

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/25849> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Kluge, Angela Johanna Helene

Title: A grammar of Papuan Malay

Issue Date: 2014-06-03

11. Verbal clauses

This chapter discusses different types of verbal predicate clauses in Papuan Malay. In verbal clauses a verb occupies the “semantic and syntactic core” of the clause (Givón 2001: 105). In Papuan Malay verbal clauses, the predicate typically follows the subject and, in transitive clauses, precedes the direct object. In negated verbal clauses, the negator precedes the predicate.

Verbal clauses can be distinguished “based on the argument structure of the verb, including the distinction between transitive and intransitive clauses” (Dryer 2007a: 250). These distinctions are discussed in §11.1. The subsequent sections describe special types of (in)transitive clauses: causative clauses in §11.2, reciprocal clauses in §11.3, existential clauses in §11.4, and comparative clauses in §11.5. The main points of this chapter are summarized in §11.6. Negation is described in §13.1.

11.1. Intransitive and transitive clauses

Papuan Malay verbal clauses can be intransitive, monotransitive, or ditransitive. Typically, intransitive clauses are formed with monovalent verbs which take one core argument; as discussed below, though, bi- and trivalent verbs also occur in monotransitive clauses. Monotransitive clauses are usually formed with bivalent verbs which take two core arguments, the subject and a direct object. These two types of verbs and verbal clauses are the most common ones in Papuan Malay. In addition, Papuan Malay has ditransitive clauses formed with a small number of trivalent verbs which take three core arguments, a subject and two objects. (See also Payne 1997: 154–155 and Dryer 2007a: 250–251.)

It is important to note, though, that the trivalent verbs do not “require” but “allow three syntactic arguments” (Margetts and Austin 2007: 401). Likewise, bivalent verbs allow but do not require two arguments. That is, in clauses with tri- or bivalent verbs, core arguments are often elided when they are understood from the context.

Given this syntactic mismatch between valency and transitivity, this section on transitivity is not organized in terms of intransitive, monotransitive, and ditransitive clauses. Instead, it is organized in terms of the valency of the verbs, and describes how the three verb classes are used in transitive and/or intransitive clauses. Verbal clauses with monovalent verbs are discussed in §11.1.1, with bivalent verbs in §11.1.2, and with trivalent verbs in §11.1.3. (The properties of verbs are described in §5.3. For details on optional linguistic expressions providing additional information about the setting of the events or states depicted by the verbs, see Chapter 10 and §5.2.5.)

11.1.1. Verbal clauses with monovalent verbs

Papuan Malay has a large open class of monovalent verbs. Involving only one participant, they always occur in intransitive clauses (490 are attested in the present corpus; for a list of examples see Table 10 in §5.3.1).

Semantically, the verbs can be divided into dynamic ones (139 verbs) and stative ones (351 verbs), as is typical of languages lacking a class of adjectives. The former

denote actions, while the latter designate states or more time-stable properties. Syntactically, however, there are no distinctions between dynamic and stative verbs.

Typically, monovalent verbs follow their clausal subjects, as shown with dynamic *lari* ‘run’ in (1), and with stative *bagus* ‘be good’ in (2).

Monovalent verbs with canonical subject-verb word order

- (1) o, babi **lari**
oh pig run
‘o, the pig **ran**’ [080919-004-NP.0021]
- (2) itu **bagus** skali
D.DIST be.good very
‘that is very **good**’ [081025-003-Cv.0267]

If speakers want to emphasize the predicate with a monovalent stative verb, they can front it, such as stative *bagus* ‘be good’ in (3). In this case, the predicate is set-off by a boundary intonation, which is achieved by marking the stressed syllable of the verb with a slight increase in pitch (“’”). Consultants disagree, however, whether monovalent dynamic verbs can be fronted. While two consultants stated that dynamic *jatu* ‘fall’ in the elicited example in (4) can be fronted, a third one rejected the example as ungrammatical. Furthermore, one of the consultants who accepted the verbal clause in (4) suggested that the fronting of monovalent dynamic verbs is a recent development and that older Papuan Malay speakers would not use such a construction.

Preposed monovalent verbs

- (3) **bagus** skali itu
be.good very D.DIST
‘very **good** is that’ [081025-003-Cv.0270]
- (4) o, **játu** dia!
oh fall 3SG
‘oh, he **fell**’ [Elicited BR131227.001]

The subject can also be omitted if it can be inferred from the context. In (5) the elided subject is *sa* ‘1SG’, and in (6) it is *de* ‘3SG’.

Elision of subject argument

- (5) siang Ø **jalang**, trus malam Ø **duduk menyanyi** sampe jam dua
day walk next night sit sing until hour two
‘(during) the day (I) **went** (over there), then in the evening (I) **sat about**
(and) **sang** (songs) until two o’clock (in the morning)’ [080923-003-CvNP.0002]
- (6) Speaker-2: adu, Ø **nakal**
oh.no! be.mischievous
[Speaker 1: ah, that Petrus!]
Speaker-2: oh no, (he’s) **mischievous**’ [081115-001a-Cv.0033]

11.1.2. Verbal clauses with bivalent verbs

Papuan Malay has a large open class of bivalent verbs (535 are attested in the present corpus; for a set of examples see Table 10 in §5.3.1). Bivalent verbs have two core arguments, a subject and an object. In terms of their semantic roles, “two-place predicates take an agentlike argument A, and a non-agent-like argument P” (Margetts and Austin 2007: 396). As mentioned, though, bivalent verbs in Papuan Malay allow but do not require two syntactic arguments. Examples of bivalent verbs are *bunu* ‘kill’ in (7) and *potong* ‘cut’ in (8).

Bivalent verbs with two arguments and canonical subject-verb-object order

- (7) kalo ko masi mo berjuang kitorang **bunu** ko
 if 2SG still want struggle 1PL kill 2SG
 ‘if you still want to fight, we’ll **kill** you’ [081029-004-Cv.0072]
- (8) jadi kamu **potong** sapi
 so 2PL cut cow
 ‘so you cut up the cow’ [080925-005-CvPh.0007]

The monotransitive clauses in (7) and (8) also illustrate the canonical subject-verb-object order for bivalent verbs. If speakers want to emphasize the object, they can also front it. Unlike clauses with preposed monovalent verbs, though, there is no clear boundary intonation to set-off the preposed object arguments from the rest of the clause. In (9), the preposed object *paylot* ‘pilot’ is marked with a slight increase in pitch of its stressed penultimate syllable (“”) and is separated from the rest of the clause with a comma intonation (“,”). Besides, the ultimate syllable of *bunu* ‘kill’ receives final lengthening, signaled with the vowel tripling. In (10), the preposed object remains unmarked but the clause-final verb *potong* ‘cut’ is marked with a slight increase in pitch of its stressed penultimate syllables.

Bivalent verbs with preposed object arguments

- (9) páylot | dorang **bunuuu**
 pilot 3PL kill
 ‘the pilot they **killed**’ [081025-004-Cv.0040]
- (10) dong dua pu telefisi sidi dua dia **pótong**
 3PL two POSS television CD.player two 3SG cut
 ‘the television (and) both CDs of the two of them he **destroyed**’ [081011-009-Cv.0006]

When one or both of the core arguments are understood from the context, they can be omitted, as shown in (11) to (16).²¹⁴ Elision of the object argument is illustrated for *bunu* ‘kill’ in (11), and *potong* ‘cut (up)’ in (12).

²¹⁴ At this point in the research, the number of clauses with overt and elided core arguments has not been quantified to examine which strategy is preferred.

Elision of object argument and retention of subject argument

- (11) ... kalo prempuang melahirkang laki~laki dong **bunu** Ø
 if woman give.birth RDP~husband 3PL kill
 ‘[indeed, these women can’t live with men,] when a woman gives birth to a boy, they **kill** (him)’ [081006-023-CvEx.0058]
- (12) ... tong **potong** Ø hari itu
 1PL cut day D.DIST
 ‘[we shouldered it, the pig, (and) carried (it) to the garden shelter,] we **cut** (it) **up** that day’ [080919-003-NP.0013-0014]

Elision of the subject argument is demonstrated for *bunu* ‘kill’ in (13), and *potong* ‘cut’ in (14).

Elision of subject argument and retention of object argument

- (13) Ø **bunu** dia, Ø **bunu** dia
 kill 3SG kill 3SG
 ‘(they) **kill** him, (they) **kill** him’ [081006-022-CvEx.0088]
- (14) baru Ø **potong** pisang di tenga~tenga to?
 and.then cut banana at RDP~middle right?
 ‘and then (we) **cut** the bananas in the middle, right?’ [080922-009-CvNP.0041]

Finally, speakers can also omit both core arguments at the same time, as shown for *bunu* ‘kill’ in (15), and *potong* ‘cut’ in (16).

Elision of subject and object arguments

- (15) Ø **bunu** Ø tapi kasi hidup lagi
 kill but give live again
 [About sorcerers who can resurrect the dead:] ‘(they) **kill** (him) but (they) make (him) live again’ [081006-022-CvEx.0087]
- (16) Ø **potong** Ø kecil~kecil
 cut RDP~be.small
 ‘(I) **cut** (the meat) very small’ [080919-003-NP.0016]

11.1.3. Verbal clauses with trivalent verbs

Papuan Malay has a small number of trivalent verbs with three core arguments, a subject and two objects. In the present corpus seven trivalent verbs are attested: *ambil* ‘fetch’, *bawa* ‘bring’, *bli* ‘buy’, *ceritra* ‘tell’, *kasi* ‘give’, *kirim* ‘send’, and *minta* ‘request’.

In terms of their semantic roles, three-place predicates “take an agent-like A, a participant that will label R on the basis of its most common role as recipient (but that may also be a beneficiary, goal, addressee, location, or source), and a T (typically some thing or information conveyed by A to R)” (Margetts and Austin

2007: 396). As mentioned, though, trivalent verbs in Papuan Malay allow but do not require three syntactic arguments.

Trivalent verbs exhibit dative alternation in that they appear in ditransitive clauses with double-object constructions (§11.1.3.1), or in monotransitive clauses with oblique constructions (§11.1.3.2). Alternatively, the R and T arguments can be combined into one noun phrase with an adnominal possessor (§11.1.3.3). Another option is to omit the R and/or T arguments (§11.1.3.4). The distributional frequencies for these strategies are discussed in §11.1.3.5.

11.1.3.1. Double-object constructions

In Papuan Malay ditransitive clauses with double-object constructions, the R and T arguments are unflagged and occur in the order R-T. In this construction type, the semantically peripheral R is brought “center-stage” while the T has “status as the ‘second object’” (Payne 1997: 173). Cross-linguistically, the R typically precedes the T which, as Malchukov et al. (2010: 16) suggest, “probably derives from the fact that the R is generally human (and often definite) and thus tends to be more topical than the T, which is typically inanimate (and often indefinite)”. Double object constructions with R-T word order are presented in (17) to (23). Overall, however, double-object constructions are not very common in Papuan Malay. The present corpus contains only 30 constructions among a total of 1,160 verbal clauses formed with trivalent verbs (2.6%).²¹⁵

Double-object constructions: R-T word order

- (17) mungking de suru dia, ko **ambil** sa air!
 maybe 3SG order 3SG 2SG fetch 1SG water
 ‘maybe he/she’ll order him/her, ‘you **fetch** me water!’ [081006-024-CvEx.0092]
- (18) tiga orang itu datang ... **bawa** dong pakeang
 three person D.DIST come bring 3PL clothes
 ‘those three people came ... (and) **brought** them clothes’ [081006-023-CvEx.0074]
- (19) paytua dia **bli** Andi satu set
 husband 3SG buy Andi one set
 ‘the gentleman **bought** Andi one (TV/CD) set’ [081011-009-Cv.0055]
- (20) nanti waktu tidor de bilang, a, bapa **ceritra** ko
 very.soon time sleep 3SG say ah! father tell 2SG
 dongeng~dongeng dulu
 RDP~legend be.prior
 ‘later at bed-time he’ll say, ‘ah, I (‘father’) **tell** you some stories first’
 [081110-008-CvNP.0140]

²¹⁵ This total excludes serial verb constructions formed with *kasi* ‘give’ (see §11.2.1.2).

