



PROJECT MUSE®

Voice at the Crossroads: Symmetrical Clause Alternations in Äiwoo, Reef Islands, Solomon Islands

Åshild Næss

Oceanic Linguistics, Volume 54, Number 1, June 2015, pp. 270-307 (Article)

**Oceanic
Linguistics**
VOLUME 54 NUMBER 1 JUNE 2015

Published by University of Hawai'i Press

DOI: 10.1353/ol.2015.0000

➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ol/summary/v054/54.1.naess.html>

Voice at the Crossroads: Symmetrical Clause Alternations in Āiwoo, Reef Islands, Solomon Islands

Åshild Næss

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE

This paper argues that the Āiwoo language of the Reef Islands shows what could be characterized as a symmetrical voice system with three voices: an actor voice, an undergoer voice, and a circumstantial voice. Although it differs from better-described symmetrical voice systems in lacking a syntactic pivot, the overall pattern of morphosyntactic alternations, as well as the discourse-pragmatic function, is essentially that of a symmetrical voice system. Moreover, the Āiwoo system combines the syntactic characteristics of a “Philippine-type” symmetrical voice system with the morphological characteristics of an “Indonesian-type” system in a way that appears to be unusual.

This analysis, while confirming the status of the Reefs-Santa Cruz language group to which Āiwoo belongs as Austronesian, raises doubts about their current classification as Oceanic, since the symmetrical voice system of Proto-Austronesian is usually assumed to have been lost by the time of Proto-Oceanic. Alternatively, the analysis may be taken to imply that current reconstructions of Proto-Oceanic morphosyntax must be revised. Overall, it adds to the complex picture of voice and transitivity-related systems in Austronesian languages, and to the challenges involved in understanding their historical relationships.

1. INTRODUCTION.¹ This paper demonstrates that the Oceanic language Āiwoo, spoken in the Reef Islands in Solomon Islands’ Temotu Province, has a pattern of clausal organization that shows many of the characteristics of a symmetrical voice system with three voices: actor voice, undergoer voice, and circumstantial voice. There are crucial differences between the Āiwoo system and the symmetrical voice systems found in Western Austronesian languages, notably the lack of a syntactic pivot in Āiwoo; but the overall pattern of alternation, as well as the function of marking the verb for the role of the participant that shows the highest degree of prominence in the discourse context, is essentially the same as those found in such systems.

1. I would like to thank Malcolm Ross for insightful comments on an earlier draft, and for his constant willingness to discuss matters relating to the history of Reefs-Santa Cruz with me; and Brenda Boerger and Anders Vaa for comparative Reefs-Santa Cruz discussions. None of these helpful people necessarily agrees with all the points made in this paper, and any errors or misinterpretations are entirely my own responsibility.

It has previously been claimed (Næss 2013) that the Äiwoo system of argument alternation derives historically from a symmetrical voice system. This work, however, stops short of actually analyzing the synchronic system in Äiwoo as symmetrical voice. The present paper claims that Næss (2013) did not push the analysis far enough and that, while applying the term “voice” to a system that lacks clear grammatical relations may be stretching the definition, the patterns found in present-day Äiwoo nevertheless have central properties in common with a symmetrical voice system. Moreover, while its three-way voice distinction is similar to the so-called Philippine-type symmetrical voice systems, it also has formal properties in common with Indonesian-type systems, and I will argue that some of the morphology involved is plausibly cognate with one of the applicative suffixes found in many Indonesian-type languages.

Under current classification, Äiwoo is a member of the Temotu first-order subgroup of Oceanic (Ross and Næss 2007). The analysis of the language as having a type of symmetrical voice system raises two potential problems with this classification: first, Proto-Oceanic (POC) is generally assumed to have lost the original symmetrical voice system found in Proto-Austronesian (PAN) and Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP), meaning that the presence of a symmetrical voice system with clear formal links to the PMP voice morphology in an Oceanic language is unexpected. Second, this analysis underscores the radical differences in structure between the Reefs-Santa Cruz languages, on the one hand, and the languages of Utupua and Vanikoro, supposedly part of the same subgroup (Tryon 1994; François 2009, 2013), on the other. While such structural differences certainly do not negate the significance of the shared phonological innovations noted by Ross and Næss (2007), they do call into question the precise relationship between Reefs-Santa Cruz, on the one hand, and Utupua-Vanikoro, on the other. Furthermore, the unusual properties of the Äiwoo symmetrical-voice system, which appear to some extent to mix Philippine-type syntactic properties and Indonesian-type morphological properties, add to the complex picture of voice and transitivity-related systems in Austronesian languages, and to the challenges involved in understanding their historical relationships.

2. SYMMETRICAL VOICE. A number of terms have been applied to what will here be described as symmetrical voice systems, and the precise characteristics of such systems vary between languages. In essence, a symmetrical voice system is a system that morphologically marks all verbs for the semantic role of the verb’s most prominent argument. “Most prominent argument” is usually understood as meaning “subject” in the sense of syntactic pivot (Schachter 1976, 1977), though this will be discussed with respect to Äiwoo in section 4 below.

Example (1) from Tagalog illustrates a typical symmetrical voice system.² Each verb shows a morphological marker glossed respectively as ‘actor voice’, ‘patient voice’, ‘loc-

2. Nonstandard abbreviations used in glosses: AUG, augmented number; AV, actor voice; BN, bound noun; CIRC, circumstantial bound noun; COLL, collective; CONJ, conjunction; CS, change of state; CV, circumstantial voice; DEIC, deictic particle; DIR, directional; EF, emphatic focus; HON, honorific article; INCH, inchoative; LK, linker; LV, locative voice; MIN, minimal number; NM, noun marker; NPV, nonpivot core argument; OBL.PRO, oblique proform; POT, potential; RLS, realis; SPEC, specific; SUFF, suffix (function unclear); VPL, verbal plural; UA, unit-augmented number; UTEN, utensils possessive class; UV, undergoer voice.

ative voice', and 'circumstantial voice'. The argument NP with the semantic role specified by the voice morphology takes the marker *ang* and shows a syntactically privileged status in constructions such as relative clauses, to be discussed further below.

(1) TAGALOG

a. **Mag-alis** **ang babae** ng bigas sa sako para sa bata.
 AV-take.out SPEC woman NPIV rice LOC sack for LOC child
 'The woman will take some rice out of a/the sack for a/the child.'

b. A-alis-**in** ng babae **ang bigas** sa sako para sa bata.
 DUR-take.out-PV GEN woman SPEC rice LOC sack for LOC child
 'A/the woman will take the rice out of a/the sack for a/the child.'

c. A-alis-**an** ng babae ng bigas **ang sako** para sa bata.
 DUR-take.out-LV GEN woman NPIV rice SPEC sack for LOC child
 'A/the woman will take some rice out of the sack for a/the child.'

d. **Ipag-alis** ng babae ng bigas sa sako **ang bata**.
 CV-take.out GEN woman NPIV rice LOC sack SPEC child
 'A/the woman will take some rice out of a/the sack for the child.'

(Schachter 1976:494–95; glosses from Ross 2002a:26)

Such systems are "voice" systems in the sense that they mark a syntactic relationship between the verb and its syntactic pivot (Himmelman 2002:13). They are "symmetrical" in the sense that all voices show overt morphological marking, as opposed to asymmetrical voice systems such as active/passive systems where the active is unmarked and the passive derived from the active by overt morphological marking. In some languages, they are also "symmetrical" in that all voices are considered to be equally transitive, again as opposed to a passive derivation that derives an intransitive construction from an active one. But in many symmetrical-voice languages, the actor voice appears to be less transitive than the other voices on a number of criteria. However, Himmelman (2005a:159) argues that "syntactic transitivity distinctions are largely irrelevant" for symmetrical-voice systems because they often do not distinguish clearly between core and peripheral arguments.

Symmetrical voice systems are characteristic of Western Austronesian languages. "Western Austronesian" is not a genealogically defined subgroup of Austronesian, but rather a geographically defined term; as defined in Himmelman (2002), it includes the Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan, the Philippines, mainland southeast Asia, Western Indonesia (Sulawesi and all islands to the west of it), Borneo, and Madagascar, as well as Palauan and Chamorro. Crucially for the present paper, it does not include the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian.

Symmetrical voice systems are often further subdivided into "Philippine-type" and "Indonesian-type" systems. In terms of the differences in voice patterns, which are the focus of this paper, Philippine-type languages have an actor voice, where the actor is the pivot, and a set of undergoer voices that allow noun phrases with a variety of semantic roles such as patient, location, instrument, and so on, to become pivot (Arka and Ross 2005:7). Indonesian-type languages, by contrast, have an actor voice and an undergoer voice, with further derivational affixes applying to both voices. While it is possible for Indonesian-type languages to have more than one undergoer voice, these are not semanti-

cally distinct; that is, they do not promote arguments with different semantic roles in the manner seen with Philippine-type undergoer voices.

A symmetrical voice system has been reconstructed to Proto-Austronesian, on the basis that such systems occur synchronically both in several of the Formosan first-order subgroups and in the Malayo-Polynesian subgroup. However, it is generally accepted that the symmetrical voice system had been lost by the time Proto-Malayo-Polynesian developed into Proto-Oceanic, having developed into a system marking transitivity on verbs (Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002:61–62; Ross 2012).

3. CLAUSE ALTERNATIONS IN ÄIWO

3.1 THE ÄIWO LANGUAGE. The Äiwo language is spoken in the Main Reef Islands, and in a number of settlements on nearby Santa Cruz Island, in Solomon Islands' Temotu Province. It belongs to the so-called Reefs-Santa Cruz language group, which was a source of considerable controversy in Oceanic linguistics for several decades. The languages were long thought to be of mixed genealogical origin—Austronesian with a Papuan substrate (see, for example, Wurm 1978, 1981, 1991)—but recent research has shown the arguments for the Papuan substrate to be flawed (Næss 2006; Næss and Boerger 2008), and Ross and Næss (2007) propose that the Reefs-Santa Cruz languages, together with the languages of the other major islands of Temotu, Utupua and Vanikoro, make up a first-order subgroup of Oceanic that they label “Temotu.” This classification is based on a shared phonological innovation, the merger of POC *l and *r as *l, as well as a set of idiosyncratic innovations in individual lexical items.

Moreover, Ross and Næss propose that Reefs-Santa Cruz forms a further subgroup within Temotu, and Utupua-Vanikoro languages form another subgroup; within the latter, they take Utupua to form a further subgroup, but find no evidence for a Vanikoro subgroup. However, François (2009) does present such evidence, and thus assumes Utupua-Vanikoro to split further into the Utupua and Vanikoro subgroups.

It is clear that there are substantial differences, both lexically and structurally, between the Reefs-Santa Cruz languages, on the one hand, and the Vanikoro languages on the other. Very little information is available on the Utupua languages, but from what is known (Ray 1926; Tryon and Hackman 1983; Tryon 1994), they show far greater parallelisms with the Vanikoro languages than with Reefs-Santa Cruz. Indeed, the Utupua and Vanikoro languages have been recognized as Oceanic languages for as long as they have been known to linguists; by contrast, the striking structural properties of the Reefs-Santa Cruz languages were a major factor in their being classified as mixed Austronesian-Papuan.

3.2 A-VERBS vs. O-VERBS. Äiwo has two basic clause types. The first shows basic SV/AVO word order and marks the S/A argument by prefixes on the verb (cf. table 1):

- (2) a. Toponu mo lâpu lâ ki-li-mo-le=to=wâ.
 turtle and rat DEIC:DIST IPFV-3AUG-stay-UA=CS=DEIC:DIST
 ‘The turtle and the rat were staying together.’

- b. Pe-sime-engâ li-epave=to sii=kâ.
 COLL-person-DEM:DIST 3AUG-cook.A=CS fish=DEIC:DIST
 'The people cooked fish.'

The second clause type shows basic OVA word order and marks the A argument (and for some combinations of A and O arguments, also the O argument) by suffixes on the verb (cf. table 2):

- (3) a. Sii lâ ki-epavi-i=to=wâ.
 fish DEIC:DIST IPFV-cook.O-3AUG=CS=DEIC:DIST
 'They cooked the fish.'
- b. Lâto nuwo i-luwa-kâ toponu eä nupaa i-luwa-kâ lâpu.
 thus bottom PFV-take.O-DIR:3 turtle CONJ top PFV-take.O-DIR:3 rat
 'The turtle took the bottom half, and the rat took the top.'

O arguments can be marked on the verb only when (i) the A is 1MIN and the O is 2nd person,³ in which case the A suffix takes the form *-nee* and the O is marked by *-mu* (2MIN) or *-mi* (2AUG); or (ii) the A is 3MIN and the O is non-3MIN, in which case the A is marked by *-gu* and the O is marked with a suffix of the same form as those given in table 2. The exception is a 1MIN O, which is not marked by a suffix; a verb marked by *-gu* with no following O suffix is interpreted as having a 3MIN A and a 1MIN O. It is likely that *-gu* has been reanalyzed from a 1MIN marker, as POC had **-gu* as the 1SG possessive suffix and the Äiwoo suffixes reflect POC possessive pronouns (Ross and Næss 2007:476; Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002:67); note that *-gu* still appears to mark a 1MIN O in imperatives:

TABLE 1. S/A PREFIXES

	MINIMAL	AUGMENTED
1ST	i-	me-
1ST+2ND	ji-	de-
2ND	mu-/mi-	mi-
3RD	Ø	li-/lu-

TABLE 2. A SUFFIXES

	MINIMAL	AUGMENTED
1ST	-no/-nee [†]	-ngo(pu)
1ST+2ND	-ji	-de
2ND	-mu	-mi
3RD	-Ø/-gu [‡]	-i

[†] *-nee* is the form found preceding a 2MIN object suffix

[‡] *-gu* is used when the object is non-3MIN

3. Äiwoo person marking is organized according to a so-called minimal-augmented system, where 'you and I' ('1st+2nd' person) functions as a distinct person category. It patterns like the other persons in that it can be "pluralized," but since its "singular" form refers to two people, the terms "minimal" and "augmented" are used instead of "singular" and "plural" for such systems. The "unit-augmented" number refers to minimal number plus one, that is, two people for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons, but three for the 1st+2nd person: 'you and I plus one'. Person affixes on verbs do not show a distinct unit-augmented form in Äiwoo; instead, a suffix *-le* is added to the augmented form of the verb.

