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1 Indonesian-type voice systems and eastern Indonesia

This paper presents an analysis of voice and grammatical relations in the Lewotobi dialect of the Lamaholot language, framing this language and its voice systems in the context of Indonesian-type voice systems. According to Ross (2002), Arka and Ross (2005b), and Himmelmann (2005), among others, Indonesian-type voice systems are characterized by the combination of (i) a voice system with two or three symmetrical voice alternations and (ii) applicative morphology. Geographically, languages with Indonesian-type voice systems are found mainly in Malaysia and western Indonesia.

In contrast, Austronesian languages in eastern Indonesia are believed not to display voice phenomena of this kind (Arka and Ross 2005b, Himmelmann 2005). It is said that languages in this region “either do not show any grammaticized voice alternations at all or the voice alternations are clearly asymmetrical” (Himmelmann 2005:114). However, in this paper, I argue that this characterization is not true of Lamaholot, an Austronesian language of eastern Indonesia; rather this eastern Indonesian language represents voice systems of the Indonesian-type. By closely examining formal variations of voice alternations and factors for voice selection in Lamaholot, I demonstrate that Lamaholot uses periphrastic means, such as agreement markers, verb serialization, and word order, in order to express various voice and transitivity-related oppositions. I also show that two different kinds of grammatical relations are to be posited for the purpose of describing these phenomena: the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations (subject, primary object, secondary object, and oblique) and the pragmatico-syntactic grammatical relation (topic).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I provide a preliminary sketch of the Lamaholot language and its typological characteristics. This language is almost an isolating language and a typical example of “preposed possessor languages.” In Section 3, however, I demonstrate that this isolating language has various periphrastic means for expressing voice and transitivity-related functional domains. These voice phenomena without voice morphology define and interact with grammatical relations, which are explored in Section 4. In Section 5, then, the topic, another type of grammatical relation, is introduced to describe the Actor-Topic and Undergoer-Topic constructions. Finally, Section 6 concludes this paper with some remarks upon the symmetry of Lamaholot voice systems.

* I thank I Wayan Arka, Masayoshi Shibatani, and Fay Wouk for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper. The research presented here is based on the fieldwork conducted in the Nurri village of Kabupaten Flores Timur between June 2008 and October 2008. This work has been supported by the National Science Foundation grant for the project “Austronesian voice systems: an eastern Indonesian perspective” (BCS-0617198) headed by Masayoshi Shibatani. Lastly but sincerely, I would like to express my gratitude to people in Nurabelen, especially Hugo Hura Puka, who has been supporting me as the Kepala Desa of Nurri and as my primary consultant.
2 Lamaholot, an Austronesian language of eastern Indonesia

Lamaholot is a Central Malayo-Polynesian language of the Austronesian language family (Blust 1993; cf. Donohue and Grimes 2008). It is spoken in the eastern part of Flores Island and neighboring islands of eastern Indonesia, almost serving as the lingua franca of the region (Grimes et al. 1997). Lamaholot is best understood as a dialect chain with enough substantial differences between some of the dialects, so as to make them mutually incomprehensible (Keraf 1978; Bowden 2008). In this description, I focus exclusively on Lewotobi, the most westerly dialect in the chain. This dialect is spoken by approximately 6,000 speakers in Kecamatan Ile Bura. Other dialects studied with some detail include the Lamalera dialect (Keraf 1978) and the Lewoingu dialect (Nishiyama and Kelen 2007).

Two notes on the typological characteristics of Lamaholot are in order. First, Lamaholot is nearly an isolating language. Flores languages, including Lamaholot, are known for having little morphology (Himmelmann 2005; Arka 2007; Donohue 2007a; McWhorter 2007). Its grammatical formatives are S/A-agreement prefixes (Table 1), S-agreement enclitics (Table 2), the possessive markers ~ and = $k\tilde{a}$, the pronominal possessive marker -$\tilde{a}$$p$, and several others.1,2 Central to my investigation is the lack of any affix dedicated for voice and valence-related functions.

Table 1: S/A-agreement prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>k- m- (EXC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t- (INC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>m- m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>n- r-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: S-agreement enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>=$\tilde{a}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=k$\tilde{a}$ (INC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>=ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>=a?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=ka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, Lamaholot is a typical instance of “preposed possessor languages,” despite “transitional languages” being predominant in this island (Nagaya 2009a, b; see Himmelmann 2005 for preposed possessor and transitional languages; cf. Klamer 2002; Donohue 2007a; Musgrave 2008a). This language represents an array of typical eastern Indonesian features. For instance, the basic word order is SVO; there is person marking for S and A arguments (Table 1); a (lexical) possessor precedes its possessum as in (1)a and (1)b; inalienable and alienable possessions take different constructions as in (1)a and (1)b; nouns precede numerals as in (1)c; and the negator and other TAM markers occur in the clause-final position as in (1)d.

(1) a. Hugo lanoʔ =k$\tilde{a}$ Hugo head.POSS ‘Hugo’s house’
     Hugo house =POSS ‘Hugo’s head’
     c. ata rua  d. go is$\tilde{a}$ kbako halaʔ.
     person two 1SG suck tobacco NEG ‘two persons’
     ‘two persons’  ‘I don’t smoke.’

1 Abbreviations used in the paper are: CONJ-conjunction, DEM-demonstrative, DIR-directional, EMP-emphatic marker, EXC-exclusive, INC-inclusive, NEG-negator, PL-plural, POSS-possessive, REL-relativizer, SG-singular, 1-first person, 2-second person, and 3-third person.
2 S/A-agreement prefixes obligatorily occur with certain verbs, either transitive or intransitive; S-agreement enclitics are optionally used with intransitive verbs.
3 Voice oppositions without voice morphology

Lamaholot does not have any morphological means for voice and valence-changing operations, but it uses agreement enclitics, verb serialization and other periphrastic means for these purposes (Nagaya 2009b). In this section, I briefly survey how these functional domains are expressed in Lamaholot. For the sake of convenience, I divided voice and transitivity-related phenomena into two types: semantically-based and pragmatically-motivated voice phenomena (Shibatani 2006; cf. “semantic and pragmatic de-transitive voice constructions” in Givón 2001).

