PROJECT MUSE®

Jespersen in the Reef Islands: Single versus Bipartite
Negation in Äiwoo

Giovanni Roversi, Åshild Næss

Oceanic Linguistics, Volume 58, Number 2, December 2019, pp. 324-352 (Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press

➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/751107>

Jespersen in the Reef Islands: Single versus Bipartite Negation in Äiwoo

Giovanni Roversi and Åshild Næss

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

In this paper, we discuss the properties of negation in the Oceanic language Äiwoo. Like many Melanesian languages, Äiwoo has a bipartite negation construction; more unusually, this construction contrasts with a simple negation construction involving only the first morpheme of the bipartite negation, which typically has the reading ‘not yet’. We account for this situation by arguing that the second part of the bipartite negation originates in a morpheme indicating that the verbal action is unachieved; and that the absence of this morpheme, even after the bipartite negation grammaticalized as the standard negation construction, is typically interpreted as meaning that the event, though unachieved at present, may still take place at some later stage. We further discuss scope effects related to the second negative morpheme as a possible explanation for the cases where single negation does not get the reading ‘not yet’. Finally, we argue that Äiwoo shows a variation on Jespersen’s cycle not previously discussed in the literature, where the original single negation construction is not lost in the process of grammaticalization, but is rather reinterpreted as indicating what we call ‘weakened negation’ in contrast to the new double-marked construction.

1. INTRODUCTION. This paper examines the formal and semantic properties of negation in the Oceanic language Äiwoo, spoken in the Reef Islands in Solomon Islands’s Temotu Province. Like many Oceanic languages of Melanesia, Äiwoo has a bipartite negation construction, consisting of a preverbal marker *ba* and a clitic *=gu* occurring at the end of the verb phrase, as in (1):

- (1) **Ba** i-kää-no=**gu**.
 NEG1 PFV-know.UV-1MIN=**NEG2**
 ‘I don’t know.’¹

1. The authors would like to thank Jozina Vander Klok, Patrick Grosz, Pritty Patel-Grosz, and participants at the 2nd Crete Summer School of Linguistics (2018) for comments on various parts of the analysis presented in this paper, as well as two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on the manuscript as a whole. Abbreviations follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules where these apply. Additional abbreviations used in glosses: AUG, augmented number; AV, actor voice; BN, bound noun; CONJ, conjunction; CONT, continuous; CV, circumstantial voice; DIR, directional; GA, generic agent; MED, medial; MIN, minimal number; POSS:FOOD, possessive marker for edible items; POSS:LOC, possessive marker for locations; POSS:TOOL, possessive marker for tools and utensils; PREF, prefix with unclear function; UA, unit-augmented number; UV, undergoer voice.

However, under certain conditions *ba* can also appear without final *=gu*. In most cases, this yields the meaning ‘not yet’, though there are other cases where the presence or absence of *=gu* seems to be linked to the presence of a post-verbal adverb or aspect marker. In this paper, we attempt to account for the distribution of *=gu* and the semantic effects of its presence versus absence. We argue that the ‘not yet’ reading is linked to the likely origin of *=gu* as an aspectual marker indicating that an event is unachieved or incomplete; its absence invites the inference that the event may yet be achieved at some later stage. We further argue that when a reinforcement marker grammaticalizes into a part of the standard negation, giving rise to a bipartite negation construction, this may lead to scope effects, which can be observed in the distribution of *=gu* in Äiwoo. Finally, we show that the analysis we propose represents a variation on Jespersen’s cycle not previously described, where the original single-marked negation construction is not lost when the double-marked construction is grammaticalized. Rather, the single-marked construction takes on a number of special functions related, first, to the contrast with the bipartite construction, and second, to the fact that the addition of another negative morpheme in the verb complex may lead to scope effects, which may be manipulated by speakers.

2. THE ÄIWOO LANGUAGE. Äiwoo is spoken by approximately 8,000 people in Temotu Province, the easternmost province of Solomon Islands in the southwest Pacific. It is classified as belonging to the Temotu subgroup of Oceanic (Ross and Næss 2007). In what follows, we sketch the main properties of the verb complex in Äiwoo, as this paper is concerned mainly with negation as applied to verbs—though as noted in section 3.1 below, the same construction is used for the negation of nonverbal elements as for verbs.

We distinguish between stative and dynamic verbs, where stative verbs typically occur without aspect-mood morphology when referring simply to an ongoing state; though they accept such morphology if used to refer, for example, to a temporary or prospective state or a change of state:

- (2) a. Ba ki-siwo-mu=*gu* go nyime-mu, go **vepe**.
 NEG1 IPFV-*hold*.UV-2MIN=*NEG2* with hand-2MIN because be.hot
 ‘You don’t touch [the oven stones] with your hands, because they’re hot.’ (ELAR-Baking potatoes 93-94)
- b. Ile nuwai enge lâ **ki-vepe**=kâ go
 PROX water DEM:PROX DIST IPFV-be.hot=*DIST* from
 ile teväivä ile ki-to-oli-mä ngä nyigenaa
 PROX stone PROX IPFV-be-go.down-DIR:1 LOC cabbage
 ‘This water becomes hot from the stones sitting here on the cabbage.’
 (ELAR-Cooking cabbage 93)

Nonverbal predicates pattern like stative verbs with respect to aspect-mood marking. Dynamic verbs occur with one of four aspect-mood prefixes: *i-* ‘realis

perfective’, *ki-/ku-* ‘realis imperfective’, *nā-/nâ-* ‘irrealis’, and *de-* ‘apprehensive’. Where a dynamic verb appears to lack an overt aspect-mood prefix, we assume that this is a phonologically conditioned elision of perfective *i-*, as it occurs mainly under certain specific conditions, namely (i) where the verb takes a vowel-final person prefix, which would normally be followed by the aspect prefix; (ii) when the verb takes the 3AUG prefix *li-/lu-* (which otherwise follows the aspect prefix if there is one); and (iii) when the verb root has an initial /w/. It may be noted that the perfective appears to be the unmarked member of the perfective/imperfective opposition in Äiwoo in that it only indicates a lack of reference to the internal structure of an event, rather than implying that the event does not have any internal structure, as per Comrie’s (1976:21) definition of perfectivity (Næss 2019). In addition to the aspect-mood prefixes, various adverbs and clitics carry aspectual meaning, as will be discussed in more detail in section 4.4 below.

Äiwoo shows a symmetrical voice system where two-participant verbs take two different forms, one indicating actor voice and another indicating undergoer voice. There is no regular and clearly segmentable morphology deriving one form from the other or both from a common root, and due to this, previous literature (e.g., Næss 2015b) used the terms ‘A-verbs’ and ‘O-verbs’, respectively, for the actor-voice and the undergoer-voice forms. However, these alternations can also be understood as constituting a system of inflectional classes, where different classes of verbs mark actor voice (AV) or undergoer voice (UV) with different morphology, in the same manner as, for example, different classes of Romance verbs mark the same grammatical categories with different affixes (Roversi 2019). We will not attempt to segment and gloss voice morphology separately from the root, but will simply indicate it as fused to the root itself, so that *epave*, for example, will be glossed as ‘cook.AV’ and *epavi* as ‘cook.UV’, as in (3b,c) below.

Intransitive verbs and actor-voice verbs take actor prefixes, whereas undergoer-voice verbs take actor suffixes (and, for some combinations of person and number, also undergoer suffixes). This is illustrated in (3) below:

- (3) a. Toponu mo lâpu lâ ki-**li-mo**-le=to=wâ.
 turtle and rat DIST IPFV-**3AUG-stay**-UA=now=DIST
 ‘The turtle and the rat were staying together.’ (Stories-Rat and turtle 1)
- b. Pe-sime-engâ **li-epave**=to sii=kâ.
 people-person-DEM:DIST **3AUG-cook.AV**=now fish=DIST
 ‘The people cooked fish.’ (Stories-Sulu 37)
- c. Sii lâ ki-**epavi-i**=to=wâ.
 fish DIST IPFV-**cook.UV-3AUG**=now=DIST
 ‘They cooked the fish.’ (Stories-Sulu 35)

The person markers follow a so-called minimal-augmented pattern, which treats the category ‘you and I’ as a distinct person category, which can be “pluralized” along the same lines as the first, second, and third persons.

TABLE 1. BOUND PERSON MARKERS

	Prefixes	Suffixes
1MIN	i-	-no
1+2MIN	ji-	-ji
2MIN	mu-/mi-	-mu
3MIN	Ø	Ø/-gu
1AUG	me-	-ngo(pu)
1+2AUG	de-	-de
2AUG	mi-	-mi
3AUG	li-/lu-	-i

The terms “singular” and “plural” are unsuitable for such systems, as the ‘you and I’ category does not have a singular in the sense of a form referring to one person; the minimal number of referents required to use such a form is two. Accordingly, the term “minimal” is used instead of “singular” for the forms referring to the minimal number of referents included in the person category—that is, one for the first, second, and third persons, but two for the first + second persons—and “augmented” is used instead of “plural” for the forms referring to more than the minimal number (McKay 1978). Accordingly, the bound person markers in Äiwoo pattern as given in table 1.

The pronominal paradigm in Äiwoo includes a third number value, namely the so-called unit-augmented number, referring to minimal number plus one: ‘I and another person’ (first person unit-augmented), ‘you and I and another person’ (first + second person unit-augmented), ‘you and another person’ (second person unit-augmented), and ‘he/she and another person’ (third person unit-augmented). In the verb, this is indicated by adding the suffix *-le* to a verb with an augmented-number person marker, regardless of whether the latter is a prefix or a suffix:

- (4) a. Mi-ku-wä-**le**.
2AUG-IPFV-go-UA
‘You two go.’ (elicited)
- b. Ki-te-kä-mi-**le**.
IPFV-see.UV-DIR:3-2AUG-UA
‘You two see [it].’ (Farewell speech 32)

For more on number in Äiwoo, see Næss (2018a).

