.UV-cut=3SG.GEN

'The mother accidentally/managed to split the mango # but she didn't cut it.'

This, in fact, is the type of example that probably caused Dell to claim that potentives "assert that a Result, intended or not, was actually achieved" (Dell 1983:181), or in other words, that they essentially denote a result state. The fact that potentives also convey lack of control is, according to this view, an optional epiphenomenon (note the interpolation of "intended or not" in the quote). However, there are reasons to assume that it is the other way round: lack of control implies culmination, as we now argue.

According to the *Agent Control Hypothesis* proposed by Demirdache & Martin (2015; see also Martin 2015), there is a systematic correlation between the degree or kind of agenthood and the availability of (non-)culminating interpretations. Actions intended or initiated by highly agentive participants are "ontologically independent of their potential effects" (Martin 2015:259). That is, the intention of a highly agentive participant to carry out a particular action is enough for the action to come to be felicitously referred to by a telic predicate with past time reference. The relevance of the inherent degree of agentivity in this regard is illustrated by the example pair in (51). In (51)a, cancelling the culmination implicature of an event expression is possible, if the subject is highly agentive, for example, a fully

[18] See Martin (2019) and Martin & Demirdache (2020) for recent surveys of the substantial body of literature on non-culminating accomplishments that has appeared in the last two decades. As convincingly argued in these works, one has to take considerable care in delimiting different types of phenomena that on the surface may look like non-culminating accomplishments. Thus, for example, there are non-maximal accomplishment readings as in *Mary ate the pizza in five minutes (although not completely)*, which differ from non-culminating accomplishments on a number of counts including the fact that they allow use of an *in*-adverbial (cp. Martin 2019:8 for the full argument). See also the typology of different readings for accomplishment predicates provided by Martin & Demirdache (2020:1223). Here, we are exclusively concerned with the uses labelled 'non-culminating' in this typology.

[19] D. Kaufman (p.c.) draws our attention to the fact that this type of example was already noted in López' Ilokano grammar from 1631 (republished as López 1895).

capable, awake adult human being. The implicature, however, cannot be cancelled when the AGENT is inanimate, as in (51)b. Note that verbal tense and aspect are identical in both of the following examples, hence the pragmatic difference solely depends on the subject referent.

(51) French (Martin 2015:248)

a. *Ils* *l'ont* *réparé* *mais* *cela* *ne* *fonctionne* *toujours* *pas.*
they it=have repaired but this NEG works still NEG

'They repaired it but it still doesn't work.'

b. *Le* *choc* *l'a* *réparé* *#mais* *cela* *ne* *fonctionne* *toujours* *pas.*
the shock it=has repaired #but this NEG works still NEG

'The shock repaired it #but it still doesn't work.'

Demirdache & Martin remain somewhat vague with regard to which property of AGENTS it is that provides for the possibility of cancelling the culmination implicature of telic predicates (their definition of the *Agent Control Hypothesis* simply speaks of "'agenthood' properties" [Demirdache & Martin 2015:201]). Calling it the *Agent Control Hypothesis*, however, suggests that the ability to control an event from its initial conception to its very end is of major relevance in this regard. Thus, the fact that potentive telic accomplishment predicates are necessarily culminative can be derived from the fact that the agentive argument is marked as having only limited control. In this view, limited control is the core meaning of potentives and culmination the epiphenomenon.

Having clarified basic aspects of the meaning of statives in the preceding section and of potentives in the current section, we may now look more closely into similarities and differences between predicates of these two types. The next section is primarily concerned with differences.

5 Where potentives and statives differ

The distinction between stative and dynamic predicates is a standard one in the literature on (lexical) aspect, usually traced back to Vendler's seminal article on verbs and time (Vendler 1957). Oversimplifying drastically,[20] stative eventualities do not change over time but dynamic ones do. It is widely agreed that this is a central distinction with many ramifications in the grammar of verbs in most, if not all languages. These ramifications cluster around two intricately intertwined grammatical subject matters. On the one hand, they show up in the grammar of aspect and modality (e.g. whether or not both stative and dynamic bases allow for progressive marking and the meanings correlated with such marking). On the other hand, there are differences with regard to agentivity. Very roughly, stative predicates lack agentive arguments, while many (but not all) dynamic predicates occur with them.

The labels widely used for potentives in the Austronesianist literature such as 'involuntary' or 'non-volitional' suggest that potentive marking relates primarily to agentivity rather than to aspectual structure. This is in line with our proposal to analyze potentives as limited-control predicates. However, the opposite view, namely that potentive marking primarily signals a change in aspectual structure, has

[20] The notion of aspect in language continues to be an object of a complex and contentious debate which we will not get into here (see Sasse 2002 for a succinct summary of core issues, and Croft 2012, Filip 2019, and Maienborn 2019 for some more recent contributions). The following discussion remains at a fairly superficial level, not the least because the whole topic has received comparatively little attention in western Austronesian studies. Here and elsewhere in this article, 'aspect' and 'aspectual structure' are used in a wide sense encompassing both so-called viewpoint aspect (e.g. perfective vs. imperfective) and the temporal characteristics of eventualities known by a plethora of terms including 'actional type', 'aktionsart', 'verbal character', 'event type', etc. The main focus, however, is on the latter, which we refer to as 'eventuality types'. In line with much of the literature, we assume that eventuality types represent linguistic construals of the temporal characteristics of extralinguistic situations. That is, a situation involving a person who sleeps, for example, is not per se a state or an activity, but can be construed in either way.