3.1 Semantically-based voice oppositions

Semantically-based voice alternations are those in which different voice forms represent different conceptual contents in terms of parameters pertaining to the evolution of an action (Shibatani 2006): for instance, does the action extend beyond the agent’s personal sphere or is it confined to it (active vs. middle), does the action achieve the intended effect in a distinct patient (active/ergative vs. antipassive), does the action originate with an agent heading the action chain that is distinct from the agent or patient of the main action (causative vs. non-causative), and so on. In Lamaholot, voice contrasts of this kind are expressed by (i) S-agreement enclitics and (ii) the demonstrative ia.

(i) S-agreement enclitics

Syntactic transitivity of Lamaholot verbs is lexically determined. Some verbs are strictly transitive or intransitive; others are ambitransitive, being used either intransitively or transitively. Although there is no transitivity marker per se in this language, the syntactic transitivity of an ambitransitive verb can be explicitly indicated by the existence or absence of the S-agreement enclitics in Table 2, which mark the person and number of an intransitive subject. Since they are only used for intransitive verbs, agreement enclitics function practically as markers of syntactic transitivity and thus express semantically-based voice contrasts by means of an alternation between an intransitive verb with an agreement enclitic and a transitive one without: (2) an antipassive (Health 1976; Levin 1993), (3) a middle/reflexive, and (4) an anticausative.

(2) Antipassive:
   a. go  kə̃ pao.         (transitive)
      1SG eat.1SG mango
      ‘I ate the mango.’
   b. go  kə̃ =nəʔ.3       (antipassive/indefinite object deletion)
      1SG eat.1SG =1SG
      ‘I ate (a meal or something one typically eats).’

(3) Middle/reflexive:
   a. go  həbo  anaʔ goʔè. (causative)
      1SG bathe child 1SG.POSS
      ‘I bathed my child.’
   b. go  həbo  =ʒʔ.       (middle)
      1SG bathe  =1SG
      ‘I took a bath.’
(4) Anticausative:
   a. go ləŋa wato. (causative)  
       1SG fall stone
       ‘I dropped the stone down (accidentally).’
   b. go ləŋə =əʔ. (inchoative)  
       1SG fall =1SG
       ‘I fell down.’

(ii) Demonstrative ia
One of the functions of the demonstrative ia is to introduce an oblique argument. When it is used with verbs of contact, this demonstrative indicates an incomplete or unintended contact. See (5). It is also used in a prepositional recipient construction (Section 4.2).

(5) Conative alternation:
   a. go tədu =əʔ ia knəbi. (conative)  
       1SG collide =1SG DEM wall
       ‘I (almost) collided with the wall’ or ‘I collided with the wall (accidentally).’
   b. go tədu knəbi. (non-conative)  
       ‘I collided with the wall (intentionally).’

3.2 Pragmatically-motivated voice oppositions
Pragmatically-motivated voice alternations are those in which different voice constructions are contrasted in terms of topicality and other discourse factors. For example, the English passive construction represents such a voice contrast. Its pragmatic function is to indicate that an agent is more topical than a patient by bringing a patient into the subject position.

For pragmatically-motivated voice alternations, Lamaholot uses periphrastic strategies: word order, verb serialization, the demonstrative ia, and the third person plural pronoun. As shown in Section 4, these alternations change the grammatical relation of an argument from one relation to another, bringing about different interpretations in reference-tracking.

(i) Actor-Topic and Undergoer-Topic constructions Lamaholot has two competing (mono- and di-) transitive constructions, the Actor-Topic and the Undergoer-Topic constructions (Nagaya 2009a, b). The Actor-Topic construction is a transitive clause with Actor-Verb-Undergoer word order, a subject argument being in the sentence-initial position. In the Undergoer-Topic construction, in contrast, a non-subject core argument occupies the sentence-initial position, yielding Undergoer-Actor-Verb word order. In terms of surface structure, the UT construction uses the same UAV word order as inverse in Standard Indonesian (Donohue 2007b, 2008) and passive in Palu’e (Donohue 2005). In Section 5.3, I return to this contrast and demonstrate that neither of the two analyses is applicable to the contrast between the AT and the UT constructions.

(ii) Antidative and benefactive
The antidative and benefactive alternations are used for promoting a recipient and a beneficiary of high topicality into the primary object position respectively. I return to these constructions in the discussion of the primary object and secondary object in Section 4.2.

---

4 Here “actor” corresponds to A arguments, while “undergoer” is a cover term for P, R, and T arguments.
(iii) **Plural agent constructions** Lamaholot does not have a morphological passive, but expresses an agent’s low topicality by means of the third person plural pronoun ra. Plural agent constructions in (6) and (7) indicate that someone non-specific or unknown did something to the speaker. This construction may be interpreted as an incipient stage of passive in the sense of “agent-defocusing” (Shibatani 1985).

(6) ra bəŋo go.
    3PL hit 1SG
    ‘Someone hit me’ or ‘I was hit.’

(7) ra broka go.
    3PL cheat 1SG
    ‘Someone cheated me’ or ‘I was cheated.’

### 3.3 Summary
Flores languages are said to be isolating languages, and Lamaholot does lack any morphological means for voice oppositions. This Flores language, however, uses periphrastic strategies like agreement markers and word order for distinguishing voice categories. In this sense, Lamaholot has voice alternations without voice morphology (Donohue 2004, 2005; Arka and Kosmas 2005; Shibatani 2008a, 2009a, to name a few). Based on these observations, I examine the grammatical relations of this language in the next section.

