Chapter 3
Syntactic units and the clause

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the layers of the clause in Tukang Besi, and proposes syntactic tests for them. The externally motivated tests for the major constituents of the clause, the verb phrase and the case phrase, are given, followed by a discussion of the three major clause types in Tukang Besi. An unusual feature of the verbal clause in Tukang Besi is that whilst the verb unambiguously displays prefixes that index the subject of the verb, and usually has agreement indexing the object of the verb if transitive, nominal case marking is at variance with this pattern. The nominals are marked in a Philippine-type manner, the marking not directly agreeing with the verbal indexes but indicating a syntactically determine clause.

3.2 Categories and terms

3.2.1 [A], [S], [O] and Pivot

The labels [A], [S] and [O] are used as labels of convenience to describe the basic grammatical functions of arguments of transitive and intransitive clauses. [S] is the single argument of an intransitive clause, whether it is an unergative verb or an unaccusative verb (The subjects of unergative and unaccusative verbs can be distinguished by subscripting them as $S_A$ or $S_O$, referring to the properties shared by these [S]s and the appropriate argument of a transitive verb ([A] or [O]). In a transitive clause, the two arguments are in either [A] or [O] roles. Andrews (1985: 68) describes the discovery and testing procedure for these roles in terms of reference to the ‘primary transitive verb’, and the morphosyntactic treatment of its two arguments as follows:

The class of two-argument verbs taking an Agent and a Patient (eg. kill, eat, smash) is important enough to be given a name: we shall call them ‘primary transitive verbs’ (PTVs). Languages always seem to have a standard way or ways in which they express the Agent and Patient of a PTV. If a NOMINAL is serving as an argument of a two-place verb, and receiving the morphological and syntactic treatment normally accorded to an Agent of a PTV, we shall say that it has the grammatical function A; if it is an argument of a verb with two or more arguments receiving the treatment normally accorded to the Patient of a PTV, we shall say that it has the grammatical function O.

The labels [A], [S] and [O] are thus means of describing the arguments that are accessible to different morphological and syntactic operations that are sensitive to the syntactic role an argument plays in the clause. If an operation is constrained so that not all
arguments of a clause have equal access to it, then those that do have such access may be said to be the pivot of that construction (see Heath 1975, Dixon 1979, Foley and Van Valin 1984 for further discussion and exemplification of this term). A process may be described as selecting an [S,A] pivot, for instance, or an [S,O] one, depending on the particular constraints of that morphological or syntactic process. The morphological and syntactic pivots of Tukang Besi are further described in chapter 20.

3.2.2 Core versus oblique

The division of nominals into those that are ‘core’ and those that are not has been thoroughly discussed in Foley and Van Valin (1984: 77-80), who note that the use of the same division (under a variety of different names) is found in tagmemic theory (Pike and Pike 1982), Dik’s functional grammar (Dik 1978), and relational grammar. Basically, the list of ‘core’ arguments includes those arguments said to be more closely associated with the verb: the [A], [S] and [O] arguments, as defined in the previous section. Unlike Foley and Van Valin, I assume that more than two arguments can be core arguments in a clause; evidence for the morphosyntactic unity of these arguments in Tukang Besi is given in 3.11.1. The other category, ‘oblique’ (= Foley and Van Valin’s ‘periphery’), is the set of nominals less closely associated with the verb, more optional, less likely to be indexed on the verb. For a recent evaluation of the relevance of the divisions ‘core’ and ‘oblique’, see Alsina (1993), where he discusses evidence for the category cross-linguistically (under the label ‘direct’).

3.2.3 Subject and object

The term ‘subject’ has been the source of considerable confusion in the modern linguistic literature, particularly with respect to the treatment of Philippine-type languages, and languages with ergative elements to their syntax. ‘Subject’ has been used to describe either a grouping of [S] and [A] categories that are treated alike with respect to some area of morphology or syntax, or to refer to ‘the’ grammatical pivot of a language that some/most/all grammatical processes refer to; the confusion in the terminology comes from the fact that in the more familiar European languages both uses coincide, but not in other languages (see Dixon (1972, 1979), Payne (1978), Schachter (1976, 1977) for the basic description of languages in which the two definitions of the term do not coincide). In this description the term subject will be used solely to refer descriptively to the first usage: the collapse of the [S] and the [A] roles, without ascribing any grammatical uniqueness to this argument.

Object is used to refer to any core argument (see section 3.11.1) that is NOT a subject; there may be more than one in a predicate, and in that case we can distinguish a primary object and a secondary object (see chapter 4.5.3 and chapter 10), on the basis of various morphosyntactic tests. The term object and the syntactic role [O], as defined by Andrews, are not identical; more than one object may be present in a clause, but in an asymmetrical language (as defined by Bresnan and Moshi 1990, and see also the discussion in chapter 10.7), such as Tukang Besi, only one of these may be in the syntactic role of [O].
3.2.4 Nominative

Philippine-type languages present problems for the analysis of grammatical processes in terms of [A], [S] and [O], and ‘subject’ and ‘object’. Analyses of these languages, typically exemplified by Tagalog, have variously ascribed accusative syntax to them (e.g. Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis 1992), or ergative syntax (e.g. Byma 1986), or even as displaying an essentially nominal character (e.g. Starosta, Pawley and Reid 1982, Naylor 1995 and the references therein). Maclachlan (1994) has shown that there is equal justification for viewing the language as either ergative or accusative, depending on the approach taken to morphological classification (though see Foley 1991b), and that Tagalog is better treated as displaying characteristics of both of these categories. Despite this, Tagalog does not absolutely belong to either of these camps, what Maclachlan calls the ‘hybrid’ hypothesis. Unlike languages with (predominantly) accusative or ergative syntax, each clause in a Philippine-type language must morphologically select one of the arguments of a transitive verb as its pivot; there is no unmarked choice (or, rather, either choice may be interpreted as equally marked); this analysis is thoroughly treated in Schachter (eg., 1976, 1977) and Foley and Van Valin (1984).

I use the term ‘nominative’ in a sense similar to that employed by Bell (1983) for Cebuano and Kroeger (1993) for Tagalog to refer to the case that is assigned to that selected argument in the clause, regardless of whether that argument is in [A], [S] or [O] syntactic role. In previous literature on Philippine-type languages this pragmatic role has been referred to as the “focus”, “subject” or “topic”. I use nominative to escape the other associations that these terms carry, which can be shown (Kroeger 1993, and paragraph 3.2.3) to be distinct from the nominative pivot. Nominative is used in two senses, to refer to the morphological case marker *na*, and also to refer to the unique grammatical function that may be marked by the article *na*. The difference between these two uses of the term are further described in section 3.8.3.

3.2.5 Semantic roles and the thematic hierarchy

Reference to [A] [S] and [O] syntactic roles, to subject and object, and to nominative or non-nominative grammatical relations, is not sufficient to describe the syntactic processes that are found in Tukang Besi. In addition to these, use will be made of a modified version of the thematic hierarchy as set up by Bresnan and Kanerva (1989). Their version of the thematic hierarchy assumes the following list of semantic roles, in an ordered hierarchy (the choice of the label ‘thematic’ or ‘semantic’ is arbitrary; I shall refer to semantic roles, since that is (I believe, perhaps mistakenly) the most wide-spread and unambiguous term; I shall, however, continue to refer to the ‘thematic hierarchy’ as an ordered list of these terms, since ‘thematic hierarchy’ is a term that has become established in the literature):

agent > beneficiary > goal/experiencer > instrument > theme/patient > locative

See Roca, ed., 1992, for many further works and bibliographies of works that have used the thematic hierarchy as an explanatory tool. Important discussion on the use of semantic roles in grammar can be found in Dowty (1991), and much earlier work on a slightly differently ranked thematic hierarchy can be found in Foley and Van Valin (1984). Bruce (1984) explicitly uses an early version of the thematic hierarchy as an explanatory
The workings of Tukang Besi grammar do not provide evidence for all these distinctions. Since this grammar is intended primarily as a description of the workings of Tukang Besi, only those divisions necessary for such are description are employed here. The modified hierarchy referred to in this grammar is as follows, collapsing Bresnan and Kanerva’s beneficiary, goal and experiencer into one position, here labelled ‘dative’ (since it covers a lot of the ground occupied by traditional dative cases), and recognising that on morphosyntactic grounds we cannot distinguish theme and patient, thus collapsing them into ‘theme/patient’ (various other languages, notably those of the Caucasus and of Polynesia, clearly do distinguish theme from patient. See Kibrik (1985), Chung (1978), amongst others):

agent > dative > instrument > theme/patient > locative

Various parts of grammar refer to the role that arguments bear on this hierarchy, and the relative order of the different semantic roles in this hierarchy is also particularly useful in explaining some facts of object relative clauses (chapter 15). Conventions that need to be introduced with respect to the use of argument structure and semantic roles are the use of empty square brackets ‘[ ]’ to refer to an argument whose semantic role value is not specified or irrelevant to the discussion at hand, and the use of angled brackets ‘〈 〉’ to represent the list of arguments in a verbs subcategorisation frame. If a verb subcategorises for oblique arguments, then they are represented in a separate list: 〈(CORE) 〈(OBLIQUE)〉. An example of this is one of the argument list for the verb kahu ‘send’: ‘send 〈[Agent] [Theme] 〉 〈[Recipient]〉’.

3.3 Guide to Tukang Besi grammatical forms

3.3.1 Clause types

We can distinguish verbal clauses, non-verbal clauses, and existential clauses as morphosyntactically distinct entities in Tukang Besi. A verbal clause (section 3.4) is one in which the predicate uses subject indexing on the verb, or is an imperative. A non-verbal clause presents the predicate in an NP, either in a KP or in a PP, with oblique article $i$ or preposition, respectively (many prepositions obligatorily or optionally combine with the oblique article $i$); this type of clause includes equative, exclamatory and presentative clauses. An existential clause is predicated by the semi-verbs ane or mbea’e, which do not take subject indexing, nor are they part of a KP or PP.