- (4) Meli-kâ-gu=to go nyâ-wä!
 let.go-DIR:3-1MIN.O=CS PURP 1MIN.IRR-go
 ‘Release me now, so I can go!’

In previous work, the clause types in (2) and (3) have been classified as ‘intransitive’ (2a), ‘semi-transitive’ (2b), and ‘transitive’ (3), respectively. However, a closer analysis shows that the difference between (2b) and (3) is not, in fact, characterizable in terms of transitivity.

A transitivity-based analysis assumes that (2b) is formally intransitive because its morphological argument marking is identical to that of the one-argument clause in (2a), and different from that in (3), which would be defined as the transitive clause type. This would imply that the O NP in (2b) is incorporated into the verb or verb phrase. However, although the O NP in this clause type cannot be indexed on the verb, it is clearly an argument of the clause from a syntactic point of view. It is a phrasal constituent that can take various modifiers, including numerals, stative verbs, possessives (5a), and relative clauses (5b).

- (5) a. Lâ tumwä i-lâwââ-kâ=to [opo nyigi lakwaio tä=nâ].
 DEIC.DIST father.3MIN PFV-build.A-DIR=CS house one small POSS.LOC=DEIC.DIST
 ‘Then her father built her a little house.’
 b. Jises i-wâ-päko-ute [sime nää ku-mo-lâmä ngâgo].
 Jesus PFV-CAUS-good-again person spirit IPFV-stay-inside to.3MIN
 ‘Jesus heals a man who has a spirit living inside him.’

Furthermore, the position of the O NP relative to other elements of the clause shows that it cannot be incorporated. Næss (2015) establishes the verb phrase in Äiwoo as bounded by certain (nonobligatory) enclitics, including the negation enclitic =*gu*, the future/habitual enclitic =*Caa*, and the phasal aspect enclitics =*jo* and =*to*. The A argument of O-verbs precede these enclitics and so must be analyzed as included in the verb phrase:

- (6) a. Ba i-te-kä sime=gu.
 NEG PFV-see-DIR:3 person=NEG
 ‘No one saw (him).’
 b. Ki-vääpo-kä tumwä=jo=wâ.
 IPFV-ask-DIR:3 father.3MIN=PROG=DEIC.DIST
 ‘Her father asked her.’
 c. I-luwa-kä tumwä=nâa.
 PFV-take-DIR:3 father.3MIN=FUT
 ‘Her father would take it.’

O arguments of A-verbs, by contrast, follow the clitics, as seen for the aspect clitic =*to* in (2b) and (5b), and the future clitic =*Caa* in (13). Thus they are outside the verb phrase, and, hence, cannot be analyzed as incorporated.

The O argument can be definite, which speaks further against an incorporation analysis. Äiwoo lacks articles, but the distal demonstrative *eângâ* ‘that’ is frequently used to mark nouns as identifiable, that is, definite (Vaa 2006:74–76):

- (7) Kâ=nâ päko-pwâ nâ-eamole-ee-päko-kâ=nâ lâ sime eângâ.
 say=CV good-SUFF IRR-look.A-go.up-good-DIR.3=DEIC.DIST DEIC.DIST person DEM.DIST
 ‘He wanted very much to have a good look at that person.’

An alternative analysis might be that the O argument is oblique, but there is no evidence to support this. Ross (2002a:28) defines an oblique argument as follows: “an argument is oblique if an argument with the same structure may also occur as a peripheral argument (one not required by verbal valency).” There are verbs in Äiwoo that plausibly take oblique arguments in this sense. Drawing a distinction between oblique arguments and adjuncts is not straightforward, since in Äiwoo, like in many Oceanic languages, arguments of all types frequently remain unexpressed if identifiable in the discourse context. A plausible candidate for an oblique argument is the recipient of *lää/la* ‘give’, which is encoded with the verbal preposition *ngâgo* ‘to, for’, the same encoding shown by human peripheral participants such as the goal of *pu* ‘go’ in (8b):

- (8) a. Ki-li-lää-kä numonu mi-elo ngâgo tumwä sigiläi.
 IPFV-3AUG-give.A-DIR:3 money BN-big to.3MIN father.3MIN male
 ‘They give a lot of money to the boy’s father.’
 b. I-pu-kä=to ngâgo isä.
 PFV-go-DIR:3=CS to.3MIN mother.3MIN
 ‘He went to his mother.’

By contrast, the O argument of A-verbs is unmarked, like the A of A-verbs and both arguments of O-verbs.

The types of syntactic tests for core vs. oblique status applied, for example, by Kroeger (1993) to Tagalog, for the most part, do not apply to Äiwoo, as they largely refer to control phenomena; Äiwoo allows any argument to be omitted if it is identifiable from context, and does not appear to have syntactic control (Næss 2015). Quantifier float, which is used as a test for core status in Balinese by Arka (2003), is possible for obliques in Äiwoo, at least as far as the quantifying verb *du* ‘finish; all’ is concerned. When modifying a noun, *du* can either function as a modifier in the noun phrase or be serialized to the main verb of the clause; the latter may be considered an instance of quantifier float in that the quantifier appears in a different constituent from the noun it modifies:

- (9) a. nyenaa-du ngâ paveli eângâ
 tree-finish LOC garden DEM:DIST
 ‘all the trees in the garden’
 b. Ngaa tepekoulâ ku-luwa-du-kä=jo.
 CONJ things IPFV-take-finish-DIR:3=PROG
 ‘She did all the chores.’

(10) shows *du* as part of the verb complex modifying the oblique *ngâgoi* ‘from them’:

- (10) I-pie-du-päko ngâgo-i.
 PFV-adopt.A-finish-good to.3MIN-3AUG
 ‘They had adopted (children) from all of them.’

The distributional facts of *dä* ‘some’ are considerably more complex and require further investigation. It can appear before or after a noun (or both) or within the verb phrase, following the verb and, for O-verbs, the A NP (Næss 2015:87–88); this distribution means that, in a number of the available examples, it is not possible to determine whether it belongs in the NP or is floated, and, consequently, no conclusions can be drawn regarding its patterning with respect to core vs. oblique arguments at this stage.

To summarize, all available evidence points to the O NP of A-verbs being a core argument; in other words, the clause types illustrated in (2b) and (3) both have two syntactic arguments. It is a characteristic of Oceanic languages that they tend to show a clause type that appears to be transitive from the point of view of syntax, but intransitive from the point of view of morphology; Margetts (2008) refers to this phenomenon as “transitivity discord,” as it appears to involve a mismatch between morphological and syntactic diagnostics of transitivity. However, any examination of clause structure alternations presupposes that arguments can be consistently identified across constructions; that is, an NP cannot be at the same time an argument and not an argument of the same construction. I take argumenthood to be a syntactic relation between a verb and a noun phrase, and, thus, if AVO clauses have two arguments from the point of view of syntax, then they are two-argument constructions.

Äiwoo, then, shows an alternation between two types of two-argument clauses: one with basic AVO word order and actor prefixes, and one with basic OVA word order and actor suffixes. A further essential difference between the two types is the form of the verb that appears in them. I will refer to the verb forms occurring in AVO clauses as A-verbs, and to the verb forms occurring in OVA clauses as O-verbs.

There is no single, clearly segmentable morpheme that derives A-verbs from O-verbs or vice versa, nor a single set of morphemes that derive both verb types from a common root. Instead, there are pairs of verbs that show systematic formal correspondences falling into a number of distinct types.

In type 1, a final *-e*, *-ei*, *-oi*, or *-Ø* in the A-verb corresponds to final *-i* in the O-verb. Examples are given in table 3. The *-i* in the Äiwoo type 1 O-verbs uncontroversially reflects the suffix **-i*, which arose from a merger between the PMP locative voice and goal voice markers into a single undergoer voice. This suffix is then thought to have been further reanalyzed in POC as a marker of transitivity, and is reflected as such in numerous present-day Oceanic languages (Pawley and Reid 2011 [1980]; Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002; Ross 2012).

Äiwoo *-i* is not synchronically segmentable in the sense that, with the exception of pattern 1c in table 3 above, no unsuffixed roots **beng*, **läv*, and so on, exist. However, *-i* behaves like a suffix phonologically in that it does not undergo elision in final position. The high vowels /i/ and /u/ in Äiwoo are predictably elided or devoiced in certain positions, including final position; but this does not apply to the final *-i* in O-verbs. So, for example, in *bolevi* ‘shore’, the final *-i* is part of the root, and the word is pronounced as [ˈmboˈlev] if not followed by further material; but the O-verb *epavi*, for which the corresponding A-verb is *epave*, cannot be pronounced **[eˈpav]*. The final *-e* of type 1a A-verbs also undergoes certain phonological processes characteristic of an /e/-initial morpheme being added to a root: for example, *popoi* ‘kick, O-verb’ > *popoe* [popwe:] ‘kick, A-verb’, where the /o/ preceding the final *-e* has been desyllabified and the *-e* correspondingly lengthened.

TABLE 3. TYPE 1 VERB ALTERNATIONS

TYPE	A-VERB	O-VERB	EXAMPLES
1a	-e	-i	benge–bengi ‘block’, läve–lävi ‘fish with a net’
1b	-ei/-oi	-i	ei–ii ‘peel’, gei–gi ‘shave’
1c	Ø	-i	eta–etai ‘fish with a line’, lotälä–lotäläi ‘prepare’

In type 2 alternations, the A-verb shows a root-internal sequence *-ou-*, *-ow-*, *-âw-* that is not present in the O-verb. Examples are given in table 4. Naess (2013) argues that this *-ow-/âw-* reflects the PMP actor-voice infix **<um>*, which followed the root-initial consonant; a similar reduction of **<um>* to *<uw>*, *<u>*, or *<w>* has taken place in Palauan (Lemaréchal 2010:15) and Rukai (Ross 2009:311–12). Note that the type 2c forms are bimorphemic; for example, *tâlowe* ‘cut long flexible object, A-verb’ is segmentable into *tâ-* ‘cut with a knife’ and *-lowe* ‘break, of long flexible object’, leaving the proposed reflex of the infix in the expected position. PMP **<um>* was an independent actor-voice morpheme, whereas the forms generally reflected in Oceanic languages were dependent verb forms (Ross 2012). However, Ross (pers. comm.) considers it likely that **<um>* forms in PAN also served as dependent forms, meaning that a reflex of this morpheme having survived in Äiwoo is not unlikely. It may be noted that this pattern has a considerably lower type frequency than the type 1 alternations.

TABLE 4. TYPE 2 VERB ALTERNATIONS

TYPE	A-VERB	O-VERB	EXAMPLES
2a	-ou	-u	tou-tu ‘carry, bring’, gou-gu ‘husk’
2b	-âwââ	-ââ	dâwââ-dââ ‘tie up’, câwââ-cââ ‘pull’
2c	-lowe	-lu	tâlowe-tâlu ‘cut long flexible object’, eaalowe-eaalu ‘tickle’

The type 3 pattern has *-ei* in A-verbs corresponding to *-(i)li* in O-verbs, as in *kei-kili* ‘dig’, *vei-vili* ‘weave’, *lei-li* ‘grate’. These are the only three verbs in my data that show this alternation, and its origins are unclear.

While other patterns of alternation exist, the three types listed above account for the great majority of the available data. A final alternation to be noted is found with the verb ‘eat’. The A-verb form is *vângä*, where the initial [v] reflects POC **p*; v-initial verbs show the unlenited alternant [p] following the 3AUG prefix *li-*: *i-ki-vângä* ‘I eat’, but *ki-li-pângä* ‘they eat’.⁴ This is an obvious reflex of POC **paŋan*, whereas the O-verb form *ngä* plausibly reflects POC **kani*. Lynch, Ross, and Crowley (2002:62) point out this pair as a remnant of the actor voice/undergoer voice alternation in POC.

A special marker deriving O-verbs from A-verbs does exist for causativized verbs. The causative prefix *wâ-/vâ-* derives an A-verb from a one-argument verb; for the vast majority of verbs, the suffix *-(w)â/-nâ* must be added to form a causative O-verb:

- (11) a. Li-nubo-du=to=wâ.
 3AUG-die-all=CS=DEIC:DIST
 ‘They are all dead.’
- b. Lu-pwâ-nubo sii.
 3AUG-CAUS-die fish
 ‘They killed fish.’
- c. Dengaa i-te-wâ-i iumu, lâto ku-wâ-nubo-wâ-i iumu=wâ.
 lest PFV-see-DIR:2-3AUG 2MIN then IPFV-CAUS-die-UV-3AUG 2MIN=DEIC:DIST
 ‘If they see you, they will kill you.’

4. Some variation exists, as shown by example (13). A similar alternation is found for verb-initial [w], which becomes [p] or [pʷ] following the 3AUG prefix; cf. (11b).

While the A-verb/O-verb alternation is pervasive throughout the verbal lexicon, there are verbs that do not participate in the alternation. A highly frequent example is *te* 'see', an O-verb that does not appear to have a corresponding A-verb. There are also a few verbs that appear in both patterns with no change in form. More work is needed to determine how common such nonalternating forms are as a proportion of the total verbal lexicon. One-argument verbs do not alternate, but derivational processes exist that derive O-verbs from one-argument verbs; these are discussed in 4.7.