In addition to aspect/mood and person marking, the verb complex in Äiwoo may include two or more serialized verb roots, manner adverbs,² directionals, and various voice- and valency-related morphology, which will not be further discussed here. It is possible to identify a verb phrase as delimited by certain clitics (Næss 2015a); this verb phrase includes the A argument of UV verbs, but excludes either S or O arguments (though see 3.3 below). Thus, in (5a), the O

2. The distinction between noninitial verbs in a serialization construction and manner adverbs is not clear-cut. We classify a form as a manner adverb if it is not attested with an independent use as a predicate.

argument *nuwâdâ* ‘seashell(s)’ follows the clitic complex $=to=we$ ‘now=PROX’ (see fn. 11 for a discussion of the semantics of $=to$), whereas the A argument *Usaliki* (a man’s name) precedes $=to=wâ$ ‘now=DIST’ in (5b).

- (5) a. Ki-pelää-ute=**to=we** nuwâdâ.
 IPFV-collect.AV-again=**now=PROX** seashell
 ‘She was collecting shells again.’ (Stories-Moliki 222)
- b. I-luwa-kâ Usaliki=**to=wâ**.
 PFV-take.UV-DIR:3 Usaliki=**now=DIST**
 ‘Usaliki took him.’ (Usaliki 51)

Example (6) shows that the negation clitic $=gu$, which will be discussed in detail in section 3, patterns in the same way, following an A but not an O argument of an UV verb:

- (6) a. Ba i-te-kâ sime=**gu**.
 NEG1 PFV-see.UV-DIR:3 person=**NEG2**
 ‘No one saw him.’ (Stories-Sulu 19)
- b. Ba i-te-kâ-mu=**gu** ijii?
 NEG PFV-see.UV-DIR:3-2MIN=**NEG2** 3AUG
 ‘Haven’t you seen them?’ (Stories-Temaa 197)

Our data come from a variety of sources, and while most of the data is available to the public in some form or other, it is not all available in the same format or with the same level of annotation. The bulk of the data come from fieldwork carried out by the second author in Honiara and the Reef Islands in 2004, 2005, and 2015.³ This data consists mostly of audio- or videotaped narratives and interviews, as well as response to certain video elicitation tools. The 2015 materials can be accessed through the Endangered Languages Archive, including video and audio recordings as well as transcriptions and annotations in FLEX and ELAN.⁴

Most of the narrative texts collected in 2004–2005 are published as Næss (2006). Some of the associated audio recordings are archived with PARADISEC but currently without further annotation.⁵

Some examples also come from Stephen Wurm’s materials archived with the Australian National University, some of which have been digitized and made available online at PARADISEC.⁶ The archived materials are in the form of handwritten transcriptions and rough glosses. In one instance, where we could not find any adequate examples in our own data, an example is cited from the Äiwoo translation of the Gospel of Mark, published by the Bible Society of the South Pacific.

In this paper, we have indicated the source of each example as follows. References to examples from the materials available from ELAR are prefixed

3. The support of the Norwegian Research Council, project number 148717, and the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme, grant number SG0308, in funding the fieldwork is gratefully acknowledged.

4. See <https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI1032004>.

5. See <http://catalog.paradisec.org.au/collections/AN1> (DOI: 10.4225/72/56E9775C61EC9).

6. See <http://www.paradisec.org.au/fieldnotes/SAW2/SAW2S002.htm>.

with ‘ELAR’, examples from texts published in the 2006 volume are prefixed with ‘Stories’, and examples from the Wurm materials are prefixed with ‘Wurm’. All example numbers are from our FLE_x annotations. So, for example, (ELAR-Nuts and fruits 122) indicates that the text is available in the ELAR collection with the title ‘Nuts and fruits’ and the example is line number 122 in the FLE_x annotation; (Stories-Rat and turtle 53) means the example comes from ‘The story about the rat and the turtle’ published in the 2006 volume and so forth. References lacking any prefix are to field materials which are not currently accessible in online or printed form.

Although we draw on corpus data from several sources, no elicitation has been carried out specifically targeting negation, which means that our data is inadequate when it comes to conclusively answering certain questions; this is pointed out in the relevant sections below.

3. NEGATION IN ÄIWO

3.1 THE BIPARTITE NEGATION CONSTRUCTION. Bipartite negation, where an initial preverbal negative element is combined with a second, postverbal element,⁷ is fairly common in Oceanic languages, although the actual forms of the negators differ widely between languages (Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002:52). Vossen and van der Auwera (2014) show that bipartite negation in Oceanic is largely concentrated in Melanesia, the only exception being Rapanui.⁸

As shown in (1), in Äiwoo the negative morphemes have the form *ba* ... =*gu*. This is the standard negation construction in the sense of Miestamo (2005), that is, “the basic way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses” (Miestamo 2005:3). The bipartite negation construction is the basic way of negating all types of verbal clauses, including both stative and dynamic intransitives, actor-voice and undergoer-voice transitives. Of a total of 365 examples of negated verbal clauses in our corpus, only 16 did not show bipartite negation; these exceptions are the topic of section 4 below.

Negation in intransitive clauses is shown in (7–8) with the verbs *to* ‘be, exist’ and *wo* ‘go’.

- (7) Mo **ba** **ki-to=gu** ngä nye-maapi,
 CONJ NEG1 IPFV-be=NEG2 LOC place-bush
 ki-to ngä nye-polââ.
 IPFV-be LOC place-clear
 ‘But it doesn’t grow in the bush, it grows in the clear places.’
 (ELAR-Growing pana 213–214)

7. This is the most common situation, and to the best of our knowledge the only one attested in Oceanic languages, though as Van Alsenoy and van der Auwera (2014:19, fn. 7) point out, other patterns of bipartite negation are occasionally found.

8. In the text, Vossen and van der Auwera (2014:61) claim that “63 of the 65 Oceanic languages [with double negation] are spoken in Oceania,” but the actual languages cited do not match these numbers.

- (8) a. Ku-wo-to=**kaa=kâ**.
 IPFV-go-go.in=**FUT=**DIST
 ‘He will go inside.’ (ELAR-Initiation Speech 1 21)
- b. Mo **ba** ku-wo-to=**gu=naa**.
 CONJ **NEG1** IPFV-go-go.in=**NEG2=**FUT
 ‘He won’t go into [this dancing circle].’ (ELAR-Initiation Speech 1 14)

Examples (9) and (10) show negation in transitive clauses in the actor voice and undergoer voice, respectively.

- (9) a. Naive nugu-de ku-woeaa dâ-sime ki-**veve**.
 taboo POSS:TOOL-1+2AUG IPFV-destroy some-person IPFV-**pay.AV**
 ‘If anyone destroys our taboo, he will pay [a fine].’ (Naive 60)
- b. lie **ba** ki-**veve=gu** naive me-vetängä=**kâ**,
 who **NEG1** IPFV-**pay.UV=NEG2** taboo person-destroy=**DIST**
 sime ku-nubo.
 person IPFV-die
 ‘Anyone who destroys the taboo and does not pay [a fine], will die.’
 (ELAR-Taboos 219)
- (10) a. Ki-**ve-mä-i**.
 IPFV-**pay.UV-DIR:1-3AUG**
 ‘They buy [it] from me.’ (ELAR-Basket weaving 101)
- b. **Ba** ki-**ve-i=gu**.
NEG1 IPFV-**pay.UV-3AUG=NEG2**
 ‘They didn’t buy [it].’ (ELAR-Land rights 242)

All the negated examples in (7–10) show the imperfective prefix *ki-/ku-*, which is the most frequent both in our corpus in general and in our negation data, with 235 of our verbal negation examples showing this prefix (64.4 percent of the total, or 72.1 percent if we eliminate the stative verbs, which typically do not show aspect prefixes). However, the perfective aspect (marked by *i-*) also occurs with negation, as shown in (11b) (compare with the corresponding affirmative sentence in [11a]) and (12–13). If we include the cases where, as discussed in section 2 above, an apparently unmarked verb form is assumed to have underlying perfective marking, which is lost under certain phonological conditions, perfective verbs account for 27.6 percent of our examples where aspect marking is expected (i.e., excluding the stative verbs).

- (11) a. Bäli enge i-kää-päko-i-no.
 side DEM:PROX PFV-know.UV-be.good-UV-1MIN
 ‘I know this topic very well.’ (ELAR-Fermenting breadfruit 1)
- b. Iu=nge **ba** i-kää-päko-i-no=**gu**.
 1MIN=**PROX NEG1** PFV-know.UV-be.good-UV-1MIN=**NEG2**
 ‘I don’t know this very well.’ (ELAR-Taboos 102)

- (12) Nulä **ba** i-wâ-pu-vili=**gu**.
 neck.3MIN **NEG1** **PFV-CAUS-go-shake=NEG2**
 ‘It doesn’t turn its head.’ (ELAR-Shark fishing 87)
- (13) Mo **ba** i-tu-mä=**gu**.
 but **NEG1** **PFV-bring.UV=DIR:1=NEG2**
 ‘But he didn’t bring her home.’ (ELAR-Polygamy 86)

The apprehensive prefix *de-* does not occur in combination with negative *ba...=gu* in our corpus. This could be due to a semantic constraint, as the semantics of the apprehensive is in a sense inherently negative; it indicates that a prospective event is undesirable and to be avoided (14a). We do not, however, have any data showing whether the undesirable prospective event can itself be negated (e.g., *I was afraid that the tree would not fall down* in a situation where it is important to get the tree to fall), and so we cannot say with any degree of certainty whether the apprehensive is categorically ungrammatical with the *ba...=gu* construction. On the other hand, it does occur with the prohibitive enclitic *=eo/=io*, for which the apprehensive mood is obligatory (14b).