3.3.2 Morphology

Tukang Besi is a language that puts a greater functional load on the verbal part of the clause than the nominal part. There is case marking, accomplished by the use of the articles and prepositions, but there is much more verbal morphology than there is nominal morphology. In the valency-increasing category are the three causative prefixes and three applicative markers (chapters 9 and 10), and valency-decrease is accomplished by three
3.4 Verbal clauses

3.4.1 Word order and marking strategies

The basic verbal clause in Tukang Besi is verb-initial, and, due to extensive indexing of arguments on the verb (see chapter 5 for a more detailed analysis of the status of the pronominal indexing on the verb), often consists of ONLY a verb (including this pronominal indexing); nominals representing core arguments are optional in Tukang Besi if the referential identity of their arguments has already been established, the information about their syntactic functions being carried by the verbal agreement for both object and subject. The nominal object of a transitive clause, if present, usually immediately follows the verb, with the subject after it, but the order of these two constituents is not fixed. The verb in a main clause is obligatorily prefixed to indicate the subject of the verb, and optionally (though usually) suffixed (or perhaps better encliticised - see Chapter 5) to index the object if transitive. The clause in these two clauses can be modelled as follows; different patterns occur if the verb is NOT indexed for an object; see 3.4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive:</th>
<th>s-V-o</th>
<th>na O</th>
<th>te A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive:</td>
<td>s-V</td>
<td>na S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These different patterns are illustrated in sentences (1) - (3) (the other possible means of indexing subject and object are described in chapter 5):

Transitive:

(1) 3R-see-3OBJ NOM friend-3POSS CORE child
No-’ita-’e na kene-no te ana.
‘The child saw its friend.’

(Or, equally grammatical and natural, No’ita’e te ana na keneno, with VAO word order)

Intransitive, active:

(2) 3R-run NOM child
No-tinti na ana.
‘The child is running.’

Intransitive, non-active:

(3) 3R-fall NOM child
No-buti na ana.
‘The child fell.’
As illustrated in examples (1) to (3), any NP referring to a core argument is obligatorily preceded by a core article. If the argument is known, given information, and pragmatically prominent, it may be assigned nominative case, and is marked with the nominative article *na* (with variant *a*, glossed as ‘NOM’). Only one argument per clause may be nominative; other core arguments, not selected as filling the nominative position in the clause, are marked with the general non-nominative core article *te* (with variants ‘e and e, CORE’). This is also the article used when a core argument is fronted (either clause-internally or topicalised), so it is perhaps better to call it the ‘other’ article; core argument other than the nominative, argument other than the post verbal ones. Here it is glossed as *TOP* when marking, along with a near-obligatory pause, a topicalised NP, and CORE when marking a core argument that is within the clause but not in nominative case. For the apparent ‘objects’ of the verbs *mo'aro* and *motindo'u* (see section 3.8.2) the *CORE* gloss is used, rather than introducing a third gloss for this use of the article.

The unit that is made up of the article and the NP is referred to as the case phrase (KP, see section 3.10.2 for a discussion). Notice that the agreement on the verb does not indicate semantic roles directly; the agreement markers index the [S,A] argument and the [O] of the verb respectively, regardless of the semantic role borne by the argument to which the affix refers. This is demonstrated by the same prefix being used for both the agents in (1) and (2) and also for the patient in (3), thus grouping the single argument of an intransitive verb with the agentive argument of a transitive verb together in the same relation for the purposes of verbal indexing. Notice also the following examples (4) and (5), in which a Dative role may appear either prefixed or suffixed on the verb, depending on the grammatical function that it serves:

Dative role prefixed as subject:

(4)  
*Ku-'awa-'e na pandola.*

1SG-get-3OBJ NOM  eggplant

‘I got the eggplants.’

Dative role suffixed as object:

(5)  
*Ku-hoti-'e na ana kilua.*

1SG-donate-3OBJ NOM  child half.orphaned

‘I gave (food and clothing) to the child one of whose parents is dead.’

This point, the non-equivalence of semantic roles and verbal indexing, is illustrated in more depth in chapter 20. While it may seem overly cautious to make the point here, the relevance of semantic role information in other parts of the grammar renders this assumption non-trivial.

### 3.4.2 Transitive verbs without object agreement

The constituent order and nominal marking strategy shown in 3.4.1 is different when a transitive verb appears without its object agreement. When this agreement is not used, the subject prefixing on the verb does not change, but the basic constituent order of the arguments is rigidly [VOI]A and, importantly, the articles used to mark the nominals are used in the opposite way to a clause with object agreement, schematically as follows:
Normal transitive: \(s-V-o\) \(na\) \(O\) \(te\) \(A\)

no object indexing: \(s-V\) \(te\) \(O\) \(na\) \(A\)

In these transitive clauses without object agreement, the marking of the \([A]\) at the KP is now shown by the nominative article \(na\), but the verbal indexing of the \([A]\) argument has remained consistent with example (1), still prefixed onto the verb.

Some examples of these patterns and their differences are given in (6) and (7):

**Transitive verb with object agreement:**

(6)  
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. No-kiki'-'ko</td>
<td>(na iko'o)</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>beka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3R-bite-2SG.OBJ</td>
<td>NOM 2SG CORE</td>
<td>cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The cat bit you.’

b. * No-kiki'\-'ko | te | iko'o | na | beka. |
| 3R-bite-2SG.OBJ | CORE 2SG NOM | cat |

‘The cat bit you.’

**Transitive verb without object agreement:**

(7)  
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. No-kiki'</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>iko'o</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3R-bite</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>2SG NOM</td>
<td>cat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The cat bit you.’

b. * No-kiki' | te | beka | na | iko'o. |
| 3R-bite | CORE | cat NOM | 2SG |

‘The cat bit you.’

In both (6a) and (7a) the agent \(beka\) is indexed on the verb by the third person realis subject prefix \(no\)-, and additionally in (6) the second person singular object is indexed by means of the second person singular object agreement marker -ko. When this agreement marker is not used, as in (7), the agent \(beka\) must be marked by the nominative article \(na\), and \(iko'o\) by the non-nominative article \(te\). This variation in the presence or absence of object agreement is the only way that the case assigned to nominals may be changed; note the ungrammatical (6b) and (7b). Clearly, the presence or absence of object agreement on verbs functions as a form of voice system. The analysis adopted here is that it is a Philippine-style voice system, with a restricted range of categories, two (a stronger case for this position is put in Chapter 7.6.1, and an alternative is considered in 7.6.2). In Tukang Besi the diachronic drift towards head-marking pronominal indexing has proceeded to quite an extent, but at the same time the overt Philippine-style case system has been preserved, and its verbal cues reinterpreted as being those involving the presence versus absence of the object agreement.

Although the transitive verbs we have seen can appear either with or without object agreement, there is evidence that the suffixed (i.e., morphologically more complex) versions are in some sense the ‘basic’ ones: they appear more frequently in texts (approximately 70% of transitive verbs in texts use object agreement); they are the citation
forms of most transitive verbs; and, although all transitive clauses may appear with object agreement, there are some transitive clauses that cannot appear without object agreement, such as the verb *molinga* ‘remember’. Furthermore, there are many verbs (see chapter 4.3.3) that, if used transitively, require object agreement, and the limited data available to me on child language acquisition suggests that children learning Tukang Besi acquire a command of the object agreement earlier than they do of the subject prefixes. Children often substitute the near-frozen ‘adjectival’ prefix *mo-* in the place of subject prefixes until they are about 5 or 6 years old, but seem to be able to manipulate the object suffixes on their verbs much earlier, indicating that object indexing is learnt earlier than is subject indexing.

3.4.3 Passive clauses

Compare these patterns with those found with a *to-* passive form (see chapter 11), in which no *by-*phrase may be mentioned, and the single argument of the verb may be indexed on the verb by means of subject prefixes, seen in (8):

(8) 'U-to-kiki'i na iko'o.  
2SG.R-PASS-bite NOM 2SG  
‘You were bitten.’

In (8) the patient nominal takes the nominative article just like the patient of an object suffixed verb form such as (6), but unlike that sentence the patient of the passive verb is subject, not object, and is indexed by the prefixed set of pronominal affixes, as an intransitive subject, whether unaccusative or unergative (as in (2)) would be (though with a passive clause a third person prefix may always be substituted: *Notokiki'i na iko'o* is also grammatical. See chapter 11 for details and an assessment of the implications of this marking). Thus whilst treating the patient of the verb alike, as far as its nominative marking goes, the indexing strategy on the verb is quite different. Notice also that in (6) the agent of the verb is present in the subject prefixes on the verb; in (8) the agent may not be expressed in any way whatsoever. If the *A* of the unpassivised sentence was an instrument, then the instrument may be present in the passive sentence. Furthermore, a verb with more than one object (either ditransitive or a verb with applicative or causative morphology) allows the second object to be present in the passive clause. See chapters 11 and 20.

3.4.4 Ditransitive verbs and multiple objects

There is only one verb that is unambiguously ditransitive in Tukang Besi, *hu'u* ‘give’. Two other verbs display ditransitive behaviour. One of these, *kahu* ‘send’ has two alternative subcategorisation frames, the first ditransitive: 〈[Agent] [Dative] [Theme]〉 and the other transitive 〈[Agent] [Theme]〉 〈[Dative]〉. See chapter 4 for a discussion. The second, *sumbanga* ‘donate’ is a (probably recent) loan word (≠ Malay *sumbang* ‘donate’), and is not treated consistently by speakers, perhaps because it is still an unstable borrowing. With this verb, from the theme and the dative arguments, only the DATIVE nominal may be treated as an object; the nominal in theme role cannot be indexed on the verb (deriving the verb through the use of the applicative suffix *-ako* does allow the theme
to be treated in some respects as an object. This is elaborated in chapter 10). Compare the articles used on the nominals in (9) with those in the corresponding object suffixed sentence in (10), and the ungrammatical (11):

(9) Ko₁-hu'u te ikaₖ (na iko'oᵢ) te iakuᵢj.
    2SG.I-give CORE fish NOM 2SG CORE 1SG
    ‘You will give me some fish.’