also been suggested in the literature. In fact, Dell's (1983) classic paper on the topic is entitled *An aspectual distinction in Tagalog* and he states:[21]

> It is my contention that the ultimate semantic difference between neutral [i.e. dynamic] forms and their AIA [i.e. potentive] counterparts is this: one uses a neutral form when one intends to assert that a certain Maneuver took place, but one wants to remain noncommittal as to whether it did actually bring about the intended Result; on the other hand, one uses an AIA form when the main business at hand is to assert that a Result, intended or not, was actually achieved. (Dell 1983:181; capitalization in original)

We take this to mean that potentive predicates denote result states rather than the events leading up to them (see also the quote from Dell 1983 in section 4.1 above). Dell does not discuss the relation between statives and potentives. Hence it is not clear to what extent he considers them to be alike. Recall from section 3 that Tagalog (and Totoli) statives also allow for result-state readings. If potentives in fact denote result states, one would expect the two predicate types to be very similar, if not identical, with regard to aspectual structure. In this view, the pervasive morphological overlap between potentive and stative marking reviewed in section 2 would be unsurprising: both predicate types may denote result states.

Despite its initial plausibility we argue here against the view that potentive marking involves a change in aspectual structure, converting dynamic predicates into (result) stative ones. Instead, at least for Tagalog and Totoli, the available evidence supports an analysis that considers a change in agentivity to be the core function of potentive marking (this may be different in other western Austronesian languages). There are three arguments for this view. First, not all potentive predicates refer to telic events. Hence, not all of them can be analyzed as referring to result states (section 5.1). Second, stative predicates do not allow for progressive/imperfective formations while potentives do (section 5.2). Third, there are significant differences between the argument structure of stative and potentive predicates, contrary to what one might expect if potentives were to denote result states (section 5.3).

5.1 Atelic predicates may be potentive

Most examples of potentives discussed in the literature pertain to agentive accomplishments; that is, events that include some kind of activity by an agentive argument and a result state providing a natural endpoint for said activity. These most often involve transitive predicates such as 'kiss someone', 'write a book', or 'open a window'. But they may also include intransitive predicates referring to an activity bounded by some kind of goal or measure such as 'go to Manila' (with the result state 'being in Manila'). All examples discussed by Dell (1983) are of this type.

However, potentive marking is also possible for unbounded activity predicates such as 'work' (52)a or 'endure, suffer' in (52)b; see also 'run' in (29)a above.

(52) a. *daan* *mo-opus* *poni* *ana* *moko-liok* *poni*
later **ST**-finished again MED **POT**.AV-act again

'later, when we are done again, we may work again' [conversation_2.0687]

b. *kan* *makataan* *kita* *dei* *ongot*
kan moko-taan kita dei ongot
PART **POT**.AV-endure 1PL.INCL LOC pain

'(when we do this) we can endure/carry on in pain' [explanation-lelegesan_SYNO.024]

[21] In a similar way, Jacobs (2011) claims that control morphology in the Salishan language Sḵwx̱wú7mesh "is essentially aspectual in that it is concerned with whether a predicate's natural endpoint coincides with the actual endpoint of the given event — i.e., CONTROL is about event (non)culmination" (Jacobs 2011:5). Furthermore, Travis (2005) uses *telic* as the label for the Malagasy prefixes *(m)aha-*, *tafa-* and *voa-*, which at least in part are cognate with potentive morphology in Tagalog and Totoli. While these analyses differ substantially from the one proposed by Dell, they clearly situate potentives in the realm of aspect rather than agentivity.

As seen in these examples, atelic activities referred to with potentive predicates usually involve ability readings. Still, it is clearly not a result state that is referred to by these predicates but the dynamic phase of an activity. At least in these cases, it would be wrong to claim that potentive forms refer to result states.

5.2 Potentive predicates allow for progressive forms, statives do not

Totoli makes use of a number of different reduplication patterns with a broad variety of functions. One such pattern involves the reduplication of the first syllable of the stem of a voice-mood inflected form and lengthening of the vowel of the reduplicated syllable (glossed as RDP2 here). The meaning of this formation roughly corresponds to the English progressive. It is, in principle, possible for all dynamic and potentive verbs, but it is not attested for stative stems. Examples (53) and (54) illustrate this contrast. Note that the examples in (54) are good without RDP2.

(53) a.

Sokologmo	*ondo*	*aku*	*nangae'*	*geipo*	*nakaakaala.*
so-kolog=mo	ondo	aku	noN-kae'	geipo	no-RDP2-ko-ala
ONE-cut=CPL	day	1SG	AV.RLS-fish.with.a.line	INCPL	AV.RLS-RDP2-**POT**-fetch

'I've been fishing for a whole day but I'm not getting any.'

b.

Sajammo	*aku*	*nongusut*	*niug*	*tapi*	*geipo*	*nokookoita.*
so-jam=mo	aku	noN-kusut	niug	tapi	geipo	no-RDP2-ko-ita
ONE-hour=CPL	1SG	AV.RLS-look.for	coconut	but	INCPL	AV.RLS-RDP2-**POT**-see

'Already for one hour I've looked for coconuts but I'm not seeing any.'

(54) a.

