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The Aiwoo verb complex

- Aiwoo: Oceanic language (Ross & Næss 2007); Solomon Islands, Temotu Province, Reef Islands; data collected by Ashild Næss (see e.g. Næss 2015a,b and ref.s therein)

- Potentially fairly complex verb forms, where the affixes’ positions do not clearly correlate to their function/category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Asp</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Post-verbal clitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[a’]</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>[b’]</td>
<td>[c’]</td>
<td>[b’’]</td>
<td>[c’’]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- How do we explain this? How much of it can we account for?

- Spoiler: almost all slots can be accounted for, apart from slot 7
How to build words: layered morphology and templatic morphology

• Simpson & Withgott (1986): two systems, layered vs templatic morphology

• **Layered:** morphemes are added one at a time, generating (headed) hierarchical structures

(1)

```
                  N
                 / \
                /   \
            V -ation
              /   \
         A -iz(e)
               /   \
      N -ual
        concept
```

• **Templatic:** rigid linear string of «slots», into which (groups of) morphemes are inserted (in paradigmatic alternation)

(2) Ahtna (Athapaskan; Good 2016: 13 (Kari 1989):

```
na gh i z i ñiìk ø e
```

THM-QUAL-IPFV.NEG1-S-2SG-CLF-feel-IPFV.NEG2-IPFV.NEG3 «You have not yet found a fabric-like object»
Discontinuous dependencies in templatic morphology

• Importantly: templatic systems allow for discontinuous dependencies: morphemes can depend on each other from a distance

• E.g. Swahili (Stump 1997: 221–222):

(3) a.  *tu-m-pige*  
1PL.SUBJ-3SG.OBJ-beat.SBJV
«That we may beat him»

b.  *tu-si-m-pige*  
1PL.SUBJ-NEG-3SG.OBJ-beat.SBJV
«That we may not beat him»

c.  *ha-tu-m-pigi*  
NEG-1PL.SUBJ-3SG.OBJ-beat.IND
«We don’t beat him»
«Templatic morphology» is not a good explanation?

- **Layered Morphology**: the distribution and behaviour of affixes is predictable based on other factors, such as syntax or semantics (e.g. Baker 1985, Bybee 1985)

- **Templatic Morphology**: the distribution and behaviour of affixes are unpredictable/unexpected, and we must stipulate an arbitrary linear template
  - *Not a satisfying explanation*: more a restatement of the problem
  - Many studies have tried to argue that a given language is *not* templatic, e.g. Rice (2000) on Athapaskan, Korotkova & Lander (2010) about Adyghe
Roadmap

• **My goal**: push a layered-morphology analysis of the Aiwoo verb as far as possible

• **Overview**:
  • **Stem**: clearly hierarchical
  • **Person marking system**: maybe not clearly hierarchical, but it does not need arbitrary stipulations
  • **Slot 7**, the circumstantial voice marker =Cā: cannot be accounted for
The stem of the Aiwoo verb (1)

• Nuclear-layer verb serialization: the first stem determines voice/valence, the following ones modify it

(4) $\text{ku-}lu-[[\text{po}]-[\text{to}]-[\text{du}]]=\text{kaa}$

  \text{IPFV-3AUG-go-go.in-finish=FUT}

«They will all go in»
The stem of the Aiwoo verb (2)

• If the first stem is in undergoer voice (UV), the following ones have to agree in UV, with the suffix -i/-nyii:

(5) a. inâ lâ ki-[[âwââ]-[mana]]=kâ
   3MIN DIST IPFV=pull.AV-very=DIST
   «He catches a lot (of fish)»

   b. ki-[[ââ]-[mana-i]]=mu=kâ
      IPFV=pull.UV-very-UV.AGR=DIST
   «You catch a lot (of fish)»

• This suffix behaves recursively: every following stem will take it

(6) a. bäli engeke i-[[kââ]-[pâko-i]]=no
   side this ASP=know.UV-good-UV.AGR-1MIN
   «I know this topic well»

   b. i-[[kââ]-[pâko-i]-[mana-i]]=no
      ASP=know.UV-good-UV.AGR-very-UV.AGR-1MIN
   «I know it very well»
The stem of the Aiwoo verb (3)

(6) b. \(i-[[kää]-[päko-i]]-[mana-i]]-no\)

ASP-know.UV-good-UV.AGR-very-UV.AGR-1MIN

«I know it very well>
Person marking – prefixes: not all person markers are born alike

- **Prefixes** for AV/intransitives, **suffixes** for UV/CV
- All prefixes are before aspect; only 3\text{AUG} \textit{li}- is after aspect

\begin{align*}
\text{(7)} \quad & \text{me-} \textit{ki}-\text{vevaale-wâ}=\text{to}=\text{wâ} \\
\text{1\text{AUG}-IPFV}-\text{wait-} \\
& \text{DIR2=NOW=DIST} \\
& \text{«We wait»}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(8)} \quad & \text{dowâlili} \quad \text{lâ} \quad \text{\textit{ki-li}-pevaale-mâ}=\text{to}=\text{wâ} \\
& \text{child} \quad \text{DIST} \quad \text{IPFV-3\text{AUG}-wait-DIR1=NOW=DIST} \\
& \text{«The children are waiting»}
\end{align*}