## 4 Grammatical relations in Lamaholot

In this and the following sections, I argue that two kinds of grammatical relations must be distinguished in order to fully understand Lamaholot morphosyntax: the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations (subject, primary object, secondary object, and oblique) and the pragmatico-syntactic grammatical relation (topic) (cf. Shibatani 2008a, b, 2009a). The former grammatical relations are semantically-motivated syntactic categories, while the latter is a grammaticalized pragmatic category. A similar distinction is also made in a Lexical-Functional Grammar framework (“argument functions” vs. “nonargument functions,” and “(grammaticalized) discourse functions” vs. “non-discourse functions”; Bresnan 2001:97-98). The A-position and A’-position in a Government and Binding framework is related to the distinction in question, too. The contrast between agent-like subject and topic-like subject has also been a point of contention in Japanese linguistics for centuries (Shibatani 1991), and has long been known as the distinction between role-related and reference-related properties of subjects in Philippine linguistics (Schachter 1976).

In this section, I look closely at the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations. Let us begin by introducing the well-known semantico-syntactic roles listed in (8) (Comrie 1978; Dixon 1979, 1994; Dryer 1986, 2007). For the purpose of this paper, ditransitive clauses are syntactically defined and thus are equivalent to double-object constructions, although they are often semantically captured in typological studies on three-place predicates (Haspelmath 2005; Margetts and Austin 2007).

(8) Semantico-syntactic roles:
- S Single argument in an intransitive clause
- A More agent-like argument in a transitive clause
- P More patient-like argument in a transitive clause

---

5 They also have an ordinary interpretation that more than one identifiable person hit the speaker.
6 Accordingly, an argument bearing a theme role (or a recipient role) is considered as T (or R) only when it appears in a syntactically defined ditransitive clause. See Section 4.2.
Semantico-syntactic grammatical relations refer to those higher-order groupings of these roles that are required in the analysis of grammatical phenomena of an individual language (cf. Dixon 1979, 1994; Dryer 1986, 2007). In Lamaholot, the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations listed in (9) are relevant to its morphosyntactic phenomena and are to be postulated for their description.

(9) Semantico-syntactic grammatical relations:
   a. Subject SUBJ \{S, A\}
   b. Primary object PO \{P, R\}
   c. Secondary object SO \{T\}
   d. Oblique OBL Others

As has been demonstrated by many recent typological works (Dryer 1997; Croft 2001), grammatical relations are construction-specific and thus language-specific concepts. In the rest of this section, I demonstrate how the grammatical relations above are justified in Lamaholot by examining the constructions where S and A are treated alike as opposed to P (Section 4.1), and those where P behaves like R and differently from T (Section 4.2).

4.1 Subjects \{S, A\} in Lamaholot

There are several morphosyntactic phenomena that constitute evidence that S and A arguments behave alike in Lamaholot. Evidence comes from both the structural coding and behavioral potential of S and A arguments (see Keenan 1976 and Croft 2001 for structural coding and behavioral potential). Two structural coding phenomena are relevant to S and A arguments. First, only S and A arguments can appear directly to the left of the verb without any prepositional marking. Second, only S and A arguments can agree with verbs in terms of person and number. Observe that S/A-agreement prefixes (Table 1) agree with S and A but not P in (10).

(10) a. S
    na n-aʔi=aʔ kaeʔ.
    3SG 3SG-leave=3SG PERFECTIVE
    ‘He or she has already left.’

   b. A
    go k-enu tuaʔ.
    1SG 1SG-drink tuak
    ‘I drink tuak.’

   c. P
    *go n-enu tuaʔ.
    1SG 3SG-drink tuak
    Intended for ‘I drink tuak.’

Turning to behavioral potential, only subjects can bind the reflexive expression wəki ‘self.’ See (11). Moreover, in the kadǐʔi-coordination construction, only subjects can control a
gap in the second clause as in (12). Lastly, the addressee of an imperative must be in the subject relation. See (13).

(11) Reflexive \( wəki \) ‘self’ construction:
   a. Hugo plew\( ə \) ki nəʔ\( ẽ \). [SUBJ = antecedent, 
      Hugo praise self 3SG.POSS OBJ = reflexive]
      ‘Hugo praised himself.’
   b. *\( wəki \) nəʔ\( ẽ \) plew\( ə \) Hugo. *[SUBJ = reflexive, 
      self 3SG.POSS praise Hugo OBJ = antecedent]

(12) \( Kədiʔ \)-coordination:
   a. S \( \rightarrow \) S:
      na gaka, kədiʔ __ gwali. 3SG cry then return
      ‘S/he cried, and (s/he) returned.’
   b. A \( \rightarrow \) S, but not P \( \rightarrow \) S:
      na bəŋo go, kədiʔ __ gwali. 3SG hit 1SG then return
      ‘S/he hit me, and (s/he) returned.’

(13) Imperative constructions:
   a. S addressee:
      mo gõ =no kia ka! 2SG eat.2SG=2SG now EMP
      ‘You eat!’
   b. A addressee:
      mo gõ ikə̃ kia ka! 2SG eat.2SGfish now EMP
      ‘You eat (the) fish!’
   c. P addressee:
      *ra bəŋo mo kia ka! 3PL hit 2SG now EMP
      Intended for ‘Be hit by them!’