**Angin*	*makaakaaling*	*laeng*	*dei*	*puun*	*kayu*	*ia.*
angin	mo-RDP2-ko-aling	laeng	dei	puun	kayu	ia
wind	AV-RDP2-**ST**-disappear	leaf	LOC	tree	wood	PRX

For: 'The wind is removing the leaves on this tree.'

b.

**Ogo*	*udan*	*nokookopuling*	*gumbang.*
ogo	udan	no-RDP2-ko-puling	gumbang
water	rain	AV.RLS-RDP2-**ST**-full	water.barrel

For: 'The rain was filling the water barrel.'

If potentives were stative-like, one would expect them to pattern with statives in regards to their compatibility with progressive marking. The fact that they pattern with dynamic predicates suggests that they are dynamic-like, and not stative.

5.3 Differences in argument structure

As argued in section 4, the use of potentive marking presupposes that control is at issue, which means that potentive predicates refer to eventualities that can be controlled by an agentive participant, but are in fact not controlled to the extent that can normally be expected for the eventuality in question. From this hypothesis, a further hypothesis follows, namely that potentive predicates include an agentive argument in their argument structure and, in this regard, are similar to dynamic predicates taking agentive arguments. Stative predicates, on the other hand, lack agentive arguments per definition. Hence, there should be clear evidence for a difference in the basic argument structure of potentive and stative predicates. This indeed holds true, and, importantly, these differences are also found when potentives and statives are morphologically indistinguishable.

The evidence for a difference in argument structure is perhaps most clearly seen in actor voice forms with *moko-*, which are available for by both potentive and stative predicates. Recall from section 2 above that in transitive actor voice forms, the more actor-like argument functions as subject, while the more undergoer-like argument occurs in non-subject core function (= immediate postverbal position). Potentive actor voice can be formed with intransitive and transitive bases. The single core argument of

the intransitive construction and the subject (= more actor-like argument) of the transitive constructions are limited-control agentive arguments, as seen in (55) and (56).

(55) *Noko-undug* *kita* *kobongi.*
POT.AV.RLS-sing 1PL.INCL last.night

'We got to sing last night.'

(56) *Nakkaan* *bau* *tunu* *yaku.*
noko-kaan bau tunu i=aku
POT.AV.RLS-eat fish bake HON=1SG

'I happened to eat grilled fish.'

Stative actor voice predicates, on the other hand, are necessarily transitive. The thematic role of the subject argument in this construction is the CAUSE, a non-controlling entity that is construed as causing the event denoted by the predicate. The prototypical CAUSE argument is inanimate, as seen in (57)a and (58)a, because inanimate arguments are difficult to construe as being in control of the event they are involved in. The fact that stative predicates do not allow for agentive arguments is therefore supported by the fact that animate, and especially human, arguments are generally not allowed as subjects in stative actor voices, as shown by (57)b and (58)b with, respectively, *aku* 'I' and *inangku* 'my mother' in subject function.

(57) a. *Ogo* *udan* *noko-puling* *gumbang.*
water rain **ST**.AV.RLS-full water.barrel

'The rainwater filled the water barrel.'

b. **Aku nokopuling gumbang.*

For: 'I filled the water barrel.'

(58) a. *Api* *moko-init* *ogo.*
fire **ST**.AV-hot water

'The fire heats up the water.'

b. **Inangku mokoinit ogo.*

For: 'My mother heats up the water.'

Importantly, the reason why (58)b is not acceptable is strictly speaking not that *inangku* 'my mother' is animate. Rather, the reason is that human beings are not heat-radiating entities, at least not to an extent that brings water to boil. That this is the case is shown by the fact that animate arguments can function as subjects of stative actor voice predicates if they can be construed as non-agentive CAUSES and not as controlling AGENTS, as seen in (59).

(59) *I* *Reni* *makaambang* *tau* *dakona.*
I Reni moko-ambang tau dako=na
HON PN **ST**.AV-ashamed person big=3SG.GEN

'Reni makes her parents feel ashamed.'

In (59), Reni does not do something with the purpose of triggering the feeling of shame in her parents. Rather, there is something in her appearance or behavior that makes them feel ashamed.

The same constraint holds in undergoer voice constructions where the CAUSE argument occurs in non-subject function. Here again, agentive arguments are not possible in the same function. Compare examples (60)a-c.

(60) a. *Mata ondo noko-itom book=na.*
eye day **ST**.AV.RLS-black skin=3SG.GEN

'The sun blackened his skin.'

b. *Boko=na ni-ko-itom-an mata ondo.*
skin=3SG.GEN RLS.UV-**ST**-black-UV2 sun day

'The sun blackened his skin.'

c. **Buok=ku ni-ko-itom-an Radna.*
hair=1SG.GEN RLS.UV-**ST**-black-UV2 PN

For: 'Radna dyed my hair black.'

The above examples clearly show that potentives and statives differ with regard to their basic argument structure along the lines predicted by our hypothesis that potentives signal limited control: potentives involve agentive arguments, albeit handicapped ones (i.e. with limited control); statives do not.

The argument structure of stative and potentive predicates also differs in other regards, as further discussed by Himmelmann & Wolff (1999) for Toratán and by Hauk (2019) for Western Subanon (see also Himmelmann 2004, 2006 for Tagalog). For current purposes, the above examples should suffice.