3.3 VERB ALTERNATIONS AND PRAGMATIC PROMINENCE. I argued above that the contrast between the clause pattern that shows A prefixes, AVO word order, and A-verbs, and the one that shows A suffixes, OVA word order, and O-verbs, does not constitute a transitivity alternation. Rather, the choice between the two patterns is determined by the relative prominence of clausal constituents in the discourse. "Prominence" is to be understood as relating to how a speaker structures a stretch of discourse in terms of which elements are marked as worthy of attention in the context.

When discussing pragmatic prominence, the proliferation of terminology found in the literature must be approached with some caution, especially as one finds both different terms being used for similar concepts and similar terms used for different concepts. In particular, terms such as "topic" and "topicality," which are clearly related to what I mean by pragmatic prominence, are used in different ways within different frameworks.

The term TOPIC, as defined in Lambrecht (1994), is a sentence-level construct; the topic of a sentence is defined as "the thing which the proposition expressed is ABOUT" (Lambrecht 1994:118, emphasis in original). A sentence can have more than one topic, which may differ in their pragmatic salience (Lambrecht 1994:147–50).

By contrast, the term TOPICALITY, as employed by Givón (1983, 2001, for example) and others, denotes a discourse-level concept. Referents in a stretch of discourse have a greater or lesser degree of topicality, which "can be understood as the relative importance or contribution of a referent to the narrative" (Cooreman 1987:13). Since "importance" in itself is difficult to measure, topicality is taken to be associated with repeated mention over a certain stretch of discourse, on the assumption that the more central to the discourse a referent is, the more likely it is to recur across multiple clauses. Accordingly, topicality in this sense is typically quantified in terms of two independent measures: referential distance, that is, the number of clauses separating the present mention of a referent from the previous mention in the same text, and topic persistence, that is, the number of times the referent recurs within the following stretch of text.

Givón (2001:254) links referential distance to *accessibility* of the referent in the hearer's mental representation of the discourse, and topic persistence to the referent's *importance* in the subsequent discourse. He states that "the grammar of referential processing is sensitive to both aspects of topicality [referential accessibility and thematic importance, author's note], with different grammatical devices skewed more toward one or the other" (Givón 2001:254). While no statistical analysis has been carried out as to how these factors play out in the use of A-verbs vs. O-verbs in Äiwoo discourse, this alternation seems primarily to reflect what Givón calls thematic importance. Consider the following example:

- (12) Lu-po-kā-le, nyâ-nou nyigi i-te-kā-i-le ki-ko.
 3AUG-go-DIR:3-UA tree-banana one PFV-see.O-DIR:3-3AUG-UA IPFV-lie
 ‘They went along, and they saw a banana tree lying there.’

Nyânou nyigi ‘a banana tree’ is clearly not a topic in Lambrecht’s sense. This is the first mention in the text of this referent, and it is part of the focus domain in Lambrecht’s terminology: the topic is ‘they’, and the reference to the banana tree is part of the information we are being given about the topic.

With respect to Givón’s notion of topicality, *nyânou nyigi* is topical insofar as it will go on to play a central part in the narrative: the two protagonists divide the tree in half and each plant a part; only the bottom half with the roots survives and brings forth fruit, which subsequently becomes a source of strife. At the same time, it is not anaphorically accessible, that is, established in the preceding discourse (Givón 2001:229), and so would be given a high rating for referential distance by standard topicality measures⁵.

Now consider the following passage from a text about traditional maturation ceremonies:

- (13) Poi le ku-bo-kele=to ngä sâpulâu=ke. Sime=kâ
 pig DEIC:DIST IPFV-INCH-carve=CS LOC men’s.house=DEIC:PROX person=DEIC:DIST
 li-välâ=to ngä sâpulâu go ki-li-vängä=kaa ilâ
 3AUG-gather=CS LOC men’s.house PURP IPFV-3AUG-eat.A=FUT DEIC:DIST
 poi êângâ.
 pig DEM:DIST
 ‘Pigs would be carved up in the single men’s house. People would gather in the single men’s house to eat that pig.’

Despite the O argument *ilâ poi êângâ* being recently introduced and highly accessible, the final clause has the A-verb *vängä* rather than the corresponding O-verb *ngä*. The overall importance of the individual pig or pigs⁶ in the narrative is, however, relatively low; they play a role as an important ceremonial food, but it is the act of eating—the ceremonial feast—that is the central aspect of this passage, not the referent of *poi* as such.

What is encoded by the A-verb vs. O-verb alternation, then, seems clearly related to Givón’s notion of thematic importance, and, thus, to topicality in the discourse sense. Nevertheless, I believe the term “topicality” is problematic in the current context because of its association with anaphoric accessibility. This can be further illustrated by example (14):

- (14) Ngaa ... ilâ ki-lää-kä tepekoulâ eââ ilâ
 CONJ DEIC:DIST IPFV-give.A-DIR:3 thing DEM:DIST DEIC:DIST
 pe-Nganaa=kâ.
 COLL-Nganaa=DEIC:DIST
 ‘So the ones who gave him those things were the people (=spirits) of Nganaa.’

This clause has the A-verb *lää* ‘give’. In Lambrecht’s sense, the A participant is focal, not topical.⁷ In Givón’s terms, the O NP *tepekoulâ eââ* ‘these things’ is arguably far more topical than the A in the sense of being an established and persistent referent in the discourse—the things in question (a large luxurious house and all manner of food crops

5. An arbitrary number, typically 20, is assigned to the first mention of an NP in measures of anaphoric distance.

6. Äiwoo does not have inflectional number on nouns, and *poi* here could refer to one or several pigs.

7. In this particular case, the A shows argument focus, and this is the reason why this clause shows VOA rather than the unmarked AVO word order, since the clause-final position functions as a focus position in Äiwoo.

appearing magically overnight in the bush) have been the main focus of the narrative for several paragraphs prior to this example. It is, thus, not obvious that topicality in Givón's sense is what governs the choice of verb form here. The A-verb is chosen because the A is the *most prominent participant* in the discourse context—it is the element to which the speaker wishes to attract the hearer's attention.

Contrast (14) with (15), which has the O-verb form *la* 'give':

- (15) Ngamaa numonu eângâ ki-la-mä=kâ ki-tokoli
 if money DEM:DIST IPFV-give.O-DIR:1=DEIC:DIST IPFV-sit
 mo nyowää?
 with what
 'If he gives us the money, what will we do with it?'

As in (14), the O argument *numonu eângâ* 'the money' in (15) is definite and topical. But in this case, the money is the most prominent argument, the focal point on which the discourse turns—the focus of attention is not on who gives the money, but on what will happen to the money once it is given.

The fact that the O argument is equally definite and topical in both examples is further evidence that the alternation between the two clause types is not based on transitivity. Examples (14) and (15) show no obvious differences in semantic transitivity as defined, for example, by Hopper and Thompson (1980); specifically, if the A-verb construction had an incorporated object, this object would be expected to be low in features of individuation, such as definiteness and specificity, as has been suggested for other Oceanic languages for which an incorporation construction has been posited (Margetts 2008). However, this is clearly not what distinguishes (14) and (15); rather, it is the relative overall importance of the A and O arguments in the situation described that governs the choice of verb form.

The examples in (16) involve the verb pair *eamole* (A-verb), *eamoli* (O-verb) 'look, see':

- (16) a. Kā=nā pāko-pwâ nā-eamole-ee-pāko-kā=nā lâ
 say=CV good-SUFF IRR-look.A-go.up-good-DIR.3=DEIC:DIST DEIC:DIST
 sime eângâ.
 person DEM:DIST
 'He wanted very much to have a good look at that person.'
- b. Sime mi-doo=lâ i-amoli-kâ-no=ngâ?
 person BN-what=DEIC:DIST PFV-look.O-DIR.3-1MIN=DEIC:DIST
 'What kind of person was that I saw?'

In (16a), the most prominent part of the discourse is not the agent as such, but the action that the agent performs—the act of looking that the agent has a great desire to carry out. Thus, A-verbs are used when either the A argument or the action carried out by the A participant is the most prominent element of the clause. By contrast, in (16b), the most prominent element is the O, whose characteristic features are the focus of attention.

Given the potential problems associated with using established terms like topicality to describe this alternation, I will use the term *PROMINENCE*, where the most prominent element of the clause is the one that the speaker wishes to draw particular attention to. The link between discourse prominence (also sometimes referred to as "salience") and attention has been drawn by a number of studies; for example, Payne (1992:4) notes that the

various cognitive and pragmatic factors she identifies as potentially relevant to word order “may ultimately be reduced to a single factor having to do with a severely limited amount of *focal attention*”. Chiarcos (2009) analyzes what he calls salience in terms of the speaker’s need to direct the hearer’s attention to match his own: “without proper guidance, the hearer cannot obtain the mental representation of the discourse the speaker wants him to construct. To prevent such a failure of communication, the speaker employs a number of packaging devices to direct the flow of attention in discourse. This is what is meant by ATTENTION CONTROL IN DISCOURSE” (Chiarcos 2009:15, emphasis in original). That is, a prominent or salient referent is one that the speaker seeks to bring into the hearer’s focus of attention by means of various structural devices of language. One such structural device may be the subject relation (Tomlin 1995), though I will argue in section 4 that Äiwoo does not, in fact, make use of grammatical relations to mediate the encoding of pragmatic prominence.

A similar principle of the relative discourse prominence of clausal constituents is frequently evoked in descriptions of symmetrical voice systems in various Western Austronesian languages, although the terminology used varies a great deal. For Tagalog, in which definiteness is a major influencing factor, in that definite patients nearly always trigger patient voice, Himmelmann (2005b:368) writes that “it is also common to make indefinite patients and themes the subject if they are going to be major participants in the ongoing discourse, in particular if they are animate”; Naylor (1986), also on Tagalog, refers to “the focus of orientation of talk” as what is grammaticalized by the voice system. Arka (2008:196) suggests that in various eastern Indonesian languages, promotion to core/SUBJ status, that is, being selected as the most prominent argument by the voice system, is licensed by pragmatic prominence. Huang and Tanangkingsing (2011), in discussing the Formosan languages Kavalan, Squliq, and Tsou, use the term “saliency,” and note that this is not a property of the verb as such, but of the entire discourse context “at the point of planning for the production of a discourse fragment” (Huang and Tanangkingsing 2011:115). Wouk (1996), writing about voice alternations in Indonesian, employs the term “thematicity” and defines it in terms of “being the focus of attention.” Ross (2002a:23) notes that “the higher the topicality of the undergoer referent [in languages with Philippine-type voice systems], the greater the probability that it will be selected as syntactic pivot.”

In short, it is clear that some type of discourse prominence is relevant to voice selection in symmetrical-voice systems in Western Austronesian languages in general. The Äiwoo system of clause alternations, encoded through the use of what I have called A-verbs vs. O-verbs, shows the same basic properties as Western Austronesian symmetrical voice systems: it provides alternate clause structures, where both have two syntactic arguments and neither is clearly derived from the other, to present the same real-world situation, and the governing principle behind the alternation is the relative discourse prominence of the encoded participants. From this perspective, the Äiwoo alternation between A-verbs vs. O-verbs patterns like a symmetrical voice system.

Analyzing the Äiwoo system as symmetrical voice has further advantages in that it solves both a synchronic and a diachronic problem in the analysis of the verbal person-marking system. As noted in 3.2 above, Äiwoo marks the S argument of one-argument verbs and the A argument of A-verbs by prefixes, while the A argument of O-verbs is

marked by suffixes. On a transitivity-based analysis, this is a puzzling pattern, as a system contrasting subject prefixes for intransitive verbs with subject suffixes for transitive verbs would be highly unusual for an Oceanic language. Moreover, the suffixes reflect POC possessive pronouns, a fact that is noted as something of a historical mystery by Ross and Næss (2007:479). Under a voice analysis, both the function of the system and its historical origin is straightforward: The person prefixes in table 1 mark the actor in the actor voice, whereas the person suffixes in table 2 mark the actor in the nonactor voices⁸. This closely parallels the systems of person marking found in Western Austronesian symmetrical-voice languages. Moreover, PAN and PMP are reconstructed as having marked the actor in nonactor voices with genitive forms, explaining why the Äiwoo suffixes reflect possessives (Næss 2013:117–18).

3.4 THE =Cä CLITIC

3.4.1 Formal properties. In addition to the alternation between A-verbs and O-verbs described in 3.2, Äiwoo has a morpheme, analyzed here as a clitic of the form =Cä, that interacts with this alternation in interesting ways.

The basic formal properties of the =Cä clitic are somewhat unusual. It is analyzed as an enclitic because, although it is phrase-final and takes independent stress, and so might be considered a grammatical word, it has a series of allomorphs conditioned by the person-number properties of the preceding morpheme. The forms are as follows:

- =ngä after markers of 1MIN and 1st+2nd person;
- =(w)ä after markers of 1AUG and 2nd person, and the phasal aspect clitics =jo ‘progressive’ and =to ‘change of state’;
- =nä after markers of 3rd person, the unit-augmented suffix -le, and the negative clitic =gu;
- =lä after markers of 3AUG; and
- =kä following the future/habitual enclitic =Caa as well as any other forms that have no person/number features.

- (17) a. Kâ-no=ngä.
say-1MIN=CV
‘I say/want.’
- b. Kâ-mu=wä.
say-2MIN=CV
‘You say/want.’
- c. Kâ=nä.
say=CV
‘S/he says/wants.’
- d. Kâ-i=lä.
say-3AUG=CV
‘They say/want.’

8. The discussion so far has focused on the A-verb vs. O-verb distinction as marking actor voice vs. undergoer voice; section 4.6 will present arguments for the presence of a third, circumstantial voice.