- (21) skarang dong **kasi** dia senter
 now 3PL give 3SG flashlight
 ‘now they **give** him a flashlight’ [081108-003-JR.0002]
- (22) sa baru~baru bilang, ... kaka **kirim** dong uang!
 1SG just.now say oSb send 3PL money
 ‘just now I said, ‘older sibling **send** them money!’” [080922-001a-CvPh.0860]
- (23) trus sa bukang orang miskin **minta~minta** kamu uang
 next 1SG NEG person be.poor RDP~request 2PL money
 ‘and I’m not a poor person (who) **keeps begging** you (for) money’ [081011-020-Cv.0043/0045]

The T can also precede the R in double-object constructions, as shown in (24) and (25). This T-R order “is relatively widespread in South-East Asia”, as Malchukov et al. (2010: 17) point out. Building on Dik and Hengeveld’s (1997: 435–436) notion of “iconic sequencing”, Malchukov et al. (2010: 17) suggest that “the order T-R is more iconic than the order R-T, because in the unfolding of the event the T is first involved in the action, which reaches the R only in a second step”.

In Papuan Malay, however, T-R constructions are even less common than R-T constructions; the present corpus contains 17 constructions among the total of 1,160 verbal clauses formed with trivalent verbs (1.5%). All of them are formed with *kasi* ‘give’, as in (24) and (25). In 12, the T is *nasihat* ‘advice’ as in (24), in two it is *ijin~ijin* ‘permission’ as in (25), and in the remaining three the Ts are *ana* ‘child’, *kemerdekaang* ‘independence’ and *swara* ‘voice’.

Double-object constructions: T-R word order

- (24) sa bilang begini, sa **kasi** nasihat kamu
 1SG say like.this 1SG give advice 2PL
 ‘I said like this, ‘I **give** you advice’ [081115-001a-Cv.0332]
- (25) adu, nene knapa **kasi** ijin~ijin dia begitu
 oh.no! grandmother why give RDP~permission 3SG like.that
 ‘oh no!, why did you (‘grandmother’) **give** him permission like that?’
 [081014-008-CvNP.0026]

In double-object constructions the R is most often encoded by a pronoun, namely in 42/47 attested constructions (89%), as in (17) and (18). In the remaining five constructions, the R is encoded by a nominal. Three nominals occur in R-T constructions, namely in *bli Andi* ‘buy Andi’ in (19), and in *kirim bapa* ‘send father’, and *minta Noferus* ‘request Noferus’. The remaining two occur in T-R constructions, namely in ‘*kasi nasihat* R’ constructions. The respective Rs are *pendeta* ‘pastor’ and *ana~ana* ‘children’. These distributional frequencies are discussed in §11.1.3.5.

11.1.3.2. R-type oblique constructions

One alternative to double-object constructions is the “oblique strategy” (Margetts and Austin 2007: 411) in which “the verb takes only two direct arguments and the third participant is expressed as an oblique” (2007: 411).

In Papuan Malay oblique constructions the word order is T-R, with the R being expressed with a prepositional phrase; hence “R-type oblique” (Margetts and Austin 2007: 402, 413). Examples are given in (26) to (32). This T-R order for R-type obliques is also cross-linguistically the dominant one (Malchukov et al. 2010: 17).²¹⁶

Overall, however, R-type oblique constructions are not very common in Papuan Malay. The present corpus contains only 41 R-type obliques among the total of 1,160 verbal clauses formed with trivalent verbs (3.5%). Moreover, in the present corpus, R-type obliques are not attested for all seven verbs (the examples for *bawa* ‘bring’ in (27), *bli* ‘buy’ in (28), and *kirim* ‘send’ in (31) are elicited). Most R-type obliques are introduced with the benefactive prepositions *buat* ‘for’ or *untuk* ‘for’ (26/41 tokens – 63%), while the remaining 15 R-type obliques are formed with goal-oriented *sama* ‘to’. (The semantics of the three prepositions are discussed in §10.2.)

R-type oblique constructions

- (26) pi **ambil** bola sama ade
go fetch ball to ySb
[Talking to a young boy:] ‘go (and) **fetch** the ball for the younger sibling!’
[081011-009-Cv.0022]
- (27) kemaring Lukas de **bawa** kayu bakar buat Dodo dorang
yesterday Lukas 3SG bring wood burn for Dodo 3PL
‘yesterday Lukas **brought** fire wood to Dodo and his associates for their benefit’ [Elicited BR130221.035]
- (28) bapa de su **bli** baju natal buat sa pu ade
father 3SG already buy shirt Christmas for 1SG POSS ySb
‘father already **bought** a Christmas shirt for my younger sibling’ [Elicited BR130221.002]
- (29) ... nanti sa **ceritra** ini sama dia
very.soon 1SG tell D.PROX to 3SG
‘[when he has returned home,] then I’ll **tell** this to him’ [080921-010-Cv.0004]
- (30) sa **kasi** hadia untuk kamu kalo kam kenal bapa
1SG give gift for 2PL if 2PL know father
‘I’ll **give** a gift to you for your benefit if you recognize me (‘father’)’
[080922-001a-CvPh.1334]

²¹⁶ Alternatively, the oblique strategy is also called “‘dative alternation’, earlier ‘dative shift’ or ‘dative movement’” (Malchukov et al. 2010: 18); an alternative term for “R-type obliques” is “indirective alignment” (2010: 3).

- (31) kaka dorang su **kirim** uang banyak sama dong pu mama
 oSb 3PL already send money many to 3PL POSS mother
 ‘older sibling and his/her associates already **sent** lots of money to their
 mother’ [Elicited BR130221.003]
- (32) de bilang, yo, sa **minta** maaf sama paytua
 3SG say yes 1SG request pardon to husband
 ‘he said, ‘yes, I **beg** pardon of (your) husband’’ [081011-024-Cv.0140]

In the R-type oblique constructions in the present corpus, the R is most often encoded by a noun or a noun phrase, namely in 28/41 attested constructions (68%), as for instance in (26) and (27). In the remaining 13 constructions (32%), the R is encoded by a pronoun, as in (29) or (30). The distributional frequencies and possible explanations for them are further discussed in §11.1.3.5.

11.1.3.3. Adnominal possessive constructions

Another alternative to encode the R and T arguments is to express them in an adnominal possessive construction, in which “the agent and the theme are expressed as syntactic arguments of the verb, while the R-type participant, which will be the beneficiary with transfer verbs [...], is expressed as a grammatical dependent of the theme, namely as its possessor” (Margetts and Austin 2007: 426).

In Papuan Malay, speakers use adnominal possessive constructions when the T is definite. The present corpus includes 14 such constructions among the 1,160 clauses formed with trivalent verbs (1.2%). Examples are given for *ambil* ‘fetch’ in (33), *bli* ‘buy’ in (34), and *kasi* ‘give’ in (35). In each case, the possessor denotes the benefiting R of the event expressed by the verb; the possessum denotes the T as the anticipated object of possession (adnominal possession is described in Chapter 9). In the present corpus, the possessor is typically encoded by a pronoun (13/14 tokens – 93%), as in (34) and (35). Only in one construction, presented in (33), the possessor is expressed with a noun, namely the proper noun *Sofia*.

Adnominal possessive constructions

- (33) mama nanti **ambil** [Sofia pu ijasa SD]
 mother very.soon fetch Sofia POSS diploma primary.school
 ‘later you (‘mother’) **fetch** the primary school diploma for Sofia’ (Lit.
 ‘Sofia’s primary school diploma’) [081011-023-Cv.0065]
- (34) dia punya ulang-taung kita **bli** [de punya pakeang ulang-taung]
 3SG POSS birthday 1PL buy 3SG POSS clothes birthday
 ‘(for) her birthday we **buy** birthday clothes for her’ (Lit. ‘her birthday
 clothes’) [081006-025-CvEx.0022]
- (35) ibu distrik de **kasi** [kitong dua pu uang ojek]
 woman district 3SG give 1PL two POSS money motorbike.taxi
 ‘Ms. District **gave** us two money for the motorbike taxis’ (Lit. ‘our_{two}
 motorbike taxi money’) [081110-002-Cv.0036]

11.1.3.4. Elision

Elision is a third alternative to double-object constructions and used when the T and/or R are understood from the context. In this case, one or both of them can be omitted. In the present corpus, this strategy is used in 1,058 verbal clauses of 1,160 clauses formed with trivalent verbs (91%).

Most often the R is elided and the T retained (601/1,058 tokens – 57%); these distributional frequencies are further discussed in §11.1.3.5. Examples are given for *bli* ‘buy’ in (36), *ceritra* ‘tell’ in (37), and *kirim* ‘send’ in (38).

Elision of R and retention of T

- (36) *kalo besok ada berkat sa bli Ø komputer baru*
 if tomorrow exist blessing 1SG buy computer be.new
 ‘if there is a (financial) blessing in the near future, I’ll **buy** (us) a new computer’ [081025-003-Cv.0086]
- (37) *malam nanti Matias bilang, mama ceritra Ø dongeng ka?*
 night very.soon Matias say mother tell legend or
 ‘later tonight Matias will say, ‘are you (‘mother’) going to **tell** (me) a story?’ [081110-008-CvNP.0142]
- (38) *bapa kirim Ø uang banyak~banyak!*
 father send money RDP~many
 ‘[father I want to buy a cell-phone for myself,] father **send** (me) lots of money!’ [080922-001a-CvPh.0440]

Constructions with elided T and retained R occur much less often in the present corpus (75/1,058 tokens – 7%). In most cases, the retained R is encoded as an oblique (49/75 tokens – 65%). This is demonstrated for *bawa* ‘bring’ in (39), *ceritra* ‘tell’ in (40), and *kasi* ‘give’ in (41).

Elision of T and retention of oblique R

- (39) *e, ko bawa Ø ke sana, ko bawa Ø sama ade*
 hey! 2SG bring to L.DIST 2SG bring to ySb
 [Talking to a young boy:] ‘hey, **bring** (the ball) over there, **bring** (the ball) to the younger sibling’ [081011-009-Cv.0015]
- (40) *... baru dia yang ceritra Ø sama saya*
 and.then 3SG REL tell to 1SG
 ‘[I’d already forgotten who this gentleman was,] and then (it was) him (who) **told** (this story) to me’ [080917-008-NP.0005]
- (41) *ko kasi Ø sama kaka mantri, e?*
 2SG give with oSb male.nurse eh
 ‘**give** (the keys) to the older brother nurse, eh?’ [080922-010a-CvNF.0167]

Less often (26/75 tokens – 35%), the retained R is encoded as a direct object. This is illustrated for *kasi* ‘give’ in (42), and *minta* ‘request’ in (43).

Elision of T and retention of direct-object R

- (42) ... hari ini dorang bisa **kasi** ko Ø
 day D.PROX 3PL be.capable give 2SG
 ‘[if (you) say (you also want) a trillion (rupiah),] today they can **give** you
 (the money)’ [081029-004-Cv.0023]
- (43) piring~piring kosong, sa **minta** Ise Ø, sa bilang ...
 RDP~plate be.empty 1SG request Ise 1SG say
 ‘the (cake) plates were empty, I **asked** Ise (for a piece of cake), I said ...’
 [081011-005-Cv.0034]

In constructions with elided T and retained R in the present corpus, the R is most often encoded by a nominal (56/75 tokens – 75%). This applies to oblique Rs (39/49 – 80%), as in (39), and to direct-object Rs (17/26 – 65%), as in (43). Retained pronominal Rs, by contrast, occur much less often (19/75 tokens – 25%), be they oblique Rs as in (40), or direct-object Rs as in (42). These distributional frequencies are discussed in §11.1.3.5.

Finally, elision can also affect the R and the T at the same time. That is, both can be omitted at once if they are understood from the context. In the present corpus, this applies to a substantial number of verbal clauses formed with trivalent verbs (382/1,160 tokens – 36%). This type of elision is illustrated for *ambil* ‘fetch’ in (44), *bli* ‘buy’ in (45), and *kirim* ‘send’ in (46).