5.4 Whence the morphological overlap?

To conclude, in this section we argued that potentive marking does not involve a major change in aspectual structure. Specifically, potentive marking does not convert dynamic eventualities into stative ones. Even in those instances where potentives and statives are formally identical, they differ with regard to argument structure and the possibility of occurring in progressive aspect. Potentives may also be used to refer to unbounded activities and thus do not always include a result state in their temporal structure. In all of these regards, potentives are in fact similar to their dynamic counterparts. Telic potentives, however, differ from telic dynamic predicates with regard to event culmination, as shown in section 4.4 above. Thus, the match with dynamic predicates is also not perfect.

Overall, then, this section has primarily identified differences between potentives and statives, which in turn raises the question as to why there is the pervasive morphological overlap between western Austronesian potentive and stative predicates documented in section 2. From a diachronic point of view, the morphological overlap suggests that present-day statives and potentives derive from a common source construction, a hypothesis we will briefly explore in the next section, following up on a suggestion by Kaufman (2012) that perception predicates[22] may be of particular relevance in this regard.

Our goal here is not to offer an account for the actual historical developments leading to the morphological systems reviewed in section 2, which would be well beyond the scope of this paper. The following remarks are thus not to be read as hypotheses about actual historical trajectories in the development of stative and potentive morphology. Instead, the goal of the next section is to make a contribution to the conceptual framework for a proper historical investigation, specifically, to identify a possible bridging context where potentive and stative uses overlap semantically and syntactically.

6 Bridging statives and potentives: perception predicates

Perception predicates form a special class of predicates that have attracted a lot of attention in the literature on event structure because they often show grammatical properties, including special morphological marking, that sets them apart from other predicate classes.[23] Western Austronesian languages are no exception in this regard. What is more, in the case of Totoli, perception predicates and a few other lexical items such as 'get' and 'remember' show a special paradigm of potentive marking that distinguishes them from other potentives. Based on this and other facts briefly reviewed in this

[22] Kaufman (2012) speaks more generally of "emotion and other experiencer predicates", but the Totoli evidence provided in the next section points more specifically to perception predicates.
[23] The monograph by Gisborne (2010) supplies ample illustration and further references.

section, we venture the hypothesis that perception predicates, and in particular the lexical bases for 'see/look at' and 'hear/listen to',[24] have a special role to play in understanding the morphological overlap between statives and potentives in western Austronesian. The exposition proceeds from more general, cross-linguistically applicable characteristics of perception predicates to their specifics in western Austronesian symmetrical voice languages and in Totoli in particular.

A relevant characteristic in the present context is the fact that limited-control perception predicates such as 'see' and 'hear' show a "curious equivalence of *I see it* and *I can see it* or even *I saw him all the time* and *I could see him all the time*" (Vendler 1957:156). That is, whenever one says *I see it*, one could also say *I can see it* (and vice versa) without there being a clear difference in meaning between the two statements, provided that *can* is understood as referring to the external ability of seeing (i.e. there are no obstacles that obstruct the view on the percept).[25] In other words, the ambiguity between (external) ability and involuntary readings characteristic of Austronesian potentives is an integral part of limited-control perception predicates such as 'see'.

Furthermore, perception predicates form a special class because they systematically distinguish three different, but interrelated meanings: a controlled experience ('look at'), a limited-control experience ('see'), and a percept state ('be visible' or 'look like').[26] Importantly for our purposes, these three meanings are formed with the same lexical base in many western Austronesian symmetrical voice languages, for example, Totoli *ita* 'be visible, see, look at' exemplified in (61). The controlled experience is rendered by a dynamic predicate, the limited-control experience by a potentive one, and the percept state by a stative predicate.

(61) a. *Isia* *nog-ita* *kitik.*
3SG AV.RLS-see duck

'S/he watched/looked at the ducks.'

b. *Isia* *noko-ita* *kitik.*
3SG **POT**.AV.RLS-see duck

'S/he saw the ducks.'

c. *Buleong* *dako* *mo-ita* *uli=ai* *buki'* *itu.*
whirlpool big **ST**-visible from=VEN mountain DIST

'The big whirlpool is visible from this mountain.'

A third major characteristic of perception predicates, and possibly the one of major relevance in the current context, pertains to the fact that limited-control perception predicates such as 'see' are somewhat elusive with regard to their aspectual type. They are sometimes simply classified as stative (e.g. Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:115, 125), but this is too simplistic. Vendler (1957) discusses English *see* at length without a clear-cut conclusion, but suggests that it has at least a state and a punctual event (i.e. achievement) reading. Which reading applies, depends on the percept. The punctual event reading arises in reference to eventualities where seeing means spotting something as in *I saw them when they got into their car*. The state reading arises when the percept consists of a durative eventuality as in *I saw them mowing the lawn*.

[24] To simplify the discussion, we exclude the other major senses (smell, taste and feel/touch) from further consideration. In western Austronesian languages, they grammatically behave like 'see' and 'hear' for the most part, but often involve some additional idiosyncrasies. In our Totoli data, for example, they are not attested with potentive *mo-*.

[25] As Vendler (1957:156f) makes clear, this is different when *can* refers to the internal capability for seeing that exists independently of the actual ability to see something (cp. *she can see again but currently still needs to wear a bandage to protect her eyes*).

[26] Terminology varies widely. Gisborne (2010:6), for example, speaks of 'agentive verbs', 'EXPERIENCER verbs' and 'percept verbs', but mostly makes use of the English lexemes to refer to the meaning and grammar of perception predicates (e.g. LISTEN-class verbs, HEAR-class verbs, SOUND-class verbs).