- (14) a. Kâ-no=ngä nyenaa **de-eobu-mä=dä**.
 say-1MIN=CV tree **APPR-fall-DIR:1=some**
 ‘I thought a tree might fall down on me.’ (Cyclone 363)
- b. **De-wâ-tepeu-nâ-mu=io** iu!
APPR-CAUS-be.stupid-UV-2MIN=PROH 1MIN
 ‘Don’t make fun of me!’ (Stories-Rat and turtle 53)

More interestingly, the irrealis appears to be all but incompatible with negation. While irrealis forms are not rare in our corpus (949 tokens in total), only a single example shows irrealis marking with negation; this example moreover does not follow the standard negation construction, as the postverbal clitic *=gu* is lacking:

- (15) Mo i-doo **ba** **nâ-lu-pwaapo-mä** go
 CONJ **PFV-what** **NEG1** **IRR-3AUG-wake-DIR:1** so.that
 nâ-li-tuwo-kä be-lu-pu-kä-mäi ngâ nubotage?
 IRR-3AUG-take-DIR:3 **PREF-3AUG-go-DIR:3-together** **LOC** road
 ‘Why didn’t they wake us so we could help them carry and accompany them on the road?’ (Stories-Moliki 390)

It seems unusual for negation to show restrictions on cooccurrence with the irrealis mood; the reverse situation, where negation requires marking for a category that denotes nonrealized states of affairs, appears to be more common crosslinguistically (Miestamo 2005:96–108). This is for example the case in some of the Epi languages spoken in central Vanuatu. In these languages, as in many other languages of that area, the realis versus irrealis distinction is marked on the verb root, with a pattern of root-initial consonant mutations distinguishing between the two (e.g., in Bierebo, *van* ‘go, irrealis’ contrasts with *ban* ‘go, realis’; Budd 2010:516). In some of these languages (Baki and Mkir),

negation consistently selects the irrealis form of the verb in its scope; this is illustrated in (16) with examples from Baki (Budd 2010:528, originally citing Ray 1926:251). Note that semantic difference between realis and irrealis is not neutralized, but is realized through the use of different negation constructions.

- (16) a. Maka na-iali.
 NEG1 1SG.S-IRR.see
 ‘I didn’t see.’
 b. Na-iali re.
 1SG.S-IRR.see NEG2
 ‘I won’t see.’

On the other hand, there are Oceanic languages with several negation constructions, which restrict some of them to realis clauses; this is the case for the clause-final negator *poli* in Lewo (Early 1994b:66, 82) and the negators *mara* and *pwel(i)* in Bierebo (Budd 2010:517).

We lack elicited data which would show how speakers negate clauses with irrealis semantics in Āiwoo. In some of the contexts where the irrealis occurs in affirmative clauses, the apprehensive is found in corresponding negative contexts; for example, in statements of purpose following the conjunction *go* ‘so that’, the corresponding negative statement ‘so that X won’t happen’ requires the prohibitive clitic with an apprehensive prefix:

- (17) a. Ki-ngapu-to-kä-i go nă-päko=nă
 IPFV-pour.UV-go.in-DIR:3-3AUG so.that IRR-be.good=DIST
 go nyiba de-wo-kä=eo.
 so.that worm APPR-go-DIR:3=PROH
 ‘They pour it in so it will be good, so that worms won’t come.’
 (ELAR-Fermenting breadfruit 44)
 b. Ki-teve-to-kä-de go nyi-vepe
 PFV-line.with.stones.UV-go.in-DIR:3-1+2AUG so.that NMLZ-be.hot
 eä de-wo-lâ=eo.
 of.3MIN APPR-go-go.out=PROH
 ‘We line it with stones so that the heat won’t leak out.’ (ELAR-Baking potatoes 72)

An alternative to the prohibitive construction in such contexts seems to be a standard negation construction with imperfective *ki-/ku-*; compare (17b) to (18), from the same text:

- (18) Go ki-epave de-ki-li-ngä
 because IPFV-cook.AV thing-IPFV-GA-eat.UV
 nyi-vepe ba ku-wo-lâ=gu.
 NMLZ-be.hot NEG1 IPFV-go-go.out=NEG2
 ‘Because to cook the food, the heat mustn’t leak out.’
 (ELAR-Baking potatoes 86)

In general, the imperfective *ki-/ku-* may be used with a future/prospective meaning, with or without the future enclitic =*Caa*, as in (19); the lack of =*Caa* seems to indicate a more immediate future:

- (19) a. Ko-kä=nä 'Ipe! Iu i-ku-wâ=to ngââgu.'
 say-DIR:3=CV old.woman 1MIN 1MIN-IPFV-go=now bush
 'He said, 'Wife! I'll go to the bush now.' (Stories-Moliki 32)
- b. Bulaape eângâ i-ku-wâ=nāa ngâ numa
 tomorrow DEM:DIST 1MIN-IPFV-go=FUT LOC field
 ngâ nubââ.
 of.3MIN shark
 'The day after tomorrow I'll go to the shark area.'
 (Stories-First people 35)

We hypothesize, then, that *ki-/ku-* (=Caa) rather than irrealis *nâ-/nâ-* is the preferred marking under negation; compare the examples in (20a,b):

- (20) a. Kele m-enge nâ-vâpulâ-wâ-no.
 here BN-DEM:PROX IRR-finish-DIR:2-1MIN
 'I'm about to finish this one.' (ELAR-Weaving a
 benuwää 222)
- b. Ba ki-vâpulâ-no=gu=nāa.
 NEG1 IPFV-finish-1MIN=NEG=FUT
 'I won't tell the whole thing (lit. I won't finish it).'
 (ELAR-Village structure 22)

More research is needed into the precise semantics of the irrealis in Äiwoo and how it contrasts with *ki-/ku-* and =Caa in order to be able to give a more detailed account of these patterns.

The bipartite negation construction with *ba . . . =gu* is used not only for the negation of verbal clauses, but also negates a variety of other constituents, including nominal predicates (21a), pronouns (21b), possessive classifiers (21c), and prepositional phrases (21d):

- (21) a. De-enge **ba** nyibiko ki-dâ=**gu**.
 thing-DEM:PROX **NEG1** log IPFV-float=**NEG2**
 'This is not a floating log.' (Stories-First people 83)
- b. **Ba** iude=**gu** lâ käsä Nyiwoo=kâ ngâpogo.
NEG1 1+2AUG=**NEG2** DIST be.like Reef.Islands=DIST only
 'It wasn't, like, just us here in the Reefs.' (ELAR-Nuts and fruits 159)
- c. Numwa **ba** to-ngopu dâ=**gu**.
 reef **NEG1** POSS:LOC-1AUG some=**NEG2**
 'We don't have a reef (lit. a reef is not ours).'
 (ELAR-Traditional fishing 43)
- d. I-ki-mââ go pepa, pepa
 1MIN-IPFV-smoke with paper paper
 ku-mââ-i=lâ=ne, mo **ba** go paipi=**gu**.
 IPFV-smoke-3AUG=CV=PROX CONJ **NEG1** with pipe=**NEG2**
 'I smoke with paper, rolling paper, and not with a pipe.'
 (ELAR-Gardening 540)

3.2 THE DISTRIBUTION OF *ba*. The preverbal particle *ba* plausibly reflects Proto Oceanic *bʷali, which according to Lynch, Ross, and Crowley (2002:88) was probably a negative verb meaning ‘not be so’. Äiwoo *ba* also has a verbal use, with the meaning ‘not be, not be present, be gone’. In this function, the vowel is often lengthened when *ba* is followed by a clitic, especially the aspect clitic =to; this is likely due to prosodic factors, and speakers insist there is no difference between [ba] and [ba:].

- We nevertheless consider *ba* as a prepredicate negative particle and as a negative verb as two distinct morphemes, as one can be used to negate the other:

- It may be noted that we have a single example of preverbal *ba* and the main verb both taking the aspect prefix *ku-*, suggesting that *ba* may retain a certain degree of verbal behavior even in this construction (25); however, on the basis of this one example nothing further can be concluded.

- Äiwoo has a second negative verb *bââ* ‘not exist, be nothing, be ended’, which presumably is etymologically related to *ba*; we will not discuss this form further here.

