Chapter 18
Conjoining

18.1 Levels of coordination

This chapter is concerned with means of connecting clauses, sentences, and other syntactic units. Clauses are linked at the outermost level, and this is evidenced by the separate intonation that can be assigned to the different parts of the unit, and by the scope of certain operators, such as negation. For instance, in (1), the negator affects only one of the two clauses:

(1) No-tade toka mbeaka no-lagu.
    3R-stand but not 3R-sing
    ‘He is standing but isn’t singing.’

This is not always so simple; for some conjunctions, notably kene, which can operate to conjoin units of different levels, different interpretations are possible, revealing different levels of operation by the conjunction. In (2), if the conjunction is taken to be linking two clauses, then the only interpretation is that the negator has scope over only the first verb; if, in the second interpretation, the conjunction is interpreted as joining two verbs, then the negator must have scope over both verbs.

(2) Mbeaka no-tade ke o-lagu.
    not 3R-stand and 3R-sing
    ‘He isn’t standing whilst he’s singing.’
    ‘He isn’t standing and singing.’

Compare the constituent structures associated with the two possible (but intonationally distinct) interpretations of (2) (see Borseley (1994) and the references contained there for a discussion of different constituent structure representations of phrases involving conjunctions. The binary-branching version shown here has been adopted mainly to account for the facts of verbal indexing that are found with conjoined NPs, and in reciprocal constructions.):
It is of course possible to negate the second verb alone, in this case, the only possible interpretation (justified by intonation) is that the conjunction links two clauses. This is the case with (3):

(3) *No-tade ke mbeaka no-lagu.*
    3R-stand and not 3R-sing
    ‘He is standing and isn’t singing.’
    ‘He’s standing whilst not singing.’

(3)’
This shows that whilst we can conjoin clauses, or Vs, it is not possible to conjoin a V'. The inability to conjoin two VPs can be demonstrated with (4). If it were possible for two VPs to be conjoined, then the second interpretation of (4) would be more natural, and there would not have to be an intonation break between the two verbs. (4) is somewhat odd regardless of the interpretation put on it, in that, since the expectation is that a different agent paints the house after the building is done, a different conjunction such as *toka ‘but’ or *maka ‘and then’ would be more likely to be used.

(4) # No-he-tade-’e kene no-kamalo-’e te Wa ama.
    3R-DO-stand-3OBJ and 3R-paint-3OBJ CORE Wa father
    ‘They built it and Dad painted it.’
    ? ‘Dad built (it) and painted it.’

KPs may not be conjoined, but NPs may be. This is seen in sentences (5) and (6), in which the presence of articles in the ungrammatical (6) shows that KPs are not coordinated:

(5) Te Wa ama kene Wa ina.
    CORE Wa father and Wa mother
    ‘Mum and Dad.’
Two KPs may appear to be conjoined if they are functioning predicatively; an example of this is seen in (7). This is, however, not coordination of KPs, but is better thought of as the coordination of two clauses, with zero anaphora operating on the subject of the equative clause:

(7) *Te Wa ama kene te Wa ina.
   CORE Wa father CORE Wa mother
   ‘Mum and Dad.’

(5)'

(6)'

This same pattern of apparent conjunction is found with PPs as well; an example is given in (8), also better considered as zero anaphora in two clauses:
The inability to coordinate N's has already been discussed in chapter 5, and need not be repeated here. In short, we find that different conjunctions can serve to join Clauses (Ss), verbs (Vs), or NPs. These different categories of conjunction are discussed below in sections 18.2 - 18.3.

18.2 Clauses joined without a conjunction

Two clauses can be conjoined without an overt conjunction being necessary, nor even a separate intonational contour. As has already discussed in chapter 8 on serialisation, many such constructions can be ambiguously interpreted as either a core-level serial verb construction or a pair of conjoined clauses; in the case of a conjoined pair of clauses, an intonational break is always possible, even if not actually realised, whereas a serial verb construction allows for no such pause. Only a few examples are given here of two clauses without an overt conjunction between them

(9) \textit{Molengo molengo [no-wila] [no-'awa-mo te opa} long long 3R-go 3R-obtain-PF CORE grotto
\textit{nu mata meha] [no-kai-'e-mo] kambeda te mata meha}. GEN eye red 3R-hook-3OBJ-PF fact CORE eye red
ʻAfter a while he went and came across a \textit{Matameha}’s hole, and he hooked it because there was a \textit{Matameha}.’ (Oen:3)
(a \textit{Matameha} is a kind of crab)

(10) \textit{Te La Kolokolopua no-hembula te hu'u-no}, TOP La Tortoise 3R-plant CORE trunk-3POSS
\textit{[te La Kandokendoke no-hembula te umbu-no]. TOP La Monkey 3R-plant CORE extremity-3POSS (SA:9)
ʻTortoise planted the trunk, and Monkey planted the top.’

(11) \textit{[No-rato di umbu-no] [no-manga-mo} 3R-arrive OBL extremity-3POSS 3R-eat-PF
\textit{na La bela Kandokendoke]. NOM La dear Monkey (SA:37)
ʻWhen he arrived at the top, Monkey just ate.’

(12) \textit{O-raho-'e te watu, o-to-puge ke lima}. 3R-affect-3OBJ CORE stone 3R-PASS-break and arm (Obuti: 3)
ʻHe banged himself on a stone, and it was so bad that (his) arm broke.’

