11.1 Valency reducing affixes

There are several prefixes that are used derivationally to produce verbs with a lower valency than that displayed by the underived verb. Most of these prefixes appear to be incompatible with each other on the one verbal root, even though they can be shown (through interaction with other prefixes) to occur in different positions (an exception to this is that a verb whose valency has been increased by an applicative suffix, and so has more than one object to discard, does allow multiple valency reduction, as does an object which appears as the result of possessor ascension.). Both subject and object may be combined to form a single subject through the use of the reciprocal prefix po-. The passive prefixes are dealt with in section 11.2, and serve to mark a verb in which the subject of the clause is the affected argument (the one lowest on the thematic hierarchy), and do not allow for any mention of the instigator of the action at all. At the other end of the verb, an object may be incorporated into the verb, thus reducing the transitivity in a different way. This has been dealt with in chapter 7.

11.1.1 Durative performance prefix heme-

The prefix heme- implies that an action is done over a period of time; it derives an intransitive verb, and so can have no objects even if based on a transitive base.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{no-ita} & \quad \text{‘see’} & \quad \text{no-heme-ita} & \quad \text{‘search around’} \\
\text{no-landa} & \quad \text{‘stamp, squash’} & \quad \text{no-heme-landa} & \quad \text{‘stamp feet about for a while’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
s-V & \quad (\text{te O}_j) & \quad \text{na S/A}_i \\
\downarrow & & \\
s-\text{heme-}V & \quad \text{na S}_i
\end{align*}
\]

(1) \textit{Ku-lende te po’o iso.} \\
1SG-squeeze CORE mango yon \\
‘I squeezed that mango.’

(2) \textit{Ku-heme-lende.} \\
1SG-DUR-squeeze \\
‘I squeezed (them).’ (over a period of time)
It can of course be speculated that this prefix is really a combination of the verbal prefix he- and the frequentive prefix me-. This cannot be tested, though the semantics of the two prefixes do not seem to be compatible.

11.1.2 Frequentive prefix me-

This prefix is used on active verbs to derive a non-active intransitive verb out of the root, with the meaning ‘perform the activity denoted by the verb on several occasions’.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{no-tinti} & \text{‘run’} & \text{no-me-tinti} & \text{‘frequently runs’} \\
\text{no-lele'e} & \text{‘urinate’} & \text{no-me-he-lele'e} & \text{‘frequently urinate’} \\
\text{no-’ita} & \text{‘look’} & \text{no-me-’ita} & \text{‘frequently look’}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
s-V \quad (\text{te } O_i) \quad \text{na } S/A_{[\text{Agent}]} \\
\downarrow \\
s-me-V \quad \emptyset \quad \text{na } S_i
\end{array}
\]

(5) No-mo-talo.
3R-ANTICAUS-beat
‘They have been beaten.’

(6) No-me-mo-talo.
3R-FREQ-ANTICAUS-beat
‘They always lose.’

(7) No-tita'i ala'a.
3R-defecate just
‘S/he’s only defecating.’

(8) No-me-tita'i ala'a.
3R-FREQ-defecate just
‘All s/he does is defecate.’

(9) No-laha te doe.
3R-search CORE money
‘He is looking for money.’

(10) No-me-laha (* te doe).
3R-FREQ-search CORE money
‘He is always looking.’
11.1.3 Reciprocal prefix *po-*

The reciprocal prefix is not always a ‘true’ reciprocal, in that there does not have to be two-way action (see example (41), using the multiple subject prefix *pada-*), which may be rephrased as *Noposimbi na sanggila kene amai*, though *Nopomoturu* is completely unacceptable. The rephrasing of (41) is possible since the multiple participants are affected patients as well as subjects). There are, however, necessarily two or more participants that are affected by the action. Normally, of course, these will be the subject and the object of the underived verb. The subject prefix on the verb that represents the combined subject and object of the underived verb can index either the person and number features of the combined nominals, or only one or the other of them (see chapter 18 for details on the restrictions involved).

### Argument Structure

\[
\begin{align*}
  & s-V \\
\downarrow & \text{te } O_j \\
  & \text{na } A_i \\
  & s_{i+j} / s_j / s_i-{po-V} \quad \emptyset \\
  & \text{na } S_{i+j} A_i O_j
\end{align*}
\]

This is represented in argument structure as follows:

\[
\text{‘REC } \langle [  ], \ [  ], [  ] \rangle \text{ PRED } \langle [  ], [  ] \rangle\text{’}
\]

The two possibilities for the use of the subject prefixes are shown below in (12) and (13), with the underived sentence presented first in (11):

1. **(11)**
   
   `(')U-ita-aku te iko'o.
   
   2SG.R-see-1SG.OBJ CORE 2SG

   ‘You saw me.’

   The reciprocal sentence with subject indexing showing both the base [A] and the base [O] is seen in (12):

   2. **(12)**

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   & \text{To-po-ita-ita } (\text{na ikita}) / ((\text{na iaku}) \ ke \ iko'o). \\
   & \text{1PL.R-REC-RED-see NOM 1PL NOM 1SG and 2SG}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   ‘We saw each other.’

   If the subject prefix indexes only the base [A], then the base [O] is obligatorily present in the form of a conjunct phrase:

   3. **(13)**

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   & \text{U-po-ita-ita } ((\text{na ikita}) / (\text{na iko'o})) \ *(ke iaku). \\
   & \text{2SG.R-REC-RED-see NOM 1PL NOM 2SG and 1SG}
   \end{align*}
   \]

   ‘You and I saw each other.’

Details of the person and number combinations, and the indexing on the verb, that are allowed can be found in chapter 18.
11.2 Passive prefixes

There are three passive prefixes in Tukang Besi that can be used with transitive verbs, *to-, te- and mo-. They all share the properties of being restricted to transitive (or ditransitive) verbs, that they display a preference for appearing with the perfective aspect marker -mo (less strong with mo-), and that there can be no by-phrase with the passive verb form. After that the differences between the three prefixes (which are mutually incompatible) become apparent. With *to-, the most productive of the three, the object of a transitive verb is conceived of as having the action described by the verb performed on it, in a rather inexact manner (multiple or unidentified participants, or over a long period of time). We may characterise this passive as follows:

\[ x \text{ (intentionally or otherwise) causes V to happen to } y. \]
\[ y \text{ may or may not be changed as a result of this.} \]

With the *te- accidental passive there is no sense of volitionality in the verb at all; other than this qualification, the meaning is very similar to that found with *to-. Since there is no agency in the verb at all, either implicit or assumed, the set of verbs that *te- may appear with is much more restricted than the set which may appear with *to-, being limited to things that may be plausible caused by natural forces. The characterisation of *te- is as follows:

\[ V \text{ happens to happen to } y \text{ (without volition), which may or may not have changed.} \]

The final ‘passive’ prefix, *mo-, is better termed an anticausative (see Comrie (1981) and Lichtenberk (1991) for the use of this term). It attaches to process verbs, and the derived verb denotes the state resulting from that activity. We may semantically characterise this construction as follows:

\[ y \text{ was V-ed, and has now changed state significantly.} \]

These different passive prefixes will now be discussed one by one.

11.2.1 General passive  *to-

The prefix *to- attaches to active transitive verbs and can be characterised as a subject-demoting passive, in that the argument corresponding to the subject of the non-passive sentence loses many pivot properties, most of which are NOT acquired by the original object, which becomes the single argument of the derived intransitive verb. The single argument of the passive verb is marked by the nominative article, following the pattern for intransitive verbs, and is additionally eligible to be marked on the verb by means of subject prefixes. As is apparent from the preceding description, a passive cannot be formed on an intransitive verb. In such a derived passive verb form, coding of any argument by means of object-suffixes is not possible (Even in a ditransitive verb: *No-to-hu'u-ke-mo. 3R-PASS-give-3OBJ-PF ‘They were given it.’). The correspondences involved between a passive sentence and a non-passive one can be summarised by the following schema:
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The argument structure model of this process is taken to be that shown below:

\[
\text{\textit{\textit{to-}}} \quad \langle [ ] \rangle \quad \text{PRED} \langle [ ], [ ] \rangle \rangle
\]

This same structure also accounts for the other passive-like prefixes.