As will be apparent from the above examples, *ba* appears at the left edge of the negated constituent, preceding any prefixes to the verb or prenominal

modifying elements in a negated noun phrase; the latter is seen in (26) where the deictic form *kele* ‘here, this’ appears between *ba* and the head of the negated noun phrase:

- (26) Nuwopa mi-ki-ngângo, **ba** kele
 house BN-IPFV-be.strong NEG1 here
 opo nulou doo=**gu**=ne.
 house small.leafed.sago like.this=NEG2=PROX
 ‘Solid houses, not these leaf houses.’ (Cyclone 229)

The only bound morpheme we have attested preceding *ba* is the bound noun *mi-* ‘the one which . . .’, which forms nominalized expressions often functionally equivalent to relative clauses (Næss 2018b); the bound noun precedes *ba* when the relative clause has scope over the negation (‘ones which are not . . .’; [27a]), while it follows *ba* when the negation has scope over the relative clause (‘not ones which are . . .’; [27b]):

- (27) a. Nuwola nupää=to=wâ, **ba** mi-päko=gu.
 old cloth=now=DIST NEG1 BN-be.good=NEG2
 ‘Old clothes, not good ones.’ (ELAR-Childbirth 310)
 b. sime **mi-ba** ku-wâ-une=gu
 person BN-NEG1 IPFV-CAUS-be.true=NEG2
 ‘people who don’t believe in it’ (Wurm-Nyagovä3 10)

Other uses of *ba*, which will not be touched on further in this paper, are as a negative response to a question or situation (28a), and in negative ellipsis (28b):

- (28) a. Kâ-i=lâ nâ-dâ=to=wâ Tukuba=kâ,
 say-3AUG=CV IRR-drift=now=CV Tukuba=DIST
 mo kâ Naulâ=kâ **ba**.
 CONJ say Naulâ=CV NEG1
 ‘They said, “Let Tukuba drift”, but Naulâ said no.’
 (ELAR-Solomon Tukuba 2 29–30)
 b. Ku-woli=nâ nyâlo go nulie eä=nâ
 IPFV-go.down=CV deep CONJ pana of.3MIN=DIST
 ku-wee-mä, mo ile dâ nuwosi nâ
 IPFV-go.up-DIR:1 CONJ PROX some kind of.3MIN
 nulie=ke **ba**.
 pana=PROX NEG1
 ‘It goes down deep because the tuber grows upwards, but these other kinds of pana don’t.’ (ELAR-Growing pana 141–142)

3.3 THE DISTRIBUTION OF =GU. The postverbal negative clitic =*gu* appears at the right edge of the verb phrase. It follows the phasal-aspect clitics =*jo* ‘progressive’ and =*to* which we gloss as ‘now’ and discuss in more detail in section 4.4 below (29a), but generally precedes the future/habitual

clitic =*Caa* (29b), the circumstantial voice clitic =*Că*, and the deictic clitics =*Ce* ‘proximal’, =*Câ* ‘distal’ (29c).⁹

- (29) a. Ba ku-basiki=to=**gu**.
 NEG1 IPFV-run=now=NEG2
 ‘He couldn’t run anymore.’ (Stories-Hermit crab 78)
- b. Go maa ilâ deea=kâ
 because if DIST like.that=DIST
 mo ba mi-ku-wâ-nubo-pâko=**gu**=naa sii.
 CONJ NEG1 2MIN-IPFV-CAUS-die-be.good=NEG2=FUT fish
 ‘Because if they do that, you won’t catch much fish.’
 (ELAR-Fishing 306)
- c. Ngaa ilâ ba ki-vângä=**gu**=nä=nâ.
 so DIST NEG1 IPFV-eat.AV=NEG2=CV=DIST
 ‘So that’s why she doesn’t eat.’ (ELAR-Childbirth 394)

As described in section 2, with undergoer-voice verbs the verb phrase in Äiwoo includes a postverbal A argument NP (Næss 2015a). This means that the constituent bracketed by *ba* ... =*gu* can be fairly long, as in (30), where the A argument is a nominalized clause with the bound noun *me-* ‘person’ as its head.

- (30) Ngamaa lâ [ba i-kää
 if DIST NEG1 PFV-know.UV
 [me-ki-tokoli-woli-mâ ngâ boat]=**gu**=nâ].
 person-IPFV-sit-go.down-DIR:1 LOC boat=NEG2=DIST
 ‘If the person sitting in the boat doesn’t know ...’ (ELAR-Catching
 turtles 141)

In a very small number of examples, =*gu* follows what appears to be a larger constituent than the VP. As noted in section 2, O arguments of UV verbs are outside the VP, and as such would normally also be expected to follow =*gu*, as in (6b). In the two examples in (31), however, the O argument of *liaa* ‘reach’ precedes =*gu*. Compare (32), with the same verb, where the O argument *nepe* ‘month’ follows =*gu*.

- (31) a. Êamo ba leaa-kâ dâlo=**gu**?
 CONJ NEG1 reach.UV-DIR:3 year=NEG2
 ‘But can’t it reach [=last for] a year?’ (ELAR-Weaving a
 benuwää 167)
- b. Ba i-liaa-kâ dâjelâ=**gu**.
 NEG1 PFV-reach.UV-DIR:3 something=NEG2
 ‘It doesn’t amount to (lit. reach) anything.’ (ELAR-Marriage
 ceremony 33–34)
- (32) Ba ki-liaa-kâ=**gu** nepe êamo sime i-nubo.
 NEG1 IPFV-reach-DIR:3=NEG2 month CONJ person PFV-die
 ‘It doesn’t even take a month for the person to die [if afflicted by a
 certain illness].’ (ELAR-Diseases and medicine 43)

9. We have a very small number of examples where =*Caa* and =*Că* precede =*gu*. At this point, we are unsure how to interpret these data, but the discussion on scope in section 4.4 may well turn out to be relevant.

It is noteworthy that all our examples involve *liaa* ‘reach’, an accomplishment verb according to Vendler’s (1957) classification. Accomplishments are defined as being both durative and telic, that is, they have complex aspectual semantics. Our tentative explanation for (31)—tentative because our data is so limited—is that the contrast between the O preceding *=gu* versus following it corresponds to a focus on the durative versus the telic component of the verb’s semantics. Note that, in (31a), the English translation of *liaa* is ‘last for’—in other words, what is being negated here is the duration of the event for an entire year. Compare (32), which focuses on the telic component, the arrival at a time when the person is dead. (31b) is less obvious because it is not directly temporal in meaning; it refers to the composition and size of the bride’s family’s contribution in a ceremonial gift exchange preceding a marriage, where the family representative speaking is toning down the value of the gift. Arguably, though, this could be seen as a kind of metaphorical duration in that it refers to an amount to be put together through collective effort, and the focus is less on some expected state of completion than on the contents of the gift itself—the metaphorical “duration” of the gift.

If this explanation is valid, then it shows that the placement of an O argument with respect to negation can affect the aspectual interpretation of a clause. This is in line with Tenny’s (1994) analysis of objects as “measuring arguments,” which impose delimitedness on an event. Granted, the O argument of a verb like ‘reach’ is not an affected argument in Tenny’s sense of undergoing a change of state, but it nevertheless “marks the temporal end of an event” (Tenny 1994:158) in that the event is accomplished once the O is reached.

Moreover, it shows that in Äiwoo, the placement of negation with respect to other elements of the clause has effects on interpretation, and especially on aspectual properties. This is an important point for the analysis we will develop below of cases where negated clauses do not show *=gu*.

4. SINGLE NEGATION: *BA* WITHOUT *=GU*

4.1 DATA. As noted in section 3.1, our corpus contains only 16 examples of preverbal *ba* without postverbal *=gu*, out of a total of 365 negated verbal clauses. In the majority of cases, the examples that lack *=gu* have the reading ‘not yet’.

- (33) a. De-ku-wo-kä=to=we ngä isä=ne,
 1+2AUG-IPFV-go-DIR:3=now=PROX LOC mother=PROX
 mo tememe eââ **ba** de-ki-eu=ke.
 CONJ baby DEM:DIST NEG1 1+2AUG-IPFV-speak=PROX
 ‘Now we have discussed the mother, but we haven’t talked
 about the baby yet.’ (ELAR-Childbirth 441–442)

- b. Maa i-te-kâ-mu=wä kâ-mu=wä i-nubo=to (...)
 if PFV-see.UV-DIR:3-2MIN=CV say-2MIN=CV PFV-die=now
 mo ilâ=kâ **ba** ku-nubo.
 CONJ DIST=DIST **NEG1** IPFV-die
 ‘If you see [the shark], you will think that it is dead (...),
 but at this point it is not dead yet.’ (ELAR-Shark fishing 119)
- c. Li-luwoli=dä=to, lâ ki-täve-po-lâ-waa,
 3AUG-bear.fruit=some=now DIST IPFV-hang-between-go.out-LOC:MED
 mo **ba** ki-lâ-bâlu-no=dä.
 CONJ **NEG1** IPFV-chop-bend.UV-1MIN=some
 ‘Some of them have borne fruit, they are hanging over there,
 but I haven’t cut any down yet.’ (ELAR-Gardening 180)

A more frequent way of expressing the meaning ‘not yet’ is with the adverb *ngä* ‘still, yet’, either following *ba* (34a) or in its usual position in the verb complex, preceding *=gu* (34b). Note that *=gu* does not appear when *ngä* follows *ba* directly.

- (34) a. **Ba-ngä** dä ku-pulo mo vaa=to.
 NEG1-still some IPFV-be.ripe CONJ be.close=now
 ‘None of them are ripe yet, but it is close.’ (ELAR-Gardening 200)
- b. **Ba** ku-wo-to-**ngä**=gu,
 NEG1 IPFV-go-go.in-**still**=NEG2
 ki-doo=waa=kâ le ku-pu-vili.
 IPFV-like.that=FUT=DIST PROX IPFV-go-surround
 ‘He does not go inside yet, what he does is go around it.’
 (ELAR-Initiation speech 1 10)

In a handful of examples, however, *ba* on its own does not appear to give the reading ‘not yet’, as shown in (35). These examples nearly all show either an adverb with a meaning of repetition or addition (*ute/usi* ‘back, again’,¹⁰ *eopu* ‘also, too’) or the aspect marker *=to* which indicates that the state of affairs denoted by the verb holds at a certain reference time.¹¹

10. The choice between these two forms depends on the voice of the verb preceding *usi/ute*; *ute* appears following intransitive verbs and AV verbs, while *usi* appears following UV verbs. Diachronically, this alternation can presumably be traced back to the fact that intransitive verbs serialized to an UV verb are followed by the suffix *-i*; note that the distinction between /t/ and /s/ is neutralized before /i/, with [s] appearing in all cases.

11. Given the fairly general semantics of *=to*, it is debatable whether it is best described as a type of aspect or as relative (present) tense (Næss 2019; see also the discussion in Ridge 2018:144–48). We choose to label *=to* an aspect marker due partly to the way that it interacts with aspect prefixes to produce different aspectual readings such as inceptive or perfect, and partly to the fact that it contrasts paradigmatically with progressive *=jo*; though clearly one could also argue for a different terminological choice. We gloss *=to* ‘now’ in order to capture in as brief a gloss as possible its semantics of ‘X holds at reference time’, though it must be noted that the reference time need not be identical to speech time, that is, ‘now’ should not be interpreted as strictly deictic.