- e. Kā Pita=kā.
 say Peter=CV
 ‘Peter says/wants.’

3.4.2 Distribution and function. The clitic has a number of functions that are not all well understood. It occurs obligatorily on certain verbs taking clausal complements, such as *kā* ‘want, say’ in example (17) above, which was chosen for exemplification of the allomorphy patterns because examples with the clitic in all its forms are readily available.

However, in the context of this paper, the interesting cases are those where the clitic is not obligatory on a given verb, but serves a function related to voice and argument structure. As examples (18)–(20) show, the =Cā clitic can attach to one-argument verbs (18), A-verbs (19), and O-verbs (20):

- (18) a. Li-e-ko-oli, lâ ki-li-mei=to=wâ.
 3AUG-VPL-lie-go.down DEIC:DIST IPFV-3AUG-sleep=CS=DEIC:DIST
 ‘They lay down and slept.’
 b. Ilâ lu-pwaselee-le opo nugono, lâ
 DEIC:DIST 3AUG-make.A-UA house betel.leaf DEIC:DIST
 i-mei-i-le=to=wä=nâ.
 PFV-sleep-3AUG-UA=CS=CV=DEIC:DIST
 ‘Then they built a shelter of betel leaves to sleep in.’
- (19) a. Gisi, ji-nâ-eâ-lâ bwää ji-nâ-tei sii.
 brother.1MIN 1+2MIN-IRR-paddle-go.out ocean 1+2MIN-IRR-fish.A fish
 ‘Brother, let us paddle out to sea to catch fish.’
 b. Ko-kä=nâ ku-tu-mu mo ki-tei-mu=wä sii=kâ.
 say-DIR:3=CV IPFV-take-2MIN and IPFV-fish.A-2MIN=CV fish=DEIC:DIST
 ‘(The snake) said: Take it (=a fishing net) and catch fish with it.’
- (20) a. Li-vängä, lâ li-väpoulâ=kâ, nyimä-i i-konyi-i.
 3AUG-eat DEIC:DIST 3AUG-finish=DEIC:DIST hand-3AUG PFV-wash.O-3AUG
 ‘They ate, and when they had finished, they washed their hands.’
 b. Lâto i-luwa-kä i-konyipe=nâ nyibä=nâ.
 thus PFV-take-DIR:3 PFV-wash.O=CV eye.3MIN=DEIC:DIST
 ‘Then he took (the magic leaf) and rubbed his face with it.’⁹

It should be clear from these examples that the clitic functions to introduce a peripheral participant in the event into the clause core. In (18), this participant is a location: ‘a shelter to sleep in’. In (19) and (20), it is an instrument: ‘catch fish with it’, ‘rubbed his face with it’. These are the most common participant types introduced by =Cā, but a range of others are possible, for example, temporals (21a), stimulus of certain experience verbs (21b), or inanimate causes (21c)

- (21) a. Tuge ki-li-pängä=nâ âpa=to.
 time IPFV-3AUG-eat.A=CV pass=CS
 ‘The time to eat had passed.’

9. The precise function of the suffix *-pe* on *konyi* ‘wash, rub’ in (20b) is unknown. The important aspect of this pair of examples is that the base verb *konyi* is an O-verb, as evidenced by the presence of the A suffix in (20a); there is nothing in the available data to suggest that *pe* affects the choice of verb form.

- b. Muli=ângâ lâ ko=kâ. Lâto=wâ i-bou=nä.
 sea.snake=DEM:DIST DIST lie=DEIC:DIST thus=DEIC:DIST PFV-be.afraid=CV
 ‘The sea snake was lying there. And she was afraid of it/frightened by it.’
- c. Lâto=waa lâto ku-nubo=nä=nä.
 thus=FUT thus IPFV-die=CV=DEIC:DIST
 ‘In that case (= if traditional medicine did not work), one would die from it (illness).’

Examples (18) and (19) show that the addition of the clitic affects argument structure: when added to one-argument verbs or A-verbs, the person marking changes from prefixing to suffixing. In this, the clitic has a clearly different function from the particle *ngämi*, which also represents a peripheral participant, but is simply a proform for a prepositional phrase with the locative preposition *ngä*. The presence or absence of *ngämi* has no impact on person marking, as shown by (22a,b), where it appears in a clause with a one-argument verb and an A-verb, respectively, and the verbs take person prefixes.

- (22) a. Lu-po-to ngämi.
 3AUG-go-go.in OBL.PRO
 ‘They went ashore there.’
- b. Mi-nâ-lo-kä totokale ngämi.
 2MIN-IRR-hold.A-DIR:3 picture OBL.PRO
 ‘You can take pictures of it.’

Furthermore, when the peripheral participant introduced by a =Cä clitic is overtly present in the clause, it is unmarked in the same way as a core argument, rather than being marked by a preposition, as is the case for most circumstantial adjuncts:

- (23) a. Chair=kâ ki-li-tokoli-woli=nä, mo i=nä
 chair=DEIC:DIST IPFV-GA-sit-go.down=CV CONJ 3MIN=DEIC:DIST
 ki-so-li=nä.
 IPFV-stand-go.down=CV
 ‘A chair is for sitting on, but he is standing on it.’
- b. Sigiwâu dä i-pu-maa i-tää-e ngä chair.
 male some PFV-go-LOC:DIST IPFV-sit-go.up LOC chair
 ‘A man came and sat down on a chair.’

Clearly, then, the addition of =Cä promotes a circumstantial participant to core status. Note also that the position of the promoted argument ‘chair’ in (23a) is preverbal, like the A of A-verbs and the O of O-verbs.

The motivation behind the use of =Cä appears linked to the notion of prominence, like that of the A-verb/O-verb distinction discussed in 3.3. In (23a), the chair is clearly the most prominent participant; the A of the initial clause has generic reference, as indicated by the prefix *li-*,¹⁰ and the focus of attention is on chairs and their function. Consider further the following pair of examples with the verb *mei* ‘sleep’. In (24a), the topic of discussion is where the protagonists will sleep, and the verb is unmarked; the location is represented in the clause by the oblique proform *ngämi* (cf. example [22]). In (24b), on

10. The generic-agent prefix *li-* is homophonous with, and clearly diachronically related to, the 3AUG S/A prefix *li-*. However, it shows a different distribution: it occurs on O-verbs as well as A-verbs, and is retained when the verb takes =Cä.

the other hand, the most prominent aspect of the stretch of discourse is the hut, and =Cā is attached to the verb phrase (note that the combination of *ngāmi* and =Cā is unusual, but serves to illustrate that the two have clearly different functions):

- (24) a. *Nyigāsā opo nugono ku-mo-no=ngā mo iso-ji,*
 half house betel.leaf IPFV-live-1MIN=CV with mother-1+2MIN
ji-nā-mei-lāmā ngāmi.
 1+2MIN-IRR-sleep-inside OBL.PRO
 'The betel-leaf hut where I live with my mother, we will sleep there.'
- b. *Lāto i-lāwāā-ee-kā nyigāsā opo nugono lāto*
 thus PFV-build.A-go.up-DIR:3 half house betel.leaf thus
ku-mo-lāmā=nā=nā. Ki-mei ngāmi=nā=nā.
 IPFV-live-inside=CV=DEIC:DIST IPFV-sleep OBL.PRO=CV=DEIC:DIST
 'He built a betel-leaf hut for her, and that was where she lived. That was where she slept.'

The hut is the focus of attention in (24b) because this type of structure—*nyigāsā* 'piece, half' indicates that the hut in question is a basic shelter with a single wall—would not normally be considered fit for permanent human habitation; the passage underscores the primitive conditions in which the woman in question lives after being banished to the bush for getting pregnant while still unmarried.

The conditions determining the use of the =Cā clitic, thus, appear very similar to those governing the A-verb vs. O-verb alternation: it is used to assign a circumstantial participant the status of most prominent argument of the clause.

Syntactically speaking, the effects of =Cā could, to some extent, be said to neutralize the distinction between A-verbs and O-verbs. In both cases, the outcome is a clause with person suffixing on the verb, and the O argument of the original verb normally occurs postverbally, if it is overtly present; compare (19b) and (20b). When an O-verb takes the clitic, the person marking does not change: that is, the A and O (in the cases where it is possible to mark O on the verb) of the noncliticized verb remain marked on the cliticized verb:

- (25) a. *Mo nyidebo nā-te-kā-gu-i-le=nā i-vaave-epu-i-kā-i-le.*
 and magic IRR-see.O-DIR:3-3MIN-3AUG-UA=CV PFV-show.O-also-UV-DIR:3-3AUG-UA
 'And a magic leaf to make him able to see the two of them (lit., 'that he would see them with'), they showed to him also.'
- b. *Go iu=nge dee ku-wāā-gu=ngā tumo.*
 because 1MIN=DEIC.PROX this.thing IPFV-warn-3MIN=CV father.1MIN
 'Because my father has forbidden it to me.'

In (25a), the person suffixes *-gu* '3MIN' and *-i-le* '3AUG-unit.augmented' mark the A and O argument, respectively, that is, the person seeing and the persons seen; without the =Cā clitic, the person marking would be exactly the same (*nātekāguile* 'he will see the two of them'). The =Cā clitic introduces a new prominent argument, *nyidebo* 'kastom magic, traditional medicine', but does not change the person marking on the verb. In (25b), the suffix *-gu* marks a combination of a 3MIN A and a 1MIN O; no examples are available of this verb without =Cā, but the structure and context of the available examples suggest that the thing warned against or forbidden is the argument introduced by =Cā,

meaning that the arguments of the base verb would be the giver and the addressee of the warning, respectively. It seems clear that these constructions have three core arguments: the two original arguments marked on the verb, and the additional circumstantial argument introduced by =C*ä*. This is, in fact, the only way of constructing a clause with three core arguments in Äiwoo; as shown by examples (8a), (14), and (15), canonical three-place verbs such as ‘give’ take only two core arguments, encoding the recipient participant either with an oblique or by means of a directional marker (cf. Margetts 2007).

4. NATURE OF THE ÄIWOO SYSTEM OF CLAUSAL ALTERNATIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION. In 3.2 and 3.3, I described the basic alternation between A-verbs and O-verbs in Äiwoo, and argued that this alternation builds on the same basic principles as symmetrical voice systems, namely picking out the actor vs. the undergoer participant as the most prominent argument of the clause. In 3.4, I presented the =C*ä* clitics that promote a peripheral participant into the clause core, and argued that it similarly assigns this participant the status of most prominent argument.

In this section, I will address the question of what kind of overall system is constituted by these various alternations. This involves, first, examining the syntactic correlates of the notion of prominence: what are the syntactic properties of the argument marked by the verb form as prominent? I will show that Äiwoo here departs from Western Austronesian symmetrical voice systems in one important aspect, namely, that Äiwoo has no syntactic pivot; that is, the exact syntactic correlates of the verbal voice alternations are much less clear.

Second, the precise status of the =C*ä*-marked forms will be discussed. Forms that promote a peripheral participant to core status could be analyzed as applicatives or as voice markers, depending on their precise properties (Himmelman and Riesberg 2013:208). I will argue that, though Äiwoo =C*ä* shows some properties more characteristic of applicatives, it functions within the overall system essentially as a marker of circumstantial voice. Overall, then, the Äiwoo system of clausal alternations has most of its key properties in common with symmetrical voice systems, though it differs crucially from Western Austronesian systems in that the underlying discourse-pragmatic principle of prominence, which motivates the voice alternations, appears to be encoded in the system directly, without being mediated through grammatical relations.

4.2 “SUBJECT” vs. “VOICE-SELECTED ARGUMENT.” As noted in the introduction, Western Austronesian symmetrical voice systems are considered voice systems because they mark a syntactic relationship between the verb and its pivot. In descriptions of Western Austronesian symmetrical-voice languages, the argument selected by the voice morphology is often referred to as the subject (though see Schachter 1976, 1977, for discussion of the ways in which this argument in Tagalog differs from the traditional concept of subject). This is based, first, on the fact that this argument takes a special case-marker not found on any other arguments, usually labeled nominative, and second, that it is the syntactic pivot; indeed, Foley (2007) refers to languages with Tagalog-type symmetrical-voice systems as “symmetrical pivot” languages.

The formal status of the argument selected by the voice alternation in Äiwoo is rather more difficult to pin down. As will be clear from the examples presented above, Äiwoo has no case marking; core arguments are unmarked, whether or not they are selected as prominent by the verb. More importantly, Äiwoo does not appear to have a pivot (Næss 2013, 2015, and 4.4 below), raising the question of the precise syntactic status of the argument selected by the verbal voice as the most prominent argument of the clause. Since terms such as “subject” and “pivot” imply a certain set of morphosyntactic properties, and the aim of this section is to determine exactly which such properties the argument in question has, I will use “voice-selected argument” as a neutral term referring to the A of an A-verb, the O of an O-verb, and the promoted circumstantial argument of a verb marked by =C*ä*.

4.3 ARGUMENT MARKING. The system of argument marking on verbs was described in 3.2 above: the S of one-argument verbs and the A of A-verbs is marked by prefixes, while the A of O-verbs, and in some cases also the O, is marked by suffixes. That is, the verb-marking pattern does not systematically mark voice-selected arguments as opposed to other arguments, in the sense of aligning the A of A-verbs with the O of O-verbs. The system does refer to relative prominence, which is the rationale behind the voice alternation, but largely in the marking of A: A is always marked on the verb, but it is marked differently depending on whether or not it is the voice-selected argument. Rather than being a direct reflex of the prominence conferred by the choice of verb form, the argument-marking pattern marks a combination of semantic and pragmatic properties, distinguishing between prominent (voice-selected) and nonprominent actor arguments.