Elision of R and T

- (44) ... Matias nanti anjing, cepat, ko **ambil** Ø Ø dulu!
 Matias very.soon dog be.fast 2SG fetch be.prior
 ‘[Matias, younger sister’s fish fell down,] Matias, very soon the dogs (will get it), quick, you **fetch** (your sister the fish)!’ [081006-019-Cv.0002]
- (45) ... de pu tete tanya dia, ko **bli** Ø Ø di mana?
 3SG POSS grandfather ask 3SG 2SG buy at where
 ‘[when the grandchild emerged, he was holding a fried banana,] then his grandfather asked him, ‘where did you **buy** (yourself the fried banana)?’ [081109-005-JR.0007]
- (46) ... mama dong di kampung tra **kirim** Ø Ø
 mother 3PL at village NEG send
 ‘[it’s difficult, there is no money,] mother and the others in the village don’t **send** (us money)’ [080922-001a-CvPh.0943/0945]

11.1.3.5. Distributional frequencies

The above description of how Papuan Malay trivalent verbs are used in verbal clauses shows three types of variation, namely in word order, in encoding the R and T arguments, and in eliding one or both of these arguments. The data also indicate distributional preferences for these three variation types. Summarizing this variation, this section provides an explanation for the distributional frequencies and preferences in terms of salience.

Following Haspelmath (2007b: 92), the noted variation types, or “alignment alternations”, are related to distinctions between the R and T arguments in terms of three “salience scales (animacy, definiteness, person)”, with Haspelmath (2007b: 84) presenting the following conflated “individuation scale”:²¹⁷

1st/2nd > 3rd > proper noun > human > non-human

When the R is more salient than the T, speakers favor a double-object construction. This preference applies especially to pronominal Rs, which are the most salient ones. Otherwise, as Haspelmath (2007b: 83) states, the oblique construction is the favored one:

Special (“indirective” or “dative”) R-marking is the more likely, the lower the R is on the animacy, definiteness, and person scales.

The same distributional preferences apply to Papuan Malay, as illustrated in Table 2. Before discussing the distribution of nominal and pronominal Rs, however, Table 1 gives an overview of the distributional frequencies for trivalent verbs in the different constructions types discussed in the preceding sections.

Table 1 shows that Papuan Malay disfavors clauses in which both the R and T arguments are overtly mentioned. Double-object (DO) constructions are rare (4.1%); the 47 clauses include 30 clauses with R-T order and 17 with T-R order. Likewise, R-type oblique (Obl) constructions are rare (3.5%). Adnominal possessive (AdPoss) constructions with an R possessor occur even more rarely (1.2%). Instead, trivalent verbs usually occur in clauses with elided R and/or T arguments (91%; Table 3 gives details on elision).

Table 1: Distributional preferences for trivalent verbs

	Token #	%
DO	47	4.1%
Obl	41	3.5%
AdPoss	14	1.2%
Elision	1,058	91.2%
Total	1,160	100%

As for the distribution of nominal and pronominal Rs, Table 2 indicates clear preferences. Five nominal Rs occur in double-object constructions (6%), and about one third in R-type oblique constructions (28/90 tokens – 31%). Besides, one nominal R is used in an adnominal possessive construction (1%). Instead, most nominal Rs occur in clauses with elided T arguments (56/90 tokens – 62%; Table 3 gives details on elision). By contrast, about half of the pronominal Rs occur in double-object constructions (42/87 tokens – 48%), while 13 Rs are used in R-type oblique constructions (15%). Another 13 Rs occur in adnominal possessive constructions (15%; compare with one token for nominal Rs). Yet another 19 Rs occur in clauses with elided T (22%; compare with 56 nominal Rs).

²¹⁷ See also Comrie’s (1989) animacy hierarchy, Dixon’s (1979: 85) agency scale, and Silverstein’s (1976) hierarchy of features.

Table 2: Distribution of nominal (NOM) and pronominal (PRO) Rs²¹⁸

	DO	Obl	AdPoss	Elision	Total
NOM-R	5 5.6%	28 31.1%	1 1.1%	56 62.2%	90 100%
PRO-R	42 48.3%	13 14.9%	13 14.9%	19 21.8%	87 100%
Total	47 26.6%	41 23.2%	14 7.9%	75 42.4%	177 100%

This tendency for pronominal Rs to occur in double-object constructions, while nominal Rs are more often used in R-type oblique constructions is in line with Haspelmath's (2007b: 84) "individuation scale". As mentioned, this scale suggests that speakers favor a double-object construction when the R is more salient than the T, a preference that applies especially to pronominal Rs. Otherwise, speakers favor an oblique construction.

There is one exception, though. When speakers want to signal that a pronominal R is also the beneficiary of the transfer, they encode this R as an R-type oblique, which is introduced with benefactive *buat* 'for' or *untuk* 'for' (both prepositions and their semantics are discussed in §10.2). This benefactive marking of the R is not possible in double-object constructions. Hence, speakers have to use an R-type oblique construction; this applies to 13 pronominal Rs in the present corpus occurring in R-type oblique constructions. In nine of them (70%), the oblique is introduced with a benefactive preposition.

As already discussed, however, Papuan Malay disfavors constructions in which the R and T arguments are both overtly mentioned. Instead, trivalent verbs usually occur in clauses in which the R and/or T arguments are elided (1,058/1,160 tokens – 91%; see Table 1). Most often, the more salient R is omitted while the less salient T is retained (601/1,058 tokens – 57%), as shown in Table 3. Clauses in which the R and the T are both elided at the same time are also rather common (382/1,058 tokens – 36%). Only rarely, the T is omitted while the R is retained (75/1,058 tokens – 7%).

Retention of the R most often affects nominal Rs (NOM-R) (56/75 tokens – 75%); most of them are encoded as R-type obliques (39/56 tokens – 70%). Retention of pronominal Rs (PRO-R), which are more salient than nominal ones, is much less frequent (19/75 tokens – 25%). In light of the data given in Table 2, one would expect the 19 pronominal Rs to be encoded as direct objects rather than as R-type obliques. As shown in Table 3, however, ten of the 19 pronominal Rs are encoded as R-type obliques (53%). Again, this has to do with their marking as benefactive Rs: seven of the ten pronominal Rs are introduced with a benefactive preposition, similar to the 13 pronominal R-type obliques listed in Table 2.

²¹⁸ As percentages are rounded to one decimal place, they do not always add up to 100%.

Table 3: Distributional preferences for elided (elid.) and retained (ret.) arguments

	R elid. T ret.	T elid. DO-R ret.	T elid. Obl-R ret.	T elid. R elid.	Total
Distribution of elided and retained arguments					
Total	601 57%	26 2%	49 5%	382 36%	1,058 100%
Encoding of retained Rs					
NOM-R	---	17	39	---	56
PRO-R	---	9	10	---	19
Total	---	26 25%	49 75%	---	75 100%

An explanation for this preference to delete the R argument and to retain the T argument is given by Polinsky (1998) in her study on asymmetries in double-object constructions (DOC) in English. The author explains the optional deletion of the R arguments “as sensitive to topic”, in that it applies “to those elements of [Information Structure ...] that have already been activated and are accessible to speaker and hearer. More topical information is easily backgrounded, which explains why the recipient is more easily deleted” (1998: 416). Hence, Polinsky (1998: 407) presents the following implication: “If the patient of DOC can undergo optional deletion, the recipient of DOC can undergo optional deletion, too”.

This observation that the more accessible argument can be deleted also provides an explanation for the preference of Papuan Malay to elide the more salient R argument and to retain the less salient T argument.

The observed tendency to omit the R and/or T arguments has also been noted for western Austronesian languages in general. In these languages, as Himmelmann (2005: 171) points out, “there are few (if any) morphosyntactic constraints on the omission of coreferential arguments in clause sequences. That is, the possibility to omit a coreferential argument is not restricted to subject arguments”. This also applies to other eastern Malay varieties, such as Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997: 209), and Manado Malay (Stoel 2005: 133–154). Along similar lines, Mosel (2010) notes that for the Oceanic language Teop that “[all] three arguments of ditransitive constructions can be elided in both topical and nontopical positions”. These studies, however, do not discuss whether the languages under investigation have a preference for omitting the R or the T arguments in ditransitive constructions, and what the reasons for such a preference might be. An exception is Klammer and Moro’s (2013) study on ‘give’-constructions in heritage and baseline Ambon Malay. Noting that elision affects the R but not the T, the authors suggest that these distributional preferences are due to “a difference in the prominence of T and R” (2013: 9).

11.2. Causative clauses

Causative clauses are constructions which involve two events: “(1) the causing event in which the causer does something, and (2) the caused event in which the causee carries out an action or undergoes a change of condition or state as a result of the causer’s action” (Song 2006: 265). Hence, causative constructions are the result of a valency-increasing operation: in addition to the arguments of the cause event, or “non-causative predicate”, there is also the “causer” (Comrie 1989: 175). This valency-increasing operation is possible with intransitive and transitive events.

Cross-linguistically, four major strategies of encoding the notion of causation can be distinguished: lexical, morphological, syntactic, and periphrastic causatives. These constructions differ with respect to the degree of “structural integration” between the causing event, or the “predicate of cause”, and the caused event, or the “predicate of effect” (Payne 1997: 159–160). Lexical causatives show a maximal degree of structural integration in that the cause and effect are encoded in a single lexical item. Periphrastic causative constructions, by contrast, show the least degree of structural integration in that the cause and effect are encoded in two separate clauses. According to Kulikov (2001: 888–889), however, lexical causatives do not “qualify as *causatives sensu stricto*” as they do not involve a morphological or syntactic change; neither do periphrastic constructions qualify as *causatives sensu stricto* given their biclausal structure.

Morphological and syntactic causatives differ from lexical and periphrastic causatives in that they integrate the cause with the caused event into a single predication. Hence, a causativized intransitive event yields a transitive causative construction, while a causativized transitive caused event yields a ditransitive construction. The integration of the causer is achieved by demoting the agent of the caused event, the causee. Cross-linguistically, Comrie (1989: 176) notes the following grammatical relation hierarchy for this process: “subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique object”; that is, “the causee occupies the highest (leftmost) position on this hierarchy that is not already filled”.

Papuan Malay uses three types of causative constructions: lexical, syntactic, and periphrastic causatives. The main topic of this section is syntactic causatives (§11.2.1), since only they qualify as *causatives sensu stricto* (Kulikov 2001: 888–889). Lexical and periphrastic causatives are mentioned only briefly in §11.2.2 and §11.2.3, respectively. The main points of this section are summarized in §11.2.4.

11.2.1. Syntactic causatives

In syntactic causatives, or “compound” causatives (Song 2011: 450), the notion of causation is encoded in a monoclausal construction which consists of two constituents, namely a causative verb, which expresses the notion of cause, and a second constituent that denotes the effect (Kulikov 2001: 887).

In Papuan Malay syntactic causatives, a serial verb construction V_1V_2 encodes the causation: the causative verb V_1 expresses the cause event and the V_2 the caused event. Two free verb forms are used as causative verbs: trivalent *kasi* ‘give’ and bivalent *biking* ‘make’. In *kasi*-causatives the V_2 can be monovalent or bivalent while in *biking*-causatives the V_2 is always monovalent.

Semantically, causatives with *kasi* ‘give’ focus on the outcome of the causation or manipulation. Causatives with *biking* ‘make’, by contrast, focus on the manipulation of circumstances that ultimately leads to the caused event or effect. This is shown with the contrastive examples in (47) and (48) both of which are formed with monovalent stative *bersi* ‘be clean’. In the elicited example in (47), *kasi bersi* ‘cause to be clean’ stresses the outcome of the washing process, namely that the clothes are clean. In the elicited example in (48), by contrast, *biking bersi* ‘make clean’ focuses on the manipulation itself, which leads to the effect that the clothes are clean.

kasi ‘give’ versus *biking* ‘make’ causatives

- (47) malam cuci pakeang **kasi bersi** jemur
 night wash clothes give be.clean dry
 ‘(if you have to do laundry at night time) wash (your clothes), **clean** them,
 (and hang them up) to dry’ [081011-019-Cv.0009]
- (48) malam cuci pakeang **biking bersi** jemur
 night wash clothes make be.clean dry
 ‘(if you have to do laundry at night time) wash (your clothes), **clean** them,
 (and hang them up) to dry’ [Elicited BR131103.001]

The following sections discuss the syntax and semantics of Papuan Malay syntactic causatives in more detail. The two verbs that qualify as causative verbs are presented in §11.2.1.1, followed by a description of syntactic causatives with the causative verb *kasi* ‘give’ in §11.2.1.2, and with *biking* ‘make’ in §11.2.1.3.