- (35) a. *Ilâ ngângo=to=wâ, ba ku-luwa-usi-kâ.*
 DIST be.strong=now=DIST NEG1 IPFV-take.UV-again.UV-DIR:3
 ‘It is very powerful, it can’t be taken back.’ (ELAR-Land rights 166)
- b. *Ba ki-tokoli-po-ute=kâ.*
 NEG1 IPFV-sit-overnight-again.AV=DIST
 ‘It isn’t left overnight again (= a second time).’
 (ELAR-Making nâbo 33)
- c. *Ba ku-wo-lâ-eopu-kâ ngâ ...*
 NEG1 IPFV-go-go.out-also-DIR:3 LOC
 ‘It doesn’t also go out to ... [the highest-ranking leader].’
 (ELAR-Traditional governance 494)
- d. *Mo ba i-eâmolee-kâ-no=to=we.*
 CONJ NEG1 PFV-see.UV-DIR:3-1MIN=now=PROX
 ‘But I didn’t see this myself [as opposed to another practice described
 which the speaker did observe firsthand].’ (ELAR-Fermenting
 breadfruit 67)

None of these forms are incompatible with =*gu*; (29a) above shows =*to* followed by =*gu*, and (36) shows that *usi/ute* and *eopu* also readily combine with =*gu*.

- (36) a. *Ba ku-wâgooli-usi-kâ-no=to=gu go taapi.*
 NEG1 IPFV-cover.UV-again.UV-DIR:3-1MIN=now=NEG2 with leaf
 ‘I don’t cover it with leaves again.’ (ELAR-Baking potatoes 55)
- b. *Ba li-tapoto-ute-kâ-le=gu ngâ*
 NEG1 3AUG-enter-again.AV-DIR:3-UA=NEG2 LOC
nuwopa tă giângâ-i-le.
 house POSS:LOC.3MIN uncle-3AUG-UA
 ‘They didn’t call again at their uncle’s house.’ (Usaliki 748)
- c. *Eâ isâ Levela mo tumwâ*
 CONJ mother.3MIN L. CONJ father.3MIN
Levela=kâ ba lu-mo-eopu=gu.
 L.=DIST NEG1 3AUG-stay-also=NEG2
 ‘[We ran away.] And Levela’s mother and Levela’s father
 didn’t stay either.’ (Cyclone 51)

One final example, shown in (37), of which we have several similar instances attested from the same text, shows neither =*gu* nor any adverb or phasal-aspect marker.

- (37) *Numonu ee ba i-te-vaa-kâ nulo-u.*
 money DEM:PROX NEG1 PFV-see-be.close-DIR:3 neck-1MIN
 ‘I don’t want this money.’¹² (Usaliki 993)

12. The precise semantics and structure of the expression *tevaakâ nulâ*, translating most idiomatically as ‘like’ or ‘want’, is complex. In general, emotions and thoughts are located in the neck in Reef Islands culture, as in *nulâ kiiki* ‘he is angry (lit. his neck is angry)’ or *nulâ kuwâ* ‘he is thinking (lit. his neck is going)’. A more literal translation of *itevakâ nulou* ‘I like/want it’ would be ‘it is close to my neck’. We are unsure, however, whether *te* in this structure is correctly glossed as ‘see’ or whether some other morpheme may be involved, and there are unresolved questions regarding the argument structure of this construction.

4.2 THE ORIGINS OF =GU. Given that *ba* has a plausible POc source, and that cognates appear as single negators in other Oceanic languages (e.g., Bali-Vitu *ba*, Tungag *pa*; Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002:91), a plausible interpretation of the Äiwoo data is that *ba* is the original negative morpheme, while =*gu* is a more recent innovation. It is common crosslinguistically for forms expressing some sort of emphasis to grammaticalize as part of a negative expression; when the original negator is subsequently lost, this is known as Jespersen's cycle (Jespersen 1917, Dahl 1979). We need to ask, then, what the origins of =*gu* may be.

There is no form in present-day Äiwoo which stands out as the obvious diachronic source of =*gu*. A homophonous bound form does, however, occur in two different contexts, though both are relatively rare in our material.¹³

The first is on noun phrases, where it seems to indicate contrast, typically in connection with a topic shift, as seen in (38).

- (38) Ä gi-laki-enge=**gu**=ne i-pu-maa
 CONJ man-small-DEM:PROX=**GU**=PROX PFV-go-LOC:DIST
 kã=nã nã-te-kã.
 say=CV IRR-see.UV-DIR:3
 (She went back home and stayed there.) 'And this boy went
 on, wanting to see her.' (Stories-Moliki 242)

The second appears on verbs, and as such is a more plausible source for a post-verbal negation marker. Note that at least as far as position relative to the aspect clitic =*to* and the deictic clitics are concerned, this morpheme shows the same distribution as negative =*gu* (i.e., after =*to* and before the other clitics, cf. 39g). We only have seven attested examples of this in all, listed in (39) below.

- (39) a. lu nyã-eã=ta=**gu** gisi
 1MIN 1MIN.IRR-paddle=just=**GU** brother.1MIN
 nã-te-kã-no.
 IRR-see.UV-DIR:3-1MIN
 'I will just paddle to look for my brother.' (Wurm-Tewaki 97)
- b. Bulaape nyã-wã=ta=**gu** gisi
 tomorrow 1MIN.IRR-go=just=**GU** brother.1MIN
 nã-wo-potaa-no.
 IRR-go-search-1MIN
 'Tomorrow I will paddle to look for my brother.'
 (Wurm-Tewaki 131)
- c. ngä bälì ... ku-wâbâ-wâ-du=kâ ilâ=kâ
 LOC side IPFV-try-DIR:2-all=DIST DIST=DIST
 le ngä ... ki-li-viteiã=**gu**
 PROX LOC IPFV-GA-sell=**GU**
 'when it comes to ... trying to ... sell it' (ELAR-Land rights 272)

13. There is a person suffix -*gu* 3MIN, which appears under certain conditions (see Ross and Næss 2007:477–8), but this has a different distribution in the verb complex, and as far as we know person markers are not likely sources for negative morphemes. Accordingly, we will not discuss it further here.

- d. Iu namaa i-ki-lile=**gu** ...
 1MIN if 1MIN-IPFV-marry=**GU**
 'If I were to get married ...' (ELAR-Marriage customs 31)
- e. Lâto tepekâ i-wâmokee=**gu** lâto kâ=nâ
 thus flying.fox PFV-begin=**GU** thus say=**CV**
 nâ-mo-tâvile-ee-kâ=nâ.
 IRR-stay-move.fast-go.up-DIR:3=**DIST**
 'And the flying fox started trying to swing back up.' (Stories-Flying fox 45)
- f. Ku-wâbâ-vâ-kâ-mu=**ta=gu**?
 IPFV-try-a.bit-DIR:3-2MIN=**just=GU**
 'Are you going to demonstrate?' (ELAR-Structure of a house 257)
- g. Mo jii=le, i=ne silaki enge=**ke**,
 CONJ 3AUG=**PROX** 3MIN=**PROX** girl DEM:PROX=**PROX**
 le ki-pe=**to=gu=ne**.
 PROX IPFV-go=now=**GU=PROX**
 'And they, this girl, she went off as well.' (Stories-Moliki 204)

Nearly all of these examples have to do with attempting or demonstrating something, that is, acts which do not necessarily lead to the intended or expected conclusion. Examples (39a), (39b), and (39f) all involve the clitic *=ta*, glossed 'just', which is used to downplay the importance of something or indicate that it is only intended to hold for a short time. It is common in polite requests, where it softens the request by presenting the requested action as insignificant and brief, as shown in (40).

- (40) Gino-u, mi-ku-wâ=**to** ny-ââ? Ea-to-ngo=**ta!**
 son-1MIN 2MIN-IPFV-go=now place-what paddle-go.in-DIR:1=**just**
 'Son, where are you going? Paddle in here for a bit!' (Wurm-Tewaki 91)

Examples (39c) and (39f) involve the verb *wâbâ* 'try, do as if, demonstrate', which similarly indicates a low degree of commitment to the achievement of an outcome. Example (39e) has an irrealis complement, which best translates into English as 'trying to swing back up'. Example (39d) shows no such formal indication of an unrealized event, unless the modal particle *namaa* 'if, when, perhaps' is counted; but it is clear from the context (a text about traditional marriage customs) that this, too, is intended as an example, specifically, a demonstration of how marriage might take place rather than a suggestion that the speaker might actually get married at this point. Compare (41) where the clause introduced by *namaa* refers to an event that may well occur in the current context:

- (41) Namaa ki-doo=wâ, nyâ-nou enge=**ke**
 if IPFV-like.that=**DIST** tree-banana DEM:PROX=**PROX**
 ki-bapo-no.
 IPFV-topple-1MIN
 'If you keep doing that, I will push this banana tree down.' (Stories-Rat and turtle 62-63)

The odd example out is (39g), where it is not clear to us what the function of $=gu$ is. In all the others, however, it seems to be contributing a meaning of an unachieved or nonconclusive event.