4.2 Primary object \{P, R\} and secondary object \{T\} in Lamaholot

Lamaholot also provides an array of evidence for the primary object relation and the secondary object relation. Let us look at structural coding first. In terms of word order, P and R arguments appear directly to the right of the verb. Even if it is realized as a zero pronoun, the existence of a P or R argument may be indirectly indicated by the absence of S-agreement enclitics. Second, the third person singular pronoun \( =roʔ \) can be coreferential with only P and R arguments.\(^7\)\(^8\) Observe that in transitive construction \( =roʔ \) refers to the P argument, while the same pronoun designates the R argument in ditransitive construction (15).

\(^7\) The pronoun \( =roʔ \) is an enclitic pronoun for the third person singular. It can occur with the free personal pronoun \( na \). See (a) and (b). However, it is not an agreement marker; it cannot be used with a lexical noun in the same clause. See (c).

(a) Hugo bəŋo =roʔ na. Hugo hit \( =3SG \) 3SG
   ‘Hugo hit him/her.’
(b) Hugo sorõ =roʔ na gula. Hugo give \( =3SG \) 3SG candy
Transitive construction:

\[ \text{go kō}=\text{roʔ} \; \text{ia} \; \text{Ika.} \]

\[ 1\text{SG} \; 1\text{SG.eat}=3\text{SG} \; \text{DEM Ika} \]

\`I ate it in Ika’s house.`

Ditransitive/Double-object construction:

a. \[ \text{go} \; \text{sorō} \; \text{Ika} \; \text{doi.} \]

\[ 1\text{SG} \; \text{give} \; \text{Ika} \; \text{money} \]

\`I gave Ika money.`

b. \[ \text{go} \; \text{sorō}=\text{roʔ} \; \text{doi.} \]

\[ 1\text{SG} \; \text{give} =3\text{SG} \; \text{money} \]

\`I gave him/her money.`

Turning to behavioral potential, P, R, and T arguments are involved in two syntactic alternations, the antidative and the benefactive alternations. My analysis of the two alternations is presented in advance in (16) and (17) for ease of reference.

Antidative alternation (\(\leftarrow\) Topicality of a recipient)\(^9\):

a. Prepositional recipient construction:

\[ \text{Agent} \; \text{Verb} \; \text{Theme} \; \text{ia} \; \text{Recipient} \]

\[ \text{SUBJ} \; \text{PRED} \; \text{PO} \; \text{DEM} \; \text{OBL} \]

b. Double-object construction:

\[ \text{Agent} \; \text{Verb} \; \text{Recipient} \; \text{Theme} \]

\[ \text{SUBJ} \; \text{PRED} \; \text{PO} \; \text{SO} \]

Benefactive alternation (\(\leftarrow\) Topicality of a beneficiary):

a. Benefactive serial verb construction (with a bivalent predicate):

\[ \text{Agent} \; \text{Verb} \; \text{Patient} \; \text{nei/sorō} \; \text{Beneficiary} \]

\[ \text{SUBJ} \; \text{PRED} \; \text{PO} \; \text{give} \; \text{OBL} \]

b. Benefactive construction:

\[ \text{Agent} \; \text{Predicate} \; \text{Beneficiary} \; \text{Patient} \]

\[ \text{SUBJ} \; \text{PRED} \; \text{PO} \; \text{OBL} \; \text{(chômeur)} \]

The antidative alternation is one where the double-object construction is contrasted with the prepositional recipient construction in terms of the topicality of a recipient. Compare (15) and (18). The recipient Ika is foregrounded in the former, while the theme doi ‘money’ is highlighted in the latter. Crucially, what is referred to by =roʔ is the recipient in double-object construction (15)b but the theme in prepositional recipient construction (18)b. Only

---

8 Since P and R arguments are treated alike and T differently, Lamaholot ditransitive constructions represent a secundative alignment type in the typology of alignment patterns for ditransitive clauses (Haspelmath 2005; Siewierska 2003). However, this observation is true only when the enclitic pronoun =roʔ appears in a sentence. If not, this language shows a neutral alignment.

9 Like Lamaholot, English has two common constructions for representing R and T arguments in ditransitive clauses, namely, the double-object construction and the prepositional object construction. Dryer (2007:254) notes: “Many other languages employ constructions which are similar to one or the other of these two constructions in English, though it is less common to have both constructions, the way English does.”
verbs of giving and sending, namely, *neĩ* ‘give’, *sorō* ‘give’ and *gnato* ‘send’ can be involved in this alternation.

(18) Prepositional recipient construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go sorō doi ia Ika.</td>
<td>go sorō =roʔ ia Ika.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG give money DEM Ika</td>
<td>1SG give =3SG DEM Ika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I gave money to Ika.’</td>
<td>‘I gave it to Ika.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my analysis, the recipient argument bears the oblique relation in a prepositional recipient construction, because it is marked by the demonstrative *ia* (see (5) and (14) again). This is further borne out by its interaction with the Undergoer-Topic construction. First, observe that the UT construction distinguishes core arguments from non-core arguments: unlike core arguments, oblique arguments such as a companion and an instrument cannot be in the sentence-initial topic position of the UT construction. See (19) and (20).

(19) Companion SVC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go pana k-ʲʔʲ Ika.</td>
<td>*Ika go pana k-ʲʔʲ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG walk 1SG-do Ika</td>
<td>*[UT: Topic = Companion]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I walked with Ika.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20) Instrument SVC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>go poroʔ ikā pake hepe teʔē.</td>
<td>*hepe teʔē, go poroʔ ikā pake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG cut fish use knife here.POSS</td>
<td>*[UT: Topic = Instrument]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I cut the fish with this knife.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider next the combination of the UT construction with the double-object and the prepositional recipient constructions. Both the recipient and the theme can occupy the topic position in the double-object construction as in (21), while only the theme can be in the topic in the prepositional recipient construction as in (22). This strengthens the case that the recipient participant is in the oblique relation in the prepositional recipient construction, whereas the theme is still a core argument in the double-object construction.