18.3 Clauses joined with a conjunction

There is a range of different choices of linkers that may be used to join two clauses into connected discourse; some of these are clearly subordinating in function, even though
formally there is no indication of subordination in the morphology used in the clause, and these have been dealt with in chapter 17. The remainder are grouped here according to the function that they carry out.

18.3.1 Alternative  tawa

The conjunction tawa is used to present two options in a predicate (thus linking units smaller than the clause), and may also be used to join two clauses or topics together, usually with extensive zero anaphora. (12) shows two options presented as the object of the verb 'Uhadabalu. (13) shows an alternative to the use of oki‘iki‘i as a predicate, presenting te iaiiai nu bangka as a non-verbal equivalent of oki‘iki‘i, and then a further alternative, te ikaka u kolikoli:

(13) 'U-hada-balu te ana, tawa te ana?
 2SG R-want-buy CORE this or CORE this
  ‘Do you want to buy this one, or this one?’

(14) Ara o-ki’iki’i atawa te iai-ai i nu bangka,
    if 3R-small or CORE RED-younger.sibling GEN ship
    te ikaka u kolikoli iso, e ngaa-n(o)
    or CORE elder.sibling GEN canoe yon CORE name-3POSS
    e sope sope. Sopesope.
    ‘If it’s small, or like the “younger brother” of a ship, or the elder brother
    of a canoe, its name is sope-sope. Sope-sope.’

18.3.2 Simultaneous  kene

The general conjunction / serial verb kene may be used to conjoin two clauses, indicating that they take place at the same time:

(15) [Dari no-wila-mo na La Kape’ingka’i ana]
    so 3R-go-PF NOM La Fool this
    kene [no-bawa-‘e kene Bekabeka-no ana].
    and 3R-bring-3OBJ COM Cat-3POSS this (Oen:17)
    ‘So Fool went, and he took this Cat of his as well.’

(16) [Te mia no-rato], kene [no-ganta-‘e na uwe].
    CORE person 3R-arrive and 3R-scoop-3OBJ NOM water
    ‘…, people keep coming and fetching water,….’ (WW: 29)

18.3.3 Sequential  maka

The discourse connective maka is sometimes used to join two clauses, indicating that they take place in a sequential order, and that they contribute to the growing narrative that the speaker is planning:
(17) [Jari, sa-rato-no i umbu na Ndokendoke]  
   so when-arrive-3POSS OBL edge NOM Monkey  
   [o-sampi-'e-mo a loka iso] maka [o-manga].  
   3R-peel-3OBJ-PF NOM banana yon and.then 3R-eat  
   ‘So when Monkey arrived at the top he peeled the bananas, and then he ate them.’  

(18) [To-rato i Ambo to-he-lawe 'uka a, sekitar  
   1PL.R-arrive OBL Ambon 1PL.R-rest also m about  
   hato-jamu] [maka la'a-mo to-langke kua Baubau].  
   4-hours and.then just-PF 1PL.R-sail ALL Baubau (Jay: 25)  
   ‘We arrived in Ambon and rested for, hmm, about four hours, and then sailed on to Baubau.’  

(19) [Te mia no-rato], kene [no-ganta-'e na uwe].  
   CORE person 3R-arrive and 3R-scoop-3OBJ NOM water  
   ‘…, people keep coming and fetching water,….’  
   (WW: 29)  

The loan torusu ‘continue’ (< Malay terus) can be used in the same way as maka.  

(20) O-tamba-'e te golu, jari o-mboti, torusu o-buti.  
   3R-score-3OBJ CORE goal so 3R-stumble continue 3R-fall  
   ‘He scored with a goal, and then stumbled, and so fell.’  
   (Obuti: 2)  

18.3.4 Free conjunctions po'oli, pasi, ahiri  

I use the term ‘free’ conjunction to describe these words because they do not require the appearance (or even implication) of a previous clause. Po'oli ‘finish’ may be used to show that one clause is in a temporal sequence with another, preceding it. The preceding clause is usually not repeated.  

(21) [Po'oli te atu] no-wila-mo 'uka no-po-'awa-mo  
   finish CORE that 3R-go-PF again 3R-REC-obtain-PF  
   te opa nu wela’a…  
   CORE grotto GEN k.o.crab (Oen:4)  
   ‘After that he went again and met a wela’a’s hole…’  

(22) [Po'oli] no-nabu-ako-'e-mo te kuli-no  
   finish 3R-drop-APPL-3OBJ-PF CORE skin-3POSS  
   na La Kolokolopua.  
   NOM La Tortoise  
   ‘And then he dropped the skins (of the bananas) for Tortoise.’  
   (SA:41)  

(23) Jari sa-, [po'oli-mo iso], o-, o-waliako-mo.  
   so when- finish-PF yon, 3R- 3R-return-PF  
   (LaM:16)  
   ‘So when,…after that, he…, he came home.’  

The same function is filled by ahiri, a loan from Malay akhir:  

(24) [Ahiri-no] no-siasia-'e na ina-no.  
   end-3POSS 3R-hit-3OBJ NOM mother-3POSS  
   (SI:7)  
   ‘In the end his mother was beaten.’
The conjunction *pasi* functions in a similar way:

(25) \[ \text{Pas(i) iso} \ (o)-waliako-mo. \]
\[ \text{after} \ yon \ 3R\text{-return-PF} \quad \text{(WW: 30)} \]
‘After that, they go home.’