Our data is too limited to establish with any degree of certainty that $=gu$ in this function is the source of negative $=gu$. A similar development is, however, attested in several other Oceanic languages of Melanesia. In Lewo of Vanuatu, Early (1994a, b) argues that the second element of the complex negation construction has as its source a postverbal partitive particle *re*, which “indicates that the action of the verb is only partly accomplished, or limited in application or effect in some way” (Early 1994a:243). Budd (2010:535) extends this argument to the cognate NEG2 form in Lewo’s close relatives Lamelara, Bierebo, and Baki. Vossen and van der Auwera (2014:73) cite several other languages of Vanuatu, as well as Toqabaqita of Malaita, as having postverbal negators with an original meaning “somewhat” or “a little bit.” The forms of these negators vary, and none are obviously cognate with Äiwoo $=gu$, but the semantic shift from ‘somewhat, a bit, not to its full effect or achievement’ to the second element of a complex negation construction seems relatively well attested in Oceanic languages of the Melanesian region. In general, constructions similar to ‘not a bit’ are a common way to reinforce negative expressions across languages (Vossen and van der Auwera 2014:73).

4.3 REINFORCEMENT, ASPECT, AND PRAGMATIC INFERENCE.

We suggest that the hypothesis presented above about the origins of negative $=gu$ may help explain the ‘not yet’ reading that typically arises when *ba* is used without $=gu$, as in (33) above. To state that something has not yet happened is essentially to say that it may yet take place at some future time. The particular reinforcing effect of $=gu$, with its semantics of an unachieved or incomplete event, could be said to block this interpretation by explicitly stating that the event is unachieved, inviting the inference that it will remain so indefinitely.¹⁴ The fact that occasional examples of *ba* without $=gu$ can be found which do not appear to have a ‘not yet’ reading seems to us to support this analysis: the possibility of the negated event being realized at some later stage is not inherent to the semantics of *ba* itself, but is an inference arising from the absence of the morpheme explicitly stating that the event remains unachieved.

The association between the absence of $=gu$ and the possibility that the event may be realized at a later stage may further account for example (37), repeated below as (42):

- (42) Numonu ee **ba** i-te-va-kä nulo-u.
 money DEM:PROX NEG1 PFV-see.UV-be.close-DIR:3 neck-1MIN
 ‘I don’t want this money.’ (Usaliki 993)

14. As an anonymous reviewer pointed out, ‘indefinitely’ is not a very concise term. We do not mean to claim that the inference here is that the event will necessarily never be achieved, but that it will not take place within the foreseeable future or a timeframe within which the event might be reasonably expected to occur.

Example (42), and another two very similar ones from the same text, is uttered in the context of an ongoing negotiation. The implication is that there is something else the speaker does want; that is, (42) is not a final rejection but an invitation to the opposing party to make another offer. This is quite similar to the ‘not yet’ reading, where the implication is that the situation may well be achieved at some later stage.

4.4 NEGATIVE REINFORCEMENT AND SCOPE. Once the reinforcing element is grammaticalized as part of the standard negation construction, it radically alters the structure of the construction. We have already noted that the placement of preverbal *ba* is subject to scope effects; in (27), we showed how the relative placement of *ba* and the bound noun *mi-* affected the reading (‘the one that does not X’ vs. ‘not the one that does X’). With the introduction of *=gu* toward the end of the verb phrase comes an additional element potentially sensitive to scope effects, which is highly relevant because of the wide range of modifying morphemes that can follow the verb in an Äiwoo clause.

For *eopu* ‘also, too’, the examples given in (35c) and (36c) strongly suggest a scope effect. These are repeated as (43) below:

- (43) a. Eä isä Levela mo tumwä Levela=kä
 CONJ mother.3MIN L. CONJ father.3MIN L.=DIST
 ba lu-mo-**eopu**=**gu**.
 NEG1 3AUG-stay-also=NEG2
 ‘[We ran away.] And Levela’s mother and Levela’s father didn’t
 stay either.’ (Cyclone 50.)
- b. **Ba** ku-wo-lâ-**eopu**-kä ngâ ...
 NEG1 IPFV-go-go.out-also-DIR:3 LOC
 ‘It doesn’t also go out to ... [the highest-ranking leader, as well as
 the lower-ranking ones].’ (ELAR-Traditional governance 494)

In (43a), the reading of *eopu*=*gu* ‘also=NEG2’ is ‘not X either’, with ‘also’ taking scope over the negation: [not X] and [also [not Y]]. This is in line with their linear order, where *eopu* precedes *=gu*. In (43b), on the other hand, where *=gu* is omitted, the negation has scope over *eopu*. This example comes from a text about traditional conflict resolution, where the context is that if a matter can be solved at a lower level, it will not be passed on to the higher-ranking chief; that is, X but [not [also Y]].

A similar case can be made for example (35d), involving the phasal-aspect clitic *=to*. As noted briefly in section 4.1, this clitic indicates that the state of affairs denoted by the verb holds at a reference time, often with an implied contrast to an earlier or later time. The clitic *=to* is often translated by consultants as ‘now’, and this is reflected in our gloss. When *=to* is followed by *=gu*, the reading is ‘not anymore’; that is, ‘now’ has scope over the negation, and by

inference ‘now X is not the case’ is taken to mean ‘as opposed to earlier’, as seen in (44).

- (44) a. **Ba** ku-basiki=**to**=**gu**.
 NEG1 IPFV-run=**now**=NEG2
 ‘He couldn’t run anymore.’ (Stories-Hermit crab 78)
- b. **Ilâ** nye-doo=wâ **ba** i-kää-i=**to**=**gu**.
 DIST way-like.that=DIST NEG1 PFV-know.UV-3AUG=**now**=NEG2
 ‘(People) don’t know these things anymore.’ (ELAR-Greetings 203)

The clitic =*to* is not exactly equivalent to English *already*; it does not necessarily refer to an event prior to the utterance time, and its precise semantic contribution depends to some extent on which aspect/mood prefix it combines with. Note, however, that Krifka (2000:402) analyzes the semantics of *already* as asserting only that the proposition of the sentence Φ holds throughout a certain time interval t ; as noted above, this is essentially the semantics of Äiwoo =*to*. The difference lies in the presupposition posited by Krifka for *already*, namely that $\neg\Phi$ was true before t ; while this is an inference often arising from the use of =*to*, it is not a necessary presupposition.

Given these parallels, it should not be surprising that the behavior of =*to* with negation shows clear parallels to that of *already*: the reading where *already* scopes over negation is truth-conditionally equivalent to ‘not anymore’, as described by, for example, Löbner (1989, 1999), Krifka (2000), and Vander Klok and Matthewson (2015). It is thus to be expected that this reading would arise in contexts where an element with “already-like” semantics shows scope over a negative element.¹⁵

We have one single example where the order of =*to* and =*gu* appears to be reversed:

15. The “duality” analysis of which the ‘already’/‘not anymore’ equivalence is one aspect has been criticized, for example, by van der Auwera (1993) as leaving a number of facts unexplained in the languages for which it has been proposed. We lack the data to undertake a detailed analysis of the Äiwoo facts along the lines of the one van der Auwera proposes for German, but we would like to point out three aspects of the Äiwoo data which suggest that some version of a duality analysis may be of help in understanding the relationship between the various relevant aspectual expressions. The first is the neat symmetry in the set of forms and meanings: where English has the terms *already*, *still*, *not anymore*, and *not yet*, Äiwoo uses =*to* (which, although it is not equivalent to *already* in meaning, does overlap with it in use) and *ngä* and their negations: =*to* (roughly) ‘already’, *ba* *V*=*to*=*gu* ‘not anymore’, *ngä* ‘still, yet’, *ba-ngä* ‘not yet’. The second is that =*to* and *ngä*, which according to the duality analysis should be the external negations of each other’s internal negations (van der Auwera 1993:616–17), do not cooccur in our data. (*Ngä* here differs from *vesi* ‘still, continuously’ which readily cooccurs with =*to*; this is one argument for our claim that =*to* does not presuppose a change of state, although it often implies it.) The third is that on what van der Auwera calls the (t)-scalar reading of ‘already’, where German *schon* is claimed to have the dual *erst* ‘only ... so far’ rather than *noch* ‘still’, Äiwoo again uses *ngä*, that is, the same form as with the nonscalar reading: *dowälili no-mu nyigi-ngä* (child POSS:GEN-2MIN one-yet) ‘you have one child so far’. Again, much more detail and targeted data collection would be required for a full account, but at the level of detail currently available, some form of duality-based analysis seems warranted for Äiwoo.

- (45) Ngä nyi-wo-na nogo-i=lâ mo de-ki-li-ngä
 LOC NMLZ-go-NMLZ POSS.TOOL-3AUG=DIST CONJ thing-IPFV-GA-eat.UV
 ba ki-ea=**gu**=**to** vesi.
 NEG1 IPFV-be.bad=**NEG2**=**now** CONT
 ‘During their travels, their food did not go bad.’ (ELAR-Nuts and fruits 122)

This example strongly suggests that scope concerns are relevant for the relative placement of =*gu* and aspectual morphemes. Recall that =*to* indicates that a state of affairs holds at a certain reference time, in this instance the time at which the travel took place.¹⁶ In (45), =*to* takes scope over *ea* ‘bad’ (as it does over the predicates it applies to in general): saying that it is the case at a certain relevant reference time that the food is bad gives rise to the inference that the food has gone bad (i.e., it was not bad before that time). Then, negation takes scope over this ‘go bad’ predicate, giving rise to the reading ‘did not go bad’. Note the absence of the ‘not anymore’ reading that arises with =*to*=*gu*, where =*to* scopes over the negation.

It seems clear from this example that the relative ordering of the postverbal clitics gives rise to different scope effects and thus to different readings. Reordering clitics in this way is not, however, a common strategy; as already noted, this is the only example in our corpus where =*gu* precedes =*to*, and in general, cases where any combination of postverbal clitics deviate from their canonical ordering are extremely rare. We suggest, then, that the omission of =*gu* in examples (43b) and (35d) is an alternative strategy to avoid unintended scope effects; negation has scope over ‘also’ in (43b), and the reading ‘not anymore’, arising from the ordering =*to*=*gu*, is not the intended one for (35d), repeated below as (46):

- (46) Mo **ba** i-eâmolee-kâ-no=**to**=we.
 CONJ **NEG1** PFV-see.UV-DIR:3-1MIN=**now**=PROX
 ‘But I didn’t see this myself [as opposed to another practice
 previously described which the speaker did observe firsthand].’
 (ELAR-Fermenting breadfruit 67)

We suggest that omitting =*gu* may have this scope-changing function because it leaves preverbal *ba* as the only negative element, which has scope over everything that follows.