4.4 PIVOTHOOD. Næss (2013, 2015) argues that Äiwoo lacks a syntactic pivot, as it shows no restrictions on the type of arguments that can be shared under coordination, no fronting of question words, no raising, no syntactic control, no restrictions on which arguments can launch floating quantifiers, and no restrictions on which arguments can be relativized. The discussion in these publications falls short on two points, however. First, since they do not fully recognize the symmetrical nature of the Äiwoo system, they do not systematically test for pivothood of the voice-selected argument, as opposed to simply pivots based on S/A or S/O alignment. The examples provided in Næss (2015), however, do, in fact, show that neither coordination nor quantifier float is restricted to the voice-selected argument, as they include examples of a non-voice-selected A being both the target and the controller of putative coordination deletion¹¹ (Næss 2015:92, examples [23c,d]) and of a quantifier floated by the A of an O-verb (Næss 2015:96, example [33b]). The arguments for Äiwoo lacking raising and syntactic control remain unchanged under the present analysis of the system.

As far as relativization is concerned, however, some important facts were overlooked by previous publications. In relative clauses, the Äiwoo A-verb/O-verb alternation closely parallels the restriction found in Western Austronesian symmetrical-voice languages, which require the voice on the verb to match the role of the relativized argument (Himmelman 2005a:161). The following examples from Tagalog illustrate this restric-

11. There is, in fact, no constraint on which arguments may be omitted in Äiwoo, under coordination or otherwise, beyond a general notion of recoverability from the discourse context.

tion. In (26a), the relativized theme argument ‘fish’ requires the verb to be in the conveyance voice; another choice of voice, such as the actor voice in (26c) or the locative voice in (26d) renders the clause ungrammatical. In (26b), the relativized argument is the recipient ‘child’, and the verb must be in the locative voice.

(26) TAGALOG

- a. isdá-ng i-b<in>igáy niyá sa bata’
 fish-LK CV-<RLS(UG)>-gift 3SG.POSS LOC child
 ‘the fish that she gave to the child’
- b. bata-ng b<in>igy-án niyá sa isdá’
 child-LK <RLS(UG)>-gift-LV 3SG.POSS LOC fish
 ‘the child to whom she gave the fish’
- c. *isdá-ng nag-bigáy siyá sa bata’
 fish-LK RLS.AV-gift 3SG LOC child
- d. *isdá-ng b<in>igáy-án niyá ang bata’
 fish-LK CV-<RLS(UG)>-gift 3SG.POSS SPEC child

(Himmelman 2005a:161)

Relative clauses in Äiwoo show the same pattern: a relativized A argument requires an A-verb (27), a relativized O argument requires an O-verb (28), while a relativized circumstantial participant requires a =Cā clitic (29):

- (27) a. sime mi-li-pä lu-wâ-nubo sime
 person BN-3AUG-steal 3AUG-CAUS-die person
 ‘people who had stolen and killed people’
- b. Nää mi-ku-wâ-eagovä=kâ kâlâ mi-doo=wâ.
 spirit BN-IPFV-CAUS-be.ill=DEIC:DIST there BN-like.this=DEIC:DIST
 ‘The spirits who make them ill are like this.’
- (28) a. Ä sii, nubââ, wâ-nubo-wâ-i-le wâ-ki-ee-i-le=nâ,
 CONJ fish shark CAUS-die-UV-3AUG-UA CAUS-IPFV-go.up-3AUG-UA=DEIC:DIST
 lâ i-tu-ee-i-le=to ngâ nuwopa=kâ.
 DEIC:DIST PFV-bring-go.up-3AUG-UA=CS LOC house=DEIC:DIST
 ‘And the fish, the shark, which they had killed and put into the boat, they carried it up to the house.’
- b. Ngaa i-lotolâ-kâ=nâ de-na ki-pi-kâ
 so PFV-prepare.A-DIR:3=DEIC:DIST thing-POSS:FOOD IPFV-bring.O-DIR:3
 tumwâ=jo.
 father.3MIN=PROG
 ‘So she prepared some food that the father had brought.’
- (29) Ä numomoji ki-tei=nâ i-vägu-woli ngâ nelo
 CONJ outrigger IPFV-fish.A=CV PFV-push.O-go.down LOC sea
 nupou ki-ivägo=nâ nubââ wâ-ku-ee.
 net IPFV-snare.A=CV shark CAUS-IPFV-go.up
 ‘He pushed down the outrigger that he went fishing in, he put in the rope that he caught sharks with.’

Compare also the following pairs of forms with what Næss (2006) calls bound nominal elements, which will here be referred to as bound nouns (BNs): morphemes that show

structural characteristics of nouns, but only occur in construction with another word or phrase. The BNs in the examples combine with an inflected verb and fill an argument position for this verb. Effectively, they translate into English as nouns modified by relative clauses; the only difference between these constructions and those discussed above is that the head of the relative clause is a BN rather than an independent noun. As the examples show, an agentive BN requires an A-verb, whereas a patientive BN requires an O-verb:

- (30) a. *me-ki-lää-lâ* *lu*
 person-IPFV-give.A-go.out life
 'the one who gives life'
- b. *de-la-kä* *tumwä*
 thing-give.O-DIR:3 father-3MIN
 'the things his father gave him'
- (31) a. *Lâ* *i-te-kä* *me-tou=kâ* ...
 DEIC:DIST PFV-see-DIR:3 person-bring.A=DEIC:DIST
 'When her birth mother (lit., 'the one who gave birth') saw her ...'
- b. *ile* *mi-tu* *isä-i-le* *ngââgu=ke*
 DEIC:PROX one-bring.O mother-3AUG-UA bush=DEIC:PROX
 'the one their mother gave birth to in the bush'

BNs representing a circumstantial argument, *nye*- 'place, way, manner', appear with the =*Cä* clitic:

- (32) a. *nye-ku-mo=nä*
 CIRC-IPFV-stay=CV
 'the place where s/he lives'
- b. *Ba i-kää-no=gu nye-ku-lu-pasele=nä de-ki-bi.*
 NEG PFV-know.O-1MIN=NEG CIRC-IPFV-3AUG-do.A=CV thing-IPFV-gird
 'I didn't know how to work the seat belts.'

This pattern clearly looks like a pivot condition: an obvious analysis of these examples would be that the relativized argument is required to be the syntactic pivot, and the function of the verb alternations is to promote the appropriate argument to pivot function.

However, there is one crucial exception to the generalizations just given: when a clause has a relativized A argument and a pronominal O, it takes an O-verb:

- (33) a. *Ku-wä ki-ea nulo ilâ sime*
 IPFV-go IPFV-bad neck.1MIN DEIC:DIST person
ki-singä-ive-gu=ngâ.
 IPFV-lie-UV-3MIN.A/1MIN.O=DEIC:DIST
 'I hate the man who told lies about me.'
- b. *Bââ me-wowâi-mä-gu.*
 not.be person-send.O-DIR:1-3MIN.A/1MIN.O
 'Nobody sent me.' (lit., 'There is no person who sent me.')

The suffix *-ive* in (33a) derives O-verbs from one-argument verbs: for example, *giââ* 'be happy' > *giââive* 'celebrate'; *vetängä* 'be destructive' > *vetängäive* 'destroy'; *lopâ* 'say' > *lopâive* 'tell (story)'. It will be further discussed in 4.7; for the time being, the relevant point is that a verb suffixed with *-ive* behaves like an O-verb.

The use of O-verbs in clauses like (33) appears to be an instance of a more general constraint that prohibits A-verbs from taking a pronominal O.¹² This restriction suggests that even in relative clauses, the conditions on the use of the different verb forms are not, or not purely, syntactic in nature. A rule for the formation of relative clauses in Äiwoo based purely on the syntactic notion of pivot would need to be formulated roughly as follows: the relativized argument must be the syntactic pivot, except when the relativized argument is the A of a clause with a pronominal O, in which case it must be the nonpivot core argument.

There are a number of problems with such a rule, for example, that it makes reference to the formal status—noun vs. pronoun—not of the relativized argument itself, but of its coargument in the clause, and it is unclear how this would affect the status of the relativized argument from a purely syntactic perspective. More to the point, the restrictions on relativization are the only argument for positing a pivot relation in Äiwoo to begin with, and if they do not consistently make reference to a pivot, the existence of the category itself becomes highly questionable.

Instead, the restrictions on relativization can be understood as an instance of the general rules for the use of the different verb forms in Äiwoo:

- A-verbs are used when the A is the single pragmatically prominent argument of the clause. This is the basis for the morphological similarities between A-verbs and one-argument verbs, which, of course, also show a single pragmatically prominent argument.
- O-verbs and =Cā clitics are used when another argument is in competition with the A for prominence. This does not necessarily imply that the other argument is *more* prominent than the A—it would be difficult in any case to specify parameters by which such relative prominence would be measured—but it has a degree of prominence that means that the A is not the single prominent argument. When the second prominent argument is an O, O-verbs are used; this includes pronominal Os, which are prominent by virtue of being human, identifiable, and in many cases speech-act participants. When the nonactor prominent argument is a circumstantial participant, =Cā-marked verbs are used.

These rules are sufficient to account for the restrictions on relativization. Relativized arguments are by definition pragmatically prominent, being the argument that the rest of the clause functions to modify. However, when an A argument that is prominent by virtue of being relativized cooccurs with an inherently prominent pronominal O, the rules above require an O-verb to be used, since the A is not the single prominent argument, as would be required for an A-verb. Making reference to a syntactic pivot does not appear to be required, and indeed considerably complicates the analysis, as it would call for an explanation of why relativized arguments are mostly, but not consistently, pivots.

4.5 WORD ORDER. When the voice-selected argument is a lexical noun, it appears, all other things being equal, in immediately preverbal position, as seen, for example, in (2b) and (3).

For pronouns, the situation is slightly more complex. The only function for which independent pronouns are generally used without a contrastive function is the O of O-verbs. This is because, as noted in 3.2, not all Os of O-verbs can be marked directly on the verb; where

12. There are relatively few constructions of this type in my corpus; however, I have found no counterexamples to this generalization.

no bound marking is possible, an independent pronoun appears instead. By contrast, there are bound person markers for all person/number combinations for S arguments of one-argument verbs and A arguments of A-verbs (with the qualification that 3MIN arguments are zero-marked); recall that pronominal Os do not appear to be permitted with A-verbs.

Independent pronouns never appear in immediately preverbal position within the clause. This is easy to show for O-verbs, where pronominal Os systematically follow the verb rather than preceding it, as is the case for nominal Os:

- (34) a. Dengaa i-te-wâ-i iumu, lâto ku-wâ-nubo-wâ-i
 lest PFV-see.O-DIR:2-3AUG 2MIN then IPFV-CAUS-die-UV-3AUG
 iumu=wâ.
 2MIN=DEIC:DIST
 'If they see you, they will kill you.'
 b. I-ve-i=to iu.
 PFV-shoot.O-3AUG=CS 1MIN
 'They shot me.'

Pronominal S and A arguments only appear preverbally in combination with person marking on the verb.

- (35) a. Iu i-ki-tokoli=kaa kele ngâ naa ny-enge=ke, êamo
 1MIN 1MIN-IPFV-sit=FUT here LOC end place=DEM:PROX=DEIC:PROX CONJ
 imi lâ mi-ki-mo-nâbe=to=wâ muwâ=naa.
 2AUG DEIC:DIST 2AUG-IPFV-stay-in.row=CS=DIST ?=FUT
 'I will sit here at this end, and you all go and line up over there.'
 b. Iungo-le ba me-amole-ute-mâ-le=gu ngâ numangu-ngo-le.
 1AUG-UA NEG 1AUG-look.A-back-DIR:1-UA=NEG LOC back-1AUG-UA
 'We didn't look behind us.'

By contrast, when a pronominal S/A is in the clause-final position, which is used for argument focus in Äiwoo, it is the only representation of the argument in the clause, and the verb takes no person marking.

- (36) a. Maa ki-te-kâ-mu go **ku-mo** ngâ nuumä=ke iumu.
 if IPFV-see.O-DIR:3-2MIN because IPFV-stay LOC village=DEIC:PROX 2MIN
 'You must have seen it, because you are the one who stays at home.'
 b. Mo kâ=nä, ba, dee sii=ee **ku-wâ-nubo=kâ** iu.
 CONJ say=CV NEG this.thing fish=DEM:PROX IPFV-CAUS-die=DEIC:DIST 1MIN
 'And she said, "No, I am the one who killed these fish."'

The preverbal pronouns in (35) seem best analyzed as contrastive topics, which may not bear a direct argument relation to the verb; compare the following "double-topic" constructions, where the initial topic pronoun is clearly not an argument of the verb:

- (37) a. Go iu=nge nyisi biou mana.
 because 1MIN=PROX body.1MIN heavy very
 'Because my body is very heavy.' (lit., 'Me here, my body is very heavy.')
- b. Ngaa ijii=lâ sii no-i=lâ nubwe, sii mu-opulo-du.
 so 3AUG=DEIC:DIST fish POSS:GEN-3AUG=DEIC:DIST nubwe fish BN-red-all
 'And as for them, their fish (totem) is the *nubwe*, a completely red fish.'

In other words, pronouns only appear in clause-initial position when they are topicalized; and this position is distinct from the immediately preverbal position that is the default position for voice-selected NP arguments. This can be seen from, for example, (37a), where another NP intervenes between the topicalized pronoun and the verb. In other words, word order does not consistently identify voice-selected arguments; voice-selected lexical nouns are preverbal, but voice-selected pronouns are not.