18.3.5 Contrasting *toka*, *tabeda*

*toka* is an unproblematic conjunction indicating a contrast, or something contrary to what has preceded the clause with *toka*. It is closely translatable by ‘but’:

(26) \[ \text{Te ia ana mbeaka [te tando], toka [te humbu].} \]
\[ \text{CORE 3SG this not CORE tando but CORE humbu} \]
‘Talking about this, it is not a *tando*, but rather a *humbu*.’
*(Tando and Humbu are names for two different types of woven baskets)*

(27) \[ \text{Mbea'e na doe-su ako ku-[um]alu te kuikui} \]
\[ \text{not.exist NOM money-1SG.POSS PURP 1SG.buy.SI CORE cakes} \]
\[ \text{meana'e ai, [toka sabantar(a) atu ko-mai].} \]
\[ \text{now ANA but in.a.while that 1PA.R-came} \]
‘I don’t have the money to buy the cakes right now, but in a moment I’ll be back.’

(28) \[ \text{Maka la'a-mo te, e olo-m(o),} \]
\[ \text{and.then just-PF CORE CORE part.of.deep.sea-PF} \]
\[ \text{[toka mbeaka o-mendaro].} \]
\[ \text{but not 3R-deep (May: 117)} \]
‘And then it’s the *olo*. But it’s not deep.’

*tabeda* is a more complex conjunction than *toka*, and in addition to contrast shows that the following clause is an exception to what has preceded it, or that the following state of affairs is more desirable or necessary in some way:

(29) \[ \text{“Tabea ane ke iko'o, maka na-[um]ari a-[um]o-tu'o} \]
\[ \text{but exist COM 2SG then 3I-become.SI 3I-PASS.SI-fell} \]
\[ \text{na kau itu.”} \]
\[ \text{NOM tree that} \quad \text{(Sab:25)} \]
‘But if you were there then that tree could be chopped down.’

(30) \[ \text{Tabea ke mi(a) b[um]alu ala'a.} \]
\[ \text{but and person sell.SI just} \quad \text{(TB:13)} \]
‘There are only people selling.’

(31) \[ \text{Tabeda to-sawi i honda.} \]
\[ \text{but 1PL.I-travel.by OBL motorbike} \]
‘We should better go by motorbike.’
(32) Sa’asa te Desa Wali, termasuk te Wakamendo,
firstly CORE Desa Wali including CORE Wakamendo
ke Oitiu, kene Mole, te pogau-no te Ciacia,
and Oitiu and Mole CORE language-3POSS CORE Ci-Cia
po-kana ke pogau Sampolawa.
REC-same and language Sampolawa
Tabea te, te Rukuwa, Taipabu, Bante, ‘One’one,
but TOP TOP Rukuwa Taipabu Bante ‘One’one
Hopalia te pogau-no te Ka’umbeda.
Popalia CORE language-3POSS CORE Ka’umbeda (TB:25-26)
‘Firstly in Desa Wali, Wakamendo, Oitiu, and Mole, the language is Ci-
Cia, the same as the Sampolawa language. But as for Rukuwa, Taipabu,
Bante, ‘One’ one, Popalia, the language is Ka’umbeda.’

(33) Ka’ano no-ama te kodipo iso,
in.order 3R-safe TOP shark yon
tabea ta-[m]oko-mate-’e.
but 1PL.I-FACT.SI-dead-3OBJ
‘For safety’s sake, that shark, we should kill it.’

18.3.6 Surprising io, padahal

The conjunctions io and padahal (a loan from Indonesian) are used in discourse to show
the surprising and exceptional nature of what follows.

(34) Io te karna te anu, o-koruo na amai Rupu,
in.fact CORE because CORE whatsit 3R-many NOM 3PL Rupu
s[um]ikola, wila [m]o-daga, wila [m]a-langke
go.to.school.SI go REC.SI-trade go OCC.SI-sail
i Ambo, i Singapore Malahau.
OBL Ambon OBL Singapore Malahau (WW: 74)
‘In fact it’s because it’s, what’s that, many of those Rupu go to school,
go trading, go sailing in Ambon, to Singapore, to Malahau.’

(35) Io te i-manga i-helo’a-no iso
whereas CORE OP-eat OP-cook-3POSS yon
mbea-’e a hebuntu, te watu na ni-helo’a-n(o),
not.exist NOM state CORE stone NOM OP-cook-3POSS
‘But in fact the food that she was cooking didn’t really exist, It was a
stone that she was cooking.’

18.3.7 Concluding jari

The verb jari ‘become’ is also used to indicate the continuation of discourse. It is very
frequently used when concluding a piece of narrative, but is also commonly used simply to
indicate that the narrative is proceeding, with no sense of finality. Numerous examples can
be found in the texts included in the appendices.
430 Chapter 18

(36)  *I Wanse o-kura na guru, jari no-koruo*

OBL Wanci 3R-lack NOM teacher so 3R-many
na mia w[um]ila '[um]e-SMA di Baubau.
NOM person go.SI do.SI-high.school OBL Baubau

‘There aren’t many teachers on Wanci, so a lot of people go to Baubau to
do their high school.’