This in turn raises the question of why we do not see any scope effects when *ngä* ‘still, yet’ precedes =*gu*, as in (34b). In non-negative contexts, *ngä* translates most felicitously as ‘still’:

- (47) a. Iu=*nge* i-dowâli-li-ngä.
 1MIN=PROX 1MIN-child-still
 ‘I am still a child.’ (Usaliki 1034)

16. Interestingly, *vesi* ‘still, continuously’, which is more frequently found modifying the root within the verb complex, here follows the whole negated verb and takes the whole negated statement in its scope: the state of not going bad holds continuously throughout the journey.

- b. Singedâ eângâ lâ ki-so-ngã=nâ?
 woman DEM:DIST DIST IPFV-stand-still=DIST
 ‘Is that woman still standing there?’ (Staged Events 17)

The reason no scope effects arise with *ngã* is mostly likely that ‘still not’ and ‘not yet’ are truth-conditionally equivalent (e.g., Krifka 2000, Vander Klok and Matthewson 2015). That is, whether *ngã* has scope over the negation or the other way round, the resulting meaning is simply that the situation Φ does not hold at time t . In all our negated examples, the underlying presupposition seems to be that Φ was not true before t , that is, the equivalent of English *not yet* (Krifka 2000:402), but this seems to be an effect of the semantics of *ngã* rather than of scope differences as such. Compare the adverb *vesi* ‘still, continuously’, which, in a positive context, often appears semantically equivalent to *ngã* (compare [47a] to [48a]), but when preceding *=gu* in a negation construction gives the presupposition associated with English *still*, that is, that Φ was true before t :

- (48) a. Totokale mi-nyigi-vesi ki-amoli-vesi-i-kâ=mu=wâ?
 picture BN-one-CONT IPFV-see.UV-CONT-UV-DIR:3=2MIN=DIST
 ‘Do you still see that same picture?’ (Staged Events 47)
 b. Mo iu=nge, ba de-ku-mo-vesi=gu=naa.
 CONJ 1MIN=PROX NEG1 1+2AUG-IPFV-stay-CONT=NEG2=FUT
 ‘But me you will not always have with you (lit. we will not always stay together) [though it is the case that you do at present].’ (Mark 14:7)¹⁷

4.5 UNEXPLAINED CASES. We lack at present a good explanation for the absence of *=gu* with *ute/usi* ‘back, again’ in examples (35a,b). No scope effects are apparent here, and we have only a small number of parallel examples which include *=gu* to compare them with. The distinction between repetitive and restitutive readings of *ute/usi* does not appear to be relevant, as the data includes one example of each; (35a) has a restitutive reading, referring to a state which is not reversed; whereas (35b) has a repetitive reading, referring to an action that is not repeated. Aspect may be relevant in that these examples both have generic or habitual readings; they come from procedural texts describing how a certain event usually takes place. Example (35a) is from a text about land rights, describing what happens in cases where a father chooses to pass on a piece of land to a daughter (as opposed to along the male line, which is the normal state of affairs), while (35b) describes the procedure for preparing *nâbo* or dried breadfruit chips, a staple food in times of scarcity. However, the same appears to hold for (49), which does include *=gu*.

- (49) Nenu na ba ku-luwa-usi-kâ=gu.
 coconut POSS:FOOD.3MIN NEG1 IPFV-take.UV-again.UV-DIR:3=NEG2
 ‘(When the village places a taboo on a coconut tree,) [the owner]
 cannot take his coconut back.’ (ELAR-Taboos 21)

17. As our own data lack examples of *vesi* with negation, this example is taken from the Äiwoo translation of the Gospel of Mark, published by the Bible Society of the South Pacific.

We conclude that more data is required to account for these facts. One final example of missing *=gu* is one already introduced in section 3.1, the only instance in our corpus of negation combining with an irrealis prefix on the verb, repeated below as (50).

- (50) Mo i-doo **ba** nâ-lu-pwaapo-mä go
 CONJ PFV-what **NEG1** IRR-3AUG-wake-DIR:1 so.that
 nâ-li-tuwo-kä be-lu-pu-kä-mäi ngâ nubotage?
 IRR-3AUG-take-DIR:3 PREF-3AUG-go-DIR:3-together LOC road
 ‘Why didn’t they wake us so we could help them carry and accompany
 them on the road?’ (Stories-Moliki 390)

Once again, as this example is unique in our corpus, we will refrain from speculating on possible motivations for the absence of *=gu* here.

5. THE TYPOLOGY OF NEGATION: YET ANOTHER JESPERSEN CYCLE. We have proposed for Äiwoo a development in which an original single negator has been reinforced by a postverbal element, leading to a bipartite negation structure. This represents a stage in the well-known grammaticalization process known as the Jespersen cycle, which van der Auwera (2009:39) illustrates for French with figure 1.

The figure is to be interpreted as follows: in Classical Latin (stage 1), negation is expressed by a single preverbal marker *non*. Later, this weakens phonetically to *ne*, and at a certain point an emphatic marker *pas* ‘step’ is added; the whole construction now means “not a single step” (a subscript X is to be read as ‘not originally negative/absence of negative function’). Still later (stage 4), this construction is grammaticalized and both items become obligatory: this is the situation in Modern Standard French. In Modern Colloquial French (stage 5), *ne* is mostly absent; a possible future development is stage 6, where *ne* has disappeared completely. For an account of how Jespersen cycles can be employed to account for the distribution of negation strategies in the Oceanic languages of Malekula, see Barbour (2015).

In Jespersen’s (1917) original work, the cycle is driven by the phonetic weakening of the initial negator (here Latin *non*). In more recent literature (e.g., Kiparsky and Condoravdi 2006, van der Auwera 2009), however, it is mostly agreed upon that what drives the constant renewal of forms is the need for emphasis: at every point, speakers will need to distinguish between a neutral negation and an emphatic one.¹⁸ With time, the emphatic negation construction is used more and more, undergoes “inflationary bleaching,” and ends up not being perceived as emphatic at all, thus becoming neutral again. Semantic changes caused by inflationary bleaching are attested also within categories

18. It is not only emphasis that has been pointed to as a factor responsible for driving the Jespersen cycle. Schwenter (2006), basing his analysis on Catalan, Italian, and Brazilian Portuguese, claims that what plays the largest role in the bleaching process is rather the discourse status of the negated proposition, that is, old versus new information.

FIGURE 1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF FRENCH NEGATION ACCORDING TO VAN DER AUWERA (2009:39)

Stages	Strategies
1	<i>non</i> _{NEG}
2	<i>ne</i> _{NEG}
3	<i>ne</i> _{NEG} ... <i>pas</i> _X
4	<i>ne</i> _{NEG} ... <i>pas</i> _{NEG}
5	<i>ne</i> _X ... <i>pas</i> _{NEG}
6	<i>pas</i> _{NEG}

other than negation, such as politeness systems, pejoratives, and so forth (Dahl 2001).

Taking emphasis into account, van der Auwera then points out that the bleaching process can be shown to follow several different patterns from a crosslinguistic perspective, suggesting that there is not one, but several Jespersen cycles. The eight possible trajectories he describes are traced with respect to two parameters: whether a given negative construction goes from being emphatic to non-emphatic (or the opposite direction), and how many negative elements there are in each available construction.

One of the possible trajectories, the one which has happened in French, is illustrated in figure 2. At stage 3, the structure *ne*_{neg} ... *pas*_x is an emphatic negation strategy meaning something along the lines of “not a single step,” where *pas* is a non-negative element. At this stage, two strategies are available: a neutral one, and an emphatic one. At stage 4, both strategies are still available, but *pas* ‘step’ has lost its literal meaning, becoming just a negative marker (e.g., from “not a single step” to “not at all”). Toward stage 5, the old emphatic construction undergoes bleaching, and is reinterpreted as neutral; at stage 5, the old neutral construction has disappeared (i.e., stopped being available).

The situation in Āiwoo is somewhat different. The current Āiwoo system appears to be similar to stage 4, but figuratively “shifted to the right”: the bipartite

FIGURE 2. THE SHIFTING FUNCTIONS OF NEGATIVE MORPHEMES IN FRENCH (ADAPTED FROM VAN DER AUWERA 2009:44)

FIGURE 3. SHIFTING FUNCTIONS OF NEGATIVE MORPHEMES IN ÄIWOO

structure (*ba* VP=*gu*) is the neutral one, while the structure with a preverbal particle alone (*ba* VP) has a special meaning (‘not yet’), though, crucially, not an emphatic one. This scenario is not contemplated in van der Auwera’s (2009) typology.

As stated above, our proposal is that *ba* is the original negative element, while =*gu*, originally indicating an event being unachieved or non-conclusive, has been grammaticalized into a part of the negation construction. This meaning of =*gu* has not been completely lost, and it still occurs—although rarely in our data—with this semantics and without *ba*, compare to section 4.2 above. We argue that the combination of *ba* and =*gu* originally represented a form of emphatic negation (e.g., ‘not even a little bit, not at all’). With time, the bipartite construction went through semantic and pragmatic bleaching, and became non-emphatic, that is, neutral; in present-day Äiwoo, *ba* ... =*gu* is the neutral negation construction, while emphatic negation is expressed by means of the adverb *eali* ‘absolutely’, which is also emphatic in positive contexts. The former neutral structure, however, was not lost, as it was in French: rather the contrast between the two gave rise to a new meaning associated with the original structure, in this instance, ‘not yet’. This process, corresponding to steps 3–5 in figure 2, is recapitulated in figure 3. The new part with respect to figure 2 is the rightmost column, which we label “weakened negation” to capture the ‘not yet’ reading. In a neutrally negated sentence ‘not P’, P is claimed not to be the case, whereas in ‘not yet P’, P is still claimed not to be the case, but crucially only for a limited period of time; there is an expectation that the verbal event may be come to be realized at a later point in time.