Similarly, Gisborne (2010:183–192) argues that ‘see’ is underspecified for eventuality type, the actual type depending on the percept: *seeing an explosion* is a punctual event, *seeing a firework* potentially lasts as long as the firework and hence is durative (either a state or an activity). Gisborne concludes his discussion by saying “What makes SEE different is the way in which the percept conditions the experience of perception; if you like, in its relationship to its Subject SEE is just like a stative verb, but in its relationship to its Object, it is more like a dynamic verb …” (Gisborne 2010:191f). Both Vendler and Gisborne thus suggest that ‘see’ (and other perception predicates) straddle the line between stative and dynamic eventualities. This property, in turn, makes them excellent candidates for the extension of morphological marking in either direction (from stative to dynamic or vice versa).

If one follows the preceding argument, both ‘see’ and ‘be visible’ allow for readings denoting states. The major difference between the two pertains to transitivity and, in English at least, the role of the subject argument. That is, ‘be visible’ is intransitive and takes the STIMULUS (or THEME) as its single core argument; ‘see’, on the other hand, is transitive and takes the EXPERIENCER as its subject argument. But note that the latter difference does not apply in symmetrical voice languages. The subject of ‘see’ is either the EXPERIENCER or the STIMULUS, depending on the voice. In actor voice, as in (61)b above, it is the EXPERIENCER. In undergoer voice, however, the STIMULUS functions as subject, as illustrated in (62).

(62) *Nikoitaannamoko* *alpukat* *ia.*
ni-ko-ita-an=na=mo=ko alpukat ia
RLS.UV-**POT**-see-UV2=3SG.GEN=CPL=AND avocado PRX

‘He saw the avocados.’

Thus, the main grammatical difference between the undergoer voice form of ‘see’ in (62) and the intransitive stative form for ‘visible’ in (61)c pertains to grammatical transitivity. Unlike most other intransitive statives, such as the forms for ‘be red’, ‘be tall’ or ‘be hungry’, however, ‘be visible’ semantically implies a perceiver (EXPERIENCER), even if it is not grammatically expressible as a core argument. Hence, the difference between the two forms is a grammatical (syntactic) difference, not a semantic one.

The preceding observations, in our view, give some plausibility to the idea that perception predicates in principle offer a bridging context for stative and limited-control marking (in either direction) and thus may have a major role to play in explaining the pervasive overlap in the morphological marking of these two categories in western Austronesian languages. In order to adduce more concrete support for them, we conclude this section with some more specific evidence from Totoli.

Example (62) above illustrates a realis potentive undergoer voice marked by the affix combination *ni-ko--an*, which we have seen already a number of times in this article, including in example (1)b. However, unlike all other Totoli lexical base forms marked as potentive seen so far, the perception predicates *ita* ‘see’ and *tiing* ‘hear’ allow for a second undergoer voice construction where the verb is marked with the prefix *mo-*, well-known from stative predicates (cp. (61)c, inter alia).

(63) *mo-ita=na* *tau* *menderita*
POT.UV-see=3SG.GEN person suffer

‘he saw people suffering’ [farming_2.2412]

There is no obvious semantic or syntactic difference between the *mo*-potentive undergoer voice and the undergoer voice marked with *ni-ko--an* (other than the difference in mood, which is not of import in the present context). At least we have not been able to identify one so far. Formally speaking, the potentive undergoer voice form *moita*(*na*) in (63) and the stative form *moita* in (61)c are identical, except that the former usually occurs with an overt EXPERIENCER core argument (in (63), the clitic *=na*). To our minds, it is very likely that the prefix *mo-* in both forms historically derives from a common ancestor. Synchronically, however, there are good reasons to analyze them as belonging to separate paradigms and signalling different functions (potentive and stative, respectively), as we have argued in section 5 and elsewhere in this paper.

As shown in section 2.1 with example (11), the majority of dynamic lexical bases in Totoli only allow for a potentive form marked with *ko- -i/ni-ko- -an* but not one with *mo-/no-*. Only a very small number of lexical bases in Totoli makes use of *mo-* to mark potentive undergoer voice. Table 12 lists the ones that have come to our attention so far. They all share the property of being used most commonly with a limited-control argument, be it an EXPERIENCER or a more AGENT-like argument.

Table 12 Totoli mo-potentives

	Totoli root	**Dynamic potentive**	**Dynamic non-potentive**
PERCEPTION	ita	'see'	'watch, look at, look for'
	tiing	'hear'	'listen to'
REMEMBER/ FORGET	lambot	'remember'	'commemorate, keep in mind'
	lipa	'forget'	'disregard, try not to think about'
GET	ala	'get'	'fetch'
	abung	'get'	-
PASS BY/REACH	talib	'happen to pass by/go too far'	'pass through, pass by'
	lapit	'be able to reach'	-
ABILITY	taan	'be able to, endure'	'stop, block, hold'
	api'	'be able to'	-
	baba	'be able to	-

The use of *mo-* as a potentive undergoer voice marker for the lexical bases included in Table 12 leads to the unusual situation that in Totoli there are *two* potentive voice paradigms instead of one, as already noted with regard to Table 6 in section 2, repeated here as Table 13. In this regard, Totoli potentives differ from the paradigm type that is most widely attested in the Philippines, where all potentives, not just perception predicates, occur with a form cognate to Totoli *mo-* in patient/undergoer voice. Consider, for example, the Tagalog paradigm repeated here in Table 14. To the best of our knowledge, Totoli is the only language documented so far where two paradigms are attested for potentive marking.