(37)  *Jari o-rato i sikola-'a, o-wila-mo hali-hali di anu,*
so 3R-arrive OBL school-NL 3R-go-PF RED-stroll OBL whatsit
di ai anu, apa i Nua Ponda.
OBL ANA whatsit ENDPOINT OBL Nua Ponda

‘So they arrived at the school, and went strolling down to, that place, up
to Nua Ponda.’

18.3.8 Clarificatory

Information clarifying a point, or emphasising the reason for something occurring can be
added at the beginning of a sentence. In addition to the native Tukang Besi terms that are
used in this environment, which are non-verbal, there are also some unassimilated loans,
such as the frequently heard *berarti*. Only some of the more common of these linkers are
listed.

*berarti*  ‘I mean to say…’, ‘That is…’ (< Malay berarti)
*te ma’an’o*  ‘That is…’ (< Malay maknya)
*te sida*  ‘In fact,…’
*kambeda, kambea,*
*kamba*  ‘The fact is…’, ‘Because…’

(38)  *Ko-ma’eka mbea i pante 'oliha*

1PA.R-fear not OBL beach centipede
*Kamba te nduli.*
fact CORE cockroach (NP: 20-21)

‘We were afraid that we mightn’t be on a centipede beach. But it was
really cockroaches.’

(39)  *Eak(a) tabeda a-mohali. Berarti, mbeak(a) o-koruo.*

not need 3I-expensive I.mean not 3R-much

‘It doesn’t have to be expensive. I mean, there isn’t much.’

The word *kambeda* is the source of the one native term for the language group as it extends
over the four main Tukang Besi islands; the word varies in the four main dialects as follows:

Wanci  *kambeda*
Kaledupa  *'umbeda*
Tomea  *'ummea*
Binongko  *ka’umbe*

from which folk etymologies construct *ka’umbera* as a proto-form, and use this as the
name for the ethnic group as a whole. The use of this term is not very widespread.
18.4 Conjoining VPs

It is often difficult to show that a conjunct is a V, and not a clause. The presence of oblique nominals between the verbs is clear evidence that two nodes are joined at the clausal level, but the absence of such adjuncts is not proof for either stance. If a non-prominent object is shared, or an adverb appears after the second verb, this is good proof that the two verbs are joined within the VP. For instance, (45) is most likely to be joined at the clause level:

(40)  No-wila kene no-waliako
       3R-go and 3R-return
       ‘She went and came back.’

Compare with (40)', which has prepositional adjuncts inserted between the two verbs, clearly indicating that there are two clauses involved:

(40)' No-wila i daoa kene no-waliako
       3R-go OBL market and 3R-return
       ‘She went to the market and came back.’

Sentence (41) shows a conjunction within the VP:

(41)  [[[No-lemba kene no-waliako]_CONJ]_V moboha]_VP]_S.
       3R-carry.on.shoulder and 3R-return heavy
       ‘She carried (it) with difficulty and came back.’

(41)'

18.5 Conjoining NPs

Two NPs may be conjoined using ke(ne) to link them. They both appear in a higher KP or PP. An example of each is seen in (42) and (43):

(42)  [Te [[’obu]NP [kene [beka]NP ]_CONJ]_NP ]_KP.
       CORE dog and cat
       ‘cats and dogs.’

(43)  [Kua [[Waelumu]NP [kene [Patuno]NP ]_CONJ]_NP ]_PP.
       ALL Waelumu and Patuno
       ‘to Waelumu and Patuno.’

If part of a KP, the two conjuncts are both seen as participating in the verb, and may be
indexed on the verb either jointly or partly. An example of this is:

(44) *No-wila-mo* [na [[La Kasi]NP ke [kene-no]NP]NP]KP.

3R-go-PF NOM La Kasi and friend-3POSS

‘And then La Kasi and his daughter arrived.’

The structure representing (44) is given in (44)’:

(44)'

```
S
    VP
        V
            SUBJ-Verb-ASP
                No-wila-mo
            ART
                NP'
            NP' CONJ'
                SUBJ-Verb-ASP
                    na La Kasi ke kene
                ART
                    N CONJ NP'
                        N
                NP
                    N -POSS
```

This is relatively unproblematic when used with intransitive verbs. One interesting feature is that the verbal index need not agree with the sum of all the arguments in the KP. This is not apparent when two third person arguments are conjoined, as in (44), since there is no distinction made between singular and plural in the third person indexing on verbs. If one or more of the arguments is not third person, the situation becomes more complicated. From a sentence like

(45) *To-i-wila* [na [ikita]NP]KP.

1PL.R-go NOM 1PL

‘We left.’

we can also say


1PL.R-go NOM 1SG and family-1SG.POSS

‘My family and I left.’

in which the form of the subject prefix does not agree in person and number with either of the two arguments in the KP, but does agree with the total of their features; this can be expressed as shown in figure 9:
Figure 9. Feature combination of two arguments

However, there are still other options, in which the mismatch between the pronominal indexing and the nominals is greater:

(47)  $\text{Ku}_i$-wila $[na$ $[[\text{iaku}]_{NP_i}$ $[ke$ $[\text{tuha}-\text{su}]_{NP_i}]_{CONJ'}_{NP_i,j}]_{KP_{i,j}}$. $1SG$-go NOM 1SG and family-1SG.POSS  
‘My family and I left.’