Instead, this distribution underscores the nature of the Äiwoo system of clausal organization as being based around the notion of prominence as discussed in 3.3. A number of studies of word order and discourse-pragmatics point to clause-initial position as indicating that a referent is the focus of attention (Payne 1992 and references therein; Tomlin 1995; Chiarcos 2009:54). At the same time, pronouns are used for “referents in the current focus of attention” (Chiarcos 2009:36). That is, placing pronouns in initial position to indicate that they are to be assigned focus of attention is superfluous. In the words of Lambrecht (1994:201),

from my characterization of the preferred topic expression as an unaccented pronominal argument, whose function is to express the grammatical and semantic role played by a pragmatically ALREADY ESTABLISHED topic referent in a clause, it follows that the position of such a pronominal expression is functionally speaking IRRELEVANT. Once a topic referent is pragmatically established, i.e., once the function of the topic expression is no longer to ANNOUNCE the topic referent but to mark its role as an argument in a proposition, there is no longer any functional reason for the topic to appear at the beginning of the sentence [emphasis in original].

In Äiwoo, then, an argument is placed in preverbal position when it is the focus of attention, as indicated by the form of the verb. However, when an argument is pronominal, this is already sufficient to signal that it is the focus of attention; note that there is no potential for conflict between the focus of attention conferred by the verb and that implied by pronominal status, since the only noncontrastive pronouns found in the clause core are the O of O-verbs, that is, voice-selected arguments. Preverbal position in Äiwoo is, thus, associated with pragmatic prominence, but apparently not with any further syntactic privileges.

4.6 THE STATUS OF =Cä. So far, I have drawn a picture of the alternation between A-verbs and O-verbs as functioning on the same pragmatic principles as symmetrical voice systems, but without showing the corresponding syntactic relations found in Western Austronesian languages. This lack of a clear syntactic correlate of voice-selected status poses particular challenges when it comes to determining the status of the clitic =Cä within the overall system.

It is clear from the description in 3.4 that the =Cä clitic adds an argument to the clause core, by promoting a peripheral participant to core argument status. That is, it changes argument structure but not event structure, unlike, for example, causatives, which may introduce a causing agent that is not present with an uncausativized verb. Depending on the exact syntactic status of the promoted argument, this construction might be described as an applicative, defined by Peterson (2006:1) as constructions that “allow the coding of a thematically peripheral argument or adjunct as a core-object argument,” or as a part of a symmetrical voice system of the type described above, where the most prominent argu-

ment is not the actor or the undergoer but some type of peripheral participant. Such “circumstantial voices” are common in symmetrical voice languages; see (26) for examples of the conveyance and locative voices in Tagalog.

A simple description of the difference between applicatives and circumstantial voice markers would be that applicatives promote a peripheral participant to object status, whereas voice markers promote it to subject status. However, such a definition obviously presupposes that the categories “subject” and “object” can be clearly defined in the language in question. This is arguably difficult enough in Philippine-type languages, where the syntactic pivot could be taken to be the subject, but where the distinction between nonpivot core arguments and obliques is much more difficult to draw in a systematic manner (for example, Ross 2002a; Himmelmann 2005a). As the discussion above has established, there is little evidence even for a pivot relation in Äiwoo, meaning that the question of whether =C*ä* functions as an applicative or a voice marker will have to be resolved, to the extent that it can be resolved at all, on the basis of other criteria.

Himmelmann and Riesberg (2013) address the difficulties of distinguishing between applicatives and voice markers in languages that do not show a straightforward nominative-accusative alignment system, with particular reference to the Sulawesi language Totoli. According to their criteria (table 5), the Äiwoo =C*ä* clitic appears to show at least one key property of applicatives, namely that it applies to both A-verbs and O-verbs; in other words, it is not in paradigmatic opposition to the forms I have argued function as actor voice and undergoer voice, but can be added to either. In this it differs from typical circumstantial voices in Western Austronesian, which do enter into such paradigmatic relations with the actor and undergoer voices.

It might also be argued that =C*ä* obligatorily changes argument structure, in that it necessarily adds an argument to the clause core, whereas the A-verb vs. O-verb opposition simply provides alternative means of framing two-participant events; but the same is the case for circumstantial voices in Western Austronesian languages, which promote a peripheral participant to the status of voice-selected argument, increasing the number of core arguments by one relative to the actor-voice or patient-voice forms of the same verb. Indeed, as far as the effect on argument structure is concerned, Äiwoo =C*ä* patterns much

TABLE 5. DIAGNOSTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN (SYMMETRICAL) VOICE AND APPLICATIVE ALTERNATIONS[†]

SYMMETRICAL VOICE	APPLICATIVE
primary function: marks semantic role of privileged argument	primary function: allows a participant in a peripheral undergoer role to appear in a core syntactic position (typically but not necessarily object)
does not necessarily change (semantic) transitivity or argument structure	always changes argument structure and (semantic) transitivity
voice marker remains constant for semantic role (as per lexical base); occurs only when argument is in privileged position	applicative marking remains constant when other alternations apply (e.g., voice, causative)
symmetrical voice systems always include options for prototypical undergoer roles patient and theme	applicative systems usually do not target prototypical UG roles patient and theme but are restricted to more peripheral roles, in particular instrument, beneficiary, and location

[†] From Himmelmann and Riesberg (2013:421).

like the locative and conveyance voices in Tagalog as described by Musgrave (2008): the original core arguments are retained, while another, prominent argument is added to the clause structure. In Tagalog, the application of these voices to a two-argument verb is the only way to construct a clause with three core arguments (Musgrave 2008:7), and as noted in 3.4.2, the same is the case for Äiwoo =Cä. It should be noted that the latter is not in itself evidence for an analysis as either voice or applicative, as there are also Austronesian languages that can only form three-place verbs through the use of applicatives, like Taba of Halmahera (Bowden 2001).

The ability of Totoli -an to combine with both actor voice and undergoer voice is one of the arguments presented by Himmelmann and Riesberg (2013) for analyzing it as an applicative. However, although Äiwoo =Cä can combine with either A-verbs or O-verbs, it shows a rather different pattern. A clause with -an in Totoli can have either the actor, the patient, or the instrumental/benefactive argument introduced by -an as its subject; that is, in (38), (a) is actor voice, (b) is patient voice, and only with the addition of the prefix poN- in (c) is the introduced argument made the voice-selected argument:

(38) TOTOLI

- a. I Rinto manaipan aku taipan.

i Rinto moN-taip-an aku taipang
HON Rinto AV-peel-APPL I SG mango
'Rinto is peeling a mango for me.'

- b. Taipang itu kodoong taipanna i aku.

taipang itu ko-doong taip-an=na i aku
mango DIST POT-want peel-APPL I=3SG.GEN HON I SG
'He will peel the mango for me.'

- c. Aku kodoong panaipan Rinto taipan.

aku ko-doong poN-taip-an Rinto taipang
I SG POT-want SF-peel-APPL I Rinto mango
'Rinto will peel a mango for me.'

(Himmelmann and Riesberg 2013:413–14)

Äiwoo =Cä has very different effects on clause structure. The distinction between actor voice applicatives and undergoer voice applicatives cannot be made in Äiwoo, where the addition of =Cä largely neutralizes the formal differences between clauses with A-verbs and O-verbs, as shown in (25) above.

Recall that the addition of =Cä to a clause with an A-verb changes person marking from prefixing to suffixing. I argued in 3.3 that the person suffixes mark the actor in non-actor voices, that is, the person suffixes show that the clause is no longer actor voice. In this respect, =Cä patterns like a voice marker. An analysis of =Cä as an applicative would presumably imply an understanding of the person-marking alternation as marking differences in transitivity, with the suffixes in the =Cä-marked clause indicating that an object argument has been added to the clause. But this would mean that person marking in =Cä-marked clauses would be analyzed on fundamentally different principles from person marking in other clause types; as demonstrated in 3.2 and 3.3, the A-verb/O-verb alternation, and concomitant difference between person prefixes and person suffixes, is not readily analyzable in terms of transitivity.

The same kind of argument can be made for relative clauses. As demonstrated in 4.4, relativization of an A argument requires an A-verb, relativization of an O argument requires an O-verb, and relativization of a circumstantial argument requires a =C*ā*-marked verb. Under an applicative analysis, one might argue that peripheral arguments must be made core in order to be relativized on, and that the addition of =C*ā* achieves this by promoting the peripheral argument to object status. But, again, this seems to lead to a different analysis for =C*ā* clauses than for A-verb and O-verb clauses: in order for A and O arguments to be relativized on, they must be the voice-selected argument, whereas a relativized circumstantial participant is a non-voice-selected core argument.

In order for =C*ā* to be analyzed as an applicative, one would need to show that a clause with an A-verb and =C*ā* is still in the actor voice, and a clause with an O-verb and =C*ā* retains the original O as the voice-selected argument, parallel to (38a,b) in Totoli. But all evidence is to the contrary: the change of person marking on A-verbs points to a non-actor-voice clause, and the fact that the only argument that can be relativized in a =C*ā*-marked clause is the circumstantial argument indicates that it is, in fact, the voice-selected argument rather than being the result of an applicative derivation that does not change voice relations.

Moreover, one of Himmelmann and Riesberg's arguments for not analyzing the Totoli instrument/beneficiary applicative as a voice marker is that "this would be misleading in that it would suggest that Totoli has a voice alternation that freely allows instruments or beneficiaries to occur in subject function" (Himmelmann and Riesberg 2013:411); the form in question only occurs on verbs that have a corresponding actor-voice applicative, and so it is analyzed instead as an applicative in the undergoer voice. By contrast, =C*ā* in Äiwoo is completely productive.

The clitic =C*ā*, thus, appears to have the distributional characteristics of an applicative—applying equally to verbs marked as actor voice and undergoer voice—but the morphosyntactic effects of a voice marker. This pattern does not fall neatly into either of the options provided by Himmelmann and Riesberg, by which a symmetrical voice marker remains constant for semantic role, and occurs only when the selected argument is in privileged position, while an applicative remains constant when other alternations, such as voice, apply. In Äiwoo, the morphological form of the verb—A-verb vs. O-verb—is unchanged when =C*ā* is added, giving the impression of an applicative added to a basic two-way voice alternation. But the function of =C*ā* is to mark a circumstantial participant as being the most prominent argument, in the manner of a voice marker.

The lack of clear syntactic relations in Äiwoo may be seen as a contributing factor to this unusual pattern. Under the analysis presented above, the system essentially indicates pragmatic prominence directly, by a combination of verbal marking and word order, with no intermediate level of grammatical relations, and so a marker promoting a peripheral participant to core status can only be taken as indicating the pragmatic prominence of the participant in question. Peterson (2006:84) finds that the primary motivation behind the use of applicatives is to indicate the "high topicality status" of a participant; in other words, indicating the pragmatic prominence of a peripheral participant can be seen as a shared function of both circumstantial voices and applicatives, and the distinction between the two depends on the overall system of grammatical relations in a language. If

there are no clearly defined grammatical relations, the distinction may simply be irrelevant. However, since I have argued that the A-verb vs. O-verb distinction in Äiwoo functions as a kind of voice alternation, and since the =Cä clitic fills essentially the same function of indicating that a particular argument should be understood as the most prominent argument of the clause, I will classify =Cä as a circumstantial voice marker.

4.7 TARGET OF PROMOTION. The key syntactic property that defines the voice-selected argument in Äiwoo is that it is the sole target of syntactic promotion. That is, there is no way to promote an argument to what I will call nonprominent core status—a core argument that is not the voice-selected argument.

In a language like English, arguments can be promoted to most prominent (“subject”) status, for example, through passivization; but it is also possible to promote an argument to nonprominent core (“object”) status, as through dative shift.

Äiwoo has no mechanism to promote a noncore participant to nonprominent core status. The only morphological process that can derive A-verbs is causativization: causatives have an A-verb and an O-verb form, where the A-verb takes the causative prefix *wâ-* while the O-verb takes the causative prefix plus a suffix *-wâ/-eâ/-nâ*, as illustrated in (11) above. The O-verb form might be argued to introduce an argument (the causer) into nonprominent core position compared to the corresponding intransitive verb, but note that causativization is a process that changes event structure rather than simply argument structure: the introduced participant—the causee—is not simply promoted from peripheral status, but represents an element of event structure that is not present in the uncausativized verb. It is, thus, doubtful whether causativization should be considered an instance of the promotion of a participant into the clause core.

On the other hand, there are several morphological means of promoting a participant to prominent core status, that is, to the status of voice-selected argument. There are two suffixes that add a nonactor argument to the clause core of one-argument verbs: *-ive*, which adds a patient or stimulus-type argument, and *-i*, which adds a comitative argument. Crucially, both these suffixes derive O-verbs, that is, the promoted argument is also the voice-selected argument; there is no mechanism that can promote a participant of these semantic roles to core status and produce an A-verb as its outcome.

- (39) a. I-ku-mâea.

1MIN-IPFV-laugh

‘I am laughing.’

- b. Mo ku-mâea-ive-epu-wâ-no=nge ilâ nye-eli-na

CONJ IPFV-laugh-UV-also-DIR:2-1MIN=DEIC:PROX DEIC:DIST NMLZ-crawl-NMLZ

nugu-mu=wâ.

POSS-2MIN=DEIC:DIST

‘But I am also laughing at the way you crawl.’

- (40) a. I-luwo-kä kä=nä ki-siwo-gu-i-le.

PFV-rush-DIR:3 say=CV IPFV-hold.O-3MIN-3AUG-UA

‘She rushed at them and tried to grab them.’

- b. I-luwo-i-lâ-gu-i-le.

PFV-rush-COM-go.out-3MIN-3AUG-UA

‘She rushed out with (=carrying) them.’

In addition to these, the =Cā clitic functions to promote various types of circumstantial participants to prominent core status, such as spatial or temporal locations and instruments, as described in 3.4 and 4.6 above.