In other words, at stage 4 the two negation constructions are still clearly distinct. Through time, the bipartite construction—that is, stating that the negated proposition will stay unachieved, and it is not going to be the case at all—becomes highly frequent, so that a listener hearing only *ba* VP expects her interlocutor to have a reason not to use =*gu*. The pragmatic inference can be stated informally as such: if a speaker is not saying that X is not going to be the case at all (i.e., (s)he uses *ba* VP as opposed to *ba* VP=*gu*), then it may indeed come to be the case at some time in the future. This is what gives rise to the ‘not yet’ reading of the *ba* VP construction.

6. CONCLUSION. In this paper, we have discussed the properties of negation with *ba* in Äiwoo, with a focus on the unusual situation whereby the doubly marked negation construction is the neutral one, while the simple negation

has a more specialized reading, namely ‘not yet’. We have proposed, first, that *ba* is the original negative morpheme, while $=gu$ most likely arises from an aspectual morpheme marking the verbal event as unachieved or incomplete. We have further suggested that the grammaticalization of the latter as part of the standard negation construction did not lead to the loss of the single negation, but to a reinterpretation, whereby the lack of the marker explicitly indicating that the event is unachieved gives rise to the inference that, while it is not achieved at present, it may yet be so at some later stage.

We have further suggested that the interaction between negation and various aspectual and adverbial morphemes in the verb complex can be explained by scope effects. Äiwoo has a highly complex verb structure where the relative order of morphemes may in certain cases give rise to differences in scope. We showed that scope plays a role in the interaction of preverbal *ba* with the bound noun *mi-* ‘the one which ...’, which may be placed before or after *ba* with a resulting difference in scope. We moreover suggested that, as $=gu$ became grammaticalized as part of the negation construction, its position toward the end of the verb complex provided a new possibility for scope effects to arise: various preceding adverbial and aspectual morphemes were now interpreted as having scope over $=gu$, and hence over the negation, and one motivation for omitting $=gu$ appears to be to avoid this scope reading.

Finally, we have shown that the historical development we have argued for in Äiwoo constitutes a version of the Jespersen cycle not previously discussed in the literature. We have argued that, as an original emphatic negation construction loses its emphatic value and becomes the standard negation, the original single-marked negation construction is not necessarily lost as a consequence. Instead, it can be reinterpreted as what we have called a weakened negation construction, where the lack of the original reinforcing element is taken to imply that the event, though not realized at present, may yet take place at some later point in time. This is a different type of process from the semantic bleaching taken to account for the development of emphatic negation constructions into neutral negation; it hinges crucially on the contrast with another, more complex construction, and the weakened reading is, as we have shown, an inference based on this contrast rather than a necessary component of the construction’s meaning. We have assumed that the specific semantics of the newly grammaticalized element, as an aspectual morpheme indicating that an event is unachieved, played a role in this development; it would be interesting to study further to what extent the precise function of the original emphatic element has an impact on the properties of complex negation constructions in languages more generally.

A further question for future research would be comparing the situation in Äiwoo with that of its closest relatives, the Santa Cruz languages, which also have bipartite negation, but with different forms. Engdewu has preverbal *to/te* in combination with enclitic $=pwö$ (Vaa 2013:452), while Natügu has *tö-* ... *-u* (Næss and Boerger 2008:191). *te/to/tö* might reflect POc **tikai* (Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002:88), while Engdewu $=pwö$ has obvious parallels in a

number of Admiralties languages, for example, the Paluai postverbal negator *pwên* (Schokkin 2014:368). Interestingly, the Admiralties forms are, like Äiwoo *ba*, assumed to reflect POc *b^wali (Lynch, Ross, and Crowley 2002:91, fn. 20). In other words, Äiwoo and Engdewu reflect the same negative morpheme, but the Äiwoo reflex is preverbal while the Engdewu reflex is post-verbal. This is interesting given the presumed close relationship between the two languages, and might support the hypothesis of a multiple migration/contact scenario having had different effects on Santa Cruz than in the Reef Islands (Bedford et al. 2018). Clearly, a better understanding of the properties and diachrony of negation in Reefs–Santa Cruz (RSC) as a group has the potential to provide further insights both into the relationships within RSC and into the history of Oceanic more generally.

REFERENCES

- Bedford, Stuart, Robert Blust, David V. Burley, Murray Cox, Patrick V. Kirch, Elizabeth Matisoo-Smith, Åshild Næss, Andrew Pawley, Christophe Sand, and Peter Sheppard. 2018. Ancient DNA and its contribution to understanding the human history of the Pacific Islands. *Archaeology in Oceania* 53: 20–219.
- Barbour, Julie. 2015. Jespersen cycles on Malekula. *Linguistic Typology* 19(3): 425–62.
- Budd, Peter. 2010. Negation in Bierebo and the other languages of Epi, Central Vanuatu. *Oceanic Linguistics* 49(2): 511–42.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17(1-2): 79–106.
- . 2001. Inflationary effects in language and elsewhere. In *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*, ed. by Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper, 471–80. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Early, Robert. 1994a. A grammar of Lewo, Vanuatu. PhD thesis, Australian National University.
- . 1994b. Lewo. In *Typological studies in negation*, ed. by Peter Kahrel and René van den Berg, 65–92. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. København: A.F. Høst & Søn.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Cleo Condoravdi. 2006. Tracking Jespersen's cycle. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference of Modern Greek dialects and linguistic theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, and Angela Ralli, 172–97. Patras: University of Patras.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2000. Alternatives for aspectual particles: Semantics of still and already. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Aspect*, ed. by L. J. Conathan, Jeff Good, D. Kavitskaya, A. B. Wulf, and A. C. L. Yu, 401–12. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Löbner, Sebastian. 1989. German “schon - erst - noch”: An integrated analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12(2): 167–212.
- . 1999. Why German ‘schon’ and ‘noch’ are still duals: A reply to van der Auwera. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22(1): 45–107.
- Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross, and Terry Crowley. 2002. *The Oceanic languages*. Richmond: Curzon.
- McKay, Graham R. 1978. Pronominal person and number categories in Rembarnga and Djebbbana. *Oceanic Linguistics* 17:27–37.

- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Næss, Åshild. 2006. *Stories from the Reef Islands: Äiwoo texts with translations*. Oslo: The Kon-Tiki Museum.
- . 2015a. The Äiwoo verb phrase: Syntactic ergativity without pivots. *Journal of Linguistics* 51(1): 75–106.
- . 2015b. Voice at the crossroads: Symmetrical clause alternations in Äiwoo, Reef Islands, Solomon Islands. *Oceanic Linguistics* 54(1): 270–307.
- . 2018a. Plural-marking strategies in Äiwoo. *Oceanic Linguistics* 57(1): 31–62.
- . 2018b. Beyond roots and affixes: Äiwoo deverbal nominals and the typology of bound lexical morphemes. *Studies in Language* 41(4): 914–55.
- . 2019. (Im)perfectivity and phasal aspect in Äiwoo (Oceanic). *Paper presented at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea*, Leipzig University, August 2019.
- Næss, Åshild, and Brenda H. Boerger. 2008. Reefs-Santa Cruz as Oceanic: Evidence from the verb complex. *Oceanic Linguistics* 47(1): 185–212.
- Ray, Sidney H. 1926. *A comparative study of the Melanesian island languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridge, Eleanor. 2018. *Variation in Vatlongos verbal morphosyntax: Speaker communities in Southeast Ambrym and Mele Maat*. PhD thesis, SOAS, University of London.
- Ross, Malcolm, and Åshild Næss. 2007. An Oceanic origin for Äiwoo, the language of the Reef Islands? *Oceanic Linguistics* 46(2): 456–98.
- Roversi, Giovanni. 2019. *The morphosyntactic structure of the Äiwoo verb*. MA thesis, University of Oslo.
- Schokkin, Dineke. 2014. *A grammar of Paluai, the language of Baluan Island, Papua New Guinea*. PhD dissertation, James Cook University.
- Schwenter, Scott A. 2006. Fine-tuning Jespersen's cycle. In *Drawing the boundaries of meaning: Neo-Gricean studies in pragmatics and semantics in honor of Laurence R. Horn*, ed. by Betty Birner and Gregory Ward, 327–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tenny, Carol. 1994. *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Vaa, Anders. 2013. *A grammar of Engdewu*. PhD dissertation, University of Oslo.
- Van Alsenoy, Lauren, and Johan van der Auwera. 2014. On the relation between double clausal negation and negative concord. In *The diachrony of negation*, ed. by May-Britt Mosegaard Hansen and Jacqueline Visconti, 13–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 1993. 'Already' and 'still': Beyond duality. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16(6): 613–53.
- . 2009. The Jespersen cycles. In *Cyclical change*, ed. by Elly van Gelderen, 35–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vander Klok, Jozina, and Lisa Matthewson. 2015. Distinguishing already from perfect aspect: A case study of Javanese *wis*. *Oceanic Linguistics* 54(1): 172–205.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1957. Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review* 66(2): 143–60.
- Vossen, Frens, and Johan van der Auwera. 2014. The Jespersen cycles seen from Austronesian. In *The diachrony of negation*, ed. by May-Britt Mosegaard Hansen and Jacqueline Visconti, 47–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.