The use of this prefix may be illustrated in practice by the following example. In (14), the non-passive verb is shown, both with and without object suffixes. In (15), the corresponding passive verb is illustrated:

(14) a. ‘U-’ita’e na kalambe te iko’o.
    2SG.R-see-3OBJ NOM young.girl CORE 2SG
    ‘You saw the young girl.’

   b. ‘U-’ita te kalambe na iko’o.
    2SG.R-see CORE young.girl NOM 2SG

(15) No-to-’ita na kalambe.
    3R-PASS-see NOM young.girl
    ‘The young girl was seen.’

The ambiguity of the grammatical status of the original object in a clause with the passive verb can be illustrated by creating a second person object equivalent of sentence (14). Although it is the sole argument of the verb, the undergoer does not unambiguously control the person and number categories of the subject prefixes on the verb. A third person subject prefix (the same form that is used for ‘dummy’ subjects appearing in meteorological statements) is always possible, as seen in (16):

(16) a. ‘U-to-’ita (na iko’o).
    2SG.R-PASS-see NOM 2SG
    ‘You were seen.’

     b. No-to-’ita na iko’o.
    3R-PASS-see NOM 2SG
    ‘You were visible.’

This pair of sentences also illustrates the ambiguity of interpretation of a \textit{to}- passive sentence, as either a passive action or a non-active state. Speakers offered various (often inconsistent) opinions as to which of (3a) and (3b) was to be interpreted as stative or passive, but no consensus was achieved, and it seems best to consider them as variant interpretations of equal weight.

Some other examples of the \textit{to}- passive in use are given in (17) - (19):

(17) Ara mbeaka no-komo, e wuta Baubau no-to-’ita.
    if not 3R-misty CORE land Baubau 3R-PASS-see
    ‘If it’s not misty, (you) can see Buton.’ (G:61)
Further arguments for describing the *to-* passive as a backgrounding passive without any corresponding foregrounding properties concern the assignment of pivot properties to the subject of the derived verb. Although the subject, as the single argument of an intransitive verb, is marked by the nominative article *na*, and is the sole argument indexed on the verb, it does not acquire any of the pivotal properties normally associated with the nominative argument, such as the ability to be deleted under conditions of identity with a previous *na*-argument (see chapter 20). Just as (20b), illustrating coreferential deletion of non-nominative NPs, is ungrammatical, or at least infelicitous, so too is (21), despite the article use being consistent with the qualifications necessary for coreferential deletion, as is the case for (20a):

a. *Ku-‘ita-ko (na iko’o), kene ‘u-tulu.*
   1SG-see 2SG.OBJ NOM 2SG and 2SG.R-stop
   ‘I saw you, and you stopped by (for a chat).’

b. */# *Ku-‘ita te iko’o, kene ‘u-tulu.*
   1SG-see CORE 2SG and 2SG.R-stop

(21) * ‘U-to-‘ita na iko’o, kene ‘u-tulu.*
   2SG.R-PASS-see NOM 2SG and 2SG.R-stop
   ‘You were seen, and stopped by (for a chat).’

Another property ascribed to nominative arguments that is not carried through to the single argument of a *to-* passive includes the ability to launch floating quantifiers. The subject of a *to-*passive clause may only be modified by a floating quantifier within the NP. It may not launch a floating quantifier to a position outside the NP.

a. *No-to-‘ita [na bangka saba’ane]NP.*
   3R-PASS-see NOM ship all
   ‘All of the sailing ships were seen.’

b. */ Saba’ane no-to-‘ita [na bangka]NP.

c. */ No-to-‘ita saba’ane [na bangka]NP.

The subject of a *to-* passive can serve as the head of a subject relative clause, a property that is associated with an argument in [A] or [S] syntactic role, not with the nominative argument:
As indicated in the translations, the passive function is usually used with a perfective meaning. With perception verbs, such as ‘ita ‘see’, this is not morphologically apparent, but to be judged completely acceptable accomplishment verbs often require the addition of -mo ‘perfective’:

(24) a. No-sai te kabali na tukatutu.
   3R-make CORE machete NOM blacksmith
   ‘The blacksmith made the machete.’

b. # Notosai na kabali.

c. No-to-sai-mo na kabali.
   3R-PASS-make-PF NOM machete
   ‘The machete has been made.’

With a ditransitive verb, the behaviour of the two ‘objects’ with respect to passivisation depends on whether the verb contains an instrument or a recipient in its subcategorisation frame. With a verb that subcategorises for a core instrument, only the theme/patient may be passivised:

(25) a. No-tu'o te baliu te kau.
   3R-fell CORE axe CORE tree
   ‘They chopped the tree down with axes.’

b. No-to-tu'o-mo na kau te baliu.
   3R-PASS-fell-PF NOM tree CORE axe
   ‘The tree was chopped down with axes.’

c. * No-to-tu'o-mo na baliu te kau.
   3R-PASS-fell-PF NOM axe CORE tree
   ‘The axe was chopped down with at trees.’
   (Good for: ‘The axe was chopped down by means of a tree.’)

   (notice that the non-by-phrase instrumental core argument may be mentioned in the passive clause)

With a ditransitive verb involving a recipient, both the recipient and the theme are available to be the subject of a passive clause (this is despite the fact that only the recipient may head an object relative clause, or be indexed on the verb by object suffixes.):

(26) a. No-hu'u te mo'ane mandawulu te kamba.
   3R-give CORE man beautiful CORE flower
   ‘He gave the beautiful man a flower.’
b. No-to-hu'u-mo na mo'ane mandawulu te kamba.
   3R-PASS-give-PF NOM man beautiful CORE flower
   ‘The beautiful man was given a flower.’

c. No-to-hu'u-mo na kamba te mo'ane mandawulu.
   3R-PASS-give-PF NOM flower CORE man beautiful
   ‘The flower was given to the beautiful man.’
   (Though in Tukang Besi ‘the beautiful man’ is still a core argument in this sentence, so a closer translation would be ‘The flower was given the beautiful man.’, but I find this to be ungrammatical English.)

In (26b) and (26c) we also see that the non-by-phrase may be mentioned in the passive sentence, even though it is not an instrument, but a theme (in 26b) or a recipient (in 26c). One explanation for the asymmetry in behaviour is that the addition of applicative morphology on tu'o will make the instrument able to be passivised, yet that is not the case with the recipient of hu'u if applicative morphology is added. In other words, there is an alternative strategy for making the instrument of tu'o the subject of a passive sentence, but no alternative for the recipient of hu'u. The instrument of tu'o may also be present in a prepositional phrase (with kene, see chapter 12) or in a core level serial verb construction (with ako, see chapter 8). These are also options not available to the recipient of hu'u.

In short, prefixing to- to a verb backgrounds the original [A] argument completely; the argument is not expressible by any means (unless, exceptionally, it bears [Instrumental] semantic role; see chapter 20 for a discussion of this). The [O] becomes eligible to be subject indexed on the verb, though this is not compulsory, the ‘dummy’ third person index also being commonly used. The article that is used to mark the undergoer nominal is the nominative na, as would be expected for the single argument of an intransitive verb, but the presence of this article does not confer any of the pivot properties associated with nominative arguments.

11.2.2 Accidental passive te-

The prefix te- appears only on transitive verbs that can take a generic, or ‘natural’, actor. That is, they do not require animate agency or volition. The passive must be interpreted as describing an accidental occurrence, and so cannot appear on verbs that involve a volitional actor. The subject that is the single argument of the verb must be totally affected by the action. The affect of te- on the grammatical functions may be expressed by the following schema:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{s-V} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{s-te-V} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{te O}_{\text{Theme/Patient}} j \\
\text{na A}_j \\
\text{na S}_j \\
\text{Ø}
\end{array}
\]

This is illustrated in examples (27) and (28):
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(27) a. To-tompa te 'obu ako te watu.
    1PL.R-throw CORE dog INSTR CORE stone
    ‘We threw stones at the dog.’
    (Lit. ‘We threw at the dog with stones.’)

b. No-to-tompa na 'obu te watu.
    3R-PASS-throw NOM dog CORE stone
    ‘The dog had stones thrown at it (by someone).’
    (Notice that more than one argument appears here, with the subcategorised-for instrument appearing with the same marking that it had in the non-passive clause. This is the general case for multi-valent verbs, that any non-subject core arguments that are not passivised may appear in the passive sentence as well.)

c. No-te-tompa na 'obu te watu.
    3R-ACC.PASS-throw NOM dog CORE stone
    ‘Stones were thrown at the dog (by an accidental force).’