The ability to promote an argument to nonprominent core status is one of the key features that distinguish an Indonesian-type from a Philippine-type symmetrical voice system. As noted above, Indonesian-type systems combine an actor voice/undergoer voice alternation with a system of applicatives that add undergoer arguments of different semantic types (for example, locations, instruments, beneficiaries), and that can be applied to either voice. By contrast, Philippine-type languages do not have applicatives, but do have more than one nonactor voice (Arka and Ross 2005:7, Himmelmann 2005a:175); that is, they allow a variety of nonactor participants to be promoted directly to most prominent (“subject”) status, but lack any means to promote arguments to nonprominent core status.

To summarize, the Äiwoo system of clause alternations, while functioning on the same pragmatic principles as Western Austronesian symmetrical voice system, lacks the core syntactic property of such systems, in that there is little evidence for the status of the voice-selected argument as being a syntactic pivot. However, despite the lack of evidence for grammatical relations in Äiwoo, it does have a clear core-oblique distinction, and the ability to promote arguments to core status. In terms of the patterns of such syntactic promotion, the Äiwoo system can be seen to nevertheless show a key defining syntactic characteristic of a Philippine-type symmetrical voice system: it has a sole core function that is the target of syntactic promotion—the voice-selected argument—and such promotion does not involve the corresponding demotion of another argument (unlike, for example, typical passives, where the actor-subject of the active is obligatorily demoted to oblique status or deleted).

5. HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF =Cā AND THE NATURE OF THE ÄIWOO SYMMETRICAL VOICE SYSTEM. It was noted above that the clitic =Cā shows properties characteristic of both applicatives and symmetrical voice markers, although I argued that within the Äiwoo system it is best analyzed as a circumstantial voice marker. This may to some extent be understood as a consequence of the morphological nature of the A-verb vs. O-verb alternation in Äiwoo, given that there is no productive segmentable voice morphology and, therefore, no bivalent verb stems unmarked for voice. But this, in turn, raises the question of what the origin of this clitic might be, and how it has come to be integrated into a voice system where the other voices are marked by alternations in the form of the verb stem.

In 3.2 above, I showed that the A-verb vs. O-verb alternation in Äiwoo largely reflects original PMP voice-marking morphemes. Although I have argued that =Cā must be analyzed as having a voice-like function, it is not likely to similarly reflect any of the PMP voice affixes. The PMP suffix *-āni ‘dependent circumstantial voice’ has survived as an applicative suffix in two Oceanic subgroups, Admiralties and the Meso-Melanesian linkage of Western Oceanic (Ross 2012); but for this to be the origin of =Cā in Äiwoo would involve a process of degrammaticalization from suffix to enclitic, which is unlikely.

While the detailed data on sound changes required to confirm this are not available at present, I hypothesize that Äiwoo =C*ä* reflects the preposition reconstructed as POC *akin[i] and as *akən at some pre-POC stage, though it is uncertain where this form originated; it is frequent in Indonesian languages but not found in the Philippines, making it problematic to reconstruct it to PMP (Ross 2012). There are several facts to support the hypothesis that Äiwoo =C*ä* is a reflex of *akən/*akin[i]:

First, the formal status of =C*ä* as a clitic attaching to the end of verb phrases, combined with the fact that it takes independent stress, is suggestive of an origin as an independent grammatical word. Given its function to promote circumstantial arguments, most frequently locative and instrumental participants, a preposition is an obvious source; Peterson (2006:232) notes that when adpositions are grammaticalized into applicative markers, they typically give rise to locative applicatives, and often also instrumental applicatives.

Second, reflexes of *akin[i] are found in a large number of present-day Oceanic languages, largely functioning as applicatives promoting various types of peripheral participants to object status (Evans 2003:119–70). Recall that, although I argued above that =C*ä* must be analyzed as a voice marker in order to satisfactorily account for its overall effect on clause structure, it in fact has a number of properties in common with applicatives.

Finally, Äiwoo =C*ä* has an additional function not discussed above, namely deriving ordinal numbers from cardinal numbers:

- (41) a. gite mi-eve=nä
 brother.3MIN BN-three=CV
 ‘the third brother’
 b. Vili=lä=nâ singedâ.
 five=CV=DEIC:DIST female
 ‘The fifth was a girl.’

This closely parallels the double function of reflexes of *akən/*akin[i] in several other languages, both Oceanic and non-Oceanic. In Wolio of Sulawesi, the applicative *-aka*, or a suffix of the same form, attaches to numerals to form ordinal numerals (Anceaux 1988:24, cited in Evans 2003:163). The Oceanic language Erromangan (Sye) shows a similar parallelism, with the suffix *-gi* having both a transitivizing function and a function deriving ordinal numerals from cardinal numerals (Crowley 1998:137–39, 147).¹³ Northeast Ambae similarly derives ordinals with a suffix *-gi*, which Hyslop (2001:94) describes as a nominalizing suffix, but which is also homophonous with the applicative *-gi(ni)*.

It is unclear how the pattern of allomorphy with different initial consonants may have arisen. In many Oceanic languages, reflexes of *akin[i] show a so-called thematic consonant that varies depending on the root to which the form is suffixed. In some cases, this consonant is clearly a retention of an original root-final consonant that has been lost in the unsuffixed verb; but a number of verbs in a number of languages show thematic conso-

13. The origin of Sye *-gi* appears to be somewhat complex. There is a vestigial transitive suffix *-og*, which Crowley (1998:139) notes as a probable reflex of *akin[i]; but he considers *-gi* to result from a “coincidental convergent development” in that any verb taking this suffix can alternatively express the same function by means of the preposition (*o*)*gi*. It should be noted, however, that Evans (2003) reconstructs POC *akin[i] as both a suffix and a preposition, and that other Oceanic languages such as Niuean (Massam 1988), for example, have cognate morphemes with both suffixal/enclitic and prepositional uses.

nants that cannot be brought back to an original root-final consonant, and in some cases there seems to be a correlation between particular thematic consonants and semantic properties of the verb (Evans 2003: 207–30 and references therein; Ashley 2012). However, the appearance of thematic consonants presupposes that *akin[i] was a suffix at the time that root-final consonants were lost, and this is not a plausible analysis for Äiwoo, where =Cā is a phrase-final enclitic. It may be noted that the allomorphy pattern is shared by two other sets of enclitics with a similar distribution, the deictic clitics =Ce (proximal)/=Cā (distal) and the future/habitual clitic =Caa, meaning that it may have arisen in one of these other sets and spread to =Cā by analogy.

I noted above that, in general, a circumstantial voice marker has the function of promoting a circumstantial participant to the most prominent syntactic function (“subject”), while an applicative functions to promote a circumstantial participant to nonprominent core (“object”) status. It is a characteristic of the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian that its languages generally show a strongly grammaticalized object relation, having reanalyzed the original symmetrical voice system into a system marking transitivity on verbs, with overwhelmingly accusative alignment. The suffix -(C)i, mentioned briefly in 3.2 above as having been reanalyzed from an undergoer-voice marker, marks verbs in a wide range of Oceanic languages as being transitive, that is, as taking an object. It is not unexpected for such a system to have a mechanism for promoting arguments into object position, nor is it unreasonable that a morpheme that promotes circumstantial participants to object status in a transitivity-based system might have been reanalyzed from a morpheme that promotes circumstantial participants to subject status in a symmetrical-voice system. The problem is that the history of *akin[i] is somewhat unclear. Ross (2012) notes that *akən appears to have replaced the PMP circumstantial voice marker *-āni throughout most of the Indo-Malaysian archipelago, indicating an association between *akən and circumstantial voice, though to the best of my knowledge the languages in question all show an applicative function of reflexes of *akən (cf. the above discussion of the difference between Indonesian-type and Philippine-type languages). There is also clear evidence of a reanalysis from circumstantial voice to applicative in those Oceanic languages mentioned above that reflect PMP *-āni as an applicative.

Although by far the most common function of reflexes of *akin[i] in Oceanic languages is applicative, there are languages that show such reflexes with a voice-like function. The languages of the Micronesian subgroup show a reflex of POC *-akin with a passivizing function, deriving an intransitive verb denoting a resultant state from a transitive verb (Evans 2003:155). This function might be said to be similar to that of Äiwoo =Cā in that it promotes an argument to the most prominent syntactic position, although in the Micronesian transitivity-based system, such promotion necessarily also involves demotion of the original subject of the verb.

The Meso-Melanesian language Kara, spoken on New Ireland, has a suffix -ai that shows an intriguing range of functions, although the information available is relatively scarce. It is said to have a passive function in clauses like (42b), although it also indicates a focus on the location *ti Amerika* rather than the patient ‘this car’; note that the patient-focused version (42c) has the same form of the verb as the active, suggesting that the function of -ai is not simply passivization, since (42c) must also be analyzed as passive.

(42) KARA

- a. [Ri]_A ves-an [a kar aanabe?]_O pe Amerika.
 3PL.S make-EF NM car this.here PROG A.
 ‘They made this car in America.’
- b. [A kar aanabe?]_S a ves-ai ti Amerika.
 NM car this.here 3SG.S make-DEM ABL A.
 ‘This car was made in America.’
- c. A kar aanabe? a ves-an pe Amerika.
 NM car this.here 3SG.S make-EF ABL A.
 ‘This car was made in America.’

(Schlie 1983 cited in Evans 2003:140–41)

In fact, rather than promoting a patient participant to subject status, *-ai* seems to demote the patient in examples like (43b), where the affixation of *-ai* leads to the O argument being marked as oblique and “apparently also has the function of shifting the focus of the clause from *a wai* ‘the tree’ to the agent and action” (Evans 2003:141).

(43) KARA

- a. [A malu]_A a fiit [a wai aapave]_O e vuax-e.
 NM wind 3SG.S blow NM tree that.there and break-3SG.O
 ‘The wind blew that tree and broke it.’
- b. [A malu]_S a fiit-ai se-na wai aapave e vuax-e.
 NM wind 3SG.S blow-DEM CONC-3SG tree that.there and break-3SG.O
 ‘The wind blew against that tree and broke it.’ (Evans 2003:141)

This pattern is suggestive of an original voice system with *-ai* as the circumstantial voice marker, as seen in the contrast between the “patient focus” form in *-an* and the “location focus” form in *-ai* in (42b,c). However, *-ai* appears to have expanded its function to a general “nonpatient focus,” possibly as a consequence of the loss of overt actor-voice morphology in POC (Næss 2013).

In the non-Oceanic languages that show a reflex of **akən*, it typically forms part of a set of morphemes analyzed as applicatives because they promote a circumstantial participant to core status; that is, they add a nonactor argument to the clause core. Whether this promoted argument is the syntactic subject or not depends on whether the verb is in actor voice or in undergoer voice (sometimes termed “active” and “passive” for some Indonesian languages), in other words, the type of system exemplified by Totoli in (38) (though the Totoli examples did not involve reflexes of **akən*). In these languages, then, the basic symmetrical voice alternation has been retained. The addition of applicative morphemes¹⁴ to such a system amounts to introducing a possibility to promote an argument to nonprominent core status, as discussed in 4.7 above. Whether this is a reanalysis of an original circumstantial voice morpheme, or an addition of a new morpheme with a new function to an original two-way voice system resulting from the loss of PMP **-áni*, is difficult to say; as noted above, Ross (2012) describes **akən* as having replaced **-áni*, but does not elaborate on the change from circumstantial voice to applicative.

14. In addition to reflexes of **akən*, Indonesian-type languages typically have an additional applicative marked with reflexes of **-i*.

Although the evidence is far from conclusive, it is certainly suggestive of a link between *akən/*akin[i] and a circumstantial voice function. If the hypothesis that Äiwoo =Cä reflects *akin[i] is correct, then this reflex functions to promote a circumstantial argument into the clause core, as it does in Oceanic and Indonesian-type languages. But Äiwoo does not permit the promotion of an argument to nonprominent core status, and so the function of =Cä is to promote a circumstantial argument to the status of most prominent argument, making it effectively a circumstantial voice marker.

In a very real sense, then, the Äiwoo symmetrical voice system comes across as a hybrid of a Philippine-type and an Indonesian-type system. It is syntactically like a Philippine-type system in that it only permits the promotion of arguments to the status of most prominent argument. But it has the morphological characteristics of an Indonesian-type system, in that the circumstantial voice marker can be added to both actor-voice and undergoer-voice verb forms—and is plausibly a cognate of the applicative marker found in many Indonesian-type systems.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION. This paper has demonstrated that the basic clause alternations in Äiwoo have fundamental properties in common with the Western Austronesian symmetrical voice systems, and that the morphology marking the voice alternations has clear historical links to PMP voice marking, and plausibly to the preposition *akən/*akin[i], which has given rise to applicative morphemes in a number of Austronesian languages both in the Oceanic subgroup and elsewhere.

As discussed in section 4, there are also significant differences between the Äiwoo system and those found in Western Austronesian languages, notably that Äiwoo does not appear to have a syntactic pivot, and so the system appears to code the relative prominence of arguments directly, without systematically linking this pragmatic prominence to syntactic prominence. Whether or not a system of this type can feasibly be called a symmetrical voice system is ultimately a question of how far one is willing to stretch the term “voice.” As noted in section 2, Himmelmann (2002) considers the Western Austronesian systems of clausal alternations to be voice systems because they mark a syntactic relationship between the verb and its syntactic pivot; if a language does not have a syntactic pivot, this definition clearly does not apply.

The Äiwoo system is clearly unusual, and its place within a broader typological context of voice systems and alignment patterns is in need of further exploration that is beyond the scope of this paper. Historically, however, the most plausible explanation for the current system is that it derives from an original symmetrical voice system where the pivot was lost, possibly as a consequence of the development of head marking (Næss 2013, 2015); it is common for head-marking languages to lack a syntactic pivot, because they track referents across clauses through coreferent argument marking on the verb rather than through syntactic pivot relations (Dixon 1994; Falk 2006). For purposes of historical comparison, which is the goal of this section, it, therefore, seems appropriate to treat the Äiwoo system as a symmetrical voice system, albeit one that has developed in a typologically unusual direction.