(10) Ko₁-hu'u-akuᵣj te ikaₖ (na iakuᵢj) (te iko'oᵢj).
    2SG.I-give-1SG.OBJ CORE fish NOM 1SG CORE 2SG
    ‘You will give me some fish.’

(11) * Ko₁-hu'u-keₖ na ikaₖ (te iko'oᵢj) te iakuᵢj.
    2SG.I-give-3OBJ NOM fish CORE 2SG CORE 1SG
    ‘You will give me some fish.’
    (Good for: ‘You will give me to the fish.’)

In most cases involving the verb *hu'u* there is no possible confusion between the recipient and the theme arguments, which are case marked the same way in (10), or between the recipient and theme objects, identically case marked in (9), and so the word order is not fixed. There are possible sentences in which both the recipient and the theme are animate, as seen in (12):

(12) No₃-hu'u te rajaᵣj te tudu'aₖ.
    3R-give CORE ruler CORE slave
    ‘She gave a slave to the king.’

In this case, the word order is fixed: *te tudu'a* cannot precede *te raja* without causing a change in the meaning:

(13) No₃-hu'u te tudu'aₖ te rajaᵣj.
    3R-give CORE slave CORE ruler
    ‘She gave the king to a slave.’
    * ‘She gave a slave to the king.’

We can see that there is a preference, when potential ambiguities present themselves, to have the recipient precede the theme (though compare (13) with (9), where there is no potential for ambiguity, and no restriction on the relative ordering of the two objects).

With ditransitive verbs that have an optional instrument as well as an agent and a patient (see chapter 4.5.1 for details on this), the order is fixed: the patient must precede the instrument, as seen in (14) and (15):

(14) No₁-tompa-'eᵣj na 'obuᵣj te watuₖ.
    3R-give-3OBJ NOM dog CORE stone
    ‘She threw a stone at the dog.’

(15) * No₁-tompa-'eᵣj te watuₖ na 'obuᵣj.
    3R-give-3OBJ CORE stone NOM dog

A sentence with a non-nominative object is just as ungrammatical as (15) when the
instrument precedes the patient: *No1-tompa te watuk te 'obuj. With the instrument following the theme, and both marked with te, there is no problem with grammaticality: Notompa te 'obu te watu.

Verbs with applicative morphology, introducing an extra object as a core argument, are similarly restricted as to which of the two ‘objects’ may be treated as the [O]. See Chapter 9.2 for further discussion.

3.4.5 Serial verb constructions

Often two verbs are used together in a serial verb construction (see chapter 8 for a discussion on the usefulness and cohesion of this term); there are several morphosyntactically distinguishable classes of serial verb constructions, and the two verbs may be linked either contiguously or non-contiguously. These are all dealt with in detail in chapter 8. In one type, the same-subject type, both of the verbs share the same subject:

(16) Saba'ane ko-manga-tolu-'e na gora'u (te ikami).
all IPA.R-eat-be.three-3OBJ NOM egg CORE IPA
‘The three of us ate all the eggs.’

In what I shall (following Crowley 1987) call a switch-subject type of construction, the second of the verbs refers to the object of the first, and thus may be thought of as having a different subject at some level:

(17) I po-sepa-'a i aba, i Lia ito,
OBL REC-kick-NL OBL previous, OBL Lia that:higher
no-sepa-raha-ako-'e-mo na La Ali ana.
3R-kick-blood-APPL-3OBJ-PF NOM La Ali this
‘At the last po-sepa’a, up there in Lia, Ali here was kicked so hard that he bled.’

In addition to these examples serial verb constructions are also used to indicate aspect and modality; this is discussed in chapter 8.

3.5 Non-verbal clauses

3.5.1 Core noun phrase predicates

Equative expressions are presented in a non-verbal clause, with two core case phrases juxtaposed with each other. The unmarked order presents the subject first followed by a predicate in a non-nominative case phrase, the opposite order to that which is found with an intransitive verbal clause. If the subject is emphasised it appears as a nominatively marked NP after the predicate. Equative clauses are used for naming objects, adding information about a known entity, and presenting a referent for a question word.

| Normal: | te SUBJ | te PRED |
| Focussed: | te PRED | na SUBJ |
Examples of these sentence types are given in (18) and (19):

(18)  
Te ia te toilda-su.  
CORE 3SG CORE cousin-1SG.POSS  
‘She is my cousin.’

(19)  
Te iko'o na w[um]ila '[um]akala-aku.  
CORE 2SG NOM go.SI trick.SI-1SG.OBJ  
‘It’s you who went and tricked me.’  (Wal: 82)

This construction is commonly used in questions, with the questioned element serving as the predicate:

(20)  
Te emai na '[um]elo-'elo-aku iso?  
CORE who NOM RED.SI-call-1SG.OBJ yon  
‘Who is it that’s calling me there?’  (Wal: 65)  
(Lit., ‘Who is it that is that one calling me?’)

Further details on these constructions can be found in Chapter 14.

3.5.2 Oblique predicates

Clauses with oblique predicates are similar to equative clauses in their structure, except that the predicate nominal is in an oblique case phrase or a prepositional phrase, and the subject nominal is found initially in most cases. When being questioned the predicate may be fronted, and the subject nominal nominatively marked, but this is rare (in the matrix below ‘OblP’ is an abbreviation for an oblique phrase, whether a preposition phrase or a case phrase).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal:</th>
<th>te SUBJ</th>
<th>OblP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focussed:</td>
<td>OblP</td>
<td>na SUBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of these forms follow in (21) - (23), with a case phrase serving as the predicate in (21), and prepositional phrases in (22) and (23):

(21)  
Te wunua-mami i kampo ito.  
CORE house-1PA.POSS OBL village that:higher  
‘Our house is in the village up there.’

(22)  
“Te w[um]ila kua ‘umpa?”  
CORE go.SI ALL Q  
‘Where did (she) go?’  
(Lit., ‘The going one is to where?’)
More details on the semantic range and syntactic frames of the different prepositions are found in Chapter 12.

3.6 Other clause types

3.6.1 Existential clauses

Existential clauses use the semi-verb *ane* to assert the existence of something. The existential object is marked by the conjunct *ke(ne)* (see chapter 18 for a justification of the analysis of *kene* as a conjunction). If it follows immediately after the verb root; otherwise it is marked by the nominative article *na* (though the nominatively marked argument has no nominative pivot properties; see chapter 20.4). The following sentences show the basic pattern in (24), and then a nominatively-marked existent separated from the semi-verb by a nominal phrase, in (25). (26) shows how the semi-verb may take object agreement, in which case the existent, as the object of the construction, is also overtly nominatively marked:

(24) \[ Ane \text{ } ke \text{ } po'o \text{ } koruo \text{ } i \text{ } Tindoi. \]
\[ \text{exist and mango many OBL Tindoi} \]
‘There are many mangoes in Tindoi.’

(25) \[ Ane \text{ } i \text{ } Tindoi \text{ } na \text{ } po'o \text{ } koruo. \]
\[ \text{exist OBL Tindoi NOM mango many} \]
‘There are many mangoes in Tindoi.’

(26) \[ Ane'\text{-}e \text{ } na \text{ } po'o \text{ } koruo \text{ } i \text{ } Tindoi. \]
\[ \text{exist-3OBJ NOM mango many OBL Tindoi} \]
‘There are many mangoes in Tindoi.’

Two constructions can be used to assert the non-existence of something, either the above construction using *ane* and the predicative negator *mbea(ka)* may be used; more commonly, however, the negative existential *mbea'e* is used:

(27) \[ Mbea\text{-}mo \text{ } ane \text{ } ke \text{ } po'o \text{ } koruo \text{ } i \text{ } Tindoi. \]
\[ \text{not-PF exist and mango many OBL Tindoi} \]
‘There aren’t many mangoes in Tindoi any more.’

(The *ka* is usually omitted before an object suffix or an aspectual suffix)

(28) \[ Mbea'\text{e}\text{-}mo \text{ } na \text{ } po'o \text{ } koruo \text{ } i \text{ } Tindoi. \]
\[ \text{not.exist-PF NOM mango many OBL Tindoi} \]
‘There aren’t many mangoes in Tindoi any more.’

The syntax of existential clauses is discussed further in chapter 14 and chapter 20.
3.6.2 Possession

Possession may be expressed clausally using either an existential construction, with possessive suffixes or a genitive phrase to indicate the possessor subject, or using the special incorporating verb *hoto*—‘have’, in which case the possessor is marked by subject prefixes on the verb. Examples of each type are give in (29) and (30):

(29) *Ane-ho kene kabali-su.*  
exist-yet and machete-1SG.POSS  
‘I still have a machete.’

(30) *Ku-hoto kabali-ho.*  
1SG-have machete-yet  
‘I still have a machete.’

Whilst (29) is a normal existential construction, which we could gloss literally as ‘My machete still exists’, (30) is more interesting in that the object of possession cannot appear as a separate nominal; it must either be incorporated, as in (30), or be present as an object suffix: *kuhoto’e ho*, ‘I still have it.’ The two constructions are not completely interchangeable; see chapter 13 for details.

3.7 Pragmatically determined variations in clause structure

3.7.1 Pre-verbal position

The basic order of constituents presented in 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 can be, and often is, modified through the appearance of an argument before the verb. There are two strategies by which a nominal can appear in a preverbal position, either fronting within the clause, which serves as a ‘focusing’ strategy, or fronting to a position outside the clause, topicalising the nominal. Topicalisation is discussed in 3.7.2, and clause-internal fronting is discussed in this section. This is very similar to the position that Durie (1987) called the CORE TOPIC; this term is not appropriate for Tukang Besi, however, since non-core time expressions may also occur in this position (see 3.11.3). See also Aissen (1992) for a discussion of two different preverbal positions in Mayan languages, and King (1995) on Russian, and the theoretical implications in a unification grammar.