(28) a. No-nabu te kaluku na amai ito.
    3R-drop CORE coconut NOM 3PL that:higher
    ‘They dropped the coconut.’

b. No-to-nabu-mo na kaluku.
    3R-PASS-drop-PF NOM coconut
    ‘The coconut was dropped (by someone).’

c. No-te-nabu-mo na kaluku.
    3R-ACC.PASS-drop-PF NOM coconut
    ‘The coconut happened to fall.’
    (through forces of nature, such as a storm)

The accidental instrumental passive contrasts with the normal to- passive as shown in the examples in section 11.2.1.

The same restrictions on lack of nominative properties apply to single argument of the te- passive as apply to the to- passive, namely lack of control over coreferential deletion and the inability to launch floating quantifiers:

(29) a. No-nabu-'e na boku-no, mbeaka-mo no-lolaha-'e.
    3R-drop-3OBJ NOM book-3POSS not-PF 3R-search-3OBJ
    ‘They tossed his book aside, and he couldn’t find it any more.’

b. * No-te-nabu na boku-no,
    3R-ACC.PASS-drop NOM book-3POSS
    mbeaka-mo no-lolaha-'e.
    not-PF 3R-search-3OBJ
    ‘His book happened to fall away, and he couldn’t find it any more.’

(30) a. No-te-mepa-mo [na pakea saba'ane]NP.
    3R-ACC.PASS-wet-PF NOM clothes all
    ‘All of the clothes were soaked.’
b. * Saba'ane notemepamo [na pakea]NP.

c. * Notemepamo saba'ane [na pakea]NP.

This passive too, then, can be described as a backgrounding passive in which there is no promotion of the undergoer argument to a more prominent position, yet the actor in backgrounded entirely, being obligatorily deleted.

In discourse, the use of these passive forms is rather a ‘dead end’: after a sentence with a to- or te- passive, the thread of discourse must be started again from scratch, and so we can think of these passives not only as backgrounding passives, but also as ones that are ‘concluding’ passives, a sort of morphological full stop that marks the end of a thematic unit in discourse. This is consistent with the lack of a nominative pivot associated with a clause using either of these two passive types, which would not allow discourse centred around that particular topic to continue without reiterating all the nominals concerned (since conjunction reduction typically both targets and is controlled by nominative arguments, see chapter 20). For example, in (31) the passive is used to stop someone from droning on endlessly about fishing:

(31) A: O-saori-koruo na ika i-wini-no. No-wini no-wini
3R-very-many NOM fish OP-reel.in-3POSS 3R-reel.in 3R-reel.in
no-wini-torusu. No-wini te ika to'oige, no-wini
3R-reel.in-continue 3R-reel.in CORE fish big 3R-reel.in
'uka te ika ki'iki'i, malingu-giu. Ane ke simbuku,
also CORE fish big various-kinds exist and octopus
ane'e. Kene 'uka ane 'uka...
exist-3OBJ and also exist also
‘Oh, they got a lot of fish. They were pulling them in, they kept on pulling them in, non-stop. They got some big fish, they got some smaller fish, lots of different sorts. They had octopus, they did, and they also had…’

B: Óo, no-to-wini-mo. Maka pasi-mo atu?
yes 3R-PASS-reel.in-PF and.then after-PF that
‘Right, they were all caught. And then?’

A: Oho, jari, po'oli atu, te amai no-waliako-mo.
yes so finish that CORE 3PL 3R-return-PF
‘Yes, well, and then after that they came back home.’

To continue discussing the fish after the use of a passive is very infelicitous discourse, and so the speaker is more-or-less forced to change the topic, thus getting on with the narrative.

11.2.3 Anticausative mo-

The mo- prefix attaches to active transitive process verbs and serves to show that the original object is in the changed state that can be assumed to result from the process activity described in the verb. This set of relationships can be described by the following schema:
This is illustrated in practice by the following example. In (32), the non-passive verb is shown, both with and without object suffixes. In (33), the corresponding passive verb is illustrated:

(32) a. 'U-gonti'-e na kau.
   2SG.R-chop-3OBJ NOM wood
   ‘You chopped the wood.’

   b. 'U-gonti te kau.
      2SG.R-chop CORE wood

(33) No-mo-gonti-mo na kau.
    3R-ANTICAUS-chop-PF NOM wood
    ‘The wood is chopped.’
    (with the implication that the activity was done volitionally)

As with the other two passive prefixes, nominative pivot properties are not associated with the argument of the intransitive verb, and the by-phrase may not be mentioned.

11.2.4 Passive summary

These similarities and differences between the different passive forms, and the diathesis introduced by the presence or absence of object suffixes on the verb, are summarised in table 22:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor may be present?</th>
<th>Verbal agreement?</th>
<th>Nominative properties?</th>
<th>Degree of affectedness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>object-suffixes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>as object</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to- prefix</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>(subject)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te- prefix</td>
<td>none implied</td>
<td>(subject)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo- prefix</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>(subject)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3 Valency-neutral prefixes

The set of ‘valency-neutral’ affixes are so called because, when added to a verb, they do not either add or subtract any additional arguments to the clause. In contrast to the valency reducing affixes, which always reduce the valency of the verb by one, or the valency increasing affixes, which always add one argument to the verb (to a maximum of three arguments in any one verb phrase), the valency neutral affixes do not specify a change in valency.
11.3.1 Intensifier **heka-**

Adding **heka-** to an intransitive verb gives the sense that the activity is performed with more than usual effort and for a longer period of time. With reduplication of the root, the meaning is similar, but with the implication that the action or state is not real, that it is only being pretended.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{s-V} & \quad \text{na S} \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{s-heka-V} & \quad \text{na S}
\end{align*}
\]

- **rau** ‘yell’
- **no-heka-rau** ‘cry out repeatedly’
- **nangu** ‘swim’
- **no-heka-nangu** ‘practise swimming’
  (go through the motions)

With reduplication:
- **hesowui** ‘wash’
- **no-heka-heso-hesowui** ‘pretend to wash oneself’
- **hawaa** ‘angry’
- **no-heka-hawa-hawaa** ‘pretend to be angry’

(34) Te ia di 'one ala'a, no-heka-nangu ala'a.
  CORE 3SG OBL beach just, 3R-INTENS-swim just
  ‘Oh, he’s just on the beach, he’s only going through the motions of swimming.’

(35) Bar(a) ('u-ma'eka-ako-'e, no-heka-hawa-hawaa ala'a la.
  don’t 2SG.R-afraid-APPL-3OBJ, 3R-INTENS-RED-angry just ILL.FORCE
  ‘Don’t be afraid of him, he’s just pretending to be angry.’