In (47), only one of the nominals has its person and number features indexed on the verb, despite both of them appearing in the same KP. If we try to index the person and number categories of the second nominal, the result is ungrammatical:

(48)  * $\text{No}_j$-wila $[na$ $[[\text{iaku}]_{NP_i}$ $[ke$ $[\text{tuha}-\text{su}]_{NP_i}]_{CONJ'}_{NP_i,j}]_{KP_{i,j}}$. $3R$-go NOM 1SG and family-1SG.POSS  
‘My family and I left.’

Even rearranging the order of the two nominals leaves a third person subject prefix on the verb inadequate:

(49)  * $\text{No}_j$-wila $[na$ $[[\text{tuha}-\text{su}]_{NP_i}$ $[ke$ $[\text{iaku}]_{NP_j}]_{CONJ'}_{NP_i,j}]_{KP_{i,j}}$. $3R$-go NOM family-1SG.POSS and 1SG  
‘My family and I left.’

Even with a first person subject prefix, this ordering of nominals is ungrammatical, because of animacy constraints (see below):

(49)'  * $\text{Ku}$-wila $[na$ $\text{tuha}-\text{su}$ $ke$ $\text{iaku}$. $1SG$-go NOM family-1SG.POSS and 1SG

(49)''  * $\text{To}$-wila $[na$ $\text{tuha}-\text{su}$ $ke$ $\text{iaku}$. $1PL.R$-go NOM family-1SG.POSS and 1SG

In fact, the version with the first person prefix (either singular or plural) may even appear without a first person referent expressed nominally (further explained in 18.6):

(50)  $\text{To}_{i,j}$-wila $[[ke$ $[\text{tuha}-\text{su}]_{NP_j}]_{CONJ'}$. $1PL.R$-go and family-1SG.POSS  
‘My family and I left.’

(51)  $\text{Ku}_i$-wila $[[ke$ $[\text{tuha}-\text{su}]_{NP_j}]_{CONJ'}$. $1SG$-go and family-1SG.POSS  
‘My family and I left.’

There appear to be two constraints operating here. In the first place, the pronominal indexing on the verb may refer to either the NP immediately under the NP’ node, or to the
NP' as a whole, but may not index the person and number categories of the NP dominated by CONJ' exclusively. The second restraint is on the relative ordering of the two arguments; the explanation for the constraints on which argument may appear in which position is that there is an animacy hierarchy operating, such that, given two NPs coordinated in one KP, only the highest ranked of these arguments may appear as the sister of CONJ'. The hierarchy that I propose to account for this data is the familiar one proposed by Silverstein (1976), amongst others:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most animate</th>
<th>Least animate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td>Pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td>3rd Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>Proper nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>non-human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>Common nouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10. Animacy hierarchy (after Silverstein)*

Given that the verbal indexing does not distinguish different types of third person referents, we can collapse this hierarchy to just the left-most three members for our purposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td>2nd Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td>3rd Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 11. Modified animacy hierarchy*

Given a structure like (52):

(52)

\[ \text{KP} \]

\[ \text{ART} \rightarrow \text{NP'} \]

\[ \text{NP}_1 \]

\[ \text{CONJ'} \]

\[ \text{CONJ'} \rightarrow \text{NP}_j \]

we can state that the verbal indexing will agree with either the sum of the person and number features of the whole KP, or just those of the first conjunct. This may be formalised as follows:

\[ \text{PERS, NUM}_{\text{SUBJ, Verbal}} = \text{PERS} [\text{NP}_1], \text{NUM} [\text{NP}_1 + \text{NP}_j] \quad \text{OR} \]

\[ = \text{PERS} [\text{NP}_1], \text{NUM} [\text{NP}_i] \]

An argument may appear in the first conjunct position (NP₁) if it outranks the second in terms of the animacy hierarchy \((\text{NP}_1 > \text{NP}_j)_{\text{Animacy}}\).

If the conjunction occurs in a KP serving as object in a transitive clause, the rules are slightly different. In (58), for instance, the object suffix may index the person and number features of both the conjoined NPs:
Conjoining

(53)  No\textsubscript{-ita-komiu\textsubscript{i,j}} [na [i\textsubscript{ko'}o]\textsubscript{NP} [ke [kene-'u]\textsubscript{NP} ]\textsubscript{i,j} ]\textsubscript{KP}.

\begin{quote}
3R-see-2PL.OBJ NOM 2SG and friend-2SG.POSS
\end{quote}

‘They saw you and your friend.’

The constituent structure representing (53) is given in (53)’:

(44)’
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Just as for an intransitive clause, we find that the verbal index may reflect only the person and number categories of one of the conjoined arguments, the one that is highest on the animacy hierarchy:

(54)  No-’ita-k\textsubscript{o} [na [i\textsubscript{ko’o}]\textsubscript{NP} [ke [kene-’u]\textsubscript{NP} ]\textsubscript{i,j} ]\textsubscript{KP}.

\begin{quote}
3R-see-2SG.OBJ NOM 2SG and friend-2SG.POSS
\end{quote}

‘They saw you and your friend.’

(55)  * No-’ita-’e\textsubscript{j} [na [i\textsubscript{ko’o}]\textsubscript{NP} [ke [kene-’u]\textsubscript{NP} ]\textsubscript{i,j} ]\textsubscript{KP}.

\begin{quote}
3R-see-3OBJ NOM 2SG and friend-2SG.POSS
\end{quote}

‘They saw you and your friend.’