11.2.1.1. Causative verbs

The Papuan Malay verbs which express the notion of cause in syntactic causatives, *kasi* ‘give’ and *biking* ‘make’, are used synchronically as full transitive verbs, as shown in (49) to (51). Trivalent *kasi* ‘give’ exhibits dative alternation, as illustrated with the double-object constructions in (49) and the R-type oblique construction in (50) (see §11.1.3 for more details on dative alternation). The transitive uses of *biking* ‘make’ are illustrated in (51).

- (49) a, kam **kasi** sa air ka
 ah 2PL give 1SG water or
 ‘ah, you **give** me water, please’ [080919-008-CvNP.0005]
- (50) de **kasi** sratus ribu sama Madga
 3SG give one.hundred thousand to Madga
 ‘he **gave** one hundred thousand (rupiah) to Madga’ [081014-003-Cv.0008]
- (51) Ika **biking** papeda
 Ika make sagu.porridge
 ‘Ika **made** sagu porridge’ [081006-032-Cv.0071]

11.2.1.2. Syntactic causatives with *kasi* ‘give’

As a causative, trivalent *kasi* ‘give’, with its short form *kas*, is used with two types of verbal bases: monovalent ones, as in (52) to (59), or bivalent ones as in (60) to (63). Semantically, causative *kasi* ‘give’ highlights the outcome of a causation.

Monovalent bases

In causatives with monovalent bases, the agent of the caused event is demoted from its intransitive subject function (S) to the transitive object or PATIENT (P) function, while the incoming causer takes the transitive subject or AGENT (A) function (Comrie 1989: 110–111). This strategy, which corresponds to Comrie’s (1989: 176) causative hierarchy, is also used in Papuan Malay causatives with monovalent bases. This is illustrated with the causatives with monovalent non-agentive bases in (52) to (55) and the causatives with monovalent agentive bases in (56) to (59).

In causatives with monovalent non-agentive bases, the effect expression can be a stative verb such as *panjang* ‘be long’ in (52), or a non-agentive dynamic verb such as *gugur* ‘fall (prematurely)’ in (54). The resulting V₁V₂ expressions function as transitive predicates.

Causatives with monovalent non-agentive bases

- (52) ... mama harus **kas panjang** kaki
 mother have.to give long foot
 [Addressing someone with a bad knee:] ‘[you shouldn’t fold (your legs) under,] you (‘mother’) have to **stretch out** (your) legs’ [080921-004a-CvNP.0069]
- (53) ko **kasi sembu** sa punya ana ini!
 2SG give be.healed 1SG POSS child D.PROX
 [Addressing an evil spirit:] ‘you **heal** this child of mine!’ [081006-023-CvEx.0031]
- (54) pernah dia punya pikirang untuk de mo **kasi gugur**
 ever 3SG have thought for 3SG want give fall(.prematurely)
 ‘once she had the thought that she wanted to **abort** (the child)’ [080917-010-CvEx.0097]
- (55) banyak mati di lautang, **kas tenggelam**
 many die at ocean give sink
 [About people in a container who died in the ocean:] ‘many died in the (open) ocean, (the murderers) **sank** (the containers)’ [081029-002-Cv.0025]

In causatives with monovalent agentive bases, the effect expression is encoded by a monovalent dynamic verb, as shown in (56) to (59).

Causatives with monovalent agentive bases

- (56) sa di bawa, Roni **kas duduk** sa di atas
 1SG at bottom Roni give sit 1SG at top
 [A ten-year old boy on a truck-trip:] ‘I was down (in the cargo area, but) Roni **enabled me to sit** on top (of the cab)’ [081022-002-CvNP.0012]
- (57) ... tapi dong kasi bangkit dia lagi, **kasi hidup** dia
 but 3PL give be.resurrected 3SG again give live 3SG
 [About sorcerers who can resurrect the dead:] ‘[he’s already (dead),] but they resurrect him again, **make him live**’ [081006-022-CvEx.0095]
- (58) kam **kas kluar** pasir dulu!
 2PL give go.out sand be.prior
 ‘you **remove** the sand first!’ [080925-002-CvHt.0005]
- (59) kam **kas kluar** Dodo dari dalam meja situ!
 2PL give go.out Dodo from inside table L.MED
 [About a fearful person hiding under the table:] ‘you **remove** Dodo / **enable** Dodo **to get out** from under the table there!’ [081025-009b-Cv.0028]

Cross-linguistically, causative constructions receive different readings, depending on the causee’s level of agentivity (Kulikov 2001: 891–893). This also applies to Papuan Malay. When the causee has no control, the causative receives a “manipulative or directive” reading, while it receives an “assistive or cooperative” reading, when the causee has some level of agentivity (2001: 892).

In causatives with monovalent non-agentive bases, as in (52) to (55), the causer controls the event while the causee has no control. Hence, these causatives always receive a directive reading. Likewise, causatives with monovalent agentive bases receive a directive reading when the causee is inanimate, or animate but helpless. This is the case in (57) and (58). When, by contrast, the causee has some level of control, as in (56), the causation is less direct; hence, the causative receives an assistive reading. Sometimes, however, the reading of a causative is ambiguous, as in (59). If the causee *Dodo* is conscious and can move, the causative receives the assistive reading ‘enable to come out’. But if *Dodo* is unconscious out of fear and thereby helpless, the causative receives the directive reading ‘remove’.

Bivalent bases

In causatives with bivalent bases, the expected operation is for the PATIENT (P) of the caused event to retain its P function and for the AGENT (A) of the caused event to be demoted to the indirect object function (Comrie 1989: 176).

Papuan Malay, however, uses a different strategy, in that all the arguments involved shift their functions. That is, the A of the caused event, or causee, is demoted to the P function, while the P of the caused event is moved out of the core into an oblique slot. This is illustrated with the examples in (60) to (63).

In (60), for instance, the original A, or causee, *anjing* ‘dog’, is demoted to the P function and juxtaposed to the V₁V₂ construction. Semantically, the causee becomes the THEME argument of the causative expressions *kas makang* ‘give to eat’. With the

P slot being taken, the original P *papeda* ‘sagu porridge’ is moved out of the core into an oblique slot.

Causatives with bivalent bases: Demoting the A and P functions

- (60) saya **kas makang** anjing deng papeda
 1SG give eat dog with sagu.porridge
 ‘I **fed** the dogs with papeda’ [080919-003-NP.0002]
- (61) dia **kasi minum** kitong dengan kopi air
 3SG give drink 1PL with coffee water
 ‘he’ll **give** us coffee and water **to drink**’ [080919-004-NP.0069]
- (62) sa pikir ko **kasi naik** kaca mata di sini
 1SG think 2SG give ascend glass eye at L.PROX
 ‘I thought you’d **raised** (your) glasses up here (on your head)’ [080919-005-Cv.0004]
- (63) ... sa **kas naik** Ø di atas prahu
 1SG give ascend at top boat
 [About a sick boy:] ‘[I carried (him) on my shoulders all the way to the river ...] I **lifted** (him) onto the boat’ [081025-009b-Cv.0041]

Causatives with bivalent bases also receive different readings depending on the causee’s level of agentivity. In (60) and (61), the causees are able to control their own actions. Therefore, *kasi* ‘give’ receives an assistive or cooperative reading. In (62), by contrast, the causee is inanimate while in (63) the elided causee is animate but helpless. Hence, *kasi* ‘give’ receives a directive or manipulative reading.

11.2.1.3. Syntactic causatives with *biking* ‘make’

As a causative, bivalent *biking* ‘make’ is used with monovalent bases. Semantically, this causative type stresses the causer’s manipulation of circumstances, which leads to the caused event or effect. That is, *biking*-causatives are causer-controlled, with the causee having no control. Therefore, causatives with *biking* ‘make’ are formed with monovalent non-agentive bases, or with monovalent agentive bases with inanimate or with animate but helpless causees. This is shown in (64) to (69). Overall, though, *biking*-causatives are rare in the present corpus.

The causative in (64), for example, is formed with non-agentive stative *pusing* ‘be dizzy/confused’. The use of *biking* ‘make’ stresses the manipulating behavior of the causer *ana~ana* ‘children’ which leads to the effect *pusing* ‘be worried’; the causee *mama* ‘mother’ has no control. The elicited examples in (65) and (66) contrast with the corresponding *kasi*-causatives in (54) and (55). They show that *biking*-causatives are also formed with monovalent non-agentive dynamic bases, such as *gugur* ‘abort’ or *tenggelam* ‘sink’, respectively. Again, the manipulation itself is stressed. The base can also be agentive dynamic if the causee is animate but helpless. This is illustrated with the elicited example in (67), which contrasts with the corresponding *kasi*-causative in (57). The base is agentive dynamic *hidup* ‘live’ but the animate causee is helpless and therefore has no control.

Causatives with monovalent non-agentive bases

- (64) ana~ana **biking pusing** mama
 RDP~child make be.dizzy/confused mother
 ‘the kids **worry** (their mother)’ (Lit. ‘**make to be dizzy/confused**’)
 [081014-007-CvEx.0047]
- (65) perna dia punya pikirang untuk de mo **biking gugur**
 ever 3SG have thought for 3SG want make fall(.prematurely)
 ‘once she had the thought that she wanted to **abort** (the child)’ [Elicited
 BR131103.002]
- (66) banyak mati di lautang, **biking tenggelam**
 many die at ocean make sink
 [About people in a container who died in the ocean:] ‘many died in the
 (open) ocean, (the murderers) **sank** (the containers)’ [Elicited BR131103.003]
- (67) ... tapi dong **biking bangkit** dia lagi, **biking hidup** dia
 but 3PL make be.resurrected 3SG again make live 3SG
 [About sorcerers who can resurrect the dead:] ‘[he’s already (dead),] but
 they **resurrect** him again, **make him live**’ [Elicited BR131103.005]

Causatives with agentive bases are unacceptable. This is due to the fact that *biking*-causatives focus on the causer’s manipulation of circumstances itself while the causee has no control. This is illustrated with the unacceptable *biking*-causatives in (68) and (69), which are formed with monovalent dynamic *duduk* ‘sit’ and bivalent *makang* ‘eat’ respectively. The two elicited examples contrast with the corresponding *kasi*-causatives in (56) and (60).

Causatives with monovalent and bivalent agentive bases

- (68) * sa di bawa, Roni **biking duduk** sa di atas
 1SG at bottom Roni make sit 1SG at top
 Intended reading: ‘I was down (in the cargo area, but) Roni **made** me **sit** on
 top (of the cab)’ [Elicited BR131103.006]
- (69) * saya **biking makang** anjing deng papeda
 1SG make eat dog with sagu.porridge
 Intended reading: ‘I **made** the dogs **eat** papeda’ [Elicited BR131103.009]

11.2.2. Lexical causatives

Unlike syntactic causatives, lexical causatives “are in a suppletive relation with their non-causative counterparts” (Kulikov 2001: 887). That is, the notion of causation is encoded in the semantics of the causative verb itself and not in an additional morpheme. This suppletive relation is shown with the pairs *mati* ‘die’ and *bunu* ‘kill’ in (70), and *jatu* ‘fall’ and *tebang* ‘fell’ in (71) and (72).

- (70) de bisa jalang gigit, **bunu** manusia, sperti ular,
 3SG capable walk bite kill human.being similar.to snake

de bisa gigit, orang mati
3SG be.capable bite person die

[About an evil spirit:] ‘it can go (and) bite (and) **kill** humans like a snake, it can bite (and) someone **dies**’ [081006-022-CvEx.0133]

- (71) ... itu yang monyet **jatu** dari atas
D.DIST REL monkey fall from top
‘...that’s why the monkey **fell** off from the top (of the banana plant)’
[081109-002-JR.0005]
- (72) mo **tebang** sago
want fell sago
‘(I) want to **fell** a sago tree’ [081014-006-CvPr.0069]

11.2.3. Periphrastic causative constructions

Papuan Malay also uses periphrastic causative constructions which involve two predicates: (1) a “matrix predicate” which “contains the notion of causation”, the “predicate of cause”, and (2) an embedded predicate which “expresses the effect of the causative situation”, the “predicate of effect” (Payne 1997: 159–160).