11.3.2 Verbaliser **homo-**

The prefix **homo-** (possibly a combination of hoN- ‘purposeful verbaliser’ and mo- ‘anticausative’, though it is not immediately apparent how the semantics of the two prefixes are compatible) has only been encountered twice in texts, so very little can be said about its functions or semantic content. The examples of its use are presented in (36) and (37) below, with the surrounding text attached:

(36) No-homo-ro-'e-mo kambeda te opa nu kompa.
  3R-VRB-insert.hand-3OBJ-PF fact CORE grotto GEN eel
  Jari la'a-mo no-ro-'e no-kaha-'e-mo na lima-no.
  so just-PF 3R-insert.hand-3OBJ 3R-bite-3OBJ-PF NOM hand-3POSS
  ‘He felt around a bit with his hand, because that’s the cave of eels.’
  ‘So just as he inserted his hand, it was bitten.’ (Oen: 4-5)

(37) Saba'a-ba'ane na mia no-homo-ngaru
  all.RED NOM person 3R-VRB-carry
  sa-'apa-'apata-no.
  1-RED-extremity-3POSS (Sab: 40)
  ‘All the people were carrying as much as they could.’
11.3.3 Social activity prefix  *hopo-*

The use of *hopo-* on a verb implies that the action carried out is done for a social or ceremonial function, and not just for purely personal goals. The transitivity of the clause is not affected, a transitive verb serves as input, and a transitive verb is the result of the derivation.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  s-V & (te \ O_j) & na \ S/A_i \\
  \downarrow & & \\
  s-hopo-V & (te \ O_j) & na \ S/A_i \\
\end{array}
\]

Alternatively, the derivation can be taken to refer to a person who carries out that action. Examples of the derivation of verbs and nouns through the addition of *hopo-* are given below:

- *wiliisi* ‘visit’  
  - *no-hopo-wiliisi* ‘visit someone in official function’  
  - *te hopowiliisi* ‘person who officially visits’  
  (composed of *wila* ‘go’ and the directional applicative suffix -VCi)

- *elo* ‘call out to’  
  - *no-hopo-elo* ‘summon for social /ceremonial duty’  
  - *te hopoelo* ‘person who officially summons’

- *topa* ‘slap with fingers’  
  - *no-hopo-topa* ‘chasten by slapping’  
  - *te hopotopa* ‘person who officially chastises’

- *waa* ‘tell, inform’  
  - *no-hopo-waa* ‘announce’  
  - *te hopowaa* ‘person who announces news’

(38)  *No-waa-'e kua no-rato.*  
3R-tell-3OBJ SW:COMP 3R-arrive  
‘She told them that she had arrived.’

(39)  *No-hopo-waa-'e kua no-rato.*  
3R-SOC-tell-3OBJ SW:COMP 3R-arrive  
‘She announced to them that she had arrived.’

11.3.4 Multiple subject prefix  *pada-*

The prefix *pada-* is sometimes used as a reciprocal prefix, but is more commonly used to indicate simply that there is more than one participant involved in conducting the action, and not necessarily that the action involved is reciprocal. Unlike *po-* , *pada-* does not have valency reduction as a necessary component of its semantics. Because of this it may be used with intransitive verbs as well as transitive ones.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  s-V & te \ O_i & na \ A_j \\
  \downarrow & & \\
  s-pada-V & \emptyset & na \ S_{j/A/O} \ (kene \ S_{i0/A}) \\
\end{array}
\]
11.3.5 Iterative para-

The iterative prefix para- can be applied to transitive or intransitive (unergative) verbs to derive a verb with the same meaning and same valency, but with the added meaning that the activity is a regular one. Thus from ‘ita ‘see’ the derived verb para’ita ‘frequently look (nosily)’. If the verb was originally transitive, it may still display objects, either nominative or non-nominative, in the derived form.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aso} & \quad \text{‘sell’} & \text{no-para-aso} & \quad \text{‘sell as a regular activity’} \\
\text{langke} & \quad \text{‘sail’} & \text{no-para-langke} & \quad \text{‘sail regularly’}
\end{align*}
\]

(42) No-para-aso te loka di daoa.
3R-ITER-sell CORE banana OBL market
‘She sells bananas in the market.’

(43) No-para-langke di Maluku.
3R-ITER-sail OBL Maluku
‘They frequently sail in Maluku.’

11.3.6 Verbaliser / Nominaliser wo-

The prefix wo- has only been attested in a few cases, and derives either intransitive verbs or nominals which refer to the place of origin of the verbal activity.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sala} & \quad \text{‘path’} & \text{no-wo-sala} & \quad \text{‘go by means of a road’} \\
\text{lua} & \quad \text{(vomit)} & \text{te wolua} & \quad \text{‘spring (of water)’}
\end{align*}
\]

(44) No-wo-sala na La Kasi.
3R-VRB/NOM-road NOM La Kasi
‘La Kasi left by the road.’

11.4 Valency-announcing prefixes

Unlike the valency-neutral prefixes, which do not change the valency of a verb to which they attach, the valency-announcing prefixes have a set valency target (either intransitive or transitive) for the derived verb, such as hoN-, which always derives a transitive verb, regardless of whether the input verb was intransitive (in which case it changes by the addition of an argument) or transitive (in which case there is no change in the valency of
the verb). A pre-categorial root is normally intransitive if used verbally, so the addition of a verbalising prefix in such cases cannot be said to increase the valency of the root, but only to license the use of the root as a verb in the first place. The fact that a transitive verb root appears as an intransitive verb when used with certain of the prefixes, such as he-, does not mean that we can characterise he- as a valency-decreasing affix, since the other valency decreasing affixes are unequivocally NOT able to be used with intransitive roots. We can thus better characterise the sort of behaviour exhibited by he- and other prefixes as valency-announcing, rather than valency decreasing.

11.4.1 Breaking verbaliser  ban-

The prefix ban- is used to make verbs out of the two body part terms that are only capable of being used verbally when specially affixed with verbal prefixes. The resulting verbs have a more forceful interpretation than verbs formed with the he- prefix, the other option for these two body parts. The two body parts that are used with ban- are siku ‘elbow’ and tu‘u ‘knee’. The difference between hesiku and bansiku is that hesiku is less forceful than bansiku, which implies a stronger impact, preferably with bone, whereas hesiku can be used to describe either a weaker impact, or an impact with soft tissue. Similar distinctions hold between hetu‘u and bantu‘u. The derived verb is transitive.

| siku  | ‘elbow’     | no-ban-siku | ‘smash with elbow’ |
| tu‘u  | ‘knee’      | no-ban-tu‘u | ‘smash with knee’  |

(45) No-ban-siku-aku na buku karakara-su.  
3R-BREAK-elbow-1SG.OBJ NOM bone rib-1SG.POSS  
‘He broke my ribs with his elbow.’

(46) No-ban-tu‘u-ke na bali-no mina mbea-ho  
3R-BREAK-knee-3OBJ NOM opponent-3POSS from not-yet  
no-sepa liku‘e.  
3R-kick behind-3OBJ  
‘He kneed his opponent damagingly before he did a back kick on him.’  

Compare with peku ‘backfist, hit with backfist’; busu ‘fist; hit with fist’; sambu ‘back of hand; hit with back of hand’, compare with the instrumental use of randa nu ae in sepa te randa nu ae ‘kick with instep’, and the specialist term sepa ‘kick with foot’.

11.4.2 Verbaliser  he-

The prefix he- is used to make verbs out of some words that are not capable of being used verbally, and can also be used with inherently verbal roots to produce a sense of extended duration, and more forceful performance. Additionally, there is a special sense attached to the use of he- with the names of building parts, with which the prefix combines to mean ‘produce, make’. Examples of the use of he- include:

Root is nominal: derived verb is intransitive:
Production:

- **wunua** ‘house’ — **no-he-wunua** ‘build a house’
- **lante** ‘floor’ — **no-he-lante** ‘make a bamboo floor’
- **ato** ‘roof’ — **no-he-ato** ‘weave a thatch roof’
- **lima-lima** ‘one of a ship’s planks’ — **no-he-lima-lima** ‘make the lima-lima for a ship’

Conceivably, **he-** in this context can be related to the verb **sai** ‘make’ (*s > h is attested only rarely in Tukang Besi, but is a common sound change in other languages of the Muna-Buton region), and the original building part could be thought of as an incorporated object.