There is, however, a further restriction on the ability of an argument to impose its person and number features over those of the KP as a whole. Compare (56) and (53) earlier with the ungrammatical (57):

(56)  Ku-’ita-komiu\textsubscript{i,j} [na [i\textsubscript{ko’o}]\textsubscript{NP} [ke [kene-’u]\textsubscript{NP} ]\textsubscript{i,j} ]\textsubscript{KP}.

\begin{quote}
1SG-see-2PL.OBJ NOM 2SG and friend-2SG.POSS
\end{quote}

‘I saw you and your friend.’

(57)  * Ku-’ita-k\textsubscript{o} [na [i\textsubscript{ko’o}]\textsubscript{NP} [ke [kene-’u]\textsubscript{NP} ]\textsubscript{i,j} ]\textsubscript{KP}.

\begin{quote}
1SG-see-2SG.OBJ NOM 2SG and friend-2SG.POSS
\end{quote}

‘I saw you and your friend.’

The ungrammaticality in (57) is due to the fact that the subject of the sentence outranks the highest of the objects on the animacy hierarchy. We must formulate the condition for person and number categories of objects on the verb as follows.
Given a structure like (58):

\[
(58) \quad S \\
\downarrow \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{KP} \\
\downarrow \quad \text{V'} \\
\quad \text{ART} \\
\downarrow \quad \text{V} \\
\quad \text{NP'} \\
\quad \text{NP}_i \\
\downarrow \quad \text{CONJ'} \\
\text{SUBJ}_k \quad \text{Verb-OBJ} \\
\text{CONJ} \quad \text{NP}_j
\]

we can state that the verbal indexing will agree with

\[
PERS, \ NUM_{OBJ, \ verbal} = \begin{cases} 
\text{PERS \ [NP_i]}, \ \text{NUM \ [NP_i + NP_j]} & \text{OR} \\
\text{PERS \ [NP_i]}, \ \text{NUM \ [NP_i]} & \text{iff} \ [NP_i > NP_j]_{\text{Animacy}} \ \text{and} \ [NP_i > NP_k]_{\text{Animacy}} 
\end{cases}
\]

That is, the object pronominal indexing may agree with either the features of the KP as a whole, or with those of the first conjunct NP, if it outranks the subject of the clause in terms of the animacy hierarchy ([NP_i > NP_k]_{Animacy}). An argument may appear in the first conjunct position (NP_i) if it outranks the second in terms of the animacy hierarchy ([NP_i > NP_j]_{Animacy}).

Notice that the structures proposed in this section are very different from that exhibited by sentences like (59):

\[
(59) \quad \text{Ku-wila \ ke \ iaku.} \\
\quad 1SG \text{-go and} \ 1SG \text{'I went too.'}
\]

In (59) ke replaces the article in a KP, a device used to emphasise the inclusion of the speaker (described in chapter 12); when kene appears in this use, it replaces any core articles that would normally be there. Sentence (59) does not, then, represent a coordinate structure in which the person and number indexed on the verb represent only one of the NPs. This would be ruled out by the account that has been proposed because the first person iaku necessarily outranks any other NPs on the animacy hierarchy, and so cannot have another argument outranking it in terms of animacy, and appearing as the first conjunct. The structure behind (59) is shown in (59)’:

\[
(59)' \quad S \\
\downarrow \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{KP} \\
\downarrow \quad \text{V'} \\
\quad \text{ART (NOM)} \\
\downarrow \quad \text{V} \\
\quad \text{ke} \quad \text{n}\text{e} \\
\quad \text{N'} \\
\quad \text{NP} \\
\downarrow \quad \text{CONJ} \\
\quad \text{NP}_j \\
\quad \text{SUBJ}_k \quad \text{Verb-OBJ}
\]
As explained in chapter 12, only a nominative article may be replaced in this way; the article *te on a fronted (preverbal or topicalised) KP may not be replaced in this way, nor may the non-nominative article on a post-verbal core argument:

(60)  * Ke iaku ku-wila.
      and 1SG 1SG-go
      ‘I went too.’

(61)  No-’ita-aku ke La Hadi.
      3R-see-1SG.OBJ and La Hadi
      * ‘Even La Hadi saw me.’
      (Good for: ‘They saw me and La Hadi.’)

18.5.1 [A], [O] and instrument

This same person hierarchy is also reflected morphosyntactically when instrumental NPs are presented in a sentence that does not use *ako. Compare (62) and (63) with (64) and (65):

(62)  No-pisa te gora’u te sidu.
      3R-break CORE egg CORE spoon
      ‘S/he broke an egg with a spoon.’

(63)  No-pisa te gora’u kene sidu.
      3R-break CORE egg INSTR spoon
      ‘S/he broke an egg with a spoon.’

(63)'

(64)  Ku-pisa te gora’u te sidu.
      1SG-break CORE egg CORE spoon
      ‘I broke an egg with a spoon.’