Periphrastic causative constructions with *kasi* ‘give’ are given in (73) and (74), and those with *biking* ‘make’ in (75) and (76). Besides, Papuan Malay forms periphrastic causatives with a wide range of speech verbs; they are not further discussed here.

- (73) kalo de minta kesembuhan, setan **kasi de sembu**
if 3SG ask recovery evil.spirit give 3SG be.healed
‘when he/she asks for recovery, the evil spirit **has her healed**’ [081006-023-CvEx.0082]
- (74) ... baru mo biking papeda **kasi ana~ana makang**
and.then want make sago.porridge give RDP~child food
‘[they said (they) wanted to catch chickens,] and then (they) wanted to make sago porridge (and) **have the children eat**’ [081010-001-Cv.0191]
- (75) de pu swami **biking de sakit hati** to?
3SG POSS husband make 3SG be.sick liver right?
‘her husband **made her feel miserable**, right?’ [081025-006-Cv.0163]
- (76) kata itu tu yang **biking sa bertahang**
word D.DIST D.DIST REL make 1SG hold(.out/back)
‘(it was) those very words that **made me hold out**’ [081115-001a-Cv.0234]

11.2.4. Summary

Papuan Malay employs three different strategies to express the notion of causation: syntactic, periphrastic, and lexical causatives. The main focus of this section was to describe the syntax and semantics of syntactic causatives. Lexical and periphrastic causatives were discussed only briefly.

Papuan Malay syntactic causatives are monoclausal V_1V_2 constructions in which a causative verb V_1 , namely trivalent *kasi* ‘give’ or bivalent *biking* ‘make’, encodes the notion of cause while the V_2 denotes the notion of effect. Syntactic causatives have monovalent or bivalent bases. In causatives with monovalent bases, the grammatical relations correspond to those established by Comrie (1989: 176): the original A is demoted from its intransitive S function to the transitive P function, while the incoming causer takes the transitive A function. In causatives with bivalent bases, the original A is demoted to the P function while the original P is moved out of the core into an oblique slot.

Semantically, causatives with *kasi* ‘give’ focus on the outcome of the manipulation, whereas causatives with *biking* ‘make’ focus on the manipulation of circumstances itself, which results in the effect. Both causative verbs typically generate “causer-controlled” causatives (Kulikov 2001: 892), in which the causer controls the event while the causee has no agentivity. This applies especially to *biking*-causatives which stress the manipulation itself. Causatives with *kasi* ‘give’ however, can also receive an assistive, rather than the typical directive, reading. This applies to agentive monovalent or bivalent bases when the causee has some level of agentivity.

Most causative constructions in the present corpus are formed with *kasi* ‘give’, while causatives with *biking* ‘make’ are much fewer. Table 4 lists the type and token frequencies for both causative verbs in the present corpus.

Table 4: Frequencies of causative constructions

Base	<i>kasi</i> ‘give’		<i>biking</i> ‘make’	
	Type #	Token #	Type #	Token #
V.MO(ST)	24	36	16	25
V.MO(DY)	18	115	0	0
V.BI	39	327	0	0
Total	81	478	16	25

In the present corpus, *kasi* ‘give’ is used most often with bivalent bases, which are mostly agentive (AGT). Less often, *kasi* ‘give’ occurs with monovalent bases, which can be agentive or non-agentive (NON-AGT). Most monovalent bases are dynamic, whereas stative bases, which are mostly non-agentive, are much rarer. Most monovalent dynamic bases, in turn, are agentive, while non-agentive dynamic bases are rare. By contrast, *biking* ‘make’ always takes monovalent bases which are typically stative and non-agentive. Causatives with monovalent non-agentive dynamic bases are also possible, although they are unattested in the present corpus. Causatives with monovalent agentive bases are only possible if the causee is inanimate or animate but helpless. Table 5 shows these distributional patterns.

Table 5: Properties of causative constructions

Base	Agentivity	<i>kasi</i> ‘give’	<i>biking</i> ‘make’
V.MO(ST)	NON-AGT	Less often	Most often
V.MO(DY)	NON-AGT	Rarely	Possible although unattested
V.MO(DY)	AGT	Less often	Possible with inanimate or with animate but helpless causees although unattested
V.BI	AGT	Most often	Unacceptable

11.3. Reciprocal clauses

Reciprocal clauses describe situations “in which two participants equally act upon each other” (Payne 1997: 181), with the two participants performing “two identical semantic roles” (Nedjalkov 2007: 6). That is, in reciprocal clauses “two subevents are shown as one event or situation” by presenting two predications as one (2007: 7).

Cross-linguistically, four major strategies of encoding the notion of reciprocity structurally are distinguished, following Nedjalkov (2007: 9–16): syntactic, morphological, clitic, and lexical constructions.²¹⁹ Syntactic reciprocals are formed with reciprocal pronouns or reciprocal adverbs. Morphological reciprocals are formed by means of affixation, reduplication, compounding, or periphrastic constructions involving an auxiliary.

Papuan Malay employs two of these strategies to express reciprocal relations: a syntactic strategy with the dedicated reciprocity marker *baku* ‘RECP’, discussed in §11.3.1, and a lexical strategy, briefly mentioned in §11.3.2.

11.3.1. Syntactic reciprocals

Papuan Malay forms syntactic reciprocals with the dedicated reciprocity marker *baku* ‘RECP’. A typical example is given in (77).

Papuan Malay reciprocity marker *baku* ‘RECP’

- (77) kitong dua **baku melawang** gara-gara ikang
 1PL two RECP oppose because fish
 ‘the two of us are **fighting each other** because of the fish’ [081109-011-JR.0008]

The present corpus contains 101 reciprocal clauses formed with 42 different verbs. The vast majority are bivalent: 37 verbs (88%) accounting for 95 tokens (94%). One reciprocal clause is formed with trivalent *ceritra* ‘tell’. The remaining four verbs are monovalent dynamic (accounting for five tokens) (for details see §11.3.1.1).

²¹⁹ Nedjalkov (2007: 10) groups syntactic, morphological, and clitic reciprocal constructions together as grammatical or derived reciprocals.

Structurally, Papuan Malay uses two different types of syntactic reciprocals: (1) a “simple reciprocal construction” (§11.3.1.1), and (2) a “discontinuous construction” (§11.3.1.2), using Nedjalkov’s (2007: 27–30) terminology. In simple reciprocals *baku* ‘RECP’ can receive a reciprocal or a sociative reading, while in discontinuous reciprocals the marker always receives a reciprocal reading.

Cross-linguistically, the reciprocity marker is classified in different ways; in some languages it is classified as a pronoun or an adverb, in others as an affix or an auxiliary (see Nedjalkov’s 2007: 9–16 above-mentioned distinction of syntactic and morphological reciprocals). As for the Papuan Malay reciprocity marker, this grammar analyzes *baku* ‘RECP’ as an independent word and not as an affix, without, however, further specifying its morphosyntactic status at this point. This analysis as a separate word is based on the fact that *baku* ‘RECP’ can be reduplicated, as shown in (78). Affixes, by contrast, cannot be reduplicated, as discussed in §4.1.

Reduplication of *baku* ‘RECP’

- (78) itu sampe tong **baku~baku** tawar ini deng dosen
 D.DIST reach 1PL RDP~RECP bargain D.PROX with lecturer
 ‘it got to the point that we and the lecturer were arguing **constantly with each other**’ [080917-010-CvEx.0177]

This analysis of *baku* ‘RECP’ as an independent word is also applied by Donohue (to be published: 33), while other researchers such as van Velzen (1995: 324) treat the reciprocity marker as a prefix. For most of the other eastern Malay varieties, the reciprocity marker is also treated as a prefix, namely for Ambon Malay (van Minde 1997: 101–105), Banda Malay (Paauw 2008: 250), Kupang Malay (Steinhauer 1983: 46), Manado Malay (Stoel 2005: 23), North Moluccan / Ternate Malay (Taylor 1983: 19, Voorhoeve 1983: 4, and Litamahuputty 2012: 130–133).

11.3.1.1. Simple reciprocal constructions

Most reciprocal constructions in the present corpus (86/101 – 85%) are “simple reciprocals”. In such a construction, both participants are encoded as the clausal subject, which is called the “reciprocator”, following Haspelmath’s (2007c: 2092) terminology.²²⁰ Hence, the typical structure for simple reciprocals is ‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’, as shown in (79) to (87). The reciprocator can be a coordinate noun phrase such as *nona~nona ana laki~laki* ‘the girls (and) boys’ in (79), or a plural personal pronoun such as *kamu* ‘2PL’ in (80).

In ‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions, *baku* ‘RECP’ can receive a reciprocal reading in the sense of ‘RECIPROCATOR V each other’, or a sociative reading in the sense of ‘RECIPROCATOR V together’.

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions with a reciprocal reading are characterized by a reduction in syntactic valency, which corresponds to the reduction in semantic valency: with both participants being encoded by the clausal subject, the object that typically encodes a second participant is deleted. This is shown in (79) to (84); reciprocals with a sociative reading are given in (85) to (87).

²²⁰ Nedjalkov (2007: 6) uses the term “reciprocant” rather than “reciprocator”.

Typically, the verbal base in a ‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ construction is bivalent (80/86 reciprocals – 93%); the corpus also contains one reciprocal construction formed with trivalent *ceritra* ‘tell’. Examples are given in (79) to (81). These examples show that the bases can have reciprocal/bidirectional semantics such as *cium* ‘kiss’ in (79), or non-reciprocal/unidirectional semantics such as *benci* ‘hate’ in (80). (Reciprocals with monovalent bases are presented in (82) and (83).)

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions with bivalent verbs: Reciprocal reading

- (79) nona~nona, ana laki~laki **baku pacar** di pinggir skola ...
 RDP~girl child RDP~husband RECP date at edge school
baku cium di pinggir~pinggir
 RECP kiss at RDP~edge
 ‘the girls (and) boys are **courting each other** at the edge of the school (grounds), ... (they) are **kissing each other** at the edges (of the school grounds)’ [081115-001a-Cv.0017]
- (80) kamu tida bole **baku benci**, tida bole **baku mara**
 2PL NEG may RECP hate NEG may RECP feel.angry(.about)
 ‘you must not **hate each other**, (you) must not **feel angry with each other**’
 [081115-001a-Cv.0271]
- (81) Markus deng Yan dong **baku ceritra**
 Markus with Yan 3SG RECP tell
 ‘Markus and Yan were **talking to each other**’ [Elicited BR130601.001]²²¹

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions with monovalent dynamic bases are also possible, but rare. Of the attested 86 simple reciprocals, only five are formed with monovalent verbs (6%), namely with *bertengkar* ‘quarrel’ (1 token), *saing* ‘compete’ (1 token), *tampil* ‘perform’ (2 tokens), and *tanding* ‘compete’ (1 token) (none of the four verbs occur in discontinuous reciprocal constructions). Examples are given for *saing* ‘compete’ in (82) and for *tanding* ‘compete’ in (83).

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions with monovalent dynamic verbs:
 Reciprocal reading

- (82) ade-kaka **baku saing**
 ySb-oSb
 siblings RECP compete
 ‘the siblings were **competing with each other**’ [080919-006-CvNP.0001]
- (83) dong ada brapa orang itu **baku tanding** rekam
 3PL exist how.many person D.DIST RECP compete record
 ‘they were (indeed) several people (who) were **competing with each other** to record (their songs)’ [080923-016-CvNP.0006]

²²¹ The present corpus contains one reciprocal construction formed with trivalent *ceritra* ‘tell’, similar to the elicited one in (81). For the most part, however, the original utterance is unclear, as the speaker mumbles.