Within the clause, only a nominal bearing the nominative grammatical relation may be fronted. The nominal is placed in a pre-verbal position, yet still within the clause, and the article of the nominal is not the nominative *na*, but rather the more general *te*. We can thus say that arguments with nominative case are marked by either the article *na*, or by preverbal position (and the general article *te*). The pronominal marking on the verb is unaffected by this process. The changes in constituent order and article use can be summarised as follows:
Syntactic units and the clause

Transitive: te O s-V-o te A
Intransitive: te S s-V
Transitive, no object indexing te A s-V te O

Fronted examples of (1) and (2) are presented below as (31) and (32), and an object-suffix-dropping version of (1) is fronted as (33):

(31) Te kene-no no-’ita-’e te ana.
    CORE friend-3POSS 3R-see-3OBJ CORE child
    ‘The child saw its friend.’

(32) Te ana no-tinti.
    CORE child 3R-run
    ‘The child is running.’

(33) Te ana no-’ita te kene-no.
    CORE child 3R-see CORE friend-3POSS
    ‘The child saw its friend.’

Note the difference between (31) and (33), in which the grammatical relations are signalled only by constituent order and the object suffix on the verb. Further specification that a nominal is focussed, beyond this preverbal positioning, can be given with the use of ba’anomo ‘it is the one’:

(34) Ba’anomo te iaku ku-’ita te laku.
    FOCUS CORE 1SG 1SG-see CORE cuscus
    ‘I’m the one who saw the cuscus.’

3.7.2 Topicalisation

A wider range of nominals may be fronted by topicalising to a clause-external position than is possible by moving to a preverbal position, but staying within the clause. The article on all topicalised nominals is the non-nominative article te. The pronominal marking on the verb is unaffected by this process, and both nominative and non-nominative core arguments may be topicalised. The most significant difference between clause-external topicalising and clause-internal fronting is that topicalisation necessarily accompanied by a pause separating it from the rest of the clause, which is indicated here by the use of a comma (I use the term ‘pause’ in accordance with traditional terminology, though all acoustic studies of ‘pauses’ have shown that what is perceptually a pause rarely involves a period without phonation, but rather represents a break in the intonation contour of the utterance (Chafe 1980: 14, Cruttenden 1986:36-39). This is realised acoustically by lengthening of the last pre-pausal segment, and a break in the F₀ contour.). Additionally, non-nominative core arguments and non-core arguments may be topicalised, but not fronted. The changes in constituent order and article use can be summarised as follows:
Expanding on (31) - (33) to produce equivalent topicalised sentences generates the forms found in (35) - (39):

(35)  
Te kene-no, no-‘ita-‘e te ana.  
TOP friend-3POSS 3R-see-3OBJ CORE child  
‘As for the friend, the child saw her/him’

(36)  
Te ana, no-‘ita-‘e na kene-no.  
TOP child 3R-see-3OBJ NOM friend-3POSS  
‘As for the children, they saw their friend.’

(37)  
Te ana, no-tinti.  
TOP child 3R-run  
‘As for the child, s/he ran off.’

(38)  
Te ana, no-‘ita te kene-no.  
TOP child 3R-see CORE friend-3POSS  
‘As for the children, they saw their friend.’

(39)  
Te kene-no, no-‘ita na ana.  
TOP friend-3POSS 3R-see NOM child  
‘As for the friend, the child saw her/him.’

Sentences (40) and (41) show examples of topicalised non-core arguments, with their prepositions or case marking preserved:

(40)  
Di kadera to’oge atu, ku-kede.  
OBL chair big that 1SG-sit  
‘In that big chair, I sat.’

(41)  
Ako te iko’o, ku-homoru te wurai wo’ou ana.  
PURP CORE 2SG 1SG-weave CORE sarong new this  
‘As for you, I am weaving this new sarong (for you).’

Because of the freedom allowed to all nominals to be topicalised, the role played by the topicalised nominal is not immediately apparent before the rest of the sentence is uttered. Other devices can also be used to emphasise the fact that a nominal is topicalised:
Further discussion of topicalisation and other pragmatic effects on clause structure can be found in Chapter 19.

3.7.3 Topic-comment constructions

Examples of topicalisation have already been seen in verbal clauses (section 3.7.2), and fronting has been discussed as a separate phenomenon. Topicalisation is also frequently found as a means of presenting the ‘background referent’ of a clause; this is different from the topic constructions that have already been seen in that the comment following the topic is not necessarily a whole clause, as in (43), or overtly related to the topic, as in (44):

(43) **Te manga-'a-no, te piri leama.**
    TOP eat-NL-3POSS CORE plate good
    ‘The place where he eats has good plates.’
    (Lit, ‘As for the place where he eats, good plates.’)

The pause between a topic and its comment disambiguates this from a segmentally identical equative clause meaning ‘His eating place is a good plate.’; this pause is even more relevant for the disambiguation of example (45).

(44) *“Tabea e iaku, o-ba’e-mo.”*
    but TOP 1SG 3R-fruit-PF
    ‘But as for me, it (a banana tree) has fruit.’
    (ANd: 40)
    (That is, ‘As for me (TOPIC), it (a banana tree of mine) is already in fruit’)

This same construction can also be used to indicate a form of possession, as in (45):

(45) **Te iaku, te ika.**
    TOP 1SG CORE fish
    ‘As for me, (I have some) fish.’

Although this construction appears to be identical to an equative clause meaning ‘I am a fish’, the intonation patterns of each are distinct, with the intonation break found in the topic-comment construction much more pronounced than that found with a normal equative clause, involving a greater lengthening of the preceding vowel and a greater fall in F0.
3.7.4 Right dislocation

Any core argument of a clause, nominative or non-nominative, may be right-dislocated, and occur after the rest of the sentence. Both preverbal positioning and topicalisation may cooccur in the same clause as right dislocation. Unlike preverbal positioning, right dislocated nominals use the same articles that they would display in a basic clause; this is a characteristic that distinguishes right dislocation from a clause-external afterthought, in which the article of all nominals is the non-nominative te, seen in (48). Otherwise, both afterthoughts and right dislocation may follow the final intonation contour for the sentence. Only a few examples are given:

(46) *No-pa-kede'-e i kadera te ama-no, na kalambe.*
    3R-CAUS-sit-3OBJ OBL chair CORE father-3POSS NOM young.girl
    ‘Her father sat her down in the chair, the girl.’

(47) *Saba‘ane no-moro’u-ke na tee, te mia k[lum]alu iso.*
    all 3R-drink-3OBJ NOM tea CORE tired.SI yon
    ‘They drank all the tea, those tired people’

(48) *No-mbule-mo wa!; te Wa Yani measo’e ai.*
    3R-return-PF ILL.FORCE TOP Wa Yani REF-yon ANA
    ‘She’s already gone home! Wa Yani, that is.’

3.8 Articles and case marking

We have seen that the structure and choice of nominative or non-nominative case of the arguments in a clause in Tukang Besi is monitored to a large extent by the pronominal affixing on the verb, and the choice of articles on nominals. This section summarises the used of the two core articles, na and te, in both verbal and non-verbal clauses. There are constructions that use KPs (NPs with case-marking articles), and yet more that use bare NPs, without articles; these are now dealt with separately.

3.8.1 Nominative *na*

The nominative article *na* is restricted in its functions, being a marker of a unique position in the clause. It can only be used to mark a core argument that has been selected as being the nominative pivot in that clause. The syntactic ramifications of an argument being the nominative pivot are dealt with in more detail in chapter 20, though some examples will be seen in 3.8.3. Givenness, definiteness and referentiality are all pragmatic notions that are bound up in the specification that is part of a nominative argument’s pragmatic representation.

3.8.2 Non-nominative *te*

In contrast to the nominative article *na*, the other article used to mark core arguments, *te*, has a wider range of functions. It is used to mark
1. non-nominative core arguments;
2. fronted core arguments with nominative case;
3. predicates of a non-verbal clause;
4. topicalised core arguments;
5. the argument in [Cause] role (for certain bodily sensations);

The first use, the marking of non-nominative core arguments, is unproblematic, involving only the specification that after the nominative KP has been determined, all other core arguments are assigned the article te. In 3.7.1 we saw that a clause may have a variant in which the nominative KP is fronted, but remains within the clause, and is marked with te. In 3.5.1 we saw that both the nominal predicate and the subject of a non-verbal clause are marked by the non-nominative article te; this means that both of the NPs are marked in the same way unless the clause presents a fronted predicate, with only constituent order to distinguish the two arguments (since the clause is equative anyway, this is not really a problem). With topicalised constructions a core argument is also marked by te; in order not to describe a clause-external argument with the gloss CORE, the gloss TOP is used in this context. Two experiencer verbs, mo'aro ‘hungry’ and motindo'u ‘thirsty’ allow an optional ‘object’, the cause of the sensation, to be present in the clause, and marked by te. This is somewhat surprising; other adjectives, such as monimpala ‘miss’ and ma'eka ‘afraid’, mark their optional oblique objects with the oblique article i. It can be shown, however, that despite the marking with te, the ‘objects’ of mo'aro and motindo'u are not core arguments in any syntactic sense. They are not, for example, able to be indexed on the verb with object agreement (50) without being first made core arguments by means of applicative morphology (51), (52):

(49) \[\text{No-mo'aro te bae (na amai).}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
3R & \text{hungry} & \text{CORE} & \text{rice NOM 3PL} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘They are hungering for rice.’

(50) \[\text{*No-mo'aro'-e na bae (te amai).}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
3R & \text{hungry-3OBJ} & \text{NOM} & \text{rice CORE 3PL} \\
\end{array}
\]

(51) \[\text{No-mo'aro-ako te bae (na amai).}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
3R & \text{hungry-APPL CORE} & \text{rice NOM 3PL} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘They are hungering for rice.’

(52) \[\text{No-mo'aro-ako'-e na bae (te amai).}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
3R & \text{hungry-APPL-3OBJ NOM} & \text{rice CORE 3PL} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘They are hungering for rice.’