(65)  Ku-pisa te gora’u kene sidu.
      1SG-break CORE egg and spoon
      ‘I broke an egg and a spoon.’
In (62) and (63) we can see that the instrumental NP may use either a core (non-nominative) or comitative marking strategy with equal effect; the role of *sidu* is only interpretable as that of instrument in both cases, and the patient can only be *gorau*. Note that the relative positions of *te gorau* and *te sidu* are important; were they reversed, a technically grammatical but pragmatically nonsensical sentence would result. With a first or second person (the first person subject prefix in the above examples may be replaced by second person subject prefixes with no loss in grammaticality) subject the non-nominative core article will allow an identical interpretation to that found with the third person examples, but using *kene* results in only one possible interpretation, that *sidu* is coordinated with the object NP; *kene* is interpreted not as modifying the clause as a whole with an instrumental role, but as conjoining two NPs together. In short, the level to which *kene sidu* is interpreted as belonging to depends on the person of the subject; it is interpreted as modifying the whole clause if the subject is third person, and as modifying the object NP if the subject is first or second person. We may formalise this observation as follows:

\[
\text{NPOBJ } \text{kene } \text{NP} = [\text{NPOBJ} [\text{CONJ} [\text{NPOBJ}]]_{\text{CONJ}'}]_{\text{NP}} \iff \text{SUBJ [PERS 3]}
\]

\[
\text{NPOBJ } \text{kene } \text{NP} = [\text{NPOBJ} [\text{PREP} [\text{NP}]]_{\text{PP}}} \iff \text{SUBJ [PERS 1/2]}
\]

18.6 ‘Floating’ conjuncts

When two arguments are presented as participating in a verbal clause together, they may be joined with *ke*. Numerous examples of this have been seen in this chapter and elsewhere; further examples are given in (66) and (67):

(66) *Maka no1-rato [na [La Kasi]_{\text{NP}} [ke [ana-no]_{\text{NP}}]_{\text{CONJ}'}_{\text{NPi}1} ]_{\text{KP}}*:  
and.then 3R-arrive NOM La Kasi and child-3POSS

‘And then La Kasi and his daughter arrived.’

(67) *Jari to-po-awa-ngkene-e1*  
so 1PL.R-REC-get-COM-3OBJ

[na [La Ijaunga]_{\text{NP}} [ke [kene-no]_{\text{NP}}]_{\text{CONJ}'}_{\text{NPi}1} ]_{i_{\text{KP}}} Wa ‘Ega. 
NOM La Ijaunga and friend-3POSS OBL Wa Ega

‘So we met La Ijaunga and his friend in Wa ‘Ega.’

If one of the arguments is already established in the discourse, then it does not have to be
expressed nominally, the pronominal affix on the verb carrying this load. Thus, an alternative to (66) is (68), in which we interpret the subject prefix as referring to both the NP present, and another argument:

(68) Maka no,i,-rato [[ke [ana-no]NP]CONJ-
and.then 3R-arrive and child-3POSS
‘And then (he) and his daughter arrived.’

Notice that in (68) there is no article used with the NP; this is the cue that lets the hearer know that the child is not the only one to arrive. An alternative interpretation is ‘And then even their child arrived.’, with kene interpreted replacing the article on the KP na anano. Given a sentence such as (68), we must assume that the pronominal index carries all and sufficient information about the arguments in the clause, as argued in chapter 5, even when not expressed nominally.

A potential problem in interpretation emerges when both the subject and the object arguments of a transitive verb are present only by means of the pronominal affixes on the verb, and one conjunct is left behind without an article. In a sentence like (69), there are intuitively two different possible interpretations to the sentence, one in which the floating conjunction is associated with the [A] argument, and one in which it is associated with the [O] argument:

(69) Maka no-po-‘awa-ngkene-‘e [[ke [ana-no]NP]CONJ-
and.then 3R-REC-get-COM-3OBJ and child-3POSS
A: *‘And then he and his child met them.’
B: ‘And then he met them and his child.’

In fact, (69) is not ambiguous. In transitive sentences in which a floating conjunction can be interpreted as being launched by either the [A] or the [O] of the sentence, it is always interpreted as being associated with the [O], and never with the [A]; the (A) reading of (69) is therefore ungrammatical. This restriction is so strong that in some cases, for some people, a sentence with a nominal [A] that has a clause-final conjunct immediately following it is interpreted with the conjunct referring to the [O] argument, and not the contiguous [A] argument. For example, example (70), in which there is a conjunction immediately following na iaku, was judged as having only one possible interpretation, in which the conjunction referred to te ia. The constituent structures representing both the grammatical and ungrammatical interpretations of (70) are given in (70)’ and (70)’

(70) Ku-pepe te ia na iaku kene mia hele.
1SG-hit CORE 3SG NOM 1SG and person other
‘I hit him and another person.’
*‘I and another person hit him.’

(70)’
The same interpretations are found when there is a third person subject, showing that this aspect of the grammar of conjunctions is not dependent on the hierarchy ordering first and second person above third person that has been observed elsewhere:

(71) V pepe te iaku na ia kene mia hele.

'SHe hit me and another person.'

'SHe and another person hit me.'

Sentence (71) also shows that the status of the KPs as nominative or non-nominative is also irrelevant to the interpretation of a floated conjunct; that is, the structure representing (71) is as seen in (71)'

(71)' V pepe te iaku na ia kene mia hele.

showing that the fact that the CONJ' and the KP representing the object were in different parts of the clause structure is irrelevant for the purposes of determining the antecedency of the conjunction. The only way that a conjunction phrase can be interpreted as linking two arguments is if the KP containing it is in a preverbal position, either the normal preverbal position or topicalised. This is illustrated in (72) with an example involving topicalisation:

(72) Te ikaka-su kene kalaminsala-su iso ai,

'My brother and sister, they went looking for daddy.'