Most of the verbs used in reciprocal clauses in the present corpus also occur in non-reciprocal transitive clauses (38/42 verbs). This is illustrated with *gendong* ‘hold’ in (84). The remaining four verbs are only used in reciprocal constructions: bivalent *ancam* ‘threaten’ (1 token) and *cium* ‘kiss’ (2 tokens), and monovalent *bertengkar* ‘quarrel’ (1 token) and *tanding* ‘compete’ (1 token). Whether these verbs can also occur in non-reciprocal transitive clauses requires further investigation.

Reciprocal and non-reciprocal uses of verbs

- (84) Nofela **gendong** bapa ato bapa yang **gendong** Nofela
 Nofela hold father or father REL hold Nofela
deng Siduas ka ... kitong **baku gendong** to?
 with Siduas or 1PL RECP hold right?
 [During a phone conversation between a father and his children:] ‘you
 (‘Nofela’) will **hold me** (‘father’) or I (‘father’) will **hold you** (‘Nofela’)
and Siduas ... we’ll **hold each other**, right?’ [080922-001a-CvPh.0687/0695]

In the simple reciprocals presented so far, *baku* ‘RECP’ denotes reciprocal relations. Alternatively, though, ‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ clauses can signal sociative relations in the sense of ‘RECIPROCATOR V together’. “The sociative meaning (also called associative, collective, cooperative, etc.) suggests that an action is performed jointly and simultaneously by a group of people (at least two) named by the subject [...] and engaged in the same activity” (Nedjalkov 2007: 33).

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions with a sociative reading are characterized by valency retention, in that “the number of the participants increases without changing the syntactic structure” (Nedjalkov 2007: 22). This is illustrated with the examples in (85) and (87).

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions: Sociative reading

- (85) baru kitong mulai **baku ojek**
 and.then 1PL start RECP take.motorbike.taxi
 ‘and then we started **taking motorbike taxis together**’ [081002-001-CvNP.0004]
- (86) kitong mo **baku bagi** swara bagemana
 1PL want RECP divide voice how
 [About upcoming local elections:] ‘how do we want to **share the votes together**?’ [080919-001-Cv.0165]
- (87) Aksamina deng Klara dong dua **baku rampas bola**
 Aksamina with Klara 3PL two RECP seize ball
 ‘both Aksamina and Klara **tackled the ball together**’ [081006-014-Cv.0007]

Overall, the present corpus contains only few ‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions with a sociative reading. Further research is needed to determine whether there are any formal criteria that allow ‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V’ constructions with a reciprocal reading to be distinguished from those with a sociative reading.

11.3.1.2. Discontinuous reciprocal constructions

In discontinuous reciprocal constructions, only one of the participants is expressed as the subject, while the second participant “is a comitative phrase” (Nedjalkov 2007: 29). In Papuan Malay, this second participant, or “reciprocee” (Haspelmath 2007c: 2092),²²² is encoded by a prepositional phrase which is introduced with the comitative preposition *deng(an)* ‘with’ (see also §10.2.1). Hence, the structure for discontinuous reciprocals is ‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V *deng(an)* RECIPROCEE’.

Discontinuous reciprocals result in a reduction in syntactic valency, since the second participant is not encoded as the direct object but as a prepositional phrase. That is, the non-subject reciprocee is “a constituent of lower pragmatic and syntactic status”, as Nedjalkov (2007: 28) points out; semantically, however, it is of the same status as the subject reciprocator.

In the present corpus, discontinuous constructions occur much less often than simple ones; only 15 of the 101 reciprocals are discontinuous (15%). All of them designate reciprocal relations in the sense of ‘RECIPROCATOR V with RECIPROCEE’, literally ‘RECIPROCATOR V each other with RECIPROCEE’. Unlike the simple reciprocals in §11.3.1.1, discontinuous constructions do not express sociative relations.

In most of the discontinuous reciprocals (10/15 – 67%), the second participant is mentioned overtly, as in (88) to (90). (For discontinuous constructions with omitted reciprocee see the examples in (91) and (92).)

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* V *deng(an)* RECIPROCEE’ constructions

- (88) ... ko laki~laki bisa **baku dapat deng** bapa
 2SG RDP~husband be.capable RECP get with father
 ‘[I thought,] you, a man, can **meet with** me (‘father’) (Lit. ‘can **meet each other with** father’) [080922-001a-CvPh.0234]
- (89) sa tida perna **baku mara deng** orang laing
 1SG NEG ever RECP feel.angry(.about) with person be.different
 ‘I never **get angry with** other people’ (Lit. ‘**feel angry about each other with** another person’) [081110-008-CvNP.0067]
- (90) ... de **baku tabrak deng** Sarles
 3SG RECP hit.against with Sarles
 ‘[right then Sarles was standing by door,] it (the evil spirit) **collided with** Sarles’ (Lit. ‘**hit against each other with** Sarles’) [081025-009b-Cv.0026]

Given the lower pragmatic status of the reciprocee, it can also remain “unspecified” (Nedjalkov 2007: 42), as in (91) and (92). This applies to five of the 15 discontinuous constructions in the present corpus (33%). That is, if the second participant is understood from the context, or considered irrelevant, it can be omitted together with its preposition. In (91), the omitted reciprocee *orang* ‘person’ was mentioned earlier. In (92), the omitted reciprocee ‘community’ is understood from the context, as the topic of the narrative is communal life in the village.

²²² Nedjalkov (2007: 8) refers to non-subject reciprocants as “co-participants”.

‘RECIPROCATOR *baku* v Ø’ constructions

- (91) saya kalo macang **baku pukul Ø** rasa takut
 1SG if variety RECP hit feel feel.afraid(.of)
 ‘(as for) me, when (I) kind of **fight (with another person)**, I feel afraid’
 (Lit. ‘**hit each other**’) [081110-008-CvNP.0066]
- (92) ... dia dapat babi, de biasa **baku bagi Ø**
 3SG get pig 3SG be.usual RECP divide
 [How to be a good villager:] ‘[when he catches fish,] (when) he catches a pig, he usually **shares (it with the community)**’ (Lit. ‘**divides with each other**’) [080919-004-NP.0063]

11.3.2. Lexical reciprocals

Lexical reciprocals “are words with an inherent reciprocal meaning” (Nedjalkov 2007: 14). Therefore, they do not need to be marked with the reciprocity marker *baku* ‘RECP’, as illustrated in (93) to (95). All three examples denote “naturally reciprocal events” (Kemmer 1993: 102), such as *ketemu* ‘meet’ in (93), or *nika* ‘marry’ in (94).

- (93) sa **ketemu** de di kampus
 1SG meet 3SG at campus
 ‘I **met** him on the (university) campus’ [080922-003-Cv.0102]
- (94) dorang dua **nika**
 3PL two marry.officially
 ‘the two of them **married**’ [081110-005-CvPr.0095]
- (95) kam dua **cocok**
 2PL two be.suitable
 ‘the two of you **match**’ [080922-004-Cv.0033]

11.3.3. Summary

In Papuan Malay, the dedicated reciprocity marker *baku* ‘RECP’ signals reciprocity. In reciprocity clauses two predications are presented with the two subjects of each predication equally acting upon each other. The main focus of this description is syntactic reciprocal constructions; lexical reciprocal were mentioned only briefly. Two types of reciprocal constructions are attested, simple and discontinuous ones.

In simple reciprocals, both participants are encoded by the clausal subject. The base is most often a bivalent verb, although reciprocals with monovalent verbs are also attested. Usually, these clauses are the result of a valency-reducing operation and receive the reciprocal reading ‘RECIPROCATOR v each other’. Alternatively, these constructions can receive a sociative reading in which case the reciprocal clause is characterized by valency retention. Further investigation is needed to determine whether there are formal criteria to distinguish the reciprocal from the sociative readings. The basic scheme for simple reciprocals is given in (96).

Scheme for simple reciprocals

(96) RECIPROCATOR *baku* V

In discontinuous reciprocals, one participant is encoded by the clausal subject while the second one, the RECIPROCEE', is expressed in a prepositional phrase introduced with comitative *deng(an)* 'with'. This type of reciprocal also results from a valency-reducing operation and receives the reading 'RECIPROCATOR V with RECIPROCEE'. The second participant can also be omitted if it is understood from the context. The basic scheme for discontinuous reciprocals is given in (97).

Scheme for discontinuous reciprocals

(97) RECIPROCATOR *baku* V (*deng(an)* RECIPROCEE)**11.4. Existential clauses**

In Papuan Malay, existential clauses are formed with the existential verb *ada* 'exist'. Structurally, two types of existential clauses can be distinguished: (1) intransitive clauses with one core argument and (2) transitive clauses with two core arguments.

In one-argument clauses, *ada* 'exist' precedes or follows the theme expression depending on the theme's definiteness. This clause type asserts the existence of an entity, expresses its availability, or, with definite themes, denotes possession. In two-argument clauses, *ada* 'links' the subject with the direct object. This clause type signals possession of an indefinite possessum. One-argument clauses are described in §11.4.1 and two-argument clauses in §11.4.2; §11.4.3 summarizes the main points of this section. (Negation of existential clauses is discussed in §13.1.1.2.)

11.4.1. One-argument existential clauses

In one-argument existential clauses, *ada* 'exist' precedes or follows the subject, or theme expression, such that 'S V' or 'V S'. These differences in word order serve to distinguish nonidentifiable themes from identifiable ones (Dryer 2007a: 241), as shown with the near contrastive examples in (98) and (99). When the theme is pragmatically indefinite or nonidentifiable, *ada* 'exist' precedes it, such that 'V S', as in (98). When the theme is definite or identifiable, *ada* 'exist' follows it, such that 'S V', as in (99).

One-argument existential clauses: 'V S' versus 'S V' word order

(98) ke mari, ada nasi
to hither exist cooked.rice
'(come) here, there's **cooked rice**' [081006-035-CvEx.0052]

(99) nasi ada itu, timba suda!
cooked.rice exist D.DIST spoon already
'**the cooked rice** is over there, just spoon (it)!' [081110-002-Cv.0051]

In existential clauses with indefinite or nonidentifiable themes, fronted *ada* 'exist' has two functions, as shown in (100) and (101). One is to convey the existence of an

entity, such that ‘a THEME exists’, as in (100), where *ada* ‘exist’ signals the existence of *babi* ‘pig’. A second function is to signal availability in the sense of ‘a THEME is available’, as in (101), where *ada* ‘exist’ asserts the availability of *kuskus* ‘cuscus’ and other game; see also the example in (98).

‘V S’ word order: Existence or availability of an indefinite/nonidentifiable theme

- (100) *ada babi di situ*
 exist pig at L.MED
 ‘there is a pig there’ [081006-023-CvEx.0004]
- (101) *maytua liat, wa, kantong itu fol, ada kuskus, ada*
 wife see wow! bag D.DIST be.full exist cuscus exist
tikus-tana, ada kepiting e, ketang, ada ikang
 spiny.bandicoot exist crab uh crab exist fish
 [After a successful hunt:] ‘(my) wife saw, ‘wow!, that bag is full’, there was **cuscus**, there were **bandicoots**, there were **crabs**, uh, **crabs**, there were **fish**’ [080919-004-NP.0031]

In existential clauses with definite or identifiable themes, post-posed *ada* ‘exist’ also has two functions, as demonstrated in (102) and (103). One function is to assert the existence of an already established theme, such that ‘the THEME exists’. This is the case in the elicited example in (102), which contrasts with the existential clause in (100), and it also applies to the example in (103); see also the example in (99).

‘S V’ word order: Existence of a definite/identifiable theme

- (102) *babi ada di situ*
 pig exist at L.MED
 ‘the pig is there’ [Elicited MY131105.004]
- (103) *saya ada*
 1SG exist
 [About a motorbike accident:] ‘I am alive’ [081015-005-NP.0024]

A second function of post-posed *ada* ‘exist’ is to designate possession of a definite or identifiable possessum, as shown in (104) and (105) (for existential clauses with an indefinite possessum see §11.4.2). To convey the notion of possession the theme is expressed in an adnominal possessive construction, such that ‘POSSESSIVE NP EXISTS’ or ‘POSSESSOR has the POSSESSUM’. The clause in (104), asserts the known existence of *bapa pu motor* ‘father’s motorbike’. In this adnominal possessive construction, the possessor noun phrase *bapa* ‘father’ modifies the identifiable possessum noun phrase *motor* ‘motorbike’; both constituents are linked with the possessive marker *pu* ‘POSS’ (for more details see Chapter 9). The same applies to the clause in (105) which signals possession of the definite possessum noun phrase *dana* ‘funds’.