(21) UT construction + Double-object construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ika, go sorō gula.</td>
<td>gula, go sorō Ika.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ika</td>
<td>candy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG give candy</td>
<td>1SG give Ika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Topic = Recipient]</td>
<td>[Topic = Theme]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(22) UT construction + Prepositional recipient construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>doi, go sorō ia Ika.</td>
<td>*Ika, go sorō doi ia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money 1SG give DEM Ika</td>
<td>1SG give money DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Topic = Theme]</td>
<td>*[Topic = Recipient]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize, the double-object construction is a syntactically ditransitive construction, taking a recipient as PO and a theme as SO. The PO status of a recipient is guaranteed by co-
reference with the pronominal enclitic =roʔ. Moreover, the core-argument status of PO and SO is supported by the fact that both can be topicalized in UT constructions. On the other hand, the prepositional recipient construction is a syntactically transitive construction that takes a theme as PO with a recipient as OBL. Taken together, the function of an antedative alternation lies in the manipulation of the topicality of a recipient. A recipient is foregrounded in the double-object construction but backgrounded in the prepositional recipient construction.

This antedative alternation is similar to, but functionally different from, the benefactive alternation, in which benefactive serial verb constructions (SVCs) are opposed with the benefactive construction in terms of the topicality of a beneficiary. On the one hand, Lamaholot introduces a beneficiary into a clause by serializing the verb of giving (either neĩ or sorõ ‘give’). See (23).

(23) Benefactive SVC:
   a. go soka neĩ Ika. S-V-Beneficiary
      1SG dance give Ika SUBJ-PRED-OBL
      ‘I dance for Ika.’
   b. go hope gula neĩ Ika. A-V-P-Beneficiary
      1SG buy candy give Ika SUBJ-PRED-PO-OBL
      ‘I bought candies for Ika.’
   c. go hope =roʔ neĩ Ika. A-V-P-Beneficiary
      1SG buy =3SG give Ika SUBJ-PRED-PO-OBL
      ‘I bought it for Ika.’

On the other hand, a relatively large number of transitive verbs of transaction and creation (BUY-verbs, COOK-verbs, etc.) can promote a beneficiary participant of high topicality into the primary object position. Compare (23) and (24). Notice that what is referred to by =roʔ is the beneficiary argument, not the theme argument, in (24).

(24) Benefactive construction:
   a. go hope Ika gula. A-V(P(Beneficiary))-Theme
      1SG buy Ika candy SUBJ-PRED-PO-OBL
      ‘I bought Ika candies.’ (cf. (23)b)
   b. go hope =roʔ gula. A-V-P(Beneficiary)-Theme
      1SG buy =3SG candy SUBJ-PRED-PO-OBL
      ‘I bought him/her candies.’ (cf. (23)c)

The oblique status of the theme in (24) is again confirmed by means of the UT construction. When the benefactive construction in (24) takes a UT construction, only the beneficiary can be in the sentence-initial topic position. This shows that the theme is in the oblique relation.

(25) UT construction + Benefactive construction:
   a. Ika, go hope gula. [Topic = Beneficiary]
      Ika 1SG buy candy
      ‘I bought Ika a candy.’
   b. *gula, go hope Ika. *[Topic = Theme]
      candy 1SG buy Ika

Naonori Nagaya
Thus, the antidative and the benefactive alternations look superficially similar but work in a different way (Dryer 1986; cf. Goldberg 2002), and can be understood only by distinguishing PO, SO and OBL. The primary object in Lamaholot can be defined by its position in a clause and by co-reference with the enclitic pronoun =roʔ. It is also involved in the antidative and the benefactive alternations. In these two alternations, the division between PO/SO and OBL is highlighted. The former can be in the sentence-initial topic position in UT constructions, but the latter cannot. 10

4.3 Summary

In this section I have discussed the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations in Lamaholot, and argued that SUBJ, PO and SO can be distinguished in terms of the morphosyntactic phenomena summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Semantico-syntactic grammatical relations in Lamaholot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ {S, A}</th>
<th>PO {P, R}</th>
<th>SO {T}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[__V (NP)]</td>
<td>[NP V __]</td>
<td>[NP V NP __]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Enclitic pronoun =roʔ</td>
<td>Antidative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivization</td>
<td>Antidative</td>
<td>UT construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kəʔiʔ-coordination</td>
<td>Benefactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee of an imperative</td>
<td>UT construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Subject and topic: Actor-Topic and Undergoer-Topic constructions

As mentioned in Section 3.2, Lamaholot has two competing transitive constructions, the Actor-Topic and the Undergoer-Topic constructions. The Actor-Topic construction is a transitive clause with AVU word order, a subject argument being in the sentence-initial topic position. In the Undergoer-Topic construction, in contrast, a non-subject core argument (either PO or SO) occupies the topic position, yielding UAV word order. To illustrate, I compare the examples in (26). Importantly, there is no surface difference between the two constructions, either on the verb or on the nominals, except in word order. Although its

10 Although there is no space to fully develop this argument here, the secondary object in Lamaholot should be considered as OBJθ in an LFG framework (Bresnan 2001; Falk 2001): it is better defined as “a family of secondary OBJ functions associated with a particular, language-specific set of thematic roles” (Dalrymple 2006). In Lamaholot, two OBJθs can be posited, OBJ-theme for ditransitive events and OBJ-stimulus for mental events. Verbs of mental events, such as LOVE-verbs and HATE-verbs, take an experiencer as SUBJ and a stimulus as OBJ-stimulus. See (i). As is often the case with other Indonesian languages (Palu’e (Donohue 2005), Manggarai (Arka 2008), and Indonesian (Musgrave 2008)), OBJ-stimulus is marked differently from OBJ but can be in the TOP relation in the Undergoer-Topic constructions. See (ii). It can even acquire reference-tracking properties associated with TOP such as relativization. The defining features of OBJθ in Lamaholot are, therefore, (a) thematically fixed, (b) appear only in ditransitive or mental events, (c) do not appear adjacent to the main verb and receive non-core marking, and (d) can be in the topic relation in the UT construction.