Use:

- **baju** ‘shirt’ — **no-he-baju** ‘wear a shirt’
- **kabali** ‘machete’ — **no-he-kabali** ‘wave a machete around’
- **siku** ‘elbow’ — **no-he-siku** ‘hit s.o. with elbow’
- **tu’u** ‘knee’ — **no-he-tu’u** ‘hit s.o. with knee’

Root is verbal, the derived verb is intransitive:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{s-V (te O_j) na A/S[Agent] i } \\
\downarrow \\
\text{s-he-V na S_i}
\end{align*}
\]

- **kai** ‘hook for something’ — **no-he-kai-kai** ‘hook around (for something)’
- **doito** ‘cry’ — **no-he-doito** ‘carry on, cry (out), wail’

(47) *Rato i mawi no-he-kai-kai-mo.*

‘Arriving at the sea he started trailing his hooks.’

(48) *No-he-kai-kai-e.*

3R-DO-RED-hook-3OBJ

(49) *No-he-kai-kai te opa.*

3R-DO-RED-hook CORE grotto

One case has come to light of the derived verb with **he-** being transitive (or at least ambitransitive). When **he-** combines with **tade** ‘stand’ (ambitransitive), it makes for a derived verb that may take an object. Compare (48) with (48)’:

(48)’ *No-he-tade-e na wunua wo’ou-no.*

3R-do-stand-3OBJ NOM house new-3POSS

‘They built their new house.’

This irregularity might just be a result of analogy with Malay, which has **membangun** ‘build’ formed from the intransitive **bangun** ‘wake up, get up, stand up’.
11.4.3 Purposeful verbaliser *hoN-*

Generally intransitive verbs, or else nouns, can be made transitive through the addition of the prefix *hoN-*.

The prefix is unusual in causing nasal substitution in the initial consonant of the root. This takes the following forms:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hoN} & + p-, h- & \rightarrow & \text{hom-} \\
\text{hoN} & + t- & \rightarrow & \text{hon-} \\
\text{hoN} & + k-, h- & \rightarrow & \text{hong-}
\end{align*}
\]

The common meaning of the prefix is difficult to pin down, but involves the derivation of a transitive verb, and a stronger sense of result arising from the action than would be the case with *he-* or *heka-*.

**kabali**  ‘machete’

no-ho-ngabali

‘use a machete effectively and usefully’

(cf. *hekabali* ‘use a machete ineffectually; wave it around without result’)

**toha**  ‘wash, scrub’

no-ho-noha

‘wash (clothes)’

(cf. *totoha* ‘wash (of clothes) (ineffectually or intransitively)’)

If the intransitive verb was unergative, then the original subject becomes the [A] of the derived verb, and an object is added. If, however, the underived verb was unaccusative, then the original subject becomes the object of the derived verb, and an [A] is added (similar distributional restrictions have been reported for a variety of affixes in a group of contiguous Pama-Nyungan languages stretching from far north Queensland to north-eastern South Australia (Angela Terrill p.c., Peter Austin (1995)), and in Tzotzil (Robertson p.c.); Evans (nd) discusses a similar affix in Mayali (Kunwinjku)):

\[
\begin{align*}
s-\text{V} & \quad \text{na } S_{[\text{Ag}]i} & \quad \text{or} & \quad s-\text{V} & \quad \text{na } S_{[\text{Dat}/\text{Thm}/\text{Pt}]i} \\
\downarrow & \quad \downarrow & \quad & \quad & \\
\text{s-} \text{hoN-} \text{V} & \quad \text{te } O_j & \quad \text{na } A_{[\text{Ag}]i} & \quad \text{s-} \text{hoN-} \text{V} & \quad \text{te } O_{[\text{Dat}/\text{Thm}/\text{Pt}]i} & \quad \text{na } A_j
\end{align*}
\]

The argument structure model of this process is taken to be one of those shown below, the first representing the interaction with a verb that subcategorises for an [Agent], the second representing the predicate interaction found with a [Dative], [Theme] or [Patient] base predicate:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘hoN-} & \quad \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Thm}/\text{Pt}] \quad \text{PRED}_{\text{unergative}} \quad \langle [\text{Ag}] \rangle \text{’} \\
\text{‘hoN-} & \quad \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Dat}/\text{Thm}/\text{Pt}] \quad \text{PRED}_{\text{unaccusative}} \quad \langle [\text{Dat}/\text{Thm}/\text{Pt}] \rangle \text{’}
\end{align*}
\]

Generalising, we can say that when *hoN-* is applied to an intransitive predicate it adds whatever arguments are necessary to flesh out a transitive predicate, adding an [A] to
unaccusative verbs, the non-agentive argument acting as an [O], and adding an [O] to unergative verbs, the agentive argument of which is treated as an [A].

If the verb was transitive before the *hoN-* prefix was added, then the verb remains transitive, and no reordering of the arguments occurs:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{s-V} & \quad \text{te O}_{j} \quad \text{na A}_{\text{Ag}i} \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{s-hoN-V} & \quad \text{te O}_{j} \quad \text{na A}_{\text{Ag}i} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘*hoN-* \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Dat/Thm/Pt}] \text{ PRED } \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Dat/Thm/Pt}] \rangle’

Examples of the use of *hoN-* are presented in (50) - (57):

(50) A: No-ha’a-mo?  B: No-totoha.  
3R-why-PF  3R-wash.clothes  
‘What are they doing?’ ‘They are washing clothes.’

(51) a. * No-totoha. te wurai-no.  
3R-wash.clothes CORE sarong-3POSS  
‘They are washing their sarongs.’

b. No-ho-[n]oha te wurai-no.  
3R-VRB-wash.clothes CORE sarong-3POSS  
‘They are washing their sarongs.’

(52) Te iaku ku-tutu ku-tutu ku-tutu  
CORE 1SG 1SG-pound 1SG-pound 1SG-pound  
ku-tongka ku-lola.  
1SG-pierce 1SG-fly  
(LW:13) ‘I’ll pound and pound and pound and pierce (it), and then fly away.’

(53) Te tukatutu no-ho-[n]utu te kabali.  
CORE blacksmith 3R-VRB-pound CORE machete  
‘The blacksmith is pounding out a machete.’

[S] of underived verb is [Patient]:

(54) No-tunu na kau.  
3R-burn NOM wood  
‘The wood is burning.’

(55) No-ho-[n]unu te kau.  
3R-VRB-burn CORE wood  
‘S/he is burning the wood.’

[S] of underived verb is [Agent]:

(56) No-rau na ana.  
3R-yell NOM child  
‘The child is yelling.’
Other verbal morphology

(57) **No-ho-rau** te **kene-no.**
3R-VRB-yell CORE friend-3POSS
‘They are yelling at their friend.’

11.4.4 Occupational prefix  *pa-*

The prefix *pa-* is used to derive a non-active intransitive verb from an active verb, regardless of whether the root was transitive or intransitive. This morpheme is probably related to the causative prefix *pa-* or a specialised meaning of that prefix (compare the use of English *-ise* as a causative morpheme (as in *summary, summarise*), and its quite different use in *womanise*). Whilst not restricted to occurring on verbs, when it does so it has the effect of specifying the derived verb as being an intransitive verb.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{s-V} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{s-} \text{pa-v} \\
\end{array} \\
\text{Ø} \\
\text{na S}_i
\]

(58) **No-ho-(n)utu** te **ha'o** na **ia.**
3R-VRB-pound CORE hammer NOM 3SG
‘He’s pounding the hammer.’

(59) **No-pa-tutu** (na **ia**).
3R-OCC-pound NOM 3SG
‘He’s a blacksmith.’

Note that *patutu* is not a free nominal form in Tukang Besi; ‘blacksmith’ is *pandetutu*, using the nonproductive noun-deriving prefix *pande-*. The prefix *pa-* is a strictly verb-deriving prefix, and (59) cannot be thought of as analogous to (60), in which an underived ‘nominal’ (really a precategorial root) is used as a verbal root:

(60) **No-wowine** (na **tolid-su**).
3R-woman NOM cousin-1SG.POSS
‘My cousin is a woman.’

The unacceptability of derived *pa-* forms functioning as nominals is illustrated in (61):

(61) a. **No-pa-langke.**
3R-OCC-sail
‘He is a sailor.’

b. * **Te ia te pa-langke.**
CORE s/he CORE OCC-sail

c. **Te ia te pande-langke.**
CORE 3SG CORE WORK-sail
‘He is a sailor.’