'S V' word order: Possession of a definite/identifiable theme

- (104) **bapa pu motor** ada
 father POSS motorbike exist
 [Reply to a question:] 'father had a motorbike' (Lit. 'father's motorbike exists') [080919-002-Cv.0012]
- (105) kalo **sa pu dana** suda ada brarti sa undang ...
 if 1SG POSS fund already exist mean 1SG invite
 [About a planned meeting:] 'if I already had the funds, that means I would invite ...' (Lit. 'my funds already exist') [081010-001-Cv.0131]

If the theme can be inferred from the context it can also be omitted as in (106). In this example, the omitted theme is *bagiang dana* 'funding department'. Having been presented in the previous clause, it is now omitted, which leaves *ada* 'exist' as the sole constituent of the existential clause.

Omitted theme expression

- (106) Ø **ada**, de punya dana sendiri
 exist 3SG have fund be.alone
 '(the funding department) exists, it has its own funding' [081010-001-Cv.0174]

Definite or identifiable existential clauses also co-occur with prepositional phrases, such as the locational phrase *di situ* 'there' in (107). This clause can be analyzed in two ways. One analysis is that of an existential clause with a locational adjunct which gives additional information about the theme's current location. This analysis is substantiated by the contrastive example in (108), in which *di situ* 'there' is fronted to the clause-initial position. This possibility of fronting the prepositional phrase is typical for adjuncts. In (108) the fronting serves to emphasize the location (concerning the rather common elision of locative *di* 'at', see §10.1.5). An alternative analysis of (107) is that of a prepositional predicate clause with progressive reading. This analysis is substantiated with the (near) contrastive examples in (109) to (111). The example in (109) presents a nonverbal clause in which *di situ* 'there' serves as the predicate. The example in (110) shows how a prepositional predicate clause can undergo aspectual modification, as for instance with the prospective adverb *masi* 'still'. The example in (111) shows the progressive-marking function of existential *ada* 'exist' in verbal clauses (see also §5.4.1). When presented with both analyses, however, one of the consultants rejected the first analysis. Instead this consultant maintained that *ada* 'exist' in (107) has the same function as *masi* 'still' in (110), namely to modify the prepositional predicate *di situ* 'there'. The two analyses and the reading chosen by one of the consultants for the clauses in (107) require further investigation.

Alternative readings of clauses with definite/identifiable themes and post-posed prepositional phrases

- (107) de **ada** di situ, Martina **ada** di situ
 3SG exist at L.MED Martina exist at L.MED
 'she was (being) there, Martina was (being) there' [081109-001-Cv.0087]

- (108) ... *pace de tulis di kertas, suda, situ de ada,*
 man 3SG write at paper already L.MED 3SG exist
de su biking daftar
 3SG already make list
 [Enrolling for a sports team:] ‘[Herman gave his name,] the man wrote (it)
 on a paper, that’s it, there it **was!**, he (the man) had already made a list’
 [081023-001-Cv.0001]
- (109) *de di situ*
 3SG at L.MED
 ‘he (**was**) **there**’ [080922-010a-CvNF.0256]
- (110) *de masi di situ*
 3SG still at L.MED
 ‘he (was) **still** there’ [Elicited MY131105.002]
- (111) *de ada tidor di situ*
 3SG exist sleep at L.MED
 ‘he **is** sleeping there’ [Elicited MY131105.003]

11.4.2. Two-argument existential clauses

In two-argument existential clauses, *ada* ‘exist’ links both core arguments. This type of existential clause expresses possession of an indefinite possessum. As shown in (112) and (113), the possessor noun phrase takes the subject slot and the possessum noun phrase takes the direct object slot, such that ‘POSSESSOR EXISTS POSSESSUM’ or ‘POSSESSOR has a POSSESSUM’. In (112) *ada* ‘exist’ links the possessor *sa* ‘1SG’ with the possessum *ana* ‘child’ which gives the possessive reading ‘I have children’. The possessum can be encoded by a bare noun as in (112), or by a noun phrase such as *dia punya jin* ‘her genies’ in (113).²²³

- (112) *sa ada ana, jadi sa kasi untuk sa pu sodara*
 1SG exist child so 1SG give for 1SG POSS sibling
 ‘**I have children**, so I gave (one) to my relative’ [081006-024-CvEx.0010]
- (113) *prempuang iblis itu ada dia punya jin*
 woman devil D.DIST exist 3SG POSS genie
 [About evil spirits taking on the form of women:] ‘that woman spirit **has**
her (own) genies’ [081006-022-CvEx.0053]

Cross-linguistically, Stassen (2011b) identifies five major types of predicate possession: Have-Possessive, Oblique Possessive, Genitive Possessive, Topic Possessive, and Conjunctional Possessive. In terms of this classification, the

²²³ For an alternative strategy to express possession of an indefinite possessum see §12.2 (nominal predicates).

existential possessive constructions in (112) to (113) are best explained as Topic Possessives.²²⁴ According to Stassen (2009: 219),

[in] a standard Topic Possessive, the possessee is the subject of the be-verb.
[...] The possessor is constructed as a sentential topic and may or may not be marked as such, for example by sentence-initial position ...

Following this analysis, an alternative translation for the possessive construction *sa ada ana* 'I have children' in (112) would be: '(as for) me, children exist'.

11.4.3. Summary

In Papuan Malay, existential clauses are formed with the existential verb *ada* 'exist'. Syntactically, two clause types can be distinguished: intransitive clauses with one core argument, and transitive clauses with two core arguments. Table 6 gives an overview of the different constructions and their functions, with one-argument clauses given in (1) and two-argument clauses in (2).

In one-argument clauses, *ada* 'exist' precedes the theme expression when this is pragmatically indefinite or nonidentifiable, as in (1a). This construction conveys the existence or availability of an entity. When the theme is definite or identifiable, *ada* 'exist' follows it, as in (1b). This construction asserts the existence of an already established theme or denotes possession of a definite/identifiable possessum. In two-argument clauses, *ada* 'exist' links the subject and direct object arguments. This type of existential clause indicates possession of an indefinite possessum, as in (2).

Table 6: Overview of existential clause constructions

1. One-argument existential clauses			
a.	<i>ada</i> 'exist' precedes indefinite/nonidentifiable THEME		
	THEME <i>ada</i>	'a THEME exists'	Existence
		'a THEME is available'	Availability
b.	<i>ada</i> 'exist' follows definite/identifiable theme		
	THEME <i>ada</i>	'the THEME exists'	Existence
		'POSSESSOR has the POSSESSUM'	Possession
2. Two-argument existential clauses			
Possession of an indefinite possessum			
	SUBJECT <i>ada</i> OBJECT	'POSSESSOR has a POSSESSUM'	

²²⁴ As for the remaining four types of possessive constructions, the data in the present corpus indicate the following: (1) the Have-Possessive is formed with the ditransitive verb *punya* 'have' (see (1) in §9.1), and the Genitive Possessive is used to encode possessive relations in which the possessum has a definite reading (see (104) and (105) in §11.4.1; see also Chapter 9). The Oblique and Conjunctional Possessive do not exist in Papuan Malay.

11.5. Comparative clauses

Comparative clauses with gradable predicates involve “two participants being compared, and the property in terms of which they are compared” (Dixon 2008: 788), as illustrated in (114) and (115). The two participants being compared are the COMPAREE, that is, the object of comparison, and the STANDARD of comparison, in Dixon’s (2008) terminology. When the standard is expressed in a prepositional phrase, the preposition serves as the MARK of the comparison. The property attributed to the comparee and standard is the PARAMETER of comparison. The parameter is marked with an INDEX of comparison which signals the “ordering relation” between the comparee and the standard “to the degree or amount to which they possess some property” (Kennedy 2006: 690–691).

Degree-marking and identity-marking comparative clauses

- (114) COMPAREE INDEX PARAMETER MARK STANDARD
 dia **lebi** **tinggi** dari saya
 3SG more be.high from 1SG
 ‘he/she is **taller** than me’ (Lit. ‘be **more tall** from me’) [Elicited
 BR111011.002]

- (115) COMPAREE PARAMETER INDEX MARK STANDARD
 de **sombong** **sama** deng ko
 3SG be.arrogant be.same with 2SG
 ‘she’ll be **as arrogant as** you (are)’ (Lit. ‘be **arrogant same** with you’) [081006-005-Cv.0002]

Degree-marking clauses, expressing the notion of superiority, as in (114), inferiority, or superlative, are discussed in §11.5.1. Identity-marking clauses, signaling similarity, as in (115), or dissimilarity, are described in §11.5.2. Both clause types differ in terms of their word order. In degree-marking clauses the parameter follows the index, while in identity-marking clauses the parameter precedes the index or is omitted.

11.5.1. Degree-marking comparative clauses

Degree-marking comparative clauses convey the notions of superiority, inferiority, and superlative in the sense of ‘less than’, ‘more than’ and ‘most’, respectively, such that ‘COMPAREE is more/less/most PARAMETER (than STANDARD)’. In this type of comparative clause, the parameter follows the index, as illustrated in the superiority clause in (114). The following constituents serve as index: the grading adverb **lebi** ‘more’ signals superiority while **paling** ‘most’ marks superlative; the bivalent verb **kurang** ‘lack’ marks inferiority. The standard can be stated overtly, as in (116) and (117), or be omitted as in (118) to (121).

In clauses with an overt standard, the standard is expressed in a prepositional phrase which is introduced with the relative preposition **dari** ‘from’, as illustrated in (116) and (117). This preposition serves as the mark of the comparison. In the present corpus, however, degree-marking clauses with an overt standard are rare. The corpus contains only the two superiority clauses, one of which is given in (116).

Inferiority clauses with an overt standard are also possible, as shown with the elicited example in (117). Superlative clauses with an overt standard do not exist.

Superiority and inferiority clauses with overt standard

- (116) di klas itu dia **lebi besar** dari smua ana~ana di dalam
 at class D.DIST 3SG more be.big from all RDP~child at inside
 ‘in that class he’s **bigger** than all the (other) kids in it’ [081109-003-JR.0001]
- (117) saya **kurang tinggi** dari dia
 1SG lack be.high from 3SG
 ‘I am **shorter** than him/her’ (Lit. ‘**lack being tall**’) [Elicited BR111011.001]

Most often, the standard is elided in degree-marking clauses, as it is usually known from the discourse, as in the examples in (118) to (121). The superiority clause in (118) is part of a conversation about a village mayors’ meeting which had been delayed several times. The speaker criticizes the fact that the mayors accepted this delay in spite of the fact that they had more authority than the elided standard ‘those who caused the delay’. Likewise, in (119) to (121) the standard of comparison is known from the preceding discourse. Besides, the example in (121) shows that a superlative comparison can be reinforced with the degree adverb *skali* ‘very’.

Degree-marking clauses with omitted standard

- (118) kam punya fungsi wewenang **lebi besar** Ø
 2PL POSS function authority more be.big
 [About a mayors’ meeting:] ‘your function (and) authority is **bigger** (than that of those who caused the delay)’ [081008-003-Cv.0056]
- (119) ... karna itu **kurang bagus** Ø
 because D.DIST lack be.good
 ‘... because those (old ways) are **less good** (than our new ways)’ (Lit. ‘**lack being good**’) [080923-013-CvEx.0010]
- (120) puri tu **paling besar** Ø
 anchovy-like.fish D.DIST most be.big
 ‘that anchovy-like fish is **the biggest** (among the larger pile of fish)’ [080927-003-Cv.0002]
- (121) Aris **paling tinggi** skali Ø
 Aris most be.high very
 ‘Aris is **the very tallest** (among the two of you)’ [080922-001b-CvPh.0026]

In the present corpus, inferiority clauses formed with *kurang* ‘lack’ occur much less often than superiority clauses with *lebi* ‘more’. Instead of stating that the comparee is inferior to the standard in terms of a specific quality, as in (117), repeated as (122), speakers prefer to use a superiority clause which asserts that the comparee is superior to the standard, as in (114), repeated as (123).