Further evidence that these ‘objects’, such as that in (49), are not core objects is seen in chapter 4. It must be emphasised that there are only two verbs known to have this unusual habit of marking a non-core argument with the article te, and syntactic tests (such as tests for objecthood as appearing on the verb by object indexing, being subject in a passive construction, heading an object relative clause) clearly show that the putative objects of these verbs do not behave as other objects do.

From the above we can see that the function of te, unlike na, is not a clearly defined one; it is used more as an ‘other’ category than as marking a specific set of relations.
Within the core of the clause, one argument is selected as the nominative one, and all others are marked by \textit{te}. In the sentence as a whole, the most external argument, the topicalised one, is marked by \textit{te} regardless of its role in the clausal core, and other, more central, arguments, preserve their original marking.

### 3.8.3 Grammatical relations versus morphological case

We have already seen that it is necessary to recognise a certain grammatical relation associated with nominals bearing nominative case as a descriptive element underlying several processes in this chapter, such as the ability to be fronted within the clause (further discussion can be found in chapter 20). However, it has also been seen that once fronted a noun phrase loses the explicit nominative marking, and is instead marked by the general article \textit{te}. This has already been illustrated in sections 3.7.1 and 3.7.2, and the relevant examples are repeated here for easy reference:

(1) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{No-‘ita-‘e na kene-no te ana.} & \text{‘The child saw its friend.’} \\
\text{3R-see-3OBJ NOM friend-3POSS CORE child} & \\
\end{tabular}

(31) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Te kene-no no-‘ita-‘e te ana.} & \text{‘The child saw its friend.’} \\
\text{CORE friend-3POSS 3R-see-3OBJ CORE child} & \\
\end{tabular}

Here we can see that the nominatively marked \textit{kene-no}, when fronted, has the explicitly nominative case marker replaced by the more general \textit{te}. Given that the subcategorised argument position of the verb is actually filled by the pronominal affix on the verb (see chapter 5), once the identity of the referent has been established, the nominal may be wholly dispensed with, giving (53):

(53) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{No-‘ita-‘e te ana.} & \text{‘The child saw her/him/it/them.’} \\
\text{3R-see-3OBJ CORE child} & \\
\end{tabular}

It can be shown, however, through various syntactic tests, that although \textit{te kene-no} in (31) and the object suffix in (53) are not explicitly marked by the nominative article, they still behave as an argument bearing the nominative grammatical relation would behave, for instance by being able to launch floating quantifiers, a property not available to non-nominative arguments. This is illustrated in (54) - (56), with subscripts used to show the launcher of the floated quantifier:

(54) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Sa-mia}_1 no-‘ita-‘e na kene-no}_1 te ana. & \text{‘The child saw one of its friends.’} \\
\text{1-CLASS 3R-see-3OBJ NOM friend-3POSS CORE child} & \\
\* ‘One of the children saw its friend.’ & \\
\end{tabular}

(55) \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Sa-mia}_1 te kene-no}_1 no-‘ita-‘e te ana. & \text{‘The child saw one of its friends.’} \\
\text{1-CLASS CORE friend-3POSS 3R-see-3OBJ CORE child} & \\
\* ‘One of the children saw its friend.’ & \\
\end{tabular}
We must then recognise that although the arguments in (31) and (53) are not marked for morphological nominative case, they nevertheless behave as a nominative argument does; I shall refer to these arguments as being the nominative pivot.

The opposite phenomenon, that of an argument being marked with the nominative article, but displaying none of the properties that distinguish nominative arguments from non-nominative ones, also occurs. In a passive construction, the (derived) subject of the passive verb is marked with the nominative na; it does not, however, display any of the syntactic properties normally associated with nominative arguments; this is illustrated again with floating quantifiers, though other properties produce the same result. In (58) we can see that, despite overtly appearing in nominative case, the argument anano mai cannot launch a floated quantifier:

\[
(57) \begin{align*}
\text{No-to-kiki'i} & \quad \text{na} \quad \text{ana-no} \quad \text{mai}. \\
3\text{-PASS-bite} & \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{child-3POSS} \quad \text{INAL} \\
\text{‘Their children were bitten.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(58) \quad * \quad \text{Tolu-miaj} \quad \text{no-to-kiki'i} \quad (\text{na} \quad \text{ana-no} \quad \text{mai})^{i}.
\]

\[
(59) \quad \text{3-CLASS} \quad 3\text{-PASS-bite} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{child-3POSS} \quad \text{INAL}
\]

In this case, we must say that the argument displays nominative case, as indicated by the choice of article, but does not carry the nominative pivot, as shown by its (lack of) nominatively controlled syntactic properties; the single argument of a passive verb lacks not only all properties associated with nominative arguments, but also the syntactic property that is associated specifically with non-nominative core arguments, namely the ability to launch a floating adverb. It does, however, participate in a number of other (argument structure-dependant) pivot processes. See chapters 11, 15 and 20 for more details on this construction.

### 3.8.4 Bare NPs

In addition to the KPs marked by either the nominative or non-nominative article, in certain environments NPs appear without an article. NPs without articles are found with:

1. Prepositional phrases
2. Incorporated objects

Examples of prepositional phrases have already been seen in 3.5.2, and many more are presented in chapter 13. All prepositional phrases are in the outermost layer of the clause, and are thus syntactically rather inert, unless promoted to core status by the use of applicatives.

Examples of incorporated objects can be seen in (59) with the verb jari ‘become’, which obligatorily incorporates its object. A version with an object in a normal case
phrase, as in (60), is ungrammatical.

(59) *No-jari raja-mo.
   3R-become king-PF
   ‘He became king.’
   (also good as *No-jari-mo raja, but not *No-jari-mo te raja)

(60) No-jari te raja-mo.
   3R-become CORE king-PF

When an incorporated object appears with a verb, no other ‘object’ may be present, either as a pronominal index or as an independent NP:

(61) No-sai-'e kabali.
   3R-make-3OBJ machete
   ‘He makes them, machetes.’

(62) *No-sai kabali-'e.
   3R-make machete-3OBJ
   ‘He makes machetes.’

(63) *No-sai kabali te kabali melangka.
   3R-make machete CORE machete long
   ‘He machete-makes long machetes.’

It is clear from these data that the incorporated object is filling the argument position of object called for by the verb; on the other hand, it loses its syntactic status as a core argument through the process of incorporation.

3.9 A short note on interclausal relations

As has been mentioned in 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, one argument in a clause is selected, based on its pragmatic prominence, and assigned nominative case. This choice is motivated by the exigencies of discourse, since the nominative argument is the preferred controller and target of zero anaphora across coordinate clause boundaries. Since the nominative argument usually represents relatively older, known, specific and more ‘given’ information, with newer participants appearing as non-nominative arguments, arguments are usually nominatively marked only after being introduced as a non-nominative argument. A short example from the middle of a text illustrates this nicely:

(64) Ara ku1-[m]o-busu na1-[um]alo-aku1, kene te ia1
   if 1SG-REC.SI-forward.fist 3I-win.SI-1SG.OBJ and CORE 3SG
   no1-pande di lola-a, jari labi ku1-akala-e1.
   3R-clever OBL fly-NL so better 1SG-trick-3OBJ
   ‘If I want to fight he’ll beat me, and he’s good at flying, so it’d be better if I tricked him.’
   (RA: 24)

In these four clauses, ‘I’ begins as the nominative argument in an [S] role (with no object in the clause, the single argument must be the one with nominative case) in the conditional clause; the next clause sees a new argument (‘he’) introduced in [A] role, and ‘I’
continuing in an [O] role, still the nominative argument. The third clause uses fronting to highlight the change of grammatical relations; in this clause, the ‘he’ argument is continued, but placed preverbally as the single argument of an intransitive verb, making it necessarily nominative (although the overt marking is not nominative, because of its position); the final clause follows the same pattern as was seen in the second clause, the [S] argument now becoming an [O] but remaining nominative, and a new argument being (re-)introduced as an [A]. Notice also that in four clauses, containing two transitive and two intransitive verbs, only once is a core argument expressed with a nominal as well as the pronominal affixes, and that occurred when there was a change in the identity of the nominative argument, in the second clause. Since the referential information about the participants is already clear from the context of story, only the role information present on the verbs is needed, combined with occasional pragmatic marking of the nominals, to monitor which participant is being referred to at any time.

The beginning of a story, in which there can be no assumed knowledge about the identity and relative prominence of the participants, is illustrated in the next example. The protagonist Wa Sabusaburengki is introduced as the object of an existential clause, and in the next clause becomes the predicate of an identificational clause, and then the nominative [A] of the transitive clause headed by asumumbele. Following the introduction of a new argument as the [O], Wa Sabusaburengki loses nominative status (but remains an [A]); the new character introduced as an [O] in the preceding clause, the chicken (kadola) becomes the new nominative argument and retains this status for the rest of the passage:

(65) Sapaira sapaira ana, one kene wowine1 sa-mia,
once.a.time exist and woman 1-CLASS

te ngaa-no1 te Wa Sabusaburengki.
CORE name-3POSS CORE Wa Sabusaburengki

Te Wa Sabusaburengki ana1 qa-s[um]umbele
CORE Wa Sabusaburengki this 3I-decapitate.SI

te kadola1 CORE chicken

La’a-mo na1-s[um]umbele-*e1 na kadola iso1,
just-PF 3I-decapitate.SI-3OBJ NOM chicken yon

no1-pogau-mo na kadola iso1 kua ...
3R-say-PF NOM chicken yon : ‘Once upon a time, there was a lady1, and her name1 was Wa Sabusaburengki. Wa Sabusaburengki1 was going to cut off a chicken1’s head. Just as she1 was about to cut off its1 head, that chicken1 said “……”.’ (WaSab: 1-3)

As would be expected, given the lack of previous information, the proportion of core nominals per clause is higher in this section of text, serving to lexically expand the role information carried on the verbs. Of five clauses, two are transitive verbal clauses and one an intransitive verbal clause; these three clauses display a total of four KPs.