'My brother went looking for my sister and (my) father.'
18.6.1 Prepositions or floated conjuncts?

The use of *kene* is a sentence such as (51) (repeated here) is also very prepositional in appearance; it may be interpreted as having the structure shown in (51)'

(51) *Ku₁-wila [[ke [tuha-su]NP]ₚ. 1SG-go and family-1SG.POSS
‘My family and I left.’

(51)' S
       VP       PP
             P     NP

The reason that such an analysis is not adopted here is based on two factors. The first is that *kene* does not behave as a typical preposition in some ways, most notably its ability to have the NP that it governs replaced by object suffixes (as discussed in chapter 12.12). Secondly, if we assumed a structure such as (51)' to represent (51), we would, to be consistent, have to assume that the structure behind sentences such as (47) is that given in (47)'

(47)' S
       VP       KP       PP
             ART    NP    P    NP

despite the clearly conjoining function that *kene* plays in (47) and sentences like it.

Furthermore, we would have trouble explaining why a prepositional phrase, a supposedly independent syntactic unit serving as an adjunct in the clause, can only refer to an antecedent in [O] syntactic role. That is, if the structure behind (69) was that shown in
(69)':

(69)  Maka  no-po-'awa-ngkene-'e  [[ke  [ana-no]NP]CONF.
and.then  3R-REC-get-COM-3OBJ  and  child-3POSS
'And then he met them and his child.'

we would have to explain why *ke anano* can only refer to an addition to the [O] argument, and not the [A] argument. If the prepositional analysis was taken, the structure behind (67), repeated here, would be that shown in (67)':

(67)  Jari  toj-po-'awa-ngkene-'e
so  1PL.R-REC-get-COM-3OBJ
NOM  La Ijaunga  and  friend-3POSS  OBL  Wa Ega
'So we met La Ijaunga and his friend in Wa 'Ega.'

and again we would have to explain why a prepositional adjunct is restricted to referring to one of the arguments in the clause, and not the other (in practical terms, why the reading 'So we and his friend met La Ijaunga in Wa 'Ega.' is ungrammatical for (67)). With other oblique arguments, such as *i*, an adjunct phrase can refer to either (or both) of the arguments in a transitive clause:

(73)  No-’ita-’e  [[na  [ama-no]NP]KP  [[i  [koranga]NP]KP.
3R-see-3OBJ  NOM  father-3POSS  OBL  garden
'She saw her uncle in the garden.'
A:  'She saw her uncle whilst he was in the garden.'
B:  'She saw her uncle whilst she was in the garden.'
C:  'She saw her uncle who was in the garden.'

The structures associated with the different interpretations of (73) are shown in (73)' A, (73)' B and (73)' C, the arrows in the first two indicating which argument the prepositional phrase is associated with:
The alternative interpretations of (73) show that prepositional phrases are not restricted to appearing with a particular argument; nominative or not, [A] or [O] are equally likely antecedents of a prepositional phrase.

If, on the other hand, we assume that the restriction is on the ability to float away from the CONJ’s normal position in the KP (floating out of normal position is also found with adverbs, described in chapter 7, and certain qualifiers, described in chapter 20, and so is not a process that would need to be invoked especially to account for these data), then the control ceases to be a problem, and we have a simple grammatical restriction (only the [S] or [O] argument in a clause) as to the ability to launch a floated conjunct. The structure behind (69) is thus taken to be analogous to that shown in (70)’ and (71)’, and is shown in (69)’:

18.7 Reciprocal constructions

In a reciprocal construction, using the prefix po- (see chapter 11), there are necessarily two NPs at the level of argument structure. Often only one of these is found in the surface structure. Compare (74), showing a subject prefix on the verb that agrees with the person and number features of the NP’, and (75), in which only one of the NPs is indexed on the verb, the one that is not present:

(74)  

(75)  

‘On the road to Waha, Wa Inggi and I met this morning.’
This appears to be the same phenomenon that was seen in the previous section on floating conjunctions, namely that there is KP-obviation at work removing one of the NPs and the article. The syntax in a reciprocal construction is slightly different, however, in that (76) is not grammatical (compare with (47) in section 18.4):

(76) * I sala kua Waha, i rearea ai ku1-po-'awa
OBL road ALL Waha OBL morning ANA 1SG-REC-get
[[kene[Wa Inggi]NPj]CONJ'
and Wa Inggi
‘On the road to Waha, Wa Inggi and I met this morning.’

The following restriction is found in reciprocal constructions: if one NP (the first, and highest in animacy) in the coordinated KP imposes its person and number categories over those of the KP as a whole, then it may not be overtly realised in the KP. In other words, the verbal index is obligatorily interpreted as pronominal in this case. We may formalise this as follows:

\[
\text{PRO}_{\text{SUBJ}} \{ \text{REC}, \text{Verbal} \} = [+] \\
\text{if PERS, NUM}_{\text{SUBJ, Verbal}} = [\text{NP}_i]
\]

This does not state that the PRO value of a subject prefix is [ - ] if the person and number categories indexed there are those of [NP$_i$ + NP$_j$], but rather that the PRO value of a subject prefix must be [ + ] if it indexes the person and number values of [NP$_i$] alone.