Table 13 Totoli potentive and stative paradigms

	POTENTIVE	**POT.PERCEPTION**	**STATIVE**	
AV	mo-ko-	mo-ko-	mo-ko-	ST.AV
UV	--	**mo-**	mo-	ST
UV	ko- -i	ko- -i	ko- -i	ST.UV
LV	po-ko- -i	po-ko- -i	ko- -i	ST.LV

Table 14 Tagalog potentive and stative paradigms

	POTENTIVE	**STATIVE**	
AV	maka-	maka-	ST.AV
PV	**ma-**	ma-	ST
LV	ma- -an	ka- -an	ST.LV
CV	ma-i-	i-ka-	ST.CV

The hypothesis that perception predicates may be of particular relevance in the historical development of formally overlapping potentive and stative paradigms is further supported by their frequency. As just mentioned, in the case of 'see' and 'hear', potentive undergoer voice forms are possible with both *mo-* and *ni-ko--an* (and its non-realis counterpart *ko--i*). The *mo*-form is by far the most frequently used form of all the forms perception predicates appear in, as seen in Table 15.

Table 15 Corpus frequency of perception predicates in Totoli

			UV	**AV**
ita 'see'	potentive	**206** (mo-/no-)	8 (ko--i/ni-ko--an)	56 (moko-/noko-)
	non-potentive	-	125 (-i/ni--an)	73 (mog-/nog-)
tiing 'hear'	potentive	**37** (mo-/no-)	1 (ko--i/ni-ko--an)	6 (moko-/noko-)
	non-potentive	-	21 (-i/ni--an)	68[27] (moN-/noN-)

Specifically, the *mo*-form for *ita* 'see' is by far the most frequent form of all forms attested for perception predicates in our corpus. The potentive undergoer voice form with 'regular' *ko--i/ni-ko--an* is very rare (only eight tokens). The figures for *tiing* 'hear' are much smaller, but the overall tendencies are the same. Furthermore, the *mo*-form for 'see', namely *moita/noita*, is by far the most frequent of all potentive forms attested in the corpus, much more frequent than forms meaning 'able to make', 'manage to take', 'accidentally hit', etc. Thus, in terms of frequency, one may say that perception predicates, and specifically 'see', represent the most typical use of the potentive. In fact, *ita* 'see' is not only the most frequent base occurring with potentive morphology but also the most frequent lexical verbal base in our corpus of Totoli, regardless of its morphological marking. With a total of 627 occurrences, *ita* 'see' vastly outnumbers the other lexical bases, the next most frequent bases being *gutu* 'make' with 407 occurrences, *ala* 'take' with 345, *koto* 'know' with 276, and *been* 'give' with 158.

To conclude, this section has presented some evidence to support the hypothesis that perception predicates may have a special role to play in the emergence of the pervasive morphological overlap between potentives and statives in western Austronesian symmetrical voice languages. Perception predicates systematically include a limited-control form, be it lexical as in English *see* vs. *look at*, be it morphologically derived as in Totoli *moita* vs. *mogita*. The word for 'see' may actually be the most frequent limited-control predicate in many, if not all languages. More importantly for the possibility of bridging the divide between dynamic and stative eventualities, limited-control perception predicates usually allow for both stative and dynamic (punctual event) readings without further overt marking.

7 Conclusion

This paper explored the question to what extent limited-control predicates, which may denote accidental actions and (external) abilities, are similar to (controlled) dynamic and stative predicates. Our answer is that they are neither clearly stative nor clearly dynamic but constitute a grammatical category of their own, a category not easy to place on either side of the dynamic vs. stative divide, though perhaps leaning more strongly to the dynamic side.

In order to arrive at this conclusion, it was necessary to analyze the meaning of limited-control predicates in greater detail than has been done so far. In section 4 in particular, we establish that it is indeed control and not volition or intention that is of primary concern here. Among other things, 'limited control' is the meaning component that is common to the complete range of uses of limited-control morphology, including in particular abilitative and accidental uses. Furthermore, limited-control is only marked on

[27] This relatively high number is due to the fact that the data base includes two transcripts from a radio call-in show in Totoli where the moderator routinely addresses his hearers with "everyone who listens to us right now" or a similar phrase. Without the tokens from this transcript, the total number of non-potentive actor voice tokens of *tiing* 'listen to' would be 15.

predicates where control is at issue. Dynamic predicates generally are underspecified for control. Only in those instances where control is at issue, is control conversationally implicated for them.

The fact that the same morphological formations often allow for both limited-control and stative readings in western Austronesian languages is arguably due to the fact that they derive from a common ancestor construction. In this paper, we have not been able to present a detailed account of the historical developments that lead to the rise of two semantically and syntactically different, but morphologically often still identical constructions from this common ancestor. However, we have provided some evidence for the hypothesis that perception predicates had an important role in this process. One property of perception predicates that is of relevance in this regard is the fact that the same predicate (e.g. English *see*) may be used to refer to both stative and dynamic eventualities, thus also straddling the stative vs. dynamic divide.