3.10 The status and structure of phrases in the clause

3.10.1 Verb phrases

The verb phrase in Tukang Besi contains the verbs and sometimes the object nominal. It is
the unit within which a floating adverb may appear (see Chapter 7), and is a constituent that cannot contain an oblique nominal phrase or a time expression (see 3.11.2 and 3.11.3). From the existence of such pairs as (66) and (68), and the ungrammaticality of (67):

(66) Dinggawi no-’ita te kadadi l[um]ola i ito.
yesterday 3R-see CORE bird fly.SI OBL there:higher
‘They saw a bird flying up there yesterday.’

(67) * Dinggawi no-’ita i ito te kadadi l[um]ola.
yesterday 3R-see OBL there:higher CORE bird fly.SI
‘They saw a bird flying up there yesterday.’

(68) Dinggawi no-’ita-’e i ito na kadadi l[um]ola.
yesterday 3R-see-3OBJ OBL there:higher NOM bird fly.SI
‘They saw a bird flying up there yesterday.’

we must conclude that the verb phrase does not contain the object KP if the verb is indexed for the object; in (67) the sentence is ungrammatical because of the oblique phrase i ito being placed between the verb and the object te kadadi lumola, thus inside the verb phrase. In (68), however, the oblique phrase in the same position does not render the sentence ungrammatical, because the object KP is now no longer in the verb phrase, which fact is signalled by the object agreement on the verb and the nominative marking on the nominal. Further evidence from floating adverbs (see chapter 7), and the greater mobility of a nominative object when compared to a non-nominative one (see 3.4.1), supports this conclusion. We can then define the VP as being the unit that includes the verb, and either a bound pronominal object or an object KP, but not both. These two options are schematised as follows:

\[
[s-V \text{ te } \text{ NP}_O]_{VP} \quad \text{or} \quad [s-V-o]_{VP} \quad \text{but not} \quad [s-V-o \text{ na } \text{ NP}_O]_{VP}
\]

When a verb has object agreement, the object KP is not in the verb phrase, but simply a constituent in the sentence, so that structures behind (66) and (68) are those seen in (66)’ and (68)’, the brackets indicating the constituency of the phrases:

(66)’ [Dinggawi [no-’ita [te kadadi l[um]ola]_{KP}]_{VP} [i ito]_{KP}]_S.

(68)’ [Dinggawi [no-’ita-’e]_{VP} [i ito]_{KP} [na kadadi l[um]ola]_{KP}]_S.

Evidence for this comes from the fact that the non-nominative article is phonologically part of the preceding verb for the purposes of stress assignment when it refers to an object nominal, but neither the non-nominative article when referring to a non-object, nor the nominative article, are part of the verb phonologically:
This is taken as evidence of a closer bond between the unsuffixed verb and its object than a verb with object agreement and any argument, either nominative or non-nominative, that follows it.

The manner in which an activity is performed may be indicated either by an exclamatory clause (for further details see chapter 14), by nominalising the action and then predicating it with an adjective, or by an adverbial construction, in which an uninflected adjective or adverb directly modifies the verb, appearing directly after it. These last two are illustrated here:

(73)  *No-menti’i na tinti-(a) u kumbou measo’e la!*
      3R-fast NOM run-NL GEN goanna REF-yon ILL.FORCE
      ‘That goanna’s running was fast!’

(74)  *No-tinti menti’i na kumbou.*
      3R-run fast NOM goanna
      ‘The goanna ran fast.’

As has been mentioned, the adverb may, with syntactic restrictions, ‘float’ away from its immediate post verbal position to appear anywhere within the verb phrase; this is discussed in chapter 7.
3.10.2 Noun phrases

The fact that Tukang Besi needs to distinguish between the Noun Phrase (NP) and the Case Phrase (KP) has already been foreshadowed. The argument for this is that the paradigmatic roles that the constituent traditionally called the ‘NP’ plays in clauses can be summed up as follows:

- serve as a direct (core) argument of a verb;
- be the unit replaced by a clause in a complement construction;
- be the sister of a preposition in a preposition phrase

It is true that the first two of these functions are played by the one constituent in Tukang Besi; compare the following two sentences:

(75) \textit{Dinggawi ku-’ita-’e na Wa Darwin r[um]ato-NP.}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,NP.}}
\textit{yesterday 1SG-see-3OBJ NOM Wa Darwin arrive.SI}'I saw Wa Darwin arrive yesterday.'
\textit{(lit., ‘Yesterday I saw Wa Darwin who was arriving.’)}

(76) \textit{Dinggawi ku-’ita-’e [no-rato na Wa Darwin]COMP.}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,NP.}}
\textit{yesterday 1SG-see-3OBJ 3R-arrive NOM Wa Darwin}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,NP.}}'I saw Wa Darwin arrive yesterday.'

However, when we examine the structure of a prepositional phrase, we find that an oblique case article + NP constituent is not always the constituent that is the sister of the preposition. In (77) \textit{mina} takes a case article + NP sister, but in (78) the preposition \textit{kua} occurs with no article, and indeed cannot occur with an article when specifying motion towards a person, as seen by the ungrammaticality of (78)’:

(77) \textit{No-rato [mina [i Wa Darwin]KP ]PP.}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,PP.}}
\textit{3R-arrive from OBL Wa Darwin}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,PP.}}'She misses Wa Darwin.'

(78) \textit{No-wila [kua Wa Darwin]PP.}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,PP.}}
\textit{3R-go ALL Wa Darwin}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,PP.}}'She went to Wa Darwin.'

(78)’ \textit{\ast No-wila [kua [i Wa Darwin]KP ]PP.}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,PP.}}
\textit{3R-go ALL OBL Wa Darwin}\textsuperscript{\texttt{\,PP.}}

For this reason we need to recognise a larger constituent in Tukang Besi which consists of the NP and its preceding case-marking article. The terminology for such a constituent exists, proposed by Fillmore (1968), and used more recently by Lamontagne and Travis (1987), Kroeger (1990) and others, as well as a long descriptive tradition within (lexi-)case grammar. A NP that is preceded by a case-marking article is assumed to be nested inside a Case Phrase (KP); when an NP appears without a case article, having only a preposition preceding it, it is a simple NP. It is understandable that the oblique case marker has come to be omitted following some prepositions, since the use of a preposition already signals the nominal as oblique, and moreover more finely specifies the semantics.
of the relation. We can hypothesis that a pre-Tukang Besi had only the oblique case \( i \), and that the other ‘prepositional’ forms are more recent additions to the language. \( \text{mina} \) and \( \text{kene} \) are still used as verbs, and \( \text{kua} \) (southern variant \( \text{ka} \)) is clearly derived from Malay \( \text{ak} \). Only \( \text{apa} \) has no clear etymology, and this is the preposition that must appear with a complete oblique case marked KP following it. The structures proposed for these two phrases are seen in (79) and (80). The structure associated with a KP is that given in (79) (details in chapter 12):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{KP} & \quad \text{ART} \quad \text{NP} \\
(79) & \quad \text{Te} \quad \text{mia} \quad \text{to'oge}. \\
& \quad \text{CORE} \quad \text{person} \quad \text{big} \\
& \quad \text{‘the big person.’}
\end{align*}
\]

A prepositional phrase with the preposition \( \text{kua} \), which has as its sister an NP which does not use articles, has an apparently nearly identical structure, seen in the putative tree for (80), but this is only the result of a missing oblique article, as (80)' shows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP} & \quad \text{PREP} \quad \text{NP} \\
(80) & \quad \text{kua} \quad \text{wunua} \quad \text{to'oge}. \\
& \quad \text{ALL} \quad \text{house} \quad \text{big} \\
& \quad \text{‘to the big house.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PP} & \quad \text{PREP} \quad \text{KP} \\
(80)' & \quad \text{apa} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{wunua} \quad \text{to'oge}. \\
& \quad \text{ENDPOINT OBL} \quad \text{house} \quad \text{big} \\
& \quad \text{‘up to the big house.’}
\end{align*}
\]

From (80)' we can see that the PP takes a KP as its object; indeed, \( \text{kua i wunua to'oge} \) is also acceptable, though more marked. We must conclude that some PPs unusually allow a non-headed KP as the sister of the preposition; since a preposition already specifies the non-core status of its argument, the oblique case marker is simply double marking of that fact, and so in some cases may be dispensed with.

The internal structure of the Noun Phrase is dealt with at length in Chapter 12; here I will only mention that the NP is head-initial, and that some details of the structural organisation of the NP depend on the pragmatic status assigned to the argument (nominative case is explicitly marked by the choice of \( \text{na} \) or preverbal position, as the article for the KP (all non-core NPs have the structure associated with a non-nominative
The crucial aspects of this variation are the choice of demonstratives available at the end of the NP, and the ordering of the constituents in the N’ at the beginning of the NP. The ordering of the two different types of N’ constituents is as follows:

Nominative NP:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N' \\
N \quad \text{-POSS} \quad ADJ
\end{array}
\]

(81) (na) wunua-su molengo.
NOM house-1SG.POSS old
‘My old house.’

Non-nominative NP:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N' \\
N \quad ADJ \quad \text{-POSS}
\end{array}
\]

(82) (te) wunua molengo-su.
CORE house old-1SG.POSS
‘My old house.’

Further details on structural differences can be found in chapter 12.

We can define the NP paradigmatically as the unit that may be replaced by a simple pronoun or noun. Further, the KP or PP is a unit that, while it is somewhat mobile in the clause, may not be broken up and its constituents scattered through the clause. Thus, the head of the noun phrase may not be separated from its modifying adjective in (83) - (85):

(83) Dinggawi no-mai [min(a) i [Pada Kuru]NP ]PP
yesterday 3R-come from OBL Pada Kuru
[na [mia mo'owu iso]NP ]KP
NOM person fat yon
‘That fat person came from Pada Kuru yesterday.’