Inferiority versus superiority clauses

- (122) saya **kurang tinggi** dari dia
 1SG lack be.high from 3SG
 ‘I am **shorter** than him/her’ (Lit. ‘**lack being tall**’) [Elicited BR111011.001]
- (123) dia **lebi tinggi** dari saya
 3SG more be.high from 1SG
 ‘he/she is **taller** than I am’ [Elicited BR111011.002]

Alternatively, the attested inferiority clauses could be interpreted as instances of mitigation used for politeness. This mitigating function is also illustrated with the inferiority clauses in (124) and (125): the speakers assert that the respective referents possess less of the positive qualities of being *ajar* ‘taught, educated’ or *hati-hati* ‘careful’, instead of stating that they are ‘impolite’ or ‘careless’.

Inferiority clauses: Mitigation function

- (124) Klara **kurang ajar**
 Klara lack teach
 ‘Klara was **impolite**’ (Lit. ‘**lack being educated**’) [081025-009a-Cv.0045]
- (125) itu karna **kurang hati-hati**
 D.DIST because lack RDP~liver
 ‘that (happened) because (I) was **careless**’ (Lit. ‘**lack being careful**’)
 [081011-017-Cv.0009]

For the most part, mitigating inferiority constructions are fixed expressions, such as the *kurang* ‘lack’ constructions presented in (119), (124) and (125).

Superlative constructions have the additional function of expressing ‘high degrees of parameter’, as illustrated in (126) and (127). In (126), the superlative construction *paling emosi* ‘feel most angry (about)’ conveys that the speaker was ‘very very angry’. Likewise in (127), the superlative construction signals ‘high degrees of parameter’. The superlative clauses in (126) and (127) do not involve a comparison, unlike the superlative constructions in (120) and (121).

Superlative clauses: ‘High degrees of parameter’

- (126) **paling emosi**
 most feel.angry(.about)
 ‘(I) **felt very very angry**’ (Lit. ‘**most angry**’) [081025-009a-Cv.0154]
- (127) de **paling takut**
 3SG most feel.afraid(.of)
 ‘he **felt very very afraid**’ (Lit. ‘**feel most afraid**’) [081115-001a-Cv.0060]

In summary, the scheme for degree-marking comparative constructions in Papuan Malay is ‘COMPAREE – INDEX – PARAMETER (– MARK – STANDARD)’.

11.5.2. Identity-marking comparative clauses

Identity-marking comparative clauses express similarity or dissimilarity between a comparee and a standard, in the sense of ‘same as’ or ‘different from’, respectively. In this type of comparative clause, the index follows the parameter, as illustrated with the similarity clause in (115), repeated as (128).

Identity-marking comparative clauses

- (128) COMPAREE PARAMETER INDEX MARK STANDARD
 de **sombong** **sama** deng ko
 3SG be.arrogant be.same with 2SG
 ‘she’ll be **as arrogant as** you (are)’ [081006-005-Cv.0002]

Similarity comparisons are presented in (129) to (134) and dissimilarity comparisons in (137) and (138).

In similarity clauses, the index is the stative verb *sama* ‘be same’, and the mark is the comitative preposition *deng(an)* ‘with’. The standard can be encoded in two ways. One option is to express it in a prepositional phrase, as in (128) to (130) (the second possibility is illustrated in (131) to (133)). In the similarity comparison in (129), the comparee and standard are considered to be similar in terms of a specific property, such that ‘COMPAREE is as PARAMETER as STANDARD’. If, however, the parameter is known from the context, it can be omitted, such that ‘COMPAREE is the same as STANDARD (in terms of an understood PARAMETER)’, as in (130).

Similarity clauses: Standard is expressed in a prepositional phrase

- (129) orang itu **ganas** **sama** deng
 person D.DIST feel.furious(.about) be.same with
 dong pu penunggu
 3PL POSS tutelary.spirit
 ‘those people were **as ferocious as** their tutelary spirits’ [081025-006-Cv.0288]
- (130) de Ø **sama** dengan kitong juga
 3SG be.same with 1PL also
 ‘she is also **the same as** we are (in terms of **being foreign**)’ [081010-001-Cv.0061]

Alternatively, the standard can be encoded as the clausal subject together with the comparee, such that ‘COMPAREE & STANDARD are equally PARAMETER’, as in (131) to (133). The standard and comparee can be encoded by a coordinate noun phrase, as in (131), or a plural personal pronoun, as in (132). Again, the parameter can be omitted if it is understood from the context, such that ‘COMPAREE & STANDARD are the same (in terms of an understood PARAMETER), as in (133).

Similarity clauses: Standard is encoded as the clausal subject together with the comparee

- (131) sa deng mace tu **cocok sama**
 1SG with woman D.DIST be.suitable be.same
 ‘I and that woman are **equally well-matched**’ [081011-022-Cv.0016]
- (132) kam dua pu mulut **besar sama**
 2PL two POSS mouth be.big be.same
 ‘the two of yours mouth is **equally big**’ [080922-004-Cv.0033]
- (133) prempuang laki~laki **Ø sama**
 woman RDP~husband be.same
 ‘women (and) men are **the same** (in terms of **having leadership qualities**)’
 [081011-023-Cv.0244]

Not only the parameter, but also the standard can be omitted if it is understood from the context. In (134), for instance, the omitted standard is ‘the Yali children’, while the omitted parameter has to do with the fact that both the comparee and standard are adventurous and would rather roam the forest than study.

Similarity clauses with omitted standard and parameter

- (134) misionaris~misionaris dong punya ana~ana juga **sama** saja
 RDP~missionary 3PL POSS RDP~child also be.same just
 ‘the missionaries’ children are just **the same** (as the Yali children in terms of **being adventurous**)’ [081011-022-Cv.0280]

Dissimilarity clauses are formed without an overt parameter. Instead, the comparee and standard are compared in terms of an understood attribute or quality, such that ‘COMPAREE is different from STANDARD (in terms of an understood PARAMETER)’, as illustrated in (137) to (138).

The index is the stative verb *laing* ‘be different’ or *beda* ‘be different’, and the mark is elative *dari* ‘from’ or comitative *deng(an)* ‘with’. Dissimilarity comparisons are typically formed with *laing dari* ‘be different from’ as in (135). They signal that the two participants are dissimilar in terms of their overall nature. If speakers want to indicate that the two participants diverge from each other in terms of specific attributes or features rather than their overall nature, they use a dissimilarity clause formed with *beda dengan* ‘be different with’. This is demonstrated with the elicited example in (136), which contrasts with the clause in (135). Another example is the dissimilarity clause in (137). Clauses formed with *beda dari* ‘be different from’ are also acceptable but considered to be Indonesian-like rather than typical Papuan Malay. Clauses formed with *laing dengan* ‘be different from’ are unacceptable.

Dissimilarity clauses: ‘COMPAREE is different from STANDARD’

- (135) sifat ini **laing dari** ko
 nature D.PROX be.different from 2SG
 ‘this disposition (of mine) is **different from** you (in every aspect)’ [081110-008-CvNP.0089]

- (136) sifat ini **beda** **dengan** ko
 nature D.PROX be.different with 2SG
 ‘this disposition (of mine) is **different from** you (in terms of some specific aspect)’ [Elicited BR111011.008]
- (137) orang Papua **beda** **dengan** orang Indonesia
 person Papua be.different with person Indonesia
 ‘Papuan are **different from** Indonesians (in terms of their physical features)’ [081029-002-Cv.0009]

If the comparee is understood from the context, it can be omitted, as shown in (138).

Dissimilarity clauses with omitted comparee

- (138) banyak, tapi Ø **beda** **dengan** Jayapura punya
 many but be.different with Jayapura POSS
 [Comparing different melinjo varieties:] ‘(there’re) lots (of melinjo), but (they’re) **different from** Jayapura’s (melinjo in terms of **being bitter**)’ [080923-004-Cv.0010]

In summary, the scheme for identity-marking comparative constructions in Papuan Malay is ‘(COMPAREE – PARAMETER) – INDEX – MARK – STANDARD’.

11.5.3. Summary

Papuan Malay employs two structurally distinct types of comparative constructions: (1) degree-marking clauses, and (2) identity-marking clauses.

Degree-marking clauses signal superiority, inferiority, or superlative. The following constituents serve as index: *lebi* ‘more’ (superiority), *kurang* ‘lack’ (inferiority), and *paling* ‘most’ (superlative). The mark is elative *dari* ‘from’. The index precedes the parameter. The standard together with its mark can be omitted. The basic scheme for this type of comparative clauses is given in (139).

Scheme for degree-marking clauses

- (139) COMPAREE INDEX PARAMETER (MARK STANDARD)

Identity-marking clauses express similarity or dissimilarity. In similarity clauses the index is *sama* ‘be same’ and the mark is comitative *dengan* ‘with’. In dissimilarity clauses, the index is *lain* ‘be different’ in combination with the mark *dari* ‘from’, or *beda* ‘be different’ in combination with the mark *dengan* ‘with’. Clauses formed with *lain dari* ‘be different from’ indicate overall dissimilarity, whereas clauses with *beda dengan* ‘be different from’ signal dissimilarity in terms of some specific features. In identity-marking clauses the index follows the parameter, which is optional. The standard is typically encoded in a prepositional phrase, with the preposition serving as the mark of comparison. This scheme for identity-marking clauses is illustrated in (140). In similarity clauses, the standard can also be encoded as the clausal subject together with the comparee, as shown in (141).

Schemes for identity-marking clauses

(140) (COMPAREE PARAMETER) INDEX MARK STANDARD

(141) COMPAREE & STANDARD (PARAMETER) INDEX

11.6. Summary

This chapter has described different types of verbal clauses. The most pertinent distinction is that between intransitive and transitive clauses. Given, however, that Papuan Malay verbs allow but do not require core arguments, there is no one-to-one correspondence between valency and transitivity. Trivalent verbs most often occur in monotransitive or intransitive clauses rather than in ditransitive clauses. Along similar lines, bivalent verbs are very commonly used in intransitive clauses.

Also discussed are causative clauses. They are the result of a valency-increasing operation. Papuan Malay causatives are monoclausal V_1V_2 constructions in which causative V_1 encodes the notion of cause while V_2 expresses the notion of effect. Papuan Malay has two causative verbs which usually produce “causer-controlled” causatives: trivalent *kasi* ‘give’, and bivalent *biking* ‘make’. While *kasi*-causatives stress the outcome of the manipulation, *biking*-causatives focus on the manipulation of circumstances, which leads to the effect. Causatives with *kasi* ‘give’ can have mono- or bivalent bases, while *biking*-causatives always have monovalent bases.

Another type of verbal clauses is reciprocal clauses, formed with the reciprocity marker *baku* ‘RECP’. In these clauses, two predications are presented as one, with two participants equivalently acting upon each other. In simple reciprocals, both participants are encoded as the clausal subject. In discontinuous reciprocals, the second participant is expressed with a comitative phrase. Both clause types typically result in a reduction in syntactic valency. The exception is simple constructions with a sociative reading which are characterized by valency retention.

Also discussed are existential clauses formed with the existential verb *ada* ‘exist’. Two clause types can be distinguished: intransitive clauses with one core argument, and transitive clauses with two core arguments. In one-argument clauses, *ada* ‘exist’ precedes or follows the subject, or theme, depending on its definiteness. Existential clauses express existence, availability, or possession.

A final type of verbal clauses discussed in this chapter is degree-marking and identity-marking comparative clauses. Degree-marking clauses denote superiority, inferiority, or superlative. In these clauses, the parameter follows the index, the comparee takes the subject slot, and the optional standard is expressed in a prepositional phrase. Identity-marking clauses designate similarity or dissimilarity. In these constructions, the parameter either precedes the index or is omitted. The comparee takes the subject slot while the standard is usually expressed with a prepositional phrase. In similarity clauses, the standard can also be encoded as the clausal subject together with comparee.