Finally, we should emphasize once again that the analyses and hypotheses presented here are primarily based on evidence from two languages, Tagalog and Totoli. Considerably more detailed analyses of limited-control predicates in other western Austronesian languages are needed to determine to what extent the present account also applies to these other languages.

Acknowledgements

The research for this paper was carried out within the project *B05 Prominence related structures in Austronesian symmetrical voice languages* of the SFB1252 *Prominence in Language* (Project-ID 281511265) funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) at the University of Cologne – support we gratefully acknowledge.

The Totoli data used in this paper come from the Totoli documentation project funded by the Volkswagen Foundation's DoBeS Program (https://dobes.mpi.nl/projects/totoli/), and the Totoli documentation corpus collected within the SFB 1252 funded by the German Research Foundation (https://lac.uni-koeln.de).

Our sincere thanks go to the Totoli community and all the Totoli people who have helped us for many years to understand their language. Full acknowledgements can be found in the above mentioned collections and in Himmelmann (2001). A very special thanks goes to Sumitro S. Pogi for many hours of demanding grammar elicitation. We are also grateful to Katharina Gayler, Ivan Kapitonov, Kurt Malcher, Eric Zobel and two anonymous reviewers for comments and questions that greatly improved the argument and exposition. Another very special thanks is due here to Co-Editor Daniel Kaufman, who provided us with a host of interesting observations and challenging questions, only a fraction of which we could properly address in our revision.

Author contribution

All authors contributed to the design of the research, the analysis of the Totoli data, and the overall structure of the argument. MBF wrote the first draft of the manuscript and conducted the primary research for sections 2, 4.2, 4.4 and 5. NPH wrote the second and third drafts and developed the main argument of sections 4-6. All authors collaborated on the final manuscript.

References

Akamine, Jun. 2005. Sama (Bajau). In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 377–396. London: Routledge.

Boutin, Michael E. 1994. *Aspect in Bonggi*. PhD Thesis, University of Florida.

Bracks, Christoph. 2020. *Intonation units and grammatical units in Totoli*. PhD Thesis, Universität zu Köln.

Bracks, Christoph A., Datra Hasan, Maria Bardají i Farré, Sumitro Pogi & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2017–2020. Totoli documentation corpus 2. Language Archive Cologne. https://lac2.uni-koeln.de/de/

Coates, Jennifer. 1983. *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*. London: Croom Helm.

Croft, William. 2012. *Verbs: Aspect and causal structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davis, Henry & Lisa Matthewson. 2009. Issues in Salish syntax and semantics. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3, 1097–1166.

Davis, Henri, Lisa Matthewson & Hotze Rullmann. 2009. 'Out-of-control' marking as circumstantial modality in St'át'imcets. In *Cross-linguistic semantics of tense, aspect and modality*, ed. by Lotte Hogeweg, Helen de Hoop, & Andrej L. Malchukov, 205–144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dell, François. 1983. An aspectual distinction in Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 22–23, 175–206.

Demirdache, Hamida & Fabienne Martin. 2015. Agent control over non culminating events. In *Verb classes and aspect*, ed. by Elisa Barrajón López, José Luis Cifuentes Honrubia & Susana Rodríguez Rosique, 185–217. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, 547–619.

Durie, Mark. 1985. *A grammar of Acehnese on the basis of a dialect of North Aceh.* Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde 112. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Fauconnier, Stephanie. 2012. *Constructional effects of involuntary and inanimate agents: a cross-linguistic study*. PhD Thesis, Universiteit Leuven.

Fauconnier, Stefanie. 2013. Completives as markers of non-volitionality. *Folia Linguistica* 47, 35–54. https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2013.003

Filip, Hana. 2019. Aspectual class and Aktionsart. In *Semantics - Noun phrases and verb phrases*, ed. by Paul Portner, Klaus von Heusinger & Claudia Maienborn, 274–312. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110589443-009

García Laguía, Alexandro-Xavier. 2018. *Documentation of Northern Alta: grammar, texts and glossary*. PhD Thesis, Universitat de Barcelona.

Gisborne, Nikolas. 2010. *The event structure of perception verbs.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goddard, Cliff. 2003. Dynamic *ter-* in Malay (Bahasa Melayu). A study in grammatical polysemy. *Studies in Language* 27, 287–322.

Hauk, Bryn. 2019. Functions of the Subanon *mo*-prefix: Evidence from paradigms and argument Structure. *Oceanic Linguistic*s 58.2, 257–91. https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2019.0009

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1987. *Morphosyntax und Morphologie - Die Ausrichtungsaffixe im Tagalog*. München: Fink.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1991. Tomini-Tolitoli sound structures. *NUSA* 33, 49–70.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2001. *Sourcebook on Tomini-Tolitoli languages*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2004. On statives and potentives in western Austronesian (mostly Tagalog). In *Proceedings of Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association* 11, ed. by Paul Law, 103–119. [ZAS Papers in Linguistics Nr 34, October 2004, Berlin].

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2005a. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: typological characteristics. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 110–181. London: Routledge.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2005b. Tagalog. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 350–376. London: Routledge.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2006. How to miss a paradigm or two: Multifunctional *ma-* in Tagalog. In *Catching Language*, ed. by Felix Ameka, Alan Dench & Nicholas Evans, 487–526. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2008. Lexical categories and voice in Tagalog. In *Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian Languages*, ed. by Peter Austin & Simon Musgrave, 247–293. Stanford: CSLI.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & Sonja Riesberg. 2013. Symmetrical voice and applicative alternations: Evidence from Totoli. *Oceanic Linguistics* 52.2, 396–422.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & John Wolff. 1999. *Toratán (Ratahan)*. München: Lincom. Languages of the World, Materials 130.