(84) * No-mai [min(a) i [Pada Kuru]NP ]PP
3R-come from OBL Pada Kuru
[na mia dinggawi mo'owu iso].
NOM person yesterday fat yon

(85) * Dinggawi no-mai
yesterday 3R-come
[na mia [min(a) i [Pada Kuru]NP ]PP mo'owu iso].
NOM person from OBL Pada Kuru fat yon

Additionally, the head of an NP may not be fronted without fronting any other modifying elements as well (though a quantifier may float away from its KP, giving the impression of a stranded modifier, as in (85)’):

CORE friend-1SG.POSS 3R-come-PF 2-CLASS
‘Both of my friends have come.’
Equally importantly, the NPs in the sentence, mia mo’owu and Pada Kuru may be replaced with personal pronouns or demonstratives. Of course, as a core argument the KP may be left out altogether, if the referential information is all retrievable from context, since the information about its role in the clause can all be discovered by the pronominal affixes on the verb:

(88) Dinggawi no-mai [min(a) i Pada Kuru]PP [mo’owu].
    yesterday 3R-come from OBL Pada Kuru fat
    ‘This one there came from Pada Kuru yesterday.’

(89) Dinggawi no-mai [min(a) i yon]PP [na id]KP.
    yesterday 3R-come from OBL yon NOM 3SG
    ‘S/he came from over there yesterday.’

Apart from the information on their internal structure, presented in chapter 12, the facts of syntactic mobility, coherence, and paradigmatic relationship with pronouns and demonstratives serve to define the noun phrase in Tukang Besi. Information on pronouns can be found in chapter 5, and information on the modificational possibilities in an NP is found in chapters 6, 13, 15 and 18, in addition to the structural summary in chapter 12.

3.10.3 Oblique phrases

Little needs to be said about the coherency of prepositional phrases; their internal structure has been illustrated in (80) and (80)’. Paradigmatically and syntagmatically they are subject to the same constraints as apply to noun phrases (though see 3.5.2 for further details). The internal structure of any oblique phrase is that of a non-nominative NP (see section 3.10.2).

3.11 The layers of the clause: core and oblique arguments

The clause outside the verb in Tukang Besi is split into levels, with the entire clause, including all oblique arguments on the one hand and the core (also known as direct functions or terms) on the other. The nuclear level of juncture, to use Foley and Van Valin’s terminology, is represented by contiguous verb serialisation within the V constituent in the VP, and is discussed and explained in detail in chapter 7. This is also the level at which some serial verb constructions (chapter 8) are joined. The first is the domain of prepositional case-marking based on semantic role function; the latter, the core layer,
displays articles that serve to code the pragmatic role of their constituents, and may be indexed on the verb to show their syntactic functions. The ability to be indexed on the verb has been mentioned before, by Foley and Van Valin (1984:79) as a feature that is often useful in distinguishing core arguments from others in the clause, “Correlating with the unmarked morphological status of core arguments is the possibility of their being cross-referenced on the verb” (1984: 79). See also Alsina (1993).

3.11.1 Core arguments

The arguments that may be indexed on the underived verb are limited. Without the addition of applicative morphology, only arguments in [Agent], [Dative], [Instrument] or [Theme/Patient] semantic roles may be indexed on the verb (if that verb’s subcategorisation frame calls for an argument in that semantic role), and without the use of applicative morphology only these arguments may be selected as the pivot in various constructions (some grammatical constructions automatically select a pivot because of the particular syntactic or semantic role that it bears, which is not a variable; see chapter 20). The fact that a single semantic role (illustrated with [Dative]) may appear indexed on the verb as either subject or object, depending on the verb’s subcategorisation frame, has already been seen in 3.4.1. This point is exemplified in more detail in chapter 20, and the use of applicative morphology is dealt with in chapter 10.

We have seen that verbal indexing is an option only available for core arguments. Further arguments that can be used to establish the special status of core arguments are:

° core arguments are obligatorily marked by articles on their KP, whilst oblique nominals are often grammatical with just a preposition, dropping the oblique article i.
  (the verbal origins, and verbal characteristics, of some of these prepositional forms, are mentioned in chapter 4, and chapter 12. See chapter 12 for a chart summarising the differences in use of the prepositions and articles)

° only core arguments may launch floating quantifiers (if nominative) or floating adverbs (if non-nominative);

° only core arguments may be relativised, using the subject relative clause or the object relative clause;

° in nominalised constructions, or if the verb is in an object relative clause, possessive suffixes or genitive phrases may only indicate the core arguments of the verb;

Andrews (1985: 82) writes that “One set of cases, commonly called ‘syntactic’ cases, code the core functions”, and that “NPs with ‘syntactic’ cases tend to express a wide range of semantic functions and to be targeted by rules sensitive to grammatical function”. The evidence from Tukang Besi would support the conclusion that the articles te and na are primarily used to mark core arguments.

Examples of floating adverbs and floating quantifiers are given in Chapters 7 and 20, respectively; it is shown there that they can be floated only with reference to a
(non-nominative or nominative, respectively) core argument. Nominalisation is also covered in chapter 12, but some examples are given below. The basic verbal sentence is presented in (90), and (91) is a grammatical nominalisation based on that sentence; (92), on the other hand, which marks the oblique *i wale wale* as a genitive phrase in the nominalisation, is not grammatical, offering an important point on which core and non-core arguments differ:

**Basic sentence:**

(90) *No*₁-*hu'u-aku*₁ *te* *boku*₉ *i* *wale wale*₁.
3R-give-1SG.OBJ CORE book OBL shelter

‘They gave me a book in the shelter.’

**Nominalisation:**

(91) *'U-*ī*ta* *te* [*hu'u-ka-no*₁ *nu* *iaku*₁]
2SG.R-see CORE give-NL-3POSS GEN 1SG
*nu boku*₉ Nominalisation *i* *wale wale*₁.
GEN book OBL shelter

‘Did you see them giving me a book in the shelter?’

(Lit., ‘Did you see their giving of a book of me in the shelter?’)

(92) * *'U-*ī*ta* *te* [*hu'u-ka-no*₁ *nu* *iaku*₁ *nu* *boku*₉]
2SG.R-see CORE give-NL-3POSS GEN 1SG GEN book
*nu wale wale*₁ Nominalisation-
GEN shelter

(Lit., ‘Did you see their giving of a book of me of the shelter?’)

The facts and restrictions of relativisation are covered in chapter 15, and do not need to be enumerated here, since they correspond closely to the restrictions on nominalisations: only and all core arguments may be indexed by means of genitive phrases.

As well as the evidence from nominalisations, a second piece of morphosyntactic evidence separates the putatively core arguments from the rest (the obliques), namely that of case-marking options. The core arguments are the only arguments in these semantic roles that can be marked with *te* or *na* without the need for derivational morphology, and which cannot appear marked by the oblique case *i* (with the exception of [Cause], which (in the case of the two verbs *mo'aro* ‘hungry’ and *motindo'u* ‘thirsty’) can be marked with *te*. The cause NP does not, however, display any features that are normally associated with core arguments marked by *te*; see section 3.8.2 for details). Additional (negative) evidence for the special status of core arguments is that, when topicalised, an oblique nominal keeps its original preposition or case marker, whereas a core nominal always has *te* as its article, as illustrated in (93), showing an oblique KP topicalised, and still marked with *di*, and (94), showing that a core KP uses *te* when topicalised.

(93) *Di* *koranga, ku-elo-'e* *na* *Wa Ngge'e*₁.
OBL garden 1SG-call-3OBJ NOM Wa Ngge'e

‘In the garden, I called Wa Ngge'e.’

(94) *Te* *Wa Ngge'e, ku-elo-'e* *di* *koranga*.
TOP Wa Ngge'e 1SG-call-3OBJ OBL garden

‘Wa Ngge'e, I called her in the garden.’
3.11.2 Oblique arguments

In addition to the core arguments of a clause, various non-core, or oblique, arguments may be present. The facts of topicalisation provide one piece of evidence for there being a unified concept of the oblique, or non-core, level of the clause, and the inability to be part of a nominalisation also serves to separate them from the core arguments of a clause. The oblique arguments in Tukang Besi can be divided into those that are Inner Oblique (Dixon’s (1980: 98) syntactic periphery, Andrews’ (1985) inner locatives, though these terms are not wholly synonymous), and those that are Outer Oblique. The arguments in the outer oblique layer are either unmarked time expressions (dinggawi ‘yesterday’, duaalo ‘in two day’s time’), or oblique case or prepositional phrases (mina i Kahedupa ‘from Kaledupa’, kua Buru ‘to Buru’, kene inano ‘with his mother’, di kampo ‘in the village’, i ta'o i aropa ‘next year’). Syntactically, these arguments in the outer oblique layer are different from the ones in the inner oblique layer in that they cannot be referred to by valency changing processes, such as applicative constructions (unlike claims that have been made for applicative constructions in Kinyarwanda (Kimenyi 1980) (but see Kozinsky and Polinsky 1991 for a counterpoint)).

The inner oblique layer consists of those NPs that function not as setting, but as a part of the action involved in the predicate. Thus the same article i that is used in the outer oblique layer can be used to mark arguments here, functioning as inner locatives. Andrews (1985:70) describes his inner locatives as being the NP serving in the role that gives “the location of a participant, rather than of the event or state as a whole”, and the outer locative as being “the place where something is done”. An example of this distinction in Tukang Besi can be seen in the following pairs of sentences:

(95) ![No-hengolo te sede](3R-boil CORE taro OBL pot) Core i panse Oblique-
‘She boiled the taro in the pot.’

(96) * ![No-hengolo-mi te panse te sede](3R-boil-DIR CORE pot CORE taro) Core-
‘She boiled the taro in the pot.’

(97) ![No-tau te sede](3R-put CORE taro OBL pot) Core i panse Oblique-
‘She put the taro in the pot.’

(98) ![No-tau-pi te panse te sede](3R-put-DIR CORE pot CORE taro) Core-
‘She put the taro in the pot.’