(i) go brea =əʔ k-sʔs Nia. [AT construction]
   1SG like  =1SG 1SG-do Nia
   ‘I like Nia.’
(ii) Nia, go brea=əʔ. [UT construction]
    ‘Nia, I like.’
precise characterization is discussed in Section 5.2, I refer to the sentence-initial argument in the AT and UT constructions as the topic.

(26) a. AT construction:
   Tanti bəŋo Ika. A(=TOP)-V-P
   ‘Tanti hit Ika.’
   b. UT construction:
   Ika, Tanti bəŋo. P(=TOP)-A-V
   Ika Tanti hit
   ‘Ika, Tanti hit (her).’

In this section, I examine the nature of the AT-UT contrast in detail and make the following arguments. First, the UT constructions are pragmatically marked constructions (Section 5.1). Second, the topic relation needs to be posited for a better understanding of the contrast between the AT and the UT constructions (Section 5.2). Third and more crucially, this alternation does not change the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations (Section 5.3). My analysis of the two constructions is presented in advance in (27).

(27) Actor-Topic and Undergoer-Topic constructions (← Topicality of an undergoer)
   a. Actor-Topic construction:
      Argument structure: Agent Verb Patient
      Semantico-syntactic GRs: SUBJ PRED OBJ
      Pragmatico-syntactic GR: TOP
   b. Undergoer-Topic construction:
      Argument structure: Patient Agent Verb
      Semantico-syntactic GRs: OBJ SUBJ PRED
      Pragmatico-syntactic GR: TOP

5.1 Pragmatics of the AT and the UT constructions

According to native Lamaholot speakers’ intuition, there is no doubt that AT constructions are more basic than UT constructions. When they were asked, my consultants clearly stated that an AT construction is more biasa “usual” than its UT counterpart. In elicitation sessions, they usually used an AT construction to answer the present author’s questions. This observation is also borne out by text frequency. UT constructions rarely occur in the text data available at this point.

If AT constructions are basic and unmarked, then what is the best analysis of UT constructions? Analyzing the same constructional contrast in another Flores language, Palu’e, Donohue (2005) concludes that its UT construction is passive, via which an undergoer is promoted into the clause initial subject position (see also Arka and Kosmas 2005 for Manggarai passive; cf. Shibatani 2009a). Is this analysis also applicable to Lamaholot? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to examine more details of UT constructions here.

The most prominent characteristic of UT constructions is that they show properties often associated with topicalization or marked topic constructions in other languages (see “Y-movement” and “L-dislocation” in Givón 2001: Chapters 15 and 16). First, intonationally distinct contour is usually found on the undergoer of UT constructions. Second, intonational break (pause) is optionally placed after the undergoer of UT constructions. These characteristics are also found in topicalization of obliques as in (28).
Third, UT constructions can be used only in main clauses, as is often the case with topicalization in topic-prominent languages such as Chinese and Japanese.\textsuperscript{11}

These formal characteristics suggest that UT constructions share some features with topicalization. This raises a question about the pragmatic status of the undergoer of UT constructions. Interestingly, there exist pragmatic constraints on it. First, the undergoer of UT constructions cannot be the focus of answer in question-and-answer pairs. The portion of a sentence that corresponds to the answer of question is considered as focus (Halliday 1967). An undergoer can be the focus in an AT construction, but cannot in a UT construction, although an actor can be so in either construction. Compare (29) and (30).

(29) Agent is the focus of answer:
Q: hege gə̃ ikə̃ peʔɛ?
who eat.3SG fish that.POSS
‘Who ate that fish?’
A1: AT construction:
Hugo gə̃ ikə̃ peʔɛ.
Hugo eat.3SG fish that.POSS
‘Hugo ate that fish.’
A2: UT construction:
ikə̃ peʔɛ, Hugo gə̃.
‘That fish, Hugo ate.’

(30) Patient is the focus of answer:
Q: Hugo gə̃ aʔ?
Hugo eat.3SG what
‘What did Hugo eat?’
A1: AT construction:
Hugo gə̃ ikə̃.
Hugo eat.3SG fish
‘Hugo ate fish.’
A2: UT construction:
?? ikə̃, Hugo gə̃.
fish Hugo eat.3SG
Intended for ‘Fish, Hugo ate.’

Second, the undergoer of UT constructions cannot be the focus of negation. In (31), the fish \textit{hua} is the focus of negation, being contrasted with the fish \textit{kowi}. It cannot be in the sentence-initial topic position.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(31)] a. AT construction:
go kə̃ ikə̃ hua həlaʔ, kū ikə̃ kowiʔ.
1SG eat.1SG fish tuna NEG but fish kowi
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{11} For this reason, it is not possible to use control constructions and other PRO-related constructions as syntactic tests for distinguishing subject and topic in this language (cf. Shibatani 2008a, b, 2009a).
‘I don’t eat hua, but kowi.’

b. UT construction:

*ikə̃ hua, go kə̃ həlaʔ, kū ikə̃ kowiʔ.
fish tuna 1SG eat.1SGNEG but fish kowi

Intended for ‘I don’t eat hua, but kowi.’

The data above show that the undergoer of UT constructions cannot be narrowly focused. In other words, it conveys topical/presupposed information rather than focal information. Therefore, the UT constructions are best analyzed as topicalization.