As noted in the introduction, current classification places Äiwoo within the Temotu first-order subgroup of Oceanic (Ross and Næss 2007). As has also been noted, the sym-

metrical voice system that has been reconstructed from PAN and PMP is generally thought to have been lost by the time of Proto-Oceanic. Given the close formal and functional links between the Äiwoo system and symmetrical voice systems found in other branches of Austronesian, it seems implausible that Äiwoo would have reinvented its symmetrical voice system from a POC transitivity-based system that showed no remaining traces of symmetrical voice. This leaves two possibilities, namely that a symmetrical voice system was still present in POC, or that Äiwoo is not an Oceanic language.

Næss (2013) argues that the reanalysis generally thought to have taken place in POC, whereby a reduced version of the PMP voice morphology was reanalyzed as marking a distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs, must have proceeded in two stages: in the first stage, the post-PMP dependent verb forms were reanalyzed as independent forms, leading to the loss of productive actor-voice morphology, although it has been noted that Äiwoo retains what appears to be relics of the independent actor voice infix **<um>*. The immediate outcome of this reanalysis would have been a system contrasting an unmarked actor voice with an **-i*-marked undergoer voice, which in a subsequent step was reanalyzed as marking a contrast between intransitive and transitive verbs. However, this step does not appear to have taken place in Äiwoo's ancestral language, since the voice alternation is, in fact, retained in present-day Äiwoo. This means that either the final step of reanalysis did not, in fact, take place in POC, but in some subsequent stage after Proto-Reefs-Santa Cruz or Proto-Temotu had split off; or else the ancestral language in question was a sister rather than a daughter of POC, sharing with it the reanalysis of dependent verb forms to independent forms, but not the subsequent reanalysis of voice morphology to transitivity morphology.

The function of *=Cä* as a circumstantial voice marker was not recognized by Næss (2013), since that publication failed to recognize the voice-like characteristics of the present-day Äiwoo system. If the hypothesis that *=Cä* reflects **akən/*akin[i]* is correct, this adds to both the unclear picture of the origins of this morpheme (Ross 2002b, 2012) and the challenges in accounting for the relationship between Äiwoo and (the rest of) Oceanic. Äiwoo *=Cä* may be said to have the same basic function in Äiwoo as reflexes of **akən/*akin[i]* have in other languages, namely promoting a noncore participant to core status. But in most languages where such a reflex exists, it functions to promote this participant to nonprominent core ("object") status, whereas in Äiwoo it promotes it to prominent ("subject") status. The latter is not unheard of for reflexes of **akin[i]* in other Oceanic languages, though this function is typically integrated into a reanalyzed transitivity-based system, such as in Micronesian, where the function of promoting an undergoer argument to subject status requires the corresponding deletion of the agent, leading to the passivizing function of the Micronesian **aki* reflexes. In Äiwoo, on the other hand, the reanalysis to a transitivity-based system clearly has not happened, and *=Cä* has instead been integrated into the existing symmetrical voice system.

Comparative research on argument structure in the rest of the Reefs-Santa Cruz group may help shed some light on the history of these constructions. Currently available information suggests that neither Engdewu (Nangu) nor Natügu of Santa Cruz has a reflex of **-akən/*-akin[i]*. Both languages have a suffix *-(n)ö* (Engdewu)/*-ngö* (Natügu), which is analyzed as applicative (Vaa 2013; van den Berg and Boerger 2011). Natügu *-ngö* is

homophonous with a suffix that combines with a prefix *ně-* to form action nominalizations ('his going'). Van den Berg and Boerger (2011) make a strong case for the prefix *ně-* being a reflex of POC *<in>/ni-, which in turn suggests that *-ngō* is, in fact, a reflex of *-an; PMP *<in>-stem-*an had the double function of marking the locative voice in the perfect aspect and forming nominalizations. The evidence is less conclusive for Engdewu *-(n)ō*, but it does appear in nominalizations in combination with a prefix *nō-*, although it does not appear to be obligatory in such constructions (Vaa 2013:328). (For comparison, the corresponding action nominalization construction in Äiwoo takes the form *nye-V-naa*; the suffix *-naa* is clearly distinct from =Cā both in form and distribution.)

Both Natügu and Engdewu also have morphology that is plausibly related to the Äiwoo A-verb vs. O-verb distinction, namely the "detransitivizing" prefix *(v)ō-/ō-*, which might be related to the <ow>/<āw> characteristic of some Äiwoo A-verbs, and the "transitivizing" suffix *-ti*, which is a likely reflex of POC *-i. However, the precise characteristics of these affixes differ between the languages and are in need of further study. In Engdewu, *(v)ō-* and *-ti* are mutually exclusive, though either can combine with applicative *-(n)ō* (Vaa 2013: 262–64); this is reminiscent of the Äiwoo pattern where =Cā can combine with either A-verbs or O-verbs. In Natügu, on the other hand, *ō-* and *-ti* can and do combine on the same verb, and/or with applicative *-ngō* (Brenda Boerger pers. comm.). These systems have not been studied with a view to determining whether they show voice-like characteristics similar to those found in Äiwoo, though in Natügu at least, the possibility of combining the morphemes I have hypothesized to be cognate with those forming A-verbs vs. O-verbs in Äiwoo clearly indicates that the basis of the system is rather different.

Ross and Næss (2007) posit a single Temotu subgroup, including Reefs-Santa Cruz and the languages of Utupua and Vanikoro, on the basis of the shared merger of POC *r and *l as *l, as well as three phonological innovations in individual lexical items. However, François (2013) questions the integrity of this subgroup, pointing out that the languages of Vanikoro appear to have very little in common with Reefs-Santa Cruz, either in lexicon or in structural characteristics. The analysis presented in this paper underscores just how profound these structural differences are, as nothing remotely like a system of symmetrical voice appears to exist in any of the Vanikoro or Utupua languages. While it is certainly not possible to draw any conclusions about subgrouping on the basis of this, it clearly shows that more research is needed on the relationships of the Temotu languages.

In short, in spite of the hypothesis of a Papuan substrate in Reefs-Santa Cruz having been abandoned, the languages of this group continue to pose challenges to our understanding of the linguistic history both of Temotu Province and of Oceanic more generally. Äiwoo is structurally unusual in two respects: it shows a symmetrical voice system in a region where such systems have been thought not to exist, and it combines properties of Philippine-type and Indonesian-type systems in what appears to be a rather unusual way. These findings suggest that the relationship between Reefs-Santa Cruz and the rest of Oceanic may be more complex than what has previously been assumed; moreover, they suggest that the current understanding of the development from the PMP symmetrical-voice system to the POC transitivity-based system may be in need of reexamination, both in terms of the loss of the actor voice/undergoer-voice distinction and the history and functions of *akin[i].

REFERENCES

- Anceaux, J. C. 1988. *The Wolio language: Outline of grammatical description and texts*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2003. *Balinese morphosyntax: A lexical-functional approach*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2008. Voice and being core: Evidence from (eastern) Indonesian languages. In *Voice and grammatical relations in Austronesian languages*, ed. by Peter K. Austin and Simon Musgrave, 183–227. Stanford: CSLI.
- Arka, I Wayan, and Malcolm Ross. 2005. Introduction. In *The many faces of Austronesian voice systems: Some new empirical studies*, ed. by I Wayan Arka and Malcolm Ross, 1–15. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ashley, Karen. 2012. Semantics of Sa'a transitive suffixes and thematic consonants. MA thesis, Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics.
- Bowden, John. 2001. *Taba: Description of a South Halmahera language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Chiarcos, Christian. 2009. Mental salience and grammatical form: Towards a framework for salience metrics in Natural Language Generation. PhD diss., University of Potsdam.
- Cooreman, Ann. 1987. *Transitivity and discourse continuity in Chamorro narratives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Crowley, Terry. 1998. *An Erromangan (Sye) grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Bethwyn. 2003. *A study of valency-changing devices in Proto Oceanic*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Falk, Yehuda. 2006. *Subjects and Universal Grammar: An explanatory theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, William A. 2007. A typology of information packaging in the clause. In *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 1: *Clause structure*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 362–446. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- François, Alexandre. 2009. The languages of Vanikoro: Three lexicons and one grammar. In *Discovering history through language: Papers in honour of Malcolm Ross*, ed. by Bethwyn Evans, 103–26. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2013. Person syncretism and impersonal reference in Vanikoro languages. Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics, University of Newcastle, February.
- Givón, T. 1983. The pragmatics of de-transitive voice: Functional and typological aspects of inversion. In *Voice and inversion*, ed. by T. Givón, 1–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2001. *Syntax*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2002. Voice in western Austronesian: An update. In *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 7–16. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2005a. Typological characteristics. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman, 110–82. London/New York: Routledge.
- . 2005b. Tagalog. In *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman, 350–76. London/New York: Routledge.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P., and Sonja Riesberg. 2013. Symmetrical voice and applicative alternations: Evidence from Totoli. *Oceanic Linguistics* 52:396–422.

- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2):251–99.
- Huang, Shuanfan, and Michael Tanangkingsing. 2011. A discourse explanation of the transitivity phenomena in Kavalan, Sqliq, and Tsou. *Oceanic Linguistics* 50:93–119.
- Hyslop, Catriona. 2001. *The Lolovoli dialect of the North-East Ambae language, Vanuatu*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lemaréchal, Alain. 2010. *Comparative grammar and typology: Essays on the historical grammar of the Austronesian languages*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross, and Terry Crowley. 2002. *The Oceanic languages*. Richmond: Curzon.
- Margetts, Anna. 2007. Three-participant events in Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46:71–127.
- . 2008. Transitivity discord in some Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 47:30–44.
- Massam, Diane. 1988. Instrumental *aki* and the nature of Niuean transitivity. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37:12–28.
- Musgrave, Simon. 2008. Introduction. In *Voice and grammatical relations in Austronesian languages*, ed. by Peter K. Austin and Simon Musgrave, 1–21. Stanford: CSLI.
- Næss, Åshild. 2006. Bound nominal elements in Āiwoo (Reefs): A reappraisal of the “multiple noun class systems.” *Oceanic Linguistics* 45:269–96.
- . 2013. From Austronesian voice to Oceanic transitivity: Āiwoo as the “missing link.” *Oceanic Linguistics* 52:106–24.
- . 2015. The Āiwoo verb phrase: Syntactic ergativity without pivots. *Journal of Linguistics* 51(1):75–106.
- Næss, Åshild, and Brenda H. Boerger. 2008. Reefs-Santa Cruz as Oceanic: Evidence from the verb complex. *Oceanic Linguistics* 47:185–212.
- Naylor, Paz B. 1986. On the pragmatics of focus. In *FOCAL I: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington, and S. A. Wurm, 43–57. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Pawley, Andrew, and Lawrence Reid. 2011 [1980]. The evolution of transitive constructions in Austronesian. Online version accessed July 2012: <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~reid/Combined%20Files/A21.%201979.%20Pawley-Reid--AN%20transitivity--rev%2011-06-09.pdf>
- Payne, Doris L. 1992. Introduction. In *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*, ed. by Doris L. Payne, 1–13. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Peterson, David A. 2006. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ray, Sidney H. 1926. *A comparative study of the Melanesian Island languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2002a. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. In *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 17–62. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2002b. Final words: Research themes in the history and typology of western Austronesian languages. In *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 451–74. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

- . 2009. Proto Austronesian verbal morphology: A reappraisal. In *Austronesian historical linguistics and culture history: A festschrift for Robert Blust*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Andrew Pawley, 295–326. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 2012. Just how different was Proto Oceanic from Proto Malayo-Polynesian? Paper presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Denpasar, Indonesia, July.
- Ross, Malcolm, and Åshild Næss. 2007. An Oceanic origin for Äiwoo, the language of the Reef Islands? *Oceanic Linguistics* 46:456–498.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above? In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles Li, 491–518. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 8: *Grammatical relations*, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock, 279–306. New York: Academic Press.
- Schlie, Virginia. 1983. Topicality and individuation as indices of transitivity: The Kara passive. Unpublished MS. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Tomlin, Russell S. 1995. Focal attention, voice, and word order: An experimental, cross-linguistic study. In *Word order in discourse*, ed. by Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan, 517–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tryon, Darrell T. 1994. Language contact and contact-induced change in the Eastern Outer Islands. In *Language contact and change in the Austronesian world*, ed. by Tom Dutton and Darrell T. Tryon, 611–48. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tryon, Darrell T., and Brian D. Hackman. 1983. *Solomon Islands languages: An internal classification*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Vaa, Anders. 2006. Some aspects of referent mention and discourse organisation in Äiwoo. MA thesis, University of Oslo.
- . 2013. A grammar of Engdewu. PhD thesis, University of Oslo.
- van den Berg, René, and Brenda H. Boerger. A Proto-Oceanic passive? Evidence from Bola and Natügu. *Oceanic Linguistics* 50:221–46.
- Wouk, Fay. 1996. Voice in Indonesian discourse and its implications for theories of the development of ergativity. *Studies in Language* 20(2):361–410.
- Wurm, S. A. 1978. Reefs-Santa Cruz: Austronesian, but ... ! In *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings*, ed. by Lois Carrington and S. A. Wurm, 969–1010. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- . 1981. Notes on nominal classification systems in Äiwo, Reef Islands, Solomon Islands. In *Linguistics across continents: Studies in honor of Richard S. Pittman*, ed. by Andrew Gonzalez and David Thomas, 123–42. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics and Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- . 1991. Language decay and revivalism: The Äiwo language of the Reef Islands, Santa Cruz archipelago, Solomon Islands. In *Currents in Pacific Linguistics: Papers on Austronesian languages and ethnolinguistics in honour of George W. Grace*, ed. by Robert A. Blust, 551–60. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.