Some further examples of *pa-* are given below:
Nominal roots may also be prefixed by pa-; the resulting verbal form is also intransitive:

(64)  No-pa-wowine.
3R-OCC-woman
‘He likes womanising.’

(65)  No-pa-koranga.
3R-OCC-garden
‘He works in a garden.’

11.5 Causative-applicative combinations

In addition to double causative and double applicative constructions, which were discussed in chapters 9 and 10 respectively, (certain) verbs may combine a causative and an applicative together. These deserve special mention since they are the only examples of valency-increasing morphology in the language, and the interaction between the two of them is revealing about the relative ordering of the affixes on the verb, despite their being at opposite ends of the verb. There are no examples of a double causative combining with an applicative affix, or of a double applicative appearing together with a causative prefix. An example of causative and applicative morphology appearing on the same verb is given in (66):

(66)  Ku-pa-gonti-ako te ama-su te kau meana’e te iai-su.
1SG-CAUS-chop-APPL CORE father-1SG.POSS CORE wood REF-that CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
‘I had my younger brother chop that wood for my father.’

Although the causative prefixes and the applicative suffixes appear on opposite sides of the verb, it can be shown that the order of combination with the base verbal predicate must be with the causative first and the applicative second. Only the applied object may be nominative, and indexed on the verb by means of object suffixes. The causee may not be nominative if there is an applied object present:

(67)  Ku-pa-gonti-ako’e na ama-su te kau meana’e te iai-su.
1SG-CAUS-chop-APPL-3OBJ NOM father-1SG.POSS CORE wood REF-that CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
‘I had my younger brother chop that wood for my father.’
Other verbal morphology

(68) * Ku-pa-gonti-ako-'e te ama-su
   1SG-CAUS-chop-APPL-3OBJ CORE father-1SG.POSS
   te kau meana'e na iai-su.
   CORE wood REF-that NOM younger.sibling-1SG.POSS
   ‘I had my younger brother chop that wood for my father.’

The fact that the applied object and not the causee object may be nominative implies an argument structure combination of predicates as given in (67)', leaving the applied object in the second position of the combined predicate, and not the structure in (68)' that would have the causee as the second argument:

(67)' ‘APPL ⟨[Ag], [Dat] CAUS ⟨[Ag], [Pt] chop ⟨[Ag], [Pt]⟩⟩⟩

(68)' * ‘CAUS ⟨[Ag], [Pt] APPL ⟨[Ag], [Dat] chop ⟨[Ag], [Pt]⟩⟩⟩

The same restrictions on the relative ordering of the causative and applicative predicates on the verb may also apply to the very different requestive causative hepe-. In (69), the nominative marking goes on the [Dative] argument, with which the object suffix agrees:

(69) Ku-hepe-putara-ako-'e na ama-su
   1SG-REQ-rotate-APPL-3OBJ NOM father-1SG.POSS
   te teepu wo'ou-'u.
   CORE tape new-2SG.POSS
   ‘I asked (someone) to play your new tape for my father.’

Due to the nature of the argument linking involved with this verb, however, both a structure with a requestive predicate before an applicative predicate, and one with an applicative predicate before the requestive predicate, will produce the same surface grammatical features, as illustrated in the competing argument structures presented in (67)' and (68)'. In both cases, the agent of the base predicate becomes oblique, and the dative argument is the only one available to be nominative.

(69)' ‘APPL ⟨[Ag], [Dat] REQ ⟨[Ag], [Pt] rotate ⟨[Ag], [Pt]⟩⟩⟩

(69)“ ‘REQ ⟨[Ag], [Pt] APPL ⟨[Ag], [Dat] rotate ⟨[Ag], [Pt]⟩⟩⟩

With intransitive base predicates, the picture is more complicated. If the base predicate was an unergative verb, then the same restriction applies as for a transitive verb, namely that the causative predicate is closer to the base predicate than is the applicative one,
evidenced by the ability of the applied object to be nominative.

(70) Ku-pa-wila-ako-'e na ompu-su
1SG-CAUS-go-APPL-3OBJ NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS
te  iai-su kua daoa.
CORE younger.sibling-1SG.POSS ALL market
‘I had my younger brother go to the market as a favour for my grandmother.’

(70)’ ‘APPL 〈[Ag], [Dat] CAUS 〈[Ag], [Pt] go 〈[Ag]〉〉’

This is the pattern found with applicative constructions that introduce [Agent], [Dative] or [Instrument] roles, if the applied object is [Locative], the order of combination is applicative predicate first, causative predicate second:

(71) No-pa-kede-mi-'e te kadera na anabou iso
3R-CAUS-sit-DIR-3OBJ CORE chair NOM child yon
te  ina-no.
CORE mother-3POSS
‘That child was made to sit on the chair by its mother.’

(72) * No-pa-kede-mi-'e na kadera te anabou iso.
3R-CAUS-sit-DIR-3OBJ NOM chair CORE child yon

(71)’ ‘CAUS 〈[Ag], [Pt] APPL 〈[Ag], [Loc] sit 〈[Ag]〉〉’

If we try to combine the same morphemes on an unaccusative base, however, the result is ungrammatical

(73) * No-pa-moturu-mi te anabou iso te ina-su.
3R-CAUS-sleep-DIR CORE child yon CORE mother-1SG.POSS

A composition that saw the applicative combined with the base predicate first would be ruled out by the prohibition against unaccusative verbs participating in applicative constructions, through the requirement that the agent argument of the applicative predicate be coindexed with an agent argument in the base predicate. Thus the argument structure

(73)’ ‘CAUS 〈[Ag], [Pt] APPL 〈[Ag], [ ] PREDUnaccusative 〈[Pt]〉〉’

is ruled out before the second (causative) predicate is added. There is no such restriction on the addition of a causative morpheme to an unaccusative predicate, however, and so the reasons why

(73)" ‘APPL 〈[Ag], [ ] CAUS 〈[Ag], [Pt] PREDUnaccusative 〈[Pt]〉〉’
is ungrammatical are less than clear.

11.6 Combinations with reciprocals

The reciprocal prefix can occur in combination with several other grammatical-function changing processes. Here I shall briefly mention its use in combination with causatives, external possession, passives and object incorporation. The use of reciprocals added to applicative constructions has already been extensively documented in chapter 10, but there has not yet been any mention of applicatives based on reciprocal verbs. These are treated here.

11.6.1 Reciprocals and causatives

Causatives may take a reciprocal verb form as their base, but the opposite is not true. Compare (74) and the ungrammatical (75), both based on transitive verbs:

(74) No-pa-po-tandu-tandu-‘e na wembe.
3R-CAUS-REC-RED-horn-3OBJ NOM goat
‘He incited the goats to butt each other.’

(75) * No-po-pa-manga-manga.
3R-REC-CAUS-RED-eat
‘They made each other eat (it).’

11.6.2 Reciprocals and external possession

The combination of reciprocals and external possession is an interesting one, since once the ascended possessor (the primary object) is joined with the subject in the reciprocal construction, the original object, the ‘part’, may resurface as object. Compare the developments seen in (76) - (77):

a. Noi-pekug-‘e_k na talapihu_k-noi.
3R-backfist-3OBJ NOM temple-3POSS
‘He_i backfisted his_j temple_k.’

3R-REC-RED-backfist NOM 3PL
‘They_i,j backfisted each other.’
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(76b) ‘REC ⟨[ ] backfist ⟨[Ag], [Pt]⟩⟩’

(77) a. Noi-peku-'eį na talapihiį-noįi.
3R-backfist-3OBJ NOM temple-3POSS
‘Heį backfisted hisį templeį.’

3R-REC-RED-backfist-3OBJ NOM temple-3POSS
‘Theyįį backfisted each other in the templeįį.’