5.2 Establishing the topic relation

The discussions in Section 5.1 might give the impression that the topic relation in Lamaholot is only defined in terms of left-dislocation and pragmatic presupposition and that it does not have any syntactic function, like the English topicalization. However, that is not the case. In this section, I claim that the topic relation in Lamaholot does display several behavioral properties that cannot be reduced to any simple semantic role or information structure and must be treated as another grammatical relation in this language.

As has been revealed through the examination of the antidiative and the benefactive alternations, only core arguments can be topicalized in the UT constructions. In other words, the topic is a grouping of topical A, P, R, and T. In terms of structural coding, the topic relation appears in the sentence-initial position. As for behavioral potential, only topics can control a gap in the second clause in the kia gə coordination. The AT-UT contrast results in different interpretations. See (32) and (33).

(32) TOP → S
a. AT construction:

Besa n-oi Hugo kia gə ___ plaʔe.
Besa 3SG-see Hugo CONJ CONJ run

‘Besa saw Hugo and then (Besa) ran away.’

b. UT construction:

Hugo, Besa n-oi kia gə ___ plaʔe.
Hugo Besa 3SG-see CONJ CONJ run

‘Hugo, Besa saw (him) and then (Hugo) ran away.

(33) TOP → S
a. AT construction:

Ika bəŋo Nia kia gə ___ plaʔe.
Ika hit Nia CONJ CONJ run

‘Ika hit Nia and then (Ika) ran away.’

b. UT construction:

Nia, Ika bəŋo kia gə ___ plaʔe.
Nia Ika hit CONJ CONJ run

‘Nia, Ika hit (her) and then (Nia) ran away.’

12 This sentence-initial position of UT constructions, however, somehow mysteriously accommodates wh-words as well. See (a).

(a) aː mo gəʔ?
what 2SG eat.2SG

‘What did you eat?’
Another topic-related construction is relativization. Only nominals bearing the topic relation (and a possessor of such nominals) can be relativized, regardless of their semantico-syntactic grammatical relation (cf. Kuno 1973; Schachter 1973, 1976).

(34) **SUBJ (S)**
    ana? yang [__ n-aʔi =aʔ Larantuka n-ai] səna.
    person REL 3SG-go=3SG Larantuka 3SG-go cool
    ‘The person who went to Larantuka is cool.’

(35) **SUBJ (A)**
    ana? yang [__ kri̱ laŋo teʔe] səna.
    person REL work house here.POSS cool
    ‘The person who built this house is cool.’

(36) **PO (P)**
    ana? yang [__ go bəŋo] səna.
    person REL 1SG hit cool
    ‘The person who I hit is cool.’

(37) Recipient:
    a. **PO (R = Recipient) in the double-object construction:**
       Ika ana? yang [__ go neĩ gula].
       Ika person REL 1SG give candy
       ‘Ika is the one whom I gave a candy.’
    b. **OBL (Recipient) in the prepositional recipient construction:**
       *Ika ana? yang [go neĩ gula ia __].
       Ika person REL 1SG give Ika DEM
       Intended for ‘Ika is the one who I gave a candy to.’

(38) Theme:
    a. **SO (T = Theme) in the double-object construction:**
       teʔe gula yang [__ go neĩ Ika].
       here.POSS candy REL 1SG give Ika
       ‘This is the candy I gave Ika.’
    b. **PO (P = Theme) in the prepositional recipient construction:**
       teʔe gula yang [__ go neĩ ia Ika].
       here.POSS candy REL 1SG give DEM Ika
       ‘This is the candy I gave to Ika.’

(39) Theme:
    a. **PO (P = Theme) in the benefactive SVC:**
       teʔe gula yang [__ go hope neĩ Ika].
       here.POSS candy REL 1SG buy give Ika
       ‘This is the candy I bought for Ika.’
    b. **OBL (Theme) in the benefactive construction:**
       *teʔe gula yang [go hope Ika __].
       here.POSS candy REL 1SG buy Ika
       Intended for ‘This is the candy I bought Ika.’

(40) Beneficiary:
    a. **OBL (Beneficiary) in the benefactive SVC:**

---

13 Kuno (1973)’s theory of relativization: “what is relativized is not an ordinary noun phrase, but the theme (NP-wa) [i.e. topic ---NN] of the relative clause.” (ibid. 2)
14 See Shibatani (2009b) for a nominalization-based account for relativization.
Ika ana? yang [go hope gula neĩ __].
Ika person REL 1SG buy candy give
Intended for ‘Ika is the person who I bought a candy for.’

b. PO (Beneficiary) in the benefactive construction:
Ika ana? yang [__ go hope gula]
Ika person REL 1SG buy candy
‘Ika is the person who I bought a candy.’

(41) OBL (Companion):
*Ika ana? yang [go pana k-š⁸š __].
Ika person REL 1SG walk 1SG-do
Intended for ‘Ika is the person with whom I walked.’

(42) OBL (Instrument):
*teʔe hepe yang [go poroʔ ikš pake __].
here.POSS knife REL 1SG cut fish use
Intended for ‘This is the knife with which I cut the fish.’

(43) POSS of TOP:
ra mala atatikš oto =kš.
3PL steal person car =POSS
‘They stole the person’s car.’

→ UT construction:
atatikš oto =kš, ra mala.
‘The person’s car, they stole.’

→ Relativization:
ata dikš yang [__ oto =kš ra mala] səna.
‘The person whose car they stole is cool.’

As Kunio Nishiyama (p.c.) points out, this constraint on relativization may be explained in terms of a syntactic constraint on A-bar movement. In Lamaholot wh-questions, however, wh-words occur in situ, not triggering wh-movement (but see footnote 12). Moreover, a wh-word can appear in a position that is not relativizable. In (44), for instance, the wh-word hege ‘who’ follows the serialized verb neĩ ‘give’ but the sentence is grammatical. Remember that the object of a serialized verb cannot be topicalized and thus is not relativizable as in (40)a. Therefore, it is difficult to postulate a single A-bar constraint on both relativization and wh-question in this language.