In (95), i panse is an outer oblique argument, and cannot be promoted to core status by use of the directional applicative suffix -VCi (see chapter 10), as seen in the ungrammaticality of (96). In (97), on the other hand, i panse is part of the specification of the action, the [Location] where the [Agent] places the [Theme], and is an inherent part of the action; as such, being in the Inner oblique layer, it can be promoted to core status by use of the applicative suffix, seen in (98).
The two non-contiguous serial verbs, ako and kene, also control NPs within the clause but in a separate core layer. The verbal character of ako is revealed by the fact that NPs governed by ako are inside core KPs, as witnessed by the fact that they preserve their articles. This difference between being a core argument of ako and kene in this type of construction and being an argument of a contiguous serial verb construction (see chapters 8 and 10) is that their objects are in the second case part of the core layer of the main verb; this is essential for any relativisation or passivisation operations to occur. Thus the non-main core unit ako te inano in (99) may not appear in the part of the clause delimited by core arguments of ala, seen in (100). With a contiguous serialisation, seen in (101), this becomes possible, because the two core constituents have been combined:

(99) \[[\text{No-ala te sede}]_{\text{Core1}} \[\text{ako te ina-no}]_{\text{Core2}}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{3R-fetch CORE} \quad \text{taro} \\
&\text{BEN CORE} \quad \text{mother-3POSS} \\
&i \quad \text{Wa 'Ega} \text{Oblique-} \\
&\text{OBL} \quad \text{Wa Ega} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘She fetched the taro from Wa Ega for her mother.’

(100) * \[[\text{No-ala [ako te ina-no]}_{\text{Core2}} \text{te sede}]_{\text{Core1}}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{3R-fetch CORE} \quad \text{mother-3POSS CORE} \quad \text{taro} \\
&i \quad \text{Wa 'Ega} \text{Oblique-} \\
&\text{OBL} \quad \text{Wa Ega} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(101) \[[\text{No-ala-ako te ina-no te sede}]_{\text{Core}}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{3R-fetch-APPL} \quad \text{CORE} \quad \text{mother-3POSS CORE} \quad \text{taro} \\
&i \quad \text{Wa 'Ega} \text{Oblique-} \\
&\text{OBL} \quad \text{Wa Ega} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘She fetched the taro from Wa Ega for her mother.’

As the various oblique arguments appear to have the same restrictions regarding their position in the clause, they are not all exemplified here, but only examples using the (most basic and least problematic) general oblique article i are given here; for further details, see chapter 13.

3.11.3 Oblique arguments in the clause: time expressions

Compensating for their often unmarked status (appearing as bare NPs in the clause, rather than being embedded in a KP), time expressions (sentence-level adverbials) are more constrained in terms of their position in the clause than are prepositionally marked outer locative phrases. A time expression usually appears in the preverbal position (unless that position is occupied by a core argument), or following all other clausal constituents. A time expression may also appear before the object KP and following the verb as long as (a) the object is nominative (this is equivalent to saying that the time expression may not occur in a verb phrase) and (b) this will not place the time expression between a subject KP and the verb. So, for example, the √ indicates where the adverbial time expression dinggawi ‘yesterday’ may occur, * shows where it cannot occur:

(102) \(\sqrt{,}^\wedge ; \quad \sqrt{,}^\wedge ; \quad \text{No-manga-’e-mo} \quad * \quad \text{na bae} \quad * \quad \text{te ana-no} \quad \sqrt{,}^\wedge ; \quad \text{3R-eat-3OBJ-PF} \quad \wedge \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{rice} \quad \wedge \quad \text{CORE} \quad \text{child-3POSS} \quad \wedge \)

‘Their children ate the rice yesterday.’
(103) \(\sqrt{\sqrt{\text{No-manga-'e-mo}} \ast \text{te} \ \text{ana-no}} \ \sqrt{\text{na} \ \text{bae}} \ \sqrt{.}\)
\[\text{3R-eat-3OBJ-PF} \ \text{CORE} \ \text{child-3POSS} \ \text{NOM} \ \text{rice}\]

‘Their children ate the rice yesterday.’

When one of the core arguments is fronted, the preverbal position is not available for a
time expression, but the time expression may be topicalised, and placed before the whole
clause:

(104) \(\sqrt{\text{te} \ \text{ana-no}} \ \ast \text{no-manga-mo} \ast \text{te} \ \text{bae}} \ \sqrt{.}\)
\[\text{CORE} \ \text{child-3POSS} \ \text{3R-eat-PF} \ \text{CORE} \ \text{rice}\]

‘Yesterday, their children ate the rice.’

If one of the core arguments is topicalised, the time expression may still appear in the
clause-internal fronted position:

(105) \(\text{Te} \ \text{ana-no}, \ \sqrt{\text{no-manga-mo}} \ast \text{te} \ \text{bae}} \ \sqrt{.}\)
\[\text{TOP} \ \text{child-3POSS} \ \text{3R-eat-PF} \ \text{CORE} \ \text{rice}\]

‘Their children, yesterday they ate the rice.’

3.11.4 Oblique arguments in the clause: locative expressions

A locative expression is always in a prepositional or oblique case phrase, and is usually
found after all other core arguments. If it is preverbal, it must be topicalised; it cannot
occupy the fronted position that core arguments and time expressions can occupy. It may
appear between the subject and the verb, unlike a time expression. It may not, however,
intervene between a \(\text{te}\)-marked object NP and the verb (that is, it may not occur in the verb
phrase). The following sentences use the same \(\sqrt{\}\) and \(\ast\) symbols to indicate where a
locative expression such as \(\text{i wunua hele}\) ‘in another house’ may and may not occur:

(106) \(\sqrt{\ast \text{No-sangka}} \ast \text{te} \ \text{kie}} \ \sqrt{\text{na} \ \text{ompu-su}} \ \sqrt{.}\)
\[\text{3R-weave.mat} \ \text{CORE} \ \text{mat} \ \text{NOM} \ \text{grandparent-1SG.POSS}\]

‘My grandmother wove the mat in another house.’

(107) \(\text{Te} \ \text{kie}, \ \ast \text{no-sangka}} \ \sqrt{\text{na} \ \text{ompu-su}} \ \sqrt{.}\)
\[\text{TOP} \ \text{mat} \ \text{3R-weave.mat} \ \text{NOM} \ \text{grandparent-1SG.POSS}\]

‘That mat, my grandmother wove (it) in another house.’

If the verb is marked with object agreement and two core KPs are present, then right
dislocation of one of them must occur if they are both post verbal.

(108) \(\text{No-sangka-'e}} \ \sqrt{\text{te}} \ \text{ompu-su} \ \sqrt{; \ \text{na} \ \text{kie}}.\)
\[\text{3R-weave.mat-3OBJ} \ \text{CORE} \ \text{grandparent-1SG.POSS} \ \text{NOM} \ \text{mat}\]

‘My grandmother wove it in another house, a mat.’

(109) \(\text{No-sangka-'e}} \ \sqrt{\text{na} \ \text{kie}} \ \sqrt{; \ \text{te} \ \text{ompu-su}}.\)
\[\text{3R-weave.mat-3OBJ} \ \text{NOM} \ \text{mat} \ \text{CORE} \ \text{grandparent-1SG.POSS}\]

‘She wove the mat in another house, my grandmother.’
Of course, the locative phrase *i wunua hele* may freely appear at the end of the clause, following all the KPs, and so not force any right dislocation, as in (110):

(110)  

\[ \text{No-sangka-} {\acute{e}} \text{ te ompu-su na kie } \wedge. \]

3R-weave.mat-3OBJ CORE grandparent-1SG.POSS NOM mat \wedge 

‘My grandmother wove a mat in another house.’

3.12 Summary

The relationship between the functional categories and the constituent structures found in Tukang Besi, which have been described in the preceding sections, can be summarised in the following structure. The evidence supporting an analysis with a VP constituent is presented in more detail in chapter 7; existential and non-verbal clauses are covered in chapters 14 and 18 in more detail.

A: Any argument, core or oblique
B: A nominative KP, or a time expression
C: The verb, and any bound pronominal arguments
D: Any non-prominent KPs (applicative and causative morphology or ditransitive verbs can mean that more than one argument is non-prominent, and thus present in the VP)
E: Prominent KPs in the clause. The preferred (though not absolute) order of KPs under the S node is shown below, the position of any time expressions or oblique phrases is also included:

\[
\text{Oblique} \quad \left[ [V \text{ te O}] \text{ te A na A na O} \right] \quad \text{Time}
\]

Oblique arguments may appear anywhere in the area indicated on the diagram; in other words, they must follow the VP. A time expression may only appear in the position indicated, if it is not pre-verbal or right-dislocated.

Even though some time expressions are marked by the oblique article, they may still
occur here, despite locative obliques being excluded from this position. This can be seen in
the textual example below which includes a topicalised subject followed by a oblique-
marked time expression in a preverbal position:

(111) E ikami ana, i rondo buka-'a baaba-'a-no
TOP 1PA this OBL night festival-NL first-NL-3POSS
ku-wila tolu-rondo tolu-oloo…
1SG-go 3-night 3-day
‘Well as for us, on the night of the festival I went first three days and
three nights…’ (Sin: 1)

One piece of terminology deserves some explanation. An NP is said to be ‘prominent’
if it either is the highest semantic role in its clause, or it is selected as the sole nominative
argument in its clause; if either of these conditions are met, then the NP is ‘prominent’. If
neither of these two conditions are met, then the NP is ‘non-prominent’. In formal notation
the conditions for prominence are thus:

(111) Prominence condition:
〈[ ]…〉 or 〈…[ ]…〉
| NOM

Later it will be argued that in fact nominative status is the result of being the sole
argument of a predicate that is combined with the base predicate, and so we can think of
the prominence condition as being, on a more abstract level, simply an NP being the
highest semantic role in its outermost predicate, which only takes a single nominal
argument; a lexicalist representation of this is given as (112):

(112) [ LCS Voice ‘nominative 〈[ ], ARG〉’
TERMS 〈[ ], [ ],…〉
ARG [ LCS ‘ita 〈[ ], [ ]’
TERMS 〈[ ], [ ]〉

In the event of two arguments in one predicate sharing the same relative prominence on the
thematic hierarchy, then there must be a decision on the speaker’s part as to their relative
(perceived) prominence. This is only necessary in constructions involving the addition of
the comitative applicative suffix -ngkene, described in chapter 10.2.