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This volume is the third in a series investigating languages located in Sulawesi, Indonesia. It consists of five papers, each of which focuses on a grammatical feature of one of these languages. The languages discussed are Balantak and Padoe of Central Sulawesi, and Seko Padang, Mamasá, and Mamuju of South Sulawesi.

The stated purpose of the volume is to make available reliable data about Sulawesi languages which other linguists can use to investigate various issues, such as focus, ergativity, and transitivity. The volume accomplishes its purpose and is of value precisely because it offers data acquired through primary research in languages which have had little previous documentation, and almost none in English. Although the papers vary in depth of analysis and sophistication of argumentation, each presents data that is of interest to linguists studying Indonesian languages, Philippine languages that are similar to Indonesian languages, such as the Sama languages, or languages having Philippine-type focus systems. The papers are also of interest to those concerned with the more general issues of morphological ergativity and transitivity.

The volume begins with a brief introduction which identifies the genetic relationship of the languages represented in the volume. It also includes a discussion of the similarities and differences in South Sulawesi languages in 'person marking,' an agreement system in which affixes on the verb agree in person and number with the subject (i.e., more agentive argument) and the object (i.e., less agentive argument) of the clause.

In the first paper, Robert L. Busenitz proposes that clause types in Balantak can be reduced to two constructions: those in which the verb occurs with actor focus (AF) affixes and those in which the verb occurs with goal focus (GF) affixes. He states that the primary function of AF affixes is to mark the 'actor' as the topic of the sentence while that of GF affixes is to mark the 'goal' as the topic. Unfortunately, Busenitz provides few arguments to support this claim. To the contrary, one wonders if what Busenitz calls the 'goal focus' suffix, -on (or its perfective allomorphs ni- and -in-), is a transitivizing affix that enables a non-agent argument to be a syntactically required argument (i.e., an object), particularly since it can co-occur with the suffixes -i (LOC 'Locative') and -kon (BEN "Benefactive"), when a semantic role other than Patient is the object of the clause. (When the object is a Patient, -on occurs on the verb, but not -i or -kon.) If -on is not a transitivizer, then it would be helpful if Busenitz gave arguments to show otherwise. The paper also contains
a careful description of the allomorphs of AF affixes which is of interest for its phonological
detail.

Marjo Karhunen presents a straightforward description of the structure of the Padoe
noun phrase, written to be part of a grammar. Of interest is the small set (four) of noun
classifiers which usually, but not always, occur with numbers in a NP, and the morpheme
io, an ‘article,’ which according to Karhunen can occur with almost every NP, and does not
indicate definiteness. Discussions of relative clauses would have been more useful if ex-
amples had been given as both independent clauses and relative clauses so that the two
structures could have been compared.

Kathryn B. Laskowske describes negation of verbal and nonverbal clauses in Seko
Padang. Seko Padang has two basic negators ha- and da-, each of which has derived forms.
Ha- is an unmarked form and occurs in the widest range of clause types. Da- is a marked
form and occurs in dependent clauses; specifically, 1) conditional clauses, 2) relative clauses
modifying a noun, 3) headless relative clauses following aka ‘what’ or ‘why’ in WH ques-
tions, and 4) nominalized clauses, following conjunctions such as hampo ‘but’ and saba
‘because.’ In addition, the two negators appear to require different sets of pronominal
forms: with ha-, pronominal forms display an ergative/absolutive pattern; with da-, the
ergative NP of a transitive clause continues to be marked by an ergative form, but the
absolutive NP is now marked by the possessive form. This pattern and others would have
been clarified if Laskowske had consistently supplied the affirmative form of each negated
clause for comparison.

David F. Matti presents a convincing argument for split ergativity in Mamasa pro-
noun sets, and this is the best paper in the volume. Matti argues that pronouns in inde-
pendent clauses or in initial clauses in ‘consecutive clause constructions’ have an ergative/
absolutive pattern. A ‘consecutive clause construction’ is defined as a construction in
which a clause follows the ‘consecutive clause marker’ an-. The constituent preceding an-
can be a clause; a temporal word, such as ‘yesterday’; or a WH-interrogative, such as
‘when,’ ‘what,’ or ‘why.’ Clauses following an-, on the other hand, have a nominative/
accusative pattern. Matti considers alternative analyses for the pronoun sets and provides
evidence that these cannot be applied to Mamasa. He also notes that in certain nominalized
clauses, the absolute pronoun of the verbal clause counterpart is replaced by the posses-
sive pronoun. This is similar to what Laskowske notes for Seko Padang.

Kari K. Stromme describes the distribution of the four pronominal sets occurring in
Mamuju. Stromme suggests that verb agreement affixes have an ergative/absolutive pat-
tern, but notes that the subject (i.e., the more agentive argument) of a transitive verb can be
marked as the absolutive rather than the ergative. She suggests that selection of case
marking for semantically transitive verbs may be controlled by uncertainty or by generaliza-
tion. Looking at the examples, one suspects that the two case marking patterns reflect two
different voice constructions: the active construction in which the subject (i.e., the more
agentive argument) is marked as the ergative NP and the antipassive construction in which
it is marked as the absolutive NP. This, of course, still leaves the question, what controls
the selection of either construction? Before this question can be answered, however, the
clause types first need to be accurately identified.

Taken together, these papers offer details concerning the grammar of a group of
languages about which little is known, and are a welcome addition to the field.