Inman, Michael V. 1993. *Semantics and pragmatics of colloquial Sinhala involitive verbs*. PhD Thesis, Stanford University.

Jacobs, Peter W. 2011. *Control in Skwxwu7mesh*. PhD Thesis, The University of British Columbia.

Kaufman, Daniel. 2012. Predicate classes and PAn **ka-*. Presented at the 19th Annual Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA-19), June 26–30, Academia Sinica, Taipei.

Kimoto, Yukinori. 2017. *A grammar of Arta: A Philippine Negrito language*. PhD Thesis, Kyoto University.

Kittilä, Seppo. 2005. Remarks on involuntary agent constructions. *Word* 56, 381–419.

Kroeger, Paul R. 1990. Stative aspect and unaccusativity in Kimaragang Dusun. *Oceanic Linguistics* 29, 110–131.

Kroeger, Paul. 2005. Kimaragang. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 397–428. London: Routledge.

Kroeger, Paul. 2017. Frustration, culmination, and inertia in Kimaragang grammar. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 2(1):56, 1–29.

Lehrer, Keith. 1968. Cans without ifs. *Analysis* 29.1, 29–32. https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/29.1.29

Leto, Claudia, Winarno S. Alamudi, Jani Kuhnt-Saptodewo, Sonja Riesberg, Hasan Basri & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2005–2010. DoBeS Totoli documentation. DoBeS Archive MPI Nijmegen. https://dobes.mpi.nl/

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2005. *Argument realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

López, Francisco. 1895. *Gramática Ilocana compuesta por el P. Predicador Fr. Francisco López corregida y aumentada por el P. Carro*. Malabón: Establ. Tipo-Litografico del Asilo de la Consolación.

Lowder, Matthew W. & Peter C. Gordon. 2015. Natural forces as agents: Reconceptualizing the animate-inanimate distinction. *Cognition* 136, 85-90.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2019. Events and states. In *Handbook of event structure*, ed. by Robert Truswell, 50–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, Fabienne. 2015. Explaining the link between agentivity and non-culminating causation. *Proceedings of SALT* 25.

Martin, Fabienne. 2019. Non-culminating accomplishments. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 13.8, 1–120.

Mayani, Luh Anik. 2013. *A grammar of Tajio. A language spoken in Central Sulawesi*. PhD Thesis, Universität zu Köln.

Palmer, Frank R. 1990. *Modality and the English modals*. 2nd edition. London: Longman.

Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paul, Ileana, Baholisoa Simone Ralalaoherivony & Henriëtte de Swart. 2020. Culminating and non-culminating accomplishments in Malagasy. *Linguistics* 58.5, 1285–1322.

Riesberg, Sonja. 2014. *Symmetrical voice and linking in western Austronesian languages*. Pacific Linguistics 646. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Riesberg, Sonja, Kurt Malcher & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2021. The many ways of transitivization in Totoli. In Silvia Luraghi and Elisa Roma (eds.), *Valency over time: Diachronic perspectives on valency patterns and valency orientation.* Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 235-264. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110755657-008

Ross, Malcom D. 1995. Proto-Austronesian verbal morphology: Evidence from Taiwan. In *Austronesian studies relating to Taiwan*, ed by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 727–791. Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology 3. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Rubino, Carl. 1997. *A reference grammar of Ilocano*. PhD Thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Rubino, Carl. 2005. Iloko. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 326–349. London: Routledge.

Rubino, Carl. 2008. Zamboangueño Chavacano and the potentive mode. *Roots of creole structures: Weighing the contribution of substrates and superstrates* 33, 279–299.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 2002. Recent activity in the theory of aspect: Accomplishments, achievements, or just non-progressive state? *Linguistic Typology* 6, 199–271.

Schachter, Paul & Fe Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Searl, John. 1983. *Intentionality, an essay in the philosophy of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. The control system: A major category in the grammar of Salishan languages. In *The Victoria conference on Northwestern languages*, ed. by Barbara S. Efrat, 156–76. Victoria, BC: Provincial Museum.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1985. Control in Salish grammar. In *Relational Typology*, ed. by Frans Plank, 391–428. Trends in Linguistics (Studies and Monographs 28). New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Thompson, Laurence C. & M. Terry Thompson. 1992. The Thompson language. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 8. Missoula: University of Montana.

Travis, Lisa. 2000. Event structure in syntax. In Carol Tenny and James Pustejovsky (eds.) *Events as Grammatical Objects: the Converging Perspectives of Lexical Semantics and Syntax*. Stanford: CSLI Publications

Travis, Lisa. 2005. Passives, states, and roots and Malagasy. *Proceedings of AFLA XII*, 395–409.

Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vendler, Zeno. 1957. Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review* 66.2, 143–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2182371

Walton, Charles. 1986. *Sama Verbal Semantics*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Wolff, John U., Maria Theresa C. Centeno & Der-Hwa V. Rau. 1991, *Pilipino through self-instruction*, 4 vols. Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program

Zobel, Erik. 2005. Buol. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 625–648. London: Routledge.