- Generalization: 1st/2nd person is before aspect, 3rd person is after aspect (3\text{MIN} is not marked anywhere)
- Typical split 1st/2nd vs 3rd person!
- The two different positions are explained if these markers are of **different nature**
The prefix system (2)

- Linear sequence: 1st/2nd – ASP – 3rd(AUG) (– STEM)
- Exactly the same pattern as in Athapaskan languages (Rice 2000: 182–183; Slave, in (9), is head-final, so the surface order mirrors the Aiwoo one, i.e. 3rd – ASP – 1st/2nd):
  
  (9) a. ní-né-o-hˈiˈ (1SG: -h-)  
  b. ní-ke-néo-ˈiˈ (3PL/DU: -k-)  
  (‘hide’, optative)
- Assumption: 3rd person is no «person», but it represents the absence of person (e.g. Benveniste 1971, Harley & Ritter 2002, etc.)
- Then: these «3PL» (3AUG) markers are in fact only number markers (PL/AUG), i.e. they mark agreement in number, but not in person
- Rice (2000) connects the asymmetry with respect to aspect to the different discourse status of 1st/2nd (inherently referential) to 3rd (has to get its reference from somewhere)
The suffix system: two constructions

- In UV (and CV), the A is always marked; for some combinations of A and O, the O is marked as well:

  (10) a. *i-togulo-iaa*
      ASP-hit-*3AUG*=FUT
      «They will hit him/her/it»
  
  b. *i-togulo-neemmu=waa*
      ASP-hit-*1MIN-2MIN*=FUT
      «I will hit you»
  
  c. *i-togulo-gu-ngopu=waa*
      ASP-hit-*3MIN-1AUG*=FUT
      «(S)he/it will hit us»

- The construction in (10b,c) occurs whenever:
  - A = *1MIN*, O = 2nd person (as in 10b); or
  - A = *3MIN*, O = non-*3MIN* (as in 10c).
The suffix system: a direct/inverse split

- The Aiwoo system is split along two interwoven hierarchies: a person hierarchy \(2 > 1 > 3\) and a number hierarchy \(\text{AUG} > \text{MIN}\).

- When the A is lower than the O, a special construction is used (the one with two suffixes) = inverse construction
  - \(A = 1\text{MIN}, O = 2\text{nd person} \leftrightarrow 1 < 2, \text{MIN} \leq \{\text{MIN, AUG}\}
  - \(A = 3\text{MIN}, O = \text{non-3MIN} \leftrightarrow 3 \leq \{3, 1, 2\}, \text{MIN} \leq \{\text{MIN, AUG}\}

- Crucially: when the A is high on either hierarchy (2nd, AUG), the inverse construction is blocked altogether: \(A = 3\text{AUG}\) triggers the direct construction, even if 3rd person is low.

- Direct/inverse splits are not known from Austronesian languages...

- Conclusion: the person marking system is complex, but it can be explained/accounted for
  - we do not need linear stipulations
The circumstantial voice marker =Cä

- Circumstantial voice: highlights a peripheral argument as the most prominent one of the clause (locative, instrumental, benefactive, etc.)

- This clitic can be added to both INTR, AV, UV (already strange: voice/valence morphology is usually stem-internal/close to the stem...)

(11) \textit{ilã} \textit{dee} \textit{ku-nubo-epu-i=lã}  \quad \text{INTR}
that \quad this \quad IPFV\text{-}die\text{-}also-3AUG=CV

«They also die of this thing»

(12) \textit{nye-ki-vei-lâ-i=lâ} \quad \text{benuwãã}
BN:\text{way\text{-}IPFV\text{-}weave.AV\text{-}go.out\text{-}3AUG=CV} \quad \text{kind.of.basket} \quad \text{AV}

«The way in which they weave the \text{benuwãã}»

(13) \textit{lâto} \textit{ile} \textit{ki-vili-wâ-no=ngâ}  \quad \text{UV}
then \quad this \quad IPFV\text{-}weave.UV\text{-}DIR2-1MIN=CV

«Now I weave with them»
=Cä and person marking

• =Cä influences the person marking system: INTR/AV normally take prefixes (12), but with =Cä they take suffixes (13)

(14) me-nä-vei
    1AUG-IRR-weave.AV
    «We (want to) weave»

(15) nye-ki-vei-lâ-i=lâ
    BN:way-IPFV-weave.AV-go.out-3AUG=cv
    kind.of.basket
    «The way in which they weave the benuwää»

• Problematic! How can this be modelled in a layered fashion?

UV verbs: ✓

AV verbs: ×
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Summary and prospects

- Several of the morphemes occurring within the Aiwoo verb complex can be accounted for without making arbitrary linear stipulations
  - The stem shows recursive behaviour
  - The person marking system shows a 1st/2nd vs 3rd split in the prefix system, and a direct/inverse split in the suffix system
  - The circumstantial voice marker =Cä eschews explanations: it influences the person marking system «from the outside»

- How do the TAM-related morphemes interact with each other? How should we account for them?
- How should we solve the conundrum of =Cä?
References