(77a) ‘backfist ⟨[Ag], [Pt]⟩’ > ‘backfist ⟨[Ag], [part: Instr]. [possessor:Pt]⟩’

(77b) ‘REC ⟨[ ] backfist ⟨[Ag], [part: Instr]. [possessor:Pt]⟩⟩’

The claim is that when external possession is found, the affected part is seen as the ‘means’ by which the whole is affected, and so treated as an [Instrument]. The object properties ascribed to the ‘part’ are only regained if the ‘whole’ is no longer an object, such as being bound to the original subject, as in a reciprocal construction. An example of an unambiguous [Instrument] displaying this behaviour is seen in (78):

(78) a. To-po-simbi-simbi-'e na hansu.
1PL.R-REC-RED-slash-3OBJ NOM sword
‘We slashed each other with swords.’

b. No-to-po-simbi-simbi-mo na hansu.
3R-PASS-REC-RED-slash-PF NOM sword
‘The swords have been used for mutual slashing.’

(78a) ‘REC ⟨[ ] backfist ⟨[Ag], [Instr]. [Pt]⟩⟩’

(78b) ‘PASS ⟨[Pt] REC ⟨[ ] backfist ⟨[Ag], [Instr]. [Pt]⟩⟩⟩’

Sentences (77) - (78) show that with a primary ([Theme/Patient]) object removed by binding with the subject, monitored by the addition of reciprocal morphology, the instrument may appear as an object, and the same phenomenon operating with external possession. In addition to this, once external possession is in place the original affected
part may be incorporated, as seen in (79) and (80):

(79)  *No-po-sepa-sepa pa’a.*
3R-REC-RED-kick thigh
‘They kicked each other in the thigh.’

(80)  *To-po-konta lima.*
1PL.R-REC-hold hand
‘Let’s shake hands.’

The sentences that take us from a simple transitive clause, through a version with external possession, to a reciprocalised version, to (79), are shown in (81a) - (81c):

(81) a.  *No{\textsubscript}{3R}i-sepa’{\textsubscript}{e}{\textsubscript}{k} na pa’a{\textsubscript}{3OBJ}k-no{\textsubscript}{3POSS}.*
3R-kick-3OBJ NOM thigh-3POSS
‘He kicked his thigh.’

b.  *No{\textsubscript}{3R}i-sepa’{\textsubscript}{e}j na pa’a{\textsubscript}{3OBJ}k-no{\textsubscript}{3POSS}.*
3R-kick-3OBJ NOM thigh-3POSS
‘He kicked his thigh.’

c.  *No{\textsubscript}{3R}i,j-po-sepa-sepa te pa’a-no{\textsubscript}{3POSS}j.*
3R-REC-RED-kick CORE thigh
‘They kicked each other’s thighs.’

(81)’ ‘REC ⟨[ ]⟩ kick ⟨[Ag], [part: Instr], [possessor:Pt]⟩’

11.6.3 Reciprocals and applicatives

Chapter 10 included many examples of a reciprocal prefix being added to an already applicativised predicate. This is exemplified by (82), the argument structure of which is that seen in (82)’:

(82)  *No-po-ala-ako te kau.*
3R-REC-fetch-APPL CORE wood
‘They fetched wood for each other.’

(82)’ ‘REC ⟨[ ]⟩ APPL ⟨[Ag], [Dat] fetch ⟨[Ag], [Thm]⟩⟩’

It is also possible for a reciprocal predicate to then have an applicative predicate added. An example of this is seen in (83a), in which the fact that the applicative is added after the reciprocal can be shown by the ability of the applied object to be indexed on the verb as an object, as in (83b), or the subject of a passive sentence, as in (83c).
11.7 Combinations with passives

Chapters 9 and 10 have presented many examples of passive predicates added to causative or applicative structures. One example of each is given in (85) and (86):

(85) No-to-pa-ala-mo na iai-su te kau.
    3R-PASS-CAUS-fetch-PF NOM younger.sibling-1SG.POSS CORE wood
    ‘My younger sibling was made to fetch some wood.’

(86) No-to-ala-ako-mo na ama-su te kau.
    3R-PASS-fetch-APPL-PF NOM father-1SG.POSS CORE wood
    ‘My father was fetched some wood.’
The argument structure representations of these sentences are given in (85)' and (86)'

\( \text{(85)'} \) 'PASS $\langle [\ ] \text{CAUS} \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Pt}] \rangle \text{fetch} \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Thm}] \rangle \rangle'$

\( \text{(86)'} \) 'PASS $\langle [\ ] \text{APPL} \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Dat}] \rangle \text{fetch} \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Thm}] \rangle \rangle'$

It is impossible, however, to combine an applicative and passive predicate in the reverse order; (87) is ungrammatical. This is easily explainable by the fact that the passive predicate fails to supply an [Agent] that is required by the applicative predicate in its immediately embedded predicate (see chapter 10).

\( \text{(87)'} \) * 'No-to-ala-ako-mo na kau te ama-su.

3R-PASS-fetch-APPL-PF NOM wood CORE father-1SG.POSS

'Some wood was fetched for my father.'

\( \text{(87)'} \) * 'APPL $\langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Dat}] \rangle \text{PASS} \langle [\ ] \text{fetch} \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Thm}] \rangle \rangle'$

If the applicative predicate could access a predicate embedded more than one level away, the structure in (87)" would result:

\( \text{(87)"} \) * 'APPL $\langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Dat}] \rangle \text{PASS} \langle [\ ] \text{fetch} \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Thm}] \rangle \rangle'$

The [A] is, however, unavailable for any processes when a passive predicate is added, not even being able to appear as an oblique argument, as described in 11.2

A construction consisting of a causative of a passive is also ungrammatical:

\( \text{(88)'} \) * 'No-pa-to-gonti-mo na kau.

3R-CAUS-PASS-chop-PF NOM wood

'Some wood was made to be chopped.'

\( \text{(88)'} \) * 'CAUS $\langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Pt}] \rangle \text{PASS} \langle [\ ] \text{chop} \langle [\text{Ag}], [\text{Thm}] \rangle \rangle'$

Since a causative formed with \textit{pa}-, and also \textit{hepe}-, like an applicative, also has a restriction on the semantic roles of its base predicate (they must be [Agent]), this is also easily explainable. The factitive \textit{hoko}- might be able to combine with a passive predicate if the passive is based on a verb with a theme or patient [O], even though it is normally only found with unaccusative verbs. If the factitive predicate can only ‘see’ one layer into the complex predicate, then it would only refer to one ([Theme/Patient]) semantic role, and so
qualify for being grammatical. Unlike the single argument of an unaccusative verb, however, the single argument of a passive verb is not nominative, and thus is not identical to the single argument of an intransitive verb, and so the combination is ungrammatical:

(89) * No-hoko-to-ja'o-ke-mo na kau melangka.
3R-FACT-PASS-bad-3OBJ-PF NOM wood long
'The kau melangka was arranged to be ruined.'

(89)' * ‘FACT ([Ag], [Pt] PASS ([ ] chop ([Ag], [Thm]))’

It is perhaps interesting to note that, cross-linguistically, causatives of passives have only been reported as being grammatical in Chamorro, by Gibson (1980: 115), cited in Baker (1988a: 414 and also 419). A relevant example is shown in (89)":

Chamorro:
(89)" Si nana ha=na'-ma-fa'gasi i kareta ni lalahi.
PN mother 3SG.SUBJ=CAUS-PASS-wash the car OBL males
'Mother had the car be washed by the boys.'

11.8 Reduplication

Reduplication of verbs in Tukang Besi is used to show the extension of an action over time, or the lack of reality about the action, both concepts commonly associated with reduplication. The processes involved in reduplication have already been discussed in chapter 2, and only some additional comments needed to explain some curiosities of the interaction of reduplication with different verb roots will be discussed here.

Reduplication never applies to the subject prefix of a verb. Thus from the unreduplicated (90a), (90b) is a grammatical reduplicated form, and (90c) is not:

(90) a. No-kede.
3R-sit
'They are sitting down.'

b. No-kede-ngkede.
3R-RED-sit
'They are sitting around.'

c. * Noke-no-kede.
RED-3R-sit

Other verbal prefixes are included in the scope of the reduplicated two syllables, including the subject infix -[um]-; we might explain this as being the result of the process of reduplication applying to a verb form after all the prefixes have been added except the subject prefixes, which are added after reduplication has already applied.
(91) a. No-he-tade-‘e.
3R-DO-stand-3OBJ
‘They are building it.’

b. No-heta-he-tade-‘e.
3R-RED-DO-stand-3OBJ
‘They are building it, sort of.’

c. * No-he-tade-ntade-‘e.