(44) mo hope gula neĩ hege?
2SG buy candy give who
‘Who did you buy a candy for?’

To summarize, the Undergoer-Topic construction is not a mere topicalization but involves inter-clausal reference-tracking phenomena. In order to make a full description of the phenomena, it is necessary to posit the topic relation independently of the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations. The difference between topic and subject/object is that the former is a grammaticalized pragmatic function, while the latter is a grammaticalized semantic function.

5.3 Subject and topic

At the beginning of this section, I mentioned that similar construction types, namely transitive clauses with UAV word order, in other Indonesian languages have been analyzed.
differently by different researchers. To name a few, the Palu’e UAV construction is analyzed as passive \([U = \text{SUBJ}, A = \text{OBL}]\) (Donohue 2005), while the Standard Indonesian UAV construction is considered inverse \([U = \text{SUBJ}, A = \text{OBJ}]\) (Donohue 2007b, 2008).

The Lamaholot UT or UAV construction, however, rejects these analyses, because S and A arguments work as subject relative to the subject-related phenomena examined in Section 4.1, in either the AT or UT construction. First, the AT-UT contrast does not change agreement patterns. As in (45), A arguments agree with the verb in both the AT and the UT constructions. Even in the reflexivization of the UT construction, A arguments still control a reflexive expression. See (46). In the \(kədiʔ\) coordination, again, the AT-UT contrast does not change the interpretation of the sentences. Only A arguments can control a gap in the second clause. See (47). Lastly, the addressee of an imperative must be an A argument even in UT constructions as in (48).

\[(45)\] Agreement:
\[a. \text{go} \ k-enu \ tuaʔ \ teʔẽ \ k-waro. \ [\text{AT}; \ A \text{agreement}] \]
\[1SG \ 1SG-drink \ tuak \ here.POSS \ 1SG-can \]
\[\text{‘I can drink this tuak.’} \]
\[b. tuaʔ \ teʔẽ, \ go \ k-enu \ k-waro. \ [\text{UT}; \ A \text{agreement}] \]
\[tuak \ here.POSS \ 1SG \ 1SG-drink \ 1SG-can \]

\[(46)\] Reflexivization + UT construction:
\[a. \text{waki} \ naʔẽ, \ Hugo \ plewẽ. \ [\text{SUB} = \text{antecedent}, \ OBJ = \text{reflexive}] \]
\[self \ 3SG.POSS \ Hugo \ praise \]
\[‘Himself, Hugo praised.’ \]
\[b. *Hugo, \ waki \ naʔẽ \ plewẽ. \ *[\text{SUB} = \text{reflexive}, \ OBJ = \text{antecedent}] \]
\[Hugo \ self \ 3SG.POSS \ praise \]

\[(47)\] \(Kədiʔ\) ‘kemudian’ coordination:
\[a. na \ bəŋo \ go, \ kədiʔ \ _ \ gwali. \ [\text{AT}; \ A \rightarrow \text{S}] \]
\[3SG \ hit \ 1SG \ then \ return \]
\[‘S/he hit me, and (s/he) returned.’ \]
\[b. \text{go, na} \ bəŋo, \ kədiʔ \ _ \ gwali. \ [\text{UT}; \ A \rightarrow \text{S}] \]
\[1SG \ 3SG \ hit \ then \ return \]
\[‘Me, s/he hit, and (s/he) returned.’ \]

\[(48)\] Imperative constructions + UT construction:
\[a. \text{A addressee:} \]
\[ikā, \ mo \ gō \ kia \ ka! \]
\[fish \ 2SG \ eat.2SG \ now \ EMP \ ‘You eat (the) fish!’ \]
\[b. \text{P addressee:} \]
\[*mo, \ ra \ bəŋo \ kia \ ka! \ Intended for ‘Be hit by them!’ \]
\[2SG \ 3PL \ hit \ now \ EMP \]

The data examined above clearly show that the alternation between AT and UT does not change semantico-syntactic grammatical relations like subject and object. Therefore, it is not appropriate to analyze this alternation as passive or inverse, which necessarily changes such grammatical relations. Instead, it is needed to postulate the topic relation independently of subject and object. Thus, the function of this alternation lies in changing the topic relation from one argument to another for pragmatic and reference-tracking purposes. The differences between subject and topic are summarized in Table 4.
Table 4: Subject and topic in Lamaholot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject (SUBJ)</th>
<th>Topic (TOP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Sentence-initial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivization</td>
<td>Relativization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kədiʔ-coordination</td>
<td>Kia go-coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee of an imperative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusions

In this paper I have argued that Lamaholot, a Flores language with typical eastern Indonesian features, displays voice phenomena with periphrastic strategies. It has also been demonstrated how these voice phenomena change and interact with grammatical relations. Our conclusion is that two different sets of grammatical relations are required for a better understanding of these voice phenomena.

By way of conclusion, let us consider the question posed at the beginning of this paper, namely, the symmetry of Lamaholot voice systems. On the one hand, voice contrasts made by agreement markers, verb serialization, and the demonstrative ia are asymmetrical voice alternations in that one construction is syntactically more complex than another. In particular, the antitative and benefactive alternations serve much the same functions as the applicative morphology of Indonesian-type voice systems. On the other hand, the alternation between AT and UT is a symmetrical one; the two constructions differ only in word order. Importantly, this alternation does not affect the alignment of the semantico-syntactic grammatical relations. Therefore, this eastern Indonesian language displays a symmetrical non-demotional voice alternation, which is characteristic of symmetrical voice languages in the Philippines and western Indonesia.
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