3R-PASS.SI-see
‘They’ll be seen.’

3R-RED-PASS.SI-see
‘They’ll be seen a bit.’

c. * Na-[tum]o-‘ita-‘ita.

We can thus characterise the reduplication described here as being of the first two syllables after the subject prefix, regardless of the morphological content of those syllables:

\[
\text{SUBJ-} \sigma_1 \, \sigma_2 \, (\sigma_3 \ldots) \rightarrow \text{SUBJ-} \sigma_1 \, \sigma_1 \, \sigma_2 \, (\sigma_3 \ldots)
\]

When reduplication occurs with adjectives, there are some problems to this otherwise neat analysis. With adjectives that do not exhibit either  ma-, me- or mo- (historically all derived from the same *ma- prefix, which is now, to varying degrees, fossilised onto the verb) at the beginning, or else are of only two syllables (such as meha, ‘red’ (< PAN *ma-iRaq), which begins with me-, but is only two syllables long), there is no irregularity:

(93) a. No-to’oge.
3R-big
‘She’s big.’

b. No-to’o-to’oge.
3R-RED-big
‘She’s rather big.’

When the adjective begins with ma-, the same rules apply as have already been described:

(94) a. No-mandawulu.
3R-beautiful
‘She’s beautiful.’

b. No-manda-mandawulu.
3R-RED-beautiful
‘She’s quite beautiful.’

When the adjective begins with me- (which may drop if the adjective is placed in an
exclamatory clause, or if the factitive prefix (chapter 9.2) is added, then there are two possible reduplicated forms of the verb:

(95)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{No-melangka.} \\
& 3R\text{-tall} \\
& \text{‘She’s tall.’} \\

b. & \text{No-mela-melangka.} \\
& 3R\text{-RED-tall} \\
& \text{‘She’s rather tall.’} \\

c. & \text{No-me-langka-langka.} \\
& 3R\text{-RED-tall} \\
& \text{‘She’s rather tall.’}
\end{align*}

When the adjective begins with *mo-* there is only one possible reduplicated form of the verb:

(96)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{No-mopera.} \\
& 3R\text{-short} \\
& \text{‘She’s short.’} \\

b. & \text{No-mo-pera-pera.} \\
& 3R\text{-RED-short} \\
& \text{‘She’s rather short.’} \\

c. & * \text{No-mope-mopera.}
\end{align*}

We may summarise the behaviour of the morphologically different types of adjectives as follows, with the ( )\(^2\) notation indicating the reduplicated portion of the word:

non-Adjective, un-prefixed adjective, *ma-* prefixed adjective

(94)' \quad \text{SUBJ-} (\sigma_1 \sigma_2)^2 \sigma_3

*me-* prefixed adjective

(95)' \quad \text{SUBJ-} (\sigma_1 \sigma_2)^2 \sigma_3 \quad \text{OR} \quad \text{SUBJ-} \sigma_1 (\sigma_2 \sigma_3)^2

*mo-* prefixed adjective

(96)' \quad \text{SUBJ-} \sigma_1 (\sigma_2 \sigma_3)^2

This would seem to indicate that the *mo-* prefix is the least strongly bound of the *ma-* , *me-* and *mo-* prefixes, and *ma-* the most strongly bound.

11.9 The position of verbal morphology

The relative positioning of the different verbal morphology is described below, expanding on the structural diagram representing the internal structure of the verb within the verb phrase that was presented in 7.1.
Preverbal:  \text{SUBJ-PASS-CAUS\textsc{REQ}-CAUS\textsc{FACT,CAUS}-REC, V}_\text{reducing} \{-V_{\text{neutral}}, V_{\text{announce}}\}\text{-[SI]}―\text{VERB ROOT}―

Postverbal: \text{-O}_{\text{incorporated}} \text{-APPL}_{\text{VCi}} \text{-APPL}_{\text{ngkene}} \text{-APPL}_{\text{ako}} \text{-OBJ} \text{-ASP}

The abbreviations used are as follows:

\text{SUBJ:} Subject prefixes, realis and irrealis (section 5.4)
\text{PASS:} Passive prefixes to-, te- and mo- (section 11.2)
\text{CAUS\textsc{REQ}:} Requestive prefix hepe- (section 9.1.4)
\text{CAUS\textsc{FACT,CAUS}:} Factive and Causative prefixes hoko- and pa- (section 9.1.4)
\text{REC:} Reciprocal prefixes po- and pada- (sections 11.1.3 and 11.3.4)
\text{V}_{\text{neutral}} \text{-} V_{\text{announce}:} Other Valency neutral and Valency announcing prefixes (sections 11.3 and 11.4)
\text{SI:} Subject infix -\{\text{um}\}- (section 7.3)
\text{O}_{\text{incorporated}:} Incorporate nominal (section 7.7)
\text{APPL}_{\text{VCi}:} Directional applicative suffix -V_{\text{Ci}} (section 10.4)
\text{APPL}_{\text{ngkene}, ako:} Comitative and general applicative suffixes -ngkene and -ako (sections 10.2 and 10.3)
\text{OBJ:} Object suffixes (section 5.6)
\text{POSS:} Possessive suffixes (section 5.5)
\text{ASP:} Aspectual suffixes -mo, -ho and -do (section 7.8)

Notice that we cannot characterise the subject infix -\{\text{um}\}- as occupying a unique structural position in this schema with respect to the verb root. It simply is infixed after the first consonant following the subject prefix, regardless of that consonant’s morphological identification. The location of the infix is thus dependant on morphological information (location with respect to the subject prefix) and phonological information (the shape of the morpheme to which it attaches (see chapter 2 for a discussion of this affix). For two verbs (\text{nde}'u ‘not want’, \text{hu}'u ‘give’) there is an irregularity in the application of the subject infix. This is discussed in 2.4.1.

The most affixed verbs that have been recorded in freely occurring speech have about five morphemes total, such as (97). This is also the number of morphemes found in forms involving a passive of an applicativised verb, or a causative plus applicative, or double applicative construction, when the pronominal indexes are also taken into account, (97) is interesting in showing an incorporated object in a complex construction:

\begin{verbatim}
(97) ...ku-[m]epe-'ita-taria-'a-ako-ko,...
     1SG-REQ.SI-see-ESP-NL-APPL-2SG.OBJ
     ‘... I ask to be let go to see a sage for you,...’ (WaI: 4)
\end{verbatim}

\text{SUBJ} \text{- CAUS\textsc{REQ}} \text{\textbf{VERB ROOT} -O}_{\text{incorporated}} \text{-APPL-OBJ}

\text{=SI=}
Notice that (97) includes an incorporated nominal (itself a derived form: *taria* ‘Extra sensory perception’ + -’a ‘nominalising affix’) which is the base object of the causativised *hepe’ita*. In total the verb contains six morphemes other than the root, counting the incorporated nominal as one morpheme.

At this point in time I have no further data on the productivity of combinations consisting of an incorporated object on a causativised verb, though such combinations are extremely rare in texts. The argument structure representing (97) is given in (97)’:

\[
(97)' \quad \text{REQ} \quad \langle \text{[Ag]}_4, \ [\text{Pt}]_3 \ \text{APPL} \langle \text{[Ag]}_1, \ [\text{Dat}]_3 \ \text{PRED} \langle \text{[Ag]}_1, \ [\text{Thm}]_2 \rangle \rangle
\]

Information concerning the productivity and choice of objects for causative structures that select the causee, not the causand, as their direct object will be the subject of further research.
(97)'REQ \langle [Ag]_3, [Pt]_2 \text{ PRED } \langle [Ag]_1, [Thm]_2 \rangle \rangle

OBL INCORP